



# The Targum of Samuel

EVELINE

VAN STAALDUINE-  
SULMAN

## The Targum of Samuel







STUDIES IN  
THE ARAMAIC INTERPRETATION  
OF SCRIPTURE

— MANAGING EDITOR —

PAUL V. M. FLESHER *University of Wyoming*

— EDITORIAL BOARD —

BRUCE CHILTON *Bard College*

WILLEM SMELIK *University College, London*

JOHANNES C. DE MOOR *Theological University, Kampen*

MOSHE BERNSTEIN *Yeshiva University*

JOSEP RIBERA *University of Barcelona*



Volume 1

# The Targum of Samuel



*by*

EVELINE  
VAN STAALDUINE-  
SULMAN

Brill



LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

**Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme**

Staalduine-Sulman, Eveline van :  
The Targum of Samuel / by Eveline van Staalduine-Sulman.  
– Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2002  
(Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture ; Vol. 1)  
ISBN 90-04-12164-1

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is also available

ISSN 1570-1336  
ISBN 90 04 12164 1

© Copyright 2002 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.*

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

*To Theo*

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Contents

---

	<i>Preface</i> .....	xiii
1	<i>Previous Work on Targum Samuel</i> .....	1
1.1	Introduction .....	1
1.2	Targum Jonathan: Witness and Translation .....	4
1.2.1	Paul Anton Lagarde .....	4
1.2.2	Wilhelm Bacher .....	5
1.2.3	Zacharias Frankel .....	8
1.2.4	Samuel Rolles Driver .....	11
1.2.5	Victor Aptowitzer .....	12
1.2.6	Paul Ernst Kahle .....	14
1.2.7	Pinkhos Churgin .....	17
1.2.8	Pieter Arie Hendrik de Boer .....	20
1.2.9	The Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest .....	21
1.2.9.1	Maier Vogel .....	22
1.2.9.2	Herman Helfgott .....	24
1.2.9.3	Yehuda Komlosh .....	26
1.2.9.4	Conclusion .....	28
1.3	Targum Jonathan: Text and Exegesis .....	29
1.3.1	Alexander Sperber .....	29
1.3.2	Samson H. Levey: Messianism and Dating .....	33
1.3.2.1	Messianism in TJon .....	33
1.3.2.2	The Date of TJon .....	35
1.3.3	Abraham Tal: The Date of TJon Revisited .....	37
1.3.4	Levy Smolar and Moses Aberbach .....	38
1.3.5	Translators of <i>The Aramaic Bible</i> .....	40
1.3.6	Emiliano Martínez Borobio .....	43
1.3.7	Rimon Kasher and the Tosefta-Targumim .....	44
1.4	Conclusions .....	45
2	<i>The Text of Targum Samuel</i> .....	49
2.1	Introduction .....	49
2.2	Errors in Sperber's Edition .....	51
2.3	Manuscripts .....	53
2.3.1	Selected Manuscripts with the Complete Text .....	54
2.3.2	Incomplete Manuscripts, Fragments and <i>Haftarot</i> ....	57

2.4	Targum Samuel as <i>Haftara</i> .....	59
2.4.1	The Annual Cycle .....	59
2.4.2	The Triennial Cycle .....	61
2.5	Recapitulation .....	62
3	<i>Exegetical and Translational Features</i> .....	63
3.1	Introduction .....	63
3.2	Rhetorical Devices .....	63
3.2.1	Introduction .....	63
3.2.2	Phonetic Figures .....	64
3.2.3	Structural Figures .....	66
3.2.3.1	<i>Repetitio</i> .....	66
3.2.3.2	<i>Adiectio</i> .....	70
3.2.3.3	<i>Detractio</i> .....	72
3.2.3.4	<i>Transmutatio</i> .....	73
3.2.3.5	<i>Immutatio</i> .....	74
3.2.3.6	Summary .....	75
3.2.4	Semantic Figures .....	76
3.2.4.1	<i>Repetitio</i> .....	76
3.2.4.2	<i>Adiectio</i> .....	77
3.2.4.3	<i>Detractio</i> .....	78
3.2.4.4	<i>Transmutatio</i> .....	79
3.2.4.5	<i>Immutatio</i> .....	81
3.2.4.6	Summary .....	85
3.3	Exegetical Techniques and Theological Motives .....	86
3.3.1	Exegetical Techniques and the <i>Middot</i> .....	87
3.3.2	Exegetical Techniques in Modern Literature .....	88
3.3.3	Classification Model .....	90
3.3.3.1	Formal Methods .....	90
3.3.3.2	Exegetical Techniques .....	91
3.3.3.3	Stimuli and Motives .....	92
3.3.4	Classification of Exegetical Techniques .....	93
3.3.4.1	Demand for a Meaningful Basic Text .....	94
3.3.4.2	Demand for Clarity in the Co-text .....	98
3.3.4.3	Demand for Harmony in the Broadest Co-text .....	109
3.3.4.4	Actualization to the Translator's Context .....	117
3.3.4.5	Reverence for God and His People .....	121
3.3.4.6	Retention of Poetical Devices .....	129
3.3.4.7	Copyists' Concepts .....	129
3.3.5	Targum Samuel and the <i>Tiqqune Sopherim</i> .....	131

3.4	Targum Samuel and the Hebrew Chronicles .....	132
3.5	Literalism in Targum Samuel .....	134
3.6	Recapitulation .....	137
4	<i>Semantic Studies in the Targum of Samuel</i> .	139
4.1	Introduction .....	139
4.2	The Rendering of Certain Hebrew Words .....	140
4.3	The Usage of Certain Aramaic Words .....	156
4.4	Conclusions .....	183
5	<i>A Commentary on TJon 1 Samuel</i> .....	185
5.1	Introduction .....	185
5.2	The Birth of Samuel (1 Samuel 1) .....	186
5.3	The Prophecy of Hannah (1 Samuel 2:1-10) .....	197
5.3.1	Hannah's Song as <i>Haftara</i> .....	197
5.3.2	Hannah's Song as Prophecy .....	198
5.3.3	Links with the Psalm of David (2 Sam. 22) .....	201
5.3.4	Links with the <i>Magnificat</i> and the <i>Benedictus</i> .....	203
5.3.5	Commentary .....	204
5.4	Serving in Shiloh (1 Samuel 2:11-36) .....	219
5.5	The Call of Samuel (1 Samuel 3) .....	229
5.6	The Capture of the Ark (1 Samuel 4) .....	235
5.7	In the Country of the Philistines (1 Samuel 5) .....	240
5.8	The Return of the Ark (1 Samuel 6:1-7:17) .....	245
5.9	The Demand for a King (1 Samuel 8) .....	258
5.10	Saul Anointed (1 Samuel 9:1-10:16) .....	263
5.11	The Chosen King 1 Samuel 10:17-27) .....	280
5.12	The Siege of Jabesh-gilead (1 Samuel 11:1-13) .....	283
5.13	Samuel's Farewell (1 Samuel 11:14-12:25) .....	288
5.14	Saul and Jonathan (1 Samuel 13-14) .....	299
5.15	Saul and the Amalekites (1 Samuel 15) .....	320
5.16	David Anointed, Saul Departed (1 Samuel 16) .....	337
5.17	Against Goliath (1 Samuel 17:1-18:5) .....	342
5.18	Saul's Jealousy (1 Samuel 18:6-30) .....	387
5.19	David's Flight to Samuel (1 Samuel 19) .....	395



5.20	David and Jonathan (1 Samuel 20) .....	401
5.21	The Priests of Nob (1 Samuel 21-22) .....	412
5.22	Saul Hunting David (1 Samuel 23) .....	423
5.23	David Spares Saul I (1 Samuel 24) .....	429
5.24	David and Abigail (1 Samuel 25) .....	435
5.25	David Spares Saul II (1 Samuel 26) .....	449
5.26	David's Stay with the Philistines (1 Samuel 27) .....	455
5.27	Saul's Last War I (1 Samuel 28) .....	457
5.28	David in Saul's Last War (1 Samuel 29-30) .....	464
5.29	Saul's Last War II (1 Samuel 31) .....	473
6	<i>A Commentary on 2 Samuel</i> .....	477
6.1	The Report of Saul's Death (2 Samuel 1:1-16) .....	477
6.2	David's Lament (2 Samuel 1:17-27) .....	480
6.3	David King of Judah (2 Samuel 2:1-7) .....	488
6.4	David Against Ish-bosheth (2 Samuel 2:8-3:5) .....	489
6.5	Abner Between Two Kings (2 Samuel 3:6-39) .....	494
6.6	The Report of Ish-bosheth's Death (2 Samuel 4) .....	503
6.7	The King and his Capital (2 Samuel 5) .....	506
6.8	The Ark of the LORD (2 Samuel 6) .....	515
6.9	David's House (2 Samuel 7) .....	523
6.10	Enemies and Friends (2 Samuel 8) .....	534
6.11	The Son of Jonathan (2 Samuel 9) .....	540
6.12	More Friends and Enemies (2 Samuel 10) .....	542
6.13	The Bathsheba Affair I (2 Samuel 11) .....	545
6.14	The Bathsheba Affair II (2 Samuel 12) .....	550
6.15	Amnon and Tamar (2 Samuel 13) .....	559
6.16	Absalom's Return (2 Samuel 14) .....	566
6.17	Absalom's Revolt Incited (2 Samuel 15-17) .....	573
6.18	Absalom's Revolt Put Down (2 Samuel 18-19) .....	592
6.19	The Aftermath of the Revolt (2 Samuel 20) .....	607
6.20	The Gibeonites' Revenge (2 Samuel 21:1-14) .....	615
6.21	Heroes and Adversaries (2 Samuel 21:15-22) .....	619

6.22	David's Psalm (2 Samuel 22) .....	634
6.22.1	The Date of TJon 2 Sam. 22:32 .....	634
6.22.2	The Structure of 2 Sam. 22 .....	639
6.22.3	Commentary .....	642
6.23	The Last Things (2 Samuel 23:1-8) .....	664
6.23.1	The Structure of TJon 2 Sam. 23:1-8 .....	664
6.23.2	Commentary .....	665
6.23.3	The Messiah in Tg. 1 Chron. 11:11 .....	683
6.23.4	Reward and Punishment in the Messianic Age .....	685
6.24	David's Heroes (2 Samuel 23:9-39) .....	686
6.25	Counting the People (2 Samuel 24) .....	692
7	<i>Conclusions</i> .....	701
7.1	Characteristics of TJon Samuel .....	701
7.1.1	Reverence for God and His People .....	701
7.1.2.	Reverence for the Sacred Text .....	702
7.1.3	Theology of Revelation .....	704
7.1.4	Susceptibility to Poetic and Rhetorical Devices .....	706
7.1.5	Unity .....	707
7.2	The Early History of TgSam .....	708
7.2.1	Exegetical Techniques .....	708
7.2.2	Exegetical Choices .....	709
7.2.3	Lectionary Cycles .....	711
7.3	Poetry, Prophecy, Eschatology, Messianism .....	713
7.3.1	Poetry .....	713
7.3.2	Prophecy, Eschatology, Messianism .....	715
	<i>Indices</i> .....	719
	Abbreviations .....	721
	Index of Authors .....	724
	Index of Subjects .....	732
	Index of Biblical References .....	739
	Index of Jewish Sources .....	760

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Preface

---

It has been thirteen years ago now that professor J.C. de Moor offered me the opportunity to work on the Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets. My first assignment was to learn Aramaic and to analyze every word of the Targum of Samuel. After the completion of the Samuel volumes it seemed dismal not to use all the experience for further research. It gives me great satisfaction to present this study on which I have worked during the past five years. I am grateful to Prof. De Moor for his inspiring and sympathetic guidance as supervisor, for his trust in my capacity to work independently, and for his support, including practicalities such as computing. It was a privilege to benefit from his scholarly experience and thorough knowledge of Semitic poetry and Targumic studies.

I wish to thank Dr W.F. Smelik, co-supervisor of this work, for his generous advice. His own dissertation served as an example in many ways. He was instrumental in the selection of the manuscripts. My treatment of various topics was enhanced by our conversations and by his critical notes, which tended to be short but influential.

Prof. R.P. Gordon graciously agreed to evaluate the manuscripts as an external referent. He offered me lists of improvements beyond his obligations, and I wish to express my gratitude to him.

I have benefited from the help and support of many friends and colleagues. Thanks are due to Dr A. Houtman, for her assistance and advice in collating the manuscripts. Thanks to Dr F. Sepmeijer, who taught me Syriac and never failed to ask how life was going; to Dr David Shepherd, who helped me think about the categories in Chapter 3; to Prof. R. Kasher for his willingness to correspond with me on the targumic version of 2 Samuel 21; to Prof. C. Houtman, who supplied me with biographical details; to Dr J.W. Wesselius for his interest in narrative patterns and poetic structures; to Dr Paul Sanders for his stimulating remarks on 2 Samuel 22; to Marian Smelik for her kindness and her research on TgPs. 18; to Marjolein Turner-Prins and her husband Martin Turner, who took the task of correcting my English; and to Frans de Boer for sharing his insight in making tables. A special word of gratitude is due to Johanna Tanja and Jaap Overeem who took care of some indexes.

I wish to thank Kampen theological university, and especially its board of governors, for appointing me Research Assistant and for the use of its resources. I also express my appreciation to the staff of the

library, who were always ready to help with every request, and to various other unknown librarians, who sent me copies of an enormous amount of articles.

I owe special thanks to Prof. W. Baars, who kindly gave me his copy of Herman Helfgott's doctoral thesis. That booklet was not available in the libraries in this part of Europe. On his suggestion, I will pass it on to the library of the Theologische Universiteit Kampen. I must also express appreciation to Gyöngyi Wiekeraad-Kovács, who corrected my translation of this Hungarian work, as well as of Vogel's thesis.

Most pages of this book have been written in the period I was privileged to work in one room with my colleague Hennie Marsman. She offered me her friendship, her insight in feminist theology, and several suggestions concerning literature on women in the Old Testament. She even assisted me in making the indexes. Equally stimulating was the friendship of Dr Geert W. Lorein, who once taught me Hebrew and suggested several books with interesting titles, mainly concerning the famous giant Goliath.

As this study has been completed, I am aware of the encouragement and support of my family. I must have inherited the deep interest in the Old Testament from my parents, just as my husband inherited his interest in history from his parents. Both couples showed their love and interest to both of us. My daughters Marion and Karen, and my son Simon have provided me with joy which has constituted a welcomed diversion from research and writing. I wish to dedicate the final product to Theo, my covenant partner. Without his undaunted support this project would not have been possible. His love embraced a family that grew during these years.

My final gratitude should go to the LORD who graciously commits himself to his servants. He inspired the writers and poets of the Biblical texts upon which Targum Jonathan is based. He also encourages people in all ages to consider these texts relevant to their lives:

*My support whose word supported me*

סמכני דהוה מימרייה סמך לי

(TJon 2 Sam. 22:3)

Kampen, February 2002

Eveline van Staalduine-Sulman

## Chapter 1

---

# Previous Work on Targum Samuel

### 1.1 Introduction

Like every other translation of the Bible, Targum Jonathan betrays the presuppositions of its translators, mainly through its deviations from the source text. Many of these deviations have been detected and described by earlier scholars of the Targum.

Some authors present these deviations simply as the result of translation technique with a minimum of theological motivation.<sup>1</sup> Others attempt to explain deviations from the source text mainly by comparing them with contemporary religion and theology, and refer to other Jewish sources sharing the same exegetical traditions.<sup>2</sup> In these books, however, the Jewish sources are used without discrimination. No attempt has been made to reduce the exegetical traditions to Palestinian or Babylonian rabbis, to older or younger sources.

From the Targum of Samuel exegetical techniques and theological motives can be derived, even though its translation can be regarded as fairly literal. Moreover, the literal style of TgSam, and the absence of theological expansions in most of its chapters, makes this book suitable for the study of the Targumic exegesis. Whereas explanations and expansions show the Targumic theology, literalness reveal the limits of the translator's freedom and the borderline between what was considered clear and proper and what was not. In spite of this, little research has been conducted into the Targums of the Former

---

<sup>1</sup>Z. Frankel, "Zu dem Targum der Propheten", *Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars "Fraenkel'scher Stiftung"*, Breslau 1872, 1-48; P. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, New Haven 1907 [1927], repr. New York (YOS.R, 14) 1980; Y. Komlosch, *המקרא באור הרמנים*, Tel Aviv 1973; A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b: The Targum and the Hebrew Bible, Leiden 1973; D.J. Harrington, A.J. Saldarini, "Introduction", in: *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (AramB, 10), Wilmington (DE) 1987, 1-15; P.S. Alexander, "Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scripture", in: M.J. Mulder, H. Sysling (eds), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRI, 1/1), Assen & Philadelphia 1988, 217-53.

<sup>2</sup>W. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum", *ZDMG* 28 (1874), 1-72; M. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve Targumának viszonya a maszórai szöveghez*, Budapest 1939; H. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve Targumának viszonya a maszórai szöveghez*, Budapest 1940; L. Smolar, M. Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, New York & Baltimore 1983; E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible; Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), 1988.

Prophets, whereas much research has been done into the theology of the latter prophets, of which Isaiah was the most popular.<sup>3</sup> The Targum of Samuel has only been discussed by three Hungarian scholars, and in relatively short publications.<sup>4</sup>

However, none of the studies enumerated above offer a comprehensive and systematic analysis of the Targum to the Books of Samuel as a translation. Therefore the major focus of the present study will be on the exegesis of the Targum of Samuel. Its purpose is twofold:

1. To catalogue the exegetical techniques and their underlying motives, theological or otherwise, and to explain the deviations from the source text as meaningful.
2. To relate the exegetical traditions of TgSam to Jewish sources, whether in the Talmudic and Midrashic tradition, or written down in older works such as the pseudepigrapha, Josephus, the New Testament or Pseudo-Philo, and, if possible, to recover the date and place of origin of these traditions.

The emphasis on the exegesis of TgSam entails that this study does not describe TJon in general. Since other authors have done so, there was no need to envisage such an ambitious enterprise.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, their results will be incorporated in the thematic chapters and in the

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the bibliography in B.D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum* (AramB, 11), Edinburgh 1987, xxxvi-liii.

<sup>4</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*; Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*; Y. Komlosch, "קווים אופייניים בהרגום הארמי לספר שמואל", in: B. Zvieli (ed.), שיחות במקרא: *Talks on Scripture*, Vol. 1, Jerusalem 1968, 182-83; Idem, "ספרי שמואל", in: *המקרא באור*, התרגום, 299-329.

<sup>5</sup>See, e.g., Frankel, "Zu dem Targum"; E. Deutsch, "On the Targums", in: *Literary Remains of the Late Emanuel Deutsch*, London [1874], 319-403; L. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, Frankfurt a.M. 21892, 65-86; A. Sperber, *Zur Sprache des Prophetentargums*, Bonn 1924; Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*; G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition* (StPB, 4), Leiden 1961; R. Le Déaut, *Introduction à la littérature targumique*, Rome 1966; J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretation of Scripture*, Cambridge 1969; A. Diez Macho, *El Targum: Introducción a las Traducciones aramais de la Biblia*, Barcelona 1972; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b: *The Targum and the Hebrew Bible*, Leiden 1973; Komlosch, *המקרא באור התרגום*; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*; Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible*; M. Taradach, *Le Midrash: Introduction à la littérature midrashique*, Genève, 1991, 49-160; A. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targumic Exegesis* (TSAJ, 27), Tübingen 1992; R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets* (VT.S, 51), Leiden 1994, 5-39; J. Trebolle Barrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible*, transl. W.G.E. Watson, Leiden 1998, 324-32.

commentary. Neither can various other themes in connection with TgSam be thoroughly investigated here. The value of TgSam as a textual witness,<sup>6</sup> the language of TgSam,<sup>7</sup> and its relationship to the other ancient versions<sup>8</sup> are discussed several times. These studies will be referred to, as necessary.

In this introductory chapter previous research into the exegesis of the Targum of Samuel is described. On account of the lack of research into the Targum of Samuel in particular, some publications on Targum Jonathan in general are also discussed, if they are dealing with parts, or special characteristics, of TgSam.<sup>9</sup> This chapter is arranged in loose chronological order. In some instances publications on one subject are

---

<sup>6</sup>V. Aptowitzer, *Das Schriftwort in den rabbinischen Literatur, I–V* (LBS), ed. S. Loewinger, New York 1970; A.B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel*, Vol. 3, Leipzig 1910, 162–346; S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, Oxford<sup>3</sup> 1913; O.H. Boström, *Alternative Readings in the Hebrew of the Books of Samuel*, Rock Island (IL) 1918; M. Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik* (ATA, 8/3), Münster 1937; P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel i–xvi*, Amsterdam (diss.) 1938; Idem, “1 Samuel xvii: Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions”, *OTS* 1/1 (Leiden 1941), 79–103; Idem, “Research into the Text of 1 Samuel xviii–xxxi”, *OTS* 6 (1949), 1–100; Idem, *Liber Samuelis* (BHS, 5), Stuttgart 1976–1977; D. Barthélemy (ed.), *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*, t. 1, Fribourg & Göttingen 1982. This field of investigation is summarized by A. van der Kooij, “De tekst van Samuel en het tekstkritisch onderzoek: Historisch overzicht en stand van zaken”, *NedThT* 36 (1982), 177–204.

<sup>7</sup>M.Z. Kadari, “The Use of ׀ Clauses in the Language of Targum Onkelos”, *Textus* 3 (1963), 36–59; Idem, “Studies in the Syntax of Targum Onkelos”, *Tarbiz* 32 (1963), 232–51; A. Tal, לשון החרגים לנביאים ראשונים ומעמדה בכלל ימי הארמיה, Tel Aviv 1975.

<sup>8</sup>For a comparison of TgSam with the Peshitta, see E. Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung des ersten Buches Samuelis und ihr Verhältniss zu MT., LXX und Trg.*, Berlin 1897; C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL, 11), Leiden 2001. For a comparison of TgSam with the Vulgata, see V. Aptowitzer, “Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata”, *ZAW* 29 (1909), 241–52; F. Stummer, “Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas”, *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3–30; Idem, “Beiträge zu dem Problem Hieronymus und die Targumim”, *Bib.* 18 (1937), 174–81; S. Klein, “Targumische Elemente in der Deutung biblischer Ortsnamen bei Hieronymus”, *MGWJ* 83 (1939), 132–41; C.T.R. Hayward, “Saint Jerome and the Aramaic Targumim”, *JSS* 32 (1987), 105–23. For a comparison of TgSam with the Septuagint, see V. Aptowitzer, “Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata”, *ZAW* 29 (1909), 241–52; L.H. Brockington, “Septuagint and Targum”, *ZAW* 66 (1954), 80–85; J.P. Brown, “The Septuagint as a Source of the Greek Loan-words in the Targums”, *Bib.* 70 (1989), 194–216.

<sup>9</sup>Obviously it would be counterproductive to discuss every short note on a single passage in TgSam at length in this general survey. These and other publications will be used in the commentary of the text in Chapter 5–6.



discussed together in order to avoid repetitions. We start in 1872, the year in which a unique edition of TJon appeared, the edition of the Targum in the *Codex Reuchlinianus*, not based on the Bomberg Bible and with many marginal notes.<sup>10</sup>

## 1.2 Targum Jonathan: Witness and Translation

### 1.2.1 Paul Anton de Lagarde

Paul Anton de Lagarde, born Paul Anton Boetticher in 1827, was a German Protestant orientalist and political philosopher. Opting for an academic career, he became a *Privatdozent* at Halle, receiving no standing loan but a student's fee only. In 1869 he was appointed professor of oriental philosophy in Göttingen, filling the vacancy of G.H.A. Ewald. Lagarde died in 1891.

A nationalist and conservative philosopher, Lagarde criticized materialism and strove for the unification of the entire German nation through the adoption of a nationalistic Christianity.<sup>11</sup> His philosophy "evolved into an ideology extolling the primacy of the German *Volk* over all other nations, and spurning the Jews",<sup>12</sup> whom he held responsible for the materialism and the lack of nationalistic and ethical feelings of his times. As a professor of oriental philosophy, Lagarde was highly interested in Biblical textual criticism and edited several ancient translations of the Bible for that purpose, e.g. the Targum of the *Codex Reuchlinianus*<sup>13</sup> and part of the Septuagint.

Although only an unvocalized rendering of the text was given,

---

<sup>10</sup>Of course, the text of TJon had been published in several editions from the first Bomberg Bibles on, which served as models for the later editions, but the manuscript basis of these editions is not always known. For a survey of editions and translations which appeared from the 16th to 18th century, see J.H. Petermann, *Brevis linguae chaldaicae grammatica*, Berolini 21872, 82-83, 85-87. See L. Díez Merino, "Targum Manuscripts and Critical Editions", in: D.R.G. Beattie, M.J. McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 68-75.

<sup>11</sup>See e.g. P. de Lagarde, *Deutsche Schriften*, Göttingen 31892. A. Rosenberg, one of the leading philosophers in the early days of National Socialism, based his idea of "Positives Christentum" on the concepts of De Lagarde. Rosenberg's Positive Christianity was a mixture of Nordic and Christian values, in which the Crucifixion was substituted by the spirit of the hero. See also L.L. Snyder, *Encyclopedia of the Third Reich*, London 1976, s.vv. "Lagarde, Paul Anton de" and "Positive Christianity".

<sup>12</sup>*EJ*, s.v. "Lagarde, Paul Anton de"

<sup>13</sup>P. de Lagarde, *Prophetae chaldaice e fide codicis Reuchliniani*, Leipzig 1872. In 1956 Alexander Sperber published a *fascimile* edition of the *Codex Reuchlinianus* in his series *The Pre-Masoretic Bible*, Copenhagen 1956-1959.

Lagarde's edition of the *Codex Reuchlinianus* gave a strong impulse to the study of the Targum. Before this edition, scholars had mainly used one of the printed editions from the sixteenth or seventeenth century, and had not been fully aware of the differences in the textual tradition of the Targum. The marginal notes in the *Codex Reuchlinianus*, however, supplied alternative translations, commentaries and additions to the Targumic text. Moreover, the running text was older than any other manuscript known so far: it had been completed by Serach ben Jehuda in 1105.

In the preface to his edition Lagarde compared the text of the *Codex Reuchlinianus*, including the marginal notes, with that of the Bomberg Bible of 1515–17 (pp. v-xlii). After this comparison he suggested some emendations of the Hebrew text, based on the Aramaic translation in the codex (pp. xlvi-li). Since he gave a modest list of emendations, among them only five for the Books of Samuel, the conclusion must be drawn that he regarded most deviations from the source text as interpretative translations or stylistic peculiarities.<sup>14</sup>

In the same year 1872 and later Lagarde collated and examined several manuscripts of the Jewish community at Erfurt. One of these manuscripts consisted of the Pentateuch with *haftarot*, both in Hebrew and in Aramaic, according to Lagarde copied in the thirteenth century. The Aramaic version of 2 Sam. 22:1-14, 50-51 contained many variants, which were edited by Lagarde,<sup>15</sup> but were not used in the edition of Sperber.<sup>16</sup>

### 1.2.2 Wilhelm Bacher

After the edition of the *Codex Reuchlinianus* by Paul de Lagarde, Wilhelm Bacher made a thorough analysis of its text. Born in Liptó-Szent-Miklós (Hungary, Austro-Hungary, in present Slovakia) in 1850, Bacher was ordained rabbi of Szeged (Hungary) in 1876. One year later he became professor of Bible at the newly founded Rabbinical Seminary in Budapest. From 1907 until the end of his life in 1913 he was head of the Seminary. In those years he was consulting editor for the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* as well. Bacher dealt with Biblical exegesis, Hebrew philology, aggada and midrash.<sup>17</sup>

During his years of study Bacher made an analysis of the Targum

<sup>14</sup>The five emendations for the Hebrew text of Samuel will be discussed in the commentary in Chapter 4.

<sup>15</sup>In his article "Hebräische handschriften in Erfurt", which was printed in his *Symmicta*, Göttingen 1877, 129-64. The variants were compiled on pp. 139-40.

<sup>16</sup>These variants will be discussed in the Commentary in Ch. 4.

<sup>17</sup>More details of Bacher's life can be found in *EJ s.v.* "Bacher, Wilhelm".

text of the *Codex Reuchlinianus*, and published his results in 1874.<sup>18</sup> In categorising the different variant readings in the margins of the text, Bacher paid due attention to the different categories within these marginal notes. The categories חרומים ירושלמי ('Targum Jerushalmi', Sperber's f<sub>6</sub>)<sup>19</sup> and ספר אחר ('another book', Sperber's f<sub>5</sub>) predominantly give aggadic explanations. Bacher proved, however, that despite their introduction as *Targum Jerushalmi*, many of these explanations can be found in the Babylonian Talmud. In the marginal note to 1 Sam. 3:14 it becomes even clear that the *Targum Jerushalmi* preferred the explanation of the Babylonian Talmud to the Palestinian one: the sins of the house of Eli might be forgiven by studying Law and practising charity (cf. RHsh. 18a; San. 108a), and not by prayer alone (cf. yRHsh. 2:5; ySan. 1:2).<sup>20</sup> Bacher refrained from stating that these aggadic explanations were all derived from Babylonian sources and had no Palestinian background.<sup>21</sup>

Other categories of marginal notes do not give aggadic explanations, except for three instances introduced with לישנא אחרניא ('another expression', Sperber's f<sub>3</sub>).<sup>22</sup> The other instances introduced with לישנא אחרניא include exegetical variations or paraphrastic readings, usually less literal than the translation in the running text. The marginal notes introduced with ואיה דאמרי ('there are some who say', Sperber's f<sub>2</sub>) or concluded with פליגי ('different opinion', Sperber's f<sub>4</sub>) consist of exegetical variants. Conscientiously, Bacher did not attempt to describe the variant categories as homogeneous, but kept the divergences in view.

Even though Bacher recognizes the sometimes remarkable closeness of the marginal notes in the CR to Babylonian rabbinic tradition, he is convinced of their Palestinian origin and their Palestinian

<sup>18</sup>W. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum", *ZDMG* 28 (1874), 1-72. Additional information can be found in G. Klein, "Bemerkungen zu Herrn Dr. Bacher's 'Kritischen Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum'", *ZDMG* 29 (1875), 157-61; W. Bacher, "Gegenbemerkungen und Nachträge das Prophetentargum betreffend", *ZDMG* 29 (1875), 319-20; Idem, "Notes on the Critique of the Text to the Targum of the Prophets", *JQR* 11 (1899), 651-55.

<sup>19</sup>Cf. A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 2: The Former Prophets According to Targum Jonathan, Leiden 1959, ix.

<sup>20</sup>Bacher mentioned RHsh. 18a only. G. Klein, "Bemerkungen", 157-58 added the others. Cf. also Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 76.

<sup>21</sup>W. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 58. Smelik proved that several marginal notes, introduced with the words חרומים ירושלמי, do have a Palestinian origin, cf. his *The Targum of Judges*, 406-12 (on Judg. 5:4); 414-30 (on Judg. 5:5); 561 (on Judg. 12:7).

<sup>22</sup>W. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 28, n. 2. These three instances are 1 Sam. 11:11; 12:2; 21:8 (the latter is not included in the edition of Sperber).

dialect.<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, Paul Kahle seems to have a good point in drawing attention to the fairly large proportion of Greek loan-words which would be easier to explain if the Tosefta-Targum came from Palestine.<sup>24</sup> However, Greek and Latin loan-words may occur in any of the dialects written in the Hellenistic age.<sup>25</sup>

In regard to the running translation of the *Codex Reuchlinianus*, Bacher is more prejudiced. He states, "Usually one may assume that the rendering in *Codex Reuchlinianus* is also the original",<sup>26</sup> although he admits that the rendering of CR is "strangely enough" not always in conformity with the normal translational rules of the Targum.<sup>27</sup> In some instances his prejudice against the younger editions (the two Bomberg Bibles and the Buxtorf edition) is very clear. For example, the editions are accused of adding the conjunction "and" before וּפָקֵן (1 Sam. 2:26), whereas Bacher fails to notice that CR erroneously omitted the same conjunction before וּפָקֵה in the same verse.<sup>28</sup> This prejudice has led to confusing statements: Bacher asserts that the word וּפָקֵה from CR must be added in the editions (1 Sam. 27:9), whereas he has to admit later that the option of the editions in the same verse, the addition of the word וּפָקֵה, is the best rendering.<sup>29</sup>

The differences between the editions and *Codex Reuchlinianus* are categorized as well. Bacher reports omissions, scribal errors, erroneous interpretations made by copyists, additions to complement or to specify the meaning of a phrase, exegetical variants, and Hebraisms. Bacher's main conclusion here is that copyists still changed, or added to, the Aramaic text after the completion of the Targum. A second conclusion, based on the supposition that the rendering in the *Codex Reuchlinianus* is the most original, is that an inclination towards Hebraisms can be detected in the course of time. In the light of all manuscripts collated in the edition of Sperber this conclusion appears to be premature. One can indeed detect an inclination towards

<sup>23</sup>W. Bacher, "Targum", *JE*, Vol. 12, New York & London 1906, 61, "Linguistically they [the glosses, EvS] are Palestinian in origin". Cf. "Kritische Untersuchungen", 58.

<sup>24</sup>P.E. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, Bd. 2, Stuttgart 1959, 10\*. In addition to his examples he might have pointed to 1 Sam. 2:14 f<sub>2</sub> וּפָקֵה; 2 Sam. 3:33 f<sub>3</sub> וּפָקֵה; 2 Sam. 4:2 f<sub>2</sub> וּפָקֵה; 2 Sam. 18:14 f<sub>3</sub> וּפָקֵה.

<sup>25</sup>Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 69, n. 400.

<sup>26</sup>W. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 51: "Gewöhnlich darf man annehmen, dass die Uebersetzung in C. Reuchl. auch die ursprüngliche ist".

<sup>27</sup>W. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 52: "merkwürdigerweise".

<sup>28</sup>W. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 54. Cf. Bacher's discussion of 1 Sam. 2:2 and 2 Sam. 5:8 on p. 55 where both the editions and CR are not in accordance with MT, and still the rendering of CR is preferred to that of the editions.

<sup>29</sup>W. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 39 and 52.

Hebraisms in the editions, but should not rush to a conclusion about the date of these Hebraisms.<sup>30</sup>

### 1.2.3 Zacharias Frankel

In the year in which the edition of the *Codex Reuchlinianus* saw the light, Zacharias Frankel wrote an article on the characteristics of Targum Jonathan, though without using the new edition of the *Codex Reuchlinianus*.<sup>31</sup> Born in Prague in 1801, Frankel studied philosophy, natural sciences and philology in Budapest (1825–1830). After his graduation he was ordained district rabbi and worked as such in Litoměřice (Bohemia). He was one of the first rabbis in Bohemia to preach in German. Frankel was appointed chief rabbi of Dresden in 1836 and was very active in the work of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, a scientific movement which stimulated research in Jewish literature and history. For that purpose he founded the periodical *Monatschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* in 1852 and cooperated in the foundation of the Jewish Theological Seminary at Breslau two years later. He published mostly on Biblical-Talmudic law, the historical development of the halakha and Talmudic exegesis.<sup>32</sup>

Whereas Frankel had uttered his opinion in the founding issue of *MGWJ* that the emancipation and the acceptance of the Jewish people in Europe was almost complete,<sup>33</sup> he felt urged to become one of the thinkers in the “Alliance Israélite Universelle”, founded in Paris in 1860, to promote the emancipation and moral progress of the Jews, and to assist Jews suffering from anti-Semitism.<sup>34</sup>

In his article of 1872 Frankel describes the historical background of TJon and TO. Since the translational style of Aquila is different from that of Onqelos, Frankel concluded that TO was not made by Aquila.

<sup>30</sup>Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 336.

<sup>31</sup>Z. Frankel, “Zu dem Targum der Propheten”, *Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars “Fraenkel’scher Stiftung”*, Breslau 1872, 1-48.

<sup>32</sup>For historical details of the life of Z. Frankel, see *EJ s.v.* “Frankel, Zacharias”; for the historical details of the Seminary at Breslau, see G. Kisch, *Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar (Fraenckelscher Stiftung) in Breslau 1854–1938: Gedächtnisschrift*, Tübingen 1963.

<sup>33</sup>Frankel introduced the periodical for the purpose of stimulating the Jewish people to dedication, while the “separateness of the Jew in Germany is now—only one state makes an exception—disregarded. (...) And faith in fidelity and reason forbids to utter concern about the future here”. Z. Frankel, “Einleitendens”, *MGWJ* 1 (1852), 2-3, cited by R. Schaeffler, “Die Wissenschaft des Judentums in ihrer Beziehung zur allgemeinen Geistesgeschichte im Deutschland des 19. Jahrhunderts”, in: J. Carlebach, *Wissenschaft des Judentums: Anfänge der Judaistik in Europa*, Darmstadt 1992, 113-31, esp. 129.

<sup>34</sup>*EJ s.v.* “Alliance Israélite Universelle”.

Besides, TO was known neither in the Palestinian Talmud nor in the Midrash Rabbah on Genesis and Leviticus.<sup>35</sup> On the other hand, renderings from TO can be found in the Babylonian Talmud. Frankel supposes that Rab encouraged the making of a literal translation into Aramaic after the example of Aquila's translation, which he had seen during his stay in Palestine.<sup>36</sup> R. Jose, leader of the Academy at Pumbedita, might have made the translation of the Prophets in the fourth century, as is supported by the Bavli.<sup>37</sup>

Subsequently Frankel enumerates some characteristics of TJon and discusses its relationship to Targum Onqelos. He concludes that the translation of TJon resembled that of TO, although differences were present. Some verses, though differing in the original Hebrew, even show literal similarity in Aramaic, e.g. the phrase 'confiscate someone's donkey' in 1 Sam. 12:3 and Num. 16:15.<sup>38</sup> Frankel gives an erroneous example of a difference between TJon and TO. He mentions the translation of the verb זָבַח, 'to sacrifice', with הָרַם in 1 Sam. 11:7,<sup>39</sup> but in this verse MT uses the verb נָחַץ, 'to press down', which is similarly rendered in 1 Kgs 18:23, 33. Frankel rightly states that the Hebrew verb זָבַח, 'to sacrifice', is usually rendered with רָבַח or רָבַס. Only in 1 Kgs 19:21 the Hebrew verb זָבַח is rendered with the verb הָרַם. In this case, however, the context does not refer to any offering.

Other characteristics of TJon, shared with TO, were also reviewed in the rest of the article. TJon frequently substitutes the passive voice for the active one as well as the plural for the singular (p. 16). It avoids repetition of an expression in one verse (p. 17). Thus the double verb נוּס, 'to flee', in 2 Sam. 4:4 is once rendered with אָפַק, and once with עָרַק.<sup>40</sup> On the other hand, similar expressions in separate verses are rendered identically, which is also the case in the Septuagint (p. 18-19). TJon uses different expressions in regard to God and human beings (p. 22). Thus the Israelites fear "before God", but "from the words of Samuel" (1 Sam. 12:18). TJon avoids every ambiguity, es-

<sup>35</sup>Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 6. Cf. also Z. Frankel, "Nachtrag zu der diesjährigen Programmarbeit: 'Zu dem Targum der Propheten'", *MGWJ* 21 (1872), 192, where he states that Jerome could not mention TO, because he studied in Palestine where TO was not present at that time.

<sup>36</sup>Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 9.

<sup>37</sup>Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 10. Frankel was not the first to defend a Babylonian origin of the TO and TJ, cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 15.

<sup>38</sup>Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 13, n. 1

<sup>39</sup>Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 15.

<sup>40</sup>Also in TO, cf. Z. Frankel, "Nachtrag zu der diesjährigen Programmarbeit: 'Zu dem Targum der Propheten'", *MGWJ* 21 (1872), 192. See below, Ch. 4, s.v. אָפַק, and literature there.

pecially in regard to God (p. 23). The pronouncement of God that He will be a father for David, is rendered as a simile: "I will be as a father for you" (2 Sam. 7:14). The deeds and words of the Biblical heroes are rendered very decorously. They do not sin unwillingly and are always indicated with respectful terms (p. 24). The fact that the abusive language of David against himself is rendered euphemistically (1 Sam. 24:15; 26:20) and that the same expression against Shimei, David's enemy, is rendered literally (2 Sam. 16:9) demonstrates that the Tg defends the heroes but not the sinners. Sometimes double translations appear (p. 39). Such is the case in 1 Sam. 17:25, where  $\text{וְשָׂרָא}$  is rendered with "free people and commanders".<sup>41</sup> A Targumic translation technique which does not occur in the books of Samuel is the spreading of pronouncements across different persons (p. 35). An example of this technique can be found in TgJer. 8:20-22.

Frankel demonstrates that several techniques could be used in one translation. For example, God's pronouncement that He was with Moses is consistently rendered with "my Word was in Moses' aid" (Josh. 1:5). But the following pronouncement that He would equally be with Joshua is not rendered in this way in order to avoid the double use of this expression in one verse: "I will be with you" (p. 24).

Finally, Frankel proposes that the paraphrastic renderings in the poetical parts of Samuel are later insertions. He argues that the literal rendering could be recognized as a separate unit at the end of the verse. Such is the case in 1 Sam. 2:1-3 and 2 Sam. 22:1 (pp. 41-43). In all other poetic verses, however, Frankel is not able to demonstrate a separate treatment of the literal and paraphrastic renderings.

The classification of Frankel is very useful, though neither systematic nor complete.<sup>42</sup> His classification is not systematic, because he mixes translation techniques and theological concepts. For example, Frankel mentions the substitution of the passive for the active voice without referring to underlying theological motives (p. 16), whereas he does recognize the theological motive behind the avoidance of ambiguity in regard to God with the technique of rendering a simile (p. 23). Frankel's classification is not complete, because he omits the identification of anonymous persons and the answering of rhetorical questions. On the other hand, Frankel makes his readers aware of exceptions to the rules, and the use of several conflicting translation techniques in one verse.

<sup>41</sup>This double translation is only present in the Bomberg Bible of 1515-17.

<sup>42</sup>Cf. A. Geiger, "Das Thargum zu den Propheten", *JZWL* 10 (1872), 198-201, esp. 199, who accuses Frankel of using old material and being very unsystematic.

### 1.2.4 Samuel Rolles Driver

Samuel Rolles Driver, who lived from 1846 until 1914, has been important for the textual criticism of the Books of Samuel. He studied Arts and Mathematics in Winchester and at New College, Oxford, and was a Fellow (from 1870) and a Tutor (from 1875). In October 1883 he was appointed regius professor of Hebrew at Christ Church, Oxford. For this appointment he had been ordained priest in January 1883.<sup>43</sup> Driver was the first in England who introduced Wellhausen's theories on Old Testament criticism, though he was a moderate adherent and admitted that the results could not be too certain because of the complexity of the Old Testament material.<sup>44</sup> Because of his interest in textual criticism, evident from his *Introduction*<sup>45</sup> and critical commentaries<sup>46</sup>, he was asked to cooperate in the second edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* of Kittel.<sup>47</sup>

In 1889 Driver published his *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, which was revised and enlarged in 1913.<sup>48</sup> This book was meant as "a contribution to the philology and textual criticism of the Old Testament."<sup>49</sup> For that reason, Driver compared the MT with the ancient translations in search of the original Hebrew reading. He depends on the earlier studies of Thenius, Wellhausen and Klostermann, of which he respected Wellhausen the most: "his judgement is rarely at fault".<sup>50</sup>

A great part of his "Introduction" is used to give a description of the character of the ancient versions, among them TJon. This Targum "deviates but rarely from MT".<sup>51</sup> Two features of TgSam are mentioned especially: (1) the tendency to soften or remove anthropomorphisms with reference to God; and (2) the tendency to paraphrase.

<sup>43</sup>J. Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany*, London 1984, 273, n. 5.

<sup>44</sup>C. Houtman, *Der Pentateuch: Die Geschichte seiner Erforschung neben einer Auswertung*, Kampen 1994, 121, n. 48 and 369.

<sup>45</sup>S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature to the Old Testament*, Edinburgh<sup>9</sup>1913.

<sup>46</sup>He was one of the editors of the series *The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments*, Edinburgh, in which he also wrote several volumes.

<sup>47</sup>R. Kittel (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica*, Lipsiae<sup>2</sup>1909, ii. Driver edited the books Deuteronomy, Joshua and Ecclesiastes. For more biographical details, cf. J.W. Rogerson, "Driver, Samuel Rolles (1846-1914)", in: *TRE*, Bd. 9, Berlin & New York 1982, 190-92.

<sup>48</sup>S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, Oxford 1889,<sup>2</sup>1913.

<sup>49</sup>Driver, *Notes*, v.

<sup>50</sup>Driver, *Notes*, vii.

<sup>51</sup>Driver, *Notes*, lxix.



In this very rough classification Driver compiles several deviations in TgSam. The first category consists of examples with the preposition ׀ק and the passive construction “is revealed before Thee” instead of the active “Thou seest” (1 Sam. 1:11). The second category contains diverse specimens of paraphrastic renderings.

In the practice of his commentary Driver shows himself indeed a moderate adherent of Wellhausen’s theories. The ancient translations are not often used to correct the Masoretic Text, but he frequently cites these translations to show the variety of solutions, suggested by the ancient exegetes. By comparing these solutions Driver is able to detect the problems within the Hebrew text, and sometimes to suggest his own solution. In many cases he prefers the Hebrew text, and gives a convincing exegesis. And although the Qumranic and Ugaritic findings are not incorporated in his commentary, his *Notes* are still worth reading.

### 1.2.5 Victor Aptowitz

A procedure for analyzing the Targum text, totally different from Frankel’s, was followed by Victor (Avigdor)<sup>52</sup> Aptowitz. He had no intention of investigating the translational style of the Targum, but used the text as a source for textual criticism. He published his results in four articles, in which he noted divergent Biblical quotations in the Talmudim, the Midrashim, and the medieval commentators as well.<sup>53</sup>

Aptowitz was born in Tarnopol (Galicia, Austro-Hungary, in the present Slovakia) in 1871 and studied at the University and the Jewish Theological Seminary of Vienna. From 1909 until his emigration to Palestine in 1938 he taught Biblical exegesis, aggada and religious philosophy in Vienna. During those years he also taught Talmud at the Hebrew Teachers’ College in Vienna and reviewed Talmudic literature

---

<sup>52</sup>Since 1837 Jews in Austro-Hungary were only allowed to be a rabbi on the condition that they could register the names of their people in Hungarian or in German. Therefore, the Jews used a Hungarian or German name, which resembled their Jewish name, for public purposes.

<sup>53</sup>V. Aptowitz, “Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur I: Prolegomena”, “II: Samuel I”, *Sitzungsbericht der kaiserlichen Akademie, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, Bd. 153, Abhandlung 6 (Vienna 1906); Bd. 160, Abhandlung 7 (Vienna 1908); “III: Samuel II”, *XVIII. Jahresbericht der Israelitisch-Theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien für das Schuljahr 1910/1911*, Vienna 1911; “IV: Josua-Richter”, *XXII. Jahresbericht der Israelitisch-Theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien für das Schuljahr 1914/1915*, Vienna 1915. In 1970 these articles were collected by S. Loewinger and reprinted in V. Aptowitz, *Das Schriftwort in den rabbinischen Literatur, I-IV* (LBS), New York 1970. In the present book the reprint is referenced.

in the *MGWJ*. Aptowitzer died in Jerusalem in 1942.<sup>54</sup>

In his student days (in 1906) Aptowitzer published his first article on Biblical quotations in Targum, Talmud, Midrash and commentaries. It consisted of the exposition of his methods and a few examples of divergencies in the translations and quotations from the Masoretic Text. Encouraged by scholars who expressed a wish to read the subsequent part of his investigation,<sup>55</sup> Aptowitzer decided to publish his complete compilation of textual variants in the book of 1 Samuel in 1908. In 1911 the textual variants in the book of 2 Samuel were published. Altogether, he saw over 300 divergences from MT in the Targum of Samuel.

In regard to the Targum, it is disappointing that Aptowitzer did not compare his results with the outcome of Bacher's or Frankel's investigations. This shortcoming resulted in his confusing divergences based on a different *Vorlage*, divergences due to harmonization of the text and divergences caused by an interpretative translational style.<sup>56</sup> At least half of Aptowitzer's items can easily be recognized as the result of Targumic interpretation. This applies to

- Divergent prepositions, *e.g.* the many instances in which the Hebrew preposition לְ is rendered with the Aramaic לְ. This is done to indicate enmity (*e.g.* in 1 Sam. 23:26, "lying in wait against David") or to specify a location (*e.g.* in 2 Sam. 18:4, "stood on the ascent of the road"). Sometimes the preposition is determined by the verb (*e.g.* in 1 Sam. 25:1, "wept over him").
- The substitution of the plural for the singular. Words or suffixes referring to a people are put in the plural, *e.g.* "their outcry" (1 Sam. 9:16). The plural is used, if it is required by the context, *e.g.* the "doers of evil" in 2 Sam. 3:39, which is not considered a general statement but a reference to the sons of Zeruah.
- The completion of the sentence. Sometimes the subject is added, *e.g.* "the women" in 1 Sam. 4:20; sometimes an object is added, *e.g.* the suffix 3m.sg. in 2 Sam. 6:6.
- The conversion of a rhetorical question into its answer, *e.g.* God's question to Eli: "Did I not reveal myself to the house

<sup>54</sup>Cf. *EJ s.v.* "Aptowitzer, Victor (Avigdor)".

<sup>55</sup>Cf. Aptowitzer's "Vorwort" to his second publication in: *Das Schriftwort in den rabbinischen Literatur, I-IV*, 65.

<sup>56</sup>As Sperber already noticed in *The Bible in Aramaic IVb: The Targum and the Hebrew Bible*, Leiden 1973, 41-102 *passim*. For further counter-arguments, see below, Chapter 3.

of your father?" in 1 Sam. 2:27.

- Associative translations. Many expressions in the Books of Samuel are standardized, such as "the prophet of the LORD", "the desire of your soul" or "he and his men".
- Precision in person and number in regard to nations, such as the addition of "the sons of" before "Ammon" in 1 Sam. 11:11, as TgSam usually does (cf., *e.g.* 2 Sam. 10).
- Adjustments to Aramaic grammar and vocabulary. The word ܢ is sometimes rendered by "except" (1 Sam. 18:15; 2 Sam. 18:20; 19:8) because of the context. Blood does not "fall", but is "shed" (1 Sam. 26:20).
- Naturalistic translations of metaphors. For example, the word "seed" is rendered "sons" (2 Sam. 4:8) and the metaphor "to snatch away our eyes" is interpreted as "to cause us trouble" (1 Sam. 20:6).
- Halakhic adjustments in order to protect the Biblical heroes, *e.g.* the burning "on behalf of" the bodies of Saul and his sons in 1 Sam. 31:12.

Consequently, Aptowitz's work is useful to make scholars aware of the many divergences in texts, translations and quotations. In many instances his book proves that the various versions had interpreted the text in the same way, revealing an identical exegetical tradition. On the other hand, his work cannot be used as a basis for textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Aptowitz had not been critical enough to achieve that end.

### 1.2.6 Paul Ernst Kahle

On the reconstruction of the history of TJon, Paul Ernst Kahle (1895–1965) has been of great influence. Born in East-Prussia, Kahle served six years as a minister in Cairo. Afterwards he taught at the universities of Halle, Giessen and Bonn, but had to seek refuge in England (Oxford) in 1938 because of his and his wife's pro-Jewish activities. He took a great interest in the history of the Masoretic Text and its vocalization.<sup>57</sup>

Kahle was the first scholar who recognized the importance of Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts with Babylonian vocalization. In 1913

<sup>57</sup>For more information on the life of Kahle, see *EJ s.v.* "Kahle, Paul Ernst".

he published more than 50 Babylonian manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza in his *Masoreten des Ostens*.<sup>58</sup> Fifteen years later he had tracked down another 100 fragments from the Geniza and published the locations and characteristics of these fragments in *ZAW*.<sup>59</sup> Among these fragments were Eb 6, which contains the Targum of 1 Sam. 1:1-2, and Eb 8 with fragments of the Targum of 1 Sam. 13-20.

In 1941 Kahle delivered the Schweich Lectures for the British Academy. Right at the beginning of his third lecture, on the ancient translations of the Bible, Kahle confirmed the statement that there is no doubt that the official Targums were composed in Babylonia.<sup>60</sup> The arguments for this statement can be found in the rest of his lecture and are recapitulated here. It must be said that Kahle withdrew some of his conclusions in the second edition of his book because of the Qumran finds.

First, the fragments of TO and TJon found in the Cairo Geniza show a different vocalization system from that of the more expanded Targumim.<sup>61</sup> On the basis of this difference Kahle developed the thesis that the two centres of rabbinic learning, Babylon and Palestine, each created a complete system of vocalization.<sup>62</sup> The vocalization system of the expanded Targumim, also known as Palestinian Targumim or *Targum Jerushalmi*, was called "Palestinian vocalization" and therefore the vocalization system of TO and TJon was called "Babylonian vocalization". Consequently, Kahle called TO and TJon Babylonian Targumim.

Secondly, the presence of the Palestinian Targumim in the Cairo Geniza shows that they were still in use in the ninth century and that the official Babylonian Targumim had no authoritative value in Palestine at that time. Kahle assumes that the attempts of the eighth century to make Palestine Jewry accept the authority of the Babylonian Talmudic and Targumic tradition had no immediate success. The Babylonian Targumim were officially accepted in Palestine at a time when Aramaic had ceased to be the spoken language there and had been replaced by Arabic.<sup>63</sup> Still, Midrashic material from the Palestinian Targum was collected at that time in the Fragmentary

<sup>58</sup>P.E. Kahle, *Masoreten des Ostens: Die ältesten punktierten Handschriften des Alten Testaments und der Targume*, Leipzig 1913.

<sup>59</sup>P.E. Kahle, "Die hebräischen Bibelhandschriften aus Babylonien", *ZAW* 46 (1928), 113-37.

<sup>60</sup>P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1941), London 1947, 117; Oxford <sup>2</sup>1959, 191.

<sup>61</sup>P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947, 117.

<sup>62</sup>*EJ s.v.* "Kahle, Paul Ernst".

<sup>63</sup>P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947, 25 and 126.

Targum to prevent its loss.<sup>64</sup>

Thirdly, TO and TJon were written in a learned and literary Aramaic, an artificial imitation of the Hebrew original which was never spoken in Palestine.<sup>65</sup> This was intended, not to assist Aramaic-speaking Jews to understand the Hebrew original, but to guarantee the official interpretation of the Torah. The Palestinian Targum, on the other hand, was composed in a language really spoken in Palestine. This formulation, however, undercuts arguments for both a Palestinian and a Babylonian origin of TJon. If it was an artificial language, it was not used in Babylonia either.<sup>66</sup>

Furthermore, the official Babylonian Targum could not have been fixed before the fifth century, because it is "everywhere in accordance with the Halakha, the 'doctrine', as codified in the Mishna and developed later in the Talmud".<sup>67</sup> Whereas Kahle made this statement about TO in the first edition of *The Cairo Geniza* and seemed to include TJon as well,<sup>68</sup> he admitted in the second edition that "old parts can be found in the Targum of the Prophets which go far back into pre-Christian times".<sup>69</sup> He came to this conclusion through the discoveries of new Targum fragments among the Dead Sea scrolls, and through the study of the Midrashic material included in TJon itself, although he did not go as far as E.Y. Kutscher to claim an early date of origin for TJon from the similarity between the Aramaic of TJon and that of the Genesis Apocryphon from Qumran.<sup>70</sup> In both editions Kahle argued that the Palestinian Targumim are much older because of their non-Mishnaic explanations of the Torah.<sup>71</sup>

Finally, the only place where the Targum to the Torah is attributed

<sup>64</sup>P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, Oxford <sup>2</sup>1959, 202.

<sup>65</sup>P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947, 119; cf. Dalman, *Grammatik*, 13.

<sup>66</sup>E.M. Cook, *Rewriting the Bible: The Text and Language of the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum*, Los Angeles 1986, 12, based on M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Language of Targum Onqelos and the Model of Literary Diglossia in Aramaic", *JNES* 37 (1978), 169-79, esp. 171. Cook states that the question of written versus spoken language is artificial itself, since we only have written evidence and since literary language can be identified as to its date. Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 1-23, with the literature cited there.

<sup>67</sup>P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947, 119.

<sup>68</sup>P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947, 119-20.

<sup>69</sup>P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, Oxford <sup>2</sup>1959, 196, going back to an earlier theory of A. Geiger in his article "Das Thargum zu den Propheten", *JZWL* 10 (1872), 198-201, esp. 199.

<sup>70</sup>E.M. Cook, *Rewriting the Bible*, 13. The Aramaic dialect of TJon was never adapted in Babylonia, because it had always been a stranger among the eastern dialects.

<sup>71</sup>P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947, 122-24; Oxford <sup>2</sup>1959, 205-208.

to Onqelos is in the Babylonian Talmud (Meg. 3a). The name depends on information from the Palestinian Talmud, where the Greek version of Aquila is mentioned (yMeg. 1:9). Since little was known of Aquila's Greek version of the Bible in Babylonia, the name was altered to Onqelos and connected with the Aramaic version.<sup>72</sup>

### 1.2.7 Pinkhos Churgin

Pinkhos Churgin was born in Pohost (Minsk, Russia) in 1894 and emigrated to Palestine with his parents in 1907. He studied at the *yeshivah* of Volozhin (Lithuania) and became a teacher of Hebrew, first in New Jersey and later in New Haven. Since 1920 he worked at the Teachers' Institute in New York City and was one of the prime movers in the development of Yeshivah University. Meanwhile, he pursued his graduate studies at Yale University. In 1955 he left for Israel to found the Bar-Ilan University at Ramat-Gan. Churgin specialized in the study of the Targumim and the history of the Second Temple Period. He died in 1957.<sup>73</sup>

In his book on the Targum of the Prophets, which he initially wrote as a doctoral dissertation,<sup>74</sup> Churgin regarded TO and TJon as very early translations of the Bible (p. 9), although he, too, rejected the connection with Jonathan ben Uzziel or Theodotion (p. 15). He further stated that TJon originated in Palestine and was never rejected there (p. 16), for the official Targumim are quoted in both the Talmud Yerushalmi and the Palestinian Midrashim (p. 11). Many generations in Palestine "contributed to the composition of the Targum".<sup>75</sup> This historical background shows that TJon came into existence partly in the Roman period and partly in the rabbinic times afterward. Allusions to the Second Temple, the priesthood and the Roman invaders in all Targumim prove that former theories assuming a rupture between earlier, expanding, Palestinian Targumim and later, fairly literal, Babylonian Targumim were wrong. Those theories were based upon the doubtful supposition that the poetical and difficult passages were the first to be rendered. Churgin thought it safe to suppose that all passages were rendered in the same period and that

<sup>72</sup>P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947, 118; Oxford <sup>2</sup>1959, 191.

<sup>73</sup>See *EJ s.v.* "Churgin, Pinkhos".

<sup>74</sup>P. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (YOS.R 14), New Haven 1907 [1927], repr. New York 1980, also reprinted in L. Smolar, M. Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* & P. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, New York & Baltimore 1983, 229-380. The original pagination has been maintained in both reprints.

<sup>75</sup>P. Churgin, "The Targum and the Septuagint", *AJSL* 50 (1933), 41-65, esp. 42.

the difficult poetical passages were rendered paraphrastically because of their terse style (p. 36).<sup>76</sup> He concluded that the official Targumim were in a definite shape in the time of R. Aqiba (p. 42).

Churgin denied a general revision of TO and TJon in Babylonia, because these Targumim are neither in complete harmony with current halakha, nor with the established Hebrew text (p. 17). These unacceptable halakhic translations were permitted, because the Targumim were connected with Ezra and the last prophets, "which cast a halo over them" (p. 19), and because these Targumim were only read together with the Hebrew text (p. 20).

In regard to the Targum as a textual witness, Churgin published an opinion opposite to Aptowitz. He wrote about the principles, the exegesis and the general characteristics of the translation, but was very cautious in ascribing deviations to a different *Vorlage*. In the Chapter "Textual Variations in Jonathan" (pp. 52-77) Churgin distinguished three categories of variants: actual different readings, grammatical adjustments and associative translations. He admitted only twelve cases for TgSam in the first category and he granted in two of them that the variance could have been influenced by another text.<sup>77</sup> One of the "textual variants" is due to a printer's error in 1 Sam. 1:31.<sup>78</sup>

Churgin pays much attention to the exegetical and translational principles in TJon. He considers clarity the general underlying principle. TJon is "an attempt to render intelligible to the fullest possible degree that which is obscure" (p. 78). Therefore, the Targumist renders the implicit message rather than the literal passage as a result of his desire to correctly understand the text and to make this understanding intelligible to the readers. Three salient features of TJon are recorded by Churgin (p. 79). First, TJon never leaves a word unrendered. Secondly, TJon is not preoccupied by particular concepts, a statement soon contradicted by Churgin himself in the succeeding chapters, for TJon appears to have strong ideas on the difference between the holy and the profane (pp. 111-19), on the fate of Israel (pp. 119-22), on the Torah (pp. 122-23), and on the Messianic hope (pp. 124-25). The fact that several later authors could attempt to

<sup>76</sup>This argument alone cannot explain the unequal distribution of extensive pluses. David's lament on Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. 1:19-27) is poetic, but not expanded.

<sup>77</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 56, n. 6 (the plural "those days" in 1 Sam. 3:2, probably influenced by verse 1); 57, n. 2 (2 Sam. 5:12, probably influenced by 1 Chron. 14:2).

<sup>78</sup>As Aptowitz supposed in *Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur I-IV*, 71.

formulate a “theology” of TJon shows that Churgin was right in assuming that the Targumists were so preoccupied.<sup>79</sup> Finally, TJon has little regard for the historical reality of the prophecies involved. In various instances references to the Messianic age are made, especially when words such as “light”, “righteous” or “Gehenna” appear.

Churgin distinguishes four different translational methods in cases where the version of TJon differs from the MT: the allegorical method, the metaphorical method, the exegetical complement and the lexical method.<sup>80</sup> The allegorical method, mainly used in the aggada and in Philo, the Apostles and the Church fathers, was confined by the Targumist to passages which obviously have an implication beyond the surface of the text, e.g. Ezek. 16 and Hos. 1 and 3. The metaphorical method is used to render not the metaphor itself but what it represents. The method of the exegetical complement fills the gaps in the poetic contraction of the prophetic style. It also applies to diversification of identical words or clauses within one verse. The Targumist appears convinced that each of the repeated words has independent significance. The lexical method is applied when words are substituted with their intended meaning, e.g. “I will bring him to Babylon” is rendered with “I will exile him to Babylon” (Ezek. 12:13). Unfortunately, Churgin’s classification is so general that the categories are receptacles of various translation techniques. The category “Complement” includes every addition in TJon such as supplied subjects and objects, associative and complementary translations, added modal auxiliary verbs, reverential circumlocutions and eschatological expansions, whereas the category “Lexical method” includes every substitution such as identifications of anonymous persons, actualizations of names and customs, harmonizations and halakhic adjustments.

TJon’s theology was also reviewed. One of the general theological features that Churgin mentioned is “the principle to differentiate between the holy and the profane”.<sup>81</sup> TJon differentiates between God and the idols; between offerings to God and offerings to idols; between Israelite priests and idol priests; between permitted festival meals and prohibited sacrifices on high places; between God’s law and human rules; between acknowledged prophets and other important persons, called “scribes”. Although differentiation in the rendering of several

<sup>79</sup>See, for example, Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*; E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible; Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), Berlin & New York 1988.

<sup>80</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 80; the four methods are discussed on pp. 80-84; 84-88; 88-90; 90-92.

<sup>81</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 111.



words indeed occurs in TJon, it is not necessarily a differentiation between the holy and the profane.<sup>82</sup> For example, the word “high place” is rendered literally in 1 Kgs 3:3-4, where Solomon sacrificed before the LORD. If the differentiation were to distinguish the holy and the profane, the Hebrew בַּמָּוֶה would also be rendered with “banqueting house” in this verse. Likewise, the variant translations of the Hebrew מִשְׁפַּט are motivated by the desire to translate as precisely as possible rather than by theology. The word מִשְׁפַּט is rendered with נִמְסָא in Tg-Sam, if it refers to a written law (the law of priests, 1 Sam. 2:13; the law of kings, 1 Sam. 8:9, 11; 10:25); with דִּינָא, if it refers to jurisdiction (1 Sam. 8:3; 30:25; 2 Sam. 8:15; 15:2, 4, 6; 22:23); and with הִלְכָא, if it refers to customs which are not based on Law or jurisdiction (1 Sam. 27:11).<sup>83</sup> In short, these differentiations can best be regarded as the result of the clarifying translation of TJon.

Churgin synthesizes many results of previous research into the style and the theology of TJon. Despite his “stylistic inelegance”<sup>84</sup> and the abundance of misprints,<sup>85</sup> Churgin’s work gives a useful overview of TJon’s translational style, theological concepts and historical background.

### 1.2.8 Pieter Arie Hendrik de Boer

Although P.A.H. de Boer never published specifically on the Targum of Samuel, he greatly contributed to our knowledge of the Masoretic Text of Samuel in relation to its ancient translations. Born in Woubrugge (The Netherlands) in 1910, he studied theology and worked as a minister in Berkenwoude for two years. While minister, he finished his dissertation on *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel i-xvi*<sup>86</sup> and was appointed professor of Old Testament at Leiden. During his 40 years of professorship he spent his “seemingly boundless energy”<sup>87</sup> on international projects on the study of the Old Testament.<sup>88</sup> Professor

<sup>82</sup>Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 13 with regard to the term “ephod”.

<sup>83</sup>Cf. E. van Staalduijn-Sulman, *Samuel* (BCTP, 3-5), Leiden 1996.

<sup>84</sup>R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VT.S 51), Leiden 1994, 11.

<sup>85</sup>Cf. A. van der Kooij, “L. Smolar and M. Aberbach, *Studies ...*”, *NedThT* 40 (1986), 341-43, esp. 341.

<sup>86</sup>P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel i-xvi*, Amsterdam (diss.) 1938.

<sup>87</sup>G.W. Anderson, “P.A.H. de Boer”, *VT* 60 (1990), 1-3.

<sup>88</sup>He was the founder of the International Organization of Old Testament Scholars, later IOSOT, the founder and secretary of VT (1951-1975), editor of VT.S (1953-1974), editor of OTS (1941-1969), editor of StPB (1959-1970), editor of *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version*, Leiden 1959-1980.

de Boer died in 1989.<sup>89</sup>

The research into the text of 1 Samuel began in his dissertation of 1938 and was completed in two other articles in 1942 and 1949.<sup>90</sup> It culminated in his critical edition of the Hebrew text of 1 and 2 Samuel in the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (1976) and of the Peshitta version of these books (1978). He gave special attention to the Song of Hannah in its various ancient translations.<sup>91</sup>

De Boer's research into the first 16 chapters of 1 Samuel shows little knowledge of contemporary literature about the Targumim, let alone about TgSam. Therefore, he does not differentiate between various translation techniques, but only mentions "elucidation" and "indirect expression" as two categories. His lists of divergences in TgSam are not complete and very compressed.<sup>92</sup> Still, he draws the justifiable conclusion that TgSam cannot be used as an independent textual witness to the Hebrew Bible.

### 1.2.9 The Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest

In 1877 the Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest was founded after the example of the Seminary at Breslau set up by Zacharias Frankel. Wilhelm Bacher, one of the three first professors, was responsible for instruction in Hebrew, Aramaic and the history of exegesis.<sup>93</sup> He himself wrote articles on Targumic subjects and also encouraged his students in this direction. From 1892 onward several students of the Seminary graduated on theses concerning the old translations of single books of the Bible, the majority in the Targum version. Bacher's successors also supervised students in the study of the Targum. B. Heller (professor of

<sup>89</sup>More biographical information can be found in G.W. Anderson, "P.A.H. de Boer", *VT* 40 (1990), 1-3; P.B. Dirksen, "In memoriam P.A.H. de Boer (1910-1989)", *NedThT* 44 (1990), 54-55. A bibliography of his publications can be found in P.A.H. de Boer, *Selected Studies in Old Testament Exegesis*, ed. C. van Duin, Leiden 1991, 227-34.

<sup>90</sup>P.A.H. de Boer, "1 Samuel xvii: Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions", *OTS* 1/1 (Leiden 1941), 79-103; "Research into the Text of 1 Samuel xviii-xxxi", *OTS* 6 (1949), 1-100.

<sup>91</sup>P.A.H. de Boer, "A Syro-hexaplar Text of the Song of Hannah: 1 Samuel ii 1-10", in: D. Winton Thomas, W.D. McHardy (eds), *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver*, Oxford 1963, 8-15; Idem, "Confirmatum est cor meum. Remarks on the Old Latin Text of the Song of Hannah: 1 Samuel ii 1-10", *OTS* 13 (1963), 173-92; Idem, "Once Again the Old Latin Text of Hannah's Song", *OTS* 14 (1965), 206-13.

<sup>92</sup>Cf. R.P.R. de Vaux, "Recension P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I-XVI* . . .", *RB* 48 (1939), 313.

<sup>93</sup>J. Schweitzer, "Das Budapester Rabbinerseminar", in: J. Carlebach, *Wissenschaft des Judentums. Anfänge der Judaistik in Europa*, Darmstadt 1992, 74-85, esp. 74-75. See above, § 1.2.3.

Bible, 1922–1931) was mainly interested in the comparison of legends and aggada, whereas D.S. Loewinger (professor of Bible, 1931–1950) dealt with problems in the Hebrew text.<sup>94</sup> During the years 1939–1944 many Hungarian Jews studied at the Rabbinical Seminary, because they were denied admission to other faculties. In the end, 18 doctoral theses on Targumic subjects were published, among them two short commentaries on the Targum of Samuel by Maier Vogel (on 1 Samuel) and Herman Helfgott (on 2 Samuel).<sup>95</sup>

The hope that the Nazi terror would pass Hungary by proved wrong. On March 19, 1944, the Germans entered Hungary, “and on the very next day, the building of the Seminary was confiscated by the SS, to serve as a transit prison for thousand of Jews on their tragic way to the extermination camps”.<sup>96</sup> After being plundered by a Nazi group, the so-called “Hungarian Institute for Researching the Jewish Question”, the library was sealed off by Adolf Eichmann. At the end of the Second World War the library wing was used as an artillery building and thus bombed by the Allies. Although the Seminary was reopened after the war, Targumic studies were not reinstated.

### 1.2.9.1 Maier Vogel

Maier Vogel was born in Petrilla in 1913. He studied at the Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest and graduated in 1941. After his graduation he stayed in Budapest and became a teacher there. During the German occupation (1944–1945) he disappeared.<sup>97</sup>

The subject of Vogel’s doctoral thesis is *The Relationship of the Targum of the First Book of Samuel to the Masoretic Text*.<sup>98</sup> Where necessary, he mentions other versions. For the relationship between TgSam and aggada he mainly uses the book by Churgin on Targum Jonathan to the Prophets.<sup>99</sup> Although Vogel agrees with Churgin that several exegetical methods can be distinguished in TJon, he believes

---

<sup>94</sup>EJ, s.vv.

<sup>95</sup>M. Carmilly-Weinberger, *The Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest. 1877–1977*, New York 1986, 322. Other theses discuss the Targum in general, its relationship to the aggada, and the versions of single books of the Bible such as the Targum of Joshua, Judges, Kings, Amos, Zechariah, Lamentations, Koheleth and Song of Songs, and the Peshitta of Jeremiah, Ezra and Nehemiah.

<sup>96</sup>M. Carmilly-Weinberger, *The Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest: 1877–1977*, New York 1986, 33.

<sup>97</sup>Gy.G. Landeszman, “Ordained Rabbis”, in: M. Carmilly-Weinberger, *The Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest. 1877–1977*, New York 1986, 303–20, esp. 319.

<sup>98</sup>M. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve Targumának viszonya a maszárai szöveghez*, Budapest 1939.

<sup>99</sup>P. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, New Haven 1907 [1927].

it impossible to draw a strict dividing line between them. Therefore he decided not to follow Churgin in ordering his book after these exegetical methods, but maintained the order of chapter and verse, as in 1 Samuel.<sup>100</sup>

Vogel's criterion for determining whether to discuss a verse seems to be simple. He claims to deal with every text in which Targum Jonathan differs from the Masoretic Text,<sup>101</sup> but actually he discusses only 93 verses, whereas he could have discussed over 250 verses. Although he uses the Aramaic text of the CR, including the marginal notes,<sup>102</sup> he rarely quotes any tosefta-targum or alternative readings from the margin. Vogel never mentions standardized differences between MT and the Aramaic version, such as the insertion of the word *Memra* or the translation of the Hebrew *Elohim* with the name of God. Furthermore, he seems to prefer major divergences, though not consistently. For example, he does not discuss the rendering of 1 Sam. 21:6 where the remark about cleanliness is transferred by the Targum from David's men to the showbread, according to the halakhic argument in Men. 95b. On the other hand, Vogel discusses texts with a small divergence, such as the rendering of "inhabitant" for the Hebrew בעל in 1 Sam. 23:11.

For the relationship of the Targum to the Masoretic Text and other versions Vogel makes abundant use of the commentary of Driver.<sup>103</sup> In one third of the cases, he refers to Driver or gives information that is also found in Driver's *Notes*, although he does not accept Driver's information uncritically. A conjecture of Klostermann for the difficult הפצר in 1 Sam. 15:23 was rejected by Driver with "cannot be said to be satisfactory", whereas Vogel considers it "most serious".<sup>104</sup>

At the end of his thesis, Vogel draws the following conclusions regarding the translation characteristics of the Targum of Samuel:<sup>105</sup> Targum Jonathan purposefully renders euphemistically in connection with God. For example, God is never described as someone's enemy, cf. Tg 1 Sam. 26:19. TJon stresses the holiness and the authority of the prophets, e.g. in Tg 1 Sam. 15:23 and 19:18. In TgSam King

<sup>100</sup>Vogel in his "Introduction" to *Sámuel első könyve*, 4. He distinguishes three exegetical methods in TgSam: paraphrase, clarification of metaphors, and giving concrete examples for abstract ideas.

<sup>101</sup>Vogel in his "Introduction" to *Sámuel első könyve*, 4.

<sup>102</sup>Vogel in his "Introduction" to *Sámuel első könyve*, 4.

<sup>103</sup>S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, Oxford 21913.

<sup>104</sup>See Driver, *Notes*, 128; Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 22: "a legkomolyabb ajánlatot".

<sup>105</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 31-33.

David is described as chosen by God, with an emphasis on God's unchangeable will. The Targum of Samuel derives much material from aggadic sources. Vogel cites in his commentary both Talmudim and the early Midrashim, and concludes that much is collected in the later Midrash Samuel.<sup>106</sup> He never mentions instances in which TgSam diverges from these sources. Only a few times halakhic material is used in TgSam, e.g. in 1 Sam. 9:13 where Samuel pronounces the benediction before the meal. TJon often builds its renderings by analogy with surrounding verses. Vogel mentions four clear instances that can also be found in Churgin.<sup>107</sup> The fifth of Churgin's texts was not repeated by Vogel. This omission is not explained.

Finally, Vogel tries to reconstruct the Hebrew text which the Targumists must have used as the *Vorlage* for their translation. Vogel comes to the same conclusion as Churgin: the Hebrew text used by the Targumists does not differ much from the Masoretic Text. Vogel gives eight proposals for a divergent *Vorlage*, three from Churgin (leaving out three others), three from Driver (leaving out several others) and two additional ones.<sup>108</sup> However, not all the differences he mentions here are necessarily based upon a divergent *Vorlage*. For example, the insertion of "inhabitants" before "the land" in Tg 1 Sam. 14:25 is a regular insertion when the Hebrew word  $\gamma\text{ר}א$  is used as collective noun for all the inhabitants of the land.<sup>109</sup>

### 1.2.9.2 Herman Helfgott

Herman Helfgott (Zvi Azarya) was born in Beodra (Yugoslavia) in 1913. He studied at the Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest and graduated in 1940. Afterwards he was ordained rabbi and worked as such in London, Cologne and Hannover. Later, Helfgott emigrated to Israel.<sup>110</sup>

The subject of Helfgott's doctoral thesis is *The Relationship of the Targum of the Second Book of Samuel to the Masoretic Text*.<sup>111</sup> Helfgott follows the methodology of his predecessor, Maier Vogel, in giving respectively the Hebrew text, the Aramaic translation of the

<sup>106</sup>Vogel used the edition of S. Buber, *Midrasch Samuel*, Krakau 1893.

<sup>107</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 71.

<sup>108</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 32-33. These proposals will be discussed in the commentary to the respective verses.

<sup>109</sup>Likewise in 1 Sam. 17:46; 2 Sam. 15:23; 21:14; 24:25, cf. Van Staalduine-Sulman, *Samuel 1* (BCTP 3), Leiden 1996, 293.

<sup>110</sup>Gy.G. Landeszman, "Ordained Rabbis", in: M. Carmilly-Weinberger, *The Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest. 1877-1977*, New York 1986, 303-20, esp. 303.

<sup>111</sup>H. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve Tár gumának viszonya a maszórai szöveghez*, Budapest 1940.

text, the Hungarian translation of the Aramaic text, and remarks about TJon and its relationship to the MT and Jewish literature. He also uses the same literature and bases himself on the same Aramaic texts, viz. the *Codex Reuchlinianus* and the *Mikraoth Gedoloth*.<sup>112</sup>

In the Targum to the second book of Samuel the Aramaic translation is very literal and often not expanded. Two poetic parts form an exception and are paraphrastically rendered: the Psalm of David (Ch. 22) and the Last Words of David (Ch. 23). Therefore, a great part (9 out of 32 pages) of Helfgott's thesis consists of the discussion of these two chapters. Like Vogel, Helfgott does not discuss standard translations. Unlike Vogel, however, Helfgott is conscious of exceptions in TJon. In this respect he mentions whether TJon renders the Qere (general rule) or the Ketib (exception).<sup>113</sup> Contrasts between the exegesis in TJon and in the Talmud or the Midrash are also discussed, such as TJon's supposition in 2 Sam. 3:39 that  $\aleph$  would mean 'normal' in contrast to a Midrash, mentioned by Kimḥi, which rendered it with 'noble, glorious'.<sup>114</sup>

Although the additions in TJon to the second book of Samuel are relatively few and small, Helfgott is able to find at least one halakhic and 12 aggadic expansions. Several Biblical heroes are "identified", especially in the Psalm of David (Ch. 22).<sup>115</sup> Whilst the Targum to the first book of Samuel stresses the importance of the prophet, the Targum to the second book tends to emphasize the person of David. In this respect, Helfgott distinguishes between eschatological, dynastic and messianic expansions, although his compilation makes clear that these three categories are interwoven, especially in the Last Words of David (2 Sam. 23:1-8).<sup>116</sup>

In 22 instances Helfgott surmises that TJon was based on a different *Vorlage* of the Hebrew text. Some of these instances were already mentioned by Churgin, but Helfgott compiles his list independently. For this reason, Helfgott sometimes assumes a different *Vorlage*, though Churgin interpreted these instances as translations

<sup>112</sup>Helfgott in his "Introduction", *Sámuel második könyve, 3-4*: P. de Lagarde, *Prophetæ chaldaice e fide codicis Reuchliniani*, Lipsiæ 1872; *Mikraoth Gedoloth*, Warschau 1862.

<sup>113</sup>TJon follows Qere in 2 Sam. 8:3; 14:19; 16:12; 18:3 where Helfgott remarks that TJon mostly renders in favour of the Qere; 20:14; 21:4; 23:20. TJon, however, follows Ketib in 2 Sam. 18:13 and 21:20. See the listing in Helfgott's "Conclusions", in: *Sámuel második könyve*, 29.

<sup>114</sup>Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 8. Contrasts to the Talmud can be found in 2 Sam. 23:8 (p. 26).

<sup>115</sup>Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 28.

<sup>116</sup>Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 29.

based on similar expressions in the same verse or in surrounding verses.<sup>117</sup> Generally, one can say that Helfgott explains too many divergent translations as different readings. As a case in point, the expansion in 2 Sam. 8:13 (“and David gathered *troops*”) can be explained as the complement of the missing object. Furthermore, the translation of 2 Sam. 22:9 can best be considered an extended simile.<sup>118</sup>

Because of the small amount of differences between TJon and the MT, Helfgott concludes that TJon was edited at a relatively late date. It could not have been completed until the Masora was at least very near its present condition. Helfgott therefore endorses Dalman’s viewpoint that the Targum of the Prophets obtained its final form in the fifth century.<sup>119</sup>

### 1.2.9.3 Yehuda Komlosh

Otto (Yehuda) Komlosh was born in Baranya-Mágoacs (Hungary) in 1913. He studied at the Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest and graduated in 1940. The subject of his doctoral thesis was *Aggadic parallels to Targum Onkelos*.<sup>120</sup> Afterwards he was ordained rabbi and worked as such in Szélesfeyérvár and in Buda. After the Second World War he became professor at the Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest (1948–1957). In 1957 he was appointed professor at the newly founded Bar-Ilan University (Ramat-Gan) in Israel.<sup>121</sup>

Yehuda Komlosh wrote two articles about the Targum of Samuel. The first article deals with “the characteristic features of Targum Samuel”.<sup>122</sup> Later he incorporated most of the material from this article in the chapter “The Books of Samuel”, in his book *The Bible in the Light of the Targum*.<sup>123</sup> Both the article and the chapter in his book discuss the features of the Aramaic translation of the Books of Samuel. Therefore, the three features which they have in common, will be discussed first. It must be noted that two of these three features

<sup>117</sup> E.g. 2 Sam. 3:15 (Churgin’s type B) or 2 Sam. 12:21 (Churgin’s type C). See Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 7 and 12; Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 66 and 72.

<sup>118</sup> See below, Chapter 3.

<sup>119</sup> Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 30, citing Dalman, *Grammatik*, 15.

<sup>120</sup> O. Komlós, *Á targum Onkelosz aggádikus párhuzamai*, Budapest 1939.

<sup>121</sup> Gy.G. Landeszman, “Ordained Rabbis”, in: M. Carmilly-Weinberger, *The Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest. 1877–1977*, New York 1986, 303–20, esp. 311.

<sup>122</sup> Y. Komlosh, “קווים אופייניים בתרגום הארמי לספר שמואל”, in: B. Zvieli (ed.), שיחות במקרא: *Talks on Scripture I*, Jerusalem 1968, 182–83.

<sup>123</sup> Y. Komlosh, “ספרי שמואל”, in: המקרא באור התרגום, Tel Aviv 1973, 299–329.

are also mentioned in the conclusion of Maier Vogel.<sup>124</sup>

The first feature of TgSam is the estimation of the Biblical heroes,<sup>125</sup> especially of Samuel. Prophets and kings are protected from the accusation of any defect. For example, Targum Jonathan does not render that Samuel sacrificed on a *bama*, but “in the banqueting house” (1 Sam. 9:12). Heroes are not only protected, but even praised abundantly for their religious deeds. For instance, Saul was reciting the Torah when he was hiding from the people (1 Sam. 10:22), and David was not dancing before the ark, but singing songs of praise (2 Sam. 6:5).

Another feature of Targum Samuel is the adjustment of the translation to contemporary exegesis and *halakha*.<sup>126</sup> Sometimes it is connected with the protection of heroes. When Israel poured out water before the LORD, the Targum understood it as a metaphor for their pouring out their hearts in repentance (1 Sam. 7:6). The people did not sin against the rule that only the priests were permitted to perform a libation.

A third feature mentioned in the article is the custom of ascribing anonymous deeds to well-known persons.<sup>127</sup> For example, Goliath was the one that killed Hophni and Phinehas, captured the ark, and was a leader in every war of the Philistines (1 Sam. 17:8).

In his book Komlosh works out three other main features in-depth: adjustment to the context, both with regard to grammar (pp. 300-304) and understanding (pp. 318-20); the avoidance of personification (pp. 313-16); and the realistic translation of metaphors (pp. 323-26).

More features are mentioned occasionally. Komlosh tries to classify them, but fails to do this consistently. In the first paragraph, on “modifications of the vocalization”, some exegetical tendencies, such as the protection of Biblical heroes (p. 299), are already mentioned. The paragraph on “midrash and aggada in Targum Samuel” (pp. 316-20) is full of different translation techniques, such as ascribing anonymous deeds to well-known persons (p. 318-19) and harmonization (p. 318). The final paragraph, on “additions on behalf of clarity”, ends with an addition in order to harmonize (p. 329). In general it can be said that the linguistic alterations in Targum Jonathan are

<sup>124</sup>Vogel mentioned the protection of the Biblical heroes and the incorporation of contemporary exegesis, cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 31.

<sup>125</sup>Komlosh, “קווים אופייניים”, 182-83. Cf. Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 299-329, esp. 299-300; 304-307; 317-20.

<sup>126</sup>Komlosh, “קווים אופייניים”, 182-83, esp. 183. Cf. Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 299-329, esp. 300-304; 318-20.

<sup>127</sup>Komlosh, “קווים אופייניים”, 182-83, esp. 183. Cf. Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 299-329, esp. 318-19; 322-23.



discussed in the first and the last paragraphs (pp. 298-305; 326-29); the exegetical tendencies after the first and before the last paragraphs (pp. 306-307; 313-26); and the poetic parts of the books of Samuel in the middle of it (pp. 308-13).

Although Komlosh sums up three poetic parts in the Books of Samuel—the Prayer of Hannah (I 2:1-10), the Song of David (II 22), and the Last Words of David (II 23:1-8), leaving out David's Lament over Saul and Jonathan (II 1:19-27)—he only discusses the Prayer of Hannah (pp. 308-309) and the Song of David (pp. 310-13) more thoroughly. In his discussion of the Song of David he incorporates the comparison of this song with Psalm 18 (pp. 310-12).

The translation of these songs can be called normal for the poetical chapters, although it must be noted that the Song of David is not as interpretative in its character as the Prayer of Hannah and the Song of Deborah (p. 310). Both the Prayer of Hannah and the Song of David are called prophecies in the Targum. According to the Biblical text the Prayer of Hannah is interpreted in a general way, the people of Israel being its subject, whereas the Song of David is constantly rendered in the singular with a few exceptions (p. 310). The Prayer of Hannah is rendered very paraphrastically, though the Targum has not removed itself entirely from the Biblical wording. The faithfulness of the LORD is depicted in the Targum as well, worked out by inserting occurrences from the history of Israel (p. 308). In his commentary on the contents of the Song of Hannah, Komlosh mentions several allusions to Biblical narratives and the parallel passages in Talmud and Midrashim (pp. 308-10).

In the poetical parts Komlosh notes the same translational features as in the rest of the Books of Samuel. He mentions translations adjusted to the context, explanations of words according to other verses, avoidance of anthropomorphisms, added aggadic material, naturalistic translation of metaphors, affirmative translation of rhetorical questions, insertion of words, insertion of the *nimshal*, double translations and the diversification of parallels (pp. 310-13).

#### 1.2.9.4 Conclusion

The three Hungarian students of the Rabbinical Seminary provide us with much information about TgSam and its relationship to the MT and Jewish literature, especially about the poetical parts of TgSam. The works complement each other: whilst Vogel and Helfgott follow chapter and verse of the Biblical book, Komlosh compiles translational and exegetical features. Although the three investigate TgSam in order to establish its relationship to the MT, they are modest in as-

suming a different Hebrew *Vorlage* and indefatigable in finding parallels in ancient Jewish literature. In this respect, however, only Helfgott is aware of contrasts between Targumic translations and other Jewish exegesis.

### 1.3 Targum Jonathan: Text and Exegesis

#### 1.3.1 Alexander Sperber

After a first specimen,<sup>128</sup> Alexander Sperber published the first complete critical edition of TO and TJon, and later a non-critical edition of the Targum to the Hagiographa, between 1959 and 1968.<sup>129</sup> For the Books of Samuel, this was the first critical edition ever. Other books were done earlier, especially the latter prophets,<sup>130</sup> e.g. Ezekiel,<sup>131</sup> Nahum,<sup>132</sup> Joshua and Judges,<sup>133</sup> Jeremiah,<sup>134</sup> and Isaiah.<sup>135</sup> For a critical edition of TgSam one had to wait until 1959.

Born in Czernowitz (Bukowina, Austro-Hungary, in the present Ukraine) in 1897, Sperber studied in his native town and in Bonn, where he graduated in 1924. He was enlisted as an "assistant editor for the Ancient Versions" for the purpose of the third edition of the *Biblia Hebraica*, under the general editorship of R. Kittel, and had a great influence on the apparatuses of the prophetic books.<sup>136</sup> He also wrote his dissertation in Bonn, on the relationship between TJon and the MT, concluding that TJon had several translation techniques

<sup>128</sup>A. Sperber, "Specimen of a Targum Edition", in: *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume*, New York 1945, 293-303.

<sup>129</sup>A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic* vols. 1-4a, Leiden 1959-1968. The text of TgSam will be discussed in Chapter 2.

<sup>130</sup>C.H. Cornill, "Das Targum zu den Propheten", *ZAW* 7 (1887), 177-202.

<sup>131</sup>C.H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, Leipzig 1886, esp. 110-36; S. Silbermann, *Das Targum zu Ezechiel nach einer südarabischen Handschrift*, Strassbourg 1902.

<sup>132</sup>M. Adler, "A Specimen of a Commentary and Collated Text of the Targum to the Prophets", *JQR* 7 (1895), 630-57.

<sup>133</sup>F. Praetorius, *Das Targum zu Josua in jemenischer Überlieferung*, Berlin 1899; Idem, *Das Targum zum Buch der Richter in jemenischer Überlieferung*, Berlin 1900.

<sup>134</sup>L. Wolfsohn, *Das Targum zum Propheten Jeremias in jemenischer Überlieferung*, Halle 1902.

<sup>135</sup>M. Felman, *Dissertation on Study of Yemenite Manuscript Targum Isaiah* (diss. Yeshiva University), New York 1949; J.F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah*, Oxford 1949.

<sup>136</sup>R.P. Gordon, "Alexander Sperber and the Study of the Targums", in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 92-102, esp. 96.

to overcome difficulties in the Hebrew text.<sup>137</sup> He left Bonn in 1933 and joined the Jewish Theological Seminary of America after a brief interval in Jerusalem.

Following his graduation in 1924 Sperber investigated and collated several Targum manuscripts under the aegis of the Berlin *Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, and, since 1939, with financial support from the Theological Seminary of America.<sup>138</sup>

During his collation work he realized that many variants he found “were influenced by the Hebrew of their *Vorlage*” and were not only internal Aramaic variants.<sup>139</sup> Then Sperber began to compile translational features of the Targum and to investigate the various motives for internal Aramaic variants. The results of these investigations have led to several articles and to the last volume 4b of his series *The Bible in Aramaic*, which was posthumously printed and edited in 1973.<sup>140</sup>

Sperber sees two different schools of translators at work in TO and TJon. One school “adhered to a literal translation as far as possible” and is mainly discernible in the narrative and legal portions, whilst “the other school handled the text quite freely” and can be traced in the prophetic and poetic portions.<sup>141</sup> He states that this division is supported by the existence of doublets: passages in which the translations of both schools were fused together. This division, however, has already partly been countered by Churgin, who explained that the poetic and prophetic portions of the Bible were rendered more freely because of their difficult, contracted style<sup>142</sup>—an opinion

<sup>137</sup>Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 16-17.

<sup>138</sup>Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, xiv and 17. Biographical information about Sperber can be gathered from the “Foreword” and the first chapter of Sperber’s volume 4b, xii-xv; 1-34; Cf. R.P. Gordon, “Foreword to the Reprinted Edition”, in: A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 1: The Pentateuch according to Targum Onkelos, Leiden 1992, n.pp.; Idem, “Alexander Sperber and the Study of the Targums”, in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 92-102.

<sup>139</sup>Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 19.

<sup>140</sup>The following articles are incorporated in this book: “Zur Textgestalt des Prophetentargums,” *ZAW* 44 (1926), 175-76 (incorporated in Chapter 2 and 3); “Zur Sprache des Prophetentargums,” *ZAW* 45 (1927), 267-88 (incorporated in Chapter 3, § 23); “The Targum Onkelos in its Relation to the Massoretic Hebrew Text,” *PAAJR* 6 (1934/35), 309-51 (incorporated in Chapter 4); “Peshitta and Targum”, in: *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut*, New York 1935, 554-64 (= Chapter 8).

<sup>141</sup>Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 3; following Frankel, “Zu dem Targum”, 41-43; see above, § 1.2.3; followed by A.S. Rodrigues Pereira, *Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E.-c. 600 C.E.): Selected Jewish, Christian and Samaritan Poems*, Leiden (diss.) 1996, 27.

<sup>142</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 36, see above § 1.2.7.

which Sperber shared earlier.<sup>143</sup> In addition, the doublets can better be explained as a tendency to include the literal translation alongside the explanatory—a tendency mainly occurring in one manuscript (Sperber's a) and the two Bomberg editions (Sperber's b and g).<sup>144</sup> Moreover, one translator could well alternate between literal and expansive renderings, just as sages alternated between literal and metaphorical interpretations of Scripture.<sup>145</sup>

Sperber's compilation of translational features has brought Targum studies a great step forward. His divisions are more systematic than Frankel's and more detailed than Churgin's.<sup>146</sup> Moreover, Sperber adds so many examples that he proves most divergencies in the Targum to be based on explanatory tendencies in the translation and not on a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. In this respect, he reacts against scholars like Aptowitz, who has used the Targum exclusively as a textual witness for the Hebrew Bible without taking into account its own techniques and theology.<sup>147</sup> It is unfortunate, however, that Sperber does not attempt to explain and group the different categories of translational features. For example, many divergencies in TJon are actualizations or clarifications of the Biblical texts, such as "Free Translations" (§ A.d) and "Additions Necessary for a Better Understanding" (§ A.f), but also "Collective Nouns Treated as Plurals" (§ A.g). Furthermore, it is regrettable that Sperber does not make any attempt to summarize his findings or draw conclusions from them.<sup>148</sup>

Sperber frequently stresses the occurrence of Hebraisms in the Targum, in both the manuscripts and the editions. He explains these Hebraisms as later corrections of the text and sees two reasons for this tendency: (1) the gradual decline in the understanding of the Aramaic language; and (2) the gradually increasing respect for the exact wording of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>149</sup> However, since the Targumim

<sup>143</sup>A. Sperber, "Zur Sprache des Prophetentargums", *ZAW* 45 (1928) 276-88, esp. 276.

<sup>144</sup>A. Díez Macho, "Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic* IV B . . .", *JSJ* 6 (1975), 217-36, esp. 218. Cf. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 191.

<sup>145</sup>R. Kasher, "The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature", in: M.J. Mulder, H. Sysling (eds), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRI, 2/1), Assen & Philadelphia 1988, 547-94, esp. 554.

<sup>146</sup>See above, § 1.2.3 and § 1.2.7.

<sup>147</sup>See above, § 1.2.5.

<sup>148</sup>Cf. also A. Díez Macho, "Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic* IV B . . .", 226.

<sup>149</sup>A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 23; adopting the theory of W. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 57. Cf. A. Sperber, "Zur Textgestalt des Prophetentargums", *ZAW* 44 (1926), 175-76.

originate in the multilingual society of Palestine and in view of the repeatedly occurring tendency to adjust a translation to its original,<sup>150</sup> lexical Hebraisms can hardly be called surprising.

Several lists of Hebraisms can be found at the end of Sperber's third chapter.<sup>151</sup> However, by only compiling the inner Aramaic variants Sperber creates unreliable lists. As a case in point, consider the first example in the list of "Hebraisms in the Aramaic Vocabulary" (p. 159):

<i>verse</i>	<i>MT</i>	<i>Codex Reuchl.</i>	<i>Variant</i>	
Josh 24.10	וְלֹא אֲבִיחִי (ולא)	הַפְצִיחָה	אֲבִיחִי	a b d g k o
Judg 11.17	וְלֹא אֲבָה (ולא)	אֲבָה	קִבִּיל	d g

It seems as if six witnesses in TgJosh. 24:10 read a Hebraism and one in TgJudg. 11:17, *viz.* the *Codex Reuchlinianus*. But taking into account that the normal rendering of the Hebrew אֲבָה is אֲבָחָה<sup>152</sup> and observing that the readings of the CR in TgJosh. 24:10 and of the Bomberg Bibles in TgJudg. 11:17 are the exceptions, we are compelled to say that the opposite of Hebraisms is found in these two texts: an explanatory rendering deviating from the Hebrew wording. In all cases where the "Hebraism" is in the *Codex Reuchlinianus* column, the reader must be aware that the manuscripts not mentioned in the *Variant* column agree with the *Reuchlinianus*, so that the Hebraism mostly turns out to be the rule and not the exception.

Very straightforwardly, Sperber writes in the conclusion that the *Vorlage* of the Targum does not deviate much from what we now know as the Masoretic Text. Even in those cases where Hebrew manuscripts seem to support a divergent reading of the Targum, Sperber would explain these readings as inherent in the still fluctuating, explanatory style of the copyists, the same style by which the Targumists made their translations.<sup>153</sup>

Some deviations from the MT, however, seem to be explained as based on a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. These deviations are compiled in Chapter 5 (pp. 265-350), subdivided into several categories in Chapter 6 (pp. 351-76), and explained in Chapter 7 (pp. 377-406). These explanations sometimes make one surmise that the deviations are the result of translational style rather than of a variant Hebrew

<sup>150</sup>Already discernible in the Greek versions; cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 337, n. 56.

<sup>151</sup>A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 159-92.

<sup>152</sup>*e.g.* TgJudg. 19:10, 25; 20:13; 1 Sam. 15:9; 22:17; etc. Cf. *BCTP*, *s.v.* אֲבָחָה *Peal*.

<sup>153</sup>A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 23.

*Vorlage*, for Chapter 7 is called "Targum and Biblical Exegesis". Furthermore, the deviations mentioned in Chapters 5-7 are not always in accordance with Sperber's findings in the first chapters. For example, the change from an active to a passive voice in 2 Sam. 18:18 is classified in Chapter 6 among other deviations in active/passive voice (p. 354). It is not mentioned in Chapter 2, although there is a special category, "Passive Construction in lieu of Active" (p. 74). Here Tg 1 Sam. 26:20 is listed. The reason why the same phenomenon is classified once as translation technique (p. 74) and once as the result of a different *Vorlage* (p. 354) remains obscure.

Although Sperber's *The Targum and the Hebrew Bible* is a compilation of old and new ideas, in which cohesion is sometimes absent, the book is a useful tool describing the different translational features of the Targum. It makes the reader aware of the various translation techniques used to explain the Hebrew text. And it forces Targum scholars not to rush to the conclusion that a divergence from the Hebrew text is based on a different *Vorlage*.

### 1.3.2 Samson H. Levey: Messianism and Dating

#### 1.3.2.1 Messianism in TJon

Messianism in the Targumim has especially been an interesting topic for Christian authors. Although several articles had been published on this subject,<sup>154</sup> Samson H. Levey, Professor of Rabbinics and Jewish Religious Thought, Hebrew Union College (Los Angeles), has given research into messianism in the Targumim a new boost with his dissertation on *The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum* at the University of Southern California in 1955. He summarized his results in a conveniently arranged book, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation*.<sup>155</sup> Targumic texts with the word "Messiah" or with messianic interpretations of the Biblical original are rendered into English and explained, among them several texts from TgSam.

Since then more authors have paid attention to messianism in the

<sup>154</sup> E.g. W. Ayerst, *Die Hoffnung Israels oder die Lehre der alten Juden von dem Messias, wie sie in den Targumim dargelegt ist*, Frankfurt am Main 1851; E. Hühn, "Die Targumim nach 300 n. Chr.", in: *Die messianischen Weissagungen des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes bis zu den Targumim*, Freiburg im Breisgau etc. 1899, 111-14; P. Humbert, "Le Messie dans le Targum des Prophètes", *RThPh* 43 (1910), 420-47; 44 (1911), 5-46; J.J. Brierre-Narbonne, *Exégèse targoumique des prophéties messianiques*, Paris 1936; and several other articles compiled in L. Landman (ed.), *Messianism in the Talmudic Era*, New York 1979.

<sup>155</sup> S.H. Levey, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation. The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum* (HUC.MS, 2), Cincinnati & New York 1974.

Targumim.<sup>156</sup> These authors more or less follow the same method as Levey, *i.e.* they give a translation of the Bible text and the Targum rendering of that text and comment upon its messianic interpretation. Furthermore, they almost fully agree in their list of messianic texts in TgSam: 1 Sam. 2:7-10 (not mentioned by Oegema); 2 Sam. 22:28-32 (Landman adds verse 51); and 2 Sam. 23:1-5 (Oegema adds verse 6).<sup>157</sup> Also in earlier publications the “Song of Hannah” and the “Last Words of David” had been recognized as messianic.<sup>158</sup>

With regard to Tg. 2 Sam. 7:11-16 the opinion on the messianic value of this verse has shifted. On the one hand, this text was not regarded as messianic by Levey and De Moor,<sup>159</sup> because the Aramaic translation does not refer to any future Messiah and avoid any hint to the title “son of God” by rendering “And I will be for him *like* a father and he will be before Me *like* a son” (Tg. 2 Sam. 7:14). On the other hand, Landman and Oegema consider this text messianic to a certain extent, because the rendering of “The LORD will build you a house” (2 Sam. 7:11) with “The LORD will establish for you a kingdom” refers to the kingdom of the Messiah. However, this rendering cannot be taken as a typically messianic rendering, because it only explains the metaphor “house” with the clarifying word “kingdom”, borrowed from the direct co-text of verse 11 (cf. vss. 12, 13, 16). De Moor is right in observing that the interpretation of this verse in the New Testament is far more messianic (cf. Lk. 1:32 and Heb. 1:5).<sup>160</sup>

<sup>156</sup>K. Koch, “Messias und Sündenvergebung in Jesaja 53-Targum”, *JSJ* 3 (1972), 117-48; J.C. de Moor, “‘Van wie zegt de profet dit?’ Messiaanse apologetiek in de Targumim”, in: H.H. Grosheide *et al.* (eds), *De knechtsgestalte van Christus. Studies door collega’s en oud-leerlingen aangeboden aan Prof.dr. H.N. Ridderbos*. Kampen: Kok, 1978, 91-110; A. Landman, *Messias-interpretaties in de Targumim*, Kampen 1986; G.S. Oegema, *De Messias in Talmoud en Midrasj*, Baarn 1993.

<sup>157</sup>E. van Staalduine-Sulman, “The Aramaic Song of the Lamb”, in: J.C. de Moor, W.G.E. Watson (eds), *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT, 42), Neukirchen & Vluyn 1993, 265-92 suggested that 2 Sam. 23:1-8 forms a messianic unity. Cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 29, who recognized the messianic sense in 2 Sam. 23:8.

<sup>158</sup>Cf. W. Ayerst, *Die Hoffnung Israels oder die Lehre der alten Juden von dem Messias, wie sie in den Targumim dargelegt ist*, Frankfurt am Main 1851, 20; E. Hühn, “Die Targumim nach 300 n. Chr.”, in: *Die messianischen Weissagungen des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes bis zu den Targumim*, Freiburg im Breisgau etc. 1899, 111-14, esp. 112; P. Humbert, “Le Messie dans le Targum des Prophètes”, *RThPh* 43 (1910), 420-47, esp. 427. J.J. Brierre-Narbonne, *Exégèse targoumique des prophéties messianiques*, Paris 1936 does not mention any text from TgSam.

<sup>159</sup>Levey, *The Messiah*, 37; De Moor, “‘Van wie zegt de profet dit?’”, 95.

<sup>160</sup>De Moor, “‘Van wie zegt de profet dit?’”, 95; a conclusion shared by Levey, cf. H. Wansbrough, “The Messiah: an Aramaic Interpretation . . .”, *ScrB* 6 (1975), 16.

### 1.3.2.2 The Date of TJon

Levey also gave new impetus to the discussion of the dating of the Targumic literature.<sup>161</sup> The date of the origin of Targum Jonathan and the date of its final redaction have often been discussed in Targumic studies.<sup>162</sup> Some scholars tend to a very early date of origin, because of verses in the Targum which are explained in a non-Mishnaic way, assuming that non-Mishnaic exegesis must be from pre-Mishnaic times.<sup>163</sup> Others point to the similarity of TJon's exegesis and the *halakha* of early Talmudic times, explaining the differences away with the statement that there have always been divergent opinions among the rabbis.<sup>164</sup> A comparison between exegetical notions in Targum Jonathan and specific characteristics of Roman times has also been useful for dating Targum Jonathan's exegetical ideas.<sup>165</sup> The noted influence of Targumic exegesis on the works of Flavius Josephus and Jerome indicates the age of those exegetical notions.<sup>166</sup> Finally, the

<sup>161</sup>In 1987 Levey published the translation of TgEzek in the series *The Aramaic Bible*: S.H. Levey, *The Targum of Ezekiel Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (AramB, 13), Edinburgh 1987.

<sup>162</sup>See for a recent summary of this discussion, Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, Leiden 1996, 42-68.

<sup>163</sup>P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947, 123; R. le Déaut, *La Nuit Pascale: Essai sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode xxi 42* (AnBib, 22), Rome 1963, 41-43; S.H. Levey, "The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets", *VT* 21 (1971), 186-96, esp. 190; M. McNamara, *Targum and Testament: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*, Grand Rapids 1972, 86-89; C.T.R. Hayward, "Some Notes on Scribes and Priests in the Targum of the Prophets", *JJS* 36 (1985), 210-21, esp. 221; the assumption that non-Mishnaic is also pre-Mishnaic is contradicted by A.D. York, "The Dating of Targumic Literature", *JSJ* 5 (1974), 49-62, esp. 54.

<sup>164</sup>S.H. Levey, "The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets", *VT* 21 (1971), 186-96, esp. 186; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 1; B.D. Chilton, *The Glory of Israel* (JSOT.S 23), Sheffield 1983, 97-102.

<sup>165</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 68-98; 111-28; S.H. Levey, "The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets", *VT* 21 (1971), 186-96, esp. 187; R.P. Gordon, "Targum as Midrash: Contemporizing in the Targum to the Prophets", in: M.H. Goshen Gottstein (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies 1985*, Jerusalem 1988, 61-73, esp. 73.

<sup>166</sup>For the influence of Targumic exegesis on the works of Josephus, see A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archäologie*, Basel 1895; H. St John Thackeray, *Josephus, the Man and the Historian*, New York 1929, 78; R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VTS 51), Leiden 1994, 21; for the influence of Targumic exegesis on the works of Jerome, see V. Aptowitz, "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata", *ZAW* 29 (1909), 241-52; F. Stummer, "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas", *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30; Idem, "Beiträge zu



discovery of Aramaic, and especially Targumic, literature in Qumran, written in an Aramaic dialect close to TJon, makes it likely that TJon was written in the second century CE.<sup>167</sup>

Churgin had strongly suggested the fall of Babylonia as a *terminus ad quem*. Reading TJon, and especially TgIsa. 21:9 where the fall of Babylonia is still expected, he concluded that the overthrow of Babylonia by the Arabs had not yet taken place when TJon reached its final shape. And from the absence of any reference to the Islamic period he fixed the *terminus ad quem* at the rise of Islam, before the fall of Babylonia (640–641 CE).<sup>168</sup> Rejecting this reasoning as an *argumentum e silentio*, Levey has reconsidered the data for a *terminus ad quem* and has come to a contrary conclusion. He sees a “glaring reference” to the Arabs and their Islamic religion in Tg 2 Sam. 22:32. In his opinion, the translation of the question “Who is God but the LORD?” into the assertive statement “There is no God but the LORD” in the second half of this verse was made in reaction to the Islamic creed.<sup>169</sup>

To support this conclusion Levey gives several arguments which are repeated here:<sup>170</sup> (1) The Aramaic phrase יי ליה אלה אלא is “an exact translation” of the Arabic creed in Islam: *lā ilāha illā 'llāh*. (2) The Targum uses the verb ירה, ‘to confess’. (3) The response of the people of Israel to this confession in Tg 2 Sam. 22:32 runs ועמך ימרון ויה דחקך אלא אלהנא, “And your people will say: There is none who is strong except our God”, and seems to be a rejoinder of the Islamic *'Allāh 'akhbār*, ‘Allah is mighty’. (4) The messianic context in the Targum deals with peoples, nations and tongues who are confessing their faith in the one God. This could be an allusion to the conversion of all the nations which were conquered in the name of Allah. (5) The Arabic translation of Ps. 18:32 (= 2 Sam. 22:32), given by Saadia Gaon (892–942 CE), also conceives of this text as an assertive statement: *Laisa ilāhun gaira 'rrābi*, “There is no god besides the LORD”, just like TgSam and Syr. (6) A further similarity between TJon and the works of Saadia Gaon in the Islamic period consists of the name

dem Problem Hieronymus und die Targumim”, *Bib.* 18 (1937), 174-81; S. Klein, “Targumische Elemente in der Deutung biblischer Ortsnamen bei Hieronymus”, *MGWJ* 83 (1939), 132-41; C.T.R. Hayward, “Saint Jerome and the Aramaic Targumim”, *JSS* 32 (1987), 105-23.

<sup>167</sup>See below, § 1.3.3.

<sup>168</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 28.

<sup>169</sup>S.H. Levey, “The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets”, *VT* 21 (1971), 186-96, esp. 192. Cf. the paragraph on “Anti Moslem Polemic” in E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible* (BZAW, 174), Berlin 1988, 194-98.

<sup>170</sup>Levey, “The Date”, 192-95.

of Armilus the wicked in TgIsa 11:4.

Several authors have reacted against Levey's article, stating that his arguments were not convincing and could be countered in every respect.<sup>171</sup> The similarity between the Islamic creed and the rendering of Tg 2 Sam. 22:32 (and also TO Exod. 15:11; Tg 1 Sam. 2:2) is striking, but gives no reason to assume a relationship of dependence. The Targum, on the one hand, came to this formulation by its usual exegetical methods. The Arabs, on the other hand, took the most beautiful formulation to express their faith in one God, using the strong alliteration of *Alif*, *Lām* and *Hā'*. Furthermore, the content of the Islamic creed is based on Biblical pronouncements.<sup>172</sup>

### 1.3.3 Abraham Tal: The Date of TJon Revisited

In his dissertation on the language of TJon,<sup>173</sup> Abraham Tal compares its language with Qumran Aramaic and several Aramaic dialects of Palestinian and Babylonian origin. He examined words, barbarisms, grammatical constructions and variant spellings in order to establish in which period and in which region the language of TJon originated.<sup>174</sup> He concluded that the language of TJon has many similarities with classical Aramaic and Palestinian dialects. Furthermore, he agrees with Kutscher that it became the literary language in the aftermath of the Bar Kokhba revolt.<sup>175</sup> Since it shows fewer similarities to Galilean dialects, Tal assumes that it originated in Judaea.<sup>176</sup>

Although Tal's work is respected everywhere,<sup>177</sup> it has not remained without contradiction. Edward Cook argues that "the language situation for 'Middle Aramaic'—the Aramaic dialects of the

<sup>171</sup> E.g. R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VT.S, 51), Leiden 1994; R. Syrén, *The Blessings in the Targums: A Study on the Targumic Interpretations of Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33* (AAAbO, Ser. A., 64/1), Åbo 1986; A.S. Rodrigues Pereira, *Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E.-c. 600 C.E.): Selected Jewish, Christian and Samaritan Poems*, Leiden (diss.) 1996, 45-46.

<sup>172</sup> A more detailed discussion of Levey's argumentation is given in Ch. 6, before the commentary on 2 Sam. 22.

<sup>173</sup> A. Tal, *לשון החרגום לנביאים ראשונים ומעמדה בכלל ימי הארמיה*, Tel Aviv 1975.

<sup>174</sup> The several dialects are also summed up by A. Díez Macho, "Abraham Tal (Rosenthal), *L<sup>e</sup>shon ha-Targum . . .*", *BO* 36 (1979), 207-212, esp. 208.

<sup>175</sup> Tal, *לשון החרגום לנביאים ראשונים*, xii; E.Y. Kutscher, "The Language of the 'Genesis Apocryphon': A Preliminary Study", *ScrHie* 4 (1958), 1-35, esp. 10, n. 44.

<sup>176</sup> Díez Macho, "Abraham Tal (Rosenthal), *L<sup>e</sup>shon ha-Targum . . .*", 211.

<sup>177</sup> Cf. S.A. Kaufman, "Dating the Language of the Palestinian Targums and Their Use in the Study of First Century CE Texts", in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 118-41, esp. 123.

period 200 BCE – 200 CE—is best described as a dialect continuum”.<sup>178</sup> This would mean that Tal was wrong to split up these dialects into the two categories “Western” and “Eastern Aramaic”. Tal himself later refined his distinction between “Galilean” and “Judaean Aramaic”.<sup>179</sup>

Despite this criticism and refining, Tal’s conclusions have largely been adopted by many Targum scholars. Discussions concerning time and place have definitely moved from Babylonia to the West, and from the fifth century CE to the time after the Bar Kokhba revolt. Still, some questions remain: Why did the Aramaic language of Onqelos and Jonathan not influence the Aramaic of the Bavli? What is the relationship between these Targumim and the early Midrashim? And were these Targumim adopted in Babylonia with minor changes or did these Targumim undergo an extensive redaction?<sup>180</sup> Answering these questions is a task which goes beyond the scope of this study.

### 1.3.4 Leivy Smolar and Moses Aberbach

In 1983 Leivy Smolar and Moses Aberbach, professors at Baltimore Hebrew College, published their *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* as an enlarged “prolegomenon” to the reprint of Churgin’s *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*,<sup>181</sup> including several useful indexes to both works.<sup>182</sup> Both studies are concerned with TJon’s features, though Smolar and Aberbach’s results are more descriptive in style.<sup>183</sup> These authors agree with Churgin’s view that TJon was an early Palestinian translation of the Bible, slightly revised in a Babylonian setting. Therefore, they consider TJon “a prime resource for the study of early Rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity”.<sup>184</sup> In this respect,

<sup>178</sup>E.M. Cook, “A New Perspective on the Language of Onqelos and Jonathan”, in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 142-56, esp. 147. Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 19-21.

<sup>179</sup>A. Tal, “The Dialects of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic and the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch”, *Sefarad* 46 (1986), 441-48.

<sup>180</sup>Cf. H. Sysling, “De Palestijnse Targumim: een overzicht van recente studies over ontstaan, ontwikkeling, onderling verhouding en vorm van de rabbijnse Aramese vertalingen van de Pentateuch”, in: I.E. Zwiép, A. Kuyt (eds), *Dutch Studies in the Targum: Papers read at a workshop held at the Juda Palache Institute, University of Amsterdam (18 March 1991)*, Amsterdam 1993, 13-38, esp. 21-22

<sup>181</sup>L. Smolar, M. Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, P. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, New York 1983.

<sup>182</sup>However, most of the textual index for Samuel is missing. This index is published in Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 317-18.

<sup>183</sup>Cf. R. le Déaut, “Leivy Smolar – Moses Aberbach, *Studies ...*”, *Bib.* 66 (1985), 294-98, esp. 298: “plus descriptif qu’analytique”.

<sup>184</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, xxviii.

they ignore Churgin's statement that TJon's halakha is not completely in harmony with that of Rabbinic Judaism.<sup>185</sup>

Smolar and Aberbach's book consists of three parts: (1) halakha; (2) historical and geographical allusions; and (3) theological concepts in TJon. In the first part halakha in TJon is examined and compared with rabbinic texts. The authors came to the conclusion that halakha in TJon is in conformity with the teachings of the school of R. Aqiba, although they acknowledge allusions to the period after Aqiba and mostly compare TJon's exegetical results with the Babylonian Talmud.<sup>186</sup> Also in this respect, they ignore Churgin's view that TJon is considerably Amoraic.<sup>187</sup> As a case in point, the authors mention Tg 1 Sam. 21:6, which explains why David and his men could eat the shewbread in the same manner as R. Simeon did, who was a prominent disciple of R. Aqiba (Men. 95b-96a; mYoma 8:6). Another example is the broad view on divorce in Tg 1 Sam. 17:18 which is also in conformity with the view of R. Aqiba's school (Shab. 56a; Ket. 9b). Cases, however, in which TJon diverges from rabbinical exegesis or reasons why TJon chooses between several exegetical possibilities are not mentioned.<sup>188</sup> The lack of contradictions between TJon and rabbinical exegesis, together with the relatively late date of the extant manuscripts, could therefore lead to the conclusion that TJon is a source for the study of the early and mediaeval history of exegesis.<sup>189</sup>

In the second part, historical allusions found in TJon show that much material originates in Roman times, not much after the fall of Jerusalem. Specific dates are mentioned, such as 66 CE regarding the counting of the people "with lambs" in Tg 1 Sam. 15:4 (p. 69); the first Jewish war and the fall of Jerusalem to show that the Tosefta-Targum on 1 Sam. 17:43 seems to allude to the Zealot party during this war (pp. 72-74); the second Jewish war and the death of Bar Kokhba, if the singular "stronghold" in Tg 2 Sam. 1:19-21 refers to the last stage of the second Jewish war (p. 81); and Trajan's Parthian campaign in 114/7 CE, which might be mentioned in Tg 2 Sam.

<sup>185</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan* 17.

<sup>186</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 1-2 and 129, referring to R. Aqiba; 48 and 80-89, referring to later times.

<sup>187</sup>Cf. B.D. Chilton, "Three Views of the Isaiah Targum," *JSOT* 33 (1985), 127-28.

<sup>188</sup>Cf. S.D. Fraade, "Targum Jonathan to the Prophets", *JQR* 75 (1985), 392-401, esp. 399; L. Díez Merino, "Leivy Smolar and Moses Aberbach, *Studies* . . .", *JSJ* 17 (1986), 272-73.

<sup>189</sup>I. Rabinowitz, "Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. By Leivy Smolar and Moses Aberbach, . . .", *JAOS* 106 (1986), 363-64.

8:3 (p. 81).<sup>190</sup> These historical allusions and TJon's similarity to R. Aqiba's views, together with TJon's affinity with the Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls, affirm "Churgin's argument that this Targum came into being in its initial form in the early 2nd century in Palestine".<sup>191</sup>

Many historical details, however, only refer to general Roman customs and do not say anything about a specific date for TJon. This is fully acknowledged by the authors and demonstrated with several examples, such as the reference to the two houses, *viz.* of the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Exilarch of Babylonia in Tg 2 Sam. 7:29 (p. 89); dragging war prisoners through the streets in Tg 2 Sam. 12:31 (p. 68); the hanging of slaves and rebels on crosses in Tg 2 Sam. 21:9 (p. 98); the custom of slaves to come in every morning to enquire after their master's health in 1 Sam. 10:27 (p. 100); and taxes rather than forced labour in 2 Sam. 20:24 (p. 100).

Some historical details only refer to rabbinic times in general, such as the women who were not allowed to work as perfumers in 1 Sam. 9:4 in accordance with rabbinical rules (p. 107) and the rendering of the name Zuph with "prophets" in 1 Sam. 1:1; 9:1 (pp. 125-26). Likewise, the role of the prophets and priests and the relationship between masters and their servants are depicted in terms of rabbis and their disciples as if in rabbinic times. This can be illustrated with the overwhelming importance of Torah study and schools in TJon (pp. 101-102) and with the verb שָׁרַשׁ, 'serve', in 1 Sam. 16:21-22 (p. 31), which is also used in Talmud to describe the relation of a pupil to his rabbi.

In the third part of the book important theological concepts are compiled: monotheism, God's holiness and omnipotence, the distance between God and men, the study of Torah, prayer as a substitute for sacrifices, the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. In contrast to Churgin's book, exegetical methods and translational features are not the focus here.<sup>192</sup>

### 1.3.5 Translators of *The Aramaic Bible*

In 1987 the first volumes of the series *The Aramaic Bible*, translations of the Targumim into English, were published under the direction of

<sup>190</sup>Some renderings must be explained from the works of Josephus, such as the counting of the people of Israel "with lambs" in Tg 1 Sam. 15:4; others with the books of non-Jewish authors, such as the singular "stronghold" in 2 Sam. 1:19-21.

<sup>191</sup>Smolar, *Aberbach, Targum Jonathan*, xx. Cf. Fraade, "Targum Jonathan to the Prophets", 396.

<sup>192</sup>Cf. Fraade, "Targum Jonathan to the Prophets", 397.

Martin McNamara.<sup>193</sup> Apart from the volumes on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets,<sup>194</sup> a translation of the Targum to the Former Prophets saw the light.<sup>195</sup> Daniel J. Harrington, S.J., Professor of New Testament at Weston School of Theology in Cambridge (Mass.) and general editor of *New Testament Abstracts*, translated almost the entire text of the Former Prophets from Sperber's edition and supplied the text with notes and a small introduction. In the same period he also published an article on the Targum of the Prayer of Hannah with an English translation and an extended commentary.<sup>196</sup> Anthony J. Saldarini, Associate Professor in the Department of Theology at Boston College, revised the translation and supplied the text with an introduction on translation techniques and theology in Targum Jonathan and with notes on these subjects in the text.<sup>197</sup>

Any translation of a translation should be made with a high degree of consistency in order to show the characteristics of the translation in contrast to its source text.<sup>198</sup> This translation, however, is not very consistent. For example, the Aramaic word כִּנְיָ is rendered 'worship' in 1 Sam. 1-15 (before God), 'bow down' in 1 Sam. 20-25 (before humans), 'do obeisance' in 1 Sam. 28-2 Sam. 12 (before God and humans), and 'bow down' again in 2 Sam. 14-24 (before God and humans). Unfortunately, the quality of this translation is as high as the level of its consistency.<sup>199</sup> Starting at the very beginning, a variety

<sup>193</sup>An interim report on the Aramaic Bible Project was made by McNamara in his article "The Michael Glazier-Liturgical Press Aramaic Bible Project: Some Reflections", in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 103-15.

<sup>194</sup>B.D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum* (AramB, 11), Edinburgh 1987; C.T.R. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah* (AramB, 12), Edinburgh 1987; S.H. Levey, *The Targum of Ezekiel* (AramB, 13), Edinburgh 1987; K.J. Cathcart, R.P. Gordon, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets* (AramB, 14), Edinburgh 1989.

<sup>195</sup>D.J. Harrington, J.J. Saldarini, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (AramB, 10), Wilmington (DE) 1987. McNamara's report shows that this was the first translation of TgSam, cf. M. McNamara, "The Michael Glazier-Liturgical Press Aramaic Bible Project: Some Reflections", 103-105.

<sup>196</sup>D.J. Harrington, "The Apocalypse of Hannah: Targum Jonathan of 1 Samuel 2:1-10", in: D.M. Golomb, *Working with No Data: Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*, Winona Lake 1987, 147-52.

<sup>197</sup>Cf. the "Preface", in: Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, ix.

<sup>198</sup>The chief editor of the series, McNamara, defines this statement in his Guidelines, § 8: "The English translation itself was expected to be literal, faithful to the Aramaic text" and "if the same Hebrew term or phrase is always translated in the same manner in Aramaic, the same should be done in the English translation", cf. McNamara, "The Michael Glazier-Liturgical Press Aramaic Bible Project: Some Reflections", 108-109.

<sup>199</sup>Cf. E.M. Cook, "Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets . . .", *CritRR* 3

of errors can be noted: “Jehoram” (1 Sam. 1:1) should be “Jeroham”; “Is not my good will to you more . . .” (1 Sam. 1:8) should be “Is not my will to you better . . .”; “I have” (1 Sam. 1:28) should be “I also have”; “he fixes judgment” (1 Sam. 2:3) should be “judgment is fixed”; “walk about” (1 Sam. 2:9) should be “be punished”; and so on.<sup>200</sup>

The introduction on “Translation Techniques and Theology” (pp. 4-13) and the notes equal the translation in consistency. In this introduction eight characteristics of the Targum are discussed: the plural translation of names of peoples, the identification of place-names, regular substitutions, dealing with an unclear *Vorlage*, modernizing, realistic language for metaphors, reverential translations regarding God, and Midrashic additions, theological interpretations, and halakhic harmonizations. The last characteristic is a collection of several textual divergences, motivated by the context of the translator, including the exculpation of Biblical heroes (see *e.g.* 108, n. 5; 117, n. 19; 120, n. 43), monotheistic tendencies (see *e.g.* 111, n. 9; 174, n. 41; 183, n. 14) and the addition of features of contemporary religious life (see *e.g.* 139, n. 33; 172, n. 23; 196, n. 30).

Beside these eight features, Saldarini mentions other features in the notes, such as the identification of unknown heroes (cf. 122, n. 16), making the (assumed) implicit explicit (cf. 125, n. 28), harmonization (cf. 127, n. 43; 199, n. 8), and the translation of euphemisms with other euphemisms (cf. 147, n. 3; 150, n. 22; 151, n. 48; 181, n. 9). Exceptions to these features are not noted. As a case in point, it is not noted when TgSam translates the Ketib and not the Qere (cf., *e.g.* 1 Sam. 2:16), whereas Saldarini states that “sometimes the Targum translates the Qere rather than the Ketib”.<sup>201</sup>

Not even all differences between MT and Tg are noted, *e.g.* the addition of the pronomen relativum is systematically ignored (cf. *e.g.* 1 Sam. 2:13; 2 Sam. 16:17). Other differences are incidentally forgotten, *e.g.* the addition of ‘to you’ (1 Sam. 1:8) and the addition of ‘his’ (1 Sam. 2:13).

Harrington and Saldarini have included rabbinic parallels in the notes to the translation, but the parallels, merely based on the work

---

(1990), 343-48, esp. 344 about the first four volumes of the Aramaic Bible Project: “Still, there are a number of instances where, it seems to me, the Aramaic is misconstrued or badly translated; the Harrington-Saldarini volume is the worst offender in this respect.”

<sup>200</sup>The translation in Harrington, “The Apocalypse of Hannah” is the same as in *The Aramaic Bible* and therefore contains the same errors.

<sup>201</sup>Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 7

of Smolar and Aberbach, are far from complete. The statement that they “included whatever parallels there are”<sup>202</sup> is exaggerated.

The work of Harrington and Saldarini meets the need for a translation of the Targum. It is understandable, but unfortunate, that variant readings have not been incorporated.<sup>203</sup> It is, however, disappointing that the many errors and inconsistencies render this translation and its notes unreliable in clearly distinguishing the differences between TJon and MT.

### 1.3.6 Emiliano Martínez Borobio

The text of the Babylonian manuscripts has been investigated in Spain, especially under the influence of the late Alejandro Díez Macho. Within this line of investigation several editions of the Babylonian text of Biblical books were made. The edition of the Babylonian fragments of TgSam by Emiliano Martínez Borobio<sup>204</sup> appeared in the same year as Harrington and Saldarini’s translation. Unfortunately, the latter were unable to consult these new and important textual witnesses.

The Babylonian fragments, edited by Martínez Borobio, are not included in the edition of Sperber. They are vocalized according to the “authentic Babylonian tradition”.<sup>205</sup> In his introduction Martínez Borobio compiles the various Babylonian characteristics, such as the vocalization of the conjunction *waw*, of the particles *b-*, *d-*, *k-* and *l-*, and of the gutturals. Besides, the *hîreq* could be used as an auxiliary vocal in the Babylonian vocalization system.<sup>206</sup> The description of the different manuscripts, however, shows that a purely Babylonian vocalization does not exist. The influence of the Tiberian vocalization system is ubiquitous, even in the most important MS Eb 1.<sup>207</sup> Still, this edition is a valuable complement to Sperber’s edition.

<sup>202</sup>Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, ix

<sup>203</sup>In contrast to the intention of the Guidelines; cf. M. McNamara, “The Michael Glazier-Liturgical Press Aramaic Bible Project: Some Reflections”, 108, § 8.

<sup>204</sup>E. Martínez Borobio, *Targum Jonatán de los Profetas Primeros en tradición babilónica*, Vol. 2: I-II Samuel (TECC, 38), Madrid 1987. The author dutifully noted previously published editions and descriptions of these fragments by P. Kahle, A. Díez Macho, I. Yeivin and Y.L. Nahum in his introduction.

<sup>205</sup>Martínez Borobio, *I-II Samuel*, 10: “Tg. Jonatán a Profetas Anteriores en su auténtica tradición babilónica”.

<sup>206</sup>Martínez Borobio, *I-II Samuel*, 14-16. According to Borobio’s notes 18-30 (on p. 35), this compilation is based on a similar listing in A. Díez Macho, “Un importante manuscrito targúmico en la Biblioteca Vaticana”, in: *Homenaje a Millás-Vallierosa*, Vol. 1, Barcelona 1954, 399-433.

<sup>207</sup>Martínez Borobio, *I-II Samuel*, 15, cf. 4.2: “Yod timbrado con *hîreq*. No se da en Eb 1 esa puntuación típica babilónica.”



### 1.3.7 Rimón Kasher and the Tosefta-Targumim

In 1996, Rimón Kasher, professor at the Bar-Ilan University, edited a collection of Targumic toseftot to the Prophets,<sup>208</sup> expansions to TJon, either incorporated within the Aramaic version or quoted in the margin of a manuscript. These toseftot are all found within the Western tradition of TJon. The numbers 41-70 from Kasher's collection are toseftot to TgSam. Before giving the text and his comments, Kasher described the type of the Targumic expansion, its relation to the *haftara*, its dialect, and former publications of the variant, the latter mostly by De Lagarde, Bacher or Sperber. In his comments Kasher gave Biblical, Talmudic and Midrashic parallels to explain the contents of the variants. Other and later Jewish literature is also used as background for the exegesis in these variants, *e.g.* Josephus, Pseudo-Philo and the mediaeval commentators.

Kasher was aware of contradictions between the exegesis of the Targumic variants and that of the other Jewish literature. In the margin of *Codex Reuchlinianus*, a variant to 1 Sam. 4:12 is identifying the unknown messenger with Saul: "And Saul, the son of Kish, a man from the tribe of Benjamin, ran from the battle-lines and came to Shiloh on that day by means of an angel, who made him run from there." In the Midrashim, however, Saul was said to be so swift on his feet that he could run from the battle to Shiloh in one day.<sup>209</sup> In this case the Targumic expansion is not in harmony with other Jewish sources.<sup>210</sup> Kasher has the courage to admit that some variants do not have any parallel in Jewish literature. As a case in point, the lineage of Goliath to Samson is without parallel, in contrast to his lineage to Orpah. Both lineages are attested in the margin of *Codex Reuchlinianus* in a variant to 1 Sam. 17:4.<sup>211</sup>

Kasher's book is a valuable tool to gather insight into the exegetical background of the Targumic toseftot, apart from a missing tosefta on 1 Sam. 6:19, which is printed in Sperber's edition, some

<sup>208</sup>R. Kasher, *תוספתות תרגום לנביאים* (SSJC, 2), Jerusalem 1996. Cf. his specimen in "האם יש מקור אחד לתוספתות התרגום לנביאים?", *AJSReview*, 22.2 (1997), 1-21.

<sup>209</sup>MShem. 11:1 (78-79); MTeh. 7:2 (63); cf. Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 54:3-4; 61:2. The assumptions in these works are founded on 2 Sam. 1:23.

<sup>210</sup>Kasher, *תוספתות*, 103. Other examples can be found in his comments on 1 Sam. 11:11; 17:42; 2 Sam. 21:1.

<sup>211</sup>Kasher, *תוספתות*, 105. Another variant without parallels can be found in his comments on 2 Sam. 21:16-19 (pp. 120-21).

minor errors<sup>212</sup>, and some missing references.<sup>213</sup> Almost every tosefta has its parallels or contradictions in other Jewish literature. Kasher explains these variants as meaningful additions to the Targumic text of the Books of Samuel.<sup>214</sup>

## 1.4 Conclusions

Since the second half of the nineteenth century TgSam has been studied from various angles. It was mainly used as a textual witness in attempts to establish the 'original' Hebrew text of the Bible, as were the other ancient versions. De Lagarde's edition of *Codex Reuchlinianus* served this purpose, as did the text-critical studies of Aptowitz, Driver, De Boer, Vogel and Helfgott. In this period the Hebrew Bible was conceived of as God's revelation and every witness of this revelatory text was warmly welcomed and studied.

The character of TJon's translation was examined as well and various features were noted, especially in books published by Frankel, Churgin, Sperber, Komlosh, and Smolar and Aberbach. Especially the latter authors were interested in TJon itself: its background, its *Sitz im Leben*, its theology. Smolar and Aberbach neither compared the Aramaic text with the Hebrew original, nor attempted to establish the possible *Vorlage* of this version. They treated TJon, not as a witness to God's revelation, but as a document of the translators' faith.

Since the first half of the twentieth century separate books of TJon were investigated, especially at the Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest. After the second World War Targumic study spread to other universities and seminaries. Several publications on the books of TJon saw the light and a critical edition of TO and TJon was prepared by Sper-

<sup>212</sup>Nr. 41, comment to lines 2-3: ySan 10,5 must be: 10,4; nr. 45, second comment to line 2: TanExod 19 must be: 16; nr. 47, second comment to line 2: MekY, *Vayassa'*, 4 must be: 5; nr. 57, comment to line 19: tBer 4:18 must be: 4:20; nr. 69, second comment to line 12: MekY, *Vayassa'*, 3 must be: 4; nr. 69, comment to line 22: 2 Sam. 5 must be: 1 Sam. 5; nr. 70, comment to lines 2-3: line 5 must be: line 6.

<sup>213</sup>Nr. 41, comment to line 2, add: MTeh 49, 71:4; nr. 45, second comment to line 2, add: Zeb 102a; DevR 2,7; nr. 51, comment to lines 2-3, add: Tg Sheni Esther 4:13; RutR 1,20; San 95a; nr. 57, comment to line 33, add: San 6b; nr. 62, second comment to line 1, add: BemR 4,20, yQid 4:1, ySan 6:9.

<sup>214</sup>Other toseftot and expanded Targumic texts of TgSam are discussed in E. van Staaldoune-Sulman, "The Aramaic Song of the Lamb", in: J.C. de Moor, W.G.E. Watson (eds), *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT, 42), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1993, 265-292 (on 1 Sam. 17:43); Idem, "Reward and Punishment in the Messianic Age (Targ. 2 Sam. 23.1-8)", *JAB* 1 (1999), 273-296 (on 2 Sam. 23:1-8); A.S. Rodrigues Pereira, *Studies in Targumic Poetry* (c. 100 B.C.E. - c. 600 C.E.), Leiden (diss.) 1996 (on 2 Sam. 22).

ber. Specific verses, ideas and words of TJon were also discussed in order to investigate the language and the character of TJon as a translation.<sup>215</sup> In recent times new editions of the Babylonian fragments, a series of translations and concordances of TJon have provided a new stimulus to further research into TJon.

The origin of TJon has been a point of discussion since the end of the 19th century. Whereas Frankel believed that TJon originated in Babylonia, most authors considered Palestine as its place of origin. At first, Kahle agreed with Frankel to the extent that he saw Babylonia as the place in which TJon found its final shape. Later he stressed that there were older, non-Mishnaic parts in TJon which could very well be Palestinian in origin. Regarding the time of origin, Churgin believed that TJon had reached its final form in the time of R. Aqiba. This opinion was adopted and illustrated by Smolar and Aberbach. Kahle, however, at first considered TJon as a relatively late work, not finished before the fifth century CE. The discoveries at Qumran changed the discussion, because the language of the Aramaic Genesis Apocryphon seemed to be similar to the Aramaic of TO and TJon. A relatively early date and Palestine as the place of origin had to be accepted for at least the body of TJon.

The character and theology of TJon have also been subjected to research. The way in which such research was conducted differed significantly. Whereas Churgin categorized all deviations from the source text in TJon into four groups, which should be subdivided further, and Driver divided the Targumic deviations into only two categories, Sperber made a detailed division, in which some categories only consisted of a few examples. A middle course between these two extremes was pursued by Frankel, Komlosh, Smolar and Aberbach. A comparison between their classifications shows that translation techniques and theological concepts are listed together indiscriminately, except in Sperber's division; that these compilations partly agree and are partly unique; and that they all fail to show to what extent translation techniques and theological concepts are used consistently.

In regard to TgSam in particular, two editions, one annotated translation, two short commentaries, two articles on its character, and one concordance<sup>216</sup> have been published on this specific book.

---

<sup>215</sup>Whereas the Pentateuchal Targumim have been heavily drawn on for comparative studies, especially in regard to the New Testament, this tendency is not attested in studies on TgSam. This might originate in the fairly literal character of TgSam as well as in the fact that the New Testament did not often quote from the Books of Samuel.

<sup>216</sup>The philological and exegetical elucidation of TgSam will be facilitated by

Besides, several articles on a small part of TgSam have seen the light, along with one chapter on Targumic expansions. Only three authors systematically paid attention to variant readings within the Targumic tradition, *viz.* Bacher, Sperber and Kasher.

On account of the inconsistencies and errors in Harrington and Saldarini's translation, and in the absence of variant readings, their work will not suffice for further studies. The two commentaries of Vogel and Helfgott are very short and only deal with selected verses of TgSam. The collected parallel texts are interesting, but incomplete. Since the two commentaries are written in Hungarian, these books have often been simply neglected. Komlos's articles on TgSam contain a wealth of information about the translational features of the Targum, but the first article is very short and the second is not systematically arranged. This applies equally to the listing of the translational features in Vogel's commentary and to that in the preface to Harrington and Saldarini's translation. Levey's article on the date of 2 Sam. 22:32 demonstrates that a systematic listing and discussion of the translational features in the Targumim is needed in order not to confuse regular translation and externally motivated interpretation.

The preceding paragraphs show that further research into the exegesis and the exegetical origins of the Targum of Samuel is still necessary:

- A systematic compilation and discussion of the translational features of TJon is needed. This compilation must consist of equivalent and workable categories, in which the results of former research are included (Chapter 3).
- A consistent translation of TgSam, including its variant readings, must be made (Chapters 5-6).
- A discussion of the exegesis of TgSam, including its variant readings, is needed. Attention must be paid to historical background, exegetical sources and similarities with other books in ancient Judaism (Chapters 5-6).
- Many parallels in rabbinic and other Jewish literature have been indicated in previous research. However, since the Targum of Samuel was never systematically discussed, it is reasonable to assume that many parallels remain to be discovered (Chapters 5-6).

---

the appearance of a bilingual concordance which may be regarded as a pilot project leading up to the present dissertation, cf. E. van Staalduine-Sulman, *Samuel* (BCTP, 3-5), 3 vols., Leiden 1996.

- The debate on TJon's treatment of Hebrew poetry, which had led some scholars to the conclusion that at least two schools of translators had been at work, must be carried on in a more systematic way.
- The parallel texts must be grouped according to their date and place of origin, in order to establish, if possible, the date and place of origin of the exegetical traditions incorporated into TgSam (Chapter 7).

Therefore, several manuscripts of the Targum of Samuel are discussed and compared (Ch. 2). A compilation of exegetical techniques and theological motives is given (Ch. 3). The text of TgSam is translated, analyzed and annotated (Chs 5-6). From the different annotations a list of translation techniques and motives is compiled. In order to keep the commentary readable and within bounds, I have chosen to present several semantic studies before the commentary on the entire text (Ch. 4). Finally, some conclusions will be drawn with regard to the characteristics, the unity, and the poetry of TgSam, as well as the place and date of various parallel traditions (Ch. 7).

## Chapter 2

---

# The Text of Targum Samuel

### 2.1 Introduction

Any discussion of Targum Jonathan to the Books of Samuel has to start with the selection of the textual basis. The most comprehensive edition of TgSam was published by Alexander Sperber in the second volume of his *The Bible in Aramaic*, containing the Former Prophets. As a basic text he used MS Or. 2210 of the British Museum, a Yemenite manuscript dated 1469 CE.<sup>1</sup> Soon after, criticism was expressed about this edition, especially about his neglect of Babylonian manuscripts and his lack of accuracy.<sup>2</sup> The fact that Sperber gave neither a description of the manuscripts collated, nor an explanation for his selection of manuscripts caused some surprise.<sup>3</sup>

The neglect of Babylonian manuscripts has been compensated by Martínez Borobio's edition of TJon in the Babylonian tradition.<sup>4</sup> This edition also shows that the Babylonian tradition cannot function as a basic text. There is no complete manuscript for the whole of Tg-

---

<sup>1</sup>Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 2, v. The manuscript was used by A. Merx in his *Chrestomothia targumica*, Berlin 1888; and by J.F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah*, Oxford 1949.

<sup>2</sup>P. Kahle, "Die Aussprache des Hebräischen in Palästina vor der Zeit der Tiberischen Masoreten", *VT* 10 (1960), 375-85, esp. 383; M. Martin, "The Babylonian Tradition and Targum", in: R. De Langhe (ed.), *Le Psautier: Ses origines. Ses problèmes littéraires. Son influence* (OBL, 4), Louvain 1962, 425-51; J. van Zijl, "Errata in Sperber's Edition of Targum Isaiah", *ASTI* 4 (1965), 189-91; Idem, "A Second List of Errata in Sperber's Edition of Targum Isaiah", *ASTI* 7 (1968/69), 132-34; J. Ribera Florit, *Biblia Babilónica: Profetas Posteriores (Targum)*, Salamanca 1977; A. Díez Macho, "A. Sperber (ed.), *The Bible in Aramaic*, etc.", *JSJ* 96 (1975), 217-36; E. Martínez Borobio, *Targum Jonatan de los Profetas Primeros en tradición babilónica*, Vol. 2: I-II Samuel (TECC, 38), Madrid 1987, 9-10; R.P. Gordon, "Sperber's Edition of the Targum to the Prophets: A Critique", *JQR* 64 (1973/74), 314-21; D. Barthélemy (ed.), *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* t. 3: Ézéchiél, Daniel, et les 12 Prophètes, Göttingen 1992, ccix-ccx; summarized by R.P. Gordon, "Foreword to the Reprinted Edition", in: A. Sperber (ed.), *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 1, Leiden 1992, n.pp.; Idem, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VT.S, 51), Leiden 1994, 30; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 114-5; A. Houtman, "Planning a New Targum Edition: Look Before You Leap", *JAB* 2 (2000), 213-31, esp. 217.

<sup>3</sup>D. Winton Thomas, "A. Sperber (ed.), *The Bible in Aramaic*, etc.", *JSS* 5 (1960), 286-88, esp. 287.

<sup>4</sup>E. Martínez Borobio, *Targum Jonatán de los Profetas Primeros en tradición babilónica*, Vol. 2: I-II Samuel (TECC, 38), Madrid 1987.

Sam. The major manuscript<sup>5</sup> had to be supplemented with parts of two other manuscripts, MS L 230 (EMC 5) of the Jewish Theological Seminary, and Qafih 2 in Jerusalem,<sup>6</sup> neither of which are genuinely Babylonian texts.<sup>7</sup> “So Sperber’s choice of a well-executed Yemenite MS was not so injudicious after all.”<sup>8</sup> The Babylonian tradition is incorporated in the commentary of Chs 5-6 according to Martínez Borobio’s sigla.

In addition to the Yemenite manuscript which he selected as his basis text, Sperber offered a small selection of variant readings. For TgSam he used four Yemenite and three Western manuscripts, two *haftarot* and, indiscriminately, some fragments of the Taylor-Schechter Collection in Cambridge.<sup>9</sup> A search in several catalogues has resulted in a list of 25 complete manuscripts for TgSam, of which Sperber used seven. Kasher’s edition of Targumic toseftot, however, demonstrates that exegetical expansions can be found in several other, mostly Western, manuscripts.<sup>10</sup> These tosefta-targumim are used in Chapters 5-6 as well.

Since complete collation of all remaining witnesses goes beyond the scope of the present study, I have selected six complete manuscripts and some interesting fragments and *haftarot*, which were not used by Sperber, Martínez Borobio or Kasher to search for more exegetically relevant variants.<sup>11</sup> The manuscripts selected for collation are described in § 2.3. I collated selected chapters from these manuscripts from microfilm,<sup>12</sup> and scanned the other chapters for exegetical variants. The selection of chapters consists of all the *haftarot*, both of the annual and of the triennial cycle,<sup>13</sup> special *haftarot*, such as 1 Sam. 17 (in the Italian tradition) and 2 Sam. 21 (for times of drought), and five other passages as a check: 1 Sam. 5, 16 and 21; 2 Sam. 23:1-8 and 24.<sup>14</sup> To sum up, the following chapters were collated entirely: 1 Sam.

<sup>5</sup>MS L 229 (EMC 105) of the Jewish Theological Seminary, Martínez Borobio’s Eb 1.

<sup>6</sup>Martínez Borobio’s Eb 66 and Eb 76.

<sup>7</sup>Martínez Borobio, *I-II Samuel*, 17-8.

<sup>8</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 115-6.

<sup>9</sup>Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 2, v-vi.

<sup>10</sup>R. Kasher, *תוספתות תרגום לנביאים*, Jerusalem 1996, 101-23.

<sup>11</sup>At least two criteria played a role in the selection process, *viz.* the MS was not to contain too much errors and the MS was not closely related to one of the MSS used by Sperber.

<sup>12</sup>The microfilms of the manuscripts collated are all present in the library of the Theologische Universiteit at Kampen (Oudestraat 6), The Netherlands.

<sup>13</sup>See below, § 2.4.

<sup>14</sup>It seems that 2 Sam. 23:1-7 and 2 Sam. 24 have been part of an unattested cycle of *haftarot*, cf. M.L. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah*

1-2, 4-6, 9, 11-12, 15-17, 20-21, 2 Sam. 5:13-7:29, 21-23:8, 24.

The collation of these chapters resulted in finding few minor exegetical variations which were not registered by Sperber, Martínez Borobio or Kasher. Neither any major exegetical variant, nor any tosefta-targum not already mentioned in one of the three books were found. In conclusion, with the two editions and Kasher's addition of tosefta-targumim the vast majority of variants and expansions is accessible. In addition, the fragments found in extra-Targumic literature were used for completion.<sup>15</sup>

## 2.2 Errors in Sperber's Edition

Having Martínez Borobio's edition of Babylonian manuscripts and Kasher's selection of Targumic toseftot now at our disposal, the remaining problem of Sperber's edition is his lack of accuracy.<sup>16</sup> However, most errors are easily discovered and do not affect the meaning of the text. On the basis of the collated manuscripts the following consonantal errors in Sperber's edition of TgSam were discovered:<sup>17</sup>

### ERRORS IN THE MAIN TEXT

I 4:15	ועונוהי	read:	ועינוהי
I 5:9	דיוי	read:	דיוי <sup>18</sup>
I 6:8	בתיחבא	read:	בתיחבא
I 6:9	עם	read:	אם
I 8:9	דימלך	read:	דימלך
I 9:13	למכיל	read:	למכיל
I 12:10	זי	read:	זי
I 14:15	בחק לא	read:	בחקלא
I 18:10	ביומה	read:	ביומא
I 20:5	בחקלט	read:	בחקלא
<i>continued on next page</i>			

*Collections* (CULGS, 8), Cambridge 1992, 40 no. 460, 33 no. 389.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. M. Goshen-Gottstein, שְׂקִיעִים מִהַרְגוּמֵי הַמִּקְרָא הָאֲרָמִיִּים, Vol. 1, Ramat-Gan, 1983.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. J. van Zijl, "Errata in Sperber's Edition of Targum Isaiah", *ASTI* 4 (1965), 189-91; Idem, "A Second List of Errata in Sperber's Edition of Targum Isaiah", *ASTI* 7 (1968/69), 132-34; R.P. Gordon, "Sperber's Edition of the Targum to the Prophets: A Critique", *JQR* 64 (1974), 314-34; Idem, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VT.S, 51), Leiden 1994, 30.

<sup>17</sup>With special thanks to Jerome A. Lund, associate research scholar at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati (OH), who pointed out some errors.

<sup>18</sup>The errors in 1 Sam. 5:9; 6:9; 20:29; 24:12; and 2 Sam. 22:3 are also noted in the corrigenda in A Sperber (ed.), *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 1, Leiden 1992, iv.



<i>continued from previous page</i>			
I 20:29	עם	read:	אם
I 20:42	עם	read:	עד
I 21:2	ליה [2°]	read:	לית
I 24:12	יך	read:	ית
I 25:22	עם	read:	עד
I 27:11	דכין	read:	כדין
II 6:23	עם	read:	עד
II 7:12	והשכוב <sup>19</sup>	read:	והשכוב
II 10:6	ויך	read:	וית
II 11:1	בירושלם	read:	בירושלם
II 11:19	כשיצויתך	read:	כשיצויתך
II 13:23	אבשלים	read:	אבשלום
II 14:7	למשקל	read:	למקטל
II 22:3	לארעא	read:	לארמא
II 22:25	כברורווי	read:	כברירווי

The most obvious and critical errors in the second apparatus are:

#### ERRORS IN THE SECOND APPARATUS (INCOMPLETE)

I 2:22		ית	read:	ית (2°)
I 2:31 d		31: תקוף		1° or 2° or both?
I 4:9		גברין <		1° or 2° or both?
I 9:4		ועבר [2°]	read:	ועבר [3°]
I 12:5	b d Fr	ואמרן ואמר	add:	ונפלה ברת קלא מן שמיא ואמרת סהיד f <sub>6</sub>
I 12:10		f שמשון ברן	add:	ויה שמשון דאתי מן שיבט דן f <sub>3</sub>
I 15:17		דבעא יי (1°)	read:	דבעא יי
I 17:43 c d		פשילחאה	read:	פלישחאה
I 18:19 c d		דקרושהא [1° and 2°]	read: <sup>20</sup>	דקירושהא
I 18:19 c d		קרשה	read:	קירשה
I 18:19 c d		ומאן	read:	ומן
I 18:19 c d		משה	read:	מן שוה

*continued on next page*

<sup>19</sup>Note that Martínez Borobio most probably reads the same error in this verse.

<sup>20</sup>For the corrections of 1 Sam. 18:19 in MSS c d, see R. Kasher, חוספתוה תרגום, Jerusalem 1996, 111-2; S.D. Luzzatto, "Nachträgliches über die Thargumim", *WissZJüdTh* 5 (1844), 124-37, esp. 132.

continued from previous page			
I 18:19 c d	ודוד	read:	ודוד
I 18:19 c d	מינה	read:	מינה
I 19:4	לך		1° or 2° or both?
I 20:4	Fr חימר	read:	Fr f חימר
I 21:8		add:	8: אדומאה רבן תלמידא דלשאול .f <sub>3</sub>
I 26:1	+ בית f	read:	+ בית f <sub>3</sub>
I 29:7	בעיני	read:	9: בעיני
I 31:9	9: וית (2°) < c	read:	9: ית (2°) < c
II 1:18 f <sub>1</sub>	והיכן	read:	פירוש והיכן
II 14:21	20 [2°]	read:	21
II 20:19	ראמר < c	read:	20: ראמר < c
II 22:21	21: אמר דויד + o	read:	21: אמר דויד < o
II 22:25	24 [2°]	read:	25
II 23:4	א f זיהור	add:	ב כזיהור
II 23:4	ראתון < o	read:	o < ראתון
II 23:11	טורא d -	read:	;d טורא

## 2.3 Manuscripts

The Aramaic text used for this study is based on Sperber,<sup>21</sup> Martínez Borobio,<sup>22</sup> Kasher,<sup>23</sup> and manuscripts collated by myself.<sup>24</sup> For economical reasons, all sigla are preceded by the indication "MS", whether it concerns a real manuscript, a marginal note or a printed edition.

In the following description of manuscripts, the first paragraph contains general information about the whole manuscript or group of manuscripts to which it belongs: name, place of preservation, date and place of origin, language, material, number of folios, columns and lines, texts and vocalizations, and other characteristics. The second paragraph provides information about the Targumic text of the Books of Samuel in the relevant manuscript: number of errors, abbreviations

<sup>21</sup> Indicated by his sigla a b c d f j k o m p w x y or with the names Rashi and Kimḥi, as explained in Sperber's "Prefatory Remarks", v-vi.

<sup>22</sup> Indicated by his sigla eb1 eb3 eb4 eb12 eb30 eb66 eb75 eb76 eb91 eb93 eb124 kb15 kb52, as explained in his introduction to *Targum Jonatán de los Profetas Primeros en tradición babilónica*, Vol. 2: I-II Samuel (TECC, 38), Madrid 1987.

<sup>23</sup> Indicated by Sperber's sigla, if possible, or by its full name, cf. R. Kasher, *הוספתות הרגום לנביאים* (SSJC, 2), Jerusalem 1996.

<sup>24</sup> Indicated as below. The sigla are partly based on sigla used in Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 118-59; and partly new in order to avoid the double use of a siglum.

and corrections, missing verses, marginal notes, tosefta-targumim and other textual variations.

### 2.3.1 Selected Manuscripts with the Complete Text

The following manuscripts, containing the complete text of TgSam, were partly collated:

B: Ms Or. Fol. 1-4 (Kennicott 150),

Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz. Bilingual: Pentateuch with TO, Prophets with TJon alternating. Chapters are indicated by Hebrew letters. Both Hebrew and Aramaic with sub-linear vocalization and accents. Parchment, 140, 208, 243 and 293 folios, 3 cols. in 35 lines, with Masorah. The manuscript is from the 14th century, written by Baruch ben Abraham, but its punctuation is dated 1455. It includes *Somnium Mordechai* in Aramaic.<sup>25</sup>

The manuscript contains many errors, but few abbreviations, only at the end of a line. It has many corrections which often affect the vocalization. The vocalization may be based on a different *Vorlage* and the punctuator frequently corrected obvious errors. MT 1 Sam. 6:9 is missing. The names in 2 Sam. 5:15-16 are given only once. The beginning of the *haftarot* is indicated by the word הפטרה in the margin; thus in the margin of 1 Sam. 11:14; 15:2; 20:18; 2 Sam. 6:1. There are no tosefta-targumim to TgSam.

C: Mss B.H. III-IV (Cod. De Rossi Ext. 23),

Biblioteca Civica Berio, Genoa. Bilingual: MT and TJon alternating. Parts of seven volumes, Vols. III-IV contain Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings. Parchment, French “tedesco” character (German according to De Rossi), Masorah, commentary of Rashi, decorated, dated 1438, 88 folios (54,3 x 41.0 cm.) and 95 folios (55,0 x 41,0 cm.), 3 cols.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup>Cf. I.B. De Rossi, *Variae Lectiones V.T.*, Vol. 1, 1784, lxvi-lxvii; B. Kennicott, *Dissertatio Generalis in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, cum variis lectionibus ex codicibus manuscriptis et impressis*, Oxford 1780, 83; *Catalogue Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts: The Jewish National and University Library*, nos 27198-27201.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. I.B. De Rossi, *Variae Lectiones V.T.*, Vol. 1, cxxviii; Idem, *Specimen variarum lectionum sacri testus*, Rome 1782, 66; G.G. Bjoernstaehl, *Lettere nei suoi viaggi stranieri al Sig. Gjowell*, Poschiavo 1785, tomo 3, 251; S. de Saby, “Rapport sur les recherches faites . . .”, *Mémoires d'Histoire et de littérature orientales*, Parigi 1818, tomo 3, 90-91; G. Gabrieli, *Manoscritti e carte orientali nelle biblioteche e negli archivi d'Italia: data statistici e bibliografici delle collezioni, loro storia e catalogazione*, Florence 1930, 21; A. Luzzatto, *La Bibbia Ebraica della Biblioteca Berio di Genova—Quaderni dell' Università di Genova*, Genua 1966; V. Antonioli Martelli, L. Mortara Ottolenghi, *Manoscritti biblici ebraici decorati*:

TJon in this manuscript includes many *matres lectionis*, a great number of abbreviations, even completely abbreviated verses (e.g. 1 Sam. 15:10), and minor omissions. TJon 2 Sam. 5:15-16 is omitted, because these verses only contain names. Both in the MT and in TJon, 2 Sam. 22:45 is omitted. There is no tosefta-targum to TgSam.

D: Ms Parma 3187 (Cod. De Rossi 737),  
Biblioteca Palatina, Parma. Bilingual: Former prophets (Josh. 11:23-Kgs) with TJon. Parchment, first of three volumes, 2 cols. of Hebrew with 2 very narrow cols. of targum in the margin. The Hebrew includes sublinear vocalization with accents, the Aramaic is not vocalized. The leaves with 2 Sam. 20:5b until the end of the Samuel books are missing. German, 13th-14th century, partly damaged.<sup>27</sup>

This manuscript includes abundant use of abbreviations and many *matres lectionis*. Some verses in TJon are indicated BY the first word of the Hebrew text: 1 Sam. 2:1-5 and 17:40. The text of TJon is very corrupt. Much is omitted, mostly through haplography, although there are also several plusses through dittography. TJon 1 Sam. 2:6-10 is missing. The Aramaic text contains several Hebrew spellings or even Hebrew words. The manuscript includes a tosefta-targum on TJon 1 Sam. 17:39.

J: Ms El. f.6 (Kennicott 182),  
Universitätsbibliothek, Jena. Bilingual: MT and TJon alternating, both Hebrew and Aramaic with sublinear vocalization and accents. Parchment, 471 folios (38 x 48 cm.), 3 cols. in 31 lines, except the last page of 2 Sam. which contains one small and one large column, German square, 13/14th century,<sup>28</sup> with some minor decorations. At the beginning of each book space is left for a major decoration, containing the first Hebrew word, but the decorations were never made. The text of MS J is very similar to the text of MS Add. 26879 of the British Museum, which Sperber gave siglum a.<sup>29</sup>

---

*provenienti da biblioteche italiane pubbliche e private*, Milan 1966, 74ff., nos 25-31; Catalogue *Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts: The Jewish National and University Library*, nos 27848-27849.

<sup>27</sup>CF. I.B. De Rossi, *MSS. Codices Hebraici Bibliotheca G.B. De-Rossi*, Vol. 2, Parma 1803, 143; Idem, *Variae Lectiones V.T.*, Vol. 1, cxxi; Catalogue *Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts: The Jewish National and University Library*, no 13914.

<sup>28</sup>According to C. Alfonso Fontela, *El Targum al Cantar de los Cantares (Edición Crítica)*, Madrid 1987, 54-55.

<sup>29</sup>Cf. I.B. De Rossi, *Variae Lectiones V.T.*, Vol. 1, lxxix; B. Kennicott, *Dissertatio Generalis in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum; cum variis lectionibus ex codicibus manuscriptis et impressis*, Oxford 1780, 86; E. Roth et al., *Hebräische Handschriften* (VOHD, 6/2), Wiesbaden 1965, 151, no 213.

This manuscript made abundant use of abbreviations, indicated by a dot, and *matres lectionis*. There are many errors and cases of haplography in the targum, but quite a few are corrected by its pointing or by additions in the margin. Hebrew endings and words can be found in the Aramaic. The use of the *Sin* is preferred over the *Samech*. TJon 2 Sam. 5:15-16 is omitted, because these verses only contain names; TJon 2 Sam. 6:23 is written in a different handwriting. The manuscript contains a tosefta-targum to 1 Sam. 17:8.

S: Ms Kennicott 5 [85],

Bodleian Library, Oxford. De Rossi and Kennicott listed this manuscript with the signature "Kennicott 85",<sup>30</sup> but the Bodleian Library followed a printing error in Neubauer's catalogue.<sup>31</sup> Bilingual: Former Prophets with TJon, provided with the commentaries of Rashi, Kimḥi and Levi ben Gershom in the margins, both Hebrew and Aramaic with sublinear vocalization, Hebrew with accents. Parchment, 262 folios in 2 cols. for the MT with 2 smaller ones for the targum, Spanish, Sefardi square script, written in Segovia, 13th century (cf. folio 262<sup>v</sup>).<sup>32</sup>

This manuscripts contains abbreviations, indicated by a dot above the last letter of the abbreviated word, although sometimes the omitted letters were added later. There are quite a few errors, with several corrections. This manuscript includes many *matres lectionis*, Hebrew spellings and vocalizations in the Aramaic text. The *Sin* is used and not often replaced by the *Samech*. In the Aramaic text the *haftarot* 1 Sam. 20:18-21:1 and 2 Sam. 6:1-19 are written in a different, smaller handwriting. In the Hebrew text 2 Sam. 15:16 is missing, in the Aramaic 2 Sam. 12:30b and 21:17b, in both 1 Sam. 17:21. David's Psalm (2 Sam. 22) is written in 1 col. Hebrew with 1 smaller col. TJon. The Aramaic for 2 Sam. 23:27-38, the list of David's heroes, is only indicated with some deviating names. This manuscript includes tosefta-targumim on 1 Sam. 17:8; 17:42-43 (a version slightly deviating from other versions of this tosefta-targum); 18:25; 2 Sam. 12:14; 20:22.

<sup>30</sup>I.B. de Rossi, *Variae Lectionis V.T.*, Vol. 1, lxiii; B. Kennicott, *Dissertatio generalis in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum; cum variis lectionibus ex codicibus manuscriptorum et impressis*, Oxford 1780, 78.

<sup>31</sup>A. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, Vol. 1, Oxford 1886, no. 2329.

<sup>32</sup>Cf. *Catalogue Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts: The Jewish National and University Library*, no 21024.

T: Cod. Or. 72 (MS A. 1,2; Kennicott 240), Biblioteca Angelica, Rome. Bilingual: Former Prophets and Writings with targum in the inner margin, several commentaries, Hebrew is vocalized with accents (except the first 5 folios of Genesis), Aramaic unvocalized and in smaller characters. Parchment, 346 folios (46,0 x 32,0 cm.) in 29 lines in Hebrew, decorated, written in Frascati (Italy) and dated 1323-26. The manuscript includes a Hebrew translation of the Aramaic parts of Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah.<sup>33</sup>

There are many abbreviations, quite a few *matres lectionis*, several errors, some of which are corrected, and cases of haplography, which are not corrected. Most verses in TJon start with the first Hebrew word of the verse. Often the last word of TJon from the previous page is repeated at the beginning of a new page. TJon 2 Sam. 5:15-16 are only indicated by the first Hebrew words, because these verses only contain names. This manuscript includes no tosefta-targumim to TgSam.

### 2.3.2 Incomplete Manuscripts, Fragments and *Haftarot*

The following fragments and *haftarot*-collections were collated and used. I depend on Lagarde's collation of MS 9<sup>h</sup> for 2 Sam. 22.

9<sup>h</sup>: Ms Or. Fol. 1214 (Kennicott 603),

Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz (formerly Michaelis no. 4, Universitätsbibliothek Erfurt).<sup>34</sup> Parchment, 282 folios, 3 col., 13th century. Folios 279-282 are damaged. Bilingual: MT and TO alternating in the Torah section, which begins with Gen. 34:5; Megilloth; *haftara* collection neither according to the German tradition nor according to the Spanish tradition; Job 1-33 without Aramaic version. There are Masoretic notes in the margin of the Torah and the Megilloth sections.

Variant readings in some *haftarot* are listed by Lagarde, among them the variant readings of 2 Sam. 22.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>33</sup>Cf. I.B. De Rossi, *Variae Lectiones V.T.*, Vol. 1, lxxiii; B. Kennicott, *Dissertatio Generalis in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum; cum variis lectionibus ex codicibus manuscriptis et impressis*, Oxford 1780, 90; V. Antonioli Martelli, L. Mortara Ottolenghi, *Manoscritti biblici ebraici decorati: provenienti da biblioteche italiane pubbliche e private*, Milan 1966, 48ff., no 7 (eroneously catalogued as Targum Onqelos); Catalogue *Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts: The Jewish National and University Library*, no 11715.

<sup>34</sup>No. 4 according to the numbering of P. de Lagarde, *Symmicta*, Göttingen 1877, 138-39.

<sup>35</sup>Cf. P. de Lagarde, *Symmicta*, Göttingen 1877, 139-40.

10: Hs. 438,29,

Universitätsbibliothek Freiburg i.B. Fragments containing 2 Sam. 23:2-16 (fol. 1) and 1 Kgs 1:38-2:4 (fol. 2), pointed, with both Masorah's, MT with TJon in the margin. The verses 2 Sam. 23:2, 4b-9a of TJon are barely legible.<sup>36</sup>

11<sup>h</sup>: Abt. 701, Nr. 759, 5, 6,

Staatsarchiv Koblenz. Aramaic: partly damaged poems in Aramaic (fol. 1); TJon for the Shabbath and the seventh day of Passover, beginning with Ezek. 37:12 and ending with 2 Sam. 22:21 (fols. 2-3). Parchment, 3 fols. (20 x 31 cm.), 3 cols. in 30 lines, square script, 13th century.<sup>37</sup>

12<sup>h</sup>: Ms C 091 (20),

Institute of Oriental Studies, St.-Petersburg. Bilingual: MT and TJon alternating, Hebrew with Tiberian vocalization and accents; Aramaic with supralinear vocalization. Paper, 108 folios (30,0 x 19,0 cm.) and some fragments, 1 col. of 25 lines, although two *haftarot* have the Hebrew in one column and the Aramaic in the outer margin and lower margin, Yemenite square handwriting. Heading and names of owners on folios 1a-b. Several folios are badly damaged or missing entirely. On some slightly damaged folios the missing Aramaic words are added in the margin in modern Hebrew handwriting. Some missing folios have been replaced by modern paper sheets with the missing text in modern Hebrew handwriting.

The manuscript contains hardly any errors or abbreviations, except for  $\rho$  instead of  $\rho$ קד. The manuscript includes *haftarot* for weekly *parashot* (annual cycle), special Shabbaths and festivals, including 1 Sam. 1:1-2:10; 11:14-12:22; 14:52-15:33; 20:18-42; 2 Sam. 6:1-7:3. In some verses the targum text has been divided into logical parts by means of dots between the words.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. E. Roth *et al.*, *Hebräische Handschriften* (VOHD, 6/2), Wiesbaden 1965, 65, no 98.I; Catalogue *Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts: The Jewish National and University Library*, no 11392.

<sup>37</sup>Cf. E. Roth *et al.*, *Hebräische Handschriften* (VOHD, 6/2), Wiesbaden 1965, 171, no 236.

## 2.4 Targum Samuel as *Haftarah*

The public reading of selected portions from the Bible during a Jewish religious service is an old institution, which probably dates back to the Second Temple period.<sup>38</sup> In Palestine, Jews were accustomed to complete the reading of the Pentateuch in a period of more than three years, while the Babylonian Jews distributed the readings across a single year.<sup>39</sup> The latter cycle was followed by the European Jews, and probably also used in some Jewish communities in Judea.<sup>40</sup> Still, the triennial cycle was used at least until the twelfth century in Palestine and Egypt,<sup>41</sup> although there is a great lack of uniformity as to the number of the sedarim in this cycle.<sup>42</sup>

The tradition of accompanying these Pentateuchal readings with Prophetic readings is more recent, but it is already discussed at the end of the first century CE<sup>43</sup> and confirmed by New Testament texts, such as Lk. 4:7 and Acts 8:15, 27; 13:15.

### 2.4.1 The Annual Cycle

Some chapters from the Books of Samuel are used in the annual cycle.<sup>44</sup> These chapters are listed in the following overview. The relationship between the Torah reading and the accompanying *haftarah* will be discussed in the commentary of Chs 5-6. at the beginning of each chapter.

<sup>38</sup>A. Büchler, "The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle", *JQR* 5 (1893), 420-468, esp. 420; explained in 423-468.

<sup>39</sup>Büchler, "The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle", 420 refers to Meg. 29b.

<sup>40</sup>J. Mann, I. Sonne, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, Vol. 1, 1940; repr. New York 1971, xxiii connect it with R. Simon b. Eleazar, who lived in Southern Palestine.

<sup>41</sup>*EJ*, s.v. "Triennial Cycle". Büchler, "The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle", 422, even cites a fifteenth century source in which the triennial cycle is mentioned as still in use.

<sup>42</sup>J. Mann, I. Sonne, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, Vol. 1, 1940; repr. New York 1971, xxvii.

<sup>43</sup>A. Büchler, "The Triennial Reading of the Law and Prophets", *JQR* 6 (1894), 1-73, esp. 2 mentions mMeg. 4.

<sup>44</sup>*EJ*, s.v. "Torah, Reading of"; for festal readings also C. Perrot, "The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue," in: M.J. Mulder, H. Sysling (eds), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Assen & Philadelphia 1988, 137-159, esp. 141 and 146; A. Büchler, "The Triennial Reading of the Law and Prophets", *JQR* 6 (1894), 1-73.



## SAMUEL IN THE ANNUAL CYCLE

Name	Torah (EJ)	Haftara (EJ)
שמיני	Lev. 9:1–11:47	2 Sam. 6:1–7:17 <sup>45</sup>
קרח	Num. 16:1–18:32	1 Sam. 11:14–12:22
כי תטא	Deut. 21:10–25:19	Isa. 54:1–10 <sup>46</sup>
האזינו	Deut. 32:1–52	2 Sam. 22:1–51 <sup>47</sup>
Rosh Hashanah	Gen. 21:1–34 <sup>48</sup>	1 Sam. 1:1–2:10 <sup>49</sup>
Sh. Zakhor <sup>50</sup>	weekly portion <sup>51</sup>	1 Sam. 15:2–34 <sup>52</sup>
7th Day Passover	Exod. 13:17–15:26 <sup>53</sup>	2 Sam. 22:1–51 <sup>54</sup>
Sh. Mevarekhin <sup>55</sup>	weekly portion	1 Sam. 20:18–42 <sup>56</sup>
7th Day of drought	Deut. 28:1–29:9	2 Sam. 21:1–14 <sup>57</sup>

<sup>45</sup>2 Sam. 6:1–19 according to the Sefardi tradition, cf. Kasher, *רוספסות*, 113. Ms 12<sup>b</sup> reads 2 Sam. 6:1–7:3; MS S reads 2 Sam. 6:1–19.

<sup>46</sup>According to Kasher, *רוספסות*, 105–109, 1 Sam. 17 is a *haftara* in the Italian tradition. Also attested in T.-S. K26.36 and in West. Coll. Misc. 70, cf. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts*, 39 no. 458, 120 no. 1573.

<sup>47</sup>In T.-S. K26.26 this *haftara* is starting with 2 Sam. 21:15, cf. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts*, 39 no. 454.

<sup>48</sup>Perrot, “The Reading of the Bible” and Büchler, “The Triennial Reading”, 20–1 mention Lev. 23 as Torah reading, but agree with Gen. 21 as the portion “in later times”. Aggadat Bereshit mentions 1 Sam. 2:21 as *haftara*, cf. Büchler, “The Triennial Reading”, 22.

<sup>49</sup>NS128.14 and AS69.200 add 1 Sam. 2:11 (in margin) and 3:19–20, cf. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts*, 51 no. 615, 94 no. 1209.

<sup>50</sup>Shabbath Zakhor is the Shabbath preceding Purim.

<sup>51</sup>Perrot mentions Deut. 25:17–19.

<sup>52</sup>1 Sam. 15:1–34 according to the Sefardi tradition. Perrot, “The Reading of the Bible” mentions 1 Sam. 15:2–9, 31 (cf. tMeg. 3:2 and T.-S. B16.16); P reads 1 Sam. 14:52–15:33; T.-S. B18.7 reads until 16:1, adding 16:12–13; T.-S. 6H5.1 reads 1 Sam. 15:2–9, 31, cf. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts*, Cambridge 1992, 33 (no. 395), 39 (no. 459).

<sup>53</sup>EJ erroneously mentions Exod. 13:17–15, 26.

<sup>54</sup>Cf. Meg. 31a. According to MS 9<sup>b</sup> only 2 Sam. 22:1–14 and 50–51 was read. According to Kasher, *רוספסות*, 116, some traditions begin with 2 Sam. 21:15, cf. his edition of Codex Manchester which adds the words “Last day of Passover of Samuel” before verse 15 (no. 69). Also attested to by T.-S. B18.19, reading 2 Sam. 21:15–23:4, and by T.-S. AS69.225, cf. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts*, 35 no. 407 (where erroneously 1 Sam. is mentioned), 95 no. 1223.

<sup>55</sup>Shabbath Mevarekhin is the Shabbath preceding Rosh Ḥodesh; according to Büchler, “The Triennial Reading”, 31, only if this Shabbath is the day preceding New Moon.

<sup>56</sup>EJ erroneously mentions 1 Sam. 20:18–12. S reads 1 Sam. 20:18–21:1.

<sup>57</sup>According to Kasher, *רוספסות*, 115. It is documented by Sh. Albeck, *ספר האשכול*, Jerusalem 1935, 132; J. Musafia, *תשובות חאונים*, Jerusalem 1967, 27.

## 2.4.2 The Triennial Cycle

In the triennial cycle quite a few pericopes from the Books of Samuel were used.<sup>58</sup> These chapters are listed in the following overview. The relationship between the Torah reading and the accompanying *haftarah* will be discussed in the commentary of Chs 5-6. at the beginning of each chapter. Numbers in brackets refer to the Sefardi tradition.

## SAMUEL IN THE TRIENNIAL CYCLE

<i>Torah (EJ)</i>	<i>Haftarah (Perrot)</i>	<i>Haftarah (EJ)</i>
Gen. 15:1	2 Sam. 7:17-29	–
Gen. 21:1	1 Sam. 2:21-28 <sup>59</sup>	1 Sam. 2:21-28
Gen. 25:1	2 Sam. 5:13–6:1 <sup>60</sup>	2 Sam. 5:17–6:1
Gen. 27:1	1 Sam. 4:15ff. 1 Sam. 2:22ff. <sup>61</sup>	–
Gen. 29:31	1 Sam. 1:(1) 2ff. <sup>62</sup>	–
Gen. 30:22 (21)	1 Sam. 1:11-22 <sup>63</sup>	1 Sam. 1:11
Gen. 39:7	1 Sam. 2:22-30, 35	–
Gen. 49:27	1 Sam. 9:1-10 <sup>64</sup>	–
<i>continued on next page</i>		

<sup>58</sup>With variations, cf. C. Perrot, *La lecture de la Bible: Les anciennes lectures palestiniennes du Shabbat et des fêtes*, Hildesheim 1973; Idem, "The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue," in: M.J. Mulder, H. Sysling (eds), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Assen & Philadelphia 1988, 137-159, esp. 141 and 146; *EJ*, s.v. "Triennial Cycle"; J. Mann, I. Sonne, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, 1940; repr. New York 1971 (Vol. 1); repr. Cincinnati 1966 (Vol. 2); A. Büchler, "The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle", *JQR* 5 (1893), 420-468; Idem, "The Triennial Reading of the Law and Prophets", *JQR* 6 (1894), 1-73. Cf. J. Heinemann, "The Triennial Lectionary Cycle", *JJS* 19 (1968), 41-48; M. Bregman, "The Triennial Haftarah and the Perorations of the Midrashic Homilies", *JJS* 32 (1981), 74-84; L. Teugels, "Aggadot Bereshit and the Triennial Lectionary Cycle", *JJS* 51 (2000), 117-32.

<sup>59</sup>Mann, Sonne, *The Bible as Read and Preached* mention 1 Sam. 2:21-28, 35 and as a variant 2:21-28, 3:19-22.

<sup>60</sup>Mann, Sonne, *The Bible as Read and Preached* and Büchler, "The Triennial Reading", 46 agree with 2 Sam. 5:13–6:1. In T.-S. B17.9, J2.80 and AS70.130 it is read until 6:2, cf. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts*, 32 no. 387, 37 no. 440, 100 no. 1295.

<sup>61</sup>Isa. 45:15–46:3 and 46:3–47:4 are also mentioned.

<sup>62</sup>Perrot, *La lecture de la Bible*, 263, n. 18. Isa. 60:15–61:3 is also mentioned. Büchler, "The Triennial Reading", 49 agrees with 1 Sam. 1:1-10.

<sup>63</sup>Mann, Sonne, *The Bible as Read and Preached* agree with 1 Sam. 1:11-22.

<sup>64</sup>Zech. 14:1-11 is also mentioned, cf. T.-S. B17,38 and B17,39.

<i>continued from previous page</i>		
Exod. 10:1	1 Sam. 6:6-14 <sup>65</sup>	1 Sam. 6:6
Exod. 32:15 (14)	2 Sam. 22:10-33 (51) <sup>66</sup>	2 Sam. 22:10-51
Lev. 8:1	1 Sam. 2:28-31; 3:5, 20	–
Num. 4:17	[1 Sam. 6:10] <sup>67</sup>	–
Num. 16:1	–	1 Sam. 11
Deut. 17:14	–	1 Sam. 8:1 <sup>68</sup>
Deut. 17:24 ( <i>sic</i> )	–	1 Sam. 10:24 <sup>69</sup>
Deut. 20:10	[1 Sam. 17:37] <sup>70</sup>	–
Deut. 32	(2 Sam. 22:1) <sup>71</sup>	–

## 2.5 Recapitulation

Since Sperber's edition is the only complete edition of TJon, it is the best we have. However, it contains a number of printing errors and completely ignores the Babylonian tradition. Moreover, Sperber does not provide descriptions of the manuscripts he used, nor a stemmatological analysis of their mutual relationship. For all these reasons his edition does not provide a sound basis for scholarly work.

The combination of Sperber's edition, Martínez Borobio's edition of the Babylonian manuscripts, my own collation of some additional, mainly Western, manuscripts, and Kasher's edition of *toseftot* covers all manuscript traditions and the vast majority of variant readings and expansions. Nevertheless, additional collation work is desirable with regard to a number of manuscripts and to their mutual relationship. A complete new edition of Targum Samuel, however, falls outside the scope of this study.

<sup>65</sup>*EJ* also mentions Isa. 19 and Jer. 4:6. Mann, Sonne, *The Bible as Read and Preached* and Büchler, "The Triennial Reading", 32 agree with 1 Sam. 6:6ff.

<sup>66</sup>Similarly Mann, Sonne, *The Bible as Read and Preached*.

<sup>67</sup>Büchler, "The Triennial Reading", 33; Not in Perrot, *La lecture de la Bible*, 73.

<sup>68</sup>According to Büchler, "The Triennial Reading", 37, only in the Yemenite and South Italian tradition. T.-S. K26.36 attests 1 Sam. 8:4-8 as (part of) a *haftara*.

<sup>69</sup>Similarly Büchler, "The Triennial Reading", 33. He, too, mentions the non-existing Deut. 17:24.

<sup>70</sup>Büchler, "The Triennial Reading", 37 mentions 1 Sam. 17:37

<sup>71</sup>Perrot, *La lecture de la Bible*, 87, n. 267 placed it in the Roman and Karaite tradition; Büchler, "The Triennial Reading", 71 in the German tradition.

## Chapter 3

---

# Exegetical and Translational Features

### 3.1 Introduction

“Whoever renders a verse literally is a liar; and whoever adds to it, he is a blasphemer and a reviler.”<sup>1</sup> Between these two extremes translators manoeuvred to render the Hebrew text into Aramaic as respectfully and as clearly as possible. In the translation process many things happen: decisions are made, meaning is lost and meaning is added, some interpretations are avoided, others stimulated, rhetorical devices are recognized and dealt with.

In this chapter the translation process of TgSam is described and categorized. The following questions require answers: (1) How does TgSam render the many rhetorical devices found in the Books of Samuel? (2) What theological motives and exegetical methods are discernible in TgSam, and do these motives and methods agree with those used in contemporary literature? (3) Did TgSam use the Books of Chronicles to interpret the Books of Samuel? (4) How literal is the translation in TgSam? These four questions are explored in the next four sections.

### 3.2 Rhetorical Devices

#### 3.2.1 Introduction

Although the Books of Samuel are mainly written in prose, rhetorical devices are not at all absent. The Hebrew text of Samuel appears to be a combination of “narrative art and poetry”, with a splendid choice of words.<sup>2</sup> On the one hand, it seems natural that part of these rhetorical devices has been lost in the process of translation, especially those devices which are based on the sound of the words. On the other hand, translators can attempt to retain as many devices as possible. In this section, the rhetorical devices occurring in the Books of Samuel are discussed, and examples are given to illustrate how TgSam renders them into Aramaic.

The list of rhetorical devices is compiled from handbooks containing lists of rhetorical devices, complemented by my own observations

---

<sup>1</sup>Qid. 49a. The same baraita is preserved in tMeg. 3:41.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. J.P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*, 4 Vols., Assen 1981-1993.

on the Books of Samuel.<sup>3</sup> A definition of each device is given after its name. Examples are partly based on the books of Fokkelman about the narrative art of the Books of Samuel and partly on my work for the concordance of TgSam<sup>4</sup> and for the present study. The rhetorical devices are classified into three main categories: (1) phonetic figures, which add something extra to a text through the sound of letters or words; (2) structural figures, which convey meaning through the structure of a text; and (3) semantic figures, which convey meaning through a special choice of words.

### 3.2.2 Phonetic Figures

The phonetic figures<sup>5</sup> which are present in the Books of Samuel are alliteration, assonance, and rhyme—although it is questionable whether rhyme is due to the author's intention or to the linguistic structure of the Hebrew.

*Alliteration*, the recurrence of consonant sounds, occurs frequently in the poetical parts of Samuel and sometimes in the prosaic parts.<sup>6</sup> Although the original alliteration of the Hebrew text cannot always be maintained, TgSam sometimes appears to represent and even increase it. It is partly omitted in 2 Sam. 12:3, where three *Kaphs* and two *Qophs* appear. The three *Kaphs* are not represented, while the two *Zayins* in זעירא דיבנה compensate for the loss of the two *qophs*. Alliteration is maintained in 1 Sam. 17:4, though not at the same places. The triple *Gimel* of גלית שמו מנה גבהו is repeated in the two names and is augmented by the word גברא, 'man'. Alliteration is renewed in 2 Sam. 1:24. The Hebrew text gives an *Ayin* four times

<sup>3</sup>The basic list stems from R. Harris, "A Handbook of Rhetorical Devices," 19 August 1997, Internet, [http://www.secu.edu/faculty/R\\_Harris/rhetoric.htm](http://www.secu.edu/faculty/R_Harris/rhetoric.htm); complemented by W. Bühlmann, K. Scherer, *Sprachliche Stilfiguren der Bibel: Von Assonanz bis Zahlenspruch; ein Nachschlagewerk*, Gießen <sup>2</sup>1994; G.W. Lorein, *Stijlkenmerken*, Leuven 2000, MS. The latter article forms the basis of the categorization; cf. also W.G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOT.S, 26), Sheffield <sup>2</sup>1986, 222-50, 458-9.

<sup>4</sup>J.P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*, 4 Vols., Assen 1981-1993; Van Staaldouine-Sulman, *Samuel*.

<sup>5</sup>Similar phenomena were observed by J.W. Wesselius, "Poëzie in de Targum: de voorzegging over Juda in Targum Onkelos op Genesis 49:8-12", in: I.E. Zwiep, A. Kuyt (eds), *Dutch Studies in the Targum*, Amsterdam 1993, 99-100; English translation: "Biblical Poetry through Targumic Eyes: Onkelos' Treatment of Genesis 49:8-12", in: J. Dyk (ed.), *Give Ear to my Words: Psalms and Other Poetry in and around the Hebrew Bible. Essays in Honour of Professor N.A. van Uchelen*, Amsterdam 1996, 131-45, esp. 140-42.

<sup>6</sup>According to this definition alliteration is more than *homoiokatarcton*, the recurrence of consonant sounds at the beginning of subsequent words; cf. Brühlmann, Scherer, *Sprachliche Stilfiguren*, 16.

and a *Daleth* twice, עמי-ערנים המעלה עדי, which is represented by two *Taws*, three *Qophs* and three *Nuns*, תפנוקין ומסיק תקני. It is maintained and augmented in 1 Sam. 2:7-8. The Hebrew text gives seven words beginning with a *Mem*. The Aramaic version contains nine words beginning with a *Mem* through the choice of מסכין as the translation of the Hebrew דל and by rendering the Hebrew imperfect ירים by a participle. Alliteration is introduced in 2 Sam. 1:22, where the Hebrew text shows no trace of alliteration. The Aramaic text gives a triple combination of *Cheth* and *Resh* in מסתחרן לאחרא וחרבא.

*Assonance*, the recurrence of similar vowel sounds, is harder to detect in Hebrew and Aramaic because of the small number of vowels present in these languages. In most cases, therefore, it is doubtful whether the author intentionally used assonance. Similarly, it is doubtful whether the Targumist used assonance on purpose or not.<sup>7</sup> For example, the expression הלוך וגדול is translated by similar assonance וסני איל in 1 Sam. 2:26 and 2 Sam. 5:10, but the circumstance that the same rendering is chosen in 1 Sam. 14:19 and 2 Sam. 15:12 where the Hebrew has ורב instead of וגדול would seem to exclude intentional imitation of the assonance in the Hebrew. In TJon 2 Sam. 1:21-23 an abundance of *Hireqs* is used, whereas the Hebrew text is less plentiful.

*Rhyme*, the recurrence of identical or similar ending sounds, is not a frequent phenomenon in Hebrew poetry and prose. Still, some cases are present.<sup>8</sup> The stock phrase בקול גדול is translated without rhyme by בקל רם. Likewise, the rhyme of עיר and עשיר in 2 Sam. 12:2 is not maintained. Many forms of rhyme are naturally maintained, when the Hebrew text provided this rhyme with suffixes or plural endings. For instance, the double suffix in עמי אלהינו (2 Sam. 10:12) is rendered with similar suffixes, and therefore with similar rhyme. The combination of rhyme and alliteration in 2 Sam. 12:3, מפתו תאכל, ומכסו השתה ובחיקו השכב is translated by a combination of rhyme and assonance. TJon introduces rhyme, as well as alliteration, in 1 Sam. 14:4, where the names Bozez and Seneh are rendered by *Mashro'ita* and *Madrokhita*.<sup>9</sup>

Although the impression can arise that most phonetic figures disappear in the process of translating, it is premature to assume that this is the case in TJon as a whole. In the first place, phonetic figures are well preserved because of the similarity between Hebrew and Aramaic. In the second place, the Targumist appears to be very sus-

<sup>7</sup> Apart from the problem of the vocalization systems both in the Hebrew and in the Aramaic tradition.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 229-34.

<sup>9</sup> See below, commentary on 2 Sam. 22:5-6, 21-23, 36-38.

ceptible to phonetic figures. In several cases such figures are either rendered in the Aramaic version or compensated by similar phonetic figures, and sometimes even augmented.

### 3.2.3 Structural Figures

Both structural and semantic figures can be classified into five types: (1) *repetitio*, the repetition of earlier phrases or words; (2) *adiectio*, the addition of words or phrases; (3) *detractio*, the omission of words or phrases; (4) *transmutatio*, placing varying words or phrases in juxtaposition; and (5) *immutatio*, exchanging the meant words or phrases for other, often more figurative, words or phrases.<sup>10</sup>

#### 3.2.3.1 *Repetitio*

*Anaphora*,<sup>11</sup> the repetition of one word or more at the beginning of successive clauses or sentences, is usually maintained in TgSam. A fine example can be found in 2 Sam. 19:7, where every phrase begins with ׀ and every second phrase contains also הוהו. Smaller forms of anaphora are the repetition of “woe to us” in 1 Sam. 4:7-8 and the repetition of “and they went out” in 2 Sam. 20:7.

*Epistrophe*,<sup>12</sup> the repetition of one or more words at the end of successive clauses or sentences, is usually maintained in TgSam. A few instances are the double “forehead” in 1 Sam. 17:49; the triple “and they also prophesied” in 1 Sam. 19:20-21; and the double “the priests of the LORD” in 1 Sam. 22:17. In 1 Sam. 14:7 the repeated “according to your heart” is translated by two different Aramaic words, once literally, once by “according to your will”. Since inner coherence of the Bible is important to TJon, it is not surprising that similar, but not identical, endings of sentences are rendered by an *epistrophe*, as far as the word order allows it: in 1 Sam. 1:6 כעד is omitted, because it was not present in the ending of 1 Sam. 1:5.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup>W. Bühlmann, K. Scherer, *Sprachliche Stilfiguren der Bibel: Von Assonanz bis Zahlenspruch; ein Nachschlagewerk*, Gießen <sup>2</sup>1994 also have the first three types (Wiederholung, Häufung, Abkürzung), but take the latter two types together (Umschreibung, Verschleierung, Entschleierung). They did not distinguish between phonetic and semantic figures. They classified the structural figures separately (Wort- und Satzstellung), but this type is not classified further. Moreover, they classified all the metaphorical figures in one category, named “Tropen”.

<sup>11</sup>Cf. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 276.

<sup>12</sup>Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry* calls this *epiphora*. Cf. also Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 276-7.

<sup>13</sup>*Symploce*, a combination of anaphora and epistrophe, does not occur in Samuel. *Anadiplosis*, the repetition of the last word of the previous sentence in the beginning of the actual sentence, does not occur either in Samuel. *Sorites*, a set of statements which proceed to a climactic conclusion, each statement picking

*Conduplicatio*, the repetition of a key word, is maintained as far as possible. For instance, the fivefold use of the word היום, 'today' (2 Sam. 19:6-7), is maintained in the Aramaic version. The seemingly endless repetition of the word אחר in 2 Sam. 2:19-28 could not be maintained, because in 2:20 and 2:23 it has to be translated by אחר, 'behind, back', whereas it is rendered by בחר, 'after', in the remaining verses. Consequently, if the various meanings of the key words are used in a *conduplicatio*, then TgSam rendered them according to their meanings. In these cases the distinction between *conduplicatio* and word play is slight. The frequent repetitions in David's Lament (2 Sam. 1:19-27) are fully integrated in TgSam. They are even expanded, such as the stem לבש in 1:24. New key words are introduced in this poem as well, for instance, קטילין and אהקטלו in 1:19 and רמשיה and במשחא in 1:21. The new repetition in 1:19 is especially interesting, because the verb אהקטלו is not the usual translation of Hebrew נפל. In the same phrases in 1:25 and 1:27 the verb תבר is used. The key word לא אבה is used thrice in the Hebrew text of 2 Sam. 13 (cf. 13:14, 16, 25), but is twice added in the Aramaic version (cf. 13:9, 11). A new key word is also introduced in 1 Sam. 15 by translating both שוב, 'turn back', and נחם, 'regret', by the Aramaic verb תוב, 'turn back'. The result is that God turns his back on Saul, because Saul had turned away from his worship of God (cf. 15:11). In 1 Sam. 1 a new key word is introduced: Eli is waiting for Hannah (1:12), while Hannah is waiting for God (1:16), and afterwards Hannah will wait until Samuel is weaned (1:23). Furthermore, Hannah's Song (2:1-10) and David's Psalm (2 Sam. 22) are strongly linked by the use of the stem תקף.<sup>14</sup>

*Epanalepsis*, the repetition of the beginning word or phrase of a clause or sentence at the end of the same clause or sentence, is maintained in TgSam. An example in one verse is the double "be heroic men" in 1 Sam. 4:9. The complete clause "the LORD will surrender Israel also into the hand of the Philistines" at the beginning and the end of 1 Sam. 28:19 is also rendered literally. Similar to the *epanalepsis* is the *responsion* or *envelope*, which occurs at the beginning and end of a section, e.g. the double "were born to David in Hebron" in 2 Sam. 3:2-5.<sup>15</sup> This is also maintained in TgSam. The same is

---

up the last key word or key phrase of the preceding one, does not occur in the Books of Samuel. Cf. H.A. Fischel, "The Use of Sorites (*Climax, Gradatio*) in the Tannaitic Period", *HUCA* 44 (1973), 119-51; Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 212-13.

<sup>14</sup>See below, § 5.3.3.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 282-87. The double "Hebron" stresses



true for the repeated phrase "How are the heroes fallen" (1:19, 25, 27), both in Hebrew and in most Aramaic manuscripts. Some manuscripts, however, translate it in 1:19 by "How are the heroes killed", repeating the stem קָטַל, but in the other two verses by "How are the heroes broken", probably because of the alliteration. The translation is still exact enough to maintain the repetition.<sup>16</sup>

*Epizeuxis*, the pure repetition of one word, is usually repeated in TgSam. The double גִּבְהָה in 1 Sam. 2:3 is equally rendered. The double "Samuel" in 1 Sam. 3:4 is also equally rendered, although the Midrashim give several explanations for this double call.<sup>17</sup> The repetition of "far be it" in 2 Sam. 20:20 is maintained without further comment.<sup>18</sup> Note that *epizeuxis* in prophetic texts is rarely maintained in the Aramaic version in order to avoid the idea of redundancy.<sup>19</sup>

*Metabasis*, a brief statement of what has been said and what will follow, is not attested in Samuel. There are some summaries in the Hebrew text, which are rendered as such in the Aramaic version, *e.g.* in 1 Sam. 17:50, as well as some summaries of later events, *e.g.* in 2 Sam. 2:23. See below, *prolepsis*.

*Refrain*, the regular recurrence of one phrase or sentence, does not occur in the Books of Samuel.<sup>20</sup>

*Parallelism*, recurrent syntactical and semantical similarity, is the basic feature of Hebrew poetry. There are four large sections of poetry in the books of Samuel, *viz.* Hannah's Song (1 Sam. 2:1-10), David's Lament (2 Sam. 1:19-27), David's Psalm (2 Sam. 22), and David's Last Words (2 Sam. 23:1-7). Smaller sections of poetry occur in *e.g.* 1 Sam. 17:34-37<sup>21</sup> and 2 Sam. 3:33-34. As a rule TgSam translates par-

---

the dynastic aspect of this passage. Thematically, the list of David's sons is a typical blessing statement, and is therefore fully justified in the description of David's growing strength (2 Sam. 2:1-5:5); cf. S. Rummel, "Narrative Structures in the Ugaritic Texts", in: S. Rummel (ed.), *Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*, Vol. 3 (AnOr, 51), Rome 1981, 300.

<sup>16</sup>*Diacope*, the repetition of a word or phrase after an intervening word or phrase (cf. Psalm 96:7), does not occur in the Books of Samuel.

<sup>17</sup>The double calling was either regarded as a sign of love or as a sign that Samuel was the same man before and after God's call, cf. NumR. 14:21.

<sup>18</sup>EccI.R. 9:18 § 2 explains it as "Far be it from Joab, far be it from David, far be it from his government."

<sup>19</sup>*E.g.* the double calling לִי רִוִי in Isa. 24:16 and the double נִפְלָה in Isa. 21:9.

<sup>20</sup>Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 13 calls the repetition of "How are the heroes fallen" in 2 Sam. 1:19, 25, 27 a refrain. However, this repetition must be regarded as a *inclusion*, beginning the poem, as well as ending the fourth strophe concerning Saul and the fifth strophe concerning Jonathan (see commentary on 2 Sam. 1:17-27).

<sup>21</sup>Cf. A.R. Ceresko, "A Rhetorical Analysis of David's 'Boast' (1 Samuel 17:34-

allelism by parallelism. David's Lament is translated rather literally and parallelism is preserved. David's Psalm is translated less literally, but in many verses parallelism is preserved, albeit sometimes out of balance. Some cola are rephrased and therefore much longer than their counterparts. Some parallelism is enhanced, *e.g.* "For I kept the ways of the LORD || and have not wickedly departed from my God" (2 Sam. 22:22) is supplemented with an antithesis, "For I kept the ways that are *good* before the LORD || and I have not walked *in evil* before my God". A beautiful example of a largely amplified sentence with retention of strict parallelism forms Samuel's warning against disobedience (1 Sam. 15:23a), which is followed by a good example of lost repetition, although parallelism is maintained (1 Sam. 15:23b):

For the sin of divination is rebellion,  
 and iniquity and idolatry is stubbornness.  
 Because you have rejected the word of the LORD,  
 He has also rejected you as king.

In the Aramaic version parallelism in the first colon is enhanced by

כחובי עמא ד- || כחובת גבריא ד-  
 כין חובת כל אנש ד- || כין חובת כל גבר ד-  
 על מלי נבייא || על פתגמי אוריתא

while parallelism in the second colon is altered by the double translation of the verb מאס in order to maintain reverence for God. Note that the first bicolon of this little poem is altered into a double tricolon with the pattern ABC-ABC.

For as the guilt of the men who inquire of divination,  
 thus is the guilt of every man  
 who rebels against the words of the Torah.  
 And as the guilt of the people who go astray after idols,  
 thus is the guilt of every human  
 who cuts out or adds to the words of the prophets.

Because you have refused the service of the LORD,  
 He has removed you from being king.

Even in the largely expanded poems, Hannah's Song and David's Last Words, much parallelism is maintained in the Aramaic version. But when some phrases are allegorically related to certain periods in Israel's history, as is the case with Hannah's Song, or when some phrases

37): Some Reflections on Method," *CBQ* 47 (1985), 58-74, esp. 65-66.

are regarded as important prophecies concerning the messianic era, as is the case with David's Last Words, parallelism is dropped. In the paraphrastical translation of 2 Sam. 23:1-8 a poetical structure exists, *i.e.* a new poetical structure made by the Targumists.<sup>22</sup>

The exegetical technique *Diversification* plays an important role in the treatment of parallelism in the prophetic paragraphs of TgSam. Sometimes, not nearly always, parallel words or phrases are given a diverse meaning, in order to avoid redundancy. Whereas through the process of diversification parallelisms can be destroyed, as is the case in the paraphrastical translation of 1 Sam. 2:1-4, the same process can create new parallelism. Such is the case in 2 Sam. 23:5 where the (internally) parallel pair עריכה || שמורה is rendered by the (externally) parallel phrases, "to endure like the orders of creation endure || and to be preserved for the world to come".

### 3.2.3.2 *Adiectio*

*Polysyndeton*, the use of a conjunction between each word, phrase or clause, is a very common feature of Semitic languages. It is, therefore, naturally maintained in TgSam, for instance the four conjunctions in "sheep and oxen and asses and camels and clothes" in 1 Sam. 27:9.

*Scesis Onomaton* emphasizes an idea by expressing it in a string of generally synonymous phrases or statements. It differs from parallelism, because it is not necessarily formulated in a parallel grammatical structure. Since parallelism is the basic device of Hebrew poetry, it is not surprising that a similar device is often used in Hebrew prose. Usually these strings of phrases are rendered without a change in TgSam, such as Elkanah's questions (1 Sam. 1:8) and Hannah's prayer to be remembered (1 Sam. 1:11).

*Enumeration*, detailing parts, causes, effects or consequences, is clearly used in two of Samuel's speeches, *viz.* in the warning against a king's habit (1 Sam. 8:11-18) and his farewell speech (1 Sam. 12, esp. 3-5). These speeches are correctly translated into Aramaic. Literal enumerations are found throughout the Books of Samuel, for instance David's children (2 Sam. 3:2-5) and his warriors (2 Sam. 23:8-39), and are retained in TgSam.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup>Cf. E. van Staaldoune-Sulman, "Reward and Punishment in the Messianic Age (Targ. 2 Sam. 23:1-8)", *JAB* 1 (1999), 273-96. Other examples of new poetry in TgSam are mentioned in E. van Staaldoune-Sulman, "Translating with Subtlety: Some Unexpected Translations in TgSam", paper read at the third meeting of the IOTS, Basel August 2-3, 2001, forthcoming in *JAB* 3 (2001).

<sup>23</sup>A special form of enumeration are the numerical proverbs; cf. W. Bühlmann, K. Scherer, *Sprachliche Stilfiguren der Bibel: Von Assonanz bis Zahlenspruch; ein Nachschlagewerk*, Gießen 1994, 64. These are not found in the Books of Samuel.

*Climax*, or *gradatio*, consists of arranging words, clauses of sentences in the order of increasing importance. It is used *e.g.* in 1 Sam. 17:46, where David threatens, "I will strike you down, and cut off your head, and I will give the dead bodies of the Philistine host to the birds of the air . . ." A very special form of climax is used by Samuel in his warning against kings: At first it seems to be the opposite of a climax, for he sums up sons, daughters, fields, servants, cows, sheep and goats, but at the end he states that "you yourselves will be his slaves" (1 Sam. 8:17). A real anticlimax is used in 1 Sam. 10:20-21, where Benjamin is chosen out of all the tribes of Israel, and the family of Matar out of all the families of Benjamin, then Saul out of this family, "and they sought him and could not find him". Both climax and anticlimax are maintained in the Aramaic version.

*Parenthesis*, the insertion of a phrase or sentence as an aside in the middle of another sentence, does not occur in Samuel. The closest phenomenon is the insertion of such a phrase or sentence in the middle of a story, which occurs<sup>24</sup> and is maintained in TgSam. Two examples are the explanation of the word 'seer' in 1 Sam. 9:9 and the explanation of the Gibeonites' position within Israel in 2 Sam. 21:2.<sup>25</sup>

*Apostrophe*, the interruption of a discourse by a direct addressing of a person or a personified thing, is not a usual device in Hebrew. The nearest device is the addressing in David's Lament (2 Sam. 1:19-27). But since five different addressees are mentioned in this lament (the glory of Israel, the mountains of Gilboa, Saul and Jonathan, daughters of Israel, Jonathan my brother), one cannot speak about an interruption of the discourse, but rather about the poetical style of this lament (see further *Personification*).<sup>26</sup>

*Exemplum*, citing an example or using an illustrative story, is maintained in TgSam.<sup>27</sup> Illustrative stories are mainly used by the

<sup>24</sup>The phenomenon is very frequent in the Books of Chronicles, cf. I. Kalimi, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten: Literarisch-historiographische Abweichungen der Chronik von ihren Paralleltextrn in den Samuel- und Königsbüchern* (BZAW, 226), Berlin & New York 1995, 235-48.

<sup>25</sup>*Parenthesis* can be combined with resumptive repetition or *Wiederaufnahme*. This occurs in 2 Sam. 21:2, where the introduction "the king called the Gibeonites and spoke to them" (21:1) is repeated in "David said to the Gibeonites" (21:2) after the insertion. Cf. R.F. Person, "A Reassessment of *Wiederaufnahme* from the Perspective of Conversation Analysis", *Biblische Zeitschrift* 43 (1999), 239-248.

<sup>26</sup>*Expletive*, a single word or short phrase interrupting normal syntax to lend emphasis to proximate words, does not occur in Samuel either.

<sup>27</sup>*Sententia*, quoting a maxim or wise saying to apply to the situation, does not occur in Samuel. *Apophases*, also called *praeteritio* or *occupatio*, refers to the situation that the speaker emphasizes something by stating to ignore it. This device does not occur in the Books of Samuel. Likewise, *aporia*, the expression of

prophets, for instance, the saving deeds in the past (1 Sam. 12:7-12) and the parable of Nathan (2 Sam. 12:1-4). But also the woman of Tekoa used a parable to open up David's eyes (2 Sam. 14:6-11). It was not necessary for TJon to paraphrase these parables, because they were explained by the real situation in the co-text.<sup>28</sup>

*Acrostics*, poems in which the first letters of the lines form a name, a message or the alphabet, do not occur in the Books of Samuel. In some manuscripts an acrostic is added to 1 Sam. 17:42 or 17:43 (see below, commentary on these verses). A small acrostic on the verb מָשַׁח, 'anoint', is integrated in TJon 2 Sam. 23:8.

### 3.2.3.3 *Detractio*

*Asyndeton*, the omission of a conjunction between words, phrases, or clauses, is usually maintained in TgSam. A good example of the alternation of polysyndeton and asyndeton is 2 Sam. 3:39, consisting of four clauses, three beginning with וְ, but the last one without any conjunction, "And I am this day a common man and (yet) exalted to kingship, and these men, the sons of Zeruah, are too hard for me; may the LORD requite the evildoer according to his evil." In TgSam it is rendered in the same way.

*Zeugma*, the linkage of two or more parts of speech by another part of speech, is usually integrated in TgSam, because it is also part of Aramaic grammar.<sup>29</sup> One verb, connected with several objects, occurs in 1 Sam. 27:9, "he led sheep ... and camels and clothes." Several manuscripts do not regard "lead" as the correct verb for the object "clothes", so they add another verb, "he led sheep ... and he *took* clothes" (cf. TgJudg. 8:16).<sup>30</sup> In poetical sections a double duty verb is often translated twice, especially in figurative speech.<sup>31</sup> The verb "go up" in 2 Sam. 22:9 can function as an example, "The pride of the pharaoh *went up* like smoke before Him. Therefore, He *sent* his anger like fire on the earth." It is clear, therefore, that the Targumist

---

doubt or deliberation about an issue, does not occur in these books.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. D.M. Gunn, "Traditional Composition in the 'Succession Narrative'", *VT* 26 (1976), 214-29, esp. 219, "Wherever else parables may occur (...) these particular ones are thoroughly at home in their narrative setting."

<sup>29</sup>The grammatically correct usage of this figure is sometimes called *apokoinou-construction*, while the incorrect usage of this figure is then called *zeugma* cf. W. Bühlmann, K. Scherer, *Sprachliche Stilfiguren der Bibel: Von Assonanz bis Zahlenspruch; ein Nachschlagewerk*, Gießen<sup>2</sup>1994, 57.

<sup>30</sup>See below, § 3.3.4.2, *s.v. Providing Hidden Information*.

<sup>31</sup>Cf. W.F. Smelik, "Translation and Commentary in One: The Interplay of Pluses and Substitutions in the Targum of the Prophets", *JSJ* 29 (1998), 245-60, esp. 256.

did not accept *zeugma* automatically, but weighed whether it could be maintained or not.

*Parataxis*, using successive independent clauses and thereby neglecting the relationship of these clauses, is a most common feature of both Hebrew and Aramaic. It is therefore not surprising that TgSam took over the majority of the paratactical clauses without a change. Still, several times TgSam specifies the relationship between clauses by adding a conjunction or by replacing ׀ by a paratactical conjunction. Two examples: ׀ is added in "And *when* the LORD has dealt well with my lord, then remember your handmaid" (1 Sam. 25:31) and ׀ is the rendering of Hebrew ׀ in "I will come upon him *while* he is weary" (2 Sam. 17:2). TgSam appears to add only temporal conjunctions. The conjunction ׀א, 'because', is never used to render Hebrew ׀.<sup>32</sup>

*Ellipsis*, an omission of a word or a phrase which belonged to the usual grammatical structure, is sometimes complemented by TgSam to increase the clarity of the text. This happens *e.g.* in "her countenance was no longer *sad*" (1 Sam. 1:18); "a fork *with* three prongs" (1 Sam. 2:13); "and Jonathan made *a covenant* with David's house (2 Sam. 20:16). Also the ellipsis in 1 Sam. 30:23, a phrase without verb commencing with a nota accusativi, is not complemented.<sup>33</sup> The use of the third person plural without explicit subject for the so-called indefinite subject is maintained in *e.g.* 1 Sam. 1:25; 19:24; 23:28.<sup>34</sup>

#### 3.2.3.4 *Transmutatio*

*Hyperbaton*, which involves departure from normal word order, is always maintained by TgSam. A point in case is 1 Sam. 22:19, beginning with its object, "And Nob, the city of the priests, he put to the sword . . ." An example in which the subject is mentioned twice as the last word of a sentence is the poetical verse 1 Sam. 15:33, "Just as she has made women childless—your sword, so shall be childless among women—your mother." Also this departure from normal word order remains in the Aramaic version.

*Chiasmus*, reverse parallelism in which two parts of a clause are balanced by two additional parts, only in reverse order, is fully incorporated in TgSam as far as parallelism is incorporated. *Chiasmus* can be destroyed by a paraphrasing translation, but in most cases it

<sup>32</sup>Cf. Van Staaldoune-Sulman, *Samuel*, s.v. ׀א.

<sup>33</sup>Similar phrases are not complemented in TO Num. 3:26; TJon Ezek. 14:22; Hag. 2:5.

<sup>34</sup>In other cases a specific subject was supplied, cf. C. Rabin, "The Ancient Versions and the Indefinite Subject", *Textus* 2 (1962), 60-76.

is maintained. A case in point is the alteration of the verb “go forth” and personal names in 2 Sam. 2:12-13. *Chiasmus* is introduced in the lament on Absalom’s death (2 Sam. 18:33).<sup>35</sup>

*Hypophora*, raising one or more questions and then proceeding to answer them, is not very common in the narratives in the Books of Samuel. Still, it is attested in the LORD’s promise concerning David’s house (2 Sam. 7:5) and rendered as such in TgSam.<sup>36</sup>

*Hendiadys*, a phrase in coordination instead of in a singular construction,<sup>37</sup> occurs in 1 Sam. 19:2, where the phrase *וישבת בסתר ותחבאת* should be translated by “keep hidden in a secret place”. This verbal hendiadys is maintained in TJon. Expressions like *הלך וחזק*, ‘growing stronger’, are also maintained in the Aramaic version. However, the combination of *ולמשהט* *לחק*, ‘statute and ordinance’ (1 Sam. 30:25), is rendered by one construct chain, *viz.* *לגזירת דין*, ‘legal jurisprudence’.<sup>38</sup>

### 3.2.3.5 *Immutatio*

The *Anacoluthon*, the change from one to another grammatical structure within one sentence, of 1 Sam. 15:33, “Just as she has made women childless—your sword, so shall be childless among women—your mother”, is maintained. Note that Josephus repaired strict parallelism of this verse to “As you have made many mothers of Hebrews to lament and mourn for their children, so shall you cause your mother to grieve over your own destruction” (*Antiquities*, 6:155). Neither is the juxtaposition of *ואת . . . ראה א* in 1 Sam. 26:16 corrected, nor that of *ואת . . . לבשר בית* in 1 Sam. 31:9.

*Constructio ad sensum*, a grammatical construction formed according to its sense, not according to its form, is often found in connection with words such as “people” or “man”. In some cases a plural verb is used, in other cases a singular. TgSam does not change this use, but takes over the various numbers, *e.g.* *ודחיל כל עמא* in 1 Sam. 12:18 and

<sup>35</sup> *Antanagoge*, which places a good point next to a fault criticism, does not occur in the Books of Samuel.

<sup>36</sup> The scheme of question and answer is more often used in prophetic literature, and especially by Jeremiah; cf. B.O. Long, “Two Question and Answer Schemata in the Prophets”, *JBL* 90 (1971), 129-39.

<sup>37</sup> Sometimes close to *merismus*, because not the extremes are indicating the total, but two or three parts; cf. H.A. Brongers, “Merismus, Synekdoche und Hendiadys in der bibel-hebräischen Sprache”, in: P.A.H. de Boer (ed.), *כה: 1940-1965* (OTS, 14) Leiden 1965, 100-14, esp. 108-109.

<sup>38</sup> Related to the hendiadys is the break-up of composite phrases; cf. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 329. For instance, in “Let us lie in wait for blood, let us ambush the innocent for no reason” (Prov. 1:11) the combination of “innocent blood” and “bloodshed for no reason” are split up. Although this is a typical feature of parallelism, it does not occur in the Books of Samuel.

עמא כל ואמרו in 1 Sam. 12:19. However, sometimes the juxtaposition of plural and singular is considered wrong and corrected in the Aramaic version, for instance, the singular verb in ויהי לפניה ילדים (1 Sam. 1:2) is replaced by a plural verb.

### 3.2.3.6 Summary

On the one hand, TgSam does not vary renderings. If words are repeated in the Hebrew original, these are repeated in the Aramaic version as well, as long as they are used in the same sense. If various meanings of the repeated words are involved, TgSam may vary the Aramaic words in order to render the meaning of the Hebrew as exactly as possible. On the other hand, TgSam may attempt to increase the repetitive structural devices, or to compensate for the loss of these devices. This demonstrates that TgSam stresses the meaning of a text, but is susceptible to structural devices in its *Vorlage*.

In poetical, or rather prophetic, sections of Samuel parallel and synonymous words or clauses are not repeated without change in the Aramaic version. The rule that there is no redundancy in the Scripture dictates that these parallel clauses must be interpreted in different ways. In many cases, then, parallelism is destroyed, although it is re-established in other cases.

The figures of *adiectio*, showing abundance, are fully incorporated in the Aramaic translation. Out of respect for the source text nothing was omitted or summarized. The figures of *detractio*, showing stylistic thriftiness, are either incorporated, if the clarity of the text and the Aramaic grammar did not suffer,<sup>39</sup> or complemented by what was felt omitted.

The figures of *transmutatio* formed no problem to the Targumists and were incorporated in the Aramaic version. The clarity of the text was not endangered, for all the aspects of the meaning were present in the text. The figures of *immutatio* were so close to those in Aramaic that the majority formed no problem. Some figures, however, were adapted to Aramaic grammar.

In short, deviations from the original text are made (1) if key words are used with different meanings; (2) if part of Scripture might appear to be redundant; (3) if the clarity of the text was endangered by omissions or ultra-short formulations; and (4) if grammatical constructions could not be incorporated in the Aramaic. Note (5) that

<sup>39</sup> "Though ellipsis occurs in all languages, the particular structures which permit such 'omitted' words are by no means identical from language to language," cf. E.A. Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*, Leiden 1964, 227.



the poetical devices of repetition are sometimes enhanced or compensated.

### 3.2.4 Semantic Figures

Like the structural figures, the semantic figures are classified into five categories.

#### 3.2.4.1 *Repetitio*

*Absolute Infinitive*, the use of an absolute infinitive before a verbal form of the same stem to stress the intensity or certainty of the verb's meaning, is usually maintained in TgSam, albeit with a normal infinitive.<sup>40</sup>

*Horizontal paronomasia* consists of a word play<sup>41</sup> in which also the word referred to is mentioned.<sup>42</sup> Since word play is based on the alternate meanings of one word or the different meanings of two identical or very similar words, it is very difficult to maintain word play in a translation. The obvious word play in 1 Sam. 25:25, נבל שמו ונבלה עמו, is not maintained in the Aramaic version, whereas the word play between Samuel's name and the verb שאל in 1 Sam. 1:20 is retained. In some manuscripts a word play on the name of Nabal, which means "fool", is made by rendering Hebrew איש הבליעל by גברא שטיא, 'insane man'.<sup>43</sup> More hidden word plays are not often maintained, such as the use of the verb והגד, 'tell', in the context of Saul the prince, נגיד (1 Sam. 9-10), and the connection between הנה אהנו עבריים (1 Sam. 14:8) and הנה עבריים (14:11).<sup>44</sup>

<sup>40</sup>This is not always the case in the Targumim; cf. S. Bombeck, *Das althebräische Verbalsystem aus aramäischer Sicht: Masoretischer Text, Targume un Peschitta* (EHS.T, 23/591), Frankfurt a.M., 1995, 192-6; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 271; M.C.A. Korpel, J.C. de Moor, F. Sepmeijer, 'Consistency with Regard to Tenses: Targum and Peshitta in Two Samples from Deutero-Isaiah', in: *Actes du Cinquième Colloque International Bible et Informatique: Traduction et Transmission*, Paris 1998, 217.

<sup>41</sup>See M. Garsiel, "Word Play and Puns as a Rhetorical Device in the Book of Samuel", in: S.B. Noegel (ed.), *Puns and Pundits: Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature*, Bethesda (MD) 2000, 181-204.

<sup>42</sup>Paronomasia also includes the etymology of names.

<sup>43</sup>New word plays are also made by the Targumists in Isa. 1:3 by choosing אריא for "crib", which resembles the complemented object of the last phrase, איריחא, 'Torah'; and in 2 Kgs 9:37 by comparing Queen Jezebel (איזבל) with dung (זיבל).

<sup>44</sup>A special case is TgJer. 6:31 where the Hebrew word נמאס is translated twice: once to give the exact meaning in Aramaic, פסיקלא, and once to represent the word play, מרצקין.

### 3.2.4.2 *Adiectio*

*Figura Etymologica* is the combination of an intransitive verb with an object of the same or a similar stem. It occurs in both Hebrew and Aramaic. For instance, in 2 Sam. 14:13 the expression “to think thoughts” is integrated in the Aramaic version.

*Amplification*, a restatement with additional detail of words, is usually maintained.<sup>45</sup> When Joab says that Sheba rebelled “against the king, against David” (2 Sam. 20:21), this is not changed in Tg-Sam.<sup>46</sup> Nor is “between them, between David and Jonathan” in 2 Sam. 21:6 changed or explained.

*Analogy*, a comparison between things which are alike in several respects, is maintained in TgSam. A famous analogy is drawn by the woman from Tekoa, who compared the troubles concerning her two sons with David’s troubles concerning his successors (2 Sam. 14). The analogy commences in 14:13, where the woman asks, “Why then have you planned such a thing against the people of the LORD?” In Hebrew as well as in Aramaic the preposition ׀ is used to denote the comparison.

*Similes*, direct and expressed comparisons between two things essentially dissimilar, but resembling each other in at least one aspect, are maintained, because they are expressed as similes and therefore clear enough to be understood. David’s lament can function as an example, “Saul and Jonathan . . . were swifter than eagles and stronger than lions” (2 Sam. 1:23).

The *oxymoron*, a paradox reduced to two words, in 1 Sam. 20:13 is not maintained, for “It seems good to my father to do evil to you” is rendered by “My father sentenced to do evil to you”, neglecting Saul’s evil feelings towards David and making him a reasonable judge. This verse is also influenced by 20:7, 9, where the verb גרם is already used as a translation of Hebrew כלה.<sup>47</sup>

*Epithets*, adjectives or adjective phrases appropriately qualifying a subject by naming one of its most important characteristics, are frequently used in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>48</sup> Especially epithets for God, such as עליון, are frequently attested. In the books of Samuel, however, God

<sup>45</sup> *Metanoia*, a restatement by expressing it in a better, milder or stronger way, does not occur in the Books of Samuel.

<sup>46</sup> EcclR. 9:18 § 2 explains the double reference to King David as rebellion against the Supreme King of kings and against David, the king of Israel.

<sup>47</sup> Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 312-13 mentions the oxymoron “a donkey’s funeral” in Jer. 22:19. This is retained in TJon.

<sup>48</sup> This device is also called *antonimosy*.

is almost without exception called אלהים or יהוה, both mostly rendered by יי.<sup>49</sup> One occurrence of the epithet עליין is indeed translated by its equivalent epithet עלאה. A well-known epithet for the Philistines in the Books of Samuel is the word “uncircumcised”, which is literally translated into Aramaic. Independent epithets, a kind of *metonymy*, are also maintained in TgSam, such as the noun “uncircumcised one” for a Philistine; “your servant” for the speaking person; and “my lord” for the addressed person.

*Pleonasm* is the usage of more words than required to express an idea. In 1 Sam. 20:38 Hebrew מהרה חושה, ‘hurry, make haste’, is rendered even more pleonastically with אחזי בפריע, ‘hurry in haste’. The obvious *tautology* חייך וחי נפשך, ‘by your life and by the life of your soul’ (2 Sam. 11:11), is also maintained in the Aramaic version.<sup>50</sup>

*Appositives*, nouns or noun substitutes placed next to another noun or noun substitute in order to give a closer description, are frequently used in the Hebrew Bible, but not always maintained in the Aramaic version. Aramaic grammar allows appositives, as is attested in sentences like “Elkanah, son of Jeroham, etc.” (1 Sam. 1:1) and “the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas” (1 Sam. 1:3). However, some appositives are replaced by subordinate clauses, especially appositives which consist of gentilic names. Most gentilic names are replaced by “who was from” plus the place-name, such as “Samah who was from Harod” for “Samah the Harodite” (2 Sam. 23:25).<sup>51</sup>

### 3.2.4.3 *Detractio*

*Aposiopesis*, suddenly breaking off speaking and leaving a statement unfinished, does not occur in the Books of Samuel.<sup>52</sup> The conditional oath in its full formula, “So may the LORD do to me and more also if . . .”, cannot be considered as suddenly broken off, because the condition is mentioned in the sequel and it only leaves the punishment to the imagination of the hearer.<sup>53</sup>

*Brachylogy*, constructing a sentence in as few words as possible, is the father of many proverbs. In the Hebrew Bible a couple of ultra-short sentences are attested, such as Ahitophel’s advice “like the re-

<sup>49</sup>Or one of its variant spellings, such as יי.

<sup>50</sup>The usual form of the oath is either חי יהוה וחי נפשך (1 Sam. 20:3; 25:26) or חי נפשך (1 Sam. 17:55); cf. Driver, *Notes*, 290; M. Greenberg, “The Hebrew Oath Particle *hay/he*”, *JBL* 76 (1957), 34-39.

<sup>51</sup>Cf. M.Z. Kadari, “Studies in the Syntax of Targum Onqelos”, *Tarbiz* 32 (1963), 232-51, esp. 240.

<sup>52</sup>Cf. A.D. Crown, “Aposiopesis in the O.T. and the Hebrew Conditional Oath”, *Abr-Nahrain* 4 (1963-1964), 96-111; against GKC § 167a.

<sup>53</sup>Crown, “Aposiopesis”, 106.

turn of the whole is the man whom you seek". It is clarified and translated by "they will all return, after the man whom you seek is killed" (2 Sam. 17:3).<sup>54</sup> Also Samuel's poetical warning against disobedience, "the sin of divination is rebellion and iniquity and idolatry is stubbornness" is amplified, "as the guilt of the men who inquire of divination, thus is the guilt of every man who rebels against the words of the Torah. And as the guilt of the people who go astray after idols, thus is the guilt of every human who cuts out or adds to the words of the prophets." (1 Sam. 15:23).<sup>55</sup>

#### 3.2.4.4 *Transmutatio*

*Antithesis*, the establishment of a clear, contrasting relationship between two ideas by juxtaposing them, is frequently used in Hebrew prose and poetry. In prose it is simply maintained in the Aramaic version, such as Saul's warning to David, "you are but a youth and he has been a man of war from his youth" (1 Sam. 17:33). In poetry the antithesis is mostly maintained, although some verses are rendered paraphrastically. The antitheses in Hannah's Song are good examples (1 Sam. 2:4-7). However, the antithesis of "the full and the hungry" (1 Sam. 2:5) is not maintained in this shape, but replaced by the antithesis of "the rich and the poor" (see below, on *merismus*).<sup>56</sup>

*Hysteron proteron*, saying first what comes later, either chronologically or logically, is a rare rhetorical device in the Hebrew Bible. In most cases this device is clearly indicated by the conjunction אחר, which was translated by בחר, e.g. in "And Hannah rose after she ate in Shiloh" (1 Sam. 1:9). TJon regarded the terse expression of Ahitophel, "like the return of the whole is the man whom you seek", as *hysteron proteron* and adds a conjunction in its rendering: "they will all return, after the man whom you seek is killed" (2 Sam. 17:3). TJon also regarded the peculiar construction of 2 Sam. 18:29 as *hysteron proteron* and renders, "I saw a great tumult after Joab sent the king's servant".

*Prolepsis*, depicting future events as already happened or suggesting cause and effect as simultaneous, is not absent from the Hebrew

<sup>54</sup>C.J. Goslinga, *Het tweede boek Samuël* (COT), Kampen 1962, 301 regards this phrase as brachylogy, but others assume that the Hebrew text is corrupt. Howbeit, it is clear from the Aramaic text that TJon did not regard this as a corrupt text, but rather as a terse expression. Similar discussions exist on 1 Sam. 14:14, 16.

<sup>55</sup>Further examples are found in 1 Sam. 18:8; 2 Sam. 14:11; 20:3, 18.

<sup>56</sup>*Equality by association*, putting a dissimilar item into a list of similar items or ideas in order to give an ironic value to the dissimilar item, does not occur in the Books of Samuel.

Bible and is incorporated in the Aramaic version. One frequent use of *prolepsis* is the well-known formula to describe the length of a king's reign at the beginning of his kingship, e.g. in 1 Sam. 13:1 for Saul and in 2 Sam. 5:4-5 for David. Such phrases are "statements of the omniscient narrator"<sup>57</sup> and it is clear that this omniscient narrator is accepted by the Targumists. Other cases of *prolepsis* are also maintained in TgSam, such as the proverb about the lame and the blind who are not to enter "the house" (2 Sam. 5:8), while there is neither a palace nor a temple at that moment, and the summary and overview of the completion of Jerusalem, the construction of David's palace and the birth of all his sons after the capture of Jerusalem (2 Sam. 5:11-16).<sup>58</sup>

Beside the narrative *prolepsis* there is a more detailed kind of *prolepsis*. In 1 Sam. 30:9 it is stated that "the rest" stayed by the brook Besor, while it is in the next verse that this group is described as too exhausted to cross the brook and to go on with their pursuit. This minor form of *prolepsis* is reformulated in the Aramaic version by "part of them stayed by the brook Besor".

*Variatio*, the use of different constructions in equivalent phrases, is maintained as long as the harmony in the Bible is not endangered. The variation in phrasing in the account of Samuel's call (1 Sam. 3:4-8) is maintained, because it varies the wording of three separate events,<sup>59</sup> but the variation in phrasing of Eli's place (1 Sam. 4:13, 18) is not maintained, because it varies the phrasing of one and the same situation. In the latter case an associative translation is made by combining the phrasing of both verses. The slight variation in the women's song about Saul and David (1 Sam. 18:7; 21:11; 29:5) is dropped in the translation, because these verses all refer to one and the same song.

---

<sup>57</sup>J.P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*, Vol. 3: Throne and City, Assen 1990, 143.

<sup>58</sup>Since Hiram of Tyre took up his reign only seven years before Solomon's accession, the verses 2 Sam. 5:11-12 describe the last years of King David's reign; cf. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 145.

<sup>59</sup>The argument of the separate events is also used in rabbinic exegesis for variation in phrasing where the Hebrew Bible suggests only one event. The differences between the account of the field of lentils in 2 Sam. 23:11 and the field of barley in 1 Chron. 11:13 is explained in RuthR. 5:1. One rabbi said that it concerned two different fields, another assumed that it concerned the same field in two different years. This shows that variation in wording was not to endanger the harmony in the Bible.

### 3.2.4.5 *Immutatio*

*Allusions* to famous persons or stories occur abundantly in the Books of Samuel. Since the Targumist renders every word of the Hebrew original, many allusions are maintained, such as the allusions to former Biblical heroes in Samuel's farewell speech (1 Sam. 12:6-12). Also vague allusions are maintained through the translation process, for example, the combination of a war against the Philistines and the thirst of David (2 Sam. 23:11-17), which are reminders of the battle of Samson against the Philistines at Lehi, after which he was thirsty (Judg. 15:9-20). Some allusions are even made more striking by associative translation, such as the change from "I brought up out of Egypt" to "I brought out, out of Egypt" (1 Sam. 8:8), which reminds the reader of the beginning of the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20:1). Allusions can also be introduced by Targumists themselves when no allusion seems present in the Hebrew text. This is a result of their belief that Scripture is coherent. As a case in point, the choice of words in TJon 1 Sam. 9:16 reminds of Exod. 3:9, the announcement of the Exodus, whereas the Hebrew text does not share this connection. However, some vague allusions have been lost in the translation process. For example, the conformity in wording between the attack of Nahash the Ammonite who wanted to put disgrace upon Israel (1 Sam. 11:1-2) and the challenge of Goliath the Philistine who also put shame and disgrace upon God's people (1 Sam. 17:23, 26) is not attested in the Aramaic version, because Nahash is called "the king of the sons of Ammon".

*Exclamations*, the use of sounds or (almost) meaningless words to express certain feelings, are replaced by meaningful words in the Aramaic version. The exclamation אַבֵּל is rendered by בְּקִשְׁטָא, 'in truth' (2 Sam. 14:5); בִּי by בְּבִעוּ, 'please, permission to speak' (1 Sam. 1:26; 25:24); אָהָה by בְּעוֹזִי בְּעוֹזִי, 'accept my prayer' (Josh. 7:7); and the frequent נָא by כְּעַן, 'now'.

A *litotes*, denying the opposite of what is intended, is used by Eli against his sons, when he says that he is hearing "no good report" (1 Sam. 2:24), meaning that he hears about their "evil dealings" (2:23). TgSam maintains this device. David's description of Abner as "not bound" and "not fettered" (2 Sam. 3:34) is also translated without a change. TJon produces one standard *litotes* as the translation of the Hebrew verb מָאֵן, 'refuse', viz. לֹא אֲבֵא, 'would not' (cf. 1 Sam. 18:19).<sup>60</sup>

*Rhetorical questions* are usually maintained in TgSam. Since rhet-

<sup>60</sup>A *litotes* is also created in TgJosh. 7:15, where Hebrew נְבִלָה, 'stupidity, severe

orical questions are a common device in both oral and written literature, the translators were not overly eager to restructure from a question to a declarative statement.<sup>61</sup> TJon was more restrictive in this respect than the author of Chronicles. For instance, the question “Would you build Me a house to dwell in?” (2 Sam. 7:5) is retained in the Aramaic version, while the parallel verse 1 Chron. 17:4 replaced it by the statement “You shall not build Me a house to dwell in”.<sup>62</sup> In some verses TJon even introduced rhetorical questions, where the Hebrew text reads a statement. For instance, Joab’s remark in 2 Sam. 18:14 is transformed into a question. And in 1 Sam. 1:14 a statement is turned into a question to soften Eli’s rebuke. However, in several manuscripts one or two questions are replaced by their answer. In these cases the particle ܟܐ, ‘behold’ is substituted for the interrogative particle ܟܘܢ, ‘is it not’,<sup>63</sup> cf. 1 Sam. 1:8 (Kimḥi); 15:17 (MS a), or for the interrogative prefix ܘܢ, cf. 1 Sam. 10:24 (MSS a f); 15:22 (MS b); 16:11 (Fr); 17:25 (Fr).<sup>64</sup> The question concerning God’s uniqueness are replaced by declarative statements in order to stress monotheism (cf. 1 Sam. 2:2).

A *Hyperbole*, a deliberate exaggeration, is found in 2 Sam. 17:13. There it is said that the army of Israel will tear down a city, until not even a pebble is found.<sup>65</sup> TJon reduced the exaggeration to more

---

sin’ is rendered by “not fitting”.

<sup>61</sup>As is recommended in the UBS-handbook, R.L. Omanson, Ph.A. Noss, *A Handbook on the Book Esther: The Hebrew and the Greek Texts* (Helps for Translations), New York 1997, 259.

<sup>62</sup>PesR. 2:5; 6:4; MTeh. 62:4 do not understand the question of 2 Sam. 7:5 as a rhetorical question that had to be answered negatively. The question is understood as implying the possibility of an affirmative reply. The interrogative particle might even have been replaced by the particle ܟܐ, resulting in the affirmative “Behold, you will build Me a house to dwell in”; cf. W.G. Braude, *Pesikta Rabbati: Discourses for Feasts, Fasts, and Special Sabbaths* (Yale Judaica Series, 18), Vol. 1, New Haven & London 1968, 54, n. 21.

<sup>63</sup>“Very often the context . . . seems to allow no other conclusion than that the real purpose of the ‘question’ is only to ask attention for something obvious. Here the participle is best to be rendered by ‘Lo’ or ‘Look!’ (cf. Hebrew *hinnē*.)” So H.A. Brongers, “Some Remarks on the Biblical Participle *h<sup>a</sup>lo*”, *OTS* 21 (1981), 175-89, esp. 180. This is often done in Syr, cf. C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPII, 11), Leiden 2001, 77.

<sup>64</sup>In TgJer., however, several questions beginning with the interrogative prefix ܘܢ are replaced by a declarative statement beginning with “like it is impossible to . . .” (cf. TgJer. 18:14; 31:36, 37; 33:20).

<sup>65</sup>It is also found in Gen. 41:44, where “without your consent no man shall lift up hand or foot” is represented by military language, “without your word no man shall lift up his hand to collect weapons or his foot to ride on horses.” TO reduced it to more normal proportions.

acceptable proportions, *viz.* that not a stone will be found.<sup>66</sup>

*Irony*,<sup>67</sup> a mocking inversion of the facts, is maintained in 1 Sam. 21:12, where David is called “the king of the country”, while he is the only king without a country at that moment. It is questionable, whether TJon recognized this phrase as irony, or considered it another case of ignorance being attributed to the Philistines. The irony in 1 Sam. 11:12, “Saul will reign over us”, is translated according to its intrinsic meaning, “Saul is not fit to reign over us”. The irony in Absalom’s words, “This is your loyalty towards your friend” (2 Sam. 16:16), is maintained.<sup>68</sup>

*Metaphors*, which imaginatively identify one thing with another, dissimilar, thing and thereby transfer some of the qualities of the second to the first thing,<sup>69</sup> are usually replaced by non-figurative language or complemented by the preposition “ $\supset$ ” with or without the ground of the comparison.<sup>70</sup> Three representative examples of TJon’s treatment of metaphors are the substitution of “the plague of God” for “hand of God” (1 Sam. 4:8); its perception as a metaphor in “I will be *as* a father to you” (2 Sam. 7:14); and its replacing the metaphor by a simile in “Saul was *as innocent as* a one year old boy when he started to reign” (1 Sam. 13:1).<sup>71</sup> Sometimes a metaphor is replaced by a better known metaphor, *e.g.* “the cornerstones of the army” (1 Sam. 14:38) is translated by “heads of the army”, a frequently used metaphor in TJon.<sup>72</sup>

A special kind of metaphor is called the *Annexionsvergleich*, in which two vehicles are juxtaposed within a genitive construction. These metaphors are replaced by non-figurative language. Most of

<sup>66</sup> *Understatement*, intentionally representing something as less than it is, is not found in the Books of Samuel.

<sup>67</sup> *Antiphrases*, one word irony established by context, is not found in Samuel.

<sup>68</sup> Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 134 took the trouble to explain that these words are meant negatively, and he reformulated the phrase into a rhetorical questions.

<sup>69</sup> In this classification “my brother is as strong as a bear” is a simile, while “my brother is a bear” is a metaphor. See the elaborate discussion in M.C.A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (UBL, 8), Münster 1990, 35-58.

<sup>70</sup> For this well-known feature of Targumic exegesis, see *e.g.* Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 84-91; W.F. Smelik, “Concordance and Consistency: Translation Studies and Targum Jonathan”, *JJS* 49 (1998), 286-305, esp. 301-302.

<sup>71</sup> The fact that the latter text was not meant to be a metaphor is irrelevant to this section. TJon considered this verse a metaphor as a way to obtain a meaningful basic text and rendered it as a simile to obtain a clear and meaningful translation.

<sup>72</sup> *Catachresis*, an extravagant, implied metaphor using words in an alien way, does not occur in the Books of Samuel.



these metaphors occur in David's Psalm (2 Sam. 22), such as "the waves of death" and "the torrents of perdition" (22:5); "the cords of Sheol" and "the snares of death" (22:6); "the shield of thy salvation" (22:36); see below, commentary on these verses.

*Synecdoche*, sometimes called *metonymy*, is a form of metaphor in which a part stands for the whole or vice versa. All kinds of *synecdoche* exist, like *pars pro toto* and *totum pro parte*, *concretum pro abstracto* and *abstractum pro concreto*,<sup>73</sup> poetical plural or plural of majesty and *merismus*.<sup>74</sup> In many cases the word used in *synecdoche* is both realistically and metaphorically applied, for instance, "deliver from the hand of the enemies" (2 Sam. 22:1), in which "hand" is referring to the actual hands of the enemies, but also to their power (*concretum pro abstracto*); and "all the tribes of Israel came to David" (2 Sam. 5:1), in which tribe is referring to the heads of these tribes (5:3), but also to the tribes themselves being represented by these heads (*totum pro parte*). In many cases TgSam maintains the *synecdoche*. In other cases, however, TgSam replaces the *synecdoche* by the intended meaning. The word "gate" is replaced by "city", the "ropes" in 2 Sam. 17:13 refer to all kinds of weapons and instruments of the army, and are therefore rendered by "armies" (*pars pro toto*) and the word צַרִים, 'stone (knives)', is replaced by "killed ones" (*concretum pro abstracto*; 2 Sam. 2:16).<sup>75</sup>

*Merismus*, a kind of *synecdoche*, is always maintained. Expressions like "from great to small", "good and bad", "men and women" (all meaning "everyone"), "from Dan to Beer-sheba" (meaning "everywhere in Israel") were evidently easy to understand.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>73</sup>J. Ribera Florit, "The Use of the *Derash* Method in the *Targum of Ezekiel*", in: C.A. Evans (ed.), *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* (JSP.S, 33), Sheffield 2000, 406-22, esp. 415-16 gives several examples where TgEzek. replaces a *concretum pro abstracto* or an *abstractum pro concreto* by its intended meaning.

<sup>74</sup>W. Bühlmann, K. Scherer, *Sprachliche Stülfikuren der Bibel: Von Assonanz bis Zahlenspruch; ein Nachschlagewerk*, Gießen <sup>2</sup>1994, 72-85 give more examples.

<sup>75</sup>*Eponym*, substituting for a particular attribute the name of a famous person, does not occur in the Books of Samuel. Close to this device is the use of אֱלֹהִים or the tetragrammaton to express the superlative; cf. D. Winton Thomas, "A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew", *VT* 3 (1953), 209-24; Idem, "Some Further Remarks on Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew", *VT* 18 (1968), 120-24; P.A.H. de Boer, "יהוה" as Epithet Expressing the Superlative", *VT* 24 (1974), 233-35. In TJon this kind of reference to God is expressed by the reverent יי קדם מן קדם, as usual, although sometimes the superlative is indicated as well; see below, commentary on 1 Sam. 26:12.

<sup>76</sup>More examples can be found in H.A. Brongers, "Merismus, Synekdoche und Hendiadys in der bibel-hebräischen Sprache", in: P.A.H. de Boer (ed.), כּוּחַ: 1940-

*Euphemisms*, using less harsh and direct words, sometimes very near to *synecdoche*, are rendered euphemistically in TgSam. For example, “to scorn the enemies of the LORD” is translated by “to open the mouth of the enemies of the people of the LORD” (2 Sam. 12:14) and “Saul covered his feet” became “Saul relieved himself” (1 Sam. 24:3).

*Aischrology* or dysphemism, the opposite of euphemism, using more harsh and direct words, is not maintained in TgSam. Such expressions are considered too offensive, and are replaced by more euphemistic ones. The male adults, described as those “urinating against the wall” (1 Sam. 25:22) are defined as those “knowing knowledge” in the Aramaic version.<sup>77</sup>

*Personification*, metaphorically representing animals or inanimate objects as having human attributes, is used and maintained in David’s Lament, when the hills of Gilboa are called upon (2 Sam. 1:21). Some other personifications are avoided. Expressions with “son of . . .”, which could imply personification of wickedness, death, strength and so on, are replaced by plain language, such as “wicked persons”, “man deserving to be killed”, and “man making war”. In these cases the clarity of the text prevails.<sup>78</sup> However, other expressions might be considered cases of personification, although they are not meant to do so. When the Memra of God is at someone’s aid or when the Memra is rejecting someone (cf. 1 Sam. 28:16), the reader could easily personify it.

### 3.2.4.6 Summary

Whereas repetition in the shape of an absolute infinitive plus another verbal form is repeated in TgSam, repetition in horizontal paronomasia is not always maintained, although sometimes an attempt is made. The devices of *adiectio* are all maintained, except for some

1965 (OTS, 14) Leiden 1965, 100-14. Brongers suggests on pp. 113-14 that *merismus* may be considered a form of internal parallelism.

<sup>77</sup>The captive women, described as “a lap or two” (Judg. 5:30), are completely removed from the translation, and replaced by the phrase “a man and his house”.

<sup>78</sup>In other cases TJon interprets trees, plants, hills as personifications and treats them as a metaphor, cf. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 84-90; J.F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah*, Oxford 1949, xii-xiv; Komlosh, המקרא באור הרגום, 372-95; G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (StPB, 4), Leiden <sup>2</sup>1973, 26-39, 42-43; A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO, 35), Freiburg 1981, 176; J. Ribera Florit, *El Targum de Isaías* (Biblioteca Midrásica, 6), Valencia 1988, 30-31. See for a number of pertinent methodological remarks W.F. Smelik, ‘Concordance and Consistency: Translation Studies and Targum Jonathan’, *JJS* 49 49 (1998), 301-2.

appositives, which are reduced to the more fluent and clear form of a subordinate clause, and an oxymoron, which is rendered euphemistically in order to clear King Saul from guilt. Some short sentences of *detractio* form no problem for the Aramaic translators, but others are amplified and translated by complete and clear statements.

The rhetorical devices of *transmutatio* are treated in accordance with the aim and theology of TJon. In some cases of *hysteron proteron* TJon adds the right conjunction to clarify the sentence, as was the case with asyndetic phrases. Some cases of variation are maintained, but other cases are adapted in order to harmonize the message of Scripture.

The rhetorical devices of *immutatio* are treated in order to deliver a clear and unambiguous translation. Hyperboles, exclamations and metaphors are replaced by more realistic language, since these devices do not exactly say what they were supposed to mean. Some rhetorical questions, synecdoches, and personifications are also replaced, but in many cases the Aramaic version can do without replacement. In case of euphemisms it is clear that TgSam maintained or even increased them out of reverence for God and his people. Allusions are sometimes increased or enhanced because of the coherence in the Bible.

In short, the original text is adapted in several circumstances, (1) where it was too short to be properly understood; (2) where it could result in internal contradictions; (3) where it was too figurative to be properly understood; (4) where it used rhetoric devices which could be erroneously interpreted; and (5) where it would suggest guilt or sin in Biblical heroes. Note that the devices “allusion” and “euphemism” are maintained or even increased (6) to enhance the internal coherence of Scripture; and (7) to deliver a reverent translation. For the rest, (8) semantic figures are maintained, if they do not endanger the clarity of the text, the coherence of Scripture and the holiness of God and his people.

### 3.3 Exegetical Techniques and Theological Motives

Even in the fairly literal translation of TgSam many deviations from the Hebrew source text are present. Some of these deviations are due to the grammar or the vocabulary of the Aramaic language. They can be called syntactic deviations and are not our main concern. Other, more semantic deviations are not caused by the features of the Aramaic language, but seem to originate in the exegesis of the translator.<sup>79</sup> These deviations from the Hebrew text of the Bible in the

<sup>79</sup> “It is not the targum’s agreement with the Hebrew that needs explanation

Targum can lead the modern reader to the exegetical and theological concepts in the mind of the translators. These exegetical and theological concepts have already been collected and discussed in several monographs.<sup>80</sup> The exegetical techniques of TJon, however, have only been collected and discussed without referring to literature on other Jewish exegetical techniques used in the first centuries CE, although a large quantity of reference material is available in the literature on Midrashic and Talmudic exegeses. Hardly any comparison between the Targumic exegetical techniques and the Midrashic or Talmudic exegetical techniques has been made.<sup>81</sup>

### 3.3.1 Exegetical Techniques and the *Middot*

Rabbinic exegetical techniques are traditionally rendered in three lists of *middot*, 'measures, norms': (1) the seven rules of Hillel (Sifra Introd. 1:7; ARN<sup>a</sup> 37:55; tSan. 7 end); (2) the 13 (or 16) rules of R. Ishmael (Sifra Introd. 5); and (3) the 32 rules of R. Eliezer b. Yose ha-Gelili, compiled in *Mishnat Rabbi Eliezer* and frequently quoted in the Middle Ages.<sup>82</sup> Although the latter compilation is considered

---

but its divergence from it", cf. E.M. Cook, *Rewriting the Bible: The Text and Language of the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum*, Los Angeles 1986, 9, although it is also the Targum's agreement with the Hebrew that needs explanation in verses where one would expect deviation, cf. A. Samely, "Is Targumic Aramaic Rabbinic Hebrew?", *JJS* 45 (1994), 92-100, esp. 97.

<sup>80</sup>See above, Ch. 1, note 1.

<sup>81</sup>In spite of the good intentions of many authors, cf. G. Boccaccini, "Targum Neofiti as a Proto-Rabbinic Document: A Systematic Analysis", in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 254-63, esp. 254, n. 1, only D. Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (SBL.DS, 22), Missoula (MT) 1975, 55-58 gave a small comparison of exegetical techniques and jumped to the conclusion that "these techniques and methods are nothing else than those contained in the thirty-two *middoth* for aggadic interpretation, which are ascribed to R. Eliezer ben Yose ha-Galily."

<sup>82</sup>L. Jacobs, "Hermeneutics", *EJ* 8: 366-72; J.Z. Lauterbach, "Rules of Eliezer b. Yose ha-Gelili, the Thirty Two"; "Rules of Ishmael, the Thirteen"; "Rules of Hillel, the Seven", *JE* 10 (1905), 510-12; J.Z. Lauterbach, "Talmud Hermeneutics", *JE* 12 (1907), 30-33; H. Grätz, "Hillel und die sieben Interpretationsregeln", *MGWJ* 1 (1851/52, repr. 1969), 156-62; H.G. Enelow, *The Mishnah of Rabbi Eliezer or the Midrash of the Thirty-two Hermeneutic Rules*, New York 1933, 11-41; J. Bonsirven, *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne*, Paris 1939, 81-82; D. Daube, "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric", *HUCA* 22 (1949), 239-63, esp. 251-58; H.L. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, München<sup>6</sup> 1976, 96-108; J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretation of Scripture*, Cambridge 1969, 315-18; A. Díez Macho, *El Targum: Introducción a las traducciones aramaicas de la Biblia* (Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros", 21), Barcelona 1972, repr. Madrid 1979, 17,

post-Talmudic—for the first time cited in the Gaonic<sup>83</sup> age—, several *middot* from this list are discussed and used in earlier times. For example, R. Eliezer's first and second rule, ריבוי, 'inclusion', and בייעוט, 'exclusion', were frequently used in the school of R. Aqiba, but contradicted by the school of R. Ishmael (SifBam § 112 on Num. 15:27-31).<sup>84</sup>

The rules of Hillel and R. Ishmael are mainly applicable to halakhic sections, those of R. Eliezer are mainly employed for the aggada.<sup>85</sup> Therefore, it is not surprising that the rules of R. Eliezer are more in accordance with the exegetical techniques found in TJon than the rules of Hillel and R. Ishmael. In the following classification of exegetical techniques in TJon references will be made to the exegetical techniques compiled in the three lists of *middot*. When no reference is made, the exegetical technique is not found in either of these lists, although it could have been used in Talmud or Midrash.

The traditional dichotomy between *Peshaṭ* and *Derash* cannot be successfully used in the classification of Targumic exegetical techniques. In the first place, this dichotomy was defined in later periods, although the later distinctions between *Peshaṭ* and *Derash* can even be found in Tannaitic literature.<sup>86</sup> In the second place, it is not always clear in the Targum which method was used, because only the resulting translation is extant and not the exegetical path from question to answer, as it is often discernible in the Midrashic literature. In the third place, this dichotomy is too coarse.

### 3.3.2 Exegetical Techniques in Modern Literature

In the course of time several classifications of the semantic deviations in TJon and TO have been made. The classification model of Churgin consists of four categories: the allegorical method, the meta-

n. 35; P.S. Alexander, "The Rabbinic Hermeneutical Rules and the Problem of the Definition of Midrash", *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 8 (1984), 97-125; R. Kasher, "The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature", in: M.J. Mulder, H. Sysling (eds), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRI, 2/1), Assen & Philadelphia 1988, 547-94, esp. 584-86; D. Instone Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (TSAJ, 30), Tübingen 1992, 226-31; L. Díez Merino, "Procedimientos targumicas", in: V. Collado-Bertomeu, V. Vilar-Hueso (eds), *II. Simposio Bíblico Español (Córdoba 1985)*, Valencia-Córdoba 1987, 462; R. Jospe, "Hillel's Rule", *JQR* 81 (1990), 45-57.

<sup>83</sup>From the sixth to the middle of the eleventh century CE.

<sup>84</sup>L. Jacobs, "Hermeneutics", *EJ* 8: 366-72, esp. 371; Enelow, "Introduction", in: *The Mishnah of Rabbi Eliezer*, 21-23.

<sup>85</sup>Kasher, "The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature", 586.

<sup>86</sup>Kasher, "The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature", 553.

phorical method, the exegetical complement and the lexical method.<sup>87</sup> Churgin's classification, however, is so general that the categories are receptacles of various exegetical techniques.<sup>88</sup> Even more general are Driver's two categories: the tendency to soften or remove anthropomorphisms and the tendency to paraphrase.<sup>89</sup> A completely different classification was made by Sperber, who distinguishes all details and even divides into categories which only include a few items each.<sup>90</sup> A middle course is pursued by Frankel, Komlosh, Smolar and Aberbach, who only categorizes clearly distinguishable "translation techniques" and theological concepts. None of these authors shows to what extent these techniques and concepts are used consistently.<sup>91</sup>

In 1998 W.F. Smelik pointed out the confusion and made some relevant observations on the analytical description of translational changes. He distinguished between (1) exegetical formal methods, which can be formally described, (2) exegetical results, often confusingly called "translation techniques", and (3) stimuli or motives for a translational change. These stimuli can be found in both the source text and the context of the translator.<sup>92</sup> On the basis of these observations, a clear distinction can be made between the almost objective observation of the formal methods, their classification into known exegetical techniques, and finally their underlying motives, which are clearly interpretations of the modern reader.

<sup>87</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 80; the methods are discussed on pp. 80-84; 84-88; 88-90; 90-92.

<sup>88</sup>The same is true for Ribera's classification in J. Ribera Florit, "The Targum: From Translation to Interpretation", in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 218-25, where he classifies the interpretation techniques of the Targum into (1) 'al tiqre, (2) tarte mašma', (3) free translations for explaining or specifying the Hebrew text, and (4) changes on account of theological ideas; Cornill's classification in C.H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, Leipzig 1886, 122-25, where he classifies into (1) paraphrastic rendering of difficult verses, (2) avoiding of misunderstandings, (3) avoiding of anthropomorphisms, and (4) reverential treatment of the people of Israel; and Stenning's classification in J.F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah*, Oxford 1949, xii-xxvii, where he classifies into (1) paraphrase, (2) aggadic influence, (3) textual variations, and (4) variations of punctuation.

<sup>89</sup>Driver, *Notes*, lxix.

<sup>90</sup>A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b: The Targum and the Hebrew Bible, Leiden 1973.

<sup>91</sup>Z. Frankel, "Zu dem Targum"; Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*. Several authors made their own list of translation techniques, partly based on Frankel's list. These new lists are cited in the introduction to each technique.

<sup>92</sup>W.F. Smelik, "Concordance and Consistency: Translation Studies and Targum Jonathan", *JJS* 49 (1998), 286-305, esp. 290.

### 3.3.3 Classification Model

The following classification of deviations from the Hebrew source text in TgSam takes its cue from Smelik's observations. I have worked out the classification of translational changes into the following model: First, the exegetical methods, such as "Plus" and "Minus" are distinguished (observation); secondly, these methods are sub-divided into the exegetical categories, among them techniques known from rabbinic literature (classification)<sup>93</sup>; finally, underlying motives and stimuli are used to group these exegetical techniques together (interpretation).

"Since we have no direct evidence of the mental processes of the translators, (...) there is a certain subjective and hypothetical element in all discussion of our question."<sup>94</sup> This can, however, be kept within reasonable bounds, if the researcher does not decide on the basis of individual cases and if external evidence is taken into account. In studying the many chapters of TgSam exegetical tendencies become clear, tendencies also noticed in other Targumim and discussed in modern literature. Indirect evidence is gained from the discussions on exegesis in Midrashim and Talmudim, where several exegetical techniques also found in TJon are mentioned and described.

#### 3.3.3.1 Formal Methods

In principle every deviation from the source text, based on the primary unit of the lexeme, is made by the method of plus, substitution, minus and transposition,<sup>95</sup> or by a combination of these methods. The most frequent combination of methods is the "Plus and substitution", a phenomenon in which TJon substitutes a Hebrew word and explains it with extra words. Another form of deviation from the source text, regularly found in the Targumim, is the "Multiple Translation".<sup>96</sup>

<sup>93</sup>Following A. van der Kooij, "Some Remarks on the Analysis of the Interpretative Character of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, with particular attention to Targum Isaiah XXIII", in: I.E. Zwiep, A. Kuyt (eds), *Dutch Studies in the Targum: Papers read at a workshop held at the Juda Palache Institute, University of Amsterdam (18 March 1991)*, Amsterdam 1993, 78-88, esp. 78 and 79, n. 3, the term "translation technique" is not used.

<sup>94</sup>J. Barr, "The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations" (MSU, 15), *NAWG* 11 (1979), 279-325, esp. 285.

<sup>95</sup>According to the translation theory of A. Langeveld, *Vertalen wat er staat*, Amsterdam & Antwerpen 1994, 69: "toevoegingen, veranderingen, weglatingen, omzettingen"; cf. W.F. Smelik, "Concordance and Consistency: Translation Studies and Targum Jonathan", *JJS* 49 (1998), 286-305, esp. 297.

<sup>96</sup>Not frequently used, in contrast to TN, which used e.g. ברא ושכלל (Gen. 1:1) and טוב ותיקן for טוב (Gen. 1:10).

A distinction is drawn between “Substitution” and “Semantic shift”.<sup>97</sup> The first occurs when TJon renders a Hebrew word by a totally different Aramaic word. The latter is defined as substitution by a word within the same semantic field, *e.g.* a noun by a verb from the same stem or a divergent choice between synonyms. Finally, it is noted whether each exegetical technique is used consistently or not. In short, the following division of formal methods has been made:

- Semantic Shift
- Substitution
- Plus
- Plus and Semantic Shift
- Plus and Substitution
- Multiple Translation
- Minus
- Transposition
- Exceptions (if consistency is not maintained)

### 3.3.3.2 Exegetical Techniques

The following step is the classification of these formal methods, carried out by means of (traditional) exegetical or translational techniques. Some of these techniques are derived from ancient rabbinic sources, such as the lists of *middot*.<sup>98</sup> Since these lists do not supply an exhaustive description, other techniques were adopted from modern literature on the Targumim. Some traditional “translation techniques”, mentioned in previous publications, are not included in the

<sup>97</sup>According to the labelling of J.C. Lübke, “Describing the Translation Process of 11QTgJob: A Question of Method”, *RdQ* 13 (1988), 583-93, esp. 587-88, a substitution is made by words which are “polar” or “foreign” to each other; and a semantic shift is made by words which are “co-extensive”, “overlapping”, “generic”, “included”, or “contiguous”.

<sup>98</sup>See above, § 3.3.1. The Rabbinic exegetical tradition articulated its exegetical rules, although the lists of rules are far from complete. “They are not an adequate description of what actually goes on in midrash—at least for most of the time”, cf. P.S. Alexander, “The Rabbinic Hermeneutical Rules and the Problem of the Definition of Midrash”, *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 8 (1984), 97-125, esp. 97.



present classification.<sup>99</sup> For example, “Midrashic additions, etc” is not included, because it can be incorporated within many of the following exegetical techniques.<sup>100</sup> “Converse Translation Technique” is severely reduced, because it is a collection of “Converse Translation”, “Precision in Meaning”, “Plain Language”, and “Harmonization”. Only where God and his people are protected against misunderstandings the result is a real converse translation.<sup>101</sup>

Although some exegetical techniques sometimes cause great differences between the source text and the target text, especially in the poetical parts of TgSam, the main principle of Targumic translation is to render every word in the right order. This principle means that the translation methods “Minus” and “Transposition” are rarely used.<sup>102</sup> It must also be noted that several exegetical techniques can occur in the same verse. At times they complement each other, then again they obstruct each other.<sup>103</sup> In every case, however, the entire range of techniques is noted.

### 3.3.3.3 Stimuli and Motives

In order to make a survey of the exegetical techniques more manageable, these techniques are interpreted by means of different motives. Basically six basic motives are distinguishable in the creation of TJon: (1) the demand for a meaningful basic text and therefore the solving of problems in particular words (smallest co-text);<sup>104</sup> (2) the demand for clarity of the translation, albeit a clarity within the conceptual frame-work of the translator; (3) the demand for harmony in God’s revelation, constituting the broadest co-text; (4) the demand for actualization of God’s revelation; (5) reverence for God and his people, both collective and individual; and (6) the retention of rhetorical devices, as long as the first five motives are not endangered. These motives are traceable in the basic translation of TJon itself,

<sup>99</sup>Only publications on TJon and TO were used for this purpose. For “translational characteristics” of the Palestinian Targumim, see e.g. M.L. Klein (ed.), *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, Vol. 1, Cincinnati 1986, xxix-xxxiv.

<sup>100</sup>Against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 5.

<sup>101</sup>Against M.L. Klein, “Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique”, *Bib.* 57 (1976), 515-37.

<sup>102</sup>Minuses and transpositions are especially rare in TJon to the Former Prophets. They are more frequent in the Latter Prophets.

<sup>103</sup>Frankel, “Zu dem Targum”, 24.

<sup>104</sup>In the following chapters the word “co-text” is used for the text surrounding a certain word or verse; the word “context” is used for the surroundings of the writer of the text.

but also in the textual history of the translation. Several variants in the manuscripts are based on one of these motives.

Besides these six motives of the translators and the copyists, there are motives in the reception history of TJon, *viz.* in the copyist's concepts: the motive to enhance the text, either by correcting (assumed) errors or by bringing the translation closer to the Hebrew. These latter motives are only mentioned in clearly distinguishable cases, because it is very hard to draw a dividing line between editorial and scribal changes.

The exegetical techniques found are attached to one of the aforementioned motives, although it must be admitted that some techniques are used with several motives: The motive to solve problems (Motive 1) and to translate as clearly as possible (Motive 2) are definitely influenced by the translator's concepts of God and revelation. In fact, motives 1-4 are all based on the translator's concept of revelation. According to him, the Bible is meaningful (Motive 1), explicable (Motive 2), given by one God and therefore harmonious (Motive 3), and applicable in everyday life (Motive 4). And since it was given by God, it could not give wrong theological ideas to its readers (Motive 5). Therefore, the classification of the first five motives can best be depicted as concentric circles with the observation that the exterior circles affect the interior.

The first group of exegetical techniques (Motive 1) are directly caused by problems in the source text: a word was considered incomprehensible or was unknown to the translators. Other groups of exegetical techniques (Motive 3-5) lack such direct cause in the text, but in most cases a word or phrase induced the translator to add contemporary theological concepts, such as the words "light" and "darkness" which were considered references to the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked in the world to come.<sup>105</sup> The words prompting the use of the latter groups of techniques must be identified and discussed.<sup>106</sup>

### 3.3.4 Classification of Exegetical Techniques

This classification of exegetical techniques is partly dependent on former literature about Targumim and partly on the present study

<sup>105</sup>Cf. "darkness" in 1 Sam. 2:9; "lighten the darkness" in 2 Sam. 22:29; "light" in 2 Sam. 23:4.

<sup>106</sup>D.M. Golomb, "The Targumic Renderings of the Verb *l<sup>e</sup> hištah<sup>a</sup>wôt*: A Targumic Translation Convention", in: D.M. Golomb (ed.), *Working with No Data. Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*, Winona Lake (IN) 1987, 105-18, esp. 106, called such inducing words "triggers".

of the Targum of Samuel. Therefore, some exegetical techniques are mentioned which do not occur in TgSam. Each category is given a short name and is explained by a description of the category. Next, the exegetical technique is compared to the nearest exegetical technique known from Midrashic or Talmudic literature. Finally, examples are given, preferably from TgSam.

The basic attitude of the Targum towards the Hebrew text, *i.e.*, rendering every Hebrew word in its order, is the most important exegetical technique in TJon.<sup>107</sup> This rule is based on the translator's reverence for Scripture. "Everything is meaningful in Scripture" was the basis for Jewish exegesis as well as for Jewish translations of the Bible.<sup>108</sup> In connection with this basic attitude it must be said that TJon based its translation on the Masoretic standard text,<sup>109</sup> without textual improvements and textual divergencies as found in Qumran and the Greek versions.

The second basic attitude of TJon can be called the technique of solving problems within the very verse. The meaning of the verse must be clear after translating that verse; it must not be postponed until later.

### 3.3.4.1 Demand for a Meaningful Basic Text

Since the Bible is God's revelation, everything in it is meaningful. Therefore, the exegete and the translator must search for a meaningful basic text. The first group of techniques the Targumists employed are only used in case of unknown or untranslatable words in the source text. These are mainly explained by substitution. Because of the existence of this group of techniques, it is very hard to answer the question whether TJon had a different *Vorlage* or used one of these techniques, emending the original text. "What the Targum is expressing in Aramaic is not Scripture by itself, but Scripture as

<sup>107</sup>In contrast to Syr, where the "many omissions resulted in a more polished, less repetitive translation", cf. C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL, 11), Leiden 2001, 78.

<sup>108</sup>Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 65-66; cf. J.W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, Assen 1954, 89.

<sup>109</sup>If the earliest parts of TJon were based on Pre- or Proto-Masoretic manuscripts, tradition no doubt smoothed out most of the differences with MT. See on the coming into existence of the Masoretic text, E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Assen 1992, 21-79; on the Proto-Masoretic *Vorlage* of TJon *e.g.* A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO, 35), 1981, 214-20; R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VT.S, 51), Leiden 1994, 62-73.

already interpreted".<sup>110</sup>

In this classification the techniques "Substitution of a Consonant", "Metathesis", "Paronomasia" and "Notaricon" are ranged separately, although they can be combined in the traditional term *'al tigre*.<sup>111</sup> One must be aware that, although the alternative readings of *'al tigre* were not intended to be in competition with the official text, TJon mostly gave these alternative readings as the only translation. One must further bear in mind that a precise knowledge of Hebrew grammar and lexicography did not exist in the time of origin of TJon.<sup>112</sup> As a consequence, the vocalization and the exact derivation of a word is "not an independent piece of evidence, fed into the work of translation as evidence additional to the graphic evidence of the written text".<sup>113</sup> Of course, a tradition of vocalization and interpretation existed, but in several instances translators had to choose one meaning of the variety of meanings which were possible in the context. This means that what we summarize as *'al tigre* might in fact be the translator's most logical choice. The familiar terms "vocalization" and "derivation" are therefore, when applied to the time of the Targumists, ambiguous.<sup>114</sup> For the sake of categorizing, we take the Masoretic Text as our starting point and call some readings of TJon *'al tigre*.

Another matter that complicates things is the occurrence of Ketib-Qere within that Masoretic Text. In some instances another consonant and/or vocalization was read than was present in the traditional text.<sup>115</sup> These instances were determined outside the Targumic tradi-

<sup>110</sup>Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 53.

<sup>111</sup>Cf. C. McCarthy, *The Targum Sopherim and other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO, 36), Freiburg & Göttingen 1981, 139-46; J. Ribera Florit, "The Targum: From Translation to Interpretation", in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 218-25, esp. 220-22; Idem, "The Use of the *Derash* Method in the *Targum of Ezekiel*", in: C.A. Evans (ed.), *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* (JSP.S, 33), Sheffield 2000, 406-22, esp. 406-407.

<sup>112</sup>J. Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew Among the Ancient Translators", in: B. Hartmann et al. (eds), *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner* (VT.S, 16), Leiden 1967, 1-11, esp. 9, assumes that a conscious Hebrew grammar only appeared after Islamic times. As a consequence, "conceptions which are today familiar to the beginner in Hebrew, such as the triliteral stem, the distinctness of stem consonants from afformatives, and the conditions under which certain consonants seem to disappear or to reappear in different places, were unknown or poorly known to the ancient translators".

<sup>113</sup>Barr, "Vocalization", 2.

<sup>114</sup>Barr, "Vocalization", 2.

<sup>115</sup>See R. Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the Kethib-Qere*,

tion. In most cases TJon followed the Qere rather than the Ketib.<sup>116</sup> In rare cases the Ketib is rendered,<sup>117</sup> while in equally few cases an independent rendering is given.<sup>118</sup> Most deviations from the Qere are found in the latter half of 2 Samuel. It is as if the redaction of TJon became less strict as the work progressed.

1. *Substitution of a Consonant*, or תמורה, other than the official instances of Ketib-Qere:

- Semantic Shift: In many cases TJon translates Hebrew אל, 'to', by a more aggressive על, 'against'. Part of these instances is best explained by grammatical rules, but another part might well be a case of 'al tigre.<sup>119</sup>
- Substitution: In some cases that are different from the traditional Qere, TJon sometimes seems to have read—or at least rendered according to—different consonants. For instance, מורא instead of מורה in 1 Sam. 1:11; נגעה instead of נגשה in 1 Sam. 6:9.
- Multiple Translation: In 2 Sam. 18:3 most Hebrew MSS read עתה, but some Hebrew MSS and ancient versions read ארה. TJon appeared to have translated both readings.

2. *Anagram* or צירוף: transposition of consonants; if only two consonants are exchanged, it is called *metathesis* or חילוף.<sup>120</sup> In 2 Sam. 1:19 the first word is not read as הַצִּיב 'splendour, beauty', a denotation for the land of Israel (cf. Dan. 11:16, 41), but as הַצִּיב, a Hiphil perfect from נצב, but it is rendered as if it were a Niphal perfect: 'you took your stand'. In 1 Sam. 15:9 the Targumist appears to have read והשמנים instead of והמשנים. In

Philadelphia 1937 [repr. New York 1971]; J. Barr, "A New Look at Kethibh-Qere", *OTS* 21 (1981), 19-37. Barr noted that, beside the issue of a different vocalization, "in the vast majority of instances, the difference between K and Q is a difference of *one* element only in the consonantal text" (p. 25).

<sup>116</sup>Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 29; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 132-33; Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 4.

<sup>117</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 2:16, but not in MSS a b c f<sub>4</sub> m y eb1 B D J S, 2 Sam. 15:21; 22:47. Furthermore in 1 Sam. 18:14 (MSS p eb66); 22:22 (MS eb66); 2 Sam. 12:9 (MSS a c d y); 12:24 (MSS o w y); 13:34 (MS eb1); 14:22 (MS eb1); 18:12 (MS m); 21:21 (MS S).

<sup>118</sup>Cf. 2 Sam. 5:8; 15:8; 18:20; 21:20; 24:16.

<sup>119</sup>This kind of 'al tigre is also attested in Ber. 32a; cf. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim*, 143.

<sup>120</sup>Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 318, n. a; Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 179-80; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 98.

1 Sam. 19:20 several ancient translators read קהלת instead of להקת.<sup>121</sup>

3. *Paronomasia* or רמו, 'hint' (R. Eliezer 28), basing the translation on a different vocalization, and thus playing with cognate roots.<sup>122</sup> This rule is in accordance with the teachings of R. Ishmael, who followed the principle that only the tradition regarding the consonantal text is authoritative. R. Aqiba, however, regarded the traditional vocalization as normative, too.<sup>123</sup> Because this rule was apparently rarely put into practice, one might conclude that TJon did not dogmatically stick to R. Ishmael's view.<sup>124</sup>

- **Semantic Shift:** In 1 Sam. 2:16 the clause "they will burn the fat pieces" (יִקְשְׁרוּן) is rendered "the fat pieces will be burnt" (יִקְשְׁרוּן). The subject might be omitted, because it is plural. Since the sons of Eli are not regarded as priests (TJon 1 Sam. 1:3), there could only be one priest to sacrifice the fat pieces, Eli himself.<sup>125</sup> In 1 Sam. 4:2 the clause "it [= the ark] will save us" or "He will save us" (וַיִּשְׁעֵנוּ) became "we will be saved" (וַיִּשְׁעֵנוּ), at the same time omitting the theologically wrong subject and denying a direct identification of the ark with God. In 1 Sam. 26:20 the

<sup>121</sup>Metathesis might also occur in 1 Sam. 20:30; 2 Sam. 5:11, 7:19; see Ch. 5, commentary and notes on these verses.

<sup>122</sup>T. Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and the Ancient Versions of Zechariah ix-xiv", *OTS* 7 (1950), 1-142, 21 (also in Peshitta, cf. p. 33; and in LXX, cf. p. 44); Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 298-99, 302; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 56; Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 177-78; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 97. Also attested in Syr, cf. C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL, 11), Leiden 2001, 91; in Mt. 2:23, where *Nazōpāios* is a Greek paronomasia of *Naziraios* (cf. LXX Judg. 13:5, 7); cf. M.J.J. Menken, "The Sources of the Old Testament Quotation in Mt. 2:23", paper held at the first EABS meeting, Utrecht 7 August 2000; and in Jerome's translation, for instance, he translated במה not as *in quo*, but as *excelsus*; cf. J. Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew Among the Ancient Translators", in: B. Hartmann et al. (eds), *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner* (VT.S, 16), Leiden 1967, 1-11, esp. 7.

<sup>123</sup>J.Z. Lauterbach, "Talmud Hermeneutics", 31.

<sup>124</sup>Aquila followed R. Ishmael's teachings more rigorously; cf. J. Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew Among the Ancient Translators", in: B. Hartmann et al. (eds), *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner* (VT.S, 16), Leiden 1967, 1-11, esp. 7.

<sup>125</sup>But there is more to it. The Aramaic version only translates one verbal form and at the same time omits Hebrew כיים.

word  $\text{יִרְדֵּי}$  is vocalized as  $\text{יִרְדֵּי}$ , because the subject was considered impersonal.<sup>126</sup>

- Substitution: In 2 Sam. 6:2 one of the double  $\text{שׁ}$  is vocalized as  $\text{שׁ}$  in MS S (>18).<sup>127</sup>
  - Multiple Translation = *tarte mašma*: The Hebrew word  $\text{מִשְׁבֵּר}$  in 2 Sam. 22:5 is first rendered by  $\text{עֲקָא}$ , ‘anguish’, but in the sequel explained by a *mashal* concerning a woman on a birth-stool ( $\text{מִשְׁבֵּר}$ ) who had no strength to bear.
4. *Notaricon* or *Acronym*,  $\text{נוֹטָרִיקוֹן}$  (R. Eliezer 30): taking the consonants of a word as abbreviations of the words intended, a technique attested in a variant of 2 Sam. 6:19; or breaking up a word into two or more words,<sup>128</sup> which is not found in TgSam.
  5. *Gematria* or *גמטריא*  $\text{לְשׁוֹן גַּמְטְרִיָּא}$  (R. Eliezer 29), basing the translation on the value of the consonants,<sup>129</sup> which has no example in TgSam, or using a secret alphabet by exchanging the letters, which occurs in TgJer. 51:1, in which the Hebrew  $\text{לֵב קָמִי}$  is replaced by  $\text{כְּשָׂרִים}$ .<sup>130</sup>

### 3.3.4.2 The Demand for Clarity in the Co-text

In a way the demand for clarity is also a general underlying principle of the exegesis in TJon: “to render intelligible to the fullest degree that which is obscure”.<sup>131</sup> Still, a difference exists between clarity and adjustment to the translator’s context. Therefore, the demand for clarity is seen as one of the translator’s motives.<sup>132</sup>

<sup>126</sup>This shift from the active to the passive voice is also attested in Mt. 1:23, where Isa. 7:14 is quoted. Matthew uses the passive voice “his name shall be called” instead of the active “she shall call his name”.

<sup>127</sup>The same shift is found in 2 Sam. 8:13 (MS o and Syr).

<sup>128</sup>Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 318, n. a; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 57; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 374, 420, 559. The history of the notaricon is briefly described by J. Koenig, *L’Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d’après les témoins textuels d’Isaïe*, Leiden 1982, 392-95.

<sup>129</sup>Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 318, n. a; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 57; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 98.

<sup>130</sup>Two systems of exchanging letters are known: (1) Athbash, by which the *Aleph* and *Taw* are exchanged, *Beth* and *Shin*, etc. (2) Albam, by which *Aleph* and *Lamed* are exchanged, *Beth* and *Mem*, etc., cf. P. van Grinsven, “Filius unius anni erat Saul, cum regnare coepisset; duobus autem annis regnavit super Israel (I Sam. 13,1),” *Bib.* 7 (1926), 193-203.

<sup>131</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 78.

<sup>132</sup>Thus also Díez Macho, *El Targum*, 23.

6. *Etymological Association*: deriving the word from a different root.<sup>133</sup> This technique was widely spread among the rabbis, but also vehemently opposed.<sup>134</sup> It must be noted that this technique differs from *Substitution of a Consonant* (>1), *Anagram* (>2), and *Paronomasia* (>3). By the latter techniques the Hebrew text is read differently, by the former technique the Hebrew text is maintained but associated with other words. The association might even arise within the Aramaic language itself. Consequently, while the latter techniques belong to the group of *'al tigre* and an alternative Hebrew reading can be provided, the former technique belongs to the translation process and is not based on an alternative Hebrew word.

Sometimes an Aramaic word is chosen, because it resembles the Hebrew original. The association is made during the process of translation, although there is no semantic connection between the two words.

- Semantic Shift = *Translation of Place-Names*: “Stone of Help” (1 Sam. 7:12); “The Fuller’s Spring” (2 Sam. 17:17). The Greek word פִּלְס, *‘phollis’*, is chosen because of its similarity with Hebrew פִּלַּח in 1 Sam. 30:12.<sup>135</sup>
- Substitution: The name Zophim (1 Sam. 1:1) is regarded as a derivation from צִפָּה, ‘watch’, and can function as a cipher for the word “prophet”, cf. Ezek. 3:17. The name Zuph (1 Sam. 9:5) is interpreted in the same way.
- Multiple Translation = *tarte mašma’*: usage of the double “meaning” of a word. The Hebrew verb עָצַר, a rather negative verb meaning ‘to reign, to dominate’, was considered unfit to be associated with Saul (1 Sam. 9:17). The negative sense is maintained, but is applied to the enemies of Israel in a harmonizing translation. Another meaning of the same verb, ‘to withhold, to shut’, is added and applied

<sup>133</sup>Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 56: “playing with homonymous roots”; Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 178: “Wurzelloassoziationen”; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 98; also in LXX, cf. E. Bons, “Die Septuaginta-Version des Buches Rut”, *BZ* 42 (1998), 202-24, esp. 211: “Ableitung von einem anderen Wort oder Wortstamm”, and 220: “Etymologische Wiedergabe”.

<sup>134</sup>See the discussion between R. Nehemia and R. Yehuda bar Ilai, and that between R. Aqiba and R. Ishmael mentioned by Kasher, “The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature”, 582.

<sup>135</sup>Exonyms, writing geographical names according to the spelling of the receiving languages, are not included here, but are regarded as literal translations, e.g. Aramaic רְמָחָא for Hebrew רָמָה.



to Saul. While it is said in the preceding verse that Saul would save Israel from the hands of the Philistines, now we are told that he will take away their dominion.<sup>136</sup> The Aramaic word עִצְחָא (2 Sam. 3:37) is a second translation of Hebrew מִהַמֶּלֶךְ, ‘from the king’: Aramaic מִלְךְ can also mean “counsel, advice” and is the usual equivalent of Hebrew עִצָּה. Consequently, whereas Hebrew עִצָּה is usually translated by Aramaic מִלְךְ, in 2 Sam. 3:37 Hebrew מִלְךְ is rendered by Aramaic עִצְחָא.

7. *Generalization*: When the meaning is not completely known, TJon may choose a more general word of the same semantic field.<sup>137</sup> The specific פֶּךָ, a kind of small vessel (1 Sam. 10:1), as well as the צִפְחָה (1 Sam. 26:11), are rendered by the very general מִנָּא, ‘vessel’. The general words “portion” and “share” are used for a source text, which is not completely clear (2 Sam. 6:19). The geographical name Shalishah is rendered by the general indication of “the South” (1 Sam. 9:4).
8. *Extension and Exclusion*, רִיבּוּי וּמִיעוּט (R. Eliezer 1-2): The particles אֵן, גַּם, אַחַךְ and כֹּל indicate amplification to situations not (clearly) mentioned in the Biblical texts. The particles אֵין, אֵךְ, רַק, the definite article, and the preposition מִן are used to limit the amplifying effects of a רִיבּוּי.<sup>138</sup> These particles need not to be translated literally, but can be substituted by what they indicate. These rules were already established by R. Naḥum of Gimzo and taught to R. Aqiba, who was convinced that the divine language of the Torah was distinguished from the speech of men. This was often contradicted by R. Ishmael, who considered most of these particles normal linguistic features.<sup>139</sup> R. Ishmael himself made a modest use of this rule, in most cases restricted to the מִיעוּט.<sup>140</sup> This Rule is rarely applied in TgSam, but each

<sup>136</sup>Cf. also Van der Kooij, *Die alten Zeugen*, 180, sub 12, 2nd example (TgIsa. 3:12); J. Ribera Florit, “The Targum: From Translation to Interpretation”, in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 218-25, esp. 222.

<sup>137</sup>Also attested in LXX, cf. Bons, “Die Septuaginta-Version des Buches Rut”, 210, “Wahl eines Verlegenheitsäquivalent”.

<sup>138</sup>M.L. Chernick, “The Use of *Ribbūyīm* and *Mi’ūṭīm* in the Halakic Midrash of R. Ishmael”, *JQR* 70 (1979-80), 96-116, esp. 98-99.

<sup>139</sup>tShevu 1:7; Shevu 26a; Ḥag 12a; cf. H.L. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1976, 101; J.Z. Lauterbach, “Talmud Hermeneutics”, 31; Kasher, “The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature”, 569 and 587.

<sup>140</sup>Chernick, “The Use”, 115.

time the particle itself is omitted.

- Substitution: In 1 Sam. 2:26 the word נֹכַח is represented thrice: once in general, once in regard to God, and once in regard to mankind. The latter two translations are due to the double Hebrew נָ, which is omitted in the rendering. In 2 Sam. 12:14 (MS S) the particle אַף, 'also', is understood as a reference to more casualties in David's family than the little boy alone. The deaths of Amnon, Absalom and Adoniah are explicitly mentioned, while the particle is omitted.
- Exceptions: the present technique is rarely used, and is an exception in itself.

9. *Precision in Number*: translating collective, singular nouns with plural nouns; adjusting verbs to the intended plural or singular meaning.<sup>141</sup> In most cases the text is not changed at all. Collectives were understood, plural verbs with singular, collective subjects were perfectly sound Aramaic as well. Almost every *constructio ad sensum* is integrated into the Aramaic version. It seems that *Codex Reuchlinianus* never adjusted the number of verbs to the intended plural of the subject, but maintained the singular in these instances. Other manuscripts irregularly adjust the number of the verbs.<sup>142</sup> This resembles Hillel's seventh and Ishmael's twelfth rule, namely, that the meaning of a text may be deduced from the co-text.

In tMeg. 3:41 it is said that the meturgeman was not allowed to exchange the singular for the plural and *vice versa*.<sup>143</sup> According to this rule, several rabbis attempted to explain singular collective nouns as a meaningful singular. R. Aqiba tended towards an ultra-literal explanation of the singular, e.g. his "single frog that filled the whole land of Egypt" in Exod. 8:2, but he was contradicted by R. Elazar b. Azariah who stated, "there was but one

<sup>141</sup>Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 90-92, "finite verb instead of the absolute infinitive". Also in LXX, cf. Bons, "Die Septuaginta-Version des Buches Rut", 212: "Angleichungen an die Grammatik und Stilistik der Zielsprache".

<sup>142</sup>Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 61-65, "collective nouns treated as plurals"; 65-67, "abstract nouns by corresponding concrete forms"; 99-102, "the numerus adjusted to that of the context", 147-48, "collective nouns treated as plurals".

<sup>143</sup>About the meturgemanim is written there: "A verse which is written in the singular they do not present in the plural, and one which is written in the plural they do not present in the singular".

frog; it whistled to the other and they came" (San. 67b).<sup>144</sup> In both cases the singular noun is maintained, but R. Elazar respected the collectivity of the noun. TJon's explanations are in this respect in accordance with R. Elazar's exegesis rather than with R. Aqiba's, but being a translation rendered the plural for collective nouns.

- Shift: TJon uses the first person in "chose" (1 Sam. 2:28) because also the preceding and the following verses have the first person. Collective nouns can be rendered by plurals,<sup>145</sup> e.g. the shift from the collective בָּקָר to the plural תּוֹרֵי־אֵי. Note however that the collective צֹאן is translated by the collective עֵבָא.
- Minus: In some cases the word כֹּל is omitted, especially in MSS f and w.<sup>146</sup>
- Exception: In most cases the number is not adapted to the intention of the text.<sup>147</sup>

10. *Providing Hidden Information*, or דרך קצרה, *Short Path* (R. Eliezer 9, but cf. also R. Eliezer 19/22), which allowed the addition of missing words in abbreviated or elliptical phraseology: making the (assumed) implicit meaning explicit.<sup>148</sup>

<sup>144</sup>Note a similar contradiction of singular and plural explanations within the Pauline letters: Paul deliberately uses the singular form of the word "seed" in Gal. 3:16, quoting Gen. 22:17, while he proves to be aware of its collective meaning in Gal. 3:29 and Rom. 9:7. His awareness of the collective meaning agrees with the translation techniques of TJon; his usage of the singular is more in agreement with R. Aqiba's teachings; cf. P. Lapide, *Ist die Bibel richtig übersetzt?*, Gütersloh 1986, 107-108.

<sup>145</sup>Cf. Samely, *Interpretation of Speech*, 10.

<sup>146</sup>Cf. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic* Vol. 4b, 154.

<sup>147</sup>See above, § 3.2.3.5, *s.v. constructio ad sensum*.

<sup>148</sup>Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 49-50; R. le Déaut, "Un phénomène spontané de l'herméneutique juive ancienne: 'le targumisme'", *Bib.* 52 (1971), 505-25, esp. 513, "la propension à la glose"; Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 300-304; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 51-61, "Targum elaborates on brief text" and "additions necessary for a better understanding"; 69-73, "adding or omitting suffixes"; 145-47, "Targum elaborates on brief text"; 151, "addition of suffixes", 75-76, "choice of verbal tense according to the context", 152-53, "choice of verbal tense according to the context"; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 62; Van der Kooij, *Die alten Zeugen*, 177, "exegetische Ergänzungen" ... "Auffüllungen von Texten, die dem Übersetzer zu kurz erschienen"; C.T.R. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah* (AramB, 12), Edinburgh 1987, 21: "supplying of missing details"; 24: "making precise of what might appear vague"; Ribera Florit, "The Targum: From Translation to Interpretation", 222-24, "free translation for explaining or specify-

- Semantic Shift: The verb לקח is rendered by רבר in regard to humans and by נטב in regard to animals and things.<sup>149</sup> A distinction is made between “good olive orchards” (1 Sam. 8:14) and “handsome young men” (1 Sam. 8:16), although the Aramaic טבא can also be used for humans. The word נער can be translated by “young man”, but also by “child”.<sup>150</sup>
- Plus:<sup>151</sup> Expressions like “house of the tribe” (of Ephraim, etc.); the standardized object in “to wage war”,<sup>152</sup> the standardized object in “burn sweet-smelling incense” (e.g. in 1 Sam. 2:28); pluses that stress the unreality of a scene by adding what can be called modal auxiliary verbs, cf. 2 Sam. 2:27; 4:10; 18:11, 13, 2 Sam. 23:16;<sup>153</sup> for example, the question “Will they deliver me?” with its answer “They will deliver you” (1 Sam. 23:12) is not in accordance with the rest of the story, so TJ adds the verb “to plan”: “Are they planning to deliver me?” etc.<sup>154</sup>
- Multiple Translation (R. Eliezer 19/22): the two translations of the double duty verb,<sup>155</sup> cf. 2 Sam. 22:9.

11. *Precision of Meaning*, related to the preceding technique. This technique does not concern implicit information from the Hebrew text, but external views affecting the choices within the Ara-

---

ing the Hebrew text”; also in LXX, cf. Bons, “Die Septuaginta-Version des Buches Rut”, 211: “Wahl eines Wortes, das sich in den Sinn des Kontextes einfügt”, and 215: “Ergänzungen des Textes”; and in Syr, cf. C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIIL, 11), Leiden 2001, 14-17.

<sup>149</sup>So also in TgJudg. 8:16 according to most MSS; see above, § 3.2.3.3, *s.v. zeugma*.

<sup>150</sup>Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 327.

<sup>151</sup>Frankel, “Zu dem Targum”, 16; Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 326-29; Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 3.

<sup>152</sup>“War” is called a plus because of the appearance of the verb without the object in 1 Sam. 20:23; 25:28; 2 Sam. 11:20; 2 Kgs 14:28.

<sup>153</sup>Note that this verse is also influenced by the motive of Reverence for Biblical heroes: David was unfit to perform libation offerings, for he was not a priest.

<sup>154</sup>This resembles the instances of Gen. 42:13; 42:36; 37:33; 43:14, which M.L. Klein, “Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique”, *Bib.* 57 (1976), 515-37 called *Converse Translation*.

<sup>155</sup>Cf. W.F. Smelik, “Translation and Commentary in One: The Interplay of Pluses and Substitutions in the Targum of the Prophets”, *JSJ* 29 (1998), 245-60, esp. 256. This is one application of R. Eliezer’s 19th Rule, *viz.* that an utterance about one thing also applies to its neighbour, e.g. in Ps. 97:11 the word “light” must be added in the second half, and the word “joy” in the first; and R. Eliezer’s 22nd Rule, *viz.* that a sentence can be complemented with elements from a parallel sentence, cf. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, 105-106.

maic translation. Consequently, these changes cannot always be found in dictionaries and grammars concerning the Hebrew language. This process can already be distinguished in Chronicles, where precisions are made to the source texts.<sup>156</sup>

- Semantic Shift = *Specialization*:<sup>157</sup> Sometimes, the choice of words in the Hebrew text was obviously too general for the Aramaic translators. In those cases they specified the general Hebrew word by the use of several Aramaic synonyms.<sup>158</sup> The Hebrew word מִשְׁפָּט is interpreted by דִּינָא or by the verb דִּין when true jurisdiction is meant (1 Sam. 8:3; 30:25; 2 Sam. 8:15; 15:2, 6); by נִימוּסָא when human (written) laws are meant (1 Sam. 2:13; 8:9, 11; 10:25); and by הִלְכָתָא when an oral law or habit is meant (1 Sam. 27:11). The variant נִמְסִיָּה in 1 Sam. 27:11 (Eb 1) classifies David's habit among his laws. In some cases the Hebrew conjunction וְ is translated by “when” or “after” in order to specify the temporal relationship of sentences (e.g. 1 Sam. 25:31; 2 Sam. 17:3).<sup>159</sup>
- Plus: In 2 Sam. 13:39 “soul” is added before “David”; this is one of the examples which appear in the text of the 32 Rules of Eliezer.<sup>160</sup>
- Minus: In some MSS the copula וְ is omitted in the list between the words for military commanders and the words for craftsmen (1 Sam. 8:12) in order to distinguish between the two groups.<sup>161</sup>

<sup>156</sup>C.J. Goslinga, “De parallele teksten in de boeken Samuël en Kronieken”, *GerThT* 61 (1961), 108-16 gives the examples of “all his men” in 1 Sam. 31:6 becoming “all his family” in 1 Chron. 10:6 and מִצְרַת גֹּתְהָא in 2 Sam. 8:1 becoming “Gath and its villages” in 1 Chron. 18:1. See further I. Kalimi, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten: Literarisch-historiographische Abweichungen der Chronik von ihren Paralleltexen in den Samuel- und Königsbüchern* (BZAW, 226), Berlin & New York 1995, 57-79.

<sup>157</sup>Many specialized words are discussed in Ch. 4. Cf. J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, Oxford 1961, 3. Also used in LXX, cf. P. Churgin, “The Targum and the Septuagint”, *AJSL* 50 (1933), 41-65, esp. 44-45.

<sup>158</sup>Some examples of specialization or hyponymy are given in A. Samely, “Between Scripture and its Rewording: Towards a Classification of Rabbinic Exegesis”, *JJS* 42 (1991), 39-67, esp. 42, n. 9; W.F. Smelik, “Concordance and Consistency: Translation Studies and Targum Jonathan”, *JJS* 49 (1998), 286-305, esp. 298-99.

<sup>159</sup>See above, § 3.2.3.3, *s.v. parataxis* and § 3.2.4.4, *s.v. hysteron proteron*.

<sup>160</sup>Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, 102.

<sup>161</sup>For such minuses and plusses in 11Q10, see D. Shepherd, “Will the Real

12. *Different Division* or סדור שנחלק (R. Eliezer 11), which allows changing the division of a sentence to reveal another meaning.<sup>162</sup>

- (Syntactic) Shift: While LXX and Vg regarded Gath as the subject of the verb ויאמרו, rendering “And the Gathites said”, TJon and Syr considered Gath to be the accusative of the next verb, adding the preposition ל־ and rendering “be brought around to Gath”. The latter division of the verse is also attested by the Masoretic accents (1 Sam. 5:8).
- Plus: By an addition of several words TJon divided the Hebrew phrase המלבשכם שני עם־ערנים and translated it by two phrases: “who clothed you with scarlet clothes” and “and brought you delicacies” (2 Sam. 1:24). In 1 Sam. 3:3 the verse is split into two sentences by making a full stop after “And Samuel was lying down”. Both halves are complemented by additional words: “and Samuel was lying down in the court of the Levites. And a voice was heard from the LORD’s temple . . . ”<sup>163</sup>
- Multiple Translation: In 2 Sam. 23:3b the natural division would be מושל באדם צדיק, which is represented in TJon, “[God] has dominion among the sons of man, judging the truth”; the traditional division, however, attested both in MQ 16b and in the punctuation of the Masoretes, includes the word צדיק in the following clause, מושל יראת אלהים, which is also attested in TJon’s words “the Messiah who is to arise and rule in the fear of the LORD”.

13. *Explanation of Metaphors*: TJon prefers comparisons in which the tenor and the vehicle are combined by the preposition כ־, to metaphors in which only the vehicle is clear. When confronted

---

Targum Please Stand Up? Translation and Coordination in the Ancient Aramaic Versions of Job”, *JJS* 51 (2000), 88-116.

<sup>162</sup>Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 56-57, although his example of Gen. 22:8 is not convincing. Very rare in TJon, but more frequent in LXX, cf. Bons, “Die Septuaginta-Version des Buches Rut”, 212: “Abweichungen aufgrund einer anderen Satzabgrenzung”. Also attested in the NT: Mt. 3:4 shows that Isa. 40:3 could be divided differently. Matthew’s division originates in the LXX. Mt. 4:15-16 shows that Isa. 8:23 could be regarded as the introduction of Isa. 9. TgIsa, however, translates 8:23 as the conclusion of Isa. 8.

<sup>163</sup>This altered division is not made to clarify the text, but to clear Samuel from sleeping in the temple, which he was not allowed to do. This division is confirmed by the punctuation in the MT.

with a metaphor, the Targumist either replaced it by more realistic language or added the preposition ׀. Sometimes, however, TJon only replaced an unclear metaphor by a better known metaphor.<sup>164</sup>

From the instances in which TJon maintained the metaphor it is clear that the clarification of the text must have been the basic underlying principle. Well-known metaphors could be integrated in the Aramaic version, while unknown metaphors had to be explained. There is a curious example in 2 Sam. 19:13. The metaphorical *hendiadys* “my bone and flesh”, with the sense of “my family”, is partly maintained and partly explained: “my kinsmen and my flesh”.

- Semantic Shift: The metaphorical באוני is rendered by קרם, both before God (e.g. 1 Sam. 8:21; 12:17) and before men (e.g. 1 Sam. 9:15; 16:22).<sup>165</sup> Replacement by better known metaphors occurs, e.g. the “cornerstones of the army” (in 1 Sam. 14:38) translated by “heads of the army”, a frequently used metaphor in TJon. Substitution of the metaphor by more realistic language also occurs: In 1 Sam. 10:12 the word “father” is rendered by the more realistic “master”; the “eying” of Saul (1 Sam. 18:9) became “lying in wait”.
- Substitution:<sup>166</sup> “hand of God” is rendered by “plague of God” in 1 Sam. 4:8. David did not hate the lame and the blind, but the sinners and the guilty (2 Sam. 5:6).
- Plus = *Extended Simile*, related to משל, *marshal* (R. Eliezer 26).<sup>167</sup> Being a translation, TJon does not add complete

<sup>164</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 85, “The targumist made it a principle to render not the metaphor but what it represents”, and 87, “both the literal and the implied rendering of the metaphor in question is given.”; Jansma, “Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and the Ancient Versions of Zechariah ix-xiv”, 22; Le Déaut, “Un phénomène spontané de l’herméneutique juive ancienne: ‘le targumisme’”, 512; Díez Macho, *El Targum*, 23, “se concreta el sentido de metáforas”; M. Aberbach, B. Grossfeld, *Targum Onqelos on Genesis 49* (SBL-AS, 1), Missoula (MT) 1976, 12, n. 20; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 48-49, “figurative speech”; Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 6; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 98, “substitution of metaphors” and “extended simile”; Idem, “Concordance and Consistency: Translation Studies and Targum Jonathan”, *JJS* 49 (1998), 286-305, esp. 301-302. See also the literature cited in connection with *Personification*.

<sup>165</sup>P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel i-xvi*, Amsterdam (diss.) 1938, 12.

<sup>166</sup>Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 323-26; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 98.

<sup>167</sup>R. Kasher, “Metaphor and Allegory in the Aramaic Translations of the Bible”,

*meshalim* in its translation, but especially the *Extended Simile* is a kind of explained *mashal*.<sup>168</sup> For instance, the Hebrew simile “like a bursting flood” (2 Sam. 5:20) is extended to “like a clay vessel, out of which the water streams when it is broken”. Sometimes, TJon turns the text into a simile by adding the preposition ׀. The exegetical problem involved is not completely solved, because the ground of the comparison is not added, cf. “his heart died within him and became *as* a stone” in 1 Sam. 25:37. Sometimes, TJon even add the ground, e.g. “my lord the king is *as wise as* the angel of the LORD” (2 Sam. 19:18).

- Multiple Translation: In 1 Sam. 2:31 the metaphorically used ‘arm’ is rendered both literally by “arm” and more realistically by “strength”. In 1 Sam. 12:21 the metaphorical הדי is translated by “idol, which is nothing”. In 1 Sam. 25:10 Hebrew המופרצים, ‘breaking away’ became “fleeing and hiding”.
- Exceptions: In 1 Sam. 10:12 (MS eb1) the word “father” is not rendered by the more realistic “master”.

14. *Plain language* for non-metaphorical figures of speech:<sup>169</sup> TJon substituted these devices only in a few cases.<sup>170</sup> Some examples will suffice here to show that TJon dealt with these rhetorical devices by means of substitutions, pluses, multiple translations, and minuses.

---

JAB 1 (1999), 53-77, esp. 58; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 85, “addition of a particle of comparison”, 87, “*k*-comparisonis instead of *l*”.

<sup>168</sup>In TPsJ a few complete *meshalim* were added, e.g. in Deut. 32:50-51, but this type of aggadic material is “un-Targumic”, cf. A. Shinan, “The Aggadah of the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Rabbinic Aggadah: Some Methodological Considerations”, in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 203-17, esp. 209.

<sup>169</sup>Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 326; Díez Macho, *El Targum*, 23; Smolar, *Aberbach, Targum Jonathan*, 130; R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VT.S, 51), Leiden 1994, 143; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 463, n. 759. Contra M.L. Klein, “Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique”, *Bib.* 57 (1976), 515-37, who considers answering rhetorical questions a *Converse Translation*. However, the meaning of a phrase including a rhetorical question is not converted by translating its answer, cf. E.A. Nida, C.R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden 1969, 30.

<sup>170</sup>See above, § 3.2.4.6. E.W. Tuinstra, *Hermeneutische Aspecten van de Targum van Job uit grot XI van Qumrân*, [Groningen 1970], 52 added to this that the targum of Job does not show any sense of humour.



- Substitution: substitution of the interrogative prefix by the particle הִיא, “behold”, only occurring in variant readings.<sup>171</sup>

Hebrew שַׁעֲרִים, ‘gates’, is regarded as meaning ‘cities’ in e.g. TgJudg. 5:8 and one ms. of TJon 2 Sam. 18:26.<sup>172</sup> The expression “hear the voice” is considered a *concretum pro abstracto* for “to accept the words” (e.g. 1 Sam. 15:20), and likewise the verb “answer” is interpreted by “accept one’s prayer” (e.g. in 1 Sam. 28:6).<sup>173</sup> Also the name of the people is substituted for the name of the land (*abstractum pro concreto*), e.g. Moabites for Moab in 2 Sam. 8:2.

The exclamation אַבֵּל is rendered by בְּקִשְׁטָא, ‘in truth’ (2 Sam. 14:5); בְּבַעוּ בִי, ‘please, permission to speak’ (1 Sam. 1:26; 25:24); קְבִיל בְּעוֹזִי בַּי אֲדָהּ, ‘accept my prayer’ (Josh. 7:7);<sup>174</sup> כַּעֲן בַּי נָא.

David’s emotional expletive<sup>175</sup> “that son of death” in 2 Sam. 12:5 is represented by “he is a man deserving to be killed”. Personification of death is avoided.

Some forms of *hysteron proteron* are clarified by the conjunction בְּתוֹרָה (e.g. 2 Sam. 17:3; 18:29).

- Plus: A few very short sentences are complemented to clarify their meaning, e.g. Samuel’s prophetic word in 1 Sam. 15:23.<sup>176</sup>

Plural nouns are added before collective words (*abstractum pro concreto*), such as “people” (of the land), “inhabitants” (of a country/city), “wagers” (of the war).

- Multiple Translation: A rhetorical question can be rendered twice, cf. Cairo Geniza Ms G on Exod. 15:11 where

<sup>171</sup> Also attested in Syr, e.g. 1 Sam. 12:17. Several times in TgJer the interrogative prefix is substituted by the introductory phrase “As it is impossible to . . .” (TgJer. 18:14; 31:36, 37; 33:20, not found in TgSam).

<sup>172</sup> Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 437.

<sup>173</sup> Although the verb “accept” is an example of a substitution of the rhetorical device *concretum pro abstracto*, the addition of the word “prayer” constitutes a theological framework; cf. M. Maher, “The Meturgemanim and Prayer”, *JJS* 41 (1990), 226-246. See below, Ch. 4, s.v. Aramaic צִלָּא.

<sup>174</sup> For the addition of the word “prayer”, see below, Ch. 4, s.v. Aramaic צִלָּא.

<sup>175</sup> Cf. G. Gerleman, “Schuld und Sühne: Erwägungen zu 2. Samuel 12”, in: H. Donner et al. (eds), *Beiträge zu alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift für Walther Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag*, Göttingen 1977, 132-39, esp. 133: “affektgeladener Kraftausdruck”.

<sup>176</sup> See above, § 3.2.4.3, s.v. *Brachylogy*.

both the question and its answer are translated.<sup>177</sup> Not found in TgSam.

- Minus: omission of the interrogative prefix, 1 Sam. 2:27. Omission of Hebrew שָׁמַר, 'his shoulder' (*pars pro toto*), because Saul turned completely to leave Samuel (1 Sam. 10:9).
- Exception: In many cases rhetorical devices are not replaced by plain language.

### 3.3.4.3 Demand for Harmony in the Broadest Co-text

Because of the belief that the Bible was the revelation of God, and therefore a coherent book without contradictions, the translators did their best to harmonize the whole Hebrew Bible. Not only ideas in different verses are harmonized or identically translated, but also the whole of prophets and other books are harmonized with the Torah given by Moses.<sup>178</sup>

Moreover, TJon uses stock phrases and standardized translation in verses which are of similar wording in the Hebrew text. By translating this way the Targumist increases the unity and the comprehensibility of the Bible. "By embedding various actions of God in MT in one term, the targumist also increases the coherence and inner strength of his presentation of God's acting."<sup>179</sup>

15. *Associative Translation*: Translation in literal accordance with similar verses or in better parallelism than the source text, according to parallelisms in similar verses.<sup>180</sup> By associative translations TJon can make links between verses or between

<sup>177</sup>M.L. Klein, "Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique", *Bib.* 57 (1976), 515-37, esp. 534.

<sup>178</sup>Cf. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 123, "Torah thus gains centrifugal force in the prophecy"; Le Déaut, "Un phénomène spontané de l'herméneutique juive ancienne: 'le targumisme'", 517-18; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 66: "Scripture is to be explained by Scripture"; A. Goldberg, "Formen und Funktionen von Schriftauslegung in der frührabbinischen Literatur (1. Jh. v. Chr. bis 8. Jh. n. Chr.)", *LingBibl* 64 (1990), 5-21, esp. 6; A. Samely, "Between Scripture and its Rewording; Towards a Classification of Rabbinic Exegesis", *JJS* 42 (1991), 39-67, esp. 65-67.

<sup>179</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 330, who refers to A. Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim* (TSAJ, 14), Tübingen 1986, 260.

<sup>180</sup>Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 13, 18-19; Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 54-55, 70-77; Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 30; Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and the Ancient Versions of Zechariah ix-xiv", 19, "parallelizing" (occurs

Biblical persons.<sup>181</sup> This technique shows similarity to the Mid-rashic גזרה שוה, *Gezerah Shavah*, which explains a phrase in one text by its use in another text, assuming that similar phrases throughout Scripture bear always the similar meaning (Hillel 2, cf. Hillel 6, כיוצא בו במקום אחר, “as is similar in another text”, R. Ishmael 2, R. Eliezer 7.)

Associative renderings already appear within the Hebrew textual tradition where scribes tended to complement verses with phrases from similar verses or to correct assumed false reading by comparing them with more clear verses.<sup>182</sup> Within the Aramaic tradition it must be noted that the combination of a *parasha* and a *haftara* may produce a more than usual accordance,<sup>183</sup> but rarely does so.<sup>184</sup>

A special form of associative translation is the mixing of quotations, attested both in early Jewish and early Christian literature, called שמיחה. Sometimes lines from the Hebrew Bible are simply quoted after one another (cf. Rom. 3:10-18), but in other instances the two quotations are really blended. For example, Mt. 21:5 quotes parts of Zech. 9:9 and Isa. 62:11,<sup>185</sup> whereas

---

also in the Peshitta, cf. p. 30; and seldom in LXX, cf. p. 42, 46); Komlosh, המקרא, באור התרגום, 304-305; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, 44-45, “changes in accord with similar Biblical passages”, 68, “parallelism re-established”; Le Déaut, “Un phénomène spontané de l’herméneutique juive ancienne: ‘le targumisme’”, 515: “explications (...) à l’aide de passages parallèles”; M.L. Klein, “Associative and Complementary Translation in the Targumim”, *ErIs* 16 (1982), 134-40; P. Doron, “The Methodology of Targum Onkelos”, *EstB* 43 (1985), 173-87, esp. 182; C.T.R. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah* (AramB, 12), Edinburgh 1987, 5-7, “stock phrases”; Van der Kooij, “Some Remarks on the Analysis of the Interpretative Character of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, with particular attention to Targum Isaiah XXIII”, 80-87; Alexander, “Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scripture”, 227-28; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 97. Similarly in Syr, cf. C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL, 11), Leiden 2001, 34-49.

<sup>181</sup>S.P. Brock, “Translating the Old Testament”, in: D.A. Carson, H.G.M. Williamson (eds), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, Cambridge 1988, 87-98, esp. 89.

<sup>182</sup>J. Koenig, *L’Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d’après les témoins textuels d’Isaïe*, Leiden 1982, *passim*, but see esp. 379-425.

<sup>183</sup>Le Déaut, “Un phénomène spontané de l’herméneutique juive ancienne: ‘le targumisme’”, 522; Díez Macho, *El Targum*, 26.

<sup>184</sup>See above, SS 2.4.1 and 2.4.2; cf. also Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 186.

<sup>185</sup>Jn 12:15 gives another mixture of texts, probably Zech. 9:9 and 8:15, which also speaks about comfort for the city of Jerusalem., but cf. M.J.J. Menken, “Die Redaktion des Zitates aus Sach 9,9 in Joh 12,15”, *ZNW* 80 (1989), 193-209.

Mt. 2:23 is a combination of LXX Judg. 13:5, 7 and Isa. 7:14,<sup>186</sup> although it could also be an allusion to the addition to 1 Sam. 1:22, found in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus, that he [Samuel] shall be a nazir.<sup>187</sup>

- Semantic Shift = *Associative Translation*: In 1 Sam. 18:6 the phrase “sing and dance” is rendered by “to praise with dances” according to the Hebrew in 21:11.<sup>188</sup> In 2 Sam. 3:38 the Hebrew combination שָׂר וְגִדּוּל is translated by the frequently used combination רַב וְשָׁלִיט, as in TN Gen. 27:29; 44:15, based on this combination in Dan. 2:10.<sup>189</sup>
- Semantic Shift = *Restored parallelism*: in 1 Sam. 17:44 (MSS b c m w x y B D S T eb1) the “beast of the field” are turned into “the beast of the land” in order to restore parallelism with “the birds of heaven”. The same phenomenon is found in Isa. 18:6 (“birds of heaven” parallel to “beasts of the land”) and Isa. 24:18 (“heaven” parallel to “earth”).
- Semantic Shift = *Simplification*:<sup>190</sup> All words for sin, rebellion, crime, etc. are translated by the Aramaic חֻבָּא, ‘guilt’.
- Plus in one verse = *Associative Translation*: the twofold confession 2 Sam. 22:32, “For who is God, but the LORD? And who is a rock, except our God?” is rendered by a triple confession by analogy with 1 Sam. 2:2.
- Plus in several verses = *Complementary Translation*:<sup>191</sup> 1 Sam. 4:13 and 18 might be considered complementary:

<sup>186</sup>Cf. M.J.J. Menken, “The Sources of the Old Testament Quotation in Matthew 2:23”, paper read at the EABS meeting, 7 August 2000.

<sup>187</sup>Josephus calls Samuel a prophet, but the word prophet is Josephus’ standard translation of Hebrew nazir.

<sup>188</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 71.

<sup>189</sup>Klein, “Associative and Complementary Translation in the Targumim”, 138-39.

<sup>190</sup>E. Brederik, “Bemerkungen über die Art der Übersetzung im Targum Onkelos”, *ThStKr* 74 (1901), 351-77, esp. 359; Jansma, “Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and the Ancient Versions of Zechariah ix-xiv”, 19; Komlosh, הַמְקָרָא בְּאֵיךְ הַרְרִינִים, 304; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 97; also in Peshitta, cf. Jansma, “Inquiry”, 30-31; also in LXX, cf. Jansma, “Inquiry”, 42; Bons, “Die Septuaginta-Version des Buches Rut”, 210-11: “Wahl eines ‘favourite word’.”

<sup>191</sup>M.L. Klein, “Associative and Complementary Translation in the Targumim”, *ErIs* 16 (1982), 134-40; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 97; C.T.R. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah* (AramB, 12), Edinburgh 1987, 5-7, “stock phrases”; Alexander, “Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scripture”, 228.

Eli was sitting upon his seat “on the path (18) of the road (13) of the gate (18)”, although the complete Aramaic wording is a literal translation of 2 Sam. 15:2.

- Minus: In 1 Sam. 1:6 the word בער is omitted by analogy with 1 Sam. 1:5. Ms D omitted the word וברמחא in 1 Sam. 17:45 by analogy with 17:47.
- Multiple Translation: more or less fixed double translations, of which the origin can be traced to the Hebrew Bible, e.g. the double translation אורי ושבח from Dan. 2:23 can be found in TN Gen. 24:26 and TN Exod. 15:1.<sup>192</sup> Not found in TgSam.
- Transposition: it is remarkable that in associative translations the word order of the source text is maintained, cf. 1 Sam. 1:5 // 1:6 and 1 Sam. 4:13 // 4:18.

16. *Harmonization* within one text or with other Biblical texts.<sup>193</sup> Whenever it is done by translating the opposite of the source text, it may be called “Converse Translation”.<sup>194</sup>

<sup>192</sup>Klein, “Associative and Complementary Translation in the Targumim”, 138.

<sup>193</sup>Komlosh, המקרא באור החרגום, 318; Díez Macho, *El Targum*, 24, “eliminación de contradicciones”; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 42-43, “changes and additions in keeping with Jewish tradition”; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 64, “a biblical text is often understood only in its relationship with texts from other parts of the Hebrew Bible”; Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 177; P. Doron, “The Methodology of Targum Onkelos,” *EstB* 43 (1985), 182; A. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targumic Exegesis* (TSAJ, 27), Tübingen 1992, 182; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 97. Also attested in LXX, cf. M. Harl, in: G. Dorival, M. Harl, O. Munnich (eds), *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*, Cerf 1988, 211; J. Cook, “The Translator of the Greek Genesis”, in: N. Fernández Marcos, *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros”, 34), Madrid 1985, 169-82, esp. 169-75; and in Syr, cf. C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL, 11), Leiden 2001, 34-49.

Harmonization started within the Hebrew canon itself, see e.g. E.L. Curtis, *The Books of Chronicles* (ICC), Edinburgh 1910, 13-14; M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, Oxford 1985, esp. 221-8, 342, 529-30; Kalimi, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten*, 113-48.

<sup>194</sup>M.L. Klein, “Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique”, *Bib.* 57 (1976), 515-37; Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech*, 228; C.T.R. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah* (AramB, 12), Edinburgh 1987, 21, 25; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 98. In almost every instance the “Converse Translation” is made in order to obtain harmonization with the surrounding verses. Even in instances in which adjustment to contemporary theology seems to motivate the “Converse Translation”, harmonization within the Hebrew Bible is at stake. The impossibility to

Harmonization is based on the background assumption that Scripture is true and does not contain internal contradictions.<sup>195</sup> This resembles the Midrashic rule that two texts which contradict each other can be harmonized by a third (R. Ishmael 13; R. Eliezer 15) and the rule that a text can be complemented by a second text about the same subject (R. Eliezer 23). In the Targum contradictions are resolved without the use of a third text, as is often done in Talmud and Midrash as well.

In some Tannaitic sources there are lists of adjacent verses which have to be attributed to different speakers or subjects (tSot. 9:2-8; SifBam. § 88; ySot. 9:7 (23d)). These different speakers or subjects harmonize the contradiction found in these verses.<sup>196</sup>

- Substitution: David, and not Elhanan, killed Goliath in 2 Sam. 21:19. Jonathan, not David, made the actual appointment in 1 Sam. 20:35 (MS eb1).
- Plus: In 2 Sam. 21:8 the five sons of Michal are described as “the five sons of *Merab*, whom Michal the daughter of Saul raised” in harmony with 2 Sam. 6:23 in which is stated that Michal died without having any male offspring. The introduction of different speaking persons is attested in 1 Sam. 2:1; the first two Hebrew sentences are supposed to be said by Hannah herself, but the latter two are put into the mouth of the congregation of Israel (cf. also 1 Sam. 2:2).

Sometimes narratives are linked to each other by adding additional, harmonizing material.<sup>197</sup> This phenomenon is not found in TgSam.

- Multiple Translation: The double translation of the Hebrew verb עָצַר (1 Sam. 9:17) might be ranged here as well; see above, exegetical technique no. 6, *Etymological Association*, s.v. Multiple Translation.
- Transposition: In TJon 1 Sam. 4:3 (MS 12<sup>b</sup>) a word is added and the word order is changed to harmonize the verse with

---

hide from God (Gen. 4:14) is a harmonization with the contents of Psalm 139. The impossibility to be heard by God (Deut. 5:21 TN gl) is a harmonization with Num. 21:16-19.

<sup>195</sup>Samely, “Scripture’s Implicature”, 183.

<sup>196</sup>Kasher, “The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature”, 558. Cf. Frankel, “Zu dem Targum”, 35, who noticed this phenomenon in Jer. 8:20-22.

<sup>197</sup>Cf. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech*, 182.

4:4. It is said that “*they went to the elders of Israel and said*” instead of “the elders of Israel said”. Perhaps this harmonization is also inspired by reverence for the elders of Israel, who should have known better than bringing the ark to the battlefield.

- Exception: In the margin of *Codex Reuchlinianus*, a variant to 1 Sam. 4:12 identified the unknown messenger with Saul: “And Saul, the son of Kish, a man from the tribe of Benjamin, ran from the battle-lines and came to Shiloh on that day by means of an angel, who made him run from there.” In the Midrashim, however, Saul was said to be so swift in his feet that he could run from the battle to Shiloh within one day.<sup>198</sup> The assumption in these works is in harmony with 2 Sam. 1:23. The price of the threshing floor in 2 Sam. 24:24 is not harmonized with its price in 1 Chron. 21:25.<sup>199</sup> In 1 Sam. 4:8-9 the contradiction between the feeble utterance of verse 8 and the heroic utterance of verse 9 is not solved by attributing these two verses to different speakers, as is supposed in the Tannaitic sources on this subject.<sup>200</sup> In 1 Sam. 1:24 TJon made no attempt to harmonize the three bulls with the one in 1:25, as did LXX and Syr.

17. *Onomasticon*: anonymous persons are named or identified with known Biblical heroes,<sup>201</sup> because Scripture is coherent and complete. This technique is rarely used, only in those instances in which the identification could be deduced from the Scriptural text.<sup>202</sup> Some toseftas and marginal notes offer more identifications than the official text. Rabbinic literature and the Palestinian Targumim show a variety of name-givings and identifications.<sup>203</sup>

<sup>198</sup> MShem. 11:1 (78-79); MTeh. 7:2; cf. also Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 54:3-4; 61:2.

<sup>199</sup> As is done in SifBam. § 42 (Num. 6:26); NumR. 11:7; Zev. 116b.

<sup>200</sup> Kasher, “The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature”, 558, n. 73.

<sup>201</sup> Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 28; Le Déaut, “Un phénomène spontané de l’herméneutique juive ancienne: ‘le targumisme’”, 515-16; Komlosh, המקרא הבריק, 318-19, 322-23; Díez Macho, *El Targum*, 23; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 59-62; Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech*, 13, 171, 182; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 99.

<sup>202</sup> Cf. E. van Staalduijn-Sulman, “Translating with Subtlety: Some Unexpected Translation Techniques in the Targum of Samuel”, *JAB* 3 (2001), 225-235.

<sup>203</sup> Some names were also used in the NT. In 2 Tim. 3:9 the names Jannes and Jambres are mentioned, not known in the Hebrew Bible but originating in its subsequent tradition. In Hebrew they were called Jóhanan and Mamre. The Semitic name of Jannes is already found in the 1st century BCE, while the name

- Substitution: Bedan is identified with Samson, 1 Sam. 12:11 (except in MS S, although a later corrector adds the name of Samson right above the name of Bedan).
- Plus: Saul was identified with the unknown messenger to Eli, 1 Sam. 4:12 (f<sup>m</sup>). Since the messenger was a Benjaminite and could run fast from the battlefield to Shiloh, the identification with Saul was easily made: Saul was a Benjaminite and was said to be swifter than eagles (2 Sam. 1:23).<sup>204</sup> Goliath is identified as the murderer of Hophni and Phinehas in a tosefta to 1 Sam. 17:8 (MSS w<sub>1</sub> a b c d).
- Exception: In most MSS the anonymous messenger and the murderers of Hophni and Phinehas (1 Sam. 4) are not named. No attempt is made to identify the prophet who came to Eli (1 Sam. 2:27), although several identifications are known in contemporary literature. No connection is made between the threshing floor of Arvan and the later site of the Temple (cf. 1 Chron. 22:1; 2 Chron. 3:1).

18. *Diversification*<sup>205</sup> or דבר שהוא שני, *A Matter Which Repeats* (R. Eliezer 10): Translation in which repeated words, synonyms or parallels are given a different meaning. This exegetical technique is ranged here because it does not add anything to the clarity of a text, but is based on the exegetical rule which admitted no redundancy in Scripture.<sup>206</sup> The background assumption that Scripture is always relevant excludes mere repetition of meaning. Scripture does not say the same thing twice, but uses the same words to convey two different meanings.<sup>207</sup> The

---

of Jambres is attested in treaties of the 2nd century CE. A brief history of this tradition is given by L.L. Grabbe, "The Jannes/Jambres Tradition in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and its Date", *JBL* 98 (1979), 393-401, esp. 394-96. In early Christianity name-giving was an ongoing process, cf. B.M. Metzger, "Names for the Nameless in the New Testament: A Study in the Growth of Christian Tradition", in: P. Granfield, J.A. Jungmann (eds), *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, Vol. 1, Münster 1970, 79-99.

<sup>204</sup>Cf. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech*, 13.

<sup>205</sup>Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 53; Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 17; Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 89; Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 326; Aberbach, Grossfeld, *Targum Onkelos on Genesis 49*, 1, n. 1; P. Doron, "The Methodology of Targum Onkelos", *EstB* 43 (1985), 173-87, esp. 180-81; C.T.R. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah* (AramB, 12), Edinburgh 1987, 25-26; Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech*, 182, 313; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 98.

<sup>206</sup>Kasher, "The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature", 560; Instone Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions*, 21, 230.

<sup>207</sup>Samely, "Scripture's Implicature", 173-74, cf. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 89.



technique of diversification shows the richness of Scripture.<sup>208</sup>

Diversification was mostly used by R. Aqiba, contrary to R. Ishmael who explained these instances as a Hebrew use of words, explaining that “the Tora spoke in common parlance”.<sup>209</sup> Although TJon sometimes followed R. Aqiba in this respect, it is not so drastic in its application as to describe two different meanings to a finite verb and its accompanying absolute infinitive.<sup>210</sup> Note that this phenomenon almost always appears inside one verse. Resemblances between two separate verses are often translated identically, cf. *Associative Translation*.

- Plus: The double number of the Hebrew text is rendered by “seventy men of the elders and fifty thousand men of the people” in 1 Sam. 6:19. Sometimes complementary utterances are divided over several objects, e.g. in tSot. 9:4 where 1 Sam. 4:8-9 is divided into three types of reactions: the good ones say, “Woe to us! Who can deliver us from the power of these mighty gods?” The evil ones react, “These are the gods who smote the Egyptians with every sort of plague in the wilderness”, while the heroes say, “Take courage, and acquit yourselves like men, O Philistines!”<sup>211</sup> This also plays a role in the division of the first line in Hannah’s Song (2 Sam. 2:1). It is applied in 2 Sam. 15:11 (MS f<sub>5</sub>), where Absalom’s guests are divided into two categories, “part of them were invited, and part of them went in their simplicity”. The pair ערוכה and שמורה is augmented, “to

<sup>208</sup>This is also noticeable in the NT. The two references to an ass in Zech. 9:9 are considered fulfilled separately in Mt. 21:1-7: Jesus used an ass and a colt; cf. E. Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (NTD, 2), Göttingen 1976, 263; A. Sand, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Regensburger NT), Regensburg 1986, 413. One cannot state that Matthew did not know the language or the poetical rules of the Hebrew Bible; against G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*, Göttingen 1966, 76. The same technique is applied to Jesus’ clothes in Jn 19:23-24, where the two verse-lines from Ps. 22:18 are equally considered fulfilled.

<sup>209</sup>G.G. Porter, *The Traditions of Rabbi Ishmael*, Part 2: Exegetical Comments in Tannaitic Collections, Leiden 1977, 17; cf. Kasher, “The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature”, 569-70 and 588-89.

<sup>210</sup>TJon is less drastic in its application of *Diversification* as Midrashic literature. It respects idiomatic phrases and grammatical constructions in which repetition is given, as opposed to Midrashic literature, cf. Samely, “Scripture’s Implicature”, 192-93.

<sup>211</sup>Cf. SifBam § 88 (Num. 11:6-7); not attested in TgSam.

endure like the orders of creation endure || and to be preserved for the world to come" (2 Sam. 23:5).<sup>212</sup>

- Plus and Substitution: "The *people* are saved from the *hand* of the enemies and *David* is saved from the *sword* (not: hand) of Saul" in 2 Sam. 22:1.
- Exception: The rule is that parallelism is maintained in Tg-Sam. Only where Scripture really seems redundant, mostly in prophetic sections, TgSam diversifies the meaning of synonyms.

#### 3.3.4.4 Actualization to the Translator's Context

The same belief in the Bible as God's revelation made the translators strive for relevance of Scripture. If God revealed his will in the Bible, it must have meaning for contemporary times. Therefore, some actualizations seem to break the rule that Scripture is to be interpreted by Scripture. Still, "the Targumic actualization of the Bible occurred as the function of a community whose life was structured by the Bible as understood through the Tradition which was nothing else than this very actualization."<sup>213</sup>

Several theological concepts reflecting later rabbinical teaching are found in TJon, most of which can be summarized as "prophetic expansions". Although the contents of these "prophetic expansions" originate in rabbinic theology, the exegetical technique itself is based upon the same principle that the Bible was relevant, not only for contemporary times, but also for the present and the future. It is

<sup>212</sup>Diversification with the contrast between this world and the world to come is often found in rabbinic literature. It is even preserved in Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 109, where he stated that God shows mercy in this world and truth in the future.

<sup>213</sup>Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 80; cf. Le Déaut, "Un phénomène spontané de l'herméneutique juive ancienne: 'le targumisme'", 522-23; Goldberg, "Formen und Funktionen von Schriftauslegung", 6; A. Samely, "Scripture's Implicature: The Midrashic Assumptions of Relevance and Consistency", *JSt* 37 (1992), 167-205, esp. 170. Also attested in the LXX, cf. M. Harl, in: G. Dorival, M. Harl, O. Munnich (eds), *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*, Cerf 1988, 212-214.

Actualization, too, was an exegetical goal long before the common era. For some examples see B.S. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, London 1962; J.W. Groves, *Actualization and Interpretation in the Old Testament* (SBL.DS, 86), New Haven (diss.), 1979; M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, Oxford 1985; several contributions in: J.C. de Moor, H.F. van Rooy (eds), *Past, Present, Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets* (OTS, 44), Leiden 2000.

as if history loses its temporal significance and is compressed into an endless continuum,<sup>214</sup> so that Sennacherib and Nebuchadnezzar, Abtalion and Shemayah may become contemporaries<sup>215</sup> and even the Turks may still be accommodated when they appear on the scene of world history as late as the twelfth century CE.<sup>216</sup>

19. *Modernizing* place-names and customs.<sup>217</sup> In many occasions of actualization the result will be an anachronistic one.<sup>218</sup>

- Substitution: with regard to names, e.g. “Kenites” for “Shalmaites” in 1 Sam. 15:6;<sup>219</sup> with regard to customs, e.g. “drag them through the streets” in 2 Sam. 12:31.<sup>220</sup>
- Multiple Translation: In TPsJ Num. 33:25 the place-name Makheloth is once rendered literally and subsequently by a Midrashic interpretation.<sup>221</sup> Not found in TgSam.

<sup>214</sup>There is no before and no after in Biblical texts; cf. Le Déaut, “Un phénomène spontané de l’herméneutique juive ancienne: ‘le targumisme’”, 518; Díez Macho, *El Targum*, 25.

<sup>215</sup>Variant reading  $f_6$  to 2 Kgs 19:35-37; cf. Kasher, תוספתה, 147-49.

<sup>216</sup>Cf. שורקאי in a Tosefta-Targum to TgObad. 21 (cf. Kasher, תוספתה, 206-207; also to be read in TgLam. 4:21. Cf. A. Shinan, “Post-Pentateuchal Figures in the Pentateuchal Aramaic Targumim”, in: K.J. Cathcart, M. Maher (eds), *Targumic and Cognate Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara* (JSOT.S, 230), Sheffield 1996, 122-38.

<sup>217</sup>Some of these renderings include religious adjustment, e.g. the omission of the word Baal in names. Cf. Le Déaut, “Un phénomène spontané de l’herméneutique juive ancienne: ‘le targumisme’”, 519; Komlosch, המקרא באור התרגום, 320-21; Díez Macho, *El Targum*, 25; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 102-104; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 77; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 60-128; Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 2; C.T.R. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah* (AramB, 12), Edinburgh 1987, 24; P.S. Alexander, “Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scripture”, in: M.J. Mulder, H. Sysling (eds), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Assen & Philadelphia 1988, 217-53, esp. 226-27; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 98.

<sup>218</sup>Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 76-81; Kasher, “The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature”, 577.

<sup>219</sup>However, part of the motivation for this change may be found in harmonization, see comment on this verse.

<sup>220</sup>Also in the NT old images are put into a modernized setting, for instance, the vineyard of Isa. 5 is introduced into the parallel of “The Labourers in the Vineyard” (Mt. 20:1-19), but the setting of the labourers, standing on the market place and waiting for someone to hire them, is a modern one.

<sup>221</sup>M. Maher, “Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of Deuteronomy 1.1-8”, in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 264-90, esp. 269.

- Exceptions: Many place-names are not translated or substituted. Many place-names, however, must still have been known. It is therefore difficult to mention real exceptions. It is even more difficult to find exceptions for customs.

20. *Typology* כננר, *Correspondence* (R. Eliezer 27), and *Allegory*. In the theology of rabbinic Judaism, the Hebrew Bible was not only seen as the Law, but also as the book of the prophets. The authors had preached to their own contemporaries, but their words had been written down for later generations, too. The authors were supposed to have been prophets. Therefore, it is not surprising that many Biblical words could be applied to later times, even if the plain sense of the text was meant for the times of the prophets themselves.<sup>222</sup> "All that happened to the fathers was a sign for their sons" is the famous definition of typology given by Immanuel of Rome.<sup>223</sup> Especially the poetic parts of the books of Samuel are more or less interpreted as prophetic poems. TJon digresses into several prophetic themes, including Israel's history, the Messiah, the world to come, the reward for the righteous and the punishment for the wicked.<sup>224</sup> These themes are not systematically worked out, but are part of the theological development in rabbinic times.<sup>225</sup>

In TJon there is no distinction between typology applied to historical events and typology applied to persons, human characteristics or other abstract phenomena.<sup>226</sup> According to this

<sup>222</sup>The same is true for the treatment of the OT in the NT, cf. J. Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments*, London 1966, 124-25; W.F. Albright, C.S. Mann, *Matthew* (AB), Garden City (NY) 1971, lix.

<sup>223</sup>Quoted by M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, Oxford 1985, 350, who also stressed the widespread use of typology in Judaism and Christianity.

<sup>224</sup>M. McNamara, *Targum and Testament; Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*, Grand Rapids 1972, 133-41; Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 124, "the targumists had preserved many of the current ideas about the last days"; Y. Komlosh, "קיום אוניברסיטת בהרמום הארמי לספר שמואל", in: B. Zvieli (ed.), *שיחור במקרא*, *Talks on Scripture*, Vol. 1, Jerusalem 1968, 182-83, esp. 182; Idem, *התרגום באור המקרא*, 306-307; 301-302; Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 161-75, "aktualisierende Interpretation"; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 173-75; Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 8; H. Sysling, *Tehiyat Ha-Metim: The Resurrection of the Dead in the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Parallel Traditions in Classical Tabbinic Literature* (TSAJ, 57), Tübingen 1996.

<sup>225</sup>Cf. Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 74-76.

<sup>226</sup>For a discussion on typology and allegory, see Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation*, 103.

technique a number can be explained with the same number elsewhere, an event with a similar event elsewhere, a saying as prophetic of future persons or events. This includes several halakhic adjustments and Midrashic expansions,<sup>227</sup> partly in variants, in order to render a theological dimension to vague numbers or times by comparing them to their counterparts in other Biblical texts. Generally, TJon does not give a meaning which belonged to a quite different world of thought, as *e.g.* Philo of Alexandria sometimes did.<sup>228</sup>

- Substitution: In a way, 1 Sam. 2:5b is a substitution, albeit with one plus: “Rome, which is filled with great numbers of people, her armies will cease to be”.
- Plus: In a Tosefta-Targum to 1 Sam. 17:43 the five stones of David are explained with the help of the names of the three Patriarchs, and Moses and Aaron. In the Psalm of David (2 Sam. 22:26-27) the three just persons, “the loyal, the blameless and the pure”, are identified as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The times that Goliath scorned the army of Israel in 1 Sam. 17:16, “morning and evening”, are explained in the margin of CR with “*the time of the continual offering of the morning and the evening*”.
- Plus and Substitution: texts about Gehenna and heaven (based upon the words “darkness” and “guard”) in 1 Sam. 2:9; texts concerning the Messiah and the world to come (2 Sam. 23:1-8).
- Multiple Translation: In fact the first verses of Hannah’s song are double translations. First the allegorical explanation is given, referring to several future periods. Then a more or less literal rendering of the Hebrew original is given.

#### 21. *Structural Devices* to enhance the attention of the audience.

- Plus: Incipit formulas are added to throw light on the content of the following verse, *e.g.* the repetition of “she prophesied” in 1 Sam. 2:2-5. Sometimes the audience is directly

<sup>227</sup>Frankel, “Zu dem Targum”, 24; Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 318-20; Díez Macho, *El Targum*, 23, “las glosas dan números exactos, fechas concretas”; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 1-60; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 42-43, “changes and additions in keeping with Jewish tradition”; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 99.

<sup>228</sup>Cf. Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation*, 116.

addressed by the Targumist, e.g. "Blessed are you, O just ones!" (2 Sam. 23:4); sometimes indirectly by adding "the people of the House of Israel" (2 Sam. 22:28).<sup>229</sup>

### 3.3.4.5 Reverence for God and His People

The fifth important principle in exegesis was reverence for God<sup>230</sup> and for his people.<sup>231</sup> This exegetical motive is already attested in

<sup>229</sup>Some incipit formulas are used as poetical markers, especially in 2 Sam. 22 and 23:1-8. According to J. Ribera i Florit, "Elementos comunes del Targum a los Profetas y del Targum Palestinense", in: N. Fernández Marcos et al. (eds), *Simposio Bíblico Español (Salamanca 1982)*, Madrid 1984, 477-93, esp. 481, these incipit formulas are related to the haftaroth. B.D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum* (AramB, 11), Edinburgh 1987, xiii-xiv suggested that these formulas were used to defend the translation, because the translator would have claimed almost prophetic authority. This is criticized by R.P. Gordon, "Targum as Midrash: Contempering in the Targum to the Prophets", in: M.H. Goshen-Gottstein (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Jerusalem 1985). Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Ancient Near East*, Jerusalem 1988, 61-73, esp. 64-66; cf. Idem, *Studies in the Targum of the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VT.S, 51), Leiden 1994, 74-82.

<sup>230</sup>From the vast literature on this subject I cite only a small selection: M. Kadushin, *The Rabbinic Mind*, New York 1952, 325-36; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 59; S. Maybaum, *Die Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien bei Onkelos und den spätern Targumim*, Breslau 1870; M. Ginsburger, *Die Anthropomorphismen in den Thargumim*, Strassbourg 1891; G.F. Moore, "Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron", *HTHR* 15 (1922), 41-85; A. Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God*, Vol. 2, London 1937; V. Hamp, *Der Begriff 'Wort' in den aramäischen Bibleübersetzungen*, München 1938; G.I. Lehman, *Anthropomorphisms in the Former Prophets of the Hebrew Bible as Compared with the Septuagint and Targum Jonathan*, New York 1964; Smolar, Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan*, 130-50; J. Shunary, "Avoidance of Anthropomorphism in the Targum of Psalms", *Textus* 5 (1966), 133-44; D. Muñoz León, "Soluciones de los Targumim del Pentateuco (1) a los antropomorfismos", *EstB* 28 (1969), 263-81; E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), Berlin & New York 1988, 43-61; C. McCarthy, "The Treatment of Biblical Anthropomorphisms in Pentateuchal Targums", in: K.J. Cathcart, J.F. Healey, *Back to the Sources: Biblical and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Dermot Ryan*, Dublin 1989, 45-66; L. Díez Merino, "Epithetos divinos en la literatura targúmica y rabínica", *Anuari de Filologia* 19 (1996), 35-64; D. Shepherd, "MN QDM: Deferential Treatment in Biblical Aramaic and the Qumran Targum of Job?", *VT* 50 (2000), 401-404.

<sup>231</sup>E. Deutsch, "On the Targums", in: *Literary Remains of the Late Emanuel Deutsch*. London [1874], 319-403, esp. 372-73; Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 299-300, 304-307; 317-20; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 64, "seeing the biblical text through the colored glasses of the Tradition"; Aberbach, Grossfeld, *Targum Onkelos on Genesis 49, 7, n. 8*; J. Ribera Florit, "The Image of Israel According to the Targum of Ezekiel", in: K.J. Cathcart, M. Maher (eds), *Targumic and Cognate*

the Books of Chronicles.<sup>232</sup> Reverence for God and his Biblical heroes is a common feature in rabbinic literature.<sup>233</sup>

This item is also influenced by the desire for harmony in the Bible and the desire for actualization into contemporary theological concepts. Not only from the book of commandments, but also from *migra'* people can learn how to live, as Abraham ibn Ezra later stated (1157-58): "It is also good to know the *migra'*, because many commandments can be learned from them, such as 'You shall not eat with its blood' (Lev. 19:26) from what Saul did . . ." (1 Sam. 14:32-35).<sup>234</sup>

22. *Monotheistic Precisions*: The doctrine that there is only one God influenced the translation of Hebrew texts, in which references to other gods or even the question who is like God, are mentioned. This technique is a specific development of *Precision in Meaning*. Monotheistic precisions already occur in some Hebrew verses (cf. 2 Sam. 7:23).

- Semantic Shift: "There is none beside Thee" instead of "There is none like Thee" (2 Sam. 22:32).<sup>235</sup>
- Semantic Shift = *Simplification*: In many cases both אלהים and יהוה are translated by יי.<sup>236</sup> Although in the Books of Chronicles the name of God became more important,<sup>237</sup> the use of the tetragrammaton is not increased.<sup>238</sup> In several instances Chronicles uses אלהים instead of the יהוה in the parallel verses in Samuel.<sup>239</sup>
- Semantic Shift = *Specialization*: different words for idol gods and idol priests.<sup>240</sup> Different renderings are used in

---

*Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara* (JSOT.S, 230), Sheffield 1996, 111-21; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 99-111.

<sup>232</sup>Cf. E.L. Curtis, *The Books of Chronicles* (ICC), Edinburgh 1910, 13-14.

<sup>233</sup>L.H. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Samuel", *Abr-Nahrain* 30 (1992), 103-41, esp. 111.

<sup>234</sup>As rendered by U. Simon, *Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms: From Saadiah Gaon to Abraham ibn Ezra*, New York 1991, 202.

<sup>235</sup>It is not changed in 2 Sam. 7:22.

<sup>236</sup>See below, Ch. 4, Hebrew אלהים and אל.

<sup>237</sup>Cf. J.M. Myers, *I Chronicles* (AB), Garden City (NY) <sup>2</sup>1974, lxxv.

<sup>238</sup>If one excludes Yahwistic personal names, cf. J.C. de Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism* (BETL, 91A), Leuven <sup>2</sup>1997, 31-32.

<sup>239</sup>M. Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik* (ATA, 8/3), Münster 1937, 109; S. Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (BEATAJ, 9), Frankfurt 1989, 37.

<sup>240</sup>The same phenomenon occur in Josephus, *Antiquities*, cf. J. Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus", *JJS* 25 (1974), 239-62.

verses where God and men are treated alike in the Hebrew text, e.g. “the people feared *before* the LORD and *the words* of Samuel” (1 Sam. 12:18), whereas the Hebrew text gives twice the *nota accusativi*.<sup>241</sup>

- Plus: Avoiding the plural, if speaking about God, cf. 1 Sam. 4:8 where the plural הארירים is not describing God, but his deeds.
- Exception: “There is none like thee . . .” (2 Sam. 7:22), instead of “There is none besides thee . . .”<sup>242</sup>, also occurring in Jer. 49:19; 50:44.

23. *Reverential Circumlocution* to protect divine transcendence, similar to the avoidance of direct contact between high-placed persons and their subordinates.<sup>243</sup> When a human being is the object of a verb, the use of God as its subject is avoided, in order to prevent the verb from indicating some kind of contact between God and man.<sup>244</sup> The Chronicler already avoided direct contact between the heavenly and the earthly realm, where the angel is depicted as standing between earth and heaven (1 Chron. 21:16), a fact not mentioned in the parallel text of 2 Sam. 24:16.<sup>245</sup>

- Semantic Shift: Rendering any preposition before “God” or “the LORD” by קדם. So God is prevented from being the object of a verb of which a human being is the subject.<sup>246</sup>

<sup>241</sup>Cf. Frankel, “Zu dem Targum”, 22; Komlosh, באור התרגום, 315.

<sup>242</sup>S.D. Luzzatto, *Oheb Ger*, 18 explained these kind of renderings as removals of every hint to plurality (of God) or similarity (to other beings); cited in M.L. Klein, “Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique”, *Bib.* 57 (1976), 515-37, esp. 535, n. 38.

<sup>243</sup>Komlosh, באור התרגום, 313-16; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 37-41 “changes and additions for reasons of dogma and belief”, 144-45, “free translation motivated by reasons of dogma”; P. Doron, “The Methodology of Targum Onkelos”, *EstB* 43 (1985), 173-87, esp. 178-79; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 138-45; Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 7; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 98, “reverential translation”; Alexander, “Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scripture”, 226. Similar “euphemisms” are attested throughout rabbinic literature, cf. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim*, 174-76.

<sup>244</sup>Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 37, “changing verbs from the active (...) to the passive”. Note, however, that this translation technique can result in a different sentence without leading to a passive form.

<sup>245</sup>Cf. E.L. Curtis, *The Books of Chronicles* (ICC), Edinburgh 1910, 14. In contrast to the Books of Chronicles, TJon does not show the tendency to stress wonders and miracles.

<sup>246</sup>The use of קדם before the name of God indicates that He is treated as



The rendering of “honour your sons *above Me*” by “honour your sons *first*”, where the reference to God is omitted (1 Sam. 2:29). In 1 Sam. 1:11 all ingredients of the clause “Thou wilt look on the affliction of thy handmaid” are substituted in such a way as to avoid direct contact between God and man: “The affliction of thy handmaid was indeed revealed before Thee”. TJon accepted a different vocalization of the word  $\text{הי}$  in oaths to differentiate between God and man, as it is also attested in the Masoretic punctuation: the Hebrew  $\text{הי יהוה}$  became  $\text{היי הוה}$ , ‘the LORD is living’, whereas the Hebrew  $\text{הי נפשך}$  is translated by  $\text{היי נפשך}$ , ‘by your life’ (e.g. 1 Sam. 20:3).

- Substitution: *Euphemisms* are rendered by greater euphemisms: “to scorn the enemies of the LORD” is represented by “to open the mouth of the enemies of the people of the LORD” (2 Sam. 12:14) and the expression “knowing knowledge” is substituting “urinating against the wall” (1 Sam. 25:22).
- Plus: Words like “Speech”, “Presence”,<sup>247</sup> “people”, “service”, etc. before the mentioning of God.<sup>248</sup> The “enemies of the LORD” are always considered the “enemies of the people of the LORD”, since only humans can have human enemies (e.g. 1 Sam. 25:28).<sup>249</sup> In 1 Sam. 12:18 the people are “fearing the LORD and Samuel”, which is rendered “fearing before the LORD and the words of Samuel” to avoid the assimilation of Samuel and God. The Hebrew text “Samuel did not know the LORD” is complemented to obtain a more reverential utterance concerning this prophet, “Samuel *had not learned to know instruction from before the LORD*” (1 Sam. 3:7).

the king, cf. M.L. Klein, “The Preposition  $\text{קדם}$  (‘Before’): A Pseudo-Anti-Anthropomorphism in the Targums,” *JThS* 30 (1979), 502-507, esp. 504-505.

<sup>247</sup>For a discussion on words like  $\text{מימרא}$ ,  $\text{שכינא}$ , etc., see Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 99-111. The fact that the term “Shekhinah” was adopted in rabbinic Judaism and the term “Memra” was not, is due to the strong expansion of all kinds of Logos-doctrines in Christianity and gnosticism, cf. F. Aber, “Memra und Schechinah”, in: *Festschrift zum 75. Jährlichen Bestehen des Jüdischen Theologischen Seminars in Breslau*, Bd. 2, Breslau 1929, 1-10, esp. 6.

<sup>248</sup>However, some plusses can be explained “pour une raison parénétiqne”, cf. A. Diez Macho, “Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic IV B: The Targum and the Hebrew Bible*”, *JSJ* 6 (1975), 217-36, esp. 226.

<sup>249</sup>Also attested elsewhere, cf. Komlosh,  $\text{המקרא באור החרום}$ , 370.

- Plus = *Passivum Divinum*:<sup>250</sup> The words אלהים, אלהא and ״ are not added in the official text of TJon, except in “the prophet of the LORD” in 1 Sam. 9:7.<sup>251</sup> If references to God’s deeds are added, they are expressed in the passive without a direct reference to God<sup>252</sup>, e.g. “they will be saved” in TJon 1 Sam. 2:1 or “And there a great miracle will be done to him” in TJon 1 Sam. 2:2.<sup>253</sup>
- Plus and Syntactical Shift = *Passivum Divinum*: In 1 Sam. 1:5 the clause “And the LORD closed her womb” is changed into “And birth was withheld from her from before the LORD”<sup>254</sup> In 1 Sam. 1:11 the clause “And remember me” is rendered by “And my memory went up before Thee” (cf. Jer. 15:15).<sup>255</sup>
- Multiple Translation: The one word “sinned” in the Hebrew original is rendered twice to differentiate between God and man (1 Sam. 15:24): “*I have sinned* against the Word of the LORD and *I have despised* your word”.
- Transposition: In 1 Sam. 16:15-16 the word order of רוח אלהים רעה is changed in order to avoid a connection between God and the adjective “evil”. The Aramaic version is now רוח בישא מן קדם יי.
- Exception: In 1 Sam. 12:18 (CR) the juxtaposition of “the LORD and Samuel” is maintained. The reverse of the *pas-*

<sup>250</sup>Described by P. Lapide, *Ist die Bibel richtig übersetzt?*, Gütersloh 1986, 119; W. Bühlmann, K. Scherer, *Sprachliche Stilfiguren der Bibel: Von Assonanz bis Zahlensprache; ein Nachschlagewerk*, Gießen <sup>2</sup>1994, 89.

<sup>251</sup>The word ברא, ‘Master’, is added twice in the official text of TJon as a reference to God, viz. in 1 Sam. 15:29 (“the Master of the victories of Israel”) and in 2 Sam. 22:29 (“The Master of the light of Israel”). In Syr several indications of God were added, cf. C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL, 11), Leiden 2001, 22-23, 56.

<sup>252</sup>This passive construction is often used in the N.T. (e.g. Mt. 7:1, 7), but rarely occurs in rabbinic literature. There the usual expression to avoid direct reference to God is the active 3rd person plural (cf. Lk. 16:9). Cf. H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Vol. 1: Mattäus, München <sup>6</sup>1974, 443.

<sup>253</sup>Additions of the *passivum divinum* can be found in 1 Sam. 2:1, 2, 5, 25; 15:29; 2 Sam. 22:3, 7, 26, 47; 23:4.

<sup>254</sup>Active forms which are substituted by the *passivum divinum* can be found in 1 Sam. 1:5, 6; 2:4 (twice), 5 (twice), 9, 30; 3:8, 10, 21; 6:9; 9:6 (twice), 15, 17; 10:26; 13:14; 15:16; 18:17, 21; 24:21; 26:10, 19; 2 Sam. 12:22; 21:22; 22:10, 11, 42; 23:5, 7 (twice); 24:14 (twice).

<sup>255</sup>In these cases the preposition קדם is a plus on the level of the lexeme. Through this plus a text is created which is more reverential than the original one.

*sivum divinum* does not occur in TgSam; never is a passive form substituted by an active with God as subject.

24. *Halakhic Adjustment* of the behaviour of Biblical heroes.<sup>256</sup> This modernization is not made in order to actualize the text and adapt it to the translator's context, but in order to depict the lives of Biblical heroes as respectfully as possible. Moreover, there is a tendency to polarize between good and bad: Not only are Biblical heroes made moral examples, the villains are made anti-moral examples.<sup>257</sup>

- Semantic Shift: In 1 Sam. 1:11 God is not asked, "do not forget your maidservant", but "do not reject". The word "ephod" remained "ephod" with regard to priests, but is rendered by "tunic" with regard to other persons.<sup>258</sup>
- Substitution: Samuel did not sacrifice at a high place, but slaughtered holy offerings in a "banqueting house" (1 Sam. 9).<sup>259</sup> David did not dance, but he praised (2 Sam. 6:5). David hid in the Talmud School with Samuel (1 Sam. 19–20). Euphemisms are introduced: good heroes cannot be described as a "dog" or a "flea", they are at most "a weakling" or "a common fellow" (1 Sam. 24:16; 26:20; 2 Sam. 3:8; 9:8.<sup>260</sup> In 2 Sam. 16:9 the expression "dead dog" is not replaced, because it is used for Shimei, an opponent of David, who is depicted as a villain.
- Plus: 1 Sam. 2:30 stresses that God's judgments are true. David did not really perform a libation outside the sanctuary in 2 Sam. 23:16, he only "said to" pour it out. Saul was reciting the Torah when he was hidden (1 Sam. 10:22

<sup>256</sup> Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 24; Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 318-20; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 42-43, "changes and additions in keeping with Jewish tradition"; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 1-60; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 99.

<sup>257</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 78. In many ways the list in Heb. 11 adjusted the Hebrew narratives to contemporary tradition. For example, Abraham's motives to sacrifice Isaac are not found in the account of Gen. 22, but are added in Heb. 11:19. The Biblical heroes are all depicted as examples of faith.

<sup>258</sup> Ephod in 1 Sam. 2:28; 14:3 (cf. 14:19); 21:10; 22:18; 23:6, 9; 30:7, but tunic in 1 Sam. 2:18 and 2 Sam. 6:14.

<sup>259</sup> Against the Talmudic view that the ban of *bama* had been lifted at that time (Zev. 112b, 118a), cf. Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 116. Still, some rabbis taught that the ban on the *bamoth* was not lifted during the ark's stay in Shiloh.

<sup>260</sup> Cf. P.A.H. de Boer, "Research into the Text of 1 Sam. xviii-xxxi", *OTS* 6 (1949), 57, 75.

ms <sup>f</sup>). Elkanah was sharing holy things (1 Sam. 1:1) and Hannah was prophesying (1 Sam. 2:1).

- Minus: In 1 Sam. 1:11 the conjunction **ו** is omitted, because Targumic theology insists on God hearing all utterances of men.<sup>261</sup> In 2 Sam. 6:20 (MS 12<sup>b</sup>) the verb **גל** is omitted. As a result, King David is honouring himself, but not “uncovering” himself before the eyes of his subjects.
25. *Metaphorical Perception*.<sup>262</sup> This exegetical technique is the reverse of of *Explanation of Metaphors*, which tries to substitute or explain metaphors. The extended simile, however, is not used to clarify the text, but rather to avoid wrong explanations and certainly to avoid wrong theology.
- Plus:<sup>263</sup> The basic elements of the Hebrew text are regarded as the vehicle of a simile and TJon then adds the preposition **כ** and sometimes even the ground: e.g. “I will be as a father to you” in 2 Sam. 7:14; the phrase “Smoke went up before Him” is rendered “*The haughtiness of Pharaoh went up like smoke before Him*” (2 Sam. 22:9). The dark statement in 1 Sam. 13:1 that Saul was one year old when he started to reign is solved in a simile, “Saul was as innocent as a one year old boy when he started to reign”.<sup>264</sup>
  - Transposition: In 1 Sam. 7:6 the word order of “and they drew water and poured it out before the LORD” is changed to explain this phrase as a metaphor, “and they poured out their hearts like water, in repentance before the LORD”. In the same procedure the first Hebrew word is omitted. This rendering avoids a the mentioning of a wrong practice, viz. a libation without a priest.

<sup>261</sup>For a similar phenomenon in the Targum of Job, see E.W. Tuinstra, *Hermeneutische Aspecten van de Targum van Job uit grot XI van Qumrân*, [Groningen 1970], 53.

<sup>262</sup>R. Kasher, “Metaphor and Allegory in the Aramaic Translations of the Bible”, *JAB* 1 (1999), 53-77, esp. 58; Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 85, “addition of a particle of comparison”, 87, “*k*-comparationis instead of *l*”.

<sup>263</sup>Komlosh, **המקרא באור התרגום**, 310-13; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 98.

<sup>264</sup>Cf. R. le Déaut, *La Nuit Pascale: Essai sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode xxi 42* (AnBib, 22), Rome 1963, 61.

26. *No Translation*:<sup>265</sup> In 2 Sam. 7:23 the verse is rendered in such a way that the last two words, “nations and his god”, refer to the LORD and his people Israel.<sup>266</sup> The implication would be that God went to Egypt to redeem Israel and its God, *i.e.* the LORD himself. This implication is accepted by some rabbis, but rejected by others, among whom R. Aqiba.<sup>267</sup> Therefore, TJon does not translate these words, but gives them in Hebrew: גוים ואלהיו, to avoid the objectionable idea that God delivered himself from Egypt.<sup>268</sup> Hebrew כהרין is not translated, because the Targumist most probably did not know the meaning, which was obsolete (2 Sam. 2:29). Also the denotations צבאות and sometimes אלהים are not translated, but are integrated in the Aramaic text.
27. *Converse Translation*: Rendering the opposite of what is given in the original text in order to protect God or his people from misinterpretations and wrong theological conclusions.<sup>269</sup> This technique only occurs once in TgSam.
- Substitution: The negation in 2 Sam. 1:21 (בלי) is rendered by כר, ‘as if’, in order to prevent the misunderstanding that Saul was not the anointed of the LORD.<sup>270</sup>

<sup>265</sup>TJon includes a translation of all the chapters of the Books of Samuel, notwithstanding the recomandation in the Mishnah, the Tosephta and the Bavli that some chapters should not be translated. See below, commentary on 2 Sam. 11 and 2 Sam. 13. Shortly after 341 CE Wulfila translated the Bible into Gothic, but gave no translation of the books of Samuel. He did not want to give the Gothic people any impulse to waging wars. Cf. J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, *Handboek der Kerkgeschiedenis*, Vol. 1: De Kerk tot Gregorius de Grote, Leeuwarden <sup>5</sup>1979, 168.

<sup>266</sup>In accordance with MekY, *Pisha*, 14 (on Exod. 12:41), SifBam. § 84 (on Num. 10:35), ExodR. 15:12.

<sup>267</sup>Cf. the discussion concerning this verse in EcclR. 7:1 § 2.

<sup>268</sup>Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, 80. An identical phenomenon occurs in TgEzek 1:26, where the words דמה כמראה אדם, ‘who is like the appearance of a human being’, are not translated, but integrated in the text.

<sup>269</sup>M.L. Klein, “Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique”, *Bib.* 57 (1976), 515-37. This phenomenon also occurs in LXX, Syr, Vg and the NT, cf. M. Harl, in: G. Dorival, M. Harl, O. Munnich (eds), *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*, Cerf 1988, 215-16; R.P. Gordon, “‘Converse Translation’ in the Targums and Beyond”, *JSP* 19 (1999), 3-21; against R.B. ter Haar Romeny, “Techniques of Translation and Transmission in the Earliest Text Forms of the Syriac Version of Genesis”, in: P.B. Dirksen, A. van der Kooij, *The Peshitta as a Translation: Papers Read at the II Peshitta Symposium Held at Leiden 19-21 August 1993*, Leiden 1995, 177-185, esp. 181.

<sup>270</sup>A similar notion is attested in Vg, translating “as though he [Saul] had

### 3.3.4.6 Retention of Poetical Devices

Finally, when all the aforementioned motives were satisfied, the translators of TgSam attempted to retain rhetorical and poetical devices and even try to compensate for the loss of such devices. In poetry the Targumists were especially susceptible to phonetic devices, such as alliteration, assonance and rhyme, and to repetitive structural devices.<sup>271</sup> There is no special exegetical technique to achieve this, but it becomes clear in the translator's choice of words. In any case it can be said that TgSam never dropped any rhetorical device unless it endangered the clarity of the text, the high standard of Scripture or the reverential attitude toward God and his people.

28. *Choice of Words*: Certain words are chosen or added because of their similarity with the Hebrew original or in order to preserve rhetorical devices. Certain forms of words were chosen to meet this end.

- Semantic Shift: The word מסכין is chosen in 1 Sam. 2:8 in order to enhance alliteration. In 2 Sam. 21:23 words with a *hireq* are chosen to obtain assonance.
- Plus: The Aramaic word נברא is added in 1 Sam. 17:4 to restore the triple alliteration of the *gimel*. The stem לבש is added in 1 Sam. 1:24 in order to create a triple repetition of this stem.
- Plus and Semantic Shift: The first colon of 1 Sam. 15:23 is augmented, but also rendered in perfect parallelism.

### 3.3.4.7 Copyists' Concepts

Comparison of manuscripts shows changes made to the Targumic text. In most cases variant readings can be classified into the same categories of exegetical techniques and motives as the main text. In those cases the readings are included in the preceding groups of exegetical techniques, since it is impossible to determine which variant is part of the editorial process of TJon and which variant is a result of a copyist's interference. In some cases, however, a variant is clearly introduced by a single copyist deviating from the main stream of Targumic renderings. These cases are classified here.

---

not been anointed', while Syr omits the negation without any substitution. Cf. R.P. Gordon, "'Converse Translation' in the Targums and Beyond", 6.

<sup>271</sup>See above, §§ 3.2.2 and 3.2.3.1.

29. *Corrections*: variant readings which are intended to give a better translation. Some corrections tend to give Hebraisms, others give better Aramaic renderings.<sup>272</sup> Some corrections tend to give Aramaic synonyms that resemble the Hebrew original more. Some corrections are obviously wrong, resulting in a *conflated reading*, i.e. one correct and one falsely “corrected” rendering placed together.

Counting the instances in which corrections toward the Hebrew text are attested—and taking MS p as a starting point—one can determine that this type of correction is mostly present in the Western tradition and in the printed editions. Within the Western tradition MSS a f have a stronger tendency to correct toward the Hebrew text than MS c. Of the printed editions, the editions b and d show this tendency more often than the Antwerp Polyglot. Within the Western manuscripts collated by myself this tendency is equally spread. Only MS C more or less refrains from this kind of corrections.

- **No Semantic Shift**: In 2 Sam. 23:11 one of the editions of TJon reads “from Harar” and not consistently “from the mountain”.<sup>273</sup> In 1 Sam. 1:13 כֹּחֵמָה, ‘as a (drunken) woman’, is turned into לֹאֲחֵמָה, ‘a (drunken) woman’, in accordance with the Hebrew text. With this correction, the purpose of the preposition כֹּ is lost, viz. reverence for the Biblical hero Eli, who could not have been erring, and Hannah, who ought not to be depicted as a drunken woman. Some manuscripts use the stem עֵלֵב instead of לֵעֵב, probably because it resembled the Hebrew equivalent עָלָה (1 Sam. 31:4).
- **Multiple Translation = Conflated Rendering**:<sup>274</sup> In 1 Sam. 17:6 a the editor of the second Bomberg Bible understood מַטֵּל, not מִסְחָפָא, as the translation of כִּידוֹן. Consequently, he added ו before it and רִנַּחֲשָׂא after it. In 2 Sam. 4:2 (MS p) the phrase בֶּן־שָׂאֵל is rendered עִם בֶּר שָׂאֵל, ‘with Saul’s son’, as well as מִגִּיטַת שָׂאֵל, ‘from Saul’s family’. The latter

<sup>272</sup>D.R.G. Beattie, “The Textual Tradition of Targum Ruth”, in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 340-46, esp. 346; contra Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 23 who adopted the theory of W. Bacher, “Kritische Untersuchungen”, 57. See above, § 1.3.1.

<sup>273</sup>Bacher, “Kritische Untersuchungen”, 40-41.

<sup>274</sup>Bacher, “Kritische Untersuchungen”, 41, 46-47.

interpretation is also suggested by MS f<sub>2</sub>.

- Omission: In 2 Sam. 4:2 the main stream tradition gives two renderings of Hebrew שָׂרִי, viz. רַבֵּי and רִישִׁי. MS a omits the first rendering, while MS f omits the latter.

30. *Rewritten Bible*: Some manuscripts include Targumic toseftot which repeat a Biblical story already translated in the running text and give a different interpretation of that text. In most cases the story is re-written without maintaining every word or the word order.

### 3.3.5 Targum Samuel and the *Tiqqune Sopherim*

Finally, the question whether TgSam adapted its translation to the lists of the *tiqqune sopherim* must be answered.

In several lists of the *tiqqune sopherim* Hebrew לָהֵם in 1 Sam. 3:13 is regarded as a euphemistic reading of the original אֱלֹהִים.<sup>275</sup> The latter reading is attested in LXX. Scribes of the Hebrew text emended the word אֱלֹהִים according to the teaching of R. Johanan, transmitted by R. Hiyya b. Abba, "It is better that one letter be uprooted from the Torah than that the Name of names be publicly profaned."<sup>276</sup> TJon adheres to the transmitted Hebrew text and rendered לָהֵם.

Only in later lists Hebrew בְּעֵינִי (Ketib) or בְּעֵינֵי (Qere) in 2 Sam. 16:12 are considered emendations of the anthropomorphic בְּעֵינֵי or בְּעֵינֵי, referring to the LORD. Most ancient versions attest a reading which is related to the Ketib, but TJon rendered the Qere, adding the word "tear": "Would that the LORD would look upon the tear of my eye".<sup>277</sup>

Already in MekY, *Shirata*, 6 Hebrew לְאֵהֲלֵי in 2 Sam. 20:1 is regarded as a monotheistic emendation of לְאֵלֹהֵי. In many other Talmudic and Midrashic instances, however, the present reading of the MT is considered original, but an *al-tiqre* is proposed, reading לְאֵהֲלֵי. TJon's לְקִרְוֵהִי reflects the present reading לְאֵהֲלֵי.<sup>278</sup>

In all three instances TJon reflects the present reading of the MT, without referring to the assumed original reading, mentioned in either list of *tiqqune sopherim*. Given the reverent and euphemistic nature of the Aramaic version one cannot be surprised by this conclusion. The

<sup>275</sup> E.g. in MekY, *Shirata*, 6.

<sup>276</sup> C. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO, 36), Freiburg & Göttingen 1981, 79.

<sup>277</sup> Cf. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim*, 81-85.

<sup>278</sup> Cf. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim*, 85-91.



same conclusion must be drawn with regard to euphemistic readings in the MT which are not included in the official lists of *tiqqune sopherim*. The Targumim faithfully reproduced the MT in almost all the emendations.<sup>279</sup>

### 3.4 Targum Samuel and the Hebrew Chronicles

Since harmonization plays a role in the translation process of TJon, we need to ask to what extent the Aramaic version of Samuel was adapted to the Chronicler's version of the same stories.<sup>280</sup> In general, it must be said that the text of Chronicles does not prevail. TJon has its own rules for the rendering of the divine name and titles,<sup>281</sup> while the Chronicler appears to deliberately vary the divine names.

Names are not adjusted by TJon to the version in Chronicles;<sup>282</sup> numbers not harmonized.<sup>283</sup> The connection between the threshing floor of Araunah and the later site of the Temple is not integrated into TJon's version of 2 Sam. 24, although it is specifically mentioned in 1 Chron. 21:29–22:1. Reverence for the traditional Hebrew wording, combined with a lack of necessity to clarify the text, leads the

<sup>279</sup>So McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim*, 241. She mentions (241, n. 244) two notable exceptions in FT Exod. 34:20 and TgPs. 42:3, along with three instances of a conflated rendering in TPsJ Deut. 32:8; TJon 1 Kgs 9:8; Isa. 19:18, showing "how the Targum tried to 'serve two masters', both MT and the original text".

<sup>280</sup>The parallel versions are discussed by M. Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik* (ATA, 8/3), Münster 1937; C.J. Goslinga, "De parallele teksten in de boeken Samuel en Kronieken", *GerThT* 61 (1961), 108-16; S. Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (BEATAJ, 9), Frankfurt 1989; I. Kalimi, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten: Literarisch-historiographische Abweichungen der Chronik von ihren Paralleltexen in den Samuel- und Königsbüchern* (BZAW, 226), Berlin & New York 1995.

<sup>281</sup>See below, Ch. 4, s.vv. אלהים and אדני.

<sup>282</sup>Baale-jehudah (2 Sam. 6:1) is translated by "the cities of the House of Judah", and not by "Baalath, that is, Kiriath-jearim which belongs to Judah" (1 Chron. 13:6). The name of the king of Ammon (2 Sam. 10:1) is not added, as in 1 Chron. 19:1. Abishai is not called Abshai, except in 2 Sam. 10:10, in conformity with the Hebrew text. Ithra remains an Israelite (2 Sam. 17:25), and not an Ishmaelite (1 Chron. 2:17). Sheva (2 Sam. 20:25) is not called Shusha (1 Chron. 18:6), except in MS b. Goliath the Gittite is slain (2 Sam. 21:19), and not Lahmi his brother (1 Chron. 20:5). The indication ישב בשבה תחכמי was not considered a name (2 Sam. 23:8), as in 1 Chron. 11:11. The Jonathan without any family references (2 Sam. 23:32) is not called the son of Shagee the Hararite (1 Chron. 11:34). The name of Araunah is turned into Arvan (2 Sam. 24), and not into Ornan (1 Chron. 21). Only MS y adds the gentilic Jairite in 2 Sam. 20:26, based on 1 Chron. 11:28.

<sup>283</sup>TJon adopted the numbers of the Hebrew text of Samuel in 2 Sam. 6:13; 24:9, 13, 24 instead of the numbers of the Chronicler's version in 1 Chron. 15:26; 21:5, 12, 25.

translators to abstain from adjustment to the explanations of Chronicles.<sup>284</sup>

Although TJon refrains from adjusting its translation to the version of Chronicles in many verses, it uses the latter version in an equal number of cases. Most of these adjustments perfectly fit within the exegetical techniques of TJon. The words גופא (1 Sam. 31:12) and רקד (2 Sam. 6:16) are good translations, but also agree with the wording of 1 Chron. 10:12 and 15:29 respectively. The addition of ידיה (2 Sam. 6:14), the reference to the conquest (2 Sam. 7:23), the name Euphrates (2 Sam. 8:3), and the addition of וביה (2 Sam. 12:30) are natural complements to the Hebrew text, in conformity with the Chronicler's wording (resp. 1 Chron. 13:9; 17:21; 18:3; 20:2). The translation "kings" instead of "messengers" appears to be older than TJon, according to the witnesses (2 Sam. 11:1; 1 Chron. 20:1). Reverence for God and his people gives rise to the translations "and David and his men burnt them" (2 Sam. 5:21, cf. 1 Chron. 14:12); "sleeved tunic" (2 Sam. 6:14; cf. 1 Chron. 15:27); and "the sons of David were teachers" (2 Sam. 8:18; cf. 1 Chron. 18:17). The reading "that his kingdom was exalted" (2 Sam. 5:12), based on the Niphal of 1 Chron. 14:2; the rendering "Benaiah the son of Jehoiada was appointed over the archers and over the slingers" (2 Sam. 8:18), based on the preposition of 1 Chron. 18:17; and the reading "man of stature" (2 Sam. 21:20), based on the simpler text of 1 Chron. 20:6, are none of them against TJon's exegetical techniques.<sup>285</sup>

The omission of the preposition כִּי (2 Sam. 7:23; cf. 1 Chron. 17:21) is the only case that does not really fit within the accepted techniques. Yet the rest of that verse is not translated in conformity with the Chronicler's version, although it resulted in an incomplete and partly incomprehensible translation.

In conclusion, TJon follows the Hebrew text of Samuel as much as possible. Incongruities with the Books of Chronicles are not solved. Only where the text of Samuel can be clarified by the version of Chronicles within the boundaries of the accepted exegetical techniques, TJon makes use of Chronicles. This demonstrates that TJon

<sup>284</sup>See e.g. the killed men (1 Sam. 31:6) instead of the killed members of the house (1 Chron. 10:6); David's encouragement to conquer Jerusalem (2 Sam. 5:7; 1 Chron. 11:6), except for MSS a f; the maintaining of the rhetorical question (2 Sam. 7:5; 1 Chron. 17:4); the reading "tribes" instead of "judges" (2 Sam. 7:7; 1 Chron. 17:6); the plural forms (2 Sam. 7:23; singular in 1 Chron. 17:21); the translation "arrangement of the cubit" instead of a reference to the Philistine city Gath (2 Sam. 8:1; 1 Chron. 18:1).

<sup>285</sup>The notaricon in MS f<sup>m</sup> is also based on 1 Chron. 16:3.

is a translation of the Books of Samuel, not a midrash on Biblical narratives. This also demonstrates that harmonization is not the most important technique in TJon.

### 3.5 Literalism in Targum Samuel

In contrast to *e.g.* TgEzek. the Aramaic translation of Samuel has always been considered fairly literal. Confronted with the classification of exegetical techniques above, however, the question arises to what extent TgSam is translated literally. Many of the exegetical techniques show signs of a freer translation. Following J. Barr in his typology of literalisms in ancient Biblical translations,<sup>286</sup> we checked the degree of TJon's literality.

#### *Division and sequence of elements*

Literal translation gives a fair representation of every word or element of the original, preferably in the same word order. Whether this representation is given owing to a literalist policy or "to habit and the quest for an easy technique"<sup>287</sup>, in this respect TgSam is a literal translation. Almost every aspect of the Hebrew original is represented in the same order in the Aramaic rendering. Omissions are rare and even alliteration and assonance are given a place, where possible.

#### *Quantitative addition or subtraction of elements*

"Quantitative divergence from the original in either direction means loss of literality. A literal translation will express only the linguistic elements that are present in the original, and will express all of them."<sup>288</sup> In this respect TgSam is far from being literal. What is added to the representation of the Hebrew original, consists of about 7 % of TgSam's words.<sup>289</sup> These additions are not due to the grammatical structure of the Aramaic language, but they originate in the translators' theology.

#### *Consistency in the rendering*

It is a mark of literal translations if they use the same word every time a given word in the original appears.<sup>290</sup> Unlike Aquila's translation, TgSam does not maintain this kind of consistency. A Hebrew word

<sup>286</sup>J. Barr, "The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations" (MSU, 15), *NAWG* 11 (1979), 279-325.

<sup>287</sup>Barr, "The Typology of Literalism", 298; M. Flashar, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter", *ZAW* 32 (1912), 81-116, 161-89, 241-68, esp. 95.

<sup>288</sup>Barr, "The Typology of Literalism", 303-304.

<sup>289</sup>See the calculations in Van Staaldune-Sulman, *Samuel*.

<sup>290</sup>Barr, "The Typology of Literalism", 305.

is given an average equivalent of 1.78 Aramaic words.<sup>291</sup> Words that are used often, such as פקד or ברא, are rendered by a variety of equivalents, mainly depending on the co-text. Repeated words within a verse are sometimes rendered by two different equivalents (see above, exegetical technique no. 18, *Diversification*). Idiomatic expressions are translated as a whole, e.g. מו' יתן is not rendered literally, but by Aramaic לוי, 'if only', or by צבית, 'I wish'. Homonyms are recognized and translated by different equivalents. For example, the words אבל are grouped as (1) אבלא, 'mourning', (2) אבנא and מישרא, 'stone' and 'plain', and (3) ברם and בקשטא, 'but' and 'truly'. All these features show a fairly free translational style in TgSam, although admittedly TgSam does not permit itself an abundant freedom in this respect.

#### *Accuracy and level of semantic information*

"Literality in this case means the correct estimate of the semantic range of the term being translated."<sup>292</sup> Generally speaking, TgSam is literal in this respect, in sharp contrast to the Targum of Canticles. But metaphors are rendered by their underlying significance and the actual metaphor itself is often destroyed (see above, exegetical technique no. 13, *Explanation of Metaphors*). Several translations do not offer the semantic value of the original word, but the exegetical-theological value of the reference (see above, exegetical technique no. 11, *Precision of Meaning*; exegetical technique no. 14, *Plain Language*, and exegetical technique no. 19, *Modernization*). Anthropomorphic expressions are treated as if they were metaphorical expressions.<sup>293</sup>

#### *Coded "etymological" indication of semantic relationship*

Where literalism is far enough advanced, a translation begins to be a guide to the form of the Hebrew or a reflection of that form.<sup>294</sup> Indeed, the Aramaic of TgSam reflects the Hebrew of Samuel, but this must be mainly attributed to the fact that the two languages are much alike. Still, TgSam did not always choose words that reflect the Hebrew original, e.g. אסף is rendered by both אסף and כנש. For the stem מור both מור and קטל are chosen. The form of the construct chain is not adapted to the Hebrew. TgSam could choose between the real construct form and forms with the aid of ׀, and did so. Word plays in Hebrew are rarely maintained. The "etymological" method

<sup>291</sup>Cf. the Hebrew-Aramaic Index of Van Staaldvine-Sulman, *Samuel*, Vol. 3, 310-68. Small prepositions, like ער, are not included.

<sup>292</sup>Barr, "The Typology of Literalism", 314.

<sup>293</sup>Barr, "The Typology of Literalism", 316.

<sup>294</sup>Barr, "The Typology of Literalism", 318.

is rarely used, although there are instances where TgSam translated one word twice, because it wanted to preserve its two meanings. In this respect literalism is highly esteemed.<sup>295</sup>

*Level of text and level of analysis*

Literalism in this respect “can be characterized as having very close relations with the verbal form of the original”, but also with the original meaning on the level of sentence and story. Freedom can be achieved by choosing for the consonantal text only or by putting the “literal” elements of the original in an entirely different ensemble.<sup>296</sup> With a few exceptions TgSam complied to the traditional vocalization, known to us as the Masoretic Text. In this sense TgSam is strictly literal. However, TgSam frequently alters the co-text, although all original elements are used. Outstanding examples can be found in the typological or allegorical expansions. For example, “Hannah’s remarks about Sennacherib and others usually end up by including a fairly literal rendering of the Hebrew words, now enclosed in this new context” (1 Sam. 2:1-10).<sup>297</sup> These expansions are not mere additions, but they are a new exegetical co-text, providing new meaning to the original wording.

*Summary*

TgSam shows freedom and literalism in one translation. At the level of the original elements, TgSam is strictly literal, but in every other respect it allows itself the freedom to deviate from quantity, consistency, accuracy, semantic relationships and the plain meaning of the text. It is true, then, that TgSam’s chief consideration is to render “the implication rather than the surface literalness of the passage or word involved”.<sup>298</sup> The Targumist does not abstain from interpretation and is as such not literal.<sup>299</sup>

---

<sup>295</sup>The etymological method of translating is put into practice by Aquila, cf. J. Barr, “Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew Among the Ancient Translators”, in: B. Hartmann *et al.* (eds), *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner* (V.T.S., 16), Leiden 1967, 1-11, esp. 6-7.

<sup>296</sup>Barr, “The Typology of Literalism”, 323.

<sup>297</sup>Barr, “The Typology of Literalism”, 304.

<sup>298</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 79.

<sup>299</sup>Cf. Flashar, “Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter”, 94-95: “Where a translator is literal it is commonly not possible to know what he had in mind as the correct interpretation of the passage.”

### 3.6 Recapitulation

- The basic attitude of TgSam's translators was reverence for the text, *i.e.* the Hebrew, consonantal text in what was later called the Masoretic tradition. This reverence restrained them in many cases from varying the translation, introducing Midrashic material and harmonizing the text with other Biblical narratives—especially the Books of Chronicles.
- Three constantly present motives are the urge for clarity, reverence for God and the importance of his Revelation. These motives are not only apparent in the Targumists' own exegetical techniques, but also in their treatment of rhetorical devices. These devices were not adapted or complemented, unless they endangered the clarity of the translation, the harmony in Scripture, or the reverence for God and his people.
- The more influence theology had on the translation, the more use was made of the method of Plus rather than of the method of Substitution. Clarification of the text was mainly attained by substitution (including semantic shifts), while harmonization, actualization and reverence were often achieved by pluses. The many reverential circumlocutions added to the text of TJon are good examples of theological plusses.
- The consistency in using the exegetical techniques depends on theological motives. Techniques to protect God's honour are used very strictly, but techniques to clarify the text are used more haphazardly. The word "technique", therefore, is not correct, since it implies an automatism which is not attested in TJon.
- In the realm of exegetical techniques TJon did not follow the school of R. Aqiba. With regard to vocalization TJon followed R. Ishmael's principle that only the consonantal text is authoritative (see *Paranomasia*); with regard to particles TJon translated particles and other small words as normal linguistic features in contrast to R. Aqiba's rules of extension and exclusion (see *Extension and Exclusion*); with regard to collective singular nouns TJon regarded these mostly as plurals in contrast to R. Aqiba's ultra-literal explanations (see *Precision in Number*); and with regard to parallels and synonyms in one verse TJon

sometimes followed R. Aqiba's rule of diversification, but not in his drastic manner (see *Diversification*). The general tendency of TJon "is to adhere to the literal meaning of the Hebrew text, and in this sense he is closer to the School of R. Ishmael rather than to that of R. Aqiba".<sup>300</sup>

- The rabbinic *middot* are formulated and compiled within the realm of Midrashic reasoning, and even for this realm the lists are not complete. Therefore, they are not suitable to describe the translation methods of TJon, although they contribute to the understanding of some methods.
- Adjustments to more complicated halakhic discussions were hardly made in TgSam, in contrast to the Palestinian Targumim.<sup>301</sup>
- Adjustments to the text of the Books of Chronicles are only made within the boundaries of the exegetical techniques. This clearly distinguishes TgSam from any Midrashic explanation of the Biblical narratives. This also demonstrates that harmonization is not the most important technique in TgSam.
- The Targumatic translators show an unexpected receptibility for rhetorical and poetical devices. They even show the ability to create new "Biblical" poetry, including parallelism, chiasm, alliteration, assonance and rhyme. Repetition is one of the characteristics of this new Aramaic poetry.
- TgSam is meant to be a clear, unambiguous,<sup>302</sup> and exegetically sound translation of every Hebrew word of the Books of Samuel. As such, TgSam is a non-literal translation.

---

<sup>300</sup> Cf. B. Grossfeld, "Targum Onqelos, Halakha and the Halakhic Midrashim", in: D.R.G. Beattie, M. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOT.S, 166), Sheffield 1994, 228-46, esp. 244, who said the same about TO.

<sup>301</sup> E.g. the translation "both hands" in Exod. 15:17, which refers to a discussion in MekY, *Shirata*, 10, cf. H. Sysling, "De Palestijnse Targumim: een overzicht van recente studies over ontstaan, ontwikkeling, onderling verhouding en vorm van de rabbijnse Aramese vertalingen van de Pentateuch", in: I.E. Zwiep, A. Kuyt (eds), *Dutch Studies in the Targum: Papers read at a workshop held at the Juda Palache Institute, University of Amsterdam (18 March 1991)*, Amsterdam 1993, 13-38, esp. 16.

<sup>302</sup> Just as the other Targumim tried to avoid ambiguity, cf. D. Golomb, "'A Liar, A Blasphemer, A Reviler': The Role of Biblical Ambiguity in the Pentateuchal Targumim", in: P.V.M. Flesher (ed.), *Textual and Contextual Studies in the Pentateuchal Targums* (Targum Studies, 1), Atlanta 1992, 135-46.

## Chapter 4

---

# Semantic Studies in the Targum of Samuel

### 4.1 Introduction

“One would naturally expect the language of a religious tradition to have certain special semantic developments and problems over and above those which occur in every-day speech.”<sup>1</sup> With the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Aramaic we have a considerable specialization, for this translation, being used in synagogues and schools, did not represent the way in which the Jews spoke in their daily life. It is rather rendered in a highly theological language. Therefore, the use of several words is restricted to one or two meanings, whereas the dictionaries may supply more.

In order to avoid unnecessary repetition in my commentary on Tg-Sam, some semantic issues are collected and discussed in the present chapter. The rendering of certain Hebrew words and the usage of several Aramaic words are examined to uncover the semantic flavour of these words, to test consistency and inconsistency in TJon and also to reveal the exegetical manoeuvres of the Targumists. These semantic studies are concentrated around Hebrew and Aramaic lemmata and presented in alphabetic order. A Hebrew lemma is chosen when the Hebrew word appears to have more Aramaic equivalents, and Aramaic lemma is chosen when the Aramaic word functions as the translation of several Hebrew equivalents. Cross-references show where a certain word is discussed.

These studies are all performed in the Former Prophets, because these books cover a large number of chapters written in a similar genre. Therefore, it may be assumed that they are rendered in the same exegetical style. It is advisable, then, to consult the matching volumes of the *BCTP*.<sup>2</sup> References to exegetical techniques in Ch. 3 are made by the numbers that have been assigned to them there, *e.g.* >15 refers to *Associative Translation*.

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, Oxford 1961, 3.

<sup>2</sup>J.C. de Moor, *Joshua* (BCTP, 1), Leiden 1995; W.F. Smelik, *Judges* (BCTP, 2), Leiden 1996; E. van Staalduine-Sulman, *Samuel* (BCTP, 3-5), Leiden 1996; B. Grossfeld, *Kings* (BCTP, 6-8), Leiden 1997. See also the lexically parsed texts of the Targumim to the Former Prophets at the Web site of the *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*: [http://call.cn.huc.edu/text\\_browse.html](http://call.cn.huc.edu/text_browse.html).



## 4.2 The Rendering of Certain Hebrew Words

This section consists of discussions of certain Hebrew words through the eyes of the TJon's makers. It is neither a lexicon, nor a theological dictionary. It discusses the various translations of a Hebrew word within TJon and why TJon chose for specialization in these cases.

אָרֹן, *lord, master*. For the sake of clarity TJon renders the plural אֲדֹנָי, being a designation of God, by his Name, יְיָ,<sup>3</sup> while the singular אֲדֹנָי, designating humans (Judg. 19:12) or angels (Josh. 5:14), by Aramaic רַבְּנָא, 'lord, master' (>11, >23). The most frequently occurring phrase in human intercourse is רַבְּנֵי מַלְכָּא, 'my lord the king'. Only in cases of a genitive construction אָרֹן for God is translated with רַבְּנָא, such as in רִיבֹן כָּל אַרְעָא, 'Lord of all the earth' (Josh. 3:11, 13). Therefore, the Name will be rendered by 'LORD' in Chs 5 and 6, while the translation of Aramaic רַבְּנָא will be 'lord' or 'Lord'.

A special case is formed by Hebrew אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה. This is represented according to its pronunciation, as a *Qere perpetuum*, by יְיָ אֱלֹהִים, as it is sometimes done in some verses in various Hebrew manuscripts (cf. 2 Sam. 7:22, 25) and in the Books of Chronicles.<sup>4</sup>

אֹהֶל, *tent*. The usual rendering of Hebrew אֹהֶל is מִשְׁכָּנָא, 'tent'. In 2 Sam. 16:22 TJon allows Absalom not only to lie in a tent with his father's concubines, but to have the luxury of a קַנּוּפָא, a 'canopy bed'. This agrees with his situation in the co-text (>16).<sup>5</sup> The Hebrew expression אִישׁ לְאֹהֶלָּיו, 'each to his own tent', is consistently rendered by גַּבְרָא לְקַרְוֵהֵי, 'each to his own town' (1 Sam. 4:10; 13:2; 2 Sam. 18:17; 19:9; 20:1, 22). This can best be seen as an actualization (>19), made by associative translation (>15).<sup>6</sup> Similarly, the women are serving in houses, not in tents (TgJudg. 5:24). See further Aramaic קַרְוָא.

<sup>3</sup>TO uses the same representation, cf. A. Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim* (TSAJ, 14), Tübingen 1986, 326. In Chronicles the epithet אֲדֹנָי is not used either, cf. M. Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik* (ATA, 8/3), Münster 1937, 109; S. Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (BEATAJ, 9), Frankfurt 1989, 13, 21.

<sup>4</sup>Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 109. TO also uses the same formula, cf. Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles*, 327.

<sup>5</sup>TJon uses a Greek loan-word, whereas LXX gives the normal equivalent for tent; cf. also J.P. Brown, "The Septuagint as a Source of the Greek Loan-words in the Targums", *Bib.* 70,2 (1989), 194-216, esp. 215.

<sup>6</sup>Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4, 67; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 99.

און, *evil, harm*, see Aramaic חובא.

איב, *enemy*, see Aramaic בעיל דכבא.

נביא האלהים, *man of God*, see Aramaic נביא.

אל, *God, El*. Generally, TJon is inclined to render Hebrew אל by Aramaic אלהא, 'God' (>22). Even in texts where one could use God's name, TJon does not translate it by the Name (e.g. in 2 Sam. 22:48), although this is TJon's custom with the Hebrew word אלהים (see Aramaic ירי). In verses where the word אלהא has already been used, TJon maintains the word אל (>18; TgJosh. 22:22; 24:19). In TgEzek. 28:2, 9 the word is rendered by צרכא and דחלתא, denotations of idols, because the human speaker claims to be a god. In this co-text TJon could neither maintain the word nor render it with אלהא, to uphold monotheism (>22). In TgJudg. 9:46 אל is rendered together with the preceding בית, 'Bethel'.<sup>7</sup> Only in 2 Sam. 23:5 אל is maintained without obvious reason.<sup>8</sup>

אלהים, *God, gods*. Hebrew אלהים falls into two groups of meanings: the one God of Israel and the other gods of the nations around.<sup>9</sup>

In the first case TJon preferably translates אלהים by God's Name, ירי, for the sake of clarity, as is the case in the rendering of Hebrew אדני אדני (>11).<sup>10</sup> If translation by God's Name is impossible, the singular אלהא, 'God', is used. Some examples are genitive constructions, such as 'the God of Israel' (Josh. 22:16) and 'your God' (1 Sam. 12:19),<sup>11</sup> constructions with an adjective, such as 'a holy God' (Josh. 24:19, cf. also 1 Sam. 6:20), and when the indefinite 'a god' is meant, as in 'there is a god in Israel' (1 Sam. 17:46) and 'no god in all the earth except in Israel' (2 Kgs 5:15). In verses where אלהים is used predicatively and absolutely ('the one and only God'), whether the Hebrew text reads אלהים or האלהים, TJon prefers to borrow Hebrew אלהים (Josh. 2:11; 22:22, 34; 2 Sam. 7:25 and in the vocatives in 2 Sam. 7:25, 28).<sup>12</sup>

The second meaning of Hebrew אלהים, 'gods', is rendered by טעווא,

<sup>7</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 532.

<sup>8</sup>A similar case is found in TgIsa. 40:18. In most cases TO renders simply by the same אל, while in a few instances it uses אלהא, cf. A. Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim* (TSAJ, 14), Tübingen 1986, 339.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 321.

<sup>10</sup>So also TO, cf. Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles*, 330. In contrast to the relatively extensive use of האלהים as a proper name in the Books of Chronicles, cf. S. Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles*, 29.

<sup>11</sup>Cf. 'the God of eternity' (Isa. 40:28).

<sup>12</sup>So also TO, cf. Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles*, 331.

'idol', or by דחלתא, 'deity'.<sup>13</sup> In most cases the word טעוהא, 'idol', is used, but "put into the mouth of foreigners, TJon refrains from the pejorative expression טעוהא"<sup>14</sup>, as it seems unlikely that they would sneer at their own god.<sup>15</sup> In spite of this general rule in TJon, all references to gods other than the God of Israel in the Books of Samuel are equated with טעוהא. As a case in point, the Philistines spoke about "Dagon, our idol" (1 Sam. 5:7; cf. 6:5) and Goliath cursed David by his idols (1 Sam. 17:43 and 1 Sam. 17:8 in the MSS a b c d w<sub>1</sub>). With regard to these translations TgSam is clearly the exception in TJon.<sup>16</sup>

The standard translation of the Hebrew expressions אלהים אחרים, 'other gods', and אלהי הנכר, 'strange gods', is טעוה עממיא, 'idols of the nations' (cf. 1 Chron. 16:26 and 2 Chron. 32:29). Also this rendering is made to deny the existence of other gods (>22).<sup>17</sup>

אמה, *maidservant*, see Aramaic אמחא.

אפוד, *ephod, cultic garment*. The rendering of Hebrew אפוד can be divided into two categories. If the co-text indicates that the ephod was worn by a priest, TJon simply renders it with the same word איפודא. In this case it refers to a cultic garment (1 Sam. 2:28; 14:3, 22:18), including a kind of oracle (1 Sam. 14:19; 21:10; 23:6, 9; 30:7). In all verses the accompanying verb, לבש, 'wear as clothing', indicates that TJon considered the ephod to be a garment. However, if the co-text indicates a different bearer, then TJon renders it with the less sacral כדוויטא, 'sleeved tunic', which is the case with Samuel (1 Sam. 2:18) and with David (2 Sam. 6:14).<sup>18</sup> This translation protects the Biblical heroes from the accusation of being underdressed. In spite of Michal's accusations David appeared to be dressed in a sleeved tunic (2 Sam. 6:20).<sup>19</sup>

אשם, *guilt, guilt offering*, see Aramaic חובא.

<sup>13</sup>These renderings are also attested in the Pentateuchal Targumim, cf. Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles*, 332.

<sup>14</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 590.

<sup>15</sup>E.g. Judg. 16:23-24; 18:24; 1 Kgs 20:10; 2 Kgs 18:33-35, but also Isa. 36:18-20; 37:12; Jer. 2:28; 11:13; Ezek. 28:2, 6, 9.

<sup>16</sup>So also Kasher, *חויספחות*, no. 53b.

<sup>17</sup>In most cases TO uses the same basic formula, טעוה עממיא, but the combination אחרן and even אלה אחרן are present as well, cf. Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles*, 332-33.

<sup>18</sup>Cf. also Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 116; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 14.

<sup>19</sup>Cf. A. Phillips, "David's Linen Ephod", *VT* 19 (1969), 485-87; N.L. Tidwell, "The Linen Ephod: 1 Sam. ii 18 and 2 Sam. vi 14", *VT* 24 (1974), 505-507.

בליעל, *uselessness*. Hebrew בליעל is translated according to its context, although the Aramaic stem רשע is mostly used.<sup>20</sup> Translations of בליעל are רשיעא, 'evil person', and its plural; רשעא, 'evil'; שקרא, 'lie' (2 Sam. 22:5 in FT); and חיבא, 'sinner' (2 Sam. 22:5).<sup>21</sup> TJon made no use of any etymology by cutting the word into בלי יעל, 'without use, in vain';<sup>22</sup> into בל יעל, 'without ascending' (*i.e.* who will never ascend from the grave to the future world);<sup>23</sup> or into בלי עול, 'without the yoke (of heaven)'.<sup>24</sup> Neither did TJon personify the word, as is done in the texts of Qumran and in 2 Cor. 6:15.

במה, *high place*. TgSam never equated Hebrew במה with Aramaic במחא, as it is done in TgKgs. In TgSam it is either translated by ביה אסחרהא, 'banqueting hall', or by ביה חקפא, 'stronghold'. These renderings, made in order to protect Samuel and David's honour, were not necessary, because most rabbis agreed that offering on high places was permitted before the temple period, after the destruction of Shiloh (cf. *e.g.* LevR. 22:9; Meg. 9b-10a).<sup>25</sup> Even if the Targumists held the opinion that offering on high places was not allowed during the ark's stay in Shiloh,<sup>26</sup> they could have maintained the high places during the latter part of Samuel's life, because the ark was in Kiriath-jearim. It seems, therefore, that TgSam was stricter in sacral topics than usual. Note that LXX and Pseudo-Philo also protected Samuel's honour by interpreting the high place in 1 Sam. 9 as the place-name Bama.

ברח, *to flee*, see Aramaic אפך.

גבע, *hill*, *Geba*, see Aramaic גבעתא.

גבעה, *hill*, *Gibeah*, see Aramaic גבעתא.

<sup>20</sup>In TgJudg. and TgKgs רשעא is used (Judg. 19:22; 20:13; 1 Kgs 21:10, 13), except in two variants in TgJudg 19:22 and 20:13 that read רשיעא. The word בליעל does not occur in Joshua.

<sup>21</sup>Aramaic ששיא, 'insane person' is used in 1 Sam. 25:25 (MSS a b c d m o w y) to make a word play with Nabal's name. Cf. also Symmachus' "ignorant people" in Judg. 19:22.

<sup>22</sup>HALAT<sup>3</sup>, *s.v.* בליעל.

<sup>23</sup>Cf. San. 111b.

<sup>24</sup>EccI.R. 1:18 § 1; adopted by Jerome in Judg. 19:22 and by Pseudo-Jerome in 1 Sam. 1:16, "Belial enim interpretatur absque jugo", cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Questions*, 67.

<sup>25</sup>Cf. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 116; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 16.

<sup>26</sup>From the coming to Gilgal until the ark's stay in Shiloh, the high places were permitted; cf. mZev. 5:7; 14:4-5; yMeg. 1:13 (72c); Zev. 114a-b, 117a.

דם, *blood*, see Aramaic חובא.

הלך Hitp., *to follow, to serve*, see Aramaic פלח.

זבח, *sacrifice, slaughter*. The Hebrew stem זבח usually corresponds to Aramaic רבח, 'to sacrifice', and רבחה, 'sacrifice'. In some verses, however, TJon prefers the words נכס, 'to slaughter', and נכסהא, 'slaughtering'. These verses have a co-text in which the meat of the offering is described (1 Sam. 2:13, 15), or in which the Hebrew text speaks about the meal rather than about the offering itself, *e.g.* Saul's meal at Endor (1 Sam. 28:24) and King David's gifts to the people (2 Sam. 6:13). In these cases the Targumist gives the text more precision (>11) and the meaning of the word shifts towards the slaughtering of an animal for a meal.<sup>27</sup> This differentiation is in accordance with R. Eleazar's pronouncement that everyone may slaughter, but that the presenting of the blood and the offering itself must be done by a priest (Ber. 31b). Consequently, Aramaic רבח can best be translated by 'sacrifice', while נכס can best be rendered 'slaughter'.

In TgKgs all offerings upon high places and to idols are described as רבח. Since these offerings are explicitly forbidden in the Hebrew text itself (1 Kgs 3:2-4), TJon did not feel the urge to shift their meaning toward a meal. For instance, in 1 Kgs 8:5 Solomon sacrifices (רבח) during the dedication ceremony of the temple, although FT reads נכס.

The Hebrew stem שחט, 'slaughter' is usually equated with Aramaic נכס, 'to slaughter', and נכסהא, 'slaughtering'. These words can refer to a part of an offering (*e.g.* 1 Sam. 1:25), but can also mean the slaughtering of animals for a meal without any reference to an offering (*e.g.* 1 Sam. 14:34).

In order to protect the honour of the Biblical figures (>24) TJon often renders נכסה קדשיא, "sacrifice of holy things", which is the rendering of Hebrew שלם, 'peace offering'. Peace offerings belonged to the votive offerings and were "a sacrifice of lesser sanctity" (mZev. 5:7). They could be brought outside the sanctuary, after the establishment of the sanctuary at Shiloh (cf. Meg. 9b; Zev. 119a).<sup>28</sup> Since Hebrew שלם is translated by נכסה קדשיא,<sup>29</sup> the verb and the object

<sup>27</sup>It is not explained in TgSam why Samuel was allowed to make offerings as a Levite, but TJon explicitly renders him offering in 1 Sam. 7:9. This Targumic viewpoint is best described by Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 16; against Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 116.

<sup>28</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 17; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 355.

<sup>29</sup>Translation of the complete expression זבח שלמים (Lev. 7:11), in TO נכסה קדשיא.

in 1 Sam. 11:15 are assimilated.<sup>30</sup> In this verse Hebrew זבח is also rendered by Aramaic נכס. This means that TO and TJon stress the element of the meal in the שלם and not the element of offering.

קעק, *to call for help*, see Aramaic צלא.

חזה, *seer*, see Aramaic נביא.

חטא, *to sin* see Aramaic חרובא.

חטאת, *sin* see Aramaic חרובא.

חי, *life*. Just as MT diversifies the vocalization of the word חי in oaths, between חי if a human being is meant and חי if God is referred to, so TJon diversifies its translation.<sup>31</sup> Phrases like חי נפשך are represented quite literally by חיי נפשך, 'by the life of your soul' (1 Sam. 1:26; 17:55; 20:3; 25:26; 2 Sam. 11:11 14:19, but cf. also 2 Sam. 15:21).<sup>32</sup> Phrases like חי יהוה are translated by קים הוא יי, 'as the LORD is living', in accordance with the Masoretic vocalization (1 Sam. 14:39, 45; 19:6; 20:3, 21; 25:26, 34; 26:10, 16; 28:10; 29:6; 2 Sam. 4:9; 12:5; 14:11; 15:21; 22:47, but cf. also 2 Sam. 2:27).<sup>33</sup>

חלה, *to appease*, see Aramaic צלא.

טוב, *good, pleasing, suitable, friendly*. Since Hebrew טוב is very general in its meaning, it is translated by a variety of Aramaic equivalents. Dependent on its co-text it becomes טוב, 'good', שפיר, 'beautiful', or חקין, 'right'.

<sup>30</sup>This is also the case in TgJosh 8:31; 22:27.

<sup>31</sup>J. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten in seinem Verhältnis zu verwandten Erscheinungen sowie die Stellung des Eides im Islam*, Strassburg 1914, 18 observed that חי is most likely the contracted construct form, even turned into a particle (cf. חי-אני), while חי before the divine name is the old singular form, diversified in the vocalization, in accordance with the rule that the diphthong ay never contracts before a lengthened yodh. This view is supported by M. Greenberg, "The Hebrew Oath Particle hay/hē", *JBL* 76 (1957), 34-39. Greenberg assumed on p. 36 that hay had become associated with the Tetragram on purely phonetic grounds, but that this spelling was transferred to other expressions denoting the Deity, even the personal pronoun אני. He wondered whether this transfer took place in ancient times or by the Masoretic vocalizers. Since the Targums already indicate the diversification between the divine and the human חי, it is most likely an ancient diversification.

<sup>32</sup>A variant reading of 2 Sam. 15:21 renders the "divine" wording of the oath: קים רבני מלכא.

<sup>33</sup>Cf. HALAT<sup>3</sup>; Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 111.

מִיָּמִים יְמִימָה, *yearly*. The general “from time to time” is interpreted as referring to the great festivals, as in 1 Sam. 1:3; 2:19, after Exod. 13:10 (י>11, י>15).<sup>34</sup> Likewise, Vg renders “statutis diebus”, which is explained by Pseudo-Jerome as Pesach, Pentecost and Tabernacles.<sup>35</sup> Also Jewish sources mention these three feasts.<sup>36</sup> However, some explain this expression as a reference to Pesach only, because Exod. 13 concerns the Pesach ordinances,<sup>37</sup> while others refer to the eighth day of the festival of Sukkoth (MShem. 1:8, basing itself on Num. 29:35).<sup>38</sup>

ד, *hand*, see Aramaic מַחְזָא.

ישע, *to help*, see Aramaic פֶּרַק.

כה, *so, thus*, see Aramaic כִּדְנָן.

כהן, *priest*. Hebrew כהן is rendered according to its co-text. Priests serving other gods than the God of Israel are named כַּמְרָא, ‘idol priest’ (1 Sam. 5:5 and most MSS in 6:2).<sup>39</sup> Even sons of respectful men who still serve an image are called by that name (*e.g.* Moses’ grandson in TgJudg. 18:30).<sup>40</sup> Priests of the LORD are called כְּהֹנָא, ‘priest’. People who are called priest in the Hebrew Bible, but are considered unworthy by the Targumist, are described with other words, such as מַשְׁמֹשֵׁין, ‘serving’ (Hophni and Phinehas in 1 Sam. 1:3) or רַב־רִבִּין, ‘commanders’ (David’s sons in 2 Sam. 8:18 and Ira in 2 Sam. 20:26). The priests of Ahab, mentioned after Ahab’s commanders and relatives, are called “friends” (2 Kgs 10:11).

כן, *so, thus*, see Aramaic כִּדְנָן.

כפר, *unwalled village*, see Aramaic קְרַחָא.

<sup>34</sup>Cf. Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 6, 216, n. 9; Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 316; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 544-46.

<sup>35</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 66. Cf. also V. Aptowitz, “Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata”, *ZAW* 29 (1909), 241-252, esp. 241; F. Stummer, “Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas”, *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, esp. 4.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. yBer. 9:5; AgBer. 29:2; QohR. 5:19; SER 9 (p. 47).

<sup>37</sup>Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 50:2; AgBer 19:60; 29:2; GenR. 49:5.

<sup>38</sup>Cited by Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 6.

<sup>39</sup>Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 36-37; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 594-96.

<sup>40</sup>One MS reads זַמְרִין, ‘musician’, which is more flattering for Moses’ grandson.

לקח, *to take*. TJon divided the translation of Hebrew לקח into two categories: it used Aramaic נסיב, 'to take', when the object was an animal or an inanimate thing and Aramaic רבר, 'to lead', when the object was a human being.<sup>41</sup> Some examples of the object of נסיב are: land (Josh. 11:23), booty (Josh. 7:23), sword and spear (Judg. 3:21; 1 Sam. 26:22), cows and kids (Judg. 6:26; 13:19), corpses or separate parts of the body (1 Sam. 17:54; 31:12; 2 Sam. 18:17; cf. Judg. 19:28). Some examples of the object of רבר are: sons and daughters (Josh. 7:24; 2 Sam. 8:13), servants and citizens (2 Sam. 20:6; Josh. 4:2), women, wives and concubines (2 Sam. 3:15; 11:4; 12:11; 20:3).

Two exceptions to this rule exist. The first is the idiomatic expression "to take a wife", which is constructed with the verb נסיב in spite of the human object (*e.g.* Judg. 3:6; 14:3; 19:1; 2 Sam. 15:13). The second exception is the use of the verb רבר with the object "herds" (*cf.* 1 Sam. 23:5; 30:20).

מגפה, *plague, torment*, see Aramaic מחחא.

מלך, *king*, see Aramaic מלכא.

מכה, *stroke*, see Aramaic מחחא.

מלאך, *messenger*. TJon distinguished between heavenly and earthly messengers. In 29 verses Hebrew מלאך is rendered אונדא, 'messenger', to stress that the messenger was a human being.

Heavenly messengers are denoted by the (Hebrew) term מלאכא, 'angel'. In four verses the Hebrew as well as the Aramaic text compares David with an angel of the LORD (1 Sam. 29:9; 2 Sam. 14:17, 20; 19:28). In the Books of Samuel there is only one angel on the scene, *viz.* in 2 Sam. 24, but the Aramaic version adds the term angel in the narrative concerning the appearance of Samuel (1 Sam. 28:13) and in the miraculous victory against the Philistines (2 Sam. 5:24).

TJon could use the word "angel" in 1 Sam. 28:13 to denote the conjured spirit of Samuel because of rabbinic opinions concerning the likeness of prophets and angels. "The rabbis discussed the distinction between prophets and angels and although they concluded that there is a difference, they also suggested that some prophets may be termed 'angels', and *vice versa* some angels may be termed 'prophets'."<sup>42</sup> The prophet Samuel could therefore well be termed

<sup>41</sup>Cf. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 52-53.

<sup>42</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 351. Key-texts in this discussion were Judg.



'angel'.<sup>43</sup>

The introduction of a warrior-angel in 2 Sam. 5:24<sup>44</sup> instead of the LORD is exceptional in TJon. Similar verses maintain the LORD as the subject of verbs like "go out" and "wage war", although the verb is rendered with "reveal oneself".<sup>45</sup> The warrior-angel appears mainly in TJon if it is already present in the Hebrew text.<sup>46</sup> In Geonic circles the introduction of angels was not considered proper. R. Yehudah b. Ilai thought it blasphemous to translate "they saw the angel of the LORD" (Exod. 24:10), and preferred "they saw the Glory of God". Seen against this background the Aramaic version of 2 Sam. 5:24 represents the less accepted, and perhaps the older, exegetical tradition.<sup>47</sup>

מלט, *to escape*, see Aramaic פרק.

מצב, *outpost*, see Aramaic אסטריינא.

משפט, *judicial process, right*. In the sense of 'judicial process' Hebrew משפט is equated by Aramaic דינא (1 Sam. 8:3; 2 Sam. 8:15; 15:2, 4, 6). These instances refer to the actual process of going to the judge until his passing sentence in the case. Also jurisprudence could be called דינא (1 Sam. 30:25).

In the sense of 'right' a distinction is made between rules given by God and other kinds of legal rights.<sup>48</sup> Laws given in the Torah, indicated with Hebrew משפט, are called דינא (2 Sam. 22:23, but cf. also Ezek. 11:12; 20:16). In these verses the word משפט is often used as a synonym of קינא, 'covenant, ordinance'. A custom, regardless of its origin, is translated by Aramaic הלכא (1 Sam. 27:11).<sup>49</sup> TJon indicates other laws, customs or rights with the Greek word νιμωσα,

13:6 and 2:1; cf. LevR. 1:1; DeutR. 16:1; MTeh. 103:17; YalqS Lev. § 427; Num. § 763; Hag. § 567; SOR 20.

<sup>43</sup>Pseudo-Philo combines the terms "god" and "angel", stating that the woman saw gods, *viz.* Samuel accompanied by two angels; cf. LAB, 64:6.

<sup>44</sup>Integrated in the commentary of Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 116; and Rashi, *ad loc.* But cf. TgJudg. 4:14 and Tg. 1 Chron. 14:15.

<sup>45</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 386, n. 347 mentions Judg. 5:4; Isa. 26:21; 42:13; Mic. 1:3; Hab. 3:13; Zech. 14:3. All Targums are remarkably reluctant to introduce angels, apart from Pseudo-Jonathan.

<sup>46</sup>Cf. Josh. 5:14; 2 Kgs. 19:35; Isa. 37:36.

<sup>47</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 387-88 has more reasons to assume that the parallel text of TgJudg. 4:14 is an older tradition. He points to the place of angels in warfare in IQM 1:6.

<sup>48</sup>This is not the same as a distinction between sacral and profane use, as is suggested by Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 117. In that case the priestly rights in 1 Sam. 2:13 should be profane and not sacral.

<sup>49</sup>Also in rabbinic Hebrew, cf. W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der*

whether they concern priestly rights (1 Sam. 2:13), royal customs (1 Sam. 8:9, 11; 10:25) or foreign laws (Ezek. 5:7; 11:12; 20:18). This Graecism always denotes an adverse quality.

It is interesting to see that Pseudo-Jerome considered “iudicium”, *i.e.* the judicial process, to be the first sense of the Hebrew word **מִשְׁפָּט**.<sup>50</sup> Also in 1 Sam. 10:25 he explains that the Vulgate’s rendering “legem regni” ought to be “iudicium regni”, in contrast to TJon’s rendering. Whereas Samuel positively instructed Saul about how to judge, in Pseudo-Jerome’s view, he negatively warned the people about royal customs as he had done in 1 Sam. 8, in TJon’s view.

**נֹאֵם**, *utterance*. Hebrew **נֹאֵם** is always equated with a derivation from the stem **אָמַר**, mostly by a verbal form like **יִי אָמַר**, sometimes by the noun **אָמַרָא**, ‘speech, utterance’ (2 Sam. 23:1).

**נָבֵא**, *to prophesy*, **נְבִיא**, *prophet*. The Hebrew verb **נָבֵא**, both Niphal and Hitpael, is mostly translated by the Aramaic verb **נִבֵּא**, whether referring to true or false prophets. Exceptions are those cases in which the co-text shows that not the sense ‘to prophesy’ but rather ‘to be in ecstasy’ is meant. In the latter cases TJon uses the verbs **שָׂטָא**, ‘behave insanely’ (1 Sam. 18:10; 1 Kgs 18:29; Ezek. 13:2), and **טָפַשׁ**, ‘behave foolishly’ (Jer. 29:26).

Very surprising, therefore, are those verses in TgSam in which the co-text clearly suggests that **נָבֵא** is used in the sense of ‘to be in ecstasy’, but where TJon renders this Hebrew verb with **שָׁבַח**, ‘to praise’ (1 Sam. 10:5, 6, 10, 11, 13; 19:20, 21, 23, 24). In these two chapters Saul runs into a company of prophets and, filled with God’s Spirit, begins to prophesy. Although TJon accepts that God’s Spirit was a prophetic spirit, it renders the prophets as a “company of scribes” and the activity of Saul as “praise”. It is true that “praise” is often connected with prophesying in TJon (TJon Judg. 5:1-3; 1 Sam. 10:10-11; 2 Sam. 22:1 and indirectly in TJon 1 Sam. 2:1), but the Targumist clearly hesitated to depict Saul as a prophet. The reason is probably that Saul was eventually rejected by God as king and as a bearer of his Spirit. Furthermore, the contents of this prophesying of Saul remained unknown.<sup>51</sup> Although this company is not depicted as prophets, TJon does not connect them with the high places.

*jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*, Vol. 1, Leipzig 1899, repr. Darmstadt 1965, 42, “Vorschrift ohne Rücksicht auf ihre Herleitung aus der heiligen Schrift”.

<sup>50</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 83.

<sup>51</sup>Pseudo-Jerome states that it concerned the war against Gog and Magog, the reward for the righteous and the punishment of the wicked, cf. *Quaestiones*, 81.

Hebrew נביא is most often translated by the Aramaic word נביא, 'prophet'. The fundamental goal of a prophet is to lead the people back to the LORD,<sup>52</sup> hence the synchronization of idolatry and cutting from the prophet's words (1 Sam. 15:23). False prophets, *i.e.* prophets without the guidance of God's Spirit<sup>53</sup>, are always indicated as such. They are called נבי שקרא, 'prophets of falsehood' (*e.g.* 1 Kgs 13:25-29); נביי בעלא, 'prophets of Baal' (*e.g.* 1 Kgs 18:22); נביי אשירחא, 'prophets of Asherah' (*e.g.* 1 Kgs 18:19); נביאי אבוך ונביאי אמך, 'prophets of your father and your mother' (*e.g.* 2 Kgs 3:13); or, directed to the king of Israel, נבייך, 'your prophets' (*e.g.* 1 Kgs 22:23).

In some verses TJon prefers the word ספרא, 'scribe' (1 Sam. 10:5, 10-12; 19:20, 24; 28:6, 15; 2 Kgs 17:13; 23:2).<sup>54</sup> The people mentioned do not belong to the acknowledged prophets of rabbinic Judaism. The Targumist read "scribes into Biblical stories because to him they are an important avenue for teaching revelation . . . In so translating, the Targumist refers to the rabbinic teachers of his own day as the model for societal leadership and communication with God."<sup>55</sup> Especially ecstatic prophets are transformed into scribes, functioning in the milieu of worship and study.<sup>56</sup> The scribes can be positive figures in TJon,<sup>57</sup> praising God by the Spirit of the LORD (TJon 1 Sam. 10:5, 11; 19:20, 24) or giving instruction from the Torah (TJon 1 Sam. 28:6, 15; 2 Kgs 17:13).<sup>58</sup> Some scribes definitely function as negative figures in TJon, along with false priests and deceiving sages.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>52</sup>J. Ribera Florit, "Prophecy according to Targum Jonathan to the Prophets and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch", in: P.V.M. Flesher (ed.), *Targum Studies*, Vol. 1: Textual and Contextual Studies in the Pentateuchal Targums, Atlanta 1992, 61-74, esp. 65.

<sup>53</sup>Ribera Florit, "Prophecy", 67.

<sup>54</sup>Also Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:120 adds scribes to the narrative.

<sup>55</sup>A.J. Saldarini, "Is Saul also among the Scribes?: Scribes and Prophets in Targum Jonathan", in: H.J. Blumberg *et al.* (eds), "Open Thou Mine Eyes . . ." *Essays on Aggadah and Judaica Presented to Rabbi William G. Braude on His Eightieth Birthday and Dedicated to His Memory*, New Jersey 1992, 239-53, esp. 253.

<sup>56</sup>Saldarini, "Is Saul also among the Scribes?", 251.

<sup>57</sup>Against C.T.R. Hayward, "Some Notes on Scribes and Priests in the Targum of the Prophets", *JJS* 36 (1985), 210-21, esp. 210. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 101 estimate them as positive.

<sup>58</sup>Cf. J. Shachter, H. Freedman, *Sanhedrin* (The Babylonian Talmud), London 1935, 360, n. 7: "in the time of Ezra, it referred to the body of teachers who interpreted the Law to the people, and then it came to mean teachers generally".

<sup>59</sup>Cf. *e.g.* TJon Isa. 3:2; 9:15; 28:7; 29:10; 33:18; Jer. 8:10; 26:7-8, 11, 16; Ezek. 7:26, cited by J.C. de Moor, "The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1-12: The

In other verses the existence of groups of prophets is acknowledged by TJon, for instance, when Obadiah is hiding hundred prophets of the LORD from Queen Jezebel (1 Kgs 18:4). Combinations like תלמידי, ‘pupils of the prophets’ (e.g. in 2 Kgs 9:7), and עבדי נבייא, ‘my servants, the prophets’ (e.g. in 2 Kgs 5:22), are maintained by TJon, and even added (e.g. in 1 Sam. 1:1). Still, there is no sign of a group of prophets in Samuel’s days. He is no head of a prophetic school, as Pseudo-Jerome suggests,<sup>60</sup> but rather head of a Talmud School, as is suggested in TJon 1 Sam. 19:20.<sup>61</sup>

Two special cases must be mentioned. In TgJudg. Hebrew בלאך, ‘angel’, is rendered with נביא (TgJudg. 2:1, 4; 5:23), which is an unique equation in TJon to the prophets.<sup>62</sup> And in TgSam the place-names צוף and צוף are also rendered with נביא (1 Sam. 1:1; 9:5). See further below, Aramaic נביא.

נגיד, *prince*. The nuance in the Hebrew text that Saul was first נגיד, ‘prince, pretender’ (1 Sam. 9:16; 10:1), until the people accepted him as a king (1 Sam. 10:24), is not present in the Aramaic version. TJon uses, in associative fashion, the word “king” (>15). The texts in which David is called “prince”, during the period of Saul’s reign, are also simplified in TJon and give the standard translation “king” (1 Sam. 13:14; 25:30; 2 Sam. 5:2; 6:21; 7:8).<sup>63</sup>

An additional complication was that Aramaic נגידא or נגידא was already used to denote the first judges (Judg. 2:16-19). These judges were called “leaders”, because it is explicitly stated that no one listened to them. Therefore, TJon distinguished them from the later “judges”, who received more respect.<sup>64</sup>

גרה, *abode*, see Aramaic אלפנא.

גורח, *pasturage, residence*, see Aramaic אלפנא.

גוס, *to flee*, see Aramaic אפך.

נחם Niphal, *to regret, to be comforted*. The Hebrew verb נחם is mostly used with regard to God, especially in the sense of “to regret”. When

Parable of the Wicked Tenants’, *JSJ* 29 (1998), 63-80, esp. 73, n. 48.

<sup>60</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 102, but cf. Kimḥi’s notes on 1 Sam. 28:6.

<sup>61</sup>This agrees with Pseudo-Philo’s remark that Saul did not find a prophet after Samuel’s death, cf. *LAB*, 64:3.

<sup>62</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 350.

<sup>63</sup>This standard translation for נגיד is also used in 1 Kgs 1:35; 14:7; 16:2; 2 Kgs 20:5; Isa. 55:4. For the meaning of נגיד, cf. E. Lipiński, “*Nāgīd*, der Kronprinz”, *VT* 24 (1974), 497-99; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 178-79.

<sup>64</sup>Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 363-64.

it is used in the sense of “to be comforted”, the subject is mostly a human being.<sup>65</sup> The underlying meaning of the verb is that the subject’s feelings change, either from positive to negative or *vice versa*.

In those verses where the subject is human, and where the verb is used in the sense of “to be comforted”, TJon used the Aramaic *Ithpeel* נָחַם, ‘to be comforted’.<sup>66</sup> In Jer. 31:19 it is translated with אֲתַרְחֵם, ‘be shown mercy’.

In those verses where God is the subject, the main sense of the verb is ‘to regret’. It is mostly translated by the Aramaic verb תָּוֹב, ‘to turn back’.<sup>67</sup> Not the feeling of regret is mentioned, but the accompanying action (>14). “God’s decisions are not portrayed as whimsical and liable to moody changes.”<sup>68</sup> In some verses a different rendering is used, because the verb תָּוֹב had already been used. The second rendering is either כָּרַב, ‘to lie, to deny’ (1 Sam. 15:29), אֲתַרְחֵם, ‘to show mercy’ (Ezek. 24:14; Joel 2:14; Jon. 3:9), or none at all (Jer. 4:28).

With regard to the verb נָחַם TJon consistently recast God’s feelings into acts. This shows TJon’s great reverence and reserve in this respect, as well as its attention to the problem of what is properly said of God.<sup>69</sup> Therefore, TJon treated the word “regret” as metaphorical language and replaced the feeling expressed with it by an accepted behaviour.

נָצִיב, *garrison*, see Aramaic אֲסַרְטִינָא.

נָצַל, *to rescue*, see Aramaic פָּרַק.

סֵלַע, *rock*, see Hebrew צוּר.

עָבַד, *to serve*, see Aramaic פָּלַח.

עִבְרִי, *Hebrew*, see Aramaic יְהוּדָאָה.

עֹלָם, *long period, eternity*, see Aramaic עֲלַמָּא.

<sup>65</sup>Cf. HALAT<sup>3</sup>, s.v.

<sup>66</sup>This is the case in TJon Judg. 21:6, 15; 2 Sam. 13:39; Jer. 13:15; Ezek. 14:22; 31:16; 32:31. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 628 gives another interpretation of this Aramaic verb in TgJudg. 21:6, 15.

<sup>67</sup>This is the case in TJon Judg. 2:18; 1 Sam. 15:11, 29, 35; 2 Sam. 24:16; Isa. 57:6; Jer. 4:28; 15:6; 18:8, 10; 20:16; 26:13, 19; 42:10; Joel 2:13; Amos 7:3, 6; Jon. 3:10; 4:2; Zech. 8:14.

<sup>68</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 365.

<sup>69</sup>Not necessarily its anti-anthropopathism, because God’s anger and love are still present in TJon; see Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 365; against Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 134, cf. also n. 37.

עון, *assault, sin*, see Aramaic חובא.

עיר, *town, village*, see Aramaic קרחתא.

עמד, *to stand, to serve*, see Aramaic פלח.

ענה, *to answer, to react*, see Aramaic קביל.

פרה, *to ransom*, see Aramaic פרק.

פלט, *to bring to safety*, see Aramaic פרק.

פלל, *to pray*, see Aramaic צלא.

פקד, *to call up, to miss, to examine, to visit*. Due to its variety of meanings the Hebrew verb פקד is equated with a variety of Aramaic equivalents. When it is used in the sense of 'to call up, to muster', TJon usually uses the Peal of מנא, e.g. in Josh 8:10 and 1 Sam. 15:4. Sometimes the Pael of this verb fits better, especially when people are appointed in responsible jobs (2 Kgs 11:15; 12:12). In cases where the Hebrew verse means 'to miss, to lack', TJon translates according to the co-text and chooses verbs like שנא, 'to miss' (1 Sam. 25:15), or בעא, 'to ask' (1 Sam. 20:6).

The more figurative meaning of 'examine' is replaced by סער, 'to examine', either in the Peal (1 Sam. 14:17) or in the Aphel (1 Sam. 17:8; 2 Sam. 3:8). Furthermore, the other non-literal meaning of 'to visit' is rendered דכר, 'to remember' (Judg. 15:1; 1 Sam. 15:2; 2 Kgs 9:34). If God is the subject of this visiting, the reverential circumlocution עלל דוכרנא קדם יי, 'the memory went in before the LORD' is used (1 Sam. 2:21, but cf. 1 Sam. 1:11, 19).<sup>70</sup> A special use of Hebrew פקד is found in 2 Kgs 5:24, where it is translated by the Pael of Aramaic פקד, 'to arrange'.

פרץ, *to break loose*, see Aramaic אפך.

פשע, *crime, to commit a crime*, see Aramaic חובא.

צבא, *host*. Hebrew צבא becomes חילא, 'army, strength'.<sup>71</sup> In every case of the Hebrew combination יהוה צבאות, however, it is not rendered, but integrated in the translation as יי צבאות, as if the second word were a name, too. Therefore, Aramaic יהוה צבאות can best be rendered 'the LORD Šebaoth'.

<sup>70</sup>Cf. also Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 575, nn. 1486-87.

<sup>71</sup>Aramaic חילא is also used in 2 Sam. 22:5, 33, 40 with the sense of "strength".

צדיק, *righteous*. Hebrew צדיק is mostly equated with Aramaic זכא, 'innocent' (e.g. in 1 Sam. 24:18). Likewise, Hebrew צדקה is rendered with זכוחא, 'innocence, merit' (e.g. in 1 Sam. 12:7; 2 Sam. 22:21). Twice in TgSam the Hebrew verb צדק is rendered רין קשטא, 'judge truthfully' (2 Sam. 15:4; 23:3), although the same verb is translated by the verb זכא in 2 Sam. 15:4 (in the margin of CR) and 1 Kgs 8:32.

The rendering זכא is due to the fact that the Hebrew word צדקה changed in meaning. In Biblical Hebrew it could well be used as a synonym of משפט, but in Rabbinic Hebrew it can best be translated by "charity" (cf. San. 6b). Obviously, the translators of TJon realized this shift in meaning, and therefore chose not to maintain the stem צדק.

Still, the word צדיקא is used in TJon to denote the group of people worthy to rise to eternal life (e.g. 1 Sam. 2:8, 9; 2 Sam. 22:29; 23:4). In those verses it is always used in the plural form. This agrees with its usage in the N.T., e.g. the righteous who are to shine in the kingdom of heaven (Mt. 13:43, 49).<sup>72</sup>

In some MSS the word is also added to describe some Biblical heroes, such as Manoah (TgJudg. 12:9 in MS f), Samson (TgJudg. 15:15 in MS f), Moses and Aaron (TgJudg. 18:3 in MS f; TJon 1 Sam. 2:6 in MS f), and Abraham (TJon 1 Sam. 17:43 in MS c), all in Palestinian fragments. A similar usage is attested in writings of the Second Temple period, Noah (Sir. 44:17), Abel (T. Benj. 7:4), Henoch (Hen. 1:2; T. Lev. 10:5; T. Jud. 18:1; T. Dan. 5:6; T. Benj. 9:1), as well as in the N.T., e.g. Joseph (Mt. 1:19), Abel (Mt. 23:35; Heb. 11:4), and Lot (2 Pet. 2:7). It becomes commonplace in rabbinic literature,<sup>73</sup> but is conspicuously absent in Qumran.

Examples of the reverse phenomenon can also be given. Rome is indicated with the epithet "guilty" (1 Sam. 2:5), while the pharaoh of Egypt is called "wicked" (2 Sam. 22:9).

צדק, *to be right*, see Hebrew צדיק.

צדקה, *righteousness*, see Hebrew צדיק.

צור, *rock*. The figuratively used צור is rendered according to its implied meaning, i.e. strength (>13).<sup>74</sup> Thus, God is called "strong" (זקיק)

<sup>72</sup>See also TgIsa. 5:20; 21:12; 24:15; 45:7.

<sup>73</sup>Cf. R. Mach, *Der Zaddik in Talmud und Midrasch* Leiden 1957.

<sup>74</sup>This usage does not occur in TJon Josh., Judg. and Kgs, but is attested in several Targumim on Deut. 32:4, 15, 18, 30, 31 and in TgIsa. 26:4; 44:8. Cf. A. Wiegand, 'Der Gottesname צור und seine Deutung um dem Sinne Bildner oder

in TJon 1 Sam. 2:2 and 2 Sam. 22:32; “the Strong One” in 2 Sam. 22:47 and 23:3; and “Strength” in 2 Sam. 22:3 and 47.<sup>75</sup> In the verses where Hebrew צור occurs twice, a second rendering is given (>18). In TJon 2 Sam. 22:3 Aramaic רחצנא, ‘security’ is used. Moreover, also the figurative סלע becomes תקפא (2 Sam. 22:2).

צלח, *to be strong, to be successful*, see Aramaic רוחא.

קול, *voice*, see Aramaic מימרא.

קניי, *Kenite*, see Aramaic שלמאא.

קרא, *to call, to read*, see Aramaic צלא.

רוח, *wind, spirit*, see Aramaic רוחא.

רעה, *evil*, see Aramaic חובא.

שדה, *field, space, territory*, see Aramaic קרהא.

שאל, *to ask, to inquire*, see Aramaic שאל.

שבט, *tribe, staff*. In cases where Hebrew שבט is used in the sense of ‘tribe’, the Aramaic rendering is also שבטא (cf. *e.g.* 2 Sam. 7:7). The rendering בני, ‘sons of’, in 1 Sam. 15:17 is an exception. In all other cases the word שבטא is avoided and other words are used, *e.g.* גיסא, ‘javelin’ (2 Sam. 18:14), חוטרא, ‘staff, rod’ (2 Sam. 23:12), or קולמוסא, ‘pen’ (Judg. 5:14). In 2 Sam. 7:14 Hebrew שבט is used metaphorically and TJon replaces it by its intended meaning (>13).

שחט, *to slaughter*, see Hebrew זבח.

שלח, *to send*, see Aramaic שדר.

שלם, *peace offering*, see Hebrew זבח.

---

Schöpfer in der alten jüdischen Litteratur’, *ZAW* 10 (1890), 85-96. For the Old Testament background of this epithet see P. Sanders, *The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32* (OTS, 37), Leiden 1996, 141-43, 357-60. Another explanation is given in MekY, *Shirata*, 8; TanB, *Vayyiqra*, 4:3; MTeh. 18:26, where it is connected with the verb צור, ‘shape, build, paint’. This phrase points at the uniqueness of God as Creator.

<sup>75</sup>This is a common explanation in Syr and Vg. Also the LXX avoids a literal translation of this epithet, cf. S. Olofsson, *God is my Rock: A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (CB.OT, 31), Stockholm 1990. Cf. A.L. Warren, “A Trisagion Inserted in the 4QSam<sup>a</sup> Version of the Song of Hannah, 1 Sam. 2:1-10”, *JJS* 45 (1994), 278-85, esp. 283, n. 30.



שלל, *booty, plunder*. Hebrew שלל is equated with Aramaic בִּזְזָא and by עֲדָאָה. Aramaic בִּזְזָא, 'plunder, spoil', is used where Israel's enemies had attacked and plundered. This is how it functions in TJon Josh. 22:8; Judg. 5:30; 1 Sam. 14:32 (Israel turns to the things that the Philistines had taken from Israel); 1 Sam. 30:19, 26 (David brings Amalek's booty back to Israel). Aramaic בִּזְזָא could also function where Israel took illegal booty, e.g. in the case of Ai (Josh. 7:21) and Amalek (1 Sam. 15:19, 21).

In cases where Israel took booty from its enemies in a legal way Aramaic עֲדָאָה, 'removed things, booty', is preferred. This translation is used in TJon Josh. 8:2, 27; 11:14; 2 Sam. 3:22; 8:12; 12:30. The difference between the two translations becomes clear in 1 Sam. 30. The spoil of the Amalekites is called בִּזְזָא (1 Sam. 30:19, 26), while David's spoil is called עֲדָאָה (1 Sam. 30:20, 22). The only exception is Amalek's booty in 30:16, which is called עֲדָאָה, whereas one would expect בִּזְזָא.<sup>76</sup>

שמע, *to hear, to listen, to obey*, see Aramaic קִבִּיל.

שנא, *to hate*, see Aramaic בַּעִיל דְּבַבָּא.

שפחה, *maidservant*, see Aramaic אַמְתָּא.

שרת, *to serve*, see Aramaic פִּלַּח.

### 4.3 The Usage of Certain Aramaic Words

This section consists of discussions of certain Aramaic words used in TJon. It is no dictionary, but displays the use of these words within the Targumic text. It shows which Hebrew equivalents could be represented by these words, and why TJon chose for simplification in these cases.

אֲזַנְרָא, *messenger*, see Hebrew מַלְאָךְ.

אִפְרָדָא, *ephod, cultic garment*, see Hebrew אִפְרֹדִית.

אל, *God, El*, see Hebrew אֵל.

אלהא, *God*, see Hebrew אֱלֹהִים and Hebrew אֵל.

אלוהים, *Elohim*, see Hebrew אֱלֹהִים.

<sup>76</sup>The translation in TgJudg. 8:24 might also be an exception, unless TJon indirectly suggested that the Midianites took the earrings from the Arabs. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 516, however, assumed that TJon identified the Midianites with the Arabs.

אִלְפָנָא, *teaching, instruction*. The use of the word אִלְפָנָא creates an anachronistic impression, because it refers to the halakhic tradition received from former generations.<sup>77</sup> This meaning is not necessarily present in TJon 1 Sam. 3:7 and 1 Sam. 12:2 (in the margin of CR), where Samuel and his sons are said to receive instruction from the LORD, but is certainly present in the phrase בֵּית אִלְפָנָא, “house of study, Talmud School”, used in 1 Sam. 10:22 (MS f<sub>6</sub>) and in 1 Sam. 19:18, 19, 22, 23; 20:1.<sup>78</sup> In these verses TJon makes an actualization by depicting Samuel head of a rabbinic school, while Saul and David were his pupils.<sup>79</sup> Note that also the prophetess Huldah is in the בֵּית אִלְפָנָא (2 Kgs 22:14).<sup>80</sup> Hebrew נֹחַ in 2 Sam. 15:25 is translated by “sanctuary”, since it applies to the place of the ark, and not to the place of the prophet.<sup>81</sup>

This בֵּית אִלְפָנָא is most probably the name of the Talmud Schools, where adult students were trained in Talmudic dialectic.<sup>82</sup> Young students first went to the בֵּית סֵפֶר, an elementary school where reading and writing was taught and where Scripture was the basic teaching material, and later to the בֵּית מִשְׁנָה, a secondary school for teenagers where they studied Mishnaic tradition.<sup>83</sup>

אָמַר, *to say*, see Hebrew נָאֵם.

אִמְרָא, *speech, utterance*, see Hebrew נָאֵם.

אִמְרָא, *maidservant*. Aramaic אִמְרָא is the translation of both Hebrew אִמָּה and שִׁפְחָה (see e.g. 1 Sam. 1:16, 18). Any difference between these two Hebrew words has faded away.

אִנְשָׁא, *man, people*. TJon often adds the word אִנְשָׁא, to make its translation more precise. Usually אִנְשָׁא is used in the singular mode. It is added before בֵּיתָא, ‘the people of someone’s house’ (e.g. in 1 Sam. 1:21); before a place name, ‘the people of Aram’ (e.g. in 2 Sam.

<sup>77</sup>W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*, Vol. 2, Leipzig 1905, repr. Darmstadt 1965, s.v. אִלְפָנָא.

<sup>78</sup>The Talmud School here is a translation of Hebrew נִיּוּחַ.

<sup>79</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 101-102.

<sup>80</sup>Many other references to the Talmud School can be found in the Targumim, cf. A. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targumic Exegesis* (TSAJ, 27), Tübingen 1992, 27, 51.

<sup>81</sup>A similar connection is made by Zev. 54b: Samuel and David were in נִיּוּחַ to look for the correct site of the Temple.

<sup>82</sup>M. Aberbach, “Educational Institutions and Problems During the Talmudic Age”, *HUCA*, 36 (1966), 107-20, esp. 110.

<sup>83</sup>Aberbach, “Educational Institutions and Problems”, 107.

10:9); and before a place-name as substitution of the Hebrew gentilic, 'the people of Ziph' instead of 'the Ziphites' (e.g. in 1 Sam. 26:1).

אֲסַטְרִיָּא, *military magistrate, praetor*. Hebrew מִצָּב, 'outpost', and נָצִיב, 'garrison', are rendered with the Graecism אֲסַטְרִיָּא, also spelled as אֲצַטְרִיָּא.<sup>84</sup> This Greek word was used for military commanders in the first place, but also for certain types of military governors. In Greece a military magistrate of a city could be called στρατηγός (cf. Acts 16:20-38), Athens had ten magistrates of this kind. The Romans used the word for military governors in foreign provinces, but also commanders lower in rank could be called στρατηγός, such as the officers of the temple guard (cf. Lk. 22:4, 52; Acts 4:1; 5:24, 26).<sup>85</sup>

In TJon this Greek word is used to denote military or semi-military governors in cities or in countries. The word is therefore rendered in this book by "praetor"—another barbarism. The Philistines had "praetors" in Gibeah (1 Sam. 10:5; 13-14) and in Bethlehem (2 Sam. 23:14), David appointed "praetors" in Aram (2 Sam. 8:6) and in Edom (2 Sam. 8:14). King Solomon had many officers in foreign countries (1 Kgs 5:7, 30; 9:23), but he appointed also "praetors" over the twelve tribes in his own country to provide food for his household (1 Kgs 4:5, 7, 19). However, the text sometimes suggests that not only the military commander is referred to, but also his entire garrison (cf. 1 Sam. 14:11, but also Lk. 22:4, 52).

אָפַךְ, *to turn, to retreat*. There are two Hebrew verbs in the text of the Former Prophets meaning "to flee", viz. בָּרַח and נוּס.<sup>86</sup> These verbs

<sup>84</sup>TJon contains several Greek and Latin loan-words; cf. S. Kraus, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*, Bd. 2, Berlin 1899. The somewhat higher proportion of Greek loan-words in the Palestinian Targumim is shared by the tosefta-targum on Samuel, see e.g. 1 Sam. 2:14 f<sub>2</sub> אֲלִפְיָסָא = λoπας (also in TgJudg. 6:19, cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 491); 2 Sam. 3:33 f<sub>3</sub> הַדְיִוִּט = εἰδωλετης; 2 Sam. 4:2 f<sub>2</sub> נִיסָח = γενος; 2 Sam. 18:14 f<sub>3</sub> לִנְיָכִי = λογχη. See on this phenomenon P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, Bd. 2, Stuttgart 1930, 9\*-11\*, but also Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 69, n. 400, with bibliography, as well as J.P. Brown, "The Septuagint as a Source of the Greek Loan-Words in the Targums", *Bib.* 70 (1989), 194-215.

<sup>85</sup>Cf. H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H.S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1968, 1652. Note how the word can also be used for civil governors, e.g. in GenR. 3:6, "The King, who had two governors, one in command by day and the other in command by night . . ."

<sup>86</sup>Hebrew אָפַךְ, 'turn around, change', is translated according to its co-text. TJon uses e.g. the equivalents הִפָּךְ, 'to turn'; הוּר, 'to go around, to return'; or שָׁנָא, 'to change'. Hebrew נוּד, 'to flee, to wander around', does not occur in the

are mainly equated with two Aramaic verbs, *viz.* ערק, 'to flee', and אפך, 'to turn, to flee'. In TJon to the Prophets ערק is used for both Hebrew verbs, while אפך is only used as the equivalent of Hebrew נוס.<sup>87</sup> This phenomenon, as well as all the occurrences of these verbs in the remaining Targumim, led Grossfeld to the conclusion that a later recension is distinguishable here. Comparison of all the usages would show that the verb אפך was preferred later over the already used verb ערק.<sup>88</sup>

In spite of this conclusion concerning the possible date of the verbs, the usage of the Aramaic verbs in TgSam depends on their meaning. The verb אפך is mainly used for the massive retreat of an army,<sup>89</sup> while the verb ערק is mainly used for individual flights, either in battle scenes or elsewhere.<sup>90</sup> Therefore, Aramaic אפך can best be translated by "to retreat", while ערק must be rendered "to flee".<sup>91</sup>

בוזא, *plunder, spoil*, see Hebrew שלל.

ביהא, *house*. TJon usually adds ביה before the names of peoples, tribes or family names (>11). In these cases the word "house" refers to the people belonging to a certain group, as in "house of your father", and "the hill country of the House of Ephraim" (1 Sam. 1:1). This meaning corresponds with its usage in Mt. 10:6, where the "House of Israel" is mentioned in contrast to the Gentiles and the Samaritans. From this usage a new meaning was derived in the Bar Kokhba documents, where "House of Israel" seems to denote the state of Israel.<sup>92</sup> In the Hebrew Bible, however, as well as in rabbinic literature, the expression "House of Israel" is predominantly used for

---

Former Prophets. In the Latter Prophets it is equated with verbs like גלא, 'to go into exile', or טלשל, 'to exile'.

<sup>87</sup>B. Grossfeld, "The Relationship between Biblical Hebrew *brh* and *nws* and their corresponding Aramaic Equivalents in the Targum 'rq, 'zl, 'pk: A Preliminary Study in Aramaic-Hebrew Lexicography", *ZAW* 91 (1979), 107-23, esp. 120-21.

<sup>88</sup>Grossfeld, "The Relationship", 119-20.

<sup>89</sup>*E.g.* the Israelites in 1 Sam. 4:17; the Philistines in 1 Sam. 14:22, the Aramaeans in 2 Sam. 10:14.

<sup>90</sup>*E.g.* David and his men before Absalom in 2 Sam. 17:2; Mephibosheth's nurse in 2 Sam. 4:4; the single messenger in 1 Sam. 4:16.

<sup>91</sup>This division is supported in the other Former Prophets, but exceptions and variant readings exist. For instance, if the word "to flee" is used twice in a verse, TJon prefers to use two different translations (cf. 2 Sam. 10:14). In the Targumim to the Pentateuch the situation is quite different, because the verb אזל is often used as the equivalent for Hebrew ברח; cf. Grossfeld, "The Relationship", 120-21.

<sup>92</sup>D. Goodblatt, "From Judeans to Israel: Names of Jewish States in Antiquity", *JSJ* 29 (1998), 1-36, esp. 33-34.

the liturgical and religious entity of Israel.<sup>93</sup>

Aramaic בית in other constructions appears to be a area designator.<sup>94</sup> On the one hand, it can simply mean “house, building”, as in the combinations בית מקדשא, ‘sanctuary’, and בית אולפנא, ‘Talmud School’. On the other hand, it can best be interpreted as “room” of even as the neutral “place”, as in בית משכבא, ‘sleeping room’, and בית אסחרותך, ‘your dining place’ at the table (1 Sam. 20:18). In one particular combination Aramaic בית resembles the Syriac preposition בל, ‘between’, viz. in the combination of בית עינוהי (1 Sam. 17:49). This can either mean “the place of the eyes, forehead” or, according to the Syriac counterpart, “between the eyes”.<sup>95</sup>

במה אסחרותא, בית אסחרותא, *banqueting hall*, see Hebrew במה.

בית מקדשא, *sanctuary*. Whereas Hebrew היכל is consistently represented by Aramaic היכלא, additional references to any house of God—either in Shiloh (cf. 1 Sam. 2:29) or in Jerusalem itself (cf. 1 Sam. 2:1)—are made by using the term בית מקדשא, ‘sanctuary’.<sup>96</sup> TJon probably chose this general term to create an internal coherence within the texts, in spite of all the different sanctuaries that were in use, and to remind the reader of the sanctity of these buildings.

בית אלפנא, *Talmud School*, see Aramaic אלפנא.

בית תקפא, *stronghold*, see Hebrew במה.

בעא, *to ask*, see Hebrew פקד.

בעיל דבבא, *enemy*. The usual word for “enemy” in prose texts is Hebrew איב, rendered by Aramaic בעיל דבבא. However, since this Aramaic expression is a construct chain itself, the Targumists did not use it at the beginning of construct chains.<sup>97</sup> In those cases the more poetical word סנאה, ‘hater’, is used. For instance, Hebrew איבי המלך, ‘the enemies of the king’, becomes סנאי מלכא (1 Sam. 18:25).<sup>98</sup> Heb-

<sup>93</sup>Goodblatt, “From Judeans to Israel”, 34.

<sup>94</sup>B. Grossfeld, “The Derivative Meaning of the Particle בית in Compound Constructions in the Targum”, *JSP* 19 (1999), 23-34, esp. 27.

<sup>95</sup>B. Grossfeld, “The Derivative Meaning of the Particle בית in Compound Constructions in the Targum”, 23-25; following E. Nestle, “Das syrische Wort *bēt* in Zusammensetzungen”, *ZDMG* 60 (1906), 95-96; T. Nöldeke, *Grammatik der neusyrischen Sprache*, repr. Hildesheim 1974, 51.

<sup>96</sup>Cf. B.D. Chilton, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOT.S, 23), Sheffield 1983, 18; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 607, n. 1667.

<sup>97</sup>Aramaic בעיל דבבא was used with suffixes, e.g. בעילי דבבוי in 1 Sam. 14:47.

<sup>98</sup>So also TJon Judg. 5:31; 1 Sam. 20:15, 16; 25:22; 29:8; 30:26; 2 Sam. 12:14;

rew שלל איביו, 'the booty of his enemies', is likewise rendered by בֹּזֵז (1 Sam. 14:30) in MS p, but many other manuscripts use the equivalent רִכְבָּא (2 Sam. 22:1, 3 (thrice), 4).<sup>100</sup>

In poetical sections the Aramaic equivalent סִנְאָה is preferred, cf. 2 Sam. 22:18, 38, 41, 49.<sup>99</sup> It is noteworthy that the same chapter starts with prose expansions, using the equivalent רִכְבָּא (2 Sam. 22:1, 3 (thrice), 4).<sup>100</sup>

Two exceptions can be found in TgSam. Both in 1 Sam. 25:26 and in 2 Sam. 5:20 Hebrew אֵיב is translated with Aramaic סִנְאָה. In 1 Sam. 25:26 this phenomenon can best be explained as an associative translation, since in 25:22 Aramaic סִנְאָה had to be used in a construct chain. David's utterance in 2 Sam. 5:20 is probably conceived of as poetry ("The LORD has broken my enemies before me, like the breaking of water") and henceforth translated as poetry.

גִּבְעָהּ, *hill, Gibeah*. It remains a mystery how many places existed with the name Gibeah or Geba in the territory of Benjamin. Most authors tend to distinguish at least two different places, namely the place Gibeah of Saul (1 Sam. 10:26; 11:4; 15:34; 23:19; 26:1, 3) and Geba, also called Gibeah of Benjamin (1 Sam. 13-14).<sup>101</sup> Whether "the hill of God" (1 Sam. 10:5, 10) can be identified with Geba—there was a Philistine garrison in both places (cf. 1 Sam. 13:3)—is doubted.<sup>102</sup> The hill in Kiriath-jearim, where the ark of the LORD stayed for a while, is not regarded as a place-name, but as a higher place within a city (cf. 1 Sam. 7:1; 2 Sam. 6:3-4).

TgSam renders both גִּבְעָה and גִּבְעָה with Aramaic גִּבְעָהּ, 'hill', thus identifying Gibeah of Benjamin with Geba (1 Sam. 13-14). Moreover, as in Hebrew there is no visible difference between the words גִּבְעָה, 'hill', and גִּבְעָה, 'Gibeah', there is neither a visible criterion to divide between Aramaic גִּבְעָהּ, 'hill', and גִּבְעָהּ, 'Gibeah'. TJon did not attempt to solve this ambiguity. Therefore, it is impossible to decide whether TgSam situated the ark in Gibeah or on a hill in Kiriath-jearim. The situation is even more complex, because "the

18:32.

<sup>99</sup>Note that the first occurrence in 22:18, 41 is rendered with סִנְאָה, whereas the second is rendered with רִכְבָּא (>18).

<sup>100</sup>A.S. Rodrigues Pereira, *Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E.-c. 600 C.E.): Selected Jewish, Christian and Samaritan Poems*, Leiden (diss.) 1996, 52 only mentions the two equivalents.

<sup>101</sup>HALAT<sup>3</sup>, s.vv., agrees in most details with J. Simons, *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament*, Leiden 1959, 311-14 and Driver, *Notes*, 80, 98. However, J. Maxwell Miller, "Geba/Gibeah of Benjamin", *VT* 25 (1975), 145-66 that Geba, Gibeah and probably Gibeath-elohim were essentially identical.

<sup>102</sup>By HALAT<sup>3</sup>. Not by Simons, *GTT*, 313 and Driver, *Notes*, 80.

hill of God" (1 Sam. 10:5, 10) is rendered with "the hill on which the ark of the LORD was", identifying this hill with the hill in Kiriath-jearim. But since "the hill of God" was also the place of the Philistine garrison (1 Sam. 10:5), it seemed to be identified with Geba, where the Philistine garrison was (1 Sam. 13:3), as well. Even Gibeah of Saul could have been part of this identification.<sup>103</sup>

In the present study Aramaic גבעתא is rendered into English with "the hill" or "The Hill", although there is no visible difference between the word and the place-name.

גיהנום, *Gehenna*. The name Gehenna originates from the Hebrew name גיא הנם, the valley of Hinnom (Josh. 15:8; 18:16; Neh. 11:30).<sup>104</sup> This Hebrew name, however, is rendered into Aramaic by חלה הנום. According to popular belief in the Second Temple Period this valley was the place of judgment and punishment.<sup>105</sup> It is evolved into the place of punishment after God's final judgment. In this sense it is found in TJon, but also in other ancient Jewish literature, including the NT.

דבח, *to sacrifice*, see Hebrew זבח.

דבחה, *sacrifice*, see Hebrew זבח.

דבר, *to lead, to bring*, see Hebrew לקח.

דוכרנא, *memory*, see Hebrew פקד.

דחלהא, *fear, respect, deity*, see Hebrew אלהים.

דינא, *judicial process, lawsuit*, see Hebrew משפט.

דכר, *to remember*, see Hebrew פקד.

הוה מלכא, *to be king*. Hebrew combinations like משה למלך, 'to anoint king' or פקד למלך, 'to appoint king' are usually expanded with the auxiliary verb הוה. It is not likely that TJon vocalized Hebrew מלך

<sup>103</sup> An even greater complex of identifications can be found in the Midrashim, cf. e.g. LevR. 4:20, where Gibeah, the hill in Kiriath-jearim and the high place of Gibeon are identified. Against Simons, *GTT*, 312: the identification of Gibeah of Saul with Geba/Gibeah of Benjamin is not so unlikely, since Saul seemed to be familiar there (1 Sam. 10:9-16) and especially since he started the war against the Philistine garrison in his own town (1 Sam. 13:3).

<sup>104</sup> On the Old Testament usage, see J. Day, *Molech: A God of Human Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, Cambridge 1989, 52-57.

<sup>105</sup> W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin & New York <sup>5</sup>1971, s.v. γέεννα.

as a verb, for the same addition is made in combinations such as *המלך למלך*, 'to make king' (cf. 1 Sam. 15:11) and *בחר לכהן*, 'to choose as priest' (cf. 1 Sam. 2:28).<sup>106</sup>

*הלכא*, *custom*, see Hebrew *משפט*.

*זכא*, (*be*) *innocent*, see Hebrew *צדיק*.

*זכותא*, *innocence*, *merit*, see Hebrew *צדיק*.

*חובא*, *debt*, *guilt*. Together with the verb *חוב* and the adjective *חויבא*, Aramaic *חובא* is used as the main equivalent of various words for sin, crime and guilt in the Former Prophets (>11, simplification).<sup>107</sup> In the first place, it is the rendering of Hebrew *חטא* and *חטאת*, 'sin', although TJon also uses these words, especially in the expression *רחיל חטאין*, 'fearing sins, avoiding sins' (1 Sam. 10:26; 2 Sam. 23:20; 1 Kgs 1:42, 52; 2 Kgs 4:8). Furthermore, *חטאת* is used in the sense of 'sin offering' (TJon 2 Kgs 12:17) and 'major offence' (TJon Judg. 20:6).

In the second place it is the translation of many other words for sin, *viz.* *אין*, only occurring in 1 Sam. 15:23, *אשם*, except in the sense of 'guilt offering', *e.g.* in 2 Sam. 14:13, *דם*, in the figurative sense of 'blood guilt', *e.g.* in TJon 1 Sam. 1:16, *עון*, *e.g.* in TJon 1 Sam. 3:13-14, *פשע*, *e.g.* in 1 Sam. 25:28, and *רעה*, *e.g.* in TJon 1 Sam. 24:12; 26:18, although the Aramaic *בישרא* is its usual translation. Whenever the word *חוב* would have been used twice in one verse, the Targumist uses a different translation for one of the occurrences (>18), such as *סרחנא*, 'revolt' (1 Sam. 20:1; 24:12), or *מרד*, 'rebel' (1 Kgs 8:50).

This simplification is found neither in LXX, nor in the New Testament. Still, the use of a word meaning 'guilt, debt' as rendering of the idea of sin or evil is found in the New Testament. In two parables remission of debt is used as an image for the forgiveness of sins.<sup>108</sup> Besides, the Greek word *ὀφείλω*, 'owe, be obliged, be in debt', and its derivations are also found with the meaning 'sin, offence' (Mt. 6:12; Lk. 11:4; 13:4), and are in their usage and meaning influenced

<sup>106</sup> Against Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung*, 45.

<sup>107</sup> There are some more equivalents in the Former Prophets (see below) and in the Latter Prophets, such as *עריא*, 'wickedness, sin', cf. TgIsa. 43:24; 53:4, 5; Hos. 7:1.

<sup>108</sup> Mt. 18:23-35; Lk. 7:41-42. Parables like this are also found in rabbinic literature, cf. the references in H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Vol. 1: Mattäus, München <sup>6</sup>1974, 799.



by the Aramaic verb חרב.<sup>109</sup>

The choice of the word חרבא as the rendering of all kinds of sin means theologically that TJon considered the relationship between God and man as a balance, in which merit (זכרוא) and debt played a role. Several times TJon refers to the merit of the fathers, which could also be transferred to later generations. However, TJon did not assume that someone's guilt could be transferred to other people. People would not suffer for the sins of their fathers, except when they perpetuated their fathers' sinfulness.<sup>110</sup>

חוייא, *seer*, see Aramaic נביא.

חשא, *to sin*, see Aramaic חרבא.

חשאח, *sin*, see Aramaic חרבא.

חיא, *life*, see Hebrew חי.

חירבא, *guilty*. Nearly all sinners and criminals are referred to with Aramaic חירבא, 'guilty', see above, Aramaic חרבא. A special case is found in TJon 2 Sam. 5:6-8, where "the lame and the blind" became חשאיא חירבא, 'sinners and offenders' (see below, commentary on 2 Sam. 5:6).

חשוחא, *idol*, see Hebrew אלהים.

יהודאה, *Judaean, Jew*. The name "Hebrew" was considered unfit for the Aramaic translation, for it was mostly used as a name of honour instead of a gentile name.<sup>111</sup> Thus it is frequently attested in the Books of the Maccabees and by the apostle Paul (1 Cor. 11:22; Phil. 3:5). This denotation stressed that a person was a descendant of Abraham, but also that he stayed faithful to his language and culture.<sup>112</sup> It was still in use, even by foreign authors such as Tacitus.<sup>113</sup> In the Second Temple Period, however, the name was also

<sup>109</sup>H. Balz, G. Schneider, *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Bd. 2, Stuttgart 1981, s.v. ὀφείλω. In LXX this verb does not occur with the meaning 'sin, crime'. The usual translation of Hebrew חשא is ἀμαρτία, as is the most occurring word for sin in the New Testament.

<sup>110</sup>E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible; Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), Berlin & New York 1988, 110.

<sup>111</sup>TWNT, s.v. ישראֵל, Vol. 3, 368.

<sup>112</sup>TWNT, s.v. ישראֵל, Vol. 3, 369; J. Gnllka, *Der Philipperbrief* (ThKNT, 10/3), Freiburg 1976, 190. Cf. Acts 6:1, although J. Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB), Garden City (NY), 1967, 292 states that this verse refers to the Samaritans and not to Jews.

<sup>113</sup>Tacitus, *Hist.* 5:2, quoted by D.B. Redford, "The 'Land of the Hebrews' in

claimed by the Samaritans, calling themselves Hebrews after their ancestor Abram the Hebrew (Gen. 14:13).<sup>114</sup> In Qumran the name 'Hebrew' is absent. Mostly 'Israel' is used, less frequently 'Judah'. In this line of development it is logical that TJon substituted the name "Hebrews" by an actualized name, יהודא, 'Jew' (>19).<sup>115</sup>

The latter name was used since the Hasmonaean reign, albeit only in official documents (1 Macc. 13:42; 14:27-45).<sup>116</sup> Coins from that period (about 120-37 BCE) contain the name of the ruler, mostly accompanied by the term חבר היהודים, 'Association of the Judeans'.<sup>117</sup> Judea was the name of the province under the control of a Roman governor, also when Perea, Galilee and the northwestern territories were later removed.<sup>118</sup> Likewise, it is used in the NT, especially in the Gospel according to John and in Acts. Also Josephus used the term Judaeans to denote all the people of Israel, but merely as a variation of Hebrews and Israelites.<sup>119</sup> The leaders of the second revolt against Rome, however, preferred the names "Israel" and "House of Israel".<sup>120</sup>

יְי, *LORD*. The Name of God, יְי, is in TJon the rendering of the Hebrew Name of God, יהוה.<sup>121</sup> Moreover, it functions as the basic translation of Hebrew אלהים, 'God' (see above, Hebrew אלהים), as well as the first translation of Hebrew ארן, 'Lord' (see above, Hebrew ארן). Note that Aramaic יְי is only once added to the text (1 Sam. 9:7). In all other cases TJon preferred to use a *passivum divinum* (>23).

יְקָרָא, *glory, honour*. Like Memra and Shekhinah, the word יְקָרָא is an exegetical manoeuvre to maintain the reverential distance between

Gen. XL 15", *VT* 15 (1965), 529-32.

<sup>114</sup>J. Munck, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB), Garden City (NY), 1967, 292, who quotes Josephus, *Antiquities*, 9:8.

<sup>115</sup>Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 98.

<sup>116</sup>D. Goodblatt, "From Judeans to Israel: Names of Jewish States in Antiquity", *JSJ* 29 (1998), 1-36, esp. 6, 10.

<sup>117</sup>Goodblatt, "From Judeans to Israel", 9.

<sup>118</sup>Cf. L.L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*, Vol. 2: The Roman Period, Minneapolis 1992, 386.

<sup>119</sup>H. St. John Thackeray, R. Marcus, *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities*, Books V-VIII (Loeb Classical Library, 281), Cambridge & London 1988, 179, n. b.

<sup>120</sup>Goodblatt, "From Judeans to Israel", 29, 33.

<sup>121</sup>With a great amount of variant spellings, such as יְי and יְי plus an extra *Yodh* above and/or under the word. Even the Hebrew spelling יהוה is sometimes used. The same representations occur in the Pentateuchal Targumim, cf. A. Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim* (TSAJ, 14), Tübingen 1986, 325, n. 1.

God and man.<sup>122</sup> Whereas Memra is often used in the context of the contact between God and man and Shekhinah to indicate God's dwelling in the tabernacle or in the Temple, the Glory of the LORD is mentioned where He reveals himself. Part of this reverential vocabulary can also be found in the NT, especially in the Gospel according to John, which links the verbs "reveal" and "see" with the word "Glory" (e.g. Jn 12:41).<sup>123</sup>

כרנן, *thus, so*. Hebrew כה, ככה, כזוה or כזואז, and כן, all meaning 'thus, so', are mostly rendered with Aramaic כרין with the same meaning. Only in the phrase "thus said the LORD" TJon uses Aramaic כרנן, also meaning 'thus, so' (e.g. in 1 Sam. 2:27).<sup>124</sup> Only in 1 Sam. 9:9 כרנן is found before the utterance of a man. Other exceptions are found in variant readings.

כהנא, *priest*, see Hebrew כהן.

כמרא, *idol priest*, see Hebrew כהן.

כדרושא, *sleeved tunic*, see Hebrew אפור.

מועד, *festival*, see Hebrew ימימה.

מימרא, *word, speech, Memra*. There is no strong evidence that TJon attempted to avoid anthropomorphisms.<sup>125</sup> Therefore, the use of the

<sup>122</sup>M.L. Klein, "The Preposition קדם ('Before'): A Pseudo-Anti-Anthropomorphism in the Targums," *JThS* 30 (1979), 502-507, esp. 505; B.D. Chilton, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOT.S, 23), Sheffield 1983, 75-77; J.E. Fossum, "Glory", in: K. van der Toorn et al. (eds), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden 1999, 348-52, esp. 349.

<sup>123</sup>J.E. Fossum, "Glory", in: K. van der Toorn et al. (eds), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden 1999, 348-52, esp. 351-352.

<sup>124</sup>This diversification between the divine and the human realm is not often found in TgSam. It might be due to the importance of revelation, and its difference from normal, human speech. A similar kind of diversification is attested in mediaeval and renaissance paintings, on which Jesus is crucified with nails and the two rebels with cords. In this way painters showed that Jesus' sufferings were of a different kind than those of the rebels. Cf. the crucifixions of Hans Baldung (1484/5-1545); Cornelis Engelbrechtsz (1468-1533); and of an unknown Salzburg master on the altar in the Nonnenberg abbey near Salzburg (1435-1461); all in the Kunstmuseum at Basel.

<sup>125</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 107-11 gives an excellent survey of the debate on the word Memra. B.M. Zlotowitz, *The Septuagint Translation of the Hebrew Terms in Relation to God in the Book of Jeremiah, with an Introductory Essay: On Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Septuagint and Targum by Harry M. Orlinsky*, New York 1981, 183 draws the same conclusion with regard to the Greek version: "Even when—and that only quite rarely—the translator

word “Memra” is rather a translation technique to stress reverence for God.<sup>126</sup> “In many instances it is clearly introduced as a verbal buffer—one of many such in the Targum—to keep God from seeming to come to too close quarters with men and things; but it is always a buffer-word, not a buffer-idea; still less a buffer-person.”<sup>127</sup> While “Glory” and “Shekhinah” have other connotations, the word “Memra” has the following meaning, “God present in past, present, and future creation and history through the medium of His saying.”<sup>128</sup> “It is as close as the targumists allow themselves to approach to God’s “I”, and is employed in such situations as those in which God meets with, speaks with, makes a covenant with, and above all “is with” an individual, a group, or a nation.”<sup>129</sup>

Note, however, that Aramaic מִמְרָא is also used for humans. Eli’s sons did not accept their father’s “word” (1 Sam. 2:25), Samuel was to listen to the “speaking” of the people (1 Sam. 8:7), Saul listened to the “speaking” of the people (1 Sam. 15:24), Israel refused to obey Samuel’s “message” (1 Sam. 8:19). The expression מִמְרָא רִיִּי, however, means more than merely “word, speaking, message”, witness its usage in phrases like יהי בטעריך מִמְרָא רִיִּי יהי עמך, ‘the speech of the LORD be in your aid’, which is the regular rendering of יהוה עמך or האלהים עמך.

This use of the word “Memra” is at first based on Ps. 33:4-6, where the word of God is associated with God’s creative action. Philo of Alexandria, amongst others, worked out this verse into one of the several Logos-theologies. In Philo’s writing it is difficult “to interpret

---

rendered a word less than literally (. . .) the sole motive was to make the Hebrew phrase intelligible, but not to avoid any anthropomorphism.”

<sup>126</sup>F.C. Burkitt, “Memra, Shekinah, Metatron”, *JThS* o.s. 24 (1923), 158-59; M.L. Klein, “The Preposition קִדָּם (‘Before’): A Pseudo-Anti-Anthropomorphism in the Targums”, *JThS* 30 (1979), 502-507, esp. 504; Idem, “The Translation of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Targumim,” in: J.A. Emerton, *Congress Volume Vienna 1980* (VT-S, 32), Leiden 1981, 163-77, esp. 177. Against G.H. Box, “The Ideas of Intermediation in Jewish Theology”, *JQR* n.s. 23 (1932/33), 103-119, esp. 110; C. McCarthy, “The Treatment of Biblical Anthropomorphisms in Pentateuchal Targums,” in: K.J. Cathcart, J.F. Healey, *Back to the Sources. Biblical and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Dermot Ryan*, Dublin 1989, 45-66.

<sup>127</sup>G.F. Moore, “Intermediaries in Jewish Theology (Memra, Shekinah, Metatron),” *HTR* 15 (1922), 41-85, esp. 53. Sometimes the idea of a buffer-person does not seem completely impossible, cf. the translation “into the hand of the speech of the LORD” in 2 Sam. 24:14.

<sup>128</sup>C.T.R. Hayward, “Memra and Shekhina: A Short Note,” *JJS* 31 (1980), 210-13, esp. 212.

<sup>129</sup>P. Vermes, “Buber’s Understanding of the Divine Name related to Bible, Targum and Midrash,” *JJS* 24 (1973), 147-66, esp. 152.

the extent to which he accords him separate existence",<sup>130</sup> as in the Johannine literature of the NT.<sup>131</sup> The Targumic use of "Memra" runs more parallel to the rabbinic use of the words "Dibbur" and "Shekhinah" (e.g. in mAv. 5:1; San. 42a),<sup>132</sup> avoiding personalization of these terms, although the rabbis realized the danger of assuming more gods by using more words for Him (tMeg. 3:41).<sup>133</sup>

Whereas פתגמא must be translated with "word" and מלא with "word, thing", the word מימרא is rendered with "speech" in this book. Note also that the standard translation of Hebrew "the LORD be with you" is "the speech of the LORD be in your aid", rendering the Hebrew preposition אה with בטערא.

מחצא, *stroke*. The divergent meanings of Hebrew יד are translated according to their co-text. In cases where Hebrew יד is used in connection with God in a negative connotation, the word is translated with מחצא, 'stroke'. What the Philistines experienced after the capture of the ark of the LORD, was the stroke of the LORD (1 Sam. 5-6). This translation is in accordance with the outcome of a discussion in RuthR. 2:19, where Exod. 9:3 functions as a proof-text for the explanation that Hebrew יד must be read as "pestilence".<sup>134</sup> Whatever the Hebrew original word was in this narrative (יד, מגפה or מכה), TJon renders it with מחצא (>15). Also the ten plagues in Egypt are called מחצא (1 Sam. 4:8).<sup>135</sup> God's stroke is compared with arrows which are fired away by God (2 Sam. 22:15). It is notable that the reverential preposition קדם is not used in TJon 1 Sam. 5-6, whereas it is used in יי קדם מן מחצא in TgJudg. 2:15.

A severe defeat in battle can also be described with the term מחצא. There was a great stroke among the Israelites (1 Sam. 4:8,

<sup>130</sup>D.T. Runia, "Logos", in: K. van der Toorn *et al.* (eds), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden <sup>2</sup>1999, 525-31, esp. 528.

<sup>131</sup>Cf. J. Potin, *La fête juive de la Pentacôte: Étude des textes liturgiques* (LeDiv, 65), Paris 1971, 245-79; M. McNamara, *Targum and Testament: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*, Grand Rapids 1972, 98-106; B.D. Chilton, "Typologies of *memra* and the fourth Gospel", in: P.V.M. Flesher (ed.), *Targum Studies*, Vol. 1: Textual and Contextual Studies in the Pentateuchal Targums, Atlanta 1992, 89-100.

<sup>132</sup>G.H. Box, "The Ideas of Intermediation in Jewish Theology", *JQR* n.s. 23 (1932/33), 103-119, esp. 113; M.L. Klein, "The Translation of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Targumim," in: J.A. Emerton, *Congress Volume Vienna 1980* (VT-S, 32), Leiden 1981, 163-77, esp. 172-73.

<sup>133</sup>G.H. Box, "The Ideas of Intermediation in Jewish Theology", *JQR* n.s. 23 (1932/33), 103-119, esp. 112.

<sup>134</sup>Also Judg. 2:15 is mentioned in this rabbinic discussion; see Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 363.

<sup>135</sup>Cf. TO, TN and TpsJ on Exod. 3:20.

17), among the Philistines (1 Sam. 19:8) and among the followers of Absalom (2 Sam. 17:9; 18:7).

מישרא, *valley, plain*. Aramaic מישרא is the rendering of various Hebrew geographical indications.<sup>136</sup> It is the natural translation of Hebrew בקעה, 'valley-plain' (cf. TgIsa. 41:18; 63:14), מישר, 'plain' (cf. Tg-Josh. 20:8; Isa. 40:4; 42:16), and עמק, 'valley, plain' (e.g. in TgJosh. 10:12), but also other Hebrew words are rendered with "plain", such as בעל in Baal-gad (e.g. in TgJosh. 11:17), in Baal-perazim (2 Sam. 5:20) and in Baal-hazor (2 Sam. 13:23); ערבה, 'desert', which occurs very frequently in the Targums of Joshua and Samuel; אבל, 'brook, watercourse' (e.g. in TgJudg. 7:22); אלון, 'great tree' (e.g. in Tg. 1 Sam. 10:3); יקב, 'wine-press' (in TgJudg. 7:25); and מערה, 'cave' (in TgJudg. 20:33). In all these cases the geographical indication is replaced by "plain", but the geographical name is maintained.

מלאכא, *angel*, see Hebrew מלאך.

מלכא, *king*, see Hebrew מלך.

מנא, *to count*, see Hebrew פקד.

מקדשא, *sanctuary*, see Aramaic בית מקדשא.

מרא, *owner, master*. Aramaic מרא is not used as the translation of any Hebrew word in TgSam. It occurs in additions and expansions of the Hebrew text. It can either be used for God (1 Sam. 15:29; 17:8 (tosefta-targum); 2 Sam. 21:17 (tosefta-targum); 22:29) or for humans (1 Sam. 22:2). In order to distinguish this word from the name of God, it is rendered with "master".

משכנא, *tent, dwelling*, see Hebrew אהל, *tent*.

נבא, *to prophesy*, see Aramaic נביא.

נבואתא, *prophecy*. TJon connected the spirit of God and the words from God with prophecy.<sup>137</sup> Hence the frequent רוח נבואה, 'prophetic spirit', and פתגם נבואה מן קדם יי, 'prophetic word from before the LORD'. The accompanying preposition is עם: the prophetic word is "with" the prophet. Not only is the word נבואתא added in case of an acknowledged prophet, such as Samuel in 1 Sam. 15:10, but also in other cases where God's spirit is active. The spirit of

<sup>136</sup>Cf. Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 28.

<sup>137</sup>The tendency toward indirect communication with Israel through the Spirit is already attested in the Books of Chronicles, cf. J.M. Myers, *I Chronicles* (AB), Garden City (NY) <sup>2</sup>1974, lxv.

prophecy came over Saul (TJon 1 Sam. 10:10), although he was not called a prophet but a scribe (TJon 1 Sam. 10:12).<sup>138</sup>

Sometimes the word 'prophecy' is added in the introduction to direct speech. This was not done to justify the actualization of this text in TJon, for actualization was done more often than in these texts alone (>19), but probably to indicate the nature of the source text being translated.<sup>139</sup> Hannah's Song, David's Psalm and David's Last Words are indicated as such (1 Sam. 2:1; 2 Sam. 22:1; 23:1-2).

The word *נבואתא* is also used as a translation of Hebrew *חזון* and *חזיון*, both 'vision' (TJon 1 Sam. 3:1; 2 Sam. 7:17),<sup>140</sup> although Samuel's vision is referred to with the double *נבואתא חזיון*, 'the prophetic vision' (TJon 1 Sam. 3:15).<sup>141</sup>

*נביא*, *prophet*. The prophet in TJon is the transmitter of God's word<sup>142</sup> and the interpreter of events, in history, present times and in the future.<sup>143</sup> According to TJon's way of simplification (>11), all the terms in the Hebrew original used to denote a God-inspired man are rendered with Aramaic *נביא*, 'prophet', such as *נביא* itself (e.g. 2 Sam. 12:25), *איש האלהים*, 'man of God' (e.g. 1 Sam. 9:6), and once even *חזה*, 'seer' (2 Sam. 24:11 in MS c), normally equated with *חזויא*. In the same way, all terms used to convey the idea of speaking as a prophet are rendered with Aramaic *נבא*, 'prophecy', such as *אמר*, 'say' (e.g. 1 Sam. 9:6), *קרא*, 'call' (e.g. 1 Kgs 13:4), or *חזיון/חזון*, 'vision' (1 Sam. 3:1; 2 Sam. 7:17).<sup>144</sup>

<sup>138</sup>For the strong link between God's Spirit and prophecy, cf. J.P. Schäfer, "Die Termini 'Heiliger Geist' und 'Geist der Prophetie' in den Targumim und das Verhältnis der Targumim zueinander", *VT* 20 (1970), 304-14; Idem, *Die Vorstellung vom Heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur* (SANT, 28), München 1972, 23, 62. Note that the term 'prophetic spirit' is only used in TO and TJon, while TN, FT, the Talmudim and Midrashim use 'holy spirit'. TpsJ uses both expressions, cf. Schäfer, "Die Termini", 308, 313.

<sup>139</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 396-97 and the literature in 396, n. 408.

<sup>140</sup>So also Isa. 1:1; for *חזיון*, see Isa. 21:2; 29:11.

<sup>141</sup>The same double rendering is given for Hebrew *נראה* in TgEzek. 1:1; 8:3; 40:2.

<sup>142</sup>J. Ribera Florit, "Prophecy according to Targum Jonathan to the Prophets and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch", in: P.V.M. Fleisher (ed.), *Targum Studies*, Vol. 1: Textual and Contextual Studies in the Pentateuchal Targums, Atlanta 1992, 61-74, esp. 61; Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets*, 74-9.

<sup>143</sup>Comparable to Josephus' definition of the prophet, cf. L.H. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Samuel", *Abr-Nahrain* 30 (1992), 103-41, esp. 103.

<sup>144</sup>Cf. A.J. Saldarini, "Is Saul also among the Scribes?": Scribes and Prophets in Targum Jonathan", in: H.J. Blumberg et al. (eds), "Open Thou Mine Eyes . . ." *Essays on Aggadah and Judaica Presented to Rabbi William G. Braude . . .*, New Jersey 1992, 239-53, esp. 240.

In many respects TJon's view on prophets and prophetism corresponds to the image of prophets in Josephus' *Antiquities*. Josephus, too, saw prophets as the speakers of God.<sup>145</sup> Prophets, at least the prophets of the LORD, always told the truth (*Antiquities* 8:417).<sup>146</sup> In many instances Josephus adds the title of prophet, although the Hebrew original gave no inducement.<sup>147</sup> Similarly, TJon calls Hannah's Song (1 Sam. 2:1-10) and David's Psalm and Last Words (2 Sam. 22; 23:1-7) a prophecy. The combination of "scribes and priests" are favoured in both TJon and Josephus' *Antiquities*.<sup>148</sup> This combination also occurs in the New Testament, symbolizing the spiritual authorities in the land of Israel.<sup>149</sup>

Finally, the combination of prophecy and music in 1 Chron. 25:1-3 gave rise to the thought that many poems were in fact prophecy.<sup>150</sup> Consequently, the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. 2:1-10) and the poems of David (2 Sam. 22; 23:1-7) are considered prophecy. This phenomenon is also present in Lk. 1:67 where the *Benedictus* of Zechariah is introduced with the words that Zechariah "prophesied".

נחם, *to comfort*, see Hebrew נחם.

משפט, *law, right, custom*, see Hebrew מִשְׁפָּט.

זבח, *to slaughter*, see Hebrew זָבַח.

נכסתא, *slaughtering*, see Hebrew זָבַח.

לקיח, *to take*, see Hebrew לָקַח.

בעיל רבבא, *to hate*, see Aramaic בעיל רבבא.

נביא, *scribe*, see Aramaic נביא.

<sup>145</sup>Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Samuel", 103.

<sup>146</sup>Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Samuel", 106. Cf. 1 Sam. 9:6.

<sup>147</sup>Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Samuel", 103.

<sup>148</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 11:128; 12:142; cf. Hayward, "Some Notes on Scribes and Priests", 213.

<sup>149</sup>Mt. 2:4; 5:20; 16:21; 20:18; 21:15; 27:41; Mk 11:18, 27; 14:1, 43; 15:1; Lk. 20:19; 22:2, 66; 23:10. In early Christianity this combination is explained as a fulfilment of Jacob's prophecy "Simeon and Levi are brothers" in Gen. 49:5. While the priests were descendants of Levi, the scribes were from the tribe of Simeon. See also TO on this verse, cf. M. Aberbach, B. Grossfeld, *Targum Onqelos on Genesis 49* (SBL-AS, 1), Missoula (MT) 1976, 7, n. 7.

<sup>150</sup>U. Simon, *Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms: From Saadiah Gaon to Abraham Ibn Ezra*, Albany 1991, 188. Even the word "song" could refer to prophecy (Deut. 32:1). The combination of prophecy and praise occurs in TJon Judg. 5:1-3; 1 Sam. 10:10-11; 2 Sam. 22:1 and indirectly in TJon 1 Sam. 2:1; Lk. 2:27, 36-38.



סער, *to examine*, see Hebrew פקד.

עדאה, *booty, spoil*, see Hebrew שלל.

עלמא, *world, eternity*. In rabbinic Hebrew “עולם is a word that has undergone a clear semantic development (...) from ‘eternity’ to ‘world’, employed in eschatological contexts in constructions that contrast the present and future world.”<sup>151</sup> In rabbinic texts the plain בעולם means ‘in the world’, referring to normal terrestrial time and space. The contrast between the present and the future world is indicated with בְּעוֹלָם הַזֶּה, ‘in this world’, and בְּעוֹלָם הַבָּא, ‘in the world to come’. However, the phrase לעולם still meant ‘forever’, just as in Biblical Hebrew.<sup>152</sup>

In the Aramaic of TJon the same semantic development of the word עלמא is discernible. The plain בעלמא refers to the terrestrial world: God is ruling in the world (1 Sam. 2:6), there are worldly rulers (1 Sam. 2:8) and this world will come to an end and will be judged then (2 Sam. 23:1, 7). The contrast between this world, עלמא הדין (2 Sam. 22:28), and the world to come, עלמא דאחי (2 Sam. 7:19; 23:5) or עלמא דעתיד למיחי (2 Sam. 22:29) is indicated. Still, the meaning ‘eternity’ is present as well in לעלם (e.g. 1 Sam. 15:29; 27:12), עד עלמא (e.g. 1 Sam. 1:22) and phrases like חיי עלמא, ‘eternal life’ (e.g. 1 Sam. 2:6; 25:29).

The same phenomenon can be traced in the use of the Greek αἰών in the N.T. It can mean ‘eternity’ (e.g. 1 Cor. 2:7) or ‘world’ (e.g. Mt. 13:22). A distinction is made between this world, ὁ αἰὼν τούτος (e.g. Rom. 12:2) and the future world, ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων (e.g. Mt. 12:32).<sup>153</sup>

עמא, *people*. Following the saying that God is in heaven and that we are on earth (Qoh. 5:2), implying a division between the divine and the human realm, TJon often inserts the word עמא, ‘people’, before a reference to God, in order to maintain the division. It appears in the Books of Samuel that wars and battle ranks are considered to belong to the human realm. Hebrew “ranks of the LORD” became “ranks of the LORD’s people” (so 1 Sam. 17:26, 36). The “wars of the LORD” became the “wars of the LORD’s people” (1 Sam. 18:17; 25:28). The “enemies of the LORD” are described as the “enemies of the LORD’s

<sup>151</sup>M. Pérez Fernández, *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*, Leiden 1997, 24.

<sup>152</sup>Pérez Fernández, *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*, 24, 82, 173.

<sup>153</sup>Cf. W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin & New York 1971, s.v. αἰών.

people" (1 Sam. 30:26; 2 Sam. 12:14). The same is true for the land, which is called "inheritance of the LORD" in the Hebrew Bible, but "inheritance of the LORD's people" in the Aramaic version (1 Sam. 26:19; 2 Sam. 14:16; 20:19; 21:3).

A similar principle applies to texts in which Aramaic עמא could not be inserted. For instance, whereas the Hebrew Bible implies in 1 Sam. 28:16 that God became Saul's enemy (ויהי ערך, 'and He became your enemy'), the Aramaic version inserted some words referring to David, whom Saul had pursued: ויין בסעדיה דגברא דאת בעיל דבבביה, 'and He is in the aid of the man whose enemy you are'.

ערק, *to flee*, see Aramaic אפך.

עהיד, *future, ready*. Whereas TgSam generally uses the imperfect to express the future, some prophetic passages use the form עהיד. This form can be construed either with the preposition ל plus the infinitive or with the conjunction ד plus the imperfect.<sup>154</sup> The word עהיד occurs only in prophetic parts of the books,<sup>155</sup> aside from its use in TJon 2 Kgs 3:27 where it refers to an unfulfilled human plan: The king of Moab "took his eldest son who *was destined* to reign in his stead, and offered him for a burnt offering upon the wall".

The usage of this word in the prophetic parts of TJon to the Former Prophets cannot lead to the conclusion that these passages must be dated differently.<sup>156</sup> In the Latter Prophets the addition of עהיד to indicate the future is more common. It indicates the certainty or the necessity of a future event, sometimes even its proximity.<sup>157</sup> The latter modality is probably present in 2 Sam. 22:28, where the readers are comforted with the promise "Thy people, the House of Israel, who are called 'poor people' is this age—Thou art *about* to save them."

<sup>154</sup>The combination with the infinitive occurs 16 times in TJon to the Former Prophets, while the combination with the imperfect occurs 10 times.

<sup>155</sup>Only in Deborah's Song (Judg. 5); Hannah's Song (1 Sam. 2:1-10); David's Psalm (2 Sam. 22); and David's Last Words (2 Sam. 23:1-8); and in the prophecies of Solomon (1 Kgs 5:13) and Elisha (2 Kgs 8:1).

<sup>156</sup>Against D.J. Harrington, "The Apocalypse of Hannah: Targum Jonathan of 1 Samuel 2:1-10", in: D.M. Golomb (ed.), *Working with No Data: Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*, Winona Lake 1987, 147-52, esp. 152; K. Koch, "Das apokalyptische Lied der Profetin Hanna: 1 Sam 2,1-10 im Targum", in: W. Zwickel (ed.), *Biblische Welten: Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (OBO, 123), Freiburg & Göttingen 1993, 61-82, esp. 80.

<sup>157</sup>Cf. J. Ribera i Florit, "La función modificado de 'atid en arameo", *Aula Orientalis* 5 (1987), 146-49, esp. 147.

פּלַח, *to serve*. Aramaic פּלַח is a rendering of Hebrew עָבַד, if used in the sense of serving,<sup>158</sup> and, when the context requires this, of some other Hebrew words. Aramaic שָׁמַשׁ is a rendering of Hebrew עָבַד, if used in the sense of serving,<sup>159</sup> שָׂרַת, 'to serve', and, when the context requires this, of some other Hebrew words. Besides, in TgSam שָׁמַשׁ is used as a rendering of the Hebrew Hitpael הִתְהַלֵּךְ, 'to walk, to follow', whereas this Hitpael is equated with Aramaic פּלַח in TgKgs.

The objects of פּלַח and שָׁמַשׁ can be both men, mostly kings, and God or gods. A slight difference in usage can be found between these two verbs, as well as in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Hebrew עָבַד and שָׂרַת stress the act of serving, and so does Aramaic שָׁמַשׁ. Aramaic פּלַח, however, has the connotation of being subject to someone, being in someone's service, without stressing the work. Consequently, Aramaic שָׁמַשׁ can best be interpreted as 'to serve, to work as a servant', while פּלַח can best be translated by 'to be subject to, to worship'. This difference can also be found in the plusses. As a plus, the verb שָׁמַשׁ stresses the working situation (Judg. 5:24). Aramaic פּלַח is used for Hushai in Absalom's service (2 Sam. 16:19) or for David as a subject of King Akis (1 Sam. 27:12), although שָׁמַשׁ is used, too (1 Sam. 29:8).

The noun פּלִיחָא, 'service, worship' functions as an indication of the relationship between men and their God, or gods, and once as an indication of the subjection of men to their king (1 Kgs 12:4). This noun can also be added to clarify the metaphor "to leave God" (*e.g.* in Judg. 2:12).

Aramaic שָׁמַשׁ in TJon should not be confused with Hebrew שָׁמַשׁ in the Midrashim. In the latter books שָׁמַשׁ is the word to express the relationship between disciple and rabbi. The disciple learned from his master by serving him, including things like opening the door for him and serving his meal.<sup>160</sup> In TJon there is no indication that שָׁמַשׁ had this connotation.<sup>161</sup> Sometimes שָׁמַשׁ is added in order to create a reverential distance between God and man. Therefore, it is said that Samuel would be serving before the LORD (1 Sam. 1:28) and not that he was given to the LORD (>23).

<sup>158</sup> Cf. also M. Maher, "The Meturgemanim and Prayer", *JJS* 41 (1990), 226-46, esp. 234-35.

<sup>159</sup> In some cases Hebrew עָבַד is interpreted as reference to prayer, cf. M. Maher, "The Meturgemanim and Prayer", *JJS* 41 (1990), 226-46, esp. 235-36 who cites Jer. 15:1; Ezek. 13:5; 22:30.

<sup>160</sup> P. Lenhardt, P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Rabbi Akiva: Texte und Interpretationen zum rabbinischen Judentum und Neuen Testament* (ANTZ, 1), Berlin 1987, 93.

<sup>161</sup> Against Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 31.

Aramaic עבד is never used in the sense of 'to serve', but always with the meaning 'to do, to make'. Hebrew עבד is thus divided into Aramaic פלח, 'to serve', and עבד, 'to do, to make'. The only exception in TJon to the Former Prophets is 2 Sam. 9:10, where Siba must "serve the land" (פלח), because the meaning 'to do, to make' would not fit.

פלחנא, *worship, service*, see Aramaic פלח.

פרק, *to save*. All the Hebrew verbs meaning "to save", "to ransom", "to rescue", "to escape" or "to bring to safety" are represented by two Aramaic verbs.<sup>162</sup> The rendering שיוב is used for Hebrew נצל, 'to rescue', and פלט, 'to bring to safety', while its Ishtaphal is used for Hebrew מלט, 'to escape'. Both in Hebrew and Aramaic, this group of verbs have the connotation of snatching someone away from an enemy. These verbs are often accompanied by the preposition מן, e.g. "the king delivered us *from* the hand of our enemies" (2 Sam. 19:10).

Hebrew ישע, 'to help, to save', and פדה, 'to ransom', are translated by Aramaic פרק. The latter verb has the more general meaning of saving a person, protecting his life. It is once used unexpectedly in combination with מיד (1 Sam. 2:1), but this is due to the fact that this verb is often used both in the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. 2:1-10) and the Psalm of David (2 Sam. 22); and that these two songs are rendered in close harmony (see below, § 5.3.3).

צבאות, *Sebaoth*, see Hebrew צבא.

צלא, *to pray*. "It is a well-known device of the Targums to transform human utterances to God into prayers."<sup>163</sup> The Aramaic verb צלא is the translation of Hebrew דבר, 'to speak' (1 Sam. 1:13); היה, 'to be' (2 Sam. 18:3); זעק, 'to call for help' (1 Sam. 7:8, 9; 15:11); חלה, 'to flatter' (1 Sam. 13:12); פלל, 'to pray' (1 Sam. 1:10, 12, 26, 27; 2:1; 7:5; 8:6; 12:19, 23; 2 Sam. 7:27); צבא, 'to serve' (1 Sam. 2:22); and קרא, 'to call' (1 Sam. 12:17, 18; 2 Sam. 22:4, 7) in the Books of Samuel. The Aramaic noun צלותא is the translation of Hebrew קול, 'voice' (2 Sam. 22:7), and תפלה, 'prayer' (2 Sam. 7:27), while it is introduced into the text of twelve other verses. This readiness

<sup>162</sup>Cf. A.S. Rodrigues Pereira, *Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E.-c. 600 C.E.): Selected Jewish, Christian and Samaritan Poems*, Leiden (diss.) 1996, 51, who only notes the amount of equivalents, but does not explain it.

<sup>163</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 365; cf. M. Maher, "The Meturgemanim and Prayer", *JJS* 41 (1990), 226-246, esp. 232. The same phenomenon can be traced in Syr, albeit less strict.

to interpret several Hebrew words as references to prayer is also attested in rabbinic literature. Three lists of words are given there which are to be linked to prayer.<sup>164</sup> We may well assume that the Targumists wanted “to instil into their audiences a love for prayer and an appreciation of its efficacy.”<sup>165</sup>

Still, some exceptions can be found, but also explained. In 1 Sam. 8:18 Hebrew זעק is rendered with צוח to make a link with the account of the Exodus (>15). In 2 Sam. 22:7 Hebrew קרא occurs twice and is therefore rendered by צלא and חנן (>18).

צלוהא, *prayer*, see Aramaic צלא.

צלח, *to be successful*. The Aramaic verb צלח is mostly linked to the person of the king in order to describe the fine results of his kingship. The verb can function as the equivalent of many Hebrew verbs, such as חיה, ‘to live’ (1 Sam. 10:24; 2 Sam. 16:16); יכל, ‘to be victorious’ (1 Sam. 26:25); לכד, ‘to capture’ (1 Sam. 14:47); נתן, ‘to give, deliver’ (2 Sam. 16:8); and naturally שכל, ‘to have success’ (1 Sam. 18:5, 14, 15, 30). The latter verb is also used for other persons than kings.

קביל, *Pael, to accept, to receive*. The Aramaic verb קביל is used as the translation of a variety of Hebrew verbs. Its meaning involves obedience and due acceptance.<sup>166</sup> Thus Samuel’s sons accept bribes, not only to enrich themselves, but also to alter their judgment (1 Sam. 8:3). The tribes Reuben and Gad accepted their inheritance (Josh. 13:8). In both verses this verb is the translation of the Hebrew verb לקח, ‘take’.

Besides, קביל can have a figurative meaning. In that case, it is often the rendering of Hebrew שמע, taking this as a *pars pro toto* for obedience (>14). People can accept someone’s word, קביל למימרא (e.g. 1 Sam. 15:20) or God’s commandments (Judg. 3:4). In Amoraic times this usage of the verb קביל, both in Hebrew and in Aramaic, often occurs to indicate that certain rabbis were teaching what they had “received” from tradition, for example, מקבל אני, “I received from tradition” (Sifra Lev. 10:1).<sup>167</sup>

<sup>164</sup>Sifre Deut. 26 and YalqS § 811 give thirteen synonyms; Tan., *Va-Ethannan*, 3 gives nine; and DeutR. 2:1 and YalqS § 157 give ten; cf. M. Maher, “The Meturgemanim and Prayer”, *JJS* 41 (1990), 226-246, esp. 227.

<sup>165</sup>M. Maher, “The Meturgemanim and Prayer”, *JJS* 41 (1990), 226-246, esp. 246.

<sup>166</sup>Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 353.

<sup>167</sup>W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*, Vol. 2, Leipzig 1905, repr. Darmstadt 1965, s.v. קביל. Cf. the Pauline usage of the word in 1 Cor. 11:23.

TJon renders that God accepts prayers, wherever the Hebrew Bible states that God answers them (*e.g.* 1 Sam. 7:9), a clear case of a reverential circumlocution (>23).<sup>168</sup> This rendering is also used for the phrase “He will smell your offering” in 1 Sam. 26:19, which is translated as “your offering will be accepted by his will”.

The combination “accept one’s word” is also attested in the New Testament, where *δέχομαι* (Acts 2:41; 8:14) or *λαμβάνω* (Jn 3:33) is used. The combination “accept one’s prayer” is not attested in the New Testament, but is still preserved in the Roman Catholic liturgy, commencing a prayer with *preces placatus admittere*, “receive our prayer in grace”.<sup>169</sup>

קִרְמ, *before*. The preposition קִרְמ, ‘before’, is the usual translation of Hebrew נֶגַד, although this can also be rendered with קִבֵּיל.

Furthermore, it often occurs in TgSam as a rendering of Hebrew prepositions. In the case of composite prepositions as בְּאָזְנֵי, ‘in the ears of’, לְפָנֵי, ‘before the face of’ and מִפִּי, ‘from the mouth of’, Aramaic קִרְמ is used for both God and men. In these cases קִרְמ functions as a realistic translation for the metaphorically used Hebrew words, not as an anti-anthropomorphic feature of TJon (>13).<sup>170</sup>

Something else is at stake in the case of בְּעֵינֵי, ‘in the sight of’. It is rendered with קִרְמ for divine use, although some manuscripts tend to use the original expression in their inclination to translate according to the Hebrew text.<sup>171</sup> But it is translated with בְּעֵינֵי for human use. However, some manuscripts use קִרְמ before high persons, such as the king (MSS a b in 1 Sam. 16:22); the chiefs of the Philistines (MS f in 1 Sam. 29:7); a prince and pretender (MS a in 2 Sam. 13:6, 18); or the high priest (MS a in 1 Sam. 1:18). It seems that the anti-anthropomorphic motive of this translation is overtaken by the reverential motive in these manuscripts.<sup>172</sup>

As translation of the Hebrew prepositions אֶל, אֵת, לִ-, מִן, עַל and עִמָּךְ, Aramaic קִרְמ is only used in reverential formulae before God and the king.<sup>173</sup> With reference to God the preposition קִרְמ is consist-

<sup>168</sup>Cf. M. Maher, “The Meturgemanim and Prayer”, *JJS* 41 (1990), 226-46, esp. 236; also Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 353.

<sup>169</sup>*Missaal: Latijns-Nederlandse uitgave van het volledige Missale Romanum met inleidingen en verklaringen*, Utrecht n.d., 5.

<sup>170</sup>Cf. also M.L. Klein, “The Preposition קִרְמ (‘Before’): A Pseudo-Anti-Anthropomorphism in the Targums,” *JThS* 30 (1979), 502-507; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 354.

<sup>171</sup>Cf. *e.g.* MSS b f w y in 1 Sam. 3:18; MS f in 2 Sam. 11:27; and MS a in 2 Sam. 15:26 (>29).

<sup>172</sup>See Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 357-59.

<sup>173</sup>Also attested in Syr.

ently used, also consistently added if necessary; with reference to the king it is used in expressions of “speaking” or “serving” before the king. Otherwise Aramaic ליה is preferred (>23).<sup>174</sup> A special case is its use before the name of Absalom in 2 Sam. 15:4, where TJon already expresses Absalom’s claim on the kingdom in the reverential preposition קדם.

The Hebrew expressions ברגלי, ‘at the feet of’, and תחת, ‘under’, are also rendered with קדם. In these cases it is replaced by realistic phrasing (>13), and the co-text required the reverential preposition.<sup>175</sup>

קימא, *living*, see Hebrew חי.

קניפא, *curtained couch*, see Hebrew אהל, *tent*.

קרא, *town, village*, see Aramaic קרתא.

קריא, *town, village*, see Aramaic קרתא.

קריחא, *town, village*, see Aramaic קרתא.

קרתא, *town, village, city*. Aramaic קרתא and cognate forms are used to denote every reference to a city, from the smallest township to the fortified city. Hebrew עיר is rendered so, but also כפר, ‘unwalled village’ (e.g. 1 Sam. 6:18), מבצר, ‘fortified city’ (2 Sam. 24:7), פרוץ, ‘open country’ (Judg. 5:7, 11) and the *pars pro toto* שער, ‘gate’ (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:37).<sup>176</sup> The “field of the Philistines” is also regarded as a reference to their cities and villages (e.g. 1 Sam. 6:1). Besides, the ancient expression לאהלי, ‘to his tents’, is likewise rendered לקריה, ‘to his cities’.<sup>177</sup>

The inflection of Aramaic קרתא in TJon forms a problem apart. The singular emphatic form is קרתא. Its construct form is only used with suffixes, as in בקרתיה, ‘in his city’. As a construct form without a suffix the relative pronoun is used after קרתא, as in קרתא דרויך (e.g. in 2 Sam. 5:7), or the form קרייה is used, mostly in terms that resemble place-names, such as בקרייה מלכותא, ‘in the city of the kingdom, in the royal city’ (1 Sam. 27:5). The singular absolute form seems to

<sup>174</sup>The word קדם is used before the king in 1 Sam. 12:3; 19:3-4; 21:16; 2 Sam. 14:2, 15 (2x); 15:2, 3, 6; 16:19; 19:28-29; 20:4; 22:41.

<sup>175</sup>See 1 Sam. 25:24, 27; 2 Sam. 22:10.

<sup>176</sup>The rendering of “gate” with “city” is very general in Targumic versions, cf. B. Grossfeld, *Targum Neofiti 1: An Exegetical Commentary to Genesis Including Full Rabbinic Parallels*, New York 2000, 177.

<sup>177</sup>See above, Hebrew אהל.

be קריא<sup>178</sup> or קרי, used only in 2 Sam. 15:2; Josh. 21:40; 2 Kgs 3:19. The plural forms are all taken from the stem קרו, the emphatic form קרויא (e.g. 2 Sam. 6:2), the absolute קרוין (e.g. 2 Sam. 24:7), and the construct form, both with and without suffix, such as לקרויה (e.g. 1 Sam. 13:2) and בקרוי חברון (2 Sam. 2:3). Therefore, the words קרויא, קריא, קריחא and קרחא can be collected under one entry in dictionaries and concordances.<sup>179</sup> Schematically:

	<i>singular</i>	<i>plural</i>
<i>emphatic</i>	קרחא	קרויא
<i>absolute</i>	קרי / קריא	קרוין
<i>construct</i>	קרתיה קרחא דדויד קריח מלכותא	קרויה קרוי חברון

רבונא, *lord, master*, see Hebrew ארון.

רגנא, *anger*. Hebrew ויחר־אף is a circumlocution, meaning “and his anger was kindled”. TJon considers it a metaphor and renders it more realistically: ותקיף רגנא, ‘and his anger was strong’. This translation is given both when God becomes angry (1 Sam. 28:18; 2 Sam. 6:7; 22:16; 24:1) and when humans are filled with anger (1 Sam. 11:6; 17:28; 20:30, 34; 2 Sam. 12:5).

רוחא, *spirit*. Whenever a spirit from God is mentioned it is specified as a spirit of prophecy (1 Sam. 10:6, 10; 19:20, 23; 2 Sam. 23:2, cf. also 1 Sam. 2:1), a spirit of might (1 Sam. 11:6; 16:13, 14) or a spirit of evil<sup>180</sup> (1 Sam. 16:14, 15, 16, 23; 18:10; 19:9), see further Aramaic נבואה. The Aramaic verb שרא is the technical term for the dwelling of God’s spirit upon a human being. This verb is used as translation of several Hebrew verbs, such as הויה, ‘be’ (e.g. in 1 Sam. 19:9) and צלח, ‘be strong, be successful’ (e.g. in 1 Sam. 10:10).

רחצנא, *security*, see Hebrew צור.

<sup>178</sup> Although it is an emphatic form, it is the translation of the indefinite Hebrew עיר and can be rendered with the indefinite “city” in 2 Kgs 3:19, so also Jer. 1:18; Ezek. 26:19.

<sup>179</sup> Against Dalman, *Handwörterbuch*, s.v. In agreement with Smelik’s remark that one cannot distinguish the meaning of the different entries, in Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 341. Cf. Wm.B. Stevenson, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, Oxford<sup>2</sup>1962, 36; M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*, Bar Ilan 1990, s.v. קרייה.

<sup>180</sup> Since both נבואה and נבורא are in the absolute, we can safely assume that also בישא is the absolute form of בישחא, ‘evil’.



רִישָׁא, *head, leader*. Aramaic רִישָׁא can be used as a military term for the leader of an army or the leader of a company. The metaphorically used פְּנוֹת, “cornerstones” (1 Sam. 14:39), is rendered this way (cf. also LXX and the explanation of Pseudo-Jerome<sup>181</sup>), as well as the metaphorically used רֹאשׁ in 2 Sam. 23:8, 13, 18; and 22:44. It is introduced as such in 1 Sam. 8:20; 12:2; 14:38; 18:13, 16; and 2 Sam. 5:2.

רְשִׁיעָא, *evil*, see Hebrew בְּלִיעַל.

רְשַׁע, *evil*, see Hebrew בְּלִיעַל.

שָׂאל, *to ask, to inquire*. The Hebrew expression שָׂאל בִּיהוָה and its parallel שָׂאל בְּאֱלֹהִים are specific forms of inquiry using the Urim and the Thummim.<sup>182</sup> Since this kind of inquiry suggests that God manifests Himself in the process of answering,<sup>183</sup> TJon stereotypically translated this expression with שָׂאל בְּמִימְרַא דִּינִי, ‘inquire of the speech of the LORD’.<sup>184</sup> Other Hebrew expressions, like שָׂאל מִיהוָה and שָׂאל לַיהוָה are rendered with שָׂאל מִן קִרְם יִי.<sup>185</sup>

שָׁבַח, *to praise*. Various kinds of dancing and entertaining are indicated by the Aramaic verb שָׁבַח, ‘to praise’. This praising is not necessarily praising God, for the women welcoming in Saul and David were definitely praising the two human heroes in their song (1 Sam. 18:7, but see also 2 Sam. 19:36).<sup>186</sup> In most cases שָׁבַח has a religious connotation, close to prophesying (cf. e.g. 2 Sam. 22:1; see further Hebrew נָבֵא).

Aramaic שָׁבַח is the standard equation of Hebrew שָׁר, ‘to sing’ (cf. TgJudg. 5:3). It is also used as the rendering of “dancing”, with the intention of raising the merit of the Biblical heroes and avoiding to attribute to them profaneness in their deeds (>24).<sup>187</sup> The transition from dancing to praising also occurs in the explanation of the verb “to dance” in NumR. 4:20, stating that David “struck his hands

<sup>181</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 87.

<sup>182</sup>HALAT<sup>3</sup>, s.v. שָׂאל.

<sup>183</sup>Cf. B.D. Chilton, “Typologies of *memra* and the fourth Gospel”, in: P.V.M. Fleisher (ed.), *Targum Studies*, Vol. 1: Textual and Contextual Studies in the Pentateuchal Targums, Atlanta (GA) 1992, 89-100; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 329.

<sup>184</sup>See 1 Sam. 10:22; 14:37; 22:10, 13, 15; 23:2, 4; 28:6; 30:8; 2 Sam. 2:1; 5:19, 23.

<sup>185</sup>The first form is attested in 1 Sam. 1:20; the second form in 1 Sam. 2:20. This second form might be the result of associate rendering (>15).

<sup>186</sup>This distinction is made in MekY, *Shirata*, 1.

<sup>187</sup>So Komlosh, *באור התרגום*, 307.

against each other, clapping them and saying, 'Hail, all High!'"<sup>188</sup> However, dancing was not completely forbidden by the Targumist: in 2 Sam. 6:16 the verb רקד, 'to dance', is used as the translation of the Pilpel of כרר.<sup>189</sup>

שגא, *to lack*, see Hebrew פקד.

שרר, *to send*. Although Hebrew שלח is usually equated with the same verb in Aramaic, it has the equivalent שרר in six verses of TgSam. Comparison of these verses with the amount of Aramaic verses with שלח leads to the conclusion that in the verses where שלח (Qal) is used, messages are sent and orders are given through a medium, mostly "messengers". Aramaic שרר, however, describes just the act of sending someone or something. These persons or things are not supposed to come back to the sender. It is therefore noteworthy that TJon consistently describes the sending of Uriah to the battle field in 2 Sam. 11 with the word שרר, even if it is said that Uriah has to deliver a letter to Joab. It seems that TJon wanted to stress that David really sent Uriah (to die) and not just the letter (11:14).<sup>190</sup>

שטיא, *insane*, see Hebrew בליעל.

שיזב, *to escape, to deliver*, see Aramaic פרק.

שכינתא, *Presence, Shekhina*, see Aramaic מימרא.

שלמאה, *Shalmaite*. The Hebrew gentilic קניי, 'Kenite', is consistently represented by Aramaic שלמאה, 'Shalmaite' (1 Sam. 15:6; 27:10; 30:29).<sup>191</sup> Note that MS D consistently renders צלמאה. This identification agrees with one of the views attested in rabbinic literature.

<sup>188</sup>Cf. Ber. 24a, quoted by Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 47. The clapping of the hands could well be the original meaning of the Hebrew verb כרכר, cf. Y. Avishur, "Krk in Biblical Hebrew and in Ugaritic", *VT* 26 (1976), 257-61.

<sup>189</sup>According to mBes. 5:2 dancing was only forbidden on Shabbaths and festivals.

<sup>190</sup>Another division between the two verbs is attested in Syr, where the dividing line is drawn between the message as direct object or persons and things as direct object. Consequently, messengers are sent (ܫܪܪܐ), while the message is sent indirectly (ܫܪܪܐܐ), cf. M.L. Folmer, *The Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period: A Study in Linguistic Variation*, Leuven 1995, 660; J. Joosten, "Materials for a Linguistic Approach to the Old Testament Peshiṭta", *JAB* 1 (1999), 203-18, esp. 207.

<sup>191</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 117; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 341; B. Grossfeld, *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis* (AramB, 6), Edinburgh 1988, 71, n. 17; M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (AramB, 1b), Edinburgh 1992; 61, n. 28; B. Grossfeld, *Targum Neofiti 1: An Exegetical Commentary to Genesis Including Full Rabbinic Parallels*, New York 2000, 146.

R. Judah or R. Meir identified the Kenites, Kenizzites and the Kadmonites with inhabitants of the desert, *viz.* Arabs, Shalmites and Nabataeans. The order of these people varies and therefore it is impossible to say that these rabbis definitely identified the Kenites with the Shalmites.<sup>192</sup> This identification in TJon might be meant as harmonization, because the original Kenites, *i.e.* the offspring of Cain, were all supposed to have been killed in the flood. TJon based itself on 1 Chron. 2:51-54, where the Kenites are mentioned as descendants of Salma.<sup>193</sup>

Pliny reported about Arabian tribes, one of which is called the Scenites, 'tent-dwellers'<sup>194</sup> and another the Salmani.<sup>195</sup> However, he does not identify these tribes.<sup>196</sup>

Josephus mentioned Shechemites in his *Antiquities*, which might be a variant of Shalmite as well. Rappaport suggests that Josephus regarded the Shalmites as the inhabitants of Salem, mentioned as the capital of the Shechemites (Gen. 33:18).<sup>197</sup>

שמש, *to serve*, see Aramaic פלח.

שפיר, *beautiful*, see Hebrew טוב.

שקרא, *lie, falsehood*, see Hebrew בליעל.

חבר, *to break down, to shatter*. "All kinds of defeat or deprivation may be subsumed under the verb חבר, 'to shatter', in TJon."<sup>198</sup> Many Hebrew verbs are rendered as such in a process of simplification.<sup>199</sup>

חוב, *to turn back*, see Hebrew נחם.

תקין, *right*, see Hebrew טוב.

תקיפא, *strong*, see Hebrew צור.

תקפא, *strength*, see Hebrew צור.

<sup>192</sup>Grossfeld, *Targum Neofiti 1*, 146. The rabbinic parallels are attested in yShevi. 6:1 (36b); yQid. 1:9 (61d); BB 56a; GenR. 44:23.

<sup>193</sup>As is suggested by Komlosh, המקרא באור החרגום, 219; followed by Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 117.

<sup>194</sup>Pliny, *Natural History*, 5:12; 6:32.

<sup>195</sup>Pliny, *Natural History*, 6:30.

<sup>196</sup>Against Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, 61, n. 28.

<sup>197</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:140; cf. S. Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus*, Vienna 1930, 49. His alternative suggestion was that Josephus' "Sikim-ites" was an error for "Silimites".

<sup>198</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 378.

<sup>199</sup>See Van Staaldoune-Sulman, *Samuel*, s.v. חבר.

#### 4.4 Conclusions

More than is suggested in modern literature TJon made a distinction between the various meanings of Hebrew words (specialization). This distinction served the goal of polarization between good and evil (see Hebrew שָׁלַל); between God and the idols (see Hebrew אֱלֹהִים; כֹּהֵן); between the heavenly and the earthly realms (see Hebrew מִלְאָךְ; חַי; מִשְׁפָּט; צָבָא; Aramaic כְּרִנָּן; עֲמָא); and to adapt Biblical heroes to contemporary halakha (see Hebrew אֲשִׁיר; זִבְח).

The tendency of polarization between good and bad appears to be stronger than TJon's strife for clarity. Biblical heroes are cleared from being called "dead dog" or "flea", enemies of these heroes are not.

TJon translated MT as monotheistically as possible. It therefore preferred יי as the main references to God (simplification). Most other references can be explained from the contextual form (see Hebrew אֲרִין; אֵל, with one exception; Aramaic יי).

There is an inclination in TJon not to add clear references to God in the Biblical text. TJon preferred to use *passiva divina* or euphemistic expressions like "fearing sins" (see Hebrew יי; Aramaic חֻבָּא).

The Targum of the Books of Samuel appears to be slightly stricter in respecting God's holiness and that of Biblical heroes than the other books within TJon. Idols are always called שְׁעֵהָא, even by their worshippers (see Hebrew אֱלֹהִים). There are no high places on which offerings are brought (see Hebrew בְּמָה). There are no unidentified prophets, only anonymous scribes (see Hebrew נִבָּא).

There is a clear tendency to actualize the Biblical text (see Hebrew אֲהֵל; Aramaic צְלָא, יְהוּדָאָה, אֲלַפְנָא).

There is a vague tendency to differentiate between the choice of words in prose and that in poetry. TJon prefers the equivalent סָנְאָה, 'hater' to בְּעִיל דְּבִבְא, 'enemy', in the poetic sections. Other similarities between the poetic sections can best be explained by the fact that TJon treated most poetry as prophecies; hence the use of Aramaic עֲחִיד and other prophetic expressions.

In general it can be said that TJon translated very consistently within its own theological borders. Many specializations and simplifications can be explained. Exceptions to the rules found are rare.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Chapter 5

---

# A Commentary on TJon 1 Samuel

### 5.1 Introduction

In the following two chapters the Aramaic version of the Books of Samuel is given, followed by an English translation and a commentary on the targum's own exegesis and theology. The first book of Samuel is commented upon in Ch. 5, the second book in Ch. 6. Cross-references without the prefix "1 Sam." or "2 Sam." in Ch. 5 apply to the first book of Samuel, while those in Ch. 6 apply to the second book of Samuel.

The Aramaic text is given according to the base text of Sperber's *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 2. Following his example the tetragrammaton is represented by "𐤍", regardless of the spelling in the original manuscript. Variant readings will be mentioned in footnotes, unless these variant readings require discussion. Variant readings concerning orthographic differences, addition or omission of the copula 𐤍, variety in the use of prepositions, difference in number, tense or stem are not given, unless these variant readings result in a different content of the text. Variant readings are taken from Sperber, Martínez Borobio, Kasher, and manuscripts collated by myself.<sup>1</sup> For economical reasons, all sigla are preceded by the indication "MS", whether they concern a real manuscript or a printed edition.

The English translation of the Aramaic text, printed in italics, is based upon the *Revised Standard Version*.<sup>2</sup> This base translation is adapted where TJon deviates from its Hebrew original. Geographic names which are translated by TJon are also translated into English, for instance "Stone of Help" instead of Ebenezer (1 Sam. 4:1). Words in square brackets in the English translation are added for grammatical or syntactical reasons.

After base text and translation, the commentary on TJon's own exegesis and theology is given. Where TJon agrees with the Hebrew text, explanation and commentary can be found in other exegetical literature. Only where TJon agrees with the Hebrew text in contrast to what one would expect, will this be noticed. Frequent typically Targumic renderings have already been dealt with in Ch. 4 and are referred to with a diamond (◊) in the Aramaic text of the present

---

<sup>1</sup>Indicated by the sigla mentioned in Ch. 2, § 2.3.

<sup>2</sup>*The Bible containing the Old and New Testament*, Swindon 1967.

chapter in order to avoid repetition. Exegetical techniques have been discussed in Ch. 3 and are indicated in this chapter by their number, e.g. >15 refers to *Associative Translation*. If a verse does not require commentary, its Aramaic text and the English translation are added to the next verse. In these cases, the following commentary always refers to the last verse given. Only in poetical chapters the commentary is placed after a poetical unit, not after a verse. This occurs in 2 Sam. 1:19-27; 2 Sam. 22; and 2 Sam. 23:1-8.

Where necessary, comments concerning a passage or chapter are summarized in a section before the discussion of the separate verses. References to the synagogal lectionary cycles also appear before a chapter or larger passage. When a chapter does not begin with comments concerning its use as a *haftara*, the chapter has not been used as such.

## 5.2 The Birth of Samuel (1 Samuel 1)

In the annual cycle, 1 Sam. 1:1-2:10 is the *haftara* read after Gen. 21:1-34 on the festival of New Year. These readings are appropriate to New Year because of two reasons: In the first place New Year's day was a time to fulfil one's vows, as Hannah did;<sup>3</sup> in the second place both readings attest the word "remember", which was connected with the "memorial proclaimed with blast of trumpets" of New Year (Lev. 23:24), originally the Torah reading for New Year's Day.<sup>4</sup> Resemblances between this Torah reading and this *haftara* are already extant in the Hebrew text, viz. the barren woman who gives birth to a son, the weaning of the boy, and the two rival women. The Targum did not stress these resemblances. On the contrary, while TO Gen. 21:1 translates that "the LORD remembered Sarah", TJon 1 Sam. 1:19 renders the same original with the circumlocution that Hannah's "memory went in before the LORD".

In the triennial cycle, this chapter was the *haftara* read after the pericope of Jacob's two wives, either beginning with Gen. 29:31 or

<sup>3</sup>A. Büchler, "The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle," *JQR* 5 (1893), 420-468. Connections between Gen. 21 and 1 Sam. 1-2 are made in GenR. 38:14; 72:1; LamR. 1:2 § 26; LamR. 1:17 § 52 as well.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. e.g. RHsh. 11a; PesR. 46:1. For the antiquity of the connection between New Year and the expression מִיָּמֵי מִיָּמָה, see J.C. de Moor, *New Year with Canaanites and Israelites* (Kamper Cahiers, 21), Part 1, Kampen 1972, 10, 12; and for New Year as a commemoration festival, cf. J.C. de Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism* (BETHL, 91A), Leuven <sup>2</sup>1997, 354-55. It should be noted, however, that other Jewish traditions about the date of the festival intended did exist; cf. Ch. 4, s.v. מִיָּמֵי יָמִימָה.

with Gen. 30:22.<sup>5</sup> Here, too, resemblances are present in the Hebrew text, *viz.* the two rival wives, the barren and the fertile woman, and God's role in these struggles. In one instance the resemblances are stressed in the Aramaic translation: TO Gen. 30:2 gives a literal rendering "He [*i.e.*, the LORD] withholds birth from you", while TJon 1 Sam. 1:5-6 substitutes the reverential "from before the LORD offspring was withheld from her" for the Hebrew "the LORD had closed her womb".

1 1 והוה גברא חד מרמחא מתלמידי נבייא ד משרא דבית אפרים ושמיא אלקנה  
 בר ירוחם בר אליהוא בר חזו בר צוף<sup>6</sup> גברא פליג חולק בקדשי<sup>7</sup> בטורא<sup>8</sup> דבית  
 אפרים:

*1:1 There was a certain man of Ramah, of the pupils of the prophets, of the hill country of the House of Ephraim, whose name was Elkanah, son of Jeroham, son of Elihu, son of Tohu, son of Zuph, a man having a portion in the holy things in the hill country of the House of Ephraim.*

The name הרמחים צופים is harmonized with Samuel's usual living place רמה, literally "height", but the standard translation of the place-name Ramah (cf. *e.g.* 1 Sam. 1:19; >16). Hebrew צופים is derived from the stem צפה, 'watch' (>6),<sup>9</sup> and functions as a metaphor for "prophet" (>14).<sup>10</sup> Thus Elkanah is mentioned in Meg. 14a: "From Ramataim Zuphim, one of two hundred watchers, who prophesied to Israel".<sup>11</sup> The phrasing of TJon's expression is after the example of

<sup>5</sup>Cf. also GenR. 72:1, where "those who were full" (1 Sam. 2:5) are identified with Leah and her children, while the hungry are identified with Rachel, who was longing for children. The barren woman from the same verse is identified there with Leah, who would not have been married but for Laban's ruse, whereas the woman with many children is identified with Rachel, who had to wait for her marriage.

<sup>6</sup>Ms B reads אסף, although a later hand corrected it. Ms T reads אפרחי בר צוף as the end of the verse, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>7</sup>Ms D changes the word order and reads בטוריא בקדשי, suggesting that the holy things belonged to the tribe of Ephraim.

<sup>8</sup>Omitted in MS J.

<sup>9</sup>Contra צוף, mentioned by Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 103, n. 1.

<sup>10</sup>Hos. 9:8; cf. Isa. 21:6; Ezek. 3:17; 33:2, 6, 7; Mic. 7:4, 7; Hab. 2:1; TJon 1 Sam. 9:5; Ezek. 3:17; 33:7; likewise Meg. 2b, cf. M. Simon, *Megillah* (The Soncino Talmud, Mo'ed 4), London 1938, 8, n. 7. Cf. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 93; P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel i-xvi*, Amsterdam 1938, 10; Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 4, 57; Vol. 6, 215, n. 1; Komlosch, באור החרגות, 320; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 125-26; Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 5.

<sup>11</sup>Hebrew רמחים is split (>4) into a single *Resh*, the letter denoting 200 (>5), and the word באמתי, 'two hundred'. the dualis of Hebrew מאה. Another opinion in Meg. 14a is that it literally meant "two hills" or "one of the two hill"; cf. Vogel,



TJon 2 Kgs 5:22, מטורא דביה אפרים מתלמידי נבייא, taking the Hebrew “sons” as a metaphor for “pupils” (>15).<sup>12</sup>

Not only Elkanah, but Hannah, too, was considered prophesying (TJon 1 Sam. 2:1; cf. Meg. 14a). Consequently, not only Samuel but also his parents were endowed with the gift of prophecy. This view on Samuel’s family resembles the depiction of Moses’ family, in which Miriam and Aaron also had the gift of prophecy (cf. ExodR. 1:22; 3:16).

Although TJon maintains the word אפרתי in 1 Sam. 17:12, it renders מטורא דביה אפרים in the present verse, in order to harmonize it with 1 Chron. 6:27-28, where Elkanah and Samuel are called Levites living in the hill country of Ephraim, cf. also Josh. 21:20-21 (>16). Furthermore, the words פליג חולק בקרשיא could be a second rendering of the name Ephraim, because this name was often understood as a title rather than a tribe’s name. It would mean “nobleman” or “courtier” and then refers to the leading position of Ephraim in spiritual affairs.<sup>13</sup> Elkanah’s portion in holy things is an indication he belonged to the tribe of Levi, since the Levites did not share in the portions of the land (חולקים, cf. Josh. 14:4; 18:7), but were chosen for priesthood (Josh. 18:7), although TJon rendered vaguely “the gift that I give to them”, making a difference between the Levites and the priests. In this way it is natural for Samuel to serve in the sanctuary at Shiloh (>24).<sup>14</sup>

2 וליה תרתין נשין שום חדא חנה ושום תנייתא פננה והוי<sup>15</sup> לפננה בנין ולחנה לית בנין: 3 וסליק גברא ההוא מקרתייה מומן מועד למועד ד למסגד ולדבחה ד קדם ד יי צבאות בשילו והמן תרין בני עלי חפני ופנחס משמשין ד קדם ד יי:

1:2 And he had two wives; the name of the one was Hannah, and the name of the other Peninnah. And Peninnah had sons, but Hannah had no sons<sup>16</sup>. 1:3 And that man used to go up from his city, periodically from festival to festival, to bow down and to sacrifice before the LORD

*Sámuel elsō kõnyve*, 5. A combination of both opinions is reflected in the Syriac translation “the high point of the watschmen”; cf. C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL, 11), Leiden 2001, 26.

<sup>12</sup>Cf. TJon Isa. 7:3, תלמידך for “your son”

<sup>13</sup>Cf. LevR. 2:3; RuthR. 2:5. R. Phinḥas referred to Jacob’s blessing and stated that he blessed his grandson Ephraim with a crown: “Let my son Ephraim be crowned head of the academy, head of an excellent and commendable tribe” (Meg. 14a); cf. Vogel, *Sámuel elsō kõnyve*, 5-6.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 5:10; Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 93; Komlosh, *המקרא באור התרגום*, 306; Vogel, *Samuel elsō kõnyve*, 5-6, 14, 31.

<sup>15</sup>Plural against MT’s singular (>9), except in MSS b B eb1. Syr also has the plural.

<sup>16</sup>Both ילד and בן are rendered with ברא, ‘son’ (>15), simplification.

*Sebaoth at Shiloh, where the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, were serving before the LORD.*

TJon does not depict Hophni and Phinehas as priests, probably because of their sinful behaviour,<sup>17</sup> but also to harmonize this verse with their depiction in 2:12-17, where they are called “the priest’s servants”.<sup>18</sup> TJon chose a rendering which was closely connected with the priestly class and their work: “serving before the LORD” (cf. 1 Sam. 2:18; Isa. 60:7; 61:6; Joel 1:9, 13; 2:17). Some rabbis, however, stressed that Eli’s sons sinned as priests (see below, 1 Sam. 2:22) and that Phinehas acted as High Priest in the lifetime of Eli because of his father’s blindness (cf. Lev. 21:18).<sup>19</sup> Others state that Phinehas only sinned by not warning his brother Hophni. Phinehas was not severely punished—he received offspring through Ichabod—because of his better behaviour (Shab. 55b).

4 1 והוה יום מועדא<sup>20</sup> ורבחא אלקנה ויהב לפננה אתחיה ולכל בנהא ובנתהא חלקין<sup>21</sup>:  
5 1 ולחנה יהב חולק<sup>22</sup> חד בחיר ארי ית חנה רחים ומן קרם<sup>23</sup> זי אתמנע מנה ולד:

1:4 *And on the festival when Elkanah sacrificed, he would give portions to Peninnah his wife and to all her sons and daughters. 1:5 And he would give to Hannah one choice portion, because he loved Hannah. And from before the LORD offspring was withheld from her.*

The difficult אַפִּים is explained as “a double portion” by Pseudo-Jerome.<sup>23</sup> TJon probably intended a similar exegesis, but rendered differently to protect Elkanah’s righteousness:<sup>24</sup> Elkanah gave Hannah one portion, according to her being alone, but he gave her a choice portion, “because he loved Hannah” (>16).<sup>25</sup> The reasoning behind this translation is given in PesR. 46:1, “In this verse אַפִּים, the

<sup>17</sup>See 1 Sam. 2:17, 22 (>24). Cf. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 116.

<sup>18</sup>For a discussion on the phrase “the priest’s servants”, cf. D.T. Tsumura, “The Poetic Nature of Hebrew Narrative Prose in 1 Sam. 2:12-17”, in: J.C. de Moor, W.G.E. Watson (eds), *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT, 42), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1993, 293-304, esp. 299-301.

<sup>19</sup>Shab. 55b; AgBer. 41. Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 5:11. This more positive attitude toward Phinehas possibly rests on the identification of Phinehas with Phinehas the son of Eleazar; cf. Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 50:3.

<sup>20</sup>The same precision as in 1 Sam. 1:3 (>15). MSS a J omit the word יום.

<sup>21</sup>No unusual rendering, but see also the same word in 1 Sam. 1:1.

<sup>22</sup>No unusual rendering, but see also the same word in 1 Sam. 1:1 and 4.

<sup>23</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 67. One of the three explanations in PesR. 43:7 is “he gave her a double portion”.

<sup>24</sup>So Vogel, *Sámuel elsö könyve*, 6. He stressed that Elkanah’s righteousness and piety is often dwelled upon in Midrashic literature, citing MShem. 1:6.

<sup>25</sup>So also one of the explanations in PesR. 43:7, “the best of them”, viz. the best of the portions.

literal meaning of which is ‘faces’, is taken to mean ‘handsome’, because approval was written upon all the faces that regarded Hannah’s portion.”

The word “choice” may have been the result of the Hebrew word אַחָה, ‘one’, which is often interpreted as “very special, dear”.<sup>26</sup> The link between Hebrew אַחָה, ‘one’, and love (Hebrew אַהֲבָה) might also be due to gematria, since both Hebrew words have the same value of 13.<sup>27</sup> TJon did not opt for an etymological rendering by connecting אַפִּים with faces, cf. “before all the people present” in PesR. 43:7; or with בְּאַפִּים, ‘in anger’ (cf. Dan. 11:20). Vg translated “tristis” in the latter way.<sup>28</sup> Kimḥi gave another explanation for the Aramaic version, viz. Elkanah gave her a portion fit to be accepted with a cheerful countenance”.<sup>29</sup>

The idea of God touching Hannah in “the LORD had closed her womb” is avoided by using the passive voice together with the preposition קָדַם (>23).<sup>30</sup> The wording of this reverential circumlocution is taken from Gen. 30:2.<sup>31</sup>

1 6 ומצֵהבֵּא לָהּ עֵרְתָהּ<sup>32</sup> אַף מְרֻגָא לָהּ בְּדִיל לְאַקְיֹתָהּ<sup>33</sup> אַרִי אַתְּמַנַּע מִן קִדְמֵ יוֹ מִנָּה וְלֹד:

1:6 And her rival used to provoke her, also to anger her because of her jealousy, because from before the LORD offspring was withheld from her.

The second form of כַּעַס is translated by a different verb (>18). Vg also regards the two forms as two separate verbs.<sup>34</sup> Following these

<sup>26</sup>Cf. 2 Sam. 7:23; NumR. 3:6; 10:5 (uniqueness); NumR. 14:4; CantR. 2:16 § 1 (object of love).

<sup>27</sup>H. Poot, *Jozef: een messiaanse geschiedenis*, n.p. 1998, 25. If this link was known in the first century CE, then John’s expression that “God is love” (3 Jn 4:8) might be an alternative explanation of the *Shema*; cf. the literature in the preceding note, where Hebrew אַחָה is connected with uniqueness and love.

<sup>28</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 7. Probably, LXX had a different *Vorlage* and may have read אַסַּב, ‘howbeit’.

<sup>29</sup>Cf. D. Aberbach, מִנָּה אַחָה אַפִּים (1 Sam. I 5): A New Interpretation”, *VT* 24 (1974), 350-53, esp. 351.

<sup>30</sup>Scholars were warned always to be decent (Pes. 3a), cf. Aberbach, Grossfeld, *Targum Onqelos on Genesis 49*, 58, n. 62.

<sup>31</sup>But see also TO and TN Gen. 30:22, where similar circumlocutions are used to avoid the LORD’s opening of the womb, cf. B. Grossfeld, *Targum Neofiti 1: An Exegetical Commentary to Genesis Including Full Rabbinic Parallels*, New York 2000, 214.

<sup>32</sup>Mss a b c d f o B S read צֵרְתָהּ, ‘her rival-wife’, in conformity with the Hebrew spelling.

<sup>33</sup>Ms D read לְאַקְיֵמָא, ‘to make her stand up’, cf. 1:9 (>15).

<sup>34</sup>Stummer, “Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei

versions, Ehrlich suggests to vocalize this word as an infinitive (כַּעַס), to obtain a normal Hebrew construction (cf. Gen. 31:15).<sup>35</sup>

TgSam understands Hebrew הִרְעִימָה, 'to make her thunder' (>13) as a metaphor for jealousy. A similar interpretation underlies PesR. 43:8, "The Holy One, blessed is He, said to Penina, 'You make her thunder against Me. As you live, there are no thunders that are not followed by rain. I shall remember her at once.'" The thunder represents Hannah's lament because of Penina's provocations and the rain is a symbol for fertility.<sup>36</sup>

Hebrew בַּעַר is omitted, because it is also absent from the similar verse 1:5 (>15).

7 1 וְכִין יַעֲבִיד שָׁנָא בְּשָׁנָא בּוֹמֵן מִסְקָה לְבֵית מִקְדָּשָׁא ◊ דִּיּוּ כִין מְרַגְזָא לָהּ וּבִכִּיא וְלֹא אֲכָלָא: 8 1 וְאָמַר לָהּ אֶלְקָנָה בַּעֲלָהּ חָנָה לָמָּא אַתְּ בִּכִּיא וְלָמָּא לֹא אֲכָלָה<sup>37</sup> וְלָמָּא בְּאִישׁ לֵידָךְ לְבִידָךְ הֲלֵא<sup>38</sup> רַעוּתִי טַבָּא ◊ לֵידָךְ מַעֲסָרָא בְּנִין:

1:7 And so he did year by year; as often as she went up to the house of the Lord's sanctuary, she used to anger her. And she was weeping and would not eat. 1:8 And Elkanah, her husband, said to her, "Hannah, why are you weeping? And why did you not eat? And why is your heart sad to you? Is not my goodwill better to you than ten sons?"

In asking "Am I not better to you than ten sons?" Elkanah is very general about what is good in him. TJon makes it more explicit by rendering רַעוּתָא, 'pleasure, goodwill', corresponding to the remark in 1 Sam. 1:5 that Elkanah loved Hannah.<sup>39</sup> The fact that the Hebrew pronoun אֲנִי is used, does not necessarily play a role in this translation. Although some rabbis tended to assume that all occurrences of Hebrew אֲנִי referred to God, since He had commenced the Ten Commandments with that very word, TJon does not show that tendency at all.<sup>40</sup>

der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas", *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, esp. 5.

<sup>35</sup>A.B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel*, Vol. 3, Leipzig 1910, 163; followed by Driver, *Notes*, 9; Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 7. A similar tradition is found in MShem. 1:8.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 7.

<sup>37</sup>Ms J omitted the phrase וְלָמָּא לֹא אֲכָלָה, probably by haplography. Ms b substituted imperfect הִכֵּלִי for the perfect, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>38</sup>Kimḥi replaced the rhetorical question by a statement beginning with הֲ (>14).

<sup>39</sup>Pseudo-Philo also avoids to say that Elkanah himself would have been better, but he renders *Nonne meliores sunt mores tui*, 'is not your character better'.

<sup>40</sup>Both אֲנִי and אַנִּי are rendered with Aramaic אַנָּא. Only in this verse a different equivalent is used; cf. Van Staaldoune-Sulman, *Samuel*, s.v. אַנָּא; against Vogel,

1 9 וקמה חנה בחר דאכלת בשילו ובהר דאשחיא<sup>41</sup> ועלי כהנא יתיב על כרסיא<sup>42</sup>  
בסטר ספא דהיכלא דיוי:

1:9 *And Hannah rose, after she had eaten in Shiloh and after<sup>43</sup> they had drunk. Now Eli the priest was sitting on the seat beside the doorpost of the LORD's temple.*

TJon adds the subject of the verb שָׁתָה, 'drink', but does it in a harmonizing way, in accordance with rabbinic tradition.<sup>44</sup> Hannah is neither accused of drinking on her own<sup>45</sup>, nor of drinking at all. Her defensive answer to Eli, that she had not been drinking any wine, either new or old, was true. The variant readings which state that Hannah had been drinking, adapted the verb to the previous verb, not realizing the lack of harmony.

1 10 והיא מרירא נפש ומצליא קדם יי ומבכא בכיא:

1:10 *And she was bitter of soul and she prayed before the LORD and wept abundantly.*

The rendering מרירא נפש is grammatically unusual. It should have been נפש מרירה, as in the Antwerp Polyglot and MS D, which would have been in conformity with the Hebrew construction (cf. GKC § 128y) and with מרירי נפשו in TJon Judg. 18:25 and 2 Sam. 17:8. It could also have been נפש מרירא לה, as in TJon 2 Kgs 4:27. The present rendering is most probably based on the supposition that נפש was an apposition (cf. GKC § 131).<sup>46</sup> The same phenomenon occurs in 2 Sam. 17:8, where some MSS read מרירין נפשו instead of מרירי נפשו.

1 11 וקיימת קים ואמרת יי צבאות מגלא גלי קדמך סנוף אמתך וייעול דוכרני  
קדמך ולא תרחיק ית אמתך ותתין לאמתך בר בנו בני אנשא ואמסרניה דיהו  
משמיש קדם יי כל יומי חייה ומרת אנש לא תהי עלויה:

*Sámuel elsô könyve*, 1:8, citing MShem. 1:9 where it is stated that the form אנכי instead of אני implies a reference to Exod. 20:2.

<sup>41</sup>Mss b d read דשחיא, 'she had drunk'.

<sup>42</sup>MS D omits על כרסיא. MS o reads כורסיה, 'his seat'. MS b adds מוזוי, 'beside the doorposts', as in the Hebrew text, resulting in a conflated reading (>29).

<sup>43</sup>In many cases TJon adds the conjunction ׀, especially in sentences with an implied subordination in Hebrew; cf. M.Z. Kadari, "The Use of ׀ Clauses in the Language of Targum Onkelos: A Contribution to the Study of the Hebrew Vorlage of TO", *Textus* 3 (1963), 36-59, esp. 41.

<sup>44</sup>Cf. Ket. 65a.

<sup>45</sup>Which would have been unusual and in Kalla Rabbati 52a even forbidden. The latter tractate stresses the fact that a suffix is missing, so that Hannah is not intended here.

<sup>46</sup>This might also be the case with the reading רהוה מרירא לבא מוכא, 'she was exceptionally bitter at heart', in Ber. 30b.

1:11 *And she swore an oath and said, "O LORD Šebaoth, the affliction of thy maidservant is indeed revealed before Thee. And let my memory come in before Thee and do not keep thy maidservant far away. And give to thy maidservant a son in the midst of the sons of men. And I will hand him over, that he may serve before the LORD all the days of his life and the dominion of man will not be upon him."*

In order to avoid the misunderstanding that it was questionable whether God would see Hannah's affliction, most manuscripts of TJon omit Hebrew אִם, 'if', in the beginning of Hannah's prayer (>24). MSS a b c d f o D B J, however, maintained the conjunction 'if'. In general, this conjunction was not thought to form a theological problem, because God was considered free to look or not to look (Ber. 31b). In order to avoid the irreverent and distrustful thought that God could forget something, TJon renders Hebrew שָׁכַח with רָחִיק, 'remove, keep away' (>24). The result, rather than the deed of forgetting, is represented by this equivalence.

TJon avoids direct contact between God and men three times in this verse. Once the passive voice is used, "the affliction is revealed", twice a different solution is found: Hannah's memory goes up to heaven and Samuel will serve before the LORD (>23).

The Hebrew phrase "seed of men" is explained as a *pars pro toto* for a son, using the expression "a son in the midst of the sons of men". This agrees with some opinions in the rabbinic literature. Rab used exactly the same formula to indicate that Samuel would be a very special man (Ber. 31b) and according to NumR. 16:5 it referred to a wise and pious child.<sup>47</sup> Other rabbis, however, assumed that Hannah asked for an average child (Ber. 31b).

TJon did not read מוֹרָה, 'razor', which would be logical, since the same word is used in Num. 6:5; Judg. 13:5, 16:17 and is translated with מַסְפֵּר, 'razor', there. TJon read it as מוֹרָא, 'fear', as do some Hebrew manuscripts, interpreting it as "dominion, violence of man" (>1). Consequently, Samuel was not directly described as a Nazirite or associated with Samson, but he was said to have no fear for any man, but for the word of God only. This is in agreement with the opinion of R. Yose ben Ḥalafta, but opposed to R. Nehorai's view (mNaz. 9:5; Naz. 66a).<sup>48</sup> Because of this change, TJon had to use a

<sup>47</sup>Likewise in TanB, *Bamidbar*, 4:5, where it is assumed to refer to righteous people.

<sup>48</sup>Cf. Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 8; Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 8; Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 304. Also opposing Josephus' story, cf. *Antiquities*, 5:347, and the translation of the other ancient versions. NumR. 10:5 tried to harmonize both readings by stating that the hair is afraid of the razor.

verb with a more neutral meaning and omit the Hebrew word “head”. This word would have been a *pars pro toto* after TJon’s “dominion” and had to be replaced by realistic language (>14).

12 1 והוה מדאסניא<sup>49</sup> לצלאה<sup>50</sup> קדם<sup>51</sup> יי ועלי מוריך לה עד דתפסוק: 13 1 וחנה היא מצליא<sup>52</sup> בלבה לחור ספותהא<sup>50</sup> נידן<sup>51</sup> וקלה לא משחמע וחשבה עלי כאתא רויא<sup>52</sup>:

*1:12 And when she continued praying before the LORD, Eli was waiting for her until she would stop.<sup>53</sup> 1:13 And Hannah was praying in her heart. Only her lips moved, and her voice was not heard. And Eli took her to be as a drunken woman.*

The difference between the Hebrew “to say in one’s heart” (ב) and “to say to one’s heart” (על/אל) is explained in several Midrashim: “The wicked stand in subjection to their hearts; therefore, they speak in their hearts (Gen. 27:41; 1 Kgs 12:25; Ps. 14:1; Est. 6:6). The righteous have their hearts under their control; therefore, they speak to their hearts (Gen. 8:21; 1 Sam. 1:13; 27:1; Dan. 1:8).”<sup>54</sup> This distinction is not maintained by the Targum. Both in 1 Sam. 1:13 and in 27:1 the preposition is rendered with ב. Only MS d reads על לבה in 1 Sam 1:13, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

The Biblical “Eli took her to be a drunken woman” is turned into a more friendly sentence by the preposition כ. Only the Leiria edition reads לאתא, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

14 1 ואמר לה עלי עד אמתי את משחטיא הלא תפינין ית חמריך מניך:

*1:14 And Eli said to her, “How long will you act insane? Will you not let your wine evaporate from you?”*

As in 1 Sam. 1:13, Eli’s judgment is played down: his order is turned into a soothing question by adding הלא. The Hebrew description “drunken”, already used in the preceding verse and referring to the Hannah’s condition, is turned into its result, *i.e.* acting insane.

15 1 ואחיבת חנה<sup>55</sup> ואמרת לא רבני<sup>56</sup> אתהא עיקת<sup>57</sup> רוח אנא וחמר חרת ועתיק לא

<sup>49</sup>MS S adds the conjunction כ before this verb.

<sup>50</sup>MS S has the odd spelling שפפתהא.

<sup>51</sup>MS d reads נען, from נוע, ‘move’, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>52</sup>MS S has the odd spelling רביא.

<sup>53</sup>MT: “Eli was watching her mouth”. TJon gives the end of Eli’s action, not the action itself (>14).

<sup>54</sup>GenR. 34:10; 67:8; QohR. 5:2; EstR. 10:3.

<sup>55</sup>The words ו אחיבת חנה are omitted by MSS w y.

<sup>56</sup>רבני לא sdrow ehT are omitted by ms b.

<sup>57</sup>MS B reads עוקת רוח, which might mean “fenced of spirit”.

שתיתי ואמרית עלבון<sup>58</sup> נפשי בצלו קדם ◊ יי:

1:15 *And Hannah answered, "No, my lord, I am a woman anguished of spirit. I have drunk neither new nor old wine, but I have told the humiliation of my soul in prayer before the LORD."*

The metaphor "pour out my soul" is rendered in realistic language, amplified with the precision "in prayer" (>13, >11). Josephus made the same adjustment: "she was making supplication to God".<sup>59</sup>

The translation of Hebrew יין ושכר with "new and old wine" agrees with the rabbinic opinion as expressed in Ker. 13b.<sup>60</sup> This translation is used both in TO and in TJon, except in TO Lev. 10:9, where the combination חמר ומרוי, 'wine and strong drink', is used.

16 1 לא תכלים ית אמתך ◊ קדם בת<sup>61</sup> רשעא<sup>62</sup> ◊ ארי מסגי אקניותי וארגותי אוריכית בצלו עד כען:

1:16 *Do not rebuke your maidservant as a daughter of wickedness, for from the abundance of my jealousy and my anger I lingered in prayer until now."*

TJon makes some ideas explicit: Eli's opinion is turned into a rebuke and Hannah's saying is rendered with "lingering in prayer". This latter rendering is prompted by 1 Sam. 1:12.

17 1 ואחיב עלי ואמר איזילי לשלם ואלהא ◊ דישראל יתין ית בעותך דבעית מן קדמוהי ◊: 1 18 ואמרת תשכח אמתך ◊ רחמין בעינך<sup>63</sup> ◊ ואולת אתתא לאורחה ואכלת ואפיין בישין לא הוו לה עוד: 1 19 ואקדימו בצפרא וסגידו קדם ◊ יי ותבו ואתו לביתחון לרמתא וידע אלקנה ית חנה אתתיה ועל דוכרנה קדם ◊ יי: 1 20 והוה לזמן משלם<sup>64</sup> יומיא ועדיאת חנה וילידת בר<sup>65</sup> ◊ וקרת ית שמה שמואל ארי אמרת<sup>66</sup> מן קדם ◊ יי שאלתיה ◊<sup>67</sup>: 1 21 וסליק נברא אלקנה וכל אנש ◊ ביתיה לדבחא ◊ קדם ◊ יי ית דיבח ◊ מועדא ולשלמא ית נדריה:

<sup>58</sup> Mss o S read the Hebraism עלבון. Ms D reads a mixture of Hebrew and Aramaic, viz. עולבון.

<sup>59</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, 5:345. See below, commentary on 7:6.

<sup>60</sup> B. Grossfeld, *The Targum Onqelos to Leviticus and the Targum Onqelos to Numbers* (AramB, 8), Edinburgh 1988, 87, n. 2; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 563.

<sup>61</sup> Ms T reads the masculine בני.

<sup>62</sup> Mss B S read רשיעא, 'daughter of a wicked man'.

<sup>63</sup> Mss a J dissolve the metaphor and render קדמן (>13).

<sup>64</sup> This singular in TgSam is also reflected in some Hebrew MSS and the other versions, cf. *BHS*, crit.app.

<sup>65</sup> Omitted by MS S.

<sup>66</sup> Ms f adds ארי after אמרת: "For I have asked him from before the LORD".

<sup>67</sup> Only in this explanation of the name Samuel the word play is maintained. In the rest of 1 Sam. 1 the verb בעא is used.



1:17 And Eli answered and said, "Go in peace, and the God of Israel grant you your petition which you have made from before Him." 1:18 And she said, "Let your maidservant find favour in your sight." Then the woman went her way and ate, and her countenance was no longer sad.<sup>68</sup> 1:19 They rose early in the morning and bowed down before the LORD. Then they went back to their house, to Ramah. And Elkanah knew his wife Hannah and her memory went in before the LORD. 1:20 And at the time of the completing of the days Hannah conceived and bore a son, and she called his name Samuel, for she said, "I have asked him from before the LORD." 1:21 And the man Elkanah and all the people of his house went up to sacrifice before the LORD the sacrifice of the festival, and to fulfil his vow.

As in 1 Sam. 1:3, the Hebrew הַיָּמִים is rendered with 'festival'. Thus the Vulgate: "hostiam solemnem".<sup>69</sup> Two objects follow after the Hebrew verb וָזָבַח. TJon detached the latter one by adding the verb שָׁלַם, 'fulfil' (>10).<sup>70</sup>

22 1 וְחָנָה לֹא סָלְיָקָה אֶרְי אִמְרַת לְבַעֲלָהּ עַד דִּיתְחַסִּיל רַבִּיא וְאִיתִינִיה וִיחַזִּי קִדְמִי  
 יִי וִיחִיב חֲמֹן עַד עֲלֵמָא: 23 1 וְאָמַר<sup>71</sup> לָהּ אֲלֵקְנָה בַעֲלָהּ עֲבִידֵי דְחֻקִּין בְּעֵינֵי  
 אֹרִיכֵי<sup>72</sup> עַד דְּתַחֲסִלִּין יִתִּיה בְּרַם<sup>73</sup> יִקִּים יִי ית פִּתְגָמוּדֵי וְאֹרִיכֵת<sup>74</sup> אַתְחָא וְאֹנִיקָת  
 ית בְּרָה עַד דְּחַסֵּלַת יִתִּיה: 24 1 וְאִסְקֵתִיה עִמָּה כִּד חַסֵּלֵתִיה בְּחֻרִין תִּלְחָא וּמְכִילְחָא  
 חֲדָא דְקַמְחָא וְגַרְבַּ דְּחָמַר וְאִיתִיחִיה לְבֵית מְקֻדְשָׁא דִּי לְשִׁילוּ וּרְבִיא הוּוּ יִנִּק:

1:22 But Hannah did not go up, for she said to her husband, "As soon as the child is weaned, I will bring him that he be seen before the LORD and live there for ever." 1:23 And her husband Elkanah said to her, "Do what seems right in your sight, wait until you have weaned him. Only, may the LORD establish his words." So the woman waited and nursed her son, until she weaned him. 1:24 And when she had weaned him, she took him up with her, along with three bulls, a measure of

<sup>68</sup>TJon adds the implicit description of Hannah's face. Similarly, LXX renders "her face did not fall any longer" and Syr "and her face no longer quivered". Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 8; Komlosch, באור התרגום, 327.

<sup>69</sup>Cf. Stummer, "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas", *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, esp. 6.

<sup>70</sup>Besides, this is not a proper object after the verb 'sacrifice', cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 8. LXX gives the same solution.

<sup>71</sup>Ms B\* adds יהוה.

<sup>72</sup>Ms kb52 reads אַחִיבֵי, 'hold [him] back', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>73</sup>Mss a b c d f j m o w x y B D J T eb1 add אַם after בְּרַם: "only if the LORD will establish his words".

<sup>74</sup>Ms kb52 reads וִיחִיבָהּ, 'she held [him] back', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

*flour and a skin of wine; and she brought him to the sanctuary of the LORD, to Shiloh. And the boy was young.*

There is no attempt to harmonize the three bulls here with the one bull in 1:25, as is done in LXX and Syr (against >16). Neither does TJon harmonize the one measure of flour with the three tenths of an ephah in Num. 29:1-4, in contrast to Vg (against >16).<sup>75</sup>

The rendering of the second נער by a different term (ניק) is in accordance with the Targum's standard procedure (>10; >18).

◇ 25 ונכסו ית תורא<sup>76</sup> ואיתו ית רביא לות עלי: 1 26 ואמרת בבכו רבוני חיי נפשך רבוני<sup>77</sup> אנה אחת דאתעדת עמך הכא לצלאה קדם יי: 1 27 על רביא הדין צליתו ויהב יי לי ית בעותי דבעית<sup>78</sup> מן קדמוהי: 1 28 ואף אנה מסרתיה דייה משמיש קדם יי כל יומין דהוא קיים<sup>79</sup> ישמיש קדם יי וסגיד תמן קדם יי:

*1:25 And they slaughtered the bull and brought the boy to Eli. 1:26 And she said, "Please, my lord! By your life, my lord, I am the woman who was standing here with you to pray before the LORD. 1:27 Concerning this boy I prayed; and the LORD granted me my petition which I made from before Him. 1:28 And I have also handed him over that he may be serving before the LORD. All the days that he lives, he will serve before the LORD." And he bowed down before the LORD there.*

### 5.3 The Prophecy of Hannah (1 Samuel 2:1-10)

#### 5.3.1 Hannah's Song as *Haftara*

In the annual cycle, the Song of Hannah is the *haftara* for New Year, together with 1 Sam. 1 (see above, comments preceding 1:1). Although no resemblances can be found between the present chapter and the accompanying Torah readings, the links with New Year's day are apparently maintained. The Aramaic version of Hannah's Song refers to the day of judgment several times (2:3, 8-10) and, according to R. Abba bar Kahana, the Holy One will judge the world on New Year's Day (PesR. 40:1). The nine invocations of God's name, which were connected with the nine benedictions on New Year's Day (PesR. 40:1), are maintained as well—although some manuscripts add the LORD's name after מקרשא and ארנא in 2:1:

<sup>75</sup>Cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 68.

<sup>76</sup>Ms D reads תורהא, in contrast to 1:24.

<sup>77</sup>Mss D J omit נפשך רבוני חיי, probably by haplography.

<sup>78</sup>Omitted in MS T, probably by haplography.

<sup>79</sup>TJon seems to read חיה, as in two MSS and the other versions, cf. *BHS*, crit.app. Besides, this is one of the few examples of a divergent word order.

“And for what reason are there nine benedictions and not seven as on the Sabbath? The nine correspond to the nine invocations of God’s name in the chapter where Hannah says her prayer. The requirement of nine benedictions in the Tefillah for New Year’s Day may openly be inferred from the chapter with Hannah’s prayer, because, according to R. Abba bar Kahana, in the chapter with Hannah’s prayer it is written, “The LORD will judge the ends of the earth” (1 Sam. 2:10). On what day does the Holy One, blessed be He, judge the world and acquit them? It is on New Year’s Day that He judges His creatures and acquits them.”

### 5.3.2 Hannah’s Song as Prophecy

TJon explains the Song of Hannah in a Midrashic way. In the first three verses, interpretation and translation are kept separately: first the allegorical interpretation is given, then a more or less literal translation is offered, four times after the word כִּכִּי, ‘therefore’ (2:1-2).<sup>80</sup> This conjunction functions as the introduction to a Biblical quotation, in this case a literal translation of the Biblical text,<sup>81</sup> in the same way as  $\delta\tau\omicron$  in the New Testament.<sup>82</sup> In these three verses, and nowhere else in TgSam, the difference between Targum and Midrash is small.<sup>83</sup>

In verses 4 and 5 interpretation and translation are mixed and some Hebrew expressions are translated paraphrastically, such as “gird on strength” which is represented by “mighty deeds will be done to them” (1 Sam. 2:4).<sup>84</sup> Verses 6 and 7 are translated more or less literally, albeit with some additions within the verses. Finally, the poem ends with a mixture of interpretation and translation, in which paraphrastic rendering plays a role (2:8-10). Regarding Alexander’s division into two basic types of targum<sup>85</sup>, it is almost impossible to determine whether the Aramaic poem in TJon 1 Sam. 2:1-10 is a Type

<sup>80</sup>The Antwerp Polyglot omits the additions in verses 1-6, leaving out all allusions to historical events. In this way, a more or less literal translation is obtained. Probably this is due to the inconsistent purging of the Targum in the Antwerp Polyglot, cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 167-9. From verse 7 on, however, MS o joins the common rendering, and even adds some phrases.

<sup>81</sup>Cf. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech*, 77, n. 18; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 393. This conjunction also occurs in TgJudg. 5:2, marking the literal translation.

<sup>82</sup>Occurring in Eph. 4:8; 5:14; Heb. 3:7; 10:5; 13:6; Jas 4:6.

<sup>83</sup>This distinction is defined by A. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targumic Exegesis* (TSAJ, 27), Tübingen 1992, 163.

<sup>84</sup>Differently TJon 2 Sam. 22:40.

<sup>85</sup>P.S. Alexander, “Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures”, in:

A Targum or a Type B Targum. Type A, which forms a viable one-to-one rendering when expansions are bracketed out, can be found in vss. 1-3 and 6-7. Type B, in which the translation of the original words dissolve in the paraphrase, can partly be found in vss. 4-5 and 8-10, although Type A is also present in some sentences in these verse.

The fact that Hannah's Song is poetry, may have given rise to a prophetic, albeit not necessarily messianic, interpretation. As in later Judaism, Psalms and prayers are considered prophecy. This is paralleled in TJon's translation of the Psalm of David (2 Sam. 22) and David's Last Words (2 Sam. 23:1-7).<sup>86</sup> It was generally known in the rabbinic period that TJon interpreted many poems as messianic prophecies (Meg. 3a, Ber. 34b),<sup>87</sup> although not every poem is transformed into a detailed prophecy concerning Israel's future. Within the Hebrew Books of Samuel, Hannah's Song already functions as a prophetic, proleptic song, anticipating the throne of glory and the anointed king.<sup>88</sup> It is therefore not surprising that TJon understood the prophetic nature of some verses, and extended this nature to the entire song.<sup>89</sup>

Hannah's song is transformed into a complete prophecy, or rather an apocalypse, which describes the course of Israel's future and climaxes in an eschatological vision.<sup>90</sup> This vision is partly made after the example of the visions in Dan. 2 and 7 concerning the great empires of the world which will be defeated in the founding of God's kingdom at the end of days. It must be noted that the poem is no

---

M.J. Mulder, H. Sysling (eds), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRI, 2/1), Assen 1988, 217-53, esp. 229-37.

<sup>86</sup>U. Simon, *Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms: From Saadiah Gaon to Abraham Ibn Ezra*, Albany (NY) 1991, 188. Even the words "song" or "prayer" could refer to prophecy (Deut. 32:1; Hab. 3:1).

<sup>87</sup>See also 11QPs<sup>a</sup>, in which David's psalms are called 'prophecy'.

<sup>88</sup>J.W. Wesseliuss, "Completeness and Closure in Targumic Literature: The Emulation of Biblical Hebrew Poetry in Targum Jonathan to the Former Prophets", paper read at the third meeting of the IOTS, Basel August 2-3, 2001, forthcoming in *JAB* 3 (2001), observed that all four major songs in the Former Prophets (Judg. 5, 1 Sam. 2:1-10; 2 Sam. 22; 23:1-7) surpass their direct co-text and function as highlights in the early history of Israel: the beginning of the period of Judges, the beginning of the monarchy, and twice after the institution of David's dynasty.

<sup>89</sup>K. Koch, "Das apokalyptische Lied der Profetin Hanna: 1 Sam 2,1-10 im Targum", in: W. Zwickel (ed.), *Biblische Welten: Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (OBO, 123), Freiburg & Göttingen 1993, 61-82, esp. 61-62.

<sup>90</sup>Cf. J.E. Cook, *Hannah's Desire, God's Design: Early Interpretations of the Story of Hannah* (JSOT-S, 282), Sheffield 1999, 79.

longer an individual song of praise, but is turned into a collective recognition of God's mighty deeds in Israel's history.<sup>91</sup> The first part of Hannah's prophecy explains how Israel's enemies, introduced by the word "my enemy" in the Hebrew text of verse 1, are defeated by God's intervention and how the righteous are saved (TJon 1 Sam. 2:1-5). In this part God is depicted as a warrior, protecting his people from the great enemies.<sup>92</sup> The second half takes up the Biblical theme of the LORD as the great reverser of status.<sup>93</sup> Starting in Israel's history with the story of Esther and Mordecai, TJon describes punishment for the wicked, like Haman, Rome and Gog, and reward for the righteous. Hannah's prophecy ends with the war between Gog and the Messiah (2:10) after the statement that judgment in Gehenna is established for the wicked and life in the world for the righteous (2:9).<sup>94</sup>

Although the connection between the Hebrew and the Aramaic text may be thin on the level of the word, "one cannot say that the targum of the prayer has removed itself entirely from the Biblical wording."<sup>95</sup> The themes of the reversal of status and God's faithfulness are included in the Targumic version, but applied to events in Israel's history (>20). In this allegorical translation of TJon the poetical structure of Hannah's Song is lost. Even the strong inclusion between the first and the last verse, the exaltation of the horn, is dissolved in the paraphrastic rendering.

Pseudo-Philo also explains Hannah's Song in an allegorical way as a prophecy concerning Israel, but his version is more general and does not mention specific details from Israel's history. A few similarities with the Targumic version can be found: the acknowledgment that Samuel will be a prophet (*LAB* 51:3, 6; TJon 1 Sam. 2:1); universalism and the call to the nations to confess the God of Israel (*LAB*, 51:3-4; TJon 1 Sam. 2:1-3); and the resurrection and the final judgment (*LAB*, 51:5; TJon 1 Sam. 2:3, 6).

<sup>91</sup>So K. Koch, "Das apokalyptische Lied der Profetin Hanna: 1 Sam 2,1-10 im Targum", in: W. Zwickel (ed.), *Biblische Welten: Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (OBO, 123), Freiburg & Göttingen 1993, 61-82, esp. 69.

<sup>92</sup>Cf. J.E. Cook, *Hannah's Desire, God's Design: Early Interpretations of the Story of Hannah* (JSOT-S, 282), Sheffield 1999, 86.

<sup>93</sup>Cf. D.J. Harrington, "The Apocalypse of Hannah: Targum Jonathan of 1 Samuel 2:1-10", in: D.M. Golomb (ed.), *Working with No Data: Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*, Winona Lake 1987, 147-52, esp. 147.

<sup>94</sup>The war against Gog, the reward for the righteous and the punishment of the wicked constitute the contents of prophecy, according to Pseudo-Jerome, cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 81.

<sup>95</sup>Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 308.

### 5.3.3 Links with the Psalm of David (2 Sam. 22)

The Hebrew text of the Song of Hannah is linked to the Hebrew text of the Psalm of David (2 Sam. 22) in several ways. At the level of words, 37 out of the 86 words in the Song of Hannah are also incorporated in the Psalm of David. This makes 43 % of Hannah's words.<sup>96</sup> At the level of themes, similarity is found in

- the confession of one God (1 Sam. 2:2; 2 Sam. 22:32, 47);
- the exaltation and humiliation of people (1 Sam. 2:7; 2 Sam. 22:28);
- God's watching over the righteous (1 Sam. 2:9; 2 Sam. 22:26);
- his thundering voice from heaven (1 Sam. 2:10; 2 Sam. 22:14);
- and his aid to the anointed king (1 Sam. 2:10; 2 Sam. 22:51).<sup>97</sup>

In short, the Psalm of David can be seen as a fulfilment of the Song of Hannah.<sup>98</sup> Nevertheless, the Song of Hannah and its preceding history can also be regarded as the opposite of the Psalm of David and its following history. Hannah is raised up from her barrenness, David is humiliated after his arrogant count of the growing population.<sup>99</sup>

TJon expands both songs. The Song of Hannah is turned into a prophecy concerning the history of Israel, from the times of Samuel until the coming of the Messiah and his war against Gog. The Psalm of David is turned into a lesson about the history of Israel, from God's faithfulness to Abraham until the redemption of his people out of Egypt, but the conclusion of the Psalm also mentions the war between the Messiah and Gog (TJon 2 Sam. 22:49).

The extant links between the two songs are not only maintained, but even extended in TJon. Out of the 241 words in the Aramaic Song of Hannah, 82 words are also used in the Aramaic Psalm of David. Although this makes only 34 %, the number of corresponding themes are increased to 16:

- the author as a prophet (1 Sam. 2:1; 2 Sam. 22:1);
- miracles and mighty deeds (1 Sam. 2:1, 6; 2 Sam. 22:32, 47);
- the confession of one God (1 Sam. 2:1; 2 Sam. 22:32, 47, 51);

<sup>96</sup>Not counting the prepositions, negations, the verb הָיָה and the conjunction וְ. Cf. J.W. Watts, *Psalms and Story: Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative* (JSOT.S, 139), Sheffield 1992, 23, n. 3; J.P. Fokkeman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*, Vol. 3, Assen 1990, 354, n. 57.

<sup>97</sup>Watts, *Psalms and Story*, 23, n. 3.

<sup>98</sup>Fokkeman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*, Vol. 3, 355.

<sup>99</sup>W. Brueggeman, "1 Samuel 1: A sense of a beginning", *ZAW* 102 (1990), 33-48, esp. 33; Idem, "2 Samuel 21-24—An Appendix of Deconstruction", in: Idem, *Old Testament Theology: Essays on Structure, Theme, and Text*, Minneapolis 1992, 235-51, esp. 250.

- repeated introductions (1 Sam. 2:1-5; 2 Sam. 22:1, 4, 7, 21);
- inserted Biblical figures (1 Sam. 2:1-5; 2 Sam. 22:9, 26-27);
- the exaltation of the horn (1 Sam. 2:1; 2 Sam. 22:3);<sup>100</sup>
- God's judgment (1 Sam. 2:3; 2 Sam. 22:23);
- the exaltation and humiliation of people (1 Sam. 2:7; 2 Sam. 22:28);
- God establishing the earth (1 Sam. 2:8; 2 Sam. 22:16);
- God's guard over the righteous (1 Sam. 2:9; 2 Sam. 22:24, 26);
- the contrast between darkness and life (1 Sam. 2:9; 2 Sam. 22:29);
- the shattering of the enemies (1 Sam. 2:9; 2 Sam. 22:40, 41, 48);
- nations standing up to harm Israel (1 Sam. 2:10; 2 Sam. 22:40, 48-49);
- God's thundering voice from heaven (1 Sam. 2:10; 2 Sam. 22:14);
- Gog and the violent nations (1 Sam. 2:10; 2 Sam. 22:49);
- God's aid to the anointed king (1 Sam. 2:10; 2 Sam. 22:51).

TJon creates new links between these two poetical chapters, but also omits some existing links, *e.g.* the Hebrew verb ישע is equated with two Aramaic verbs, פּרַק and שׂיזב and the words אָזר, 'gird', and רגל, 'foot', are not repeated. On the other hand, the links are increased by translating both צוּר, 'rock', and עוּ, 'strength', with Aramaic תְּקַפָּא, 'strength'. The noun תְּקַפָּא is, together with the adjective חֲקִיפָא, 'strong', and the verb חֲקַף, the most binding word in these poems.<sup>101</sup> R. Simeon b. Lakish already noticed that the single word "strength" included the meaning and connotations of several metaphors (MTeh. 18:7). On the other hand, the strength of this argument should not be over-estimated because תְּקַפָּא and חֲקַף are used to translate an enormous variety of Hebrew words in all parts of TJon.

It is remarkable that the temporal order in both poems is the same. First the history of Israel is mentioned (1 Sam. 2:1-6; 2 Sam. 22:7-28); then the opposition of darkness in Gehenna and life in the world to come (1 Sam. 2:8-9; 2 Sam. 22:29); and finally the war against Gog and the messianic reign (1 Sam. 2:9-10; 2 Sam. 22:49-51). These last two items are elaborated on in TJon 2 Sam. 23:1-8, the Last Words of David. Evidently, TJon also establishes links between the Song of Hannah and the Last Words of David, and not just on the level of words.

<sup>100</sup>Note that in both verses the metaphor is not solved (against >13).

<sup>101</sup>תְּקַפָּא occurs in 1 Sam. 2:10; 2 Sam. 22:2-3, 11, 16-17, 31, 34, 36, 47; חֲקִיפָא in 1 Sam. 2:1-2; 2 Sam. 22:8, 12, 28, 30, 32, 47; and חֲקַף in 2 Sam. 22:5-6, 17-18, 33, 35. Cf. A.S. Rodrigues Pereira, *Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E.-c. 600 C.E.): Selected Jewish, Christian and Samaritan Poems*, Leiden (diss.) 1996, 51.

### 5.3.4 Links with the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus*

In several respects Luke composed his books, Luke and Acts, after the example of the Books of Samuel. He worked out many similarities between the two histories, such as the barrenness of the precursor's mother (Hannah and Elizabeth), childhood stories (Samuel and Jesus)<sup>102</sup>, notes on the growth and favour of the child (1 Sam. 2:26; 3:19 for Samuel; Lk. 1:80 for John the Baptist; and 2:40, 52 for Jesus), the presentation in the Temple by the parents (Samuel in 1 Sam. 1:24-28; Jesus in Lk. 1:22-40), and the name of the prophetess Anna (Lk. 2:36).<sup>103</sup> Likewise, the *Magnificat* and the *Benedictus* are reminiscent of the Song of Hannah.<sup>104</sup>

Although Mary's Song is a compilation of LXX quotations from the Old Testament, it is always connected with Hannah's Song as well.<sup>105</sup> Several themes from Hannah's Song are incorporated in the *Magnificat*: a woman praising God (1 Sam. 2:1; Lk. 1:47); God's salvation (1 Sam. 2:1; Lk. 1:47); God being holy (1 Sam. 2:2; Lk. 1:49); God reversing low and high (1 Sam. 2:8; Lk. 1:52); God satisfying the hungry (1 Sam. 2:5; Lk. 1:53); and the shattering of the enemies (1 Sam. 2:10; Lk. 1:51). Besides, the two songs have the same function in their respective books. Both songs depict a kind of plan, worked out in the rest of the books. On top of the similarities with the Hebrew Song of Hannah, the shift from the hungry to the poor is a striking similarity between the Aramaic version of Hannah's Song and the *Magnificat* (TJon 1 Sam. 2:5; Lk. 1:53).<sup>106</sup>

Traditionally, Zechariah's prophecy is not connected with the childhood account of Samuel. However, there are some similarities with the Aramaic version of 1 Samuel. Luke depicts the parent as filled

<sup>102</sup>Josephus dates the first acts of Samuel in his twelfth year (*Antiquities*, 5:10), as are the first acts of Jesus (Lk. 2:41-52).

<sup>103</sup>Even some designations of the two leading men in books of Luke and Acts remind of the Books of Samuel: Jesus the son of *David* (Lk. 3:31; 18:38, cf. also 20:41-44; Acts 2:30) and Paul who actually was called *Saul*.

<sup>104</sup>This can be called "situation similarity" or "action similarity", one of the several ways the NT is dealing with the OT, cf. J. Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments*, London 1966, 115.

<sup>105</sup>Cf. e.g. K.H. Rengstorf, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD, 3), Göttingen 1975, 29; A. Schlatter, *Das Evangelium des Lukas*, Stuttgart <sup>2</sup>1960, 170-71; U. Mittmann-Richert, *Magnifikat und Benediktus: Die ältesten Zeugnisse der jüdenchristlichen Tradition von der Geburt des Messias* (WUNT, 90), Tübingen 1996, 29.

<sup>106</sup>Two other vague similarities can be mentioned: God's great deeds or miracles (TJon 1 Sam. 2:1, 4; Lk. 1:49) and God as the mighty or strong one (TJon 1 Sam. 2:2; Lk. 1:49).



with the Holy Spirit and prophesying (Lk. 1:67, cf. TJon 1 Sam. 2:1), Zechariah quotes the phrase “a horn of salvation” (2 Sam. 22:3) and connects it with being saved from the hands of the enemy (Lk. 1:71; cf. TJon 1 Sam. 2:1), and Zechariah prophesies that his child will be a prophet (Lk. 1:76; cf. TJon. 1 Sam. 2:1). Even the phrase “that we might serve Him without fear (...) all the days of our life” (Lk. 1:74), a quote from Isa. 38:20, is reminiscent of the account of Samuel. First, the phrase is used right after the account of the deliverance from the hands of the enemy. In Hannah’s Song the service of the LORD, with song and instrument (see again Isa. 38:20), comes after the deliverance from the hand of the Philistines (TJon 1 Sam. 2:1). Secondly, Samuel is said to serve before the LORD without the dominion of man (TJon 1 Sam. 1:11). The Hebrew word מורה is interpreted here as derived from the verb ירא, ‘fear’ (cf. Naz. 66a), hence also ‘violence, dominion’.

Finally, the coming of the prophetess Anna and her comfort for “all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem” (Lk. 2:38) are reminiscent of the Aramaic version of Hannah’s Song. It must be assumed that both Luke and the Targumist read Hannah’s Song in the same exegetical milieu.<sup>107</sup>

### 5.3.5 Commentary

1 2 וצליאת חנה ברוח  $\diamond$  נבואה  $\diamond$  108 ואמרת  $\diamond$  109 כבר  $\diamond$  110 שמואל ברי עתיד  $\diamond$  למהוי נביא  $\diamond$  על ישראל ביומיהי יתפרקון  $\diamond$  מידא דפלשתאי ועל ידוהי יתעבדן להון נסין וגבורן בכין תקיף  $\diamond$  111 לבי בחולקא דיהב לי יי ואף הימן בר יואל בר ברי שמואל דעתיד  $\diamond$  דיקום הוא וארבעת עטר בנוהי למהוי אמרין בשירא  $\diamond$  112 על ידי נבלין וכנרין עם אחיהן ליואי לשבחא בבית מקדשא  $\diamond$  113 בכין רימת קרני  $\diamond$  114 במתחא דמני  $\diamond$  115 לי

<sup>107</sup>Koch even assumed that many things in Lk. 2 presuppose the Targumic text of Hannah’s Song as known to Luke; cf. K. Koch, “Das apokalyptische Lied der Profetin Hanna: 1 Sam 2,1-10 im Targum”, in: W. Zwicker (ed.), *Biblische Welten: Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (OBO, 123), Freiburg & Göttingen 1993, 61-82, esp. 82.

<sup>108</sup>Ms J<sup>c</sup> adds  $\diamond$  קד and J<sup>m</sup> adds  $\diamond$  יי: ‘before the LORD’. The correctors probably followed other texts which use this phrase after the mentioning of the prophetic spirit (>15).

<sup>109</sup>Ms f adds  $\diamond$  נבואה ברוח, probably a dittography.

<sup>110</sup>Ms D reads  $\diamond$  ברי here, omitting the following  $\diamond$  בר.

<sup>111</sup>Mss B C J read  $\diamond$  תקיף, ‘the strength of my heart is in the portion ...’

<sup>112</sup>Omitted in ms D.

<sup>113</sup>Mss a S and Kimḥi add  $\diamond$  יי in conformity with the usual expression (>15, stock phrasing).

<sup>114</sup>Kimḥi reads  $\diamond$  לבי, influenced by the preceding phrase.

<sup>115</sup>Ms f reads again  $\diamond$  ריהב, although  $\diamond$  דמני is written in the margin (f<sub>3</sub>).

יִי וְאָף עַל פּוֹרְעֵנוֹת נֹסֵא דַעֲתִידִין לְמַהוּי בַפְּלִשְׁתִּי דַעֲתִידִין דִּיחֹן יִה אַרְוֹנָא<sup>116</sup>  
 בַּעֲגֻלָּא חֲדָתָא וְעֵמִיָּה קִרְבָּן אֲשַׁמָּא בְּכִין חִימֵר כְּנִשְׁתָּא דִישְׂרָאֵל<sup>117</sup> אֲתַפְתַּח פּוּמִי  
 לְמַלְלָא רַבְרָבָן עַל בַּעֲלֵי רַבְבֵּי אַרִי חֲדִיתִי בַפְּרֻקְךָ:

2:1 *And Hannah prayed in a prophetic spirit and said: "Now my son Samuel is to be a prophet over Israel. In his days they will be saved from the hand of the Philistines and by his hands miracles and mighty deeds<sup>118</sup> will be done to<sup>119</sup> them." Therefore, "my heart is strong in the portion that the LORD gave to me."*

*"And also Heman, son of Joel, son of my son Samuel, who is to stand up, he and his fourteen sons, to be speaking in song by means of lyres and lutes, together with their brothers, the Levites, to praise in the sanctuary." Therefore, "my horn is exalted in the gift that the LORD appointed to me."*

*"And furthermore, concerning the miraculous punishment which is to be among the Philistines, who are to bring the ark on a new cart and with it the guilt offering." Therefore, let the assembly of Israel say,<sup>120</sup> "Let my mouth be opened to speak great things against my enemies, for I rejoiced in thy salvation."*

Several circumstances led to the rendering of Hannah's Song as prophecy. It is poetry, although not all poems are considered prophecy (cf. David's Lament in 2 Sam. 1:19-27). Both Samuel's parents were considered to be endowed with the gift of prophecy, as an explanation of Samuel's importance (Meg. 14a). And already in the Hebrew text this Song is prophetic, because Hannah speaks about the judgment of the world and the coming of the Anointed One (2:10). Therefore, the view that Hannah's Song was prophetic was widespread.<sup>121</sup>

Another trigger can be found in the word "horn" (2:1). According to LamR. 2:3 § 6, there are ten horns in the Hebrew Bible: Abraham, Isaac, Joseph, Moses, the Torah, priesthood, the Levites, prophecy,

<sup>116</sup>Mss a b d f B D 12<sup>hc</sup> S T eb1 and Kimḥi add דִּיי in conformity with the usual phrasing (>15, stock phrasing).

<sup>117</sup>Omitted by MSS C S.

<sup>118</sup>Or "miracles and wonders", as is said in Ch. Potok, *My Name is Asher Lev*, London 1973, 38-39. Cf. Ps. 78:4.

<sup>119</sup>Or "against", for the Philistines are intended, see the third part of this verse. The same wording is used in 2:2, also with the sense of "against".

<sup>120</sup>Or "you shall say, O assembly of Israel", cf. P. Humbert, "Le Messie dans le Targum des Prophètes", *RThPh* 43 (1910), 420-47, esp. 424. This translation is, however, not probable, because of the similar phrasing in 2:2, which must mean "let your people say".

<sup>121</sup>Cf. the version of Hannah's Song in Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 51; Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 1, 17:4; BB 14b.

the Temple and Israel.<sup>122</sup> The horn of prophecy is demonstrated in the present verse, while the horn of the Levites is demonstrated in 1 Chron. 25:5, speaking about Heman and his fourteen sons.<sup>123</sup> TJon combines these traditions and connects Hannah's horn with her offspring, Heman and his fourteen sons who will be singing together with the Levites. A strong connection is made between the horn of prophecy and the horn of the Levites, the more so since Heman is also called "the king's seer" in 1 Chron. 25:5. According to the Aramaic version of Hannah's Song, the gift of prophecy would continue along the lineage of her offspring, especially in song.<sup>124</sup> This may also explain why TJon did not replace the metaphor "horn" with its realistic meaning.<sup>125</sup>

Hannah's first utterance is assigned to three periods in time, but all three are connected with her offspring. First, her son Samuel is mentioned as a prophet, judging and saving Israel (cf. 1 Sam. 7:14-15). The exultation of Hannah's heart is connected with the birth of her son, just as her sad and bitter heart was connected with her barrenness (1 Sam. 1:8, 15). The phrase "the portion that the LORD gave to me" refers to the fact that Levites did not share in the land, but received the gift of priesthood (Josh. 18:7, cf. TJon 1 Sam. 1:1).<sup>126</sup> God's salvation is described in the passive tense "in his days they will be saved".<sup>127</sup>

Secondly, her descendant Heman is depicted as a temple singer, together with his fourteen sons and the Levites (cf. 1 Chron. 6:33; 15:17;

<sup>122</sup>A similar list of ten horns is found in MTeh. 75:5, Abraham, Isaac, Moses, Samuel (referring to the present verse), Aaron and priesthood, Sanhedrin and Torah, Heman and the Levites (referring to 1 Chron. 25:5), Jerusalem and the Temple, the Messiah (referring to 2:10), and David.

<sup>123</sup>However, Ker. 6a combines the horn with the anointing horn, with which the Davidic dynasty was anointed.

<sup>124</sup>Cf. Ps. 148:14, "He has raised up a horn for his people, praise for all his saints".

<sup>125</sup>The metaphor was well-known from the Psalms. The image "is that of an animal carrying its head high, and proudly conscious of his strength", cf. Driver, *Notes*, 23. The combination of "raising ones horn" occurs in Pss 75:11; 89:18, 25; 92:11; 112:9; and 148:14 in a positive sense. It occurs negatively in Ps. 75:5-6, 11, where it functions as a symbol of proud and blasphemy. Cf. also S. Becker-Spörl, "Und Hanna betete, und sie sprach ..." *Literarische Untersuchungen zu 1 Sam 2,1-10*, Tübingen 1992, 39.

<sup>126</sup>In TO Gen. 49:3-4 three portions are mentioned beyond the portions of the land: the birthright, the priesthood and royalty, partly based on 1 Chron. 5:1-2 and elaborated on in GenR. 98:4. Cf. M. Aberbach, B. Grossfeld, *Targum Onqelos on Genesis 49* (SBL-AS, 1), Missoula (MT) 1976, 2, n. 3.

<sup>127</sup>The same formula is used in TO Gen. 49:16 concerning Samson.

2 Chron. 5:12).<sup>128</sup> The link between the exaltation of the horn and Heman's sons is based on 1 Chron. 25:5, where Heman is presented as "the king's seer, according to the promise of God to exalt his horn, for God had given Heman fourteen sons and three daughters". TJon regarded Hannah's prophecy as the part of Scripture where God's promise to exalt Heman's horn is given. Also the harps and lyres, as well as the service in the sanctuary, are mentioned here. The references to prophecy and song can easily be connected with the book of Psalms, especially with the royal psalms. The eschatological expectations integrated in the Aramaic version of Hannah's Song were also expressed by these psalms.<sup>129</sup> If this is true, the inclusion formed by the word "horn" (2:1, 10) is still existing.

Finally, the salvation from the Philistines and the returning of the ark is referred to (1 Sam. 4-7), including the details of the new cart and the guilt offerings (1 Sam. 6:7-8). When keeping the idea of Hannah's offspring in mind, it is not difficult to see the connection between the salvation from the enemies and the account of the return of the ark. Even the verb "rejoice" is a link (1 Sam. 2:1; 6:13). Note that the first two utterances are still spoken by Hannah herself. Her heart exults because her son will be Israel's prophet and her horn is exalted because of Heman and his sons. The last utterance, however, is put into the mouth of the assembly of Israel, albeit still with the first person singular.

2 2 על סנחריב מלכא דאחור אחנביא־א־ת־ו־אמרת דעתיד־ו־130 דיסק־131 הוא וכל  
 חילתיה על ירושלם ונס סני יתעביד ביה־132 תמן יפלון פגרי משריתיה בכין יודון  
 כל־133 עממיא אומיא ולישניא ויימרון ליה דקדיש אלא יי ארי לית בר מנך ועמך  
 יימרון לית דתקף־ו־אלא אלהנא־:

*2:2 Concerning Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, she prophesied and said that he was to come up against Jerusalem, he and all his armies. And there a great miracle will be done to him: the corpses of his camps will fall. Therefore, let all the nations, peoples and languages confess*

<sup>128</sup>Cf. also K. Koch, "Das apokalyptische Lied der Profetin Hanna: 1 Sam 2,1-10 im Targum", in: W. Zwickel (ed.), *Biblische Welten: Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (OBO, 123), Freiburg & Göttingen 1993, 61-82, esp. 68.

<sup>129</sup>U. Glessmer, "Die 'Vier Reiche' aus Daniel in der Targumischen Literatur", in: J.J. Collins, P.W. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Vol. 2, Leiden 2001, 468-89, esp. 478.

<sup>130</sup>Ms b reads עוהרד, which supposes a direct speech.

<sup>131</sup>Ms b reads דייקום, 'to stand up'.

<sup>132</sup>Ms m reads ביה, referring to Jerusalem and not to Sennacherib.

<sup>133</sup>Ms D reads יודון עממיא ולישניא, 'let nations and peoples confess'.

and say, "There is none who is holy but the LORD, for there is none besides Thee." And let your people say: "There is none who is strong but our God."

The confession of one God, the holy One, is associated with the attack of Sennacherib on Jerusalem, because his general mocked the God of Israel as well as the gods of the nations (2 Kgs 18:32-35).<sup>134</sup> God sent a comforting message through Isaiah, saying that Sennacherib's general was mocking the Holy One of Israel (2 Kgs 19:22) and that he would be punished for that. Therefore, King Hezekiah trusted upon the LORD as the King of all the earth. In TJon 2 Kgs 19:15 this confession is rendered by לִיָּהּ בַּר מִנְּךָ, the same confession as in Hannah's Song. TJon used two more expressions from this account, *viz.* Sennacherib's "coming up against" the city (2 Kgs 18:17, 25) and the description of the dead bodies in the Assyrian camp (2 Kgs 19:36).

The confession of one God is highlighted by TJon (>22). The Hebrew phrase that there is none like God can be taken as an acknowledgement of other gods, lesser gods. This implication is avoided by TJon in this verse, by using the prepositions אֲלֵא and בַּר מִן, 'apart from, beside'.<sup>135</sup> The fact that TJon replaced the question by a statement also highlights the confession that there is only one God. The question in the Hebrew had to be answered correctly.

This confession is put into the mouth of the "peoples, nations and languages". This triplet is based on the vocabulary of Daniel<sup>136</sup> and is an expression referring to all the nations of the world. The visions of Daniel were also used as the basis for the four empires in the following verses: Babylon (in the person of Nebuchadnezzar), Greece, Persia (in the person of Haman), Rome, and finally the kingdom of the Messiah (Dan. 2 and 7).<sup>137</sup> The kingdoms of the visions in Daniel are incorporated in the prophecy of Hannah, albeit in a slightly different order.<sup>138</sup> It is clear, then, that TJon did not consider the four beasts

<sup>134</sup>Kasher's index of names in תוספתות, *s.v.* סַנְחַרִּיב refers to several tosefta-targumim, in which Sennacherib is also introduced as one of the main opponents of God's people.

<sup>135</sup>Cf. TJon 2 Sam. 22:32; Isa. 43:10, 11; 44:6; 45:5, 6, 14, 21, 24; 46:9; 47:8, 10; 48:12; 64:3. For the similarity of this creed with the Islamic creed, see the commentary on 2 Sam. 22:32. Note that TJon 2 Sam. 7:22 retained the preposition "like".

<sup>136</sup>Dan. 3:4, 7, 29, 31; 5:19; 6:26; 7:14. Cf. Harrington, "The Apocalypse of Hannah", 151.

<sup>137</sup>The four empires are often referred to in Jewish literature, cf. *e.g.* GenR. 44:17; ExodR. 15:16; 51:7; LevR. 13:5; TPsJ Gen. 12:15; PRE 28; MTeh. 8:1.

<sup>138</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 10. The connection between the visions of Daniel and the Song of Hannah was brought to his attention, because a fellow

from Dan. 7 to be images of Babylon, Media, Persia and the Seleucid Empire, culminating in the prosecutions of Antioch IV Epiphany, as several modern exegetes do.<sup>139</sup> Both Christian and Jewish tradition interpreted the four empires of Daniel from their own perspectives, living in the Roman empire. The four empires were Babylon, Media and Persia, Greece, and Rome.<sup>140</sup>

2 3 על נבוכדנצר מלכא דבבל אתנביאח ו אמרת אתון כסדאי וכל עממיא דעתידין למשלט בישראל<sup>141</sup> לא חסנון<sup>142</sup> למלא רברבן רברבן לא יפקון גרפין מפומכון ארי אלהא<sup>143</sup> ידע כולא וי ועל<sup>144</sup> כל עוברויה מתיח<sup>145</sup> דינא<sup>146</sup> ואף לכון עתיד לשלמא פורענות חוביון:

*2:3 Concerning Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, she prophesied and said, "You, Chaldeans and all the nations who are to rule in Israel, do not increase speaking boastful things. Let no blasphemies go forth from your mouth, for the LORD is the God who knows everything and upon all his creations judgment is meted out. And also to you He is to make full requital<sup>147</sup> for your guilt."*

The first of the four empires of Daniel is Babylonia, personified in its notorious king Nebuchadnezzar.<sup>148</sup> However, Babylonia is not mentioned on its own. The prophecy concerns all the nations which are to rule in Israel. Babylon is just the first in a series of oppressive empires.

The phrase "talk no more so very proudly" is changed into a prophecy concerning King Nebuchadnezzar because of his arrogance,

---

student wrote his doctoral thesis on the four empires in the book of Daniel; cf. I. Vajda, *Dániel könyvének négy világbirodalma a zsidó hagyományos irodalomban*, Budapest 1938.

<sup>139</sup>Various interpretations of the four beasts in Dan. 7 are discussed in G.W. Loren, *Het thema van de Antichrist in de intertestamentaire perionde*, Leuven 1997, 112-16.

<sup>140</sup>U. Glessmer, "Die 'Vier Reiche' aus Daniel in der Targumischen Literatur", in: J.J. Collins, P.W. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Vol. 2. Leiden 2001, 468-89, esp. 470.

<sup>141</sup>Ms S reads בירוש, 'in Jerusalem'.

<sup>142</sup>Ms B shows the erroneous reading חסנרון, 'bow down'.

<sup>143</sup>Ms B reads אלהנא, 'our God', which stresses TJon's monotheistic theology (>22).

<sup>144</sup>Neither the Ketib nor the Qere is rendered (cf. Soferim 37b). A different solution for a similar Hebrew phrase is found in TgEzek. 18:25, 29.

<sup>145</sup>Mss k ebl read מתח, an active participle meaning 'meting out', which is referring to God.

<sup>146</sup>Ms b reads דיניה, 'his judgment', referring to God (>11).

<sup>147</sup>The phrase לפרע can also mean "revenge someone", which does not fit here.

<sup>148</sup>Kasher's index of names in תוספתות, s.v. נבוכדנצר refers to several tosefta-targumim, in which Nebuchadnezzar is introduced as a boasting king.

described in Isa. 14:13 and Dan. 4:37.<sup>149</sup> It is associated with the judgment of God, an association which is also made in ExodR. 30:18, where God is depicted as not too old to mete out judgment (cf. Prov. 21:1-4; Dan. 8:9-10). The image of God as the highest judge is repeatedly elaborated on in TJon.<sup>150</sup>

◇ 4 על מלכות יון<sup>151</sup> אתנביאת ◇ ואמרת קשתת<sup>152</sup> דגברי יונאי יתברן ◇ ורבינת  
חשמנאי<sup>153</sup> דהו חלשין יתעברן להון גבורן<sup>154</sup>:

2:4 Concerning the kingdom of Greece she prophesied and said, "The bows of the Greek heroes will be broken and those of the Hasmonaean house who are weak, mighty deeds will be done for them."

The contrast between the mighty and the powerless reminded the Targumist of the unequal struggle between the Seleucids—called the Greek here, as they were the heirs of the Greek empire—and the Maccabees. The Maccabees did indeed feel weak compared with the Seleucids, on the evidence of Judah's prayer. Judah compares him and his men to the lack of strength in David as he fought Goliath, and in Jonathan when he fought the Philistine army (1 Macc. 4:30). The mention of the bow in the Hebrew original may also have aroused the association with Greece, since Zech. 9:13 depicts Judah and Ephraim as God's bow and arrow against Greece.<sup>155</sup> The bow is an image of power, and breaking bows is an image of universal peace and the end of war (cf. e.g. Jer. 51:56; Hos. 2:20; Ps. 46:10).<sup>156</sup>

It is remarkable that the people in this verse, as well as in the preceding verses, are passive: the bows will be broken, in conformity with the passive tense in the Hebrew text, and mighty deeds will be done, in contrast to the active tense in Hebrew. This passive voice implies God as the actor (>23).<sup>157</sup>

<sup>149</sup>Cf. Komlosch, *המקרא באור החרגום*, 308; Harrington, "The Apocalypse of Hannah", 152.

<sup>150</sup>Cf. TgIsa. 21:12; 24:16; 29:15; TgPs 14:1; TgQoh. 1:4; 12:5-7; TgHab. 1:12. Cf. M. Maher, "God as Judge in the Targums", *JSJ* 29 (1998), 49-62, esp. 55.

<sup>151</sup>The *Mikraoth Gedoloth*, Warsaw 1862, *apud* Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 11, n. 46, reads בוקרין, 'Macedonia'.

<sup>152</sup>Plural, see also Syr.

<sup>153</sup>Ms D adds מלכ- "Hasmonaean kings".

<sup>154</sup>Ms f reads the singular נבורא, in conformity with the singular in the Hebrew text; MSS b B read ניסין ונבורין following the wording in 1 Sam. 2:1. Ms kb52 read לרוח ניסין ונבורין, 'miracles and mighty deeds will be done by the Spirit'.

<sup>155</sup>Cf. also MTeh. 8:1.

<sup>156</sup>Cf. N.M. Waldmann, "The Breaking of the Bow," *JQR* 69 (1978/79), 82-88; O. Keel, "Der Bogen als Herrschaftssymbol", *ZDPV* 93 (1977), 141-77, esp. 172-73.

<sup>157</sup>Cf. TO Gen. 49:16 concerning Samson (see above, 1 Sam. 2:1).

2 על בנוהי דהמן אתנביא־ו ואמרה<sup>158</sup> דהו סבעין בלחמא וגאן בעותרא וסגיאין בממונא אתמסכנו תבו לאתזאגרא בלחים<sup>159</sup> מזון פומהון מרדכי ואסתר דהו חשיכין<sup>160</sup> עתרו ואתנשיו ית מסכינותהון תבו למהוי בני חורין כין ירושלם דהו כאתא<sup>161</sup> עקרא<sup>162</sup> עתידא־ו דתמלי מעם<sup>163</sup> גלותהא ורומי<sup>164</sup> דמליא סגי עממיא<sup>165</sup> יסופן משריחה תצדי ותחרוב:

*2:5 Concerning the sons of Haman she prophesied and said: "Those who were satisfied with bread and amassing riches and growing in money, will become poor. They have returned to hiring themselves out for bread, the food of their mouth. Mordecai and Esther who were needy became rich and forgot their poverty. They have returned to being free persons. So Jerusalem which was like a barren woman is to be filled with her exiled people. And Rome which is filled with a mass of peoples, her armies will cease to be. She will be desolate and destroyed."*

The contrast between the satisfied and the hungry is interpreted as the contrast between the rich sons of Haman and the poor Esther and Mordecai. This corresponds with the opinion of the rabbis that the sons of Haman are mentioned by Hannah (Meg. 15b),<sup>166</sup> and with their opinion that Haman abused his riches (Meg. 14a). At the end of the book of Esther, Haman's signet ring, which designates his position in the kingdom, and his house are given to Mordecai and Esther. The sons of Haman are deprived of their dignity and their home, while Esther and Mordecai are honoured and enriched (Est. 8:1-2).<sup>167</sup> By using the word חשיכין, 'needy', TJon is already referring to 1 Sam. 2:8, where the needy is lifted from the ash heap to sit with princes on a

<sup>158</sup> Ms J adds והמן ובנוהי, 'Haman and his sons who were satisfied'.

<sup>159</sup> This addition is also made in PesR. 43:7.

<sup>160</sup> Ms B gives a double translation with חשיכין מסכינין, 'needy, poor', using the same word as in TJon 1 Sam. 2:7 (>15).

<sup>161</sup> Mss B J add the verb דמי. Ms J reads דמיא לאיחא and ms B reads כאיחא (>29, conflated reading).

<sup>162</sup> Mss d B S add ילדה, 'without bearing', an associative translation referring to TJon Isa. 54:1 (>15). Ms D omits everything from עקרא until the third word in verse 10 because of lack of space.

<sup>163</sup> Mss d J add שבי, 'the people of her exilic captivity'. Ms B adds תבו, from the noun תבוהא, by analogy with the Hebrew שבוח, meaning 'the people of the return from her exile'.

<sup>164</sup> Mss a d f B add חייבתא, 'guilty Rome', cf. TgLam. 4:22.

<sup>165</sup> The Antwerp Polyglot, which also omits every allegorical addition, changes סגי עממיא into בנין סגי.

<sup>166</sup> A different interpretation is found in GenR. 72:1, where Leah is the satisfied and full person and Rachel the hungry and barren women.

<sup>167</sup> An abstracted form of this verse is given in TgPs. 49:11, "the wicked will leave their wealth to the righteous".



throne. In the latter verse Mordecai and Esther are not mentioned, because the verses 6-10 are interpreted in an eschatological sense.

The combination of Haman's sons and the city of Rome in one verse allows for the thought that these sons refer to the Romans.<sup>168</sup> In this verse TJon shifts from satisfaction to riches and from hunger to poverty, *i.e.* from the symptom to the cause—a shift partly made in the *Magnificat* (see above, § 5.3.4). TJon did not disapprove of riches, but there is a certain wariness, for people could either use them well or abuse them (cf. EcclR. 1:18 § 1). An identical warning is given concerning power (cf. 2:8).

The barren woman is identified with the city of Jerusalem, depicted as a barren woman in Isa. 54:1.<sup>169</sup> The seven (שבעה) children are interpreted either as derived from the verb שבע, 'satisfy', also used in the first part of this verse,<sup>170</sup> or as the number of abundance, hence the rendering "full".<sup>171</sup> In the same manner Vg renders "plurimos".<sup>172</sup>

The opposite figure is actualized and identified with Rome (cf. TgIsa. 54:1), which is said to become desolate. This prediction of Rome's fall does not provide any indication of the date of TJon. Many second and third century rabbis uttered confident predictions that Rome would eventually be overthrown.<sup>173</sup>

6 2 כל אלין גבורתא דיי דהוא שליט בעלמא ◊ ממת ואמר לאחאה מחית לשאול ואף עתיד◊ לאסקא בחיי עלמא◊:

<sup>168</sup>So K. Koch, "Das apokalyptische Lied der Profetin Hanna: 1 Sam 2,1-10 im Targum", in: W. Zwickel (ed.), *Biblische Welten: Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (OBO, 123), Freiburg & Göttingen 1993, 61-82, 71-72.

<sup>169</sup>TgLam. 1:1 depicts Jerusalem before her fall as a city full of crowds. An identical association is made in GenR. 38:14, LamR. 1:2 § 26, and LamR. 1:17 § 52. Gal. 4:27 also cites Isa. 54:1 in a reference to Jerusalem, albeit the heavenly Jerusalem.

<sup>170</sup>Harrington, "The Apocalypse of Hannah", 151 (>1). Likewise the Syriac translation "a barren woman gives birth and is satisfied"; cf. C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL, 11), Leiden 2001, 24. The opposite interpretation is given by the rabbis in Meg. 15b, who interpreted שבעים as שבעים, 'seventy', to establish the number of Haman's sons. Identical interpretations are found in Ar. 13b (concerning Ps. 16:11) and Ber. 14a (concerning Prov. 19:23).

<sup>171</sup>For some literature on the subject of 'seven' and its multiplications as numbers of fullness see: J.C. de Moor, 'Seventy!', in: M. Dietrich, I. Kottsieper (eds), *Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf": Studien zum Alten Testament und zum Alten Orient: Fs O. Loretz*, Münster 1998, 199-203.

<sup>172</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 69.

<sup>173</sup>Cf. L.H. Feldman, *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* (AGJU, 30), Leiden 1996, 477-81; Idem, "Rabbinic Insights on the Decline and Forthcoming Fall of the Roman Empire", *JSJ* 31 (2000), 275-97, esp. 284-88.

2:6 *All these are a mighty work of the LORD, who is ruling in the world. He puts to death and promised to make alive. He brings down to Sheol and is also to raise up in eternal life.*

The historical survey smoothly proceeds to eschatology, in which resurrection, punishment and reward, Gehenna, the war against Gog and the kingdom of the Messiah are all combined, following the example of the visions in the book of Daniel.<sup>174</sup> After the judgment of the four empires, the kingdom of God and his Anointed One will come.<sup>175</sup> God is depicted here not only as the God of individual believers or the God of the people of Israel. He is portrayed as the Master of the history of Israel and of all the nations of the world.<sup>176</sup>

In this co-text, TJon specifies the nature of God's action in raising the dead as resurrection, and life as eternal life. Therefore TJon alters the participle מַחִיָּה into a promise, "He promised to make alive", and the consecutive imperfect of וַיַּעַל into a future tense with וַיַּחֲיֶה, "He will raise up".<sup>177</sup> This shift is repeatedly made in TJon, e.g. in 1 Sam. 25:29; Ezek. 20:11, 13, 21. It is interesting that TPsJ offers a similar eschatological interpretation of the related text Deut. 32:39.<sup>178</sup>

*Codex Reuchlinianus* preserves a longer version of 1 Sam. 2:6, which is in agreement with the rabbinic exegesis of this verse:<sup>179</sup>

כל אליו גבורתא דיוי דהוא שליט בעלמא ◊ ממית ואמר לאחאה מחיית לשאול ואף  
 עתיד ◊ לאסקא בחיי עלמא ◊ ברם קרח בר יצהר בר קהת בר לוי דמיניה נפק שמואל  
 ברי איתחח לשאול על עיסק דקם ואיתפלג על משה ואהרן צדיקיא ◊ יסקון מבית  
 בליעתהון ויודון דלית אלהא ◊ בר מיניה:

*All these are a mighty work of the LORD, who is ruling in the world. He puts to death and promised to make alive. He brings down to Sheol and is*

<sup>174</sup>Cf. Harrington, "The Apocalypse of Hannah", 151-52; Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 12; Komlos, *באור התרגום*, 309.

<sup>175</sup>It is true that the four empires of Daniel are more often integrated in Targumic texts, but these empires are not always connected with a messianic era or the final salvation of Israel, cf. U. Glessmer, "Die 'Vier Reiche' aus Daniel in der Targumischen Literatur", in: J.J. Collins, P.W. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Vol. 2, Leiden 2001, 468-89, esp. 472-73. TgHab 3:17-18 did make that connection.

<sup>176</sup>Glessmer, "Die 'Vier Reiche' aus Daniel in der Targumischen Literatur", 474.

<sup>177</sup>This alteration is not made to avoid direct divine action, as J.E. Cook, *Hannah's Desire, God's Design: Early Interpretations of the Story of Hannah* (JSOT-S, 282), Sheffield 1999, 83 stated.

<sup>178</sup>Cf. H. Sysling, *Teḥiyyat Ha-Metim: The Resurrection of the Dead in the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Parallel Traditions in Classical Rabbinic Literature* (TSAJ, 57), Tübingen 1996, 242-46.

<sup>179</sup>This longer version is discussed by Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 12; Kasher, *תוספתות*, 101.

*also to raise up in eternal life. But Korah, son of Izhar, son of Kohath, son of Levi, from whom went forth my son Samuel, was brought down to Sheol on account of the fact that he stood up and differed in opinion with Moses and Aaron, the righteous ones. They will come up from the house of their entanglement and will confess that there is no God beside Him.*

In rabbinic theology, 1 Sam. 2:6 is interpreted as a prayer on behalf of Korah and his men. Whereas R. Aqiba assumed that the assembly of Korah would not rise, R. Eliezer and R. Joshua b. Levi saw their resurrection in the wording in Hannah's Song, because of the word "grave" used both in Num. 16:33 and in the present verse.<sup>180</sup> According to the school of Shammai God will judge the world in three categories: those who are destined for punishment, those who are destined for reward (cf. Dan. 12:2) and those who will rise to eternal life after suffering punishment (cf. Zech. 13:9 and the present verse).<sup>181</sup>

By an error in the division of this tosefta-targum, Humbert renders that Korah "was brought down to Sheol because he rebelled against Moses and Aaron. The righteous, however, will come up from the house of their entanglement . . .", in agreement with R. Aqiba's theology that Korah will not stand up.<sup>182</sup> The word בליעתא, however, is typical for the account of Korah (cf. TO Num. 16:32; 26:10) and cannot be used for the righteous in general.

The genealogy of Korah is taken from Num. 16:1 and corresponds with 1 Chron. 6:16-30, 38. The reason for Korah's descent to Sheol—he stood up and argued with Moses and Aaron—is taken from Num. 16:1-3, with the same words as in TO on this verse: אַחַזְפַּלִּי and קָם. The last sentence in the tosefta, however, seems to suggest an exegetic perception according to which Korah's rebellion was against the LORD rather than against his representatives.<sup>183</sup> In the end Korah and his assembly—note the plural verb—will confess that there is only one God. This confession resembles the confessions in TJon 1 Sam. 2:2 and 2 Sam. 22:32, but worded after the example of TJon 2 Sam. 7:22. The verb אָרַב, 'confess, praise' connects Korah and his assembly to the Psalms of the sons of Korah.<sup>184</sup>

<sup>180</sup>Cf. GenR. 98:4; NumR. 18:13; 18:20; RHsh. 16b-17a; ARN<sup>b</sup> 31b; TanB, *Bamidbar*, 5a:4; 5:27; MTeh. 21:4; 45:4; mSan. 10:3; San. 109b; ySan. 10:1 (29a); 10:4 (29c); MShem. 5:12.

<sup>181</sup>Cf. RHsh. 16b-17a; tSan. 13:3; CantR. 1:3 § 3.

<sup>182</sup>Humbert, "Le Messie dans le Targum des Prophètes", 425, "... fut précipité au Scheol, car il s'était révolté contre Moïse et Aaron; les justes (au contraire) remonteront de la fosse qui les a engloutis . . .".

<sup>183</sup>Kasher, תוספתות, 101.

<sup>184</sup>Pss 42-49; 84, 85, 88. Cf. also 1 Chron. 6:31-38; 2 Chron. 20:19.

2 7 יי ממסכין ומעתר משפיל<sup>185</sup> אף מרים: 2 8 מקים מעפרא מסכינא מקלקלחא מרים חשיכא<sup>186</sup> לאתבותהון עם צדיקיא דרבבי עלמא דכרסי יקרא דמחסין להון ארי קדם דיי גלן עובדי בני אנשא מלרע אתקין גיהנם לרשיעא<sup>187</sup> וצדיקיא דעבדי רעותיה שכליל להון<sup>188</sup> תבל:

2:7 *The LORD makes poor and makes rich; He brings low, He also exalts. 2:8 He raises up the poor from the dust, from the ash heap he lifts the needy, to make them sit with the righteous, the chiefs of the world, and inherit the Throne of Glory. For before the LORD the deeds of the sons of men below are revealed. He has established Gehenna for the evil ones, and for the righteous ones, doing his will, He has completed<sup>189</sup> the world.*

Not the mighty are called the chiefs of the world, but the righteous. The world is not ruled by money (cf. 2:2) or power, but by God's commandments. Aramaic עלמא most likely refers to the world to come, because the entire verse is eschatologically interpreted.<sup>190</sup> The prospect that the righteous will reign in the world to come is based on Dan. 7:27. It is also indicated in the New Testament.<sup>191</sup>

Even though the translation "Throne of Glory" is literal, the content of this phrase shifts from this world to the world to come. Terms like Gehenna and judgment do not refer to this world. This connotation also affects the phrase "Throne of Glory" which now refers to God's throne in heaven.<sup>192</sup>

Hebrew מצקי ארץ seems to have been rendered twice. Aramaic גיהנם is its first equivalent, attained by dividing the synonyms earth and world into two realms (>18). Here ארץ is interpreted as the nether-world, as for example in Jon. 2:7, while תבל is regarded as the normal terrestrial world. The second equivalent, צדיקיא, corresponds more

<sup>185</sup> Ms f reads ממיד, 'humiliating'.

<sup>186</sup> Ms S\* reads מסכינא, while MS S<sup>m</sup> reads חשיכא with MSS B C J.

<sup>187</sup> MSS b f o J S T add על מיריהו עברי, 'trespassing against his speech', by analogy with the עבדי רעותיה after "the righteous ones".

<sup>188</sup> Only MS B reads, with the Hebrew text, עליהון, 'on them'.

<sup>189</sup> Aramaic שכלל is used in TN Gen. 1:1 to denote that God completed the creation of the world on the very first day. This thought is also reflected in rabbinic literature, where Hebrew כלל Niphal is used; cf. B. Grossfeld, *Targum Neofiti 1: An Exegetical Commentary to Genesis Including Full Rabbinic Parallels*, New York 2000, 56-57.

<sup>190</sup> So K. Koch, "Das apokalyptische Lied der Profetin Hanna: 1 Sam 2,1-10 im Targum", in: W. Zwickel (ed.), *Biblische Welten: Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (OBO, 123), Freiburg & Göttingen 1993, 61-82, esp. 73.

<sup>191</sup> See e.g. the parable of the pounds in Lk 19:11-27; 2 Tim. 2:12; Rev. 5:10; 20:6; 22:5.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. also DeutR. 10:4; SER 5 (p. 21).

with rabbinic exegesis, in which the righteous are seen as the pillars of the world.<sup>193</sup> Still, TJon does not explain that the LORD will build the world *on* these righteous, but He will do so *for* them. This difference may have originated in TJon's direction of thinking, *viz.* the eschatological future, or it may be based on Ps. 75:3-4 in which the keeping of the pillars of the earth is depicted as a deed of righteous judgment. TJon's eschatological leaning can also be found in ExodR 25:8 where this verse is interpreted as, "And then will I supply you with the delights of Paradise."<sup>194</sup>

The contrast of righteous and wicked originates in the following verse (2:9), while the idea of reward and punishment has its root in the last verse of Hannah's song (2:10).

9 2 גיית עבדוהי צדיקיא<sup>195</sup> ישר מניהנם<sup>196</sup> ורשיעיא<sup>196</sup> בניהנם<sup>196</sup> בחשוכא ידרנן<sup>197</sup>  
להודעא ארי לא מן דאית ביה חילא זכי<sup>197</sup> ליום דינא:

2:9 *He will keep the bodies of his righteous servants from Gehenna, but the evil ones will be judged in Gehenna to make it known that there is none in whom there is strength worthy for the day of judgment.*

The "feet of the faithful" are understood as a *pars pro toto* for their bodies (>14). Since guarding the righteous in this world was seen as superfluous (cf. TanB, *Bereshit*, 9:14; Pea 16b), TJon interprets this verse eschatologically,<sup>198</sup> as is done elsewhere in rabbinic exegesis (cf. SifBam § 40 (on Num. 6:24); NumR. 11:5; MTeh. 121:2). The term Gehenna originates in the, metaphorically understood, "darkness" in the Hebrew text.<sup>199</sup> Gehenna, prepared for the wicked, is also mentioned

<sup>193</sup>GenR 55:6; ExodR. 2:6; 15:7; DeutR. 2:7; Zev. 102a; Yom. 38b; San. 26b; TgCant. 5:15; SEZ 5 (p. 181-82). Thus also Pseudo-Jerome with "pauperes spiritu et humiles corde" as the explanation of the pillars of the world, deriving it from צוק, 'oppress', cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 70.

<sup>194</sup>However, the raising of the poor is considered there a reference to the people of Israel who were saved from the slavery in Egypt. "In eschatological scenes past, present and future tend to merge," according to J.C. de Moor, "The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1-12", *JSJ* 29 (1998), 77.

<sup>195</sup>Plural according to the Qere.

<sup>196</sup>MSS o B S add עברי מימריה (על) מימריה, as did some MSS in the previous verse. MS C has a similar addition after בניהנם, but spelled as חברי מימריה, which means 'friends of his speech', but is probably an error for עברי מימריה.

<sup>197</sup>Ithpeel pf. 3 m. pl. of דין, 'judge', see Wm.B. Stevenson, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, Oxford <sup>2</sup>1962, 77; against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 106, who translate "will walk about". Besides, MSS a b c d f o B C J read יהרנן.

<sup>198</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 13. Still, R. Jóhanan and R. Shila interpreted this phrase as keeping the righteous from sinful deeds (Yom. 38b).

<sup>199</sup>So in TJon Nah. 1:8, tosefta-targum to Isa. 45:7, cf. Hen. 10:5; 1QM XIV.17;

and described in TgIsa.<sup>200</sup> In TgIsa. 26:19 the wicked are described as transgressors of God's word; this corresponds with a few variant readings in this verse (>15), reading רשעיא עברי מימריה, 'the evil ones, violating his speech'.

The idea that none has the strength to be pure for the Day of Judgment is also attested to in Phil. 1:10. In the present verse it is stated that the righteous will be protected by God, while the wicked must endure Gehenna's purification.

10 2 יוי יתברד בעלי דבבא דקימין לאבאשא לעמיה עליהון<sup>201</sup> מן שמיא בקל  
 רם<sup>202</sup> ישקיף יוי יעביד<sup>203</sup> פורענות דין<sup>204</sup> מנוג ומשריה עממין חטופין דאזן עמיה  
 מסיפי ארעא ויתין תוקפא למלכיה וירכי מלכות משיחיה:

*2:10 The LORD will shatter the enemies who rise up to harm his people. Against them He will thunder from heaven with a loud voice. The LORD will make just requital<sup>205</sup> to Gog and the armies of the robbing nations who come with him from the ends of the earth. And he will give strength to his king and enlarge the kingdom of his anointed one.*

The last verse of Hannah's Song is connected with an eschatological war between God's Messiah and Gog, the king of Magog,<sup>206</sup> caused by the Hebrew phrase that God will judge the ends of the earth.

4Q491:Fragm. 8-10:15; SifBam § 40 (ed. Horovitz, 44); Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 51:5; Yev. 109b; San. 7b where the word "night" is interpreted as Gehenna, but cf. Mt. 8:12; 22:13; 25:30; 2 Pet. 2:17; Jude 1:13. SifBam § 40 quotes 1 Sam. 2:9 adding the word Gehenna in the preceding phrase.

<sup>200</sup>TgIsa. 26:15, 19; 30:33; 33:14, 17; 53:9. 65:5; 66:24 (with דין Itp.) as well as tosefta-targumim to Isa. 45:7; 57:20. See on this remarkable focus on the Gehenna in the Isaiah Targum A. Shapira, *המגמותיה התיאולוגיה של התרגום יונתן בן עוזיאל לישעיהו*, diss. Bar Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan 1976, 94-110.

<sup>201</sup>TJon renders according to the Qere.

<sup>202</sup>Mss k y B read רב, which is more in conformity with the usual vocabulary of TJon, cf. 1 Sam. 7:10; 28:12; 2 Sam. 15:23; 19:5 (>15). Mss a B J add יכלי, 'he will thunder', a second rendering of Hebrew ירעם (>29).

<sup>203</sup>Ms T reads the passive יחעביר, "Against them the LORD will thunder from heaven with a loud voice. Just requital will be made to Gog ..." This passive voice is influenced by 2:1 and 2:4.

<sup>204</sup>Omitted in MSS d f. The preceding פורענות is omitted in MS J. This phrase must have been felt as a conflated rendering, although it is often used in TgEzek., cf. the verses 5:10, 15; 11:19; 16:41; 23:10; 25:11; 28:22, 26; 30:14, 19.

<sup>205</sup>The phrase ל- ארפרע can also mean "revenge someone", which does not fit here.

<sup>206</sup>Cf. Ezek. 38-39; and many subsequent references, e.g. 1QM 11:16; 4Q161:Fragm. 8-10:21-22; 4Q285; cf. J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche und priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT, 2. Reihe, 104), Tübingen 1998, 59-71; 78-98; TgN Num. 11:26; 24:20; TPsJ Deut. 32:39; 34:3; TJon Isa. 33:22; tosefta-targum to Isa. 27:1.

Gog and his plundering armies may even be a second rendering of the Hebrew words “ends of the world”, since R. Abba bar Kahana interpreted it as derivation of the Hebrew verb  $\text{עֵן}$ , ‘end’ (>3), with the words: “These are the nations in the world who ended hoping in their Creator” (MShem. 5:17).<sup>207</sup> In Rev. 20:8 the peoples from the four corners of the earth are also identified as “Gog and Magog”.

In rabbinic theology, Gog and Magog get a place in eschatology as the last enemy of Israel. This enemy will be defeated in the end of days, after which the messianic era will begin.<sup>208</sup> In this context the Messiah is not one of Israel’s known kings, but the expected king to come.<sup>209</sup> Note also that Gog might be identified with Rome (GenR. 98:2), and that the coming of the Messiah is associated with the overthrow of the Roman Empire (San. 99a).<sup>210</sup>

The emphasis on the kingship of the Messiah and his worldly wars and kingdom in TJon, might be part of a tendency against the Christian interpretation of the Hebrew Bible, stressing that Jesus did not bring a kingdom by fighting against the oppressors.<sup>211</sup> It is at any rate a reflection of the early Roman times, in which hopes of the messianic era are combined with rebellion.<sup>212</sup> In later times the Messiah

<sup>207</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 14. A similar explanation of this word is given in NumR. 12:11, but here the  $\text{עֵן}$  are regarded as the dead, those who “ended” their lives.

<sup>208</sup>Cf. MTeh. 17:10; PesR 31:9 (Gog is the fifth kingdom, mentioned after the famous four, because the Book of Psalms summons God five times to arise against the nations), but also Rev. 20:7-10. In TPsJ Lev. 26:42-44 the name of Gog is also mentioned after the four empires Babylonia, Media, Greece and Rome; cf. U. Glessner, “Die ‘Vier Reiche’ aus Daniel in der Targumischen Literatur”, in: J.J. Collins, P.W. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Vol. 2, Leiden 2001, 468-89, esp. 483.

<sup>209</sup>Cf. Harrington, “The Apocalypse of Hannah”, 152. So also in LamR. 2:3 § 6, but ExodR. 1:17; 27:4 refer to David and Solomon as the anointed one indicated by Hannah. Note that TJon did not differentiate between the King Messiah and the Messiah bar Ephraim who is to vanquish Gog, as is done in TPsJ Exod. 40:11 and a tosefta-targum to Zech. 12:10.

<sup>210</sup>Cf. L.H. Feldman, “Rabbinic Insights on the Decline and Forthcoming Fall of the Roman Empire”, *JSJ* 31 (2000), 275-97, esp. 283.

<sup>211</sup>M. Aberbach, B. Grossfeld, *Targum Onqelos on Genesis 49* (SBL-AS, 1), Missoula (MT) 1976, 15, n. 25; E. Deutsch, “On the Targums”, in: *Literary Remains of the Late Emanuel Deutsch*, London [1874], 319-403, esp. 373.

<sup>212</sup>Qumranic texts also reflect the kingship and majesty of the Messiah, cf. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 46-229. Political messianism decreased after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in 70 CE, and even more after the disastrous results of the Bar Kokhba revolt. Several rabbis warned against such messianic expectations. Cf. P. Schäfer, “Die messianischen Hoffnungen des rabbinischen Judentums zwischen Naherwartung und religiösem Pragmatismus”, in: C. Thoma (ed.), *Zukunft in der Gegenwart: Wegweisungen in Ju-*

is rather depicted as a rabbi, teaching the Torah, as in Tg. 1 Chron. 11:11 (see below, commentary on 2 Sam. 23:8), although the image of the Messiah as the teacher of the Torah was never absent.<sup>213</sup>

#### 5.4 Serving in Shiloh (1 Samuel 2:11-36)

Part of 1 Sam. 2 (21-28) is read as *haftara* in the triennial cycle, after the Torah reading of Gen. 21. The remark that God remembered Hannah is reminiscent of God visiting Sarah. Both women bore a son, and both sons had trouble with the other sons living in the house. Isaac was humiliated by Ishmael, while Samuel had to witness the misbehaviour of Eli's sons. However, there is nothing in the Aramaic version of 1 Sam. 2:21-28 that is based on the Torah reading of Gen. 21.

The same part, starting with 1 Sam. 2:22, could be read as *haftara* in the triennial cycle, after the Torah reading of Gen. 27. Both accounts start with the remark that the father is old, and continue with the troubles in the relationship of the father and the two sons. The Aramaic version is not based on the Torah reading of Gen. 27.

A similar part, 1 Sam. 2:22-30 complemented by verse 35, was read as *haftara* in the triennial cycle, after the Torah reading of Gen. 39. Both accounts describe seduction and adultery. There is no indication that the Aramaic version of the *haftara* was influenced by this Torah reading.

A similar part, 1 Sam. 2:38-31 complemented by 3:5 and 20, was read as *haftara* in the triennial cycle, after the Torah reading of Lev. 8 concerning the consecration of Aaron as high priest. This Torah reading has not affected the Aramaic translation of the chapter either.

11 2 ואזל אלקנה לרמתא לביתה ורביא הוה משמיש קדם 214 יי בחיי 215 עלי  
כהנא: 2 2 ובני עלי גברין רשיעין 216 לא הו ידעין למרחל 216 מן קדם יי:

2:11 And Elkanah went home to Ramah. And the boy served before the LORD, during the life of Eli the priest. 2:12 And the sons of Eli were evil men. They did not know how to fear from before the LORD.

The verb "fear" is added, because the original "know the LORD" had to be rendered more reverentially (>23). Knowing God was impossible

*dentum und Christentum* (JudChr, 1), Bern & Frankfurt a.M. 1976, 95-125, esp. 97.

<sup>213</sup>Cf. e.g. J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, New York 1995, 102-23.

<sup>214</sup>Cf. also V, "in conspectu Domini".

<sup>215</sup>Usually rendered by קדם, but that word was used already (>18).

<sup>216</sup>Mss f T read למיפלה, "to worship".



but through his miraculous intervention in history, the study of his Torah, or through the fear of the LORD.<sup>217</sup> Since the expression *רחל יי* is also used to indicate the status of a semi-proselyte (cf. TgIsa. 19:21; 44:5; Acts 10:2), the accusation against the sons of Eli is very strong. They knew less than proselytes.<sup>218</sup>

Note that both the alliteration of the first phrase, *ובני עלי בני בליעל*, and the word play between Eli and “Belial” disappeared in the process of translation.

13 2 וּנְמוֹסָא דְכַהֲנָי מִן<sup>219</sup> עֵמָא כֹּל גַּבְר דְּנִכְסִים נִכְסְתָא וְאֲחֵי עוֹלִימָא דְכַהֲנָי כַּמְבַּשֵׁל בְּסָרָא וּמְשִׁילִיא דְלִיהַּ תְּלַת שְׁנִין בִּידֵיהּ:

2:13 *And this was the priests' due from the people—any man who slaughtered a sacrifice: the priest's servant would come, while the meat was boiling, with a three-pronged fork in his hand,*

While many modern commentators join the first phrase of verse 13 to the previous verse, TJon considered them two separated verses. By translating *נוֹמוֹסָא* TJon did not refer to the Torah in which the priests' laws are written, because laws in the Torah are specified by Aramaic *דִּינָא*. The Graecism *נוֹמוֹסָא* is used by TJon to denote laws or customs outside God's laws (see above, Ch. 4, Hebrew *משפט*), and it refers in the present verse to the bad habits of Eli's sons.

14 2 וּקְבַע לִיהַּ בְּאִיּוֹרָא<sup>220</sup> אִו בְּדוּרָא אִו בְּקִרְרָא אִו בְּמִלִּיסָא<sup>221</sup> כֹּל דְּמַסִּיק מְשִׁילִיא נְסִיב וְכַהֲנָא לְנַפְשִׁיהּ כְּרִין עֲבָדִין לְכֹל יִשְׂרָאֵל דְּאֲחֵן לְדַבְּחָא<sup>222</sup> וְתַמֵּן בְּשִׁילּוֹ: 2 15

<sup>217</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 136-37.

<sup>218</sup>The debate on the term “God-fearer” is recently summarized by L.L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*, Vol. 2: The Roman Period, Minneapolis 1992, 534-36.

<sup>219</sup>TJon renders in conformity with some Hebrew MSS and other versions, cf. Deut. 18:3. D.T. Tsumura, “The Poetic Nature of Hebrew Narrative Prose in 1 Sam. 2:12-17”, in: J.C. de Moor, W.G.E. Watson (eds), *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT, 42), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1993, 293-304, esp. 295 assumed that *הכהנים מאח העם* is a phonological adjustment of *העם הכהנים אח העם*. If that is true, the present passage is exactly the same as Deut. 18:3, while both the reading *מן* and the reading *אח* is explained. Driver, *Notes*, 29 and McCarter, *I Samuel*, 78 assumed that the *Mem* has been associated with the wrong word and suggested *הכהן מאח העם*.

<sup>220</sup>MSS b o read *בכּיּוֹרָא*, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>221</sup>All kinds of (erroneous) variants exist, like the Greek *באילפיסא* in the margin of MS f; *במלפא* in MS B, although corrected in the margin; *בסילסא* in MS S; and *במיכל* in MS D.

<sup>222</sup>Omitted in MS B, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

אף עד לא יתסקון<sup>223</sup> תרביא למדבחה ואחי עולימא דכהנא ואמר לגברא דנכיס<sup>224</sup> ◇  
 הב בסרא למטוי לכהנא ולא יסב ◇ מנך בסר מבשל אלהין כד חי:

2:14 and he would set it into the pan, or kettle, or cauldron, or pot; all that the fork brought up the priest would take for his living. So they did at Shiloh to all Israel who came there to sacrifice. 2:15 Moreover, before the fat pieces were brought up to the altar, the priest's servant would come and say to the man who was slaughtering, "Give meat for the priest to roast; for he will not accept boiled meat from you, but raw."

TJon explains the Hebrew "burn" with the image that the fat pieces had to be brought up to the altar first, and had to be burnt there, before the priest could ask for a piece of the remaining meat. The Hebrew קטר is always used in the sense of burning a sacrifice (e.g. Lev. 1:9) or incense (e.g. Exod. 30:9)<sup>225</sup>, and TO usually renders this by סלק Aphel whenever the fat is involved (e.g. Lev. 4:26; 6:5; 7:31; 8:16; 9:20; 16:25). The order of burning and eating would explain the phrase of the priest's servant concerning the boiled meat. The priest clearly did not want to wait until after his duty of the actual offering, because in the meantime the person who came to sacrifice would already have cooked the remaining meat.

16 2 ואמר ליה גברא אוריך עד דיתסקון<sup>226</sup> תרביא<sup>227</sup> וסב ◇ לך כמא דרעוא<sup>228</sup>  
 נפשך ואמר ליה<sup>229</sup> ארי כען תחין ואם לא יסבון ◇ מנך בעל כרחך: 2 17 והוה חוב ◇  
 עולימא סגי לחדא קדם ◇ יו ארי בוו גבריא ית קרבניא דייו:

2:16 And if the man said to him, "Wait until the fat pieces are brought up and then take according to the will of your soul," he would say to him, "For you must give it now; and if not, they will take it against your will." 2:17 And the guilt of the young men was very great before the LORD, for the men robbed<sup>230</sup> the offerings of the LORD.

<sup>223</sup>Ms B reads יקרבין, "before they sacrificed the fat pieces", another precision (>11).

<sup>224</sup>Mss b f m o w x y B C D J S T e b l read דבחה, 'sacrifice'.

<sup>225</sup>Driver, Notes, 31.

<sup>226</sup>Passive voice through different vocalization (>3). Ms d reads יסקון יומא דין, 'they bring up the fat pieces today'. The Hebrew phrase כיום is introduced again (>29). Ms S reads the same active verb (>29).

<sup>227</sup>Mss a B<sup>m</sup> J add למדבחה, 'to the altar', in conformity with the previous verse (>15).

<sup>228</sup>Mss a d m w x y J T read דרעיא, "according to what your soul pleases".

<sup>229</sup>TJon renders according to the Ketib, although Mss a b d f<sub>4</sub> m o y B D J S e b l render לא according to the Qere.

<sup>230</sup>From the stem בוו instead of בוא. In unvocalized texts, however, the difference cannot be distinguished.

Whereas Hebrew אנשים is neither attested in LXX nor in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, TJon found it in its *Vorlage* and incorporated it in its translation.<sup>231</sup> The Hebrew text was deemed not sufficiently prudent in stating that the men scorned the Most High, so TJon translated the Hebrew verb נאץ with the usual בוא, but vocalized it as derived from בוז, 'rob' (>6), in agreement with the contents of 2:29 (>15). Because this verse was harmonized with 2:29, it was not rendered in agreement with the identical phrase in Num. 16:30.

2 18 ושמואל משמיש קדם יוי עולימא אסיר כרוטס דבוץ: 2 19 ומעיל זעיר תעביד ליה אמיה ומסקא ליה מזמן מועד למועד<sup>232</sup> במסקה עם בעלה לרבחא ית דיבחה מועדא: 2 20 וברוך עלי ית אלקנה וית אחזיה ואמר יקים יוי לך בנין כשרין מן אחתא הדא חלף שאילתא דשאל<sup>233</sup> מן קדם יוי ואולו לאתרהון<sup>234</sup>: 2 21 ארי על דכרנה דחנה קדם יוי ועדיאת וילידת תלתה בנין וחרתין בנן ורבא רביא שמואל משמיש<sup>235</sup> קדם יוי: 2 22 ועלי סיב לחדא ושמע ית כל דעבדין בנודי לכל ישראל וית דשכבין ית נשיא דאתין לצלאה ד בחרע משכן זמנא:

*2:18 And Samuel was serving before the LORD. The young man was girded with a linen sleeved tunic. 2:19 And his mother used to make for him a little robe and take it to him from festival to festival, when she went up with her husband to offer the sacrifice of the festival. 2:20 Then Eli would bless Elkanah and his wife, and say, "The LORD raise up to you suitable sons by this woman for the request which he<sup>236</sup> asked from before the LORD." Then they would go to their own place. 2:21 For the memory of Hannah went up before the LORD, and she conceived and bore three sons and two daughters. And the boy Samuel grew up, serving before the LORD. 2:22 Now Eli was very old, and he heard all that his sons were doing to all Israel, and that they lay with the women who had come to pray at the entrance of the tent of meeting.*

TJon avoids the misunderstanding that this text deals with women doing the housekeeping at the entrance of the tent.<sup>237</sup> It concerns

<sup>231</sup> Cf. C. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO, 36), Freiburg & Göttingen 1981, 206-207.

<sup>232</sup> Ms a reads לימן מזמן, a less interpretative rendering.

<sup>233</sup> The use of the stem שאל is in agreement with 1:20, but against 1:7, 27.

<sup>234</sup> Ms p renders a plural suffix, as is done in some Hebrew MSS and in the Syr (>9). MSS a b c d f o m w x y B C D S T maintain the singular suffix. Ms eb1 gives a harmonization: וואלו גבר לאתריה: 'they went, each to his own place' (>16).

<sup>235</sup> Omitted by MSS o eb75.

<sup>236</sup> Some MSS maintain Hebrew masculine form, although Hannah did make the petition, cf. 1 Sam. 1:17, 20, 27.

<sup>237</sup> Likewise Josephus, *Antiquities*, 5:10. Cf. TgJudg. 5:24 in MS Pococke 184

women who came there to serve the LORD. They prayed while their husbands were involved with the slaughtering of the beasts. Likewise Tan., *Piqqude*, 9 where women say, "We do not have the tabernacle, nor the temple, let the prayer of our mouth be as an offering before your face in the tabernacle."<sup>238</sup> By this rendering TJon affirms that Eli's sons misbehaved against *all* Israel who came to serve God at Shiloh, men and women.

A marginal text in the CR gives a slightly different interpretation, but maintains that the text deals with women who came to pray:

ספרן אחרן ויה דמשהן ית קרבני נשיא דמרכיין דאתן לצלאה

*another book: and that they delayed the offerings of the women who were cleansing themselves, who came to pray*

This marginal text tries to protect Eli's sons by diminishing their guilt (>23). Eli's sons did not really sleep with the women as in the Hebrew text, but delayed their offerings and therefore Scripture reckons it as if they were sleeping with them.<sup>239</sup> The reason for accounting this as sin, is that the women could only have intercourse with their husbands after the offering of the bird, that is, after cleansing themselves (cf. Lev. 12:6-8). Therefore, the priests who delayed the offering, also delayed a normal married life.<sup>240</sup> Note that in this variant reading Eli's sons are acting as priests in contrast to the omission of the word "priest" in TJon 1 Sam. 3:1.

This depiction of the priests delaying the offerings also gives a better explanation of the destruction of Shiloh's sanctuary. Adultery would have resulted in the death of the priests alone, but contempt for offerings and pious people could indeed result in the destruction of a sanctuary; cf. the discussion in Yom. 9a.

23 2 ואמר להון למא תעבדון כפתגמא<sup>241</sup> האלין דאנא שמע ית פתגמיכון בישין מן כל עמא אלין: 24 2 לא בני ארי לא תקנא ◊ שמועתא דאנא שמע רדנין עמא דיין:

*2:23 And he said to them, "Why do you do such things, that I hear of your evil dealings from all these people? 2:24 No, my sons; it is no*

(Bodleian Library, Oxford), where women did not "serve", but "came to pray", cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 472.

<sup>238</sup>Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 304.

<sup>239</sup>Shab. 55b; Yom. 9a-b; GenR 85:12; yKet. 13:1 (35c); ySot. 1:4 (16d); AgBer. 41c; MShem. 7:4. Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 14; Kasher, תוספתא, 102.

<sup>240</sup>A slightly different reasoning is followed by Pseudo-Jerome, who supposed that Eli's sons sent the women home without actually bringing their sacrifices with the result that they slept with their husbands while being unclean, cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 71. Likewise AgBer. 42:4.

<sup>241</sup>Mss f T render פתגמא ית, probably influenced by the following words.

*right report that I hear the people of the LORD speaking.*

The Aramaic ררנין is an erroneous reading of דרנין, from the verb רנן, 'speak, think', used here in the negative sense of 'to murmur, to gossip'.<sup>242</sup> Various other erroneous readings can be found.<sup>243</sup> Another verb is used in MS D, *viz.* דרנין, "that I hear the people of the LORD judging (you)", although this may be a scribal error.

25 2 אַם יחוב ד גבר לגבר הלא ייתי<sup>244</sup> לקדם ד רינא וישמע<sup>245</sup> מליהון ויפלי ביניהון  
ואם קדם זיי יחוב ד גברא ממון יבעי וישתביק ליה ולא קבילו ד למימר אבוהון ארי  
רעוא קדם זיי לקטלותהון:

*2:25 If a man is in debt to a man, will he<sup>246</sup> not come before the judge and he will hear their words and examine between them? But if a man is in debt before the LORD, from whom will he ask that it shall be forgiven to him?" But they would not accept their father's speech, for it was the LORD's will to kill them.*

This mysterious text has led to a variety of interpretations and translations among the versions.<sup>247</sup> TJon divides the verse into two separate utterances, dividing even the two designations of God (>18). The first half deals with human struggles and lawsuit before the worldly judges—being the translation of the Hebrew אלהים. The translation "judges" also occurs in TO Exod. 21:6 and 22:8, where the existence of gods besides the LORD is denied (cf. also TJon 2 Sam. 14:14).<sup>248</sup> This interpretation agrees with the opinion of R. Joseph b. Ḥelbe, who said in a discussion with R. Abbahu that אלהים means "judge" in this verse (Yom. 87a).

The second half concerns sin against God and his reaction. The first occurrence of the verb פלל is rendered by the Aramaic פלא, 'investigate' (>6), the second rather literally with בעא, 'ask'.<sup>249</sup> The fact

<sup>242</sup>Levy, *CWT*, *s.v.* רנן. The correct spelling is attested in MSS a b c d f o B<sup>m</sup> C S and in Kimhi's commentary (ed. 1515/1517), while variant f<sub>3</sub> gives a participle of this verb.

<sup>243</sup>Like ררעין in MS g, ררנין in MS J, רכנין in MS eb1 and דרבנין in MS B.

<sup>244</sup>Only MS p. The other MSS read ייחון, 'they will come'.

<sup>245</sup>MS d adds קל here. This could be an erroneous correction, meaning to add this word after קבילו, in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>246</sup>Only in MS p. Other MSS read: "they".

<sup>247</sup>A survey of the ancient translations is given by E.F. de Ward, "Eli's Rhetorical Question: 1 Sam. 2:25", *JJS* 27 (1976), 117-37, esp. 120; a survey of modern interpretations is given by C. Houtman, "Zu I Samuel 2 25", *ZAW* 89 (1977), 412-17.

<sup>248</sup>See also the monotheistic interpretation of Ps. 82 (San. 7a; TgPs. 82).

<sup>249</sup>In contrast to MekY, *Nezikin*, 8, where the verb is interpreted as "God shall judge him".

that Aramaic בעא is used and not the usual rendering צלא suggests that the Targumists may have interpreted the phrase as “from what human will he ask that it shall be forgiven to him?”<sup>250</sup>

26 ורביא שמואל אזיל וסגי ושמידה טב ׀ תקנן ׀ אורחתיה קדם ׀ יוי ותריצין עברוהי  
בנו בני אנשא:

2:26 *And the boy Samuel continued to grow and his name was good. His ways were right before the LORD and his deeds were just in the midst of the sons of men.*

By adapting the exegetical rule of extension and exclusion the particle ג is regarded as an indication that the meaning of the word טוב was extended. So TJon repeated the word טוב twice, while omitting the particle ג (>8).

27 ואתא נביא ׀ דיוי ׀ לות עלי ואמר ליה כדנן ׀ אמר יוי אתגלאה<sup>251</sup> אתגליהי על  
בית אבוך כד הוו במצרים ומשעברין<sup>252</sup> לבית פרעה:

2:27 *And there came a prophet of the LORD to Eli, and said to him, “Thus the LORD has said, ‘I indeed revealed myself to the house of your father when they were in Egypt subject to the house of the pharaoh.*

There is no attempt in any manuscript to identify this anonymous prophet with a known Biblical hero (against >17). In other literature this prophet is called Aaron,<sup>253</sup> Phinehas or is identified with Samuel’s father Elkanah.<sup>254</sup>

28 ואתרעית<sup>255</sup> ביה מכל שבטיא ׀ דישראל<sup>256</sup> קדמי ׀ למהוי כהין לאסקא  
קרבן על מדבחי לאקטרא קטרת בסמין למלבש אפור ׀ לשמשא ׀ קדמי ׀ ויהיבית לבית  
אבוך ית כל קרבניא דבני ישראל<sup>258</sup>: 29 למא אתון אנסין בנכסח ׀ קדשי ובקרבני

<sup>250</sup>M. Maher, “The Meturgemanim and Prayer”, *JJS* 41 (1990), 226-46, esp. 238, although בעא is sometimes used for prayer (cf. 2 Kgs 19:20; Isa. 37:21).

<sup>251</sup>All MSS omit the interrogative particle (>14), except for MSS a J. Similarly LXX and Syr have positive statements.

<sup>252</sup>This plus is also found in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and in LXX. In TJon it is a natural precision, which avoids the explanation that Eli’s family “belonged to the house of the pharaoh” (>11).

<sup>253</sup>ExodR. 3:37; Tan., *Shemot*, 27 [24].

<sup>254</sup>Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 6, 222, n. 28.

<sup>255</sup>Ms d reads ואיחרע, perf. 3rd sg. in conformity with the Hebrew text. The other MSS explain it as the first person, like LXX, Syr and Vg (>9).

<sup>256</sup>MSS a J read דישראל, according to other verses in which בית is added before tribes and peoples (>10, >15).

<sup>257</sup>Ms d reads לי, against the normal reverential translation (>23). Omitted in MS o.

<sup>258</sup>The last three words of MS D are קרבנייה דביה ישר- in conformity with the earlier wording in this verse (>15).

דפקירית לקרבא קדמי  $\diamond$  בבית מקדשי  $\diamond$  ויקרת יה בנך קדמוחא<sup>259</sup> לאוכלוהון מריש כל קרבן<sup>260</sup> ישראל עמי:

*2:28 And I chose him out of all the tribes of Israel for Me, to be priest, to bring up sacrifices upon my altar, to burn sweet-smelling incense, to wear an ephod, to serve before Me. And I gave to the house of your father all the offerings of the sons of Israel. 2:29 Why then are you robbing my holy sacrifice and my offering, which I commanded to bring before Me in my sanctuary, and honour your sons first of all to let them eat first of every offering of my people Israel?*

The figurative מען is rendered in association with other occurrences of this word ( $\succ$ -15). The combination מען ביתך (Ps. 26:8) and the independent use in 2 Chron. 36:15 made the rendering with בית מקדשא logical.

Again Eli is spared as a Biblical hero ( $\succ$ -23). He did not honour his sons more than God, which would have been an act of idolatry, but he honoured his sons first. This vague rendering can be interpreted as “first among men”. TJon did not even render “honour your sons more than my worship”, which could have been expected and which is Josephus’ rendering.<sup>261</sup> TJon assumed that Eli did not eat from the offerings himself, for the suffix after this verb is changed from 2nd to 3rd person, in harmonization with 2:17.

2 30 בכין<sup>262</sup> אמר  $\diamond$  יי אלהא  $\diamond$  דישראל מימר אמרית ביתך וביה אבוך ישמשון<sup>263</sup> קדמי  $\diamond$  עד עלמא  $\diamond$  וכען אמר  $\diamond$  יי קשטא אנון דיני ארי לדמיקרין קדמי  $\diamond$  איקר ודמבסרין על שמי<sup>264</sup> יתשטון: 2 31 הא יומיא אתן<sup>265</sup> ואקמוף יה תקוף<sup>266</sup> דרעך ויה תקוף<sup>267</sup> דרע בית אבוך מלמהווי סב בביתך:

*2:30 Therefore, the LORD the God of Israel says, ‘I surely said that your house and the house of your father should serve before Me for ever,’ but now<sup>268</sup> the LORD says, ‘My judgments are true. Those who*

<sup>259</sup>Omitted in MS S.

<sup>260</sup>Mss a b c d f m o w x y B C D J S T eb1 read מנחה קרבן, a double rendering.

<sup>261</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 5:10.

<sup>262</sup>Mss a o read כרנן, more in conformity with the usual vocabulary (see Ch. 4, Aramaic כרנן). Mss J S have the double rendering כרנן כרנן.

<sup>263</sup>See also Vg and Syr.

<sup>264</sup>Mss w y have a different reverential rendering, viz. קדמי, ‘before Me’. Ms J has a totally different rendering, viz. ודמרנוין קדמי, ‘those who make Me angry’, in accordanc with TJon 1 Sam. 3:3.

<sup>265</sup>Ms eb1 adds יי אמר, ‘said the LORD’, as in Jer. 7:32; Amos 8:11; 9:13; etc. ( $\succ$ -15).

<sup>266</sup>Omitted in MS d.

<sup>267</sup>Omitted in MS d.

<sup>268</sup>In all cases of Hebrew ועתה TJon renders with וכען, ‘and now’. So TJon elimin-

*bring honour before Me I will honour, and those who act despicably against my Name will be despised.* 2:31 Behold, the days are coming, when I will cut off your arm's strength and the arm's strength of your father's house, so that there will not be an old man in your house.

This verse has a double rendering: the word 'arm' is maintained but its meaning 'strength' is added.<sup>269</sup> Note the alliteration of the words ואקטוף יה תקוף.

270 32 ותהי מסתכל וחהי חזי בעקתא דתחי על אנש ביתך בחובין דחבתון 271  
בבית מקדשי ובתר כין איחי טבתא על ישראל ולא יהי סב בביתך כל יומיא:

*2:32 And you will realize and see the distress that will come upon the people of your house, because of the sins that you sinned in my sanctuary. And after that I will bring goodness upon Israel, but there shall not be an old man in your house for ever.*

This verse is rendered in harmony with the following verses and chapters (>16). Eli's punishment will be the death of his sons and the temporary loss of the ark. The goodness that will be brought upon Israel will only be apparent after Eli's death and will not be seen by him. In the paraphrasing process the first Hebrew verb is rendered twice.

33 2 ואנש לא אפסיק לך מן מדבחי לחשכא יה עינך ולאפחא יה נפשך וכל סגיות  
ביתך יתקטלון עולימין:

*2:33 A man I will not cut off from my altar to darken your eye and to grieve your soul. And all the multitude of your house will be killed as young men.*

TJon harmonizes this verse with 1 Sam. 22:18 by translating "be killed", avoiding the misunderstanding that Eli's sons would die of natural causes, and with 1 Sam. 2:31 by rendering "young men", because there would be no old man in Eli's family.

34 2 ודין לך אחא דייחי לוח תרין בנך לוח חפני ופינחס ביומא חד יתקטלון תרויהון:  
35 2 ואקים קדמי כהין מהימן דכמירי וכרעותי יעביד ואקים ליה מלכו קימא  
וישמיש<sup>272</sup> קדם משחי כל יומיא:

ates every nuance of Hebrew ועתה. These nuances are discussed in H.A. Brongers, "Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch des adverbialen w<sup>e</sup>attāh im Alten Testament", VT 15 (1965), 289-99.

<sup>269</sup> Against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 108, who translate this with "the strength of your seed and the strength of the seed of the house of your father".

<sup>270</sup> For this equivalent of Hebrew מען, see above, commentary on 2:29.

<sup>271</sup> Ms a b J add the reverential קדמי (>23).

<sup>272</sup> Omitted by Ms D.



2:34 *And this is the sign to you which will come unto your two sons, unto Hophni and Phinehas: both of them shall be killed in one day.*  
 2:35 *And I will raise up before Me a faithful priest, who shall do according to my speech and according to my will. And I will raise up for him a lasting kingdom, and he will serve before my anointed for ever.*

The double Hebrew  $\text{נאמן}$  is represented by two different Aramaic words ( $\text{>18}$ ). Furthermore, this verse is thoroughly cleared from all metaphorical language ( $\text{>13}$ ). God's heart and soul are changed into his word and will. The image of building a house is rendered according to 2 Sam. 7, where the same image is interpreted as the establishment of the Davidic dynasty ( $\text{>15}$ ).<sup>273</sup> Consequently, the "house" in this verse must also be a dynasty, a reward for the faithfulness of the faithful priest. The relationship between the priest and the Anointed One is also clarified. Hebrew "walking before" is turned into "serving before". The Messiah definitely takes priority over the priest. The same conclusion is drawn in ARN:<sup>274</sup>

"These are the two anointed ones, that stand by the LORD of the whole earth" (Zech. 4:14). This is a reference to Aaron and the Messiah, but I cannot tell which is the more beloved. However, from the verse, "The LORD has sworn, and will not repent: Thou art a priest forever after the manner of Melchizedek" (Ps. 110:4), one can tell that the Messianic King is more beloved than the righteous priest.

2 36 ויהי כל דישתאר בביחך ייתי לאשתפלא ליה למעא דכסף ופתא דלחמא ויימר  
 מניני<sup>275</sup> כען לחדא ממטרת כהניא<sup>276</sup> למיכל פתא דלחמא:

2:36 *And every one who is left in your house shall come to bow down for a silver coin or a slice of bread, and shall say, 'Please, appoint me as one of the priests' guard,' to eat a slice of bread.'*

<sup>273</sup>The image of building a house is also used in 1 Kgs 11:38 and turned into the establishment of a dynasty by TJon. However, this image in Deut. 25:9, referring to the levirate, is left unchanged in TO.

<sup>274</sup>J. Goldin, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan*, New Have 1955, 137-38, cited by G.J. Blidstein, "A Rabbinic Reaction to the Messianic Doctrine of the Scrolls", *JBL* 90 (1971), 330-32, esp. 330.

<sup>275</sup>The word play between Hebrew  $\text{ספחני}$ , 'assign me', and the names of Eli's sons could not be preserved in the Aramaic version; cf. further M. Garsiel, "Word Play and Puns as a Rhetorical Device in the Book of Samuel", in: S.B. Noegel (ed.), *Puns and Pundits: Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature*, Bethesda (MD) 2000, 181-204, esp. 184.

<sup>276</sup>Mss a J read  $\text{כהנוחא}$ , 'priesthood', in conformity with the Hebrew text ( $\text{>29}$ ).

TJon translates the Hebrew להשתחוה with the exceptional לאשתפלא. The reason for this cannot be found in an avoidance of the normal verb סגד, because this verb can also be used with regard to human beings, e.g. bowing before the king in 2 Sam. 14:33.<sup>277</sup> It may be that the Targumist also wanted to render the connotation of “humbling oneself” or “pleading” and therefore chose the stem שפל.

Since Eli’s family would no longer be priests, they ask to be priests’ guards. The freedom in priestly affairs could not be tolerated by the Targumists.<sup>278</sup> Moreover, TJon harmonized this verse with the other prophecies concerning Eli’s house and the actual history of his house (>16).

### 5.5 The Call of Samuel (1 Samuel 3)

1 3 ורביא שמואל משמיש קדם יי בחיי עלי ופתגמא דיין הזה כסי ביומיא האנן לית נבואה גליא<sup>279</sup>: 2 3 וזהו ביומא ההוא<sup>280</sup> ועלי שכיב באתריה ועינוהי<sup>281</sup> שריאה למכה לא יכיל למחוי: 3 3 ובוצין בית מקדשא דיין עד לא טפא ושמואל שכיב בעזרה ליואי וקלא<sup>282</sup> אשתמע מהיכלא דיין דתמן ארונא דיין:

*3:1 And the boy Samuel was serving before the LORD during the life of Eli.<sup>283</sup> And the word of the LORD was hidden in those days; no prophecy was revealed. 3:2 At that time Eli was lying down in his own place. His eyes had begun to grow dim so that he could not see. 3:3 And the lamp of the LORD’s sanctuary had not yet gone out, and Samuel was lying down in the court of the Levites. And a voice was heard from the LORD’s temple, where the ark of the LORD was.*

TJon starts a new sentence after the Hebrew שכב (>12). As a result, Samuel is not sleeping in the temple, where only priests and Davidic kings were allowed to sleep (cf. Qid. 78b). Samuel is cleared from any misbehaviour (>24) and, since he is a Levite, he sleeps in the court of the Levites (cf. also 1 Sam. 1:1).<sup>284</sup> The same phenomenon is apparent

<sup>277</sup>Cf. also M. Maher, “The Meturgemanim and Prayer”, *JJS* 41 (1990), 226-46, esp. 244.

<sup>278</sup>Cf. P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel i-xvi*, Amsterdam 1938, 18.

<sup>279</sup>Cf. Syr.

<sup>280</sup>Ms b reads ביומיא האינן, ‘in those days’, cf. also 3:1. So also Syr. Vogel, *Sámuel elsõ kõnyve*, 32 assumed that the plural was based on a different *Vorlage*, but it is most probably an associative translation based on the previous verse (>15).

<sup>281</sup>The plural is in conformity with many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

<sup>282</sup>The Antwerp Polyglot adds דיין, “the voice of the LORD”; it omits the verb אשתמע.

<sup>283</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 2:11.

<sup>284</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 15.

in the Masoretic Text, where the *atnach* is placed under the Hebrew שֹׁכֵב, and in 4Q160, where Samuel is lying in front of Eli.<sup>285</sup> Others, however, saw no difficulty in rendering that Samuel lay in the temple, e.g. LXX, Syr and Pseudo-Philo.<sup>286</sup>

TJon did not explain the phrase about the lamp metaphorically, but as a literal utterance concerning the lamp in the LORD's sanctuary. R. Abba gave the explanation that Eli had not yet died (GenR. 58:2, cf. CantR. 6:2; Qid. 72b), while the lamp in 2 Sam. 21:17 is translated with "kingdom". This translation agrees with R. Naḥman's explanation of the verse, viz. that the phrase "in the Temple of the LORD" applies to the lamp and not to the sleeping place of Samuel. R. Naḥman explained, "And the lamp of God was not yet gone out in the Temple of the LORD, and Samuel was laid down in his place" (Qid. 78b). The addition of the word "sanctuary" after the word "lamp" is incorporated in TJon, but the phrase "in the Temple of the LORD" also receives an independent explanation.

4 3 וקרא יוי לשמואל ואמר האנא: 5 3 ורהט לות עלי ואמר האנא ארי קריתא לי ואמר לא קריתי טוב שכוב ואול ושכיב: 6 3 ואויסיף יוי מקרי עוד שמואל וקם שמואל ואול לות עלי ואמר האנא ארי קריתא לי ואמר לא קריתי ברי טוב שכוב: 7 3 ושמואל עד לא אוליף למדע אלפן ♦ מן קרם ♦ יוי ועד לא אתגלי ליה פתגם<sup>287</sup> נבואחא ♦ דייו:

3:4 Then the LORD called Samuel, and he said, "Here I am." 3:5 And he ran to Eli and said, "Here I am, for you called me." But he said, "I did not call; lie down again." So he went and lay down. 3:6 And the LORD called again, "Samuel!" And Samuel arose and went to Eli, and said, "Here I am, for you called me." But he said, "I did not call, my son; lie down again." 3:7 Now Samuel had not yet learned<sup>288</sup> to recognize instruction from before the LORD, and the prophetic word of the LORD had not yet been revealed to him.

Although the Hebrew text strongly resembles 1 Sam. 2:12, the Aramaic text diverts from it out of reverence for Samuel. Of the wicked sons of Eli it is said (2:12) that they did not know the fear of the LORD, but Samuel only did not yet know how to recognize God's instructions. The Targumist, like many others, did not accept the lit-

<sup>285</sup> Vogel, *Sámuel elsǝ kõnyve*, 14-15; R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum of the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VT.S, 51), Leiden 1994, 71, n. 33.

<sup>286</sup> Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 53:2. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 5:348 completely omits the reference to Samuel's sleeping place.

<sup>287</sup> Omitted in MS f.

<sup>288</sup> Since all dictionaries agree that the Aphel of אִלֵּף does not exist in Targumic literature, the form אִלֵּיף seems to be an error for the Peal form אִלֵּיף attested in MSS f w y, or אִלֵּיף attested in MSS b m; cf. also Dalman, *Grammatik*, 299, s.v. Perfekt, 1 Plur. c.

eral meaning of the Hebrew: 'Samuel did not yet know the LORD'.<sup>289</sup> Samuel was not as ignorant as Eli's sons (>23, against >15). Only Kimḥi uses in his commentary the phrase that Samuel did not know the fear of the LORD.

8 3 ואוסיף יוי מקרי שמואל בחליחתא וקם ואול לות עלי ואמר האנא ארי קריחא לי וסבר עלי ארי מן קדם ◊ יוי מחקרי לרביא: 9 3 ואמר עלי לשמואל איזיל שכות ויהי אם<sup>290</sup> יקרי לך ותימר מליל יוי ארי שמע עבדך ואול שמואל ושכיב באחריה: 10 3 ואתגלי<sup>291</sup> יקרא ◊ דיוי<sup>292</sup> ואתעתד וקרא כזמן כזמן<sup>293</sup> שמואל שמואל ואמר שמואל מליל ארי שמע עבדך: 11 3 ואמר יוי לשמואל האנא עביד פתגמא בישראל כל דישמעניה ייצלן תרחין אדנוהי: 12 3 ביומא ההוא אקים על עלי ית כל דמליליה על אנש<sup>294</sup> ביתיה אנמר<sup>295</sup> ואשיצ:

3:8 And the LORD called Samuel again the third time. And he arose and went to Eli, and said, "Here I am, for you called me." Then Eli perceived that the boy was called from before the LORD. 3:9 And Eli said to Samuel, "Go, lie down; and if He calls you, you shall say, 'Speak, LORD, for thy servant hears,'" So Samuel went and lay down in his place. 3:10 And the glory of the LORD was revealed and stood forth, calling as at other times, "Samuel! Samuel!" And Samuel said, "Speak, for thy servant hears." 3:11 Then the LORD said to Samuel, "Behold, I am doing a thing in Israel, at which the two ears of every one that hears it will tingle. 3:12 On that day I will fulfil against Eli all that I have spoken concerning the people of his house. I will destroy and I will end.

The Hebrew expression החל וכלה, 'from beginning to end', is paraphrastically rendered in accordance with its meaning: God will completely destroy Eli's house. TJon may have interpreted Hebrew החל as the Hiphil of חלה, 'make ill, hurt', and not as the Hiphil of חלל, 'begin'.

13 3 וחיותי ליה ארי מתפרע אנא מן אנש ◊ ביתיה עד עלמא ◊ בחובינ ◊ דידע ארי מרגזין להון כנוהי ולא כהא<sup>296</sup> בהון:

<sup>289</sup> Cf. Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 53:1, "nesciens adhuc quid essent eloquia Domini", and Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 75, "per prophetiae mysterium necdum ei reuelatus fuerat sermo Domini".

<sup>290</sup> Ms a reads ארי, as some Hebrew MSS

<sup>291</sup> Ms eb1 starts with רביעיחא, 'For the fourth time'.

<sup>292</sup> MSS b f m w x y do not read יקרא דיוי, but simply יוי (against >23).

<sup>293</sup> Ms eb1 adds ואמר, 'and He said'.

<sup>294</sup> Omitted in MS b, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>295</sup> Omitted in MS m eb1, probably because it was felt as the doublet of אשיצ (>29).

<sup>296</sup> Ms f reads נוף, "and he did not threaten them".

3:13 *And I told him that I take revenge on the people of his house for ever, for the guilt which he knew, because his sons are provoking and he did not restrain them.*

The general שפוט, 'judge', is given a more precise meaning in the Aramaic מהפרע, 'take revenge'. The latter stem is often used to indicate punishment by God, mostly with the noun פּרעוּתָא, 'requital, punishment', e.g. in 1 Sam. 2:1, 3 (>11, >15). Smolar and Aberbach's assumption that the idea of God's revenge is not present in TJon,<sup>297</sup> is hardly justified. The verb פּרע, Ithpaal, intends every kind of requital, from reward to punishment, from judgment to revenge. It is our modern feeling that revenge is beyond justification which makes us hesitant to translate פּרע with "revenge".

The Hebrew מקללים, 'blaspheming', is replaced by the more general מרנוין, 'provoking', as a euphemism (>14).<sup>298</sup> The Aphel of רנו is often used to describe sinful behaviour towards God (cf. e.g. TO Num. 16:30; TJon Jer. 7:18; 11:17; 25:7; etc.). Consequently, the choice of the equivalent implies that TJon considered God the object of the verb. Still, He is not mentioned as such, but Hebrew להם is rendered literally. Since להם does not fit into this sentence and LXX appears to have read אלהים, this word is regarded as one of the *tiqqune sopherim*, the scribes' corrections in the Hebrew text.<sup>299</sup> And although TJon did not translate what most probably was the original reading (אלהים), it showed by its choice of words that God was intended as the object of the phrase.

14 3 ובכין קיימית לבית עלי אם ישתבקן חוביִי בית עלי בנכסח־ קרשין ובקרבנין  
עד עלמא־:

3:14 *Therefore I swore to the house of Eli that the guilt of Eli's house shall not be forgiven by holy slaughterings or offerings for ever."*

In the CR a marginal text gives an addition, intended to be added after the whole verse:

ירושןלמין אלהין במעסק באוריתא ובעוברין טבין

*Jerushalmi: unless he devotes his attention to the Law and good works*

<sup>297</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 147.

<sup>298</sup>The same equivalence is attested in TJon Isa. 52:5; 60:14; Jer. 33:24.

<sup>299</sup>Cf. C. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO, 36), Freiburg & Göttingen 1981, 77-79; M. Harl, in: G. Dorival, M. Harl, O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*, Cerf 1988, 204-205.

This escape clause agrees with the opinion of R. Abbaye, being a member of the house of Eli, in the discussion found in RHsh. 18a,<sup>300</sup> "From where [do we know] that a sentence which is accompanied by an oath is not annulled? From that it is said, 'Therefore I swore to the house of Eli that the sins of Eli's house will not be expiated by sacrifice and offering.' Rabba said, 'By sacrifice and offering they are not expiated, but they are expiated by Torah'; Abbaye said, 'But they are expiated by Torah and by works of charity'." A different opinion is expressed by R. Kahana, a member of the house of Eli himself, "With sacrifice and with offering atonement is not made for him; but with prayer atonement is made for him" (yRHsh. 2:6 (58b), cf. ySan. 1:2 (18c)). Although the marginal text is titled "Jerushalmi", the content fully agrees with the Bavli, not with the Talmud Jerushalmi.<sup>301</sup>

15 3 ושכיב שמואל עד צפרא ופתח ית דשי בית<sup>302</sup> מקדשא דיוי ושמואל דחיל מלחואה ית חיזו נבואתא ד לעלי: 16 3 וקרא עלי לשמואל<sup>303</sup> ואמר שמואל ברי ואמר האנא: 17 3 ואמר מא פתגמא דמליל עמך לא כען תכסא מני<sup>304</sup> כדין יעביד לך יוי דכדין יוסיף אם תכסא מני פתגם מכל פתגמא דמליל עמך: 18 3 וחוי ליה שמואל ית כל פתגמא ולא כסי מניה ואמר יוי הוא דתקין דקדמוהי<sup>305</sup> יעביד: 19 3 ורבא שמואל ומירא דיוי הוה בסעדיה ולא בשיל<sup>306</sup> מכל פתגמוהי חד<sup>307</sup>:

*3:15 Samuel lay until morning; then he opened the doors of the sanctuary of the LORD. And Samuel was afraid to tell the prophetic vision to Eli. 3:16 But Eli called to Samuel and said, "Samuel, my son." And he said, "Here I am." 3:17 And Eli said, "What is the word that He spoke with you? Do not hide it from me. May the LORD do so to you and more also, if you hide anything from me of all the word that He spoke with you." 3:18 So Samuel told him all the words and hid nothing from him. And he said, "It is the LORD; let him do what is right before Him." 3:19 And Samuel grew, and the speech of the LORD was in his aid, and none of all his words failed.*

<sup>300</sup>Cf. also San. 108a; Yev. 105a. SER 11 (p. 53) quotes the solution of R. Johanan that charity delivers from death (Prov. 10:2). These escape clauses are not mentioned in MekY, *Bahodesh*, 7.

<sup>301</sup>Kasher, תוספתא, 102.

<sup>302</sup>Omitted in MS d.

<sup>303</sup>MSS d f w y eb1 read ית שמואל, as in some Hebrew MSS.

<sup>304</sup>MSS d eb1 add פתגמא, just like after the next מני.

<sup>305</sup>MSS b f w y read בעינוהי, more in conformity with the Hebrew text in many MSS or with the Qere in other MSS, cf. *BHS*, crit.app.

<sup>306</sup>MSS m w y x read the Pael בשיל, resulting in "the LORD was in his aid and did not annul one of all his words.

<sup>307</sup>Some MSS restored the Hebrew "earth", by writing לארעא instead of תד (MSS b w<sub>1</sub>) or by adding לארעא after it (MSS m eb1). Neither MS did adjust the verb with the result that the translation is weird.

The expression “let not fall to the ground” means that the subject did not fail to fulfil his words. This expression is translated with the plain verb בשיל in Aramaic (>14). And although the Hebrew text has the subject “he”, TJon made “one of all his words” the subject of the verb.<sup>308</sup> However, the sentence remains as ambiguous as the original Hebrew sentence—whose words did not fail, the LORD’s or Samuel’s?<sup>309</sup> Interpreted within the wider context of 1 Sam. 3 and of TJon as a whole, the suffix would refer to the LORD: in 3:12 the LORD promised, “I will fulfil against Eli all that I have spoken”, and this type of sentences is mostly used in reference to the LORD’s words.<sup>310</sup> However, interpreted within its narrower context, viz. 3:19-21, the suffix refers to Samuel, for he is depicted here as the reliable prophet. And “the concept of prophecy which underlies the statement of vs. 20, is that a prophet is genuine if his words are fulfilled” (cf. Deut. 18:21-22; Jer. 28:9).<sup>311</sup> Taking into account that several Jewish interpreters did indeed consider the suffix referring to Samuel, one must choose in favour of the latter possibility.

Josephus states at this point about Samuel that “all that he prophesied was seen to come true”.<sup>312</sup> Pseudo-Jerome also suggested that whatever he prophesied came true (cf. 1 Sam. 9:6). This interpretation is affirmed by Kimḥi, who added that even prophecies without the sanction of the divine Spirit were fulfilled.<sup>313</sup>

◇ 20 וידע כל ישראל מִדָּן עַד בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע אֲרֵי מִדְּיָן<sup>314</sup> שְׁמוּאֵל בִּפְתָגְמֵי נְבוֹאָתָא דִּיִּי: 21 וְאֹסִיף יְיָ לְאַתְגְּלָא<sup>315</sup> בְּשִׁילֹ אֲרֵי אַתְגְּלֵי יְיָ לְשְׁמוּאֵל בְּשִׁילֹ בִּפְתָנָא דִּיִּי:

3:20 And all Israel from Dan to Beersheba knew that Samuel was reliable in the prophetic words of the LORD. 3:21 And the LORD continued to reveal himself at Shiloh, for the LORD revealed himself to Samuel at Shiloh by the word of the LORD.

<sup>308</sup>Cf. similar expressions in TJon Josh. 21:43; 23:14 (*bis*); 1 Kgs 8:56; Ezek. 12:28.

<sup>309</sup>Cf. the differences in modern translations, described in W.T. Claassen, “1 Sam. 3:19 — A Case of Context and Semantics”, *JNSL* 8 (1980), 1-9, esp. 1-3.

<sup>310</sup>Cf. similar expressions in TgJosh. 21:43; 23:14 (*bis*); TgEzek. 12:28.

<sup>311</sup>W.T. Claassen, “1 Sam. 3:19 — A Case of Context and Semantics”, *JNSL* 8 (1980), 1-9, esp. 2. Claassen also expounded the two exegetical options—that of the wider and the narrower context—on p. 8.

<sup>312</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 5:351.

<sup>313</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 76. See also the reading of several Yemenite MSS which render that He—most probably the LORD—did not annul any of his words.

<sup>314</sup>Ms b adds הָוָא.

<sup>315</sup>MSS w y read לְאַתְגְּלָא, ‘to show himself’, in conformity with the Hebrew text.

## 5.6 The Capture of the Ark (1 Samuel 4)

In the triennial cycle, the last part of 1 Sam. 4 is read after the Torah reading from Gen. 27, the account of Isaac blessing Jacob. The first verses of the readings are very similar. Both first verses, Gen. 27:1 and 1 Sam. 4:15, contain the phrase that the eyes of the old men, Isaac and Eli, were blind. The Aramaic version of the present chapter was not adjusted to the Torah reading.

1 4 והוה פתגם שמואל מרעא<sup>316</sup> לכל ישראל ונפק ישראל לקדמות פלשתאי לאגהא קרבא ושרו על אבן סעדא ופלשתאי שרו באפק: 2 4 וסדרו קרבא<sup>317</sup> פלשתאי לקדמות ישראל ואחרשישו עבדי קרבא ואחברו ישראל קדם פלשתאי<sup>318</sup> ומחו בסדרא בחקלא כארבעה אלפין גברא: 3 4 ואתא עמא למשריתא ואמרו סבי ישראל למא חברנא יוי יומא דין קדם פלשתאי נסיב כען לנא משילו ית ארון קימא דיי<sup>319</sup> ויהך<sup>320</sup> ביננא בדיל יקר שמיה<sup>321</sup> נתפריק<sup>322</sup> מיד בעלי דבכנא:

4:1 *And the word of Samuel was pleasing to all Israel. Now Israel went out to wage war against the Philistines; they encamped at Stone of Help and the Philistines encamped at Aphek. 4:2 The Philistines drew up in line against Israel, and when the wagers of the battle spread, Israel was shattered before the Philistines. They slew about four thousand men in the battle line on the field. 4:3 And when the people came to the camp, the elders of Israel said, "Why has the LORD shattered us today before the Philistines? Let us take the ark of the covenant of the LORD from Shiloh to us, that he may go between us. On account of the Glory of his name we will be saved from the hand of our enemies."*

Aside from some reverential and explanatory alterations TJon substitutes the verb "to go" for "to come". Here, the ark did not only come to the Israelite camp, but went with the warriors against the Philistines. This rendering is in accordance with the rest of the pericope (>16). Note also that the ark is not claimed to save the people, but through a different vocalization a *passivum divinum* is achieved.

An attempt to clear the elders from guilt (>23) is made in MS D, with its rendering ואתא עמא למשריחא ואולו לסבי ישראל ואמרו, "And

<sup>316</sup>Omitted in MS B, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>317</sup>Omitted in MSS T eb1, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>318</sup>MS B\* adds לקדמות ישראל through dittography.

<sup>319</sup>MS eb91 adds a second דין יומא here.

<sup>320</sup>MS b reads וייהי, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). MSS D T read ייהי.

<sup>321</sup>MS eb91 omits יקר שמיה leaving "that we will be saved from the hand of our enemies".

<sup>322</sup>Passive voice through different vocalization (>3). MSS a J read the active ויפריקנא, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). MS B<sup>m</sup> reads the perfect tense, פריקנא.



when the people came to the camp, they went to the elders of Israel and said". By doing this, MS D blames the people of bringing the ark to the battle lines. The same interpretation is given by Josephus and implicitly by Pseudo-Philo.<sup>323</sup>

4 4 ושלח עמא לשילו ונשלו<sup>324</sup> מחמן ית ארון קימא דיוי<sup>325</sup> צבאות<sup>326</sup> דשכינתיה<sup>327</sup> שריא עיל<sup>328</sup> מן כרוביא ותמן חרין בני עלי עם ארון קימא דיוי<sup>329</sup> חפני ופינחס: 4 5 והוה כד אתא ארון קימא דיוי למשריתא ויביבו כל ישראל יבבא רבא<sup>328</sup> ואשתנישח ארעא: 4 6 ושמעו פלשתאי ית קל יבבא ואמרו מא קל יבבא<sup>329</sup> רבא הדין במשרית יהודאי וידעו ארי<sup>330</sup> ארונא דיוי אתא למשריתא: 4 7 ודחילו פלשתאי ארי אמרו אתא ארונא דיוי למשריתא ואמרו וי לנא ארי לא הוה כהדא מאתמלי ומדקמוהי: 4 8 וי לנא מן ישזבנא<sup>331</sup> מיד מימרא<sup>332</sup> דיוי דעוברוהי רברבין אלין<sup>331</sup> אנון גבורתא דיוי דמחא<sup>332</sup> ית מצרא<sup>333</sup> בכל מחא ולעמיה עבד פרישן במדברא:

4:4 So the people sent to Shiloh, and they carried from there the ark of the covenant of the LORD *Sebaoth*, whose Presence dwells above the cherubim. And the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, were there with the ark of the covenant of the LORD. 4:5 When the ark of the covenant of the LORD came into the camp, all Israel gave a mighty shout, so that the earth resounded. 4:6 And when the Philistines heard the noise of the shouting, they said, "What is this noise of a great shouting in the camp of the Judaeans?" And they learned that the ark of the LORD had come to the camp. 4:7 And the Philistines were afraid, for they said, "The ark of the LORD has come to the camp." And they said, "Woe to us! For it was not like this yesterday and before that. 4:8 Woe to us! Who can deliver us from the hand of the speech of the LORD, whose works are great? These are the mighty deeds of the LORD, who smote the Egyptians with every plague, but did for his people wonders in the wilderness.

Monotheism is integrated in this verse (>22) by the use of the divine name and by avoiding the plural "gods" of the Hebrew text. The

<sup>323</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 5:353; Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 54:1.

<sup>324</sup>Ms eb1 reads ונסיכו, 'and they took', in accordance with the preceding verse (>15).

<sup>325</sup>Ms D adds יקר שמהי from the preceding verse.

<sup>326</sup>Cf. Syr.

<sup>327</sup>In conformity with TJon's habit to use יי as much as possible, but also in conformity with 2 Hebrew MSS and the other versions.

<sup>328</sup>Omitted by MS D.

<sup>329</sup>Ms D omits יבבא רבא מא קל יבבא by haplography.

<sup>330</sup>Omitted by MS B.

<sup>331</sup>Mss a b d f m w x y D C\* J T read אַלִּין a double אלִּין.

<sup>332</sup>Kimḥi reads paraphrastically דקטיל.

<sup>333</sup>Mss b J read מצרים, the land in stead of the people (>29).

phrase “these are the gods” is changed after the example of TJon 1 Sam. 2:6 into “these are the mighty deeds of the LORD”.<sup>334</sup> The plural adjective is not maintained everywhere: for example, in Josh. 24:19 TJon simply renders the singular “holy God”.<sup>335</sup> The retention of the plural forms may be due to the controversy between Jews and Christians about the number of divine persons. In this controversy R. Johanan claimed that the plural forms were necessary to show that God “does nothing without consulting his heavenly Court” (San. 38b).

The verse was also adjusted to the account set out in Exodus and Numbers, for the Egyptians were not smitten in the desert. By diversification (>18) the plagues are restricted to Egypt and the desert is the place where God was with his own people.<sup>336</sup>

9 4 אַחַפּוֹ וְהוּוּ לְגַבְרִין גַּבְרִין<sup>337</sup> פִּלְשְׁתִּי<sup>338</sup> דְלִמָּא חֲשַׁתְעַבְדוּן לִיהוּדָאִי<sup>339</sup> כְּמָא דִּאֲשַׁתְעַבְדוּ לְכּוּן וְתַחֲוּן לְגַבְרִין גַּבְרִין<sup>340</sup> וְחִיחִיון קֶרֶב: 4 10 וְאִיחִיו קֶרֶב אֲפִלְשְׁתִּי וְאֲתַבְרוּ<sup>341</sup> יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֲפִכּוּ<sup>341</sup> גַבְרִין לְקִרוּהִי וְהוּת מִחַתָּא רַבְתָּא לְחַדָּא וְאֲתַקְשְׁלוּ<sup>342</sup> מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל חֲלַתִין אֲלֵפִין גַּבְרִין רַגְלִי: 4 11 וְאַרְוֵנָא דִּיּוּי אֲשַׁתְבִּי וְתַרִין בְּנֵי עֲלִי אֲתַקְשְׁלוּ חֲפִי וּפִינַחֶס: 4 12 וְרַהֶט גַּבְרָא מִשְׁבַּטָּא<sup>343</sup> דְּבֵיתָ<sup>344</sup> בְּנִימִין מִסְדְּרָא וְאַחָא לְשִׁילוּ בְּיֹמָא הַהוּא וּלְבוּשׁוּדֵי מְבוּעִין<sup>345</sup> וְעַפְרָא רְמִי<sup>346</sup> בְּרִישֵׁיהּ:

4:9 *Take courage and be heroic men,*<sup>347</sup> *O Philistines, lest you become subjected to the Judaeans as they have been subjected to you. Be heroic men and wage war!* 4:10 *And the Philistines did wage war. And Israel*

<sup>334</sup>The same technique is used in 2 Sam. 7:23.

<sup>335</sup>In this way Syr translates the singular “mighty God” in the present verse, cf. Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung*, 13.

<sup>336</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 15; P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel i-zvi*, Amsterdam 1938, 38.

<sup>337</sup>Omitted by MSS b d, more in conformity to the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>338</sup>Omitted by MS D.

<sup>339</sup>MS T reads יִשְׂרָאֵל.

<sup>340</sup>Omitted by MSS b d, more in conformity to the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>341</sup>MS eb1 reads וְעִרְקוּ, ‘they fled’.

<sup>342</sup>MS S read וְנַפְלוּ קַטְלִין, more in conformity with the Hebrew text, although with the same explanation (>29).

<sup>343</sup>Omitted by MS d, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>344</sup>Omitted by MSS a b B J, which only read דְּבֵיתָ, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Syr also adds “from the House of”.

<sup>345</sup>MS D reads מְקָרְעִין, also ‘rent’, but more with the same stem as the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>346</sup>Omitted by MS d, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but deviating from the usual rendering, cf. 2 Sam. 1:2; 15:32.

<sup>347</sup>Against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 110, who translate, “and be men, Philistine warriors”. The combination גַּבְרִין גַּבְרִין and גַּבְרִין גַּבְרִין is frequent in TgSam, cf. 1 Sam. 14:52; 31:12; 2 Sam. 2:7; 11:16; 13:28; 17:10; 24:9.

was shattered, and they retreated, every man to his city. And it was a very great slaughter, and there fell of Israel thirty thousand foot soldiers. 4:11 And the ark of the LORD was captured; and the two sons of Eli were killed, Hophni and Phinehas.<sup>348</sup> 4:12 And a man from the tribe of Benjamin's House ran from the battle line and came to Shiloh the same day, with his clothes torn and earth thrown upon his head.

In a marginal expansion in the CR, the unknown Benjaminite man is identified with Saul, triggered by the tribal name Benjamin (י-17) and by correspondences between this account and the report on Saul's own death (י-15):

ספרן אחרן ורהט שאול בר קיש גברא דמן שיבעט די בנימן מסירי קרבא ואתא לשילו  
 ביומא ההוא על יד מלאכא דארהטיה מתמן

*Another book: And Saul, son of Kish, a man from the tribe of Benjamin, ran from the battle lines and came to Shiloh the same day, with the aid of an angel who made him run from there.*

This identification gives a very tragic introduction to the person of Saul, for his own death would be reported to David (2 Sam. 1:2-5) in the same way. Many similarities between these two reports are present in the Hebrew text, which are all integrated and even augmented in the Aramaic version: a man came from the battle field, the one from the tribe of Benjamin and the other from the presence of Saul, with his clothes<sup>349</sup> torn and earth upon his head (1 Sam. 4:12; 2 Sam. 1:2), the man reported that he had come from the battle field, Eli and David asked the same question, מה היה הדבר (1 Sam. 4:16; 2 Sam. 1:3-4), the man reported that the people of Israel had fled, נס, also (גם) that many people had been killed and also (וגם) that two particular persons had died, in one case Hophni and Phinehas, the sons of Eli, in the other case Saul and his son Jonathan (1 Sam. 4:17; 2 Sam. 1:4). These similarities are given in the same word order. It is hardly surprising, then, that the unknown messenger in 1 Sam. 4 is identified with Saul. This identification is also mentioned in other Jewish sources, which discuss the question how many miles Saul must have run on that one day.<sup>350</sup> However, these parallel sources note that Saul was swift (cf. 2 Sam. 1:23), whereas here the claim is inserted that an angel helped him.

<sup>348</sup>A tosefta-targum to 1 Sam. 17:8, which will be discussed later on, identifies Goliath as the killer of Eli's sons.

<sup>349</sup>In Hebrew two different words are used for "clothes", but in Aramaic both words are rendered with לבושא.

<sup>350</sup>Pseudo-Philo, LAB, 54:4; MTeh. 7:2; MShem. 11:1. Cf. also Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 6, 231, n. 49; Kasher, תוספתא, 102-103.

13 4 ואתא והא עלי יתיב על כרסיא על כיבש אורח תרעא מסכי ארי הוה לביה זע  
על ארונא דיוי<sup>351</sup> וגברא אתא לחואה בקרתא<sup>352</sup> ואשתגישת כל קרתא<sup>353</sup>:

4:13 *When he came, behold, Eli was sitting upon his seat on the path of the gateway, on the look-out<sup>351</sup>, for his heart trembled for the ark of the Lord. And when the man came to tell [the news] in the city, all the city was shaken.*

The reference to the gate was added because of a similar phrase in 4:18 (cf. LXX). The complete phrase “on the path of the gateway” can be found in 2 Sam. 15:2, both in Hebrew and in Aramaic (>15). TJon follows Qere here, since the Hebrew יך must be read as יד, as in these other verses.

14 4 ושמע עלי ית קל צוחתא ואמר מא קל שגושא הדין וגברא אוחי ואתא וחוי לעלי:  
15 4 ועלי בר תשעין ותמני שנין ועינוהי קמא ולא יכיל למחזי: 4 16 ואמר גברא  
לעלי אנא אתית מן סדרא<sup>352</sup> ואנא מן סדרא דקרבא ערקית<sup>353</sup> יומא דין ואמר מא  
הוה פתגמא ברי: 4 17 ואתיב<sup>354</sup> דמבסר ואמר אפך<sup>355</sup> ישראל מן<sup>355</sup> קדם<sup>355</sup> פלשתאי  
ואף מחתא רבתא הוה בעמא ואף תרין בנך אתקטלו<sup>356</sup> חפני ופינחס וארונא דיוי<sup>357</sup>  
אשתבי: 4 18 והוה כאדכרותיה ית ארונא דיוי<sup>358</sup> ונפל מעל כרסיא לאחורוהי על כיבש  
אורח תרעא ואתברת<sup>357</sup> פקותיה<sup>357</sup> ומית ארי סב גברא ויקיר<sup>358</sup> והוא דן ית ישראל  
ארבעין שנין: 4 19 וכלתיה אחת פינחס מעדיא למילד ושמעתי ית שמועתא דאשתבי  
ארונא דיוי<sup>359</sup> ודמית חמוהא ודאתקטיל בעלה וכרעת<sup>359</sup> וילידת ארי בעתוהא חבלהא:  
4 20 וכערדן מוהא ומלילא נשיא דקימן עלוה לא תדחלין ארי בר דכר ילידת ולא  
אחיבת ולא שויאת לבה: 4 21 וקרת לרביא<sup>360</sup> איכבוד למימר גלא יקרא<sup>360</sup> מישראל  
דאשתבי<sup>361</sup> ארונא דיוי<sup>361</sup> ודמית חמוהא ודאתקטיל בעלה:

<sup>351</sup> Although Eli is said to be blind in 4:15, TJon uses the verb סכא, ‘look out, hope, expect’, which definitely has the connotation of seeing, cf. also TJon Jer. 48:19.

<sup>352</sup> Ms B adds דקרבא, as in the sequel (>15).

<sup>353</sup> MSS a b c d f o m w x y B<sup>m</sup> C D J S T eb1 read אפכיה, ‘I retreated’.

<sup>354</sup> Ms B adds גברא, according to 4:12 (>15).

<sup>355</sup> Also present in various Hebrew MSS and other versions. Omitted in MSS b d B C D T.

<sup>356</sup> Ms d reads מיהו, ‘they died’, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>357</sup> Ms o reads פרקותיה; Rashi reads אפרקותיה, both meaning ‘neck’.

<sup>358</sup> By this literal translation TJon maintained the word play between Eli’s weight and God’s honour (2:30; 4:21-22); cf. M. Garsiel, “Word Play and Puns as a Rhetorical Device in the Book of Samuel”, in: S.B. Noegel (ed.), *Puns and Pundits: Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature*, Bethesda (MD) 2000, 181-204, esp. 203.

<sup>359</sup> Ms f<sub>4</sub> explains והמטח, ‘she sank down’.

<sup>360</sup> Ms f reads לעלימא, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>361</sup> Ms d reads ארי אשתבי, ‘for the ark was captured’, in accordance with the next verse. But Ms d omits ארי in the next verse.

4:14 When Eli heard the sound of the outcry, he said, "What is the sound of this panic?" Then the man hastened and came to tell Eli. 4:15 Now Eli was ninety-eight years old and his eyes were set, so that he could not see. 4:16 And the man said to Eli, "I came from the battle line, and I fled from the battle line today." And he said, "What was the situation, my son?" 4:17 He who brought the tidings answered and said, "Israel has retreated from before the Philistines, and there has also been a great stroke among the people; your two sons also, Hophni and Phinehas, have been killed and the ark of the LORD has been captured." 4:18 When he mentioned the ark of the LORD, Eli fell backward from his seat on the path of the gateway; and his neck was broken and he died, for he was an old man, and heavy. He had judged Israel forty years. 4:19 Now his daughter-in-law, the wife of Phinehas, was with child, about to give birth. And when she heard the report that the ark of the LORD was captured, and that her father-in-law had died, and that her husband was killed, she bowed and gave birth, for her pains frightened her. 4:20 And about the time of her death the women standing around her said to her, "Fear not, for you have borne a male son." But she did not answer or give heed. 4:21 And she named the boy Ichabod, saying, "The Glory has been exiled from Israel!" for the ark of the LORD had been captured and her father-in-law had died and her husband had been killed.

TJon adds all the missing verbs, following the example of 4:19 (>10). It could have been a result of a different *Vorlage*, because several Hebrew MSS read either ואל מות or ומת.

4 22 ואמרת גלא יקרא  $\diamond$  מישראל אר<sup>362</sup> ישתבי ארונא דיוי $\diamond$ :

4:22 She had said, "The Glory has been exiled from Israel," for the ark of the LORD had been captured.

## 5.7 In the Country of the Philistines (1 Samuel 5)

1 5 ופלשתאי שב<sup>363</sup> ית ארונא דיוי $\diamond$  ואיתויה מאבן סעדא<sup>364</sup> לאשדוד: 2 5 ונסיבו $\diamond$  פלשתאי יה ארונא דיוי $\diamond$ <sup>365</sup> ואעילו יתיה לבית דגון ואקימו יתיה בסטר דגון: 3 5 ואקרימו אנש $\diamond$ <sup>366</sup> אשדוד ביומא<sup>367</sup> דבתרוהי והא דגון רמי על אפוהי על ארעא

<sup>362</sup> Replaced by ם in MS d, but see preceding verse.

<sup>363</sup> MS f does not use the term of war שב, 'capture', but the neutral נסיבו, 'take', also more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>364</sup> MS C reads סייפא מאבן, 'Stone of the Sword'.

<sup>365</sup> MS C omits ית ארונא דיוי, probably by error.

<sup>366</sup> MSS b d m w x y D eb66 read the plural אנשי (>9). MS f C read אשדודאי, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>367</sup> MS D reads בצפר יומא, 'on the morning of the day', cf. 5:4 (>15).

קדם ארונא דיוי<sup>368</sup> ונסיבו ית דגון ואתיבו יתיה לאתריה: 5:4 ואקדימו בצפרא ביומא דבתרוהי והא דגון רמי על אפיה על ארעא קדם ארונא דיוי וריש דגון וחרתין פסה ירוהי קציצן מחתן<sup>369</sup> על סקופתא<sup>370</sup> לחוד גופיה<sup>371</sup> אשתאר עלוה:

5:1 When the Philistines captured the ark of the LORD, they brought it from the Stone of Help to Ashdod. 5:2 Then the Philistines took the ark of the LORD and brought it into the house of Dagon and set it up beside Dagon. 5:3 And when the people of Ashdod rose early the next day, behold, Dagon had fallen on his face to the ground before the ark of the LORD. So they took Dagon and put him back in his place. 5:4 When they rose early in the morning the next day, behold, Dagon had fallen on his face to the ground before the ark of the LORD. And the head of Dagon and the two palms of his hands were lying cut off upon the threshold; only his body was left to him.

The peculiar Hebrew wording “only Dagon was left to him” has led scholars to propose various conjectural readings. The first proposal was made by J. Wellhausen.<sup>372</sup> In his opinion, the final *nun* of the word דגון was the result of dittography. Originally, it would have been דגו, ‘his fish, his fishy part,’ based on the supposition that Dagon was a sea god, depicted partly as a fish, partly human.<sup>373</sup> Wellhausen’s proposal did not find general favour, because, due to the excavations in Mari, Ugarit and Emar, Dagon is no longer identified with the fish-man Odakon in Babylonian writings.<sup>374</sup>

Another emendation is based on the renderings of the versions. P. de Lagarde suggests גו, ‘his back,’ on the basis of the Targum,<sup>375</sup>

<sup>368</sup> Ms T omits everything from here until the ארונא דיוי of the next verse, by haplography.

<sup>369</sup> Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>370</sup> MS f reads איסקופתא.

<sup>371</sup> Ms d and Kimḥi add דרגון, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>372</sup> J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*, Göttingen 1871, 59; followed by Vogel, *Samuel elsō könyve*, 15.

<sup>373</sup> This suggestion was also mentioned by Kimḥi, cf. Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 6, 225, n. 34.

<sup>374</sup> F.J. Montalbano, “Canaanite Dagon: Origin, Nature,” *CBQ* 13 (1951), 381-97, esp. 396-97; M. Delcor, “Jahweh et Dagon”, *VT* 14 (1964), 136-54, esp. 145; L.K. Handy, “Dagon,” in: D.N. Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 2, New York 1992, 1-3; J.F. Healy, “Dagon”, in: K. van der Toorn *et al.*, *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden <sup>2</sup>1999, 216-19, esp. 218. Cf. on the contrary the depiction of Dagon in *RSV with illustrations by Horace Knowles*, Swindon 1971, 208.

<sup>375</sup> P. de Lagarde, *Prophetiae chaldaice e fide codicis Reuchliniani*, Leipzig 1872, li, followed by H.P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC), Edinburgh 1899 (repr. 1969), 39.

and S.R. Driver נָ on the basis of LXX.<sup>376</sup> Similar renderings are found in Syr ('the body of Dagon') and Vg ('the trunk of Dagon').

It is questionable, however, whether the ancient versions had a different *Vorlage*. First, the context itself indicates that the torso of Dagon is intended, as Delcor has rightly observed.<sup>377</sup> Secondly, the ancient versions clearly chose their own interpretation. Vg chose the most technical interpretation: "Dagon truncus." Most probably, the LXX used the word ῥάχις for its similarity to the Hebrew רֶקֶב, thus rendering this word twice: πλὴν ἡ ῥάχις, 'only the back.'<sup>378</sup> TJon and Syr translated the word by 'his body' (TJon גופיה, Syr ܘܨܘܡܘܬܗ ܘܨܘܡܘܬܗ) because of the similarity to the description of the body of King Saul in 1 Sam. 31:9-10, where Saul's head is cut off and his body (Heb. גוֹיֵרוֹ, TJon גופיה, Syr ܘܨܘܡܘܬܗ) fastened to the wall of Beth-shan. For this reason, the different renderings of the ancient versions can be explained as interpretations of the difficult reading דגון.<sup>379</sup>

5 5 על כין לא דרכין כמרי־ דגון וכל דעלין לבית דגון על סקופת<sup>380</sup> דגון באשדוד עד יומא הדין: 6 5 ותקיפת מחתא־ די־י על<sup>381</sup> אנש אשדוד ואצדינן ואלקי יתהון בטחורין ית אשדוד וית תחומהא:

*5:5 Therefore the idol priests of Dagon and all who enter the house of Dagon do not tread on the threshold of Dagon in Ashdod to this day. 5:6 And the stroke of the LORD was heavily upon the people of Ashdod, and He terrified and afflicted them with haemorrhoids, both Ashdod and its territory.*

TJon and Syr interpret Hebrew עפלים according to the Qere, also attested in several Hebrew manuscripts, as טחורין, 'haemorrhoids'. The same interpretation can be found in 1 Sam. 5:12; 6:4, 5. The Hebrew טחורים is already used in the text of 1 Sam. 6:11, 17, so TJon's translation could also be associative (>15). However, it is better to

<sup>376</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 51, followed by C.J. Goslinga, *Het eerste boek Samuël* (COT), Kampen 1968, 156; R.W. Klein, *1 Samuel* (WBC, 10), Waco (TX) 1983, 48, n. 4d-d; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 119; Cf. also H.W. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher* (ATD, 10), Göttingen <sup>5</sup>1973, 38.

<sup>377</sup>Delcor, "Jahweh et Dagon", 144; cf. H.J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT, 8/1), Gütersloh 1973, 139; A. Caquot, Ph. de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT, 6), Genève 1994, 88.

<sup>378</sup>Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*, 59; followed by Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis*, 139; Wellhausen is countered by Driver, *Notes*, 51, although Driver admits that double renderings in LXX exist, cf. his "Introduction", lv.

<sup>379</sup>So also Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung*, 15.

<sup>380</sup>This time Rashi reads איסקיפה, cf. MS f in the preceding verse.

<sup>381</sup>Also in several Hebrew MSS.

assume that this interpretation is a result of the description of this episode in Ps. 78:66, "He hit his adversaries on the back, He put them to everlasting shame".<sup>382</sup> Meg. 25b assumes that כַּטְחוּרִין was a more polite expression than the indelicate word עֲפִלִים.<sup>383</sup>

The interpretation of the haemorrhoids can also be found in the LXX, according to which the people of Ashdod were struck at their private parts, cf. Symmachus, Aquila and Vg. Josephus makes the disease worse and provides a description of a kind of dysentery, by which the entrails were brought out, consumed and corrupted (*Antiquities* 6:1). None of the ancient versions combines the plague of the haemorrhoids with that of the mice (see 6:4), as is done in other rabbinic literature. There it is assumed that the mice came out of the earth and jerked the entrails out of the bodies of the Philistines as they defecated.<sup>384</sup>

◇ 7 5 וחזו אנשי<sup>385</sup> אשדוד ארי שויא<sup>386</sup> עליהון מחתא ואמרין לא ישרי ארון אלהא  
דישראל עמנא ארי תקיפת מחתיה ◇ עלנא ועל דגון שעתנא :

5:7 *And when the people of Ashdod saw that the stroke was equally upon them, they said, "The ark of the God of Israel must not dwell with us; for his stroke is heavily upon us and upon Dagon our idol."*

The Aramaic verb שׁוּא, usually translated with 'be equal, be like, be deserved', is the equivalent of Hebrew כֵּן, 'just, right'. One might paraphrase the beginning of the Aramaic verse as follows: "And when the people of Ashdod saw that they deserved the stroke ..."

An alternative meaning is suggested by Gordon. He argues that the usage of this verb agrees with the plague vocabulary in the Samaritan *Memar Marqah* 1:4, which says, "An exceedingly great affliction has been *unleashed* against us", and with the Aramaic translation of Mt. 8:32, "And the whole herd of swine *rushed* headlong into the sea". In both instances the stem שׁוּא is used.<sup>387</sup> He therefore concludes that the contextual and comparative grounds for treating שׁוּא in TJon 1 Sam. 5:7 and 6:4 as a verb of rapid or hostile motion appear to be strong.<sup>388</sup>

<sup>382</sup>Cf. MTeh. 78:11. Cf. E. de Vries, *David koning van Israël: de opkomst van zijn koningschap*, Kampen n.d., 38.

<sup>383</sup>Cf. tMeg. 3, and the list of words written but not read in Soferim 38b.

<sup>384</sup>Cf. MShem. 10:77. See also Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 2, 62-63.

<sup>385</sup>Plural because of the Hebrew text, but see MSS d o C D T which replace it with the usual singular אינש (>15).

<sup>386</sup>MSS w y D read שריא, 'it was dwelling'.

<sup>387</sup>R.P. Gordon, "The Meaning of the Verb *šwy* in the Targum to 1 Samuel V-VI", *VT* 42 (1992), 395-97, esp. 396.

<sup>388</sup>Gordon, "The Meaning of the Verb *šwy*", 397.



5 8 ושלחו וכנשו ית כל טרני פלשתאי לוחהון ואמרו מא נעביר<sup>389</sup> לארון אלהא  
 דישראל ואמרו<sup>390</sup> לגת<sup>391</sup> יסתחר ארון אלהא דישראל ואסחרו ית<sup>392</sup> ארון אלהא  
 דישראל:

5:8 *So they sent and gathered together all the chiefs of the Philistines, and said, "What shall we do with the ark of the God of Israel?" They said, "Let the ark of the God of Israel be brought around to Gath." So they brought the ark of the God of Israel around.*

While LXX and Vg regarded Gath as the subject of the verb, rendering "And the Gathites said", TJon and Syr considered Gath to be the accusative of the next verb, rendering "be brought around to Gath". The latter division of the verse is also attested by the Masoretic accents.

5 9 והוה בתר דאסחרו יתיה והות מחתא דיוי<sup>393</sup> בקרתא שגושי רב לחדא ומחא  
 ית אנשי קרתא מזעירא ועד רבא ולקו להון<sup>394</sup> בטחוריא<sup>395</sup>:

5:9 *But after they had brought it around, the stroke of the LORD was on the city, a very great panic. And He struck the men of the city, great and small, so that they were afflicted with haemorrhoids.*

The last phrase of this verse is rendered after the example of 5:12 (>15). As a consequence, the citizens of Gath were considered to be the subject of the verb, while the word להון became superfluous. Only MS B\* renders in conformity with the Hebrew, in which the haemorrhoids are the subject, with ושטחו להון טחורין 'and haemorrhoids spreaded on them'.<sup>396</sup>

5 10 ושלחו ית ארונא דיוי ד לעקרן והוה כד אחא ארונא דיוי ד לעקרן<sup>397</sup> חעיקן  
 עקרונא<sup>398</sup> למימר אסחרו לוחי<sup>399</sup> ית ארון אלהא דישראל לקטלותנא<sup>400</sup> וית  
 עמנא<sup>401</sup>:

<sup>389</sup>Omitted in MS S.

<sup>390</sup>MS D omits everything from ויאמרו until the second דישראל, by haplography.

<sup>391</sup>MS B reads גת, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>392</sup>Omitted by MS T.

<sup>393</sup>MSS a J read the more reverential יי קרם יי (>23).

<sup>394</sup>MSS a b f m read יהון.

<sup>395</sup>Cf. commentary on 1 Sam. 5:6.

<sup>396</sup>MS B<sup>m</sup> adds the correction ולקו, although without the preposition ב before טחוריא.

<sup>397</sup>MSS w y omit the phrase from והוה up to לעקרן, as some Hebrew MSS, Syr and MSS of LXX and Vg.

<sup>398</sup>One of the occasions in which TJon did not render "men of ...".

<sup>399</sup>MSS b f o m w x y B D J S T eb66 read a plural suffix, לוחנא, in accordance with the number of the Ekronites and the rest of the narrative (>9).

<sup>400</sup>Plural in accordance with the number of Ekronites (>9); likewise in Syr

<sup>401</sup>MS B renders a singular suffix, עמי, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

5:10 *So they sent the ark of the LORD to Ekron. And when the ark of the LORD came to Ekron, the Ekronites cried out, "They have brought around to me the ark of the God of Israel to kill us and our people."*

In the Hebrew text the group was regarded as a unity and it was therefore possible to use a singular suffix. This is not maintained in the Aramaic version. Most manuscripts read plural suffixes to denote the members of the group. This alteration from singular to plural was not necessary, for the singular is maintained in TO Gen. 34:30; TJon Judg. 18:23; 1 Sam. 30:22; 2 Sam. 19:42-43.

5 11 ושלחו<sup>402</sup> וכנשו<sup>403</sup> ית כל טורני פלשתאי ואמרו שלחו ית ארון אלהא דישראל ויתוב לאתריה ולא יקטול יתי וית עמי ארי הוה שגוש קטלא<sup>404</sup> בכל קרתא דקיפת לחדא מחתא דיוי<sup>405</sup> חמן:

5:11 *Then they sent and gathered together all the chiefs of the Philistines, and said, "Send away the ark of the God of Israel, and let it return to its own place, that it may not kill me and my people." For there was a deathly panic throughout the whole city. The stroke of the LORD was very heavy there.*

It is surprising that TJon did not translate the phrase "me and my people" in accordance with the plural in 5:10 (against >15). Other ancient versions render "us and our people" in 5:10 as well as in 5:11.<sup>405</sup>

5 12 וגבריא דלא מיתו לקי<sup>406</sup> בטחוריא<sup>407</sup> וסליקת צוחת קרתא דציית שמיא:

5:12 *The men who did not die were stricken with haemorrhoids, and the cry of the city went up toward heaven.*

## 5.8 The Return of the Ark (1 Samuel 6:1–7:17)

In the annual cycle 1 Sam. 6:1–7:17 is read as *haftara* after Lev. 9:1–11:47. In the Sefardi tradition the *haftara* is only read up to 6:19. Similarities between the Torah reading and the *haftara* can hardly be found, except for the sin offering and the implicit idea of clean and unclean.

In the triennial cycle 1 Sam. 6:6-14 is read after the chapter of Exod. 10. The first verse of the *haftara* is reminiscent of Exod. 10:1-2,

<sup>402</sup>Omitted by MS T.

<sup>403</sup>MS B reads an Aphel of this verb ואכנישו, 'and they made them gather', more in accordance with the pericope.

<sup>404</sup>MS f reads קרתא, 'town'.

<sup>405</sup>Cf. *BHS*, crit.app.

<sup>406</sup>MS f reads איהמחיו, 'they were stricken'.

<sup>407</sup>According to Qere, cf. 5:6.

because it mentions the hardening of Pharaoh's heart and the punishment by God. Besides, both co-texts describe plagues due to the captivity of God's own: the people of Israel in Exod. 7–12 and the ark of the LORD in 1 Sam. 4–6. However, this *haftara* is not rendered in conformity with the wording of the Torah reading. While TO Exod. 10:2 turns the Hebrew verb *התעללתי*, 'I made sport of [them]', into *יז* *נסיך דעברית*, 'the wonders that I did', the *haftara* translates the same Hebrew verb in 1 Sam. 6:6 (*החלל*) by *אחפרע*, 'requitil was made [from them]'.

A similar part of the chapter, starting with 6:10, is read as *haftara* in the triennial cycle after the Torah reading of Num. 4:17ff. There is no apparant agreement between the two chapters, except the holiness of the sanctuary and its content.

1 6 והוה ארונא דיוי בקרוי<sup>408</sup> פלשתאי שבעה ירחין: 2 6 וקרו פלשתאי לכהניא<sup>409</sup> ולקסמיא למימר מא נעביד לארונא<sup>410</sup> דיוי הודעונא במא נשלחניה לאתריה: 3 6 ואמרו אם משלחין<sup>411</sup> ית ארון אלהא<sup>412</sup> דישראל לא תשלחון יתיה ריקן ארי<sup>412</sup> אתבא תתיבון קרמוהי<sup>413</sup> קרבן אשמא בכין תתסון ויתרוח לכון למא לא תנח מחתיה<sup>413</sup> מנכון:

*6:1 And the ark of the LORD was in the cities of the Philistines seven months. 6:2 And the Philistines called for the priests and the diviners, saying: "What shall we do with the ark of the LORD? Let us know with what we shall send it to its place." 6:3 And they said, "If you<sup>413</sup> send away the ark of the God of Israel, do not send it empty, for you shall by all means return before Him a guilt offering. Then you will be healed and it will be relieved to you. Why would his stroke not rest from you?"*

TJon did not accept that the Philistines were still in doubt about the origin of the plague. Therefore, the Hebrew phrase "it will be known to you why his hand does not turn away from you" is turned

<sup>408</sup>Mss a J read בחקל, 'in the field', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>409</sup>Mss a b c d f m o w y x B D J S T eb66 read לכמריא, 'to the idol priests', according to the usual way of distinguishing between the LORD's priests and idol priests (>22).

<sup>410</sup>Mss f reads the almost blasphemous rendering בארונא, 'in the ark', which is in harmony with the following verse, "do not send it empty".

<sup>411</sup>Mss a b m o w y x B D S eb66 add ארון, 'you', as is done in some Hebrew MSS and quotations, and by LXX and Syr. This plus is fully in harmony with the verse (>10).

<sup>412</sup>Mss a b c d f o read איליין, 'but, except', which is in harmony with the meaning of the verse (>16). MSS m w x y B D J S T, however, add this conjunction before ארי, making a conflated reading.

<sup>413</sup>Since one must choose a personal pronomen to complement the phrase, the second person plural, attested in many MSS, Syr and LXX, is the most natural.

into the certainty of deliverance from the plague, in accordance with the rest of the account (>16), *e.g.* 6:5. However, since LXX translates likewise, “and atonement shall be made for you”, Winton Thomas’ suggestion that the Hebrew verb ידע might be connected with the similar Arabic verb, meaning “be quiet, be at rest” and in another form even “become reconciled with”, sounds very likely.<sup>414</sup> If this is true, TJon either renders the original meaning or connects it with a different stem (>6).

4 6 ואמרו מא קרבן אשמא דנחב קדמוהי ◊ ואמרו מנין טורני פלשתאי חמשא  
טחורי<sup>415</sup> דהבא וחמשא עכברי דהבא ארי מחתא חדא שויא<sup>416</sup> לכלכין<sup>417</sup> ולטורניכון:  
5 6 ותעבדון צלמי טחוריכין<sup>418</sup> וצלמי עכבריכון דמחבלין ית ארעא ותתגון קדם  
אלהא<sup>419</sup> ◊ יקרא ◊ מא אם תגוה מחתיה מנכון ומן טעוהכין<sup>420</sup> ומן ארעכון:  
6 6 ולמא תיקרן ית לבכון כמא דיקרו מצראי<sup>421</sup> ופרעה ית לבהון הלא כד אחפרע  
מנהון ובחר כין שלחונן ואולו:

6:4 When they said, “What is the guilt offering that we shall return before Him?” they said, “The number of the chiefs of the Philistines: five golden haemorrhoids and five golden mice, for the one stroke was equally<sup>422</sup> on all of you and on your chiefs. 6:5 So you must make images of your haemorrhoids and images of your mice that ravaged the land, and you shall give glory before the God of Israel. Perhaps his stroke will rest from you and your idols and your land. 6:6 Why should you harden your hearts as the Egyptians and the pharaoh hardened their hearts? Was that not when revenge was taken on them? And afterwards they sent them away and they went.

In the second instance where reference is made to the Exodus (cf. 1 Sam. 4:8) TJon harmonizes it with the order of the Pentateuchal account. The pharaoh and his people did indeed harden their heart as God was taking revenge (*passivum divinum*), but the Egyptians only let the people go *after* the plagues. MSS a J even state that they

<sup>414</sup>D. Winton Thomas, “A Note on לָכֶם וְיָנֻדֶּה in I Samuel VI. 3”, *JThS*, 11 (1960), 52. However, see also the objections to this kind of etymologizing: J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*, Oxford 1968, 19-23.

<sup>415</sup>According to Qere, cf. the commentary on 1 Sam. 5:6.

<sup>416</sup>MSS o S reads שְׂרִיא, ‘is dwelling’ (cf. 5:7). Omitted by MS f.

<sup>417</sup>Second person, as in several Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

<sup>418</sup>According to Qere, cf. the commentary on 1 Sam. 5:6.

<sup>419</sup>MS f reads לֵאלֹהֵא, in conformity with the Hebrew text, but in contrast to the usual reverential rendering (>29; against >22).

<sup>420</sup>MS D omits טעוהכין by haplography.

<sup>421</sup>MSS a f J read מִצְרַיִם, in conformity with the Hebrew text, but in contrast to the usual rendering (>29; against >9).

<sup>422</sup>For this rendering, see the commentary on 1 Sam. 5:7.

hardened their hearts *until* revenge was wreaked on them, ועד דאיחפרע מנהון. Since God's holiness and righteousness must be stressed above all, TJon does not translate that God "made sport" of the Egyptians, but that requital was made to them. The Egyptians simply suffered the consequences of their deeds.<sup>423</sup>

6 7 וכען סבוֹ ועבידו עגלתא חדתא חדא ותרתין חורן מינקן דלא נגא<sup>424</sup> בניר ותיסרון ית חורתא בעגלתא ותתיבון בניהון מבתייהון לגוי<sup>425</sup>:

*6:7 Now then, take and prepare one new cart and two milch cows which have never pulled in a yoke. And bind the cows to the cart, but send their calves back inside, so that they cannot follow them.*

A clarification was made, in harmony with the co-text. Whether the cows were ever tied to a yoke does not matter, but whether they were used to be pulling in a yoke. Not the cause was translated, but the result (>11). Furthermore, Hebrew הביחה, 'to the house', was rendered by לגוי, 'to the inside', in this verse, while the similar Hebrew בבית is rendered by בביחא in verse 10. The translation "inside" stresses the result of the movement. It possibly indicates the difference between a house and building in which these calves were put.

6 8 וחסבוןֹ ית ארונא דיין ותחתון<sup>426</sup> יתיה בעגלתא וית מני דהבא דאחיבתון קדמוהיֹ קרבן אשמא חשוון בתיבתא מסטריה ותשלחון יתיה ויהך: 6 9 ותחזון אם באורח חחומיה סליק לבית שמש מן קדמוהיֹ אתעבידת לנא בשחא רבתא הדא ואם לא<sup>427</sup> נדע ארי לא מחתיהֹ קריבת בנא עירוע הוא דהוה לנא:

*6:8 And you shall take the ark of the LORD and put it down on the cart. And you shall place in a box at its side the golden figures which you are returning before Him as a guilt offering. Then you shall send it off, and it will go. 6:9 And you shall watch: if it goes up on the way of its own territory, to Beth-shemesh, then this great harm was done from before Him; but if not, then we shall know that it was not his stroke that came near to us, it happened to us by chance."*

The original phrase "it is He who has done us this great harm" is turned into a reverential circumlocution in the passive voice and with

<sup>423</sup> Cf. also Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 147, who also refer to the same verb in Isa. 66:4, which became "to break" in TJon.

<sup>424</sup> Ms d adds עליהון, in conformity with the Hebrew text, but it does not fit anymore into the Aramaic translation (>29).

<sup>425</sup> Ms o adds ביחא, in conformity with the Hebrew text, thus making a double rendering.

<sup>426</sup> Mss a b c d f o B D J T read וחיחון, in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>427</sup> The phrase הוא דהוה לנא is omitted by MS D (haplography).

the preposition קדם.<sup>428</sup> In this process the personal pronomen הוא is rendered by a suffix after קדם and the nota accusativi is omitted. In some MSS, however, these two words are maintained, although they no longer fit into the sentence. Ms f maintained הוא before Aramaic מן and MSS a b c d f o J T maintain the nota accusativi—before the subject בשחא.

Both TJon and Syr translate the Hebrew verb נגע, 'touch, strike' with a form of the stem קרב, 'draw near', thereby creating a distance between God and man (>23).<sup>429</sup> The meaning of the Hebrew verb is maintained in "his stroke", the circumlocution of "his hand".

10 6 ועבדו גבריא כין ודברו<sup>430</sup> תרתין תורן מינקן ואסרונון בעגלתא וית בניהון כלו בביחא: 11 6 ושוי ית ארונא דיין בעגלתא וית חיבתא<sup>431</sup> וית עכברי דהבא וית צלמי שחוריהון<sup>432</sup>: 12 6 ואכוינא תורחא באורחא על אורח בית שמש בכבשא חד אולן מיל ונעין ולא סטאה לימינא ולסמלא וטורני פלשתאי אולין בתריהון עד תחום בית שמש:

*6:10 And the men did so, and led two milch cows and bound them to the cart, and shut up their calves at home. 6:11 And they put the ark of the LORD on the cart, and the box and the golden mice and the images of their haemorrhoids. 6:12 And the cows went straight on the way, in the direction of Beth-shemesh, along one highway, lowing as they went. They turned neither to the right nor to the left, and the chiefs of the Philistines went after them as far as the border of Beth-shemesh.*

Hebrew expressions like הלכו הלך וגעו are mostly constructed with one absolute infinitive. This infinitive can be followed by a second absolute infinitive, or by an adjective, an imperfect consecutive, a perfect, or a participle.<sup>433</sup> These Hebrew phrases, expressing the idea of long continuance, are either rendered into Aramaic by one infinitive (מיל) and one participle (1 Sam. 6:12; 14:19; 19:23; 2 Sam. 3:24; 13:19; 16:5)—but note that the main verb is also a participle—or by a construction with two participles (2 Sam. 3:16; 5:10; 16:13). Sometimes the Hebrew expression is construed with a participle, followed either by a participle or by an adjective. These phrases are always translated with two participles, e.g. אולין ותקפין, 'growing stronger' (2 Sam. 3:1; 23:6, 7) and אולין ומאכין, 'growing weaker' (2 Sam. 3:1).<sup>434</sup>

<sup>428</sup> Similarly Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 55:6.

<sup>429</sup> Cf. the same shift in 1 Kgs 19:5, 7; 2 Kgs 13:21.

<sup>430</sup> MSS a b c d f m o w x y B C D J S T eb66 render ונסיבו.

<sup>431</sup> The phrase וית חיבתא is omitted by ms J.

<sup>432</sup> According to the Hebrew in the *Codex Leningradensis*, although many Hebrew MSS read עפליהם, as in former verses (cf. 5:6).

<sup>433</sup> The Hebrew variants are described in GKC § 113, s-u.

<sup>434</sup> Cf. 1 Sam. 17:15, 41; cf. S. Bombeck, *Das althebräische Verbalsystem aus*

13 6 וביה שמש הצדין חצר חטין במישראל וזקפו<sup>435</sup> ית<sup>436</sup> עניהון וחזו ית ארונא וחדיוא למחזי: 14 6 ועגלחא אתת לחקל יהושע דמבית שמש וקמת תמן ותמן אבנא רבחא וצלחו<sup>437</sup> ית אעי עגלחא וית תורחא אסיקו עלחא קדם<sup>438</sup> יוי: 15 6 וליואי אחיתו<sup>438</sup> ית ארונא דיוי וית תיבתא דעמיה דביה מני דהבא ושויוא על אבנא רבחא וגברי בית שמש אסיקו עלון ונכיסו<sup>439</sup> נכסח<sup>439</sup> קדשין ביומא ההוא קדם<sup>440</sup> יוי: 16 6 וחמשא טורני פלשתאי חזו ותבו לעקרן ביומא ההוא: 17 6 ואלין שחורי<sup>440</sup> דהבא דאחיבו פלשתאי קרבן<sup>441</sup> אשמא<sup>442</sup> קדם<sup>442</sup> יוי דאשדוד חד דעזה חד דאשקלון חד דגת חד דעקרן חד: 18 6 ועכברי דהבא מנין כל קרוי<sup>443</sup> פלשתאי לחמשא טורניא מקרוין<sup>443</sup> כריכן ועד קרוי<sup>443</sup> פצחיא ועד אבנא<sup>443</sup> רבתא דאחיתו עלה ית ארונא דיוי עד יומא הרין הא היא בחקל יהושע דמבית שמש:

6:13 *And Beth-shemesh was harvesting the wheat harvest in the valley; and when they lifted up their eyes and saw the ark, they rejoiced to see it.* 6:14 *The cart went to the field of Joshua, who was of Beth-shemesh, and stood there. And a great stone was there; and they split up the wood of the cart and sacrificed the cows as a burnt offering before the LORD.* 6:15 *And the Levites took down the ark of the LORD and the box that was with it, in which were the golden things, and put them upon the great stone. And the men of Beth-shemesh sacrificed burnt offerings and slaughtered holy sacrifices on that day before the LORD.* 6:16 *And when the five chiefs of the Philistines saw it, they returned that day to Ekron.* 6:17 *These are the golden haemorrhoids which the Philistines returned as a guilt offering before the LORD: one of<sup>444</sup> Ashdod, one of Gaza, one of Ashkelon, one of Gath, one of Ekron.* 6:18 *And the golden mice, the number of all the cities of the Philistines belonging to the five chiefs, from the fortified cities unto the unwallled cities, and unto the great stone on which they returned the ark of the LORD, to this day. Behold, it is in the field of Joshua who was of Beth-shemesh.*

*aramäischer Sicht: Masoretischer Text, Targume und Peschitta* (EHS.T, 591), Frankfurt a.M. 1997, 196.

<sup>435</sup>Literal translation of Hebrew נשא, with the same meaning; cf. S.C. Reif, "A Root to Look up? A Study of the Hebrew NS' 'YN", in: J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (VT.S, 36), Leiden 1985, 230-44.

<sup>436</sup>Omitted in MSS B\* C D T.

<sup>437</sup>This stem is also used in Syr.

<sup>438</sup>Ms D reads אייחו, 'they brought'.

<sup>439</sup>Omitted by MSS C D T.

<sup>440</sup>According to the Hebrew text, although a few Hebrew MSS read עפלי, cf. 5:6.

<sup>441</sup>Omitted in MS d, in conformity with the Hebrew text, but in contrast to the usual Targumic vocabulary (>29).

<sup>442</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>443</sup>Ms a reads מישר רביה אבנא, 'the valley in which the stone ...', more in conformity with the Hebrew text, but also according to the Targumic explanation.

<sup>444</sup>Only MS d maintains the preposition ל before the five place-names.

TJon seeks to translate a rather unintelligible verse in harmony with the preceding verses. Therefore, the Hebrew אַבֵּל, 'brook', is emended into אֶבֶן, 'stone', which is also mentioned in 6:14 (>16).<sup>445</sup> The following verb became דִּאֲחִיתוּ, which also occurs in 6:15 (>15). According to this rendering the region of the Philistines reached as far as the great stone in the field of Joshua. The number of the fortified cities is adapted to reality (>9), as is done in Syr.

In contrast to TJon, Pseudo-Jerome tries hard to explain the word אַבֵּל, represented by "Abel" in Vg. On the one hand he explains it with the great mourning that followed the stroke mentioned in 6:19. In this verse the verb אַבֵּל, 'mourn', is used. On the other hand he connects it with the city Abel mentioned in 2 Sam. 20:18.<sup>446</sup>

19 6 וְקָטַל בְּנֹבְרֵי בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ עַל דְּחִרְיָאוֹ<sup>447</sup> דְּחִזּוּ בְּאַרְוֵנָא<sup>448</sup> דִּי כִד גְּלִי<sup>449</sup> וְקָטַל<sup>450</sup> בְּסַבִּי<sup>451</sup> עֵמָא שְׁבַעִין גְּבֵרָא וּבִקְהֵלָא חֲמֵשִׁין אַלְפִין גְּבֵרָא וְאַתְאֲבֵלוּ עֵמָא אַרִי מְחָא<sup>452</sup> יִי בַעֲמָא מְחָא סְנִיָּאָה:

6:19 *And He killed among the men of Beth-shemesh, because they rejoiced as they saw the ark of the LORD, when it was exposed; and He killed among the elders of the people seventy men and among the assembly fifty thousand men. And the people mourned, because the LORD had made a great stroke among the people.*

The Hebrew combination of רָאוּ with בִּי is translated "they rejoiced as they saw",<sup>453</sup> after the example of 6:13 (>15). Most MSS then omit the preposition before אַרְוֵנָא and add גְּלִי, 'when it was exposed'. The inhabitants did not just look at the ark, which was inevitable at its return, but they exposed the ark on the great stone and enjoyed looking at it.<sup>454</sup> This explanation is also given by R. Levi, who claimed that the curtain covering the ark was removed and that they looked

<sup>445</sup>So a few Hebrew MSS, LXX and two MSS of the *Vetus Latina*.

<sup>446</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 77.

<sup>447</sup>Ms S used the copula אַרִי, while MS eb1 chose כִּד. Both MSS omit the verb דְּחִרְיָאוֹ.

<sup>448</sup>MSS a b c d f m o w x y B C D J S and Kimḥi read אַרְוֵנָא. Kimḥi and MSS a J add הִי before it.

<sup>449</sup>The phrase גְּלִי כִּד is omitted by MSS C eb1.

<sup>450</sup>Ms a reads וּמְחָא, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>451</sup>Omitted by MS eb1.

<sup>452</sup>Ms eb1 reads קָטַל, in accordance with the preceding occurrences in this verse (>15).

<sup>453</sup>See also *HALAT*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. רָאוּ; Driver, *Notes*, 58.

<sup>454</sup>Although some MSS maintain the preposition בִּי, they provide the same translation and explanation. In Aramaic the combination of חִזּוּ with בִּי also means "to look at, to gaze at", cf. TO Gen. 34:1; TgJudg. 16:27; TgEzek. 21:26.



at it (NumR. 5:9).<sup>455</sup> Only Josephus explains the implicit reason for this punishment, *viz.* the fact that they approached the ark as non-priests.<sup>456</sup>

Another explanation, making their sin even greater, is given in the margin of CR:

ואת האמרי על החדיאו בתכרייהון דישראל ובנו ית ארונא דיין כד גלא

*There are those who say: because they rejoiced in the destruction of Israel and despised the ark of the LORD, when it was exposed*<sup>457</sup>

This explanation is based on the assumption that the verb ראה means “to look with contempt”, as it is used in Cant. 1:6. Likewise R. Abehu explained the word (Sot. 35a-b), later supported by Rashi.<sup>458</sup> The contempt of the inhabitants of Beth-shemesh was expressed in their continued harvesting while the Levites took care of the ark, explains R. Eleazar (Sot. 35b, cf. also NumR. 5:9). Contempt of the ark or the temple was a grave sin, which was inevitably requited (cf. 1 Macc. 1:31-40; 2 Macc. 4:10-17).

The problem of the double figure in the Hebrew text is solved by diversification (>18).<sup>459</sup> The number 70 is connected with the elders of the people, according to the number of the Sanhedrin.<sup>460</sup> And the

<sup>455</sup> Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 317. So also SER 12 (p. 58), with the explanation “they they saw the ark, they laughed and stood up, and once they were standing, they began to dance around and even say things that were utterly inappropriate”.

<sup>456</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, 5:16. The same explanation could have been the basis of the rendering in LXX, cf. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 131.

<sup>457</sup> Or: “plundered the ark of the LORD, when it was open.”

<sup>458</sup> Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 317.

<sup>459</sup> This double figure is very rare, though not completely absent in the rest of the Hebrew Bible. The double ‘men’ is parallel to the double use of the word ‘day’ in Lev. 12:4. The order of the numbers—single figure numbers first, then the tens, then the hundreds, then the thousands, rather than the other way round—is also found Num. 3:50. The omission of the conjunction is not paralleled. Cf. D.M. Fouts, “Added Support for Reading ‘70 Men’ in 1 Samuel VI 19,” *VT* 42 (1992), 394. Most exegetes conclude that the number fifty thousand was added later, perhaps to stress the holiness of the ark, cf. J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*, Göttingen 1871, 66; H.P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC), Edinburgh 1899 (repr. 1969), 49; S.I. Feigin, “Shemesh the son of Yahweh”, *JQR* 28 (1937/38) 225-42, esp. 234; Vogel, *Samuel első könyve*, 16; H.W. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher* (ATD, 10), Göttingen <sup>5</sup>1973, 46; C.J. Goslinga, *Het eerste boek Samuël* (COT), Kampen 1968, 176; R.W. Klein, *1 Samuel* (WBC, 10), Waco (TX) 1983, 54n.19b; D.M. Fouts, “Added Support for Reading ‘70 Men’ in 1 Samuel VI 19,” *VT* 42 (1992) 394. The ancient versions were not used as a basis for this assumption.

<sup>460</sup> The translation עבא סבי might be an ‘al tigre interpretation of Hebrew שבעים, ‘seventy’, read as שבִי עב, ‘elders of the people’; cf. N.H. Tur-Sinai, “The Ark of God at Beit Shemesh (1 Sam. vi) and Pereš ‘Uzza (2 Sam. vi; 1 Chron. xiii)”, *VT*

number 50,000 is connected with the assembly of the people. Similar explanations can be found in Vg, which translates "et percussit de populo septuaginta viros et quinquaginta millia plebis"<sup>461</sup> and in the Talmudim and Midrashim (ySan. 2:4 (20b); San. 20b; Sot. 35b; NumR. 5:9).<sup>462</sup>

Another view based on the explanation, given in NumR. 5:9, is reflected in a variant reading in MSS a C J:

ומחא בסבי עמא שבעין גברא דאינון בקהלא כחמשין אלפין גברא

*And he struck among the elders of the people seventy men, who were in the assembly as fifty thousand men.*

Pseudo-Jerome also regards the second number as complementing the first. The number of dead was 70, but these people were worth 50,000 men each.<sup>463</sup> Pseudo-Jerome then refers to 2 Sam. 18:3 where David is said to be as valuable as ten thousand people.<sup>464</sup>

R. Eleazar suggests the opposite, viz. that 50,000 men were killed, who were as worthy as the 70 men of the Sanhedrin (NumR. 5:9). In SER 12 (p. 58) the following explanation is found: "There fell fifty thousand of Israel and with them the Great Sanhedrin" (cf. R. Elijah's opinion in NumR. 5:9).<sup>465</sup>

20 6 ואמרו גברי בית שמש מן יכול למקם קדם ארונא דיוי אלהים<sup>466</sup> קרישא  
הדין ולאידין אתר יסתלק מנא:

*6:20 Then the men of Beth-shemesh said, "Who is able to stand before the ark of the LORD, this holy God? And to what place shall it be brought up, away from us?"*

In order to avoid identification of the ark with the LORD<sup>467</sup> and to avoid the misunderstanding that God could be moved from one

I (1951), 275-86, esp. 280.

<sup>461</sup>V. Aptowitz, "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata", *ZAW* 29 (1909), 241-252, esp. 243; F. Stummer, "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas", *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, esp. 7.

<sup>462</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 16; Komlos, המקרא באור התרגום, 328.

<sup>463</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 78: "Hos septuaginta viros iudices septuaginta Hebrei intellegunt, quorum merito et gloriae quinquaginta milia viri comparabantur".

<sup>464</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:16 mentions only the number 70.

<sup>465</sup>Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 55:10 resolves the whole problem by concluding the story with huge numbers of Philistines who would have died.

<sup>466</sup>Omitted by MS B, leaving "before this holy ark of the LORD", cf. 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. LXX<sup>B</sup> even omits the tetragrammaton, reading "before this holy ark".

<sup>467</sup>P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel i-xvi*, Amsterdam 1938, 15; Komlos, המקרא באור התרגום, 328.

place to another, TJon applies a few exegetical techniques. First the word “ark” is added before God’s name (>23) and consequently the last verb is altered into the passive voice: the ark had to be carried (>11).<sup>468</sup> The question to whom the ark would go is turned into a question as to which place it must be carried. The ark was not personal property, but had to be put in a chosen place (>16, cf. Exod. 20:24; Deut. 12:5).

21 6 ושלחו אנגדין ◊ לות יחבי קרית ◊ יערים למימר אחיבו פלשתאי יה ארונא דיוי  
 חוהו אסיקן<sup>469</sup> יתיה לותכון: 7 1 ואהו גברי<sup>470</sup> קרית ◊ יערים ואסיקו יה ארונא<sup>471</sup>  
 דיוי ואעילו יתיה לבית אבינדב בנבעתא ◊ וית אלעזר בריה זמינו למטר יה ארונא  
 דיוי: 2 7 והוה מיומא דשרא ארונא בקרית יערים<sup>472</sup> וסגיא יומיא והו עסרין שנין  
 ואתנהיא<sup>473</sup> כל בית ישראל בחר פלחנא ◊ דיוי: 3 7 ואמר שמואל לכל בית ישראל  
 למימר אם בכל לבכון אחון תיבין לפלחנא ◊ דיוי אעדו ית שעות ◊ עממיא מביניכון  
 ועשתרתא ואתקינ לבכון לפלחנא ◊ דיוי ופלחו ◊ קדמוהי ◊ בלחודוהי וישויב ◊ יחון  
 מידא דפלשתאי: 4 7 ואעדיוא בני ישראל ית בעליא וית עשתרתא ופלחו ◊ קדם ◊ יי  
 בלחודוהי: 5 7 ואמר שמואל כנשו ית כל ישראל<sup>474</sup> למצפיא ואצלי ◊ עליכון קדם ◊  
 יי: 6 7 ואתכנשו למצפיא ושפכו לבהון בחיובא כמיא קדם ◊ יי וצמו ביומא ההוא  
 ואמרו תמן תבנא ◊ קדם ◊ יי ודן שמואל ית בני ישראל במצפיא:

6:21 So they sent messengers to the inhabitants of Kiriath-jearim, saying, “The Philistines have returned the ark of the LORD. Come down and take it up to you.” 7:1 And the men of Kiriath-jearim came and took up the ark of the LORD and brought it to the house of Abinadab on the hill<sup>475</sup>; and they appointed his son, Eleazar, to guard the ark of the LORD. 7:2 From the day that the ark lodged in Kiriath-jearim many days passed—it became twenty years—and all the House of Israel gathered themselves after the worship of the LORD. 7:3 Then Samuel said to all the house of Israel, “If you are returning to the worship of the LORD with all your heart, then remove the idols of the nations and the Ashtaroth from among you, and direct your heart to the worship of the LORD, and worship before Him alone. And He will deliver you from the hand of the Philistines.” 7:4 So Israel removed the Baals and the Ashtaroth and they worshipped before the LORD alone. 7:5 Then Samuel said, “Gather all Israel at Mizpah, and

<sup>468</sup>In LXX the word “ark” is added to this verb.

<sup>469</sup>Ms d reads אחיבו, ‘return’.

<sup>470</sup>Ms eb1 reads אינש.

<sup>471</sup>Ms a adds קיימא, ‘covenant’.

<sup>472</sup>Ms eb1 omits יערים בקרית, but adds דיוי.

<sup>473</sup>Ms f<sub>2</sub> reads ואיתוהיכו, ‘they were reprimanded, rebuked’. In this way 7:2 functions more as a heading of 1 Sam. 7.

<sup>474</sup>Ms w reads עמא, ‘all the people’.

<sup>475</sup>Or: in The Hill.

*I will pray before the LORD on behalf of*<sup>476</sup> *you.*” 7:6 *So they gathered themselves at Mizpah, and poured out their hearts like water, in repentance before the LORD. And they fasted on that day, and said there, “We are guilty before the LORD.” And Samuel judged the sons of Israel at Mizpah.*

The ritual of pouring out water is allegorically explained as repentance (>25).<sup>477</sup> In this explanation the Hebrew וישאבו is omitted and the Hebrew מים is transposed. Only the Leiria edition and the Antwerp Polyglot add the literal translation ומליא מים, ‘and they drew water’. The Antwerp Polyglot omits the Aramaic כמיא and creates a meaningful rendering, “they drew water and poured out their hearts in repentance before the LORD”.<sup>478</sup> The Leiria edition, however, maintains the Aramaic כמיא, making an odd combination of literal and figurative language.

This figurative explanation<sup>479</sup> is made to avoid the misunderstanding that the people poured out the water as a libation. Such a libation could only be performed by priests (>24).<sup>480</sup> This metaphor is based on the use of the Hebrew שפך, ‘pour out’, in this verse, which is not the usual verb to indicate libations, נסך.<sup>481</sup> The verb שפך is mostly used of pouring out liquids, and tears, cf. 1 Sam. 1:15, “I have been pouring out my soul before the LORD” referring to Hannah’s prayer; Ps. 62:9, “pour out your heart before Him”; and especially Isa. 38:5, “I have heard your prayer, I have seen your tears”, referring to Hezekiah’s prayer. In these three texts the combination of prayer and the figuratively used “pouring out” is attested.<sup>482</sup>

7 7 ושמעו פלשתאי ארי אחכנשו בני ישראל למצפיה וסליקו טורני פלשתאי על ישראל ושמעו בני ישראל ודחילו מן קדם פלשתאי: 8 7 ואמרו בני ישראל לשמואל

<sup>476</sup>This is the usual rendering of בעד with the sense of “on behalf of”, cf. B. Grossfeld, *Targum Neofiti 1: An Exegetical Commentary to Genesis Including Full Rabbinic Parallels*, New York 2000, 191.

<sup>477</sup>Thus it is quoted in SER 17 (p. 86); MTeh. 29:2; cf. 119:76.

<sup>478</sup>A similar combination of a real water libation and the figurative meaning of prayer is found in Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:22.

<sup>479</sup>Note that the same metaphor is translated with realistic vocabulary in 1 Sam. 1:15.

<sup>480</sup>Cf. mSuk. 4:1, 9-10; tSuk. 3:3, 14-16; MShem. 13:1; and Rashi and Kimhi’s commentary. Cf. Komlosh, המקרא באור החרגים, 323; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 18-19.

<sup>481</sup>Cf. Ch. Dohmen, “נסך”, in: G.J. Botterweck et al., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, Bd. 5, Stuttgart 1986, 488-93.

<sup>482</sup>The combination of water (tears) and repentance is also used in TPsJ Exod. 40:7, an instruction concerning the laver and its water “for the sins of such as convert by repentance, and pour off their perversity like water”.

לא תשתוק<sup>483</sup> מננא מלצלאה קדם יוי אלהנא ויפרקננא מידא דפלשתאי: 7 9  
 ונסיב שמואל אמרא דחלבא חד ואסקיה<sup>484</sup> עלתא גמיר<sup>485</sup> קדם יוי וצלי שמואל  
 קדם יוי על ישראל וקביל צלותיה יוי:

*7:7 When the Philistines heard that the sons of Israel had gathered themselves at Mizpah, the chiefs of the Philistines went up against Israel. And when the sons of Israel heard of it, they feared before the Philistines. 7:8 And the sons of Israel said to Samuel, "Do not fall silent in your prayer for us<sup>486</sup> before the LORD our God, that He may save us from the hand of the Philistines." 7:9 So Samuel took one sucking lamb and sacrificed it as a whole burnt offering before the LORD. And Samuel prayed before the LORD on behalf of<sup>487</sup> Israel and the LORD accepted his prayer.*

TJon made no effort to omit Samuel's fault by offering a whole burnt offering without being a priest. R. Abba b. Kahana openly acknowledged that Samuel was too young and a Levite (NumR. 14:1; MTeh. 27:6).

10 7 והוה שמואל מסיק עלתא ופלשתאי אחקרו לאנחא קרבא בישראל ואכלי יוי  
 בקל רב ביומא ההוא על פלשתאי ושגישנון ואחברו קדם ישראל: 7 11 ונפקו  
 אנש<sup>488</sup> ישראל מן מצפיא ורדפו ית פלשתאי ומחוננון עד מלרע לבית שרון<sup>489</sup>:

*7:10 As Samuel was sacrificing up the burnt offering, the Philistines drew near to wage war against Israel. But the LORD thundered with a great voice that day against the Philistines and confused them; and they were shattered before Israel. 7:11 And the men of Israel went out of Mizpah and pursued the Philistines, and smote them, as far as below Beth-sharon.*

The place-name Beth-car was altered into Beth-sharon (>19), a city in the coastal area. Although Beth-sharon satisfies the strategical needs in 1 Sam. 7, it does not agree with the archaeological point

<sup>483</sup>MS a reads תפסוק, 'cease', which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>484</sup>According to the Qere; cf. the rabbinic discussion in AZ 24b, and the list of words written without a Waw, but to be read with one in Soferim 38a.

<sup>485</sup>Omitted in MS b.

<sup>486</sup>Literally: "do not fall silent from us from praying . . ."

<sup>487</sup>This is the usual rendering of בער with the sense of "on behalf of", cf. Grossfeld, *Targum Neofiti 1*, 191.

<sup>488</sup>Singular against the Hebrew text, although MSS b f m w x y read the plural (>29).

<sup>489</sup>Menachem b. Salomo, באבן, באבן, Rome 1154, cited by W. Bacher, "Notes on the Critique of the Text to the Targum of the Prophets", *JQR* 11 (1899), 651-655, esp. 653, reads ביה שאן, which is "undoubtedly a corruption".

of view.<sup>490</sup> Syr turns Beth-car into Beth-yeshen, repeating the name as the rendering of Shen in 7:12.

12 7 ונסִיב־ שְׂמוֹאל אֶבְנָא חֲדָא וְשׁוּי בֵּין מִצְפָּא וּבֵין שֵׁנָא וְקָרָא יָהּ שְׂמָה אֲבָן סַעְדָּא  
וְאָמַר עַד הִכָּא סַעְדָּנָא יְיָ:

7:12 *Then Samuel took one stone and set it up between Mizpah and Shen and called its name "Stone of Help", for he said, "Up to here the LORD has helped us."*

The place-name Ebenezer is translated according to its meaning (>19). This translation brings about that the repetition of the verb "help" is maintained.

13 7 וְאַחֲבָרוּ פִּלְשְׁתָּאֵי וְלֹא אוֹסִיפוּ עוֹד לְמִיעַל בְּחָחוּם אַרְעָא דִּישְׂרָאֵל<sup>491</sup> וְהוּת  
מִחֲתָא דִּיּוּ בִּפְלִשְׁתָּאֵי כָּל יוֹמֵי שְׂמוֹאֵל:

7:13 *So the Philistines were shattered and did not again cross<sup>492</sup> the border of the land of Israel. And the stroke of the LORD was on the Philistines all the days of Samuel.*

Hebrew ויכנעו, 'they were subdued', is translated with the verb ואחברו, 'they were shattered', according to 7:10 (>15). Since the Aramaic חחומא means 'border' in the first place, TJon adds the word ארעא to clarify the text (>11). The Philistines stopped violating the borders of Israel's land.

14 7 וְחָבָא קְרוּיָא דְנַסִּיב־ פְּלִישְׁתָּאֵי מִן יִשְׂרָאֵל לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מַעֲקָרוֹן וְעַד נָה וְיָת<sup>493</sup>  
תְּחוּמֵהוֹן שִׁיבִיב־ יִשְׂרָאֵל מִדָּא דִּפְלִשְׁתָּאֵי וְהוּהּ שְׁלָמָא בֵּין יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבֵין אֲמֹרָאֵי: 15 7  
וְרֵן שְׂמוֹאֵל יָת יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּל יוֹמֵי חַיָּוֵי: 16 7 וְאוּיִל בּוֹמֵן שָׁנָא בְּשָׁנָא וּמִסְתַּחֲר לְבֵיתֵאֵל  
וְלִלְגָלָא וּלְמִצְפָּא וְדָאִין יָת יִשְׂרָאֵל יָת כָּל אַתְרָאֵי הָאֵלִין: 17 7 וּבְמִתְבִּיָּה לְרַמְתָּא אַרִי  
תַּמֵּן בִּיתְיָה וְתַמֵּן דִּן<sup>494</sup> יָת יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבִנָּא תַּמֵּן מִרְבַּחָא קִדְם־ יְיָ:

7:14 *The cities which the Philistines had taken from Israel were restored to Israel, from Ekron to Gath; and Israel delivered them from the hand of the Philistines. And there was peace between Israel and the Amorites. 7:15 Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life. 7:16 And he used to go on a circuit year by year to Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpah; and he was judging Israel, all these places. 7:17 And on his return to Ramah—for there was his house and there he judged Israel—he built there an altar before the LORD.*

<sup>490</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 113.

<sup>491</sup>Ms a reads merely יִשְׂרָאֵל for אַרְעָא דִּישְׂרָאֵל in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>492</sup>Literally: enter.

<sup>493</sup>Ms eb1 reads ועד: "from Ekron to Gath and to their territory".

<sup>494</sup>Mss w y d read the active participle דָּאִין, 'he used to judge'.

## 5.9 The Demand for a King (1 Samuel 8)

This chapter was read as *haftara* in the triennial cycle, after the Torah reading of Deut. 17:14-20, warnings about the future king. There are not many verbal agreements between the Hebrew text of these passages, or between the Aramaic versions. It is noteworthy that TJon specifically renders “the *customs* of the king” (8:11), and does not refer to the Torah.<sup>495</sup>

1 8 והוה כד סיב שמואל ומני ית בנוהי דיינין על<sup>496</sup> ישראל: 2 8 והוה שום בריה בכרא יואל ושום תניניה אביה דינין<sup>497</sup> בבאר שבע: 3 8 ולא הליכו בנוהי באורחתיה<sup>498</sup> ואתפניאו בחר ממין דשקר וקבילו שחדא וצלו דינא<sup>499</sup>:

*8:1 When Samuel became old, he appointed his sons as judges over Israel. 8:2 The name of his firstborn son was Joel, and the name of his second Abijah; they were judges in Beer-sheba. 8:3 Yet his sons did not walk in his ways, but turned aside after false riches: They accepted bribes and perverted justice.*

In contrast to 1 Sam. 2:22 (MS f), concerning the guilt of Eli’s sons, no attempt is made here to play down the guilt of Samuel’s sons, but cf. 12:2. It could have been done after the example of GenR. 85:12, which quotes the soothing statement of R. Berekiah, “A trading caravan passed through Beer-sheba, whereupon they would neglect their communal duties and go about their own business, and on account of such behaviour the Holy One, blessed be He, stigmatized them as though they took bribes.” A slightly different statement is made by R. Samuel b. Nahmani in the name of R. Jonathan (Shab. 56a): Samuel’s sons did not want to travel around, as their father did, in order to increase their income.

4 8 ואתכנשו כל סבי ישראל ואתו לוח שמואל לרמתא: 5 8 ואמרו ליה הא את סיבתא ובנך לא הלכו באורחתך כען מני לנא מלכא למדונא ככל עממיא: 6 8 ובאיש פתגמא בעיני שמואל כד אמרו מני<sup>499</sup> לנא מלכא למדונא וצלי<sup>500</sup> שמואל קדם<sup>501</sup> יוי: 7 8 ואמר יוי לשמואל קבילו<sup>502</sup> למימר<sup>503</sup> עמא לכל דיימרון לך ארי לא יתך רחיקו ארי בפלחני

<sup>495</sup> Cf. tSan. 4:5.

<sup>496</sup> So also Syr.

<sup>497</sup> MS f<sub>3</sub> reads גורין for דינין. This could be an attempt to keep up the standard for judges by calling Samuel’s sons, who were no good judges, merely “leaders” (>23), cf. Bacher, “Kritische Untersuchungen”, 29. These “leaders” formed a separate class of judges (cf. also TgJudg. 2:16-19); see below, commentary on 2 Sam. 7:11. The same phenomenon occurs in 1 Sam. 1:3, where Eli’s sons are not called priests.

<sup>498</sup> Plural as in the Qere and as in 8:5 (>15).

<sup>499</sup> Mss w y read הַב, ‘give’, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). The official text translates according to 8:5 (>15).

קצו מלמהויהויה מלכא עליהון:

8:4 Then all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel at Ramah. 8:5 And they said to him, "Behold, you have become old and your sons do not walk in your ways; now appoint for us a king to judge us like all the nations." 8:6 But the thing was evil in Samuel's sight, when they said, "Appoint for us a king to judge us." And Samuel prayed before the LORD. 8:7 And the LORD said to Samuel, "Accept the speech of the people in all that they say to you, for it is not you they have rejected, for they have refused<sup>500</sup> my worship so that I cannot be king over them anymore.

By using a reverential circumlocution here and in the next verse, TJon avoids saying that Israel had rejected God (>23). Such a phrase would have been too blasphemous.<sup>501</sup> By choosing the word פלחנא, 'worship', the translation also explains the nature of God's kingship in Israel, viz. through worship. The choice of the verb קיץ in this respect is due to diversification (>18).

8 8 ככל עובדיא דעברו מזומא דאסיקית<sup>502</sup> יתהון ממצרים ועד יומא הדין ושבקו פלחני ופלחון לשעות יהויה עממיא כין אנון עברין אף לך:

8:8 According to all the deeds which they have done, from the day I brought them up out of Egypt to this day—they have forsaken my worship and have worshipped the idols of the nations—so they are also doing to you, too.

Because TJon is strictly monotheistic, it consistently denotes foreign gods with טעוהא, 'error' (see above, Ch. 4, s.v. אלהים). The existence of these gods is also denied. For that reason אחרים is considered a *nomen rectum* and is rendered as the genitive following טעוהא: "the idols of the nations"<sup>503</sup>.

8 9 וכען קביל יהויה למימרהון ברם ארי אסהרא תסהיד בהון ותחוי להון נמסא יהויה דמלכא דימליך עליהון:

8:9 Now then, accept their speech. Only, you shall solemnly warn them, and tell them the right of the king who shall reign over them."

By its choice of the Graecism נמסא TJon shows that Samuel did not warn the people concerning God's law, but concerning the king's customs and rights. References to God's Torah would have been made

<sup>500</sup> Alternative translation: they have cut off.

<sup>501</sup> Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 130-31.

<sup>502</sup> Ms eb1 reads אסיקית, 'I brought out', according to the text of the first commandment (Exod. 20:2, >15).

<sup>503</sup> Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 360. Thus also in 1 Sam. 26:19.



using the word דינא (see above, Ch. 4, Hebrew משפט). With this translation TJon takes the side of Rab and R. Judah in their discussions on this chapter. While their opponents R. Samuel and R. Yose surmised that “all that is set out in the chapter, the king is permitted to do”, they argued that the present chapter was only written to inspire the Israelites with awe (San. 20b).

10 8 ואמר שמואל יה כל פתמיא דיוי לעמא דשאלין מניה מלכא: 11 8 ואמר דין יהי נמסא דמלכא דימלוך עליכון יה בניכון ידבר ד וימני ליה ברחכוהי ובפרשוהי ורדופין קרם רחכוהי:

*8:10 So Samuel told all the words of the LORD to the people who were asking a king from him. 8:11 He said, “This is the right of the king who shall reign over you: he will take your sons and appoint them to his chariots and to be his horsemen, and the pursuers before his chariots;*

The double plural “chariots” is a logical adaption to reality (>9): a king will certainly have more than one chariot. The plural is also attested in Syr and LXX.

Hebrew רצו, ‘they run’, is equated with the Aramaic intransitive verb רדופין. The verb רדף can mean ‘to follow, to pursue’, but also ‘to drive, to drift’<sup>504</sup> This Aramaic rendering is a clear example of clarification (>11) and need not to be explained by assuming that TJon derived רצו from the Hebrew verb רצף, ‘oppress’.<sup>505</sup>

12 8 ולמנאה ליה רבני אלפין ורבני חמשין ואכריא למנר ניריה ולמחצר חצריה ואומניא למעבד<sup>506</sup> מני קרביה ומני רחכוהי:

*8:12 and to appoint for himself commanders of thousands and commanders of fifty; and farmers to plough his ground and to reap his harvest; and craftsmen to make his implements of war and the equipment for his chariots.*

TJon adds the words “farmers” and “craftsmen” to make a division in this series. Three groups are created: the commanders of the king’s army, the men who must till the king’s ground, and the men who will make the king’s equipment (>11).

13 8 ויה בנתכון ידבר ד לשמשן ולטבחן ולאפאן:

*8:13 He will take your daughters to be servants and cooks and bakers.*

<sup>504</sup>Cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v.

<sup>505</sup>Against Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 302. Cf. 2 Sam. 15:1.

<sup>506</sup>Omitted in MS f.

According to TJon, women could not be perfumers. The craft of a perfumer was highly respected and desired,<sup>507</sup> and perfumers, especially those producing incense for the temple service, could only be male Levites, because of the sanctity of the temple. Moreover, it was connected with the Levite house of Abtinas only.<sup>508</sup> Syr also renders a more feminine profession, *viz.* embroiderer.<sup>509</sup> Both translations betray the contemporary social position of women.<sup>510</sup>

8 14 ויה קליכון ויה כרמיכון ויה חיתכון שביא יסב ויה חן לעברוהי: 8 15 וורעיכון וכרמיכון יסב חד מן עסרא ויה חן<sup>511</sup> לרברבוהי ולעברוהי:

*8:14 He will take the best of your fields and vineyards and olive orchards and give them to his servants. 8:15 He will take one tenth of your grain and of your vineyards and give it to his commanders and his servants.*

The Hebrew verb עָשָׂר occurs only twice in the Qal (1 Sam. 8:15, 17). Because the Aramaic equivalent עָסַר does not occur in the Peal, a translation is given in עָסַר מִן עָסָר, 'he will take one out of ten'.

8 16 ויה עבדיכון ויה אמהתכון ויה עולימיכון שפיריא ויה חמריכון ירבר ויה למהוי עבדין ית<sup>512</sup> עבידהי:

*8:16 The most handsome of your menservants, your maidservants, your young men and your asses he will take for his business.*

A distinction is made between words referring to humans and words referring to animals and things. For humans the verb דָּבַר, 'to lead' is used (1 Sam. 8:11, 13, 16), and not נָסַב, 'to take', as in the other verses of this chapter. The Hebrew original is לָקַח in all cases. The humans are called "handsome", the estates "good" (1 Sam. 8:14). In both verses the Hebrew uses טוֹב.

The last two words of the Hebrew verse, וְעָשָׂה לְמַלְאכְתּוֹ, were problematic for all translators. It is clear that the text intends that the servants, the young men and the asses will do the king's business. Thus it is stated in TJon, as well as in the Qumran text of this verse, וְעָשׂוּ לְמַלְאכְתּוֹ, "and they will do his business", but here the accusative with preposition ל־ betrays the late date of this variant (>16). Vg and LXX provide associative translations: Vg uses a causative verb,

<sup>507</sup>Cf. Qid. 82b; Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 116, n. 13.

<sup>508</sup>Cf. mYom. 3:11; Yom. 38a.

<sup>509</sup>Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung*, 21 assumed that Syr read לְרַקְמוֹהּ for לְרַקְחוֹהּ.

<sup>510</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 107.

<sup>511</sup>Ms b reads וְיָהָב.

<sup>512</sup>Omitted in MSS a f.

'he makes them do his business', similar to the construction in 8:11-12, while LXX seems to have read ועָשָׂר, 'he will take a tenth', as in the preceding and next verse (8:15, 17).<sup>513</sup>

17 8 עֲנֹכֹן יִסְבֹּךְ חֵד מִן עֲסָרָא<sup>514</sup> וְאַתּוֹן תְּהוֹן לִיָּה לְעִבְרִין: 18 8 וְתִצּוּחֹן בְּיוֹמָא<sup>515</sup>  
הָהוּא מִן קִדְמָא מְלַכְכוֹן דְּאַתְרֵעִיתוֹן לְכוֹן וְלֹא יִקְבִּיל־יְיָ<sup>516</sup> צְלוּחֹן בְּיוֹמָא<sup>517</sup>  
הָהוּא: 19 8 וְסָרִיבוּ עִמָּא לְקַבְּלָא לְמִימְרֵ<sup>518</sup> שְׁמוּאֵל וְאִמְרוּ לֹא אֱלֹהִין מְלַכָּא יְהוּ  
עֲלֵנָא:

8:17 *He will take one tenth of your flocks, and you will be his servants.*  
8:18 *And in that day you will cry out because of your king, whom you have chosen for yourselves, but the LORD will not accept your prayer in that day.* 8:19 *But the people rebelled against accepting Samuel's speech and they said, "No! but there will be a king over us."*

Whereas Hebrew בָּאָן, 'refuse', is usually equated with Aramaic לֹא אֲבָא, 'would not', in the Former Prophets (2 Sam. 2:23; 13:9; 1 Kgs 20:35; 21:15; 2 Kgs 5:16), in some verses the translation סָרַב, 'to rebel, be stubborn', is preferred, in conformity with its use in TgJer<sup>519</sup> and in TgIsa. 1:20. As a consequence, the attitude of the people described in this verse is conceived of as stubbornness and rebellion against the prophetic word. It is exactly this attitude that Samuel warns against in his farewell speech: "But if you will not accept the speech of the LORD, but rebel against the speech of the LORD, then the stroke of the LORD will be on you, as it was on your fathers" (TJon 1 Sam. 12:15). TJon condemns this attitude of rebellion, and at the same time gives the narrative more internal coherence.

<sup>513</sup>Cf. P.A.H. de Boer, "I Samuel 8, verse 16B", in: M.S.H.G. Heerma van Voss *et al.* (eds), *Travels in the World of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to Professor M.A. Beek on the Occasion of this 65th Birthday*, Assen 1974, 27-29, esp. 27. De Boer suggests the translation "and he will make them his property", while "and he will use them for his own business/work" is suggested by Driver, *Notes*, 68 based on Exod. 38:14; Ezek. 15:5; followed by McCarter, *I Samuel*, 155.

<sup>514</sup>Cf. 8:15 for this translation of the Hebrew Qal of עָשָׂר.

<sup>515</sup>Mss m o w y x read the more general בְּעֵרְנָא, 'at that time', while only MS o adapts the demonstrative to הַדִּיא.

<sup>516</sup>MS a adds הַכֹּחֵן, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), making a conflated rendering, "the LORD will not accept you, your prayer".

<sup>517</sup>Mss b m o w y x read the more general בְּעֵרְנָא, 'at that time', while only MSS b o adapt the demonstrative to הַדִּיא.

<sup>518</sup>MS d reads only בִּן, "refused to accept from Samuel".

<sup>519</sup>See F. Sepmeijer, *Jeremiah* (BCTP, 12-14), Leiden 1998, s.v. בָּאָן - סָרַב.

8 20 ונהי<sup>520</sup> אף אנחנא ככל עממיא ויחפרע לנא מלכנא ויפוק ברישנא ◊ ויגיה<sup>521</sup> ית קרבנא:

8:20 *Then also we will be like all the nations. Our king will avenge us and go out at our head and wage our wars.*"

In contrast to 8:5-6, the Hebrew verb שפט is rendered by אחפרע. It is possible that diversification played a role (>18), but adaptation to the co-text certainly did (>16). In 8:5-6 the people asked for a king to substitute Samuel's sons and to judge Israel, here they ask for a king to wage their wars. Josephus, too, combines the two verbs used by TJon, "a king to rule the nation and to wreak vengeance on the Philistines".<sup>522</sup>

8 21 ושמע שמואל ית כל פתגמי עמא וסדרנון קדם ◊ יי:

8:21 *And when Samuel had heard all the words of the people, he reported them before the LORD.*

The verb סדר is also used in Tg 2 Sam. 23:2 and in TgIsa 6:7, in the sense of 'to speak, to report the opinion of another person'. It can also be used for explaining one's case orderly in court.<sup>523</sup>

8 22 ואמר יי לשמואל קביל ◊ למימרהון ◊ ותמליך להון<sup>524</sup> מלכא ואמר שמואל לאנשי ישראל איזילו גבר לקרתיה ◊:

8:22 *And the LORD said to Samuel, "Accept the speech of the people and make them a king." Samuel then said to the men of Israel, "Go, every man to his city."*

## 5.10 Saul Anointed (1 Samuel 9:1–10:16)

The first ten verses of 1 Sam. 9 are read as *haftara* in the triennial cycle, after the Torah reading of Gen. 49:27, a depiction of the tribe of Benjamin. The Aramaic version of the present chapter seems not to be affected by the Torah reading.

9 1 והוה גברא<sup>525</sup> משבטא ◊ דבית ◊<sup>526</sup> בנימין<sup>527</sup> ושמיה קיש בר אביאל בר צרור בר בכורת בר אפיח בר גברא משבטא ◊ דבית ◊ בנימין גבר חילא: 9 2 וליה הוה בר

<sup>520</sup>Ms w reads ונהך, 'we will go'.

<sup>521</sup>Mss b m w x y eb1 read ונגיח, 'and we will wage'. Kimḥi combines this variant reading with the official reading.

<sup>522</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:35.

<sup>523</sup>Levy, *CWT*, s.v.

<sup>524</sup>Ms o reads עליהון, 'over them', as two Hebrew MSS and 1 Sam. 12:1.

<sup>525</sup>Mss a f J add חד, 'one', as some Hebrew MSS do, cf. also 1 Sam. 1:1.

<sup>526</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>527</sup>Written as one word, cf. Soferim 38a.

ושמיה<sup>528</sup> שאול<sup>529</sup> עולים ושפיר<sup>530</sup> ולית גברא מבני ישראל דשפיר<sup>531</sup> מניה מכתפיה ולעילא רם<sup>532</sup> מכל עמא: 9 3 ואבדא אתניא לקיש אבוהי דשאל ואמר קיש לשאל בריה דבר<sup>533</sup> כען עמך ית חד מעולימא וקום<sup>534</sup> איזיל בעי ית אתניא: 9 4 ועבר בשורא רבית<sup>535</sup> אפרים ועבר בארע דרומא ולא אשכחו ועברו<sup>536</sup> בארע<sup>537</sup> מחיברא<sup>538</sup> ולית ועבר<sup>539</sup> בארע שיבט<sup>540</sup> בנימין ולא אשכחו:

9:1 *There was a man of the tribe of the House of Benjamin, whose name was Kish, the son of Abiel, son of Zeror, son of Becorath, son of Aphiah, son of a man from the tribe of the House of Benjamin, a mighty hero. 9:2 And he had a son whose name was Saul, a handsome young man. There was not a man among the sons of Israel who was more handsome than he. From his shoulder upward he was taller than all the people. 9:3 Now the asses of Kish, Saul's father, were lost. So Kish said to Saul his son, "Take one of the servants with you, and arise, go in search of the asses." 9:4 And he passed through the hill country of the House of Ephraim and passed through the land of the South, but they did not find them. And they passed through the Land of the Birth-stool, but they were not there. Then he passed through the land of Benjamin, but they did not find them.*

Place-names always constitute a problem for the Targumists. Unknown and uncertain names had to be translated, explained or updated.

"There is a slight tendency in the Targums to assign places of uncertain location to the South"<sup>537</sup> (>7), which is usually referring to the Judaeen Negev.<sup>538</sup> The land of Shalishah, situated near the hill country of Ephraim,<sup>539</sup> is located in the Negev. The rabbis iden-

<sup>528</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>529</sup>Omitted in MS T.

<sup>530</sup>MS o reads רב, 'great'.

<sup>531</sup>Omitted in MS J.

<sup>532</sup>Omitted in MSS o S, which reads דאפרים.

<sup>533</sup>MS b reads the singular, as some Hebrew and Syriac MSS do, adapting the number to the surrounding verbs (>9).

<sup>534</sup>MS B omits בארעא דרומא ולא אשכחו ועברו בארעא by haplography.

<sup>535</sup>MSS f<sub>3</sub> o w y S and Kimḥi (Soncino 1485) read מדרבא, 'desert'. MSS B C J T<sup>m</sup> eb1 read מדרבא, 'birth-stool'.

<sup>536</sup>MS o reads the plural, adapted to the preceding plural (>9).

<sup>537</sup>R.P. Gordon, "Terra Sancta and the Territorial Doctrine of the Targum to the Prophets", in: J.A. Emerton, S.C. Reif (eds), *Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of E.I.J. Rosenthal*, Cambridge 1982, 119-31, esp. 127. He mentioned 1 Sam. 9:4, 13:17; Isa. 49:12; and Zech. 9:1 as examples, but see also 2 Kgs 4:42.

<sup>538</sup>Cf. *BCTP*, s.v. דרומא - נגב.

<sup>539</sup>Y. Aharoni, M. Avi-Yonah, *The MacMillan Bible Atlas*, New York & London, 1968, 59,

tified Baal-shalishah (2 Kgs 4:42) with Lod, the later Lydda, because they could not imagine that the man from Baal-shalishah who had brought food supplies to Elisha would reside anywhere but at a place distinguished by Torah learning.<sup>540</sup>

The land of Shaalim is represented by the general "Land of the Birth-stool".<sup>541</sup> It is possible that the Hebrew word שְׁעָלִים, which can mean "hollow", is associated with the hollow place below the birth-stool (>6), or that the land of Ephraim is connected with the birth-stool via TJon's own exegesis of Hos. 13:13. Other MSS read מְדַבְרָא which usually refers to the Judaeen desert, or to the more southern deserts.<sup>542</sup> The rendering מְדַבְרָא may be another generalization (>7), indicating the Judaeen desert, but may also be a different spelling of the same מְדַבְרָא, 'birth-stool'. This variant spelling is also found in a marginal gloss on TN Exod. 1:16, where עַל מְדַבְרֵיהֶן can only mean "on their birth-stools".<sup>543</sup> While the Hebrew text describes the search of Saul basically to the north of Gibeah<sup>544</sup>, the Aramaic text locates his wanderings in all directions: Ephraim in the north, the Negev in the south, the unknown land of the Birth-stool (or the desert in the south-east), and finally the complete region of Benjamin.

9 5 אָנוּן אַחוּ בִּארְעָא דְבַהּ נְבִיאָא וְשִׂאוּל אָמַר לְעוֹלִימְיָה דְעַמְיָה אִיחָא וְנָחֹב דְלִמָּא יִשְׁבּוּק אַבָּא מִן עֵיסִק<sup>546</sup> אַחְנִיא וְיִצִיף לָנָא:

9:5 *When they came to the land in which there was a prophet, Saul said to his young man, who was with him, "Come, let us go back, lest my father leave the matter of the asses and become anxious about us."*

As in 1 Sam. 1:1, the geographical name Zuph is regarded as derived from the root צָפָה, 'to watch', and considered a metaphorical expression of "prophet" (>6; >13).

<sup>540</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 113. However, to the Benjaminites Lod was located in the west; cf. Y. Aharoni, M. Avi-Yonah, *The MacMillan Bible Atlas*, New York & London, 1968, 106.

<sup>541</sup>Some MSS read the peculiar מְדַבְרָא, other MSS the usual מְדַבְרָא.

<sup>542</sup>Cf. *BCTP*, s.v. מְדַבְרָא. Note that in 1 Sam. 13:17-18 the same general geographical indications occur, viz. both the land of the South and the desert.

<sup>543</sup>Cf. A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana*, Vol. 2: Éxodo, Madrid & Barcelona 1970, 5.

<sup>544</sup>Cf. Y. Aharoni, M. Avi-Yonah, *The MacMillan Bible Atlas*, New York & London, 1968, 106; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 163.

<sup>545</sup>MS o reads the plural נְבִיאִים, 'prophets', as it is interpreted in 1 Sam. 1:1 (>15). MSS b B add דְרִי' 'of the LORD', another associative rendering (>15). MS D provides a conflated rendering, בִּארְעָא צִנְף דְבַהּ נְבִיא, 'in the land of Zuph, in which there was a prophet'.

<sup>546</sup>Omitted in MS S, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

The rendering of the Hebrew verb *חָרַל* by *שָׁבַק* is rather exceptional, since the usual equivalent is *אָחַמְנָע*, ‘to withhold oneself’, or *פָּסַק*, ‘to quit’.<sup>547</sup>

9 6 ואמר ליה הא כען נביא דיי בְּקִרְתָּא דְּהָא וּגְבֵרָא<sup>548</sup> מְתַנְבִּי דִּקְשׁוּשׁ כִּלְכִּל<sup>549</sup>  
 דִּתְנַבִּי<sup>550</sup> אֲתִקְמָא יִתְקִיִּים<sup>551</sup> כִּעֵן נִזְיִל<sup>552</sup> לַחֲמֵן דְּלִמָּא<sup>553</sup> יַחֲוִי לֵנָא יִת אֲוִרְחָנָא<sup>554</sup>  
 דִּאֲתִינָא עֵלָה:

9:6 *But he said to him, “Behold now, there is a prophet of the LORD in this city, and he is a man prophesying the truth; all that he prophesies will certainly be fulfilled. Now then, let us go there; perhaps he can tell us about our ways on which we have gone.”*

As usual the Hebrew “man of God”, which could lead to misunderstandings, is changed into the monotheistic “prophet of the LORD” (>22). Moreover, all the words referring to this prophet are translated into typically prophetic language. He is prophesying, not speaking. What he prophesies will be fulfilled, a *passivum divinum* implying God’s role in the fulfillment. And this prophet is prophesying the truth, a paraphrastic rendering of Hebrew *נִכְבֵּר*. Its usual translation is *יָקִיר*, ‘important, honoured’ (cf. 4:18), but in this case the following phrase, “all that he prophesies will certainly be fulfilled”, is seen as an explanation of the preceding word *נִכְבֵּר*, probably because of the *asyndeton*. This explanation is based on the definition of a true prophet in Deut. 18:22: If the word of the prophet was not fulfilled, he had not spoken the word of the LORD. The people would not have to fear him. Josephus used a similar phrasing, describing Samuel as a prophet in whom the truth was revealed.<sup>555</sup>

9 7 ואמר שאול לעולימיה והא ניזיל אם מקביל דמון ומא נעיל לנביא דיי<sup>556</sup>

<sup>547</sup>B. Grossfeld, *Targum Neofiti 1: An Exegetical Commentary to Genesis Including Full Rabbinic Parallels*, New York 2000, 265. Other instances with *שָׁבַק* are TgJudg. 9:9, 11, 13 and TgAm. 7:5.

<sup>548</sup>MS o provides a conflated rendering, *גְּבֵרָא יָקִיר וְיִתְנַבִּי קְשׁוּשׁ*, ‘an honoured man and he will prophesy the truth’.

<sup>549</sup>MS d and Kimḥi add *מָה*.

<sup>550</sup>MSS b o read the perfect *דִּאֲתַנְבִּי*.

<sup>551</sup>MSS d f read the perfect *אִתְקִיִּים* to stress that the fulfillment of Samuel’s prophecies was already attested.

<sup>552</sup>MS b adds the *dativus ethicus* *לֵנָא*, but omits the following *לֵנָא*.

<sup>553</sup>MSS a b f read *מֵאִים*, ‘perhaps’.

<sup>554</sup>MSS b f o w y read the singular *אֲוִרְחָנָא*, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Likewise MS d, but omitting the suffix, *אֲוִרְחָא*.

<sup>555</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:46.

<sup>556</sup>Omitted in MSS f o w y C D J S T eb1 and Kimḥi, in conformity with the Hebrew text.

אף<sup>557</sup> אַחַנָּא<sup>558</sup> זֹדִין עֲטָרוֹ<sup>559</sup> מִמֶּנָּא וּמְרַעֵם דְּכֶשֶׁר<sup>560</sup> לִיח לֵאעֲלֵא לְנַבִּיאָ דִּיּוּיִ  
וּמֵא עֲמָנָא לְמַעְבַּד:

9:7 Then Saul said to his young man, "Suppose we go, if he is used to accepting money, what can we bring the prophet of the LORD? Moreover, our own provision ceased from our sacks, and there is nothing fit to bring to the prophet of the LORD. What is there with us to do?"

The phrase "if he is used to accepting money" is added, because nothing in this narrative indicates that Samuel asked Saul and his servant for money (>16). Moreover, Samuel was held to be an incorruptible judge, who refused compensation for his time and trouble (>24).<sup>561</sup> This view is based on 1 Sam. 12:4, in which the people of Israel confirmed that Samuel did "not receive anything from the hand of a man" (>16). Pseudo-Jerome implied the same high standard for Samuel, because he thought it necessary to explain that Saul thought that Samuel would not indicate the finding-place of the asses but on payment.<sup>562</sup>

Saul's statement that their bread was gone was not interpreted as a vain proposal to offer bread to the prophet. Saul concluded that their sacks were empty, even for their own provisions. They would rather go home than delay their return by an idle attempt to consult the prophet (>11).<sup>563</sup> The word "bread" is regarded as a *pars pro toto* for food supplies and translated likewise (>14).

TJon's translation that there is nothing *fit* to give to a prophet is contradicted by CantR. 4:8 § 2. Here it is stated that the gift would be suitable, but Saul did not consider himself fitting.

8 וְאוּסִיף עוֹלִימָא לְמַעֲנִי<sup>564</sup> ית שְׂאוּל וְאָמַר הָא אֲשַׁתְּכָּח בִּידֵי זִוּא חַד דְּכֶסֶפֶא  
וְאַתִּין<sup>565</sup> לְנַבִּיאָ דִּיּוּיִ וּיְחִי לְנָא ית אֹרְחָנָא:

<sup>557</sup>Ms a translates אף ארי, rendering Hebrew כִּי. Ms J renders אף אַחַנָּא.

<sup>558</sup>Omitted in MSS a w y.

<sup>559</sup>Ms b renders עָרַן, 'they are ceasing', MS B\* renders the perfect עָרַד. The *Mikraoth Gedoloth*, Warsaw 1862, combined the two renderings into עָרַד עֲטָרוֹ, cited by Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 16, n. 68.

<sup>560</sup>Erased in MS S.

<sup>561</sup>So Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:48; Ned. 38a; NumR. 18:10. Cf. Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 6, 228, n. 43.

<sup>562</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 79, "Non enim putabat Saul sibi asinas a Samuele aliter indicari nisi pretio divinationis." Cf. also the comment of Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 16, who states that accepting money for prophesies is a habit of diviners.

<sup>563</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 16.

<sup>564</sup>MSS a J<sup>m</sup> read לֵאחָבָא.

<sup>565</sup>MSS a b m w x y B J read the 1st person pl. וְנִתֵּן, 'and we will give it', as do MSS of LXX, Syr, and Vg. This is a more reverential and realistic translation,



9:8 And again the servant answered Saul, "Behold, I have in my hand one silver zuz, and I can give it to the prophet of the LORD, that he may tell us our way."

The shekel is updated by TJon to a contemporary value, viz. the sela (tetradrachme).<sup>566</sup> A quarter of a sela was a zuz (drachme). The sela and the zuz were currency, at least since the Bar Kokhba Revolt.<sup>567</sup>

9 9 בקדמין בישראל כדנן<sup>568</sup> אמר גברא<sup>569</sup> במיזליה למחבע אלפן<sup>570</sup> מן קדם<sup>571</sup> די איתו ונחמטי עד חזויא<sup>572</sup> ארי לנביא<sup>573</sup> יומא דין מתקרי מלקדמין חזויא<sup>574</sup>:

9:9 Formerly in Israel, when a man went to seek instruction from before the LORD, he said it like this, "Come and let us meet the seer." For he who is called a prophet today was formerly called a seer.

The double use of the Hebrew verb הֵלַךְ, 'to go', is diversified (>18) and specified (>11): The first occurrence had to be rendered by "come", since the second form speaks about "us". The second occurrence is translated with "arrive", referring to the aim of the journey and not the journey itself. The verb מִטָּא reflects the rabbinic idiom.<sup>570</sup> A similar construction in 1 Sam. 14:1, לכה ונעברה, is equally treated and became איתא ונעבר, 'come and let us cross ...'

10 9 ואמר שאול לעולימי תקין<sup>571</sup> פתגמך איתא ניזיל ואולו לקרתא<sup>572</sup> דתמן נביא<sup>573</sup> די יי: 11 9 אנון סלקין במסקנא דקרתא<sup>574</sup> ואנון אשכחו עולימן נפקן לממלי מיא ואמרו<sup>575</sup> להון<sup>576</sup> האית הכא חזויא<sup>577</sup>: 12 9 ואחיבא יתהון ואמרא אית כא<sup>578</sup> הא קדמדך<sup>579</sup> אחי כען ארי יומא דין על לקרתא<sup>580</sup> ארי שירו נכסח<sup>581</sup> קדשיא יומא דין לעמא בבית אסחרותא<sup>582</sup>: 13 9 כמעלכון לקרתא<sup>583</sup> כין תשכחון יתיה עד לא יסק

because the speaker is a servant.

<sup>566</sup> Cf. GenR. 58:7, cited in M. McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (AramB, 1A), Edinburgh 1992, 117, n. 5.

<sup>567</sup> EJ, s.v. "Coins and Currency", col. 719; S.M. Lehrman, "Pe'ah: Translated into English with Notes", in: I. Epstein (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Zera'im*, London 1978, 44, n. 6 ("The sela' = 4 denars") and 45, n. 2 ("Latin denarius, another name for a zuz").

<sup>568</sup> Ms f reads כדן, which is more in conformity with the usual vocabulary of TJon.

<sup>569</sup> Mss o S erroneously read נביא, 'prophet'.

<sup>570</sup> Cf. B. Grossfeld, *Targum Neofiti 1: An Exegetical Commentary to Genesis Including Full Rabbinic Parallels*, New York 2000, 174.

<sup>571</sup> Ms T reads the verbal אֶתְקֵן. Because there is no vocalization, this form cannot be determined with certainty. It may be a Pael or Aphel 1st p. sg. of חָקַן, both meaning "I will establish your word"; it may also be an Ithpaal of the same verb, meaning "your word will be established".

<sup>572</sup> Mss a f read the singular ואמר, 'he said'.

<sup>573</sup> Only MS S reads the feminine להון, which is grammatically correct.

<sup>574</sup> Omitted by MS f, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29; against >15). In stead of הא MS S renders אָתָּא, 'he came'.

לביִת אֶסְחָרוּתָא לְמַכִּיל אַרִי לֹא אֲכִיל עִמָּא עַד מִיחֻוּי אַרִי הוּא פְּרִיס<sup>575</sup> עַל מוֹנָא  
בְּתַר כִּין אֲכַלִּין וְזִמְנִיא וְכַעַן סָקוּ אַרִי יִחִיָּה כִּיּוֹמָא דִּין חֲשַׁכְחוּן יִחִיָּה:

9:10 *And Saul said to his young man, "Your word is right; come, let us go." So they went to the city where the prophet of the LORD was.*  
9:11 *As they went up by the ascent of the city, they met young women coming out to draw water, and said to them, "Is the seer here?"* 9:12 *They answered them and said, "He is here, just ahead of you. Make haste, for today he has entered the city, because there is a meal<sup>576</sup> with the holy slaughterings for the people today in the banqueting hall.* 9:13 *As soon as you enter the city, you will find him, before he goes up to the banqueting hall to eat; for the people will not eat till he comes, since he [always] says the benediction over the food; afterward those eat who are invited. Now, go up, for you can find him at this time."*

The Hebrew verb בָּרַךְ, 'to bless', is replaced by the Aramaic verb פָּרַס, 'to break' or 'to spread out', but is also used as a pregnant expression for saying the benediction before the meal and consequently before the breaking of the bread (>19).<sup>577</sup> The verb, also used in TgJer. 16:7, became a technical term for "saying the benediction", both before a meal and before the recitation of the *Shema*. Still, the meaning "to break" was present, because it could be replaced by בָּצַע, 'to break' (cf. Hul. 7b). The same combination of breaking and reciting the benediction can be found in the report on the last supper: "Jesus, while saying the benediction, broke the bread" (Mt. 26:26; Mk 14:22; Lk. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24) and, possibly in a *hendiadys*, in the report of the five thousand fed (Mt. 14:19; 15:36; Mk 6:41; Lk. 9:16; Jn 6:11).<sup>578</sup>

TJon protects Samuel's honour by making him eat in the banqueting hall and not on a high place.<sup>579</sup> He is portrayed as the host, saying

<sup>575</sup>Omitted by MS D, but the copyist left an empty space there.

<sup>576</sup>Against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 117, who translated "they have begun".

<sup>577</sup>W. Bacher, "L'expression *prs 'l šm*", *REJ* 57 (1909), 100-102. Bacher opposes I. Elbogen, "La récitation du Schema et de la haftara", *REJ* 56 (1908), 222-27 who states that this verb always means "to break" and refers to the breaking of the bread and the recitation, with a response of the assembly, of the *Shema*; and L. Blau, "La récitation du Schema et de la haftara", *REJ* 55 (1907), 209-20 who derives it from פָּרַס, 'spread out'. The latter verb can also mean "to pray", if it is combined with ד, cf. TJon 1 Kgs 8:22, 38, 54; cf. also Levy, *CWT*, s.v..

<sup>578</sup>The present verse, as well as the New Testament references, affirm the opinion of R. Ishmael, who claims that one is to say the benediction before the meal, too (yBer. 7:1; MekY, *Pišā*, 16), cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 17.

<sup>579</sup>LXX solves this problem by interpreting בָּמָה as a geographical name. Likewise Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, s.v. Βάμα; cf. E. Klostermann, *Das Onomastikon der*

the benediction before the meal, rather than as a priest at a sacrifice.<sup>580</sup> Likewise, Josephus describes Samuel as the host at a supper, combining this meal with Samuel's knowledge of Saul's coming:<sup>581</sup> The feast was given in honour of the new king, who was coming to the city. Pseudo-Jerome, too, assumed that Samuel prepared a meal for the people, adding that this meal took place on the first day of the month, at the occasion of the New Moon.<sup>582</sup>

There are two quotations from a different Aramaic translation, which maintain the idea of the sacrifice. Both translations use the verb פָּרַס in the imperfect. R. Jonah said:<sup>583</sup>

וּפּוֹרְסִין הוּא כְּמוּ מְבָרְכִין כְּמִדְהַרְגְּמִינִן כִּי הוּא יְבָרֵךְ הַזֹּבֵחַ יְפָרוֹס דְּבַחְתָּא

וּפּוֹרְסִין *is like blessing, just as we translate "and he will bless the offering" with "he will say the benediction for the offering".*

R. Jonah not only maintained the idea of the sacrifice, but even quotes the Aramaic word דְּבַחְתָּא, 'offering', which is not used in TJon in connection with Samuel. The correct translation in TJon is the word נִכְסַחְתָּא, 'slaughtering', the standard translation for peace offerings and profane slaughterings, which were permitted outside the sanctuary. The latter translation is also attested in the Arukh:<sup>584</sup>

כִּי הוּא יְבָרֵךְ הַזֹּבֵחַ מִתְּהַרְגִימִין אַרְי הָאֵל יְפָרִיס נִכְסַחְתָּא

*"For he will bless the offering", we translate: "for he will say the benediction for the offering".*

The protection of Samuel's honour is so important to TJon that Hebrew בָּמָה, 'high place', was translated with "banqueting house, dinner place", although the ban on the high places had been lifted before then, according to rabbinic views. In no way is Samuel to be con-

*biblischen Ortsnamen* (Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte; Eusebius 3/1), Leipzig 1904. Pseudo-Philo, LAB, 56:4 also avoids the high place by making Samuel walk at "Baam", possibly a corruption of the Hebrew *bama*, and eliminates the notion of sacrifice by making Samuel a simple host inviting Saul to stay and eat with him.

<sup>580</sup>Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 117, n. 21.

<sup>581</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities* 6:48.

<sup>582</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 80, "Sacrificium in hoc loco prandium intellegitur quod preparaverat Samuel populo in kalendis". Saltman argues that Pseudo-Jerome probably derived this new element from 1 Sam. 20, from which it appears that Saul may have held regular banquets on this feast.

<sup>583</sup>R. Jonah, בְּרִכּוֹחַ, 26; cited by M. Goshen-Gottstein, שְׂקִיעִים מִתְּהַרְגִימִין הַמְּקָרָא, *הארמיים*, Vol. 1, Ramat-Gan, 1983, no. 2.16.

<sup>584</sup>Arukh, s.v. פָּרַס, 6; cited by M. Goshen-Gottstein, שְׂקִיעִים מִתְּהַרְגִימִין הַמְּקָרָא, *הארמיים*, Vol. 1, Ramat-Gan, 1983, no. 2.16.

ted with idolatry on high places.<sup>585</sup> The translation of “banqueting hall” is obtained from 9:22.

9 14 וסליקו לקרתא ד האנון עלין בנו קרתא ד והא שמואל נפיק לקדמותהון למסק לבית אסחרותא ד : 9 15 ומן קדם ד יי אחאמר לשמואל יומא חד קדם ד מית<sup>586</sup> שאול למימר :

*9:14 So they went up to the city. As they were entering the city, behold, Samuel was coming out toward them on his way up to the banqueting hall. 9:15 And from before the LORD it was said to Samuel, one day before Saul's coming:*

The figurative Hebrew phrase, “the LORD opened Samuel’s ear”, is circumlocuted in Aramaic, “and from before the LORD it was said to Samuel”.<sup>587</sup> This alteration was too substantial for the Leiria edition, which rendered “and from before the LORD it was revealed to Samuel’s ear”, maintaining the original components of the Hebrew phrase, but also maintaining the *pars pro toto* of the ear.

9 16 כערנא הדין מחר אשלח לותך גברא מארע שיבט ד בנימין ותמשחניה למהוי ד מלכא ד על עמי ישראל ויפרוק ד יח עמי מירא דפלשתאי ארי גלי קדמי ד חקא<sup>588</sup> ד עמי ארי עלת קבילתהון לקדמי ד :

*9:16 “Tomorrow about this time I will send to you a man from the land of the tribe of Benjamin, and you shall anoint him to be king over my people Israel. He shall save my people from the hand of the Philistines, for the oppression of my people is revealed before Me, for their complaint has come before Me.”*

What at first sight seems to be a simple precision—the addition of חקא, ‘oppression’, and the rendering קבילתהון<sup>589</sup>, ‘their complaint’—is a straightforward case of an associative translation.<sup>590</sup> TJon chose these words from Exod. 3:9, which is in TO: *כען הא קבילת בני ישראל* and *ועתה יתקן להון*, ‘And now, behold, the

<sup>585</sup>In the Books of Kings, however, the high places are maintained, even where King Solomon is praying for wisdom (1 Kgs 3:4).

<sup>586</sup>Ms d renders a simpler syntactical structure: *דאחא*.

<sup>587</sup>The same expression is rendered “The LORD sent me to prophesy” in TgIsa. 50:5.

<sup>588</sup>Kimḥi cites *עילבנא*, ‘humiliation’, cf. 1 Sam. 1:15. LXX adds the word “affliction”.

<sup>589</sup>The usual translation of Hebrew *צעקה* is Aramaic *צוחתא* (cf. e.g. 1 Sam. 4:14; Jer. 20:16; 18:22; 48:4, 34; 50:46; 51:54); the usual translation of the verbs *צעק* and *צעק* is Aramaic *צוח* (cf. e.g. 1 Kgs 22:32; 2 Kgs 6:5).

<sup>590</sup>There is no double translation here, against P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel i-xvi*, Amsterdam 1938, 15.

complaint of the sons of Israel has come before Me, and also the affliction of the Egyptians, with which they afflict them, is revealed before Me.' This verse has the same components, but in reverse order (cf. 1 Sam. 10:18). The conformity of these two verses causes the reader to associate Saul with Moses, and Saul's attack on the Philistines with the redemption of the Israelites from the hand of the Egyptians.

In the Hebrew Bible, the connection between the narrative of Saul and that of the Exodus is not present in this verse. Still, the Exodus and the life of Moses are underlying thoughts in the entire narrative of the life of Samuel. It is mentioned by the anonymous prophet (1 Sam. 2:27-30), by the Philistines (1 Sam. 4:8; 6:6), by God (1 Sam. 8:8; 10:18), and by Samuel (1 Sam. 12:6-10; 15:6, 17).<sup>591</sup> This connection is further increased by the role of the ark in these stories. It is, therefore, not surprising that TJon sometimes underlines this connection.

17 9 ושמואל חזא ית שאול ומן קדם יי אחאמר ליה הא גברא דאמרית לך דין יערי מרוחא מן עמי:

*9:17 When Samuel saw Saul, from before the LORD it was said to him, "Behold, the man of whom I spoke to you. He is it who will take away the dominion from my people."*

The Hebrew verb עצר, a rather negative verb for 'to reign, to dominate', was not considered to be an appropriate description of Saul's reign. The negative sense is maintained, but is, in a harmonizing translation, applied to the enemies of Israel. Another meaning of the same verb, 'to withhold, to shut', is chosen and applied to Saul. Whilst the preceding verse says that Saul will save Israel from the hands of the Philistines, this verse says that he will take away their dominion.<sup>592</sup>

18 9 וערע שאול ית שמואל בנו תרעא ואמר חוי כען לי אידין בית חזויא: 19 9 ואתיב שמואל ית שאול ואמר אנא חזויא סק לקדמי לביה אסחרוחא ותיכלון עמי יומא דין ואשלחנך בצפרא וכל דבלבך אחוי לך: 20 9 ועל עיסק אתניא דאברא לך ואת אחיהא למבעיהון יומא דין דנן<sup>593</sup> תלחא יומין לא תשוי ית לבך עליהון ארי אשתכחא ודמן כל חמרת ישראל הלא דילך ודכל בית אבוך:

*9:18 Then Saul met Samuel in the gate, and said, "Tell me where is the house of the seer?" 9:19 Samuel answered Saul, "I am the seer; go up before me to the banqueting hall. Today you shall eat with me, and in the morning I will let you go and tell you all that is on your mind."*

<sup>591</sup> Cf. H.P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC), Edinburgh <sup>2</sup>1912, xvii; J.E. Runions, "Exodus Motifs in First Samuel 7 and 8: A Brief Comment", *EvQ* 52 (1980), 130-31.

<sup>592</sup> Cf. Komlosh, באור התרגום, 301.

<sup>593</sup> Omitted by MSS D eb1 and by Kimḥi.

9:20 *As for the matter of the asses that were lost to you, and which you came to search—today for three days—do not set your mind on them, for they have been found. But whose is all the delight of Israel? Is it not yours and all the house of your father?"*

Samuel's statement in the Hebrew text that the asses had been lost for three days appears to be contradicted by the sequel, which says that they had already been found. TJon solves this contradiction by adding the sentence "which you came to search", because the search went on for three days.<sup>594</sup>

21 9 ואחיב שאול ואמר הלא בר שיבט בנימין אנה מועירי שבטיא דישראל זרעית הלשא מכל זרעית שבטי<sup>595</sup> בנימין ולמה מליחא עמי כפתגמא הדין:

9:21 *Saul answered, "Am I not a son of the tribe of Benjamin, from the least of the tribes of Israel? And is not my family the weakest of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin? Why then have you spoken with me in this way?"*

Saul's humble answer is translated in harmony with Gideon's humble answer in Judg. 6:15 (>15) and with David's humble self-denotations in 1 Sam. 24:15; 26:20. Their description as being "weak" is a non-figurative rendering of the Hebrew "small", "dead dog" or "flea" (>14).<sup>596</sup>

In spite of this presentation of Saul as a weak person, he is protected from errors and sins as much as possible. He is described as innocent as a baby (1 Sam. 13:1), TJon does not call him a power maniac (1 Sam. 9:17), and he is not depicted as a sinner towards the foreign countries (1 Sam. 14:47). In the tosefta-targumim he is even presented as studying the Torah in Talmud School (1 Sam. 10:22), and as a very meek person (1 Sam. 17:43). And despite of his sins he is given a place in the depository of eternal life (1 Sam. 28:19).<sup>597</sup> This presentation agrees with Josephus' high estimation of King Saul,<sup>598</sup> but contrasts with Pseudo-Philo's opinion of him. Pseudo-Philo stated that Saul was anointed king too early because of the impatience of the

<sup>594</sup> Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 17 considered it a superfluous addition.

<sup>595</sup> Mss b d B read the singular שבטא, harmonizing with the singular use in the rest of the Bible (>16). So also LXX, Syr, Vg and a MS of the Vetus Latina.

<sup>596</sup> Saul is more often called weak (cf. 1 Sam. 15:17; tosefta-targum on 1 Sam. 17:8). This denotation is in agreement with an explanation of R. Huna, in the name of R. Samuel, about the time of the famine caused by Saul's behaviour (RuthR. 1:4).

<sup>597</sup> Cf. also Saul being a righteous person in GenR. 54:4 and his admission to eternal life, see below, commentary on 28:19.

<sup>598</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:344-350.

people and that he was therefore doomed to fail.<sup>599</sup> And despite his successful wars against the Philistines, Saul is depicted as corrupt, because he listened to King Agag when he suggested to show him hidden treasures.<sup>600</sup>

9 22 ודבר ד שמואל ית שאול וית עולימיה ואעילנון לאסחרותא<sup>601</sup> ויהב להון אתרא בריש ד זמינא ואנון כתלתין גברא:

*9:22 Then Samuel led Saul and his young man and brought them to the meal and gave them a place at the head of those who had been invited, who were about thirty persons.*

Since Hebrew לשכה refers mostly to a room in a sanctuary (cf. Ezek. 42:13; 44:19; Ezra 8:29)<sup>602</sup> TJon adapts its meaning to the preceding verses and renders “meal”. It is neither imaginable for the Targumist that Samuel was acting in an unknown sanctuary in Zuph, nor allowable that the reader should associate this meal with one of the rooms of the temple in Jerusalem. The word לשכה was used for four specific rooms in the temple, one for the *tamid*, one for the seal, one for the fire, and one for the making of the showbread (mTam. 3:3).<sup>603</sup>

9 23 ואמר שמואל לטבחא הב ית מנחא דיהבית לך דאמרית לך שו יחה עמך: 9 24 וארים טבחא ית שקא וירכיה ושוי קדם ד שמואל ואמר הא<sup>604</sup> דאשתאר שוי קדמך דכול ארי לזמנא נטיר לך למימר עמא זמינית לשירותא ואכל שאול עם שמואל ביומא ההוא:

*9:23 And Samuel said to the cook, “Bring the portion I gave to you, of which I said to you, ‘Keep it with you.’” 9:24 So the cook took up<sup>605</sup> the shank and the loin and set them before Saul. And he said, “See, what was left over is set before you. Eat, for it was kept for you for the time [I would]<sup>606</sup> say, ‘I have invited the people to the meal.’” So Saul ate with Samuel on that day.*

TJon interpreted the difficult Hebrew construction והעליה as the preposition על with article and suffix, meaning “and what was upon it”.<sup>607</sup> This construction was replaced by its intended meaning, *i.e.*

<sup>599</sup>Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 56:2-3; so also tSan. 4:5.

<sup>600</sup>Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 58:2-3.

<sup>601</sup>Only Kimḥi renders the phrase in the same way as in the preceding verses: לבית אסחרותא.

<sup>602</sup>*HALAT*<sup>3</sup>, *s.v.* לשכה.

<sup>603</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel elsǝ kõnyve*, 17.

<sup>604</sup>Ms f reads הדיא, ‘this’.

<sup>605</sup>Or: uncovered. The portion for the priest was reserved or hidden, cf. J. Milgrom cited by McCarter, *I Samuel*, 180.

<sup>606</sup>Literally: for the time it was kept for you, saying.

<sup>607</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel elsǝ kõnyve*, 17; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 170.

the loin, which comes close to the opinion of R. Samuel b. Naḥman (yMeg. 1:12; AZ 25a). R. Eleazar said, "the thigh and the breast", probably deriving Hebrew והעליה in the same way but with a different result, and R. Johanan said, "the thigh and the fat tail", reading the Hebrew word והאליה.<sup>608</sup> The latter suggestion is based on the regulations concerning the sacrifices (cf. Exod. 29:22; Lev. 3:9; 7:3; 8:25; 9:19).<sup>609</sup> All rabbis agreed that these portions belonged to the priest in case of a major high place (Gibeon and Nob) and to the owner of the animal in case of a minor high place. And since Samuel never took anyone's animal (1 Sam. 12:3; cf. NumR. 18:10), and consequently must have taken his own, Samuel had the right to give these portions to Saul.

25 9 ונחתו מבית אסחרותא לקרחתא ומליל עם<sup>610</sup> שאול על אנרא: 26 9 ואקרימו והוה כמסק צפרא וקרא שמואל לשאול לאנרא למימר קום ואשלחך וקם שאול ונפקו תרויהון הוא ושמואל לברא: 27 9 אנון נחתין בסטר קרתא ושמואל אמר לשאול אימר לעולימא ויעבר קדמנא ועבר ואת קום הכא<sup>611</sup> יומא<sup>612</sup> דין ואשמעך ית פתגמא דיווי: 10 1 ונסיב<sup>613</sup> שמואל ית מנא דמשחא ואריק על רישיה ושקיה ואמר הלא ארי משחך יי על אכסנתיה למהוי מלכא: 10 2 במהכך יומא דין מלותי<sup>614</sup> וחשכח תרין גברין עם קבורתא דרחל בתחום בנימין בצלצח וימרון לך אשחכח אתניא דאולתא למבעי<sup>615</sup> והא שבק אבוך ית עיסק אתניא ויצף לכוך למימר מא אעביר לברי:

9:25 *When they came down from the banqueting hall into the city, he spoke with Saul on the roof. 9:26 And they got up early. Then at the break of dawn Samuel called to Saul upon the roof, "Rise up, and I will send you off." So Saul arose, and both he and Samuel went outside. 9:27 As they were going down to the outskirts of the city, Samuel said to Saul, "Say to your young man that he must pass on before us,"—and<sup>616</sup> he passed on—"And you, stand here this moment,*

<sup>608</sup>Cf. MTeh. 7:2.

<sup>609</sup>McCarter, *I Samuel*, 170.

<sup>610</sup>Omitted by MS T, reading "Saul spoke on the roof".

<sup>611</sup>Omitted by MS D.

<sup>612</sup>Mss b f m y eb1 read כיימא, "about that/this time", more in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>613</sup>Ms d reads ורבר, 'and he led', usually used with human beings and animals, not with inanimate things.

<sup>614</sup>Ms b provides a double rendering, מיני מלותי. Ms eb1 omits מלותי.

<sup>615</sup>Ms f reads למיחבע, the infinitive of חבע, 'search, investigate'. Ms b adds יהון, referring to the asses.

<sup>616</sup>This phrase is seen as the result of the first half of Samuel's speech, both in TJon's and in the Masoretic Text. It is, however, possible that MSS w y eb1 read this phrase as the introduction to the second half of Samuel's speech, because they read הדין כיימא, 'at that time', which has to refer to the passing on of Saul's



that I may make you hear the word of the LORD.” 10:1 Then Samuel took a vessel<sup>617</sup> of oil and poured it on his head, and he kissed him and said, “Has not the LORD anointed you to be the king over his inheritance?” 10:2 When you depart from me today, you will find two men by Rachel’s tomb in the territory of Benjamin at Zelzah, and they will say to you, “The asses which you went to seek are found, and now your father has left off the matter of the asses and is anxious about you, saying, ‘What shall I do about my son?’”

TJon does not consider this verse in direct contradiction to Gen. 35:19, which states that Rachel was buried on the way to Ephrath, *i.e.* Bethlehem. At least TJon does not alter the wording of the Hebrew text. In rabbinic literature, a contradiction is felt because Ephrath was in the territory of Judah and Zelzah, as depicted in this verse, in the territory of Benjamin (cf. GenR. 82:10, 99:2).<sup>618</sup>

3 10 ותהך מחמן ולהלאה ותיתי עד מִשְׁרָךְ חבור וישכחונך תמן תלחא גברין דסלקין למסגד קדם ייִן בבית אל חד נשיל תלחה גדין וחד נשיל תלחה פתין דלחים וחד נשיל גרב דחמר:

10:3 Then you shall go on from there further, and come to the valley of Tabor; three men who are going up to bow down before the LORD at Bethel will meet you there, one carrying three kids, another carrying three loaves of bread, and another carrying a skin of wine.

TJon avoids the direct translation that the three men were going up to God by a reverential circumlocution (>23).<sup>619</sup> While in other verses the verb פלח, ‘worship’, is added as the circumlocution, here TJon chose the verb סגד, ‘bow down’, probably because this verse does not refer to a continuous process. Pseudo-Jerome explains this going to Bethel as “causa orationis”, on account of prayer.<sup>620</sup>

servant. The translation of MSS w y eb1 would then be, “Say to your young man that he must pass on before us. And when he has passed on, you must stand here at that time . . .”, cf. RSV.

<sup>617</sup>From מִנְחָה. Another possibility is “a portion” from מִנְחָה, cf. Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 118. In both cases TJon gives a more general word than the Hebrew text (>7). The same word is used in 2 Kgs. 9:1-3 with reference to the anointment of Jehu. Both men did not start a dynasty, but had a short kingship (cf. LevR. 10:8).

<sup>618</sup>Jer. 31:15 gives the impression that Rachel’s tomb is near Ramah (which could have been in the territory of Benjamin, cf. Isa. 10:29). Cf. *EJ*, *s.v.* “Rachel”; Driver, *Notes*, 78; J. Simons, *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament*, Leiden 1959, 310-11.

<sup>619</sup>Only a man like Moses was allowed “to go up before the LORD”, TO Exod. 19:3.

<sup>620</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 80.

4 10 וישאלון לך לשלם ויתנון לך תרתין גריצן דלחים ותקבילן מידהון:

10:4 *And they will ask you about your well-being and give you two loaves of wreathed bread, which you shall accept from their hand.*

Even though it is natural that TJon added something before Hebrew לחם—bread is an uncountable noun—it is surprising that the word פתא from the preceding verse was not chosen. The word used in the present verse refers to the bread waved at Pentecost (cf. Lev. 23:17). In 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and in LXX this reference was added in this verse, too. These versions refer to a sacred loaf of bread, probably because of the goal of Saul's journey, the hill of God (cf. 10:5).

10 5 בתר כין תהך לגבעתא דבה ארונא דיוי דחמן אסרטיני<sup>621</sup> פלשחאי ויהי כמיעלך לחמן לקרחא וחערע סיעח ספריא נחתין מבית אסחרותא וקדמיהון נבלין וחפין וצלצלין וכנרין ואונן משבחין:

10:5 *After that you shall go to the hill,<sup>622</sup> where the ark of the LORD is, where the praetors of the Philistines are. And there, as you come to the city, you will meet a company of scribes coming down from the banqueting hall and before them harps, tambourines, cymbals and lyres, and they will be praising.*

Hebrew גבעת האלהים, 'hill of God, Gibeah of God', is connected with the place where the ark stayed (cf. 1 Sam. 7:1).<sup>623</sup> Pseudo-Jerome's explanation of the hill of God is different. He assumes that this was the place where the prophets lived.<sup>624</sup>

10 6 ותשרי עלך רוח דנבואה דמן קדם יוי ותשבח עמהון ותשתי לגבר אחרן: 10 7 ויהי ארי יתין אחיא האלין לך אתקין<sup>625</sup> לך מני מלכותא<sup>626</sup> ארי מימרא דיוי בסערך:

10:6 *Then a prophetic spirit from before the LORD will dwell upon you, and you shall praise with them and be turned into another man. 10:7 When these signs will come to you, prepare for yourselves the instruments<sup>627</sup> of kingship, for the speech of the LORD is in your aid.*

It is unlikely that the Hebrew phrase עשה לך אשר תמצא ידך, 'do whatever your hand finds to do', has been paraphrased in order to

<sup>621</sup> Plural like MT, although other versions read the singular as in 1 Sam. 13–14.

<sup>622</sup> Or: to The Hill.

<sup>623</sup> Cf. P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel i-xvi*, Amsterdam 1938, 10; Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 18. See Ch. 4, s.v. ארמאע.

<sup>624</sup> Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 81.

<sup>625</sup> Ms b reads עביד, 'make', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>626</sup> Sperber cites a fragmentary targum, adding דהשכח ידך, 'according to what your hand will find', which is the literal translation of the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>627</sup> Or: weapons.

avoid misunderstandings. The same phrase is translated literally in TgJudg. 9:33.<sup>628</sup> Another possible reason for the present rendering can be found in the commandment that a king had to uphold his dignity (cf. yYom. 8:1 (44b); ySan. 2:8 (20c); Yom. 78b; San. 22b; Taan. 17a), based on Isa. 33:17.<sup>629</sup> A similar, but more literal allusion to Saul's future royal dignity is given by Pseudo-Jerome, who explains that Saul must do all he did in a royal fashion.<sup>630</sup>

8 10 ותיחות קדמי לנגלגל והא אגא נחית לוחך לאסקא עלון ולנכסא נכסח  
 קדשין שבעה יומין תוריד עד מיתא לוחך ואחוי לך ית דתעביד: 9 10 והוה<sup>631</sup> כד  
 אתפני<sup>632</sup> למיזל מלוח שמואל ושני ליה יוי לבא אחרנא ואחאה כל אתיא האלין  
 ביומא ההוא: 10 10 ואחוי לחמן לגבעתא והא סיעת ספריא לקדמותיה ושרת עלוהי  
 רוח נבואה מן קדם יוי ושבח ביניהון: 10 11 והוה כל דידיע ליה מאחמלי  
 ומרקמוהי וחזא<sup>633</sup> והא עם ספריא משבח ואמר<sup>634</sup> עמא נבר לחבריה מא דין דהוה  
 לבר קיש האף<sup>635</sup> שאול בספריא: 10 12 ואתיב גברא מחמן ואמר ומן רבהון<sup>636</sup> על  
 כין הות למתלא האף שאול בספריא:

10:8 And you shall go down before me to Gilgal; and behold, I am coming down to you to sacrifice burnt offerings and to slaughter holy slaughterings. Seven days you shall wait, until I come to you and tell you what you shall do." 10:9 And when he turned away from Samuel, the LORD gave<sup>637</sup> him another heart. And all these signs came to pass that day. 10:10 When they came there, to the hill<sup>638</sup>, behold, a company of scribes met them; and a prophetic spirit from before the LORD dwelt upon him, and he praised among them. 10:11 And when all who knew him before<sup>639</sup> saw that he was praising among the scribes,

<sup>628</sup> Against Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 33-34.

<sup>629</sup> Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 33-34.

<sup>630</sup> Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 81, "omnia quae tibi agenda sunt regaliter age".

<sup>631</sup> In conformity with some Hebrew MSS, although other read והוה, assuming that also this verse speaks about the future.

<sup>632</sup> Ms d adds שכמיה, 'his shoulder', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). The official text omitted this word, because it is regarded as a *pars pro toto* for Saul himself (>14).

<sup>633</sup> Mss a b c d f m o w x y read the plural וחזו, 'they saw'. The singular is based on the following verb, ויאמר (>9).

<sup>634</sup> Mss b m w x y read the plural ואמרו, 'they said', like two Hebrew MSS and various MSS of other versions. This plural is based on the preceding verb, ויראו (>9).

<sup>635</sup> Ms eb1 reads אף without the interrogative particle, replacing the question by its implied answer (>14). This is not done in 10:21.

<sup>636</sup> Mss d w read רבנהון, 'their master'. Ms eb1 reads ומא אבוהון, 'and what is their father?'

<sup>637</sup> Literally: changed.

<sup>638</sup> Or: to The Hill.

<sup>639</sup> Literally: yesterday and before.

the people said, one to another, "What is this that has come over the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the scribes?" 10:12 And a man from there answered, and said, "And who is their master?" Therefore it became a proverb, "Is Saul also among the scribes?"

TJon regarded "father" as a metaphor for the teacher or the rabbi of the scribes, thus reflecting the conditions and institutions of later times.<sup>640</sup> Pseudo-Jerome also provides this explanation, adding two proof-texts: Elisha called his teacher Elijah his father (2 Kgs. 2:12), which is also rendered with רבי in TJon, and Eliphaz called Elihu his father (Job 34:36).<sup>641</sup> This usage of the word 'father' is also attested to in the rabbinic period for rabbis (e.g. R. Joḥanan in yNed. 5:7) or the head of a court (אב בית דין).<sup>642</sup>

Ms eb1, however, maintains the word "father", and translates ויבא אבהון, 'and what/who is their father?' This may reflect the vision that the gift of prophecy, or in this case the occupation of a scribe, was mostly present in certain families and rarely occurred spontaneously. This view is attested to in TJon 1 Sam. 1:1 and 2:1, where both Elkanah and Hannah had the gift of prophecy, but also in the questions put forward by the inhabitants of Nazareth, who could not believe that Jesus, a carpenter's son, had become a rabbi (Mt. 13:54-58; Mk 6:1-3; Lk. 4:22).<sup>643</sup>

13 10 ופסק מלשבחא ו על לבית אסחרותא : 14 10 ואמר אבובי דשאל ליה ולעולימייה לאן אולתון ואמר<sup>644</sup> למבעי ית אתניא וחזינא ארי לא אשכחנין<sup>645</sup> ואחינא לוח שמואל: 15 10 ואמר אבובי דשאל חוי כען לי מא אמר לכון שמואל: 16 10 ואמר שאול לאבובי חואה חוי לנא ארי אשתכחא אתניא ועל עיסק מלכותא לא חוי ליה דאמר שמואל:

10:13 When he had finished praising, he entered the banqueting hall.  
10:14 Saul's uncle said to him and to his young man, "Where did you go?" And he said, "To seek the asses. And when we saw we would not

<sup>640</sup>Cf. A.J. Saldarini, "Is Saul also among the Scribes?: Scribes and Prophets in Targum Jonathan", in: H.J. Blumberg et al. (eds), "Open Thou Mine Eyes . . ." Essays on Aggadah and Judaica Presented to Rabbi William G. Braude on His Eightieth Birthday and Dedicated to His Memory, New Jersey 1992, 239-53, esp. 253. See Ch. 4, s.v. Hebrew נבא.

<sup>641</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 82, "pater eorum, id est magister".

<sup>642</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 18.

<sup>643</sup>Cf. Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 3, 57.

<sup>644</sup>Mss a f read the plural ואמריו, based on the preceding "to him and his servant" (>9).

<sup>645</sup>Ms a replaced the explanatory לא אשכחנין by ליה, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Ms d provides another explanatory addition, viz. לא אשכחן, 'they were not found'.

*find them, we went to Samuel.” 10:15 And Saul’s uncle said, “Now, tell me what Samuel said to you.” 10:16 And Saul said to his uncle, “He told us plainly that the asses had been found.” But about the matter of the kingdom he did not tell him what Samuel had said.*

### 5.11 The Chosen King (1 Samuel 10:17-27)

17 10 וכנש<sup>646</sup> שמואל ית עמא לקדם ◊ יי למצפיא: 18 10 ואמר לבני ישראל כדנן  
 אמר יי אלהא ◊ דישראל אנא אסיקית ית ישראל ממצרים ושיויבית ◊ יתכון מידא  
 דמצראי ומיד כל מלכותא דרחקין יתכון: 19 10 ואתון יומא דין קצתון בפלחנא  
 דאלהכון ◊ דהוא פריק ◊ לכון מכל בישתכון ועקחכון ואמרתון קדמוהי ◊ לית<sup>647</sup>  
 אנחנא מתפרקין ◊ אלהי<sup>648</sup> מלכא תמני עלנא וכען אתעתדו קדם ◊ יי לשבטיכון  
 ולאפייכון: 20 10 וקריב שמואל ית כל שבטיא ◊ דישראל ואחאחד שבטא ◊ דבית<sup>649</sup>  
 בנימין: 21 10 וקריב ית שבטא ◊ דבית<sup>650</sup> בנימין לזרעיתיה<sup>651</sup> ואחאחד זרעית  
 מטת ואחאחד שאול בר קיש ובעוהי ולא אשתכח: 22 10 ושאלו ◊ עוד במימרא ◊ דיי  
 האית<sup>652</sup> עוד הכא וגברא ואמר יי הא הוא<sup>653</sup> טמיר במניא:

*10:17 Now Samuel gathered the people together before the LORD at Mizpah. 10:18 And he said to the sons of Israel, “Thus said the LORD, the God of Israel, ‘I brought Israel up out of Egypt, and I delivered you from the hand of the Egyptians and from the hand of all the kingdoms that were oppressing you.’ 10:19 But you have this day refused<sup>654</sup> the worship of your God, the one who saved you from all your evil and your distress, and you have said before Him, ‘We cannot be saved, unless you appoint a king over us.’ Now, take your stand before the LORD by your tribes and by your thousands.”<sup>655</sup> 10:20 Then Samuel brought all the tribes of Israel near, and the tribe of the House of Benjamin was singled out. 10:21 He brought the tribe of the House of Benjamin near by its families, and the family of Matar was singled out. Then Saul the son of Kish was singled out. But when they sought*

<sup>646</sup>The same verb occurs in Syr.

<sup>647</sup>In conformity with a few Hebrew MSS which read both לו and לא. Other Hebrew MSS read the combination of ל and לא, assuming that God is still speaking here. Most Hebrew MSS and ancient versions, however, only read the negation.

<sup>648</sup>MS a adds אם, ‘if’.

<sup>649</sup>Omitted by MSS a f w y.

<sup>650</sup>Omitted by MSS a b d w y.

<sup>651</sup>Plural in accordance with the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and the Vg. Other ancient versions read the plural without suffix.

<sup>652</sup>Cf. Syr. MS a reads האיתא, ‘did he come’, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>653</sup>Omitted by MS o.

<sup>654</sup>Alternative translation: you have this day cut off.

<sup>655</sup>Although TJon Judg. 6:15 renders זרעיה, ‘family, clan’ for Hebrew אלה, in the present verse, as well as in 23:23 and Mic. 5:1, it is translated with אלפא.

him, he could not be found. 10:22 So they inquired again of the speech of the LORD, "Is the man still here?" And the LORD said, "Behold, he is hidden among the vessels."

Most interpret Saul's conduct as modesty.<sup>656</sup> Another effort to explain Saul's conduct can be found in the margin of CR (>24):

הרגנום ירושןלמן ושאלו עוד במימרא  $\diamond$  דיין האית טוב הכא גברא דחויא ליה מלכותא ואמר יי הא הוא בבית אולפנא  $\diamond$  טמיר ומצלי  $\diamond$  וקרי במאני רינוג אוריחא

*Targum Jerushalmi: so they inquired again of the speech of the LORD, "Is the man here again to whom the kingship is proper?" And the LORD said, "Behold, he is hidden in the Talmud School and he is praying and reading in the desired vessels of the Law."*

By way of several additions and explanations this verse was given a Midrashic character. The Hebrew הֵלֵךְ, 'hither', is interpreted according to the Midrashic conception that this word always refers to the kingship.<sup>657</sup> David's question in 2 Sam. 7:18 was used as a proof-text: "Who am I, O LORD God, and what is my house, that Thou hast brought me thus far?" CR has a marginal note in the same verse that replaces "thus far" by "to the kingship".

The Hebrew word כְּלֵי, 'vessels', is explained as a denotation to the Torah, which is repeatedly called כְּלֵי חַמְדָּה, 'precious vessel' (e.g. yTa'an. 2:1 (65a)).<sup>658</sup> Because of this Midrashic explanation of the vessels, Saul is placed in the Talmud School, praying and reading.<sup>659</sup> The addition of the בֵּית אֹלְפָנָא has no equivalents in rabbinic literature. A less elaborate addition is attested by Vg, stating that Saul was hidden in "the house". Rashi, too, adds a house, but combines it with the luggage: Saul was hiding in the house in which the luggage was stored.<sup>660</sup>

10 23 ורהטו ודברוהו  $\diamond$  מחמן ואחעתד בנו עמא ורם מכל עמא מכחפיה ולעילא:  
10 24 ואמר שמואל לכל עמא החזיתון <sup>661</sup> דאתרעי ביה יי ארי ליה דכותיה בכל

<sup>656</sup>Cf. tBer. 4:18; Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:63; Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 6, 231.

<sup>657</sup>GenR. 45:10; 55:6; ExodR. 2:6; DeutR. 2:7; TanB, *Shemot*, 1:16; MTeh. 1:2; 108:2; Zev. 102a; SER 18 (p. 90).

<sup>658</sup>Kasher, תוספתא, 103, who also points at the literal usage of this phrase in Tg. 2 Chron. 32:27. Another explanation is given in TanB, *Vayyiqra*, 2:5, "the vessels are the Urim and the Thummim".

<sup>659</sup>Er. 53b and Git. 59a state that Saul was well versed in the Torah.

<sup>660</sup>Cf. F. Stummer, "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas", *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, esp. 7-8.

<sup>661</sup>Mss a f have no question, but דא חזיתון, 'behold, you have seen' (>14). Ms a reads in the sequel ארי איתרעי, 'that the LORD has chosen him'.

עמא ויביבו כל עמא ואמרו יצלח  $\diamond$  מלכא:

10:23 *And they ran and led him from there. And when he stood among the people, he was taller than all the people from his shoulder upward.*

10:24 *And Samuel said to all the people, "Do you see whom the LORD has chosen? For there is none like him among all the people." And all the people shouted, "May the king prosper!"*

The Hebrew phrase "May the king live!" is specified with the goal of that life: to be a successful king. This is the standard translation, although it is sometimes extended to *יצלח במלכותיה*, 'May the king prosper in his kingship!' (2 Chron. 23:11; but cf. also TJon 1 Sam. 14:47).

10 25 ומליל שמואל עם עמא ית נומסא  $\diamond$  דמלכותא<sup>662</sup> וכחב בספרא<sup>663</sup> ואצנע קדם  $\diamond$  יוי ושלה שמואל ית כל עמא גבר לביתיה:

10:25 *Then Samuel discussed the royal rights with the people, and he wrote them in a book and deposited it before the LORD. Then Samuel sent all the people away, each to his home.*

The use of the Graecism *נומסא* indicates that TJon did not regard the royal rights as being derived from God's Torah (see Ch. 4, *s.v.* *משפט*). If he had, he would have used Aramaic *דינא*. TJon links this verse with Samuel's warnings in 1 Sam. 8:11-18, which also uses the Graecism *נומסא*.<sup>664</sup> Consequently, Samuel repeats his warning that kings have their rights and their way of ruling things.

10 26 ונאף שאול אזל לביתיה לגבעתא  $\diamond$  ואולו עמיה קצת מן עמא גברין דחלי  $\diamond$  חסאה  $\diamond$  דאתיהיב דחלא מן קדם  $\diamond$  יוי  $\diamond$  בלבהון:

10:26 *And also Saul went to his home at The Hill, and with him went part of the people, men fearing sin, in whose hearts fear from before the LORD was given.*

In order to maintain a reverential distance between God and men, TJon interprets the touch of God by "the fear from before the LORD was given in their hearts". This phrase is one of the reverential representations of the Hebrew *יראה יהוה*, 'the fear of the LORD', although the more literal translation *דחלתא דיוי* is also used (cf. 2 Sam. 23:3 and Kimḥi's rendering of 1 Sam. 3:7). Even so, this fear could be a reference to the preceding phrase, "fearing sin", which is specified as "given by the LORD".

<sup>662</sup>MS b reads *דמלכא*, "the rights of the king".

<sup>663</sup>The phrase *וכחב בספרא* is omitted in MSS w y.

<sup>664</sup>MS b underlines this link by rendering "the rights of the king", cf. 1 Sam. 8:11.

Because of this theological ending of the verse, TJon also interpreted the Hebrew word חיל theologically. It is translated by “men fearing sins”.<sup>665</sup> It is possible that TJon had a *Vorlage* similar to the Qumran and LXX text, both of which attest to בני החיל, but if not, then TJon rendered it as the direct opposite of בני בליעל in the following verse (>15).<sup>666</sup> The Hebrew word חיל may have a second translation in קצה מן עמא, since it would otherwise be a superfluous addition.<sup>667</sup> The latter rendering would do justice to its meaning of “army”, the first rendering to its verbal meaning of “tremble”.

27 10 גברי־668 רשעא־669 אמרו במא־ יפרקנא־ דין ושטויה ולא אתו למשאל בשלמיה והוה כשתיק:

10:27 *But evil men said, “How can this one save us?” And they despised him and did not ask about his well-being. But he was like one who is silent.*

The Hebrew version, in which the evil men refused to bring presents to the new king, invited a comparison with the corrupt Roman government. Therefore TJon replaced the bringing of presents with the Roman custom of clients and servants paying a daily visit to their patron.<sup>670</sup> In this way, Saul is cleared from corruption and the text is updated (>24).

## 5.12 The Siege of Jabesh-gilead (1 Samuel 11:1-13)

The present chapter could be read as *haftara* in the triennial cycle, after the Torah reading of Num. 16 concerning Korah’s rebellion against Moses and Aaron. There are no striking similarities between the two chapters, neither in the Hebrew text nor in the Aramaic translation. It is possible that the choice of the reading was determined by the selection for the annual cycle (see below on 1 Sam. 11:14–12:25). A few possible similarities are indicated below.

<sup>665</sup>Cf. 2 Sam. 23:20 and TO Exod. 18:21. The Hebrew expression איש־חיל is rendered by “man fearing sins”; for Hebrew חיל בן, see commentary on 1 Sam. 14:52.

<sup>666</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 18. The omission of גברי־ן in MSS b d does not add any evidence for either option.

<sup>667</sup>This is affirmed by the omission of this phrase in MS a.

<sup>668</sup>MSS a b c d f m o w y x read ובני, “the sons of evil”, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>669</sup>Cf. Syr.

<sup>670</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 100; followed by Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 120, n. 43.



11 1 וסליק נחש מלכא רבני עמון ושרא על יביש גלעד ואמרו כל<sup>671</sup> אנשי<sup>672</sup> יביש<sup>673</sup> לנחש נזר לנא קים ונפלהנך:

*11:1 And Nahash, the king of the sons of Ammon, went up and besieged Jabesh-gilead; and all the men of Jabesh said to Nahash, "Make a treaty with us, and we will serve you."*

Not Nahash the Ammonite, but Nahash the king of the sons of Ammon, besieged Jabesh. This substitution in TJon may be based on an old tradition, because it is also attested in the Qumranic text of Samuel, but it may also be a adaptation to the wording of 1 Sam. 12:12.<sup>674</sup> It is a concrete explanation of an abstract idea (>14). In 11:2 the same explanation is given as a result of associative translation (>15). In this explanation the link between Nahash the Ammonite and Goliath the Philistine, who both wanted to put disgrace (חרפה, 1 Sam. 11:2; 17:26) upon Israel and who were both defeated in the first act of the new king, is broken.

11 2 ואמר להון נחש מלכא רבני עמון אם תעברון כהרא<sup>675</sup> אגזר לכון קים<sup>676</sup> במיקר לכון<sup>677</sup> כל עינא דימניא ואשינה ח סדא<sup>678</sup> על כל ישראל:

*11:2 And Nahash, the king of the sons of Ammon, said to them, "If you do this, I will make a treaty with you in that I gouge out all your right eyes and I put disgrace upon all Israel."*

TJon explains the reference to the right eyes literally, as did Josephus, who explained: "to render them [= the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead] utterly unserviceable, since the left eye was covered by the shield."<sup>679</sup>

<sup>671</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>672</sup>MSS w o read the singular אנש (against >9).

<sup>673</sup>MS B\* adds גלעד, but it is erased.

<sup>674</sup>The peculiar designation "Nahash the Ammonite" instead of "Nahash the king of the sons of Ammon" can be explained as the result of an extensive haplography in the MT. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the narrative of Josephus have a longer introduction to the present chapter, beginning with Nahash' official title, "And Nahash, king of the sons of Ammon, sorely oppressed the sons of Gad and Reuben, and he gouged out all their right eyes . . ."; cf. F.M. Cross, "The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Missing Verses from 1 Samuel 11 Found in 4QSamuel<sup>a</sup>", in: H. Tadmor, M. Weinfeld, *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures*, Jerusalem & Leiden 1983, 148-58.

<sup>675</sup>The explanatory כהרא is replaced by בהרא in MSS b S, in accordance with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>676</sup>Also attested in some Hebrew MSS, quotations and several ancient versions, but it is a simple case of associative complementing. Omitted in MSS b o.

<sup>677</sup>The words לכון קים במיקר are omitted in MS eb1 by haplography.

<sup>678</sup>MSS f f<sub>6</sub> B<sup>m</sup> C J S read חסדא.

<sup>679</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:19.

In the margin of CR the “right eye” is explained as a metaphor for God’s law, an interpretation also found in MShem. 14:89.

תרננום] ירושןלמין במחקותי מן אוריחא דילכון תפקדתא דכתיבא בנוה דלא ידכון  
עמונאי ומואבאי למיעל בקהלא דיזי ואשוונה חיסודא על כל ישראל

*Targum Jerushalmi: that I erase from that law of yours the commandment in which it is written that the Ammonites and the Moabites are not clean to enter the assembly of the LORD and I will put disgrace upon all Israel.*

King Nahash wished to change the Torah and remove the disgrace of uncleanness from his people (cf. TO Deut. 23:4). A similar explanation is found in Yom. 22b and Shab. 63a. This explanation betrays a condemning and hostile attitude against the Ammonites and Moabites. It may have been part of the discussion of the question whether an individual Ammonite or Moabite could enter the assembly of Israel, for example by marrying an Israelite woman (cf. mYad. 4:4).<sup>680</sup>

11 3 ואמר ליה סבי יביש אוריך לנא שבעה יומין ונשלח אנגדין  $\diamond$  ככל החום ארעא<sup>681</sup>  
דישראל ואם לית פריק  $\diamond$  יתנא ונפוק לותך:

11:3 *The elders of Jabesh said to him, “Wait for us for seven days that we may send messengers through all the territory of the land of Israel. Then, if there is no one to save us, we will come out to you.”*

Although the Hiphil of the Hebrew verb רפה is usually equated with Aramaic שבק (TJon Judg. 11:37; 2 Kgs 4:27), Aramaic ארך, ‘wait’, is used in this verse. It would not have been realistic to think that the Ammonites would leave them during the seven days of delay.

The addition of ארעא is a regular complement throughout TgSam, except in 11:7. The name *Erez Israel* was commonly used for the Holy Land from the Second Temple Period onward, but it also occurs in Biblical texts.<sup>682</sup>

11 4 ואתו אנגדיא  $\diamond$  לנבעתא  $\diamond$  דשאויל ומלילו פתגמיא<sup>683</sup> קדם  $\diamond$  עמא וארימו כל  
עמא ית קלהון ובכו: 11 5 והא שאול אחא בתר<sup>684</sup> תוריא מן חקלא ואמר שאול מא  
לעמא ארי בכן<sup>685</sup> ואשחעיאו ליה ית פתגמי אנשי יביש: 11 6 ושרת רוח  $\diamond$  נבורא<sup>686</sup>  
מן קדם  $\diamond$  יז על שאול כד שמע ית פתגמיא האלין ותקיף רגזיה  $\diamond$  לחדא: 11 7 ונסיב

<sup>680</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 56-57.

<sup>681</sup>Ms o reads עמא, ‘people’. Omitted by MSS a b J, which only read ישראל, in accordance with the Hebrew text. Ms S\* combines the readings ארעא ישראל דישראל.

<sup>682</sup>*EJ*, s.v. *Erez Israel*.

<sup>683</sup>Ms B\* reads פתגמיא ית.

<sup>684</sup>Ms J reads מבתר, “from behind the oxen”.

<sup>685</sup>Ms T reads the imperfect יבכון.

<sup>686</sup>Ms d reads נבורא, as in 1 Sam. 10:10.

פֶּן תֹּרֵיִא וְהִדְמִיָּה וְשִׁלַּח בְּכָל תַּחֲוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל<sup>687</sup> בִּיד אֹנְגִיָּא<sup>688</sup> לְמִימֵר דְּלִיתְוֵהּ  
נְפִיק בְּחַר שְׂאוּל וּבְחַר שְׂמוּאֵל כְּרִין<sup>689</sup> יִתְעַבִּיד לְחֹרֵיָּה<sup>690</sup> וּנְפַל זִיעָא<sup>691</sup> מִן קֶדֶם יוֹי  
עַל<sup>692</sup> עֵמָא וּנְפִקוּ כְּנַבְרָא חַד: 8 11 וּמַגְנֹן בְּבוֹק<sup>693</sup> וְהוּוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל תְּלַח מֵאָה אֶלְפִין  
וְאִנְשׁ<sup>694</sup> יְהוּדָה תְּלַחִין אֶלְפִין: 9 11 וְאִמְרוּ לְאֹנְגִיָּא דְאַתּוּ כְּרִין<sup>695</sup> תִּימְרוּן לְאִנְשׁ<sup>696</sup>  
יְבִישׁ גִּלְעָד מַחֵר יְהִי לְכוּן פֶּרְקָנָא כְּמִיחָם יוֹמָא<sup>697</sup> וְאַתּוּ אֹנְגִיָּא וְחֹוִיָּאוּ לְאִנְשֵׁי<sup>698</sup>  
יְבִישׁ<sup>699</sup> וְחִדְיָאוּ:

*11:4 When the messengers came to The Hill of Saul, they spoke the words before the people; and all the people lifted up their voice and wept. 11:5 Now Saul was coming from the field behind the oxen; and Saul said, "What ails the people, that they are weeping?" So they told him the words of the men of Jabesh. 11:6 And a mighty spirit from before the LORD dwelt upon Saul, when he heard these words, and his anger was very strong. 11:7 And he took the yoke of oxen and cut them in pieces and sent them throughout all the territory of Israel by the hand of messengers, saying, "Whoever does not come out after Saul and after Samuel, so shall it be done to his ox!" Then the dread from before the LORD fell upon the people, and they came out as one man. 11:8 When he counted them at Bezek, the men of Israel were three hundred thousand and the men of Judah thirty thousand. 11:9 And they said to the messengers who had come, "Thus shall you say to the men of Jabesh-gilead: 'Tomorrow, about the heat of the day, you shall experience salvation.'" When the messengers came and told the men of Jabesh, they rejoiced.*

Some manuscripts harmonized this verse with 11:11 by translating "the heat of the day" and not "the heat of the sun" (>16). Most manuscripts did not, showing that faithfulness to the Hebrew text

<sup>687</sup>Mss a w y J S read אַרְעָא דִּישְׂרָאֵל, as in 11:3 (>15).

<sup>688</sup>The words אֹנְגִיָּא בִּיד are omitted in MS 12<sup>h</sup>.

<sup>689</sup>Ms d reads כְּרִין<sup>◊</sup>, otherwise used in utterances of the LORD (against >22).

<sup>690</sup>Ms a reads the plural לְחֹרֵיָּה, 'to his oxen', in accordance with the plural in the beginning of this verse (>9).

<sup>691</sup>Ms f<sub>3</sub> suggests רַחֲיָא, 'trembling'.

<sup>692</sup>Ms d adds כָּל.

<sup>693</sup>TgSam renders a place-name. Several Midrashim explain Hebrew בּוֹק as "with pebbles". Saul had pebbles given to him by the people, and he counted the pebbles; cf. e.g. PesK. 2:8. See below, commentary on 15:4.

<sup>694</sup>Ms o reads the plural אִנְשֵׁי.

<sup>695</sup>Ms S reads כְּרִין<sup>◊</sup>, otherwise used in utterances of the LORD (against >22).

<sup>696</sup>Mss f o T read the plural לְאִנְשֵׁי, as some Hebrew MSS and several ancient versions, and like the rest of this verse.

<sup>697</sup>Mss a b d f m o w y B D J S T read שְׂבִישָׁא, 'sun', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>698</sup>Mss m w y read the singular לְאִנְשׁ, as in the beginning of this verse.

<sup>699</sup>Ms J reads גִּלְעָד, 'Gilead'. Ms B\* adds גִּלְעָד.

was more important. Still, a Midrashic discussion on this subject indicates that the expression “the heat of the sun” was interpreted as the fourth hour of the day, while the expression “the heat of the day” was considered to be two hours later.<sup>700</sup> This meant that if Saul had promised to bring deliverance about the heat of the sun (11:9), he came two hours late when finishing his battle at the heat of the day (11:11).

10 11 ואמרו אנשי יביש מחר נפוק לו תכון ותעברון לנא ככל דתקין <sup>701</sup> בעיניכון:  
 11 11 והוה ביומא דבתרוהי ומני שאול ית עמא תלת <sup>702</sup> משרין ועלו בגו משרתא  
 במטרת צפרא ומחו ית בני <sup>703</sup> עמון עד מיחם יומא והו <sup>704</sup> דאשתארו ואתבררו ולא  
 אשתארו <sup>705</sup> בהון הרין דערקין  $\diamond$  כחדא:

11:10 And the men of Jabesh said, “Tomorrow we will come out to you, and you may do to us whatever seems right in your sight.” 11:11 And on the day after it, Saul put the people in three camps; and they came onto the midst of the camp in the morning watch, and struck down the sons of Ammon until the heat of the day. And those who were left were scattered, so that no two of them were left to flee together.

A marginal note in CR gives a specification of the times given in the Hebrew text:

ל'ישנא [אחרניא] עד ארבע שעי יומא ומן אסקות עלת חדירא דצפרא

*until the fourth hour of the day, from the offering of the morning Tamid*

Either this Targumic fragment shows no trace of the Midrashic identification of “the heat of the day” with the sixth hour, as was the case in most Targumic manuscripts in 11:9 (see above), or this fragment harmonizes the two time indications. If the latter is true, the “heat of the sun” of verse 9 prevailed and was incorporated in verse 11 as the fourth hour. The Hebrew expression אשמרת הבקר is identified with the bringing of the Tamid. The same identification is given in a marginal note to 1 Sam. 17:16.

<sup>700</sup>Daytime was divided into twelve hours, which were longer in the summer and shorter in winter, cf. MekY, *Vayassa*’, 5; MekSh 15:21; GenR. 48:8; Ber. 27a; yBer. 4:1 (5).

<sup>701</sup>According to TJon’s habit of rendering טוב according to its co-text. Note that Syr renders ܬܘܒܐ, ‘beautiful’, which is another contextual rendering of the Hebrew טוב.

<sup>702</sup>Ms f reads הלתין, ‘thirty’.

<sup>703</sup>Omitted in MSS o m w y S T, in conformity with the Hebrew text, although some Hebrew MSS do read this word.

<sup>704</sup>MSS d f read the singular in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>705</sup>Ms D omits אשתארו ולא אשתארו by haplography.

12 11 ואמר עמא לשמואל מן דין דמבסר למימר לא כשר שאול לממלך עלנא איתו  
גבריא ונקטילנון:

11:12 *Then the people said to Samuel, “Who is it that said scornfully,<sup>706</sup> ‘Saul is not fit to reign over us.’ Bring the men, that we may kill them.”*

The Hebrew phrase שאול ימלך עלינו is probably intended as irony or as a question,<sup>707</sup> but TgSam transformed the question into a declarative statement by adding a negation (>14). Note that some Hebrew manuscripts, as well as LXX and Syr, add the negation before this phrase, in order to avoid misunderstanding.

13 11 ואמר שאול לא יתקטיל גברא ביומא הדין<sup>708</sup> ארי יומא הדין<sup>709</sup> עבר יוי פרקנא  
בישראל:

11:13 *But Saul said, “Not a man shall be killed this day, for this day the LORD has wrought salvation in Israel.”*

### 5.13 Samuel’s Farewell (1 Samuel 11:14–12:25)

The narrative of Samuel’s Farewell (1 Sam. 11:14–12:22) is read as *haftara* after the Torah reading of Num. 16:1–18:32 in the annual cycle. In both readings the prophetic leader defends himself against assumed accusations. Both leaders argue that they have not even taken one ass from the people (Num. 16:15; 1 Sam. 12:3). These two phrases are rendered alike in TO and TJon by associative translation (>15). The translation of 1 Sam. 12:6, which says that mighty deeds were done by Moses and Aaron, could have been influenced by the memory of Num. 16, where Moses and Aaron are challenged but confirmed by mighty deeds. The conclusion of 1 Sam. 12:15, “the plague of God will be on you as it was on your fathers”, is different from that in LXX, which ends with “on you and on your kings”. This difference might be based on the combination of *haftara* and Torah reading, since Korah was indeed punished by God for his rebellion.

14 11 ואמר שמואל לעמא איתו וניזיל לגלגלא ונחדיח תמן מלכותא: 15 11 ואולו כל  
עמא לגלגלא ואמליכו תמן יח שאול קדם ◊ יוי בגלגלא ונכיסו ◊ תמן נכסח ◊ קדשין

<sup>706</sup>The rendering “that announces saying” is also possible, but less likely; against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 121.

<sup>707</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 87 gives other examples of such phrases. So also Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 18.

<sup>708</sup>Ms d reads דין, resulting in “today” and not in “this day”, in accordance with the following expression; MSS C D read יהיא, “that day”.

<sup>709</sup>Mss a b d f m o B C D J S T eb1 read דין, resulting in “today”, in conformity with the Hebrew text.

קדם יי וחדרי תמן שאול וכל אנשי ישראל עד לחדא: 12 1 ואמר שמואל<sup>710</sup> לכל ישראל<sup>711</sup> הא קבילית למימרכון<sup>712</sup> לכל דאמרחון לי ואמליכית עליכון מלכא: 12 2 וכען הא מלכא מדבר ברישכון ואנא קשית וסיבית ובני הא אנון עמכון ואנא הליכית קרמיכון<sup>713</sup> מזעורי<sup>714</sup> עד יומא הדין:

11:14 *Then Samuel said to the people, "Come, let us go to Gilgal and there renew the kingdom." 11:15 So all the people went to Gilgal, and there they made Saul king before the LORD in Gilgal. There they slaughtered sacrifices of holy things before the LORD. And there Saul and all the men of Israel rejoiced greatly. 12:1 And Samuel said to all Israel, "Behold, I have accepted your speech, all that you have said to me, and have made a king over you. 12:2 And now, behold, the king leads you at your head; and I am old and grey, and behold, my sons are with you and I walked before you from my youth until this day.*

Both uses of the Hitpael of the verb הלך are replaced. In Samuel's case TJon simply rendered "walked", in the king's case the verb is replaced by the verb "lead" with the term of leadership "at the head of" (cf. 1 Sam. 8:20; 18:13, 16).

A variant reading in the margin of CR defends Samuel's sons:

לישנאן אחרנאן קשישת וסיבית ובני הא אוטיבו אורחתהון והא אינון באילפן עימכון

*Another expression: I am old and grey, and my sons, behold, they mended their ways. And behold, they are with you in study.*

Similar to the marginal note in CR on 1 Sam. 2:22 in which Eli's sons are cleared from sexual sins, Samuel's sons are claimed to have repented from their misconduct (cf. 1 Sam. 8:3) although they are not entirely cleared from their sins as in other Midrashic literature (cf. GenR. 85:12; Shab. 55b-56a). This variant reading stresses anew the importance of study, and it gives an actualized description of spiritual leaders (>24).<sup>715</sup>

12 3 הא עד<sup>716</sup> דאנא קיים<sup>717</sup> אסחידו בי קדם יי וקדם משחיה ית תורא דמן דברית<sup>718</sup> וחמרא דמן שחרית<sup>718</sup> וית מן עשקית וית מן אנסית ומיד מן קבילית<sup>718</sup> ממון דשקר וכבשית עיני מניה דבינא<sup>718</sup> ואחיב לכון:

<sup>710</sup>Ms T reads erroneously both Saul and Samuel as speakers.

<sup>711</sup>Mss o S read אנש ישראל, 'men of Israel'.

<sup>712</sup>Ms b reads מנכון, 'from you'.

<sup>713</sup>Ms d reads עמכון, 'with you', as is said in the earlier line of this verse.

<sup>714</sup>Mss b o S read מנעורי, a Hebraism.

<sup>715</sup>Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 102.

<sup>716</sup>Ms b reads עוד, which does not alter the meaning of the text.

<sup>717</sup>Cf. Syr which renders ܡܫܚܝܢܐ, 'standing'.

<sup>718</sup>Mss b o Fr read שחדית, 'I have bribed'.

12:3 Behold, while I am living, testify against me before the LORD and before his anointed: Whose ox have I led away? And whose ass have I stolen? And whom have I defrauded? Whom have I oppressed? And of whose hand have I accepted money of falsehood to withhold my eye from him in court? And I will restore it to you!”

While it is possible that the Hebrew text refers to a specific kind of injustice, *i.e.* accepting a price of life, which was permitted in a case of homicide (Exod. 21:30) but not in a case of murder (Num. 35:31),<sup>719</sup> the Aramaic version gives a very general word for “bribe” (cf. Amos 5:12). Samuel was free from injustice, not only in murder cases but in all legal cases.

The verb לקח is used three times in the Hebrew text, but it is translated with three different verbs in the Aramaic version. The taking of the ass is rendered as in TO Num. 16:15, where Moses argues against Korah and his company that he did not “take one ass from them”.<sup>720</sup> The Aramaic version also alters the verb in Num. 16:15, because the Hebrew text states that Moses did not “carry” an ass from them. The taking of the ox is rendered differently, probably in order to diversify the possible sins of Samuel (> 18). TJon uses the verb דבר, ‘lead’, which can also refer to borrowing or to the predicted “way of the king” (1 Sam. 8:11), who will lead sons and daughters, slaves and handmaids, oxen and sheep, *etcetera* (>15). The last usage of the verb לקח is rendered by the usual Aramaic verb “to accept”, because it did not concern theft. As a result, the summary given by the people in 12:4 is not complete in the Aramaic version, because only the verb “accept” returns.<sup>721</sup>

4 12 ואמרו לא עשקתנא ולא אנסתנא ולא קבילתאן דין אנוש מידעם: 5 12 ואמר להון סהיד מימראן דיוי בכון וסהיד משיחיה יומא הדין ארי לא אשכחתון בידי מידעם ואמרו<sup>722</sup> סהיד:

12:4 And they said, “You have not defrauded us or oppressed us or accepted anything from any man’s hand.” 12:5 And he said to them, “The speech of the LORD is witness against you, and his anointed is witness this day, that you have not found anything in my hand.” And they said, “Witness.”

<sup>719</sup>Cf. Driver, *Notes*, 88-89.

<sup>720</sup>Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 57:2 makes the connection with the account of Korah as well. Likewise NumR. 18:10.

<sup>721</sup>Therefore, a MS from the Cairo Genizah probably renders וסיבהא in verse 4.

<sup>722</sup>Mss b d fr B C D J T, and perhaps also MS S, read the singular, in conformity with the Hebrew text, although many Hebrew MSS read the plural, and likewise Syr and LXX.

Many Targumic manuscripts make the second to last word refer to the people—*they* said—, because they considered it to be a collective singular (cf. Rabba in Mak. 23b).<sup>723</sup> However, several manuscripts maintain the singular form, either to remain close to their Hebrew *Vorlage* or to leave room for another explanation, attested in Mid-rashic literature and the margin of CR. The singular verb led some to the explanation of a singular person who answered, namely the divine voice, as in several other rabbinic texts.<sup>724</sup> The voice “falling” from heaven also decides controversial matters according to tosefta-targumim to Judg. 5:5<sup>725</sup> and 1 Kgs 3:27.

ירושן למין ונפלת ברת קלא מן שמיא ואמרת סהיד

*Jerushalmi: And the divine voice fell down from heaven and said, “Witness.”*

6 12 ואמר שמואל לעמא יי דעבר גבורן על ידי משה ואהרן ודאסיק ית אבהתכון  
מארעא דמצרים:

*12:6 And Samuel said to the people, “[It is] the LORD, who did mighty deeds through the hands of Moses and Aaron, and who brought your fathers up out of the land of Egypt.*

If literally translated, the Hebrew text speaks of the creation of Moses and Aaron.<sup>726</sup> TJon avoids the misunderstanding that the birth of Moses and Aaron would have required a special act of creation<sup>727</sup> by inserting “mighty deeds” which were done by these two brothers.<sup>728</sup>

7 12 וכען אתעחדו ואתוכח עמכון קדם יי ית כל זכוחא דיי דעבר עמכון ועם  
אבהתכון: 8 12 כד<sup>729</sup> על יעקב למצרים ועיקן אבהתכון קדם יי ושלח יי ית משה  
וית אהרן ואפיקו<sup>730</sup> ית אבהתכון ממצרים ואותיבונן באחרא<sup>731</sup> הדין:

*12:7 So now, stand and let me testify with you before the LORD all the righteousness of the LORD which he performed for you and for your fathers. 12:8 When Jacob had gone into Egypt and your fathers cried before the LORD, the LORD sent Moses and Aaron, who brought forth*

<sup>723</sup> MTeh. 17A:16; 72:2 wonder if perhaps the context requires “And they said”, but they state that the singular implies a heavenly voice.

<sup>724</sup> Cf. GenR. 85:12; Mak. 23b; MTeh. 17A:16; 72:2; although in Midrash Rabbah the Holy Spirit is mentioned; cf. Kasher, *הותפסות*, no. 49.

<sup>725</sup> Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 417.

<sup>726</sup> Cf. CantR. 4:5 § 2; Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:86.

<sup>727</sup> Cf. Frankel, “Zu dem Targum”, 23.

<sup>728</sup> Similar explanations are given in NumR. 11:2; QohR. 1:4 § 4.

<sup>729</sup> The same conjunction is used in Syr.

<sup>730</sup> Ms Fr reads ואסיקו, ‘and brought up’, as in e.g. 1 Sam. 8:8; 10:18 (>-15).

<sup>731</sup> Ms o reads בארעא, “in this land”, which is more usual than “in this place”.



*your fathers out of Egypt, and made them dwell in this place.*

It is noteworthy that TJon did not equate Hebrew זָעַק, 'cry', with the usual צִלַּע, 'pray' (cf. also 12:10), as Syr did. This rendering is reminiscent of Israel's groaning and crying under their servitude in Egypt (Exod. 2:23), which included more than prayer alone. TO and TP<sub>S</sub>J also use the verb זָעַק in Exod. 2:23.

9 12 וַאֲחַשְׁיָאוּ ית פִּלְחָנָא דִּיּוּ אֱלֹהֵהוּן<sup>732</sup> וּמִסַּר יתְהוֹן בִּיד סִיסְרָא רַב חִילָא דְחַצוֹר  
וּבִיד פִּלְשֶׁתַּי וּבִיד מַלְכָא דְמוֹאָב וְאִגִּיחוּ קִרְבָּא בְהוֹן:

*12:9 But they forgot the worship of the LORD their God; and He surrendered them into the hand of Sisera, commander of the army of Hazor, and into the hand of the Philistines, and into the hand of the king of Moab, and they waged war against them.*

TJon not only establishes a distance between God and men by introducing the term "worship",<sup>733</sup> but also replaces the metaphorical "He sold them into the hand of Sisera" with the more realistic verb "surrender".<sup>734</sup>

10 12 וְזַעֲיִקוּ קִדְמָּ דִּיּוּ וְאִמְרוּ<sup>735</sup> חֲבִנְנָא<sup>736</sup> אַרִי שְׁבִקְנָא ית פִּלְחָנָא דִּיּוּ וּפִלְחָנָא  
לְבַעֲלֵיא<sup>737</sup> וְלַעֲשֶׁתְרַתָּא וְכַעַן שְׁיִזְבְּנָא<sup>738</sup> מִיד<sup>738</sup> בַּעֲלֵי דְכַבְנָא וְנִפְלַח וְקִדְמָּ דִּיּוּ<sup>739</sup>:  
11 12 וְשִׁלַּח יוּי ית נִדְעוֹן<sup>740</sup> וְיִת שְׁמִשׁוֹן<sup>741</sup> וְיִת יִפְתָּח וְיִת שְׁמוּאֵל וְשִׁיזְיִב<sup>741</sup> יתְכּוֹן מִיד  
בַּעֲלֵי דְבַבְיִכּוֹן מִסְחוֹר סְחוֹר וְיִתִּיבְחוֹן לְרַחְצֵן:

*12:10 And they cried before the LORD and said, 'We are guilty, because we have forsaken the worship of the LORD, and have worshipped the Baals and the Ashtaroth. But now, deliver us out of the hand of our enemies, and we will worship Thee.' 12:11 And the LORD sent Gideon and Samson and Jephthah and Samuel, and delivered you from the hand of your enemies on every side; and you dwelt in safety.*

<sup>732</sup>Omitted by MS b.

<sup>733</sup>Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 131-32; E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), Berlin 1988, 103, n. 15.

<sup>734</sup>The same in TJon Judg. 2:14; 3:8; 4:2, 9; 10:7; Ezek. 30:12; Joel 4:8.

<sup>735</sup>Plural according to the Qere, most Hebrew MSS and the ancient versions.

<sup>736</sup>Ms d reads חֲטָנָא, 'we sinned', more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>737</sup>Mss a b d m o w y Fr B C D J S T 12<sup>h</sup> read, both here and in the next word, a nota accusativi instead of the preposition לְ, in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>738</sup>Ms D adds כֹּל, "all our enemies".

<sup>739</sup>Ms B erroneously reads קִרְמָנָא, 'before us'.

<sup>740</sup>Mss o S T read יִרְבַּעַל, 'Jerubbaal', according to the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>741</sup>Mss f S\* T read בְּדָן, 'Bedan', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but Samson is mentioned in marginal notes in MSS f S.

The identification of Jerubbaal with Gideon is based on the Hebrew text of Judg. 6:32 and 7:1 (>16). Replacement of the name Jerubbaal clarified not only the text, but had also the advantage of losing a reference to the idol Baal.<sup>742</sup> Gideon's euphemistic name Jerubbeshet in 2 Sam. 11:21 was not replaced, but incorporated in the Aramaic version.

The identification of the unknown judge Bedan is a separate issue. Several ancient versions translate the name of a known judge instead. Only the majority of the Latin translations render the name Bedan. TgSam renders "Samson" in accordance with the exegesis of RHsh. 25a-b: "Bedan, that is Samson, and why is his name called Bedan? Because he comes from Dan" (Cf. also yRHsh. 2:9 (58b); tRHsh. 1:18; QohR. 1:4 § 4).<sup>743</sup> A similar explanation is given by Pseudo-Jerome, who states: "Ierobaal ipse est Gedeon et Bedan ipse est Sampson"<sup>744</sup> and in a marginal note in CR:

לְיִשְׁנָאן אֲחֵרִינָאן רִית שְׁמִשׁוֹן דְּאֵתִי מִן שִׁיבְט דְּדָן

*Another expression: Samson, who came from the tribe of Dan.*

LXX, however, renders "Barak".<sup>745</sup> Some exegetes argue that the rendering of LXX is based on a different *Vorlage*.<sup>746</sup> Several arguments for this assumption are given, namely, this judge is famous<sup>747</sup>, verse 9 refers to the account of Deborah and Barak by mentioning the name of their opponent Sisera, and a scribal error might be responsible for the unknown name Bedan.<sup>748</sup> In spite of all these arguments, LXX is

<sup>742</sup>The word כַּעַל in place-names was also replaced, mostly by בְּיַשְׂרָאֵל, 'valley'; cf. the Hebrew registers in *BCTP*; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 126.

<sup>743</sup>Because of this exegesis, TJon and the rabbinical quotations are indirect witnesses to the reading of the MT.

<sup>744</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 83.

<sup>745</sup>Syr renders similarly, but adds the name of Deborah to it, because Deborah is the leading person in the account in Judg. 4–5, and replaces Samuel by Samson.

<sup>746</sup>J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*, Göttingen 1871, 78; H.P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC), Edinburgh 1899 (repr. 1969), 86; H.W. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher* (ATD, 10), Göttingen 1973, 75n.1; C.J. Goslinga, *Het eerste boek Samuel* (COT), Kampen 1968, 247; R.W. Klein, *1 Samuel* (WBC 10), Waco (TX) 1983, 117; S. Dragga, "In the Shadow of Judges: the Failure of Saul", *JSOT* 38 (1987), 39-46, esp. 42; J. Day, "Bedan, Abdon or Barak in 1 Samuel XII 11?", *VT* 43 (1993), 261-63, esp. 263. Not all these authors deny the possibility that this reading was inspired by the name of Sisera in verse 9 and restored afterwards, cf. Hertzberg and Day.

<sup>747</sup>The fact that Deborah is not mentioned here, although she is the leader in Judg. 4–5, is not relevant. In the series of judges in Heb. 11:32, only Barak is mentioned. Contra Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 18-19; H. Jacobson, "Bedan and Barak Reconsidered", *VT* 44 (1994), 108-109, esp. 108.

<sup>748</sup>Note, however, that the structure of the name (Be-dan) is not without paral-

not necessarily based on a divergent reading. First, it is a well-known pattern in ancient versions that unknown persons are identified with known ones, because Scriptural texts are believed to be coherent, all details of Scripture have to be relevant.<sup>749</sup> The choice of this judge by LXX and Syr may have been inspired by the mention of Sisera in verse 9.<sup>750</sup> Secondly, the judges to which verse 9 refers do not need to be mentioned in verse 11: the man who led the battle against ‘the king of Moab’, Ehud (Judg. 3:12-30), is not mentioned there either. Therefore, a reference to verse 9 is not a valid argument.<sup>751</sup> Thirdly, it would be surprising that the well-known name Barak was replaced by a completely unknown name through scribal error.<sup>752</sup> In every respect the rendering of LXX and Syr can be compared with that of TgSam: they interpreted an unknown name, identifying it with a well-known person (>17), the first inspired by co-text, the latter by spelling. The *lectio difficilior* Bedan is most probably the source text of all ancient versions.

There are other solutions for the problem of this unknown judge, but these solutions have nothing to do with textual criticism or ancient versions. Therefore, they will only be mentioned in short. The name of Bedan may be based on an independent source which was never used by Biblical authors.<sup>753</sup> This is the only solution which does not attempt to harmonize this name with the known names in the book of Judges. Bedan may be a scribal error for Abdon, a minor judge

---

els; cf. J.C. de Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism* (BETL, 91A), Leuven 1997, 215, n. 26.

<sup>749</sup>See above, Ch. 3, *s.v.* *Onomasticon*. Cf. A. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targumic Exegesis* (TSAJ, 27), Tübingen 1992, 171; Jacobson, “Bedan and Barak Reconsidered”, 108.

<sup>750</sup>H.J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT VIII.1), Gütersloh 1973, 233, n. 11b; McCarter, *I Samuel* (AB), New York 1980, 211, n. 11; D. Barthélemy (ed.), *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament I*, Fribourg-Göttingen 1982, 173; Jacobson, “Bedan and Barak Reconsidered”, 108; A. Caquot, Ph. de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT 6), Genève 1994, 149.

<sup>751</sup>The same argument can be used against the proposal of H. Jacobson, “The Judge Bedan (1 Samuel XII 11)”, *VT* 42 (1992), 123-24, esp. 124, who assumes that Bedan is an error for Abdon (Judg. 12:13-15). Jacobson used the similarity between the two names, as well as the argument that Abdon fought against the Moabites, according to the legends in Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 61:1, thus making the link between the name ‘Bedan’ in verse 11 and ‘the king of Moab’ in verse 9.

<sup>752</sup>However, errors are not always logical, cf. J. Day, “Bedan, Abdon of Barak in 1 Samuel XII 11?”, *VT* 43 (1993) 261-63, esp. 263.

<sup>753</sup>H.J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT VIII.1), Gütersloh 1973, 233, n. 11b.

(Judg. 12:13-15): only the *Ayin* was left out.<sup>754</sup> An argument in favour of these two assumptions is that the judges to which verse 9 refers are all different from the judges in verse 11. Thus the two verses would be complementary and would mention two major and one minor judge, as well as Samuel. Furthermore, the name Bedan might be considered a variant pronunciation of the name Barak.<sup>755</sup> Finally, the judge Bedan may be identified with the judge Jephthah, because both are sons of Gilead (cf. Judg. 11:1; 1 Chron. 7:17). According to this assumption, the name of Jephthah was added as an explanation after the name of Bedan, but interpreted as a separate name by a later copyist.<sup>756</sup>

12 12 וחזיתון ארי נחש מלכא דבני עמון אחא עליכון ואמרתון לי לא<sup>757</sup> אלהין מלכא ימלוך עלנא וויי אלהכון ◊ מלככון: 12 13 וכען הא מלכא דאהרעיתון דשאילחון והא מני יי עליכון מלכא: 12 14 אם תדחלון מן קדם ◊ יי ותפלהון ◊ קדמוהי ◊ ותקבלון ◊ למימריה ◊ ולא תסרבון על מימרא ◊ דיין ותתנהון<sup>758</sup> אף<sup>759</sup> אתון ואף מלכא דימלך עליכון בחר פלחנא ◊ דיין אלהכון ◊:

12:12 *And when you saw that Nahash the king of the sons of Ammon came against you, you said to me, 'No, but a king shall reign over us,' while the LORD your God was your King. 12:13 And now, behold the king whom you have chosen, for whom you have asked; and behold, the LORD has appointed a king over you. 12:14 If you shall fear from before the LORD and worship before Him and receive his word and you shall not rebel against the speech of the LORD, then both you and the king who reigns over you shall live in worship of the LORD your God.*

Against the view of GKC § 167a, that the present verse ends in an aposiopesis, it is most probable that the Targumists assumed that the apodosis of this conditional clause starts with והיהם. If they were right, the syntax of the verse is grammatically correct. This assumption is confirmed by Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts which starts the

<sup>754</sup>H. Jacobson, "The Judge Bedan (1 Samuel XII 11)", *VT* 42 (1992), 123-24, esp. 124; but countered by Driver, *Notes*, 93 who states that this was just a minor judge.

<sup>755</sup>D.T. Tsumura, "Bedan, A Copyist's Error? (1 Samuel XII 11)" *VT* 45 (1995), 122-23, esp. 122.

<sup>756</sup>Y. Zakovitch, "בדן = יפתח", *VT* 22 (1972), 123-25, esp. 125, followed by G.J. Petter, "Bedan," in: D.N. Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 1, New York 1992, 633. This vision is supported by the fact that Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:90 only mentioned Jephthah and Gideon, cf. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 211.

<sup>757</sup>Omitted in MS D, resulting in better Aramaic.

<sup>758</sup>MS b reads ותהיון, 'you will be', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). MSS d o read ותחיון, 'you will live', another interpretation of the Hebrew text.

<sup>759</sup>MS S read the Hebraism אף twice instead of Aramaic אף.

apodosis with the verb חיה, 'live', an interpretation which is possible, both with regard to the meaning of the verb היה and with regard to the context.<sup>760</sup>

The whole verse is rephrased in a more reverential way (>23). The double *concretum pro abstracto*, "voice" and "mouth", are translated into plain terms as well (>14). Pseudo-Jerome found another solution for the "mouth of the LORD", viz. "the mouth of the prophets, who speak from the mouth of the LORD".<sup>761</sup> This idea is not present in this verse in TJon, but it does occur in 1 Sam. 15:23.

15 12 ואם לא תקבלון למימרא דיי וסריבתון<sup>762</sup> על מימרא דיי ויהי מחתא דיי בכון כמה דהות באבהתכון:

12:15 *But if you will not accept the speech of the LORD, but rebel against the speech of the LORD, then the stroke of the LORD will be on you, as it was on your fathers.*

The peculiar conclusion of the Hebrew verse has forced exegetes, either to render the conjunction ׀ as comparative, in conformity with TJon and Syr ("against you as it was against your fathers"),<sup>763</sup> or to follow the reading of the LXX, which renders "you and your king" by analogy with vss. 14 and 25.<sup>764</sup> Only Hertzberg suggests combining both readings in "against you and your king, as it was against your fathers."<sup>765</sup>

In 1976 an emendation of the texts was proposed by R. Weiss. He believes that the *Aleph* in the word ובבתיכם is the result of a copyist's error. He claims it should have been ובבתיכם, 'your houses.'<sup>766</sup> Weiss admits that there are no textual witnesses for this reading. The word

<sup>760</sup>Cf. A.D. Crown, "Aposiopesis in the O.T. and the Hebrew Conditional Oath", *Abr-Nahrain* 4 (1963-1964), 96-111, esp. 103.

<sup>761</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 84.

<sup>762</sup>Most MSS, viz. a b d f m o w y B C J P S eb1, read והסרבון, 'you will rebel', which fits into the co-text, but is not according to the Hebrew text. MSS D T omit the phrase על מימרא דיי וסריבתון by haplography.

<sup>763</sup>C.J. Goslinga, *Het eerste boek Samuël* (COT), Kampen 1968, 249; H.J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT, 8/1), Gütersloh 1973, 231; A.H. van Zijl, *1 Samuël* (POT), Vol. 1, Nijkerk 1988, 162; A. Caquot, Ph. de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT, 6), Genève 1994, 150.

<sup>764</sup>H.P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC), Edinburgh 1899 (repr. 1969), 87; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 209; R.W. Klein, *1 Samuel* (WBC, 10), Waco (TX) 1983, 117. Cf. also *BHS* app.crit. which is also referring to verse 14.

<sup>765</sup>H.W. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher* (ATD, 10), Göttingen <sup>5</sup>1973, 75, n. 2.

<sup>766</sup>R. Weiss, "La main du Seigneur sera contre vous et contre vos pères (I Samuel XII, 15)," *RB* 83 (1976), 51-54, esp. 54. He refers to similar expressions in Num. 16:32 and Deut. 11:6; cf. 1 Sam. 2:31-36.

“fathers” is attested to in all manuscripts and confirmed by several quotations and most versions.<sup>767</sup> The translation of the Targum is recognized as an interpretation of the conjunction as comparative. Even the rendering ‘king’ of LXX, as well as two manuscripts of the Vetus Latina, is not necessarily based on a divergent *Vorlage*, because of its analogy with the preceding verse.<sup>768</sup> In this respect, Weiss is very careful not to confuse reading and interpretation.

16 12 אף כען אהעחדו וחוו<sup>769</sup> ית פתגמא רבא הדין דיין עביד לעיניכו<sup>770</sup>: 12 17 הלא חצר חטין יומא דין<sup>771</sup> אצלי<sup>772</sup> קדם<sup>773</sup> יוי ויתין קלין ומטר ודעו וחוו ארי בישתכו<sup>774</sup> סניאה<sup>775</sup> דעברתון קדם<sup>776</sup> יוי למשאל לכון מלכא: 12 18 וצלי<sup>777</sup> שמואל קדם<sup>778</sup> יוי ויהב יוי קלין ומטר ביומא ההוא ודחיל כל עמא לחדא<sup>779</sup> מן קדם<sup>780</sup> יוי ומפתגמי<sup>781</sup> שמואל: 12 19 ואמרו כל עמא לשמואל צלי<sup>782</sup> על עבדך<sup>783</sup> קדם<sup>784</sup> יוי אלהך<sup>785</sup> ולא נמות ארי אוסיפנא על כל חובנא<sup>786</sup> בישא<sup>787</sup> למשאל לנא מלכא: 12 20 ואמר שמואל לעמא לא תדחלו<sup>788</sup> אתון גרמתון<sup>789</sup> ית כל בשחא הדא ברם לא חסון מבתר פלחנא<sup>790</sup> דיין<sup>791</sup> ותפלחו<sup>792</sup> קדם<sup>793</sup> יוי בכל לבכון:

12:16 Now again, stand and see this great thing, which the LORD is doing before your eyes. 12:17 Is it not wheat harvest today? I will pray before the LORD that He may send thunderclaps and rain; and know and see that your wickedness is great, which you have done before

<sup>767</sup> Yev. 63b; YalqS § 115; Rashi on this verse (“refers to digging up the dead”); Kimḥi on this verse (“kings, for the master is like a father to the people”, cf. Weiss, “La main du Seigneur”, 51.

<sup>768</sup> Weiss, “La main du Seigneur”, 52. Cf. also the commentary of Kimḥi on this verse: “kings, for the master is like a father to the people.”

<sup>769</sup> Ms d reads ותחווין, ‘and you shall see’.

<sup>770</sup> Note that TJon maintains the *pars pro toto* (against >14).

<sup>771</sup> Omitted in MS f.

<sup>772</sup> Ms d reads חוביכון, ‘your guilt, your sins’, not in conformity with the Hebrew text, but see above, Ch. 4, *s.v.* חובא. Cf. also 12:19.

<sup>773</sup> Ms d reads רבא.

<sup>774</sup> Ms d reads וקרא, ‘and he called’, which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>775</sup> Omitted in MS B\*.

<sup>776</sup> Ms f reads ית instead of קדם, which is in conformity with the Hebrew text, but against the usual reverential rendering in TJon (against >23).

<sup>777</sup> Ms f reads ויה, which is in conformity with the Hebrew text, but against the usual diversifying rendering in TJon, using different terms for God and man (against >22).

<sup>778</sup> Mss a f J T add כען, ‘now’.

<sup>779</sup> Ms o reads אלהנא, ‘our God’.

<sup>780</sup> Mss b j m o B C D J S T eb66 read the feminine שחא, ‘evil’, which is more in accordance with Aramaic grammar, cf. also 12:17, 20.

<sup>781</sup> Ms b omits the phrase לדחלוין.

<sup>782</sup> Mss a o J read עברתון, ‘you did’, more in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>783</sup> Omitted by MS D.

the LORD, in asking for yourselves a king.” 12:18 So Samuel prayed before the LORD, and the LORD gave thunderclaps and rain that day. And all the people greatly feared before the LORD and (greatly feared) the words of Samuel. 12:19 And all the people said to Samuel, “Pray on behalf of<sup>784</sup> your servants before the LORD your God, that we may not die, for we have added to all our guilt the evil to ask for ourselves a king.” 12:20 And Samuel said to the people, “Fear not; you may have brought about all this evil; even so do not turn aside from the worship of the LORD, but worship before the LORD with all your heart.

For unknown reasons TJon sometimes translates עֲשֵׂה by גָרַם (Jer. 4:18, 26:19; 44:7; Ezek. 23:30) whereas otherwise it uses עָבַד, also in renderings of Hebrew עֲשֵׂה רָעָה.<sup>785</sup> In this particular case it might be that TJon interpreted הרעה הזאת as ‘this disaster’, rain and thunderstorms being particularly unwelcome in harvest time (cf. v. 19). TJon wanted to emphasize that the people had brought this evil upon themselves in return for their own guilt (cf. v. 19). The rendering of Jer. 26:19 supports this view.

12 21 ולא תסגון מבתר פלחניה וְלֹא תִפְלַחוּן לְשִׁעוּתָא וְדַאנִין לְמָא וְלִית בְּהוּן הַנְּאִי וְלֹא מְשֻׁבְּן אַרִי לְמָא אַנִּין:

12:21 And do not turn aside from his worship and do not worship the idols, which are nothing, and which can neither profit nor deliver, for they are nothing.

TgSam solves the text-critical problem of the first כִּי by omitting it.<sup>786</sup> The Hebrew אַחֲרָי is complemented with “his worship”, in accordance with the preceding verse and a new clause is made to complement Hebrew תָּהוּ. This word is regarded as a metaphor for idols, which stand for spiritual and moral emptiness,<sup>787</sup> and it is translated both literally with לְמָא, ‘nothing’, and explanatory with שִׁעוּתָא, ‘idol’.<sup>788</sup> Similar expressions occur in TJon 2 Kgs 17:15 and Jer. 2:5.

12 22 אַרִי לֹא יִרְחִיק יְיָ יְת עֲמִיה בְּדִיל שְׁמִיה רַבָּא אַרִי רְעוּא קְדָם וְיִי לְמַעַבְד יַחְכוּן קְדֻמוּהִי לְעָם:

12:22 For the LORD will not reject his people, for his great name’s sake,

<sup>784</sup>This is the usual rendering of בְּעַד with the sense of “on behalf of”, cf. B. Grossfeld, *Targum Neofiti 1: An Exegetical Commentary to Genesis Including Full Rabbinic Parallels*, New York 2000, 191. Likewise Syr.

<sup>785</sup>TJon Judg. 9:56; 11:27; 15:3; 1 Sam. 6:9; 12:20; 2 Sam. 3:39; 12:18; 13:16; 1 Kgs 16:7; Jer. 2:13; 3:5; 18:10, etc.

<sup>786</sup>As do all ancient versions and even 2 Hebrew MSS.

<sup>787</sup>Inspired by Isa. 41:29 and 44:9. Cf. Driver, *Notes*, 95.

<sup>788</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 19.

*because it has been the will before the LORD to make you a people for himself.*

TgSam makes the Hebrew wording more pregnant by rendering the verb רחק, 'reject'. The same rendering is used to describe the rejection of King Saul (cf. 15:26) and in Solomon's blessing after the dedication of the Temple (1 Kgs 8:57). LXX makes the same shift here (cf. also Rom. 11:1).

12 23 אף אנא חס לי מלמחטי קדם יוי מלאחמנעא לצלאה־ עליכון ואליף  
 יתכון אורחא<sup>789</sup> דתהכון באורח תקניא<sup>790</sup> וכשרא: 12 24 ברם דחלו מן קדם יוי  
 ופלחו<sup>791</sup> קדמוהי<sup>791</sup> בקשוט בכל לבכון ארי חוו יח דאסני למעבר עמכון: 12 25  
 ואם אבאשא תבאשון עובדיכון<sup>792</sup> אף אתון אף מלככון תשתיצון:

*12:23 As for me, far be it from me that I should sin before the LORD and cease to pray concerning you. But I will teach you the way, that you may be in the right and the proper way. 12:24 Only fear before the LORD, and worship him faithfully with all your heart. For consider what great things He has done with you. 12:25 But if you really do wicked deeds, both you and your king shall be destroyed.*

#### 5.14 Saul and Jonathan (1 Samuel 13–14)

13 1 כבר שנא דלית ביה חובין שאיל כד מלך וזרחין שנין מלך על ישראל:  
 13:1 *As<sup>793</sup> a one year old child, in whom there is no guilt, was Saul, when he became king; and he reigned two years over Israel.*

In the Hebrew text King Saul is introduced with the words בן־שנה שאיל במלכו, which should be rendered, by analogy with similar phrases in the books of Samuel and Kings, with "And Saul was [one] year old when he began to reign . . ." The verse continues with the words ושחי ישראל. The verse continues with the words " . . . and he reigned two years over Israel." TgSam considered the first clause impossible and made it into a metaphor (>25), in accordance with the explanation of R. Huna (Yom. 22b): "Like an infant of one year, who had not tasted the taste of sin."<sup>794</sup> This interpretation is easily recognized as an indirect wit-

<sup>789</sup>Omitted in MSS a b d m o y B C D J S T eb66.

<sup>790</sup>Ms p erroneously reads the plural, whereas all other MSS read the singular.

<sup>791</sup>MSS a b d m o y Fr D J T read ותפלחון, "and you shall worship".

<sup>792</sup>Omitted by MSS w y, in conformity with the Hebrew text. This word is also superfluous in Aramaic.

<sup>793</sup>Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 124 overlooked the preposition and therefore supposed that TJon has the same impossible reading as the MT.

<sup>794</sup>Confirmed by yBik. 3:3 (65d); cf. also PesR. 48:3; MShem. 17:95 and Symmachus' version. But cf. Zev. 118b, where it is said that Saul reigns 1 year together with Samuel and two years after Samuel's death. Similarly Taan. 5b.



ness to the reading of the MT.<sup>795</sup> Pseudo-Jerome suggested a similar solution, *viz.* that Saul was as innocent as a one year old child, when he began to reign.<sup>796</sup>

The association between “one year old” and “innocent” is explained in PesR. 48:3. The words “one year old” are connected with the one year old lambs that were to be used for the daily offerings in the morning and the evening (Num. 28:3). It was on account of these offerings that God forgave sins, so that to Him the people became like an infant in its first year of life, an infant without sin.

Other ancient versions or references that render other figures are to be considered as interpretations too, the more so as these proposals have different figures. Some LXX manuscripts give 30 years for the age of Saul, when he became king. Most LXX manuscripts, however, omit this verse, as does Josephus. However, Josephus fixes the lifetime of Saul’s reign at 20 years in one place (*Antiquities* 10:143) and at 40 years elsewhere (*Antiquities* 6:378, cf. Acts 13:21).<sup>797</sup> Both Theophilus of Antioch<sup>798</sup> and Clement of Alexandria<sup>799</sup> follow the first figure of Josephus and fix the lifetime of Saul’s reign at 20 years. Finally, Eusebius<sup>800</sup> mentions that Eupolemus gave the figure 21 for the lifetime of Saul’s reign.

It has even been assumed that the figures 30, for Saul’s age, and 40, for the years of his reign, are cabbalistic references to the figures 1 and 2 in the Hebrew text. Using the system of ‘Albam’, the reader may identify the *Aleph* (= 1) with the *Lamed* (= 30) and the *Beth* (= 2) with the *Mem* (= 40).<sup>801</sup> If this were true, even the figures 30 and 40 would be based on the same Hebrew text, but it is doubtful that the Hebrew letters were already used as numbers in Biblical times.<sup>802</sup>

<sup>795</sup>Similar in the translation of Symmachus, cf. D. Barthélemy (ed.), *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament* Vol. 1, Fribourg & Göttingen 1982, 175.

<sup>796</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 84, although he adopts the Christian theory that Ishboshet was born in the year Saul began to reign, cf. *Quaestiones*, 104.

<sup>797</sup>Divided into 18 years during Samuel’s lifetime (cf. also *Antiquities* 6:294) and 22 years after Samuel’s death, although the figure 22 is transmitted as 2 in the Latin version, in agreement with *Antiquities* 10:143

<sup>798</sup>*Ad Autolyicum*, 3:25 (PG 6, 1158).

<sup>799</sup>*Stromata* 1:21 (PG 8, 838).

<sup>800</sup>Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 9:30 (PG 21, 747), referring to Eupolemus’ work on the lifetimes of Elijah.

<sup>801</sup>P. van Grinsven, “Filius unius anni erat Saul, cum regnare coepisset; duobus autem annis regnavit super Israel (1 Sam. 13,1),” *Bib.* 7 (1926), 193-203, esp. 200.

<sup>802</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 19; J. Renz, W. Röllig, *Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik*, Bd. 2/1: Zusammenfassende Erörterungen, Paläographie und Glossar, Darmstadt 1995, 48-51.

Another interpretation, which is also based on the figures of MT, is found in Syr, which reconstructs the whole verse into ܰܕܰܘܰܠ ܰܛܰܘܰܐ ܰܚܰܝܰܘܰܝܰܘܰܐ ܰܬܰܘܰܠܰܘܰܐ ܰܕܰܘܰܠ ܰܛܰܘܰܐ ܰܚܰܝܰܘܰܝܰܘܰܐ ܰܬܰܘܰܠܰܘܰܐ ܰܕܰܘܰܠ ܰܛܰܘܰܐ ܰܚܰܝܰܘܰܝܰܘܰܐ ܰܬܰܘܰܠܰܘܰܐ ܰܕܰܘܰܠ ܰܛܰܘܰܐ ܰܚܰܝܰܘܰܝܰܘܰܐ <sup>803</sup> This can be translated with “In a year or two, when Saul began his reign over Israel . . .”<sup>804</sup> or, more literally and in accordance with Zev. 118b, “During [the time that] Saul reigned one [together with Samuel] and two years [after Samuel’s death] in his reign over Israel . . .”

Being left without any basis for a textual emendation, most exegeses assume that neither Saul’s age nor the length of his reign was indicated anywhere in the text. The verse might be added by analogy with all other summaries of a king’s reign, e.g., in 2 Sam. 2:10 for Ishbosheth and in 2 Sam. 5:4-5 for David.<sup>805</sup>

In 1981 a completely different proposal was given by R. Althann. He believed 13:1 to be a poetic verse, having two parallel cola. The word ܰܚܰܝܰܘܰܝܰܘܰܐ is explained as an alternative for the preposition ܰܕܰܘܰܠ. Therefore, Althann renders:<sup>806</sup>

More than a year had Saul been reigning,  
even two years had he been reigning over Israel . . .

Poetic lines found in a prose story are not unique,<sup>807</sup> but the fact that this verse runs completely parallel to all other summaries of a king’s

<sup>803</sup> According to P.A.H. de Boer (ed.) *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version* Vol. 2/2: Samuel, Leiden 1978, in contrast to BHS, app.crit. note 1b (also edited by P.A.H. de Boer), which assumes that Syr is rendering “21” in the first half and omits the “2 years” in the second half of the verse.

<sup>804</sup> So C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL, 11), Leiden 2001, 21; cf. also D. Barthélemy (ed.), *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament* Vol. 1, Fribourg & Göttingen 1982, 176; A. Caquot, Ph. de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT, 6), Genève 1994, 157, n. 1a.

<sup>805</sup> J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*, Göttingen 1871, 80; H.J. Schoeps, “Symmachusstudien III,” *Bib.* 29 (1948), 31-51, esp. 35; H.W. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher* (ATD, 10), Göttingen <sup>5</sup>1973, 80; C.J. Goslinga, *Het eerste boek Samuël* (COT), Kampen 1968, 254; H.J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT, 8/1), Gütersloh 1973, 242, n. 1a; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 223; R.W. Klein, *I Samuel* (WBC, 10), Waco (TX) 1983, 122, n. 1a; A.H. van Zijl, *I Samuël* (POT), Vol. 1, Nijkerk 1988, 166; A. Caquot, Ph. de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT 6), Genève 1994, 157, n. 1a.

<sup>806</sup> R. Althann, “1 Sam 13,1: A Poetic Couplet,” *Bib.* 62 (1981), 241-46, esp. 244.

<sup>807</sup> Cf. J.P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel* 4 Vols., Assen 1981-1993; J.C. de Moor, W.G.E. Watson, *Verses in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT, 42), Kevelaer & Neukirchen-Vluyn 1993. Contra A.H. van Zijl, *I Samuël*, (POT), Vol. 1, Nijkerk 1988, 166. Althann’s argument would have been stronger if 13:2 had been included. Then the word play with the figures would have been “one, two, three, two, one, and the rest”. The introduction to chapter 13 would then have been a bicolon (verse 1) and a quadricolon (verse 2) with the ABBA-pattern.

lifetime, albeit without numbers, makes this rendering improbable, but not impossible. Althann's suggestion resembles Syr with regard to its contents. It resembles the version of Pseudo-Jerome with regard to its nature, *viz.* no summary of Saul's reign, but an indication of the time of 1 Sam. 13.<sup>808</sup>

13 2 ובחר ליה שאול תלתה אלפין מישראל והוו עם שאול תרין אלפין במכמש ובטור ביתאל ואלפא הוו עם יונתן בנגבעתא דבית<sup>809</sup> דבית<sup>809</sup> בנימין ושאר עמא שלח גבר לקרוהי<sup>810</sup>: 13 3 ומחא יונתן ית אסטרטיג דפלתאי דבנגבעתא ושמעו פלשתאי ושאל תקע בשופרא בכל ארעא למימר ישמעון יהודאי:

*13:2 And Saul chose three thousand of Israel—two thousand were with Saul in Michmas and the hill country of Bethel, and a thousand with Jonathan in The Hill of the House of Benjamin—and the rest of the people he sent away, each man to his own city. 13:3 And Jonathan slew the praetor of the Philistines, who was in The Hill, and the Philistines heard of it. And Saul blew the trumpet throughout all the land, saying, “Let the Jews hear.”*

The use of the Greek word אסטרטיג, which also referred to the Roman praetor in Palestine, gives this chapter a political flavour. The message of a praetor's defeat, which was spread throughout the land, must have come across as rebellious but good news in Roman days. The choice of the word “challenge” (13:4) and the word מצרתא, “stronghold, Massada” (13:6; otherwise only used in 1 Sam. 22–24) is also significant.

The Hebrew geographical name Geba is represented by גבעתא, ‘The Hill’, because this is mentioned as the place where the Philistine praetor lived in 10:5.

13 4 וכל ישראל שמעו למימר מחא שאול ית אסטרטיג דפלתאי ואף אתגרי ישראל בפלשתאי ואחכנישו עמא בתר שאול לגלגלא:

*13:4 And all Israel heard it said that Saul had slain the praetor of the Philistines, and also that Israel had attacked the Philistines. And the people were gathered after Saul in Gilgal.*

The Hebrew verb באש is interpreted as “to attack, to be passionate against” by TJon. The basic meaning of the Hebrew verb is “to smell

<sup>808</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 84: “Sic enim erat innocens quando regnare coepit sicut filius unius anni est, et in eadem innocentia duobus regnasse annis dicitur.”

<sup>809</sup>Omitted by MS o, which reads רבנימן, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>810</sup>MS a reads למשרייה, ‘to his tents’, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but in contradiction to the usual, modernizing trend of TJon (>19).

bad". The Niphal would mean "to become a bad smell, to become detested", and it may have become a technical term for a political challenge.<sup>811</sup> If so, the Philistines were challenged by the Israelites with respect to their government over the land. This view is shared by Syr ("And Israel was strong against the Philistines") and Vg ("And Israel rose against the Philistines").<sup>812</sup>

5 ופלשתאי אחכנישו לאנחא קרבא עם ישראל חלתין אלפין רתכין ושחא אלפין  
6 פרשין ועמא כחלא דעל כיה ימא לסני וסליקו ושרו במכמש מדנה בית און: 13  
7 ואנש ישראל חזו ארי עקת להון ארי אדחיק עמא ואטמרו עמא במערתא ובמצרתא  
8 ובשקיפי כיפאי<sup>813</sup> ובמערת טנריא ובגוביא:

*13:5 And the Philistines gathered together to wage war with Israel: thirty thousand chariots and six thousand horsemen and people like the sand on the seashore in multitude. They came up and encamped in Michmas, to the east of Beth-aven. 13:6 When the men of Israel saw that they were in distress, because the people were pressed, the people hid themselves in caves and in strongholds and in clefts of rocks and in caves of flints and in pits.*

Hebrew צרהים is interpreted as "caves of flints", because neither an arched room in a sanctuary nor a sepulchral vault is an appropriate hiding-place within this co-text.

7 ויהודאי עברו יה ירדנא לארע גר וגלעד ושואל עד כען בגלגלא וכל עמא  
8 אתכנישו בתרוהו: 13 8 ואוריך שבעה יומין לזמנא דאמר<sup>814</sup> שמואל ולא אחא שמואל  
9 לגלגלא ואחברד עמא מעלוהו:

*13:7 And the Jews crossed the Jordan to the land of Gad and Gilead. Saul was in Gilgal until then and all the people had gathered together after him. 13:8 He had waited seven days for the time that Samuel had said, but Samuel had not come to Gilgal and the people were scattering from him.*

TJon adds a verb in the subordinate clause אשר שמואל, because the verb is absent. Some Hebrew MSS, LXX and two MSS of the Vetus Latina have also added the same verb "to say", Hebrew אמר, which could have been omitted by haplography after the similar אשר.<sup>815</sup> However, some other Hebrew MSS read שם, 'fixed', which could easily have

<sup>811</sup>M. Tsevat, "Marriage and Monarchial Legitimacy in Ugarit and Israel", *JJS* 3 (1958), 237-43, esp. 242-43.

<sup>812</sup>Cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 85, who explains that Israel began to act bravely.

<sup>813</sup>Cf. TJon 1 Sam. 24:3.

<sup>814</sup>Ms b and Kimḥi add ליה, 'to him'.

<sup>815</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 100; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 226.

been omitted by haplography as well, since the following word begins with a *Shin* and a *Mem*.<sup>816</sup> Syr translated literally.

13 9 ואמר שאול קריבו לוחי עלהא ונכסתה קדשיא ואסיק עלתא: 13 10 והוה כשיצויה<sup>817</sup> לאסקא עלתא והא שמואל אתא ונפק שאול לקדמותיה למשאל בשלמיה:

*13:9 So Saul said, "Bring the burnt offering and the holy slaughterings near to me." And he sacrificed the burnt offering. 13:10 As soon as he had finished sacrificing the burnt offering, behold, Samuel came. And Saul went out to meet him and to inquire after his health.*

The Hebrew statement that Saul came out to bless Samuel is interpreted as an idiomatic expression for greeting.<sup>818</sup> TJon rendered that Saul inquired after Samuel's welfare, making a beautiful word play on their names.

13 11 ואמר שמואל מא עברתא ואמר שאול ארי חזיתי ארי אתבדר עמא מעלוי ואח לא אחיתא לזמן יומיא ופלשתאי אתכנישו למכמש: 13 12 ואמרית כען דלמא<sup>819</sup> ייחזון פלשתאי לוחי לגלגלא וקרם יי לא צליתיה ואתחסיניה ואסיקת עלתא: 13 13 ואמר שמואל לשאול שפישתא לא נשרתא ית תפקידת מימרא דיי אלהך דפקך ארי כען אתקין יי ית מלכותך על<sup>820</sup> ישראל עד עלמא: 13 14 וכען מלכותך לא תתקיים אתקין יי קדמוהי נבר עביד רעותיה ופקדיה יי למהוי מלכא על עמיה ארי לא נשרתא ית דפקך יי:

*13:11 Samuel said, "What have you done?" And Saul said, "Because I saw that the people were scattering from me, and that you did not come within the days appointed, and that the Philistines had gathered together at Michmas, 13:12 I said, 'Now the Philistines may come down upon me at Gilgal, and I have not prayed before the LORD.' So I forced myself and sacrificed the burnt offering." 13:13 And Samuel said to Saul, "You have done foolishly; you have not kept the commandment of the speech of the LORD your God, which He commanded you. For now the LORD would have established your kingdom over Israel for ever. 13:14 But now your kingdom shall not established. The LORD has established before Himself a man doing his will. And the LORD has commanded him to be king over his people, because you have not kept what the LORD commanded you."*

In many respects TJon adapted this verse to its own theological view. God did not have to search for a new king, but appointed one straight-

<sup>816</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 100; Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 20; following Rashi.

<sup>817</sup>Mss Fr eb66 read כד שיצי, a simpler grammatical construction.

<sup>818</sup>The same interpretation is given in 2 Kgs 4:29; 10:15.

<sup>819</sup>Unique for MS p. Perhaps MS p did not want Saul to utter a false prophecy (>23), cf. also David in 1 Sam. 24:12.

<sup>820</sup>So also in various Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

away (>24). The term “after his own heart” is explained as “doing his will” (>14). Note that these two adaptations are also found in Acts 13:22, where Paul says that God “found” in David the new king, and that David was “a man after my own heart”—which is the Hebrew version—“who will do all my will”—which is the Aramaic version of this phrase.<sup>821</sup>

15 13 וקם שמואל וסליק מן גלגל לנגבעתא דבית בנימין ומנא שאול ית עמא דאשתכחו עמיה כשית מאה גברא: 16 13 ושאל ויונתן בריה ועמא דאשתכח<sup>823</sup> עמהון יתבין בנגבעתא דבית בנימין ופלתא שר<sup>824</sup> במכס: 17 13 ונפק מחבלא ממשרת פלשתא תלת משרין חדא מתפניא לאורח עפרה לארע<sup>825</sup> דרומא<sup>826</sup>:

*13:15 And Samuel arose and went up from Gilgal to The Hill of the House of Benjamin. And Saul numbered the people who were found with him: about six hundred men. 13:16 And Saul, and Jonathan his son, and the people who were found with them, stayed in The Hill of the House of Benjamin, but the Philistines encamped in Michmas. 13:17 And the destroyer came out of the camp of the Philistines in three armies: one army turned toward Ophrah to the land of the South;*

Like Shalishah in 9:4, Shual is identified with “the South”, the usual rendering of the Judean Negev.<sup>827</sup> This is the most frequently occurring generalization of geographical names in TJon (>7).<sup>828</sup> Moreover, it solves the problem that one Philistine raiding company is heading toward Ophrah in the North,<sup>829</sup> while Saul and the Israelites are encamped in Gilgal and Gibeah in the South of Michmas.

18 13 ומשריתא חדא מתפניא לאורח בית חורון ומשריתא חדא מתפניא לאורח תחומא דמסככי לחלה אפעיא למדברא: 19 13 ואומן עביד זין לא משתכח בכל תחום<sup>830</sup>

<sup>821</sup>In Greek ὁς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ φελημάτα. Cf. M. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, Oxford 1965, 21-24, 52, 54.

<sup>822</sup>Omitted by MSS a b, which read דבנימין, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>823</sup>MSS w y read the plural דאשתכחו in a *constructio ad sensum*, but also some Hebrew MSS read the plural.

<sup>824</sup>MS Fr reads למכס, ‘were gathered at Michmas’, cf. 13:11 (>15).

<sup>825</sup>MSS w y omit לארע עפרה, probably by haplography.

<sup>826</sup>MS Fr reads שועל, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>827</sup>Cf. *BCTP*, s.v. נגב - דרומא.

<sup>828</sup>R.P. Gordon, “*Terra Sancta* and the Territorial Doctrine of the Targum to the Prophets”, in: J.A. Emerton, S.C. Reif (eds), *Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of E.I.J. Rosenthal*, Cambridge 1982, 119-31, esp. 127.

<sup>829</sup>Cf. Y. Aharoni, M. Avi-Yonah, *The MacMillan Bible Atlas*, New York & London, 1968, 60.

<sup>830</sup>Omitted in MS a, as in several Hebrew MSS. Other Hebrew MSS read גבול instead of ארץ. TgSam combines the two readings.

20 13 ארעא דישראל ארי אמרו<sup>831</sup> פלשתאי דלמא יעבדון יהודאי<sup>832</sup> סיפין או רמחין: 13 ונחתו כל ישראל לארע<sup>832</sup> פלשתאי לחרפא גבר ית פרשיה וית סכת פדניה וית כלביה וית עשפיה:

*13:18 another army turned toward Beth-horon, and another army turned toward the border that looks down on the Valley of the Hyenas<sup>833</sup>, on the wilderness. 13:19 There was no craftsman, making equipment, to be found throughout all the territory of the Land of Israel, for the Philistines had said, "Lest the Jews make themselves swords or spears". 13:20 But all Israel went down to the land of the Philistines, each man to sharpen his goad and the ploughshare<sup>834</sup> of his yoke and his axe and his chisel.*

Whether TJon was acquainted with the exact meaning of the Hebrew utensils, is questionable. In any case, TJon translates four agricultural utensils with four agricultural utensils. The double Hebrew *בחרשתו*, only occurring in this verse and usually seen as a word for plough or ploughshare, is diversified (>18), once equated with "goad", once with "chisel". Aramaic *עשפא*, 'chisel', is described as a double-edged utensil in mKel. 13:3: one side was a chisel, the other side an axe.<sup>835</sup> Hebrew *קרדם*, from unknown origin, is rendered by an Akkadian loan-word *כולבא*, 'axe'.<sup>836</sup>

21 13 והוי להון שופינא לחרפא ביה פנמת כל מן דברזול לעשפיא ולסכת פדניא ולמצלת קצריא דלה תלת שנין ולכלביא ולאנצא זקה:

*13:21 And they had the file to sharpen on it the dullness of every iron utensil—for the chisels and for the pin of the yokes and for the fork of the fullers, which had three teeth, and for axes—and to point the goad.*

The Hebrew text of this verse is explained as a further description of the Philistines' monopoly of working on iron. Hebrew *הפצירה פים*, nowadays regarded as the price for the sharpening of the mentioned in-

<sup>831</sup>Plural, as in the Qere. Most Hebrew MSS, as well as the ancient versions, read the plural.

<sup>832</sup>So also LXX, cf. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 234.

<sup>833</sup>Syr also translates the name of the valley.

<sup>834</sup>Literally: the pin. But in many instances this pin appeared to refer to the ploughshare, cf. Levy, *WTM*, s.v. סכא.

<sup>835</sup>Cf. Ned. 62a where the word is used as something "to dig with".

<sup>836</sup>Cf. S.A. Kaufman, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* (AS, 19), Chicago 1974, 61.

struments,<sup>837</sup> is derived from (1) פָּצַר, 'press, force',<sup>838</sup> and hence translated by שְׁפִינָא, 'file' (the instrument which is pressing the iron),<sup>839</sup> and (2) פֶּה, 'mouth' (the effective part of an instrument), and hence translated by פִּנְמָא, 'dullness', because the "mouths" of instruments are only sharpened when dull.

Three utensils of this verse are also mentioned in the preceding verse. TJon gives an identical translation. Hebrew שלש קלשון is unique in this verse. TJon renders "three teeth", like LXX, and gives the explanation of a fuller's fork with three teeth. A fuller had the job of fulling fabrics, in order to wash them and to felt them, which makes them thicker and stronger. Since the fulling was carried out in a fulling-trough with corrosive and scouring means, sometimes even by boiling the fabrics,<sup>840</sup> the fuller had to use a fork to place the fabrics in the trough and and to remove them from it, in order to spare his hands.

A second addition in the Hebrew verse is דרבן, 'goad'. In Hebrew this goad is established (נצב), which is also the case in the rendering of MS b and the second edition of Kimḥi (>29). Most manuscripts add that this goad must be pointed (אניץ). The Leiria edition and the first edition of Kimḥi read "compress" (אפיץ), probably an error.

22 13 והוי ביומא דקרבא ולא משתכחא חרבא ומורניהא בידא דכל עמא דעם שאול ועם יונתן ואשתכחא<sup>841</sup> לשאול וליונתן בריה: 23 13 ונפק אסטרטיג פלשחאי למגוזת מכמס: 1 14 והוה יומא ואמר יונתן בר שאול לעולימא נפיל זיניה איתא<sup>842</sup> ונעבר לאסטרטיג פלשחאי דמעברא דיכי ולאבוהי לא חוי: 2 14 ושאול יתיב בסיפי גבעתא פשולי רמון דכמגרון ועמא דעמיה כשית מאה גברא: 3 14 ואחיה בר אחיטוב אחוהי דאיכבוד בר פינחס בר עלי כהין משמיש קדם יוי בשילו לביש איפודא ועמא לא ידעו<sup>843</sup> ארי אול יונתן: 4 14 ובין מגוזת דבעא יונתן למעבר לאסטרטיג<sup>844</sup> פלשחאי שינא דכיפא מעברא מכא ושנא דכיפא מעברא מכא שום חדא משרועיחא ושום חדא<sup>845</sup> מדרוכיתא:

<sup>837</sup> HALAT<sup>3</sup>, s. vv. For פָּצַר, cf. J. A. Bewer, "Notes on 1 Sam 13 21; 2 Sam 23 1; Psalm 48 8", *JBL* 61 (1942), 45-50; G. R. Driver, "On the Hebr. פָּצַר (I Samuel XIII 21)", *AfO* 15 (1945-51), 68.

<sup>838</sup> It might also have been connected with בצר, 'omit, take away', as is done in 1 Sam. 15:23 (>1).

<sup>839</sup> It is used to file off the stamp of a coin in BQ 98a.

<sup>840</sup> R. J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*, Vol. 4, Leiden 1956, 83.

<sup>841</sup> MSS m o w y Fr eb66 read the participle ומשתכחא, as the preceding verb (>15).

<sup>842</sup> Cf. 1 Sam. 9:9 for a similar construction.

<sup>843</sup> Only in MSS p eb1. MSS a b d m o p y Fr read the singular, in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>844</sup> The preposition ל־ occurs only in MSS p eb1. MSS a b d m o w y Fr render על, as in the Hebrew text.

<sup>845</sup> Ms eb1 reads תנינא, 'second'.



13:22 So on the day of the battle there was neither sword nor spear found in the hand of any of the people who were with Saul and with Jonathan, but for Saul and Jonathan his son they were found. 13:23 And the praetor of the Philistines went out to the pass of Michmas. 14:1 One day Jonathan the son of Saul said to his young man who bore his armour, "Come, let us cross over to the praetor of the Philistines on yonder side." But he did not tell his father. 14:2 And Saul was staying in the outskirts of The Hill, under the pomegranate tree which is at Migron; and the people who were with him were about six hundred men. 14:3 And Ahijah the son of Ahitub, Ichabod's brother, son of Phinehas, son of Eli, the priest serving before the LORD at Shiloh, was wearing the ephod. And the people did not know that Jonathan had gone. 14:4 And between the passes, by which Jonathan sought to cross over to the praetor of the Philistines, there was a rocky crag on the one side and a rocky crag on the other side; the name of the one was Mashro'itha and the name of the other was Madrokhitha.

The two crags are given new names in Aramaic. Whereas Vogel denies every etymological connection between the Hebrew and the Aramaic names,<sup>846</sup> Komlosch sees the following derivation. *Mashro'itha*, meaning "a slippery place" (cf. also TgJer. 23:12), was chosen because the Hebrew root בץ means "a swampy place". *Madrokhitha*, meaning "a place which can be trodden", was chosen because the Hebrew *Seneh* is linked with the Aramaic word for "sandals", i.e. מסאנא.<sup>847</sup>

6 14 5 שנא חדא מסחכיא מצפונא לקביל מכמס וחדא מדרומא לקביל גבעתא : 14  
 ואמר יהונתן לעולימא נשיל זיניה איתא ונעבר לאסטרשינג ערליא האלין מא אם  
 יעביד יי לנא נסא ארי לית קדם יי מעצור<sup>848</sup> למפרק בסניא או בזעירי:

14:5 The one crag looked out from<sup>849</sup> the north, in front of Michmas, and the other from the south, in front of The Hill. 14:6 And Jonathan said to the young man who bore his armour, "Come, let us cross over to the praetor of these uncircumcised; it may be that the LORD will do a miracle for us, for nothing can be an obstacle before Him to save by many or by few."

TJon added an object to the verb יעשה, although it was not strictly necessary. The pregnant sense of the verb, 'act', was known and also

<sup>846</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 20.

<sup>847</sup>Komlosch, *המקרא באור התרגום*, 321, followed by Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 125 and Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 126, n. 2-3; cf. also Levy, *CWT*, s.vv.

<sup>848</sup>Ms d reads מעכב, 'abstain, refrain'.

<sup>849</sup>Or in English idiom, from a different point of view: on. Cf. Driver, *Notes*, 106.

used in the Aramaic version, e.g. in 1 Kgs 8:32 and Jer. 14:7.<sup>850</sup> Syr read יושיע, 'he saved', which might originate in 14:45.

7 14 ואמר ליה נשיל זיניה עביד כל דבלבך אחפני לך הא אנא עמך כרעותך.<sup>851</sup>  
 8 14 ואמר יהונתן הא אנחנא עברין לוח גבריא ונתגלי להון: 9 14 אם כדן יימרין.<sup>852</sup>  
 לנא אוריכו.<sup>853</sup> עד דנתמשי.<sup>854</sup> לוחתכון ונקום באחרנא ולא נסק לוחתון: 10 14 ואם  
 כדן יימרון סקו עלנא.<sup>855</sup> ונסק ארי מסרנן יוי בידנא ודין לנא אחא: 11 14 ואתגליאו  
 חרויהון לאסטרשינן פלשתאי ואמרו פלשתאי הא יהודאי נפקין מן חוריא דאמרו  
 חמן: 12 14 ואחיבו אנשי משרתא ית יונתן וית נשיל זיניה ואמרו סקו עלנא ונהודע  
 יתכון פחגמא ואמר יונתן לנשיל זיניה סק בתרי ארי מסרנן יוי בידא דישראל: 13 14  
 וסליק.<sup>856</sup> יונתן על ידוהי ועל רגלוהי ונשיל זיניה בתרוהי ונפלו מטענין.<sup>857</sup> קדם  
 יונתן ונשיל זיניה ממתית בתרוהי: 14 14 והות מחתא קרמיתא דמחא יונתן ונשיל זיניה  
 כעסרין גברא בבית.<sup>858</sup> פלגות מהלך פדן חוריא.<sup>859</sup> בחקלא.<sup>860</sup>

14:7 And his armour-bearer said to him, "Do all that is in your heart. Direct yourself, behold I am with you, as you wish." 14:8 Then said Jehonathan, "Behold, we will cross over to the men, and we will show ourselves to them. 14:9 If they say to us, 'Wait until we reach you,' then we will stand still in our place, and we will not go up to them. 14:10 But if they say, 'Come up to us,' then we will go up; for the LORD has handed them over into our hand. And this will be the sign to us." 14:11 So both of them showed themselves to the praetor of the Philistines; and the Philistines said, "Look, Jews are coming out of the holes where they have hid themselves." 14:12 And the men of the guard answered Jonathan and his armour-bearer, and said, "Come up against us, and we will let you know something." And Jonathan said to his armour-bearer, "Come up after me; for the LORD has handed

<sup>850</sup>Cf. Driver, *Notes*, 107. Against Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 33, who assumed that TJon had a different *Vorlage*.

<sup>851</sup>Ms a reads כלבך, 'according to your heart', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). The other MSS vary the rendering of the repeated "according to your heart" (>18).

<sup>852</sup>Ms eb1 erroneously adds וסלק עלנא וסלק סקו.

<sup>853</sup>Ms o reads אחעכבו, 'abstain'.

<sup>854</sup>Ms o reads מקריבנא, 'until we approach', which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>855</sup>Ms o reads לחנא, 'to us', which is in conformity with many Hebrew MSS (>29). Ms a adds וניקום from the previous verse.

<sup>856</sup>Ms eb1 reads the Hebraism ועל.

<sup>857</sup>Kimḥi reads כד טענין חרבא. The verbal form טענין is either meant as a non-existent Peal passive participle of טען, meaning "when they were stabbed by the sword", or as a perfect form with a suffix, i.e. טעינון, meaning "when the sword transfixed them". Komlosch, *באור התרגום*, 327 gave the first suggestion.

<sup>858</sup>MSS a b m w y Fr read כבית חוריא, in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>859</sup>This addition is also attested in some Hebrew MSS and Vg.

<sup>860</sup>Also Syr renders "in the field".

them over into the hand of Israel." 14:13 Then Jonathan went up on his hands and feet, and his armour-bearer after him. And they fell stabbed before Jonathan, and his armour-bearer despatched them after him. 14:14 And that first stroke, which Jonathan and his armour-bearer struck, was of about twenty men in the space of half the walk of a yoke of oxen in the field.

The cryptic conclusion of the Hebrew verse is complemented and turned into an indication of how far Jonathan and his armour-bearer went during the first fight: the dead bodies of the Philistines were lying on an area that agrees with half the walk of a yoke of oxen.<sup>861</sup> The phrase became an excellent comparison: the two warriors went through the Philistine company as a yoke of oxen ploughing through a field.

15 14 והוה זיעא במשריתא בחקלא ובכל עמא אסטרטיגיא<sup>862</sup> ומחבלא זעו אף אנון<sup>862</sup>  
וועת ארעא והוה לזיע מן קדם יי<sup>862</sup>:

14:15 And they quaked [with fear]<sup>863</sup> in the camp, in the field and among all the people. Even the praetors and the destroyer quaked. And the earth quaked. Yes, it became a quake from before the LORD.

The conclusion of the Hebrew verse most probably was intended as a superlative: "an awesome convulsion".<sup>864</sup> However, the choice of the word אלהים had not been casual. An earthquake was often regarded as a direct interfering of God, and certainly in this account, since Jonathan had assumed that God would help him (14:10).<sup>865</sup> TJon considered this meaning and rendered the usual "from before the LORD" (cf. also Jon. 3:3, "a great city from before the LORD"), although the Aramaic phrasing also betrays awareness of the superlative connotation.<sup>866</sup>

<sup>861</sup>Also HALAT<sup>3</sup> assumes that the Hebrew צמר was used as a measure: "eine Fläche Landes, die ein Ochsespann an 1 Tag umzupflügen vermag".

<sup>862</sup>MSS w y omit the phrase אנון אף זעו.

<sup>863</sup>Literally: there was a trembling.

<sup>864</sup>Cf. D. Winton Thomas, "A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew", VT 3 (1953), 209-24, esp. 210; followed by McCarter, *I Samuel*, 240 and RSV.

<sup>865</sup>C.J. Goslinga, *Het eerste boek Samuël* (COT), Kampen 1968, 272; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 240.

<sup>866</sup>Winton Thomas, "A Consideration", 210 mentions only one example, in which the Targum regarded this usage of a divine name as intensifying, or as a superlative, namely TgPs. 36:7; but see below, commentary on 26:12; further Zech. 14:13 where Hebrew מורמת יהוה רבה became "a great deathly panic from before the LORD"; cf. P.A.H. de Boer, "יהוה" as Ephithet Expressing the Superlative", VT 24 (1974), 233-35.

16 14 וחזו סכואיא לשאול בנבעתא דבית בנמינ והא המון משרית פלשתאי  
אתבר<sup>867</sup> אזיל חבריה וסני:

14:16 *And the watchmen of Saul in The Hill of the House of Benjamin looked, and behold, the multitude of the Philistine camp was broken; and its breaking grew more and more.*

The terse expression of the Hebrew verse is complemented with the phrase "the camp of the Philistines" from 14:19. Similar solutions are found in LXX, the Vetus Latina and Syr.<sup>868</sup> Both the Hebrew verb מוּן, 'to waver', and the subsequent word הלום, vocalized and read as a derivation of the verb<sup>869</sup> הָלַם, 'to conquer' (>-3), are translated with the word תבר, which is the usual rendering of all kinds of defeat.<sup>870</sup>

17 14 ואמר שאיל לעמא דעמיה סערו כען וחזו מן שאנ מננא ומנו והא לית יונתן ונשיל  
זיניה: 18 14 ואמר שאול לאחיה קריב ארונא דיוי ארי הוה ארונא דיוי ביומא  
ההוא עם<sup>871</sup> בני<sup>872</sup> ישראל:

14:17 *Then Saul said to the people who were with him, "Inspect now and see who is missing from us." And when they had numbered, behold Jonathan and his armour-bearer were not there. 14:18 And Saul said to Ahijah, "Bring near the ark of the LORD." For the ark of the LORD was at that day with the sons of Israel.*

The problem of the copula ו before "the sons of Israel" is solved by rendering it by the preposition "with", although such a construction is never attested in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>873</sup> Cf. verse 19.

19 14 והוה עד דמליל שאול עם כהנא והמונא דבמשרית פלשתאי אזיל מיזל<sup>874</sup> וסני  
ואמר שאול לכהנא קריב אפודא:

14:19 *And while<sup>875</sup> Saul was speaking with the priest, the multitude, which was in the Philistine camp, grew more and more; and Saul said to the priest, "Bring near the ephod."*

The conclusion of the Hebrew verse, אסף ידך, 'withdraw your hand', is explained by TJon as a second attempt of consulting God.<sup>876</sup> The

<sup>867</sup>Omitted by MSS w y.

<sup>868</sup>Cf. Schwartz, *Die Syrische Uebersetzung*, 40.

<sup>869</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 20; BHS, crit.app.

<sup>870</sup>Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 378.

<sup>871</sup>In conformity with one Hebrew MS, Syr, Vg and LXX.

<sup>872</sup>Ms o reads ביה, a liturgical reading.

<sup>873</sup>Cf. Schwartz, *Die Syrische Uebersetzung*, 40.

<sup>874</sup>See commentary on 1 Sam. 16:12.

<sup>875</sup>For עד in the sense of "while", cf. TJon Judg. 3:26; Jon. 4:2.

<sup>876</sup>In contrast to the explanation of PesR. 8:5; MTeh. 27:2 that Saul stopped the priest in the act of making inquiries of the Urim and the Thummim.

bringing of the ephod is attested to in several quotations, the LXX and by Josephus.<sup>877</sup> These versions mention it in verse 18, replacing the request for the ark with a request for the ephod. In this way Saul is cleared from the sin of carrying the ark to the battlefield. One may wonder whether this was TJon's intention as well, and whether the phrase "bring near the ephod" was placed in the wrong verse.

20 14 ואחכניש שאול וכל עמא דעמיה ואזו עד קרבא והא הות חרבא גבר בחבריה שגוש רב לחדא: 21 14 ויהודאי הוּו לפלשתאי כמאחמלי ומדקמוהי דסליקו עמהון במשריתא סחור סחור ואף אנון תבו<sup>878</sup> למהוי עם ישראל דעם שאול ויונתן: 22 14 וכל אנש ישראל דאטמרו בטורא דבית אפרים שמעו ארי אפכו פלשתאי ואדריקו אף אנון בתריוהון בקרבא: 23 14 ופרק יי ביומא ההוא ית ישראל ועבדי קרבא מטו עד<sup>879</sup> בית און: 24 14 ואנש ישראל ארחיק ביומא ההוא ואומי שאול ית עמא למימר ליט גברא דייכול לחמא עד רמשא עד דאחפרע מבעלי דבבי ולא טעים כל עמא לחמא:

*14:20 Then Saul and all the people who were with him gathered together and went into the battle, and behold, every man's sword was against his fellow, and there was very great confusion. 14:21 Now [some] Jews had been for the Philistines, like yesterday and before, and those who had gone up with them into the camp round about, even they turned to be with Israel, who were with Saul and Jonathan. 14:22 And when all the men of Israel who had hidden themselves in the hill country of the House of Ephraim heard that the Philistines were retreating, even they pressed after them in battle. 14:23 And the LORD saved Israel that day. And the wagers of the war reached Beth-aven. 14:24 And the men of Israel kept themselves at a distance that day, for Saul had made the people swear, saying, "Cursed be the man who eats food until the evening, until I am revenged on my enemies." So none of the people tasted any food.*

Only MS p reads ארחיק, whereas the other MSS read אדחק, 'pressed themselves, were pressed', which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text.<sup>880</sup> The verb אִיָּחַל is read as a Hiphil of the verb אָלַח, possibly according to the vocalization אִיָּחַל (>3),<sup>881</sup> which is more in conformity with the phrasing of 14:27-28.

<sup>877</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:115.

<sup>878</sup> Added to complement the sentence (>10), as is done in the other versions. Omitted in MS w (>29).

<sup>879</sup> MS b reads פ, as in some Hebrew mss, resulting in "passed over Beth-aven". Several Hebrew MSS, however, read ע, and likewise most versions.

<sup>880</sup> Sperber considered the rendering of MS p an error.

<sup>881</sup> Cf. also LXX, Vg and MSS of the *Vetus Latina*. R. Eleazar of Modi'im in MekY, *Amalek*, 3; MTeh. 24:7; SER 17 (p. 83) and TanB, *Shemot*, 1:11 also state that the verb has to do with swearing of an oath.

14 25 וכל דירי<sup>882</sup> ארעא עלו בחרשא והוה דבשא על אפי חקלא:

14:25 *And all the inhabitants of the land entered the forest, and there was honey on the surface of the field.*

TJon interpreted the Hebrew יער in 15:25-26 as “forest” and did not link it to the honey, as LXX did with its rendering “oak-coppice”, followed by Josephus.<sup>883</sup> However, the word יערת is interpreted as “honeycomb”.

14 26 ואתא עמא לחרשא והא בריו דבשא ולית דמתב<sup>884</sup> ידיה לפומיה ארי דחיל עמא משבועתא: 14 27 ויונתן לא שמע כד אומי אבוהי ית עמא ואושיט ית<sup>885</sup> ריש שושיתא ◊ דבידיה וטבל יתיה בקינא דרבשא ואתיב ידיה<sup>886</sup> לפומיה ונהרא<sup>887</sup> עינוהי: 14 28 ואתיב גברא<sup>888</sup> מעמא ואמר אומאה אומי אבוך ית עמא למימר ליט גברא דייכול לחמא יומא דין ואשתלחי עמא: 14 29 ואמר יונתן עכר אבא ית ארעא<sup>889</sup> חזו כען ארי נהרא עיני<sup>890</sup> ארי שעימת זעיר דבשא הדין: 14 30 ברם ארי אלו<sup>891</sup> מיכל אכל יומא דין עמא מבוח ◊ סנאוהי<sup>892</sup> דאשכח ארי כען לא סניאת מחתא בפלשתאי: 14 31 וקטלו ביומא ההוא בפלשתאי ממכמס עד מישר ◊ אילון ואשתלחי עמא לחדא: 14 32 ואחפני<sup>893</sup> עמא על בוחא ◊ ונסיבו ◊ ען וחורין ובני תורין ונכיסו ◊ על ארעא ואכל עמא על דמא: 14 33 וחויאו לשאול למימר הא עמא חיבין ◊ קדם ◊ יי למיכל על דמא ואמר שקרתון קריבו לוחי<sup>894</sup> יומא דין אבנא רבחתא: 14 34 ואמר שאול אחבדרו בעמא ותימרון לחון קריבו לוחי גבר תוריה וגבר אמריה ותכסון ◊ הכא ותיכלון ולא תחובון ◊ קדם ◊ יי למיכל על<sup>895</sup> דמא וקריבו כל עמא גבר תוריה בידיה בלילא ונכסו ◊ תמן:

<sup>882</sup>Usual addition of persons, not based on a different *Vorlage*; against Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 33.

<sup>883</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:118. The problems of this verse are discussed in Driver, *Notes*, 113-14; J.C. de Moor, “ar, ‘Honey-dew’”, *UF* 7 (1975), 590-91; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 245-46, 249.

<sup>884</sup>Cf. the phrasing in 14:27, where the same verb is used. Apparently Hebrew משי was interpreted as משיב. MS d reads דמיח, ‘who brought’.

<sup>885</sup>Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>886</sup>MS o reads יזיה, which could be a mere error, but also a harmonization, because it is not Jonathan’s hand that is at stake, but his staff.

<sup>887</sup>According to Qere.

<sup>888</sup>MS b adds חד, ‘one’.

<sup>889</sup>Mss b m o w y Fr eb1 read עמא דארעא, ‘people of the land’, in line with the usual rendering of a *abstractum pro concreto* in TJon (>14).

<sup>890</sup>MS b omits ארי נהרא עיני by haplography.

<sup>891</sup>Mss m w b d Fr start with אף ברם אלו, MS y with אף ברם ארי אלו, and MS o with ברם אלו.

<sup>892</sup>Only in MSS p eb1. Mss a b d m o w y read כעלי דבבוהי.

<sup>893</sup>A more neutral and less figurative rendering of the Qere, also attested in many Hebrew MSS, ויעט, “the people shouted upon the plunder”.

<sup>894</sup>MS a reads the more reverential ארי נהרא עיני ◊, ‘before me’.

<sup>895</sup>In accordance with the preceding verses, but also with many Hebrew MSS.

14:26 And when the people came into the forest, behold, a stream of honey, but there was none who brought his hand back to his mouth, for the people feared the oath. 14:27 But Jonathan had not heard, when his father made the people swear. So he reached out the head<sup>896</sup> of his staff that was in his hand, and dipped it in the honeycomb, and brought his hand back to his mouth; and his eyes became bright. 14:28 Then a man of the people said, "Your father strictly made the people swear, saying, 'Cursed be the man who eats food today.'" And the people were faint. 14:29 Then Jonathan said, "My father has ruined the country; see how my eyes have become bright, because I tasted this little honey. 14:30 The more, then, if the people had eaten freely today of the plunder of their haters which they found; for now the attack among the Philistines has not been great." 14:31 And they killed among the Philistines that day from Michmas to the valley of Ajalon. And the people were very faint. 14:32 And the people turned toward the plunder, and took sheep and oxen and calves<sup>897</sup>, and slew them on the ground; and the people ate them with<sup>898</sup> the blood. 14:33 Then they told Saul, saying, "Behold, the people are guilty before the LORD, by eating with the blood." And he said, "You have dealt treacherously. Bring near a great stone to me." 14:34 And Saul said, "Disperse yourselves among the people, and say to them, 'Let every man bring near to me his ox and his lamb, and slaughter them here, and eat. But do not be guilty before the LORD by eating with the blood.'" So all the people brought them near that night, every man his ox by the hand, and they slaughtered there.

Hebrew בזה is interpreted as "here" and not as "with this", as in the Midrashim, where, Saul is portrayed with a knife in his hand and ordering that every one slaughter his bull with that knife.<sup>899</sup> Josephus, too, assumed that Saul's "here" refers to the great stone (cf. 14:33) on which the animals were to be slaughtered.<sup>900</sup>

14 35 ובנא שאול מדבחא קדם ׀ יי יהיה שרי למבני מדבחא קדם ׀ יי:

14:35 And Saul built an altar before the LORD; it was the first altar that he built to the LORD.

TJon translated the present verse quite literally, leaving the ambiguities as they were. Discussions in the Midrashim show that Hebrew

<sup>896</sup>Or: upper end; in order to avoid the interpretation of the lower end.

<sup>897</sup>Literally: sons of oxen.

<sup>898</sup>The combination אכל על simply means "eat with", cf. Exod. 12:8; Lev. 19:26.

<sup>899</sup>LevR. 25:8; NumR. 10:1; CantR. 5:15 § 1; cf. Hul. 17b.

<sup>900</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:121.

אֵלֹהִים is considered a demonstrative, referring to Saul.<sup>901</sup> The result of this grammatical construction, “Saul was the first to build an altar to the LORD”, is either solved with the remark that Saul was the first *king* who built an altar to the LORD, or with the harmonization that Saul fulfilled the blood commandment of Lev. 19:26 and was therefore rewarded with being the first to build an altar. Most probably TJon, like Josephus,<sup>902</sup> considered Hebrew אֵלֹהִים a *casus pendens* and assumed the rendering “this was the first altar that he built to the LORD”.

Pseudo-Jerome had a similar translation, “tunc primum coepit aedificare altare Domino”, but he saw a discrepancy with 1 Sam. 13:9, where Saul had sacrificed before, in Gilgal. Pseudo-Jerome solved that problem by stating that the offering in Gilgal was brought in disobedience, so the Gilgal altar was not built “to the Lord”.<sup>903</sup>

36 14 ואמר שאול נִיחוח בתר פלשתאי בליליא ונקטול בהון עד מיהר צפרא ולא נשאר בהון אנש ואמרו כל דחקין ◊ בעינך עביר ואמר כהנא נחקרב הלכא<sup>904</sup> ונשאל במימרא ◊ דיוי◊:

14:36 Then Saul said, “Let us go down after the Philistines by night and kill them until the morning light; let us not leave a man of them.” And they said, “Do whatever seems right in your sight.” But the priest said, “Let us draw near hither and let us inquire of the speech of the LORD.”

The Hebrew verb נבִּיח, ‘let us despoil’, is made more consistent with the second half of the verse and rendered “let us kill” (>15). The movement toward God is turned into a movement toward the priest in order to ask council from the LORD (>23, >22).

37 14 ושאל◊ שאול במימרא ◊ דיוי◊ האיחוח בתר פלשתאי התמסרנן בידא דישראל ולא קביל◊ צלותיה◊ ביומא ההוא: 38 14 ואמר שאול אתקרבו הלכא<sup>905</sup> כל רישי עמא ודעו וחזו במא<sup>906</sup> הוה חובא◊ הדין יומא דין:

14:37 And Saul inquired of the speech of the LORD, “Shall I go down after the Philistines? Wilt Thou hand them over into the hand of Israel?” But He did not accept his prayer that day. 14:38 And Saul said, “Draw near hither, all you heads of the people; and know and see how this guilt has arisen today.

<sup>901</sup> Cf. the discussions in LevR. 25:8; NumR. 10:1; CantR. 5:15 § 1. For grammatical rules, cf. M. Pérez Fernández, *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*, Leiden 1997, § 2.7A.

<sup>902</sup> Josephus, , *Antiquities*, 6:121.

<sup>903</sup> Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 86-87.

<sup>904</sup> MSS o Fr read הכא, ‘here’.

<sup>905</sup> MS o reads הכא, ‘here’.

<sup>906</sup> MS o reads במן, ‘by whom’, cf. Vg.



The metaphor פנות, 'cornerstones', is turned into the better known metaphorical term רישי, 'heads', as in Judg. 20:2 (>14).<sup>907</sup>

39 14 ארי קים ◊ הוא וי דפרק ◊ ית ישראל ארי אלו איתוהי ביונתן ברי ארי אתקטלא  
 יתקטיל<sup>908</sup> וליה דמתיב ליה מכל עמא: 40 14 ואמר לכל ישראל אתון תהון לעברא  
 חד ואנא ויונתן ברי נהי לעברא חד ואמרו עמא לשאול דתקין ◊ בעינך עביד: 41 14  
 ואמר שאול קדם ◊ וי אלהא ◊ דישראל איתנה בקשוט ואתאחד יונתן ושאול ועמא  
 נפקו:

14:39 For as the LORD lives who saved Israel, though it be in Jonathan my son, he shall surely be killed." But there was none among all the people that answered him. 14:40 Then he said to all Israel, "You shall be on one side, and I and Jonathan my son will be on the other side." And the people said to Saul, "Do what seems right in your sight." 14:41 And Saul said before the LORD, the God of Israel, "Bring it in truth." And Jonathan and Saul were singled out, but the people went forth.

The rendering of Hebrew הבה is unique in the Targumim. The *patah* indicates that the suffix is feminine singular, not 1st person plural. It seems to be preceded by an energetic infix *-n* after the imperative 2 m.sg. Aphel of אהא 'Bring it (in truth)!'. On this occasion the Targumist seems to interpret הבה as a Hiphil of בוא.

TJon translates Hebrew תמים as if it were בתמים. The latter word occurs in combination with באמת in Judg. 9:16, 19, where it is translated with בקשטא ובשלמותא, 'in truth and in sincerity'. A similar rendering is given by Syr, which has chosen סב-גלבטא, 'give sincerity'. These renderings are based on the short MT, which is probably due to homoioteleuton. The complete text is preserved by LXX.<sup>909</sup> Of course TJon had no inkling of the possibility that the original text might have meant 'give Thummim'.<sup>910</sup>

<sup>907</sup>By רבא in TgIsa. 19:13; by מלכא in Zech. 10:4. See Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 616, n. 1732.

<sup>908</sup>Mss d m y Fr read במה ימה, 'he shall surely die', which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Fragments of MS eb4 suggest the same reading. The rendering of the Hebrew verb מיה is very inconsistent in this chapter (cf. 14:43, 44, 45).

<sup>909</sup>Cf. the résumé of the recent debates on this verse in A. Toeg, "A Textual Note on 1 Samuel xiv 14", *VT* 19 (1969), 493-98.

<sup>910</sup>Cf. LXX. See on this issue E. Noort, *Untersuchungen zum Gottesbescheid in Mari: Die 'Mariprophetie' in der alttestamentliche Forschung* (AOAT, 202), Neukirchen 1977, 96-97; but also C. van Dam, *The Urim and Thummim: A Means of Revelation in Ancient Israel*, Winona Lake 1997, 105-109. Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 128, n. 41, erroneously render MT as 'give Thummim'.

42 14 ואמר שאול רמו ערבין<sup>911</sup> בינא<sup>912</sup> ובין יונתן ברי ואחאחד יונתן: 14 43 ואמר שאול ליונתן חוי לי מא עברתא וחוי ליה יונתן ואמר מטעם טעימית בריש שוטיהא דבירי זעיר דובשא האנא חייב<sup>913</sup> לממת:

14:42 Then Saul said, "Cast lots between us and my son Jonathan." And Jonathan was singled out. 14:43 Then Saul said to Jonathan, "Tell me what you have done." And Jonathan told him, he said, "I did indeed taste a little honey with the head<sup>913</sup> of the staff that was in my hand; here I am, I am guilty deserving to die."

Aramaic, 'guilty', was inserted to harmonize this phrase with the rest of the narrative. Since Jonathan did not die, he could not have said, "I will die", but must have meant, "I deserve to die".

44 14 ואמר שאול כדן יעביד<sup>914</sup> יי<sup>915</sup> וכדן יוסף ארי ממת תמות יונתן:

14:44 And Saul said, "May the LORD do so and more also: you shall surely die, Jonathan."

In contrast to the usual vocabulary, where the act of killing is always worded with the verb קטל, TJon maintains the stem מות. This appears to be more usual in a death sentence, cf. "you shall surely die" (1 Sam. 22:16) and "you shall not die" (2 Sam. 19:24).

45 14 ואמר עמא לשאול היונתן יתקטיל דעבד פרקנא<sup>916</sup> רבא הדין בישראל חס קיים הוא יי אם יפול מסער רישיה לארעא ארי קרם<sup>917</sup> יי<sup>918</sup> גלי<sup>919</sup> דבשלו עבד יומא הדין ופרקו עמא ית יונתן ולא מיה<sup>920</sup>:

14:45 Then the people said to Saul, "Shall Jonathan die, who has wrought this great salvation in Israel? Far from it! As the LORD is the existing One, there shall not a single hair of his head fall to the ground, for it is revealed before the LORD that he did so accidentally this day." So the people delivered Jonathan that he did not die.

TJon protects Jonathan from severe guilt by adding the word בשלי, which usually means 'against expectation, unhopd', but in this context 'by accident'.<sup>917</sup> A similar phrase is used by King Hezekiah (Tg.

<sup>911</sup>The object is complemented (>10), as is done in LXX and Vg. Cf. Komlosh, המקרא באור ההרגום, 327.

<sup>912</sup>Mss a d e b l read בניי, 'between me', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). The rendering בינא is very strange, for TJon does not use the *pluralis majestatis*.

<sup>913</sup>Or: upper end, cf. 14:27.

<sup>914</sup>Mss a b d o Fr add לי, 'to me', as is done in many Hebrew MSS, LXX, and Vg. This was naturally understood, also without preposition, cf. 1 Kgs 19:2.

<sup>915</sup>Ms e b l has a different order: יי קרם וי.

<sup>916</sup>Ms a reads איתקטל, 'he was killed'.

<sup>917</sup>Komlosh, המקרא באור ההרגום, 314.

2 Chron. 20:18), when he pleaded for the people who sinned by accident. In doing this, TJon also clears God from being involved in Jonathan's guilt. Jonathan did not act "with God", but his acts are revealed before Him. Josephus also stressed the fact that Jonathan acted in ignorance of Saul's oath.<sup>918</sup>

◇ 46 14 וסליק שאול מבוחר פלשתאי ופלשתאי אולו לאתרהון: 47 14 ושאל אצלח  
במלכותא על ישראל ואניח קרבא סחור סחור בכל בעלי דבבוהי במואב ובבני עמון  
ובאדום ובמלכי צובה ובפלשתאי ובכל אחר דמחפני מחייב:◇

14:46 Then Saul went up from pursuing the Philistines; and the Philistines went to their own place. 14:47 And Saul prospered in the kingship, he waged war against all his enemies on every side: against Moab, against the sons of Ammon, against Edom, against the kings of Zobah, and against the Philistines. Wherever he turned, he made the place tributary<sup>919</sup>.

Avoiding the misunderstanding that Saul had committed a coup, TJon did not render that Saul "took the kingship", but that he prospered in it. The second half of the verse gave rise to this interpretation. By choosing the verb צלח, 'prosper', TJon refers back to the people hailing, "May the king prosper" (10:24). Also NumR. 11:3 explained this phrase as a positive statement: Saul deserved the kingship with all his moral and legal acts.

Avoiding the misunderstanding that Saul "acted wickedly", TJon chose the verb חויב, which in the Pael means "make tributary".<sup>920</sup> This contrasts with the critical notions in Er. 53a-b and San. 93b, where Saul is said to have acted wickedly. Other ancient versions presuppose an original verb ישע, either translating "he was saved" or "he was victorious".<sup>921</sup> The reading of the MT may be the result of a dysphemistic practice of a scribe.<sup>922</sup> Whatever the case may be, TJon as well as the other versions preferred a summary favourable to Saul (see also above, commentary on 9:21).

48 14 וכנש משרין ומחא ית דבית ◇ עמלק ושיזיב ◇ ית ישראל<sup>923</sup> מיד בזויהון:

<sup>918</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:126.

<sup>919</sup>Literally: guilty.

<sup>920</sup>Cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. Likewise, PesR. 15:3 explains the verb as "he conquered".

<sup>921</sup>The active reading of the verb is used by Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:130.

<sup>922</sup>So C. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO, 36), Freiburg & Göttingen 1981, 234-37.

<sup>923</sup>Ms o reads ישראל, 'those of the House of Israel', in line with the expression in the preceding phrase, "thou of the House of Amalek".

14:48 *And he gathered armies and struck those of the House of Amalek. And he delivered Israel from the hands of those<sup>924</sup> plundering it.*

The beginning of the Hebrew verse, ויעש חיל, is interpreted as “and he made an army” and rendered, according to the usual Targumic vocabulary, “and he gathered armies”. A similar interpretation is found in Vg, which maintains the singular in “congregatoque exercitu”, and in Syr.

49 14 והווי בני שאול יונתן וישוי ומלכישוע ושום תרתין בנתיה שום רבתא מרב ושום זעירתא מיכל:

14:49 *Now the sons of Saul were Jonathan, Ishvi and Malchishua; and the names of his two daughters: the name of the elder was Merab, and the name of the younger Michal.*

TJon translates the Hebrew בכירה, ‘first-born’, with the more general רבתא, ‘elder’. This is an adaptation to the Aramaic vocabulary and is done in all the verses where בכירה is used.<sup>925</sup>

50 14 ושום אחת שאול אחינעם בת אחימעץ ושום רב חיליהו אבינר בר נר אחבוהי דשאול: 51 14 וקיש אבוהי דשאול ונר אבוהי דאבנר בר אביאל: 25 14 והווי קרבא חקיף על פלשתאי כל יומי שאול וחזי שאול כל גבר גבר<sup>926</sup> וכל גבר עביד קרב<sup>927</sup> וכניש ליה לחתיה:<sup>928</sup>

14:50 *And the name of Saul’s wife was Ahinoam the daughter of Ahimaaz. And the name of the commander of his army was Abiner the son of Ner, the uncle<sup>929</sup> of Saul. 14:51 Kish the father of Saul and Ner the father of Abner were son of Abiel. 14:52 And the war against the Philistines was hard all the days of Saul; and when Saul saw any heroic man or any man waging war, he gathered him to himself.*

Hebrew בַּחִיל is translated in two ways. In TJon 1 Samuel it is represented by קרב עביד קרב, ‘a man waging war’ (1 Sam. 14:52; 18:17), staying as close as possible to the components of the original text. In TJon 2 Samuel it is represented by גבר גבר, ‘a heroic man’ (2 Sam. 2:7; 13:28; 17:10 *bis*), which is more in accordance with the meaning of

<sup>924</sup>Plural, since the singular “Amalek” in the first half of the verse is also replaced by the plural “those of the House of Amalek”. The same replacement is attested in Syr.

<sup>925</sup>TO Gen. 19:31, 33, 34, 37; 29:26 and this verse.

<sup>926</sup>A similar rendering of Hebrew בַּחִיל is found in Syr.

<sup>927</sup>Rendered according to the co-text, contrary to the same expression in 1 Sam. 10:26 and 2 Sam. 23:20.

<sup>928</sup>Ms o did not recognize an object in the preceding ליה and rendered therefore יחיה.

<sup>929</sup>Literally: his father’s brother.

the Hebrew expression. However, the difference between these translations is not necessarily due to different recensions of the two books. In this verse the rendering נבר נבר would not be possible, because this expression is used elsewhere in the verse (י-18). In 18:17 David is not specifically asked to be brave, but to fight the battles for Saul. One may conclude that the differentiation in rendering is due to the co-text.

### 5.15 Saul and the Amalekites (1 Samuel 15)

Part of 1 Sam. 15 is read on the Shabbath before Purim as an introduction to the theme of the hostility between Israel and the House of Amalek.<sup>930</sup> In this chapter Amalek is destroyed, but King Saul spared Agag, the king of Amalek. On the festival of Purim the book of Esther is read, in which Haman the Agagite is introduced (Est. 3:1). Amalek appears to be alive and the hostility between the two peoples continues, even the hostility between the descendants of King Saul and King Agag.<sup>931</sup> EstR. Proem 7 explains how Agag could procreate, because Saul spared him. And EstR. 4:9 explains that Esther was a descendant of King Saul himself.

The length of this *haftara* varies in the many known traditions. In most, 1 Sam. 15:1-34 is read, but the Sefardi tradition omits the first verse. The Yemenite manuscript 12<sup>b</sup> took 1 Sam. 14:52-15:33, while MS T.-S. B18.7 from the Cairo Genizah even attests that the *haftara* continued until 16:1, followed by 16:12-13, thus including the anointing of David. In other versions, the *haftara* seems to have been much shorter, for MS T.-S. 6H5.1 from the Cairo Genizah reads only 15:2-9, 31.<sup>932</sup>

TJon did not add anything which is reminiscent of the Purim festival. Neither are there any tosefta-targumim that elaborate this theme.<sup>933</sup> Equally noteworthy is the fact that no extra references to Exod. 17:14 or Deut. 25:19 are made in this Aramaic rendering, although there are in Josephus and Pseudo-Philo.<sup>934</sup>

<sup>930</sup> Cf. mMeg. 3:4; Meg. 30a.

<sup>931</sup> Note also EstR. 7:13, where Haman is assumed to write in his letter how his forebearer Agag is killed by the leaders of Israel.

<sup>932</sup> Cf. also C. Perrot, "The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue", in: M.J. Mulder, H. Sysling (eds), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Assen & Philadelphia 1988, 137-159.

<sup>933</sup> There is, however, a tosefta-targum to 1 Kgs 4:1 which summarizes this episode and mentions Haman and his ten sons as descendants of Agag; cf. Kasher, *תוספתא*, 139 (no. 93b).

<sup>934</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:133; Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 58:1.

1 15 ואמר שמואל לשאול יהי שלח יי<sup>935</sup> לרבייתך למהוי<sup>936</sup> מלכא<sup>936</sup> על עמיה על ישראל וכען קביל<sup>937</sup> למימר<sup>937</sup> פתגמא<sup>937</sup> דיי:

15:1 *And Samuel said to Saul, "The LORD sent me to elevate you to become king over his people, over Israel. Now, accept the word of the speech of the LORD.*

De Boer translates לרבייתך with "in thy youth", assuming a harmonization with 13:1.<sup>938</sup> This rendering, however, does not result in a normal sentence. Moreover, the verb רבא is more often used as the rendering of the Biblical משה. De Moor notes a tendency to use the verb רבא in some verses to avoid a messianic interpretation.<sup>939</sup> Although nothing in the history of exegesis points at a messianic interpretation of the present verse, it is surprising that the verb רבא is used as an alternative for the verb משה in TgSam (cf. משה in 9:16; 10:1). TJon is known for its stock phrases rather than for its variation in rendering. Considering the three verses with the Aramaic verb רבא as the equivalent of Hebrew משה (1 Sam. 15:1, 17; 2 Sam. 3:39), one wonders whether TJon deliberately attempted to avoid the combination of rejection or weakness and the Anointed One, so as to avoid a suffering Messiah.

However, a simpler explanation of the use of רבא may be found. In this verse, TJon attempted to avoid the misunderstanding that Samuel came to anoint Saul for the second time. In 1 Sam. 15:17 and 2 Sam. 3:39, TJon used the verb "elevate" in contrast to the low position of the would-be king. Saul and David felt themselves too humble to deserve the honour of kingship.

2 15 כדנן<sup>940</sup> אמר יי צבאות<sup>940</sup> דכרנא<sup>940</sup> יה דעבר עמלק לישראל דכמן ליה באורחא במסקיה ממצרים: 15 3 כען איזיל ותמחי יה דבית<sup>941</sup> עמלק ותגמר<sup>942</sup> ית

<sup>935</sup> Ms T omits שלח יי by haplography.

<sup>936</sup> Ms S reads למלכא, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>937</sup> Omitted by MS d. MSS D T read the plural פתגמא, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>938</sup> P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel i-xvi*, Amsterdam 1938, 20.

<sup>939</sup> J.C. de Moor, "Van wie zegt de profeet dit?" Messiaanse apologetiek in de Targumim", in: H.H. Grosheide et al. (eds), *De knechtsgestalte van Christus: Studies door collega's en oud-leerlingen aangeboden aan Prof.dr. H.N. Ridderbos*, Kampen 1978, 91-110, esp. 97, pointing at Isa. 61:1.

<sup>940</sup> Ms C reads אלהים.

<sup>941</sup> Omitted in MSS J D.

<sup>942</sup> Ms a reads the plural ותגמרין, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but not in accordance with the plural of the preceding verb (against >9). Cf. also Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 16.

כל דילהון ולא תחוס<sup>943</sup> עליהון ותקטול מגבר עד אתא מעלים<sup>944</sup> ועד יניק מהור ועד אמר מגמל ועד חמר: 15 4 וכנש<sup>945</sup> שאול ית עמא ומננון באמרי פסחיא<sup>946</sup> מאתן אלפין גבר רגלי ועסרא אלפין ית<sup>947</sup> אנש<sup>948</sup> יהודה:

15:2 *Thus says the Lord Zebaoth, 'I have remembered what Amalek did to Israel in ambushing it on the way, when it came up out of Egypt. 15:3 Now go and strike those of the House of Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have; you shall not spare them, but you shall kill from man unto woman, from young man unto suckling, from ox unto lamb, from camel unto ass.'* 15:4 *And Saul gathered the people and counted them by the lambs of the Passovers: two hundred thousand men on foot and ten thousand men of Judah.*

Using a wide-spread tradition, TJon does not consider the Hebrew טלאים a place-name (cf. Josh. 15:24), but interprets it as “lambs”, according to the Hebrew vocalization.<sup>949</sup> TJon made its translation unique through the reference to Passover. In Jewish literature this explanation is usually accompanied by a reference to 11:8, where Saul counted the people at Bezek, then translated “by stones”. In the time of the stones Israel was poor, but in the time of the lambs the people had become rich.<sup>950</sup> TJon, however, as well as Syr, appears to consider Bezek a place-name.

Neither ancient Jewish literature nor modern literature on the Targum provide an explanation of this translation. Smolar and Aberbach suggest that the rendering “Paschal lambs” might have been reminiscent of the way Cestius Gallus collected taxes in 66 CE: one kidney of every Paschal lamb. In that way, Saul could establish an army by counting the families and not the people.<sup>951</sup>

<sup>943</sup> Ms T reads the imperative טח.

<sup>944</sup> Ms 12<sup>h</sup> reads the Hebrew מליל (>29).

<sup>945</sup> Ms Fr reads ושמע, ‘he summoned’, which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>946</sup> Mss a b B C read the singular פסחא. Ms w reads פצחיא, which may mean “open place, city without walls”, but must more probably be understood as a variant reading of the word for Passover, just like the Syriac variant פסחא, cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. פסחא.

<sup>947</sup> Omitted by MS J.

<sup>948</sup> Ms o adds דבית, rendering “men of the House of Judah”.

<sup>949</sup> Cf. also Syr; Yom. 22b; NumR. 2:11; LamR. 1:1 § 2; PesK. 2:8. However, PesR. 10:14; 11:3 do not mention these explanations of the place-names Bezek and Telaim.

<sup>950</sup> Cf. Komlosh, באור החרגים, 322.

<sup>951</sup> Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 69, who refer to Josephus, *Jewish War*, 6:420-27. A similar event is told in Pes. 64b, where King Agrippa wished to take a census of the Jewish people. The High Priest gave a high number of kidneys. This number had to function as a hint to the Roman powers not to underrate

Vg gives a similar translation with “quasi agnos”: the people were counted as if they were lambs. It is unclear whether this was intended as a completely different explanation or must be regarded as an erroneous reading (כטלאים instead of בטלאים).<sup>952</sup>

15 5 ואתא שאול עד קרחא דבית ד עמלק וטקיס משריתיה בנחלא<sup>953</sup>:

15:5 *And Saul came to the city of the House of Amalek, and he deployed his army at the river.*

The Hebrew verse suggests that Saul already waged battle at the river. TJon, as well as LXX and Vg, dismissed such a rendering as not in harmony with the rest of the narrative. LXX and Vg give “he lay in wait at the river”, deriving the Hebrew וירב from the stem ארב (>3).<sup>954</sup> TJon gives a plain harmonization, albeit with a very unusual Graecism.<sup>955</sup> This harmonization is also attested in QohR. 7:16 and Yom. 22b.<sup>956</sup>

15 6 ואמר שאול לשלמאה ד איזיל זור אחפרש מגו עמלקאה דלמא אשיצינך עמיה ואח עבדת שיבו עם כל בני ישראל במסקהון<sup>957</sup> ממצרים ואחפרש שלמאה מגו עמלקאה:

15:6 *And Saul said to the Shalmaite, “Go, depart, separate yourself from among the Amalekite, lest I destroy you with him. For you showed kindness to all the sons of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt.” So the Shalmaite separated himself from among the Amalekite.*

It is remarkable that TJon renders this verse completely, with singular verbs and nouns. Whereas the usual vocabulary refers to “the sons of Ammon” or “the men of Judah”, this verse speaks of the Shalmaite and the Amalekite and even turns the plural verbs into singular forms.<sup>958</sup> The immediate cause for this change is the alternation of singular and plural forms in the Hebrew text, but TJon could have chosen for the plural forms just as well. The latter choice is made by Syr. The plural forms are only maintained in MSS a J.

---

the strength of the Jewish people, and therefore to avoid driving them too far by cruelty.

<sup>952</sup>F. Stummer, “Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas”, *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, esp. 8.

<sup>953</sup>Ms D reads the plural.

<sup>954</sup>Note that some Hebrew MSS read וירר, ‘and he went down’.

<sup>955</sup>The same combination “deploy one’s army” occurred in TgJudg. 9:29, cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 528.

<sup>956</sup>Cf. Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 303.

<sup>957</sup>Ms k reads במפקהון, ‘when they came out’, in conformity with the verb used at the beginning of the Ten Commandments, Exod. 20:1 (>15).

<sup>958</sup>Cf. also Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 53.



The Hebrew verb אָסַף is vocalized as a Hiphil from יָסַף. This would result in “lest I add you to him”, a translation also given by LXX (cf. also Prov. 10:22). TJon did vocalize it as a Qal from סָפָה (>3). Therefore, it is rendered “lest I destroy you”.<sup>959</sup> The same idea of destroying an innocent group together with the guilty one is expressed with the same verb in TO Gen. 18:23.

7 15 וּמַחַח שְׂאוּל יָת דְּבֵיתָּהּ עִמְלֹק<sup>960</sup> מְחוּלָהּ מֵעֵלְנָא דְחַגְרָא דְעַל אֲפִי מִצְרַיִם:

15:7 And Saul struck those of the House of Amalek, from Havilah, the entrance of the Heger which is facing Egypt.

The Hebrew place שָׁר in the South, at the Egyptian border, is consistently translated with Aramaic חַגְרָא.<sup>961</sup> This word might be a contemporary place-name, Hagra, but since it is always used with the definite article—in mGit. 1:1 this name occurs as הַחֲגֵר in Hebrew—it is probably a transliteration of a Hebrew noun. It is suggested that Aramaic חַגְרָא means “wall”, like the Hebrew word שָׁר, and is used for the Roman *limes*, “which was built to protect the area against the bedouins.”<sup>962</sup> It should be noted that TPsJ actualized this name with the Graecism חַלּוּצָא (e.g. Gen. 16:7 and Exod. 15:22).<sup>963</sup> In Talmudic literature the name of Cub prevails, a name mentioned in Ezek. 30:5.<sup>964</sup>

8 15 וְאַחַד יָת אַגַּג מִלְכָּא דְבֵיתָּהּ עִמְלֹק כְּדִרְ<sup>965</sup> חֵי וַיְהִי כֹל עִמָּא גַמְר לְפַתְגִּם דְּחַרְבִּי:

15:8 And he singled out Agag, the king of the House of Amalek, while he was alive. He finished off all the people by means of the sword.

Hebrew לְפִי חַרְבִּי is consistently equated with לְפַתְגִּם דְּחַרְבִּי in TgSam.<sup>967</sup> It would be too simple to consider the Aramaic as a literal equivalent of the Hebrew “by the edge of the sword”,<sup>968</sup> since the same Hebrew-

<sup>959</sup>De Boer, *Research*, 20; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 261.

<sup>960</sup>Mss a J read עִמְלֹקָא, influenced by the preceding verse.

<sup>961</sup>Also attested in 1 Sam. 27:8 and TO Gen. 16:7; 25:18; Exod. 15:22; cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 113.

<sup>962</sup>B. Maisler, “הַרְקָם וְהַחֲגֵר”, *Tarbiz* 20 (1949), 316-19, cited by Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 113, n. 335.

<sup>963</sup>So Levy, *CWT*, s.v.; followed by Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 20, who noticed that TPsJ did not consistently so.

<sup>964</sup>Cf. A. Neubauer, *La géographie du Talmud*, Paris 1868, repr. Amsterdam 1965, 409-410.

<sup>965</sup>Omitted by MSS C D S, who read דְּעִמְלֹק, דְּעַמְלֵ- and דְּעִמְלֹקָא respectively.

<sup>966</sup>Also attested in Syr.

<sup>967</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 22:19; 2 Sam. 15:14. But also in TO and the rest of TJon, cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 332.

<sup>968</sup>Cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. פְּרָגַם.

Aramaic equation occurs in Judg. 9:38, where it has no bearing on a sword at all.<sup>969</sup> The halakhic connotation, “law of war”,<sup>970</sup> is supported by the Mekilta<sup>971</sup> and by the renderings of TN and TPsJ.<sup>972</sup> Still, it cannot have been the basis of TJon’s translation, since the same equivalent is used in 1 Sam. 22:19 for the killing of the priests in Nob, and in 2 Sam. 15:14 for the possible destruction of Jerusalem and the entire Davidic family. In those verses it could only mean “the decree of the sword”, uttered by Saul and Absalom. For that reason it is highly likely that לפחגם has the same idiomatic function as לפי in post-Biblical Hebrew, as mentioned by Smelik.<sup>973</sup> If this is true, לפחגם דחרב would mean “by means of the sword”.

9 15 וחס שאול ועמא על אנג ועל שפר־ ענא<sup>974</sup> וחורי ושמיניא ופשימיא ועל כל דטב־ ולא אבו לגמרותהון וכל מדעם דשיט ודכסיר יתיה גמרו:

*15:9 But Saul and the people spared Agag, and the most beautiful of the sheep and the oxen and the fatlings and the stout ones, yea, everything that was good, and they were not willing to destroy them. But all that was base and despised: they destroyed that.*

TJon did not read המשנים, but read or interpreted השמנים, as LXX, Syr and Vg seemed to have done.<sup>975</sup> Likewise, TJon read or interpreted נמאס, ‘despised’, instead of נמס, like the other ancient versions.<sup>976</sup>

10 15 והוה פחגם נבואה־ מן קדם־ יי עם שמואל למימר: 11 15 חבית־ במימרי־ ארי אמליכית ית שאול למהוי־ מלכא ארי חב מבחר פלהני־ וית פתגמי לא קיים ותקיף לשמואל וצלי־ קדם־ יי כל ליליא: 12 15 ואקדים שמואל לקדמות שאול בצפרא ואתחווה לשמואל למימר אתא שאול לכרמלא<sup>977</sup> והא<sup>978</sup> מתקין ליה לתמן<sup>979</sup>

<sup>969</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 333, who also notes that the Hebrew plural פיות of a sword in Judg. 3:16 is appropriately rendered פומין.

<sup>970</sup>Suggested by Jastrow, *Dictionary*, s.v. פחגמא; and hesitantly by Dalman, *Handwörterbuch*, s.v. פחגמא.

<sup>971</sup>Cf. MekY, *Amalek*, 1, where the Hebrew לפי חרב is explained with “We can learn from this that this war was only by the order of the Almighty.”

<sup>972</sup>TN consistently renders the phrase פום נוריה מימרא and also TPsJ favours this interpretation; cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 333, n. 39.

<sup>973</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 333-34. See also M. Pérez Fernández, *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*, Leiden 1997, 160-61.

<sup>974</sup>Ms B erroneously reads עמא, ‘of the people’.

<sup>975</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 21.

<sup>976</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 21; De Boer, *Research*, 20.

<sup>977</sup>Ms B reads לכרמא, ‘to the vineyard’.

<sup>978</sup>Ms Fr reads ורוא, ‘and he’.

<sup>979</sup>Omitted by MSS b Fr.

אתר<sup>980</sup> לפלגא ביה<sup>981</sup> בותא<sup>982</sup> ואסתחר ועבר ונחת<sup>983</sup> לגלגלא:

15:10 *And the prophetic word from before the LORD was with Samuel, saying: 15:11 "I reconsider my speech that I have made Saul to be the king; for he has turned back from my worship and has not performed my words." And Samuel was angry and he prayed before the LORD all night. 15:12 And Samuel rose early to meet Saul in the morning, and it was told to Samuel, "Saul came to Carmel, and behold, he established a place for himself to divide the booty. And he turned, and passed on, and went down to Gilgal."*

Hebrew *י* is not interpreted as a memorial stone, but as a place (cf. also 2 Sam. 18:18; Isa. 56:5, and similarly 2 Sam. 8:3).<sup>984</sup> Besides, TJon adds a phrase to stress that this chapter deals with the matter of the booty. Whereas no booty should have been there, Saul even needed a place to divide his booty properly. This phrase also puts a different complexion on the following discussion between Saul and Samuel. While Saul claims that they took booty to sacrifice it in Gilgal, Samuel already knows of a dividing place at Carmel.

13 15 ואחא שמואל לוח שאול ואמר ליה שאול בריך את קדם<sup>984</sup> יי קימיה ית פתגמא דייו: 14 15 ואמר שמואל ואלו קיימתא<sup>985</sup> מא קל ענא הרין בארני וקל תוריא<sup>986</sup> דאנא שמע:

15:13 *And Samuel came to Saul, and Saul said to him, "Blessed be you before the LORD; I have performed the word of the LORD." 15:14 And Samuel said, "But if you did perform it, what then is this bleating of the sheep in my ears, and the lowing of the oxen which I hear?"*

A small addition is made to connect Samuel's question with Saul's preceding utterance.<sup>987</sup> Note that this addition interferes with the poetical structure of Samuel's question, which is no longer a simple bicolon.<sup>988</sup>

<sup>980</sup>Omitted by MS C.

<sup>981</sup>Mss a J read תמן, 'there'.

<sup>982</sup>MS D reads ביורנא, 'presumptuous', giving a negative judgment over Saul's deeds.

<sup>983</sup>MS C reads ונפק, 'and he went forth'.

<sup>984</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel elsõ kõnyve*, 21. Likewise Syr, cf. Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung*, 46; C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL, 11), Leiden 2001, 19.

<sup>985</sup>Mss a J add פתגמא דייו, after the example of 15:13.

<sup>986</sup>MS D omits the words וקל תוריא, leaving the phrase, "what then is this bleating of the sheep in my ears, which I hear?"

<sup>987</sup>However, this addition was not really necessary, cf. Vogel, *Sámuel elsõ kõnyve*, 21.

<sup>988</sup>Samuel is speaking rather poetically in the Hebrew chapter. The culmination

15 15 ואמר שאול מעמלקאה<sup>989</sup> איתיאנון דחס עמא על שפר<sup>990</sup> ענא ותורי בדיל<sup>991</sup>  
 לדבחה<sup>992</sup> קדם<sup>993</sup> ויי אלהך<sup>994</sup> וית מותרא<sup>995</sup> גמרנא: 16 15 ואמר שמואל לשאול אוריך  
 ואחוי לך יח דאחמלל מן קדם<sup>996</sup> ויי עמי בליליא ואמר<sup>997</sup> ליה מליל: 17 15 ואמר  
 שמואל<sup>998</sup> הלא<sup>999</sup> מן שריוחך הויתא שיט וחלש בעיני נפשך ברם זכות<sup>1000</sup> שבטא<sup>1001</sup>  
 דבנימין אבוך היא<sup>1002</sup> גרמח לך<sup>1003</sup> דבעא למעבר בימא קדם בני ישראל בדיל כין  
 רביך<sup>1004</sup> ויי למהוי<sup>1005</sup> מלכא על ישראל:

*15:15 Saul said, "They have brought them from the Amalekite, for the people spared the most beautiful of the sheep and of the oxen to sacrifice before the LORD your God. And the rest we utterly destroyed. 15:16 Then Samuel said to Saul, "Wait and let me tell you what was said with me from before the LORD this night." And he said to him, "Speak!" 15:17 And Samuel said, "Were you not from the beginning base and weak in the sight of your own soul? But the merit of the tribe of Benjamin your father was the cause for you, for he tried to pass in the sea before the sons of Israel. On account of this the LORD has elevated you to be the king over Israel.*

Whereas the Hebrew text stresses Saul's responsibility and warns against his hiding behind the will of the people, the Aramaic text also explains the contradiction between Saul's humble descent and his kingship. The explanation is found in an interpretation of Ps. 68:28, where Benjamin is רדם, "leading them", which was also seen as a word play of רד ים, "suppress the sea". Several Midrashim tell the story of Benjamin as the first to enter the sea:<sup>999</sup>

of this poetry lies in the verses 22-23, but before and after these verses Samuel also speaks in a lofty style.

<sup>989</sup>In conformity with the Hebrew text, but MSS Fr D read מעמלק, as do the other ancient versions, cf. also verse 6. MSS a J read מרביח עמלק, 'from those of the House of Amalek', which is more in conformity with the usual vocabulary of TJon, cf. verses 3 and 5. Ms T omits איתיאנון דחס, which is probably the length of a line.

<sup>990</sup>Ms B adds דתור- , which creates a grammatically incorrect phrase.

<sup>991</sup>Ms b has the conflated reading שאר מותרא, 'the rest of the rest'.

<sup>992</sup>Singular, in conformity with many Hebrew MSS and the Qere of others.

<sup>993</sup>Ms k adds לשאול, 'to Saul'.

<sup>994</sup>Ms a converts the rhetorical question into a positive statement by reading הא (>14).

<sup>995</sup>Omitted by MS a.

<sup>996</sup>Omitted by MSS b Fr.

<sup>997</sup>Kimhi adds the object of the phrase: מלכוא. A similar phrase is constructed in MS o, that omits דבעא up to ויי: "but the merit of the tribe of Benjamin your father caused you to be the king over Israel."

<sup>998</sup>Kimhi reads דברך: "He promised you to be the king over Israel".

<sup>999</sup>Tan., *Vayyigash*, 8; MekY, *Beshallah*, 6; Sot. 36b. Cf. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 94; Komlosh, באור הדרגום, 316.

When the tribes stood at the Sea, the one saying, “I will go down as first to the Sea”, and the other saying: “I will go down as first”, the tribe of Benjamin jumped and went down to the Sea first.

The theme of the struggle to be the first is well-known.<sup>1000</sup> In 1 Kgs 22:21-22, the host of heaven discusses who might go down and entice Ahab to wage war and fall. One says one thing, and another says another, but eventually one spirit is chosen by God to be a lying spirit in the mouth of all Ahab’s prophets. The same narrative structure is used in yBer. 4:18, but its content disagrees with the Midrash on Benjamin:

[R. Aqiba asked:] Why, then, did Judah merit the kingship? They said to him, “Teach us, our master.” He said to them, “Because he sanctified the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, at the sea. When the tribes came and stood at the sea, this one said, “I shall descend”, and this one said, “I shall descend”. The tribe of Judah jumped and descended first and [thereby] sanctified the name of God at the sea.

18 15 ושלחך יי באורחא ואמר איזיל ותגמר<sup>1001</sup> ית חייביא ית דביחא עמלק ותגיח קרבא בהון עד דחשיצי<sup>1002</sup> יתהון:

15:18 *And the LORD sent you on the way, and said, ‘Go and utterly destroy the guilty ones, those of the House of Amalek, and wage war against them until you destroy them.’*

Hebrew כלוחם causes difficulty in this verse. It is vocalized as a Piel infinitive, which would result in the rendering, “until *they* destroy them”. TJon harmonizes the suffix of this word with the co-text, as do LXX and Syr.<sup>1003</sup> Another possibility would have been to omit the last word and formulate according to 1 Kgs 22:11; cf. Vg.

19 15 ולמא לא קבילתא ימימרא דיו ואחפניחא<sup>1004</sup> על בוחא ועברתא דביש קדם יי: 20 15 ואמר שאול לשמואל דקבילתא ימימרא דיו ואולית באורחא

<sup>1000</sup>More examples are given in the commentary on the tosefta-targum to 1 Sam. 17:43. The same narrative structure is used in that tosefta-targum, where the five stones in David’s bag discuss who might go up in his sling and kill Goliath.

<sup>1001</sup>Ms 12<sup>h</sup> reads ותחמי, ‘you will strike’, in accordance with 15:3 (>15).

<sup>1002</sup>Mss B J erroneously read an Ishtaphal, דישחצי.

<sup>1003</sup>Cf. also Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung*, 47; De Boer, *Research*, 20; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 263.

<sup>1004</sup>Cf. 14:32 for the same rendering of Hebrew עיש.

דשלהני<sup>1005</sup> יי ואיחתי יח אגג מלכא דבית<sup>1006</sup> עמלק ויה דבית<sup>1007</sup> עמלק  
גמריה<sup>1008</sup>: 15 21 ואפריש עמא<sup>1009</sup> מן בוחא<sup>1009</sup> ען וחורין קדם<sup>1009</sup> דיחרמון לדבחה<sup>1009</sup>  
קדם<sup>1009</sup> יי אלהך<sup>1009</sup> בנגלא:

15:19 *Why then did you not accept the speech of the LORD and did you turn on the plunder and do what was evil before the LORD?* 15:20 *But Saul said to Samuel, "I have accepted the speech of the LORD, I have gone on the way on which the LORD sent me. I have brought Agag the king of the House of Amalek, and I have utterly destroyed those of the House of Amalek.* 15:21 *But the people separated out from the plunder, sheep and oxen, before they destroyed it, to sacrifice to the LORD your God in Gilgal.*

Hebrew רישית is interpreted as a time indication: "at the beginning of the ban" the people separated some sheep and oxen. It is not considered a repetition of "the best of" (15:15), which is the interpretation of Pseudo-Jerome.<sup>1010</sup>

22 ואמר שמואל  
הרעוא<sup>1011</sup> קדם<sup>1011</sup> יי בעלון ונכסת<sup>1011</sup> קדשין  
כקבלא<sup>1011</sup> למימרא<sup>1011</sup> דיוי  
הא קבלא<sup>1011</sup> למימריה<sup>1011</sup> מנכסת<sup>1011</sup> קדשין שב  
לאצחא למלי נביוהי<sup>1011</sup> מתרב פטימין:

15:22 *And Samuel said, "Is there as great delight before the LORD in burnt offerings and holy slaughterings, as in accepting the speech of the LORD? Behold, to obey his word is better than holy slaughterings, and to listen to the utterances of his prophets than the fat of rams.*

The poetic parallels are maintained in the Aramaic text, but the additions made the sentences longer than usual poetry. The synonyms שמע and קשב are rendered differently: the first word concerns obedience to God's word, the second obedience to his prophets (>18; >22). A similar diversification is attested to in the following verse. Through this rendering the high position of Samuel the prophet is stressed,

<sup>1005</sup> Ms B erroneously reads דשלהיח, 'which I sent'.

<sup>1006</sup> Omitted by MSS b d o Fr B D, which read רעמלק, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but not in accordance with the usual vocabulary.

<sup>1007</sup> Omitted by MS b, that reads עמלקאה, in accordance with 15:6 (>15), but not with the usual vocabulary.

<sup>1008</sup> Ms d reads שציית, in accordance with 15:18 (>15). Ms T omits עמלק by haplography.

<sup>1009</sup> Ms D adds a nota accusativi.

<sup>1010</sup> Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 89.

<sup>1011</sup> MSS b D read רעוא, thus turning the rhetorical question into its positive answer (>14).

which fits into the Targumic tendency toward polarization of good and bad.<sup>1012</sup>

23 15

ארי כחובת־גבריאל<sup>1013</sup> דשאלין בקסמא  
 כין־חובת־כל גבר<sup>1015</sup>  
 דמסריב על פתגמי אוריחא<sup>1016</sup>  
 וכחובי עמא דשען בתר שעותא  
 כין חובת־כל אנש  
 דבצר<sup>1017</sup> ומוסיף על מל<sup>1018</sup> נבייא<sup>1019</sup>  
 חלף דקצחא בפלחנא<sup>1020</sup> דיוי  
 ורחק<sup>1021</sup> מלמהויי מלכא:

15:23 *For as the guilt of the men who inquire of divination, thus is the guilt of every man who rebels against the words of the Torah. And as the guilt of the people who go astray after idols, thus is the guilt of every human who cuts out or adds to the words of the prophets. Because you have refused<sup>1022</sup> the service<sup>1023</sup> of the LORD, He has removed you from being king."*

Again the poetical structure is maintained, albeit in two tricola—showing an ABC-ABC-structure—and one bicolon instead of two bicola, and again the cola appear to be longer than in the Hebrew text. The ultra-short phrasing in the Hebrew text is explained as a comparison between several types of guilt. The word “teraphim” is interpreted as “idols”. This explanation is also attested in LamR. Proem 23.

<sup>1012</sup>Cf. De Boer, *Research*, 16; Komlosh, באר החרגים, 306.

<sup>1013</sup>Omitted by MS B.

<sup>1014</sup>Ms D reads דין.

<sup>1015</sup>Rashi reads אינש.

<sup>1016</sup>Mss b m Fr D eb4 read פתגמא דיוי, ‘the word of the LORD’, more in accordance with the preceding verse. Ms B reads פתגמיא דיוי, ‘the words of the LORD’. Kimhi reads מימרא דיוי, which is completely in conformity with the preceding verse (>15). Ms T reads מימרא דיוי, ‘the word of the LORD’, but maintains the following ‘the Torah’. Ms S gives another compilation, viz. פתגמי אוריחא דיוי, ‘the words of the Torah of the LORD’.

<sup>1017</sup>Mss b Fr read רבסר דיוי, ‘who despise’. Mss o S omit this verb and reads only דמוסיף, ‘who adds’.

<sup>1018</sup>Ms D reads פתגמי.

<sup>1019</sup>Ms o reads נביא, which might be a singular, denoting Samuel himself.

<sup>1020</sup>Mss a b d m o w y Fr B C D J S T eb4 read בפתגמא, which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>1021</sup>Mss Fr S add יי, like some Hebrew MSS and quotations, LXX, and some MSS of the Vetus Latina and Vg.

<sup>1022</sup>Alternative rendering: you have cut off.

<sup>1023</sup>Most MSS read: the words.

TJon linked the problematic Hebrew word *בצר* to *הפצר*, 'cut from' (י-1), and complemented with *אסף*, 'add to'. The prohibition of "cutting from and adding to" appears to be a very traditional expression, stressing accuracy and precision. In Judaism it was used in connection with God's commandments (Deut. 4:2; 13:1; Meg. 14a),<sup>1024</sup> halakhic commandments (Meg. 21a; Pes. 47a), God's creation (Qoh. 3:14. Sir. 18:5-6), the translation of the Hebrew Bible into other languages (tMeg. 4:41; Philo, *De vita Mosis*, II 6:34), and the tradition of the Hebrew and Greek Bible (RHsh. 28b; Er. 13a; Sot. 20a; *Epistula Aristoteae*, 311; Josephus, *Antiquities* 12:2; *Contra Apionem*, I 8:42).<sup>1025</sup> In 15:22-23 a similar co-text is found: God's commandments given by the prophets, and the Hebrew Bible summarized as "the words of the Torah and the words of the prophets".

In this way the Torah and the prophets are placed on the same level, just like the words of God and the words of the prophets in 15:22. This means that the prophets were highly esteemed, both as authors of Biblical books and as messengers of God.<sup>1026</sup> Nonetheless, one must consider that the prophets of Israel were supposed to have known the Torah and not to have added anything to it (Meg. 14a; yMeg. 1:39 (70d)), save the institution of the Purim festival. This supposition also applies to 15:23, because Samuel did not add anything to the Torah. Saul rebelled against the words of the Torah, because he did not fulfil God's commandments (cf. Exod. 17:14-16; Deut. 25:17-19); and he cut from and added to the words of the prophet by taking booty back to Gilgal and saving the life of King Agag.

The repetition of the stem *מאס*, 'reject', is not integrated into the Aramaic version, neither here nor in 15:26. Saul's rejection of God's word is rendered quite literally, but might contain a new paronomasia. Aramaic *קצתא* can mean "you have refused", which is the rendering of the Hebrew "you have rejected", or "you have cut off", which can be a word play on *בצר*, the cutting from the words of the prophets. On the other hand, God's rejection of Saul is expressed with a different verb, *רחק*, 'to remove'.

24 15 ואמר שאול לשמואל חבית  $\diamond$  ארי עברית על מימרא  $\diamond$  דיוי ובסרית על פתגמך  
ארי רחילית מן עמא וקבילית  $\diamond$  למימרהון  $\diamond$ :

15:24 And Saul said to Samuel, "I am guilty; for I have transgressed

<sup>1024</sup>However, TO renders the verbs *אסף* and *מנע*.

<sup>1025</sup>An excellent survey of the use of this combination, both in the Jewish and in the non-Jewish world, is given by W.C. van Unnik, "De la règle *Μήτε προσεῖναι μήτε ἀφελῆν* dans l'histoire du canon", *Vigiliae Christianae* 3 (1949), 1-36.

<sup>1026</sup>See Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible*, 143-44.



*the speech of the LORD and I have despised your word, because I feared the people and accepted their speech.*

In this verse, the ancient versions agree on avoiding the expression “the mouth of the LORD” and all give a more realistic rendering like “the word of the LORD”. Only Syr maintains the word “mouth” in its combination **בְּפִי הַיְהוָה**, ‘against the word of the LORD’s mouth’.

15 25 וכען שבוק כען לחובי<sup>1027</sup> וחוב עמי ואסגוד קדם<sup>1027</sup> יוי: 15 26 ואמר שמאול לשאול לא אתוב עמך ארי קצתא בפתגמא<sup>1028</sup> דיוי ורחקך יוי מלמהווי<sup>1028</sup> מלכא על ישראל: 15 27 ואסחר שמואל למיול ואתקיף בכנף מעיליה ואתבוע:

*15:25 But now, pardon my guilt now, and return with me, that I may bow down before the LORD.” 15:26 And Samuel said to Saul, “I will not return with you; for you have refused<sup>1029</sup> the word of the LORD, and the LORD has removed you from being king over Israel.” 15:27 As Samuel turned to go away, he grasped the hem of his robe, and it tore.*

The acting person of the second half of this verse is not specified by TJon, whereas Syr, 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, LXX, and Josephus<sup>1030</sup> added “Saul” for the sake of clarity. The use of the demonstrative “ille” (that one) in the Vulgate also points to Saul as the one tearing the robe, since Samuel is mentioned in 15:27a and Saul in 15:26. This unanimity among the ancient versions can hardly be explained by the assumption that the original meaning of the grasping of the hem was still known.<sup>1031</sup> Nowadays, if Saul is seen as the acting person, the grasping of the hem is explained as a positive act, an act of supplication: Saul pleaded with Samuel not to abandon him and not to let him down in sight of the elders and the people (15:25). A similar act is carried out by a woman with the hem of Jesus’ robe (cf. Lk. 8:44).<sup>1032</sup> It is explained as a negative act by Conrad, who interprets the tearing of the hem not as a coincidence, but as an act in which King Saul takes away the official task and status of the prophet Samuel.<sup>1033</sup>

<sup>1027</sup>Omitted by MS D.

<sup>1028</sup>MS d reads **בְּמִימְרָא**. MS T reads **בְּפִלְחָנָא**, as some MSS do in 15:23. Note that MS T does not read **בְּפִלְחָנָא** in 15:23, but **בְּפִתְגָמָא**.

<sup>1029</sup>Alternative rendering: you have cut off; cf. 15:23.

<sup>1030</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:152.

<sup>1031</sup>MTeh. 57:3 assumed that Samuel rent Saul’s robe in order to give Saul a sign that his kingdom was taken away from him. And when David cut off the hem of Saul’s robe (24:4), Saul remembered the sign and acknowledged that David would be king after him (24:21).

<sup>1032</sup>So R.A. Brauner, “‘To Grasp the Hem’ and 1 Samuel 15:27”, *JANES* 6 (1974), 35-38, esp. 38.

<sup>1033</sup>D. Conrad, “Samuel und die Mari-‘Propheten’: Bemerkungen zu 1 Sam

Josephus offers a different explanation of Saul's act, namely that Saul was seeking to detain Samuel. And RuthR. 7:12 does not refer to a supplicating or angry Saul, but explains that Samuel's clothes were torn as a sign of mourning (cf. 15:35), because his plans concerning Saul had failed.

28 15 ואמר ליה שמואל אעדי יוי ית מלכותא דישראל מנך יומא דין ויהבה לחברך  
התקנין עובדוהי מנך:

15:28 *And Samuel said to him, "The LORD has taken away the kingdom of Israel from you this day, and has given it to a neighbour of yours, whose deeds are better than yours.*

The paronomasia of the Hebrew text—the tearing of the robe and the tearing of the kingship—is not maintained in TJon. In this verse, the verb “to tear” is used as a metaphor and therefore explained as “to take away” (>14). The quality of the next king is also specified: his deeds will be better than Saul's (>11).

29 15 ואם חומר אתוב מחוביך וישתביק לי בריל דאעביד מלכותא אנא ובני על  
ישראל לעלם  $\diamond$  כבר נזיר<sup>1034</sup> עלך מן קדם<sup>1035</sup>  $\diamond$   
מרי  $\diamond$  נצחניה דישראל  
דלית קדמוהי  $\diamond$  שקר  
ולא תאיב  $\diamond$  ממא דאמר  
ארי לא כבני אנשא הוא  
דאמרין ומכרין  
גזרין ולא מקימין:

15:29 *And even now you say, 'I will turn away from my sins and it will be forgiven to me in order that I and my sons may exercise kingship over Israel forever,' it is already decreed upon you from before the Master of Israel's victory, before Whom there is no deception, and Who does not turn away from what He said; for He is not like the sons of men, who say and deny it, decree and do not carry it out."*

The transition from the preceding verse appeared too abrupt for the Targumists, so they made an explanatory addition. This explanation also functions as a defence of God's righteousness, for Saul's repent-

15:27", W. Voight (ed.), *XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag ZDMG Suppl. 1*, Vol. 1, Wiesbaden 1969, 273-80. Conrad's observation is supported by the repetition of the scene, now by David who cut off the hem of Saul's robe, in 1 Sam. 24:11. After that deed Saul recognized the new king in David and asked not to cut off his descendants after him (24:20-21).

<sup>1034</sup>MSS a J read איתנור, which has the same meaning.

<sup>1035</sup>MSS d D T add יי, in accordance with the monotheistic vocabulary of TJon (>22).

ance is said not to be wholehearted (>24). He pleads for forgiveness in order to remain king and to establish his dynasty (cf. also 13:13), not out of regret over his sins.<sup>1036</sup> Besides, it gave the translator the opportunity to elaborate on the theme of dynasty. Saul was not to be the father of a dynasty, in contrast to David.

The Hebrew metaphorical denotation of God, נצח, is rendered with two words (>13). First, the reference to God is maintained by using the word מֶלֶךְ, 'master'. Secondly, one of the meanings of the stem נצח is reiterated in נצחונָה, 'victory'. This rendering might have been affected by 1 Chron. 29:11, where נצח is an attribute of the LORD,<sup>1037</sup> and by TO Exod. 15:3, where God is called "the Master of the victory of wars". Syr and Vg also lean towards the sense of "victory".

The second half of the verse is, already in the Hebrew text, reminiscent of the second blessing of Balaam (Num. 23:19). This fact is exploited by the translators, who used more words from Balaam's blessing, although they did not choose to quote this verse directly from TO (>15). The use of Numbers resulted in a double translation of the Hebrew לְהִנָּחֵם and in a rather poetic end to this verse. Furthermore, a harmonization is achieved of Samuel's pronouncement that God would not take back what He had said,<sup>1038</sup> with the beginning and the end of this chapter (15:11, 35), which claim that God regretted his decision to appoint Saul king. This verse deals with Saul's dynasty, not with Saul's kingship in general, and in that respect it is absolutely safe to state that God does what He says and carries out what He decrees, for God never promised Saul a dynasty (>16).<sup>1039</sup>

Note that a new paronomasia is made: God does not "turn back" from what He said (15:29), but Samuel "turned back" with Saul to honour him before the elders and the people (15:31). This word play carries the implication that Samuel's turning back had something to do with Saul's kingship. A similar explanation is given by Pseudo-Jerome, who states that Saul asked Samuel to honour him as the king in order to let him remain king.<sup>1040</sup>

<sup>1036</sup>Likewise Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 89.

<sup>1037</sup>Cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 268.

<sup>1038</sup>On the Targumist's refusal to accept the idea of God changing his mind, see Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible*, 54.

<sup>1039</sup>A similar harmonization is made by Pseudo-Jerome, who explains that "God gives everything He promised to his servants", cf. *Quaestiones*, 89. A different harmonization is made by McCarter, *I Samuel*, 268, who postulates that the present verse is a late addition.

<sup>1040</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 89: "Honora me sicut regem ut ego procedam sicut rex."

15 30 ואמר חביתו כען יקרני כען קדם סבי עמי וקרם<sup>1041</sup> ישראל ותוב עמי ואסגור קדם יי אלהי: 15 31 ותב שמואל בחר שאול וסגיד שאול קדם יי: 15 32 ואמר שמואל קריבו לוהי יה אנג מלכא דבית<sup>1042</sup> עמלק ואחא<sup>1043</sup> לוהיה אנג מפנקא ואמר אנג בכבו רבוני<sup>1044</sup> מרי<sup>1045</sup> מוחא:

15:30 Then he said, "I have sinned; yet honour me now before the elders of my people and before Israel, and turn back with me, that I may bow down before the LORD your God." 15:31 So Samuel turned back after Saul; and Saul bowed down before the LORD. 15:32 Then Samuel said, "Bring near to me Agag the king of the House of Amalek." And Agag came to him cheerfully and Agag said, "Please, my lord, death is bitter."

Hebrew מערנה has caused difficulties to modern interpreters and ancient translators alike, because of its uncertain derivation.<sup>1046</sup> LXX reads τρέμω, probably derived from the root מער, 'to stumble, to totter'. R. Moshe Kimḥi let the pessimistic tenor of the sequel prevail and derived the word, by metathesis, from ענר, 'bind'.<sup>1047</sup> Aquila, Symmachus and TJon take a rendering that indicates a rather optimistic attitude of King Agag, connecting the word with ערן, 'bliss, jewellery'.<sup>1048</sup> Finally, Vg simply combines both interpretations by rendering "pinguissimus et tremens".<sup>1049</sup>

It is noteworthy that Menachem b. Shlomo quotes an unknown Aramaic translation of the word that seems to have derived it from the root ענר and rendered it, like Moshe Kimḥi, "bound, fettered".<sup>1050</sup> He explains the stem ערן as follows:

sicut rex."

<sup>1041</sup>Ms D adds סבי, "elders of Israel", making this phrase the exact parallel of the preceding phrase, "elders of my people".

<sup>1042</sup>Omitted by MSS a J S, which read רעמלק according to the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1043</sup>MSS a C read ואל, 'and he went', which is in conformity with the Hebrew text, but not with the logic of the narrative (>29).

<sup>1044</sup>Ms a adds אערי, 'take away'.

<sup>1045</sup>Ms S reads מהי, resulting in the question "What is death?"

<sup>1046</sup>S. Talmon, "1 Sam. XV 32b—A Case of Conflated Readings?", VT 11 (1961), 456-57.

<sup>1047</sup>In R. Moshe Kimḥi's commentary to Job 38:31, where he connected this word with אענרנו in Job 31:37.

<sup>1048</sup>Likewise in TO Gen. 49:20; TJon Isa. 47:8; TgLam. 4:5. It is possible that Pseudo-Philo's story about Agag offering Saul to show him hidden treasures (LAB, 58) was based on the same exegetical tradition.

<sup>1049</sup>A survey of these translations can be derived from Driver, Notes, 130; McCarter, I Samuel, 264; Talmon, "1 Sam. XV 32b", 456-57. Syr omitted the phrase.

<sup>1050</sup>Menachem b. Shlomo, בחן, אבן ערן 2; cited by M. Goshen-Gottstein, שקיעים, מהרנמי המקרא הארמיים, Vol. 1, Ramat-Gan, 1983, no. 2.17.

עדן: עניין שלשאות כאומר וילך אליו אנג מערנות ותרנום יונתן כד אסיר בשלשן  
 ערן: *a matter of chains, as it is said, "and Agag went to him מערנות", and  
 Targum Jonathan, "when he was fettered in chains".*

Hebrew *סר* has caused difficulties as well. LXX and Syr obviously do not read the word, whereas TJon and Vg give a different translation each. TJon equates the word with *שר* and renders רבוני 'my lord'.<sup>1051</sup> Vg, however, derives it from the root *סור*, 'to depart', maintaining the optimistic attitude of King Agag.

33 15 ואמר שמואל  
 כמה דאתכילה נשיא חררך  
 כין חתכל מנשיא אמך  
 ופשח שמואל ית אנג קדם יי בגלגלא:

15:33 *And Samuel said, "Just as she has made women childless—your sword, so shall she be childless among women—your mother."*<sup>1052</sup> *And Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the LORD in Gilgal.*

The meaning of Hebrew *וישכך*, which only occurs here and might be a Shaphel of *סוך*,<sup>1053</sup> can only be derived from its treatment in the ancient versions. While TJon and Syr opt for *פשח*, 'to cut into pieces'—and likewise Vg, Aquila and Symmachus—, LXX rendered "slaughtered"<sup>1054</sup>

34 15 ואזל שמואל לרמתא ושאל סליק לביתה לנבעתא דשאל: 35 15 ולא  
 אוסיף שמואל למחזי ית שאל עד יום מותיה ארי אחאבל שמואל על שאל ויזי חב  
 בממריה ארי אמליך ית שאל על ישראל:

15:34 *Then Samuel went to Ramah. And Saul went up to his house, to The Hill of Saul. 15:35 And Samuel did not see Saul again until the day of his death, for Samuel grieved over Saul. And the LORD turned back in his speech that he had made Saul king over Israel.*

<sup>1051</sup>R. Isaac used the word "prince" as well, but made it refer to Agag himself: "Are princes executed with such a bitter form of death!" (LamR. 3:64 § 9; cf. PesK. 3:6). It is not necessary to assume a different *Vorlage*, for *סר* and *שר* can easily be exchanged in Jewish hermeneutics (>1); against Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 32.

<sup>1052</sup>See above, Ch. 3, *s.v.* "hyperbaton" and "anacoluthon".

<sup>1053</sup>G.J. Thierry, "Remarks on Various Passages of the Psalms", *OTS* 13 (1963), 77-97, esp. 88; L. Wächter, "Reste von Šaf'el-Bildungen im Hebräischen", *ZAW* 83 (1971), 380-89; cited by M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography XI", *Bib.* 54 (1973), 362: "since the shaphel was the normal causative form in Ugaritic, it should appear at least residually in Hebrew".

<sup>1054</sup>Cf. Driver, *Notes*, 130; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 269.

## 5.16 David Anointed, Saul Departed (1 Samuel 16)

The chapter of 1 Sam. 16 was not used as *haftara* in either cycle. Only MS T.-S. B18.7 added 16:1 and 16:12-13 after the reading of 1 Sam. 15, the *haftara* on Shabbath Zakhor.<sup>1055</sup>

16 ואמר יי לשמואל עד אמתי את מתאבל על שאול ואנא רחיקתיה מלמהויי  
מלכא על ישראל מלי קרנך משחא ואיתא<sup>1056</sup> אשלחנך לות ישי דמבית לחם ארי גלי  
קדמי<sup>1057</sup> בבנויה כשר קדמי למהויי מלכא:

16:1 And the LORD said to Samuel, "How long will you mourn over Saul, while I have removed him from being king over Israel? Fill your horn with oil and go; I send you to Jesse, who is from Bethlehem, for there is revealed before Me among his sons one fit before Me to be the king."

The end of this verse in MS eb1 reads as follows: גלי קדמי למהויי מלכא, 'it is revealed before Me that one of his sons [will] be king for Me'. It is possible that this reading represents an older version of TJon. Whereas גלי קדמי למהויי is a unique expression, כשר קדמי is standard Targumic phraseology. Moreover, the version of MS eb1 contains לי, a rendering that may well have been experienced as all too literal, because it might suggest that God would benefit from David's becoming king.

16 ואמר שמואל איכדין איזיל ואם<sup>1058</sup> ישמע שאול ויקטלני ואמר יי עגלת תורין  
תסב בידך ותימר לדבחא קדם יי אחיתי: 16 3 ותזמין לישי בשירותא ואנא  
אחוינך ית דתעביד ותמשח קדמי ית דאימר לך:

16:2 And Samuel said, "How can I go? If Saul hears it, he will kill me." And the LORD said, "Take a heifer by your hand, and say, 'I have come to sacrifice before the LORD.'" 16:3 And you shall invite Jesse to the meal, and I will tell you what you shall do; and you shall anoint before Me him whom I name to you."

As in 1 Sam. 9 the aspect of the meal is stressed, although the idea of the offering is maintained in 16:2, 5. It appears that Samuel is allowed to sacrifice as a Levite, according to TJon (cf. also 7:9), so the aspect of the meal in the present verse is rather an explanatory phrase than an avoidance of misbehaviour.<sup>1059</sup> Still, verse 5 specifies the offering

<sup>1055</sup> Cf. M.L. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah Collections*, Cambridge 1992, 33 (no. 395).

<sup>1056</sup> So also Syr with  $\text{ܠܡܗܘܝܝ}$ .

<sup>1057</sup> Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1058</sup> MS B omitted the word  $\text{ואם}$ , in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1059</sup> Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 16; against Churgin, *Targum*

as a peace offering, which was permitted outside the sanctuary (see above, Ch. 4, Hebrew זבח).

16 4 ועבד שמואל ית דמליל יוי ואתא לבית לחם ואחכנישו סבי קרתא  $\diamond$  לקדמותיה ואמר<sup>1060</sup> שלם מיתך: 16 5 ואמר שלם לדבחהא  $\diamond$  קדם  $\diamond$  יוי אחיתי אודמנו ותיעלון עמי בשירותא  $\diamond$  חמין ית ישי ויה בנוהי וקרא להון לשירותא  $\diamond$ <sup>1061</sup> לנכסת: קדשיא:

16:4 Samuel did as the LORD said, and came to Bethlehem. The elders of the city gathered to meet him, and said, "Is your coming peaceful?" 16:5 And he said, "Peaceful! I have come to sacrifice before the LORD; consider yourselves invited and come with me to the meal." And he invited Jesse and his sons, and called them to the meal, to the sacrifice of holy things.

As before, the stress is on the aspect of the meal and not on the offering itself. Ms p even gives a double translation of the last Hebrew word, זבח: it is called both a meal and a peace offering. In the same translational manoeuvre the Targumist has Samuel "invite" the elders and the family of Jesse for the meal, and not "consecrate" them for the offering ceremony.

16 6 והוה במיעלהון וחזא ית אליאב ואמר ברם<sup>1062</sup> תקין קדם  $\diamond$  יוי משיחיה:

16:6 When they came, he looked on Eliab and said, "Surely, suitable before the LORD is his anointed one."

The small addition of Aramaic תקין makes the vague Hebrew expression of "his anointed one is before the LORD" more explicit. Eliab was considered the right choice.<sup>1063</sup>

16 7 ואמר יוי לשמואל לא תסחכל בחווייה<sup>1064</sup> וברום קומתיה ארי רחיקתיה ארי לא כמא<sup>1065</sup> דחון בני אנשא ארי<sup>1066</sup> בני אנשא חון בעיניהון וקדם  $\diamond$  יוי גלין מחשבת לבא:

16:7 But the LORD said to Samuel, "Do not look on his appearance or on the height of his stature, because I have removed him. For it is not as sons of man see; for sons of man see with their eyes, but before the LORD the thoughts of the heart are revealed."

In the Hebrew text the principal sentence, which should follow after

Jonathan, 116.

<sup>1060</sup>Plural in conformity with many Hebrew MSS, LXX, Syr and Vg. MSS a d read the singular.

<sup>1061</sup>Only present in MS p.

<sup>1062</sup>Omitted in MS T.

<sup>1063</sup>Similarly, Pseudo-Philo, LAB, 59:2 adds "holy".

<sup>1064</sup>Ms T reads בריויה, 'his appearance', cf. 16:12 (>15).

<sup>1065</sup>TJon, as well as LXX and Syr, interpreted Hebrew אשר as כאשר.

<sup>1066</sup>Omitted in MS D.

“for not as man sees”, is absent. It is only complemented in LXX with “God sees” (cf. Ch. 4, *s.v.* Aramaic קדם). This was no option for TJon because God does not “see” in a human way. For this reason, TJon closely follows the Hebrew.

The parallel expressions “to the eyes” and “to the heart” are translated in two different ways. Hebrew ללכב is described as “the thoughts of the heart” (>14).<sup>1067</sup> Hebrew לעינים is represented by a different preposition, resulting in the translation “with their eyes” (cf. Syr). This alteration may be based on the Hebrew of Ezek. 44:5, in which the same combination of words occurs: בן־אדם שים לבך וראה בעיניך, ‘son of man, pay attention and see with your eyes’.<sup>1068</sup> The ironic link between the present expression in Hebrew that God does not look “to the eyes”, and 16:12, where David is described as “with beautiful eyes”, is completely lost in the Targumic version.

◇ 8 וקרא ישי לאבינדב ואעבריה קדם<sup>1069</sup> שמואל ואמר אף בדין לא רעוא קדם יי:

*16:8 Then Jesse called Abinadab and made him pass before Samuel. And he said, “Neither is there delight in him before the LORD.”*

In 1 Sam. 16 the translation of Hebrew בחר is more reverential than in other chapters. The usual equivalent is the Ithpeel of the Aramaic verb רעא, ‘to delight in, to choose’, and also in cases where God is the subject; cf. החזיתון דאתרעי ביה יי, ‘do you see that the LORD has chosen him?’ (1 Sam. 10:24). In this chapter TJon chose a circumlocution with the noun רעוא, ‘will, pleasure’, although there is also the connotation of ‘choice’.

9 וואעבר<sup>1070</sup> ישי שמה ואמר אף בדין לא רעוא קדם<sup>1071</sup> יי: 10 וואעבר ישי שבעה בנוהי קדם<sup>1072</sup> שמואל ואמר שמואל ליש<sup>1073</sup> לא רעוא קדם<sup>1074</sup> יי באלין: 11 ואמר שמואל ליש<sup>1075</sup> השלימו<sup>1076</sup> עולימיא ואמר עוד אשהאר זעירא והא רעי בענא ואמר שמואל ליש<sup>1077</sup> שלח ואיתניא ארי לא נסחר עד מיתוהי הכא: 12 ושלח ואיתניא והוא<sup>1078</sup> סמוק עינוהי יאין ושפיר<sup>1079</sup> בריייה<sup>1080</sup> ואמר יי קום משחיה ארי דין הוא:

<sup>1067</sup>Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:160, who speaks of the “virtue of the soul” and the “beauty of the soul”.

<sup>1068</sup>Suggested by P.A.H. de Boer in *BHS*, crit.app.

<sup>1069</sup>Ms D erroneously adds יי after this קדם.

<sup>1070</sup>In MS B the entire verse is omitted, but complemented in the margin.

<sup>1071</sup>Omitted in MSS m B.

<sup>1072</sup>Ms T adds here the last part of this verse, שלח ואיתניא ארי לא נסחר עד מיתוהי, which is erased again.

<sup>1073</sup>Ms Fr reads הא שלימו, “behold, the young men are complete”, considering Samuel’s question a rhetorical one (>14).

<sup>1074</sup>Mss m B D T read והא, ‘and behold’.

<sup>1075</sup>Mss C D read למיחו, “beautiful to see”.



16:9 Then Jesse made Shammah pass by. And he said, "Neither is there delight in him before the LORD." 16:10 And Jesse made seven of his sons pass before Samuel. And Samuel said to Jesse, "There is no delight before the LORD in them." 16:11 And Samuel said to Jesse, "Are the young men complete?" And he said, "There remains one, the smallest,<sup>1076</sup> but behold, he is tending the sheep." And Samuel said to Jesse, "Send and fetch him; for we will not sit down<sup>1077</sup> till he comes here." 16:12 And he sent and brought him in. Now he was ruddy, his eyes were beautiful, and he was handsome in appearance. And the LORD said, "Arise, anoint him, for this is he."

The awkward Hebrew construction עַם עֵינָיִם יָפֶה is rendered according to its probable sense, "his eyes were beautiful" (so also Syr). The beauty of David, described in the present verse, has become the origin of the thought that the Messiah would also be beautiful (cf. TJon 1 Sam. 17:43 [MSS c S]; 18:5; 2 Sam. 23:8; TgPs. 45:3).<sup>1078</sup>

13 16 וְנָסִיב דְּשִׁמְוֵאל יֵת קְרָנָא דְּמִשְׁחָא וּמִשְׁחָא<sup>1079</sup> יִתְיָהּ<sup>1080</sup> בְּגוֹ אַחֲוָי וּשְׂרַת רוּחַ גְּבוּרָא<sup>1081</sup> מִן קִדְמָא יוּי עַל דּוּד מְיוּמָא הֵוּוּא וְלַעֲיָלָא וְקָם שִׁמְוֵאל וְאוּל לְרִמְחָא: 14 16

<sup>1076</sup>Although David can also be said to be the "youngest", the word "smallest" is better within the context. Both Saul (9:2; 10:23) and Eliab (16:7) were tall, but both men were rejected; cf. M. Kessler, "Narrative Technique in 1 Sm 16,1-13", *CBQ* 32 (1970), 543-54, esp. 550.

<sup>1077</sup>TJon interprets Hebrew נָסַב as a derivation from סָבַב, which in late Hebrew could mean "to sit down around the table", cf. also Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:163. In most earlier Biblical verses, however, it has to be derived from שָׁב, 'return' (so Syr).

<sup>1078</sup>Cf. also J.C. de Moor, "'Van wie zegt de profeet dit?' Messiaanse apologetiek in de Targumim", in: H.H. Grosheide et al. (eds), *De knechtsgestalte van Christus: Studies door collega's en oud-leerlingen aangeboden aan Prof. dr. H.N. Ridderbos*, Kampen 1978, 91-110, esp. 104; E. van Staaldoune-Sulman, "The Aramaic Song of the Lamb", in: J.C. de Moor, W.G.E. Watson (eds), *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT, 42), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1993, 265-292, esp. 278. Ultimately, this presentation depends on the idealized beauty of all ancient oriental rulers.

<sup>1079</sup>Ms Fr reads וְרָבִי, 'he elevated'.

<sup>1080</sup>Ms b specifies יֵת דּוּד.

<sup>1081</sup>MSS w b T and Kimḥi read גְּבוּרָא, "a prophetic spirit", as in other verses. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:166, also assumed that it was a prophetic spirit, for he wrote that "David began to prophesy when the divine spirit had removed to him"; and likewise Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 90, and Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 59:4, who both assumed that David began to sing a psalm in that moment. The 'Songs of David' from the Cairo Geniza, which may derive from a Qumran manuscript, also describe David the anointed as a prophet praising the LORD, cf. D. Flusser, S. Safrai, "עֵינָיִם בְּמִקְרָא", in: B. Uffenheimer (ed.), 'שִׁירֵי דָוִד' הַחִיצוֹנִים, in: *Memoriam of Joshua Grintz*, Tel Aviv 1970, 84, lines A14-16.

Ms S\* erroneously reads גְּבוּרָא, a contamination of גְּבוּרָא and גְּבוּרָא, but in the margin גְּבוּרָא is attested.

ורוח גבורא מן קדם יי דהות עם שאול עדת מניה ומבעתא ליה רוח בישא<sup>1082</sup> מן קדם יוי: 16 15 ואמרו עברי שאול ליה הא<sup>1083</sup> כען רוח בישא מן קדם יוי מבעתא לך:

16:13 Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brothers. And a mighty spirit from before the LORD dwelt upon David from that day forward. And Samuel rose up, and went to Ramah. 16:14 And the mighty spirit from before the LORD who had been with Saul, departed from him; and an evil spirit from before the LORD tormented him. 16:15 And Saul's servants said to him, "Behold now, an evil spirit from before the LORD is tormenting you.

The word order of the sentence is adjusted slightly in order to avoid a connection between God's name and the adjective "evil" (cf. 16:16). The construction of the Aramaic version is based on 16:14 (>15).

16 16 ימר כען רבוננא עבדך קדמך יבעון גברא דידע לננא בכנרא ויהי כד חשרי עלך רוח בישא מן קדם יוי ויגנין בידיה וייטב<sup>1084</sup> לך: 16 17 ואמר<sup>1085</sup> שאול לעבדוהי<sup>1086</sup> חזו<sup>1087</sup> כען לי גברא דמוטיב<sup>1088</sup> לננא וחיוניה לי: 16 18 ואחיב חד מעולימא ואמר הא חזיתי ברא לישי דמבית לחם ידע לננא וגבר חילא<sup>1089</sup> וגבר עביד קרב וסכלתן בעיצא<sup>1090</sup> וגברא שפיר<sup>1091</sup> בריויה ומימרא<sup>1092</sup> דוי בסעדיה: 16 19 ושלח שאול אנגדין לות ישי ואמר שדר<sup>1092</sup> לי ית דוד ברך דבענא: 16 20 ונסיב ישי טעון חמרא לחמא<sup>1093</sup> וגרב דחמר<sup>1094</sup> וגדיא בר עזי חד<sup>1095</sup> ושדר<sup>1096</sup> ביד דוד בריה לות שאול: 16 21 ואתא דוד לות שאול ושמיש קדמויה ורחמיה לחדא והוה ליה נטיל זנין: 16 22 ושלח שאול לות ישי למימר ישמיש<sup>1097</sup> כען דוד קדמי ארי

<sup>1082</sup> Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1083</sup> MS T reads עד, resulting in "Until now, an evil spirit . . .".

<sup>1084</sup> MS D reads וטב, which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1085</sup> The first five words of this verse are missing from MS J\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1086</sup> MS B\* adds והא, but it is erased later.

<sup>1087</sup> MS Fr reads בעו, 'seek', leaving out the following כען, in accordance with the preceding verse (>15).

<sup>1088</sup> MSS Fr eb4 read דידע, 'who knows', in accordance with the preceding verse (>15).

<sup>1089</sup> MS D omitted the phrase וגבר חילא by haplography.

<sup>1090</sup> Omitted in MS D. This word is a specification of the unspecific Hebrew דבר (>11). LXX and Vg, however, assume that David was capable in speech, cf. Driver, *Notes*, 135.

<sup>1091</sup> Cf. 16:12 (>15). LXX and Syr rendered likewise.

<sup>1092</sup> MS o reads שלח, which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>1093</sup> MSS b J inverse the word order and read חמרא טעון דלחמא, 'an ass with a load of bread'.

<sup>1094</sup> MS J erroneously reads here דלחמא, too.

<sup>1095</sup> Omitted in MS eb1. MS D erroneously reads דוד.

<sup>1096</sup> Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>1097</sup> MSS Fr eb1 eb4 read יקום, 'let he come up'.

אשכח רחמין<sup>1098</sup> בעיני<sup>1099</sup>: 16 23 והוי כד שריא רוח<sup>1100</sup> בישא מן קדם<sup>1101</sup> יוי<sup>1102</sup> על שאול ונסיב<sup>1101</sup> דוד<sup>1101</sup> ית כנרא ומנגין בידיה ומתרוח<sup>1102</sup> לשאול ופאיב ליה ומסתלקא מניה רוח<sup>1103</sup> בישא:

16:16 *Let our lord now say, your servants before you must seek out a man who knows to play the lyre. And when an evil spirit from before the LORD is dwelling upon you, he will play it with his hand, and you will be well.* 16:17 *So Saul said to his servants, "See for me a man who can play well, and bring him to me."* 16:18 *One of the young men answered and said, "Behold, I have seen a son of Jesse, who is from Bethlehem, knowing to play, a hero of the army, a man waging war, prudent in counsel, a man handsome in his appearance, and the speech of the LORD is in his aid."* 16:19 *So Saul sent messengers to Jesse and said, "Send me David your son, who is with the sheep."* 16:20 *And Jesse took an ass-load of bread, and a skin of wine, and a kid—a son of goats—and he sent them by his son David to Saul.* 16:21 *And David came to Saul, and served before him. And Saul loved<sup>1103</sup> him greatly, and he became his armour-bearer.* 16:22 *And Saul sent to Jesse, saying, "Let David serve me, for he has found favour in my eyes."* 16:23 *And whenever an evil spirit from before the LORD dwelt upon Saul, David took the lyre and played it with his hand; so it was refreshing to Saul, and the evil spirit departed from him.*

### 5.17 Against Goliath (1 Samuel 17:1–18:5)

According to BÜCHLER, part of 1 Sam. 17 was read as *haftara* in the triennial cycle after the Torah reading of Deut. 20:10. There is no specific link between these two chapters, neither in the Hebrew nor in the Aramaic version. Deut. 20:10ff. affected the translation of 2 Sam. 20:18. According to Kasher 1 Sam. 17 is only a *haftara* in the Italian

<sup>1098</sup>Note the repetition of the stem רחם in 16:21–22.

<sup>1099</sup>MSS a b J S read קדמי<sup>1100</sup>, replacing the *pars pro toto* by its intended meaning (>14).

<sup>1100</sup>In conformity with some Hebrew MSS and quotations, as well as some LXX MSS, but TJon is no reliable witness in this respect, because בישא would have been added anyway (>15).

<sup>1101</sup>Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>1102</sup>Note that the word play on רוח is maintained. MS eb1 erroneously reads ומיחי רוח לש', 'and a spirit came to S[aul]'.  
<sup>1103</sup>Hebrew אהב is translated with its natural equivalent רחם, 'love'. The political overtones, sometimes attached to Hebrew אהב, are never made explicit in TJon. Cf. W.L. Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy", *CBQ* 25 (1963), 77–87; J.A. Thompson, "The Significance of the Verb *Love* in the David-Jonathan Narratives in 1 Samuel", *VT* 24 (1974), 334–38.

tradition.<sup>1104</sup> Nevertheless, the chapter was obviously popular and appealed to people's imagination. Many toseftot were added to the chapter, describing both Goliath's brutality and David's heroic attitude.<sup>1105</sup>

17 וּכְנָשׁוּ פִלְשְׁתִּי יַחַד מִשְׁרֵיתָהוֹן לְאַגָּחַ קִרְבָּא<sup>1106</sup> וְאַחֲכַנְיֵשׁוּ לְסוּכּוֹ דְלִשְׁבֵּיטָא יְהוּדָה וְשָׂרוּ בֵּין סוּכּוֹ וּבֵין עֹקֵהָ בְּאַפְסֵי דְמִים: 2 וְשָׂאוּל וְאַנְשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲחֲכַנְשׁוּ<sup>1107</sup> וְשָׂרוּ בְּמִישֵׁרָא בְּטַמָּא וְסִדְרוּ קִרְבָּא לְקִדְמוֹת פִּלְשְׁתִּי: 3 וּפִלְשְׁתִּי קִימִין עַל טוּרָא מְכָא וְיִשְׂרָאֵל<sup>1108</sup> קִימִין עַל טוּרָא מְכָא וְחִלְהָא בִּינֵיהוֹן: 4 וּנְפַק גְּבֵרָא מִבְּנֵיהוֹן מִמִּשְׁרֵית פִּלְשְׁתִּי גֵלִית שְׁמִיהָ מְגַת רוּמִיהָ שִׁית אֲמִין וְזִרְתָּא:

17:1 And the Philistines gathered their armies to wage war; and they were gathered at Socoh, which belongs to the tribe of Judah, and encamped between Socoh and Azekah, in Ephes-dammim. 17:2 And Saul and the men of Israel gathered themselves, and encamped in the Valley of the Terebinth, and drew up in line of battle against the Philistines. 17:3 And the Philistines stood on the mountain on the one side, and Israel stood on the mountain on the other side, with the valley between them. 17:4 And there came out from between them from the camp of the Philistines a man, named Goliath, of Gath, whose height was six cubits and a span.

Hebrew אי־שֶׁבַע־בֵּין is unclear, both with regard to its etymology and to its precise meaning. Since the word בֵּין is used thrice in the preceding verses, it is tempting to derive it from that preposition. The meaning would then be “a man between two parties, middleman”.<sup>1109</sup>

<sup>1104</sup>Kasher, תוספות, 105-9; also attested in T.-S. K26.36 and in West. Coll. Misc. 70, cf. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts*, 39 no. 458, 120 no. 1573.

<sup>1105</sup>Part of the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of 1 Sam. 17 is described in S.A. Nitsche, *David gegen Goliath: Die Geschichte der Geschichten einer Geschichte, zur Fächerübergreifenden Rezeption einer biblischen Story*, Münster 1998.

<sup>1106</sup>Mss a J read לְקִרְבָּא, leaving out the verb אֲגָחַ, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Ms T omitted the noun קִרְבָּא.

<sup>1107</sup>Ms d reads כְּנִישׁוּ, ‘gathered’, without an object.

<sup>1108</sup>Ms T omitted מְכָא עַל טוּרָא מְכָא by haplography.

<sup>1109</sup>The derivation from בֵּין was suggested by Kimḥi, who defined Goliath as שְׂרֵי הַמְעֻרָה, cf. Driver, *Notes*, 139; and also defended by many modern exegetes, cf. A. Caquot, Ph. de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT, 6), Geneva 1994, 202; W. Caspari, *Die Samuelbücher* (KAT, 7), Leipzig 1936, 198; F.E. Gaebelien, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, Vol. 3, Grand Rapids (MI) 1992, 695; H.W. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher* (ATD, 10), Göttingen 1973, 113; J. Mauchline, *1 and 2 Samuel* (New Century Bible), London 1971, 132; W. Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis* (HAT, 1/4), Göttingen 1902, 85; F. Stolz, *Das erste und zweite Buch Samuel* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare), Zürich 1981, 116. Cf. Samuel's statement in Sot. 42b that Goliath was “the middle one” of the four brothers. This derivation also suits the Ugaritic *bnš bnyy* ‘middleman, intermediary’, cf. G. del Olmo Lete, J. Sanmartín, *Diccionario de la lengua*

This might be the meaning in TJon, although the following ממשרייה פלשתאי appears as an apposition: “from between them”, *i.e.* “from the camp of the Philistines”. However, these two phrase are separated in 17:23.<sup>1110</sup>

A completely different explanation is given by LXX and Syr. Both translations were inspired by 17:51, in which Goliath was called גבור, ‘hero, champion’. Therefore, LXX renders ἄνηρ δυνάτοῦς and Syr translates **גבור** **גבור**.<sup>1111</sup>

A combination of the preceding explanations is given in TgPs. 9:1, where there is an allusion to Goliath.<sup>1112</sup>

דנפק פולירכא מביני משרייה פלשתאי

*that a general came out from among the Philistine camps*

In this double translation both the explanation of the hero is given, with the Greek word πολέμαρχος, and the derivation from the Hebrew preposition בין. In the margin of CR a similar combination is given, but with a different explanation:<sup>1113</sup>

חרגנום ירושנלמין גברא פולומרכא דאיתליד מביני תרחי גניסן מן שמשון דהוה מן שיבשׁ דן ומן ערפה דהוה מן בני מואב גלית שמיא

*Targum Jerushalmi: a man, a general, who was born from between two lineages, from Samson who was from the tribe of Dan, and from Orpah who was from the sons of Moab; named Goliath*

In this marginal note the explanation of the hero is given, with the same Graecism,<sup>1114</sup> but the preposition בין is explained by Goliath’s double descent.<sup>1115</sup> He is a descendant of Samson, probably because of

*ugarítica* (AuOr.S, 7), vol. 1, Barcelona 1996, 112.

<sup>1110</sup> McCarter, *I Samuel*, 290 follows the Qumranic connotation of the word, *viz.* “infantryman”, cf. also J. Carmignac, “Précisions apportées de l’Hébreu Biblique par la guerre de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres”, *VT* 5 (1955), 356-57.

<sup>1111</sup> Rabbinic exegesis also led to this kind of solution, albeit through a different derivation. In Sot. 42b the expression is derived from the verb בנה, ‘to build’. Goliath is thus a “well-built man” or “a man like a building”.

<sup>1112</sup> The Hebrew heading על מות לבן מואב is interpreted as “concerning the death of the sons of Moab”, cf. Ibn Ezra’s interpretation, cited by U. Simon, *Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms: From Saadiah Gaon to Abraham Ibn Ezra* Albany (NY) 1991, 246.

<sup>1113</sup> Cf. Kasher, תוספתה, 105.

<sup>1114</sup> However, the Graecism may also be a second translation of Hebrew אשׁ, cf. Kasher’s second suggestion in תוספתה, 105.

<sup>1115</sup> Vg translates “spurius” (bastard) and might refer to the same double descent, cf. V. Aptowitzer, “Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata”, *ZAW* 29 (1909), 241-252, esp. 244; F. Stummer, “Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments

his physical strength, but also of Orpah on the other hand, stressing the contrast of David's and Goliath's lineage. The perception of Orpah's lineage is already expressed by Pseudo-Philo, and attested to in several rabbinic explanations.<sup>1116</sup>

In contrast to this, the lineage from Goliath to Samson has no parallel. Still, there is a linkage between Goliath and Samson. In EcclR. 1:18 § 1, Goliath and Samson are compared and the conclusion is that both abused their strength. Therefore, both did not profit by their strength. David, however, had the advantage of his strength, because he used it in the service of the LORD. Furthermore, TanB, *Vayyiqra*, 3:8 compares Goliath and Samson. Samson is called the most heroic man of Israel, whereas Goliath is called the most heroic man of the gentiles.

There is another small similarity between Goliath and Dan in early Judaism and Christianity. Several writers interpreted the struggle between David and Goliath as a foreshadowing of the on-going struggle between good and evil, between the Messiah/Christ and Satan.<sup>1117</sup> And one of the Christian writers assumed that the Antichrist, the evil enemy of the Messiah/Christ par excellence, would be a descendant of Dan, since his father Jacob called him a snake (Gen. 49:17).<sup>1118</sup>

The link between Goliath and Dan may also originate in the rabbinic interpretation of Moses' Psalm (Deut. 33). First, Moses calls Dan "a lion's whelp", and since David compares Goliath to a bear and a lion—a lion's whelp in the tosefta-targum on 17:43—, Goliath could well be a descendant of Dan. Secondly, David and Goliath are always depicted as counterparts, and since David is called a descendant from two tribes, viz. from Judah the lion (Gen. 49:9) and from Dan the lion (Deut. 33:22),<sup>1119</sup> Goliath could well be called a descend-

---

aus der Hebraica Veritas", *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, esp. 8-9, although Pseudo-Jerome explained that Goliath was the offspring of a giant father and a Gathite mother, cf. *Quaestiones*, 90.

<sup>1116</sup>Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 61:6; RuthR. 1:20; TanB, *Bereshit*, 11:8; MShem. 20:4; Sot. 42b; San. 95a; TgEst. Shen. 4:13; cf. Kasher, *רוספחה*, 105; Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 4, 85-86.

<sup>1117</sup>Hippolyte, *De David et de Goliath*, 7:9; Hilary, *Tractatus super Psalmum LI*, 4; Ambrose, *Expositio in Psalmum David CXLIII* (118:162), 11; Augustine, *Ennaratio in Psalmum XXXIII*, 4; Idem, *Ennaratio in Psalmum CXLIII*, 1-2; Idem, *Sermo XXXII*, 5; Cassiodore, *Expositio in Psalmum CXLIII*, 1; Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Librum Primum Regnorum*, 41; Primasy Adrimetanensis, *Commentaria in Epistolas S. Pauli*, s.v. Hebrews 2:14. But cf. also Sir. 47:4-6; 1 Macc. 4:30; TgPs. 144:1 and LXX Ps. 143:1; mSot. 8:1.

<sup>1118</sup>Hippolyte, *Sermo de Antichristo*, 14; cf. G.W. Lorein, *Het thema van de Antichrist in de intertestamentaire periode*, Leuven 1997, 67.

<sup>1119</sup>Cf. GenR. 97 (new version).

ant from two tribes, *viz.* from Orpah the faithless and from Dan the snake or the lion.<sup>1120</sup>

17 5 וקולס דנחש על רישיה ושרין גלבין<sup>1121</sup> הוא לביש ומחקל שרינא המשא אלפין תקלי נחשא:

*17:5 A helmet of bronze was on his head, and he was dressed with a breastplate with notches, and the weight of the breastplate was five thousand shekels of bronze.*

Since Hebrew קשקשים, ‘scales’, is always used to depict fish or other water animals (cf. *e.g.* Lev. 11:9-12; Deut. 14:9; Ezek. 29:4), TJon considered it metaphorical language and rendered more descriptively “with notches” (>14). In the margin of CR a more literal explanation of this Hebrew word is given:

תרגום] ירושלמין ושריין דגלד נוני ימא רבא הוא לביש ועלוהי שריין דנחשא ומחקל  
*Targum Jerushalmi: and he was dressed with a breastplate of the skin of the fishes of the great sea; and over it a breastplate of bronze, and the weight*  
...

Hebrew קשקשים, ‘scales’, is interpreted as a literal layer of fish scales. Consequently, Goliath must have had two layers, one of scales and one of bronze.<sup>1122</sup>

17 6 ושרקלינין<sup>1123</sup> דנחש על רגלוהי ומסחפא דנחשא נפיק<sup>1124</sup> מן קולסא מטל<sup>1125</sup> בין כחפוהי:

*17:6 Greaves of bronze upon his legs, and a shield of bronze, coming forth from the helmet, borne between his shoulders.*

Since the latter half of this verse is still dependent on the verb לבש, ‘to wear’, TJon and LXX interpreted Hebrew כידון as a defensive piece of Goliath’s armour.<sup>1126</sup> Both translations render it by “shield”, although Aramaic מסחפא can also mean “covering”. It was a type of

<sup>1120</sup>So H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Vol. 3, München<sup>6</sup> 1974, 801.

<sup>1121</sup>Kimḥi also gives the alternative גלכין, ‘points’.

<sup>1122</sup>Cf. also Kasher, *רוכספוח*, 106. Bacher, “Kritische Untersuchungen”, 7 refers to a similar exegesis in Hul. 66b and Nid. 51b.

<sup>1123</sup>Apparently vocalized as a plural, cf. Syr (>3).

<sup>1124</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1125</sup>MS S reads again נפיק.

<sup>1126</sup>Supported by the consistency in the Hebrew text that “the giant’s weapons of defence are of bronze, those of attack are of iron”, according to Driver, *Notes*, 139. However, Josephus interpreted it as “spear” (cf. *Antiquities*, 6:171), which is considered the best option in the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, but not in HALAT<sup>3</sup>.

defensive equipment, linked to the helmet and protecting the neck and the heart region between the shoulders.

In the second rabbinic Bible, Aramaic מַטְלָא is derived from מַטְלָא, 'rod', which would be a better translation of Hebrew כִּידוֹן. The redactor added דְּנַחֲשָׁא, which resulted in the conflated rendering of "and a visor of bronze, coming forth from the helmet, a rod of bronze between the shoulders".<sup>1127</sup>

17 7 ואַעֲא 1128 דְּמוֹרְנִיתִּיהָ כַּאֲכַסְן דְּגַרְדִּיאִין וְשַׁנְנָא דְּמוֹרְנִיתִּיהָ מִתְקַלֶּל שִׁית מֵאָה תְּקֵלֵי 1130 בְּרוּזָא וְנַטִּילֵי 1131 תְּרִיסָא אוּיֵל קְדָמוּהִי־:

*17:7 And the wood of his spear was like a weaver's heddle-rod, and the point of his spear weighed six hundred shekels of iron; and his shield-bearer went before him.*

The comparison of the spear's shaft to a weaver's beam is not explained in TJon. Since there is no evidence as to what exegetes of the first centuries knew of such spears—Josephus omitted this detail and the other versions gave a literal translation—we cannot simply conclude that TJon assumed that this comparison was no metaphor. The Hebrew text most probably refers to a spear equipped with a thong and ring for slinging. The slinging ensured that the spear could be thrown much farther and with much more stability than other spears. This type of spear is known to have been used in Greece and Egypt.<sup>1132</sup> This explanation is supported by the Syriac version, which give the word ܨܘܠܐ. This ܨܘܠܐ denotes both the weaver's heddle-rod and the texture that is upon it, *i.e.* the warp (cf. Syr Judg. 16:14).

Hebrew לֶהֱבֵחַ, 'flame', is interpreted metaphorically (>13) and translated with the plain "point" (cf. Nah. 3:3).<sup>1133</sup>

Although the Philistines used small, round shields in hand-to-hand fights, Goliath used a צָנֶה, a high, rectangular shield, borne by a ser-

<sup>1127</sup>Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 41; cf. P.A.H. de Boer, "1 Samuel xvii: Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions", *OTS* 1 (Leiden 1942), 79-103, esp. 83.

<sup>1128</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS, the other ancient versions and 2 Sam. 21:19, cf. also Sot. 42b.

<sup>1129</sup>Omitted in MS D, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1130</sup>Ms f reads סַלְעִין, the usual Targumic equivalent of the shekel, see above, commentary on 9:8.

<sup>1131</sup>Ms d adds זַיִנִּיהָ, resulting in "his armour-bearer", which is more frequently used is TgSam. The word "shield" is superfluous in this MS.

<sup>1132</sup>Y. Yadin, "Goliath's Javelin and the אֲרֵנִים בְּנֹר, *PEQ* 86 (1955), 58-69; Idem, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Discovery*, London 1963, 354-55; hesitantly followed by McCarter, *I Samuel*, 293.

<sup>1133</sup>Cf. the rendering "iron" in Syr.



vant.<sup>1134</sup> In its translation TJon uses the Greek word for a high, rectangular shield, which was intended to protect the bearer against long distance projectiles.

17 8 וקם ואכלי<sup>1135</sup> על סדרי ישראל<sup>1136</sup> ואמר להון למא תפקין<sup>1137</sup> לסדרא קרבא<sup>1138</sup> הלא אנא<sup>1139</sup> פלשתאה ואתון עבדין לשאול בחרו לכון<sup>1140</sup> גברא ויחוח לוחי:

17:8 *And he arose and shouted against the ranks of Israel, and said to them, "Why have you come out to draw up for battle? Am I not the Philistine, and are you not servants of Saul? Choose a man for yourselves, and let him come down to me."*

The Masoretic vocalization of ברו implies that it should be derived from ברה, which either means "eat" or is an *hapax legomenon*, meaning something like "make a covenant". With a different vocalization it could have been derived from ברר, 'to select, to choose' (cf. 1 Chron. 7:40). This is probably the option preferred by all the ancient versions, including TJon (>3).

In reading the explanation of Goliath's words in rabbinic literature, one encounters the exegesis that Goliath refers to the God of Israel.<sup>1141</sup> Hebrew איש is considered in the light of Exod. 15:3, which says that "the LORD is a man of war". TO renders this phrase with מרי נצחון קרבא, 'the LORD is the Master of the victory of wars'. This explanation is also given in a marginal note in CR:

ירושלמין הלא אנא גליית פלישתאה דעבדיית עימכון קרבא באפק ונצחית יתכון ונסבית<sup>◇</sup> מן ידיכון ית ארונא דיוי ואתון עבדין לשאול ואם אתון אמרין על מימרא<sup>◇</sup> דיוי מרי נצחון קרבא אנחנא מתרחצין קרו ליה ויחוח לוחי

*Jerushalmi: Am I not Goliath the Philistine, who waged war with you at Aphek and who conquered you and took the ark of the LORD out of your hands? And you are servants of Saul. But if you are saying, 'On the speech*

<sup>1134</sup>Cf. L. Krinetzki, "Ein Beitrag zur Stilanalyse der Goliathperikope (1 Sam. 17,1–18,5)", *Bib.* 54 (1973), 187–236, esp. 191.

<sup>1135</sup>Mss a b d D J and Kimḥi read ואכריז, 'and he loudly proclaimed'.

<sup>1136</sup>Mss a c d o S and Kimḥi read קרבא דישראל, resulting in "against the battle ranks of Israel". Ms J reads the plural קרבא.

<sup>1137</sup>Mss a o J S and Kimḥi read אתון נפקין.

<sup>1138</sup>Mss o S and Kimḥi add עם פלשתאי, 'with the Philistines'. Ms b adds עמי, 'with me'.

<sup>1139</sup>Ms o adds גליית, 'Goliath', in accordance with several tosefta-targumim.

<sup>1140</sup>Ms c reads לי מנכון, resulting in "choose for me a man from amongst you".

<sup>1141</sup>San. 93a; Sot. 42b; TanB, *Vayyiqra*, 5:10. Cf. Kasher, *רוספתוח*, 106; G. Klein, "Bemerkungen zu Herrn Dr. Bacher's 'Kritischen Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum'", *ZDMG* 29 (1875), 157–61, esp. 159.

of the LORD, the Master of the victory of wars, we are trusting,' then call Him and let Him come down to me

Goliath boasts that he captured the ark in the battle at Aphek (cf. 4:1, 11; >17). This tradition was already attested by Pseudo-Philo and circulated in several Midrashim.<sup>1142</sup> This type of tradition is due to the attempt to draw a clear distinction between good and bad, between the faithful heroes and the godless villains (>24). If it was David who brought the ark to its permanent place (2 Sam. 6), then it must have been his great adversary who captured it from its earlier location. Note that there is already a link between the capture of the ark and its return by David in the Hebrew text: both narratives commence with the warning that it was the ark of "the LORD of hosts who sits enthroned on the cherubim" (1 Sam. 4:4; 2 Sam. 6:2); and both narratives describe the ark being carried on a new cart, pulled by oxen (1 Sam. 6:10-12; 2 Sam. 6:3-6).

Furthermore, Goliath quotes the Assyrian general who challenged Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:22) by asking why the people of Israel trusted in the LORD. Lastly, he challenged the people to pray to the LORD to rescue them, with an allusion to Exod. 15:3. In this tosefta Goliath's words are explained as a challenge to God. This explanation agrees with the teaching of R. Aqiba's school, but was objected by R. Ishmael's school, who were averse to the ultra-literal explanations of R. Aqiba's method.<sup>1143</sup>

Other toseftot, then, clearly follow R. Ishmael's method and explain שׂאִי as a reference to a human male.<sup>1144</sup> This explanation is first followed by Pseudo-Philo (*LAB*, 61:2).

And a man came forth from the Philistine camp, named Goliath, and addressed Saul and Israel, and said, "Are you not Israel,<sup>1145</sup> who fled before me, when I captured the ark from you and killed your priests? And now that you are king, come down to me as man and king, and attack. If not, I will come

<sup>1142</sup>Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 54:3; MShem. 11:1; YalqS. § 102; see Kasher, תוספתות, 107, who also refers to Midrashim of Jews in Kurdistan and to Islamic traditions.

<sup>1143</sup>A. Marmorstein, *The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature*, 1920, repr. New York 1968, 67. Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 100-107.

<sup>1144</sup>The provocation of God still exists in the Sefardi type, which let Goliath say, "The Master of your covenant could not overpower me"; cf. R. Kasher, ישׂהאם?" "מקור אחד לתוספתות החרום לנביאים"

<sup>1145</sup>Or "the Israelite" as P.W. van der Horst, *De Bijbelse geschiedenis van Pseudo-Philo: een joodse hervertelling van de Bijbel uit de eerste eeuw van onze jaartelling* (Na de Schriften), Kampen 1990, 157 translated it. According to his interpretation, Saul is addressed as the one who fled to Shiloh, cf. tosefta-targum to 4:12.

to you and capture you, and I will make you and your people serve our gods.”

Text-critical investigation has led Kasher to the conclusion that the following tosefta exists in two different types, *viz.* a Sefardi and an Ashkenazi version.<sup>1146</sup> Although both versions refer to Saul as the man who ought to come down to Goliath and fight against him, they also have their own characteristics. We will first give the Sefardi tosefta, which also includes the provocation of God.<sup>1147</sup> The main text is taken from MSS c d, which have incorporated it in the text and best preserved the poetical flavour of the tosefta.<sup>1148</sup>

<i>Am I not Goliath</i>	הלא <sup>1149</sup> אנה גליה
<i>the Philistine from Gath,</i>	פלשתאה <sup>1150</sup> דמן גת
<i>who killed the two sons of Eli,</i>	דקטלית תרין בני עלי <sup>1151</sup> .
<i>Hophni and Phinehas?</i>	חפני ופינחס
<i>And I captured the ark of the LORD's covenant</i>	ושביתי ית ארון קיימא דיי
<i>and I carried it to the house of Dagon,</i>	ואובילית <sup>1152</sup> לבית דגון טעוהית
<i>my idol,</i>	
<i>and it was there for six months</i>	והיה תמן שחא <sup>1153</sup> ירחין
<i>and the Master, your Creator,</i>	ולא יכיל לי מרי <sup>1154</sup> קוניכון
<i>did not overpower me.</i>	
<i>And concerning every battle</i>	ועל כל קרב
<i>—whatever battle that the Philistines had—,</i>	וקרב דהוה להון לפלשתאי
<i>I went out as the champion,</i>	אנה נפקנא לפום קלא <sup>1155</sup>
<i>and I was victorious in battle,</i>	ונצחנא בקרבא <sup>1156</sup>
<i>and threw down the killed ones</i>	ורמינא קטילין כעפרא <sup>1157</sup> דארעא
<i>as the dust of the earth.</i>	

<sup>1146</sup>R. Kasher, “האם יש מקור אחד לתוספתות התרגום לנביאים”, *AJSReview*, 22.2 (1997), 1-21, esp. 13.

<sup>1147</sup>Attested in MSS c d S and Salamanca 1 [from now on Sall], written by Alfonso de Zamora in 1532, collated and edited by Kasher, לתוספתות “האם יש מקור אחד לתוספתות התרגום לנביאים”, 9; Idem, תוספתות, 106-107.

<sup>1148</sup>Cf. E. van Staalduine-Sulman, “The Aramaic Song of the Lamb”, in: J.C. de Moor, W.G.E. Watson (eds), *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT, 42), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1993, 265-292, esp. 279-82.

<sup>1149</sup>Ms Sall gives this tosefta with the heading (תוספתא).

<sup>1150</sup>Omitted in MS Sall.

<sup>1151</sup>Ms Sall adds כהנה, ‘the priest’, as is done in the Ashkenazi version.

<sup>1152</sup>MSS Sall S add יחיה.

<sup>1153</sup>Ms Sall reads שבעה and MS S reads שבעה, both in conformity with the Hebrew text (1 Sam. 6:1).

<sup>1154</sup>MSS Sall and S read קיימא, ‘your covenant’.

<sup>1155</sup>Ms S reads לשיסקלא; MS Sall reads לחקלא; see below, commentary.

<sup>1156</sup>Omitted in MSS Sall S.

<sup>1157</sup>Ms S reads בעפר, ‘on the dust’.

All this I have done for them  
and they did not appoint me over them,  
neither as king, nor as praetor.

כל<sup>1158</sup> דא עברית<sup>1159</sup> להון  
ולא ממנן יתי עליהון  
לא מלכא ולא אצשרטיגא

And this Saul,  
from Gibeah of Benjamin,  
what did he do for you,  
that you appointed him king over you?

והדין שאול  
דמן גבעת<sup>1160</sup> בנימן  
מה עבר<sup>1160</sup> לכון  
ארי מניחון יתיה מלכא עליכון

Now, say to him:  
if he is a strong man,  
let him come down and do battle with me.  
But if he is a weak man,  
choose for yourselves a man  
and let him come down to me.

כען אמרו ליה  
אם גבר תקיף הוא  
יחות ויעביד עמי קרבא  
ואם גבר חלש הוא  
בחרו לכון גברא  
ויחות לוהי

Goliath's boast is extended with the death of Hophni and Phinehas, and with the capture of the ark. These two events were always connected in the Hebrew Bible (cf. 5:11, 17, 19, 20), and remained connected in later exegesis.<sup>1161</sup> The duration of the ark's stay in Philistine land is six months here, whereas 1 Sam. 6:1 mentions seven months. The latter duration is used both in the Sefardi MSS Sal1 S and in the Ashkenazi tradition (see below).<sup>1162</sup>

Goliath's challenge to the God of Israel is formulated in the unique קונכון 'מרי קימכון', 'the Master, your Creator'. MSS Sal1 and S preserve a better known epithet, viz. 'מרי קימכון', 'the Master of your covenant'.

Goliath's description of his victories is stated in messianic wording. The very same words are used for the depiction of David in an eschatological setting in TJon 2 Sam. 23:8.<sup>1163</sup> By quoting these words Goliath claims messianic features for himself. This claim is another expression of the exegetical trend to depict Goliath as the exact opposite of David or the Davidic Messiah.<sup>1164</sup>

The combination of קלא לפום must probably be emended. Bacher proposed to emend it into לפוסקלא—as it occurs in MS S—, regarding it as the Aramaic form of the Latin *fasciculus* and translating it as "bearer of the *fascies*".<sup>1165</sup> However, since the Latin *fasciculus* never

<sup>1158</sup>Mss Sal1 S read וכל.

<sup>1159</sup>Mss Sal1 S read אבא עביד.

<sup>1160</sup>Ms Sal1 reads דעבר.

<sup>1161</sup>Cf. Pseudo-Philo, LAB, 54:3; MShem. 11:1; YalqS. § 102.

<sup>1162</sup>Kimḥi mentioned three months, whereas Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:18 mentioned four months.

<sup>1163</sup>Cf. E. van Staalduine-Sulman, "Reward and Punishment in the Messianic Age (Targ. 2 Sam. 23.1-8)", *JAB* 1 (1999), 273-296, esp. 288-90.

<sup>1164</sup>See above, tosefta-targum on 17:4; see below, tosefta-targum on 17:43.

<sup>1165</sup>Concerning the same combination in TJon 2 Sam. 23:8, cf. Bacher, "Kri-

designated a “bearer of the *fasces*”, the token of political power, we must look for another emendation. This can be achieved by joining the two words into לפומקלא and regarding it as a Babylonian loan-word, derived from *pungullu*, ‘very strong’.<sup>1166</sup> It must be understood, then, as a designation of the strong champion of the Philistines.<sup>1167</sup>

The epithet עבדים לשאול is midrashically derived from the verb עבד, ‘do, make’. The Targumist considered it a reference to the deeds of Saul and translated “what did Saul do” and, in the Ashkenazi version, “what mighty deed did Saul do”.<sup>1168</sup>

The last strophe of Goliath’s speech is a challenge toward King Saul. It might be a harmonization of the Hebrew text, because it was considered unusual that Goliath did not first challenge Saul, but directly asked for a chosen man.<sup>1169</sup>

The Ashkenazi version is a more direct challenge to King Saul, omitting the blaspheming of Israel’s God. The text of MS J is given as the main text.<sup>1170</sup>

הלא אנא<sup>1171</sup> פלשתא דמן גת דקטליח תרין בני עלי כהנא<sup>1172</sup> חפני ופנחס ושיחי  
ית<sup>1173</sup> ארון קימא דיני ואובילית יתיה<sup>1174</sup> לבית דגון שעותיה ◊ והותה חמן בקירויי ◊

tische Untersuchungen”, 40; Idem, “Zwei Korruptelen: Ein Beitrag zur talmudisch-midrassischen Lexicographie”, *MGWJ*, 25 (1876), 237-40, esp. 240; followed by S. Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*, Bd. 2, Berlin 1898-1899; repr. Hildesheim 1964, 432; Levy, *WTM*, Bd. 4, Berlin & Wien, <sup>2</sup>1924, 81.

<sup>1166</sup>W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, Wiesbaden 1965-1981, Bd. 2, 875, cf. also 809; paralleled by the Syriac ܦܘܡܩܠܐ; cf. Van Staaldvine-Sulman, “The Aramaic Song of the Lamb”, 281, n. 35.

<sup>1167</sup>Cf. Van Staaldvine-Sulman, “The Aramaic Song of the Lamb”, 280-81. Note that this Babylonian loan-word might also be a rendering of Hebrew איש הבנים in 17:4.

<sup>1168</sup>So Kasher, “האם יש מקור אחד לתוספתות החרגום לנביאים”, 11; Idem, תוספתות, 107.

<sup>1169</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 24.

<sup>1170</sup>In MS J it is incorporated in the text itself. The same tosefta is also attested in MSS a b w<sup>m</sup>, in the edition of Kimḥi, collated by Sperber [this edition of Kimḥi is from now on MS K<sup>s</sup>], and in the version of Kimḥi in MS Parma (Bibl. Palatino 870), collated in Kasher, “האם יש מקור אחד לתוספתות החרגום לנביאים”, 9 [from now on MS K<sup>p</sup>]. It is also adopted into the *Mikraoth Gedoloth*, Warsaw 1862, collated by Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 23 [from now on MG].

<sup>1171</sup>MSS a b w<sup>m</sup> K<sup>p</sup> add גלית, ‘Goliath’, as in the Sefardi version. The version without the name Goliath is in conformity with the Hebrew text. MG reads אנא גלית, ‘I am Goliath’.

<sup>1172</sup>Omitted in MSS b w<sup>m</sup>, as in the Sefardi version. MG reads the plural כהני, ‘the priests’.

<sup>1173</sup>Omitted in MS K<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>1174</sup>Omitted in MSS a b w<sup>m</sup> K<sup>s</sup>.

פלשתאי שבעא<sup>1175</sup> ירחין אף<sup>1176</sup> כל קרב וקרב דהווי<sup>1177</sup> להון<sup>1178</sup> לפלשתאי אנא נפיק<sup>1179</sup> בריש חילא<sup>1180</sup> ונצחנא<sup>1181</sup> בקרבא<sup>1182</sup> ורמינא קשילין<sup>1183</sup> כעפרא דארעא ועד כען<sup>1184</sup> לא אכשרו יתי פלשתאי למהוי אפילו<sup>1185</sup> רב אלפא עליוהון<sup>1186</sup> ואחון דבית<sup>1187</sup> ישנראלן<sup>1188</sup> מה גבורא<sup>1188</sup> עבר לכון שאול בר קיש דמנבעחא<sup>1189</sup> דמניהון יזיה מלכא עליוכין<sup>1190</sup> אם גבר גיבר הוא יחות ויעביד עמי קרבא<sup>1191</sup> ואם גבר חלש הוא בחרו לכון גברא יחות לוחי

*Am I not the Philistine from Gath, who killed the two sons of Eli the priest, Hophni and Phinehas? And I captured the ark of the covenant of the LORD and I carried it to the house of Dagon, my idol, and it was there, in the cities of the Philistines, for seven months. And every battle—whatever battle the Philistines had—, I went out at the head of the army, and I was victorious in battle, and threw down the killed ones as the dust of the earth. And until now, the Philistines did not consider me worthy of being even a commander of a thousand over them. And you, who are from the House of Israel, what mighty deed did Saul, son of Kish, who is from The Hill, do for you, that you appointed him king over you? If he is a heroic man, let him come down and do battle with me. But if he is a weak man, choose for yourselves a man and let him come down to me.*

In this version several terms have been made more specific, which were not in the Sefardi version. Some of these precisions were based on the Hebrew text in the Books of Samuel. The name of Goliath was omitted, as in 17:8. The ark stayed in the cities of the Philistines for

<sup>1175</sup> Mss K<sup>p</sup> K<sup>s</sup> read חלהא, 'three', without parallel. This number might be based on the duration of the ark's stay in the house of Obed-edom (2 Sam. 6:11). By this number the links between the wandering of the ark in the Philistine cities and the wandering of the ark on its way Jerusalem are increased. See above, commentary on 17:8.

<sup>1176</sup> Ms K<sup>p</sup> reads וראף; MS K<sup>s</sup> reads ואם.

<sup>1177</sup> Only in MS J; the other MSS read the singular דהוה.

<sup>1178</sup> Mss K<sup>p</sup> K<sup>s</sup> considered the combination להון לפלשתאי superfluous and emended it into לכון עם לפלשתאי, resulting in "every battle you had with the Philistines".

<sup>1179</sup> Mss a K<sup>p</sup> K<sup>s</sup> read פקנא.

<sup>1180</sup> Ms K<sup>p</sup> replaced בריש חילא by לפים קלא, as is attested in the Sefardi version.

<sup>1181</sup> Omitted in MS K<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>1182</sup> Omitted in MS K<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>1183</sup> Ms K<sup>p</sup> reads קשיליא.

<sup>1184</sup> Ms K<sup>p</sup> reads ועדיין, 'still, all the time' instead of כען.

<sup>1185</sup> Omitted in MG.

<sup>1186</sup> Only in MS J; MS K<sup>p</sup> reads עליוהון, while it is omitted in a b w<sup>m</sup> K<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>1187</sup> Ms w<sup>m</sup> K<sup>p</sup> MG read בני, "you, sons of Israel".

<sup>1188</sup> Omitted by MS K<sup>p</sup>, as in the Sefardi version.

<sup>1189</sup> Omitted by MS K<sup>p</sup>, as in the Sefardi version.

<sup>1190</sup> Mss a b w<sup>m</sup> K<sup>s</sup> read עליכין. At this point MS a adds אמרו ליה, in conformity with the Sefardi version.

<sup>1191</sup> Here ends MS K<sup>p</sup>.

seven months, and not in the temple of Dagon, as in 7:1. Goliath is no champion, but “at the head of the army”. He is described as the opposite of David, who was at the head of the Israelite army later (18:16).<sup>1192</sup> Eli is called the priest, as in 1:9. Saul is specified as the son of Kish, as in 9:1. The combination נבר גיבר belongs to the usual Targumic vocabulary and is the equivalent of Hebrew אִישׁ חַיִל and בֶּן חַיִל (1 Sam. 31:12; 2 Sam. 2:7; 11:16; 13:28; 17:10; 24:9). It is also used as the rendering of the pregnant Hebrew אִישׁ (1 Sam. 4:9 and in the present tosefta).<sup>1193</sup>

The difference between Goliath and Saul is underlined. Goliath, with all his victories, is not considered worthy to become a commander of a thousand, whereas Saul is king. This greatly contrasts the marginal tosefta to 1 Sam. 17:4 in CR, where Goliath is called a general of the elite troops.

17 9 אם יכול לאנחא קרבא עמי ויקטלני ונהי לכוֹן לעבדין ואם אֵנא אכול ליה<sup>1194</sup>  
 ואקטלניה ותהון לנא<sup>1195</sup> לעבדין ותפלוֹן יתנא: 17 10 ואמר פלשתאה אֵנא חסידית  
 ית סדרי ישראל יומא הדין איתו לי גברא ונגיח קרבא כחדא:

17:9 *If he is able to fight with me and kill me, then we will be your servants; but if I prevail against him, and kill him, then you shall be our servants and serve us.* 17:10 *And the Philistine said, “I defy the ranks of Israel this day: give me a man, that we may wage battle together.”*

Goliath repeats his claim and at the same time puts the ranks of Israel to shame. The question why Goliath’s speech is so shaming is answered in the margin of CR. The repetition of Goliath’s claim is explained as his response to the silence of Israel. Nobody came to answer his challenge:

ירושלמיִן דבעיתי מנכון קרבא ולא תגיחון קרבין קרמיִי

*Jerushalmi: that I asked from you a battle, but you do not fight battles before me*

17 11 ושמע שאול וכל ישראל ית פתגמי<sup>1196</sup> פלשתאה האלין ואחברו<sup>1197</sup> ורחילו  
 לחדא:

<sup>1192</sup>The tosefta-targum to 17:43 also describes Goliath as the opposite of David.

<sup>1193</sup>Note that Hebrew אִישׁ in 17:12 is rendered with בחיר, ‘chosen, elite’.

<sup>1194</sup>Mss D reads לכוֹן ‘you’.

<sup>1195</sup>Mss C J read erroneously להון ‘to them’.

<sup>1196</sup>Omitted in MS D, erroneously since the demonstrative האלין is maintained.

<sup>1197</sup>MS C read the active וחברו.

17:11 *When Saul and all Israel heard these words of the Philistine, they were shattered and greatly afraid.*

“All kinds of defeat or deprivation may be subsumed under the verb הבר, ‘shatter’, in TJon.”<sup>1198</sup> In the present verse, even a verbal defeat is described with that verb: Saul and Israel were internally shattered.

12 ודוד בר גבר<sup>1199</sup> אפרתי הדין<sup>1200</sup> מבית לחם דבית<sup>1201</sup> יהודה ושמה ישי וליה תמוניא בנין וגברא ביומי שאול סב מני בבחיריא<sup>1202</sup>:

17:12 *Now David was the son of this Ephrathite man, from Bethlehem, of the House of Judah, named Jesse, who had eight sons. In the days of Saul the man was old and counted among the chosen ones.*

The unclear Hebrew expression בא באנשים is explained as referring to one's status in rabbinic literature. It runs parallel to הבאים בשמות in 1 Chron. 4:38, which can best be rendered “mentioned by name”. We see that Jesse appears to be a man who is mentioned among men. NumR. 16:5 gave “men” the qualitative meaning of “righteous men”,<sup>1203</sup> while Rabba explained the phrase with the image that Jesse went among men to teach Torah (Ber. 58a). This qualitative meaning is also used in TJon. Note that MS S adds the explanation from NumR.<sup>1204</sup>

13 וואלו חלחה בני ישי רברביא ואולו בחר שאיל לאנחא<sup>1205</sup> קרבא ושום<sup>1206</sup> תלחה בנוהי דאולו בקרבא אליאב בכרא ותנייה אבינרב ותליחאה שמה: 14 ודוד הוא זעירא ותלחה<sup>1207</sup> רברביא אולו בחר שאול: 15 ודוד<sup>1208</sup> אויל ותאיב מלות שאול למרעי ית ענא דאבוהי בית לחם: 16 וקריב פלשחאה מקדים ומחשיך ואתעתה<sup>1209</sup> ארבעין יומין:

<sup>1198</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 378.

<sup>1199</sup>MS S reads Hebrew איש.

<sup>1200</sup>TJon renders the Hebrew demonstrative, although it is “contrary to grammar, as well as unsuitable” in this verse, cf. Driver, *Notes*, 140.

<sup>1201</sup>Omitted in MS C, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1202</sup>MS S adds וצדיקיא, ‘and [among] the righteous’.

<sup>1203</sup>Likewise TanB, *Bamidbar*, 4:5. See above, commentary on 1:11.

<sup>1204</sup>Syr and the Lucian translation chose to connect this expression with Hebrew זקן ובה בשנים (cf. Gen. 24:1; Josh. 13:1) and read, through metathesis, זקן ובה בשנים, ‘old and advanced in years’ (>2); cf. Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung*, 52.

<sup>1205</sup>Only in MS p; the other MSS omit אנחא and read לקרבא, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). However, MS p is in accordance with the usual Targumic vocabulary, cf. Van Staaldoune-Sulman, *Samuel*, s.v. קרבא.

<sup>1206</sup>MS B\* omitted בשום בקרב בנוהי דאולו, which is added in the margin.

<sup>1207</sup>MS a adds בנוהי, as in the preceding verse, which would result in the misunderstanding that this verse is speaking of David's sons.

<sup>1208</sup>MS eb1\* omitted the present verse, but it was added in the margin.

<sup>1209</sup>Omitted in MS B\*, but added in the margin.



17:13 *The three eldest sons of Jesse went, they went after Saul to wage war; and the names of his three sons who went in battle were Eliab the first-born, and his second Abinadab and the third Shammah. 17:14 David himself was the youngest, but the three eldest went after Saul. 17:15 And David used to go back and forth from Saul to tend his father's sheep at Bethlehem. 17:16 For forty days the Philistine drew near, early and late, and took his stand.*

The fact that Goliath came forward early and late to repeat his challenge is explained in the margin of CR.<sup>1210</sup> It is connected with the continual offerings.<sup>1211</sup>

ירושלמי מוקדים ומחשיך בעידן קרבן תדירא דצפרא ודרמשא וחסיד ארבעין יומין  
*Jerushalmi: early and late, at the time of the continual offering of the morning and the evening. And he defied for forty days.*

Bacher is right in stating that there is no rabbinic source for this tosefta,<sup>1212</sup> but there is a parallel.<sup>1213</sup> R. Johanan is said to have actualized the present verse as follows: "To make them omit the recital of the *Shema* 'morning and evening.'<sup>1214</sup> The source of this tosefta may have been Dan. 8:11-14, where the blaspheming "little horn" took away the continual offerings, and Dan. 11:3, where the king of the North did the same.<sup>1215</sup> The contemporaneous historical situation may also have induced the composition of this tosefta. In the Second Temple Period "the Tamid was the most important part of regular worship. Even during the siege of the Romans in AD 70, when famine was at its peak, the daily sacrifice was regularly offered. It was apparently the cause of great despair when at last the Tamid had to be discontinued."<sup>1216</sup>

Aramaic חסידי, 'to defy', is a free rendering of Hebrew הִצִּיב, 'to take

<sup>1210</sup>See Kasher, תוספתות, 108.

<sup>1211</sup>The connection between the combination "morning and evening" and the continual offerings is more often made in Targumic literature, cf. M. Aberbach, B. Grossfeld, *Targum Onqelos on Genesis 49* (SBL-AS, 1), Missoula (MT) 1976, 63, n. 66; they also refer to GenR. 99:3.

<sup>1212</sup>Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 18.

<sup>1213</sup>Noted by G. Klein, "Bemerkungen zu Herrn Dr. Bacher's 'Kritischen Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum'", *ZDMG* 29 (1875), 157-161, esp. 159.

<sup>1214</sup>Sot. 42b. It was R. Johanan, who also explained the period of the forty days as: "The period corresponding to the forty days in which the Torah was given." So also Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 61:2.

<sup>1215</sup>Cf. J. Lust, "Cult and Sacrifice in Daniel: The Tamid and the Abomination of Desolation", in: J.J. Collins, P.W. Flint, *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Vol. 2, Leiden 2001, 671-88, esp. 673.

<sup>1216</sup>Lust, "Cult and Sacrifice in Daniel: The Tamid and the Abomination of Desolation", 673, referring to Josephus, *Jewish Wars*, 6:94-95.

one's stand'. First, it is in conformity with 17:6, 25, 26, 35 (>15), and secondly, it is considered to be the pregnant meaning of this verb.<sup>1217</sup> The same verb plays a role in Ps. 2:2, where the kings of the earth "take their stand" to counsel together against the LORD and his anointed.

17 17 ואמר ישי לדוד בריה סב כען לאחך מכילהא דקליא<sup>1218</sup> הדין ועסר  
 טלמין דלחמא האלין ואוביל<sup>1219</sup> למשריתא לאחך<sup>1220</sup>: 17 18 וית עסר גובנין דחלבא  
 האלין<sup>1221</sup> תוביל לרב<sup>1222</sup> אלפא וית אחך הסער לשלם וית טיבהון תיחי:

*17:17 And Jesse said to David his son, "Take for your brothers a measure<sup>1223</sup> of this parched grain, and these ten loaves of bread, and carry them to the camp, to your brothers. 17:18 And take these ten cheeses of milk to the commander of a thousand. Inquire after your brothers' welfare and bring their report back.*

In the margin of CR there are two notes on this verse. The first one is a simple explanation of Hebrew עַרְבֵי הָאֵלֶף, 'commander of thousand'.<sup>1224</sup>

ספןרן אחרן לרב דמנא על אלפא גובריא

*another book: to the commander who is appointed over thousand men*

The second note appears to be an explanation of the word before last in the Hebrew text, עֶרְבָה, which is traditionally explained as "guarantee, pledge". TJon explains that David must bring back to Jesse the guarantee that the brothers were alive and well-doing.<sup>1225</sup> This Targumic explanation seems surprising, since the verb עֶרַב, 'pledge', was always used in financial and commercial transactions. The עֶרְבוֹן was given as a guarantee that the final payment would take place, a word well-known in both the rabbinic and the New Testament world.<sup>1226</sup>

<sup>1217</sup> As in Tan., *Vayiggash*, 8; cf. Kasher, תוספתא, 108.

<sup>1218</sup> Mss c d f read דקִימחא, 'of flour'.

<sup>1219</sup> Omitted in MS a.

<sup>1220</sup> Ms m reads דאחך, resulting in "the camp of your brothers".

<sup>1221</sup> The grammatically incorrect demonstrative הוּזָה in the Hebrew text is corrected by TJon, cf. Driver, *Notes*, 142.

<sup>1222</sup> Ms D omitted לרב, but left a space open.

<sup>1223</sup> TJon uses the class-name by way of explanation (>7), cf. P.A.H. de Boer, "1 Samuel xvii: Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions", *OTS* 1 (Leiden 1942), 79-103, esp. 88.

<sup>1224</sup> Cf. also Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 27.

<sup>1225</sup> Neither this rendering nor the similar Syriac and Lucian translations suggest a different *Vorlage*, Driver, *Notes*, 142; against Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung*, 52.

<sup>1226</sup> Cf. the use of the word עֶרְבָה in TanB, *Bereshit*, 11:8; and the word עֶרְבוֹן in *Pirqe Avoth*, 3:17 (used by R. Aqiba); BM 48b (used by Rab and R. Joḥanan); 2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:14.

So even the word ערבה could easily have been regarded as an advance on the final pay to Jesse's sons.<sup>1227</sup> However, this was not done in any of the ancient translations.<sup>1228</sup> The marginal note gives a different, rabbinic explanation of this Hebrew word:

ירושלמין יוה גט פיטורי נשיהון תיסב ותיח

*Jerushalmi: and the bill of divorcement of their wives you shall take and bring*

Soldiers who went to battle were supposed to divorce from their wives in case they died or got lost. The divorce was conditional, in the sense that it became retrospectively valid if the husband died (cf. Shab. 56a; Ket. 9b). Note that this explanation was not used to expose war customs, but to diminish the gravity of David's sin against Uriah (>24). Because of these conditional divorces, Bathsheba was a free woman from the time Uriah went out to battle, and was not married when David took her. David was therefore guilty of murder, but did not commit adultery.<sup>1229</sup> LXX also renders "a bill of divorce"<sup>1230</sup> and Pseudo-Jerome gives a similar explanation. The latter adds that the wives had to wait for three years before the divorce became valid.<sup>1231</sup>

19 17 ושאוּל ואנוּן<sup>1232</sup> וכל אנש<sup>1233</sup> ישראל במישרוּ בַטְמָא מניחין קרבא עם פלשתאי: 20 17 ואקדים דויד בצפרא ושבק<sup>1234</sup> ית ענא על נטרא ונסיב<sup>1235</sup> וּאוּל כמא דפקריה ישי ואחא לכרקומא ומשרית עבדי קרבא נפקן לסדרא ויביבו<sup>1236</sup> בקרבא<sup>1237</sup>:

<sup>1227</sup>Cf. H.J. Stoebe, "Die Goliathperikope und die Form der Septuaginta", *VT*, 397-413, esp. 403, n. 4; and a similar proposal by De Boer, "1 Samuel XVII", 89, "something in return for the things brought by David". Both in the Semitic world and in the Roman Empire the words ערבון, ἀρραβών, *arrabo* function as a financial or commercial guarantee; cf. J. Pairman Brown, "Literary Contexts of the Common Hebrew-Greek Vocabulary", *JSt* 13 (1968), 163-91, esp. 174-78.

<sup>1228</sup>Note the difficulties that the LXX and the *Vetus Latina* had with this word, cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 302.

<sup>1229</sup>Ascribed to R. Samuel b. Naḥmani, who also diminished the sin of Eli's sons (cf. 2:2) and Samuel's sons (cf. 12:2). This liberal view on divorces fits into the teachings of Aqiba's school, cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 46.

<sup>1230</sup>V. Aptowitz, "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata", *ZAW* 29 (1909), 241-52, esp. 245.

<sup>1231</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 91.

<sup>1232</sup>Omitted in MS B\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1233</sup>MS d reads גבר.

<sup>1234</sup>MS D adds the subject דויד.

<sup>1235</sup>Omitted in MS S. MS o renders ונטל, 'and he carried', which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1236</sup>TJon clearly read the Hebrew verb as הריעו, an Hiphil-form of רוע.

<sup>1237</sup>MS d reads במשריחא, 'in the army'.

17:19 *And Saul and they and all the men of Israel are in the Valley of the Terebinth, waging war against the Philistines.* 17:20 *And David rose early in the morning, and left the sheep with a keeper. He loaded up<sup>1238</sup> and went, as Jesse had commanded him. And he came to the bulwarks, and the host of the wagers of war went out to the battle line, shouting the war cry.*

Hebrew המעגלה, 'to the track', is correctly interpreted as a *pars pro toto* for the entire camp of Saul (>14). The same interpretation occurs in 26:4, 6.

17 21 וסדרו<sup>1239</sup> ישראל<sup>1240</sup> ופלשתאי סדרא לקדמות סדרא: 17 22 ושבק<sup>1241</sup> חויד ית מניא דעלוהי על יד נטר מניא ורהט לסדרא ואתא ושאיל<sup>1242</sup> לאחזיהי לשלם: 17 23 והוא ממליל עמהון והא גברא מביניהון<sup>1243</sup> סליק גלית פלשתאה<sup>1244</sup> שמיה מגת מסדרי<sup>1245</sup> פלשתאי ומליל כפתגמאי האלין ושמע דוד: 17 24 וכל אנש ישראל במחזיהון ית גברא ואפכרו<sup>1246</sup> מן קדמוהי<sup>1246</sup> ורחילו לחדא: 17 25 ואמר אנש ישראל החזיתון<sup>1247</sup> גברא דסליק הדין ארי לחדא ית ישראל סליק ויהי גברא דיקשלניה יעתרניה מלכא עותור סגי ויה ברהיה יתין ליה<sup>1248</sup> ויה בית אבוהי יעביד רברבין<sup>1249</sup> בישראל:

17:21 *And Israel and the Philistines drew up for battle, rank against rank.* 17:22 *And David left the baggage in charge of the keeper of the baggage, and ran to the ranks. And he went and asked for his brothers' welfare.* 17:23 *As he talked with them, behold the man from between them came up, named Goliath the Philistine from Gath, out of the ranks of the Philistines, and he spoke the same words. And David listened.* 17:24 *All the men of Israel, when they saw the man,*

<sup>1238</sup>TJon did not add to the elliptical Hebrew phrase by referring to the ass. In Gen. 31:17 the Hebrew text adds על־הגמלים and in Gen. 42:26 על־חמריהם; cf. Driver, *Notes*, 142.

<sup>1239</sup>The entire verse is missing from MS S.

<sup>1240</sup>MS B\* reads בישאל, which is corrected.

<sup>1241</sup>The entire verse is absent in MS J\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1242</sup>Omitted in MS T.

<sup>1243</sup>See above, commentary on 17:4.

<sup>1244</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>1245</sup>According to the Qere, as in many Hebrew MSS (cf. Sot. 42b), LXX, and Vg, whereas Syr rendered the singular. Kimḥi reads מבשרייה קרבא דפלשתאי 'from the war camp of the Philistines'. MS D reads מסירי קרבא פלישהא 'from the battle lines of the Philistines'.

<sup>1246</sup>MSS a J read וערקו, 'they fled'. The verb אפך is mainly used for the retreat of an army in mass (see above, Ch. 4, s.v.); against P.A.H. de Boer, "1 Samuel xvii: Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions", *OTS* 1 (Leiden 1942), 79-103, esp. 92.

<sup>1247</sup>MSS Fr B<sup>c</sup> eb4 read הא חזיתון, 'behold, you see'.

<sup>1248</sup>MS S adds לאתו, 'for a wife', like some Hebrew MSS and quotations.

<sup>1249</sup>MS b reads חורין רברבין, 'free commanders', a conflated rendering.

retreated from before him, and were greatly afraid. 17:25 And the men of Israel said, "Have you seen this man who has come up? Because he has come up to defy Israel. And the man who kills him, the king will enrich with great riches, and will give him his daughter, and make his father's house commanders in Israel."

Hebrew חפשי, 'free', usually means the opposite of being a slave, but since most soldiers would not have been slaves—and certainly not Jesse's sons—, TJon gives another reward for killing Goliath, *i.e.* promotion in the army. This reward is in line with David's actual promotion in 18:5 (>15).<sup>1250</sup>

17 26 ואמר דויד לגבריא דקימין עמיה למימר מא יתעביד לגברא דיקטול ית פלשתאה דיכי ויערי חסדא מעל ישראל ארי מן פלשתאה ערלא הדין ארי חסיד סדרי<sup>1251</sup> עמא דיוי<sup>1252</sup> קימא: 17 27 ואמר ליה עמא כפתגמא הדין למימר<sup>1253</sup> כדין יתעביד לגברא דיקטלניה: 17 28 ושמע אליאב אחוהי רבא במללותיה עם גבריא ותקיף רוגזא דאליאב ברויד ואמר למא דנן נחחא ועל מן רשחא זעיר ענא<sup>1254</sup> האנין במדברא אנא ידענא<sup>1255</sup> ית בקרנותך<sup>1256</sup> וית בישות לכך ארי בדיל למחזי עבדי<sup>1257</sup> קרבא נחחא:

17:26 And David spoke to the men who stood by him, saying, "What shall be done for the man who kills that Philistine, and takes away the defiance from Israel? For who is this uncircumcised Philistine, that he could defy the ranks of the people of the living LORD?" 17:27 And he people answered him in the same way, saying, "So shall it be done to the man who kills him." 17:28 Now Eliab his eldest brother heard when he spoke to the men, and Eliab's anger was kindled against

<sup>1250</sup> Analogies between Ugaritic *zaki* and Hebrew חפשי have led Rainey to the conclusion that the reward promised in 17:25 would be exemption from service to the palace and therefore an existence as a "free" soldier, cf. A.F. Rainey, "Institutions: Family, Civil, and Military", in: L.R. Fisher (ed.), *Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*, Vol. 2 (AnOr, 50), Rome 1975, 69-107, esp. 103-104. N.P. Lemche, "חפשי in 1 Sam. xvii 25", *VT* 24 (1974), 373-74 assumes that חפשי "were a class of clients in the city state and were supported by this either by an allocation of plots for cultivation or by supplies of provisions from the royal stores".

<sup>1251</sup> Mss a b J add קרבא עברי, 'wagers of war', as in 17:20 (>15). Ms B<sup>m</sup> only adds קרבא.

<sup>1252</sup> Ms S reads דיאלהא, 'of God', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but against the monotheistic vocabulary of TJon (against >22).

<sup>1253</sup> Ms D omits כדין למימר, resulting in "And the people said to him, 'According to this word it shall be done to the man who kills him'"

<sup>1254</sup> Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1255</sup> Ms S reads the perfect, ידעית.

<sup>1256</sup> Ms D reads, according to the Hebrew, וזנותך.

<sup>1257</sup> Omitted by MS Fr, in conformity with the Hebrew text. In this case the addition is not really necessary, for one can see a battle.

*David, and he said, "Why have you come down? And with whom have you left those few sheep in the wilderness? I know your exuberance, and the evil of your heart; for you have come down to see the wagers of war."*

Note that TJon varies the equivalent of נטש, although the Hebrew uses the same word in the present verse as in 17:20. In 17:20 David just left his sheep behind (שבק), but Eliab suggests that David lost his sheep or abandoned them (רטש). Consequently, Eliab's tone is coloured even more negatively.

17 29 ואמר<sup>1258</sup> דוד מא עבדיה כען הלא פתגם הוא<sup>1259</sup>: 17 30 ואסחר מלותיה לקביל<sup>1260</sup> אחרן ואמר כפתגמא הדין ואחיבויה עמא פתגמא<sup>1261</sup> כפתגמא קדמאה: 17 31 ואשתמעו<sup>1262</sup> פתגמא<sup>1263</sup> דמליל דויד וחויאו<sup>1264</sup> קדם ◊ שאול ודברוהי: 17 32 ואמר דויד לשאול לא יתבר◊<sup>1265</sup> לבא דאנשא מניה עבדך ייזיל ויגח קרבא עם פלשתאה דיכי<sup>1266</sup>: 17 33 ואמר שאול לדויד לא תכול למיזל על פלשתאה הדין לאנחא קרבא<sup>1267</sup> עמיה ארי יניק את והוא גבר<sup>1268</sup> עביד קרבין מינקותיה<sup>1269</sup>: 17 34 ואמר דויד לשאול רעיא הוה עבדך לאבוהי בענא ואתא אריא ואף<sup>1270</sup> דובא ונסיב◊ אמרא מעדרא: 17 35 ונפקית בתרוהי ומחיתיה ושיזבתיה◊ מפומיה וקם עלי ואחרית בלועיה ומחיתיה וקטלתייה: 17 36 אף ית<sup>1271</sup> אריא אף דובא קטל עבדך ויהי פלשתאה ערלא הדין<sup>1272</sup> כחד מנהון ארי חסיד סדרי<sup>1273</sup> עמא◊ דיוי◊ קימא: 17 37 ואמר דוד<sup>1274</sup> יוי דשיזבני◊ מיד אריא ומיד דובא הוא ישיזבני◊ מידא דפלשתאה

<sup>1258</sup> Ms D erroneously adds מה מא here.

<sup>1259</sup> Only MSS p f ends the verse here. The other MSS add either דאמריה (c d o B J eb4 and Kimḥi) or אמריה (a b m w x y D G R S eb1), both to be translated "Was is not but a word I spoke?" This addition was felt necessary because of the terse style (>10), cf. Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 327.

<sup>1260</sup> Ms J adds אתר, resulting in "He turned away from him toward another place".

<sup>1261</sup> Omitted in MS o.

<sup>1262</sup> Passive voice in conformity with *Codex Leningradensis*, although many Hebrew MSS read the active "they heard".

<sup>1263</sup> Ms B\* adds האלין, 'these'.

<sup>1264</sup> Ms B\* adds פתגמא, 'word'.

<sup>1265</sup> See commentary on 17:11.

<sup>1266</sup> This demonstrative is based on 17:26. MSS a b c d f m o w y C D J S T read the usual demonstrative הדין.

<sup>1267</sup> Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1268</sup> Omitted in MS d.

<sup>1269</sup> TJon maintained the word play between David's and Goliath's youth.

<sup>1270</sup> The unusual position of the Hebrew nota accusativi is solved by rendering it with "also", borrowed from 17:36. It is omitted in MS D, as in some Hebrew MSS and quotations.

<sup>1271</sup> MSS w y omit the nota accusativi; MSS w C S add one before "bear".

<sup>1272</sup> MSS a J add the verb חשיב, 'be considered', cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:183.

<sup>1273</sup> MSS a J add קרבא, as in 17:26.

<sup>1274</sup> Ms T erroneously reads דוד in stead of דוד, probably because its *Vorlage* abbreviated the name of David with ד.

הדין ואמר שאול לדויד איזיל ומימרא דיוי יהי בסעדך: 17 38 ואלביש שאול יח דוד לבושוהי ויהב קולס דנחש על רישיה ואלביש יתיה שרינא:

17:29 And David said, "What have I done now? Was it not but a word?" 17:30 And he turned away from him toward another, and spoke in the same way; and the people answered him in the same way as before. 17:31 When the words which David spoke were heard, they told them before Saul; and they brought him. 17:32 And David said to Saul, "Let no man's heart be dismayed<sup>1275</sup> because of him. Your servant will go and wage battle with that Philistine." 17:33 And Saul said to David, "You are not able to go against this Philistine to wage battle with him, for you are but a youth, and he has been a man, doing battles from his youth." 17:34 But David said to Saul, "Your servant used to tend sheep for his father; and when there came a lion, or even a bear, and took a lamb from the flock,<sup>1276</sup> 17:35 I went after him and smote him and delivered it from his mouth; and if he arose against me, I caught him by his jaw,<sup>1277</sup> and smote him and killed him. 17:36 Your servant has killed both lion and bear; and this uncircumcised Philistine shall be like one of them, since he defied the ranks of the people of the living LORD." 17:37 And David said, "The LORD who delivered me from the paw of the lion and from the paw of the bear, will deliver me from the paw of this Philistine." And Saul said to David, "Go, and the speech of the LORD be in your aid." 17:38 Then Saul clothed David with his clothes; he put a helmet of bronze on his head, and clothed him with a breastplate.

TJon interpreted Hebrew מדיו as civil clothing, and not as a part of Saul's armour, although it was often used for the outer garment of a warrior.<sup>1278</sup> The Aramaic version seems to imply that David was to go in Saul's place.

17 39 חריו דוד ית חרביה מעל ללבושוהי ולא אבא למיזל ארי לא אילוף ואמר דויד לשאול לית<sup>1279</sup> אנא יכיל למיזל באלין ארי לית בהון נסא<sup>1280</sup> ואעדינון דוד מניה:

<sup>1275</sup>Lit.: scattered. Or: let no man's heart be intimidated by him; cf. P.A.H. de Boer, "1 Samuel xvii: Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions", *OTS* 1 (Leiden 1942), 79-103, esp. 93.

<sup>1276</sup>Both the Hebrew and the Aramaic version of David's words (17:34-37) are rather poetical, cf. A.R. Ceresko, "A Rhetorical Analysis of David's 'Boast' (1 Samuel 17:34-37): Some Reflections on Method," *CBQ* 47 (1985), 58-74.

<sup>1277</sup>Since the beard specifically refers to the lion, TJon and LXX translate "jaw"; cf. I. Aharoni, "ar, le gypaëte barbu et 'ar-Moab", *RB* 48 (1939), 237-41, esp. 241. So also Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:182.

<sup>1278</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 145.

<sup>1279</sup>Ms T reads לא, omitting the following אבא and reading the imperfect יכיל.

<sup>1280</sup>Ms d reads לא אילופיה in stead of נסא בהון, which is more in conformity

17:39 *And David girded his sword over his clothes, but he did not want to go, for he had not learned so. Then David said to Saul, "I cannot go with these, for there is no wonder in them." And David put them off.*

Hebrew יָאֵל was apparently unknown to ancient translators, for all versions have their own rendering of the word. TJon and Syr probably derived it from Hebrew אָלָה, 'curse' (cf. exactly the same form in 14:24) instead of יָאֵל, 'decide, begin' (>3). LXX used the same technique, but connected it with the Hebrew verb לָאָה, 'become weary' (>3). Consequently, in all versions it means something negative.

Hebrew נִסָּה and Hebrew נִסִּיחִי are not translated with the same equivalent. Whereas the first נִסָּה is interpreted as "being trained" in wearing the armour, the second נִסִּיחִי is rendered by Aramaic נִסָּא, 'wonder, miracle'. Consequently, the reader is given two reasons of David's refusal to wear Saul's outfit: First, he was not trained, secondly, he considered it too easy to go and fight in full armour. There would be no wonder in the defeat of Goliath, then.<sup>1281</sup>

A third reason is given in MSS c d, quoting the Torah instruction that whoever blasphemes, must be stoned to death (Lev. 24:14-16):<sup>1282</sup>

דלא אזיל לגביה אלא באבנא ותרמילא משום דמגדפא<sup>1283</sup> הוא<sup>1284</sup> ודיניה בסקילה  
דהכי כתיב בספר אוריחא דמשה דמאן ארגיז<sup>1285</sup> קדם<sup>1286</sup> יי<sup>1287</sup> אלהא<sup>1287</sup> דשמיא  
ואפיק שמייה קדישא בחיסודין דילרגמוניה באבנא

*so that I will not go unto him except with stone and bag, because he is blaspheming. And his judgment will be by stoning, for thus is written in the book of the law of Moses, that whoever makes angry before the LORD, the God of heavens, and utters his Holy Name in blasphemy, they will stone him with stones.*

The link between Goliath's blasphemy and his death is made by referring to the laws in the Torah. This link is based on the Scripture and attested to in rabbinic literature.<sup>1288</sup>

with the Hebrew text and with the preceding phrase (>29, >15).

<sup>1281</sup> An identical motivation is mentioned in Judg. 7:2; 1 Sam. 25:26, 31, 33.

<sup>1282</sup> Also found in MS D, which integrated it in the main text of TJon, with many abbreviations. Cf. Kasher, חוספסות, 109, who found it as a tosefta in Codex Madrid 7542.

<sup>1283</sup> MS D reads the noun דגידופ, 'blasphemy'.

<sup>1284</sup> MS D reads the demonstrative דהא.

<sup>1285</sup> MS D reads the participle דמרגיז.

<sup>1286</sup> Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1287</sup> Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1288</sup> Cf. TanB, *Bereshit*, 11:9; LevR. 10:6; CantR. 4:4 § 5.



17 40 ונסיב<sup>1289</sup> חטריה<sup>1290</sup> בידיה ובחר ליה חמשה שעיעי אבניא מן נחלא<sup>1290</sup> ושוי יתהון במן רעיא דיליה ובתרמליה<sup>1291</sup> וקלעיה בידיה וקריב לוח פלשתאה: 17 41 ואזל פלשתאה אזיל וקריב לדוד וגברא נטיל חריסא אזיל<sup>1292</sup> קדמויה<sup>1293</sup>: 17 42 ואסתכי פלשתאה וחזא ית דויד ושטיה ארי הוה ניק וסמוק שפיר ברייה<sup>1293</sup>: 17 43 ואמר פלשתאה לדוד<sup>1294</sup> הכלב שטי אנא דאת אתי עלי בחטריא<sup>1295</sup> ולטיט פלשתאה ית דוד בטעותיה<sup>1295</sup>:

*17:40 Then he took his staff in his hand, and chose the five smoothest stones<sup>1296</sup> from the brook, and put them in his shepherd's bag, and in his bag. His sling was in his hand, and he drew near to the Philistine. 17:41 And the Philistine came, nearer and nearer to David, and the man who wore his shield went before him. 17:42 And when the Philistine looked, and saw David, he disdained him; for he was but a youth, ruddy and handsome in appearance. 17:43 And the Philistine said to David, "Am I a mad dog, that you come to me with sticks?" And the Philistine cursed David by his idol.*

TJon adds the adjective "mad", because one does not go with sticks to normal dogs (>11).

In several manuscripts a large tosefta-targum is present. This addition is an acrostic poem, in which every strophe starts with a letter of the Hebrew alphabet. MSS c d add it to the present verse, whereas Codex Munich 5 adds it to verse 42,<sup>1297</sup> introduced with

יונתן תרגם המקרא הזה בטוב וסחומות רבות מפורשין בה והא לך תרגמו

*Jonathan rendered this Bible verse abundantly and with many explanatory paragraphs in it, and behold, his rendering for you.*

Ms S divided it over both verses and integrated it completely in the main text: strophes *Aleph* until *Pe* are given after verse 42, while the remaining strophes are added before verse 43. The description of Goliath's death is omitted in this tosefta and MS S had to change the text slightly to let the story run fluently. It added the copula בחר בַּר after the tosefta and returned to the main text of TJon, which resulted in "... and hit the Philistine on his forehead in order to

<sup>1289</sup> Ms S\* reads Hebrew ויקח, which is corrected.

<sup>1290</sup> Ms D omits נחלא.

<sup>1291</sup> With suffix, as is the case with the surrounding nouns (>10).

<sup>1292</sup> This addition, based on 17:7, is only attested in MS p (>15).

<sup>1293</sup> See commentary on 16:12.

<sup>1294</sup> Omitted in MS B.

<sup>1295</sup> MSS a C J read בטעויה, 'in the name of his idol', see below, in the tosefta-targum to the present verse.

<sup>1296</sup> At least in Hebrew, this construction has the meaning of our superlative, cf. GKC § 132c.

<sup>1297</sup> Cf. Kasher, תוספחות, 109-10.

establish peace in the territory of Israel, after the Philistine said to David . . ." MS d only attests strophes *Aleph* until *Pe*. Since MS S also divides this tosefta after the same strophe *Pe*, one can imagine that MS d had a similar *Vorlage* as MS S, but added the first half of the tosefta to verse 43 and forgot the remainder.

A number of errors in the manuscripts indicate that later scribes did not recognize this acrostic anymore. In MSS c d the order of the alphabet is broken at four points. The *He* is filled in with the word חבל. This can be due to the pronunciation of the *Heth* in ancient Palestine,<sup>1298</sup> or to the replacing of the *He* by the similar *Heth*.<sup>1299</sup> The *Qoph* can be restored by substituting קלא for קלא, as is attested in MS S.<sup>1300</sup> The *Shin* is used twice, for the *Shin*-strophe and for the *Shin*-strophe. Only the problem of the missing *Taw* remains. It would seem certain that we have to read דעל אבנא instead of דעל אבנא because of the following feminine perfect-forms. In the *Resh*-strophe the word אבנא is treated as a feminine as well. This means that the poet deliberately kept his audience in suspense by interrupting the acrostic with two strophes before turning to God's final liberating word.

The first eighteen strophes are phrased in direct speech. The introductions of the speakers, however, do not fit into the alphabet and are placed after short strophes, making it appear that these introductions are the second half of those short strophes.<sup>1301</sup> Post-positioning of markers of direct speech is not uncommon in Hebrew and other Semitic languages.<sup>1302</sup> Because these markers are absent in several manuscripts, it is possible that they were added later on for clarity's sake. Those responsible for the markers placed them at the end of the strophes in order to leave the acrostic intact.

<sup>1298</sup>So Kasher, תוספתו, 111. This phenomenon also occurs in the "Songs of David", found in the Cairo Genizah (MS Antonin 798 of the Russian National Library at St. Petersburg), published by D. Flusser, S. Safrai, "שירי דוד' היציניים", in: B. Uffenheimer (ed.), עינים במקרא, *Studies in Memoriam of Joshua Grintz*, Tel Aviv 1970, 83-105, where the word חפצה is the beginning of the *He*-strophe.

<sup>1299</sup>So E. van Staaldoune-Sulman, "The Aramaic Song of the Lamb", in: J.C. de Moor, W.G.E. Watson (eds), *Verses in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT, 42), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1993, 265-292, esp. 267. The words חבל, 'vanity' and חבל, 'woe', can easily be exchanged.

<sup>1300</sup>Likewise in MS Munich 5, collated by Kasher, and in MS 1 of the University of Salamanca, written by Alfonso de Zamora in 1532, which Mr W.F. Smelik kindly collated for me on the spot.

<sup>1301</sup>Suggested by the lay-out of Kasher, תוספתו, 109-10.

<sup>1302</sup>Cf. S.A. Meier, *Speaking of Speaking: Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible* (VT.S, 46), Leiden 1992, 50-52. The markers of the direct speech in an acrostic tosefta-targum to Isa. 57:15 are also placed after the direct speech; cf. Kasher תוספתו, 166-67.

The transition from direct speech to the narrative part, starting with the *Qoph*-strophe is rather abrupt. Still, the acrostic guarantees that no strophe is missing. Although the structure is irregular with regard to the length of the strophes, there is a fair amount of regularity on the higher level of the canticles: they include 5 + 2 + 4 + 5 + 2 + 4 + 5 strophes. In short:

cant.	strophes	letters	speaker	content
I	5	<i>Aleph-He</i>	Goliath	David's youth and future
II	2	<i>Waw-Zayin</i>	Goliath	lamb against bear
III	4	<i>Heth-Kaph</i>	Goliath	death threats
IV	5	<i>Lamed-Ayin</i>	David	God against idol
V	2	<i>Pe-Şade</i>	Goliath	death threat and David's youth
VI	4	<i>Qoph-Shin</i>	stones	dispute of stones
VII	5	<i>Taw</i>	God	end of battle

### *Text, translation and short notes*

The following text originates from MS c and is given in colometric structure.<sup>1303</sup> Each canticle is followed by exegetical remarks.

*And he said to him* [1a]

ואמר ליה

#### I.1 (Aleph)

*“Go away for your own good!* [2a]

איזיל לך<sup>1304</sup>

*Nurse your boyhood!* [2b]

חוס על שליוחך

*Why would you provoke* [3a]

למא את מתנרי

*a lions' whelp?* [3b]

עם<sup>1305</sup> בר אריון

#### I.2 (Beth)

*You are chosen, boy,* [4a]

בחירתא<sup>1306</sup> שליא<sup>1307</sup>

*and you are very beautiful,”* [4b]

ושפירתא לחדא

*said Goliath to David.* [5a]

אמר<sup>1308</sup> ליה<sup>1309</sup> גולית לדוד

<sup>1303</sup> More details of the structural analysis of this tosefta-targum can be found in Van Staaldvine-Sulman, “The Aramaic Song of the Lamb”, 273-77. In this study I supplement and sometimes modify my earlier views.

<sup>1304</sup> Mss S Munich 5 read שליא, ‘boy’, which would be in perfect parallelism with שליוחך in the next line; and in responsion to the double אימרא of the *Waw*-strophe.

<sup>1305</sup> Unusual preposition. The usual preposition after the verb גרא is ב.

<sup>1306</sup> Peal passive perfect 2 m.sg., cf. G. Dalman, *Grammatik*, 253.

<sup>1307</sup> Ms S reads the feminine שליחא, ‘girl’.

<sup>1308</sup> The phrase “said Goliath to David” is omitted in MS S.

<sup>1309</sup> Omitted in MS Munich 5.

**I.3 (Gimel)***"The bridal chamber [6a]**your father did not construct over you [yet]. [6b]**Think of your bridal chamber [7a]**and turn back! [7b]*

גנונא דהלווא  
לא גנן עלך<sup>1310</sup> אבוך  
אדכר גננך  
הדר לאחורך

**I.4 (Daleth)***Your splendour resembles [8a]**the splendour of kings. [8b]**And I trust you [9a]**to inherit a kingdom. [9b]*

דמי זיוך<sup>1311</sup>  
לזווא דמלכי  
ורחיצא<sup>1312</sup> כך  
דאת ירתת מלכו

**I.5 (He)***Alas for you, boy, [10a]**for your shortness will be your undoing. [10b]**Alas for your youth, [11a]**that you seek to be killed. [11b]*

חבל עלך עליא  
דנמרך מצרך  
חבל על ינקותך<sup>1313</sup>  
דבעית לאחזקטלא

The first canticle in Goliath's speech deals with David's possible future. Goliath foresees a wedding party and a coronation, on the condition that David will not fight him. A concentric structure can be distinguished in the phrasing of this canticle. Strophes I.1 and I.5 refer to David's youth. Strophes I.2 and I.4 refer to David as the chosen, the future king. And in strophes I.3 Goliath describes the bright future David will have if he withdraws, *viz.* a wedding party.

Goliath's concern about David's tender age is based on the Biblical narrative (17:42). It also resembles Josephus' mention of the youthfulness of the Zealots.<sup>1314</sup> Goliath's warnings against David to turn around and withdraw from battle also resemble the situation in the Jewish War.<sup>1315</sup>

In strophe I.2 Goliath calls David the Chosen One. This refers back to 17:8, in which Goliath challenged the people to choose a man for the duel. Goliath thus supposed that David was the chosen hero. In TJon, however, the verb בחר is also used as a title for the Davidic Messiah (cf. TJon 2 Sam. 23:8; Isa. 43:10; and in many MSS of Isa.

<sup>1310</sup>MSS S Munich 5 read לך, 'for you'.

<sup>1311</sup>Ms S reads זיוך and in the next line לזווא. This can mean "your weapon resembles a king's weapon", but was more probably read as "your loss resembles a king's loss", cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. זיוא.

<sup>1312</sup>Ms S reads ררחינא, omitting the *Sade*.

<sup>1313</sup>Ms S reads ציקך, 'your fate'.

<sup>1314</sup>Josephus, *Jewish War*, 2:267; 2:290; 2:346; 2:409; 4:128; cited by Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 72.

<sup>1315</sup>Josephus, *Jewish War*, 2:345-404 (Agrippa's speech); 5:361-419 (Josephus' speech); 6:93-110 (Josephus' speech); cited by Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 73.

42:1).<sup>1316</sup> This means that the poet already hints at a connection with strophe I.4, where Goliath states that David stands a good chance of inheriting the kingdom.

The words *גמרא* and *מצרא* in strophe I.5 must be regarded as Hebraisms. The word *גמרא* is derived from Hebrew *גמד*, a linear measure. Since it is used parallel to *ניקוחא*, ‘youth’, it most likely means “shortness”. The word *מצרא* is derived from Hebrew *מצר*, which means “hardship, distress”.

## II.1 (Waw)

*Woe to you, lamb* [12a]

*that you are provoking a bear.* [12b]

*But there is no lamb* [13a]

*which can stand up against a bear.* [13b]

וי לך אימרא  
דמתגרת עם<sup>1317</sup> דובא  
ולית אימרא  
דיכיל למיקם בדובא<sup>1318</sup>

## II.2 (Zayin)

*You are small,* [14a]

*but your heart is hard.* [14b]

*Woe to you, that you are provoking* [15a]

*someone who is too hard for you.*<sup>1319</sup> [15b]

זעירא את  
ולבך קשי  
וי לך דאת מתגרת  
במאן דקשי מנך

A small canticle describes the situation of the coming fight: a small boy, comparable to a lamb, is provoking a person too hard for him, comparable to a bear. The comparison is made in strophe II.1, the explanation is given in strophe II.2.

In strophe I.1 Goliath calls himself a lion's whelp. This image, as well as the image of the bear in strophes II.1 and VI.1, are taken from the account of David slaying both lion and bear (17:34-37). But the wording resembles the image used by Moses to denote Dan (Deut. 33:22; in TO גר אריין) and may also function as a reference to Goliath's lineage. He was a descendant of Orpah and of Samson the Danite, as is explicitly stated in a tosefta-targum to 17:4 (see above). Further on, only the image of the bear is used, probably because the lion is a less suitable image through its connotation with the tribe of Judah and the Davidic dynasty (cf. Gen. 49:9).<sup>1320</sup>

<sup>1316</sup> Also used as such in Syr.Ps. 152:4; 1 Hen. 45; 48:6; 49:2; 51:3; 53:6; 55:4; Test-Benj. 11:4; cf. G.W. Lorein, *Het thema van de Antichrist in de intertestamentaire periode*, Groningen (diss.) 1997, 192.

<sup>1317</sup> Unusual preposition. The usual preposition after the verb *גרא* is *ב*.

<sup>1318</sup> Ms S reads *קדם דובא*, ‘before a bear’.

<sup>1319</sup> Cf. GKC § 133c. The expression “too hard for me” is used by David in 2 Sam. 3:39.

<sup>1320</sup> So Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 72. The lion is pre-eminently a royal symbol, cf. I. Cornelius, “The Lion in the Art of the Ancient Near East: A Study of Selected Motifs,” *JNWS* 15 (1989), 53-85.

Goliath's words are a parody on David's words in 17:34-37. David trusted that the LORD would rescue him from the Philistine, just as he had rescued lambs from the paws of the lion and the bear. Goliath takes the metaphor and, while calling himself lion and bear, compares David to a boy and a lamb. He plays with these two words: *שליא* can mean "boy" and is as such related with *שליוחך* (2b) and *ינקותך* (10b), but it has also the meaning of "lamb" and is as such the synonym of *אימרא* (12b) and the opposite of lion and bear.<sup>1321</sup> The same epithet is used in TgPs. 118:22, where Hebrew "stone" is replaced with *שליא*, although TJon mostly interprets figurative stones as a metaphor for a king or even the Messiah (cf. Isa. 28:16; Zech. 10:4). The stone in Ps. 118, too, is often interpreted as the coming Davidic Messiah.<sup>1322</sup>

The contrast between the lamb and the beasts is also used in Rev. 13:2, which explicitly stated that the beast resembles a lion and a bear. This tradition depends on Dan. 7:4-5 and the Hebrew text of 1 Sam. 17:34-37, but the question who is like the beast and who can fight against it (Rev. 13:4) is reminiscent of Goliath's claim that a lamb cannot stand up against a bear (strophe II.1) and the rumour among the Philistines that the lamb would do so (strophe VI.1).<sup>1323</sup>

### III.1 (Ḥeth)

*Your appearance and your flesh* [16a]

*I shall give to the birds of heaven,* [16b]

*if you do not go* [17a]

*and tend your sheep.* [17b]

חיווך ובשרך

אתין לעופא דשמיא

אם לא תזיל

ותרעי ענך

### III.2 (Ṭeth)

*Blessed be you, boy,* [18a]

*if you go away from before me,* [18b]

*lest I spit on you* [19a]

*and you would drown in my spittle.* [19b]

טובך שליא

אם תזיל<sup>1324</sup> מקדמי<sup>1325</sup>

דלא אירוק בך

ותטבע ברוקי

<sup>1321</sup>This playing of words gives some unexpected support to Burney's theory that the messianic title in the testimony of John the Baptist (Jn 1:29) was a translation of the Aramaic word *שליא*, cf. C.F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford 1922, 107-108. Still, the main title was apparently *אימרא*, since even in Isa. 53:7 the Targum uses *אימרא*.

<sup>1322</sup>Cf. the apocryphal *Songs of David*, A18, edited by D. Flusser, S. Safrai, "שירי דוד" החיצונים, in: B. Uffenheimer (ed.), *עיונים במקרא*, *Studies in Memoriam of Joshua Grintz*, Tel Aviv 1970, 83-105; Mk 12:1-12; 1 Pet. 2:6-8; cited by J.C. de Moor, "The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1-12: The Parable of the Wicked Tenants", *JSJ* 29 (1998), 63-80.

<sup>1323</sup>The parallel between Goliath and the beast in the book of Revelation is enhanced by the fact that both are blaspheming, cf. the tosefta-targum on 17:8 and Rev. 13:5-6.

<sup>1324</sup>Ms S erroneously reads *ניזיל*, 'we go'.

<sup>1325</sup>Ms S erroneously reads *מקדמך*, 'from before you'.

**III.3 (Yodh)**

*It was a bad day, [20a]*

*on which you went out. [20b]*

*Your father cried out, [21a]*

*and your mother wailed, 'Woe, woe!' [21b]*

יִוְמָא בִישָׂא

דְּנִפְקַת בְּנוּיָה

אֲבוּךָ צוּחַ

וְאִמְךָ מִלֵּילָא וַיִּי 1326

**III.4 (Kaph)**

*Bow your head [22a]*

*and turn back, [22b]*

*lest it will rule over you, [23a]*

*my sharp-edged sword." [23b]*

כּוּף רִישְׁךָ

וְהִרְרָךְ 1327 לְאַחוּרְךָ 1328

דְּלֵא יִשְׁלוּט בְּךָ 1329

סִיפִי 1330 דְּחַרִּיךָ

A canticle full of death threats and advices to retreat, in which a concentric structure is noticeable. In strophes III.1 and II.4 Goliath makes death threats against David: he will feed David's flesh to the birds of heaven and his sword will rule over David's body.<sup>1331</sup> These two strophes are also connected by the denotations of the body, in III.1 "appearance" and "flesh", in III.4 "head". Strophes III.2 and III.3 use opposite words, like the pair "blessed" and "woe" and the verbs "go out" and "go away". Only the threat in III.1 is taken from the Biblical narrative (17:44), the rest of Goliath's threats are inventions of the poet.

Goliath's exhortation to return and tend the sheep is yet another sentence with a hidden message. In the first place, David was a shepherd and could go back to his sheep. But in the second place, many great leaders were called shepherds and "tended" their people.<sup>1332</sup> A second reference to David's future leadership is given. The combination of the lamb and the shepherd is humoristic, although not without parallel. Rev. 7:17 says that the Lamb, Jesus, will be the Shepherd.

Goliath's threat to drown David in his spittle (strophe III.2) has a vague parallel in San. 93a, where R. Samuel said that Daniel's three friends drowned in the spittle of the people. Commentators admit

<sup>1326</sup>Ms S omits both וַיִּי.

<sup>1327</sup>Ms S probably reads וְהִרְרִים, which might be a Hiphil of רָם and mean 'lift up'.

<sup>1328</sup>Ms S reads אַחוּרְךָ, 'your property'. The entire colon in MS S is "bow your head and assemble your property".

<sup>1329</sup>Ms S reads this line as דְּלֵימָא אֶקְפְּלִינְךָ, 'lest I shall kill you', which is plain language instead of the metaphorical speech in the other MSS.

<sup>1330</sup>Ms S reads בְּסִיפִי, 'with my sword', in accordance with its preceding line.

<sup>1331</sup>The expression שְׁלוּט בְּ is also used in 1 Sam. 22:17, as a metaphor for using force against or killing someone.

<sup>1332</sup>Cf. R. le Déaut, *La Nuit Pascale: Essai sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode XXI 42* (AnBib, 22), Rome 1963, 266-70. On the background of this metaphor, cf. J.C. de Moor, "De goede herder: Oorsprong en vroege geschiedenis van de herdersmetafoor", in: *Bewerken en bewaren: Studies aangeboden aan prof. dr. K. Runia*, Kampen 1982, 36-45.

that this remark is meant either metaphorically or humoristically. It is used seriously in Rev. 12:15, where the dragon, that is Satan, "poured water like a river out of his mouth", but the earth "opened its mouth and swallowed the river" (Rev. 12:16; cf. strophe III.5).

#### IV.1 (Lamed)

"Your heart which is haughty, [24a]  
the LORD will humiliate it," [24b]  
said David to Goliath. [25a]

לִבְךָ דַרְמָא  
יְיִ יִשְׁפִיל 1333 יְתִיחֵה 1334  
אִמַר דוד לְגִלְיָת

#### IV.2 (Mem)

"The speech of my God, [26a]  
who goes with me, [26b]  
the same will deliver the lamb [27a]  
from the mouth of the bear. [27b]

מִימַר דְּאֵלֵהּ  
דַּתְאָא 1335 עִמִּי 1336  
הוּא יִשׁוּיב 1337 אִמַר  
מִפּוּם דּוּבָא

#### IV.3 (Nun)

Rest will be mine [28a]  
and the anger yours. [28b]  
You in the name of the idol [29a]  
and I in the name of the LORD *Sebaoth*. [29b]

נִיחָא דִּילִי  
וּרְגוּזָא דִּילְךָ  
אַתְּ בְּשׁוּם טַעוּתָא 1338  
וְאִנָּא בְּשׁוּם יְיִ צְבָאוֹת 1339

#### IV.4 (Samekh)

Your sharp-edged sword, [30a]  
I will cut off your head with it," [30b]  
said David to Goliath. [31a]

סִיפְךָ דַּחַרְיָךְ  
אִנָּא אִפְסִיק בְּהָ יְת רִישְׁךָ  
אִמַר דוד לְגִלְיָת 1339

#### IV.5 (Ayin)

"The meekness of Saul, [32a]  
the son of Kish, whom you have defied, [32b]  
the same will prevail over you [33a]  
and will fell your height." [33b]

עֲנוּתוֹתֵיהּ 1340 דַּשְׂאוּל  
בְּרִי קִישׁ 1341 דַּחֲסִידֵת 1342  
הוּא תַגְרוּם לְךָ  
וְחַפֵּיל קוֹמְתָךְ

<sup>1333</sup>Ms Munich 5 reads the participle משפיל.

<sup>1334</sup>The Lamed-colon is omitted in MS S, which reads "said David to Goliath".

<sup>1335</sup>MS S reads the impossible form דַּתְאָא.

<sup>1336</sup>In contradiction to the usual Targumic vocabulary which would have read דְּהוּא בְּסַעְרֵי, 'which is in my aid'.

<sup>1337</sup>MS S reads שִׁיבֵינִי, 'he will deliver me', which is in conformity with the Hebrew text (17:37). Moreover, MS S adds מְנִסְיָבָה, 'from the voluntary gift' (cf. Lev. 22:18, 23). The entire phrase must then be rendered, "he will deliver me from being the voluntary gift of the lamb, from the mouth of the bear". It appears that MS S saw David as a voluntary gift, a lamb who was sacrificed to God. This may be an allusion to the Aqedah, in which Isaac was portrayed as voluntarily going to the altar, cf. yTaan. 2:1 (65a); San. 89b; GenR. 55:3-8.

<sup>1338</sup>Mss S Munich 5 read טַעוּתְךָ, 'your idol'.

<sup>1339</sup>The line "said David to Goliath" is omitted in MS S.

<sup>1340</sup>MS S reads ועֲנוּתוֹתֵיהּ, breaking the acrostic.

<sup>1341</sup>The phrase "the son of Kish" is omitted in MS S.

<sup>1342</sup>MS S adds יְהִיָּה, 'him'.



The concentric structure of this canticle is less clear than that of two of the preceding canticles. Both strophe IV.1 and IV.5 refer to Goliath's humiliation—of his heart and of his height: **רָמָא** [24a] || **קַמְרָךְ** [33b] and **יִשְׁפִּיל** [24b] || **וַחֲפִיל** [33b]. The middle strophe stresses David's message, also mentioned in the Biblical narrative, *viz.* the struggle is not merely between human beings.

When David talks about the rest for him, he may refer to the victory of Israel over all its enemies (cf. Josh. 21:44; 1 Kgs 8:56). The contrast between rest and anger, however, is used in parallel with the texts that speak about spiritual rest (cf. Ps. 95; Heb. 3–4; Rev. 14:9–13). In rabbinic literature the contrast between rest and anger is used for the condition of souls after death: the souls of the righteous will be at peace under God's throne, whereas the souls of the wicked will see no rest (cf. LevR. 18:1; Shab. 152b).

The contrast between the name of the idol and the name of the LORD of hosts in strophe IV.3 is based on the Biblical narrative. The Philistine curses David by his gods (17:43)—his idol in the Aramaic version—and David states that he comes in the name of the LORD of hosts (17:45). The exact wording, however, is derived from the struggle of Elijah against the Baal priests. Elijah challenged the Baal priest with the words, "You will call on the name of your idols . . . and I will pray in the name of the LORD of hosts" (1 Kgs 18:24). This wording places the battle between David and Goliath in the light of a struggle between gods, which is similar to the afore-mentioned struggle of Elijah's days. Seen in that light, it is reminiscent of the events in the temple of Dagon (1 Sam. 5:3–4), where the image of Dagon twice fell before the ark of the LORD. In Midrashic literature this connection is recognized, for it is argued there that Goliath was punished in the same way as his idol was (LevR. 10:7): He fell with his head on the ground and was decapitated.<sup>1343</sup>

Strophe IV.4 betrays the exegesis of 17:51. Whereas it is uncertain in Hebrew which sword was used to decapitate Goliath, this strophe points to Goliath's own sword. Josephus gave the same interpretation, linking it to the remark in 17:50 that David did not have a sword.<sup>1344</sup>

Strophe IV.5 depends on the tosefta-targum to 17:8 in which it is Saul who is challenged by Goliath (see above, commentary on 17:8). The theme of Saul's meekness is also attested to in tBer. 4:18, where it is based on Saul's remark to his servant, "Come, let us go back lest

<sup>1343</sup>The Biblical argumentation for this connection is found in Lev. 26:30, in which the corpses of the idols are treated in the same way as the corpses of their worshippers.

<sup>1344</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:190; cf. Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 61:7.

my father cease to care about the asses and become anxious about us" (1 Sam. 9:5). From this remark it can be inferred that he attached the same value to his servant as to himself.<sup>1345</sup> In the end, Saul appears to be a bad king and ruler because of his great modesty (Yom. 22b).

### V.1 (Pe)

"When I open my mouth, [34a]  
I will swallow you," [34b]  
said Goliath to David, [35a]

פחחנא<sup>1346</sup> פומי  
ובלענא יהך  
אמר גליה לדוד

### V.2 (Ṣade)

"The shape of your face [36a]  
is beautiful and ruddy. [36b]  
And you are beautiful in looks [37a]  
and lovely in appearance." [37b]

צורת אפך  
שפירא וסומקא  
ושפירתא<sup>1347</sup> בריוא  
ויאת<sup>1348</sup> בחיוא

When Goliath threatens to swallow David in strophe III.5, he is boasting. The verb בלע only occurs twice with its literal meaning in the Hebrew Bible (Jon. 2:1; Job 7:19). In other verses it functions as a fixed metaphor for the great victory of an army, including robbery and booty (cf. 2 Sam. 17:16; Jer. 51:34, where Babylon devoured Jerusalem); or as a metaphor for death by execution.<sup>1349</sup>

Goliath's emphasis on the beauty of David is a sign of his homosexual inclination toward David (cf. LevR. 21:2). Ms Sall even reads בך דרר'ימנא, 'for I love you', instead of בך ורר'יצנא, thus making the homosexuality explicit. At the same time Goliath unwittingly predicts the beauty of the Davidic Messiah. Whereas strophe I.4 refers to the kingship of David himself, the wording in strophes I.2 and V.2 describe his beauty in terms of the beauty of the Messiah (cf. TJon 2 Sam. 23:8; TgPs. 45:3).<sup>1350</sup> The same words, however, are also used

<sup>1345</sup>Other remarks on Saul's modesty are made in ySan. 2:4; NumR. 4:20; cf. Kasher, הוספתו, 111.

<sup>1346</sup>Ms S reads ופחחנא, breaking the alphabet.

<sup>1347</sup>Ms S reads ונשפיר אה.

<sup>1348</sup>This must be regarded as an active participle with a suffix 2 m.sg. of the verb אה, 'be fit, be proper'. Ms S reads ונארי אה. The same verb is used to describe Sarah's beauty in 1 Q Ap Gen 20:2-8a; cf. J.C. Vanderkam, "The Poetry of 1 Q Ap Gen, XX, 2-8a", *RdQ* 10 (1979), 57-66, esp. 59-60; A.S. Rodrigues Pereira, *Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E. - c. 600 C.E.): Selected Jewish, Christian and Samaritan Poems* (SSN), Assen 1997, 305.

<sup>1349</sup>Cf. Num. 16:32 about the judgment of Korah with the same words והפתח הארץ והבלע אתם; Isa. 25:8, where death itself will be swallowed, cf. 1 Cor. 15:54.

<sup>1350</sup>Cf. also J.C. de Moor, "'Van wie zegt de profeet dit?' Messiaanse apologetiek in de Targumim", in: H.H. Grosheide et al. (eds), *De knechtsgestalte van Christus: Studies door collega's en oud-leerlingen aangeboden aan Prof.dr. H.N. Ridderbos*, Kampen 1978, 91-110, esp. 104; Van Staaldoune-Sulman, "The Aramaic Song of

to denote the people of Israel in TgJer. 11:16. Note that the image of the lamb could also be used for the people of Israel (cf. EstR. 10).

### VI.1 (Qoph)

*A rumour was heard among* [38a] קלא<sup>1351</sup> אישמע<sup>1352</sup> בפלישתאי  
*the Philistines,*  
*that the lamb would fight* [38b] דאימרא מכתש<sup>1353</sup> עם דובא  
*with the bear.*

### VI.2 (Resh)

*A great turmoil arose* [39a] ריגשא רבא<sup>1354</sup> הוה  
*among the five stones,* [39b] בחמשא אבנין  
*one saying to the other,* [40a] דדא אמרה לדא<sup>1355</sup>  
*"I want to mount first [in the sling]."* [40b] אנא איסק בקדמיתא

### VI.3 (Sin)

*The name of Abraham the Righteous* [41a] שמייה<sup>1356</sup> דאברהם צדיקא  
*was written on the first one;* [41b] כתיבא על קדמאה<sup>1357</sup>  
*that of Isaac the Bound* [42a] דיצחק<sup>1358</sup> עקידיא  
*was written on the second one;* [42b] כתיבא על תניינא  
*that of Jacob the Perfect* [43a] דיעקב תמימא<sup>1359</sup>  
*was written on the third one.* [43b] כתיבא על תליחאה  
*On the fourth and the fifth were written* [44a] על רביעתא וחמישיתא כתיב  
*the names of Moses and Aaron* [44b] שומהון דמשה ואהרן נביאייא  
*the Prophets.*

the Lamb", 278. E. Hühn, "Die Targumim nach 300 n. Chr.", in: *Die messianischen Weissagungen des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes bis zu den Targumim*, Freiburg im Breisgau etc. 1899, 111-114, esp. 111-12 also refers to TPsJ Gen. 49:11-12.

<sup>1351</sup>MS c reads דלא, but this has to be corrected in order to maintain the acrostic and to obtain a normal sentence, cf. MSS S Munich 5.

<sup>1352</sup>MSS S Munich 5 read the feminine אישמעה, which is more in harmony with the feminine subject.

<sup>1353</sup>MS S reads מכביש לדובא, resulting in the phrase "that the lamb would oppress the bear".

<sup>1354</sup>Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1355</sup>This line is read in MS S as אמרה דא, 'one was saying'.

<sup>1356</sup>Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1357</sup>MSS S Munich 5 read קדמיתא, as in the preceding phrase.

<sup>1358</sup>The rest of this strophe is written in a different order in MS S: על תניינא שמייה על רביעתא שמייה דיעקב על תליחאה שמייה דמשה על חמישיתא שמייה דאהרן, 'on the second the name of Isaac; on the third the name of Jacob; on the fourth the name of Moses; on the fifth the name of Aaron.'

<sup>1359</sup>MS Munich 5 reads בוכרא, 'the firstborn'.

## VI.4 (Shin)

*The name of Abraham said, [45a]* שְׁמִיָּהּ 1360 דַּאֲבֵרָהֶם אָמְרָה  
*"I will mount the sling first! [45b]* אֲנֵי אֲסִיֵּךְ לְקִילְעָא 1361 בְּקִדְמוּתָא  
*And I will hit the Philistine, [46a]* וְאֵימָחִי יֵת פְּלִישְׁתָּא  
*this uncircumcised one, [46b]* עֹרְלָאָה הָרִין עַל עֹרְלָתָהּ  
*against his uncircumcised foreskin,*  
*and take away the defiance from [46c]* וְאֵעֲרִי חִסּוּדִין מִן דְּבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל  
*those of the House of Israel."*

The poetry in this canticle gradually changes into narrative. There is no concentric structure, and both the cola and the strophes are longer. Still, the alphabet guarantees the unity of the poem.

The theme of the named stones in strophe IV.4 is also used by Pseudo-Philo.<sup>1362</sup> However, Pseudo-Philo mentions seven stones, on which David himself wrote the names of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses and Aaron, as well as his own name and the name of the Almighty, who sent the angel Zervihel to represent Him. The epithets for Abraham and Isaac have been derived from the Biblical text: Abraham is called righteous in Gen. 15:6, and Isaac is depicted as the bound one in Gen. 22. The epithet "perfect" is used for the three Patriarchs (PesR. 48:3). It is similar to the epithet "pure" in TJon 2 Sam. 22:26. The epithet "prophet" is repeatedly used for Moses in the Targumim.<sup>1363</sup> This tosefta-targum also applies it to his brother (cf. ExodR. 1:22; 3:16).

The theme of the struggle to be the first to act, as found in strophes VI.2 and VI.4, is a well-known topic. Several examples have been given in the commentary on 15:17.<sup>1364</sup> The combination of the two themes

<sup>1360</sup>Ms S reads אֲבֵנָה, 'stone', breaking the acrostic.

<sup>1361</sup>Although MS S\* attests to the same reading, it is corrected into לעילא, 'upward'.

<sup>1362</sup>Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 61:5.

<sup>1363</sup>Cf. M.J. Bernstein, "Epithets of Moses in Targumic Literature", in: *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division A: The Bible in Its World*, Jerusalem 1990, 168-71.

<sup>1364</sup>Further examples can be found in Hul. 91b, where a story is told about stones that quarrel to be the one under Jacob's head in Bethel, and in MS T-S H10/78, where the months quarrel to be the one in which the Israelites would be saved from Egypt. Another example is the dispute between the mountains which one would be singled out as the mountain of God in the tosefta-targum to Judg. 5:5, cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 414. More dispute poems are discussed in W.J. van Bekkum, "Observations on the Hebrew Debate in Medieval Europe", in: G.J. Reinink, H.J.L. Vanstiphout (eds), *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Medieval Near East: Forms and Types of Literary Debates in Semitic and Related Literatures* (OLA, 42), Leuven 1991, 77-90.

occurs in Midrash Hagadol to Deut. 21:10, where only three of the five stones are deliberating how to kill Goliath:

... and one was saying, "I am the stone of Abraham. If David sends me, I will sink through the helmet of the Philistine, that is upon his head." And the second said, "I am the stone of Isaac. If he sends me, I will strike the forehead of the Philistine and go through in his brains and go out from his neck." And the third said, "I am the stone of Jacob. If he sends me, I will hit the Philistine against his heart and I will make him fall before all Israel."

And so it happened in that Midrash. David used three stones and hit the Philistine twice in the head and once in the heart. The same Midrash says that David prayed to the LORD, as in the present tosefta (strophe V.1).

### VII.1 (BETH)

*At that moment* [47a]

*David lifted up his eyes to heaven* [47b]

*and saw angels deliberating* [48a]

*on Goliath the Philistine.* [48b]

בשעתא ההיא<sup>1365</sup>

זקיף דויד עינוהי למרומא

וחזא<sup>1366</sup> מלאכין רמחיעצין

על גליח פלישתאה

### VII.2 (BETH)

*At that moment* [49a]

*it was the will from before the LORD:* [49b]

בהשעתא ההיא<sup>1367</sup>

הוה רעוא מן קדם יי

### VII.3 (Taw)

*"Let the stone of Aaron go in!"* [50a]

*And it mounted the sling,* [50b]

*because he was a pursuer of peace.* [50c]

*And it hit the Philistine* [51a]

*against his forehead*<sup>1369</sup> [51b]

*to make peace dwell* [52a]

*by his hand in the territory of Israel.* [52b]

תעל<sup>1368</sup> אבנא דאהרון

וסליקת לקילעא

על דהוה רדיף שלמא

ומחת פלישתאה

על בית עינוהי

למישרי שלמא

על ידיה בתחומא דישראל

<sup>1365</sup>Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1366</sup>Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1367</sup>Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1368</sup>All the MSS read רעל in spite of the fact that feminine אבנא is its subject.

<sup>1369</sup>Aramaic and Syriac עינה ביה simply means "forehead", cf. also A. Geiger, "Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Wright's Apocryphal Acts", *ZDMG* 26 (1872), 798-801, esp. 800-801.

## VII.4 (BETH)

*At that moment* [53a]  
*the splendour of his face changed* [53b]  
*and his knees shook* [53c]  
*and his sword fell* [54a]  
*and the shaft of his spear was broken.* [54b]

בהשעתא ההיא  
 זיויה דאפיה אישתני<sup>1370</sup>  
 וארכובתיה נקשן  
 וסיפיה נפל  
 ואעא דמורניתיה איתבר ◊

## VII.5 (WAW/LAMED)

*And what He did with that generation,* [55a]  
*may He do with us forever.* [55b]

ודיעבד עם ההוא דרא  
 ליעביד עימא לעלם

In the centre of the last canticle, the utterance of the LORD commences the lost *Taw*-strophe. The victory over Goliath is definitely ascribed to God's will. Neither the stones, nor the angels, nor David himself, but God spoke the decisive words.<sup>1371</sup> The four surrounding strophes all commence with a time marker: three times "at that moment" and once "forever". These surrounding strophes form another acrostic, which can be achieved in two ways. Either the last two lines are exchanged, so that the word בכבל is obtained,<sup>1372</sup> or the last lines are in their correct order, so that the word בכבו can be read.

The acrostic of בכבל is the most likely, since it refers to a well-known city, Babylon, which served as the apocalyptic symbol of all kinds of evil.<sup>1373</sup> In such a city hope comes only from divine intervention, as is foretold in Isa. 48:14, "And He will do his will in Babylon" (note the words "רעוא מן קדם" in [49b]). The final strophe suggests that the poem does not only describe the struggle between David and Goliath, but also the on-going struggle between the forces of good and evil, between God and his adversaries.

The acrostic of בכבו is also possible, on the basis of its derivation from the short form בבו, 'enmity'. From the exegetical point of view the result is similar to the acrostic of בכבל. When "in enmity", one

<sup>1370</sup>Ms Munich 5 adds another line to this colon: וקישריחריציה אישתרו, 'the bones of his loins were loosened'. This addition is based on Dan. 5:6, which was used for the two original lines (>15). Ultimately, the whole description of the defeat of the "monster" rests on the ancient Canaanite myth of the defeat of the sea-dragon which also combines the hit between the eyes with the loosening of the bones of his loins; cf. J.C. de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit* (Nisaba, 16), Leiden 1987, 40-41.

<sup>1371</sup>Cf. Josephus' remark that "David was accompanied by an ally invisible to the foe, and this was God" in *Antiquities*, 6:189.

<sup>1372</sup>The same result is possible when looking at the four time markers.

<sup>1373</sup>Like idolatry (Isa. 21:9; 47:9; Baruch 6), cf. L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jew*, Vol. 1, Philadelphia 1968, 193-94; drunkenness (Jer. 25:15; 51:7); impurity (Isa. 52:11); and pride (Isa. 47:8; Jer. 50:31-32). Cf. Rev. 14:8; 16-18.

must trust the will of God and his intervention in history. Furthermore, the reader must bear in mind that Aaron's stone was chosen because of his peaceful methods and aims (see further below). Neither revenge, nor the removal of Israel's shame, but only peace in the territory of Israel is the rightful aim in enmity. "This revealing paradox abundantly clarifies the political stance of the Targumic author of this Midrash. Peaceful methods and reliance on divine intervention against the enemies of Israel will ultimately be more effective than the armed struggle advocated by the Zealots."<sup>1374</sup>

Since MS S integrated the whole tosefta in the main Aramaic translation, the text was adapted to the narrative. The remainder of this strophe is considered to consist of subordinated clauses after the main clause "it was the will from before the LORD". The text of MS S runs as follows:

דסליקת לעילא דהוה רדף שלמא ומחא ית פלשתא על ביה עינויה למשרא שלמא  
על ידיה בחותמא דישראל בתר דאמר פלשתא לדוד הכלב שטיא אנא דאח אתי עלי  
בחוטור ולאית פלשתא ית דוד בטעותיה

*that it would go upward, that he was pursuing peace, and that it hit the Philistine against his forehead to make peace dwell by his hand in the territory of Israel, after the Philistine had said to David, "Am I a mad dog that you come to me with a stick?" And the Philistine cursed David by his idol.*

The idea that David received divine help is paralleled in Pseudo-Philo's narrative. The latter let the angel Zervihel accompany David. When Goliath was hit, he looked up and saw the angel and realized that David was not his only opponent.<sup>1375</sup> A closer and interesting parallel is found in TN Gen. 22:10. Isaac, when he lay bound on the altar, saw the angels on high (cf. strophe IV.3). There is a great textual similarity between the present tosefta-targum and Neophiti's text: עייני דאברהם הווין בעייני דיצחק ועייני דיצחק נווין משיטטן במלאכי מרומא, "the eyes of Abraham were on the eyes of Isaac, but the eyes of Isaac were looking at the angels on high". The next phrase in TN commences with the well-known words "at that moment": בה בשעתא: "at that moment a *bath qol* came forth from the heavens and said, 'Come, see two unique persons who are in my world; one slaughters and the other is being slaughtered. The one who slaughters does not spare and he who is being slaughtered stretches out his neck'" The parallel is even stronger, because both David and

<sup>1374</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 74.

<sup>1375</sup>Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 61:5, 8.

Isaac are called a lamb. Abraham is saying in TN Gen. 22:8, "From before the LORD has he prepared for himself a lamb for the burnt offering; otherwise you will be the lamb of the burnt offering".<sup>1376</sup>

In strophe V.3 Aaron's stone was chosen because Aaron was a "pursuer of peace". This is a well-known tradition, ascribed to Hillel (Avoth 1:12) and to R. Eliezer b. Yose (San. 6b).<sup>1377</sup> The choice of Aaron's stone was based on the place where Goliath was hit, *i.e.* his forehead. The forehead is reminiscent of the golden plate on Aaron's forehead (Exod. 28:36-38), which he had to wear in order to atone for the people's guilt. This atonement was especially intended for shameless people and blasphemers like Goliath (cf. LevR. 10:6; CantR. 4:4 § 5). Goliath's punishment is explained in this way: he was hit on his forehead as a punishment for his blaspheming.

With the rejection of Abraham's stone, his motivation was rejected as well.<sup>1378</sup> This seems to contradict the canonical text, where David mentioned it positively in 17:26. Even the shorter version in LXX, from which verse 26 is absent, adds this motivation after verse 36.<sup>1379</sup> It is most likely that this tosefta-targum aimed to bring David's motivation on a higher level. He was not to clean the land from uncircumcised people, but to make peace in the land of Israel.<sup>1380</sup>

The prayer at the end of the poem has many parallels. One parallel is worth noting, because it is said after referring to the death of Goliath and his brother Madon (MTeh. 18:5).

#### *The Date of this Tosefta-Targum*

Although it is difficult to date the origin of a text, there are some elements in both the present tosefta-targum and in the one on 17:8 which indicate an early date. Starting with the philological observations, we must point to the use of the passive perfect in strophe I.2. This form

<sup>1376</sup>Cf. GenR. 56:4, quoted by M. McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (AramB, 1A), Edinburgh 1992, 117; but also TPsJ Gen. 22:10.

<sup>1377</sup>Cf. "Peace alludes to Aaron, of whom it is said, 'He walked with Me in peace' (Mal. 2:6)." in MTeh. 2:12.

<sup>1378</sup>The wording of Abraham's motivation originates in David's questions to the soldiers (17:26), "What shall be done for the man who kills this Philistine, and takes away the reproach from Israel? For who is this uncircumcised Philistine, that he should defy the armies of the living God?" Similar words are used in Josh. 5:9, where the reproach of Egypt is taken away from the people by the act of circumcision and the keeping of the passover. The combination of these two texts induced Abraham's suggestion.

<sup>1379</sup>Similarly, it is mentioned in the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, in its five verses about the struggle against Goliath (47:3-7), and in Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 61:4.

<sup>1380</sup>Similar thoughts can be found in the Books of Samuel: David is withheld from revenge (25:33), but is allowed to wage the wars of the LORD (25:28).



is relatively old.<sup>1381</sup> If the reconstruction of the *Taw*-strophe is right, also the defective spelling טל points to a venerable antiquity.<sup>1382</sup>

Furthermore, it is important to note that both the *Sin*-strophe and the *Shin*-strophe begin with the word שמייה. So the poem must have been composed at a time when the Aramaic *Sin* had not yet been replaced by the *Samekh*, and its pronunciation was no longer clearly distinguished from that of the *Shin*. This was the case in the second century BCE. In the course of this century the *Sin* was replaced by the *Samekh* in Jewish Aramaic and finally disappeared as a separate consonant.<sup>1383</sup> In the Uruk text of ca. 150 BCE the *Sin* is written as a *Shin*.<sup>1384</sup>

With regard to its contents, some elements also point to an early date. Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, dated with considerable certainty after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE but before the second revolt in 132 CE,<sup>1385</sup> contains extra-Biblical traditions which are also attested in the tosefta-targumim on 17:8 and 17:43. In Pseudo-Philo, Goliath scorns the Israelites with the words, "Are you not Israel who fled before my appearance, when I captured from you the ark and killed your priests?" (61:2). These words resemble the first strophes of the tosefta-targum on 17:8. Further on, Pseudo-Philo's version contains the tradition of the names of David's stones, albeit with the addition of David's name on the sixth and God's name on the seventh stone (61:5).<sup>1386</sup>

The close correspondence between the Targumic imagery of David as a lamb fighting the lion and the bear on the one hand and the apocalyptic imagery of the lamb and the beasts in the book of Rev-

<sup>1381</sup>K. Beyer, *Die aramäische Texte vom Toten Meer, samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten*, Göttingen 1984, 152, 463.

<sup>1382</sup>Beyer, *Die aramäische Texte*, 485, 657.

<sup>1383</sup>Cf. F. Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, Wiesbaden 1961, § 19; Beyer, *Die aramäische Texte*, 421.

<sup>1384</sup>Beyer, *Die aramäische Texte*, 102-103.

<sup>1385</sup>G. Kisch, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, Notre Dame (IN) 1949, 17. The similarities to ApBaruch, 4 Ezra and the *Antiquities* of Josephus tend to support that date, cf. Ch. Dietzfelbinger, *Pseudo-Philo: Antiquitates Biblicae* (JSRZ, 2/2), Gütersloh 1975, 95-96; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded", in: M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (CRI, 2/2), Assen & Philadelphia, 1984, 109; H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, Vol. 1, Leiden 1996, 199-210.

<sup>1386</sup>Other themes are used in a reversed way in the narrative of Pseudo-Philo, cf. Van Staaldoune-Sulman, "The Aramaic Song of the Lamb", 285.

elation on the other, makes it unlikely that such a poem could have been composed long after the genesis of the book of Revelation, let alone in a time that the imagery of "the Lamb of God" was common knowledge in the Christian world. Such an early date agrees with the date of the tradition that Aaron was a model for pursuing peace. It has been ascribed to Hillel in Avoth 1:12, and to R. Eliezer b. Yose, pupil of R. Aqiba (2nd century CE), in San. 6b. Finally, the absence of rhyme in the poem may also point to a fairly early date, although no absolute date can be derived from it.<sup>1387</sup>

### *David and the "Lamb of God"*

This early date makes the hypothesis likely that the imagery of this tosefta-targum is one of the antecedents of the imagery of the Lamb in the book of Revelation.<sup>1388</sup> In the long-standing debate on the origin of this christological epithet many solutions have been offered, none of which have explained all the aspects of the title.<sup>1389</sup> The fact that John the Baptist spoke of "the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" (Jn 1:29) seems to hint at the expiatory character of the lamb's office. For that reason the symbolism of the sacrificial lamb, both of the Passover lamb and the binding of Isaac, is invoked.<sup>1390</sup> Several texts, including Acts 8:32, 1 Cor. 5:7, and 1 Pet. 1:19, seem to justify this connection. However, in the book of Revelation the Lamb becomes the victorious Lion of Judah (Rev. 5:5) which is worthy "to receive power and wealth and wisdom and might and honour . . ." (Rev. 5:12). The image of David as a lamb, fighting and conquering the bear Goliath, also a prototype of the Messiah to come (TJon 2 Sam. 23:8), is the perfect match here.

<sup>1387</sup>Cf. J. Heinemann, "Remnants of Ancient Piyutim in the Palestinian Targum Tradition", *Hassifruh* 4 (1973), 367-68.

<sup>1388</sup>Van Staaldaine-Sulman, "The Aramaic Song of the Lamb", 265-292; cf. also P.W. van der Horst, "Lamb", in: K. van der Toorn *et al.*, *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden <sup>2</sup>1999, 502-504, esp. 503.

<sup>1389</sup>Summaries of previous research on this epithet can be found in L.Th. Witkamp, *Jezus van Nazareth in de gemeente van Johannes: Over de interactie van traditie en ervaring*, Kampen 1986, 72-76; H.N. Ridderbos, *Het evangelie naar Johannes: Proeve van een theologische exegese*, dl. 1, Kampen 1987, 86-94; N. Hohnjec, 'Das Lamm—τὸ ἄρνιον' in *der Offenbarung des Johannes*, Rome 1980, 11-19.

<sup>1390</sup>See the preceding note, as well as B. Gärtner, "tly' als Messiasbezeichnung", *SEÁ* 18-19 (1953-54), 99-108; R. le Déaut, *La nuit pascale: Essai sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode XII 42* (AnBib, 22), Rome 1963, 131-212; Idem, "Pâque juive et Nouveau Testament", in: O. Michel *et al.* (eds), *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*, Assen 1969, 22-43; Idem, "Targumic Literature and New Testament Interpretation", *BTB* 4.3 (1974), 270-72.

Other sources, such as 1 Henoch 89, depict the leaders of Israel as lambs, but have no messianic connotation.<sup>1391</sup> This image also occurs in several Targumic texts, such as TJon Jer. 49:20, where the Hebrew image of “the little ones of the flock” is rendered with “the strong ones of the nation”; TPsJ Exod. 1:15;<sup>1392</sup> TgPs. 118:27. The fact that David also figures in TJon 2 Sam. 23:1-8 as *David redivivus*, with exactly the same wording as in the tosefta-targumim on 17:8 and 17:43, is a welcome addition to the antecedents of the image of the New Testament lamb. The tosefta-targum to 17:43 may well be the text of the hitherto unknown “Song of the Lamb” (Rev. 15:3).

Two differences between David the lamb and Jesus the Lamb remain. First, in the New Testament the conquering Lamb is the same as the suffering Messiah. He is depicted as “a lamb, standing as though it had been slain” (Rev. 5:6).<sup>1393</sup> However, the vague reminders of the Aqedah throughout this tosefta-targum do not totally exclude the Messiah from suffering.<sup>1394</sup> Jonathan even said (1 Sam. 19:5) that David risked his own life in this battle. The combination of “chosen” and “lamb”, two epithets for David in this tosefta-targum, may also be seen in the light of TgJer. 11:19, where TJon deviates from its Hebrew *Vorlage* in translating “a *chosen* lamb led to the slaughter”.<sup>1395</sup> In any case, a suffering Messiah could not have been totally unimaginable around the beginning of the common era, because the sufferings of the righteous were considered to have conciliatory power.<sup>1396</sup>

<sup>1391</sup>Cf. L.Th. Witkamp, *Jesus van Nazareth in de gemeente van Johannes: Over de interactie van traditie en ervaring*, Kampen 1986, 72-76; Van der Horst, “Lamb”, 503.

<sup>1392</sup>The Targumic insertion in TPsJ Exod. 1:15 is discussed by K. Koch, “Das Lamm, das Ägypten vernichtet: Ein Fragment aus Jannes und Jambres und sein geschichtlicher Hintergrund”, *ZNW* 57 (1966), 79-93; J. Jeremias, “Das Lamm, das aus der Jungfrau hervorging (Test. Jos. 19,8)”, *ZNW* 57 (1966), 216-18; C. Burchard, “Das Lamm in der Waagschale: Herkunft und Hintergrund eines haggadischen Midraschs zu Ex. 1:15-22 (Targ. Ps. Jon.)”, *ZNW* 57 (1966), 219-28. Burchard’s struggling with the two meanings of Aramaic ܠܡܒܐ, ‘lamb, boy’, seems justified by the tosefta-targum on 1 Sam. 17:43. His discussion of a possible date (pp. 225-26) seems to justify the conclusion that the insertion originated in the first century CE and that it therefore may function as the Jewish background of the Johannine title “Lamb”.

<sup>1393</sup>With Ch. Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*, London 1982, 516, n. 71. Cf. Rev. 13:8.

<sup>1394</sup>Cf. the same conclusion in J.C. de Moor, “The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1-12: The Parable of the Wicked Tenants”, *JSJ* 29 (1998), 63-80, esp. 78.

<sup>1395</sup>Cf. J.C. de Moor, E. van Staaldune-Sulman, “The Aramaic Song of the Lamb”, *JSJ* 24 (1993), 266-79, esp. 279.

<sup>1396</sup>This statement is illustrated in L. Kundert, *Die Opferung/Bindung Isaaks*, 2 Bde (WMANT, 78-79), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1998.

Secondly, the lamb in 1 Henoah and the this tosefta-targum remain human beings, whereas “the author of Revelation has Christ as messianic Lamb almost united with God”,<sup>1397</sup> clearly in phrases such as “its temple is the LORD God the Almighty and the Lamb” (Rev. 21:22) and “the throne of God and of the Lamb” (Rev. 22:1).<sup>1398</sup> However, the Targumic tradition of 2 Sam. 23:8 portrays David as the exalted Messiah, ready to judge the wicked. David transcends historical proportions in the translation of that verse, and it is noteworthy that the same phrases are used to depict *David redivivus* as in the tosefta-targum to 17:43.<sup>1399</sup>

17 44 ואמר פלשתא לדוד איהא עלי ואחין ית בסרך לעופא דשמיא ולבעירא דחקלא<sup>1400</sup>: 17 45 ואמר דויד לפלשתא את<sup>1401</sup> אתי עלי בחרבא ובמורניחא ובכרמחא<sup>1402</sup> ואנא אתי עלך בשמא דינן צבאות אלה סדר<sup>1403</sup> ישראל דחסידתא: 17 46 יומא הדין ימסרנך יי בידי ואקטלנך ואעדני ית רישך מנך ואחין פנר<sup>1404</sup> משרית פלשתאי יומא הדין לעופא דשמיא ולחית ארעא<sup>1405</sup> וידעון כל דידי<sup>1406</sup> ארעא דאית<sup>1407</sup> אלה<sup>1408</sup> בישראל<sup>1409</sup>: 17 47 וידעון כל קהלא הדין ארי לא בחרבא ובמורניחא פריק<sup>1408</sup> יי ארי מן קדם<sup>1409</sup> יי נצחן קרביא<sup>1410</sup> וימסר<sup>1411</sup> יתכון בידנא:

17:44 *The Philistine said to David, “Come to me, and I will give your flesh to the birds of heaven and to the beasts of the field.”* 17:45 *Then David said to the Philistine, “You come to me with a sword and with a spear and with a javelin; but I come to you with the name of the LORD*

<sup>1397</sup>Van der Horst, “Lamb”, 503.

<sup>1398</sup>Other similarities and differences between the tosefta-targumim on 17:8, 43 and the book of Revelation can be found in Van Staaldue-Sulman, “The Aramaic Song of the Lamb”, 287-292.

<sup>1399</sup>See also De Moor, “The Targumic Background”, 77.

<sup>1400</sup>Mss b c m w y B D S T eb1 read דארעא, ‘of the land’, like many Hebrew MSS, LXX and Vg. This might be an attempt to restore the usual parallelism of heaven and earth (>15), cf. 17:46.

<sup>1401</sup>Ms o adds דהא, ‘behold’.

<sup>1402</sup>Omitted in MS D, cf. 17:47 (>15).

<sup>1403</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1404</sup>Ms b reads פניול, ‘abomination’, considering the Philistine camp in the land of Israel an abomination. MS J adds a nota accusativi before the word.

<sup>1405</sup>MS J\* reads השדה, ‘field’, as in 17:44, but it is corrected.

<sup>1406</sup>Omitted in ms S\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1407</sup>MS S reads איהא.

<sup>1408</sup>Mss B D S read the definitive אלהא, resulting in “that God is in Israel”, cf. 17:26 (>15). Mss a d o J read אלהא קימא, ‘the existing God’ (>22).

<sup>1409</sup>Mss c f read לישראל, ‘for Israel’, cf. some Hebrew MSS, LXX and Vg. Similarly, Josephus tells us “that the Hebrews have the Deity for their protection”, cf. *Antiquities*, 6:187.

<sup>1410</sup>MS S reads another phrase, viz. ארי נצחן קרביא, ‘for the Victory of battles is the LORD’, using the same title as in the Hebrew verse 15:29.

<sup>1411</sup>MS S adds the subject יי.

*Sebaoth, the God of the ranks of Israel, whom you have defied. 17:46 This day the LORD will surrender you into my hand, and I will kill you, and cut off your head. And I will give the corpse of the Philistine camp this day to the birds of the air and to the beasts of the land, that all the land may know that there is a God in Israel, 17:47 and that all this assembly may know that the LORD saves not with sword and spear; for the victory of the battles is the LORD's and He will surrender you into my hand."*

TJon clarifies David's comment by adding נצחון: not the battle alone is the LORD's, but the victory. Note how important the notion of the victory is in this chapter. Earlier, in 15:29, God was called "the master of the victory of Israel", but in the tosefta-targumim on 17:8 victory plays an important role as well. Here too, God is called the master of the victory, but Goliath denies it. Goliath claims that he himself has the victory. Later on, in the depiction of *David redivivus*, the reader will hear exactly the same words spoken of the coming Messiah: he will be victorious in battle (2 Sam. 23:8).

17 48 והוא כד קם פלשתאה ואול וקריב לקרמות דוד ואחי דוד ורהט לסדרא<sup>1412</sup>  
לקרמות פלשתאה: 17 49 ואושיט דוד ית ידיה<sup>1413</sup> למנא ונסיב<sup>1414</sup> מחמן אבנא ואחור  
ומחא<sup>1414</sup> ית פלשתאה על בית עינוהי וטבעת<sup>1415</sup> אבנא בבית עינוהי<sup>1416</sup> ונפל על  
אפוהי על ארעא: 17 50 ותקיף דוד מן פלשתאה בקלעא ובאבנא ומחא ית פלשתאה  
וקטליה וחרבא ליה בידא דדוד: 17 51 ורהט דוד וקם בפלשתאה ונסיב<sup>1417</sup> ית חרביה  
ושלפה מלדנה<sup>1417</sup> וקטליה ופסק בה<sup>1418</sup> ית רישיה וחזו פלשתאי ארי<sup>1419</sup> מית גברוהו  
ואפכו<sup>1420</sup>: 17 52 וקמו אנשי ישראל ויהודה ויביבו ורדפו בתר<sup>1421</sup> פלשתאי עד  
מעלנא דני ועד תרעי עקרון ונפלו פלשתאי קטילין<sup>1422</sup> באורח שערים<sup>1423</sup> ועד גת  
ועד עקרון:

*17:48 When the Philistine arose and came nearer toward David, David ran quickly to the battle line, toward the Philistine. 17:49 And David*

<sup>1412</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>1413</sup>MS D erroneously adds פלי.

<sup>1414</sup>Erased in MS S\*. MS b reads באקלעא בקלעא 'and he slung with the sling'. MSS a C J add this reading before the word ואחור.

<sup>1415</sup>MS f<sub>3</sub> reads the variant ותבעת, 'it sank down'. The phrase אבנא בבית עינוהי is omitted in MSS J eb1.

<sup>1416</sup>MS f<sub>3</sub> reads the variant בפיהחיה, 'in its hole'.

<sup>1417</sup>MSS b c d o D read מארנה, 'out of its sheath'.

<sup>1418</sup>Omitted in MSS B S.

<sup>1419</sup>Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>1420</sup>MSS a Fr J read וערקין, 'and they fled'.

<sup>1421</sup>Only in MS p (cf. 17:53). The other MSS read ית, as in the Hebrew text.

<sup>1422</sup>Only in MS p is the word order changed.

<sup>1423</sup>MS J reads חרי תרעי, resulting in "on the road of Two Gates".

*stretched his hand out to the bag and took from there a stone, and slung and struck the Philistine against his forehead. And the stone sank into his forehead, and he fell on his face on the ground. 17:50 So David prevailed over the Philistine with a sling and a stone, and struck the Philistine and killed him. There was no sword in David's hand! 17:51 Then David ran and stood by<sup>1424</sup> the Philistine. And he took his sword and drew it out of its sheath, and killed him and cut off his head with it. When the Philistines saw that their hero was dead, they retreated. 17:52 And the men of Israel and Judah rose and shouted and pursued the Philistines as far as the entrance of the valley and the gates of Ekron, so that the Philistines fell wounded on the way of Sha-ararim, as far as Gath and Ekron.*

TJon clearly interpretes Sha-araim as a geographical place, which was near Soko and Azeka according to Josh. 15:36. Only one manuscript, MS J, translates the word with "two gates" in order to give the meaning of the name (>19). This rendering probably refers to the gates of Gath and Ekron, since the words *תרי הרעי* can function as absolute and emphatic forms.<sup>1425</sup> This is, however, the case in the translation of LXX, where the Philistines lay even in the gates of the cities of Gath and Ekron.<sup>1426</sup>

◇ 53 17 ותבו בני ישראל מלמרדך<sup>1427</sup> בחר פלשתאי ובזו ית משריתהון: 54 17 ונסיב דוד ית רישא דפלשהא ואיתיה לירושלם ית ויניה שוי במשכניה:

*17:53 And the sons of Israel came back from pursuing the Philistines, and they plundered their camp. 17:54 And David took the head of the Philistine and brought it to Jerusalem; but he put his armour in his tent.*

TJon makes no effort to harmonize the present verse with the later remark that David took Goliath's sword from the sanctuary at Nob. The present verse might be understood as a *prolepsis*, since Jerusalem is an anachronism in this co-text.<sup>1428</sup>

<sup>1424</sup>In this phrase על does not necessarily mean "on", cf. also 22:6.

<sup>1425</sup>Cf. Dalman, *Grammatik*, 190-191; Wm.B. Stevenson, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, Oxford <sup>2</sup>1962, 26.

<sup>1426</sup>LXX's interpretation is followed by W. Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis* (HAT, 1/4), Göttingen 1902, 92; H.J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT, 8/1), Gütersloh 1973, 334; J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*, Göttingen 1871, 110; P.A.H. de Boer, "1 Samuel xvii: Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions", *OTS* 1 (Leiden 1942), 79-103, esp. 102.

<sup>1427</sup>Hebrew *לך* is considered metaphorical language for a bitter pursue, cf. Gen. 31:36.

<sup>1428</sup>So Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 92 with regard to Jerusalem. With regard to Goliath's armour, he suggests to interpret Hebrew *באהלו* as "in the LORD's tent",

17 55 וכד הוא שאול ית דוויד נפיק לקדמות פלשתאה אמר לאבנר רב חילא<sup>1429</sup> ◇ בר  
 מן דין עולימא אבנר<sup>1430</sup> ואמר אבנר חי◇ נפשך מלכא אם ידע אנא<sup>1431</sup>: 17 56 ואמר  
 מלכא שאל<sup>1432</sup> את בר מן דין עולימא: 17 57 וכד חב דוויד מלמקטל ית פלשתאה  
 ודבר◇ יתיה אבנר ואיתיה לקדם◇ שאול ורישא דפלשתאה בידיה: 17 58 ואמר ליה  
 שאול<sup>1433</sup> בר מן את עולימא ואמר דוד בר עברך ישי דמבית לחם:

*17:55 When Saul saw David go forth against the Philistine, he said to Abner, the commander of the army, "Abner, whose son is the young man?" And Abner said, "By your own life, O king, I do not know."  
 17:65 And the king said, "You, inquire whose son this young man is."  
 17:57 And as David returned from killing the Philistine, Abner led him, and brought him before Saul with the head of the Philistine in his hand.  
 17:58 And Saul said to him, "Whose son are you, young man?" And David said, "I am the son of your servant Jesse, who is from Bethlehem.*

TJon made no attempt to harmonize this verse with 1 Sam. 16:18-22.<sup>1434</sup>

18 1 והוה כד שיצי למללא עם שאול ונפשא דיהונתן אתחבבת<sup>1435</sup> בנפשא דדוויד  
 ורחמיה יהונתן כנפשיה: 18 2 ודבריה◇ שאול ביומא<sup>1436</sup> ההוא ולא שבקיה<sup>1437</sup>  
 למתב<sup>1438</sup> לבית<sup>1439</sup> אבוה: 18 3 וגור יהונתן ודוד קים בדרחים יתיה כנפשיה: 18 4  
 ושלא<sup>1440</sup> יהונתן ית מעילא דעלוהי ויהביה לדוויד ולבושוהי ועד חרביה ועד קשזיה  
 ועד זרזיה: 18 5 ונפק דוד בכל אתר דשלא ליה שאול מצלח◇ ומנייה שאול על גברי  
 עברי קרבא ושפר בעיני כל עמא ואף בעיני עבדי שאול:

*18:1 When he had finished speaking with Saul, the soul of Jonathan*

*i.e. the sanctuary at Nob. The same harmonization can be found in Josephus, Antiquities, 6:192; and is followed by H.W. Hertzberg, Die Samuelbücher (ATD, 10), Göttingen<sup>5</sup>1973, 123; J. Mauchline, 1 and 2 Samuel (New Century Bible), London 1971, 135.*

<sup>1429</sup>Mss a B D J read חיליה, 'his army', cf. also Syr and one MS of LXX.

<sup>1430</sup>Omitted in MS D, cf. also some Hebrew MSS, quotations, some MSS of LXX and Syr.

<sup>1431</sup>Mss o Fr C D J T eb4 read the participle plus suffix ידענא, and MS S reads the perfect ידעה.

<sup>1432</sup>Ms c reads שאול, rendering it before the word אבנר.

<sup>1433</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1434</sup>In contrast to Pseudo-Philo, LAB, 61:9.

<sup>1435</sup>A similar expression is found in TO Gen. 44:30, based on a similar Hebrew wording. MS d reads אתחברת, 'bound oneself' (against >15).

<sup>1436</sup>Ms eb1 erroneously reads a double ביומא.

<sup>1437</sup>Translation of Hebrew ונתן, which is rendered similarly in TO Gen. 20:6; 31:7; and so on. Likewise Syr.

<sup>1438</sup>Mss c f read למיזל, 'to go'.

<sup>1439</sup>Ms Fr reads לית, 'unto'.

<sup>1440</sup>Mss b d f read the Aphel ואשלה, while MS a reads the Ithpeel ואישלח.

was tied in love to David's soul, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul. 18:2 And Saul took him that day, and would not let him go, to return to his father's house. 18:3 And Jonathan and David made a covenant, because he loved him as his own soul. 18:4 And Jonathan sent<sup>1441</sup> his robe, that was upon him, and gave it to David, and his clothes,<sup>1442</sup> and even his sword and his bow and his girdle. 18:5 And David went out in every place that Saul sent him, successfully; so that Saul appointed him over the men waging war. And it was pleasant in the sight of all the people and also in the sight of Saul's servants.

### 5.18 Saul's Jealousy (1 Samuel 18:6-30)

18 6 והוה במיעלהון<sup>1443</sup> כד תב דויד מלמקטל יח פלשתאה ונפקא נשיא מכל קרוי־ישראל לשבחא<sup>1444</sup> בחניא לקדמות שאול<sup>1445</sup> מלכא בתפין בחרוא ובצלצלין:

18:6 As they were coming in, when David returned from killing the Philistine, the women came out of all the cities of Israel to praise in dances, to meet King Saul, with timbrels, with joy, and with cymbals.

Although Aramaic שבח is often connected with prophecy and the worship of God, in the present verse it can best be regarded as the normal praise of a brave man. The women were praising the soldiers returning home, especially the king and the new hero David (cf. 18:7).<sup>1446</sup>

The two Hebrew words לשיר והמחלות, in parataxis, are interpreted as a *hendiadys* and rendered in harmony with the construction יענו במחלות in 21:12 (>15).

18 7 ואחיבא נשיא דמשבחן ואמרא קטל שאול באלפין ודוד ברביין:

18:7 And the women who were praising answered and said, "Saul has killed by the thousands, and David by the ten thousands."<sup>1447</sup>

The women's song is a poetic couplet in which the great victories of the two heroes are lauded. The word pair "thousand, ten thousand" is a standard expression for a large number in poetry.<sup>1448</sup> The mean-

<sup>1441</sup>TJon uses a little more decent verb than the Hebrew text. Hebrew פשט can be equated with חליץ, 'strip off', or with שלח, 'send'.

<sup>1442</sup>As in 17:38 TJon does not render it with a military term.

<sup>1443</sup>Ms a reads במיזיהון, 'as they were coming'.

<sup>1444</sup>According to the Qere; cf. Soferim 38a.

<sup>1445</sup>Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>1446</sup>In the same way, Absalom was praised for his beauty, cf. 2 Sam. 14:25.

<sup>1447</sup>This translation is suggested by McCarter, *I Samuel*, 312 by analogy with the Ugaritic poetic line "he casts silver by the thousands, gold he casts by the ten thousands", since the use of the preposition כ would be unique as the introduction of the object in the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>1448</sup>W.G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*



ing of the women's song is therefore that David and Saul killed many enemies. The explanation that the women ascribed ten thousand to David and only thousands to Saul is Saul's own faulty exegesis,<sup>1449</sup> beautifully expressed by the author of this narrative, who used the poetic technique of the reversal in the sequence of a fixed parallel pair (18:8).<sup>1450</sup> Saul's jealousy was aroused by the fact that David was accorded equal treatment with the king.<sup>1451</sup> Therefore, it is not strange that TJon leaves out the suffixes in all three versions of the women's song (cf. also 21:12; 29:5), since it was neither Saul's thousands nor David's ten thousands. Furthermore, TJon harmonizes the text of the three versions, because it was only one song sung on one occasion (>15).

8 18 ותקוף לשאול לחדא ובאיש בעינהי פתגמא הדין ואמר יהבו לדוד רבין ולי יהבו אלפיא ומכען לא אשהארת ליה עוד אלהין מלכותא: 9 18 והוה שאול כמין לדויד מיומא ההוא ולהלאה:

*18:8 And Saul was very angry, and this saying was evil in his sight. He said, "They have given to David ten thousands, and to me they have given thousands. And from now on there is nothing left but the kingdom." 18:9 And Saul was lying in wait for David from that day on.*

The "eying" of Saul is explained as a metaphorical ambush. Saul waited until he could find an opportunity to harm or kill David, as is explained in the rest of this chapter. Note that the Aramaic כמן has only been used so far to denote the reprehensible conduct of the Amalekites in 15:2. By choosing this verb TJon also rejects Saul's treatment of David (see below, commentary on 24:10).

10 18 והוה ביומא דבתררהי ושרת רוחא בישא מן קדם יוי על שאול ואשחטיי בנו ביתא ודויד מננין בידיה כיום ביום ומורניחא בירא דשאול:

*18:10 And on the day after it an evil spirit from before the LORD settled on Saul, and he became insane in the midst of the house. And David was playing [the lyre] with his hand as usual, but the spear was in Saul's hand.*

(JSOT.S, 26), Sheffield 1984, 146; and S. Gevirtz, *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel* (SAOC, 32), Chicago 1963, 16, who both mention Gen. 24:60; Deut. 32:30; 33:17; Ps. 68:18; 91:7; Mic. 6:7; Dan. 7:10, as well as several Ugaritic examples.

<sup>1449</sup>This is also Josephus' explanation, stating that the elder women sang how Saul had slain many thousands of the Philistines, but the maidens how David had destroyed tens of thousands, cf. *Antiquities*, 6:193.

<sup>1450</sup>So Gevirtz, *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel*, 23.

<sup>1451</sup>Cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 312.

Since it was an evil spirit that “settled on Saul”, his speaking could not be denoted as prophecy. Therefore, TJon translates the Hebrew verb with “become insane”, which is also a connotation of the Hebrew verb.<sup>1452</sup> This connotation is used by Pseudo-Jerome in his exegesis of the present verse.<sup>1453</sup>

11 18 וארים שאול ית מורניתא ואמר אמחיניה ברוד ואברונה בכתלא ואפך<sup>1454</sup> דוד  
מן קרמיה<sup>1455</sup> חרתין זמנין:

18:11 *And Saul lifted up the spear and said, “I will make it strike David and pin it to the wall.” But David retreated twice from before him.*

Hebrew וישל seems to be vocalized as a derivation of נשל instead of שיל, ‘to cast, to throw’. This alternative, which also occurs in LXX, may be the result of the reasoning that Saul did not actually throw his spear.<sup>1455</sup> The same alternative is used in 20:33, supported by LXX, Syr and Vg.

The addition of the verb ברו seems superfluous in the present verse as well as in 19:10, but it is likely that TJon did not wish to use the verb בוחא, ‘strike’, in combination with a wall.<sup>1456</sup>

21 18 ורחיל שאול מן קרם<sup>1457</sup> דוד ארי הוה מימרא<sup>1458</sup> דיין בסעדיה וית<sup>1459</sup> שאול  
רחיק: 13 18 ואפנייה שאול מלותיה ומנייה ליה רב אלפא ונפק ועל בריש<sup>1458</sup> עמא:

18:12 *And Saul was afraid of David, because the speech of the LORD was in his aid, but it had removed<sup>1459</sup> Saul. 18:13 So Saul removed him from his presence and made him commander of a thousand; and he went out and came in at the head of the people.*

<sup>1452</sup>So Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 24. Contrast Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 62:2: ‘Saul prophesied . . . without knowing what he had prophesied’.

<sup>1453</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 93, “in hoc loco non est aliud intellegendum nisi aliena retulisse”.

<sup>1454</sup>Only in MS p. The other MSS read the more literal ואסתחר, ‘and he evaded’.

<sup>1455</sup>Cf. Driver, *Notes*, 152. The same equation is used in TJon Jona 1:4, where the wind is actually increased by God. However, the combination of the verb רים and the object “wind” demands a different translation.

<sup>1456</sup>So Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 24. Vogel refers to the similar expression ונתה in Deut. 15:17, but the verb נתן is used there.

<sup>1457</sup>MS d reads ומעם, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). MS f<sub>3</sub> gives a different ending of the verse, viz. ומעליי שאול איסתחלק, ‘and from upon Saul was departed’, which is different from the verbs used in 1 Sam. 15, but closer to the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1458</sup>MS d reads קרם, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but not with the Aramaic vocabulary.

<sup>1459</sup>This verb has been frequently used in 1 Sam. 15 and is therefore repeated here (>15).

TJon interprets the second half of the verse as a military phrase: David was a leader in battle. Pseudo-Jerome adds the explanation to this verse that it refers to battle.<sup>1460</sup>

14 18 והוה דויד לכל<sup>1461</sup> אורחיה<sup>1462</sup> מצלח<sup>1463</sup> ומימרא<sup>1463</sup> דיין<sup>1463</sup> בסעדיה: 18 14 וחוא שאול דהוא<sup>1464</sup> מצלח<sup>1464</sup> לחדא ורחיל<sup>1465</sup> מן קדמויה<sup>1465</sup>: 18 16 וכל ישראל ויהודה רחמין ית דוד ארי הוא<sup>1466</sup> נפיק ועליל ברישהון<sup>1466</sup>: 18 17 ואמר שאול לדויד הא<sup>1467</sup> ברתו רבתא מרב יתה אתין לך לאתו ברם הוי לי לגבר<sup>1468</sup> עביד קרבין ואניח קרבי עמא<sup>1467</sup> דיו ושאויל אמר לא תהי ידי ביה ויתמסר בידא דפלשתאי:

18:14 *And David was successful with regard to all his ways, for the speech of the LORD was in his aid.* 18:15 *And when Saul saw that he was very successful<sup>1469</sup>, he was afraid of him.* 18:16 *But all Israel and Judah loved David, for he went out and came in at their head.* 18:17 *Then Saul said to David, "Behold my eldest daughter Merab; I will give her to you for a wife."<sup>1470</sup> Only be a man waging battles for me and fight the battles of the LORD's people." For Saul thought, "Let not my hand be upon him, but let he be surrendered into the hands of the Philistines."*

The expression that someone's hand be or be not upon David is first translated literally, but explained the second time (>18), in conformity with the Hebrew wording in 18:25 (>15). The fact that the passive "be surrendered" is used in the second translation might be a *passivum divinum* (>23). The same verb is used in 17:46, where David explicitly states that the LORD will surrender the Philistine into David's hand.

Hebrew לְאִשָּׁה, 'for a wife', is slightly altered in the Aramaic version. It has the same meaning as the Hebrew expression, for the Aramaic uses the noun ending in תַּא—but in the absolute—whenever a new status is indicated. The expression 'for a wife' is always translated

<sup>1460</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 93, "quando egrediebantur in pugnam . . . "

<sup>1461</sup>Mss a b d o read בכל, "on all his ways", supported by LXX and Syr.

<sup>1462</sup>According to the Ketib, although only attested in MSS p eb66.

<sup>1463</sup>Ms eb66 adds the verb הויה.

<sup>1464</sup>Ms d reads ארי הוא.

<sup>1465</sup>TJon uses the same verb as in 16:12 (>15), instead of a stronger expression, as is used in the Hebrew text; cf. Driver, *Notes*, 153.

<sup>1466</sup>Omitted in MS o.

<sup>1467</sup>Ms eb66 reads the nota accusativi ית.

<sup>1468</sup>Ms a reads בגברא רחיל, thus creating a conflated rendering. For the translation of Hebrew רחיל, see above, commentary on 14:52.

<sup>1469</sup>Or: And when Saul saw how very successful he was. This might be the case, if Aramaic ית is used in the same way as Hebrew אשר, cf. GKC § 157c.

<sup>1470</sup>Literally: in marriage.

with לאמו;<sup>1471</sup> the expression 'for a handmaid' is rendered by לאמו (25:41);<sup>1472</sup> and 'for a king' becomes למלכי (2 Sam. 3:39; 23:1).

18 18 ואמר דוד לשאול מן אנה ומן<sup>1473</sup> חיי ברם<sup>1474</sup> זרעית אבא בישראל ארי איה  
חתנא למלכא:

18:18 *And David said to Saul, "Who am I, and what is my life but my father's family in Israel, that I should be son-in-law to the king?"*

TJon's embarrassment with the Hebrew expression מי חיי appears from its literal translation. Whereas the Aramaic language preferred מא, 'what', in similar expressions such as מי ביהי (2 Sam. 7:18) and מי הוה (Gen. 33:8),<sup>1475</sup> the present verse uses the literal מן. The Hebrew, on the contrary, could use מי, if the idea of a person is implied (cf. GKC § 137a). If Hebrew חי meant "folk, clan",<sup>1476</sup> and the following משפחת אבי, 'my father's family', was a mere explanation of this rare Hebrew expression, the meaning of the word had been forgotten in the time of origin of TJon.

18 19 והוה בעדן דמטא<sup>1477</sup> אחיהבא<sup>1478</sup> דמירב בת שאול לדוד והיא אחיהיבת  
לעדריאל דממחולת לאתו:

18:19 *So when the moment arrived that Merab, daughter of Saul would be given to David, she was given to Adriel, who was from Meholath, for a wife.*<sup>1479</sup>

Although Merab was promised to David—and a promise was as valid as a marriage—, she was given to another man for a wife. Moreover, David married her sister Michal, although he had Saul's promise concerning Merab. Since it was forbidden by the Torah to be married to two sisters (Lev. 18:18), David seemed to be trespassing God's laws. And later on, Michal was given to Paltiel, son of Laish (1 Sam. 25:44), although she was promised and given to David. Therefore, the rabbis

<sup>1471</sup>But the plural לנשים is likewise rendered in the plural, cf. 25:43.

<sup>1472</sup>For the variant spellings, see Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 337.

<sup>1473</sup>Ms m reads ומא, 'and what'.

<sup>1474</sup>Omitted in MS ebl.

<sup>1475</sup>In Mic. 1:5 TJon renders מי 'what?' by איכא 'where?', but this was impossible here.

<sup>1476</sup>Suggested by A.F. Kirkpatrick, "Commentary on Samuel", in: *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, Cambridge 1880 *apud* Driver, *Notes*, 153.

<sup>1477</sup>Mss a f add ומן, 'time', created a double rendering.

<sup>1478</sup>Mss a b read the active למתן, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Therefore they render the following word as מירב. The latter reading is also attested in MSS c d o and Kimḥi, where it is grammatically incorrect after the passive form.

<sup>1479</sup>Literally: in marriage, see above, commentary on 18:17.

discussed the validity of these marriages at length (cf. San. 19b) and the outcome of this debate is attested in a tosefta-targum.<sup>1480</sup>

והוה<sup>1481</sup> קא סבר דקידושהא בטעות נינהו משום דמלוה הוא ואף מיכל מבחר דאינסבה ◊ ליה אפקא מיניה בלא גט משום דסבר דקידושהא נמי בטעות נינהו דבפחות משוה פרושה קידשה ומן דמקדיש בפחות מן שוה פרושה לא קדיש ולא מידי ודויד לא אפסיד קליה מינה דקא סבר דערליא טפי משוה פרושה נינהו משום דחזו לכלביה דשאלו לשונריה

*And it was always thought concerning her marriage, that it was in error, because it was a debt. And also Michal: after her marrying him, [Saul] sent her away from him without a bill of divorce, because it was thought of her marriage too, that it was in error, since he married her for less than a paruṭah and whoever marries for less than a paruṭah, did not marry [at all] and it is nothing. But David did not scorn her little value, because he was always thinking that the foreskins were worth more than a paruṭah, because they were fit for the dogs of Saul and for his cats.*

The language of this tosefta is Babylonian Aramaic and close to the language of this subject in San. 19b, discussing the Mishnaic rule that it is forbidden to marry a king's widow.<sup>1482</sup>

According to this tosefta-targum, Merab's marriage was invalid because it was used to pay off a debt. This agrees with the opinion of R. Joshua b. Korha, who states that one was not allowed to give one's daughter to pay off a debt.<sup>1483</sup> Since Saul had promised to give his daughter as a reward for killing Goliath (17:25), David had the right to marry her, which meant—according to R. Joshua—that the betrothal was invalid.

The same invalidity threatened Michal's marriage, because Saul again offered a reward for giving him a hundred foreskins of the Philistines (18:25). But David offered him two hundred (18:27), so he could marry his daughter with a dowry, because he paid the debt—the hundred foreskins asked—and a payment. This payment consisted of a hundred foreskins, but was it worth “a paruṭah” (San. 19b)? The paruṭah was the smallest possible dowry. Saul, on the one hand, thought that the remaining hundred foreskins were worthless, so he considered Michal's marriage invalid and gave her to Paltiel.

<sup>1480</sup>Found in the text of MSS c d and in the margin of Codex Montefiori 7, collated by Kasher, תוספתא, 111-12. The text following is taken from MSS c d, according to the collation of S.D. Luzzatto, “Nachträgliches über die Thargumim”, *Wis-sZJüdTh* 5 (1844), 124-37, esp. 132.

<sup>1481</sup>Ms Montefiori 7 adds it in the margin with the heading תוספתא.

<sup>1482</sup>Kasher, תוספתא, 112.

<sup>1483</sup>Probably because it would mean that there would not be a dowry.

David, on the other hand, thought that the remaining foreskins had at least the value of animal food for Saul's dogs and cats. He therefore considered his marriage with Michal valid and demanded her back (2 Sam. 3:14).<sup>1484</sup>

This entire discussion is an attempt to clear Saul, and especially David, from trespassing the Torah and the halakhic rules (>24). Merab's marriage was considered invalid by all parties, so she could be given to Adriel, while both Saul and David had their legitimate reasons for treating Michal the way they did.

18 20 ורחימת מיכל בת שאול ית דויד וחוריא לשאול וכשר<sup>1485</sup> פתגמא בעיניהי:  
18 21 ואמר שאול אתנה ליה ותהי ליה לתקלא ויתמסר בידא דפלשתאי ואמר שאול  
לדויד בחדא מן חרתין תחתן בי יומא דין:

*18:20 Now Michal, daughter of Saul, loved David, and they told Saul, and the matter was suitable in his sight. 18:21 Saul thought, "Let me give her to him, that she may be a stumbling block for him. And may he be surrendered into the hand of the Philistine." So Saul said to David, "With one of the two you shall be my son-in-law today."*

TJon considered Hebrew בשתיים as part of Saul's speech and made it refer to Saul's two daughters: one of the two daughters would have to be David's wife. TJon uses a similar construction in Gad's speech when he announced that God would give "one of three" kinds of punishment (2 Sam. 24:12).

18 22 ופקיד שאול ית עברוהי<sup>1486</sup> מלילו עם דויד ברו למימר הא אתרעי בך מלכא  
וכל עברוהי רחמוך וכען אחחתן במלכא: 18 23 ומלילו עבדי שאול קדם<sup>1487</sup> דוד  
ית<sup>1487</sup> פתגמיא האלין ואמר דויד הזעירא בעיניכון לאחחנתא במלכא ואנא גבר מסכין  
והדיוש:

*18:22 And Saul commanded his servants, "Speak to David in private and say, "Behold, the king takes delight in you, and all his servants love you; now then, become the king's son-in-law." 18:23 And Saul's servants spoke those words before David. But David said, "Does it seem to you a little thing to become the king's son-in-law? I am a poor and common man."*

<sup>1484</sup>This entire reasoning may be reflected in Pseudo-Jerome's second explanation: the verse 18:21 says "You shall be my son-in-law today for two matters", because Saul only asked hundred foreskins and he obtained twice as much; cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 94.

<sup>1485</sup>Mss f o read ושפר 'and it pleased'.

<sup>1486</sup>According to the Qere, like many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions. Mss a c d f Fr add למימר.

<sup>1487</sup>Ms c adds כל.

TJon does not translate that David was a man without honour, or an insane man (cf. TgIsa. 3:5), but renders, out of reverence, that he was a common man (>23). This Greek loan-word is the standard solution to represent all David's humble self-denotations (cf. 1 Sam. 24:15; 2 Sam. 3:8, 39).

24 18 וחויאו עבדי שאול ליה<sup>1488</sup> למימר כפתנמיא האלין מליל דוד<sup>1489</sup>: 18 25 ואמר שאול כדון תימרון לדוד לא רעוא למלכא במהרין אלהין במאה ערלה פלשתאי לאתפרעא בסנאי<sup>1490</sup> מלכא ושאלו חשיב לממסר יה דויד בידא דפלשתאי:

*18:24 And the servants of Saul told him, saying, "According to these words did David speak." 18:25 Then Saul said, "Thus shall you say to David, 'There is no desire in the king for a dowry, except a hundred foreskins of the Philistines in order to be revenged on the king's enemies.'"* And Saul thought to surrender David into the hand of the Philistines.

On the basis of the mentioning of the dowry of a hundred foreskins, some manuscripts add part of the tosefta-targum concerning the discussion about the validity of David's marriages:<sup>1490</sup>

והוה כד סבר דקרושיה בטעות נינהו משום דמליה הוא ואף מיכל מבחר דאיתנסבא<sup>1491</sup> ליה אפיקה מניה בלא גש משום דסבר דקרושיה נמי בטעות נינהו ופחות משה פרוטה נינהו דחזו לכלבאי דשאלו ולשונדיה

*And when it is thought that his marriage was in error, because it was a debt; and also Michal, after her marrying him [Saul] sent her forth from him without a bill of divorce, because it was thought his marriage was also in error and less worth than a parutah, they were fit for the dogs of Saul and for his cats.*

Only part of the tosefta-targum is repeated here, resulting in the opinion that Michal's marriage to David was not valid either. David only paid in foreskins and they are considered less worth than a parutah, the smallest possible dowry. By this tosefta Saul is cleared from trespassing halakhic rules by giving his daughter Michal to Paltiel for a wife,<sup>1491</sup> and David is cleared from trespassing the law that one is not allowed to marry the same wife again, if another marriage has taken place after the divorce (Deut. 24:1-4, cf. San. 19b).

<sup>1488</sup>Omitted in MSS m eb1.

<sup>1489</sup>Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>1490</sup>Attested in MS S and in Codex Oxford 2329, collated by Kasher, תוספתות, 112. The following text is taken from MS S.

<sup>1491</sup>Against Kasher, תוספתות, 112, who complements this tosefta with the words of the tosefta to 18:19, making the two exactly identical.

18 26 וחויאו עברוהי לרודי ית<sup>1492</sup> פתגמיא האלין וכשר פתגמא בעיני דוד לאתחנתא במלכא ולא שלימו יומיא: 18 27 וקם דוד ואזל הוא וגברוהי וקטל בפלשתאי מתן גברא ואיתי דוד ית ערלתהון ואשלימונן<sup>1493</sup> למלכא לאתחנתא במלכא ויהב ליה שאול ית מיכל ברתיה לאתו: 18 28 וחזא שאול וידע ארי מימרא<sup>1494</sup> דיוי בסעדא דרודי ומיכל בת שאול רחימתיה: 18 29 ואוסיף<sup>1494</sup> שאול למרחל מן קדם<sup>1494</sup> דוד עוד והוה שאול בעיל דרבב<sup>1494</sup> לדוד כל יומיא: 18 03 ונפקו רברבי פלשתאי והוה בזמן מפקהון אצלח<sup>1494</sup> דוד מכל עברי שאול וסגי שמיא לחדא:

*18:26 And when his servants told David these words, it was suitable in David's sight to be the king's son-in-law. And before the time had expired, 18:27 David arose and went, along with his men, and killed two hundred Philistines. And David brought their foreskins, and gave them completely to the king in order to become the king's son-in-law. And Saul gave him his daughter Michal for a wife.<sup>1495</sup> 18:28 But when Saul saw and knew that the speech of the LORD was in David's aid, and that Michal loved him, 18:29 Saul was still more afraid before David. So Saul was an enemy to David all the days. 18:30 And the commanders of the Philistines came out—and as often as they came out, David was more successful than all the servants of Saul, so that his name was highly esteemed.*

Since the Hebrew does not denote the Philistine leaders as סרן, which it does in 1 Sam. 5–6 and 1 Sam. 29, the Aramaic version also gives a different denotation from the usual טורנא. This may appear as very consistent, but is against the rule of associative translation (against >15).

## 5.19 David's Flight to Samuel (1 Samuel 19)

19 1 ומליל שאול עם יונתן בריה ועם כל עברוהי למקטל ית דוד ויהונתן בר שאול אתרעי ברודי לחדא: 19 2 וחוי יהונתן לדוד למימר בעי שאול אבא למקטלך וכען אסתמר כען בצפרא ותחיב בסתרא ותשמר: 19 3 ואנא אפוק ואקום לת<sup>1496</sup> אבא בחקלא דאת חמן ואנא אמליל עלך פתגמין תקנין קדם<sup>1497</sup> אבא ואחוי מא ואחוי לך: 19 4 ומליל יהונתן על דוד פתגמין<sup>1497</sup> תקנין קדם<sup>1497</sup> שאול אבוהי ואמר ליה לא

<sup>1492</sup>Omitted in MS eb76.

<sup>1493</sup>Singular, in conformity with the translation of Aquila, Theodotion, Vg and MSS of the LXX. MSS f w y read the plural form ואשלימונן, 'they gave them completely'.

<sup>1494</sup>TJon vocalized the Hebrew verb as a derivation of יסף instead of אסף (>3). The phrase וואוסיף שאול למרחל מן קדם דוד עוד is omitted in MS eb76\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1495</sup>Literally: in marriage, see 18:17.

<sup>1496</sup>Kimhi reads לקדם, 'before'.

<sup>1497</sup>Plural in conformity with the following speech of Jonathan; cf. also Syr.



יחטי' מלכא בעבריה ברוד ארי לא חטא' לך וארי עובדוהי<sup>1498</sup> חקנין לך לחדא:  
 19 5 ומסר ית נפשיה כעל נב<sup>1499</sup> לאחקטלא וקטל ית פלשתאה ועבד יוי פרקנא רבא  
 לכל ישראל חזיתא וחדיתא ולמא את חאיב' בדם זכי למקטל ית דויד מגן:

19:1 And Saul spoke with Jonathan his son and with all his servants to kill David, but Jonathan, son of Saul, delighted much in David. 19:2 And Jonathan told David, saying, "Saul my father seeks to kill you. And now, take heed to yourself in the morning, and keep hidden<sup>1500</sup> in a secret place. 19:3 And I will go out and stand in my father's presence in the field where you are, and I will speak to my father good things<sup>1501</sup> about you. Then I will see whatever [happens] and I will tell you." 19:4 And Jonathan spoke good things about David before Saul his father, and said to him, "Let not the king sin against his servant, against David, because he has not sinned against you and because his deeds have been very good for you. 19:5 For he surrendered his life, as if it were on the back [of his hand], to be possibly killed, as he killed the Philistine, and the LORD wrought a great salvation for all Israel. You saw it and you rejoiced. Why then would you become guilty against innocent blood by killing David without cause?"

The Hebrew expression שים את־נפשו בכפו, meaning "to set one's life at risk", is equated with a similar metaphor in Aramaic, מסר ית נפשיה כעל, and explained with the added word לאחקטלא, 'to be killed'.<sup>1502</sup> The Aramaic metaphor is an abridged form of the expression, attested to in TgPs. 119:109, נפשי מסכנא כיד על גב ידי, which must be rendered "my soul is in danger as if it were lying on the back of my hand".<sup>1503</sup> In this psalm verse, Aramaic גב is explained as the back of the hand, as in MS f on the present verse (and likewise in 28:21; Judg. 12:3).

19 6 וקביל' שאול למימר' יהונתן וקיים שאול קיים' הוא יוי אם יתקטל: 19 7  
 וקרא יהונתן לדויד וחוי ליה יהונתן ית כל פתגמיא האלין ואיחי יהונתן ית דויד  
 לות שאול והוה משמיש' קדמוהי' כמאתמלי ומדקמוהי: 19 8 ואוסיפו<sup>1504</sup> עבדי  
 קרבא למהוי ונפק דויד ואגיה קרבא בפלשתאי ומחא<sup>1505</sup> בהון מחא סניאה ואפכרו'

<sup>1498</sup> Plural, because of the context showing several good deeds of David. Hebrew מַעֲשָׂי is singular, cf. Driver, *Notes*, 156.

<sup>1499</sup> Ms f adds ידיה, see commentary.

<sup>1500</sup> Literally: stay in a secret place and hide yourself. A good example of verbal *hendiadys*, cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 321.

<sup>1501</sup> Added by analogy with 19:4 (>15); cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 25.

<sup>1502</sup> P.A.H. de Boer, "Research into the Text of 1 Samuel xviii-xxxii", *OTS* 6 (1949), 1-100, esp. 16 states that TJon exaggerates the sense of the Hebrew verse and makes it sound like suffering martyrdom.

<sup>1503</sup> So Levy, *CWT*, s.v. גב.

<sup>1504</sup> Mss c d o add עוד, 'still, again', but omit the following עבדי.

<sup>1505</sup> Ms a reads וקטל and likewise קטל instead of מחא.

מן קדמוהי: 19 9 ושרת<sup>1506</sup> רוח ◊ בישא מן קדם ◊ יי על שאול והוא בביתיה יתיב ומורניתיה בידיה ודויד מנגין ביד: 19 10 ובעא שאול לממחי במורניתא ברוד ולמברזה<sup>1507</sup> בכחלא ואתפטר מן קדם ◊ שאול וקבע ית מורניתא בכחלא ודויד ערק ◊ ואשתזיב ◊ בליליא הוא: 19 11 ושלח שאול אונרין ◊ לבית דוד למטריה ולמקטליה בצפרא וחויאת לדויד מיכל אתהיה למימר אם ליתך משיזיב ◊ ית נפשך בליליא מחר את מתקטיל: 19 12 ושלשילת מיכל ית דויד מן<sup>1508</sup> חרכא ואול וערק ◊ ואשתזיב: 19 13 ונסיבת ◊ מיכל ית צלמניא<sup>1509</sup> ושייאת על ערסא ויה נודא<sup>1510</sup> דעזא שויאת איסרוהי וכסיאת בלבושא:

19:6 And Saul accepted the speech of Jonathan. Saul swore, "As the LORD is the existing One, he shall not be killed." 19:7 And Jonathan called David, and Jonathan told him all these things. And Jonathan brought David to Saul and he was serving before him as before. 19:8 And the wagers of war continued to be, and David went out and waged war with the Philistines, and struck a great strike among them, so that they retreated before him. 19:9 And an evil spirit from before the LORD dwelt upon Saul, and he sat in his house with his spear in his hand, while David was playing the lyre with [his] hand. 19:10 And Saul sought to hit David with his spear and to pin it to the wall, but he withdrew himself from before Saul, so that he fixed the spear in the wall. And David fled and escaped that night. 19:11 And Saul sent messengers to David's house to watch him and to kill him in the morning. But Michal, David's wife, told him, saying, "If you do not rescue your life tonight, tomorrow you will be killed." 19:12 So Michal let David down from the window; and he went and fled, and he escaped. 19:13 Michal took the images and laid them on the bed. She put a goat bag at its head and covered it with clothes.

Although Hebrew תרפים may denote only one image, TJon always equates it with the plural צלמניא, 'images, statues'.<sup>1511</sup> This rendering solves the problem of the size of teraphim. Michal's teraphim must have been life-size if the word refers to a singular "household-god", whilst the account of Rachel's teraphim suggests that these were relatively small images (Gen. 31:34).<sup>1512</sup> The following איסרוהי, 'its head',

<sup>1506</sup>Mss a d read ויהוה, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but not with the usual Targumic vocabulary (against >15).

<sup>1507</sup>See commentary on 18:11.

<sup>1508</sup>So also Syr.

<sup>1509</sup>Ms f<sub>3</sub> read עבישא, 'the camel saddle'. Likewise in 19:16; see commentary.

<sup>1510</sup>Ms f<sub>3</sub> made the following remark: ונתכא דמעו: 'a felt cover, which was from a goat'. Likewise in 19:16.

<sup>1511</sup>Cf. T.J. Lewis, "Teraphim", in: K van der Toorn *et al.* (eds), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden 1995, 1588-1601, esp. 1588. The plural רמאין is only used in TgJudg. 17-18; cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 594-96.

<sup>1512</sup>Lewis, "Teraphim", 1593.

must then be interpreted as the head of the bed.

The marginal variant in CR is interesting, since it interprets the teraphim as a “camel saddle”. This variant is affected by the pericope of Jacob’s flight, where Rachel took the teraphim and hid them in the camel’s saddle (Gen. 31:34). This rendering totally removes the idea that David and Michal possessed idols or other images (>24).

Aramaic נודע דעוא is explained by Kimḥi as a bag of wine, which David used as a pillow.<sup>1513</sup> In a marginal note in CR it is explained as a felt cover, which was made of goat’s hair. This is a more acceptable reading than that of the bag, because it would be more useful in a bedroom.<sup>1514</sup>

14 19 ושלח שאול אוגדיאן לומר ליה דוד ואמרת ממרע<sup>1515</sup> הוא: 15 19 ושלח שאול ית אוגדיאן למסער<sup>1516</sup> ית דוד למימר אסיקו יתיה בערסא לותי למקטליה: 16 19 ואחו אוגדיאן והא צלמניא<sup>1517</sup> על ערסא ונודא<sup>1518</sup> דעזיא איסדוהי: 17 19 ואמר שאול למיכל למא כדן<sup>1519</sup> שקרת בי ושלחת ית בעיל דבבי ואתתיב ואתמרת מיכל לשאול הוא אמר לי שלחני למא אקטלניך: 18 19 ודוד ערק ואתתיב ואתא לות שמואל לרמתא וחוי ליה ית כל דעבר ליה שאול ואול הוא ושמואל ותיב בבית אלפנא<sup>1520</sup>.

19:14 And when Saul sent messengers to take David, she said, “He is sick.” 19:15 Then Saul sent the messengers to examine David, saying, “Bring him up to me in the bed to kill him.” 19:16 And when the messengers came, behold, the images were on the bed and the goat’s bag was at its head. 19:17 Saul said to Michal, “Why have you deceived me thus, and let my enemy go, so that he has escaped?” And Michal said to Saul, “He said to me, ‘Let me go. Why should I kill you?’” 19:18 Now David fled and escaped, and he came to Samuel at Ramah, and told him all that Saul had done to him. And he and Samuel went and dwelt in the Talmud School.

This is the first verse in which Hebrew נויח (Qere נויח) is rendered בית אלפנא, ‘Talmud School’ (see Ch. 4, Aramaic אלפנא). David appears to

<sup>1513</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel elsö kõnyve*, 25.

<sup>1514</sup>So Vogel, *Sámuel elsö kõnyve*, 25. Vogel is astonished by the marginal note, because he read למחוי רמעוי, לא ונכא רמעוי, interpreting the letters לא as the negation instead of an abbreviation of the words אחרינא.

<sup>1515</sup>Ms b reads, with regard to the previous verse, שכב מרע, ‘laying down, sick’.

<sup>1516</sup>Mss w y read למחוי, ‘to see’, the usual equivalent of the Hebrew verb ראה (>29). The Aramaic verb סער gives more precision to the phrase (>11).

<sup>1517</sup>Ms f<sub>3</sub> read עבישא, ‘the camel saddle’. See the commentary on 19:13.

<sup>1518</sup>Ms f<sub>3</sub> made the following remark: ונכא רמעוי, ‘a felt cover, which was from a goat’. See the commentary on 19:13.

<sup>1519</sup>Ms f reads כן, ‘thus’.

<sup>1520</sup>Ms d adds ברמתא, ‘in Ramah’.

hide in the Talmud School of Samuel, until Saul finds him there (cf. 20:1). This "Naioth" could not have been a separate place, because it is stated that David is "at Naioth in Ramah" (19:19, 22, 23; 20:1).<sup>1521</sup> Therefore, TJon considers it the plural of נטה, 'place, settlement', in the most pregnant sense of the word: the best place to hide is the Talmud School.<sup>1522</sup> David hid in the Talmud School, just as Saul did after he had been elected king (tosefta-targum to 1 Sam. 10:22); thus David is hiding there.<sup>1523</sup>

19 19 ואתחזה לשאול למימר הא דויד בבית אלפנא ב רמחא: 20 19 ושלה שאול  
אוגרין למדבר ית דויד וחזון<sup>1524</sup> ית סיעת ספריא משבחין ושמואל קאים מליף  
עליהון ושרת על אוגריד שאול רוח נבואה מן קדם יי ושבחו אף אנן:

19:19 *And it was told Saul, saying, "Behold, David is in the Talmud School in Ramah." 19:20 Then Saul sent messengers to take David. And when they saw the company of scribes praising, and Samuel standing as teacher over them, a prophetic spirit from before the LORD dwelt on them, and they also praised.*

The Aramaic text formulates the entire scene of 19:20-23 in such a way that it resembles the scene of Saul's praising in 10:9-13. The Hebrew text of these two passages is similar, but TJon took care that, in avoiding calling Saul a prophet, the Aramaic wording was similar as well (>15). It was therefore not difficult for the translator to interpret the Hebrew *hapax legomenon* להקת, because in 10:10 the word הבל was used and rendered by Aramaic סיעא, 'band, company'. Most probably, Hebrew להקת was interpreted as קהלה (>2), as in Syr, LXX and Vg.<sup>1525</sup>

The position of Samuel was changed, due to the interpretation of Naioth as a Talmud School. In the present verse he is presented

<sup>1521</sup>It is also possible that Hebrew רמה and Aramaic רמחא should be considered nouns with the meaning "high place".

<sup>1522</sup>Cf. Komlosch, המקרא באור הרגום, 322. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 25, following Ewald, connected ניה with the Arabic root *nawa*, 'strive, aspire'.

<sup>1523</sup>This interpretation is also attested to in Yev. 77a; MShem. 22:4; YalqS. § 129; although a different explanation is given in Zev. 54b, where the word Naioth is connected with נאה, 'beautiful, glorious'. Consequently, Samuel and David were engaged with the glory of the world, i.e. they sought to determine the exact site for the Temple.

<sup>1524</sup>Plural in accordance with the context and with LXX, Syr, Vg and MSS of the Vetus Latina. MSS f o read the singular וחזון.

<sup>1525</sup>Cf. P.A.H. de Boer, "Research into the Text of 1 Samuel xviii-xxxi", *OTS* 6 (1949), 1-100, esp. 20; J. Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew Among the Ancient Translators", in: B. Hartmann et al. (eds), *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner* (VT.S, 16), Leiden 1967, 1-11, esp. 10.

as the teacher of the scribes and consequently of David. Again TJon confronts us with its contemporary conditions and institutions.<sup>1526</sup>

19 21 וחזרו לשאול ושלה אונגין אחרנין<sup>1527</sup> ושבו אף אנון ואוסיף שאול ושלה אונגין תליחאין ושבו אף אנון: 19 22 ואול אף הוא לרמחא ואתא עד גובא רבא דבשכו ושאל ואמר איכא שמואל ורודי ואמר<sup>1528</sup> הא בבית אלפנא ברמחא: 19 23 ואול לתמן<sup>1529</sup> לבית אלפנא דברמחא ושרת עלוהי אף הוא רוח נבואה מן קדם יי אול מיזל ומשבח<sup>1530</sup> עד דאתא לבית אלפנא דברמחא: 19 24 ושלה אף הוא ית<sup>1531</sup> לבושהי ושבו אף הוא קדם שמואל ונפל ברשן<sup>1532</sup> כל יומא ההוא וכל ליליא על כין ימרון האף שאול בספריא:

*19:21 When it was told Saul, he sent other messengers, and they also praised. And Saul sent [a] third [group of] messengers again, and they also praised. 19:22 Then he also went to Ramah, and came to the great well that is in Secu. And he asked, "Where are Samuel and David?" And one said, "Behold, they are in the Talmud School in Ramah." 19:23 And he went thither, to the Talmud School in Ramah; and a prophetic spirit from before the LORD dwelt upon him also, and he went, praising as he went, until he came to the Talmud School in Ramah. 19:24 And also he sent off<sup>1533</sup> his clothes and also he praised before Samuel. And he fell insane all that day and all night. Hence they say, "Is Saul also among the scribes?"*

Hebrew ערם, 'naked', was not considered fitting in this context. First, it was not proper to see the king's nakedness (cf. Ezra 4:14; mSan. 2:5), and secondly, it was not considered appropriate to stay in the Talmud School without wearing clothes.<sup>1534</sup> TJon renders it by ברשן. Levy explains this Aramaic word as a contraction of בר שאן, which is a derivation of the verb שנא, 'to change', and says the word means "insane".<sup>1535</sup> The same verb is used in 21:14, where David "changed"

<sup>1526</sup>Cf. C.T.R. Hayward, "Some Notes on Scribes and Priests in the Targum of the Prophets", *JJS* 36 (1985), 210-21, esp. 219-20.

<sup>1527</sup>MSS m w y read תניין, 'second'.

<sup>1528</sup>Ms c reads the plural ואמרו, 'and they said'.

<sup>1529</sup>TJon and Syr explain Hebrew שם as "thither", although "from there" would have been more logical; cf. O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels erklärt*, Leipzig<sup>2</sup> 1864, 89.

<sup>1530</sup>P.A.H. de Boer erroneously mentioned משבח as an infinitive in the app.crit. of the *BHS*. It is a Pael participle. See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 6:12.

<sup>1531</sup>Omitted in MSS a c d f m o w y, as in the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1532</sup>Ms o reads בישן, 'chaste', but Vogel, *Sámuel elsö kõnyve*, 25 derives it from באש and renders "shaming himself".

<sup>1533</sup>See above, 18:4.

<sup>1534</sup>Cf. R.P. Gordon, "Saul's Meningitis According to Targum 1 Samuel xix,4", *VT* 37 (1987), 39-49, esp. 48-49.

<sup>1535</sup>Levy, *CWT*, s.v. ברא, followed by Vogel, *Sámuel elsö kõnyve*, 25. Insane be-

his behaviour and King Achish decided he was mad. If Levy's derivation is correct, the Targumist made a tragic word play between Saul's insane behaviour here, after he was touched by a prophetic spirit (שֵׁן), and Saul's changed heart in 10:9, before he was touched by a prophetic spirit (שֵׁן).

Gordon connects Aramaic ברשן with Arab *birsam*. He claims the original expression is *sar sam*, which must be translated by "ignition of the head" and is described as meningitis. Later the expression *bar sam* occurs, which must be translated with "ignition of the breast" and can best be seen as pneumonia.<sup>1536</sup> If Gordon's interpretation is correct, then Saul must be considered to be very ill and therefore lying without his garments in the Talmud School.

Pseudo-Jerome solves the embarrassing problem of the king's nakedness by stating that Saul did not strip off all his clothes, but only his royal garments. In this way Pseudo-Jerome also harmonizes the statement that "Samuel did not see Saul again until the day of his death" (15:35) with the present verse. Samuel did not see Saul again in his official role as the king.<sup>1537</sup> A similar explanation is found with Rashi.

## 5.20 David and Jonathan (1 Samuel 20)

Part of 1 Sam. 20 is read as *haftara* on Shabbath Mevarekhin, *i.e.* the Shabbath preceding Rosh Hodesh, whenever that Shabbath is exactly the day before Rosh Hodesh.<sup>1538</sup> The *haftara* always starts at 20:18, in which Jonathan says "Tomorrow is the new moon." The chapter is usually read up to 20:42, but MS S contains this *haftara* up to 21:1. Since the weekly portion of Torah is read on Shabbath Mevarekhin, the Torah reading cannot be compared with this *haftara*.

1 וְעַרְקָה דְרִיד מְבִית אֶלְפָנָא דְבִרְמִתָּא<sup>1539</sup> וְאִתָּא<sup>1540</sup> וְאִמֵּר קִדְמָה<sup>1541</sup> יְהוֹנָתָן מֵא עֲבָדִית מֵא חֻבִּי<sup>1542</sup> וְמֵא סִרְחִנִּי קִדְמָה אֲבוּךְ אֵרִי בְעֵי לְמִקְטֵלִי:

20:1 Then David fled from the Talmud School in Ramah, and came

haviour by prophets is also mentioned in TgEzek. 13:2.

<sup>1536</sup>R.P. Gordon, "Saul's Meningitis According to Targum 1 Samuel xix,4", *VT* 37 (1987), 39-49, esp. 42.

<sup>1537</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 94, "Expoliasset vero se non omnibus vestimentis sed regalibus tantum intellegendum est."

<sup>1538</sup>A. Büchler, "The Triennial Reading of the Law and Prophets", *JQR* 6 (1894), 1-73, esp. 31; cf. Soferim 42a.

<sup>1539</sup>Omitted in MSS J\* eb1, although it is added in the margin of MS J.

<sup>1540</sup>Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1541</sup>Omitted in MS C.

<sup>1542</sup>MSS C D read the verb חֻבִּית, 'I have sinned'.

and said before Jonathan, "What have I done? What is my guilt? And what is my sin before your father, that he seeks to kill me?"

Since Hebrew עון is already rendered by the standard translation for all sins, חרובא, Hebrew חטאה is represented by a different word, viz. סחרנא (>18). The same wording is used in TO Gen. 31:37. The Hebrew expression "seek someone's life" is translated more plainly by "seek to kill me" (>14) throughout TgSam.<sup>1543</sup> This rendering is made by analogy of the Hebrew expression מבקש להמיתך in 19:2 (>15).

20 2 ואמר ליה חס לא תמות הא לא<sup>1544</sup> יעביד אבא פתגם רב או פתגם<sup>1545</sup> זעיר ולא יחוי לי ומדין יכסי<sup>1546</sup> אבא מני<sup>1547</sup> ית פתגמא הדין<sup>1548</sup> לית<sup>1549</sup> דא קימא:

20:2 And he said to him, "Far be it! You shall not die. Behold, my father does nothing either great or small without telling it to me; and why should my father hide this from me? This is not lasting<sup>1550</sup>."

TJon replaces the Hebrew figurative expression "to open one's ear" with the plain term "to tell someone" (>14). The Targumist also saw reason to add the word קימא, 'enduring, lasting' to the last sentence, "this is not". Jonathan supposes that this fit of temper will go away, as it did in 19:6.

20 3 וקים עוד דויד ואמר מדע ידע אבוך ארי אשכחית רחמין בעינך ואמר לא ידע דא יהונתן דלמא יהנסיס וכען<sup>1551</sup> קיים<sup>1552</sup> הוא<sup>1553</sup> ויי וחיי<sup>1554</sup> נפשך ארי כפסעא חדא בינא ובין מותא: 20 4 ואמר יהונתן לדויד מא רעוא<sup>1555</sup> נפשך ואעביד לך: 20 5 ואמר דויד ליהונתן הא ירחא מחר ואנא אסחרא אסחר<sup>1554</sup> עם מלכא למיכל ותשלחני ואשמר בחקלא עד ערן<sup>1555</sup> רמשא דיומא תלהאה:

<sup>1543</sup> 1 Sam. 20:1; 22:23; 23:15 25:29; 2 Sam. 4:8; 16:1.

<sup>1544</sup> According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

<sup>1545</sup> Omitted in MS B\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1546</sup> MSS b f m w y Fr B C D S T eb1 read the perfect כסי. MSS a J reads the imperfect of a different verb with approximately the same meaning, viz. 'שמיר'.

<sup>1547</sup> Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1548</sup> Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1549</sup> MS a reads לא.

<sup>1550</sup> Or: existing, true; cf. P.A.H. de Boer, "Research into the Text of 1 Samuel xviii-xxxi", *OTS* 6 (1949), 1-100, esp. 22.

<sup>1551</sup> MSS a b c d f m o w y B C D J S T eb1 read וברם, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1552</sup> Omitted in MS S, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but against the usual vocabulary.

<sup>1553</sup> MSS m w y Fr D read the verbal form רעיא, "what does your soul desire". MS f reads חימר, "what does your soul say", in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29); cf. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 52.

<sup>1554</sup> Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1555</sup> Omitted in MSS a w y J, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

20:3 But David swore, "Your father knows well that I have found favour in your sight. And he says, 'Let not Jonathan know this, lest he be sorrowed.' And now, as the LORD is the existing One, and by your own soul, there is the like<sup>1556</sup> of one step between me and death." 20:4 And Jonathan said to David, "Whatever the delight of your soul is, I will do for you." 20:5 David said to Jonathan, "Behold, tomorrow is the new moon, and I should surely turn back to eat with the king. But let me go, that I may hide myself in the field till the time of the evening of the third day.

Hebrew feminine שלישיה cannot be construed with masculine ערב, so TJon considered it a separate time indication. Although an independent use of שלישיה always means "a third part", TJon explained it as the third day.<sup>1557</sup>

20 6 אם מבוא יבעניי אבוך וחימר אשתאלא אשחאל מני דויד למיזל<sup>1558</sup> לבית לחם קרתיה ◊ ארי שירו ◊ נכסת ◊ קדשיא יומא דין חמן<sup>1559</sup> לכל זרעיתא:

20:6 If your father really seeks me, then you shall say, 'David earnestly asked leave of me to go to Bethlehem his city, for there is the meal of the sacrifice of holy things today for all the family.'

Hebrew זבח הימים should have been rendered with "yearly offering", but this would refer to one of the great festivals. And since peace offerings alone were permitted outside the sanctuary, TJon separates the two words, translating Hebrew זבח with "a meal around the peace offering" and Hebrew ימים with the singular "today".

20 7 אם כדין יימר טב שלם לעבדך ואם מתקף יתקף ליה דע ארי נמירא בשתא מניה: 20 8 ותעביד טיבו עם<sup>1560</sup> עבדך ארי<sup>1561</sup> בקימא דיין<sup>1562</sup> אעילתא יה<sup>1563</sup> עבדך עמן<sup>1564</sup> ואם אית בי חובא ◊ קטולני את ולות אבוך למא דנן העלנני: 20 9 ואמר יהונתן חס לך<sup>1565</sup> ארי אם מדע אדע ארי נמירא בשתא מן אבא למיחי עלך ולא יתה אחוי לך: 20 10 ואמר דויד ליהונתן מן<sup>1566</sup> יחוי לי או דלמא<sup>1567</sup> יתיבנך

<sup>1556</sup>TJon stresses the metaphorical meaning of the Hebrew expression (>13).

<sup>1557</sup>Cf. Driver, *Notes*, 161; Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 25.

<sup>1558</sup>Ms D reads למיעל, 'to enter'.

<sup>1559</sup>Omitted in MS eb1\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1560</sup>In conformity with some Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

<sup>1561</sup>Ms J erroneously reads the phrase עבדך יה אעילתא דיין בקימא ארי twice.

<sup>1562</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1563</sup>Ms S reads עם, 'with'.

<sup>1564</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1565</sup>Ms C reads ליל, more in accordance with the usual vocabulary.

<sup>1566</sup>Rendered literally, but introducing a still unfulfilled but possible wish (GKC § 151a); cf. commentary and note on 2 Sam. 19:1.

<sup>1567</sup>In accordance with Syr. The versions seem to show that the Hebrew text must



אבוך פתגמין<sup>1568</sup> קשן<sup>1569</sup>: 20 11 ואמר יהונתן לדוד איתא<sup>1570</sup> וניפוק לחקלא ונפקו תרויהון לחקלא<sup>1571</sup>: 20 12 ואמר יהונתן לדוד יוי אלהא דישראל ארי אברוק ית אבא<sup>1572</sup> כעדנא הרין מחר או<sup>1573</sup> דיומא תליתאה ויהון<sup>1574</sup> פתגמין תקנין דיתאמרון על דויד ולא<sup>1575</sup> אשלח לוחך ואחוי לך:

20:7 *If he says, 'Good!' it will be peace for your servant; but if he is very angry, then know that evil is determined by him. 20:8 Therefore deal kindly with your servant, for you have brought your servant into covenant of the LORD with you. But if there is guilt in me, kill me yourself; for why should you bring me to your father?* 20:9 *And Jonathan said, "Far be it from you! If I know that it was determined by my father that evil should come upon you, would I not tell you?"* 20:10 *Then said David to Jonathan, "Who will tell me, whether perhaps your father answers you with harsh words"* 20:11 *And Jonathan said to David, "Come, let us go out into the field."* So they both went out to the field. 20:12 *And Jonathan said to David, "The LORD, the God of Israel—for I will inquire my father, about this time tomorrow or the third day, and [if] it will be right words that are spoken about David, will I not send to you and tell you?"*

The terse Hebrew phrases gave rise to a rather free rendering in TJon. Hebrew השלישית was not interpreted as "the third time" (as in 1 Kgs 18:34), but as a repetition of David's words in 20:5, that he would remain hidden until the third day.<sup>1576</sup> Hebrew טוב אל-דוד was interpreted as a repetition of David's words in 20:7, where he states the possibility that Saul would say, "Good!"

be read as אם מה instead of מה; cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 26 (and 32), who cites Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel*, 1902.

<sup>1568</sup>Clarifying addition (>10).

<sup>1569</sup>Feminine, although MSS a b c d f o B J S read the masculine form. The plural is in accordance with the translation of 19:3-4.

<sup>1570</sup>Ms b reads איויל, 'go'.

<sup>1571</sup>The last three words are omitted in MS J\* by haplography, but added in the margin.

<sup>1572</sup>Ms b omits אבא.

<sup>1573</sup>Cf. Vg. From here the text of MS S is rather corrupt, reading תקין לדוד ולא אם ברין אשלח ואחוי לך.

<sup>1574</sup>Mss a b c d f m o w y B C D J T read והא, 'and behold'.

<sup>1575</sup>Mss B C D J T eb1 add מכען, 'from now on', as a translation of Hebrew או (>29).

<sup>1576</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 26 is amazed by this interpretation, since it is nowhere attested to as "the third day".

13 20 כרין יעביד יי ליהונתן<sup>1577</sup> וכרין יוסף ארי<sup>1578</sup> נמירא<sup>1579</sup> מן אבא למיתי בשתא עלך ואחוי לך ואשלחנך ותהך לשלם ויהי מימרא<sup>1580</sup> דיוי בסערך כמה דהוה בסעדיה דאבא: 14 20 ולא עד דאנא קיים ולא תעביד עמי שיבו מן קדם<sup>1580</sup> יי ולא אמות:

*20:13 But should it be decided by my father to bring evil upon you, the LORD do so to Jonathan, and add more also, if I do not tell it to you, and send you away, that you may go in peace. May the speech of the LORD be in your aid, as it has been in my father's aid. 20:14 And will you not, as long as I am alive—and will you not do goodness with me from before the LORD, that I will not die?*

Since the Hebrew text is rather confusing here, the ancient versions struggle with too many negations.<sup>1581</sup> TJon maintains all the negations and ends up with the odd recommendation that David is not to be loyal, unless the whole sentence is considered a question and the second ולא as merely resumptive of the first.<sup>1582</sup>

15 20 ולא תפסיק ית שיבותך מן אנש ביחי עד עלמא ולא כד<sup>1583</sup> ישיצי יי ית סנאי<sup>1584</sup> דויד גבר מעל אפי ארעא: 16 20 וגזר יהונתן קים<sup>1585</sup> עם ביח<sup>1586</sup> דויד ותפרע ליה<sup>1587</sup> יי. 1588 מיד סנאי<sup>1588</sup> דויד:

*20:15 And do not cut off your goodness from my house forever, when the LORD will end the haters of David, each man from the surface of the earth, 20:16 for Jonathan made a covenant with the house of David. And may the LORD take vengeance for him on David's haters."*

As before, the difficult Hebrew text results in an odd translation. The first phrase about Jonathan's covenant with David's house seems to be a warning for David not to end his loyalty to Jonathan's offspring after

<sup>1577</sup>Ms b reads לי, 'to me'.

<sup>1578</sup>Ms f adds אם, indicating the conditional clause.

<sup>1579</sup>Based on 20:7, 9 (>15). Consequently, the word play between "good" and "evil" in the Hebrew text is lost.

<sup>1580</sup>Omitted in MS J\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1581</sup>Lxx, Syr and Vg at least twice consider Hebrew לא as the affirmative לָא; cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 336. The result is then, "As long as I am alive, act loyally toward me, but when I have died, . . ."

<sup>1582</sup>Suggested for the Hebrew text by Driver, *Notes*, 164, who notes on p. 200 that resumption is a frequent characteristic of Hebrew prose style, although he admits on p. 164 that it is very unusual for Hebrew ולא.

<sup>1583</sup>Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1584</sup>Omitted in MSS w y, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1585</sup>Omitted in MS b, in accordance with 18:3 (>16).

<sup>1586</sup>MSS a J read the imperfect ויתפרע.

<sup>1587</sup>Omitted in MS o, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1588</sup>Omitted in MS B, resulting in "and Jonathan made a covenant with David and he took vengeance from the hand of David's haters".

the latter's death. Pseudo-Philo interprets it in the same way (*LAB*, 62:11). LXX interpreted the "cutting" of Jonathan as the possibility that Jonathan's name would be cut off from David's house. The LORD was called upon to take vengeance on David, the phrase "on David's haters" being regarded as a euphemism for "on David".<sup>1589</sup> Since the preceding verse speaks of the covenant between Jonathan and David, there was no need to take this phrase as a euphemism.

17 20 ואוסיף יהונתן לאומאם ית דויד בדרחים יתיה ארי רחמת נפשיה רחמיה: 18 20 ואמר ליה יהונתן מחר ירחא<sup>1590</sup> ותחבעי ארי יהי מרוח בית אסחרותך<sup>1591</sup>: 19 20 וכתלתות ירחא<sup>1592</sup> תחבעי<sup>1593</sup> לחדא ותהך לאתרא דאשמרתא תמן ביומא דחולא ותחבי בסטר אבן אתא:

*20:17 And Jonathan made David swear again by his love for him; for he loved him as he loved his own soul. 20:18 Then Jonathan said to him, "Tomorrow is the new moon; and you will be sought, for your place at the banquet will be empty. 20:19 And on the third [day] of the moon you will be greatly sought. Then go to the place where you hid yourself on the profane day and remain beside the Stone of the Sign.*

The denotation "third" is interpreted as the third day in most manuscripts (cf. 20:5, 12),<sup>1594</sup> but as the third day of the moon in some others. The first two days of the festival were apparently not suitable for Saul's men to go and find David. Hebrew *יום המעשה* is interpreted as a workday and rendered by "profane day".

The combination of the Hebrew verb *תרד*, 'you will go down', and the following *מאד*, 'very', is substituted by a repetition of the preceding verse.<sup>1595</sup> On the days of the festival David would be sought, but on the third day, a profane day again, he would be greatly sought. LXX, Syr and Symmachus render likewise.

The name of the stone is translated. Hebrew *איל* might be linked to Aramaic *אול*, 'to go' and subsequently rendered by a participle

<sup>1589</sup>Cf. R. Yaron, "The Coptos Decree and 2 Sam XII 14," *VT* 9 (1959), 89-91; M. Anbar (Bernstein), "Un euphémisme <<biblique>> dans une lettre de Mari," *Orientalia* 48 (1979), 109-11.

<sup>1590</sup>Ms f adds the precision *ראש* ר.

<sup>1591</sup>Ms f reads *אסחרותא*, 'the banqueting house', although variant f<sub>3</sub> reads the same as MS p.

<sup>1592</sup>Mss y k f o D S T eb1 and the first edition of Kimḥi read *יומא*, 'day', while MSS a b J and the second edition of Kimḥi read the plural *יומיא*, which both are in accordance with 20:5.

<sup>1593</sup>In accordance with LXX and Syr.

<sup>1594</sup>Which is in accordance with the modern interpretation of *שלש* Pi. here, cf. *HALAT*, 1428.

<sup>1595</sup>So Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 26.

of the Aramaic verb אָתָא, 'to come'.<sup>1596</sup> More likely is the rendering "Stone of the Sign", which refers to the circumstance that the stone is the landmark where Jonathan will give David the sign whether it is safe for him to return or not.<sup>1597</sup> Other sources do not support either rendering.

20 20 ואנא תלתא גרין בקשת שרי לממחי לי<sup>1598</sup> לפלגליסא: 20 21 והא אשלה ית  
עולימא איזיל איתא ית גרריא<sup>1599</sup> אם מימר אימר לעולימא הא גררא<sup>1600</sup> מנך ולכא  
סבהי ◊ ואיתא ארי שלם לך<sup>1601</sup> ולית<sup>1602</sup> מדעם ביש<sup>1603</sup> קיים ◊ הוא יוי: 20 22 ואם  
כדין אימר לעולימא הא גרא<sup>1604</sup> מנך ולהלאה איזיל<sup>1605</sup> ארי שויבך ◊ יוי:

20:20 *And I will shoot three arrows with the bow as though I want to hit a target. 20:21 And behold, I will send the young man, saying, 'Go, bring the arrows back.' If I clearly say to the young man, 'Look, the arrow is on this side of you, take it,' then you can come, for it is safe for you and there is no evil, as the LORD is the existing One. 20:22 But if I say to the young man, 'Look, the arrow is beyond you,' then go, for the LORD delivers you.*

Hebrew שלחך was not regarded as the right description of David's flight, for the LORD did not send him with a message (see Ch. 4, *s.v.* Aramaic שדר).<sup>1606</sup> So TJon replaced it with שויבך, 'he delivered you'.

20 23 ופתגמא דמלילנא<sup>1607</sup> אנא<sup>1608</sup> ואת הא מימרא ◊ דיין סהיד<sup>1609</sup> בינא ובינך עד  
עלמא ◊: 20 24 ואטמר דוד בחקלא והוה<sup>1610</sup> ירחא ואסחר מלכא על לחמא למיכל:

<sup>1596</sup>Cf. Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 141, n. 30.

<sup>1597</sup>It is probably for this reason that Vogel prefers the name Stone of the Sign in *Sámuel első könyve*, 26.

<sup>1598</sup>Omitted in MS c.

<sup>1599</sup>Ms T reads the singular גררא, in accordance with the following sentence.

<sup>1600</sup>Singular, in conformity with the LXX and some MSS of Syr. Mss b f B J read the plural.

<sup>1601</sup>Omitted in MS B; MS D erroneously reads ליה.

<sup>1602</sup>Ms c reads ולא. Ms T adds לפיתגמא.

<sup>1603</sup>Added on the basis of 20:9, 13 (>15).

<sup>1604</sup>Singular, in conformity with some Hebrew MSS, LXX, some MSS of the Vetus Latina and Syr. Mss b f B D J reads the plural, as in 20:21.

<sup>1605</sup>Omitted in MS J.

<sup>1606</sup>Against Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 23, who considers the construction "the LORD sent you" not decent enough.

<sup>1607</sup>Ms B reads the second person דמלילתא.

<sup>1608</sup>Ms T erroneously reads the name יוי.

<sup>1609</sup>Precision (>11), also attested in LXX. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 338 supposes that the Hebrew text omitted the word עד by haplography, but an identical sentence is found in 20:42. TJon and LXX add the same word in 20:42.

<sup>1610</sup>Ms T. reads ורחא, 'and behold'; MSS f T add רוביע, 'intercalation', referring to the ushering in of the new moon, based on the Aramaic text of 20:27. In the

20 25 ואסחר מלכא על שוייה כזמן בזמן על שויא דמתקן ליה בסטר כתלא וקם  
 יהנתן ואסחר אבנר מסטרא דשאול והוה<sup>1611</sup> אתרא דרוד<sup>1612</sup> מרוח: 20 26 ולא  
 מליל שאול מדעם ביומא ההוא ארי אמר דלמא<sup>1613</sup> עירוע הוה<sup>1614</sup> ליה ולא דכי הוא  
 או דלמא לאורה אול ואנחא<sup>1615</sup> לא<sup>1616</sup> זמנדי:

20:23 *And as for the matter of which I and you have spoken, behold, the speech of the LORD is witness between you and me for ever.* 20:24 *So David hid himself in the field. And when the new moon came, the king sat down at the banquet to eat.* 20:25 *The king sat upon his couch, as at other times, on the couch that was prepared for him by the wall; and Jonathan stood, and Abner sat by Saul's side, but David's place was empty.* 20:26 *Yet Saul did not say anything that day, for he thought, "Could it be that an accident has befallen him so that he is not clean? Or could he be on the road, so that we could not invite him?"*

The double "he is not clean" in the thoughts of Saul, "as if he were trying to convince himself",<sup>1617</sup> is given a double explanation.<sup>1618</sup> First it is rendered literally—that an accident might have befallen David with the result that he was unclean and could not attend the meal. Then it is suggested that David could be on a mission and had therefore missed the invitation (>18). There is no Biblical foundation for the latter explanation.<sup>1619</sup> The use of the word דלמא, however, may indicate that Saul is not trying to convince himself of David's innocence. Aramaic דלמא is mostly used for unlikely suppositions.<sup>1620</sup>

20 27 והוה ביומא דבתרוהי דהוא עבור ירחא תנינא והוה אתרא דרוד מרוח ואמר

present verse, however, the word עיבור is out of place, because the new moon is ushered in on the second day of the New Moon festival (see below, commentary on 20:27).

<sup>1611</sup>MS d reads והא, 'and behold'.

<sup>1612</sup>MS T\* erroneously reads דשאול, but it is corrected. MS D adds the name of Saul before the name of David.

<sup>1613</sup>Omitted in MS f and Kimḥi. MS D omits everything from this דלמא until, by haplography.

<sup>1614</sup>Mss b C J read הוא, 'he'. MS B adds this word.

<sup>1615</sup>Omitted in MS D, who reads only לא.

<sup>1616</sup>Omitted in MS B.

<sup>1617</sup>S. Goldman, *Samuel* (The Soncino Books of the Bible), London<sup>3</sup>1962, quoted by C.J. Goslinga, *Het eerste boek Samuël* (COT), Kampen 1968, 374.

<sup>1618</sup>Also LXX relieves the tautology of the Hebrew text by rendering "he is not clean, for he has not been cleansed" (cf. Driver, *Notes*, 169), while Syr avoids the repetition by translating "he may be unclean or clean".

<sup>1619</sup>So Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 26; Komlosch, *באור ההרגם*, 326.

<sup>1620</sup>Cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. דלמא.

שׂאול ליהונתן בריה מדין לא אחא בר ישי אף תמלי<sup>1621</sup> אף יומא דין ללחמא:

20:27 *But on the next day, which was the intercalated day of the second month, David's place was empty. And Saul said to Jonathan his son, "Why has not the son of Jesse come to the meal, either yesterday or today?"*

The two days of the New Moon festival in Saul's days are explained with halakhic words. In rabbinic times the festival of the New Moon was started on the 30th day of the preceding month, to fill up the days of the one month. This day was called *ראש חודש*, 'יום א' דראש חודש', 'the first day of New Moon'. The actual festival of the New Moon was called *יום ב' דראש חודש*, 'יום ב' דראש חודש'.<sup>1622</sup> This day was the day of the *עיבור*, the ushering in of the new month.

The way in which Saul speaks about David in the present verse is maintained in TJon: "son of Jesse". In rabbinic literature this epithet is explained as a sign of contempt (cf. NumR. 18:17; PesK. 18:1; PesR. 32:1; MTeh. 4:8).<sup>1623</sup>

28 20 ואחיב יהונתן ית שאול<sup>1624</sup> אשתאלא אשתאיל דויד מני למיזל<sup>1625</sup> עד בית לחם:  
29 20 ואמר שלחני כען ארי שירו נכסח ◊ קדשיא לכל זרעיה<sup>1626</sup> לנא בקרח<sup>1627</sup> ◊  
והוא פקיד<sup>1628</sup> לי אחי וכען אב<sup>1629</sup> אשכחיה רחמין בעיך אשתויב ◊ כען ואחוי ית  
אחי על כן לא על<sup>1630</sup> לפחורא דמלכא: 30 20 ותקיף רגזא ◊ דשׂאול ביהונתן ואמר  
ליה<sup>1631</sup> בר סרבניהא דמרדוהא קשיא<sup>1632</sup> הלא ידענא<sup>1633</sup> ארי רעי<sup>1634</sup> את<sup>1635</sup> בכר  
ישי<sup>1636</sup> לבהתך ולבהתת קלן אמך:

<sup>1621</sup> Ms D omits אף תמלי by haplography.

<sup>1622</sup> Levy, *CWT*, s.v. עיבור; Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 26; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 29.

<sup>1623</sup> The Hebrew text uses this form of the name often with implication of contempt, but not always; cf. D.J.A. Clines, "X, X ben Y, ben Y: Personal Names in Hebrew Narrative Style", *VT* 22 (1972), 266-87, esp. 282-86.

<sup>1624</sup> Mss a d B\* add אבוהי, 'his father', as in the Pesh, cf. 20:32. In ms B both Hebrew אכיו and Aramaic אבוהי is erased. Mss o S add למימר.

<sup>1625</sup> Omitted in MS eb1\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1626</sup> Mss f eb1\* omit זרעיהא. In MS eb1 it is added in the margin.

<sup>1627</sup> Omitted in MS T.

<sup>1628</sup> Ms f<sub>3</sub> reads בעא, 'he asked', probably indicating that David's brother could not order the king's servant; cf. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 29.

<sup>1629</sup> Omitted in MS B. Ms eb1 adds another כען, 'now'.

<sup>1630</sup> Ms B reads אהא, 'he came'.

<sup>1631</sup> Omitted in MSS B D.

<sup>1632</sup> Omitted in MS eb1, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1633</sup> Mss D S read the perfect ירעיה.

<sup>1634</sup> Ms d reads בחיר, 'chosen'. Ms S combines this verb with the next אה into אהרעי, 'he chose'.

<sup>1635</sup> Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1636</sup> Ms T omitted everything after this ישי up to the next ישי, by haplography.

20:28 Jonathan answered Saul, "David earnestly asked leave of me to go to Bethlehem. 20:29 He said, 'Let me go, for there is a meal with the sacrifice of holy things for all our family in town and my brother commanded me [to come]. So now, if I have found favour in your sight, let me escape and see my brothers.' Therefore he has not come to the king's table." 20:30 Then Saul's anger was strong against Jonathan and he said to him, "You son of a perverse and strongly rebellious woman!<sup>1637</sup> Do I not know that you love the son of Jesse to your own shame and to the shame of your mother's nakedness?"

TJon's choice of the verb רעא as the equivalent of Hebrew בחר shows that TJon's *Vorlage* was identical. Still, the use of the Qal—instead of the usual Ithpeel—shows that TJon considers Hebrew בחר rather as חבר, 'to be bound, to be in league', as in LXX (>2).<sup>1638</sup>

20 31 ארי כל יומיא דבר יש קיים על ארעא לא תתקן את ומלכותך וכען שלח<sup>1639</sup> ואיחיניה לוהי ארי גבר חייב ◊ קטול הוא: 20 32 ואחיב יהונתן יח שאול אבוהי ואמר ליה למא יתקטיל מא עבר: 20 33 וארים<sup>1640</sup> שאול יח מורניתא עלוהי לממחהי<sup>1641</sup> וידע יהונתן ארי גמירא היא מן אבוהי למקטל ית דויד: 20 34 וקם יהונתן מן פתורא בתקוף רגז ◊ ולא אכל ביום עבור<sup>1642</sup> ירחא תנינא<sup>1643</sup> לחמא ארי אתנסס על דויד ארי אכלמיה אבוהי: 20 35 והוה בצפרא ונפק יהונתן לחקלא לזמנא דאמר ליה דויד<sup>1644</sup> ויניק זעיר עמיה<sup>1645</sup>: 20 36 ואמר לעולימיה רהוט איתא כען<sup>1646</sup> ית גרייא דאנא שדי עולימא רהוט והוא שדא גירא לאעברותיה:

20:31 For all the days that the son of Jesse lives upon the earth, neither you nor your kingdom shall be established. And now, send and bring him to me, for he is a man deserving to be killed." 20:32 Then Jonathan answered Saul his father, "Why should he be killed? What has he done?" 20:33 But Saul raised his spear against him to hit him, so Jonathan knew that it was decided by his father to kill David. 20:34 And Jonathan rose from the table in fierce anger and

<sup>1637</sup>Literally: son of a perverse woman, whose rebellion was harsh, correcting the grammatically awkward construction of the Hebrew text, cf. Driver, *Notes*, 170-71.

<sup>1638</sup>Cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 339, who assumed that LXX had a different *Vorlage*.

<sup>1639</sup>Omitted in MS c.

<sup>1640</sup>Hebrew *וַיִּשָׁל* seems to be vocalized as a derivation of *וַיִּשָׁל*, as in 18:11, like LXX, Syr and Vg. See above, commentary on 18:11.

<sup>1641</sup>MS eb1 increases the gravity of the situation by translating *למיקטיליה*, 'to kill him'.

<sup>1642</sup>See above, commentary on 20:27.

<sup>1643</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1644</sup>MS f reads *דרוד*, 'of David', instead of *דאמר ליה דויד*, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1645</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1646</sup>Omitted in MS k.

*ate no food on the second day of the intercalation of the new moon, for he was grieved for David, for his father had disgraced him. 20:35 In the morning Jonathan went out into the field to the appointment, which David had said him, and with him a little boy. 20:36 And he said to his young man, "Run and bring now the arrows which I am shooting." As the young man ran, he shot the arrow beyond him.*

In spite of the word יניק, 'little boy', in the preceding verse, TJon renders Hebrew נער by עולימא, 'young man' from now on. This rendering is based on its use in 20:21-22, where Jonathan made the appointment.

20 37 ואתא עולימא עד אתר גירא דשרא יהונתן וקרא יהונתן בחר עולימא ואמר הלא גרא<sup>1647</sup> מנך ולהלאה: 20 38 וקרא יהונתן בחר עולימא אחי<sup>1648</sup> בפריע לא תעכיב<sup>1649</sup> ולקיש עולימא דיהונתן ית גרריא<sup>1650</sup> ואתא לות רבוניה: 20 39 ועולימא לא ידע מדעם ברם<sup>1651</sup> יהונתן ורויד ידעין ית פתגמא: 20 40 ויהב יהונתן ית זיניה לעולימא דיליה ואמר ליה איזיל אובלהי לקרתא: 20 41 עולימא אתא ורויד קם מסטר אבן אתא<sup>1652</sup> דלקביל דרומא ונפל על אפוהי על ארעא וסגיד חלה זמנין ונשיקן גבר ית חבריה<sup>1653</sup> ובכו גבר ית<sup>1654</sup> חבריה עד דרויד אסני:

*20:37 And when the young man came at the place of the arrow which Jonathan had shot, Jonathan called after the young man and said, "Is not the arrow beyond you?" 20:38 And Jonathan called after the young man, "Hurry in haste, do not delay." So Jonathan's young man gathered up the arrows and came to his lord. 20:39 But the young man knew nothing. Only Jonathan and David knew the matter. 20:40 And Jonathan gave his weapons to his young man, and said to him, "Go and carry them to the city." 20:41 And as soon as the young man had gone, David rose from beside the Stone of the Sign, which is facing South, and fell on his face to the ground and bowed three times. And they kissed one another and wept together, until David recovered<sup>1655</sup> himself.*

Hebrew נגב is first interpreted as the great stone, behind which David was to hide himself (20:19). It is also translated literally by the apposi-

<sup>1647</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>1648</sup>MS C renders אחי, 'come', to avoid the pleonasm.

<sup>1649</sup>Mss B S eb1 read the Ithpaal of the same verb, היתעכב, "do not linger".

<sup>1650</sup>Plural according to the Qere and the other ancient versions.

<sup>1651</sup>MS B\* read לחור, 'alone', but it is erased and corrected into ברם.

<sup>1652</sup>Omitted in MS J, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29); MS S\* read before the name דומא, 'good', but it was erased.

<sup>1653</sup>MS D omits everything after this חבריה until the next חבריה, by haplography.

<sup>1654</sup>Mss b c d k m D S read עם, 'with', more natural after the verb "cry".

<sup>1655</sup>Literally: grew, exceeded.



tion “facing South”. Syr gives the translation **כרס**, ‘the stone’.<sup>1656</sup>

20 42 ואמר יהונתן לדויד אויל לשלם דקיימנא תרונא אנחנא בשמא דיוי למימר מימרא דיוי יהי סהיד<sup>1657</sup> בינא ובינך ובין בני<sup>1658</sup> ובין בנך עד עלמא<sup>1659</sup>:

*20:42 Then Jonathan said to David, “Go in peace, forasmuch as we have sworn both of us in the name of the LORD, saying, ‘The speech of the LORD shall be witness between me and you, and between my sons and your sons, for ever.’”*

## 5.21 The Priests of Nob (1 Samuel 21–22)

21 1 וקם ואול ויהונתן על לקרתא<sup>1660</sup>: 21 2 ואתא דויד לנוב לזב לזא אחימלך כהנא ואחבעית אחימלך לקדמות דויד ואמר ליה מדין את בלחודך וגבר ליה עמך: 21 3 ואמר דויד לאחימלך כהנא<sup>1659</sup> מלכא פקרני פתגמא ואמר לי אנש לא ידע מדעם ית פתגמא<sup>1660</sup> דנאא שלח לך ודפקידתך וית עולימא שלחית קדמי<sup>1661</sup> לאתר כסי ושמיר:

*21:1 And [David] arose and went. And Jonathan went into the city. 21:2 Then came David to Nob to Ahimelech the priest; and Ahimelech came to meet David terrified and said to him, “Why are you alone, and no man with you?” 21:3 And David said to Ahimelech the priest, “The king has charged me with a matter and said to me, ‘Let no man know anything of the matter about which I send you and with which I have charged you.’ So I have sent ahead the young men to a hidden and concealed place.*

Hebrew פלני אלמוני is translated according to its context, “hidden and concealed”. Since פלני (derived from פלא, ‘separate’) might mean “a certain person, an unknown person”, and אלמוני “unknown, not counted” (derived from אל מנא, ‘not counted’), TJon considered the place hidden, *i.e.* unknown to outsiders.

<sup>1656</sup>Against McCarter, *I Samuel*, 340, who rendered this by “a stone”.

<sup>1657</sup>So also LXX and Vg. See above, 20:32.

<sup>1658</sup>Ms J exchanges Aramaic בני and בנך, creating a chiasm.

<sup>1659</sup>Ms C adds רבא, resulting in the title “the high priest”. This translation suggests that Ahimelech is considered to be Eli’s successor, and is identified with Ahijah (14:18, 19, 36; 22:10; 23:6), son of Ahitub, son of Phinehas, son of Eli. This identification is made by Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 95; Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:261; Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 63:1; but cf. also C.J. Goslinga, *Het eerste boek Samuël* (COT), Kampen 1968, 381; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 349.

<sup>1660</sup>Ms J\* omits פתגמא ית מדעם ית דע לא איש לא ידע מדעם by haplography, but it is added in the margin.

<sup>1661</sup>Omitted in MS c.

21 4 וכען מא<sup>1662</sup> אית<sup>1663</sup> תחות ידך חמיש שלמין דלחמא הב בירי או מא  
 דישתכח<sup>1664</sup>: 21 5 ואתיב כהנא ית דויד ואמר<sup>1665</sup> לית לחים חולין<sup>1666</sup> לתחות ידי  
 אלהין לחמא דקדשא אית ברם<sup>1667</sup> נשירין<sup>1668</sup> עולימיא לחוד<sup>1669</sup> מסואבת אחתא:  
 21 6 ואתיב דויד ית כהנא ואמר ליה בקששא<sup>1670</sup> אחתא<sup>1671</sup> מרחקא לנא כמאתמלי  
 ומדקמודי<sup>1672</sup> במפקי והוון מניהון דעולימיא<sup>1673</sup> דכן לקדשא והוא<sup>1674</sup> לא<sup>1675</sup> באורח  
 חולא הוה אויל ויומא דין הוא מתאכיל ולא מתפסיל במנא:

21:4 *Now then, what have you at hand? Give me five loaves of bread or whatever is found.* 21:5 *And the priest answered David and said, "I have no profane bread at hand, but there is holy bread; if only the young men have kept themselves from the uncleanness of women."* 21:6 *And David answered the priest and said to him, "In truth, women are removed from us as always before when I go out. The vessels of the young men are clean for holiness. And it<sup>1676</sup> is not going in a profane journey and today it is eaten and not becoming invalid by the vessel."*

The first half of this verse is translated rather literally; only the small precision is made that the young men were "clean for holiness" and not holy. The second half of this verse is rendered paraphrastically. The phrasing of TJon resembles the phrasing of a discussion between R. Judah and R. Simeon, both disciples of R. Aqiba, concerning this text (Men. 95b).<sup>1677</sup> R. Judah supposed that David came on a week-day, being the explanation of Hebrew חל דרך, and that he rebuked the priests who were baking the shewbreads then. David's argumenta-

<sup>1662</sup> Ms m eb1 adds א, resulting in "perhaps you have something at hand".

<sup>1663</sup> Mss a b c d f m o w y B C J eb1 add כא, 'here'.

<sup>1664</sup> Mss a b c d f m o w y D C J read the perfect דאשתכח, 'what has been found'.

<sup>1665</sup> Ms o adds ליה, probably a doublet of the following לית.

<sup>1666</sup> Omitted in MSS w y.

<sup>1667</sup> Mss f T read א, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29); MSS b m o w y B D J S eb1 add א.

<sup>1668</sup> Ms eb1 reads נשירין, 'hidden, kept hidden'.

<sup>1669</sup> Omitted in MS d.

<sup>1670</sup> Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1671</sup> Omitted in MS B.

<sup>1672</sup> Ms f reads the less usual ומדקמודי, 'and before it'.

<sup>1673</sup> Omitted in MS B.

<sup>1674</sup> Ms J reads ואף, 'and also'.

<sup>1675</sup> Omitted in MSS b f B, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29); see commentary.

<sup>1676</sup> Against Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 2, who translate "he", i.e. David, assuming that TJon changed the meaning of the sentence in order to clarify David's eating of the bread. He would have been on a sacred journey and therefore allowed to eat the breads. But in this rendering, David's words would have ended and the following "today" would be meaningless coming from the writer.

<sup>1677</sup> Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 1-2.

tion was that they should not bake the breads on a weekday, since the breads were sanctified in the oven, the interpretation of Hebrew  $\text{בֶּלֶם}$ , and they would become invalid during the night after the baking. R. Judah's opinion is adopted in its entirety by MSS b f B, which omit Aramaic  $\text{כֶּלֶם}$  and render, "And it is going in a profane way and today it is eaten and not becoming invalid in the vessel", which ought to be explained as: It is baked on a weekday, but since it is eaten today, it will not become invalid (by being kept overnight) in the vessel, *i.e.* the oven or a cupboard.

However, the other manuscripts add  $\text{כֶּלֶם}$  to the first phrase and agree with R. Simeon. He supposed that David came on a Shabbath and found the priest baking and thus trespassing the commandments concerning the Shabbath's rest.<sup>1678</sup> This opinion was based on the following verse, in which the bread is described as "removed from before the LORD, replaced by hot bread". R. Simeon declared that the priests could easily have baked the breads on a weekday, since it was not the oven which was indicated by "vessel" in the phrase "their vessel will be holy", but the table. The breads were consecrated to God for as long as they were on the table. Consequently, the breads were common breads until they were put on the table, and they were common breads when removed from the table. Following R. Simeon's opinion, TJon's translation should then be read as "It is not going on a weekday (so it is old bread, taken away from the table); it is eaten today and not invalid (by having lain) on the vessel, *i.e.* the table."<sup>1679</sup>

The final redactor of Men. 95b was not satisfied with R. Simeon's solution, since Lev. 24:8-9 prescribes that only the priest could eat the shewbread. So he added the phrase that David was allowed to eat the bread because his life was in danger, since the commandments of the Torah are overruled, if a life is at stake.<sup>1680</sup>

In spite of all the verbal agreements between the Targumic rendering of this verse and the discussion in Men. 95b, a different explanation of the Aramaic version is more likely. If TJon really wanted to follow either R. Judah's or R. Simeon's opinion, the translation of the days

<sup>1678</sup>This opinion is shared by three Gospel writers, cf. the references to the present text in a discussion concerning the Shabbath in Mt. 12:1-4; Mk 2:23-26; Lk 6:1-4. Cf. J. Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, Göttingen <sup>3</sup>1960, 58.

<sup>1679</sup>Although the authors of the Gospels agree with R. Simeon's opinion concerning the Shabbath day, they disagree with his exegesis of the common bread. The Gospel writers clearly consider David's eating of the breads a trespassing of the law.

<sup>1680</sup>To Jesus, David's hunger was sufficient to excuse David's violation of cultic regulation, cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 349.

and of Hebrew כָּלִי would have been much clearer. Therefore, David's words seem to be a simple reference to battle law. Both the euphemism "the vessels of the young men are holy" and the phrase about the non-profane journey refer to the consecrating of the soldiers before battle (Josh. 3:5; Deut. 23:10-15; cf. also 2 Sam. 11:11). The remark that the bread is eaten today can simply be explained as: they would eat it in their present state of purity and not let it become ritually impure. If this is true, Aramaic מְנִי is, like Hebrew כָּלִי, a euphemism.

21 7 ויהב ליה כהנא קדשא ארִי<sup>1681</sup> לא הוה תמן לחים חולִין אלהין לחים אפיא דמעדן מן קדם ◊ יי לשווייתה לחים חמים ביום אתנסבותיה ◊<sup>1682</sup>: 21 8 ותמן גברא מעברי שאול ביומא ההוא כניש קדם ◊ יי ושמיה דאג ארומאה רב רעיא דלשאול:

21:7 *So the priest gave him the holy [bread], for there was no common bread there, but only the bread of the Presence, which had been removed from before the LORD, to be replaced by hot bread on the day it is taken away. 21:8 Now a certain man of the servants of Saul was there that day, gathering before the LORD. His name was Doeg the Edomite, the commander of Saul's shepherds.*

Hebrew passive נֶעֱצַר, 'detained', became the active כָּנִישׁ, 'gathering', as though Doeg was going to the synagogue, the בית כְּנִישָׁא. Whereas Tannaitic comments about Doeg are without exception unfavourable,<sup>1683</sup> most Amoraic exegetes give a positive reason for the presence of Doeg in the sanctuary, e.g. prayer or the study of Torah.<sup>1684</sup>

Hebrew overworked metaphor אַבִּיר—originally 'bull, stallion', but gradually changed to 'strong one'<sup>1685</sup>—is rendered by the usual word for a leader, רֹבֵא, (>13).<sup>1686</sup> In the margin of CR a similar explanation

<sup>1681</sup>Ms J\* adds לחם, but it is erased.

<sup>1682</sup>Ms eb1 reads the active נִסְבוֹתֶיהָ, 'of his taking'.

<sup>1683</sup>R. Kalmin, "Doeg the Edomite: From Biblical Villain to Rabbinic Sage", in: C.A. Evans (ed.), *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* (JSP.S, 33), Sheffield 2000, 390-405, esp. 393.

<sup>1684</sup>Cf. San. 106b-107a; Tan., *ky tisse*, 4; MTeh. 3:4-5; 52:4, 6-7; NumR. 18:13; cited by V. Aptowitz, "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata", *ZAW* 29 (1909), 241-252, esp. 246.

<sup>1685</sup>However, R. de Hoop, *Genesis 49 in its Literary and Historical Context*, Leiden 1998, 197 argues the other way round: its basic meaning was "strength, force", but in Ugaritic and Hebrew it could also be used for strong animals such as bulls, oxen and stallions.

<sup>1686</sup>Cf. TanB, *Devarim*, 5:2. LXX; Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:244; and Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 63:2 suppose that Doeg was the keeper of the king's mules, probably by mixing up the metaphorical אַבִּיר; cf. W.G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOT.S, 26), Sheffield 1984, 268.

of Doeg's title is found,<sup>1687</sup> but in this variant both אביר and הרעים are conceived of metaphorically (>13):<sup>1688</sup>

לישנאן [אחוריאן] רבן תלמידא דלשאול

*another expression: Saul's teacher of the disciples*

Whereas Tannaitic rabbis considered Doeg to be a villain, Amoraic sources depict Doeg the Edomite as a sage. Babylonian sources depict him as a sinful sage and manifest substantially less anxiety about it than do Palestinian Amoraim.<sup>1689</sup> The latter Amoraim attempted in several ways to harmonize Doeg's being a sage with the Biblical depiction. For example, they denied or ignored Doeg's wickedness or they claimed that Doeg's learning was only superficial.<sup>1690</sup> Consequently, the explanation that Doeg was Saul's scholar originates from Amoraic times or later.

9 21 ואמר דויד לאחמלך ואלו<sup>1691</sup> אית כא תחות ירך מורניחא אר<sup>1692</sup>. חרבא ארי אף חרבי ואף זיני<sup>1693</sup> לא נסיביה ד בידי ארי הוה פתגם מלכא בבחילו: 10 21 ואמר כהנא חרבא דגלית פלשתא דקטלתא במישר בשמא הא היא מכרכא בשושפא<sup>1694</sup> בחר דשאל ליה באיפודא<sup>1695</sup> אם יתה חסב לך סב ד ארי לית אחרי בר מנה הכא ואמר דוד לית דכותה הבהנא<sup>1696</sup> לי:

*21:9 And David said to Ahimelech, "Would here be a spear of a sword at hand! For I have brought neither my sword nor my weapons with me, because the king's business was in haste." 21:10 And the priest said, "The sword of Goliath the Philistine, whom you killed in the Valley of the Terebinth, behold it is here wrapped in a cloak." After he inquired of the ephod for him, "If you want to take that, take it, for there is none other than that here." And David said, "There is none like that, give it to me."*

Hebrew אפוד האפור is rendered by a separate temporal clause (>12), assuming that the priest used the ephod to ask permission from the LORD to hand over Goliath's sword. This translation serves three

<sup>1687</sup>Cited by Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 28, n. 2; not attested in Sperber's edition.

<sup>1688</sup>So also MTeh. 3:4, "As to Doeg, he was chief of the high court".

<sup>1689</sup>Kalmin, "Doeg the Edomite", 394.

<sup>1690</sup>Kalmin, "Doeg the Edomite", 399-401.

<sup>1691</sup>Omitted in MS B\*, but added later.

<sup>1692</sup>MS D reads ארי, confusing this word with the following phrase.

<sup>1693</sup>MS b renders מני, 'my things', which is no military term. This suits better after the word 'sword'.

<sup>1694</sup>The same rendering is attested in Syr.

<sup>1695</sup>MS S adds מצלח, 'successfully'.

<sup>1696</sup>MS m reads יתה הכ.

purposes. First, the ephod was to be worn continuously by the high priest (Exod. 28:29-30), so TJon avoids the Hebrew wording that it hung somewhere in the sanctuary (>16).<sup>1697</sup> Secondly, the important ordinance that the ephod should be consulted before the king or a leader was to undertake an important mission (mYom. 7:5 and Ber. 3b), is kept (>24).<sup>1698</sup> Thirdly, harmonization with 22:10, 13, in which Ahimelech is said to have made inquiries for David, is achieved (>16).<sup>1699</sup>

21 11 וקם דויד וערק ביומא ההוא מן קדם  $\diamond$  שאול ואחא<sup>1700</sup> לות אכיש מלכא דגת:  
 21 12 ואמרו עבדי אכיש ליה הלא דין רויד מלכא דארעא הלא לדין משמעין<sup>1701</sup>  
 בחנניא למימר קטל שאול באלפין ורויד ברבון<sup>1702</sup>: 21 13 ושויו דויד יה פתנמא  
 האלין בלביה ודחיל לחדא מן קדם  $\diamond$  אכיש מלכא דגת: 21 14 ושני<sup>1703</sup> יה מדעיה<sup>1704</sup>  
 בענייהון ואשתמם<sup>1705</sup> בידהון<sup>1706</sup> ומסריש על דשי תרעא ומחית ריריה על דקניה:  
 21 15 ואמר אכיש לעבדוהי הא כד<sup>1707</sup> חזיתון דגבר<sup>1708</sup> שטי הוא<sup>1709</sup> למא איתיתון  
 יתיה לותי: 21 16 חסיר<sup>1710</sup> שטיא אנא ארי איתיתון יה דין לאשתטאה קרמי  $\diamond$  הדין  
 ייעול לבית<sup>1711</sup>:

21:11 And David rose and fled that day from before Saul. He went to Achish the king of Gath. 21:12 And the servants of Achish said to him, "Is not this David, the king of the land? Did they not proclaim to him in dances, saying, 'Saul has killed by the thousands, and David by the ten thousands'?" 21:13 And David took these words to heart and was much afraid of Achish the king of Gath. 21:14 So he changed

<sup>1697</sup>Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 143, n. 9; referring to Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 24.

<sup>1698</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 24.

<sup>1699</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 27.

<sup>1700</sup>Omitted in MS J.

<sup>1701</sup>Free rendering of Hebrew וענו; MSS a b B<sup>m</sup> J S read בשבחין, 'praising', in conformity with 18:6 (>15); cf. also Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 71, n. 8.

<sup>1702</sup>For the exact wording of this song in TJon, see commentary on 18:7. Only MS S adds the suffix 3 m.sg. after the two numerals.

<sup>1703</sup>MS a b J read the Aphel of the same verb, ואשני.

<sup>1704</sup>MS b read שעמיה, 'opinion', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1705</sup>MSS a B<sup>m</sup> C J read ואישעשי, 'and he became insane', in accordance with the vocabulary of the following verses (>15); MS f<sub>3</sub> reads ואישעמם, 'and he became insane'.

<sup>1706</sup>This is the first word of the verse in MS S; the preceding words are omitted.

<sup>1707</sup>MS o reads כדין, 'thus, in this way'.

<sup>1708</sup>MS f simply read שטי גבר, omitting הוא. The result is "when you saw a mad man, why did you bring him to me?"

<sup>1709</sup>Omitted in MSS f S.

<sup>1710</sup>Although MS B\* reads חסיר, it is erased and corrected into חסר, as in MSS D C J S.

<sup>1711</sup>MS b reads לווחי, 'to me', like the last word of the preceding verse.

his intelligence in their sight and feigned himself mad in their hands. He made marks on the doors of the gate and let his spittle run down his beard. 21:15 Then Achish said to his servants, "Behold, when you saw that he is a madman, why did you bring him to me? 21:16 Do I lack madmen, that you have brought this one to play the madman before me? Shall this one enter my house?"

In the margin of CR a more elaborate translation of the last phrase is attested to, in which the word כשר is added to describe Achish's intention:

ספןר] אחרן] הרין כשר למיעל לבייתי

another book: is this one suitable to enter my house?

1 22 ואול דויד מתמן ואשתויב ◊ למערה עדלם ושמעו אחוהי וכל<sup>1712</sup> בית אבוהי ונחתו לוחיה לחמן: 2 22 ואחכנישו לוחיה כל גבר מעק רוח<sup>1713</sup> וכל גבר דליה<sup>1714</sup> מרי רשו וכל גבר מריר נפש והוה עליהון לרבא והוה עמיה כארבע מאה גברא: 3 22 ואול דויד מתמן למצפיא דמואב ואמר למלכא דמואב יפוק כען אבא ואמא עמכון עד דאדע מא יעביד לי יוי◊: 4 22 ואשרינון קדם◊ מלכא דמואב ויתיבו<sup>1715</sup> עמיה כל יומין דהוה דויד משמר במצרתא<sup>1716</sup>:

22:1 And David went from there and escaped to the cave of Adullam; and when his brothers and all his father's house heard it, they went down there to him. 22:2 And every man troubled of spirit and every man who had a creditor<sup>1717</sup> and every man bitter of soul, gathered to him. And he became commander over them. And there were with him about four hundred men. 22:3 And David went from there to Mizpah of Moab; and he said to the king of Moab, "Let my father and my mother come out now [to stay] with you, till I know what the LORD will do for me." 22:4 And he let them dwell before the king of Moab and they stayed with him all the days that David was hiding in the stronghold.

While TJon read Hebrew וינחם as it is vocalized in the Masoretic tradition and rendered accordingly by "he let them dwell", Syr and Vg seem to have read ויניחום and rendered "he left them".

<sup>1712</sup>Omitted in MS b, reading also ובייתו.

<sup>1713</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 1:15. The combination "bitter of soul" is used in 1:11.

<sup>1714</sup>Omitted in MS eb76\*, but added afterwards.

<sup>1715</sup>Ms f reads והוה, 'and they were'.

<sup>1716</sup>Mss a b c d f m o eb76 and Kimḥi read the plural במצריא, 'in the strongholds'. Cf. the following verse.

<sup>1717</sup>Singular, cf. Levy, CWT, s.v. מרא; against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 144.

22 5 ואמר גר נביא לדויד לא תחיב במצדתא<sup>1718</sup> איתא ואיזיל<sup>1719</sup> לך לארעא דבית<sup>1720</sup> יהודה ואזל דויד ואתא לחרשא דחרת: 22 6 ושמע שאול ארי<sup>1721</sup> אתידע דויד וגבריא דעמיה ושואל יחיב בנבעתא חרות אשלא ברמתא ומורניתיה בידיה וכל עברויה קימין עלוהי:

22:5 Then the prophet Gad said to David, "Do not remain in the stronghold; come, and go into the land of the House of Judah." So David went and came to the forest of Hereth. 22:6 Now Saul heard that David and the men who were with him were known. Saul was sitting at Gibeah, under the tamarisk tree in Ramah, with his spear in his hand and all his servants standing about him.

Hebrew ברמה can be understood either as "in Ramah" or as "on the height". Similarly, there is no distinction between "in Ramah" and "on the height" in Aramaic. Still, it is likely that TJon considered ברמה the name of Samuel's city, since that is the common opinion among the rabbis (Taan. 5b; cf. GenR. 54:6; Seder Olam 8). Rashi regarded the tamarisk tree in Ramah as a metaphor referring to Samuel, and explained it as בוכות האשל הגדול, 'through the merit of the great tree', i.e. through the prayers of Samuel.<sup>1722</sup> The tamarisk was more often used as a symbol of a great rabbi (cf. GenR. 54:6).

22 7 ואמר שאול לעברויה דקימין עלוהי שמעו כען בני שבטא<sup>1723</sup> דבית<sup>1724</sup> בנימין אף לכלכון יתין בר ישי חקלין וקרמין<sup>1724</sup> לכלכון ימני רבני אלפי ורבני מאותא: 22 8 ארי מרידתון כלכון עלי ולית דמחוי לי כד גור<sup>1725</sup> ברי עם בר ישי ולית דכאיב ליה<sup>1726</sup> מנכון עלי ומחוי<sup>1727</sup> לי ארי אקים ברי ית עבדי עלי לכמנא כיומא הדין: 22 9 ואתיב דאג אדומאה והוא ממנא על עבדי שאול ואמר חויתי ית בר ישי אתא לנוב לוח אחימלך בר אחיטוב:

22:7 And Saul said to his servants who stood about him, "Hear now, sons of the tribe of the House of Benjamin. Will the son of Jesse give fields and vineyards also to all of you? Will he appoint all of you commanders of thousands and commanders of hundreds?" 22:8 For all

<sup>1718</sup>Mss a b c d f m o w y eb76 read the plural במצדיא, 'in the strongholds'.

<sup>1719</sup>Ms f inverts the order and reads ואיזיל ואתא, 'go and come', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29) and with the second half of this verse (>15). The other MSS introduce a chiasm.

<sup>1720</sup>Omitted in MS b, in conformity to the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1721</sup>Omitted in MS eb76\*, but added afterwards.

<sup>1722</sup>Levy, CWT, s.v. אשלא.

<sup>1723</sup>Omitted in MSS a eb76, which read רבנימן and רבנימן respectively; MS o reads רבני, 'of the sons'.

<sup>1724</sup>Mss c w y read אף, 'also'.

<sup>1725</sup>Mss a b c d f m o w y add קים, 'covenant', as is done in 20:16.

<sup>1726</sup>Mss c o read לי, 'for me'.

<sup>1727</sup>Ms a reads מחוי, 'and did not tell', cf. the beginning of this verse.



of you have rebelled against me. There was no one who told me, when my son made a covenant with the son of Jesse. And there was no one from you who felt sorry for him and told me that my son stirred up my servant against me to lie in wait, as at this day." 22:9 Then answered Doeg the Edomite and he was appointed over the servants of Saul and he said, "I saw the son of Jesse coming to Nob, to Ahimelech the son of Ahitub.

Although Hebrew על נצב is interpreted as "standing about" (22:6, 7, 17), Doeg was not standing by the servants of Saul in this verse, but was "appointed over" them, in accordance with his earlier title "commander of the king's shepherds" (21:8). An identical interpretation is given in Vg, which gives both possible translations: "qui assistebat et erat primus inter servos Saul".<sup>1728</sup>

10 22 ושאיל ליה במימרא דיוי וזודין<sup>1729</sup> יהב ליה וית חרבא דגלית פלשתא איה יהב ליה: 11 22 ושלח מלכא למקרי ית אחימלך בר אחישוב כהנא וית כל בית אבוהי כהניא דבנוב ואחו כלהון לות מלכא: 12 22 ואמר שאול<sup>1730</sup> שמע כען בר אחישוב ואמר האנא<sup>1731</sup> רבני: 13 22 ואמר ליה שאול למא מרידתון עלי אח ובר ישי במחנך ליה מזון<sup>1732</sup> וחרבא ושאילת ליה במימרא דיוי למקם עלי<sup>1733</sup> לכמנא כיומא הרין: 14 22 ואחזיב אחימלך ית מלכא ואמר ומן בכל עבדך כדויד מהימן וחחנא דמלכא ורב<sup>1734</sup> על<sup>1735</sup> משמעך<sup>1736</sup> ויקיר בביתך: 15 22 יומא דין שריתי למשאל<sup>1737</sup> ליה במימרא דיוי חס לי לא ישוי מלכא בעבריה פתגמא<sup>1738</sup> בכל בית אבא ארי לא ידע עבדך בכל דא פתגם זעיר או רב: 16 22 ואמר מלכא ממת חמות<sup>1739</sup> אחימלך את וכל בית אבוך: 17 22 ואמר מלכא<sup>1740</sup> לרהטיא דקימין עלוהי אסתחרו וקטילו כהניא דיוי אף ידהון עם דויד וארי ידעו ארי עריק הוא ולא חוו לי<sup>1741</sup> ולא אבו עבדי מלכא לאושטא ית ידהון למשלט בכהניא דיוי: 18 22 ואמר מלכא לדואג<sup>1742</sup>

<sup>1728</sup>Cf. F. Stummer, "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas", *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, esp. 11.

<sup>1729</sup>Plural as usual, cf. TJon Josh. 1:11; 9:5, 11; Judg. 7:8; 20:10; 1 Sam. 9:7.

<sup>1730</sup>Ms b reads מלכא, 'the king'.

<sup>1731</sup>Ms f only reads הא, 'behold'.

<sup>1732</sup>Associative rendering based on 22:10 (>15), although it was bread that Ahimelech gave to David.

<sup>1733</sup>In conformity with many Hebrew MSS.

<sup>1734</sup>TJon read שר instead of סר, as LXX did.

<sup>1735</sup>Ms o adds כל, 'all'.

<sup>1736</sup>Ms f<sub>3</sub> interpreted it as שימושך, 'service'.

<sup>1737</sup>According to the Qere and many Hebrew MSS.

<sup>1738</sup>Ms f<sub>3</sub> reads the paraphrastic rendering עילהא, 'inducement', cf. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 30.

<sup>1739</sup>For the use of the stem מיה, see commentary on 1 Sam. 14:44.

<sup>1740</sup>Ms eb1 erroneously reads the plural מלכיא.

<sup>1741</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

<sup>1742</sup>According to the Qere, several Hebrew MSS and Syr.

אסתחר את<sup>1743</sup> ושלום בכהניא ואסתחר דואג אדומאה ושלום<sup>1744</sup> הוא בכהניא וקטל  
 ביומא ההוא תמן וחמשא גברא דכשרין למלכא אפוד דבוין:

22:10 *And he inquired of the speech of the LORD for him. And provisions he gave him and the sword of Goliath the Philistine he gave him.* 22:11 *Then the king sent to call Ahimelech the priest, son of Ahitub, and all his father's house, the priests, who were at Nob; and all of them came to the king.* 22:12 *And Saul said, "Hear now, son of Ahitub." And he answered, "Here I am, my lord."* 22:13 *And Saul said to him, "Why have you rebelled against me, you and the son of Jesse, in that you have given him food and the sword, and have inquired of the speech of the LORD for him, so that he has stood up against me to lie in wait, as at this day?"* 22:14 *Then Ahimelech answered the king, "And who among all your servants is like David, faithful and the king's son-in-law and commander over your bodyguard and honoured in your house?"* 22:15 *Is today the first time that I have inquired of the speech of the LORD for him? Far be it from me! Let not the king impute anything to his servant, to his father's house, for your servant has known nothing of all this, much or little."* 22:16 *And the king said, "You shall surely die, Ahimelech, you and all your father's house."* 22:17 *And the king said to the runners who were standing by him, "Go around and kill the priests of the LORD, because their hand also is with David and because they knew that he fled and did not tell me." But the servants of the king did not want to stretch out their hand to use force against the priests of the LORD.*<sup>1745</sup> 22:18 *And the king said to Doeg, "You go around and use force against the priests." And Doeg the Edomite went around and used force against the priests. And he killed on that day eighty-five men, who would have been fit to wear the linen ephod.*

Because only the high priest was allowed to wear the ephod (Exod. 28:6-12), TJon added כשר to avoid the interpretation that all eighty-five men were wearing an ephod. They were all fit to become a high priest one day, but they were not wearing it.<sup>1746</sup> This exegesis is also given by R. Ḥiyya, who taught that it is not permitted to choose more than one high priest (ySan. 10:2 (29a); cf. mYom. 7:5).<sup>1747</sup>

<sup>1743</sup>Ms w reads כען, 'now'.

<sup>1744</sup>Ms o reads the infinitive ל'שלוט, 'to use force'.

<sup>1745</sup>Literally: to stretch out their hand to rule over the priests of the LORD. The image of a sword reigning in a person means using force and killing someone, cf. also above, tosefta-targum on 1 Sam. 17:43, strophe III.4.

<sup>1746</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 27; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 23-24. Against Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 94.

<sup>1747</sup>Cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 98, "tales eos fuisse qui utique digni et idonei

22 19 וית נוב קריית־ה' כהניא מחא<sup>1748</sup> לפתגם דחרב<sup>1749</sup> מגבר ועד אתא מעולים  
ועד יניק ותור וחמר ואמר<sup>1750</sup> לפתגם דחרב: 22 20 ואשתויב־ ברא חד לאחימלך  
בר אחיטוב ושמיא אביתר וערק<sup>1751</sup> בחר דויד: 22 21 וחוי אביתר לדוד ארי קטל  
שאל ית כהניא דווי: 22 22 ואמר דוד לאביתר ידענא ביומא ההוא ארי חמן דואג<sup>1752</sup>  
אדומאא ארי חואה יחוי לשאול ואנא גרמית לאסתקפא<sup>1753</sup> בכל נפש<sup>1754</sup> בית אבוך:

22:19 *And Nob, the city of the priests, he struck by means of the sword, from men to women, from children to sucklings, oxen, asses and sheep, by means of the sword. 22:20 But one son of Ahimelech the son of Ahitub, named Abiathar, escaped and fled after David. 22:21 And Abiathar told David that Saul had killed the priests of the LORD. 22:22 And David said to Abiathar, "I knew on that day, when Doeg the Edomite was there, that he would surely tell Saul. I have occasioned that he fell upon every soul of your father's house.*

Three ancient versions regarded this verse as an acknowledgment by David that he was responsible for the death of the priestly family. LXX and Syr used the word "guilt" as a translation of Hebrew סבה<sup>1755</sup>. On account of these translations many exegetes propose to emend the word to חבתי, rendering the phrase with "I am guilty with regard to the lives of your father's house".<sup>1756</sup> A slightly different translation is given in TJon, using the verb גרם, 'to cause'. Although in mediaeval Hebrew the verb סבה could also mean "cause",<sup>1757</sup> there is no evidence that this meaning was already in use in the times of the Targumists. Consequently, TJon adopted the extant explanation that David acknowledged his guilt with regard to the destruction of Nob and the assassination of the priestly family. Meanwhile, TJon also maintains the meaning of Hebrew סבב by adding the verb לאסתקפא, 'to fall over someone, to throw oneself on someone'.<sup>1758</sup>

essent ad portandum ephod".

<sup>1748</sup>Mss b f read קטל, 'he killed'.

<sup>1749</sup>For the expression דחרב לפתגם, see commentary on 1 Sam. 15:8.

<sup>1750</sup>MS a adds a second מחא, 'he struck'.

<sup>1751</sup>Omitted in MS eb1\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1752</sup>According to the Qere, several Hebrew MSS and Syr, as in 22:18. Only MS eb1 is reading according to the Ketib.

<sup>1753</sup>MS m erroneously reads לאסתקפא, 'to overflow'.

<sup>1754</sup>Omitted in MS o; MS a adds אנש, 'man'.

<sup>1755</sup>LXX renders ἐγὼ εἰμι αἴτιος, 'I am guilty', followed by Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:270; while Syr uses the Ethpeel of the verb סבב, viz. אֲסַבֵּב.

<sup>1756</sup>So Driver, *Notes*, 182, quoting O. Thenius, "Die Bücher Samuelis", in: *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, 1842; J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*, Göttingen 1871; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 363.

<sup>1757</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 182; Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 27.

<sup>1758</sup>Cf. P.A.H. de Boer, "Research into the Text of 1 Samuel xviii-xxxi", *OTS* 6 (1949), 1-100, esp. 43.

22 23 חיב עמי לא תרחל ארי דבעי למקטלי<sup>1759</sup> בעי למקטלך ארי נטיר את עמי:  
*22:23 Stay with me, fear not, for he that seeks to kill me, seeks to kill you, for you will keep yourself hidden with me.*

## 5.22 Saul Hunting David (1 Samuel 23)

1 23 וחויאו לדויד למימר הא פלשתאי מגיחין קרבא בקעילה ואנון<sup>1760</sup> בזוין ית אדריא: 2 23 ושאל דויד במימרא<sup>1761</sup> דיוי למימר<sup>1761</sup> האיזיל ואקטול<sup>1762</sup> בפלשתאי האלין ואמר יי לדוד איזיל ותקטול בפלשתאי ותפרוק<sup>1763</sup> ית<sup>1763</sup> קעילה: 3 23 ואמרו גברי דויד ליה הא כד אנחנא הכא בארעא דבית<sup>1764</sup> יהודה<sup>1764</sup> אנחנא<sup>1765</sup> דחלין ואף אלהין דניזיל לקעילה לסדרי פלשתאי: 4 23 ואוסיף עוד דויד למשאל במימרא<sup>1766</sup> דיוי וקביל<sup>1766</sup> צלותיה יי ואמר קום חות לקעילה ארי אנא מסר<sup>1766</sup> ית פלשתאי בידך: 5 23 ואזל דויד וגברוהי<sup>1767</sup> לקעילה ואניח קרבא בפלשתאי ודבר<sup>1767</sup> ית ניחיהון ומחא בהון מחא סניאה ופרק<sup>1767</sup> דוד ית יחבי קעילה: 6 23 והוה כד ערק<sup>1767</sup> אביחא בר אחימלך לות דויד לקעילה איפורא אחית בידיה:

*23:1 Now they told David, "Behold, the Philistines are waging battle in Keilah, and they are robbing the threshing floors." 23:2 So David inquired of the speech of the LORD, saying, "Shall I go and kill among these Philistines?" And the LORD said to David, "Go and kill among the Philistines and save Keilah." 23:3 But David's men said to him, "Behold, now we are here in the land of the House of Judah, we are [constantly] afraid. How much more if we go to Keilah, to the ranks of the Philistines!" 23:4 Then David inquired of the speech of the LORD again. And the LORD received his prayer and said, "Arise, go down to Keilah, for I will surrender the Philistines into your hand." 23:5 And David and his men went to Keilah and waged battle with the Philistines. He took their herd and made a great strike among them. So David saved the inhabitants of Keilah. 23:6 When Abiathar the son of Ahimelech had fled to David to Keilah, he had brought the ephod down in his hand.*

<sup>1759</sup>See commentary on 20:1.

<sup>1760</sup>Mss b c read וְהָא אֵינָן, 'and behold, they'.

<sup>1761</sup>Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>1762</sup>Ms f reads וְאִימַחֵי, 'and shall I strike', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1763</sup>Mss b c f add יַחְבֵּי, 'inhabitants', in accordance with the usual vocabulary (>15) and with 23:5 (>15).

<sup>1764</sup>Against the usual Targumic vocabulary, MS f reads only בִּיהוּדָה, 'in Judah', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1765</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1766</sup>Ms m joins מסר and the following nota accusativi together and reads מִסְרִיָּה, 'I surrender'.

<sup>1767</sup>Plural according to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and other ancient versions.

The Hebrew Qal ירד, which would result in the translation that “the ephod went down in his hand”, is read as a Hiphil. Consequently, Abiathar is the subject of the verb (cf. also LXX).

7 23 ואתחזה לשאול ארי אחזא דויד לקעילה ואמר שאול מסר יהיה יוֹיִ בְיַדִּי אַרִי נחמסר<sup>1768</sup> למיעל בקרחא דלה דשין ועברין;

23:7 *Now it was told Saul that David had come to Keilah. And Saul said, “The LORD has surrendered him into my hand, for we are surrendered to enter a town that has gates and bars.”*

Hebrew נכר, ‘he made false pretences, stole’, is translated according to the usual vocabulary, “he is surrendered” (>15).<sup>1769</sup> It could have been read as סכר ביד, a rare equivalent of the usual expression סגר ביד (>1).<sup>1770</sup>

The last sentence of the present verse seems to refer to Saul and his men, and not to David.<sup>1771</sup> Aramaic נחמסר seems to be a Itpeel 1st pl., so that Saul and his men were destined to go to the town with gates and bars, indicating that God (*passivum divinum*) gave Saul and his men the opportunity to surround the city including David and his men. Some manuscripts, however, regarded Hebrew נסגר as a Niphal pf. 3rd sg. and rendered אַתְּמַסֵּר. In these manuscripts the verb refers to David, saying that he is surrendered to enter a town in which he can be surrounded by Saul and his men.

The two genitives at the end of this verse (cf. GKC § 128a) are rendered in a separate dependent clause.

8 23 וכנש שאול יה<sup>1772</sup> כל עמא לאנחא קרבא למיחת לקעילה למצר על דויד ועל גברויה:

23:8 *And Saul gathered all the people to wage war, to go down to Keilah, to besiege David and his men.*

<sup>1768</sup>MSS a o y read the 3rd person singular אַתְּמַסֵּר, ‘he is surrendered’, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1769</sup>Likewise in Symmachus, Syr and Vg. But LXX seems to have read מכר, ‘he sold’, as in 12:9; or the translator assessed נכר as a form of מכר, cf. J. Barr, “Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew Among the Ancient Translators”, in: B. Hartmann *et al.* (eds), *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner* (VT.S, 16), Leiden 1967, 1-11, esp. 10.

<sup>1770</sup>Suggested by Driver, *Notes*, 184; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 369. The verb סכר is used in Isa. 19:4, where it is also rendered by מסר.

<sup>1771</sup>The Hebrew verb can be interpreted as a Niphal pf. 3rd person sg. If that is true, the Hebrew text states that David shut himself in by entering (cf. GKC § 114o) a town with gates and a bar.

<sup>1772</sup>Omitted in MS eb1\*, but added later.

Hebrew Piel וישמע, 'he made hear', is translated according to its intrinsic meaning (>14), that Saul announced to gather together. LXX renders likewise.

9 23 וידע דויד ארי עלוהי שאול כמין<sup>1773</sup> בשחא ואמר לאביתר כהנא קריב איפודא:  
10 23 ואמר דויד יוי אלהא ד ישראל משמע שמע עבדך ארי בעי שאול למיעל  
לקעילה לחבלא לקרחא בדילי: 11 23 הסבירין לממסרי יתבי קעילה בידיה הסביר  
למיחת שאול<sup>1774</sup> כמא דשמע עבדך יוי אלהא ד ישראל חוי כען לעבדך ואמר יוי  
סביר למיחת:

*23:9 When David learnt that Saul was plotting evil against him, he said to Abiathar the priest, "Bring the ephod near." 23:10 Then said David, "O LORD, God of Israel, thy servant has surely heard that Saul seeks to come to Keilah, to destroy the town on my account. 23:11 Are the inhabitants of Keilah planning to surrender me into his hand? Is Saul planning to come down, as thy servant has heard? O LORD, God of Israel, tell now thy servant!" And the LORD said, "He is planning to come down."*

Additions were made in accordance with the direct context, for Saul did not come down to Keilah, and the inhabitants of Keilah did not surrender David (cf. 23:13). TJon adds the verb סבר, 'to plan, to think' in both sentences (cf. also 23:12).<sup>1775</sup>

Throughout TJon,<sup>1776</sup> Hebrew בעלי is rendered by יתבי, 'inhabitants', where it does not denote the god Baal, part of a place-name,<sup>1777</sup> or an individual.<sup>1778</sup> "Hence the translation reflects the idea of 'landowner, inhabitant', though TJon alters the scope of the expression, because it not only includes the wealthy officials and landowners, but all the common people."<sup>1779</sup>

12 23 ואמר דויד הסבירין<sup>1780</sup> לממסר<sup>1781</sup> יתבי<sup>1782</sup> קעילה יתי ויה גברי בידא

<sup>1773</sup>Rashi adds the nota accusativi יה.

<sup>1774</sup>Omitted in MS o.

<sup>1775</sup>Cf. Komlosch, *המקרא באור התרגום*, 327. This resembles the instances of Gen. 37:33; 42:13; 42:36; 43:14, which M.L. Klein, "Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique", *Bib.* 57 (1976), 515-37 called "Converse Translation".

<sup>1776</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 519. In the Books of Samuel this rendering occurs in 1 Sam. 23:11, 12; 2 Sam. 21:12. In 2 Sam. 6:2 the word is translated with "villages", because the text speaks of the *ba'ale* of Judah.

<sup>1777</sup>In that event it is rendered by מישרא, 'valley'; see Ch. 4, *s.v.* ארמאית מישרא.

<sup>1778</sup>In that event it is rendered by מרא. Not occurring in the Books of Samuel.

<sup>1779</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 519. Cf. HALAT<sup>3</sup>, *s.v.* בעל; Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 27.

<sup>1780</sup>See commentary on the preceding verse 23:11.

<sup>1781</sup>Mss a b f m y eb1 add a suffix 1st sg., as in 23:11 (>15).

<sup>1782</sup>See commentary on the preceding verse 23:11.

דשאל ואמר יוי סבירין לממסר: 23 13 וקם דויד וגברוהי כשיה מאה גברא ונפקו מקעילה והליכו באתר דכשר להלכא ולשאל אחוהא ארי אשתויב דויד מקעילה ואחמנע מלמפק:

23:12 Then David said, "Are the inhabitants of Keilah planning to surrender me and my men into the hand of Saul?" And the LORD said, "They are planning to surrender you." 23:13 Then David and his men—about six hundred men—arose and departed from Keilah, and they went to every place that was fit to go to. When Saul was told that David had escaped from Keilah, he withdrew from going out.

The double use of the Hitpael of the Hebrew verb הלך, "they wandered where they wandered", is translated in line with the co-text: "they went to every place that was fit to go to". In 2 Sam. 15:20 this double use—of the Qal—is similarly rendered, "And I am going to the place, from which I do not know I am going to".<sup>1783</sup>

23 14 ויחיב דויד במדברא במצדתא<sup>1784</sup> ויחיב בשורא במדברא דזיף ובעיה שאול כל יומיא ולא מסריה יוי ד בידיה: 23 15 וחזא דויד ארי נפק שאול למבעי למקטליה<sup>1785</sup> ודויד במדברא דזיף בחרשא: 23 16 וקם יהונתן בר שאול ואול לות דויד לחרשא ותקיף<sup>1786</sup> ית ידיה במימרא דיוי: 23 17 ואמר ליה לא תדחל ארי לא תשכונך ידא דשאל אבא ואת תמלוך<sup>1787</sup> על ישראל ואנא אחוי לך לתנין ואף שאול אבא ידע כין: 23 18 וגזרו תרויהון קים קדם ד יוי ויחיב דויד בחורשא ויהונתן אול לביתיה<sup>1788</sup>: 23 19 וסליקו אנש זיף לות שאול לגבעתא ד למימר הלא דויד משמר עמנא במצדתא דחורשא בגבעתא ד חכילה דמדרום לשימון<sup>1789</sup>: 23 20 וכען בכל רעות נפשך מלכא למיחת חות ואנחנא נמסרניה<sup>1790</sup> ביד מלכא: 23 21 ואמר שאול בריכין אתון קדם יוי ארי חסתון עלי: 23 22 איזילו כען אחקינן<sup>1791</sup> עוד ודעו וחזו ית אחריה דשרי ביה מן חוהי תמן ארי<sup>1792</sup> אמרין לי דערים ונפיק הוא:

23:14 And David dwelt in the strongholds in the desert, in the hill country of the Desert of Ziph. And Saul sought him all the days, but the LORD did not surrender him into his hand. 23:15 And David saw

<sup>1783</sup> Cf. Komlosch, התרנם באור התרנם, 324. The latter translation agrees with the translation of Vg, "vagabantur incerti".

<sup>1784</sup> Ms eb1 reads the masculine plural בימצדיא.

<sup>1785</sup> See commentary on 20:1. Omitted in MSS b d f eb1. Ms o reads למבעיה, 'to seek him'.

<sup>1786</sup> Ms eb1 reads the Aphel ואחקיף.

<sup>1787</sup> Ms f reads תהי מלכא, 'you will be king'.

<sup>1788</sup> Ms o and Kimḥi read לאורחיה, 'on his way', as do several Hebrew MSS.

<sup>1789</sup> Ms f<sub>2</sub> reads למדברא, resulting in "which is south of the desert".

<sup>1790</sup> Ms a returns to the construction of the Hebrew text and renders ועלא למימסריה, 'and our part shall be to surrender him'.

<sup>1791</sup> Ms f<sub>3</sub> preserves a free rendering, viz. ואיהבררו, 'be [more] specific'; cf. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 30.

<sup>1792</sup> Omitted in MS eb1.

that Saul had come out to seek to kill him. David was in the Desert of Ziph, at The Wood<sup>1793</sup>. 23:16 And Jonathan, Saul's son, rose and went to David at The Wood, and strengthened his hand in the speech of the LORD. 23:17 And he said to him, "Fear not; for the hand of Saul my father shall not find you. You shall be king over Israel, and I shall be next to you. Saul my father also knows this." 23:18 And the two of them made a covenant before the LORD. And David dwelt in The Wood, while Jonathan went home. 23:19 Then the men of Ziph went up to Saul at The Hill, saying, "Does not David hide among us in the strongholds of The Wood, on the hill of Hachilah, which is south of Jeshimon<sup>1794</sup>?" 23:20 And now, come down according to all your heart's desire, O king, and we shall surrender him into the king's hand. 23:21 And Saul said, "Blessed be you before the LORD, for you have had compassion on me." 23:22 Go now and make more sure. Know and see the place where he dwells. Who saw him there? For they say that he is cunning and moving.

The Hebrew combination of the infinitive absolute and the finite form of the verb ערם is, against the usual translational style, rendered by two different words (> 18). First, the literal meaning is maintained by the rendering ערים, 'he is cunning'; and secondly, an explanation of David's cunning is given in accordance with the following verse, viz. that David is going forth from his hiding place. He is moving around and cannot be easily found (23:23).<sup>1795</sup>

23 23 וחזו ודעו מכל<sup>1796</sup> מטמוריתא דיטמר<sup>1797</sup> תמן ותחובון לוחי בקשוט ואהך עמכון ויהי אם איתוהי בארעא ואבליש יתיה בכל אלפיא דביח<sup>1798</sup> יהודה: 23 24 וקמו ואזלו לזיף לקדם<sup>1798</sup> שאול ודויד וגברוהי במדברא דמעון במשרא<sup>1798</sup> דמדרום לישמון<sup>1798</sup>: 23 25 ואזל שאול וגברוהי למבעי וחויאו לדויד ונחה לכיפא ויתבי במדברא דמעון ושמע שאול ורדף בחר דויד למדברא דמעון: 23 26 ואזל שאול מסטר שורא מכה דויד וגברוהי מסטר שורא מכה והוה דוד מתבעית למיזל מן קדם<sup>1798</sup> שאול ושאל

<sup>1793</sup>Supposing that חרשא is a place-name, e.g. Khirbet Khoreisa, which is approximately 2 miles from Tell Ziph; cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 374.

<sup>1794</sup>"Desolation, wilderness" in Hebrew, but TJon did not translate the name.

<sup>1795</sup>In TO Exod. 21:14 the noun ערמה is rendered by נכילוהא, a negative word meaning "cunning", while TJon Josh. 9:4 renders it by the positive word אהמכח, 'wisdom'; cf. the positive and negative sense of this word in J. Halbe, "Gibeon und Israel: Art, Veranlassung und Ort der Deutung ihres Verhältnisses in Jos. ix", VT 25 (1975), 613-41, esp. 625, n. 72.

<sup>1796</sup>Mss w eb1 correct the strange use of the preposition מן by rendering בכל.

<sup>1797</sup>Mss f reads the participle רמטמר, 'he is hiding', while MSS b o read the perfect רמטמר, 'where he hid'.

<sup>1798</sup>MS f<sub>2</sub> reads למדברא, 'to the desert', as it did in 23:19.



ונברוהי כמנין<sup>1799</sup> על דויד ועל גברוהי למיחרוהו: 27 23 ואונרא<sup>1800</sup> אתא לוח שאול למימר אחי ואיזיל ארי אתגנדו פלשתאי על ארעא: 28 23 ותב שאול מלמרדף בחר דויד ואזל לקדמוה פלשתאי על כין קרו<sup>1801</sup> לאחרא ההוא כיף פלגוחא אחרא דאתפליג ביה לבא דמלכא<sup>1802</sup> למיזל לכא ולכא:

23:23 See then and learn to know any<sup>1803</sup> of the hiding places where he hides, and return to me with truth. Then I will go with you, and if he is in the land, I will search him out among all the thousands<sup>1804</sup> of Judah." 23:24 And they arose and went to Ziph, ahead of Saul. Now David and his men were in the Desert of Maon, in the valley to the south of Jeshimon. 23:25 When Saul and his men went to seek him, David was told and he went down to the rock and dwelt in the Desert of Maon. And when Saul heard that, he pursued after David in the Desert of Maon. 23:26 Saul went on one side of the mountain and David and his men on the other side of the mountain. And David was anxious to get away from Saul, as Saul and his men were lying in wait against David and against his men to capture them. 23:27 Then a messenger came to Saul, saying, "Make haste and come, for the Philistines have marched out against the land!" 23:28 So Saul returned from pursuing after David, and went against the Philistines. Therefore they called the place Rock of Divisions, the place where the heart of the king was divided to go here or there.

TJon adds a reasonable explanation for Hebrew מחלקוה, 'divisions, sections'. There were two sections in Saul's heart, one wanted to pursue David, while another realized that the attack of the Philistines was more urgent.<sup>1805</sup> A similar explanation is given by R. Samuel b. Nahmani (MTeh. 18:7), although he explains the word "divisions" more literally as the divisions of Saul's army:<sup>1806</sup>

<sup>1799</sup>Instead of על דויד על כמנין MS f<sub>2</sub> suggests to read מקפין לדויד, 'circling around to David', which is in conformity with the meaning of the Hebrew verb עטר (>29).

<sup>1800</sup>Ms eb1 reads the plural ואיזנרא.

<sup>1801</sup>MS w reads the singular קרא, 'he called'.

<sup>1802</sup>Kimḥi adds שאול.

<sup>1803</sup>The word מכל may mean "any of", although it is rather out of place here. Several MSS read בכל, resulting in "learn to know of all the hiding places."

<sup>1804</sup>Although TJon Judg. 6:15 renders Hebrew אלף by זרעיהא, 'family, clan', it is equated with אלפא in the present verse, as well as in 15:6 and Mic. 5:1.

<sup>1805</sup>This explanation is also found in Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:281, "judging it more imperative to fight against them [the Philistines] than, through his zeal to capture his personal enemy, to leave the land to be ravaged".

<sup>1806</sup>In the Hebrew Bible מחלקוה is indeed used to denote divisions of a large group, e.g. the division of Israel according to their tribes (Josh. 11:23) and the division of the priests and the Levites (1 Chron. 23:6).

The soldiers of Saul were discussing about David. One division said, "As long as we do not capture the son of Jesse, we will not leave." Another division had the opinion, "The battle of Israel is more urgent, for we can find the son of Jesse another time."

### 5.23 David Spares Saul I (1 Samuel 24)

24 1 וסליק דוד מחמן ויחיב במצדה<sup>1807</sup> עין גדי: 24 2 והוה כד תב שאול מבחר פלשתאי וחויאו ליה למימר הא דויד במרבר עין גדי: 24 3 ודברר  $\diamond$  שאול תלחא אלפין גבר עולים מכל ישראל ואול למבעי ית דויד וגברוהי על אפי שקיפי כיפיא:

*24:1 And David went up from there and dwelt in the stronghold of En-gedi. 24:2 When Saul returned from pursuing after the Philistines, they told him, "Behold, David is in the Desert of En-gedi." 24:3 Then Saul took three thousand young men from all Israel and went to seek David and his men superficially<sup>1808</sup> in the clefts of the rocks.*

The last Hebrew words, צורי היעלים, mean "the rocks of the mountain goats". Since Saul had nothing to do with mountain goats, TJon assumes that he sought in the clefts of the rocks. The men of David—and David himself—could be hidden in these clefts.<sup>1809</sup> This rendering may be based on Jer. 16:16, where both in Hebrew and in Aramaic the hunters are searching "every mountain and every hill and out of the clefts of the rocks".<sup>1810</sup>

24 4 ואחא לחטרי ענא דעל אורחא ותמן<sup>1811</sup> מערתא ועל שאול למעבר צורכיה ודויד וגברוהי בסיפי מערתא יתבין: 24 5 ואמרו גברי דויד ליה הא יומא<sup>1812</sup> דאמר יי לך הא אנא מסר ית בעל<sup>1813</sup> דבבך  $\diamond$  בידך ותעביד ליה כמא דתקינ  $\diamond$  בעינך וקם דויד ופסק ית כנף מעילא דלשאול ברז: 24 6 והוה בתר כין וחש דויד בלביה על דפסק ית כנפא דלשאול:

<sup>1807</sup> Ms y vocalizes it as a plural, while MS eb1 reads the Hebrew plural במצודה.

<sup>1808</sup> Literally: on the surface of the clefts.

<sup>1809</sup> The same rendering is used in 13:6, where the Israelites are hiding for the Philistines.

<sup>1810</sup> Vg combines the translation of TJon with the notion of the mountain goats: "super abruptissimas petras quae solis ibicibus perviae sunt"; cf. F. Stummer, "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas", *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, esp. 11.

<sup>1811</sup> Ms a reads ותמן, 'and behold, there'.

<sup>1812</sup> Ms eb1 adds דין, 'this'.

<sup>1813</sup> Singular in accordance with the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

24:4 And he came to the sheepfolds that were by the road, where there was a cave. And Saul went in to relieve himself,<sup>1814</sup> while David and his men were dwelling in the innermost parts of the cave. 24:5 And the men of David said to him, "Here is the day of which the LORD said to you, 'Behold, I will surrender your enemy into your hand, and you shall do to him as it shall be right in your sight.'" Then David arose and stealthily cut off the hem of Saul's robe. 24:6 And afterward David was troubled in his heart, because he had cut off Saul's hem.

TJon renders the Hebrew phrase "and David's heart smote him" by the more clear and precise "and David was troubled in his heart" (>11; >14). The meaning of the Hebrew phrase can be established from 2 Sam. 24:10, where it is clear that David regrets his deeds. A variant reading in the margin of CR explains it with the verb רתח, 'and he regretted'.<sup>1815</sup> These verbs, describing feelings of trouble and remorse, may indicate that the translator felt that the cutting of Saul's hem had a hidden meaning. The following verse links the cutting of the hem strongly with a proposed attack on Saul's life, especially in the Aramaic translation. This translation can best be explained by assuming that TJon interpreted the cutting of Saul's hem as David's attempt to take away Saul's official status as the king of Israel.<sup>1816</sup> This interpretation also fits best into the order of the narrative, since David only persuaded his men after this deed that it was not good to attack the LORD's anointed. The cutting of the hem seems to be the direct result of the men's proposal to attack their enemy, viz. Saul.<sup>1817</sup> Cutting off a personal attribute like the hem of Saul's garment demonstrated to all his men that David had control over Saul's personality.<sup>1818</sup> In the Ancient Near East this was an act of psycho-robbery which explains David's remorse.

7 ואמר לגברוהי חס לי מן קדם יי אם אעביד ית פתגמא הדין לרבני  
למשיחא דיין לאושטא ידי ביה<sup>1820</sup> ארי משיחא דיין הוא: 24 8 ופיס דויד ית גברוהי

<sup>1814</sup>While the Hebrew text uses the euphemism "to cover his feet", TJon uses the euphemism "to do what he needed to do" (>14); cf. TgJudg. 3:24.

<sup>1815</sup>Likewise Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:284, who reads "repenting".

<sup>1816</sup>Cf. D. Conrad, "Samuel und die Mari-'Propheten': Bemerkungen zu 1 Sam 15:27", W. Voight (ed.), *XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag ZDMG Suppl. 1*, Vol. 1, Wiesbaden 1969, 273-80. See above, commentary on 15:27.

<sup>1817</sup>Against Driver, *Notes*, 193, who assumed it logical to transpose 5<sup>b</sup>-6 so as to follow verse 8.

<sup>1818</sup>Cf. A. Malamat, *Mari and the Bible* (SHANE, 12), Leiden 1998, 77-79, 100-101.

<sup>1819</sup>Ms a reads מלמחשי, resulting in "far be it from me to sin before the LORD"; adopted from 1 Sam. 12:23 (>15).

<sup>1820</sup>Ms f reads במלכא, 'against the king'.

בפתגמיא ולא שבקנון למקם על שאול ושאול קם ממערתא ואול באורחא:

24:7 *And he said to his men, "Far be it from me—from before the LORD—that I should do this thing to my lord, the LORD's anointed, to stretch out my hand against him, for he is the LORD's anointed." 24:8 So David calmed down his men with these words, and did not permit them to attack Saul. And Saul rose up from the cave and went upon the road.*

Hebrew Piel וישסע, 'and he tore up', can hardly be brought in harmony with its context unless it is explained as figurative for a phrase like "and David rent his men with his words".<sup>1821</sup> He "must have expressed himself with singular violence, and in terms which would be suitable rather to an abusive and malicious attack by words".<sup>1822</sup> This figurative tearing of his men would explain various ancient versions. Only Vg translates rather literally with *confregit*, 'he smashed'. LXX and TJon both used the same word, *i.e.* ἔπεισεν and יפייס,<sup>1823</sup> implying that David calmed down his men, a rather euphemistic and sparing translation (>24). Syr rendered that David made his men regret their proposal, while Theodotion explains that David talked them over.<sup>1824</sup> Ms f<sub>3</sub>, remaining within the Aramaic tradition, suggested ושדל, 'and he persuaded'.

24 9 וקם דויד בתר כין ונפק מן מערתא וקרא בתר שאול למימר רבוני מלכא ואסתחי שאול לאחורוהי וכרע דויד על אפוהי על ארעא וסגיד: 24 10 ואמר דויד לשאול למא את<sup>1825</sup> שמע ית פתגמי בני אנשא דאמרין<sup>1826</sup> הא דויד כמין<sup>1827</sup> בשתך:

24:9 *Afterward David also arose and went out of the cave. He called after Saul, saying, "My lord the king!" And when Saul looked behind him, David knelt down with his face to the ground and he bowed down. 24:10 And David said to Saul, "Why are you listening to the words of the sons of man who are saying, 'David is lying in wait for your ruin'?"*

TJon repeatedly uses the verb כמן to denote the plotting of evil against

<sup>1821</sup>Cf. HALAT<sup>3</sup>, *s.v.*

<sup>1822</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 193.

<sup>1823</sup>Brown regards the Aramaic verb as a Greek loan-word, cf. J.P. Brown, "The Septuagint as a Source of the Greek Loan-words in the Targums", *Bib.* 70 (1989), 194-216, esp. 214.

<sup>1824</sup>Cf. P.A.H. de Boer, "Research into the Text of 1 Samuel xviii-xxxi", *OTS* 6 (1949), 1-100, esp. 53.

<sup>1825</sup>Omitted in MS eb76, which reads השמע instead of the following שמע.

<sup>1826</sup>Omitted in MS eb76\*, but it is added later. MS f reads למימר, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1827</sup>Mss m y eb76 read בעי, 'he is seeking', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

another person. Up to this verse it is used for the reprehensible conduct of Amalek (15:2) and for Saul's treatment of David (18:9; 23:9, 26; cf. also 24:12). Since the Hebrew text uses all kinds of verbs for Saul's behaviour, TJon's choice for the verb כָּמַן seems to be a severe rejection of Saul's conduct. Furthermore, Saul was accusing David to make the same ambushes for him (22:8, 13; 24:10).<sup>1828</sup> By this consistent choice of words TJon slightly shifts the meaning of the present verse. David now asked why Saul was accusing him of what Saul had been doing all the time himself.<sup>1829</sup>

24 11 הא יומא הדין חזאה עינך ית דמסרך יי יומא דין בידי במערתא ואמרו אחרנין  
למקטלך וחסיית עלך ואמרית<sup>1830</sup> לא אושיט ידי ברבוני ♦ ארי משיחא דיזי הוא:

24:11 *Behold, this day your eyes are seeing how the LORD surrendered you today into my hand in the cave. And others said to kill you, but I spared you and I said, 'I will not stretch out my hand against my lord, for he is the LORD's anointed.'*

Hebrew וְהָיָה לְיָדָיו וְהָיָה לְיָדָיו, which is vocalized in the MT as “and he said to kill you, but she spared you”, causes problems for exegetes and translators alike. A literal translation would seem to imply that the LORD gave Saul into David's hand and said to David that he must kill Saul, because the LORD is the subject of the preceding sentence.<sup>1831</sup> For that reason TJon adds a different subject, the unspecified “they”.

Most ancient translations emended the text according to the preceding narrative (>16) and translated “they said to kill you”, referring to David's men,<sup>1832</sup> and that “I spared you”, referring to David him-

<sup>1828</sup>Note that also Absalom's conduct is described with the same verb in 2 Sam. 13:32; 15:14.

<sup>1829</sup>This translation gives evidence of an unexpected psychological insight in Saul's conduct. He was persecuting and plotting against the person whom he accused of persecution and plots, which is a typical symptom of paranoia. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.v. “mental diseases”, gives the following description of paranoiac behaviour: “The paranoiac feels persecuted or imagines plots and conspiracies organized against him or against parts of society with which he identifies. At times the person sees himself as a saviour of society whose mission it is to unmask the obscure plotting of clandestine agencies. The paranoiac becomes so sure of the validity of his beliefs that he may go to the extent of killing the alleged persecutors.”

<sup>1830</sup>Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>1831</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 28.

<sup>1832</sup>While Syr adds plural **ܕܘܢܐܘܢܐ**, ‘the men of my people’, TJon adds “others”. LXX adds a negation and renders “I did not want to kill you” (>27). Josephus solves the problem by describing how one man espied Saul and tried to persuade David to take revenge; cf. *Antiquities*, 6:284.

self.<sup>1833</sup> The latter translation is based on the fact that the verb חוס is usually construed with עיני, ‘my eye’ (cf. Deut. 7:16). The present expression is therefore regarded as an ellipse.<sup>1834</sup> Only Vg translates exactly according to the Hebrew consonantal text, albeit with a different vocalization of ואמר (>3) and complementing the ellipse, “and I thought to kill you, but my eye spared you”.

TJon’s depiction of David as the one who spared Saul but not as the one who had the idea to kill him, agrees with the tendency to treat Biblical heroes as respectfully as possible (>24). However, David would not have been trespassing halakhic rules if he had killed Saul. It is permitted to kill in order to avoid being killed (Ber. 62b; San. 72b; Yom. 85b).<sup>1835</sup>

TJon’s rendering is contradicted by rabbis who stress the feminine inflection of the verb “spare”. They say that not David spared Saul, but it was his own modesty that made him being spared (ySan. 2:4; NumR. 4:20). Even R. Eliezer, who reads “I spare”, does not agree with TJon’s exegesis, for he interprets both verbs as being in the first person singular, “I said to destroy you, but I spared you” (Ber. 62b). Resh Lakish has an identical explanation: “my heart said at first to kill you, but my soul spared you”.<sup>1836</sup> This explanation resulted in the rendering of Vg.

12 24 ורבוני אסתכל<sup>1837</sup> אף חזי ית כנף מעילך<sup>1838</sup> בידי ארי במפסקי ית כנף מעילך ולא קטלתך דע וחזי ארי לית בידי חובב וסרחן ולא חטיה<sup>1839</sup> לך ואת כמין על נפשי למקטלי:

*24:12 Look, my lord! Yea, see the hem of your robe in my hand! For by the fact that I cut off the hem of your robe and did not kill you, you may know and see that there is neither guilt nor transgression in my hand. I have not sinned against you, though you are lying in wait against my life in order to kill me.*

Hebrew **אב** is considered figurative language for someone’s master, cf. 10:11, although 24:17 maintains Saul’s appellation “my son”.

<sup>1833</sup>So in LXX, Syr and TJon. Kimḥi maintains the Hebrew consonants by translating נפשי, ‘my soul spared’.

<sup>1834</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 194.

<sup>1835</sup>So Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 28.

<sup>1836</sup>Cited by Komlosh, *המקרא באור התרגום*, 299.

<sup>1837</sup>A similar diversification is attested in Syr, cf. Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung*, 75, “Sie wollte nich zweimal dasselbe Wort setzen”.

<sup>1838</sup>Ms eb1 omitted the words between בידי מעילך by haplography.

<sup>1839</sup>Ms f reads חטיה, ‘I am guilty’, in accordance with the usual Aramaic vocabulary (>15). Ms o reads סטיה, ‘I am unfaithful’.

24 13 ידין יוי<sup>1840</sup> בינא ובינך ויתפרע יוי<sup>1841</sup> לי מנך וידי לא תהי בך: 24 14 כמא  
דאמרין מתלא<sup>1842</sup> מלקדמין מרשיעיא תפוק חובתהון<sup>1843</sup> וידי לא תהי בך:

*24:13 May the LORD judge between me and you. May the LORD avenge me on you. But my hand shall not be against you. 24:14 Just as they say the proverb of old times, 'Out of the wicked comes forth their guilt,' my hand shall not be against you.*

TJon slightly adapted the ancient proverb to the usual vocabulary by introducing the word "guilt". That guilt was defined with a complemented suffix as the guilt of the wicked. The personal הקדמני, which most probably must be read as הקדמנים, as in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, is rendered by an impersonal מלקדמין, 'of old times'.

24 15 בחר מן נפק מלכא דישראל<sup>1844</sup> אחר מן נפק מלכא דישראל  
בחר מן אח רדיך  
24 16 אחר חלש חר  
בחר הדיוש חר:

Not only the figurative language, but rather the offensive appellations led to TJon's explanatory translation. David simply called himself a weak person, as Gideon and Saul already did (cf. Judg. 6:15; 1 Sam. 9:21), and a common person. A similar rendering is also given concerning Abner (2 Sam. 3:8, cf. variant readings on 3:33) and Mephibosheth (2 Sam. 9:8). However, David's opponents Goliath and Shimei are called dogs both in the Hebrew and in the Aramaic text (1 Sam. 17:43; 2 Sam. 16:9).<sup>1843</sup>

24 16 ויהי ווי לדיון ויהי ווי לדיון  
ועביד<sup>1844</sup> דיין בינא ובינך  
וגלי קדמוהי<sup>1845</sup> דידין דיני<sup>1845</sup>  
that He judges my case  
ויתפרע עלבני מנך:

The poetical structure of the verses is maintained in 24:15-16. However, whereas the Hebrew text contains the synonyms ריב, שפט and דין, the Aramaic version only shows the repetition of the stem דין.

<sup>1840</sup>Omitted in MS c.

<sup>1841</sup>Omitted in MSS m eb1.

<sup>1842</sup>Ms o erroneously reads the plural מתליא.

<sup>1843</sup>So also Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 24; Vogel, *Sámuel elsö könyve*, 28; Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 11. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 46, n. 1, suggests that the difference in translation betrays a later redactional change.

<sup>1844</sup>Mss a c d o read the more suitable imperfect ויעביד.

<sup>1845</sup>Mss a f read וידין, 'and may He judge', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Ms o reads דינין, resulting in "the judges/judgments of my case".

The ending of the present verse is stated in more severe language than in the Hebrew text. The latter explains that David wished to be judged “out of your hand”, which can best be interpreted as “acquitted and released from your hand”.<sup>1846</sup> TJon has David asking for revenge on Saul.<sup>1847</sup>

17 24 והוה כד שיצי דויד למללא ית פתגמיא האלין עם שאול ואמר שאול הקלך דין ברי דויד וארים שאול קליה ובכא: 18 24 ואמר לדויד זכי ואת<sup>1848</sup> מני ארי את<sup>1849</sup> גמלתני שבתא ואנא גמלחך בשתא: 19 24 ואת חויהא יומא דין ית דעברתא עמי שיבו ית דמסרני יי בידך ולא קטלתני: 20 24 וארי ישכח גבר ית בעיל דבביה וישלחניה באורח תקנא וויי ישלמך שבתא חלף יומא הדין דעברת ליי: 21 24 וכען הא ידענא ארי<sup>1850</sup> ממלך תמלוך ותתקים בידך מלכותא דישראל: 22 24 וכען קיים לי במימרא דווי דלא חשיצי ית זרעי בתרי ולא חשיצי ית שמי מבית אבא: 23 24 וקיים דויד לשאול ואול שאול לביתה ודוד וגברוהי סליקו למצדיא<sup>1851</sup>:

*24:17 When David had finished speaking these words to Saul, Saul said, “Is this your voice, my son David?” And Saul lifted up his voice and wept. 24:18 He said to David, “You are more innocent than I, for you have repaid me good, whereas I have repaid you evil. 24:19 And you have told today how well you have dealt with me, in that you did not kill me when the LORD surrendered you into your hand. 24:20 For if a man finds his enemy, will he let him go on a right road? So may the LORD reward you with good for what you have done to me this day. 24:21 And now, behold, I know that you shall surely be king and that the kingdom of Israel shall be established in your hand. 24:22 Now swear to me by the speech of the LORD, that you will not destroy my seed after me and that you will not destroy my name out of my father’s house.” 24:23 And David swore this to Saul. Then Saul went home, but David and his men went up to the strongholds.*

## 5.24 David and Abigail (1 Samuel 25)

1 25 ומית שמואל ואתכנישו כל ישראל וספרו עלוהי וקברוהי בביתה ברמתא וקם דויד ונחת<sup>1852</sup> למדבר פארן: 2 25 וגברא במעון ונכסוהי בכרמלא וגברא<sup>1853</sup> רב לחרא וליה ען תלתא אלפין ואלף עזין והוה במגו ית עניה בכרמלא:

<sup>1846</sup>Likewise Driver, *Notes*, 194.

<sup>1847</sup>Against Smolar, Aberbach, who deny that TJon speaks about revenge, cf. *Targum Jonathan*, 147.

<sup>1848</sup>Omitted in MS o.

<sup>1849</sup>Omitted in MSS o eb1.

<sup>1850</sup>MS c reads הֵא, ‘behold’.

<sup>1851</sup>Plural, cf. 23:14, 19.

<sup>1852</sup>MS o reads ליה, ‘he went out’.

<sup>1853</sup>MS d reads the unusual ראינש.



25:1 Now Samuel died and all Israel gathered and mourned over him. And they buried him in his house at Ramah. Then David rose and went down to the Desert of Paran. 25:2 And there was a man in Maon, whose herds were in Carmel. The man was very rich<sup>1854</sup>: he had three thousand sheep and a thousand goats. And he was engaged in shearing his sheep in Carmel.

Just as Hebrew מלאכה can mean both work and the object of that work, so Hebrew מעשה is explained as the object of Nabal's work.<sup>1855</sup>

The notion that Nabal was a "great" man is translated literally, although the same notion was translated as "fearing sin" in describing the Shunammite woman (2 Kgs 4:8).<sup>1856</sup> It is likely that the literal translation of Hebrew גרול meant a condemnation of Nabal's person, as Smolar and Aberbach suggest.<sup>1857</sup> Barzilai is called "great" in the Aramaic version, while Barzilai is not spoken of with appreciation in rabbinic literature (cf. Shab. 152a). The notion of "fearing sin" is explained by R. Aqiba as a fence to humility (ARN<sup>b</sup> 26:1 (27b)).

וּבִישׁ עוֹבְרִין וְהוּא מְדַבֵּיחַ<sup>1858</sup> כָּלִבִּי  
 3 25 וּשְׁמוֹ גְּבֵרָא נָבַל וּשְׁמוֹ אֶחְזִיָּה אַבִּיגַיִל וְאַחְזָא חֲכִימָה מְדַע וּשְׁפִירָה רִיו וְגְבֵרָא קָשִׁי

25:3 Now the name of the man was Nabal and the name of his wife Abigail. The woman was wise in knowledge and beautiful of appearance, but the man was harsh and ill-behaved. And he was from the House of Caleb.

TJon reflects Qere כָּלְבִי, 'Calebite', which is represented by "from the House of Caleb".<sup>1859</sup> This is in agreement with 2 Chron. 2:42-49, where Maon is one of the settlements of the Calebites. LXX and Syr, however, imply that Nabal was behaving like a dog, which Josephus explained with "who lived according to the practices of the cynics" (*Antiquities* 6:296). The Ketib may have meant "and he was as his heart", indicating that his behaviour was as bad as his heart was.

<sup>1854</sup>Literally: great.

<sup>1855</sup>Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 28. The same explanation is found in LXX.

<sup>1856</sup>It must be noted that the Aramaic term "a man fearing sins" is the usual equivalent of Hebrew אִישׁ חָיִל (2 Sam. 23:20; 1 Kgs 1:42, 52; cf. also 1 Sam. 10:26).

<sup>1857</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 158.

<sup>1858</sup>Kimḥi reads מִזֵּרְעִיהָ, 'from the family'.

<sup>1859</sup>Also attested in Vg. Cf. MShem. 23: "What means כָּלְבִי? It means 'from the family of Caleb'." Likewise Kimḥi. Cf. F. Stummer, "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas", *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, esp. 11-12.

25 4 ושמע דויד במדברא ארי גוזי נבל ית עניה: 25 5 ושלא דויד עסרא עולימין ואמר דויד לעולימא סקן לכרמלא ותהכון<sup>1860</sup> לות נבל ותשאלון ליה בשמי לשלם: 25 6 ותמרון כדין לחיך ואח שלם וביתך שלם וכל דלך שלם:

25:4 David heard in the desert that Nabal was shearing his sheep. 25:5 So David sent ten young men and David said to the young men, "Go up to Carmel and go to Nabal and ask him concerning his well-being in my name. 25:6 And you shall say, 'Thus to your life: peace be to you, and peace be to your house, and peace be to all that you have.

Since Hebrew כה is always used at the beginning of a phrase, TJon understood it to be the beginning of the direct speech of the servants to Nabal. Hebrew לחי is interpreted as it is vocalized and accentuated in the Masoretic Text, but TJon adds the suffix 2nd m.sg. to clarify its meaning.<sup>1861</sup> The result of this rendering is a first statement, which is elaborated on in the following three phrases concerning peace to Nabal and his household. Other versions connect the phrase כה לחי with כעת חיה in Gen. 18:10, 14 and 2 Kgs 4:16, 17, where it may well be translated "at this time next year". So LXX translated "unto the time", Vg and Josephus rendered "for many years" (*Antiquities*, 6:297), while Rashi explains it with "at this time next year".<sup>1862</sup> In this case, TJon clearly wanted to reflect the Hebrew idiom as literally as possible, although the ultimate translation has a similar meaning as the Hebrew original: David wished for the best, in the Hebrew text for next year, in TJon for the rest of his life.

25 7 וכען שמעית ארי גוזין לך כען רעיא דילך הוו עמנא<sup>1863</sup> לא אנזיקננון ולא שנא להון מדעם כל יומין דהוו<sup>1864</sup> בכרמלא: 25 8 שאל ית עולימך ויחווין<sup>1865</sup> לך וישכחון עולימא רחמין בעינך ארי על יום טב<sup>1866</sup> אחינא<sup>1867</sup> הב כען ית דתשכח ירך

<sup>1860</sup>Ms eb1 reads ויחווין, 'and come'.

<sup>1861</sup>Syr regarded it as referring to David and rendered **ܘܚܝ ܗܘܝܐ ܥܝܢܐ ܗܘܝܐ**, 'from the one who is alive'. If Hebrew חי would have had the meaning of "folk, clan", then it had been forgotten by the time of the origin of TJon, see above, commentary on 18:18. Vg amends it to לאחי, 'to my brother', followed by F.B. Knutson, "Literary Genres in PRU IV", in: L.R. Fisher (ed.), *Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*, Vol. 2 (AnOr, 50), 153-214, esp. 205.

<sup>1862</sup>Cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 392; R. Yaron, "Ka'eth Hayyah and Koh lehay", *VT* 12 (1962), 500-501.

<sup>1863</sup>Ms eb1 adds וארי, 'and because'.

<sup>1864</sup>Ms a adds עימנא, 'with us', based on the preceding phrase (>15).

<sup>1865</sup>Ms eb1 adds כען, 'now'.

<sup>1866</sup>Ms f<sub>3</sub> explains the טוב יום as a יומא דשיריחה, 'a day of banquet'.

<sup>1867</sup>Read according to the plene באנו, as did Syr and LXX.

לעברך<sup>1868</sup> ולברך לדויד: 25 9 ואתו עולימי דויד ומלילו עם נבל ככל<sup>1869</sup> פתגמא האלין בשמא דדויד ופסקו:

25:7 *And now, I hear that you have shearers. Now your shepherds have been with us and we did them no harm and they missed not anything, all the days that they were in Carmel. 25:8 Ask your young men and they will tell you. And let my young men find favour in your sight, for we come on a festive day. Give now what you have at hand to your servants and to your son, to David.'*" 25:9 *When David's young men came, they spoke according to all these words with Nabal in the name of David. Then they ceased.*

To avoid the misunderstanding that the servants went to rest TJon uses an uncommon rendering of the Hebrew verb נוח, interpreting it as their ceasing to speak.

25 10 ואתיב נבל ית עבדי דויד ואמר מן דויד ומן בר יישי יומא דין סניאין עבדיא דערקין<sup>1870</sup> ודמטמין גבר מן קדם<sup>1871</sup> רבוניה:

25:10 *And Nabal answered David's servants, "Who is David? And who is the son of Jesse? There are many servants nowadays who are fleeing and hiding from their master.*

Hebrew המחפרצים, 'who are breaking away', is considered figurative language and explained as "fleeing and hiding" (>13).

25 11 ואסב<sup>1871</sup> יה מיכלי. ויה משתי ויה שירותי דאתקנית לגווי ואתין לגבריא דלא ידעיה אי מן אנן:

25:11 *And shall I take my food and my drink and my meal that I have prepared for my shearers, and give it to men who come from I do not know where?"*

Four times in a row, TJon uses a more general word than MT: food for bread, drink for water, meal for meat, and prepare for cook (>14). This is no general translation trend in TJon, since the Aramaic word לחמא is often used for food in general (1 Sam. 2:5; 14:24; 20:34; etc.) and the Aramaic מיא is used for drink in general (1 Sam. 30:12). TJon may have harmonized the present verse with the almost royal feast of verse 36.

<sup>1868</sup>Plural, as in the majority of the Hebrew mss. Against P.A.H. de Boer in the app.crit. of *Liber Samuelis* (BHS, 5), Stuttgart 1976–1977.

<sup>1869</sup>Ms o reads יה. Ms f omits כל and reads כפתגמא, "according to these words", as is done in quotations, LXX, Syr and Vg. Cf. 25:12.

<sup>1870</sup>Ms a reads the Ithpeel דמזערקין, probably following the Hebrew Hitpaal (>29). Note that TJon corrected the strange combination—a participle with the article and a substantive without it—of the Hebrew.

<sup>1871</sup>Ms d reads לחמי, 'my bread', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

12 25 ואתחזרו עולימי דויד לאורחהון ותבו ואתו<sup>1872</sup> וחויאו ליה ככל פתגמא האלין: 13 25 ואמר דויד לגברוהי זריו גבר ית חרביה זריו גבר ית חרביה זריו אף דויד<sup>1873</sup> ית<sup>1874</sup> חרביה וסליקו בתר דויד כארבע מאה גברא ומאתן אשתארו למטר<sup>1875</sup> מניא: 14 25 ולאביגיל אחח נבל חיי עולימא חד מעולימא למימר הא שלח דויד אוגרין<sup>1876</sup> ממדברא לברכא ית רבוננא<sup>1877</sup> וקץ בהון:

25:12 *So David's young men turned away and returned. And when they came, they told David according to all these words. 25:13 And David said to his men, "Every man gird on his sword!" And every man girded on his sword and David also girded on his sword. And about four hundred men went up after David, while two hundred men remained to guard the baggage. 25:14 But one of the young men told Abigail, Nabal's wife, saying, "Behold, David sent messengers out of the desert to bless our lord. And he loathed them.*

Hebrew figurative ויעט, 'and he shouted', is rendered in many different ways by the ancient versions.<sup>1876</sup> TJon takes it as the expression of Nabal's negative feelings toward David and his servants.

15 25 וגבריא שבין לנא לחדא לא אתנויקנא ולא שגא לנא מדעם כל יומין דהליכנא עמהון כד הוינא שרין<sup>1877</sup> בחקלא<sup>1878</sup>: 16 25 שור מקף<sup>1879</sup> הוו עלנא אף בלילי אף בימם כל יומין דהוינא עמהון רען ענא: 17 25 וכען דעי וחזא מא תעברין ארי גמירא בשחא למית<sup>1880</sup> על רבוננא<sup>1881</sup> ועל כל ביתיה והוא גבר<sup>1881</sup> רשיע<sup>1882</sup> מלמלא עמיה: 18 25 ואוחיאית אביגיל<sup>1882</sup> ונסיבת<sup>1883</sup> מאתן גריצן דלחים ותרין גרבין דחמר וחמיש ען תכברא וחמיש סאון קליא ומאה אתכלין דענבין יבישין ומאתן מנן דבילהא<sup>1883</sup> ושויאת על חמריא:

25:15 *Yet the men were very good to us and we suffered no harm, and we did not miss anything all the days that we were wandering among them, when we were staying in the field. 25:16 They were a*

<sup>1872</sup>Ms d reads ועלו, 'and entered'.

<sup>1873</sup>Omitted in MS eb76\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1874</sup>Omitted in MSS w y.

<sup>1875</sup>Ms f reads על, 'over', according to the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1876</sup>Cf. Driver, *Notes*, 198.

<sup>1877</sup>Omitted in MS o, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1878</sup>Ms f reads במדברא, 'in the desert', harmonizing it with the preceding verses (>16).

<sup>1879</sup>Omitted in MS d, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Note that TJon did not add the preposition כִּי to this metaphor (against >13). The LXX mitigated the metaphor to a simile; cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 393.

<sup>1880</sup>Omitted in MS d, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1881</sup>Ms a adds בר in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), thus making a conflated rendering.

<sup>1882</sup>Spelled according to the Qere and many Hebrew MSS; cf. Soferim 38a.

<sup>1883</sup>Ms f<sub>3</sub> explains Hebrew דבלים as עיגולי דבלחא, 'circles of fig cakes, round fig cakes'.

surrounding wall to us both by night and by day, all the days we were with them, tending the sheep. 25:17 And now, know this and consider what you should do, for it is determined that evil shall come against our lord and against all his house. And he is such a wicked man that one cannot speak with him.”<sup>1884</sup> 25:18 Then Abigail hurried. She took two hundred loaves of bread and two skins of wine and five sheep with stuffing and five seahs of parched grain and hundred clusters of dried grapes and two hundred mines of dried figs. And she laid them on asses.

TJon adds several words to throw light on the terse Hebrew phrasing. The general term “made sheep” is associated with the “making” of the Pesach meal.<sup>1885</sup> TJon therefore renders the contemporary verb “stuff”, as used in mPes. 7:1; Pes. 74a.<sup>1886</sup> Even if this stuffed lamb is essentially to be interpreted as a Paschal lamb, TJon stays within the borders of the halakhic rules, for it was only prohibited to prepare the festal lamb outside Jerusalem on the first day of Tabernacles and during Pesach.<sup>1887</sup> However, the account of Nabal has never been associated with Pesach. If mentioned at all, Nabal’s banquet was rejected because it was held in the period of mourning over Samuel (EcclR. 7:1 § 4).

Hebrew צמוקים, which is related to the verb צמק, ‘dry, shrivel’, is explained as “clusters of dried grapes”. The weight “mines” is complemented with the dried figs, as was usual in rabbinic times.<sup>1888</sup>

19 25 ואמרת לעולימהא עברו קדמיך האנא בחריכון אחיא ולבעלה נבל לא חויאת:  
20 25 והוה היא רכיבא על חמרא ונחתא בסטר טורא<sup>1889</sup> והא דויד וגברוהי נחתי  
לקדמותה וערעת יתהון: 21 25 ודויד אמר ברם לשקרא נטרית ית כל דלדין במדברא  
ולא שנא מכל דליה מדעם ואחיב לי בשחא חלף טבתא: 22 25 כרין יעביד יי<sup>1890</sup>  
לסנאי<sup>1891</sup> דויד וכדין יסיף אם אשאר מכל דליה עד מיהר<sup>1891</sup> צפרא ידע מדע:

<sup>1884</sup>Or: he is a man too wicked to speak with.

<sup>1885</sup>Cf. Exod. 12:48; Num. 9:2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 14; Deut. 16:1; Josh. 5:10; 2 Kgs 23:21, 23; Ezra 6:19; 2 Chron. 30:1, 2, 5; 35:1, 16, 17, 18.

<sup>1886</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 28; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 22. A different exegesis is attested in Hul. 135a, 137a, where the verb “made” is interpreted to mean that the commandment of the first of the fleece (Deut. 18:4) had been fulfilled in respect of them.

<sup>1887</sup>Cf. tBes. 2:15; Pes. 53a; quoted by Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 23.

<sup>1888</sup>Cf. e.g. mPea 8:5, quoted by Levy, *CWT*, s.v. בנא.

<sup>1889</sup>Ms b reads plural טוריא, ‘mountains’.

<sup>1890</sup>Ms b reads אלהים, ‘God’, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but against the monotheistic vocabulary of TJon (against >22).

<sup>1891</sup>Addition which is also found in the most Hebrew MSS. However, it might be an associative rendering with 25:34, 36.

25:19 *And she said to her young man, "Go on before me. Behold, I come after you." But she did not tell her husband Nabal. 25:20 And she rode on the ass and came down by the side of the mountain. And behold, David and his men came down toward her. And she met them. 25:21 Now David had said, "Surely, in vain have I guarded all that this one has in the desert, so that nothing was missed of all that belonged to him. And he has returned me evil for good. 25:22 Thus do the LORD to David's haters and more also, if by the morning light I leave any who belongs to him that knows knowledge."*

The Hebrew euphemism לַאֲיִבֵי דָוִד, 'to the enemies of David' instead of 'to David', is maintained. It is a widespread euphemism in rabbinic writings and there is no reason to assume that TJon did not recognize it as such (see below, commentary on 2 Sam. 12:14).<sup>1892</sup>

The Hebrew expression מִשְׁחִין בְּקִיר, a condescending phrase to denote the adult, male enemies, is turned into a euphemism in TJon.<sup>1893</sup> It is translated as "knowing knowledge", but since the verb יָדַע also means "sleep with, have intercourse with", it might also be considered a euphemism for adult male persons (>23).<sup>1894</sup> Without this sexual connotation it would only mean "adult".<sup>1895</sup>

23 וְהִזָּת אֲבִיגַיִל יְת דָּוִד וְאֹחִיאָת וְאַתְרֵכִינִית<sup>1896</sup> מֵעַל חֲמָרָא וְנִפְלָת לִפְנֵי דָּוִד עַל אִפְהָא וְסָנִידָת עַל אַרְעָא: 24 וְנִפְלָת קִדְמָא<sup>1897</sup> וְגַלְוָהּ וְאַמְרָת כִּבְעוּ עָלַי דִּילִי.<sup>1898</sup> רְבוּנִי וְחֻבְאִי וְחַמְלִיל כְּעַן אֲמַתְךָ קִדְמָךָ וְשִׁמְעָא<sup>1899</sup> יְת פְּחַנְמִי אֲמַתְךָ:

25:23 *When Abigail saw David, she hurried and she turned herself from upon the ass and fell before David on her face, and bowed to the ground. 25:24 And she fell before his feet and said, "Please, [mind] me, my lord, mine is the guilt. Your handmaid will speak now before you and listen to the words of your handmaid."*

<sup>1892</sup>LXX recognized the euphemism and omitted the reference to the enemies.

<sup>1893</sup>Cf. 25:34; 1 Kgs 14:10; 16:11; 21:21; 2 Kgs 9:8. γSan. 2:3 interpreted the expression as "the dogs", indicating that even a dog will get no pity.

<sup>1894</sup>So Levy, *CWT*, s.v. יָדַע; followed by Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 52.

<sup>1895</sup>Analogous with the expression "knowing good and evil", which is defined by the combination of Deut. 1:39 and Num. 32:11 as "older than twenty years"; cf. H.S. Stern, "The Knowledge of Good and Evil", *VT* 8 (1958), 405-18, esp. 415. Note that even the expression "know good and evil" has a sexual connotation, cf. Stern, "The Knowledge", 406.

<sup>1896</sup>Ms f reads וְנִחְרָתָה, 'and she went down', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1897</sup>Mss a b f read עַל, 'over, by', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1898</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1899</sup>Mss a b o read the imperfect וְשִׁמְעָא, 'and you shall hear', by analogy with the preceding verb.

Hebrew *בִּי אֲנִי* refers to the speaking person twice. TJon maintains this double reference, but also gives the usual translation of Hebrew *בִּי*, viz. *בבִּעו*, ‘in prayer, please’.<sup>1900</sup> Thus a conflated rendering is created, in which Abigail is both pleading for herself and blaming herself of being guilty. A similar expression is used in 2 Sam. 14:9, *עַל־י אֲדֹנָי הַמֶּלֶךְ*, ‘Let the guilt be upon me, my lord the king, and upon my father’s house! Let the king and his throne be innocent!’ The Hebrew text used only one reference to the speaking person and an explanation of this expression is added. Still, TJon has two references to the speaking person by analogy with the present verse (>15), *עַל־י דִּילִי רַבּוּנִי מַלְכָּא חוּבָא*, ...

25 25 לא כען ישוי רבוניי ית לביה על גברא רשיעא<sup>1901</sup> הדין על נבל ארי כשמיה  
כין הוא נבל שמיה וטפשותא עמיה ואנא אמתך<sup>1902</sup> לא חזיתי ית עולימי רבוניי דשלחחא:

*25:25 Let not my lord now pay attention to this wicked man, to Nabal, for as his name is, so is he: Nabal is his name and stupidity is with him. But I, your handmaid, did not see the young men of my lord, whom you sent.*

The word play on Nabal’s name and his נבלה, ‘churlishness, stupidity’, could not be maintained in the Aramaic version. Some manuscripts attempted to maintain a similar reference to Nabal’s stupidity by rendering Hebrew *אִישׁ הַבְּלִיעַל* with “insane man”. The rendering “wicked man” might also be understood as a reference to Nabal’s name, since a similar word play in Isa. 32:6 is translated, *אֲרֵי רִשְׁעִיא*, רשעא ממללין, ‘the wicked speak wickedness’.<sup>1902</sup>

26 25 וכען רבוניי קיים<sup>1903</sup> הוא יי וחיי נפשך דמנעך יי למשפך<sup>1904</sup> דם זכי  
ולמפרק ירך לך וכען יהון כנבל סנאך<sup>1905</sup> ורחבעין על רבוניי בשחא:

*25:26 Now, my lord, as the LORD is the existing One, and by your own life, [seeing] that the LORD has restrained you from shedding innocent blood and your hand from saving yourself, now then let your haters and those who seek to do evil to my lord be as Nabal.*

Hebrew *בוא בדמים*, ‘to come in blood’, is interpreted as a metaphor (>13). TJon therefore gives the usual expression “to shed innocent blood”.

<sup>1900</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 1:26.

<sup>1901</sup>Mss a b c d m o w y read שפא, ‘insane’, making a word play with Nabal’s name, as is done in the second half of the verse.

<sup>1902</sup>Cf. also 2 Sam. 3:33, where Hebrew *נבל* is equated with “wicked people”.

<sup>1903</sup>Mss a b c d f m w y eb76 read the grammatically correct *מלמשפך*.

<sup>1904</sup>Omitted in MS o, which reads only דבא, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

Hebrew *הוּשַׁע יָדךָ לִי* is a rare combination of an infinitive absolute and a substantive standing to it in the relation of subject.<sup>1905</sup> TJon adopts the expression as it is, albeit with the usual infinitive. Its meaning is best explained by the account of Gideon (Judg. 7:2), in which the LORD told Gideon to fight against the Midianites with a small army, lest Israel should pride themselves with the words, "Our own hand saved us!"

27 25 וּכְעַן תְּקַרְבָּתָא הָרָא דֵאִיתִיאת אַמְתָּךְ לְרַבּוּנֵי וְהַתִּיהִיב לְעוֹלִמְיָא דְמִשְׁמֵשִׁין  
קֶדָם רַבּוּנֵי:

25:27 *And now, this present which your handmaid has brought to my lord, let it be given to the young men who are serving before my lord.*

Hebrew *בֵּרַכָּה*, 'blessing', is translated according to its context. Blessings from God are naturally called *בֵּרַכָּתָא* (TgJosh. 8:34), but if the word rather denotes presents or inheritances, it is rendered differently. In the present verse Aramaic *תְּקַרְבָּתָא* is chosen, as in TO Gen. 33:11; TJon 2 Kgs 5:15.<sup>1906</sup>

28 25 שְׂבוּק כַּעַן לְחַבּוּבֵי אַמְתָּךְ אַרִי קִימָא יְקִיִּים יוּי לְרַבּוּנֵי מַלְכוּ קִימָא אַרִי  
קֶרְבֵי עֵמָא<sup>1907</sup> דִּיּוּי רַבּוּנֵי מְגִיחַ וּבִשְׂתָא לֹא אִשְׁתַּחַח בְּךָ מִיּוֹמֵךְ:

25:28 *Forgive the guilt of your handmaid, for the LORD will certainly establish for my lord a lasting kingdom, because my lord is waging the battles of the people of the LORD and evil is not found in you as long as you live.*<sup>1908</sup>

TJon equates the Hebrew combination of *עָשָׂה בֵּית* with the Aramaic combination *קִים מַלְכוּ*. For the equivalence of Hebrew *בֵּית* and Aramaic *מַלְכוּתָא*, see 2 Sam. 7:11-16. The verb *קִים* in the Pael is the usual equivalent of the general Hebrew *עָשָׂה* if God is the subject and one of his promises the object.<sup>1909</sup>

TJon changed the tense of Hebrew *הִמָּצָא* from imperfect to perfect.<sup>1910</sup> Whereas the Hebrew phrase articulated Abigail's belief that there would be no evil during David's future kingdom, in the Aramaic version it appears to be one of the reasons why the LORD would establish a lasting kingdom for David.<sup>1911</sup> The first reason is that he was

<sup>1905</sup>Cf. Driver, *Notes*, 200-201; GKC § 113gg.

<sup>1906</sup>TgJudg. 1:15 has *אִחְסָתָא*, 'inheritance'; in TJon 1 Sam. 30:26 the equivalent *מָנָח* was chosen.

<sup>1907</sup>Ms eb76 reads it with the proleptic suffix *עֵמִיחַ*.

<sup>1908</sup>Literally: since your days.

<sup>1909</sup>Cf. "establish a kingdom" in 2 Sam. 7:11 and this verse; "establish what He promised" in 1 Sam. 25:30; 28:17.

<sup>1910</sup>So also Syr.

<sup>1911</sup>Also noted by S. Bombeck, *Das althebräische Verbalsystem aus aramäischer*



waging the battles of Israel and the second reason is his innocence. TJon seized the opportunity to praise the merits of the Biblical hero (>24).<sup>1912</sup> The opportunity was given by the last word of the verse, מִיָּמִיךָ, 'since your days', which clearly refers to the past (cf. also Job 27:6).

29 וְקָם אִנְשָׁא לְמַרְדֹּפֶךָ וּלְמַבְעֵי<sup>1913</sup> לְמַקְטֹלְךָ<sup>1914</sup> וְחַוְיָה נַפְשָׁא דְרַבּוּנֵי<sup>1915</sup> גְּנִיזָא  
בְּנִנּוּ חַיֵּי עֲלָמָא קִדְמָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְיָת נַפְשׁ בְּעַלְיָ<sup>1916</sup> דְּרַבְבְּךָ יִרְחַנְהָ כְּמָא דְּמַפְרַחִין  
אַבְנָא בְּקַלְעָא<sup>1917</sup>:

*25:29 Should a man arise to pursue you and to seek to kill you, may the soul of my lord be stored in the storehouse of eternal life before the LORD your God. And may he sling out the soul of your enemies as they chase away a stone with a sling.*

The Hebrew text has two images. The first one depicts God as the administrator of the living and the dead. Texts found in Nuzi describe an administrative method whereby a buyer would keep a bag of stones that signified the number of cattle he had bought. When the buyer received his cattle, he returned the stones and everything was recorded on tablets.<sup>1918</sup> In the same way God has a bag of stones referring to the living people, and each time He delivers a stone a person is delivered to death.<sup>1919</sup>

The second image depicts the same stone, not as delivered to a

*Sicht* (EHS.T, 591), Frankfurt a.M., 1995, 141.

<sup>1912</sup>Cf. also Komlosh, *המקרא באור התרגום*, 317.

<sup>1913</sup>Ms f adds נַפְשָׁךָ, 'your soul', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), thus creating a conflated rendering.

<sup>1914</sup>See commentary on 20:1.

<sup>1915</sup>Omitted in MS o.

<sup>1916</sup>Ms f reads the singular בְּעִיל, corresponding with the singular "man" in the beginning of the present verse (>9).

<sup>1917</sup>Ms f reads מִן קַלְעָא, 'from the sling'.

<sup>1918</sup>O. Eissfeldt, *Der Beutel der Lebendigen: Alttestamentliche Erzählungs- und Dichtungsmotive im Lichte neuer Nuzi-Texte* (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Leipzig, philologisch-historische Klasse, 105/6), Berlin 1960, 13; T. Abusch, "Notes on a Pair of Matching Texts: A Shepherd's Bulla and an Owner's Receipt", in: M.A. Morrison, D.I. Owen (eds), *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians* (FS E.R. Lacheman), Winona Lake (IN) 1981, 1-9.

<sup>1919</sup>In fact this image runs parallel to the book of the living, cf. Exod. 32:32; Isa. 4:3; Mal. 3:16; Ps. 69:29; Dan. 12:1; Lk. 10:20; Heb. 12:23; Rev. 3:5; 13:8; 17:8; 20:12, 15; 21:27. N.H. Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job: A New Commentary*, Jerusalem <sup>2</sup>1967, 240-41, quoted by McCarter, *I Samuel*, 399, assumed this image to be identical with the book of the living, interpreting the verb צָרַר as "tie up (a document)", cf. Job 14:16; Isa. 8:16, but in all texts the verb צָרַר can mean "bundle".

buyer, but slung away as if slung with a sling. This picture confirms the previous one, but stresses the violence and the irreversibility of the enemy's death.<sup>1920</sup>

In Qumran 1 Sam. 25:29 is still interpreted as it was originally meant, *viz.* as God's protection of the pious. The author thanks God for his protection from his enemies, stating "you put me in the bundle of the living and have protected me from all the traps of the pit" (1QH<sup>a</sup> 10:20-21). However, in the course of the first century BCE the "bundle of the living" became the equivalent of the "storehouse" in which the souls of the righteous were kept after their death.<sup>1921</sup> The sentence *הדי נפשו צרורה בצרור החיים*, 'May his soul be bundled in the bundle of life', is frequently used as an epitaph—sometimes abbreviated to *ה נ צ ב ה*—at least from the third century CE on.<sup>1922</sup> In rabbinic literature the present verse is interpreted likewise: the souls of the righteous will be kept in a storehouse under God's throne, while the souls of the wicked will be slung away and have no rest.<sup>1923</sup> The same interpretation is found in TJon.

The entire image remains in the administrative sphere. In a tosefta-targum on 1 Sam. 28:19, Samuel predicts that Saul and his sons will be collected in the storehouse of eternal life. The verb used is *נבא*, 'levy, charge', which especially refers to tribute and tax.<sup>1924</sup> The administrative relationship between God and humankind also finds expression in several parables.<sup>1925</sup> The strongest parallel is found in a parable about R. Eliezer's son, who died at a young age. R. Eliezer was told that he received his son like a pawnee who receives things but has to give it back without mutilations. Likewise, R. Eliezer had received a pure son and would have to give him back to God in the same pure state. And so he did, for the son had only had time to study Torah, Mishnah, halakha and aggada (ARN<sup>a</sup> 14:5).

<sup>1920</sup>Eissfeldt, *Der Beutel der Lebendigen*, 25.

<sup>1921</sup>Cf. H. Sysling, *Teḥiyyat Ha-Metim: The Resurrection of the Dead in the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Parallel Traditions in Classical Rabbinic Literature* (TSAJ, 57), Tübingen 1996, 192-209.

<sup>1922</sup>Eissfeldt, *Der Beutel der Lebendigen*, 33. Likewise the image of the book of the living is used for the afterlife, cf. Dan. 12:1; Lk. 10:20; Heb. 12:23; Rev. 3:5; 13:8; 17:8; 20:12, 15; 21:27.

<sup>1923</sup>Cf. Shab. 152b; Hag. 12b; GenR. 96:5; LevR. 18:1; EcclR. 3:2 § 1; ARN 7 (23a), cf. SifBam § 139 (on Num. 27:16), using Hebrew *אוצר* for the storehouse of the souls; SifDev § 357; SER 4 (p. 18); although NumR. 11:5 explains the present verse as referring to terrestrial life, stating that David would be saved from death, but his enemies would not.

<sup>1924</sup>Cf. Levy, *CWT*, *s.v.* *נבא*.

<sup>1925</sup>Such as Jesus' parable of the talents (Mt. 25:14-30; Lk. 19:12-28), and in rabbinic literature (LevR. 18; mAv. 3:16).

25 30 ויהי ארי<sup>1926</sup> יקיים יוי לרבוני<sup>1927</sup> ככל<sup>1927</sup> דמליל לאיחאה<sup>1928</sup> טבחא עלך ויפקרנך למהוי מלכא<sup>1929</sup> על ישראל: 25 31 ולא ההי דא לך ליצפא ולחקלח לב<sup>1929</sup> לרבוני<sup>1929</sup> ולמשפך דם זכי מגן ולמפרק רבוני<sup>1930</sup> ליה וכד יושיב יוי לרבוני<sup>1930</sup> וחזכר ית אמחך<sup>1930</sup>: 25 32 ואמר דויד לאביגל כריך יוי אלהא<sup>1931</sup> דישראל דשלחך יומא הדין<sup>1930</sup> לקדמוחי: 25 33 ובריך מדריך<sup>1931</sup> ובריכא את דמנעתיני יומא הדין<sup>1932</sup> מלמשפך<sup>1933</sup> דם זכי ולמפרק ידי ליי:

*25:30 And when the LORD has established for my lord according to all He has spoken to bring goodness over you and has commanded you to be king over Israel, 25:31 this [situation] will not be for you a grief and an offence for the heart, for having shed innocent blood without cause or for my lord saving himself. And when the LORD has dealt well with my lord, then remember your handmaid." 25:32 And David said to Abigail, "Blessed be the LORD, the God of Israel, who sent you this day toward me! 25:33 Blessed be your knowledge and blessed be you, who have restrained me from shedding innocent blood and my hands from saving myself!*

TJon introduces a word play in the present chapter by translating Hebrew שטמך by מדריך (but cf. also 21:14), while Hebrew שכל (25:3) has been rendered likewise (>15, simplification). The present story has been made more thrilling. First Abigail is depicted as a woman with knowledge (25:3); then David threatened to kill all the persons "having knowledge" (25:22, repeated in 25:34). And now it appeared that this killing was avoided by the only person in Nabal's household who had knowledge.

25 34 וברם קיים<sup>1934</sup> הוא יוי אלהא<sup>1934</sup> דישראל דמנעני מלאבאשא לייך ארי אלו לפון אחיה ואחיה לקדמותי אלהין<sup>1934</sup> אשתאר לנבל עד מיהר צפרא ידע מדע<sup>1935</sup>: 25 35 וקביל דויד מנה<sup>1936</sup> ית דאחיהא ליה ולה אמר סקי לשלם לביחך חזא דקבילית מניך ונסיבית<sup>1936</sup> אפך:

<sup>1926</sup> Ms b reads the temporal כד, 'when'.

<sup>1927</sup> Ms w reads כמא, 'as'.

<sup>1928</sup> TJon smoothed out the grammatical troubles in the Hebrew construction (>11); cf. Driver, *Notes*, 202.

<sup>1929</sup> Omitted in MS eb1, probably to avoid figurative language (>13).

<sup>1930</sup> MSS b c w read דין, resulting in "today".

<sup>1931</sup> MSS w y read שטמיך, 'sense, judgment', more in conformity with the Hebrew original (>29).

<sup>1932</sup> Ms w again reads דין, resulting in "today".

<sup>1933</sup> See above, commentary on 25:26.

<sup>1934</sup> Ms c reads אא, another introduction of the main clause in oaths. MSS a b d f add אא after אלהין.

<sup>1935</sup> See above, commentary on 25:22.

<sup>1936</sup> MSS d f read מידה, 'from her hand', in conformity with the Hebrew text. The other MSS omitted the reference to the hand as a *pars pro toto* (>14).

25:34 For as the LORD, the God of Israel, is the existing One, who has restrained me from hurting you, unless you had made haste and come to meet me, truly by the morning light there had not been left to Nabal anyone knowing knowledge. 25:35 Then David accepted from her what she had brought him. And he said to her, "Go up in peace to your house. See that I have accepted from you and that I have restored you to favour."

Usually Hebrew שמע בקול 'hear one's voice', is equated with קביל למימרא, 'accept one's speech' (see above, Ch. 4, Aramaic קבל). In the present verse the word קול is not translated, because David accepted more than Abigail's words alone.

In the present context Hebrew נשא פנים means "to treat friendly" and is rendered with a similar expression. Aramaic נסיב אפין means "to restore to favour, to benefit".<sup>1937</sup>

36 25 ואת אביגיל לוח נבל הוא ליה משתיא בביתיה כמשתי מלכיא<sup>1938</sup> ולב נבל שפיר עלוהי והוא רוי עד לחדא ולא חויאת ליה פתגם זעיר ורב<sup>1939</sup> עד מיהר צפרא: 37 25 והוא בצפרא כד פג חמרא מנבל וחויאת ליה אחתיה ית<sup>1940</sup> פתגמא האלין ומית לביה במעוהי והוא הוה כאבנא<sup>1941</sup>: 38 25 והוה לזמן עסרא יומין וחבר<sup>1941</sup> יי ית נבל ומית:

25:36 And Abigail came to Nabal, and behold, he was holding a feast in his house like a feast of kings. And Nabal's heart was merry within him and he was exceedingly drunk. So she did not tell him anything, much or little, until the morning light. 25:37 And in the morning, when the wine had evaporated from Nabal, his wife told him these things. And his heart died within him and he became like a stone. 25:38 And ten days later the LORD shattered Nabal and he died.

Whereas the Hebrew text only gives the estimated time—about ten days—, TJon makes it more precise. This might originate from the rabbinic connotation that the ten days delay of Nabal's death was somehow connected with the ten days between New Year's Day and the Day of Atonement (RHsh. 18a; SER 18 (p. 109); MTeh. 26:7): Nabal received ten days of delay to atone for his sins.

39 25 ושמע דוד ארי מית נבל ואמר בריך יי דדן ית דין<sup>1937</sup> חסדאי מידא דנבל

<sup>1937</sup>Levy, CWT, s.v. נסיב.

<sup>1938</sup>Mss o eb1 read the singular מלכא, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1939</sup>Mss m f read או רב, 'or great', in conformity with this expression in 22:15 (>15). Likewise some Hebrew MSS, LXX and Vg.

<sup>1940</sup>Ms a adds כל, 'all', as some MSS of LXX.

<sup>1941</sup>Mss a d read לאבנא, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but against the Targumic technique to explain metaphors (>13). Syr and LXX also add a preposition to denote the metaphor.

ויה עבדיה מנע מלמעבר בישא ויה בישת נבל אחיב וי ברישיה ושלח דויד ושאל  
באביגיל<sup>1942</sup> למסבה ◊ ליה לאתו:

25:39 *When David heard that Nabal was dead, he said, "Blessed be the LORD who administered my shameful lawsuit against Nabal and has restrained his servant from evil. And the LORD has returned Nabal's evil upon his own head." Then David sent and asked for Abigail to take her for a wife.*<sup>1943</sup>

TJon depicts David as more civil than is apparent in the Hebrew text, since in the Aramaic version he asked for Abigail. One marginal variant in CR is an attempt to combine a literal translation and the civil depiction by rendering:<sup>1944</sup>

לְיִשְׁנָאן אַן־חַרְיָנָאן וְשָׂרְר דוּד וּמְלִיל עַל עִסְק אַבִּיגַיִל

*another expression: and David sent and talked about the matter of Abigail*

Both Josephus and the Antwerp Polyglot translate that David did not approach other people, but that he approached Abigail herself, as is already suggested in the following verse.<sup>1945</sup>

25 40 ואחו עבדי דויד לוח אביגיל לכרמלא<sup>1946</sup> ומלילו עמה למימר דויד שלחנא  
לוחיך למסביך ◊ ליה לאתו: 25 14 וקמת וסגידת על אפהא על ארעא ואמרת הא  
אמתך ◊ לאמהו לאסחאה רגלי עבדי רבני◊: 25 42 ואוחיאית וקמת אביגיל ורכיבת  
על חמרא וחמיש עולימתהא אולן לקבלה ואולת בתר אונרי◊ דוד והות ליה לאתו:  
25 43 ויה אחינעם נסיב◊ דויד מזרעאל והואה אף תרויהון ליה לנשין: 25 44 ושאל  
יהב ית מיכל ברתיה אחת דויד לפלטי בר ליש דמגלים:

25:40 *And when David's servants came to Abigail at Carmel and said to her, "David has sent us to you to take you for a wife,"*<sup>1947</sup> 25:41 *she rose and bowed down with her face to the ground, and said, "Behold, your handmaid will be the handmaid"*<sup>1948</sup> *to wash the feet of my lord's servants."* 25:42 *And Abigail hurried and rose and mounted on an ass, while her five young women went alongside her. And she went after David's messengers and she became his wife.*<sup>1949</sup> 25:43 *David*

<sup>1942</sup>Ms d reads לאביגיל, resulting in "and asked Abigail", which is in accordance with the following verse.

<sup>1943</sup>Literally: in marriage; see above, commentary on 18:17.

<sup>1944</sup>Cf. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 30-31.

<sup>1945</sup>Ms o renders לאביגיל. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:308, tells us that David sent his messengers "to the woman, inviting her to live with him and become his wife."

<sup>1946</sup>Ms eb1 omits לכרמלא.

<sup>1947</sup>Literally: in marriage, see above, commentary on 18:17.

<sup>1948</sup>Literally: will be to the service; see above commentary on 18:17; cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. אמרו.

<sup>1949</sup>Literally: in marriage; see above, commentary on 18:17.

had also taken<sup>1950</sup> Ahinoam of Jezreel. And both of them became his wives. 25:44 And Saul had given Michal his daughter, David's wife, to Palti the son of Laish, who was of Gallim.

## 5.25 David Spares Saul II (1 Samuel 26)

26 1 ואתו אנש זיף לוח שאול לגבעתא ◊ למימר הלא דויד מטמר בנבעת ◊ חכילה דעל<sup>1951</sup> אפי<sup>1952</sup> ישימון: 26 2 וקם שאול ונחת למדברא דויה ועמיה תלחה אלפין גברא בחירי<sup>1953</sup> ישראל למבעי ית דויד במדברא דויה: 26 3 ושרא שאול בנבעת ◊ חכילה דעל אפי<sup>1954</sup> ישימון על אורחא דויד יתיב במדברא וחזא ארי אתא שאול בתרווי למדברא: 26 4 ושלה דויד מאללין וידע ארי אתא שאול בקשוט: 26 5 וקם דויד ואתא לאתרא דשרא תמן שאול וחזא דויד ית אתרא דשכיב תמן שאול ואבנר בר נר רב חילה ◊ ושאול שכ׳ב<sup>1955</sup> בכרקומא<sup>1956</sup> ועמא שרן סחרנוהי: 26 6 ואתיב דויד ואמר לאחימלך חתאה<sup>1957</sup> ולאבישי בר צרויה אחוהי דיואב למימר מן יחות עמי לוח שאול למשריתא ואמר אבישי אנא יחות עמך: 26 7 ואתא דויד ואבישי לוח עמא בליליא והא שאול שכ׳ב דמך בכרקומא<sup>1958</sup> ומורניתיה נעיצא בארעא איסדויה ואבנר ועמא שרן סחרנוהי: 26 8 ואמר אבישי לדויד מסר יוי ◊ יומא דין ית בעיל דבבך ◊ בידך וכען אמחיניה כען במורניתא ואברונה<sup>1959</sup> בארעא זמנא חרא ולא אתני ליה: 26 9 ואמר דויד לאבישי לא תחבלניה ארי מן אושיט דיה במשיחא דויו וזכא<sup>1960</sup>: 26 10 ואמר דויד קיים ◊ הוא יוי אלהין מן קדם ◊ יוי יתמחי<sup>1961</sup> או יומיה ימטי<sup>1962</sup>: 26 11 חס לי מן קדם ◊ יוי מלאושטא ידי במשיחא

<sup>1950</sup> Ahinoam is always mentioned as David's first wife (cf. 27:3; 30:5), and she is also the mother of David's firstborn, Amnon (cf. 2 Sam. 3:2). Hence the pluperfect; cf. GKC § 106f.

<sup>1951</sup> The relative pronoun is added here in accordance with 23:19 and 26:3 (>15) and with many Hebrew MSS.

<sup>1952</sup> Ms f<sub>3</sub> adds בית. TJon made no attempt to harmonize the present expression with 23:19, where it is said that the hill of Hachilah was south of Jeshimon (against >15).

<sup>1953</sup> Ms a reads עולימי 'young men'; ms f<sub>3</sub> explains it with גיברי ישראל 'young men from Israel's heroes'. These renderings are in conformity with the usual equation of Hebrew בחור, cf. 1 Sam. 8:16; 9:2; 24:3. The other MSS considered Hebrew בחורי a participle of the verb בחר.

<sup>1954</sup> Ms f again adds בית, as in 26:1.

<sup>1955</sup> Ms m reads the more general יתיב 'he stayed'.

<sup>1956</sup> Regular translation, cf. 17:20; 26:6.

<sup>1957</sup> Ms y reads חואה 'the Hivite'.

<sup>1958</sup> Regular translation, cf. 17:20; 26:5.

<sup>1959</sup> See above, commentary on 18:11.

<sup>1960</sup> Ms f<sub>5</sub> adds the explanation 'in judgment', ברינא 'in judgment', referring to the Final Judgment, cf. TJon 1 Sam. 2:9.

<sup>1961</sup> Ms o reads the active ימחיה 'the LORD will strike him', instead of the passive יתמחי 'it will be struck', cf. 23:11.

<sup>1962</sup> Ms a reads the passive יתמטי 'it will be reached'.

דיוי וכען סב<sup>1963</sup> כען 1963 ית מורניתא דאיסרוהי וית מנא<sup>1964</sup> דמא וניזיל לנא: 26 12  
 ונסיב<sup>1963</sup> דויד ית מורניתא וית מנא דמא מאיסדי שאול ואזלו להון וליח דחוי וליח  
 דידע וליח דמחער ארי כלהון דמכין ארי שנא תקיפא מן קרם<sup>1963</sup> יוי נפלה עליהון:

26:1 Then the men of Ziph came to Saul at The Hill, saying, "Is not David hiding himself on the hill of Hachilah, which is facing Jeshimon?" 26:2 So Saul arose and went down to the Desert of Ziph—three thousand men chosen from Israel with him—to seek David in the Desert of Ziph. 26:3 And Saul encamped on the hill of Hachilah, which is facing Jeshimon, on the road, while David was staying in the desert. When he saw that Saul came after him into the desert, 26:4 David sent out spies and learned that Saul indeed had come. 26:5 Then David rose and came to the place where Saul had encamped. And David saw the place where Saul and Abner the son of Ner, the commander of his army, lay. Saul was lying within the bulwarks, while the people were encamped around him. 26:6 Then David said in reaction to Ahimelech the Hittite and to Joab's brother Abishai the son of Zeruiah, "Who will go down with me to Saul, into the camp?" And Abishai said, "I will go down with you." 26:7 So David and Abishai went to the people by night. And behold, Saul lay sleeping within the bulwarks, with his spear stuck in the ground at his head, and Abner and the people were encamped around him. 26:8 Then said Abishai to David, "The LORD has surrendered your enemy into your hand today. And now, let me strike him now with the spear and pin it to ground just once. I need not repeat it!" 26:9 But David said to Abishai, "Do not harm him, for who can<sup>1965</sup> stretch out his hand against the LORD's anointed and be innocent?"<sup>1966</sup> 26:10 And David said, "As the LORD is the existing One, he will be struck from before the LORD, or his day shall come and he will die, or he shall go down into battle and be killed. 26:11 Far be it from me that I should stretch out my hand against the LORD's anointed. But now, take now the spear that is at his head and the vessel of water and let us go." 26:12 So David took the spear and the vessel of water from Saul's head, and they went away. There was no one who saw it, no one who noticed, no one who awoke, for they

<sup>1963</sup>Omitted in MS b.

<sup>1964</sup>Generalization of Hebrew צפחה, which is a kind of vessel (>7).

<sup>1965</sup>Although both Hebrew and Aramaic read the perfect tense, the phrase can best be rendered as having a counterfactual meaning, cf. Driver, *Notes*, 206, who assumes that the *Yodh* has fallen out after ך. S. Bombeck, *Das althebräische Verbalsystem aus aramäischer Sicht* (EHS.T, 591), Frankfurt a.M., 1995, 67-68 maintains the perfect tense, but admits the counterfactual meaning of the sentence.

<sup>1966</sup>Note that TJon did not replace the rhetorical question by a declarative statement (against >14), as Syr did.

*were all sleeping, for a strong sleep from before the LORD had fallen upon them.*

TJon gives a double rendering of the Hebrew expression *תדרמת יהוה*, which might well denote a superlative.<sup>1967</sup> First, the idea of the superlative is expressed with the adjective “strong”. Note that the adjective is not added in Gen. 2:21 and 15:12, where Aramaic *שנא* is the equivalent of Hebrew *תדרמה* on its own. And secondly, a fairly literal translation is given with the circumlocutive “from before the LORD”. A similar explanation is given by Rab (GenR. 17:5; 44:17), who assumed that this sleep was a kind of unconsciousness, unlike the sleep of Adam and Abraham (Gen. 2:21; 15:12).<sup>1968</sup>

13 26 ועבר דויד לעברא וקם על ריש טורא מרחיק<sup>1969</sup> סגי אחרא ביניהון: 26 14 וקרא דויד לעמא ולאבנר בר נר למימר הלא העני אבנר ואחיב אבנר<sup>1970</sup> ואמר מן אח<sup>1971</sup> דקרי בריש מלכא:

*26:13 Then David went over to the other side, and stood afar off on the top of the mountain, with a great space between them. 26:14 And David called to the people and to Abner the son of Ner, saying, “Will you not answer, Abner?” Then Abner answered and said, “Who are you that invokes the head of the king?”*

Hebrew *קראת אל-המלך* is harmonized with the beginning of the verse. David did not call “to the king”, but to the people and especially to Abner, so TJon rendered *בריש מלכא*. Since the verb *קרא* is construed either with *יה* or with *ל-*, this Aramaic rendering cannot mean “to call someone”. And since *ראיסדויה* is used to denote the place at one’s head (cf. 26:11, 12, 16), Aramaic *בריש* cannot mean “at one’s head”.<sup>1972</sup> Therefore, the rendering “invoke” is chosen by analogy with the expression *קרא בשם*. Here the word “head” refers to Abner himself, who is appointed head of the king’s army.

15 26 ואמר דויד לאבנר הלא גברא<sup>1973</sup> את ומן כותך בישראל ולמא לא נטרחא על רבונך ◊ מלכא ארי אתא חד מעמא לחבלא יה מלכא רבונך ◊<sup>1974</sup>: 26 16 לא תקיין

<sup>1967</sup> Cf. D. Winton Thomas, “A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew”, *VT* 3 (1953), 209-24.

<sup>1968</sup> Cf. MTeh. 58:1.

<sup>1969</sup> Ms a adds *לחד*, ‘only, also’.

<sup>1970</sup> The phrase *ואחיב אבנר* is omitted in MS y, by haplography.

<sup>1971</sup> Only in MS p. MSS a b c d f m o p w y eb1 and Kimḥi read *דין*, ‘this’. The reading *את* is in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1972</sup> Against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 152.

<sup>1973</sup> Kimḥi explains the simple word “man” as *כבר גיבר*, ‘a heroic man’.

<sup>1974</sup> Ms c reads *ריבניה*, ‘his lord’, in which the suffix is referring to the one who came to harm the king.



פתגמא הדין דעברתא<sup>1975</sup> קיים ◊ הוא יי ארי<sup>1976</sup> גברי חייבי קטול<sup>1977</sup> אתון דלא נטרותון על רבונכון ◊ על משיחא דיוי וכען חוי אן מורניחא דמלכא וית<sup>1978</sup> מנא<sup>1979</sup> דמיא דאיסרוהי: 26 17 ואשתמודע שאול ית קלא דדויד ואמר הקלך דין ברי דויד ואמר דויד קלי רבוני ◊ מלכא: 26 18 ואמר למא דנן רבוני ◊ רדיף בתר עבדיה ארי מא עברית ולית<sup>1980</sup> בידי חובא ◊<sup>1981</sup>:

*26:15 And David said to Abner, "Are you not a man? Who is like you in Israel? Why then have you not kept watch over your lord the king? For one of the people came to harm the king, your lord. 26:16 This thing that you have done is not right. As the LORD is the existing One, you are men deserving to die, because you have not kept watch over your lord, over the LORD's anointed. And now, see where the king's spear is, and the vessel of water that was at his head. 26:17 And Saul recognized David's voice and said, "Is this your voice, my son David?" And David said, "It is my voice, my lord, O king." 26:18 And he said, "Why does my lord pursue after his servant? For what have I done? There is no guilt on my hands!*

The translation "guilt" may be an associative rendering based on David's questions in 20:1 (>15). It is remarkable that the first two questions are translated literally, whereas the third question is turned into a declarative statement (>14), creating the impression that the statement answers the two questions.

26 19 וכען ישמע כען רבוני ◊ מלכא ית פתגמי עבדיה אם מן קדם ◊ יי אתגריה בי יתקבל ◊<sup>1982</sup> קרבנך<sup>1983</sup> ברעוא ואם מן<sup>1984</sup> בני אנשא לישין אנון קדם ◊ יי ארי תרכוני יומא דין מלמדר באחסנת עמא ◊ דיוי למימר אויל דור<sup>1985</sup> ביני עממיא פלחי ◊ שעותא ◊:

<sup>1975</sup> Ms eb1 reads the plural עברתין, in accordance with the following plurals.

<sup>1976</sup> Mss c d f add ברי; MS o adds בני, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but making a conflated rendering, cf. 1 Sam. 20:31; 2 Sam. 12:5; 19:29.

<sup>1977</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:315, "this conduct indeed merits the punishment of death".

<sup>1978</sup> Ms f reads ויאן, restoring the grammatically strange construction of the anacoluthon, cf. GKC § 117m, n. 3.

<sup>1979</sup> See above, 26:11.

<sup>1980</sup> Answering the rhetorical question MS o reads ולא (>14); MS b reads ומה, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1981</sup> Mss w y read בישא, 'evil', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1982</sup> Mss b d read the Pael יקבל, 'may He accept', more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1983</sup> Mss b f o read the 1st person in קורבני, 'my offering'.

<sup>1984</sup> Omitted in Mss b c d f m o w y eb1, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1985</sup> Mss b f and Kimḥi erroneously read דוד, 'David'; it is omitted by MS o, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

26:19 *And now, let my lord the king hear the words of his servant. If it is from before the LORD that you are incited against me, let your offering be accepted with delight. But if it is from the sons of men, cursed are they before the LORD, for they have driven me today from dwelling on the heritage of the LORD's people, saying, 'Go, dwell among the sons of the nations that serve idols.'*

The usual rendering of Hebrew אלהים אחרים is טעוה עממא, 'idols of the nations', denying the existence of other gods (see above, commentary on 8:8). In the present verse, however, David is said to go and serve other gods—an unexpected curse. The Talmud and TJon could not agree with its implications at all, so a different explanation was given for this curse (>23).<sup>1986</sup> Following its own consistent translation of the words אלהים and אחרים, TJon offers the solution, "dwell among the sons of the nations that serve idols". David is not only cleared from any form of idolatry (>24), but also from assuming that God stirred him up to serve idols.<sup>1987</sup> This solution serves a homiletical goal as well, showing that it was possible to dwell among heathen nations and at the same time not serve their gods. The Hebrew formulation of the curse suggests that God could only be served in the land of Israel (>22).

The Hebrew imagery of smelling an offering is rendered in plain language (>13), but with a passive construction (>23). The addition of delight gives a precision to the smell, since not all offerings were appreciated.<sup>1988</sup> Following the Hebrew text the majority of Targumic manuscripts assume that Saul's offering had to be accepted. However, MSS b f o assume that it would have been David's fault if Saul had been stirred up against him by the LORD. For that reason these manuscripts read "my offering", *i.e.* David's offering.

26 20 ובען לא יתאשר דמי לארעא מן קדם מימרא דיי ארי נפק מלכא דישראל  
למבעי ית חלש חד כמה דמתרדיף קוראה בשוריא:

26:20 *And now, let not my blood be shed on the earth, away from before the speech of the LORD, for the king of Israel has come out to seek one weak person, as a partridge is hunted in the mountains."*

<sup>1986</sup>Cf. MTeh. 119:47; tAZ 4:5; ARN<sup>a</sup> 26:1; Ket. 110b, all stating that whoever goes outside the Holy Land is regarded as if he is serving other gods. Cf. E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), Berlin 1988, 183-84.

<sup>1987</sup>Against the rabbinic exegesis that stresses David's blasphemy in this utterance (Ber. 62b) David was punished for his blasphemy in the episode of 2 Sam. 24, where the same verb "incite" is used; cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 29.

<sup>1988</sup>Cf. Amos 5:21; כנישחכון, קורבן ברעא אקביל ולא אקביל.

The Hebrew construction *יהוה מנגד פני יהוה* would have resulted in a double use of the preposition *קדם*. For that reason TJon diversifies its translation and uses both *קדם* and *מימרא*.

The Hebrew imagery of the flea is rendered by the usual self-humiliation, “weak person” (>13; cf. 1 Sam. 9:21; 15:17; 24:15). As before, the passive voice is used to denote an unidentified subject. Hebrew *יִרְדַּף* was read as a Niphal (>3).<sup>1989</sup> Ms f<sub>5</sub> gives another solution by naming the unidentified subject of the verb (about >17):

ספן[ר] אחנר[ן] כמה דררף בר ניצצא ית קוראה בטוריא

*another book: as the hawk's son pursues the partridge in the mountains*

26 21 ואמר שאול חביתו חוב ברי דויד ארי לא אבאיש לך עוד חלף דיקרת נפשי בעינך יומא הדין<sup>1990</sup> הא אסתכלית<sup>1991</sup> ואטפשת סני לחדא: 26 22 ואחיב דויד ואמר הא מורניתא דמלכא<sup>1992</sup> ויעבר חד מעולימא ויסכה: 26 23 וויי יתיב לגבר ית זכותיה וית קשטיה דמסרך יי יומא דין ביד<sup>1993</sup> ולא אביתי לאושטא ידי במשיחא דווי: 26 24 והא<sup>1994</sup> כמה דיקרת<sup>1995</sup> נפשך יומא הדין<sup>1996</sup> בעיני כין תיקר נפשי קדם יי וישויבנני מכל עקא: 26 25 ואמר שאול לדויד בריך את ברי דויד אף ממלך תמלוך ואף אצלחא חצלח ואזל דויד לאורחיה ושאול תב לאתריה:

26:21 Then Saul said, “I am guilty. Return, my son David, for I will no more do you harm, because my soul was precious in your sight this day. Behold, I have been foolish and behaved exceedingly obtusely.”  
26:22 And David answered and said, “Behold the spear of the king. Let one of the young men come over and fetch it. 26:23 The LORD will return to each man his merit and his truth, for the LORD surrendered you into [my] hand today, but I would not stretch out my hand against the LORD’s anointed. 26:24 Behold, as your soul was precious in my sight, so may my soul be precious before the LORD. May He deliver me out of all anguish.” 26:25 Then Saul said to David, “Blessed be you, my son David! You will indeed be king and will indeed succeed.”  
So David went his way, and Saul returned to his place.

Just as 1 Sam. 24, the counterpart of the present chapter, ended with

<sup>1989</sup>So Bacher, “Kritische Untersuchungen”, 24; Komlosch, *ההרגום באור המקרא*, 298-99.

<sup>1990</sup>Ms f reads *דין*, resulting in “today”.

<sup>1991</sup>Ms f reads the Aphel *אסתכלית*, ‘I acted foolishly’.

<sup>1992</sup>This genitive construction is in accordance with the Qere, many Hebrew MSS, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the other ancient versions.

<sup>1993</sup>Mss a b d f o read *בידי*, ‘in my hand’, according to many Hebrew MSS, LXX, Syr and Vg (>10)

<sup>1994</sup>Ms w reads the verbal form *יהי*.

<sup>1995</sup>In accordance with 26:21 (>15).

<sup>1996</sup>Ms b reads *דין*, resulting in “today”.

Saul's recognition that David would one day be king (24:20), so TJon makes 1 Sam. 26 end with an identical recognition. The vague phrase "you will act and you will succeed" in the Hebrew is rendered as a reference to David's kingship and his success therein.

## 5.26 David's Stay with the Philistines (1 Samuel 27)

1 וְאָמַר דָּוִד בְּלִבִּיהֶּּ כַּעֲשֵׂי 1997 דְּלִמָּא 1999 אַתְמַסְר יוֹמָא חַד בִּידָא דְשָׂאוּל לִית לִי מַדְעָם דְּטַב אַרִי אֲשַׁתִּיבָא 2000 אֲשַׁתִּיב לְאַרְע פְּלִשְׁתִּי וִינוּח מִנִּי שָׂאוּל לְמַבְעִי עוֹד בְּכָל תַּחֲוּם אַרְעָא 2001 דִּישְׂרָאֵל וְאֲשַׁתִּיב מִן יַדִּיהָ:

*27:1 And David said in his heart, "Now, perhaps I shall be delivered one day into the hand of Saul. There is nothing better for me than that I should indeed escape to the land of the Philistines. Then Saul will rest from seeking me any longer within the borders of the land of Israel and I shall escape from his hand."*

David's utterance was slightly adjusted, because an utterance that David would perish by the hand of Saul was in contradiction to the rest of the pericope (>16). Therefore the word דְּלִמָּא, 'lest, perhaps', was added.<sup>2002</sup> Furthermore, the emotional verb "despair" was replaced by the more neutral verb "rest".<sup>2003</sup>

2 וְקָם דָּוִד וְעֵבֶר הוּא וְשִׂית מֵאָה גְּבֵרָא דְעַמִּיָּה לִוּת אַכִּיש בַּר מַעֲךָ 2004 מַלְכָּא דְגַת: 27 3 וִיתִיב דָּוִד עִם אַכִּיש בְּנַת הוּא וְגִבְרָוּהִי גִבֵּר וְאִנֶּש בִּיתִיה דָּוִד וְתַרְתִּין נִשְׁוֵהִי אַחִינוּעַם דְּמִזְרַעְאֵל וְאַבְיגִיל אַתָּת נָבַל דְּמַכְרְמֵלָא: 27 4 וְאַתְחוּהָ לְשָׂאוּל אַרִי עֵרְקִי 2005 דָּוִד לְגַת וְלֹא אוֹסִיף עוֹד לְמַבְעִיהִי: 27 5 וְאָמַר דָּוִד לְאַכִּיש אִם כַּעֲשֵׂי אֲשַׁכְחִית רַחֲמִין בַּעֲיִן יִתְנֹן לִי אַתָּר בְּחַדָּא מְקֻרְוִי חַקְלָא וְאַתִּיב חֲמֵן וְלִמָּא יִתִּיב

<sup>1997</sup>The difference between Hebrew בלבו and על/לבו is not maintained in the Targum, see above, commentary on 1:13.

<sup>1998</sup>Omitted in MS b.

<sup>1999</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>2000</sup>Omitted in ms eb1.

<sup>2001</sup>Omitted in MS o, which only reads 'ישראל', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>2002</sup>The same addition is made in 2 Sam. 20:6.

<sup>2003</sup>Differently in TJon Isa. 57:10; Jer. 2:25; 18:12, where Aramaic ܗܘܒ, 'to turn back, to repent' is used.

<sup>2004</sup>MS o reads מעכה, 'Maacah', which is in accordance with 1 Kgs 2:39 (>15). The phrase בר מעך is omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>2005</sup>MS a reads אול, 'he went', in accordance with the usual rendering of Hebrew ברך in the Pentateuchal Targumim; cf. B. Grossfeld, "The Relationship between Biblical Hebrew *brh* and *nus* and Their Corresponding Aramaic Equivalents in the Targum 'rq, 'zl, 'pk: A Preliminary Study in Aramaic-Hebrew Lexicography", ZAW 91 (1979), 107-23.

עבדך בקריח<sup>2006</sup> מלכותא עמך: 27 6 ויהב ליה אכיש ביומא ההוא ית ציקלג בכין<sup>2006</sup> הות ציקלג למלכיא<sup>2007</sup> דבת<sup>2007</sup> יהודה עד יומא הרין: 27 7 והוה מנין יומיא דיתבי דויד בקרוי<sup>2008</sup> פלשתאי יומין<sup>2008</sup> וארבעה ירחין: 27 8 וסליק דויד וגברוהי ואתגנרו על גשוראי וגוראי<sup>2009</sup> ועמלקאי ארי אנין יתבת ארעא דמיעלמא מעלנא דחגרא<sup>2010</sup> ועד ארעא דמצרים: 27 9 ומחי דויד ית יתבי ארעא ולא מקיים גבר ואחא ושבי ען ותורין וחמרין וגמלין ולבושין<sup>2011</sup> ותאיב ואחי לוח אכיש: 27 10 ואמר אכיש לאן<sup>2012</sup> אתגידתון יומא דין ואמר דויד על דרום יהודה ועל דרום ירחמילאה<sup>2013</sup> ולדרום שלמאה<sup>2013</sup>:

*27:2 So David arose and went over, he and the six hundred men who were with him, to Achish the son of Maach, king of Gath. 27:3 And David dwelt with Achish at Gath, he and his men; each man with the men<sup>2014</sup> of his house, David with his two wives, Ahinoam who was from Jezreel, and Abigail, Nabal's widow, who was from Carmel. 27:4 And when it was told Saul that David had fled to Gath, he sought him no more. 27:5 Then David said to Achish, "If I have found favour in your eyes now, let them give to me a place in one of the country towns, that I may dwell there, for why should your servant dwell in the royal city with you?" 27:6 So Achish gave him Ziklag that day. Therefore Ziklag has belonged to the kings of the House of Judah to this day. 27:7 And the number of the days that David dwelt in the cities of the Philistines was a year and four months. 27:8 Now David and his men went up, and marched out against the Geshurites, the Gizrites, and the Amalekites, for these were the inhabitants of the land, which was from of old the entrance of the Heger unto the land of Egypt. 27:9 And David used to strike the inhabitants of the land*

<sup>2006</sup> Ms f reads על כן, 'therefore'.

<sup>2007</sup> Ms o reads the singular למלכא.

<sup>2008</sup> Mss a b f read בעידן בעידן, an Aramaic idiom meaning "year". Kimḥi gives this expression as his second rendering.

<sup>2009</sup> According to the Qere, Vg and some MSS of the Vetus Latina, probably connected with Gezer. Both Gizrites and Girzites appear to be a *hapax legomenon*. Note the plural Aramaic names over against the Hebrew singular (>9).

<sup>2010</sup> See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 15:7.

<sup>2011</sup> Mss b d m o w y read ונציב לבושין, 'and he took clothes', because the verb שבא, 'capture', was not considered fit to combine with clothes; cf. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 39, 52. For the same reason MS f reads ובני לבושין, 'and he counted clothes'.

<sup>2012</sup> Ms eb1 reads ואמר דוד לאכיש at the beginning of the present verse. This is corrected with an *Aleph* above the name of Achish and a *Beth* above David's name, suggesting that the name of Achish ought to be read first. A complete correction is also found in the margin, viz. ואמר אכיש לדוד.

<sup>2013</sup> Ms f reads the tribal name ירחמאל.

<sup>2014</sup> A simple addition to show that the men did not take their houses with them, but their family and servants (>10).

and he left neither man nor woman alive, but captured the sheep, the oxen, the asses, the camels, and the clothes, and came back to Achish. 27:10 When Achish asked, “Where have you marched today?” David would say, “Against the south of Judah,” or, “Against the south of the Jerahmeelite,” or, “Against the south of the Shalmaite.”

Hebrew אל is interpreted as a preposition and complemented with אן, ‘where’, in conformity with some Hebrew manuscripts and quotations, and with Syr.<sup>2015</sup> Lxx and Vg solve the problem of the missing word by reading “to/against whom”, as is also suggested by the letters and the spaces in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

11 27 וגבר ואחא לא מקיים דויד לאיחאה לגת למימר דלמא יחוון עלנא למימר כרין עבד דויד וכרין הלכתיה<sup>2016</sup> כל יומיא דיתוב בקרוי<sup>2015</sup> פלשהאי: 12 27 והימין אכיש ברודי למימר אתגראה אתגרי<sup>2017</sup> בעמיה בישראל ויהי לי עבד<sup>2018</sup> פלח<sup>2019</sup> לעלם:

27:11 And David left neither man nor woman alive to bring them to Gath, thinking, “Lest they should tell about us, and say, “So David has done.” Such was his custom all the days he dwelt in the cities of the Philistines. 27:12 And Achish trusted David, thinking, “He has utterly provoked his own people, Israel. Now he shall be a servant, subjected to me forever.”

The relation between Achish and David was slightly adjusted in TJon with the addition of the participle פלח, which implies that David was subjected to Achish, not that he constantly served him. Otherwise the verb שמש would have been used (see above, Ch. 4, s.v. Aramaic פלח).

## 5.27 Saul’s Last War I (1 Samuel 28)

1 28 והוה ביומא האנון וכנשו<sup>2019</sup> פלשתאי ית משריתהון לחילא<sup>2015</sup> לאגחא קרבא בישראל ואמר אכיש לדויד מדע תדע ארי עמי תפוק במשריתא את וגברך: 2 28 ואמר דויד לאכיש בכין את תדע ית דיעביד עבדך ואמר אכיש לדויד בכין<sup>2020</sup> נטרא לרישי אשוניך כל יומיא: 3 28 ושמואל מית וספרו עלוהי כל ישראל וקברוהו ברמתא

<sup>2015</sup>So also Kimḥi and Rashi, cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 29.

<sup>2016</sup>Ms eb1 gives, both in the text and in the margin, the rendering נומסיה, ‘his custom’, indicating that this is neither according to the Torah, nor according to halakhic rules; see above, Ch. 3, s.v. Hebrew בשפט.

<sup>2017</sup>See above, commentary on 13:4.

<sup>2018</sup>Omitted in MS o.

<sup>2019</sup>MS f erroneously reads the passive ואיחכנישו, ‘and they gathered themselves’, cf. also 28:4.

<sup>2020</sup>Omitted in MS eb1\*, but added in the margin.

וספרו עלוהי אנש בקרתיה<sup>2021</sup> ושאויל פל-2022 בדין וזכורו מארעא:

28:1 *In those days the Philistines gathered their forces for an army, to wage war against Israel. And Achish said to David, "Understand well that you are to go with me in the army, you and your men."* 28:2 *And David said to Achish, "Thus you shall know what your servant can do." And Achish said to David, "Thus I will make you guardian of my head"<sup>2023</sup> all the days.* 28:3 *Now Samuel had died and all Israel had mourned over him. And they buried him in Ramah and they had mourned over him, each in his own city. And Saul had removed mediums and necromancers out of the land.*

Hebrew ובעירו ברמה, 'in Ramah and in his city', is diversified in the Aramaic version (>18) to avoid redundancy. The funeral is still situated in Ramah, as in 25:1. The site of "his city" is applied to the mourning of the Israelites: every man in his own city. However, since the Aramaic expression "every man in his own city" is usually constructed with גברא and not with אנשא, some manuscripts omit the preposition ב and read "and the people of his city mourned over him".<sup>2024</sup>

28 4 ואחכנישו פלשתאי ואזו ושרו בשונם וכנש שאול ית כל ישראל ושרו בגלבע:  
28 5 וחזא שאול ית משרית פלשתאי ורחיל וזע לביה לחדא: 28 6 ושאויל שאול  
במימרא דיני ולא קביל צלותיה ויי אף בחלמיה אף באוריה אף בספריא:◇

28:4 *The Philistines gathered themselves and came. They encamped at Shunem. And Saul gathered all Israel, and they encamped at Gilboa.* 28:5 *When Saul saw the army of the Philistines, he was afraid and his heart trembled greatly.* 28:6 *And when Saul inquired of the speech of the LORD, the LORD did not accept his prayer, either by dreams, or by Urim, or by scribes.*

TJon replaced the anonymous prophets by scribes, as is usual in Tg-Sam. This changed the meaning of God's answer. There was no scribe who could tell through exegesis what Saul's strategy was to be.<sup>2025</sup>

28 7 ואמר שאול לעבדוהי בעו לי אתחא דידעא לאסקא בדין ואהך לוחה ואשאל<sup>2026</sup>  
בה ואמרו עבדוהי ליה הא אתחא דידעא לאסקא בדין בעין דור:

<sup>2021</sup>Mss d f o omit the preposition.

<sup>2022</sup>Mss a b f add the nota accusativi.

<sup>2023</sup>Note that TJon did not dissolve the *pars pro toto* (against >14).

<sup>2024</sup>In this expression the use of אנשא is not rare, cf. e.g. אנש ביתו, 'the people of his house'.

<sup>2025</sup>In contrast to Mt. 2:4-6, where scribes knew the answers through exegesis of the book of Micah; cf. C.T.R. Hayward, "Some Notes on Scribes and Priests in the Targum of the Prophets", *JJS* 36 (1985), 210-21, esp. 220.

<sup>2026</sup>Mss m w y read the Itlpeel ואשתאיל, 'and I will beseech her'; MS o reads

28:7 Then Saul said to his servants, "Seek out for me a woman who knows how to conjure up the spirits of the dead that I may go to her and inquire of her." And his servants said to him, "Behold, there is a woman at Endor who knows how to conjure up the spirits of the dead."

In the Hebrew Bible the woman of Endor is described as a master of the spirits, which is a designation that appears to be in accordance with attested Canaanite practice.<sup>2027</sup> This description is given with two words in the construct form, the second construct form being an apposition to the first: "a woman of, *i.e.* a mistress of, spirits". Such construct chains also exist in Aramaic (cf. TgJudg. 19:22), although a diversified construction, such as מלכות כנשחא דציון (Isa. 37:22) or מלכות דעמי כנשחא (Jer. 14:17) seems more likely. In the present verse TJon chose to give an explanatory translation, describing the contents and avoiding the double genitive: "a woman who knows how to conjure up spirits".<sup>2028</sup>

TJon made no attempt to identify this anonymous woman, in contrast to Pseudo-Jerome and Pirque de-Rabbi Eliezer who assumed that she was Abner's mother.<sup>2029</sup> Pseudo-Philo did not give this identification, but he only named her Sedecla, which might mean "not righteous". He claimed she was the daughter of a Midianite sorcerer.<sup>2030</sup>

8 28 ואשתני שאול ולביש לבושין אחרנין ואול הוא ותרין גברין עמיה ואחו לוח אתתא בליליא ואמר קסומי כען<sup>2031</sup> לי בבדין ואסיקי לי ית דאימר לך: 9 28 ואמרת אתתא ליה הא<sup>2032</sup> את ידעת ית<sup>2033</sup> דעבר שאול דשיצי ית ברין ויה זכורו מן ארעא ולמא את מתגרי בנפשי למקטלי: 10 28 וקיים לה שאול במימרא דיוי למימר קיים ד הוא יי אם יערענך חובא ד בפתגמא הדין: 11 28 ואמרת אתתא ית מן אסיק לך ואמר ית

מנה, ואשאל מנה, 'and I will ask her'.

<sup>2027</sup>Cf. J.C. de Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism* (BETHL, 91A), Leuven 1997, 101-2.

<sup>2028</sup>The root ידע might be induced by the Hebrew word ידעני (28:3, 9). The Hebrew chapter reveals a pun on this title and the verb ידע, cf. M. Garsiel, "Word Play and Puns as a Rhetorical Device in the Book of Samuel", in: S.B. Noegel (ed.), *Puns and Pundits: Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature*, Bethesda (MD) 2000, 181-204, esp. 194.

<sup>2029</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 103; PRE 33.

<sup>2030</sup>Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 64:3; cf. Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 6, 236, n. 74; H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, Vol. 2, Leiden 1996, 1204.

<sup>2031</sup>Omitted in MS m.

<sup>2032</sup>Omitted in MS o.

<sup>2033</sup>Omitted in MS f.



שמואל אסיקי ל<sup>2034</sup>: 28 12 וחזת אחתא ית שמואל וצוחת בקל רב<sup>2035</sup> ואמרת אחתא לשאול למימר למא שקרת בי ואת שאול: 28 13 ואמר לה מלכא לא תדחלין ארי מא חזית ואמרת אחתא לשאול מלאכא ◊ דיויי ◊ חזית דסליק מן ארעא:

28:8 So Saul disguised himself and put on other clothes and went, he and two men with him. And they came to the woman by night. And he said, "Divine for me by the spirits of the dead, and conjure up for me whomever I shall name to you." 28:9 The woman said to him, "Surely you know what Saul has done, how he has put an end to the mediums and the necromancers from the land. Why then are you provoking my soul to kill me?" 28:10 But Saul swore to her by the speech of the LORD, saying, "As the LORD is the existing One, no guilt shall come upon you by this thing." 28:11 Then the woman said, "Whom shall I conjure up for you?" He said, "Conjure up Samuel for me." 28:12 When the woman saw Samuel, she cried out with a loud voice. And the woman said to Saul, saying, "Why have you deceived me? You are Saul!" 28:13 The king said to her, "Fear not. What do you see?" And the woman said to Saul, "I see the angel of the LORD, coming up out of the earth."

To avoid the misinterpretation that the woman saw God or a divine being and that divine beings should come up out of the earth, TJon rendered "the angel of the LORD".<sup>2036</sup> In Midrashic literature a different solution is offered for the term אלהים. It is connected with Exod. 7:1, which says that Moses was as God to the pharaoh. So some rabbis identified the אלהים with Moses.<sup>2037</sup> According to some opinions Samuel thought that the Day of Judgment had come and was afraid, so he brought Moses up with him (LevR. 26:7; so also Hag. 4b), while others thought he brought Moses to pray for Israel (TanB, *Vayyiqra*, 8:4). The latter opinion is based on Jer. 15:1, which mentions the possibility of Moses and Samuel standing before God to pray on behalf of the people.

28 14 ואמר לה מא חזייה ואמרת גברא סבא סליק והוא עשיף מעילא וידע שאול ארי שמואל הוא וכרע<sup>2038</sup> על אפודי על ארעא וסניד: 28 15 ואמר שמואל לשאול למא אועתני לאסקא יתי ואמר שאול עקת לי לחדא ופלשתאי מניחין קרבא בי ומימרא ◊

<sup>2034</sup>Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>2035</sup>MS o reads רם, cf. also 1 Sam. 2:10. This combination is rarer than בקל רב.

<sup>2036</sup>See above, Ch. 4, s.v. Hebrew בלאך. Note that TJon rendered both אלהים and the accompanying participle with singular words, whereas identical plurals are maintained in 1 Sam. 4:8.

<sup>2037</sup>MTeh. 138:1 assumed that אלהים might refer to prophets, taking the Hebrew construction איש אלהים as noun and its appositive, i.e. "the man, the god".

<sup>2038</sup>MS o adds שאול, 'Saul'.

דיוי רחיק יתי ולא קביל ד צלותי עוד אף ביד ספריא<sup>2039</sup> אף בחלמיא וקרית לך להודעותי<sup>2040</sup> מא אעביד: 28 16 ואמר שמואל ולמא את שאיל יתי<sup>2041</sup> ומימרא דיוי רחיק יתך והוה בסעדיה דגברא דאת<sup>2042</sup> בעיל דבביה:

28:14 *He said to her, "How is his appearance?" And she said, "An old man is coming up; and he is wrapped in a robe." Then Saul knew that it was Samuel, and he kneeled with his face to the ground and bowed down. 28:15 Then Samuel said to Saul, "Why have you disturbed me by conjuring me up?" Saul answered, "I am in great distress, for the Philistines are waging war against me and the speech of the LORD has rejected me and accepts my prayer no more, either by scribes or by dreams. So I have called you to let me know what I should do." 28:16 And Samuel said, "Why then do you ask me, since the speech of the LORD has rejected you and is in the aid of the man whose enemy you are?"*

Hebrew ער, which only occurs in Ps. 139:20 and the present verse, is interpreted as "enemy", as in many other ancient versions. Aquila and Theodotion translated it as though it were the preposition על. The Targumists had no problems with the word ער, for they could connect it with the Aramaic word ער, attested in Dan. 4:16. Note that David is not called Saul's enemy, which would have been the most literal rendering, but Saul is called David's enemy. This is both in harmony with the narratives concerning Saul's pursuit—especially with the following verse in which David is called Saul's neighbour (>16)—and in agreement with TJon's tendency to depict the heroes as being as righteous as possible (>24).<sup>2043</sup>

28 17 וקים<sup>2044</sup> יוי ליה כמא דמליל עמי<sup>2045</sup> ואעדי יוי ית מלכותא מנך<sup>2046</sup> ויהבה

<sup>2039</sup>See above, commentary on 28:6.

<sup>2040</sup>Ms eb1 renders the suffix 2 m.sg. in להודעותך. This suffix must function as the subject of the verb (not attested in Galilean Aramaic, cf. H. Odeberg, *The Aramaic Portions of Bereshit Rabba with Grammar of Galilean Aramaic*, Vol. 2: Short Grammar of Galilean Aramaic, Lund & Leipzig 1939, § 134), while the suffix 1 sg. functions as the object of the verb (cf. GKC § 115). In both cases Saul wanted Samuel to tell him what to do.

<sup>2041</sup>Omitted in MS eb1\*, but the word לי is added in the margin.

<sup>2042</sup>For this insertion, see above, Ch. 4, s.v. עמא.

<sup>2043</sup>The LORD is no-one's enemy, and his righteous are no enemies either, cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 30; Komlos, *המקרא באור התרגום*, 313-14; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 147-48.

<sup>2044</sup>Mss o eb1 read ועבר, 'and He did', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>2045</sup>Mss a b c d f m o w y read בידי, 'through me', which is in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but not in conformity with the usual vocabulary, see above, Ch. 4, s.v. ארמאיתא נבואתא.

<sup>2046</sup>In accordance with 15:28, and with the reading מעליך in some Hebrew mss

לחברך לדויד: 28 18 כמא דלא קבילתא<sup>2047</sup> למימרא<sup>2047</sup> דיוי ולא עברתא תקוף  
 רגויה<sup>2048</sup> בדבית<sup>2048</sup> עמלק על כין פתגמא הדין עבד<sup>2049</sup> לך יוי<sup>2050</sup> יומא הדין<sup>2051</sup>:  
 28 19 ומסר יוי אף ית ישראל עמך בידא דפלשתאי ומחר את ובנך עמי ואף<sup>2052</sup> ית  
 משריתא דישראל ימסר יוי בידא דפלשתאי:

28:17 *The LORD has established as He spoke with me, for the LORD has removed the kingship from you and given it to your neighbour, to David. 28:18 Because you did not accept the speech of the LORD and did not carry out his fierce anger against those of the House of Amalek, therefore the LORD has done this thing to you this day. 28:19 Moreover, the LORD will surrender Israel also with you into the hand of the Philistines. And tomorrow you and your sons shall be with me, and also the army of Israel, the LORD will surrender it into the hand of the Philistines.*

The question what Samuel meant with “with me” is answered by a tosefta-targum, attested in the margin of CR:

ספרן אחרן ומחר את ובנך נניי בגניז חיי עלמא

*another book: and tomorrow, you and your sons will be collected in the storehouse of eternal life*<sup>2053</sup>

It appears that Samuel not only announced the early death of Saul and his sons, but also their being worthy of the life in the world to come.<sup>2054</sup> This expectation is found repeatedly in the rabbinic literature, mostly attributed to R. Johanan:

R. Johanan further stated: “Whence is it deduced that the Holy One, blessed be He, pardoned him [Saul] for that sin? From where it says, ‘Tomorrow you and your sons will be with me.’ ‘With me’ implies ‘in my heavenly division’.<sup>2055</sup>

and quotations (>15). Ms f reads מן ידך in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>2047</sup>Ms f reads ששמעתא, ‘you heard’, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but not with the usual Targumic vocabulary (against >14).

<sup>2048</sup>Omitted by MSS b f, which read בעמלק, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but not with the usual Targumic vocabulary.

<sup>2049</sup>Ms d reads the imperfect יעביר, ‘He will do’, referring to the defeat of Israel and the coming death of Saul, instead of referring to God’s silence toward Saul.

<sup>2050</sup>Omitted in MS o.

<sup>2051</sup>MS w reads רין, resulting in “today”.

<sup>2052</sup>MS f reads לחוד, ‘only’.

<sup>2053</sup>For the image of the souls collected in a storehouse, see above, commentary on 25:29.

<sup>2054</sup>Cf. Kasher, חספחות, 113.

<sup>2055</sup>Er. 53b, but also LevR. 26:7; Ber. 12b; PRE 33.

In spite of Saul's future in the world to come, rabbinic literature readily acknowledges Saul's failures and sins. Six sins are mentioned in total: his transgression against the offering restrictions (1 Sam. 13:10), disobedience to the word of Samuel in the sparing of Agag (1 Sam. 15:9), the slaughter of the inhabitants of Nob (1 Sam. 22:18-19), the conjuring up of Samuel's spirit (1 Sam. 28:11), and his suicide (1 Sam. 31:4).<sup>2056</sup> However, his death made up for a great deal of his transgressions, for it fulfilled the instruction in Lev. 20:27 that whosoever conjured up spirits had to be killed, to name but one example.<sup>2057</sup> Even his suicide was forgiven (cf. GenR. 34:13).

20 28 ואוחי שאול ונפל מלי קומתיה לארעא ודחיל לחדא מפתגמי שמואל אף חילא לא הוה ביה ארי לא אכל לחמא כל יממא<sup>2058</sup> וכל ליליא: 21 28 ואתח אחתא לוח שאול וזחת ארי<sup>2059</sup> אתבהיל לחדא ואמרת ליה הא קבילת אמתך<sup>2060</sup> מנך ומסרת נפשי כעל נב<sup>2060</sup> לאתקטלא ושמעית ית פתגמך דמלילתא עמי: 22 28 וכען קבילת<sup>2061</sup> כען אף את<sup>2062</sup> למימר אמתך<sup>2063</sup> ואשוי קדמך פתח דלחמא ואכול ויהי בך חיל ארי תיזיל באורחא: 23 28 וסריב ואמר לא איכול ואתקיפו ביה עבדוהי ואף אתחא וקבילת<sup>2063</sup> למימרהון וקם מארעא ויחיב על ערסא:

*28:20 Then Saul hurried and fell full length upon the ground, for he greatly feared the words of Samuel. There was no strength in him, for he had eaten no food all day long and all night. 28:21 And when the woman came to Saul and saw that he was confused, she said to him, "Behold, your handmaid has received from you and surrendered my life, as if it were on the back [of my hand], to be killed. And I have listened to what you have spoken to me. 28:22 And now, you also accept from your handmaid. Let me set a slice of bread before you. And eat, that you may have strength when you go on your way." 28:23 He was stubborn and said, "I will not eat." But his servants, together with the woman, seized him, and he accepted their speech. So he arose from the ground and sat upon the bed.*

<sup>2056</sup> Enumerated in LevR. 26:7; GenR. 34:13; Tan., *Emor*, 4.

<sup>2057</sup> Cf. Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 64:9, who presents Saul praying that his death might have been an atonement for his sins. In 1 Chron. 10:13 the link between his sins and his death is already made.

<sup>2058</sup> MSS b o read וימא, 'day', instead of "daytime". See below, 30:12.

<sup>2059</sup> MSS m w y read ויהא, 'and behold'.

<sup>2060</sup> Ms f adds בידיי, 'in my hand', which complements the Aramaic expression. For the expression כעל נב נפשי, see above, commentary on 19:5.

<sup>2061</sup> Ms a reads שמע, 'hear', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but not with the usual vocabulary (against >14).

<sup>2062</sup> Omitted in MS w.

<sup>2063</sup> Omitted in MS eb1.

TJon stresses the stubbornness of Saul by equating Hebrew מאן, 'to refuse', with Aramaic סרב, 'rebel, be stubborn'. In TJon the Aramaic verb functions as a very negative description of a rebellious attitude toward God and his prophets (see above, commentary on 8:19).

The Hebrew verb פּרַץ is used four times in the Hebrew Bible in the sense of "to urge, to press" (1 Sam. 28:23; 2 Sam. 13:25, 27; 2 Kgs 5:23). In these four instances the verb is translated with the Aphel of Aramaic תקף, 'to strengthen, to seize, to detain'. The Hebrew verb פּצַר, too, is often rendered identically (cf. Judg. 19:7; 2 Kgs 2:17; 5:16, but also Gen. 19:3, 9; 33:11). TJon seems to identify these two verbs (>1).<sup>2064</sup>

24 28 ולא תחא עיגל פשים כביחא ואוחיאת ונכסחיה ונסיבוח קמחא ולשת ואפתיה  
פטיר: 25 28 וקריבת קדם ◊ שאול וקדם ◊ עברוהי ואכלו וקמו ואולו בליליא ההוא:

28:24 *Now the woman had a fatted calf in the house and she quickly slaughtered it. And she took flour, and kneaded it and baked unleavened bread with it. 28:25 And she brought it before Saul and before his servants and they ate. Then they rose and went away that night.*

## 5.28 David in Saul's Last War (1 Samuel 29-30)

2 29 וכנשו פלשתאי ית כל משריתוון לאפק וישראל שרן בעין דביזרעאל:  
וטורני פלשתאי עברין למאון ולאליפין ודויד וגברוהי עברין בבחריחא עם אכיש:  
3 29 ואמרו רברבי פלשתאי הלא<sup>2065</sup> מא יהודאי ◊ האלין ואמר אכיש לרברבי פלשתאי  
הלא דין דויד עברא דשאול מלכא דישראל דהוה עמי דנן יומין או דנן שנין ולא  
אשכחית ביה מדעם ביש<sup>2066</sup> מיומא דאחפרש לותי<sup>2067</sup> עד יומא הרין:

29:1 *Now the Philistines gathered all their forces at Aphek. And Israel encamped by the fountain which is in Jezreel. 29:2 As the chiefs of the Philistines were passing on by hundreds and by thousands, and David and his men were passing on in the rear with Achish, 29:3 the commanders of the Philistines said, "Why are these Jews here?" And Achish said to the commanders of the Philistines, "Is not this David, the servant of Saul, king of Israel, who has been with me now for days, or rather for years? I have found nothing wrong in him since the day he departed to me to this day."*

<sup>2064</sup>Its translation in Judg. 19:7 is therefore a literal one and not a case of simplification, against Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 609.

<sup>2065</sup>Erroneously added by MS p. MSS a b c d f m o w y eb1 omit it, in conformity with the Hebrew text and with grammatical rules.

<sup>2066</sup>Omitted in MSS f w.

<sup>2067</sup>The notion "to me" is in accordance with the translation of LXX, Vg, Syr and Symmachus, but probably adopted from a similar construction in 28:6.

Hebrew נפל, 'his falling over, his deserting', is rendered by TJon in plainer language.<sup>2068</sup> Other instances using the Hebrew verb נפל in the sense of "desert" are translated with the Ithpeel of שָׁמַע (cf. Jer. 21:9; 37:13, 14; 38:19; 46:16; 52:15). In the present verse the sense of deserting is plainly avoided, since the Biblical hero David ought to be protected against such accusations (>24).

29 4 ורגזו עלוהי רברבי פלשתאי ואמרו ליה רברבי פלשתאי<sup>2069</sup> אחיב ית גברא ויתוב לאחריה דמניתהי חמן ולא ייחוח עמנא בקרבא ולא יהי לנא<sup>2070</sup> לסטן בקרבא ובמא יתרעי<sup>2071</sup> דין לוח רבוניה  $\diamond$  הלא ברישי גבריא האנון:

*29:4 But the commanders of the Philistines were angry with him. And the commanders of the Philistines said to him, "Let the man return, that he may return to the place which you have appointed to him. He shall not go down with us to battle, lest in the battle he become an adversary to us. For how could this one please his lord? Would it not be with the heads of these men?"*<sup>2072</sup>

Aramaic סטנא only means "adversary" in TO and TJon.<sup>2073</sup> Hebrew השטן, translated in other versions as the personal name "Satan", becomes חטאה, 'seducer', e.g. in Zech. 3:1-2.

29 5 הלא דין דויד דמשמעין<sup>2074</sup> ליה בחנניא למימר קטל שאול באלפין ודויד ברבון<sup>2075</sup>: 29 6 וקרא אכיש לדויד ואמר ליה קיים  $\diamond$  הוא ווי ארי כשר את ותקין  $\diamond$  בעיני מפקד ומיעלך עמי במשריתא ארי לא אשכחית כך מדעם<sup>2077</sup> דביש מיומא דאחיתא לותי עד יומא הדין ובעיני טורניא לא תקין  $\diamond$  את: 29 7 וכען טוב ואיזיל בשלם ולא תעביד ביש בעיני טורני פלשתאי: 29 8 ואמר דויד לאכיש ארי מא עבדית ומא אשכחתיא בעבדך מיומא דהויחי משמיש  $\diamond$  קדמך  $\diamond$  עד יומא הדין ארי לא אהך ואניח קרבא בסנאי  $\diamond$  רבוני  $\diamond$  מלכא: 29 9 ואחיב אכיש ואמר לדויד ידענא

<sup>2068</sup>Cf. "since the day he came to me" in Syr, but cf. 29:6 (>15).

<sup>2069</sup>The second רברבי פלשתאי is omitted in MS eb93.

<sup>2070</sup>Omitted in MSS b m.

<sup>2071</sup>MS c reads יחידע, 'he is known, he is acknowledged'.

<sup>2072</sup>Note that the euphemism "these men" for "us" is maintained in TJon (>14), whereas it is clearly spelled out in Vg, Syr; cf. 1 Chron. 12:20. Cf. C. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO, 36), Freiburg & Göttingen 1981, 181.

<sup>2073</sup>So Num. 22:22, 32; 2 Sam. 19:23; 1 Kgs 5:18; 11:14, 23, 25.

<sup>2074</sup>Free rendering of Hebrew "ענו", cf. also 21:12 (>15). See above, commentary on 18:7.

<sup>2075</sup>For the omission of the suffixes after the numerals, see above, commentary on 18:7.

<sup>2076</sup>MSS a b c d f o y eb1 read ויטב, 'and good', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but not with the usual rendering.

<sup>2077</sup>Adopted from 28:3 (>15).

ארי תקין את בעיני<sup>2078</sup> כמלאכא דיוי ברם רברבי פלשתאי אמרו לא יסק עמנא בקרבא: 29 10 וכען אקדים בצפרא ועברי רבונך דאתו עמך ותקדמון בצפרא וינחר לכון ותזלון<sup>2079</sup>: 29 11 ואקדים דויד הוא וגברוהי למיזל בצפרא למתב לארע פלשתאי ופלשתאי סליקו לזירעאל:

*29:5 Is not this David, of whom they proclaimed in dances, 'Saul has killed by the thousands, and David by the ten thousands.' 29:6 Then Achish called David and said to him, "As the LORD is the existing One, you have been capable, and it seemed right in my sight that you should go out and come in with me in the army, for I have found nothing wrong in you from the day of your coming to me to this day. But you seem not right in the sight of the chiefs. 29:7 So return and go in peace, that you may not do anything wrong in the sight of the chiefs of the Philistines." 29:8 And David said to Achish, "But what have I done? What have you found in your servant from the day I commenced serving before you to this day, that I may not go and wage war against the haters of my lord the king?" 29:9 And Achish answered and said to David, "I know that you are as right in my sight as an angel of the LORD. Nevertheless the commanders of the Philistines have said, 'He shall not go up with us to the battle.' 29:10 Now then rise early in the morning with the servants of your lord who came with you. And you shall rise early in the morning and go as soon as you have light." 29:11 So David rose early, he and his men, to go in the morning, to return to the land of the Philistines. But the Philistines went up to Jezreel.*

1 30 והוה כד אחא דויד וגברוהי לצקלג ביומא תליתאה ועמלקאי<sup>2080</sup> אתנגרו על דרום ועל ציקלג ומחו ית ציקלג<sup>2081</sup> ואוקירו יתה בנורא: 2 30 ושבו ית נשיא דבה מזעירא ועד רבא ולא קטלו אנש ורברו ואלו לאורחהון: 3 30 ואתא דוד וגברוהי לקרתא והא קליא בנורא ונשיהון<sup>2082</sup> ובניהון ובנתהון אשתביאו: 4 30 וארים דויד ועמא דעמיה ית קלהון ובכו עד דלית<sup>2083</sup> בהון חילא למבכי: 5 30 ותרתין נשי דויד אשתביאה אחינעם דמזירעאל ואביגיל אתת נבל דמכרמלא: 6 30 ועקת לדויד לחדא

<sup>2078</sup> Ms f reads קדמי, 'before me', according to the usual vocabulary (>14).

<sup>2079</sup> Ms o reads ותהכון, 'and you shall go'.

<sup>2080</sup> Mss a y read the singular ועמלקאה, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but against the usual adaptations of the Aramaic version (against >9).

<sup>2081</sup> Ms b omits ציקלג ומחו ית ציקלג by haplography, as is the case in Syr, cf. Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung*, 87.

<sup>2082</sup> Omitted in MS eb1\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>2083</sup> Mss a b c d m w y read דלא הוה, while MS o reads the grammatically incorrect דלא הוה.

ארי אמרו<sup>2084</sup> עמא למרגמיה ארי מרת נפשא דכל עמא גבר על בנוהי<sup>2085</sup> ועל בנתיה  
 ואתקף דויד במימרא דיוי אלהיה: 7 30 ואמר דויד לאביתר כהנא בר אחימלך  
 קריב כען לי<sup>2086</sup> אפודא וקריב אביתר<sup>2087</sup> ית אפודא לות דויד: 8 30 ושאל דויד  
 במימרא דיוי למימר ארדוף בתר משריתא<sup>2088</sup> הדא האדבקנה<sup>2089</sup> ואמר ליה רדוף  
 ארי אדבקא חדביק ושיזבא תשיזיב: 9 30 ואול דויד הוא ושית מאה גברא דעמיה  
 ואחו עד נחלא דכסור ומקצתהון<sup>2090</sup> אשתארו:

30:1 Now when David and his men came to Ziklag on the third day—  
 the Amalekites had marched out against the South and against Ziklag;  
 they had struck Ziklag and burnt it with fire, 30:2 and they had taken  
 captive the women who were in it, both small and great; without killing  
 anyone, they led them off and went their way— 30:3 when David and  
 his men came to the city, behold, it was burnt with fire and their wives  
 and sons and daughters were taken captive. 30:4 Then David and the  
 people who were with him raised their voices and wept, until they  
 had no more strength to weep. 30:5 David's two wives also had been  
 taken captive, Ahinoam who was from Jezreel and Abigail the widow  
 of Nabal who was from Carmel. 30:6 And David was greatly distressed,  
 for the people spoke of stoning him, because all the people were bitter  
 of soul,<sup>2091</sup> each for his sons and daughters. But David strengthened  
 himself in the speech of the LORD his God. 30:7 And David said to  
 Abiathar the priest, the son of Ahimelech, "Bring me the ephod." So  
 Abiathar brought the ephod to David. 30:8 And David inquired of the  
 speech of the LORD, "I will pursue after this army. Shall I overtake  
 them?" And he said to him, "Pursue, for you shall surely overtake  
 and shall surely rescue." 30:9 So David went, he and the six hundred  
 men who were with him, and they came to the brook Besor. And part  
 of them were left behind.

Hebrew הנותרים, 'the rest', is a minor form of *prolepsis*. It is reformu-  
 lated in TJon, because there is no rest if the majority of the group is  
 not yet described. So TJon translated "part of them".

<sup>2084</sup>Ms w adds כל, resulting in "all the people spoke of stoning him".

<sup>2085</sup>Plural in accordance with the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

<sup>2086</sup>Ms c adds the nota accusativi, as is done in the next phrase (>15).

<sup>2087</sup>Ms w adds כהנא, 'priest', as was done in the preceding phrase (>15).

<sup>2088</sup>The usual rendering of any kind of army (>15, simplification).

<sup>2089</sup>Ms o contracts the two phrases to one by replacing Hebrew והא by the copula ו. ואדבקנה: This one statement agrees with the one answer David received from the oracle (>16).

<sup>2090</sup>Ms a reads ומקצת מנהון.

<sup>2091</sup>Literally: the soul of all the people was bitter.



10 30 ורדף דויד הוא וארבע מאה גברא<sup>2092</sup> ואשתארו<sup>2093</sup> מאתן גברא דאתמנעו  
מלמעבר ית נחלא דבסור:

*30:10 But David went on with the pursuit, he and four hundred men. Two hundred men, who refrained from crossing the brook Besor, stayed behind.*

Although the Hebrew verb פּנַר is nowadays linked to the noun פּנַר and is said to mean “be exhausted, be too tired”,<sup>2094</sup> the ancient versions do not show any awareness of this relationship. While TJon renders the passive or reflective “they refrained from crossing the brook”, Syr and LXX translated a very neutral “they stayed”.<sup>2095</sup>

11 30 ואשכחו גברא מצראה בחקלא ואיחיו ויתיה לות דויד ויהבו ליה לחמא  
ואכל<sup>2096</sup> ואשקויה מיא: 12 30 ויהבו ליה פילס דבילתא וחרין אחכלין דענבין  
יבשין<sup>2097</sup> ואכל ותבת רוחיה ליה ארי לא אכל לחמא ולא שתי מיא תלחא ימין<sup>2098</sup>  
ותלחא לילין:

*30:11 And they found an Egyptian man in the field and brought him to David. And they gave him bread and he ate, they gave him water to drink, 30:12 and they gave him a pouch of dried figs and two clusters of dried grapes. And when he had eaten, his spirit revived, for he had not eaten bread or drunk water for three days and three nights.*

Although dried figs are usually weighed with *mines* (see above, commentary on 25:18), TJon chose the Graecism פִּילס, ‘pouch’, because of its similarity with Hebrew פֶּלַח, ‘slice’ (6). This *phollis* was originally a leather bag, but the word was later used to denote an Aramaic *selah*, which had the same weight as the Hebrew *shekel*.

13 30 ואמר ליה דויד דמן<sup>2099</sup> את ואי מדין את ואמר<sup>2100</sup> עולימא מצראה אנא<sup>2101</sup>

<sup>2092</sup> Ms w adds דעמיה, ‘who were with him’, adopted from the preceding verses (>15).

<sup>2093</sup> Mss c d read וקמו, ‘they stayed’, which is a more literal translation of the Hebrew text (>29), but not in accordance with the usual vocabulary (see 30:9).

<sup>2094</sup> Kimhi’s explanation, cf. A. Caquot, Ph. de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel*, Geneva 1994, 349, n. 10c-c. So also Vg, Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:365, and HALAT<sup>3</sup>, s. v.

<sup>2095</sup> Cf. Rashi’s explanations. Both Syr and the Lucian version add in this verse that this group stayed to guard the baggage, as is stated in 30:24.

<sup>2096</sup> Ms f reads למיכל, ‘to eat’.

<sup>2097</sup> Cf. above, 25:18.

<sup>2098</sup> Mss c o w read יומין, ‘days’, see above, 28:20.

<sup>2099</sup> Mss a f read למן, in accordance with the following answer. Ms w only reads מן, resulting in “who are you?” So also Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:360

<sup>2100</sup> Ms c adds ליה, ‘to him’.

<sup>2101</sup> Omitted in MS y.

עבדא לנברא<sup>2102</sup> עמלקאה ושכני רבוני<sup>◇</sup> ארי אחמרעית יומא דיין<sup>2103</sup> דנן תלהא יומין<sup>2104</sup>: 30 14 אנהא אתננידנא על<sup>2105</sup> דרום כרית ועל דליהודה ועל דרום כלב ויה ציקלג אוקירנא בנורא:

30:13 *And David said to him, "To whom do you belong? And where are you from?" He said, "I am an Egyptian young man, servant to an Amalekite man. And my lord left me behind, because I fell sick—today three days ago. 30:14 We had marched out against the South of Chereth and against those of Judah and against the South of Caleb. And we burnt Ziklag with fire."*

Hebrew כרתי, 'Cherethite', is equated with the place-name Chereth, in accordance with the other two names. This is the only occurrence of the name Chereth; elsewhere the combination of Cherethites and Pelethites is consistently rendered "the archers and the slingers" (2 Sam. 8:18; 15:18; 20:7, 23; 1 Kgs 1:38, 44).

30 15 ואמר ליה דויד התחנני למשריתא<sup>2106</sup> הדא ואמר קיים לי במימרא<sup>◇</sup> דיוין<sup>◇</sup> דלא<sup>2107</sup> תקטלנני ולא תמסרנני בידא דרבוני<sup>◇</sup> ואהתנך למשריתא<sup>2108</sup> הדא: 30 16 ואחזיה הוא רטישין<sup>2109</sup> על אפי כל ארעא אכלין ושחן וחגנין<sup>2110</sup> בכל עדא<sup>◇</sup> סגיא דשבו מארע פלשהאי ומיארעא דבית<sup>2111</sup> יהודה: 30 17 ומחנן דויד מקבלא ועד עדן רמשא דיומא דבתרוהי ולא אשתויב מנהון אנש<sup>2112</sup> אלהין ארבע מאה גבר<sup>2113</sup> עולים דרכיבו על ינקיא<sup>2114</sup> ואפכו<sup>◇</sup>:

30:15 *And when David said to him, "Will you take me down to this army?" he said, "Swear to me by the speech of the LORD, that you will not kill me or surrender me into the hand of my lord. Then I will take you down to this army." 30:16 And when he had taken him*

<sup>2102</sup>Mss a c m o w eb66 read דנברא, 'of a man', in accordance with the preceding answer, although MS a reads אה אה.

<sup>2103</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>2104</sup>TJon gives exactly the same phrase as in 9:20 (>15), also attested in some Hebrew MSS which add ימים at the end of the verse.

<sup>2105</sup>Added in conformity with some quotations, LXX, Vg and some MSS of the Vetus Latina.

<sup>2106</sup>Usual rendering of any army (>15, simplification), see above, 30:7.

<sup>2107</sup>Translation of Hebrew אה in an oath-formula; so also Syr.

<sup>2108</sup>Usual rendering of any army (>15, simplification), see above, 30:7.

<sup>2109</sup>MS f<sub>3</sub> reads פריסין, 'spread', a synonym of רטישין, albeit less similar to the Hebrew wording, cf. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 29.

<sup>2110</sup>MS f<sub>5</sub> reads שירוהא, 'and having banquets'; cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:363, who assumed there to be "outspread tables".

<sup>2111</sup>Omitted in MS f, which reads ומארע.

<sup>2112</sup>Omitted in MS c.

<sup>2113</sup>Omitted in MS o.

<sup>2114</sup>MS m reads נקיא, the Talmudic form of the word. Mss a b c d f<sub>2</sub> w y read גמליא, 'camels', similar to the Hebrew word (>29).

down, behold, they were spread about over the surface of all the land, eating and drinking and feasting with the great booty they had taken from the land of the Philistines and from the land of the House of Judah. 30:17 And David struck them from the dark until the time of the evening of the day after. And not a man of them escaped, except four hundred young men, who mounted cow-camels and retreated.

Hebrew נשף is interpreted as the deep darkness of the night, represented by Aramaic קבלא. This interpretation represents one party in the discussion concerning evening and night in Ber. 3b, suggesting that David rose in the middle of the night (Ps. 119:62, 147). Whereas Ps. 119:62 uses Hebrew חצות לילה, 'in the middle of the night', Ps. 119:147 uses Hebrew נשף. The 23rd hermeneutical rule of R. Eliezer (>15), which dictates that a verse must be explained with another verse concerning the same subject, seems to imply that נשף must mean the middle of the night. Several rabbis disputed this conclusion by stating that נשף in Prov. 7:9 is used parallel to the word "evening", using the Aramaic word אורחא as its synonym, and explaining that נשף could be used for the end of the night and the end of the day (Rabba).<sup>2115</sup> If TJon would have favoured the latter explanation, Hebrew נשף would have been represented by אורחא, 'twilight'.

Although TJon usually gives Hebrew גמל, 'camel', its natural Aramaic equivalent being גמלא,<sup>2116</sup> most manuscripts read the word נקא, 'cow-camel' in the present verse.<sup>2117</sup> The specification of the gender might be given because most herds do not consist of male camels only and because female camels are less aggressive.<sup>2118</sup> Still, the camels used in the attacks of the Midianites are not specified as female camels in TJon (Judg. 6:5; 7:12, 8:21, 26). Another explanation might be that these four hundred camels with their riders are connected with the four hundred men of Esau, which he took with him to meet his brother Jacob (Gen. 32:6; 33:6), as in GenR. 78:15, where the female camels are connected with Jacob's present for Esau which also contained milch camels (Gen. 32:15). That is the only instance in which the Hebrew text specifies the gender of camels.

<sup>2115</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:364 interprets it as "the first hour", i.e. dawn. So also Syr with נקא.

<sup>2116</sup> Cf. Judg. 6:5; 7:12; 8:21, 26; 1 Sam. 15:3; 27:9; 1 Kgs 10:2; 2 Kgs 8:9; Isa. 21:7; 30:6; Jer. 49:29, 32; Ezek. 25:5.

<sup>2117</sup> Aramaic נקא is the natural equivalent of Hebrew בכרה, 'cow-camel' (Jer. 2:23). Consequently, נקא does not mean "young child, suckling" in this context; against Klein, "Bemerkungen zu Herrn Dr. Bacher's 'Kritischen Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum'", *ZDMG* 29 (1875), 157-161, esp. 161.

<sup>2118</sup> Cf. H. Gauthier-Pilters, A.I. Dagg, *The Camel: Its Evolution, Ecology, Behavior, and Relationship to Man*, Chicago 1981, 78, 86.

18 30 ושיזיב דויד ית כל דשבו עמלקאי וית תרתין נשוהי שזיזיב דוד: 19 30 ולא<sup>2119</sup> שגא להון מן זעירא ועד רבא ועד בנין ובנן ומבותא<sup>2120</sup> ועד כל דנסיבו<sup>2120</sup> להון כולא אתיב דויד: 20 30 ושבא דויד ית כל ענא ותורי דברו<sup>2121</sup> קדם גיתיא<sup>2121</sup> האגון ואמרו דין עדאה<sup>2122</sup> דדויד: 21 30 [ואתא דוד לוח מאתן גברא דאתנניעו<sup>2122</sup> מלמזיל בחר דוד ואותיבונון בנחלא דבשורן<sup>2123</sup> ונפקן לקדמות דויד ולקדמות עמא דעמיה וערע דויד ית עמא<sup>2124</sup> ושאייל להון לשלם: 22 30 ואתיב כל גבר ביש ורשיע<sup>2125</sup> מנבריא דאזלו עם דויד ואמרו חלף דלא אולו עמי<sup>2125</sup> לא נתין להון מעדאה<sup>2125</sup> דשיזיבנא אלהין גבר ית אחתיה וית בנוהי וידברון<sup>2126</sup> ויזילון: 23 30 ואמר דויד לא תעברון כין<sup>2126</sup> אחי ית דיהב לנא יוי<sup>2127</sup> ונטר ינא ומסר<sup>2128</sup> ית משריתא<sup>2129</sup> דאתת עלנא בידנא: 24 30 ומן ישמע לכון לפחגמא הדין ארי כחולק דנח<sup>2130</sup> בקרבא וכחולק דאשחאר<sup>2131</sup> למטר מניא כחדא יפלגון:

*30:18 David rescued all whom the Amalekites had taken captive and David rescued his two wives. 30:19 Nothing was missing, whether small or great, sons or daughters or plunder; really anything that they had taken for themselves. David brought back all. 30:20 David also took captive all the sheep and cows. And they drove before those herds and said, "This is David's booty!" 30:21 Then David came to the two hundred men who refrained from going after David and whom he had posted at the brook Besor. And they came out to meet David and to meet the people who were with him. And when David met the people, he asked them for their welfare. 30:22 Then all the bad and wicked among the men who had gone with David reacted and said, "Because they did not go with me, we will not give them any of the booty which we have rescued; except that every man may lead away his wife and*

<sup>2119</sup>MS eb66 erroneously reads a double דלא.

<sup>2120</sup>Mss f m o read דשבו, 'they had taken captive', in accordance with the preceding verses (>15).

<sup>2121</sup>Plural, because there are both sheep and cows.

<sup>2122</sup>See above, commentary on 30:10.

<sup>2123</sup>Not present in MS p. MS eb66 does add this part of the verse, but concludes it with a *soph pasuq*.

<sup>2124</sup>Kimḥi cites עמא דוד לוח, 'and David drew near to the people', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29); cf. Syr. TJon avoids David to draw near to his subjects (>23).

<sup>2125</sup>TJon maintains the 1st person, against some Hebrew MSS and quotations, LXX, Syr and Vg. See above, commentary on 5:10.

<sup>2126</sup>MS a reads כדין, 'thus'.

<sup>2127</sup>Only MS p has the order יוי לנא; all other MSS read לנא יוי.

<sup>2128</sup>Mss d f read ויהב, 'and He gave', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but not in accordance with the rule of diversification (against >18); MS f<sub>3</sub> reports the reading ומסר.

<sup>2129</sup>See above, 30:8.

<sup>2130</sup>Mss b c f y read the plural דנחתי, see also the following verb (>9).

<sup>2131</sup>Mss b c f y read the plural דאשחארו, see also the preceding verb. MS a reads דיהיב, 'who stayed'.

sons, and depart.” 30:23 But David said, “You shall not do so, my brothers, [after]<sup>2132</sup> what the LORD has given us. He has preserved us and surrendered into our hand the army that came against us. 30:24 Who would listen to this proposal of yours? For as his share is who goes down into the battle, so shall his share be who stays by the baggage. They shall share alike.”

TJon does not fully preserve the poetic style of the rule, by rendering plural forms of the verbs and using two different translations for the Hebrew stem חלק.<sup>2133</sup> The latter choice originates in the character of the Aramaic roots, for while the verb פלג means “divide, share” and is the natural equivalent of the Hebrew verb חלק, the most important meaning of the Aramaic nouns פלגורא and פלגא is “half”. Furthermore, while the noun חולקא, ‘share, portion’, is the natural rendering of Hebrew חלק, an Aramaic verb חלק does not exist.

25 30 והוה מיומא ההוא ולעילא ושייה לגזירתה<sup>2134</sup> דין לישראל<sup>2135</sup> עד יומא הדין:  
30:25 And from that day forward he made it legal jurisprudence for Israel to this day.

The fact that TJon does not render Hebrew חק ומשפט—considered a *hendiadys*—by Aramaic נומסא, ‘custom’, or הליכא, ‘oral law’, shows that in some way David was assumed to have deduced this law from Torah. The use of the word גזרתא also points at the Torah, since this word was used for Torah commandments, albeit commandments without foundation.<sup>2136</sup> And indeed, R. Judah linked this custom to Abraham’s decision to share the booty among the ones who stayed at home (GenR. 43:9 discussing Gen. 14:24).

26 30 ואחא דויד לציקלג ושדרר ◊ מבוחא ◊ לסבי בית◊<sup>2137</sup> יהודה לרחמוהי למימר  
הא לכון מתנא<sup>2138</sup> מבוח ◊ סנאי ◊ עמאי ◊ דיין: 27 30 לדבבית אל ולדברמות  
גב ולדביתר: 28 30 ולדבערער<sup>2139</sup> ולדבספמות ולדבאשחמוע: 29 30 ולדברכל

<sup>2132</sup>The nota accusativi depends on a verbal idea in the speaker’s mind, but is neither expressed in the Hebrew nor in the Aramaic text; cf. GKC § 117.

<sup>2133</sup>Cf. P.A.H. de Boer, “Research into the Text of 1 Samuel xviii–xxxi”, *OTS* 6 (1949), 1-100, esp. 95.

<sup>2134</sup>Ms a reads ולגזירתה, making a double rendering, but cf. the same combination in TO Exod. 15:25; TJon Josh. 24:25.

<sup>2135</sup>Ms a reads בישראל, ‘in Israel’, in conformity with many Hebrew MSS and the Vg.

<sup>2136</sup>Cf. W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditions-literatur*, Leipzig 1899-1905, repr. Darmstadt 1965, 12-13.

<sup>2137</sup>Omitted in MSS a b f w y, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>2138</sup>See above, commentary on 25:26.

<sup>2139</sup>Verses 28-30 are omitted in MS f, because the Aramaic names did not deviate much from the Hebrew ones. The omission of verses consisting of only names is

ולדבקריוי ירחמילאה<sup>2140</sup> ולדבקריוי שלמאה<sup>30</sup> ולדבחרמה ולדבכר<sup>2141</sup>  
 עשן ולדבעתך<sup>2142</sup>: 30 31 ולדבחרון ולכל אתריא דהליך חמן דויד הוא וגברוהי:

30:26 When David came to Ziklag, he sent part of the plunder to his friends, the elders of the House of Judah, saying, "Behold, for you a present from the plunder of the enemies of the LORD's people." 30:27 It was for those in Bethel, in Ramoth-negeb,<sup>2143</sup> in Jattir, 30:28 in Aroer, in Siphmoth, in Eshtemoa, 30:29 in Racal, in the cities of the Jerahmeelite, in the cities of the Shalmaite, 30:30 in Hormah, in Korashan, in Athach, 30:31 in Hebron, to all the places where David had roamed, he and his men.

### 5.29 Saul's Last War II (1 Samuel 31)

1 31 ופלשתאי מניחין קרבא בישראל ואפכרוי אנשי ישראל מן קדם פלשתאי ונפלו  
 קטילין בשורא דנלבע: 2 31 ואדביקו פלשתאי ית שאול וית בנויה וקטלו פלשתאי  
 ית יהונתן וית אבינרב וית מלכישוע בני שאול: 3 31 וחקיפו עברי קרבא על שאול  
 ואשכחוהי קשתאי גברין דאמנין מגד בקשהא ורחיל לחדא מקשתאי:

31:1 Now the Philistines were waging war in Israel and the men of Israel retreated from before the Philistines and fell killed on Mount Gilboa. 31:2 And the Philistines overtook Saul and his sons. And the Philistines killed Jonathan and Abinadab and Malchishua, the sons of Saul. 31:3 The wagers of war pressed hard upon Saul and the archers found him, men who were skilled at bending the bow. And he feared greatly from the archers.

Hebrew המורים, which seems to be explained in the Hebrew text by the following words בקשה אנשים, 'men with the bow', is rendered literally by "archers". But in the translation of the explanatory note TJon adds the word אמנין, 'artisan, skilled person', probably inspired by the Hebrew homonym המורים, 'teacher'.<sup>2144</sup> The problem of the homonyms is also discussed in NumR. 19:9.

attested to elsewhere, cf. 2 Sam. 5:15-16 in MSS m w y B C J T; 2 Sam. 23:27-38 in MS S.

<sup>2140</sup>MSS m y read ירחמאל, 'Jerahmeel'.

<sup>2141</sup>MSS b m w y let the name start with a *beth* in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), although many Hebrew MSS also read בכור.

<sup>2142</sup>Omitted in MS eb1\*, but ולדבעך, 'and to those in Anach', is attested in eb1<sup>m</sup>.

<sup>2143</sup>Negeb is considered to be part of the name, otherwise Hebrew נב would have been represented by דרומא, 'the south', as is done in TJon Josh. 19:8 (against >15).

<sup>2144</sup>The closest parallel to the latter equivalence is found in 1 Kgs 9:27, where Hebrew ידע, 'know', equates Aramaic אמנא.

Although several ancient (and modern) translations derive Hebrew *ויהל* from the root *הלה*, 'be weak, be sick, be wounded',<sup>2145</sup> partly based on the usage of *מצא*, which can mean "hit" if used for a weapon (cf. Deut. 19:5),<sup>2146</sup> TJon and Syr agree with the vocalization of the MT in deriving it from *חיל*, 'scream, tremble'.<sup>2147</sup> The verb is regarded as a token of fear and therefore translated by the usual verb *דחל* (>14).<sup>2148</sup> The usage of *חיל* is remarkable, since it is confined to poetry or elevated prose.<sup>2149</sup> However, MS eb1 adds in the margin the translation *ויהמרע*, 'and he fell ill' or 'and he grew weak', which is clearly derived from the Hebrew stem *הלה*.

4 31 ואמר שאול לנטייל זיניה שלוף חרבך וקטולני בה דלמא ייתון ערליא האלין ויקטלונני ויהלעבון<sup>2150</sup> בי ולא אבא נטייל זיניה ארי דחיל לחדא ונסיב<sup>2151</sup> שאול ית חרבא ונפל עלה: 5 31 וחוזא נטייל זיניה ארי מית שאול ונפל אף הוא על חרביה ומית עמיה: 6 31 ומית שאול ותלחא בנויה ונטייל זיניה אף כל<sup>2151</sup> גברוהי<sup>2152</sup> ביומא ההוא כחדא: 7 31 וחוזא אנש ישראל דבעברא דמישרא דבעברא דירדנא ארי אפכו<sup>2153</sup> אנשי ישראל וארי מיתו שאול ובנויה ושבקו ית קרויא<sup>2154</sup> ואפכו<sup>2155</sup> ותו פלשתאי ויתיבו בהון: 8 31 והוה ביומא דבתרוהי ותו פלשתאי לחלצא<sup>2153</sup> קטיליא ואשכחו ית שאול וית תלחא בנויה קטילין רמן<sup>2154</sup> בטורא דגלבע:

31:4 Then Saul said to his armour-bearer,<sup>2155</sup> "Draw your sword and

<sup>2145</sup>Cf. LXX, followed by Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:370, Vg and some MSS of the *Vetus Latina* (>1).

<sup>2146</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 228, citing A.B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel*, Vol. 3, Leipzig 1910.

<sup>2147</sup>Cf. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*, 30.

<sup>2148</sup>The same problem occurs in the parallel text of 1 Chron. 10:3, where the same variations can be found within the versions.

<sup>2149</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 228.

<sup>2150</sup>MSS d f o read *ויהעלבון*, which in this context must mean "they will humiliate". By way of metathesis (>2) an appropriate translation is achieved, the more so as this Aramaic translation strongly resembles the Hebrew original (>29). Note that a marginal note in MS f<sub>5</sub> gives the alternative of MS p. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 28 regarded the variant reading *ויהעלבון* as the original Aramaic translation.

<sup>2151</sup>MS eb1 reads *וכל* instead of *כל*. The copula *ו* is also attested in MSS b f, Syr and many Hebrew MSS.

<sup>2152</sup>MS c adds *מירו*, 'they died'.

<sup>2153</sup>MS d adds the nota accusativi, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>2154</sup>Omitted in MSS o w.

<sup>2155</sup>Note that TJon does not identify this anonymous person (against >17). Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 104 identifies him with Doeg the Edomite, while Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 65:4, calls him Edab, the son of the Amalekite king Agag. Both were inspired by the Amalekite messenger who brought the news of Saul's death to David (2 Sam. 1:8). Pseudo-Jerome explained in his commentary on 2 Sam. 1:2 that the son of Doeg was the Amalekite messenger—Amalekites being also Edomites, since Amalek was the grandson of Esau. Cf. PesK. 3:16.

kill me with it, lest these uncircumcised come and kill me and mock<sup>2156</sup> me." But his armour-bearer would not, for he feared greatly. So Saul took his own sword and fell upon it. 31:5 And when his armour-bearer saw that Saul was dead, he also fell upon his sword and died with him. 31:6 Thus Saul died, and his three sons, and his armour-bearer, all his men on that very day together. 31:7 And when the men of Israel, those on the other side of the valley<sup>2157</sup> and those on the other side of the Jordan, saw that the men of Israel had retreated and that Saul and his sons were dead, they left the cities and retreated. And the Philistines came and dwelt in them. 31:8 On the day after, when the Philistines came to strip the killed ones, they found Saul and his three sons killed, lying on Mount Gilboa.

Hebrew נפלים is translated twice. The first rendering, קטילין, is a plain translation of the Hebrew verb conceived of as a *pars pro toto* (>14). The second rendering, רמן, is a more literal translation. The latter one is omitted in two manuscripts, because it was considered superfluous.

31 9 ופסקו יח רישיה וחליצו ית זיניה ושלוהו בארע פלשתאי סחור סחור לבסרא בית  
טעותהון וית עמא:

31:9 And they cut off his head and stripped off his armour. And they sent [messengers] throughout the land of the Philistines to carry the good news into the house of their idols and to the people.

The unusual juxtaposition of Hebrew בית without nota accusativi and the following ואדהעם is maintained in TJon. However, three manuscripts clarify the sentence, either by adding ית before בית (MS a), or by rendering בבית (MSS c d).

31 10 ושויו ית זיניה<sup>2158</sup> בית<sup>2159</sup> עשתרתחא וית גופיה צלבו<sup>2160</sup> בשורא דבית שן;  
31 11 ושמעו עלוהי יחבי יביש גלעד ית<sup>2161</sup> דעברו פלשתאי לשאול: 31 12 וקמו כל  
גבר גבר ואזלו כל ליליא ונסיבו ית גופא<sup>2162</sup> דשאול וית גופי בנוהי משורא דבית שן

<sup>2156</sup>The order of killing and mocking is probably a case of *hysteron proteron*, as is suggested in the re-wording of Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:370 and Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 65:2. Mockery after death could not have been prevented by Saul's armour-bearer killing him; cf. Driver, *Notes*, 228.

<sup>2157</sup>Most probably ירעאל 'the valley of Jezreel' (cf. TgHos. 1:5), as is suggested by Driver, *Notes*, 229.

<sup>2158</sup>MS w reads מנהי, 'his things', denying the military meaning of Hebrew כלי against the translation in TO Deut. 22:5.

<sup>2159</sup>Without preposition, which is not in conformity with the usual vocabulary. MSS a f read לבית; MS o reads בבית.

<sup>2160</sup>Based on the Hebrew text of 2 Sam. 21:12 (>15), but at the same time due to actualization (>19). So also Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:374.

<sup>2161</sup>MS a adds כל, 'all'.

<sup>2162</sup>The word גופה is also used in the parallel narrative of 1 Chron. 10:12.



ואחו ליבש וקלו עליהון כמה דקלן על מלכיא חמן:

*31:10 They put his armour in the house of Ashtaroth and they hung his body on the wall of Beth-shan. 31:11 But when the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead heard about it—what the Philistines had done to Saul— 31:12 all the heroic men arose and went all night. They took the body of Saul and the bodies of his sons from the wall of Beth-shan. And when they came to Jabesh, they kindled for them a fire, as they used to kindle for the kings there.*

Although cremation was not explicitly forbidden in rabbinic times, rabbis considered burying the dead to be a positive commandment of the Torah (cf. Deut. 21:23, discussed in San. 46b). Cremation was regarded as a humiliation inflicted on criminals and enemies (Amos 2:1; Lev. 10:14; 21:9; Josh. 7:25). For that reason, Hebrew *וישרפו אהם*, ‘and they burnt them’, is not translated literally.<sup>2163</sup> TJon links the burning to the ancient and well-established practice of burning the royal accoutrements in honour of a deceased king<sup>2164</sup> The Aramaic rendering originates from the wording of this practice in Jer. 34:5, where TJon translates *כין יוקרין עלך*, and is supplemented with an explanatory note. Only the translation in CR deviates from referring to these fires by adding *בוסמיא*, ‘spices’.

13 31 ונסיברו יה גרמיהון וקברו חוחת אשלא ביביש וצמו שבעא יומין:

*31:13 And they took their bones and buried them under the tamarisk tree in Jabesh, and fasted seven days.*

<sup>2163</sup>With E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), Berlin 1988, 151; against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 159, who translate in agreement with the MT, thereby ignoring the Aramaic preposition *על*.

<sup>2164</sup>Jer. 34:5; 2 Chron. 16:14; 21:19; tShab. 7:17/18; San. 52b; AZ 11a: It was allowed to burn a pyre, consisting of the royal bed and the king’s general utensils. Cf. P.A.H. de Boer, “Research into the Text of 1 Samuel xviii–xxxi”, *OTS* 6 (1949), 1-100, esp. 100; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 8-9; Levine, *The Aramaic Version*, 151. Note that the author of Chronicles omits this verse.

## A Commentary on TJon 2 Samuel

## 6.1 The Report of Saul's Death (2 Samuel 1:1-16)

The Hebrew text of 2 Sam. 1 reveals similarities with the report of the death of Eli's sons (1 Sam. 4).<sup>1</sup> Many correspondences are integrated and even augmented in the Aramaic version: a man came from the battle field, the one from the tribe of Benjamin and the other from the presence of Saul, with his clothes<sup>2</sup> torn and earth heaped upon his head (1 Sam. 4:12; 2 Sam. 1:2), the man said that he had come from the battle field, Eli and David asked the same question, מה היה הדבר (1 Sam. 4:16; 2 Sam. 1:3-4), the man reported that the people of Israel had fled, נס, also (וגם) that many people had been killed and also (וגם) that two particular persons had died, in one case Hophni and Phinehas, the sons of Eli, in the other case Saul and his son Jonathan (1 Sam. 4:17; 2 Sam. 1:4). Associative rendering plays an important role in this chapter.

1 1 והוה בחר דמית שאול ודויד תב מלממחי ית דבית־י ׀ עמלק ויחיב דויד בציקלג יומין תרין: 2 1 והוה ביומא תליתאה והא גברא אחא מן משריתא מלות שאול ולבושוהי מבזעין ועפרא רמי<sup>3</sup> ברישיה והוה במיתוהי לוח דויד ונפל על ארעא וסגיד: 3 1 ואמר ליה דויד אי מדין את אחי ואמר ליה משריתא דישראל אשתובית: 4 1 ואמר ליה דויד מא הוה פתגמא חוי כען לי ואמר דאפך<sup>4</sup> עמא מן קרבא ואף סני נפל מן עמא ואתקטלו ואף שאול ויהנתן בריה מיתו<sup>5</sup>:

*1:1 After Saul died and David had returned from striking those of the House of Amalek, David remained two days in Ziklag. 1:2 On the third day, behold, a man came from Saul's camp, with his clothes torn and earth thrown upon his head. And when he came to David, he fell to the ground and bowed down. 1:3 David said to him, "Where are you coming from?" And he said to him, "I have escaped from the camp of Israel." 1:4 And David said to him, "What was the situation? Tell me*

<sup>1</sup>Apart from the similarities between these two chapters, there are more, though minor repetitive narrative patterns in the Books of Samuel; cf. D.M. Gunn, "Narrative Patterns and Oral Tradition in Judges and Samuel", *VT* 24 (1974), 286-317.

<sup>2</sup>In Hebrew two different words are used for "clothes", but in Aramaic both words are rendered by לבוּשָׁא.

<sup>3</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but deviating from the usual vocabulary, cf. 1 Sam. 4:12; 2 Sam. 15:32.

<sup>4</sup>MS a reads אפך.

<sup>5</sup>MS f reads איתקטלו, 'they were killed' (>15).

now.” And he said, “The people have retreated from the battle, and many of the people also have fallen and have been killed; and Saul and his son Jonathan are also dead.

Although the rendering מיהו is in conformity with the Hebrew text, it deviates from the usual translation (>18). The verb מה is often equated with the Ithpeel of Aramaic קטל if the subject died in battle, such as Eli’s sons in 1 Sam. 4:17, 19, 21. The latter verses may even have affected the rendering of this verse, since both the verbs מוח and קטל occur in 1 Sam. 4:19, 21 and in the present verse. TJon once more increased the coherence between the two chapters.

5 1 ואמר דויד לעולימא דמחוי ליה איכדין ידעת ארי מיה שאול ויהנתן בריה: 6 1 ואמר עולימא דמחוי ליה אתערעא אתערעית<sup>6</sup> בטורא דגלבע והא שאול סמיד<sup>7</sup> על מורניתיה והא רחכיא ומשרית<sup>8</sup> פרשיא<sup>9</sup> ארכיקה: 7 1 ואחפני לאחורוהי וחזני וקרא לי ואמרית<sup>10</sup> האנא: 8 1 ואמר לי מן אח ואמרית<sup>11</sup> ליה עמלקאה אנא: 9 1 ואמר לי קום כען עלי וקטולני ארי אחדני רתיא ארי כל עוד נפשי בי<sup>12</sup>: 10 1 וקמית עלוהי וקטלתיה ארי ידענא ארי לא ייחי בתר דנפל ונסיבית<sup>13</sup> כלילא דעל רישיה ושושפתא דעל דרעוהי<sup>13</sup> ואיתנתן לות רבוני<sup>13</sup> הלכא:

1:5 Then David said to the young man who told him, “How do you know that Saul and his son Jonathan are dead?” 1:6 And the young man who told him said, “By chance I happened to be on Mount Gilboa; and there was Saul leaning upon his spear. And behold, the chariots and an army of horsemen overtook him. 1:7 And when he turned behind him, he saw me and called me. And I said, ‘Here I am.’ 1:8 And he said to me, ‘Who are you?’ And I said to him, ‘I am an Amalekite.’ 1:9 And he said to me, ‘Stand beside me and kill me, for trembling has seized me. And even now my soul is within me.’ 1:10 So I stood beside him and killed him, because I knew that he could not live after he had fallen. And I took the crown which was on his head and the phylactery which was on his arms, and I have brought them here to my lord.”

<sup>6</sup>Ms f<sub>5</sub> gives a different equivalent of the Hebrew verb קרא, viz. איזדמנא איזדמני, ‘I indeed met’.

<sup>7</sup>Ms w reads the ithpeel of the same verb, viz. אסתמיד.

<sup>8</sup>Hebrew בעלי is conceived of as common people, not as lords or owners; see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 23:11.

<sup>9</sup>Ms c reads פלישחאי, ‘Philistines’.

<sup>10</sup>Ms eb1\* reads ואמר, ‘and he said’, but it is corrected.

<sup>11</sup>According to the Qere and many Hebrew MSS.

<sup>12</sup>Ms f<sub>3</sub> gives an alternative reading for the last five words of the present verse: מני שלימת כען נפשי מיני, ‘for my soul departed from me’, deriving Hebrew כל from כלה, ‘end’ (>6).

<sup>13</sup>MSS b f o y and Rashi read the singular דרעיה, cf. the Hebrew text (>29).

As in the Hebrew text the כְּלִילָא is a royal insignium. It was given to the king at the time of his investiture (2 Kgs 11:12; cf. Jer. 13:18).

Hebrew אֲצַעֲדָה is not rendered by any neutral word for bracelet (*e.g.* שְׂרִיא, cf. TgIsa. 3:20) in order to avoid trespassing of the commandment (Deut. 22:5) that men should not put on women's garments (>24).<sup>14</sup> For that reason Aramaic טוּטְפָחָא is used, meaning "bracelet, phylactery". The mention of head and arm is another pointer to this rendering.<sup>15</sup> So Saul is depicted as a faithful Jew wearing his phylacteries even in battle.

Because the word טוּטְפָחָא was mainly used for the phylactery of the head in Talmudic times,<sup>16</sup> an alternative rendering is given in the margin of CR (MS f<sub>2</sub>), *viz.* חֲפִילִין.

11 1 ואחֲקִיף דויד בלבושוהי<sup>17</sup> ובוֹעֲנוֹן ואֶף כָּל גְּבֵרִיא דַעֲמִיה: 12 1 וסִפְדוּ וּבְכוּ וּצְמָרוּ  
עַד רְמֹשָׁא עַל שְׂאוֹל וְעַל יְהוֹנָתָן בְּרִיה וְעַל עֲמָא דִיּוּי וְעַל בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲרִי אַחְקָטְלוּ  
בְּחֶרְבָּא: 13 1 וְאִמְרוּ דויד לַעֲוִלִימָא דְמַחֲוִי לִיה אִי מְדִין אַחֲ: <sup>18</sup>וְאִמְרוּ בְּרִ: <sup>19</sup>גְּבֵר גִּיּוֹר <sup>20</sup>  
עַמְלָקָאָה אֲנָא: 14 1 וְאִמְרוּ לִיה דויד אִיכְדִין לֹא דְחִלְתָּא לְאַשְׁטָא יֶדְךָ <sup>21</sup>לְחַבְלָא יֵת  
מְשִׁיחָא דִיּוּי: 15 1 וְקִרָא דויד לְחַד מְעוֹלִימָיא וְאִמְרוּ <sup>22</sup>קָרַב שְׁלוֹט בֵּיה וּמַחֲוִי וְקָטְלִיה:

1:11 Then David took hold of his clothes and tore them. And so did all the men who were with him. 1:12 And they mourned and wept and fasted until evening for Saul and for Jonathan his son and for the people of the LORD and for the House of Israel, because they had been killed by the sword. 1:13 And David said to the young man who told him, "Where are you from?" And he said, "I am the son of a proselyte<sup>23</sup>, an Amalekite man."<sup>24</sup> 1:14 David said to him, "How is

<sup>14</sup>So Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 28. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 5 assumes that it could well have been a decorative bracelet, both in Hebrew and in the Aramaic version.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. TO Exod. 13:16; Deut. 6:8; 11:18, quoted by Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 28.

<sup>16</sup>So Levy, *CWT*, *s.v.*

<sup>17</sup>Plural, according to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

<sup>18</sup>MS f adds אֲדִי, 'coming', as in 1:3 (>15).

<sup>19</sup>Omitted in MS eb1; the word אֲנָא, 'I', is added.

<sup>20</sup>Omitted in MS w by haplography.

<sup>21</sup>MS y omits יֶדְךָ לְאַשְׁטָא.

<sup>22</sup>MS a adds Hebrew גָּשׁ, 'draw near' (>29), making an conflated rendering.

<sup>23</sup>Although Aramaic גִּיּוֹרָא is the usual equivalent of Hebrew גֵּר, the chief meaning of the word is "proselyte" according to Levy, *CWT*, *s.v.* Only in Jer. 14:8 it is translated by תּוֹרֵבָא, 'sojourner', because it refers to God there; cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 98.

<sup>24</sup>TgSam did not name the anonymous man and his father, in contrast to rabbinic exegesis in *e.g.* PesR. 12:9; TanB, *Devarim*, 6:18, where the man is called the son of Doeg the Edomite.

*it you were not afraid to stretch out your hand to harm the LORD's anointed?" 1:15 Then David called one of the young men and said, "Draw near, overpower him."<sup>25</sup> And he struck him down and killed him.*

The last word of the Hebrew text is read as if it were vocalized as *נִמַּח* (an Hiphil form of *מָחַ*),<sup>26</sup> although the same expression "he struck him so that he died" occurs often (cf. e.g. 3:27; 10:18; 20:10). LXX, Vg and Syr vocalized it as a Qal.

16 1 ואמר ליה דויד חובת קפילך תהי ברישך ארי פומך אסהיד בך למימר אנא קפילת יח משיחא דיזי:

*1:16 And David said to him, "The guilt of killing you<sup>27</sup> be upon your head, for your own mouth has testified against you, saying, "I have killed the LORD's anointed."*

## 6.2 David's Lament (2 Samuel 1:17-27)

David's lament is translated quite literally in TJon, while maintaining most of its poetical outline.<sup>28</sup> On the one hand, some poetical characteristics were lost, e.g. the exact repetition of the "refrain" (1:19, 25, 27) and the string of double vocatives (see below, 1:19). On the other hand, several poetical devices were enhanced or added. Parallelism was enhanced in 1:19, and new repetitions were incorporated in 1:19 (קפל), 1:21 (משח), and 1:24 (לבש). The alliteration in *נעל מגן גבורים* (1:21) was equated with the alliteration of *חמן אהברו חריטי גבריא*. Similarly, the alliteration of *עם-עדרנים* was equated with the alliteration of *תקנין ומסיק תקני*. The alliteration in the refrains of 1:25, 27 and the assonance of the *hireqs* in 1:23 is new, whilst the alliteration of *לא מסחרן לאחרא* (1:22) is the equivalent of the assonance in the Hebrew text of *לא נשגו אחור*.

Generally, the poetical structure of the strophes and canticles is maintained. The outline of the poem is simple and balanced. There are nine strophes: each verse consists of one strophe. Each time two or

<sup>25</sup>The image of a sword ruling in/over a person means using force and killing someone, cf. also above, tosefta-targum on 1 Sam. 17:43, strophe III.4.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. Komlosh, *המקרא באור התרגום*, 299.

<sup>27</sup>Conceiving of the suffix as an objective genitive, because the Hebrew text refers to "your blood", which can best be explained as "your death". Against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 163.

<sup>28</sup>The following poetical structure is based on the Masoretic Text, for "whatever corruptions have entered were already present at the time of the text's translation into Greek, Aramaic, and Latin", so S. Gevirtz, *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel* (SAOC, 32), Chicago 1963, 74.

three strophes form a canticle, except the first and the last strophe, which function as the introduction and the epilogue.<sup>29</sup> The second canticle (20-21) shows coherence by the negations אַל and פֶּן and the geographical names Gath, Ashkelon, and Gilboa. The third canticle (22-24) gives a description of the virtues of the royal family. The first two strophes mention the names of Saul and Jonathan in chiasm, Jonathan - Saul - Saul - Jonathan, whereas the name of Saul is added in the third strophe. Both the second and the third canticle show a vocative at the beginning of the last strophe (mountains of Gilboa, daughters of Israel), an order to mourn (neither rain nor dew, mourn), whereas the parallel pair “daughters of the Philistines” || “daughters of Israel” makes an inclusion. The fourth canticle (25-26) is an elegy for Jonathan alone, which matches the second canticle which seem to mourn over Saul alone. The result is that the final strophe (27) ends the major poem concerning Saul and his son Jonathan, as well as the minor poem concerning David’s dearest friend Jonathan.

Some cola are slightly expanded in the Aramaic version, and some explained rather prosaically, resulting in a somewhat unbalanced structure. Verse 21a is expanded with one colon, in one manuscript even with two cola. In short:

cant.	vss	vocatives	refr.	names	mourn
I	19	Israel	*	Israel	
II	20			Gath, Ashkelon	
	21	mountains of Gilboa		Gilboa, Saul	*
III	22			Jonathan, Saul	
	23			Saul, Jonathan	
	24	daughters of Israel		Israel, Saul	*
IV	25		*	Jonathan	
	26	my brother Jonathan		Jonathan	
V	27		*		

17 ואלא דויד ית אליא הדא על שאול ועל יהונתן בריה: 18 ואמר לאלפא בני יהודה מגד בקשתא הא<sup>30</sup> כתיבא על ספרא דאוריחא:

1:17 And David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and over Jonathan his son. 1:18 And he promised to teach the sons of Judah the bending of the bow, behold, it is written in the book of the Torah.

TJon interprets the expression “to teach the bow” as David’s promise

<sup>29</sup>W.G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOT.S, 26), Sheffield 1984, 13 mentions ten strophes, and his canticles have a different structure.

<sup>30</sup>Mss f y read דײא, ‘it, this’, while MS a omits the word.

to train the Judaeen army in the skill of archery. This promise is a reaction on Jonathan's death at the hands of the Philistine archers (1 Sam. 31:3). The connection is made in TJon's rendering, since Aramaic *בְּקִשְׁוֹתָא מִגֵּר* is used here to describe both Philistine archery (1 Sam. 31:3) and Judaeen archery. TJon also shows that David kept his promise: the Hebrew combination *הַכֹּרֵתִי וְהַפְּלֹאֵי* is consistently rendered "the archers and the slingers" (8:18; 15:18; 20:7, 23). It follows that the second group was formed by slingers, since David himself was skilled in the art of slinging. Consequently, David is depicted as the man introducing the long range weaponry in Israel.

The unknown Book of Yashar, or Book of the Upright, is identified with the book of Torah (>17). A similar identification is given in AZ 25b which explains it as "the book of Genesis, that is the book of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who are called righteous ones".<sup>31</sup> Vg accordingly renders "the book of the righteous ones".<sup>32</sup> David's promise is regarded as the fulfilment of Jacob's prophecy concerning his son Judah (>20), as is explicitly stated in a Hebrew commentary in the margin of CR:

פִּירוּשׁ וְהִיכֵן כְּתִיב יְהוּדָה אַתָּה יוֹדִיךָ אַחֲיָךְ יָדְךָ בְּעַרְףְּ אֵיבֶיךָ אִי זֶה הָיָא מִלְחָמָה כְּנַגְדֵּי  
הַעֲרָף הוּי אִמְרָא זֶה הַחֲזֵץ

*explanation: Where is it written? "Judah, your brothers shall praise you. Your hand shall be on the neck of your enemies." What kind of war is "opposite the neck"? This is said concerning the arrow.*

This Hebrew expansion quotes Gen. 49:8. In this verse Hebrew *בְּעַרְףְּ*, 'on the neck', is interpreted as the height of the hand during the actions of war, *viz.* at the height of the neck. The phrase "your hand shall be on the neck" is therefore considered a depiction of an archer (cf. GenR. 98:6).

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 5; Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 33, n. 10, on Josh. 10:13, referring to AZ 25b, which ascribes it to R. Hiyya b. Abba, and ySot. 1:10 (17c), which also mentions the opinion that it was the Book of Numbers. Cf. also GenR. 6:9 which ascribes it to R. Hīlpa, although R. Hānin claimed that it was the Book of Deuteronomy.

<sup>32</sup>V. Aptowitz, "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata", *ZAW* 29 (1909), 241-252, esp. 247; F. Stummer, "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas", *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, esp. 12.

## I

*"You took your stand, O Israel."*<sup>33</sup> [19aA] אחעתרתון ישראל<sup>34</sup>  
*Upon your stronghold you were* על בית תקפכון אחרמיתון קטילין  
*thrown, killed.* [19aB]

*How are the heroes killed!* [19b] איכדין אחקטלו גבריא:

The first word is not read as הַצְבִּי, 'splendour, beauty', a denotation of the land of Israel (cf. Dan. 11:16, 41), but probably as הַצִּיב, a Hiphil perfect from נָצַב. However, it is rendered as if it were a Niphal perfect: "you took your stand" (>2). LXX and Aquila understood the word as a verb as well.<sup>35</sup> As a consequence, the pattern of the double vocatives and exclamations in the Hebrew poem was changed,<sup>36</sup> but the figurative sense of the sentence was removed and parallelism within this colon was enhanced.

Hebrew הלל was translated twice, in accordance with the double rendering of נפלים in 1 Sam. 31:8 (>15). This doublet complemented the predicate (>10). Moreover, the internal coherence of the strophe was enhanced by the rendering of אחקטלו in the third line.

In accordance with the tendency elsewhere in TgSam to avoid any reference to the high places, Hebrew במוֹתֵיךְ is rendered "your strongholds" (cf. also 22:34). TJon did not associate these high places with the centres of illicit worship, in contrast to Pseudo-Jerome,<sup>37</sup> because Saul was never accused of idolatry and worship on the high places (see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 28:19).

## II.1

*Tell it not in Gath,* [20aA] לא תחון בנת  
*announce it not in the streets of* לא תבסרון בשוקי אשקלון  
*Ashkelon,* [20aB]

*lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice,* [20bA] דלמא יחדין בנת פלשתאי  
*lest the daughters of the uncircumcised* דלמא ידוצן בנת ערליא:  
*exult.* [20bB]

<sup>33</sup>Delimitation according to the Masoretic Text; against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 164.

<sup>34</sup>Ms o denies the vocative by adding על: "you took your stand on Israel".

<sup>35</sup>Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 302.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. "Beauty of Israel" or "Gazelle of Israel" in 1:19; "mountains of Gilboa" in 1:21; "Saul and Jonathan" in 1:23; "daughters of Israel" in 1:24; and "my brother Jonathan" in 1:26, although the Hebrew text itself contains the singular exclamation "Jonathan" in 1:25. Some of the Hebrew exclamations are interpreted as vocatives in the Aramaic version (cf. 1:19, 25).

<sup>37</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 108-109.



## II.2

*Ye mountains of Gilboa* [21aA] טורי גלבע<sup>38</sup>  
*let there be no dew or rain upon you,* [21aB] לא ייחות עליכון טלא ומטרא  
*let there be no sufficient yield on you* לא תהי בכון עללא כמסת  
*that they make from it a dough offering* [21aC] דיעבדון מנה חלחא  
*For there the heroes' shields were* ארי תמן אחברו<sup>39</sup> תריסי גבריא  
broken, [21bA]  
*the shield of Saul, anointed as if with* תריסא דשאל דמשיח כד<sup>40</sup> במשחא:  
anointing oil [21bB]

The first difficulty which the Targumist encountered in verse 21 was the terse formulation of Hebrew *וּשְׂדֵי תְרוּמָה* “and fields of offerings”. Probably Hebrew *שְׂדֵי* was vocalized as a derivation of *שָׂדֶה*, ‘fulness, riches’, and equated with *כַּמֶּסֶת*, ‘enough’.<sup>41</sup> The reading “riches of offerings” is explained in the Aramaic version as a curse on the hills of Gilboa that there be not enough fruits, worthy of being set aside for sacred imposts. The *hallah* was the minimum amount of dough which had to be given to the priests (cf. Num 15:17-21; mHal. 2:7).<sup>42</sup>

A second and different rendering is suggested in the margin of CR, where Hebrew *וּשְׂדֵי תְרוּמָה* is regarded as the second vocative. Hebrew *שְׂדֵי* is rendered according to its Masoretic vocalization, while Hebrew *תְרוּמָה* is associated with the verb *רָוַם*<sup>43</sup> and rendered as a repetition of *טוריאי*, ‘hills’. Following this suggestion a further expansion and enhancement of the poetical verse can be obtained:

*Ye mountains of Gilboa* טורי גלבע  
*let there be no dew or rain upon you.* לא ייחות עליכון טלא ומטרא  
*And ye field of the mountains* וחקל טוריאי  
*let there be no sufficient yield on you* לא תהי בכון עללא כמסת  
*that they might make from it a dough offering.* דיעבדון מנה חלחא

<sup>38</sup>TJon normalizes the unusual phenomenon of a construct chain, broken up by a preposition, cf. GKC § 130; D.N. Freedman, “The Broken Construct Chain”, in: *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry*, Winona Lake (IN) 1980, 339-41. Mss c d f o maintain the Hebrew construction by rendering *בגלבע*; MS f<sub>3</sub> again mentions the normalization.

<sup>39</sup>Note that TJon uses the Greek word *θυπέδος*, which is also used in the LXX. This is one of the few similarities between LXX and TJon, cf. J.P. Brown, “The Septuagint as a Source of the Greek Loan-words in the Targums”, *Bib.* 70,2 (1989), 194-216, esp. 214.

<sup>40</sup>MS eb1 reads *כיד*.

<sup>41</sup>Bacher, “Kritische Untersuchungen”, 24, n. 2.

<sup>42</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 26.

<sup>43</sup>Cf. HALAT<sup>3</sup>, s.v. *תְרוּמָה*, on p. 1646. This translation can be compared with *מְרוּמֵי שְׂדֵה* in Judg. 5:18. It is regularly defenced by modern scholars, cf. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 69-70.

The second difficulty in verse 21 is found in the combination of the name of Saul with the subsequent phrase "not anointed with oil". It was unclear whether this should be applied to Saul, his shield or both (cf. MTeh. 92:9). Both TJon and Syr omit the negative particle ( $\neg$ -27), whereas TJon adds the particle כַּד, 'as if'. The latter particle is also adopted by Vg, although this version does not omit the negation. Syr and Vg unambiguously related the expression to Saul and avoided the negation of his being the anointed of the LORD.<sup>44</sup> It is not necessary that TJon also related the anointment to Saul,<sup>45</sup> although the anointment of the shield is not attested to in TJon either, cf. Isa. 21:5 where the verb צָחַץ, 'polish' is used.<sup>46</sup> Levy suggests the following excellent translation of the Aramaic phrase: "anointed (with blood), as if it were anointed with oil".<sup>47</sup>

### III.1

<i>From the blood of the killed, [22aA]</i>	מדם קטילין
<i>from the fat of the heroes [22aB]</i>	מתרב גברין
<i>the arrows of Jonathan's bow</i>	גירי <sup>48</sup> קשתא דיהנתן לא מסחרן לאחרא
<i>are not turning back [22bA]</i>	
<i>and Saul's sword is not returning</i>	וחרבא דשאול לא תיבא ריקן:
<i>empty. [22bB]</i>	

### III.2

<i>Saul and Jonathan, [23aA]</i>	שאול ויהנתן
<i>beloved and lovely in their life [23aB]</i>	דרחימין וחביבין בחייהון
<i>and in their death not distinguished</i>	ובמותהון לא אחרשו מעמהון <sup>49</sup>
<i>from their people; [23aC]</i>	
<i>swifter than eagles, [23bA]</i>	מנשריא קלילין
<i>more heroic than lions. [23bB]</i>	מאריותא גברין <sup>50</sup> :

<sup>44</sup>Cf. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 71.

<sup>45</sup>Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 7.

<sup>46</sup>See also the polishing of spears in TJon. Jer. 46:4. The anointing of the shield to keep it in good condition appears to be the best interpretation of the Hebrew text; cf. A.R. Millard, "Saul's Shield Not Anointed With Oil", *BASOR* 230 (1978), 70.

<sup>47</sup>Levy, *CWT*, s.v. משח I.

<sup>48</sup>Omitted in MS ebI; present in MS eb66. Strophe III.1 is also quoted in "The Scroll of Antiochos", edited by I. Abrahams, "An Aramaic Text of the Scroll of Antiochos", *JQR* 11 (1899), 291-99, esp. 298, ll. 77-78. In that quotation the word גירי is omitted, in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>49</sup>Omitted in MSS y eb1, in conformity with the Hebrew text ( $\neg$ -29).

<sup>50</sup>Ms w reads תַּקִּישִׁין, 'stronger'.

## III.3

*Ye daughters of Israel*, [24aA] בנת ישראל  
*weep over Saul*, [24aB] על שאול בכאה  
*who clothed you with scarlet clothes* [24bA] דהוה מלביש לכון לבושי צבענין  
*and brought you delicacies*, [24bB] ומוביל<sup>51</sup> לכון חפנוקין  
*and put golden ornaments on your* ומסיק חקני<sup>52</sup> דהבא על לבושכין:  
*clothes*. [24bC]

The combination of bow and sword refers to the entire field of weapons, both long-range and short-range weapons.<sup>53</sup> By adding the word “arrows” TJon did not really break the metonymy, but it lost the compactness of the expression.

Although the Hebrew Niphal נפרדו implies that Saul and Jonathan were not separated from each other in their deaths, TJon explains that they were not separated from their people. This explanation might be based on the parallel phrase that Saul and Jonathan were beloved. If they were loved by their people, the subsequent phrase must also mean that they died together with that people.

Assonance abounds in the Aramaic version, using the *Hireq*. The use of the participles קלילין and גברין as equivalents of Hebrew perfect tenses also show that the translator made an attempt to retain the poetical flavour of the elegy. Note also the alliteration of *Heth* and *Beth* in line 23aB.

TJon retains the difference in gender between the persons being clothed and the persons receiving ornaments. Saul obviously gave clothes and delicacies to both men and women, expressed with the masculine suffix, but the golden ornaments on the clothes were especially meant for women; see above, commentary on 1:10.

Whereas LXX seems to explain both Hebrew ערנים and עדי as jewellery, TJon conceived of these two words as referring to different things (>18). Since ערנים seems to refer to food in Jer. 51:24, it is represented by חפנוקא, ‘delicacies’, possibly after TO Gen. 49:20. Note that alliteration is retained by this choice of word.

<sup>51</sup>Mss f m w y read ומיכיל, ‘and he fed you’; similarly, MS eb1 reads מיכיל.

<sup>52</sup>MS w reads חפנוקין, ‘delicacies’, rendering both ערנים and עדי by the same word (against >18).

<sup>53</sup>Cf. O. Keel, “Der Bogen als Herrschaftssymbol”, *ZDPV* 93 (1977), 141-77, esp. 172-73.

## IV.1

*How are the heroes shattered* [25aA] איכדין אחרו<sup>54</sup> גבריא  
*in the midst of the battle!* [25aB] בנו<sup>55</sup> קרבא  
*Jonathan,* [25bA] יהונתן<sup>56</sup>  
*you are killed on your stronghold!* [25bB] על בית תקפך אהקטילחא:

## IV.2

*I am troubled for you,* [26aA] עקת לי עלך  
*my brother Jonathan,* [26aB] אחי יהונתן  
*you were very lovely for me!* [26aC] חביבת לי לחדא  
*Your love was more distinguished for me* [26bA] מפרשא רחמך לי  
*than the love of my two wives.* [26bB] מרחמת חרתין נשין:

According to the halakhic principle that an indefinite plural can reflect the dual,<sup>57</sup> TJon harmonizes the Hebrew plural with the earlier account that David married two wives.<sup>58</sup> This once more stresses the opinion that his marriage with Michal was invalid.<sup>59</sup> MShem. 25:4, however, expresses the opinion that the two wives were Michal and Abigail, the latter being loved in this age, the former in the age to come.

## V

*How are the heroes shattered* [27aA] איכדין אחרו<sup>60</sup> גבריא  
*and the utensils of war perished!"* [27aB] ואברו מני<sup>61</sup> קרבא:

The last strophe summarizes the entire poem, which says that both heroes are shattered and weapons are lost. In contrast to its usual equivalence, TJon maintains the neutral "utensils" and does not explain it with the more explicit "weapons".<sup>62</sup> This general rendering

<sup>54</sup>Mss a b c d m w y read אהקטילו, while mss f o read אהקטילו, 'they were killed'. This reading is in accordance with the first occurrence of the refrain (1:19) and with the usual vocabulary of TJon (cf. 1 Sam. 4:10; 2 Sam. 1:12; 2:16; 3:29; 11:17). The verb חבר is rarely used as the equivalent of Hebrew נפל and is chosen here because of its alliteration with גבריא.

<sup>55</sup>Ms o adds עברי, resulting in "in the midst of the wagers of war".

<sup>56</sup>This Hebrew exclamation is interpreted as a vocative in Aramaic, see above, commentary on 1:19.

<sup>57</sup>So ySan. 3:10 (21c); yShevu. 4:1 (35b); Nid. 38b; cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 44.

<sup>58</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 25:43; 27:3; 30:5, 18 (>15); Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 7.

<sup>59</sup>See above, commentary on 18:19, 25.

<sup>60</sup>Mss a b c d f m o w y read אהקטילו. This reading is in accordance with the first occurrence of the refrain (1:19) and with the usual vocabulary of TJon (cf. 1 Sam. 4:10; 2 Sam. 1:12; 2:16; 3:29; 11:17). The verb חבר is rarely used as the equivalent of Hebrew נפל and may be chosen here because of its alliteration with גבריא. See also 1:25.

<sup>61</sup>Ms a adds עברי, resulting in "the utensils of the wagers of war".

<sup>62</sup>See Van Staaldvine-Sulman, *Samuel*, s.v. זינא - כלי.

maintains the possibility to interpret the utensils of war as a synonym of the “heroes” of the first colon. In this way it is explained in RuthR. 4:8; MShem. 25:4.<sup>63</sup> This explanation is specifically denied by MS a, which reads “the utensils of the wagers of war have perished”.

Driver points out that no religious thought of any kind appears in the elegy: “the feeling expressed by it is purely *human*.”<sup>64</sup> It is more remarkable that even the Aramaic version does not introduce any religious thoughts in its translation and leaves the poem “human”. In contrast to other poetical sections, the Targumists did not conceive of this poem as prophecy.

### 6.3 David King of Judah (2 Samuel 2:1-7)

1 2 והוה בחר כין ושאל דוד במימרא דיוי למימר האסק בחדא מקרויא דבית יהודה ואמר יי ליה סק ואמר דויד לאן אסק ואמר לחברון: 2 2 וסליק לחמן דויד ואף<sup>65</sup> חרתין נשוהי אחינועם דמיזרעאל ואביגיל אחת נבל דמכרמלא: 2 3 וגברוהי דעמיה אסיק דויד גבר ואנש ביתיה ויחיבו בקרוי<sup>66</sup> חברון: 2 4 ואזו גברי שיבט<sup>67</sup> יהודה ומשחו תמן ית דויד למהוי מלכא<sup>68</sup> על דבית יהודה וחיויא דרויד למימר גברי<sup>69</sup> יביש גלעד דקברו ית שאול: 2 5 ושלח דויד אגדין לוח גברי<sup>70</sup> יביש גלעד ואמר להון בריכין אתון קדם<sup>71</sup> יי דעבדתון חסדא הדין עם רבונכון עם שאול וקברתון יתיה: 2 6 וכען יעביד יי עמכון טיבו וקשוש ואף אנא אעביד עמכון טבתא הדא דעבדתון<sup>71</sup> פתגמא הדין: 2 7 וכען יתקפן ידיכון<sup>72</sup> והווי לגברין גבריין<sup>73</sup> ארי מיה רבונכון שאול ואף יתי משחו דבית<sup>74</sup> יהודה למהוי מלכא<sup>75</sup> עליהון:

2:1 After this David inquired of the speech of the LORD, “Shall I go up to one of the cities of the House of Judah?” And the LORD said to him, “Go up.” David said, “To which shall I go up?” And He said, “To Hebron.” 2:2 So David went up there, and his two wives also: Ahinoam, who was of Jezreel, and Abigail, the widow of Nabal, who was from Carmel. 2:3 And David brought up his men who were with him, every one with the people of his house. And they dwelt in

<sup>63</sup>This explanation is still embraced by several scholars, cf. Driver, *Notes*, 239.

<sup>64</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 239.

<sup>65</sup>MS f reads והרתין דויד, ‘he and his two wives’.

<sup>66</sup>MS w reads the Hebraism בערי, ‘in the towns’.

<sup>67</sup>MS a adds רביה, resulting in “the men of the tribe of the House of Juda”.

<sup>68</sup>MS f reads למלכא, according to the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>69</sup>MS eb1 reads the more general אינשי, ‘men, people’.

<sup>70</sup>MS eb1 reads the more general אינשי, ‘men, people’; cf. 2:4.

<sup>71</sup>Mss a f add the nota accusativi.

<sup>72</sup>See below, commentary on 4:1.

<sup>73</sup>For this rendering of Hebrew בן־חיל, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 14:52.

<sup>74</sup>Mss a d f read the impersonal collective ביה (against >14).

<sup>75</sup>MS f only reads למלכא.

*the towns of Hebron. 2:4 And the men of Judah came and there they anointed David to be king over the House of Judah. And they told David, "It was the men of Jabesh-gilead who buried Saul." 2:5 So David sent messengers to the men of Jabesh-gilead and said to them, "Blessed be you before the LORD, because you showed this loyalty to Saul your lord, and buried him! 2:6 Now may the LORD show goodness and truth to you! And I will do good to you, because you have done this thing. 2:7 And now, let your hands be strong and be heroic men, because Saul your lord is dead and also because those of the House of Judah have anointed me to be king over them."*

#### 6.4 David Against Ish-bosheth (2 Samuel 2:8–3:5)

8 2 ואבנר בר נר רב חילאָ דלשאול דבר ד ית אישבשת בר שאול ואעבריה למחנים:  
9 2 ואמלכיה על דבית<sup>76</sup> גלעד ועל דבית<sup>77</sup> אשר [ועל דבית<sup>77</sup> יזרעאל]<sup>78</sup> ועל  
דבית<sup>79</sup> אפרים ועל דבית<sup>79</sup> בנימין ועל<sup>79</sup> ישראל כלהון:

*2:8 Now Abner the son of Ner, commander of Saul's army, had taken Ish-bosheth the son of Saul, and brought him over to Mahanaim.<sup>80</sup> 2:9 He had made him king over<sup>81</sup> those of the House of Gilead, the House of Asher, the House of Jezreel, the House of Ephraim, and the House of Benjamin; in short over Israel in its entirety.*

Hebrew אַשּׁוּרִי, which means Assyrians, is read as אַשְׁרִי, referring to the tribe of Asher (>3). Pseudo-Jerome's exegesis is also based on this emendation.<sup>82</sup> Vg and Syr read Geshurites (>1), a tribe in the south of Canaan that suffered from David's attacks (1 Sam. 27:8). This emendation is highly improbable, since the Geshurites seemed to have an independent king (2 Sam. 3:3).<sup>83</sup>

10 2 בר ארבעין שנין איש בושת<sup>84</sup> בר שאול כד מלך על ישראל ותרתינ שנין מלך  
ברם דבית יהודה הוו בתר דויד: 11 2 והוו מנין יומיא דהוו דויד מלכא בחברון  
על דבית יהודה שבע שנין ושחא ירחין: 12 2 ונפך אבנר בר נר ועבדי איש בושת

<sup>76</sup>Omitted in MS y, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>77</sup>Omitted in MSS b c d m o w, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>78</sup>Omitted in MS p by haplography, but present in all other MSS.

<sup>79</sup>MS y adds דבית, resulting in "those of the House of Israel", in accordance with the preceding expressions.

<sup>80</sup>TJon renders Mahanaim as a place-name and not as the dual of the Hebrew word for camp; cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 110.

<sup>81</sup>In spite of the variation in the Hebrew text—three times אל and three times על—TJon consistently renders על in all instances.

<sup>82</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 110, "Hebreus Asuri, id est super tribum Aser".

<sup>83</sup>Cf. Driver, *Notes*, 241.

<sup>84</sup>Erroneously omitted by MS y.

בר שאול ממחנים לנבעון<sup>85</sup>: 2 13 ויואב בר צרויה ועבדי דויד נפקו וערעונון על בריכתא דנבעון<sup>86</sup> כחדא ושרו אלין על בריכתא מכא ואלין על בריכתא מכא: 2 14 ואמר אבנר ליואב יקומון כען עולימיא ויחיכוין קדמנא<sup>87</sup> ואמר יואב יקומון: 2 15 וקמו ועברו במנין חרי עסר מדבית<sup>88</sup> בנימין ומדאישבשת בר שאול וחרי עסר מעבדי דויד: 2 16 ואחקיפו גבר בריש חבריה וחריביה בסטר חבריה<sup>87</sup> ואחקטלו<sup>88</sup> כחדא וקרא<sup>89</sup> לאתרא ההוא אחסת<sup>90</sup> קטיליא דנבעון:

*2:10 Ish-bosheth son of Saul was forty years old when he became king over Israel, and he reigned two years. But the house of Judah followed David. 2:11 And the number of years that David was king in Hebron over those of the House of Judah was seven years and six months. 2:12 And Abner the son of Ner and the servants of Ish-bosheth the son of Saul went out from Mahanaim to Gibeon, 2:13 whereas Joab the son of Zeruiah and the servants of David went out and met them at the pool of Gibeon. And they sat down there, the one on the one side of the pool and the other on the other side of the pool. 2:14 And Abner said to Joab, "Let the young men arise and play<sup>91</sup> before us." And Joab said, "Let them arise." 2:15 Then they arose and passed over by number, twelve from the House of Benjamin and from Ish-bosheth the son of Saul, and twelve from the servants of David. 2:16 And each caught his opponent by the head and, with his sword in the place of his opponent's loins, they were killed together. And he called that place "Inheritance of the Killed Ones", which is in Gibeon.*

Hebrew צרים is part of the name of the killing field. It is represented by קטיליא, 'killed ones'. This rendering is either based on verses like Josh. 5:2 and Ps. 89:44, where צור or צר means "stone dagger" or "the sharp edge of a sword",<sup>92</sup> or on the verbal stem צור, 'fight, oppress' (cf. Exod. 23:22; Deut. 2:9, 19; Est. 8:11). Three manuscripts add the word גבורה in the middle of the name in order to give a more exact translation of Hebrew צרים. In their case Hebrew צרים was read as the plural of צור, 'rock', and interpreted as a metaphor of strength (cf. 22:3, 47). Their translation of the name therefore reads "Inheritance of the Heroism of the Killed Ones".

<sup>85</sup> Ms f reads לנבעת 'to the hill of'. Since this word is in the construct state, it must be due to a reading error.

<sup>86</sup> Mss c d m y read דנבעון, 'which is in Gibeon'.

<sup>87</sup> Ms y omitted בסטר חבריה וחריביה by haplography.

<sup>88</sup> Mss b f y read ונפלו, 'and they fell', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but against the usual vocabulary.

<sup>89</sup> Ms eb1 reads the plural וקרו, 'and they called'.

<sup>90</sup> Mss c d o add גבורה, see below in the commentary.

<sup>91</sup> Literally: mock at each other.

<sup>92</sup> So Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 7.

17 2 ויהו קרבא תקיף עד לחדא ביומא ההוא ואתבר אבנר ואנשי ישראל קדם  
 עבדי דויד: 18 2 והו תמן תלתא בני צרויה יואב ואבישי ועשהאל ועשהאל קליל  
 ברנלוהי כחד מן<sup>93</sup> טבייא דבחקלא: 19 2 ורדף עשהאל בחר אבנר ולא אתפני למיזל  
 על ימינא ועל<sup>94</sup> סמלא מבתר אבנר: 20 2 ואתפני אבנר לאחורוהי ואמר האת דין  
 עשהאל ואמר אנא: 21 2 ואמר ליה אבנר אתפני לך על ימינך או על סמלך ואחור לך  
 חד מעולימיא וסב<sup>95</sup> לך ית זרויה ולא אבא עשהאל למזר<sup>95</sup> מבתרוהי: 22 2 ואוסיף  
 עוד אבנר למימר לעשהאל זור לך מבחרי למה אקטלנך וארמינך לארעא ואיכדין  
 אזוקף אפי ואחמיה ליואב אחוך:

*2:17 And the battle was extremely fierce that day. And Abner and the men of Israel were shattered before the servants of David. 2:18 And the three sons of Zeruiah were there, Joab, Abishai, and Asahel. Now Asahel was as swift of foot as a gazelle which is in the field. 2:19 And Asahel pursued Abner, and he did not turn, to go either to the right hand or to the left from following Abner. 2:20 Then Abner turned to look behind him and said, "Is it you, Asahel?" And he said, "It is I." 2:21 Abner said to him, "Turn aside to your right hand or to your left, and seize one of the young men, and take his belt." But Asahel would not depart from following him. 2:22 And Abner said again to Asahel, "Depart from me, for your own sake! Why<sup>96</sup> should I kill you and smite you to the ground? How then could I lift up my face and show it to your brother Joab?"*

Two Hebrew verbs are translated twice in this verse. Hebrew אככה is equated with a derivation of קטל, 'kill', but since this verb does not match with the following "to the ground", TJon adds וארמינך, 'and I will throw you' (so also Syr). Similar cases can be found in 1 Sam. 31:8; 2 Sam. 1:19. Hebrew אשא פני, 'shall I lift up my face', is first rendered literally, followed by a short explanation "and show it" (similar addition in Syr). This explains how Abner would have trouble facing Joab after killing Asahel.

23 2 ולא אבא<sup>97</sup> למזר ומחזי אבנר באחורי מורניתא בסטר ירכיה<sup>98</sup> ונפקת מורניתא מאחורוהי ונפל תמן ומיה<sup>99</sup> באתריה והוי כל דאחי לאתרא דנפל<sup>100</sup> תמן עשהאל ומיה וקימין: 24 2 ורדפו יואב ואבישי בחר אבנר ושמשא עלת ואנון מטו<sup>101</sup> עד גבעת

<sup>93</sup>Mss a f add בני, resulting in "one of the gazelles' young".

<sup>94</sup>Mss b f y read על או, "or to the left", according to 2:21 (>15).

<sup>95</sup>Ms y reads למיזל, 'to go', a more known and general verb.

<sup>96</sup>Note that this rhetorical question is retained, in contrast to LXX, Vg and Syr, which render "depart from me, lest I would strike you down".

<sup>97</sup>Usual translation, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 8:19.

<sup>98</sup>Omitted in MS y.

<sup>99</sup>Omitted in MS w.

<sup>100</sup>Ms b reads דמיה.

<sup>101</sup>Mss m w read אתו, 'they came'.



אמת<sup>102</sup> דעל אפי גיח<sup>103</sup> אורה מדברא דגבעון: 25 2 ואחכנישו בני בנימין בתר אבנר והו לסיעא חדא וקמו על ריש רמא חדא: 26 2 וקרא אבנר ליואב ואמר הלאפרש תקטול<sup>104</sup> חרבא הלא ידעתא ארי מררא יהי בסופא ועד אמתי לא תימר לעמא למחב מבחר אחיהון: 27 2 ואמר יואב קיים ◊ הוא יוי ◊ ארי אלו לפון מלילחא ארי בכין פון מעדן צפרא אסחלק עמא גבר מבחר אחודי: 28 2 ותקע יואב בשופרא וקמו כל עמא ולא רדפו עוד בתר ישראל ולא אוסיפו עוד לאגחא<sup>105</sup>: 29 2 ואבנר וגברוהי הליכו במישרא ◊ כל ליליא ההוא ועברו ית ירדנא ואולו כל בתרון ואחו למחנים:

2:23 But he did not want to depart. Then Abner smote him in the place of his loins with the back of his spear, so that the spear came out at his back. And he fell there, and died on the place where he was. And all who came to the place where Asahel had fallen and died, stood still. 2:24 But Joab and Abishai pursued Abner. And as the sun was going down, they came to the hill of The Cubit, which lies before Giah, on the road to the wilderness of Gibeon. 2:25 And the sons of Benjamin gathered themselves together behind Abner, and became one company. They took their stand upon the top of one hill. 2:26 Then Abner called to Joab, "Shall the sword kill for ever? Do you not know that it will be bitterness in the end? How long are you not saying to your people to turn back from behind their brethren?" 2:27 And Joab said, "As the LORD is the existing One, if you had not<sup>106</sup> spoken, the people would have given up only at about the time of the morning, each man in pursuit of his brother. 2:28 So Joab blew the trumpet and all the people stopped. They pursued Israel no more, nor did they fight any more. 2:29 And Abner and his men went all that night through the valley. They crossed the Jordan and they went all the bitron and they came to Mahanaïm.

Hebrew הַבְּתָרוֹן, a *hapax legomenon*, appears not to have been translated, but fully integrated in the Aramaic text. The Hebrew word may be explained as a geographical indication.

However, in the Aramaic language the word בְּתָרוֹן must have sound like "thereafter", as if it were the preposition בְּתַר with the ending *-on*.<sup>107</sup> As a consequence, the reader may understand that Abner

<sup>102</sup>Mss a f do not render the name into Aramaic, but give the Hebrew אמת instead.

<sup>103</sup>Ms eb1 reads גיה, 'Geh'.

<sup>104</sup>Explanation of the figurative "devour", cf. 11:25. Only the Arukh of R. Nathan quotes this verse with the original האכל. Mss b f m w eb1 read the Pael תקטיל.

<sup>105</sup>Mss b y add קרבא, 'battle', in conformity with the usual vocabulary.

<sup>106</sup>Not present in the translation of Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 166. But by analogy with 1 Sam. 25:34, where the translation is absolutely clear, one must render לפני in an oath with "if not".

<sup>107</sup>See Dalman, *Grammatik*, 175-76.

and his men crossed Jordan in the morning and spent all the time thereafter, *i.e.* the forenoon, in getting to Mahanaim.<sup>108</sup> A different interpretation is given in the margin of CR:

*another book: divisions*

ספר אחר פסגותא

This interpretation is based on the Hebrew verb בחר, 'to divide into parts', which is usually translated by פלג (*e.g.* TO Gen. 15:10).<sup>109</sup> However, the word must be regarded as a plural because of the double *waw*. As a consequence, one may translate this variant reading with "And they crossed Jordan and all the divisions went and arrived at Mahanaim." An alternative translation is supported by Bacher, who assumes that the Targumist thought of clefts and ravines dividing mountains: "And they crossed Jordan and went [through] all the ravines and arrived at Mahanaim."<sup>110</sup>

30 ויואב תב מבחר אבנר וכנש ית כל עמא ושגו  $\diamond$  מעבדי דויד חשעת עסר גברא ועשהאל: 2 31 ועבדי דויד קטלו מרבית  $\diamond$  111 בנימין ובגברי אבנר תלת מאה ושתינ גברא מיתו<sup>112</sup>: 2 32 ונטלו ית עשהאל וקברוהי בקברא דאבוהי דבית לחם ואולו כל ליליא יואב וגברוהי ונהר להון בחברון: 3 1 והוה קרבא תקיף<sup>113</sup> בין בית שאול ובין בית דוד ובית<sup>114</sup> דוד אולין ותקפין ובית שאול אולין ומאכין: 3 2 ואחילידו לדויד בנין בחברון והוה בוכריה אמנון לאחינעם דמזרעאל: 3 3 ותניניה כלאב<sup>115</sup> לאביגיל אחת נבל דמכרמלא ותליתאה אבשלום<sup>116</sup> בר מעכה בת תלמי מלכא דגשור: 3 4 ורביעאה אדניה בר חגית וחמישאה שפטיה בר אבישל: 3 5 ושחיתאה יתרעם לעגלה אחת דויד אלין אחילידו לדויד בחברון:

*2:30 Joab returned from following Abner. And when he had gathered all the people together, there were missing of David's servants nineteen men besides Asahel. 2:31 But the servants of David had killed among*

<sup>108</sup>This interpretation is also given by modern scholars, who conceive of Hebrew בחר as a derivation of the verb בחר, 'divide into parts', and argue that it is an adverbial accusative of time; so W.R. Arnold, *apud* Driver, *Notes*, 245; HALAT<sup>3</sup>, *s.v.*

<sup>109</sup>Cf. G. Klein, "Bemerkungen zu Herrn Dr. Bacher's 'Kritischen Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum'", *ZDMG* 29 (1875), 157-161, esp. 160.

<sup>110</sup>Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 27. The theory of the ravine is supported by several modern scholars as well, cf. Driver, *Notes*, 245; HALAT<sup>3</sup>, *s.v.*

<sup>111</sup>Omitted by MSS a f, who only read מבנימן.

<sup>112</sup>Ms a reads קטלו, 'they killed', as though it were the Hiphil form ה.מיתו.

<sup>113</sup>Ms a reads אריכא, 'extended, long-lasting', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Note that LXX and Vg translate "a great war".

<sup>114</sup>Brought into line with the surrounding expressions (>15). Omitted by MSS a d, which read דוד, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). These MSS also read singular verbs. This singular is also attested in MSS c o.

<sup>115</sup>Ms b adds בר, 'son', in line with the subsequent phrases.

<sup>116</sup>Ms c reads only שלום, 'Shalom'.

those of the House of Benjamin and among Abner's men: three hundred and sixty men had died. 2:32 And they took up Asahel, and buried him in the tomb of his father, which was at Bethlehem. And Joab and his men went all night, and the day broke upon them at Hebron. 3:1 And the war was strong between the House of Saul and the House of David. And the House of David grew stronger, while the House of Saul became weaker. 3:2 And sons were born to David at Hebron: the first-born was Amnon, of Ahinoam who was from Jezreel; 3:3 and his second Chileab, of Abigail the widow of Nabal who was from Carmel; and the third Absalom the son of Maacah the daughter of Talmai king of Geshur; 3:4 and the fourth Adonijah the son of Haggith; and the fifth Shephatiah the son of Abital; 3:5 and the sixth Ithream, of Eglah, David's wife. These were born to David at Hebron.

The apposition "David's wife" after the name of the unknown woman Eglah<sup>117</sup> gave rise to speculation concerning her identity (>17). In rabbinic literature she is identified with Michal, because she lowed like a cow (= *eglah*) during the birth of her son (cf. ySan. 2:4 (20b); San. 21a; GenR. 82:7; NumR. 4:20).<sup>118</sup> Ithream was Michal's only son, for it is claimed she bore no other children to the day of her death (2 Sam. 6:23).<sup>119</sup> This explanation is also attested to in the margin of CR:

another book: of Michal, David's wife

ספרן אחרן למיכל איהא דוד

## 6.5 Abner Between Two Kings (2 Samuel 3:6-39)

6 3 והוה כד הוה קרבא בין בית שאול ובין בית דויד ואבנר הוה מתקף בבית שאול:  
7 3 ולשאול לחינתא ושמה רצפה בת איה ואמר<sup>120</sup> לאבנר מדין עלהא לוח לחינתא  
דאבא: 8 3 ותקיף לאבנר לחדא על פתגמי איש בשת ואמר הלא רישא<sup>121</sup> אנא מכען

<sup>117</sup>Cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 110: "Quaeritur cum aliae uxores David supranotatae sint et non dicantur uxores David, cur hic sola Eglah uxor dicatur David?"

<sup>118</sup>The same reasoning is followed by Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 110-11; cf. also 118. Another reasoning for the same identification is given in MTeh. 59:4.

<sup>119</sup>There is no attempt to harmonize this account with the explicit statement that Ithream was born during David's reign in Hebron.

<sup>120</sup>MS o adds *בשה* אִישׁ בֹּשֶׁת, 'Ish-bosheth' (>11), as do Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion and Vg. LXX reads Mephibosheth, while Syr reads the unknown name *אבנרא*.

<sup>121</sup>MSS a b d o y add *דכלבא*, resulting in the question, "Am I not a dog's head?" This is in conformity with the order in the Hebrew text (>29), but it neglects the fact that Hebrew *כלב* is rendered by the subsequent phrase "I became a common man". In these MSS the word "dog" is rendered twice, cf. Bacher, "Kritische

הייתי<sup>122</sup> נבר הדיוש לשארא דבית יהודה יומא דין אעביד טיבו עם בית<sup>123</sup> שאול אבוך עם<sup>124</sup> אחוהי ועם<sup>125</sup> רחמוהי ולא מסרתך בידא דדויד ומכען את מסער עלי חוב אתחא יומא דין:

3:6 While there was war between the House of Saul and the House of David, Abner was making himself strong in the House of Saul. 3:7 Now Saul had had a concubine, whose name was Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah. And he said to Abner, "Why have you gone in to my father's concubine?" 3:8 Then Abner was very angry over the words of Ish-bosheth, and said, "Am I not the head? Consequently I became a common man for the rest of the House of Judah. Today I keep showing goodness to the House of Saul your father, with his brothers and with his friends and I did not surrender you into the hand of David. And yet you charge me today with guilt concerning a woman.

TJon divided Hebrew ראש כלב, 'a dog's head', into two phrases. The first phrase stresses the word "head" in the rhetorical question "Am I not the head?" Abner asked for confirmation of his position as head of the non-Judaeen army. The second phrase stresses the word "dog", but renders it euphemistically by הדיוש, 'a common man'.<sup>126</sup> Because Abner chose for the House of Saul, the Judaeen tribe considered him worthless. Using the same exegesis, Pseudo-Jerome explains the expression as "common" and "head of foolish people", thereby insulting the followers of Ish-bosheth of being foolish.<sup>127</sup>

9 3 כרין יעביד יוי◇ לאבנר וכרין יוסף ליה ארי כמא דקיים יוי לדויד ארי כין אעביד ליה: 3 10 לאעברא מלכותא מבית שאול ולאקמא ית כורסי דויד<sup>128</sup> על ישראל ועל<sup>129</sup> יהודה מרן ועד באר שבע: 3 11 ולא יכיל עוד לאתבא ית אבנר פתגמא מרדחיל מניה: 3 12 ושלא אבנר אונדין◇ לות דויד מאתריה<sup>130</sup> למימר מקיימנא דמן<sup>131</sup> דעבד ארעא למימר נור קימך<sup>132</sup> עמי והא ידי אמך לאסחרא לותך ית כל ישראל:

Untersuchungen", 46.

<sup>122</sup>Omitted in MS w.

<sup>123</sup>Omitted in MS b.

<sup>124</sup>Mss m w eb1 read על, 'against, upon'.

<sup>125</sup>Mss m w eb1 once more read ועל, 'against, upon'.

<sup>126</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 24:15.

<sup>127</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 111: first "caput canis se dicit esse, id est vilem" and then "eo quod princeps esset canum, id est stultorum hominem".

<sup>128</sup>Mss m eb1 render מלכותא דדויד, resulting in "the royal throne of David".

<sup>129</sup>Mss b c d o y add דביה, "and over those of the House of Judah" (>15).

<sup>130</sup>Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>131</sup>Only attested in MS p. Mss a b c d m o w y eb1 Rashi and Kimḥi read במן, while MS f reads למן.

<sup>132</sup>Ms f omits the suffix and reads קים, 'a covenant', in conformity with the following verse (>15).

3:9 *The LORD do so to Abner, and more also, if I do not accomplish for David what the LORD has sworn to him: 3:10 to transfer the kingdom from the House of Saul, and set up the throne of David over Israel and Judah, from Dan to Beer-sheba.*” 3:11 *And Ish-bosheth could not answer Abner another word, because he feared him. 3:12 And Abner sent messengers to David from his place, saying, “I am swearing<sup>133</sup> by<sup>134</sup> the One who made the earth, saying: Make your covenant with me, and behold, my hand shall be with you to bring over all Israel to you.”*”

TJon considered the phrase “Whose is the land?” as a reference to God, who made the earth and divided the lands among the nations (cf. e.g. Deut. 32:8), and translated it as an oath formula.<sup>135</sup>

13 3 ואמר שב אנא אנור עמך קים ברם פתגמא חד אנא שאיל מנך למימר לא תחזי ית<sup>136</sup> אפי אלהין קדם ◊ מיתותך ית מיכל בת שאול במיתך לאתחזאה קדמי<sup>137</sup>.

3:13 *And he said, “Good. I will make a covenant with you, but one thing I require of you, that is to say, you shall not see my face, unless you first bring Michal, Saul’s daughter, when you come to show yourself before me.*”

The unusual construction of Hebrew *כי אם לפני הביאך*, ‘except before you bring’, is fully integrated in the Aramaic version. According to the context, *כי אם* and *לפני* exclude each other (cf. 3:35).<sup>138</sup> For this reason LXX and Syr only render “except”, while Vg only expresses “before”.

14 3 ושלה דויד אנורין ◊ לוח איש בושח בר שאול למימר הב ית אחזי ית מיכל דארסית<sup>139</sup> לי במאה ערלת פלשחאי: 15 3 ושלה אישבשח ודברה ◊ מלות בעלה<sup>140</sup>

<sup>133</sup>Pael ptc. with suffix 1 sg.; cf. Dalman, *Grammatik*, 289; against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 167, who translated “we are establishing”; and against H. St. John Thackeray, R. Marcus, *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities*, Books V-VIII (Loeb Classical Library, 281), Cambridge & London 1988, 371, n. h, who translated “let us swear”.

<sup>134</sup>According to all MSS except for MS p.

<sup>135</sup>Cf. Komlosch, *דמקרא באור התרגום*, 325.

<sup>136</sup>Omitted in MS c.

<sup>137</sup>Whereas the first *ראה אתפני* is translated literally as “to see my face”, the second was transformed into “to show yourself before me” (>18).

<sup>138</sup>So Driver, *Notes*, 248.

<sup>139</sup>MS f<sub>3</sub> suggests the reading *דקדשית*, ‘whom I married’.

<sup>140</sup>Interpreted as “husband” and complemented with a suffix 3 f.sg., as all ancient versions did (>10) in conformity with the subsequent verse (>15). Because this is a very logical complement, Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 66 did not regard this as based on a different *Vorlage*; against Driver, *Notes*, 248; Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 7; McCarter, *II Samuel*, 107.

מלות פלטיאל בר ליש<sup>141</sup>: 3 16 ואזל עמה בעלה אזיל<sup>142</sup> ובכי בתרהא עד עלמת ואמר ליה אבנר אזיל תוב ותב:

3:14 Then David sent messengers to Ish-bosheth Saul's son, saying, "Give me my wife Michal, whom I betrothed for a hundred foreskins of the Philistines." 3:15 And Ish-bosheth sent and led her away from her husband, from Paltiel the son of Laish. 3:16 But her husband went with her, weeping after her all the way to Almath. Then Abner said to him, "Go, return." And he returned.

The Hebrew place-name בחרים is rendered according to its etymology, albeit not literally. Whereas Hebrew בחרים means "chosen, young men", the meaning of Aramaic עלמת tends to be more like "youth", as though TJon read בחרים.<sup>143</sup> If Hebrew בחרים refers to real young men, it is equated with עלימא.<sup>144</sup> TJon might have been thinking of Almon/Alemeth (cf. Josh. 21:18; 1 Chron. 6:60), which is also near Jerusalem.<sup>145</sup>

3 17 ופתגם אבנר הוה עם סבי ישראל למימר אף תמלי אף דקמוהי הויתון בען ית דויד למהוי מלכא ◊ עליכון: 3 18 וכען עבירו ארי יוי אמר לדויד למימר ביד דויד עבדי אפרוק<sup>146</sup> ית עמי ישראל<sup>147</sup> מיד פלשתאי ומיד כל בעלי דבביתון: 3 19 ומליל אף אבנר קדם ◊ דבית<sup>148</sup> בנימין ואזל אף אבנר למלא קדם ◊ דויד בחברון ית כל דתקין בעיני ישראל ובעיני כל דבית<sup>149</sup> בנימין: 3 20 ואחא<sup>150</sup> אבנר לות דויד לחברון ועמיה עסרין גברין ועבד דויד לאבנר ולגבריא דעמיה משתיא: 3 21 ואמר אבנר לדויד<sup>151</sup> אקום ואזיל ואכנוש לות רבוני ◊ מלכא ית כל ישראל ויגורון עמך קים ותמלוך בכל דרעיא<sup>152</sup> נפשך ושלא דויד ית אבנר ואזל בשלם: 3 22 והא עבדי דויד ויואב אחו ממשריתא ועדא ◊ סניאה עמהון אחיאו ואבנר ליתוהי עם דויד בחברון ארי

<sup>141</sup>Spelled according to the Qere and many Hebrew MSS; cf. Soferim 38a.

<sup>142</sup>See commentary on 1 Sam. 6:12.

<sup>143</sup>Consistently rendered, cf. 2 Sam. 16:5; 17:18; 19:17; 1 Kgs 2:8. The connection with "unmarried youth" is also made by R. Johanan, who assumes that Palti and Michal did not consummate their marriage.

<sup>144</sup>Smolar and Aberbach's remark that the place-name in the present verse is rendered as a generic name, is therefore not correct; cf. their *Targum Jonathan*, 125.

<sup>145</sup>Suggested by Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 13.

<sup>146</sup>First person singular, according to many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

<sup>147</sup>MS c adds a nota accusativi before the name of Israel.

<sup>148</sup>MSS o w read בני, 'sons', another way to personify the tribe (>9).

<sup>149</sup>MS o again reads בני, 'sons', in conformity with the first half of the verse (>15), but not with the Hebrew text.

<sup>150</sup>MS o adds אף, 'also', after the example of the preceding verse.

<sup>151</sup>MS eb1 erroneously reads דויד לאבנר; MS eb66 agrees with MS p.

<sup>152</sup>Verbal form. MSS d o w y read a substantive דרעוא, resulting in "according to what is the desire of your soul".

שלחיה ואזל בשלם: 3 23 נויאב וכל חילא דעמיה אתון<sup>153</sup> וחויאו ליואב למימר אתא  
 אבנר בר נר לות מלכא ושלחיה ואזל בשלם: 3 24 ואתא יואב לות מלכא ואמר מא  
 עבדתא הא אתא אבנר לותך למא דנן שלחתיה ואזל מיזל<sup>154</sup>: 3 25 ידעת ית אבנר בר  
 נר ארי<sup>155</sup> לאטעיותך אתא ולמרע ית מפקך וית מעלך ולמרע ית כל<sup>156</sup> דאח עביד:  
 3 26 ונפק יואב מלות<sup>157</sup> דויד ושלח אוגדין בחר אבנר ואחזבו יתיה מנובא דסירתא  
 דויד לא ידע: 3 27 ותב אבנר לחברון ואפנייה יואב לנו תרעא למללא עמיה בשליא  
 ומחיה תמן בסטר ירכיה ומית ברמא דעשהאל אחוהי:

3:17 And the word of Abner was with the elders of Israel, saying, "For some time past you have been seeking David to be king over you. 3:18 Now then, act! For the LORD has said to David, saying, 'By the hand of my servant David I will save my people Israel from the hand of the Philistines and from the hand of all their enemies.'" 3:19 Abner also spoke before those of the House of Benjamin. And then Abner went to speak before David at Hebron all that was deemed right in the sight of Israel and in the sight of all those of the House of Benjamin. 3:20 When Abner came with twenty men to David at Hebron, David made a feast for Abner and the men who were with him. 3:21 And Abner said to David, "I will arise and go, and I will gather all Israel to my lord the king, that they may make a covenant with you, and that you may reign over all that your soul desires." So David sent Abner and he went in peace. 3:22 Just then the servants of David and Joab arrived from the camp, bringing a great booty with them. But Abner was not with David at Hebron, for he had sent him away and he had gone in peace. 3:23 When Joab and all the army that was with him came, it was told to Joab, "Abner the son of Ner came to the king, and he has sent him and he has gone in peace." 3:24 Then Joab went to the king and said, "What have you done? Behold, Abner came to you. Why is it that you have sent him, so that he just walked away?" 3:25 You know Abner the son of Ner, that he only came to deceive you, and to know your going out and your coming in, and to know all that you are doing." 3:26 When Joab came out from David's presence, he sent messengers after Abner, and they brought him back from the cistern of Sirah. But David did not know about it. 3:27 And when Abner returned to Hebron, Joab took him aside into the midst of the gate to speak with him privately, and there he struck him down in the place of his loins, so that he died, for the blood of Asahel his brother.

<sup>153</sup>The entire verse is absent in MS c, probably by haplography. The first five words are absent in MS p, but do occur in the other MSS.

<sup>154</sup>See commentary on 1 Sam. 6:12.

<sup>155</sup>MS a adds בדיל 'in order to'.

<sup>156</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>157</sup>MSS b f y read מן קדם, 'from before', a more reverent translation (>23).

Hebrew בשלי, 'undisturbed, quietly', is translated with its direct equivalent בשליא. Two alternative renderings are given in the margin of CR:

ספןרן אחרן ברז על מה דאשתלי

*another book: secretly concerning what he had done wrong*

The first rendering is simply an Aramaic alternative for the main translation: ברז, 'secretly'. The second rendering links Hebrew בשלי with the Aramaic verb שלי (>6). Since in the ending of the present verse Abner's death is connected with his killing Asahel, it is suggested here that Joab wanted to speak with him about what Abner had done wrong. However, this alternative speaks about an error, not about great sins. This very interpretation is also known from LXX and Vg.<sup>158</sup>

An alternative and clarifying translation of the end of the verse is also given in the margin of CR, based on 3:30 (>15):

ואיתן דאנמרין חלף דקטל עשאל אחוהי

*there are some who say: because he killed Asahel his brother*

28 3 ושמע דויד מבחר כין ואמר זכי אנא ומלכותי מן קדם יוי עד עלמא דמרא דאבנר בר נר: 29 3 יחולון על רישא דיואב ועל כל בית אבוהי ולא יפסוק מבית<sup>159</sup> יואב דאיב<sup>160</sup> וסגיר ומתקיף באגר ומתקטיל בחרבא וחסיר מזון:

*3:28 When David heard of it afterward, he said, "I and my kingdom are for ever innocent before the LORD for the blood of Abner the son of Ner. 3:29 May it fall upon the head of Joab, and upon all his father's house. And may the house of Joab never be without one who is flowing, or one with a skin disease, or one who seizes wages, or one who is killed by the sword, or one who is lacking food.*

Four of the five curses on Joab and his family are rendered literally. The middle one is rather mysterious in the Hebrew text: "one who holds a spindle-whorl" (cf. Prov. 31:19). On the one hand, LXX translates "one who seizes a staff", probably implying sick or crippled people.<sup>161</sup> Likewise, San. 48b connects this curse with King Asa, who in his old age was diseased in his feet (1 Kgs 15:23).

<sup>158</sup>Bacher, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 25.

<sup>159</sup>Ms eb1 reads מדבית, '[from] those of the house of Joab'.

<sup>160</sup>Ms o reads the Hebraism זאיב.

<sup>161</sup>So also Rashi, Kimḥi and, among modern commentators, C.J. Goslinga, *Het tweede boek Samuël* (COT), Kampen 1962, 73; H.W. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher* (ATD, 10), Göttingen <sup>5</sup>1973, 209, n. 4; McCarter, *II Samuel*, 118, connecting it with Phoenician *plkm*, 'crutches'.



Most dictionaries regard Aramaic אגר as an erroneous spelling of אגר, 'staff, crutch'.<sup>162</sup> If this is true, TJon and LXX agree in their explanation. Levy mentions that the Arukh classified this expression under the heading גר 3, quoting TJon as ומתקיץ באגר.<sup>163</sup> I could not find any further manuscriptural evidence for the reading אגר until now.

On the other hand, Hebrew פלך was most often interpreted as a spindle-whorl,<sup>164</sup> a symbol of femininity (cf. San. 95a; Ket. 72b). The curse, implying that the men of Joab's house would hold a spindle, was explained in terms of cowardice or poverty. Cowardice is mentioned in yQid. 1:7 (61a), where the curse is connected with King Joash who was conquered by a small army. Therefore, he and his men must have been as feeble-minded as women (2 Chron. 24:24).<sup>165</sup> Poverty is mentioned in TanB, *Bereshit*, 6:7, which states that a man who needs to spin must have fallen to poverty because his wife could not keep her house (cf. Prov. 31:19).

This interpretation of poverty seems to have been the basis of TJon's interpretation. The translation explains that the house of Joab would never be without one who seizes wages, *i.e.* one who hires himself out for wages. This manner of earning was considered a curse for wealthy people because of the lack of freedom and the uncertainty. An identical curse was spoken by Hannah concerning the sons of Haman (1 Sam. 2:5).<sup>166</sup>

30 3 ויואב ואבישי אחוהי קטלו לאבנר על דקטל ית עשהאל אחוהו בנבעון בקרבא:  
 31 3 ואמר דויד ליואב ולכל עמא דעמיה בועו לבושיכון ואסרו סקין וספרו קדם  
 אבנר ומלכא דויד אזיל בתר ערסא: 32 3 וקברו ית אבנר בחברון וארים מלכא  
 ית קליה ובכא על קברא דאבנר ובכו כל עמא: 33 3 ואלא מלכא על אבנר ואמר  
 הכיממת רשיעין<sup>167</sup> ימות אבנר: 34 3 דך לא אסירן ורגלך לא לזקינ דנחש אתקרבא

<sup>162</sup>Cf. Dalman, *Handwörterbuch*, 5; Jastrow, *Dictionary*, Vol. 1, 11; Levy, *CWT*, Vol. 1, 7-8.

<sup>163</sup>Levy, *CWT*, Vol. 1, 7.

<sup>164</sup>So also Syr, Aquila and Symmachus.

<sup>165</sup>Cf. also Isa. 19:16; Jer. 50:35-38; Nah. 3:13. Related curses in literature of the surrounding countries express the same idea, *viz.* that warriors will lose their virility and become like women; cf. Driver, *Notes*, 250-51; D.R. Hillers, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (BO, 16), Rome 1964, 66-68; H.A. Hoffner, "Symbols for Masculinity and Femininity: Their Use in Ancient Near Eastern Sympathetic Magic Rituals", *JBL* 85 (1966), 326-34, esp. 332; S.C. Layton, "A Chain Gang in 2 Samuel iii 29? A Rejoinder", *VT* 39 (1989), 81-86.

<sup>166</sup>A. Demsky, cited by S.W. Holloway, "Distaff, Crutch or Chain Gang: The Curse of the House of Joab in 2 Samuel III 29", *VT* 37 (1987), 370-75, esp. 372, has proposed the identical explanation of "work-duty, tax in the form of conscripted labor" against the background of Akkadian *pilku*. It is highly improbable that TJon would have followed the same line of thought.

<sup>167</sup>Regular equivalent of Hebrew נבל, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 25:25.

כמפל קדם ◊ גברין רשיעין נפלהא ואוסיפו כל עמא למבכי עלוהי:

3:30 So Joab and Abishai his brother killed Abner, because he had killed their brother Asahel in the battle at Gibeon. 3:31 Then David said to Joab and to all the people who were with him, "Rend your clothes, and gird on sackcloth, and mourn in front of Abner." And King David was going after the bier. 3:32 They buried Abner at Hebron; and the king lifted up his voice and wept at the grave of Abner, and all the people wept. 3:33 And the king lamented for Abner and said, "Should Abner die as the wicked die? 3:34 Your hands were not bound, your feet not drawn near to bronze fetters. As one falls before the wicked men, you have fallen." And all the people wept again over him.

It is noteworthy that TJon maintained the verb נפל here, whereas the Targum usually gives the non-figurative אַזְקַטַל, 'be killed' (against >14). Other poetical devices, such as the collective "fool" and the idiomatic "sons of transgression", are translated into plainer terms. Since both expressions are equated with the identical רשיעין, TJon enhances the link between the first and the last phrase of the poem. In the Aramaic version the poem and its prose setting are completely chiasmic as well:

A ואלא מלכא על אבנר ואמר  
 B הכיממת רשיעין ימות אבנר  
 C ירך לא אסירן  
 C' ורגלך לא לוקין דנחש אתקרבא  
 B' כמפל קדם גברין רשיעין נפלהא  
 A' ואוסיפו כל עמא למבכי עלוהי

35 3 ואתא כל עמא לאוכלא<sup>168</sup> ית דויד לחמא עד דיומא קיים וקיים דויד למימר כדין יעביד לי יוי ◊ וכדין יוסיף אלהין קדם ◊ מעל שמשא אטעום לחמא או כל<sup>169</sup> מדעם: 36 3 וכל עמא אשחמודעו ושפר ◊ בעיניהון ככל דעבד מלכא בעיני כל עמא טב: 37 3 וידעו כל עמא וכל ישראל ביומא ההוא ארי לא הוה בעיצת מלכא למקטל ית אבנר בר נר:

3:35 Then all the people came to make David eat bread, while the day lasted, but David swore, saying, "The LORD do so to me and more also, if I taste bread or anything else till the sun goes down." 3:36 And all the people took notice of it, and it was pleasing in their sight,

An alternative and euphemistic rendering is offered by Ms f<sub>3</sub>: גבר הדיוט, 'a common man' (>23). Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 7-8 erred in reading הדיוט, 'another expression', because לא גבר הדיוט is the abbreviation of לאישא אחרתא, 'another expression'.

<sup>168</sup> Ms y reads לאיבא, which also means "to make eat".

<sup>169</sup> Ms eb1 reads איכול, 'I eat', resulting in "... if I taste bread or eat anything else till the sun goes down."

as everything that the king did was good in the sight of all the people. 3:37 So all the people and all Israel knew that day that it had not been in the king's plan to kill Abner the son of Ner.

TJon clarifies the rather vague expression in Hebrew that "it was not from the king" by adding the word בעיצה, 'in the plan'. It is interesting to note that the Aramaic word עיצתא is a second translation of Hebrew מהמלך, 'from the king': Aramaic מלך can also mean "counsel, advice" and is the usual equivalent of Hebrew עיצה (>6). Whereas Hebrew עיצה is usually rendered by Aramaic מלך, in the present verse Hebrew מלך is rendered by Aramaic עיצתא.

38 3 ואמר מלכא לעברוהי הלא תדעון ארי רב ושליש נפל יומא דין<sup>170</sup> בישראל:

3:38 And the king said to his servants, "Do you not know that a commander and a ruler has fallen today in Israel?"

Since Hebrew שר is rendered רבא, 'commander', Hebrew גדול had to be equated with a different word. Therefore the Aramaic word שליטא, 'ruler', was used.

39 3 ואנא יומא דין הדיוש<sup>171</sup> ומרבא<sup>172</sup> למלכו<sup>173</sup> וגבריא האלין בני צרויה קשן מני  
ישלים יי לעבד<sup>174</sup> בשתא כבשתיה:

3:39 And I am this day a common man, though elevated to be king. These men, the sons of Zeruiah, are too hard for me. May the LORD requite the evildoers according to his wickedness.

<sup>170</sup>Mss a b c d f m o y eb66 read הרין, resulting in "this day", which is in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>171</sup>Usual translation of all humble self-denotations, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 18:23. Another interpretation of Hebrew רך is given in BB 4a, where it is connected with Latin *rex*. Its translation of David's utterance is "I am this day royal and anointed king".

<sup>172</sup>TJon did not use the verb משח, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 15:1.

<sup>173</sup>For this absolute form, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 18:17. Ms y, Rashi and Kimhi read למלכא, though.

<sup>174</sup>Plural, because it concerns the two sons of Zeruiah (>16). Another reason for the use of the plural may have been the intention to generalize the text for the audience. Mss a y read the singular, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

## 6.6 The Report of Ish-bosheth's Death (2 Samuel 4)

1 4 ושמע בר שאול ארי מית אבנר בחברון ואתרשלא ידוהי וכל ישראל אתכהילו:  
 2 4 ותרין גברין רבני<sup>175</sup> רישי<sup>176</sup> תרתין<sup>177</sup> משרין הוו עם<sup>178</sup> בר<sup>179</sup> שאול שום חד  
 בענה ושום חנינא רכב בני רמון דמבאירות מבני בנימין ארי אף באירות מתחשבא על  
 דביה<sup>180</sup> בנימין:

*4:1 When the son of Saul heard that Abner had died at Hebron, his hands became inactive<sup>181</sup> and all Israel was terrified. 4:2 Now there were two men, commanders—heads—of two camps with the son of Saul. The name of the one was Baanah, and the name of the other Rechab, sons of Rimmon, a man of Benjamin from Beeroth—for Beeroth also is reckoned to the House of Benjamin.*

A double translation of Hebrew שרי is given, even though there is no reason for this in the Hebrew text. The usual translation, רבני, is given first, and another rendering, רישי, is added. In addition, Hebrew plural גודים is rendered as though it were a dual (see above, commentary on 1:26), and the entire sentence is given a better structure.

3 4 וערקו אנש<sup>182</sup> באירות לגתים והוו תמן דירין<sup>182</sup> עד יומא הדין: 4 4 וליהונתן בר שאול בר לקי בתרתין רגלוהי בר חמיש שנין הוה כד אחת בסורת שאול ויהונתן מזורעאל ונשלחיה תורבינותיה ואפכת<sup>183</sup> והוה באתבעתוהה למערק<sup>184</sup> ונפל

<sup>175</sup>Omitted in MS a, because the Hebrew text only gives one word for “commander”. However, MS a omitted the most usual rendering of Hebrew שר.

<sup>176</sup>Omitted in MS f, because it is a double rendering of Hebrew שר (>29).

<sup>177</sup>Omitted in MSS b y, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>178</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but disrupting the fluency of the sentence.

<sup>179</sup>Omitted in MS y. Hebrew שאל בן שאול is interpreted as מניסת שאול, ‘from the family of Saul’, in MSS f<sub>2</sub> p.

<sup>180</sup>Syr and LXX read “to the sons of Benjamin”.

<sup>181</sup>Expression used both in Hebrew (and Ugaritic) and in Aramaic which functions as a literary convention depicting the reaction to bad news; so D.R. Hillers, “A Convention in Hebrew Literature: The Reaction to Bad News”, *ZAW* 77 (1965), 86-90; cf. also 2 Sam. 17:2; Isa. 13:7; Jer. 6:24; Zeph. 3:16, while the opposite expression is used in 2 Sam. 2:7; 17:21. Obviously no need was felt to render this expression in other words.

<sup>182</sup>Since the text concerns Benjaminites, a literal rendering of Hebrew גר would be out of place. Benjaminites cannot be denoted as foreigners or proselytes. Originally, Beeroth was one of the cities of the Gibeonites. For them the denotation גר would suffice.

<sup>183</sup>Not the usual translation for an individual flight, but the verb is used again later on. TJon therefore diversified its rendering (>18); cf. also Frankel, “Zu dem Targum”, 17.

<sup>184</sup>Omitted in MS w.

ואיתחנר<sup>185</sup> ושמה מפיבשת: 4 5 ואזלו בני רמון<sup>186</sup> דמבאירות רכב ובענה ואחו כמחים יומא לבית איש בושח והוא שכיב ית שינת מלכיא:

4:3 And the men of Beeroth fled to Gittaim, and have been inhabitants there to this day. 4:4 Jonathan, the son of Saul, had a son suffering in both his feet. He had been five years old when the news about Saul and Jonathan came from Jezreel. And his nurse took him up and turned away, but in her haste to flee he fell and became cripple. And his name was Mephibosheth. 4:5 Now the sons of Rimmon who was from Beeroth, Rechab and Baanah, set out, and about the heat of the day they came to the house of Ishbosheth, while he was taking a kings' sleep.

The siesta custom is assumed to have been the more or less exclusive privilege of royalty during the age of the early Israelite monarchy, as it was only the privilege of the aristocracy in Roman times.<sup>187</sup>

4 6 והא<sup>188</sup> אחו עד גו ביחא כזבני חטין ומחיה בסטר ירכיה ורכב ובענה אחוהי אשתיו: 4 7 ואתו לביתא והוא שכיב על ערסיה באדרון בית משכביה ומחיה וקמלוהי ופסקו<sup>189</sup> ית רישיה ונסיבו ית רישיה ואזלו באורח מישרא ית ליליא: 4 8 ואתיא ית ריש איש בשת לות דויד לחברון ואמרו למלכא הא ריש איש בושח בר שאול בעיל דבבך<sup>190</sup> דבעא למקשלך<sup>191</sup> ועבר<sup>192</sup> יוי לרבנוי ית מלכא פורענותא יומא הדין<sup>193</sup> משאול ומזרעיה<sup>194</sup>: 4 9 ואתיב דויד ית ריכב וית בענה אחוהי בני רמון דמבאירות ואמר להון קיים ית דפרק ית נפשי מכל עקא: 4 10 ארי דחוי לי למימר הא מית שאול והוא הוה כמבסר בעיני נפשיה<sup>196</sup> ואחרית ביה וקמלתיה בציקלג דהוה

<sup>185</sup>Mss a b c d f o y read the Peal וחנר, 'and he crippled'.

<sup>186</sup>Ms y erroneously reads רכב, 'Rechab'.

<sup>187</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 110; cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 8.

<sup>188</sup>The Hebrew word is vocalized as וְהָיָה (>3), as in LXX and Syr. According to Driver, *Notes*, 255, the word וְהָיָה is redundant. Mss a d f<sub>3</sub> y read וְאֵנֹן, 'and they', as though the Hebrew text were וְהָיָה.

<sup>189</sup>Mss b f y read וְאֵנֹדִיא, 'and they removed'. This verb is the usual equivalent of Hebrew Hiphil סָרַח (>29). The Hebrew language prefers the expression כָּרַח אֶת־רֹאשׁ, 'cut off one's head' (cf. 1 Sam. 17:51; 31:9; 2 Sam. 20:22), which is always translated פָּסַק ית רִישָׁא.

<sup>190</sup>Ms a reads סַנְאָךְ, 'your hater'.

<sup>191</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 20:1.

<sup>192</sup>Ms f reads וַיֵּה, 'and He gave', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>193</sup>Ms a f o read דִּין, resulting in "today".

<sup>194</sup>Ms f reads וּמִבְנוֹי, 'and on his son', giving a plain rendering instead of the figurative "and on his seed" (>14). However, this was not a rhetorical device which had to be dissolved in the Aramaic version. Both זֵרְעָא, 'seed', and בְּרָא, 'son', are used as equivalents.

<sup>195</sup>Omitted in MS d, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but not with the usual translation.

<sup>196</sup>Omitted in MS a, which read בְּעֵינֵיהּ, 'in his own sight', in conformity with the

מדמי למתן ליה מתנא<sup>197</sup> בסורתיה:

4:6 *And behold, they came into the midst of the house as buyers of wheat, and they struck him in the place of his loins. Then Rechab and Baanah his brother escaped. 4:7 When they came to the house, as he was sleeping on his bed in his bedchamber, they struck him and killed him and cut off his head. And they took his head and went the way of the valley all night. 4:8 They brought the head of Ish-bosheth to David at Hebron. And they said to the king, "Behold the head of Ish-bosheth, the son of Saul, your enemy, who sought to kill you. The LORD took revenge on Saul and on his seed this day for my lord the king." 4:9 But David answered Rechab and Baanah his brother, the sons of Rimmon who was from Beeroth, "As the LORD is the existing One, who has redeemed my life out of every affliction, 4:10 when one told me, saying, 'Behold, Saul is dead,' and he was like one bringing good news in the sight of his own soul, I seized him and killed him at Ziklag, while he was imagining me to give him a present for his good news.*

Hebrew infinitive לַתְּתִילֹה, 'that I should give him', is one of the instances in which the infinitive with ל־ depends on the idea of an obligation.<sup>198</sup> Since the Hebrew text has no main verb, TJon adds הוּהוּ מדמי, 'he was thinking' (>10).<sup>199</sup>

4 11 אף ארי גברין רשיעין קטלו ית גבר [זכין] <sup>200</sup> בביתיה על שוייה<sup>201</sup> וכען הלא אחבע ית דמיה מידכון ואפלי יתכון מן ארעא: 4 12 ופקיד דויד ית עולימיא וקטלונון וקציצו ית ידיהון וית רגליהון וצלבון על בריכתא בחברון וית ריש איש בושת נסיבון וקברו<sup>202</sup> בקברא דאבנר בחברון:

4:11 *How much more, when wicked men have killed an innocent man in his own house upon his couch, shall I not now require his blood from your hand, and remove you from the land?" 4:12 And David commended his young men, and they killed them. They cut off their hands and feet, and hanged them beside the pool at Hebron. But they took the head of Ish-bosheth, and buried it in the tomb of Abner at Hebron.*

Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>197</sup>Omitted in MS c, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>198</sup>So GKC § 114l.

<sup>199</sup>Cf. Komlosch, המקרא באור התרגום, 327.

<sup>200</sup>Omitted in MS p, but attested in all other MSS. Note that this word is also omitted in Syr.

<sup>201</sup>MS d reads משכביה, 'his bed', using the same word as in the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>202</sup>MSS m w eb1 read וקברויה, 'and they buried it', which is also attested in Syr and one Hebrew MS.

## 6.7 The King and his Capital (2 Samuel 5)

In the triennial cycle, part of this chapter is read as the *haftara* after Gen. 25, the account of Abraham's sons and death. This account is paralleled by the enumeration of David's wives and sons. Perrot stated that this *haftara* commenced at 5:13, including David's children, while the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* started with 5:17. Both agree that it ended with 6:1, although findings in the Cairo Genizah show that it once ended with 6:2.<sup>203</sup> The Aramaic version of the present chapter seems not to be affected by the Torah reading.

1 5 ואתו כל שבטיא דִּישְׂרָאֵל לות דויד לחברון ואמרו למימר<sup>204</sup> הא אנחנא<sup>205</sup> קריבך ובסרך אנחנא: 2 5 אף תמלי אף דקמוהי כד<sup>206</sup> הוה שאול מלכא עלנא את הויתא נפיק ועליל בריש ישראל ואמר יוי לך את תפרניס ית עמי ית ישראל ואת תהוי למלכא על ישראל:

5:1 *Then all the tribes of Israel came to David at Hebron, and said, "Behold us, we are your bone and flesh. 5:2 Already in times past, when Saul was king over us, it was you that was going out and coming in at the head of Israel. And the LORD said to you, 'You shall take care of my people Israel, and you shall be king over Israel.'"*

The Hebrew Hiphil forms "you led out and brought in Israel" are represented by Peal forms due to associative translation (>15). Since this is the only occurrence of the Hiphil forms in this expression, and the Qal form is used elsewhere (1 Sam. 18:13, 16; 29:6), it is adapted in the present verse.<sup>207</sup>

Although the simplification "king" for Hebrew נִייד is a standard equation in TJon, it considerably changes the contents of the present verse. Whereas the LORD's utterance may well be a description of David's situation of that time—David *was* the would-be king, shepherding Israel as the commander of the army—in the Aramaic version it became a straightforward prophecy that was fulfilled in the subsequent verse. It is conceived of as a prophecy by Matthew as well, although he gave it a Messianic overtone.<sup>208</sup>

<sup>203</sup>Cf. T.-S. B17.9, J2.80 and AS70.130 it is read until 6:2, cf. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts*, 32 no. 387, 37 no. 440, 100 no. 1295.

<sup>204</sup>MSS c f read ליה, 'to him', as in Syr, some MSS of the LXX and some Hebrew MSS.

<sup>205</sup>Ms b erroneously reads אַנְנָא.

<sup>206</sup>Ms eb66 adds אף before כד, putting it on the same level as the previous phrase.

<sup>207</sup>Not recognized as an associative translation by Komlosh, *המקרא באור התרגום*, 304.

<sup>208</sup>Mt. 2:6, where Mic. 5:1, 3 and 2 Sam. 5:2 are mixed up in one quotation. This

5 3 ואחו כל סבי ישראל לות מלכא לחברון וגור להון מלכא דייד קים בחברון קדם יי ומשחו<sup>209</sup> ית דייד למלכא<sup>210</sup> על ישראל: 5 4 בר תלתין שנין דייד<sup>211</sup> כד מלך ארבעין שנין מלך: 5 5 בחברון מלך על דביח יהודה שבע שנין ושחא ירחין ובירושלם מלך תלתין ותלת שנין על כל ישראל ויהודה: 5 6 ואול מלכא וגברוהי לירושלם לות יבוסאה יחיב<sup>212</sup> ארעא ואמר<sup>213</sup> לדויד למימר לא תיעול הלכא אלהין באעדיותך חטאיא<sup>214</sup> וחיביא<sup>214</sup> דאמרין לא ייעול דייד הלכא:

5:3 So all the elders of Israel came to the king at Hebron, and King David made a covenant with them at Hebron before the LORD, and they anointed David king over Israel. 5:4 David was thirty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned forty years. 5:5 At Hebron he reigned over those of the House of Judah seven years and six months; and at Jerusalem he reigned over all Israel and Judah thirty-three years.<sup>214</sup> 5:6 And the king and his men went to Jerusalem, toward the Jebusite, who inhabited the land. And they said to David, "You will not come in here, unless you remove the sinners and the guilty, who are saying, 'David will not come in here.'"

TJon slightly altered the Hebrew clause introduced with **כי אם**, whereas the parallel passage of 1 Chron. 11:5 omitted it. Hebrew **הסירך** is read as if it were **בהסירך**, exchanging subject and object. Therefore, whereas the lame and the blind would prevent David from entering Jerusalem in the Hebrew text, David was challenged to remove them from the city in the Aramaic version.

In the Hebrew text the Jebusites mocked David with the words, "You will never enter here. Even the blind and the lame will turn you back." This event occasioned the saying "No one who is blind or lame may enter the house" (5:8). In David's time, lameness and blindness were apparently regarded as humiliating, "and there was

---

is one of the instances in which the NT gives a messianic interpretation, while TJon abstains from it; cf. J.C. de Moor, "Van wie zegt de profeet dit? Messiaanse apologetiek in de Targumim", in: H.H. Grosheide *et al.* (eds), *De knechtsgestalte van Christus: Studies door collega's en oud-leerlingen aangeboden aan Prof.dr. H.N. Ridderbos*, Kampen 1978, 91-110, esp. 95.

<sup>209</sup>Mss a c f add **המן**, 'there', in conformity with 2:4 (>15).

<sup>210</sup>Only in MSS p eb66 (>29). MSS a b c d f m o w y C read **למהוי מלכא** in conformity with the usual vocabulary (>15).

<sup>211</sup>Omitted in MS eb66, although it is added later.

<sup>212</sup>MSS b y read the plural **יהבי**, 'inhabitants', to indicate the correct number of Jebusites (>9).

<sup>213</sup>Again MSS b y read the plural **ואמריו**, 'they said', to indicate the correct number of Jebusites (>9).

<sup>214</sup>Note that TJon did not struggle with the difference between the forty years in 5:4 and the forty years and six months in 5:5, whereas rabbinic sources (*e.g.* RuthR. 5:6; San. 107b) and Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 113-14 did (against >15).



no hesitation at all in using physical disabilities as terms of abuse. The rabbinic period developed a greater sensitivity to discrimination against the handicapped . . . ”<sup>215</sup> Therefore, TJon had to reinterpret these verses and transform them from admiring physical strength and perfection into verses judging moral conditions, rendering the two categories with *חַטְאִים וְרָשָׁעִים*, ‘the sinners and the guilty’.<sup>216</sup>

It may be that TJon’s interpretation of the lame and the blind is not as arbitrary as it seems. One possible approach to the expression is to view “the lame and the blind” as synecdoches, representative of all blemished people disqualified for entering the house.<sup>217</sup> The lame and the blind can also represent the soul and the body, as in a parable of R. Judah ha-Nasi. Neither the soul nor the body could act separately, but together they sinned and were judged by the king.<sup>218</sup>

It is like a king of flesh and blood who had a beautiful orchard. The king placed in it two keepers, one of whom was lame and the other blind. The lame man said to the blind, “I see beautiful figs in the orchard. Come and take me upon thy shoulder, that we may procure and eat them.” So the lame man bestrode the blind, procured and ate them. Some time after, the owner of the orchard came and said to them, “Where are those beautiful figs?” The lame man replied, “Have I then feet to walk with?” The blind man replied, “Have I then eyes to see with?” What did he do? He placed the lame upon the blind and judged them both together as one.

Also will the Holy One, blessed be He, bring the soul, replace it in the body, and judge them together, as it is written, “He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that He may judge His people” (Ps. 50:4).

Two more advantages are gained from this transformation of “the lame and the blind”, namely the composition of a universal moral

<sup>215</sup>A. Houtman, “Sin and Illness in the Targum of the Prophets”, in: M.J.H.M. Poorthuis, J. Schwartz (eds), *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*, Leiden 1999, 195-206, esp. 204.

<sup>216</sup>As in TJon Isa. 42:18-19, which renders the combination of “the deaf and the blind”. Note that the order is rather arbitrary, for both in TJon 2 Sam. 5:6-8 and in TJon Isa. 42:18-19 the order is *חַרְשִׁים וְכִבְדִּים*, in disregard of the Hebrew original order. Cf. also Houtman, “Sin and Illness”, 199, n. 10.

<sup>217</sup>S.M. Olyan, “Anyone Blind or Lame Shall Not Enter the House’: On the Interpretation of Second Samuel 5:8b”, *CBQ* 60 (1998), 218-27, esp. 225.

<sup>218</sup>MekY, *Shirata*, 2:130-33; San. 91a-b; LevR. 4:5; the translation is from H.K. McArthur, R.M. Johnson, *They also Taught in Parables: Rabbinic Parables from the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, Grand Rapids 1990, 47.

lesson out of this Biblical verse,<sup>219</sup> and the the absence of a link between these verses and the rules concerning the sanctuary in Torah. The rule that disabled priests were not allowed to officiate at the altar (Lev. 21:17-23), or the rule that Israelites with physical defects were not allowed to enter the sanctuary (Deut. 23:2), could not have arisen from David's personal antipathy against the lame and the blind.

By this transformation TJon also avoided the interpretation that these verses prohibit the disabled from entering the Temple. Although it is not clear that this prohibition was generally accepted in the Second Temple period,<sup>220</sup> such a rule was clearly expressed in the Qumranic literature<sup>221</sup> and in the translation of LXX of 2 Sam. 5:8. This prohibition cannot be deduced from New Testament material, since Jesus healed the blind and the lame in the Temple (Mt. 21:14).<sup>222</sup>

Finally, the second לאמר in the Hebrew text is represented by an active participle referring to the sinners and the guilty. As a result, the entire sentence is rephrased and clarified: The Jebusites referred to themselves when they challenged David to remove the sinners and the guilty who said that David would never enter the city. An identical translation is given by the Vg.<sup>223</sup> Pseudo-Jerome's comments are similar to TJon, only he did not regard the lame and the blind as metaphors for sinners, but for harmless and unprotected people. Still, the Jebusites refer to themselves as lame and blind people.<sup>224</sup>

TJon does not call the Jebusites sinners because they were foreigners. He claims that they sinned in doubting David's strength and in demoralizing his men.<sup>225</sup>

<sup>219</sup>Houtman, "Sin and Illness", 206; similarly Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 304.

<sup>220</sup>"Several Tannaitic texts exclude blind and lame Jewish males from obligations to pilgrimage"; cf. mḤag. 1:1; MekY, *Mishpatim*, 20; cited by Olyan, "Anyone Blind or Lame", 223-224. The influence of 2 Sam. 5:8b is not explicit in either text.

<sup>221</sup>Cf. 11QTemple 45:12-14; 1QS<sup>a</sup> 2:3-10 cited by Olyan, "Anyone Blind or Lame", 223, n. 21; and 1QM 7:4-5; Dam. 15:15-17, cited by J. Gnilka, *Das Matthäus-evangelium*, Bd. 2 (ThKNT, 1/2), Freiburg 1988, 208.

<sup>222</sup>Unless this verse must be regarded as a protest against that prohibition.

<sup>223</sup>Rendering, "nisi abstuleris caecos et claudos dicentes non ingredietur David huc".

<sup>224</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 114, "non ingredietur huc David donec nos hinc auferat quos inermes et inbecilles sicut caecos et claudos esse arbitratur, et quos bello adgressurus sicut claudos et caecos se triumphaturum putat."

<sup>225</sup>So Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 196, who refer to mSot. 8:5; tSot. 7:22.

7 5 ואחר<sup>226</sup> דויד ית הקרא רציון היא קרתא דדויד:

5:7 Yet David took the citadel of Zion, that is, the City of David.

TJon did not translate Hebrew מצודה by the obvious מצודה, but with the Graecism הקרא (so also 2 Sam. 5:9; 17; 23:14). Amongst other things, this Greek word is used for the fortress of Jerusalem during the Maccabean age (cf. e.g. 1 Macc. 1:33; 3:45).<sup>227</sup>

8 5 ואמר דויד ביומא ההוא כל דיקטול יבוסאה וישרי<sup>228</sup> למכבש כרכא<sup>229</sup> וית חטאיה וית חייביא רחיקת נפשא דדויד על כין ימרון חטאיה וחייביא לא ייעלון לביתא:

5:8 And David had said on that day, "Whoever would kill the Jebusite, let him begin to subject the fortified city." And David's soul rejected the sinners and the guilty. Therefore they say, "The sinners and the guilty will not enter the house."

The present text produces difficulties, both with regard to its division and with regard to its meaning.<sup>230</sup> Although the Chronicler gives a clear and simple rendering of the contents, TJon solves the problems independently. Hebrew בצנור, וינע, also causing trouble nowadays,<sup>231</sup> is not emended into ויעל בצנור, 'let him go up through the water-channel', on the basis of 1 Chron. 11:6. Neither is it connected with Aramaic צניורה, 'water-channel', or צניורה, 'tongs, poker'. TJon gave its own explanation that whoever wanted to defeat the Jebusites, had to begin with the fortified city.<sup>232</sup> Unless the fortress was captured, the Jebusites were indefeatable.

<sup>226</sup> Mss f m w read וכבש, 'and he subdued', while MS f<sub>3</sub> agrees with the reading ואחר. The translation וכבש is more in conformity with the usual vocabulary of TJon (>15), since this verb is used to denote the capture of a city, cf. the subsequent verse and 2 Sam. 12:26-29.

<sup>227</sup> Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 127. So also LXX 2 Sam. 5:9; cf. J.P. Brown, "The Septuagint as a Source of the Greek Loan-words in the Targums", *Bib.* 70 (1989), 194-216, esp. 214.

<sup>228</sup> MS a reads ויגע, 'and he touched', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>229</sup> Mss a f read קרתא יחמי לרישא by introducing elements from the parallel text of 1 Chron. 11:6, "whosoever shall reach to subject the city, will be appointed head" (>16).

<sup>230</sup> "The probabilities of textual corruption here are such that one could not reasonably claim or easily refute the claim that this verse contains an aposiopesis." So A.D. Crown, "Aposiopesis in the O.T. and the Hebrew Conditional Oath", *Abr-Nahrain* 4 (1963-1964), 96-111, esp. 104, against GKC § 167a.

<sup>231</sup> This expression is discussed by G. Bressan, "L'Espugnazione di Sion in 2 Sam 5,6-8 || 1 Cron 11,4-6 e il problema del «sinnôr»", *Bib.* 25 (1944), 346-81; L.-H. Vincent, "Le sinnor dans la prise de Jérusalem", *RB* 33 (1924), 357-70.

<sup>232</sup> Similar translation in Syr, which speaks of the סבא, 'citadel'. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:62 gives a contrasting explanation, viz. David first captured the lower city.

TJon starts a new sentence after *בצנור*.<sup>233</sup> In this sentence TJon translated neither the Ketib *שנאי* nor the Qere *שנאי* (except in MS y),<sup>234</sup> whatever Hebrew word was TJon's *Vorlage* was equated with a perfect form of the Peal, 3rd f.s.g., in conformity with Hebrew *שנאה* attested in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (so also Syr).<sup>235</sup> It is clear that 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, TJon and Syr considered the blind and the lame the object of the verb, and David's soul the subject.

The MT, as it stands, as well as the Greek and Latin versions regard the blind and the lame as the object of the preceding verb: "let him touch the water shaft and [strike] the lame and the blind". The phrase *שנאי נפש דוד* of the Ketib is a separate sentence, "they hate David's soul". The passive participial construction *שנאי נפש דוד* of the Qere is an apposition referring to the blind and the lame, "who are hated by David's soul" (so also MS y), vocalized by the Greek and Latin versions as an active participle, "who are hating David's soul".<sup>236</sup> These versions may also be based on the new attitude toward the handicapped.<sup>237</sup>

The reason the Ketib was changed may be that the scribes did not want to pronounce a curse over the Davidic house, however small it might have been.<sup>238</sup> It is illogical to assume that the change of the Ketib is due to the difficult division of the verse. The version of the Qere hardly improves the text.<sup>239</sup>

Hebrew *אל־הבית*, 'to the house', is rendered literally by TJon (and Syr), not specified as the palace or the temple. LXX reads "the house of the LORD", followed by the Vulgate with "the temple". Unlike the word at the end of verse 9, it is not explained as the inner parts of the citadel. TJon refrained from any specification (close to >26).

<sup>233</sup>Except MS C. This can be recognized by the rendering *דרחיקה*, 'whom [David's soul] rejects'.

<sup>234</sup>The Ketib is impossible, while the Qere is difficult; cf. S.M. Olyan, "'Anyone Blind or Lame Shall Not Enter the House': On the Interpretation of Second Samuel 5:8b", *CBQ* 60 (1998), 218-27, esp. 219, n. 3.

<sup>235</sup>McCarter, *II Samuel*, 136; against *BHS* app.crit. and C. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO, 36), Freiburg & Göttingen 1981, 230.

<sup>236</sup>The *Vetus Latina* might be based on the Ketib, for it renders a perfect, *qui oderunt*; cf. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim*, 230.

<sup>237</sup>Cf. A. Houtman, "Sin and Illness in the Targum of the Prophets", in: M.J.H.M. Poorthuis, J. Schwartz (eds), *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*, Leiden 1999, 195-206, esp. 204.

<sup>238</sup>McCarter, *The Tiqqune Sopherim*, 231, and esp. 231, n. 190, "It is interesting to note the facility in Midrashic circles with which active verbs could be read as passive, and *vice versa*".

<sup>239</sup>Against McCarter, *II Samuel*, 136.

9 5 ויחיב דויד בחקרא<sup>240</sup> וקרא לה קרתא דרויד ובנא סחור סחור מן מליתא ולניו<sup>241</sup>: 10 5 ואול דויד אויל<sup>242</sup> וסגי ומימרא<sup>243</sup> דיוי אלהי<sup>243</sup> צבאות<sup>244</sup>: 11 5 ושלא חירם מלכא דצור אזנרין<sup>245</sup> לוח דויד ואעי ארזין ונרין דאומנין למקץ אעין וארדיכלין דאומנין בבנין<sup>245</sup> כותליא ובנו ביחא לדויד: 12 5 וידע דויד ארי אתקנה יי למהוי מלכא<sup>246</sup> על ישראל וארי מנטלא מלכותיה בדיל עמיה ישראל:

5:9 *And David dwelt in the citadel, and called it "City of David". And David built it round about, from the bulwark and inward. 5:10 And David became greater and greater, and the LORD, Elohe Šebaoth, was in his aid. 5:11 And Hiram king of Tyre sent messengers to David, and cedar trees, and carpenters who were skilled at cutting trees, and architects who were skilled at building walls. And he built David a house. 5:12 And David knew that the LORD strengthened him to be king over Israel, and that his kingdom was exalted for the sake of his people Israel.*

TJon, LXX and Syr translated the Hebrew active נשא as if it were a passive form. This might be based on the Niphal נשאה in 1 Chron. 14:2.<sup>246</sup>

13 5 ונסיב<sup>247</sup> דויד עוד לחינן ונשין מירושלם בתר דאתא מחברון ואתילידו עוד לדויד בנין ובנן: 14 5 ואלין שמחת דאתילידו ליה בירושלם שמוע ושובב נתן ושלמה: 15 5 ויבחר<sup>247</sup> ואלישוע ונפג ויפיע: 16 5 ואלישמע ואלידע ואליפלם: 17 5 ושמוע פלשתאי ארי משחו<sup>248</sup> ית דויד למהוי<sup>249</sup> מלכא<sup>249</sup> על ישראל וסליקן כל פלשתאי למבעי ית דויד ושמע דויד ונחת לחקרא<sup>250</sup>: 18 5 ופלשתאי אתו ואתרששו במישר<sup>248</sup> גבריא:

<sup>240</sup>See above, commentary on 5:7. Ms c reads בחברון, 'in Hebron'.

<sup>241</sup>The same translation of Hebrew בית is given in TO Exod. 28:26; TJon 1 Sam. 6:7.

<sup>242</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 6:12. Omitted in MS b.

<sup>243</sup>This Hebraism is rendered by the Aramaic word אלהא in MSS b Fr.

<sup>244</sup>Ms a reads עימיה, 'with him', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but against the usual vocabulary.

<sup>245</sup>Interpretation of Hebrew אבן, 'stone' (>2). Ms y and Kimḥi also give a literal translation of the Hebrew word in ואבנין אעין למקץ אעין, 'carpenters who were skilled at cutting trees and stones'.

<sup>246</sup>So also Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 8.

<sup>247</sup>Verses 15-16 are omitted in MSS m w y B C J T, because the Aramaic names did not deviate much from the Hebrew ones. Ms eb66 omits the last three names of verse 16, adding חרנ to indicate that the translation runs identical to the Hebrew text. Such omissions are also attested to 1 Sam. 30:28-30 in MS f and 2 Sam. 23:27-38 in MS S.

<sup>248</sup>MSS f J read רביאי, which is an alternative rendering, but see also above, commentary on 1 Sam. 15:1.

<sup>249</sup>Omitted in MSS f B J, which read למלכא, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>250</sup>See above, commentary on 5:7. The translation "citadel", specifically with reference to the stronghold of Zion, is surprising in combination with the verb "to

5:13 And David took more concubines and wives from Jerusalem, after he came from Hebron. And more sons and daughter were born to David. 5:14 And these are the names of those who were born to him in Jerusalem: Shammua, Shobab, Nathan, Solomon, 5:15 Ibhar, Elishua, Nepheg, Japhia, 5:16 Elishama, Eliada, and Eliphelet. 5:17 When the Philistines heard that they had anointed David to be king over Israel, all the Philistines went up in search of David. But David heard of it and went down to the citadel. 5:18 The Philistines had come and spread out in the Valley of the Heroes.

Hebrew רפאים is consistently equated with Aramaic גבריאי, 'heroes' (cf. 5:22; 21:15-22; 23:13), evidently because the Rephaim were believed to have been mighty giants (cf. Gen. 14:5; Deut. 2:11).<sup>251</sup> Josephus likewise called the place "Valley of the Giants" (*Antiquities*, 7:71).

19 5 ושאל דויד במימרא דיוי למימר האסק על פלשתאי התמסרונן בידי ואמר יי לדויד<sup>252</sup> סק ארי ממסר אמסר יח פלשתאי בידך: 20 ואחא דויד במישר ד פריצים<sup>253</sup> ומחנן תמן דויד ואמר תבר ד יי יח סנאי<sup>254</sup> קרמי<sup>255</sup> כתבור מן דחסף דמלי מין על כין קרא שמהי דאתרא ההוא מישר פריצים:

5:19 And David inquired of the speech of the LORD, saying, "Shall I go up against the Philistines? Wilt Thou surrender them into my hand?" And the LORD said to David, "Go up, for I will certainly surrender the Philistines into your hand." 5:20 And David came to the valley of Perazim, and David struck them down there. And he said, "The LORD has broken my haters before me, like the breaking of a vessel of clay full of water." Therefore he called the name of that place the Valley of Perazim.

The Hebrew word play, using פּרַץ four times, is not retained in the Aramaic version. The Hebrew name of the valley (פּרַצִּים) is incorporated in the Aramaic text, whilst the explanation is represented by the root תבר, 'to break'. Furthermore, the imagery of the water is ex-

go down" in the present verse and with "to go up" in verse 19; cf. Driver, *Notes*, 263.

<sup>251</sup>So Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 125. So also in TJon Josh. 12:4; 13:12; 15:8; 17:15; 18:16. A. Cooper, "Divine Names and Epithets in the Ugaritic Texts", in: S. Rummel (ed.), *Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*, Vol. 3 (AnOr, 51), Rome 1981, 333-469, esp. 462-63, gives a bibliography concerning רפאים.

<sup>252</sup>Omitted in MS y.

<sup>253</sup>MS o renders גבריאי, 'heroes', making the narrative more consistent: the valley was first called "Valley of the Heroes", but after David's victory over the Philistines it was called "Valley of Perazim" (5:20).

<sup>254</sup>MSS b f y J read the more prosaic words רבבי.

<sup>255</sup>MS D reads בהון, 'among them', leaving out the reference to the vessel.

panded to match the victory over the enemies: they had been broken like a clay vessel out of which the water gushes when it is broken (>13). The imagery includes the flight of the Philistines after their defeat.

21 5 ושבקו חמן יח טעותהון וְאִיקִדְנֹן דְּוִיד<sup>256</sup> וּגְבֻרָהּ׃

5:21 *And they had left their idols there, and David and his men burnt them.*

Carefully avoiding all kinds of sins in David's house (>24), TJon renders that he burnt the Philistine idols, instead of carrying them away. This rendering is based on 1 Chron. 14:12, which says that David commanded his men to burn them with fire (>16).<sup>257</sup> This translation contrasts with that of the Aggadists, who explain the verb "carry away" as smashing them and had the wind carry the dust away (cf. Isa. 41:16).<sup>258</sup> It was R. Huna who harmonized the two actions by assuming that they were burnt first and that the ashes were dispersed by the non-Israelite Ittai the Gittite (AZ 44a; cf. tAZ 3:19).

22 5 וְאוֹסִיפוּ עוֹד פִּלְשֶׁתִּי לְמַסַּךְ וְאַתְרִישׁוּ בְּמִישַׁר וְגִבְרִיא<sup>259</sup>: 23 5 וְשָׂאִיל דְּוִיד<sup>260</sup> בְּמִמְרָא וְדִיּוּ וְאָמַר לֹא חֲסַךְ אֶתְתַּחַר לְאַחֲרֵיהֶון וְתַחַךְ<sup>261</sup> לְהוֹן מִקְבִּיל אֵילְנֵיא<sup>262</sup>: 24 5 וְיָהּ כְּמִשְׁמַעַךְ<sup>263</sup> יִחַ קַל צוּחָא בְּרִישֵׁי אֵילְנֵיא בְּכִין תַּחַקַּף אַרִי בְּכִין נִפְק מְלֹאכָא<sup>264</sup> דְּוִי לְאַצְלָחָא<sup>265</sup> קְרַמְךָ<sup>266</sup> לְמִקְטֵל בְּמִשְׁרֵית פִּלְשֶׁתִּיא׃

5:22 *And the Philistines came up yet again, and spread out in the Valley of the Heroes. 5:23 And when David inquired of the speech of the LORD, he said, "You shall not go up. Go around to their rear,*

<sup>256</sup> Mss f S add הוא, resulting in "David, he and his men", in conformity with the wording of 1 Sam. 18:27 and other verses (>15).

<sup>257</sup> Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 115 made a similar harmonization with Chronicles by assuming that David carried the idols away and burnt them.

<sup>258</sup> Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, who quotes RHsh. 22b; AZ 44a. But Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:77 also assumes that David destroyed them.

<sup>259</sup> See above, commentary on 5:18.

<sup>260</sup> Omitted in MS J, but added in the margin.

<sup>261</sup> MS m reads חסך, as in the preceding part of the verse.

<sup>262</sup> TJon used a more general word for trees as the translation of a specific Hebrew word (>7), cf. the usage of Aramaic אֵילְנֵיא in Judg. 9:9-15. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 115-16 connects the Hebrew בְּכָאִים with the verb בָּכָה, 'weep' (>6), as do LXX and Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:76. MS S reads the singular אֵילְנֵיא, while MS D erroneously reads אֵילְמָא.

<sup>263</sup> Mss c w y Fr read בְּמִשְׁמַעַךְ, 'when you hear', while MS a reads כְּדִ מִשְׁמַעַךְ, 'when you hear'; both are more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>264</sup> Omitted in MS a, which only reads יִי.

<sup>265</sup> Omitted by MS a. Kimḥi quotes לְאַנְחָא, 'to wage'.

<sup>266</sup> MS a reads לְקִדְמוֹתְךָ, 'to meet you'.

and go toward them opposite the trees. 5:24 And about the time you hear the sound of an outcry in the tops of the trees, then you will be strengthened, for then the angel of the LORD will have gone out to succeed before you to kill among the camp of the Philistines.

Hebrew *צערה* means “marching, stepping” and is also attested in Syr. Most manuscripts of LXX reflect a Hebrew reading *צערה*, ‘wind, commotion’, while TJon here evidently reflects Hebrew *צעקה*, ‘outcry’. TJon can best be explained as a case of *'al tigre* (>1), based on the names of the trees.<sup>267</sup> Hebrew *בכאים* was connected with the verb *בכה*, ‘weep’, and interpreted as weeping shrubs.<sup>268</sup>

25 ויעבד דויד כין כמה דפקדיה יוי וקטל<sup>269</sup> ית פלשתאי מבכע עד מעלנא דגזר:

5:25 And David did as the LORD commanded him, and killed the Philistines from Geba to the entrance of Gezer.

## 6.8 The Ark of the LORD (2 Samuel 6)

In the annual cycle, 2 Sam. 6 is read as the *haftara* after Lev. 9:1–11:47, which gives regulations concerning the service of God and the distinction between clean and unclean. There are different traditions about where to end this *haftara*: the Sefardi tradition reads 6:1–19 (so MS S), while most other traditions read 6:1–7:17. An exception is MS 12<sup>h</sup>, which reads 6:1–7:3. Although there are some similarities between the Hebrew texts of the two readings,<sup>270</sup> influence from the Torah text on the Aramaic version of 2 Sam. 6–7 is very limited.

16 אוסיף עוד דויד למכנש<sup>271</sup> ית כל בחירי ישראל<sup>272</sup> תלתין אלפין:

6:1 And again David went on gathering all the chosen men of Israel, thirty thousand.

Hebrew *ויסף* is translated twice, once as the Hiphil of *יסף*, ‘and he did again’, and once as the Qal of *אסף*, ‘to gather’. This corresponds with the feeling expressed by R. Jeremiah b. Eleazar and R. Berekiah, in the name of R. Abba b. Kahana (NumR. 4:20), that the Hebrew

<sup>267</sup> Against Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 9, who assumes that *צעקה* had been the original reading.

<sup>268</sup> Cf. MTeh. 27:2; Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 115–16 made the same connection (>6).

<sup>269</sup> Mss f J read *ימחא*, ‘and he struck down’, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>270</sup> The gathering of the elders (Lev. 9:1; 2 Sam. 6:1); the revelation of God’s glory (Lev. 9) and the ark (2 Sam. 6), the sacrifices and the blessings.

<sup>271</sup> Omitted in MSS a f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>272</sup> Omitted in MS B, but added in the margin.



particle עור was superfluous. In the translation of TJon this particle is indeed superfluous.

TJon chose to interpret Hebrew בחור as the passive participle of the verb בחר, 'to choose, to select',<sup>273</sup> and not as the noun בחור, 'young man'. This interpretation also corresponds to the teaching in NumR. 4:20, which says that David gathered thirty thousand elders, not thirty thousand young men.<sup>274</sup> This translation may be based on the gathering of the elders in the Torah reading (Lev. 9:1).

6 2 וקם ואזל דויד וכל עמא דעמיה מקרויא דבית יהודה לאסקא מתמן ית ארונא דיוי דאתקרי שמא<sup>275</sup> שמא דיוי צבאות דשכינתיה שריא עיל מן כרוביא עלוהי:

*6:2 And David arose and went with all the people who were with him from the cities of the House of Judah, to bring up from there the ark of the LORD, which is called by the Name, the Name of the LORD Šebaoth, whose Presence dwells above the cherubim.*

Although Hebrew בעל in place-names is usually represented by בישר, 'valley', the plural בעלי is translated by a plural "cities" (>24).<sup>276</sup> In 1 Chron. 13:6 the same name is interpreted as "Baalath, that is Kiriath-jearim, which belongs to Judah", harmonizing this verse with the narrative in 1 Sam. 7:2 (>16) on the basis of Josh. 15:9 and 18:14. The Aramaic version of the present verse also solves the problem of the place from which the ark was brought up. Aramaic מושם, 'from there', now refers back to the House of Judah. And Kiriath-jearim could indeed be considered part of the House of Judah (cf. Josh. 15:9-10; 18:14-15).<sup>277</sup>

The double Hebrew שם is incorporated in the Aramaic version without any change. The phrase שמו דיוי ... כרוביא can best be considered the apposition to the first שמו (see above, English translation). R. Ḥuna affirms the repetition of the word "name" in BB 14b. In other ancient translations the double שם is either simply reduced to a single occurrence (LXX and Vg, cf. MS b) or vocalized as שם, 'there' (Syr, cf. MS S).

The phrase יהוה צבאות ישב הכרבים occurs twice in the Books of Samuel: in this verse and in 1 Sam. 4:4. As a result it functions as

<sup>273</sup>As Vg and many modern translations do. Cf. 1 Sam. 26:2; 2 Sam. 10:9; in contrast to 1 Sam. 8:16; 9:2; 24:3.

<sup>274</sup>Cf. TanB, *Bamidbar*, 3:27.

<sup>275</sup>Omitted by MS b, regarded as superfluous. MS S reads רמן, 'there', which is based on a different vocalization of the Hebrew word (>3; >18).

<sup>276</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 23:11.

<sup>277</sup>However, Kiriath-jearim is found in the Benjaminite city list as well; cf. also J. Blenkinsopp, "Kiriath-jearim and the Ark", *JBL* 88 (1969), 143-56, esp. 143.

a reference to the first wandering of the ark and as a warning if its holiness. The reader is prepared for the failure to give the ark a final resting place. Due to its consistent translation the warning is retained in the Aramaic version.

3 6 ואחיו ית ארונא דיוי◇ בעגלתא חדתא ונטלוהי מבית אבינדב דבגבעתא ועוא ואחיו בני אבינדב מדברין◇ ית עגלתא חדתא: 4 6 ונטלוהי מבית אבינדב דבגבעתא אתן<sup>278</sup> עם ארונא דיוי◇ ואחיו אזיל קדם◇ ארונא:

6:3 *And they carried the ark of the LORD upon a new cart, and carried it out of the house of Abinadab, which was on the hill. And Uzzah and Ahio, sons of Abinadab, were leading the new cart. 6:4 They carried it out of the house of Abinadab, which was on the hill. They were going along with the ark of the LORD, that is, Ahio was walking before the ark.*

In most manuscripts the problem of the superfluous phrase “with the ark of the LORD” is solved by adding a form of the verb אָחַז. The information of the present verse is then that sons of Abinadab not only placed the ark upon the cart, but went with the ark and David toward Jerusalem. In NumR. 4:20 the problem is solved by adding a reference to the gifts of the Philistines: the box with the golden mice and the golden haemerroids was going with the ark of the LORD.<sup>279</sup>

5 6 ודוד וכל בית◇ ישראל משבחין◇ קדם◇ יי בכל אעי<sup>282</sup> בירוון ובכנרין<sup>283</sup> ובנגלין ובתפין וברביעין ובצלצלין: 6 6 ואחו עד אחר מתקן ואשיט<sup>284</sup> עוא ידיה<sup>285</sup> בארונא דיוי◇ ואחו ביה ארי מרגוהי תוריא:

6:5 *And David and all the House of Israel were praising before the*

<sup>278</sup>Omitted in MSS a d y B C J S, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Ms b reads the plural אָחַז, which probably refers to Uzzah coming along with the ark whilst his brother Ahio went before the cart.

<sup>279</sup>LXX omits the first part of the present verse and combines: “Uzzah and Ahio were leading the new cart with the ark of the LORD”, whilst Vg simply omits the phrase “with the ark of the LORD”. Syr renders עם by the preposition א, indicating the object.

<sup>280</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>281</sup>Ms D reads משִׁיִן, ‘they changed’, which either refers to the unclotting of David (cf. 6:20) or to their unusual behaviour with the instruments mentioned.

<sup>282</sup>Ms B reads מְנִי, ‘instruments’.

<sup>283</sup>Ms B reads וּבַחֲנִינִין, ‘with dances’, reintroducing the more profane deed of dancing, see above Ch. 4, Aramaic שִׁבַּח.

<sup>284</sup>Omitted in MS C. Ms f reads וְשִׁלַּח, ‘and he sent’, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>285</sup>MSS w k add the nota accusativi before this word, while MSS a C omit it in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). The reading with יָדֶיהָ agrees with 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, LXX, Syr and Vg, but it is a natural complement (>10).

*LORD with all kinds of wooden [instruments] of juniper-trees: with lyres, harps, tambourines, sistras, and cymbals. 6:6 And when they came to a fixed place, Uzzah stretched out his hand to the ark of the LORD and took hold of it, for the oxen pushed it off.*

Hebrew נִכֵּן is interpreted as a Niphal form of the verb כָּנָן, 'to stand firm', according to a rabbinic explanation that seeks to harmonize the names of the present verse with 1 Chron. 13:9 (cf. NumR. 4:20; Sot. 35b). The same verbal forms in 7:16, 26 are also equated with מִזְקֵן, 'established, fixed'. The general אֶתְרָא, 'place', instead of a threshing floor, may serve the same purpose.<sup>286</sup> Given the sense of אֶתְרָא מִתְקֵן in 7:16, 26 the Aramaic translation of the present verse presupposes a measure of providence, as in other instances where God indicated a place where something had to happen.<sup>287</sup> The repetition of אֶתְרָא in 6:8 indicates the same theology: it was the place that God had destined for Uzzah to die.

TJon conceived of Hebrew שָׁמַט as a transitive verb, as did LXX and Vg, and rendered according to the co-text that the oxen pushed the ark off.<sup>288</sup> The same transitive translation is given in 2 Kgs 9:33, which describes how Queen Jezebel was thrown down.

7 6 ותקף רגואו דיין בעזא ומחדי חמן מימראו דיין על דאשתלי<sup>289</sup> ומית חמן עם ארנא דיין: 8 6 ותקף לדוד על דחרע יי תרעתא בעזא וקרא<sup>290</sup> לאתרא ההוא אתרא דמית ביה עזא עד יומא הרין:

*6:7 And the anger of the LORD was strong against Uzzah. And the speech of the LORD struck him down because he erred, so that he died there beside the ark of the LORD. 6:8 And David was strongly moved<sup>291</sup> because the LORD had broken out upon Uzzah. And he called that place "The Place where Uzzah died", to this day.*

Part of the word play on the stem פִּרַץ is retained in the Aramaic version. Twice the root חָרַע is used, but the third time it is explained with the plain verb מִית, 'die' (cf. a similar word play in 5:20).<sup>292</sup>

<sup>286</sup>Syr rendered "established threshing floor".

<sup>287</sup>TO Exod. 15:17; 33:21; TJon 2 Sam. 7:10; 1 Kgs 8:13, 21; Ezek. 46:24, all אֶתְרָא מִתְקֵן.

<sup>288</sup>Against Syr interpretation that the oxen freed themselves from the yoke; and Kimhi's explanation that the oxen slipped; cf. Komlosh, הַמְקָרָא בְּאוּר הַתְּרִנּוּם, 299.

<sup>289</sup>Hebrew שָׁל is connected with Aramaic שְׁלִי, 'be quiet, err' (>6); or with שָׁלָה, 'error, neglect' (Ezra 4:12), as R. Johanan suggests in Sot. 35a; cf. PesR. 46:1.

<sup>290</sup>Ms J adds שְׁמָא, 'name'.

<sup>291</sup>Although the verb חָרַע usually means "to be angry", here the sense of anger is less appropriate, since David appears to be afraid in 6:9. Cf. also Levy, *CWT*, s.v. חָרַע.

<sup>292</sup>The explanation that Uzzah died there is contradicted by Pseudo-Jerome,

9 ודחיל דויד מן קדם<sup>293</sup> וי ביומא ההוא ואמר איכדין ייעול לותי ארונא דיוי:  
 10 ולא אבא דוד לאפנאה לותיה ית ארונא דיוי לקרחא<sup>294</sup> דדויד<sup>294</sup> ואפנייה דויד  
 לבית עבד אדום<sup>295</sup> גתאה: 11 ושרא ארונא דיוי בית עבד אדום<sup>296</sup> גתאה<sup>297</sup> תלחה  
 ירחין ובריך יוי ית<sup>298</sup> עבד אדום<sup>299</sup> וית כל ביתיה: 12 ואתחזה למלכא דויד  
 למימר בריך יוי ית בית<sup>300</sup> עבד אדום<sup>301</sup> וית כל דליה בדיל ארונא דיוי<sup>302</sup> ואול דויד  
 ואסיק<sup>302</sup> ית ארונא דיוי<sup>302</sup> מבית עבד אדום לקרחא<sup>302</sup> דדויד בחדוא: 13 והוה כד  
 נטלו נטל<sup>303</sup> ארונא דיוי שתא זונין<sup>304</sup> ונכס<sup>304</sup> תור ופטים: 14 דויד משבח<sup>304</sup> בכל  
 תקוף קדם<sup>304</sup> יוי ודויד אסיר כרדוש<sup>305</sup> דבוץ: 15 ודויד וכל בית ישראל מסקין  
 ית ארונא דיוי ביבבא<sup>306</sup> ובקל שופרא: 16 והוה ארונא דיוי אתא לקרחא<sup>306</sup> דדויד  
 ומיכל בת שאול אסחכייאת חרכא וחזת ית מלכא דויד מרקיד<sup>307</sup> ומשבח<sup>307</sup> קדם<sup>307</sup>  
 יוי ובסרה עלוהי בלבה: 17 ואעילו<sup>308</sup> ית ארונא דיוי ואקימו יתיה באחריה<sup>309</sup> בנו  
 משכנא דפרס ליה דויד ואסיק דויד עלון קדם<sup>308</sup> יוי ונכסת<sup>308</sup> קודשין: 18 ושיצי דויד  
 מלאסקא עלתא ונכסת<sup>308</sup> קדשיא ובריך ית עמא בשמא דיוי צבאות<sup>310</sup>: 19 ופליג  
 לכל עמא לכל המונא דישראל למגבר ועד אתא לגבר גריצתא דלחים<sup>311</sup> חדא ופלוג  
 חד ומנתא חדא ואול כל עמא גבר לביתיה:

6:9 And David was afraid before the LORD that day, and he said, "How can the ark of the LORD come to me?" 6:10 So David was not willing to turn the ark of the LORD to the city of David, but David turned it to the house of Obed-edom the Gittite. 6:11 And the ark of the LORD stayed in the house of Obed-edom the Gittite three months. And the

*Questiones*, 116, who states that Uzzah disappeared from there.

<sup>293</sup>Ms a replaced the reverential קדם מן (>23) by the nota accusativi, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>294</sup>The phrase לקרחא דדויד is omitted in MS w.

<sup>295</sup>Mss Fr S read אדומאה, resulting in "Obed, the Edomite, the Gittite" or "the servant of the Edomite, the Gittite".

<sup>296</sup>Mss Fr S read אדומאה, 'the Edomite'. MS S even omits the subsequent גתאה.

<sup>297</sup>Omitted in MSS S B\*, but it is added in B<sup>m</sup>.

<sup>298</sup>MS k erroneously adds ביה, 'house', cf. 6:12.

<sup>299</sup>Mss Fr S read אדומאה, 'the Edomite'.

<sup>300</sup>Omitted in MS Fr in conformity with 6:11.

<sup>301</sup>Mss c Fr S read אדומאה, 'the Edomite'.

<sup>302</sup>MS S\* read וסליק, 'and he went up', but it is erased.

<sup>303</sup>Omitted in MSS o Fr, probably due to haplography.

<sup>304</sup>Mss o D and Kimḥi read דרגין, 'paces', although MS D also renders זונין.

<sup>305</sup>Note that the parallel 1 Chron. 15:27 reads both the Hebrew original (linen ephod) and the Targumic rendering (linen tunic).

<sup>306</sup>Erroneously omitted by MS D.

<sup>307</sup>Note that TJon used exactly the same word as the parallel 1 Chron. 15:29 did. See above, Ch. 4, Aramaic שבח.

<sup>308</sup>Mss b f y read ואתיהיא, 'and they brought it', cf. the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>309</sup>Omitted in MSS o S.

<sup>310</sup>Omitted in MS w.

<sup>311</sup>Omitted in MS b, probably considered superfluous after גריצתא, 'piece of bread'.

LORD blessed Obed-edom and all his house. 6:12 And it was told King David, "The LORD has blessed the house of Obed-edom and all that belongs to him, because of the ark of the LORD." So David went and brought up the ark of the LORD from the house of Obed-edom to the city of David with rejoicing. 6:13 And when the bearers of the ark had borne it six paces, he slaughtered an ox and a fatling.<sup>312</sup> 6:14 And David praised before the LORD with all his might; and David was girded with a linen sleeved tunic. 6:15 So David and all the house of Israel brought up the ark of the LORD with shouting, and with the sound of the horn. 6:16 As the ark of the LORD came into the city of David, Michal the daughter of Saul looked out of the window, and saw King David dancing and praising before the LORD. And she despised him in her heart. 6:17 And they brought in the ark of the LORD, and set it up in its place, inside the tent which David had pitched for it. And David brought up burnt offerings and slaughterings of holy things. 6:18 And when David had finished bringing up the burnt offerings and the slaughterings of holy things, he blessed the people in the name of the LORD *Sebaoth*. 6:19 He shared among all the people, the whole multitude of Israel, both men and women, to each one cake of bread, one share and one portion. And all the people went each to his house.

Hebrew *אֲשֵׁר* and *אֲשִׁישָׁה* are translated by the most general words for portions (>7).<sup>313</sup> Obviously the Targumists did not know the exact meaning anymore.<sup>314</sup>

In later translations and commentaries a remarkable agreement appears with regard to the word *אֲשֵׁר*. While the Greek translation is at variance with itself, Vg and Syr respectively opt for a rendering "piece of beef" and "piece of meat", also attested by Rashi and Kimḥi.<sup>315</sup> The explanation "piece of beef" is based on the technique of *notaricon* (>4), in which the word was split up into three parts. The last part, *פֶּר*, means "bull". This explanation is fully expounded in a variant reading in the margin of CR.<sup>316</sup>

<sup>312</sup>TJon did not harmonize the numbers of the offerings with 1 Chron. 15:26, in contrast to R. Papa and R. Hisda in Sot. 35b.

<sup>313</sup>Hebrew *אֲשֵׁר*, also occurring in the parallel 1 Chron. 16:3, is now considered to mean "date-cake", while Hebrew *אֲשִׁישָׁה* is translated with "raisin-cake" (cf. Isa. 16:7; Hos. 3:1; Cant. 2:5; 1 Chron. 16:3), according to HALAT<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>314</sup>Cf. Komlosh, *המקרא באור התרגום*, 304. In Isa. 16:7 it is *אֲשִׁישָׁה* is read as *אֲשִׁישָׁה*, after the example of the parallel text Jer. 48:31.

<sup>315</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 270 gives a survey, but cf. F. Stummer, "Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas", *Bib.* 10 (1929), 3-30, 12. Note that Syr 1 Chron. 16:3 also gives the general translation of "one portion".

<sup>316</sup>Cf. Kasher, *תוספתא*, 113; Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 9.

ספרן אחרן חר מן שיחא בתורא וחד מן שיחא בהינא דחמרא

*another book: one sixth of a bull and one sixth of a hin of wine*

The first *notaricon* is attributed to R. Ḥanan b. Abba (Pes. 36b; NumR. 4:20), who taught that אשפר meant אחד משישה בפר, 'one sixth of a bull'. While this *notaricon* was generally accepted,<sup>317</sup> R. Hanan's solution for the second word was disputed. He taught that it ought to be seen as the abbreviation of באיפה משישה באיפה, 'one sixth of an efa', but R. Samuel, referring to Hos. 3:1, taught that the word meant a jar of wine.

Whereas the tosefta-targum fully adopts the first *notaricon*, it distorts the second one. First, the meaning "one sixth" is adopted, but R. Hanan's explanation of "one sixth of an efa" is confused with the measure of a *hin*, which indeed is one sixth of an efa.<sup>318</sup> Instead of the explanation "one sixth of an efa, i.e. a hin", the tosefta-targum contaminates it into "one sixth of a hin". Secondly, R. Samuel's view was adopted as well, resulting in "one sixth of a hin of wine".

6 20 וחב דויד<sup>319</sup> לברכא יה אנש◇ ביתיה ונפקת מיכל בת שאול לקדמות דויד ואמרת מא אתיקר יומא דין<sup>320</sup> מלכא דישראל דאתגלי<sup>321</sup> יומא דין לעיני אמהת◇ עבדויה כמה דחליץ ומתגלי חר מן סריקיא:

*6:20 And David returned to bless the people of his house. But Michal the daughter of Saul came out to meet David, and said, "How the king of Israel honoured himself today, exposing himself today before the eyes of his servants' handmaids, as one of the immoral people who strips and exposes himself.*

Michal reproached David for shameless behaviour and compared him to a striptease dancer. TJon even aggravates her reproach by rendering both חליץ, 'to strip oneself', and אתגלא, 'to expose oneself' (>18). The conclusion must be that David wore less clothing than Michal considered to be morally justified. This conclusion is shared in Talmudic discussions, stating that the family of Saul was more chaste than David (ySan. 2:4; ySukk. 5:14): Saul and his family never showed any naked part of their body, not even a foot.<sup>322</sup> Still, there is a tend-

<sup>317</sup>It is also accepted in the Targum of the parallel 1 Chron. 16:3, אשחא, 'one sixth part of an ox'.

<sup>318</sup>Cf. R. de Vaux, *Les institutions de l'Ancien Testament*, T. 1: Le nomadisme et des survivances; institutions familiales; institutions civiles, Paris 1958, 306.

<sup>319</sup>Ms eb66 reads מלכא, 'the king'.

<sup>320</sup>Omitted in MS D.

<sup>321</sup>Ms D omits both occurrences of the verb גלא, see commentary.

<sup>322</sup>Cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 9. A proof-text is found in 1 Sam. 24:3, which says that Saul went in to "cover his feet". Therefore, even if he had to ease

ency in Jewish literature to clear David from this reproach. In its exposé on this chapter, NumR. 4:20 states that David was fully clothed; one could at most see his toes while he was dancing. This view is adopted in the translation of MS D, which omits both occurrences of the verb גלא and translates the last part of the verse as follows:

מא איחיקר יומא מלכא דישראל לעיני אמהת עבדוהי כמה דחליץ חד מן סריקיא

*how the king of Israel honoured himself today before the eyes of his servants' handmaids, as one of the immoral people who strips himself*

The omissions in this manuscript cannot be explained by mistakes. This version admits that David might have stripped himself, but omits the phrase that he exposed himself to other people. However, MS D did not entirely succeed in clearing David, because it maintained the latter half of Michal's reproach.

21 6 ואמר דויד למיכל קדם יוי דאתרעי בי מאבוך ומכל ביתיה לפקדא<sup>323</sup> יתי  
למהוי מלכא על עמא דיוי על ישראל ושבחית קדם יוי: 22 6 וזעירנא עוד מדא  
ואיהו מכיך בעיני נפשי מבכינ<sup>324</sup> ועם אמהתא דאת אמרא בעיניהון אהי יקיר: 23 6  
ולמיכל בת שאול לא הוה לה ולד עד יום מותה:

*6:21 And David said to Michal, "Before the LORD, who chose me above your father, and above all his house, to command me to be king over the people of the LORD, over Israel—I praised before the LORD. 6:22 I am yet smaller than that and I will be lower in the sight of my own soul from now on, but by the maids of whom you have spoken—in their sight I will be honoured." 6:23 And Michal the daughter of Saul had no child to the day of her death.*

The official text of TJon painstakingly follows the Hebrew original. However, R. Levi explains the phrase "until the day of her death" in the limited sense that does not include the day of her death itself, and consequently said: "Wherever 'she had not' is found, it means that eventually she did have" (GenR. 38:14; PesK. 18:3; 20:1; PesR. 32:2; cf. R. Hisda's assumption in San. 21a). Some manuscripts adopted this opinion and added a postscriptum to this verse:<sup>325</sup>

nature, he covered his feet.

<sup>323</sup>MS f<sub>2</sub> suggests למנאה, 'to appoint', which is more in conformity with the usual vocabulary (>15).

<sup>324</sup>Omitted in MSS a f o D, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). It was written in MS B\*, but erased.

<sup>325</sup>Sperber quoted MSS d Fr, while Kasher, תוספחות, 113-14 quoted Codex Salamanca 1.

ברם ביום מותה הוה לה בר ושמה יתרים

*except on the day of her death she had a son, and his name was Ithream*

The wording of the Hebrew verse was linked to similar wordings concerning Sarah (Gen. 11:30), Hannah (1 Sam. 1:2), and Zion (Isa. 54:1). And since these women eventually had children, it must have been so with Michal as well. Looking for other clues in the Hebrew text, this reasoning identifies Michal with Eglah, the wife of David, mentioned in 2 Sam. 3:5.<sup>326</sup>

From a literary point of view this addition is interesting, because it once more stresses the link between the present chapter and the narrative of the wandering of the ark (1 Sam. 4). Both chapters conclude with the death of a woman, bearing a son (cf. 1 Sam. 4:20-22).

## 6.9 David's House (2 Samuel 7)

The first part of 2 Sam. 7 is read as *haftara* in the annual cycle, together with 2 Sam. 6.<sup>327</sup> The second part of 2 Sam. 7 is read as *haftara* in the triennial cycle, after the Torah reading of Gen. 15, about the covenant between God and Abraham. Nothing in the Targumatic version of 2 Sam. 7:17-29 is reminiscent of the Torah reading.

1 7 וְהוּהוּ כַד יִחַיב מַלְכָא בְּבֵיתֶיהָ וַיִּיָּיֶן<sup>328</sup> אֲנִיחָ לִיהּ מִסְחֹר סְחֹר מְכַל בְּעַלֵּי דְבְּבוּהֵי:  
2 7 וְאָמַר מַלְכָא לְנָתָן נְבִיאָ דִּי חֲזֵי כַעַן דָּאֲנָא יִחַיב בְּבֵיתָא דְּמַטְלָל בְּכִיּוּרֵי<sup>329</sup> אַרְזֵיָא  
וְאַרְזֵיָא דִּיּוּיָּיֶן שְׂרִי<sup>330</sup> בְּמִשְׁכְּנָא בְּגוּ יְרִיעָהָ:

*7:1 Now when the king lived in his house, and the LORD had given him rest from all his enemies round about, 7:2 the king said to Nathan the prophet, "See now, that I live in a house covered with panels of cedar, while the ark dwells in a tent, in the midst of curtains.*

A small addition is made in order to explain that not the house itself was made of cedar wood.<sup>331</sup> Furthermore, the word "tent" is added to harmonize the description in 6:17, where the Hebrew text already

manca 1.

<sup>326</sup>This identification is also made in one of the variants of CR and in some rabbinic discussions, see above, commentary on 3:5. Cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 118.

<sup>327</sup>See above, introduction before 2 Sam. 6:1.

<sup>328</sup>Ms B reads דִּיּוּיָּיֶן מִיִּמְרָא, 'the speech of the LORD' (>23).

<sup>329</sup>Ms D reads צִיּוּרֵי, 'images'. This word is used in the description of the Temple in 1 Kgs 6:29 and its usage here stresses the difference between David's house and the ark's homelessness.

<sup>330</sup>Ms y reads יְיִיב, 'sitting, dwelling', more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). The other MSS diversified the translation of the double יְיִיב (>18).

<sup>331</sup>So Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 50; Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 10.



used the word אהל (>16).

3 7 ואמר נתן למלכא כל דבלבך איזיל עביד ארי<sup>332</sup> מימרא<sup>333</sup> דיין בסערך: 7 4 והוה בליליא הוא<sup>334</sup> והוה פתגם נבואה<sup>335</sup> מן קדם<sup>335</sup> יי עם נתן למימר: 5 7 איזיל ותימר לעבדי לדויד כדנ<sup>336</sup> אמר יי האת חבני קדמי<sup>336</sup> ביתא לאשראה שכינתי ביה:

7:3 *And Nathan said to the king, "Go, do all that is in your heart, for the speech of the LORD is in your aid."* 7:4 *But that same night a prophetic word from before the LORD was with Nathan, saying, 7:5 "Go and say to my servant, to David, 'Thus says the LORD: Would you build me a house to make my Presence dwell in it?'*

TJon fully maintains the rhetorical question here, while the parallel 1 Chron. 17:4 replaced it by the declarative statement "You shall not build me a house to dwell in" (>14).<sup>337</sup>

6 7 ארי לא אשריתי שכינתי<sup>338</sup> בביתא מיומא דאסיקת ית בני ישראל ממצרים ועד יומא הדין והוית משרי שכינתי במשכנין וביריען:

7:6 *Because I have not dwelt in a house since the day that I brought up the sons of Israel from Egypt to this day, but I have made my Presence dwell in tents and between curtains.*

Since Hebrew אהל and משכן are synonymous, both equated with Aramaic משכנא, 'tent', TJon had to find a second equivalent. The word יריעה, 'curtain', was chosen, because it already appeared in 7:2, but it is also abundantly used in the description of the tabernacle.<sup>338</sup> The plural intention of the Hebrew expression ("tent and tabernacle") is made explicit in the Aramaic plural equivalents.

7 7 בכל אחר דהליכיה<sup>339</sup> בכל בני ישראל הפתגם מלילית עם<sup>340</sup> חד משבטיא<sup>340</sup>

<sup>332</sup>Ms B erroneously reads אמר 'he said'.

<sup>333</sup>Omitted by MS a, which only reads יי, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>334</sup>So only MSS p C. MSS a b c d f m o w y B D S eb66 read the correct demonstrative והוה; cf. Wm.B. Stevenson, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, Oxford <sup>2</sup>1962, 18.

<sup>335</sup>Omitted in MS S\*, but added later.

<sup>336</sup>Ms D reads כה, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>337</sup>See above, § 3.2.4.5, *s.v.* rhetorical questions.

<sup>338</sup>So Exod. 26:1, 6, 7, 12, 13; 36:8, 13, 14; Num. 4:25; but see also its non-religious usage in Isa. 54:2.

<sup>339</sup>Ms J reads ראשרייה שכנתי, 'where I made my Presence dwell', in conformity with the preceding verse (>15).

<sup>340</sup>MSS d o read לכל, while MSS c Fr D S read מכל, resulting in "did I speak a word to any one of the tribes". Ms f reads the nota accusativi, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

דישראל דפקידית לפרנסא ית עמי ישראל<sup>341</sup> למימר למא לא<sup>342</sup> בניהון קדמי<sup>343</sup> ביהא דמטלל בכיור,<sup>343</sup> ארויא:

7:7 *In every place where I have wandered with all the sons of Israel did I speak a word with any of the tribes of Israel, whom I commanded to care for my people Israel, saying: Why have you not built a house before Me covered with panels of cedar?'*

A small exegetical problem appears around the Hebrew phrase אחד ישראל, 'one of the tribes of Israel'. Of these tribes, and not of any individual, the Hebrew text says that God commanded them to shepherd his people. TJon did not solve the problem.<sup>344</sup> The author of the parallel 1 Chron. 17:6 rendered שפטי, 'judges', instead of שבטי, 'tribes' (>1).<sup>345</sup>

8 7 וכען כדין<sup>346</sup> תימר לעברי לדויד כדנין<sup>347</sup> אמר יוי צבאות<sup>348</sup> אנא דברתך<sup>349</sup> מן דירא מבחר ענא למהוי מלכא<sup>347</sup> על עמי<sup>347</sup> על ישראל: 9 7 והוה מימרי<sup>349</sup> בסערך בכל אתר<sup>348</sup> דהליכתא ושיציתי ית כל בעלי דבבך<sup>349</sup> מן קדמך<sup>349</sup> ועבדיה לך שום רב<sup>349</sup> כשום רברביא דבארעא: 10 7 ואשוי אתר מתקן<sup>350</sup> לעמי ישראל<sup>351</sup> ואקיימנו וישרון באחרון ולא יזועון עוד ולא ייספון בני רשעא לעניותיה כד בקדמיתא: 11 7 ולמן יומא דפקידית נגודין על עמי ישראל ואנחית לך מכל בעלי דבבך<sup>349</sup> וחוי לך יוי ארי מלכו<sup>352</sup> יקיים לך יוי:

7:8 *Now therefore thus you shall say to my servant, to David, 'Thus says the Lord Šebaoth: I took you from the sheepfold, from after the sheep, that you should be king over my people, over Israel. 7:9 And my*

<sup>341</sup>Mss a b c d f m o Fr D C J S eb66 add the nota accusativi before the name of Israel, in conformity with most Hebrew mss.

<sup>342</sup>Strangly enough omitted by MS y.

<sup>343</sup>MS D reads בניזורי, 'images', as in 7:2. MS B\* reads בניזורי, which might be intended to mean "covered with cedar wood-carving", but the usual meaning of גיזרא is "part" or "herd". MS B<sup>m</sup> made an attempt to correct this reading, but it spelled the correction as בניורי, meaning "with adulterers". See above, notes and commentary on 7:2.

<sup>344</sup>The construction חדא מ is the usual translation of a Hebrew construct chain with אחד, see Van Staaldoune-Sulman, *Samuel, s.v.* חד - אחד.

<sup>345</sup>Followed by Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 119. There are reasons to assume that the Chronicler corrected the Hebrew reading, cf. Ph. de Robert, "Juges ou Tribus en 2 Samuel vii 7?", *VT* 21 (1971), 116-18.

<sup>346</sup>Mss c d o Fr read כדנין, already conceiving this phrase as an utterance from God.

<sup>347</sup>MS b omits על עמי by homoioarkton.

<sup>348</sup>Omitted in MS y, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>349</sup>Omitted in MS y, in conformity with a single Hebrew MS and most MSS of LXX.

<sup>350</sup>Mss a f o Fr C J S add קדמי, 'before Me'.

<sup>351</sup>Omitted in MS B\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>352</sup>Omitted in MS S. MS y and Kimḥi read בית מלכו, 'a royal house'.

*speech has been in your aid in whatever place you went. I have cut off all your enemies before you. And I have made you a great name, like the name of the great ones of the earth. 7:10 And I appointed a fixed place for my people, for Israel, and I established them that they may dwell in their own place and be disturbed no more, that sons of evil shall not continue to afflict them as formerly, 7:11 from the time that I commanded leaders over my people Israel, and I have given you rest from all your enemies. And the LORD declares to you that the LORD will establish you a kingdom,*

TJon situated the beginning of Israel's continuous affliction by enemies back in the time of the "leaders", thereby refraining from the usual equation of Hebrew שפט to Aramaic דינא (cf. TgJudg. 4:4; 11:27) or to a derivation of the verb דין. Thus the Aramaic version of the present verse refers to the time of the "leaders" (cf. TgJudg. 2:16-19), which was before the time of the "judges". It appears that the Targumists saw the judges as a separate class of leaders. By making the distinction between these leaders and the judges proper, the implication that no-one listened to ordained judges (cf. TgJudg. 2:17) was avoided.<sup>353</sup>

Although the entire chapter is a continuous word play on בית, 'house', TJon saw no possibility of consistently translating it with Aramaic ביתא. In the verses in which it referred to the Temple or to David's family, that is to say, his offspring, the Targumists retained the word ביתא. But in two verses it is conceived of as referring to more than David's offspring alone, but also having the connotation of "dynasty". It is henceforth equated with מלכותא, 'kingship, kingdom' (in the present verse and in its quotation in 7:26). TJon made it absolutely clear that the Biblical text did not refer to David's palace, or to his offspring.

12 7 ארי ישלמן יומך ותשכוב עם אבהתך ואקיים ית ברך בתרך דתוליד<sup>354</sup> ואתקין  
 ית מלכותיה: 7 13 הוא יבני ביחא לשמי ואתקין ית כורסי מלכותיה עד עלמא<sup>355</sup>: 7 14  
 אנא אהוי ליה כאב והוא יהי קדמי לבר דאם יסרח ואלקיניה במלקות גברין ובמרדות  
 בני אנשא:

*7:12 for, when your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers, I will raise up your son after you, whom you will beget,*<sup>355</sup>

<sup>353</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 363-64.

<sup>354</sup>Mss c d o Fr S add כן בחר, 'afterwards', stressing the fact that it was Solomon—indeed born after this promise—who became king and built the temple (>16). This addition was possible because TJon rendered "son" instead of the synecdoche "seed".

<sup>355</sup>Plain translation of Hebrew "who shall come forth from your body" (>14).

and I will establish his kingdom. 7:13 He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. 7:14 I will be for him as a father, and before Me he shall be a son, whom, if he grows corrupt, I will chasten with the punishment of men and with the correction of the sons of men.

The two Hebrew metaphors "rod" and "stripes", which indicate punishment, are rendered according to their intended meaning (>13). The first sentence, concerning the father and the son, is also conceived of as a metaphor (>24). Most manuscripts render these sentences with a double usage of the preposition ׀.<sup>356</sup> Some manuscripts only once use the preposition ׀, either in "as a father" or in "as a son".<sup>357</sup> Only two manuscripts maintain the double usage of ׀ (MSS c d).

Moreover, it is remarkable that TJon absolutely refrains from any messianic interpretation of the present verse. Such an interpretation would easily have been made possible by linking the relationship between the divine father and the royal human son with the messianic Psalm 2, as in 4Q246, 4Q174 and other Qumranic texts,<sup>358</sup> Mk 12:10-11, Lk. 1:32 and Heb. 1:5. Only in 7:19 a messianic interpretation of God's speech to David is implied by the rendering "Thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house for the world to come". It seems that the Targumists were familiar with "sectarian" messianic exegesis of this passage and, by implication, attempted to counteract it.<sup>359</sup>

16 7 וטובי לא יערי מניה כמה ראעריתי מן<sup>360</sup> שאול ראעריתי מן קרמך ׀: 7 15

<sup>356</sup>So in MSS b m w y B D C J eb66.

<sup>357</sup>The combination of ׀ - ׀ occurs in MSS a p, while the combination of ׀ - ׀ occurs in MSS f o S.

<sup>358</sup>See e.g. A.S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, (SSN, 3), Assen 1957, 172-75; G.S. Oegema, *Der Gesalbte und sein Volk* (SIDL, 2), Göttingen 1994, *passim*; J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, New York 1995, 154-72; C.A. Evans, 'Are the "Son" Texts at Qumran Messianic?', in: J.H. Charlesworth *et al.* (eds), *Qumran-Messianism*, Tübingen 1998, 135-53; J. Zimmerman, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran* (WUNT, 2. Reihe, 104), Tübingen 1998, 128-70.

<sup>359</sup>So, by implication, Frankel, "Zu dem Targum", 23; and more explicitly, Van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen*, 174; S.H. Levey, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation: The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum* (HUC.MS, 2), Cincinnati & New York 1974, 37; J.C. de Moor, "Van wie zegt de profheet dit? Messiaanse apologetiek in de Targumim", in: H.H. Grosheide *et al.* (eds), *De knechtsgestalte van Christus: Studies door collega's en oud-leerlingen aangeboden aan Prof.dr. H.N. Ridderbos*, Kampen 1978, 91-110, esp. 96; Idem, "The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1-12: The Parable of the Wicked Tenants", *JSJ* 29 (1998), 63-80, esp. 75-76.

<sup>360</sup>MSS c d read מלוח, while MS m reads מן קרם, both reflecting the Hebrew combination מעם (>29).

וקים ביתך ומלכותך עד עלמא  $\diamond$  קדמך  $\diamond$  <sup>361</sup> כורסי מלכותך יהי מתקן עד עלמא  $\diamond$ :  
 17 7 ככל פתגמיא האלין וככל נבואתא  $\diamond$  הדא כין מליל נחן עם דויד: 7 18 ואתא  
 מלכא דויד ויחיב קדם  $\diamond$  יי ואמר לית <sup>362</sup> אנא <sup>363</sup> כמסת יוי  $\diamond$  אלהים  $\diamond$  ומא <sup>364</sup> בתי  
 ארי אמשינני עד הלכא <sup>365</sup>: 7 19 ווערת עוד דא קדמך  $\diamond$  יוי  $\diamond$  אלהים  $\diamond$  ומלילחא אף  
 על בית <sup>366</sup> עבדך לעלמא  $\diamond$  דאתי <sup>367</sup> ודא חויא <sup>368</sup> לבני אנשא יוי  $\diamond$  אלהים  $\diamond$ :

7:15 My goodness will not pass from him, as I removed it from Saul, whom I removed from before you. 7:16 And your house and your kingdom shall be lasting for ever before you. The throne of your kingdom shall be fixed for ever.” 7:17 In accordance with all these words and in accordance with all this prophecy Nathan spoke with David. 7:18 Then King David went in and sat before the LORD, and said, “I am not sufficient, O LORD God, and what is my house that Thou hast brought me thus far? 7:19 And yet this was a small thing before Thee, O LORD God. Thou hast spoken also of thy servant’s house with regard to the world to come, and this is proper for the sons of men, O LORD God.

Hebrew לִמְרוֹחוֹק gave rise to an eschatological interpretation of the present verse. The vague wording that God spoke of David’s house “for a great while to come” is considered a reference to the world to come.<sup>369</sup> In retrospect this translation lends a messianic flavour to God’s speech of 7:5-16, although it was completely absent there.<sup>370</sup> This messianic flavour is removed from the Babylonian tradition by

<sup>361</sup>Omitted in MS y.

<sup>362</sup>Mss C S restored the Hebrew wording by translating בן, ‘who’ (>29), but did not omit the addition כמסת. The result is a conflated rendering: “Who am I, am I sufficient?” Note that one rhetorical question is replaced by its answer, while the second question is retained in the other MSS (>14).

<sup>363</sup>MS w adds ידע, resulting in “I do not know enough”.

<sup>364</sup>Mss b f m y read ומן, ‘and who’, restoring the Hebrew wording (>29), see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 18:18.

<sup>365</sup>MS f<sub>3</sub> suggests the reading מלכותא, ‘the kingdom’, which is in agreement with rabbinic interpretation (GenR. 45:10; 55:6; ExodR. 2:6; DeutR. 2:7; Tan., *Shemot*, 1:16; MTeh. 1:2; 108:2; Zev. 102a; SER 18 (p. 89-98)), see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 10:22.

<sup>366</sup>Omitted in MSS eb66 eb76.

<sup>367</sup>Omitted by MS a.

<sup>368</sup>MS B reads דא חויא instead of דא חויא, resulting in “the world to come, which the LORD God showed to the son of men”.

<sup>369</sup>So also in Kalla Rabbati 53b; SER 18 (p. 90). The same מרחק in Exod. 2:4 is interpreted as a reference to prophecy in ExodR. 1:22.

<sup>370</sup>The term “world to come” can be used as a messianic reference, cf. 2 Sam. 23:5, where David’s house is said to be “kept for the world to come”; cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 10; against P. Humbert, “Le Messie dans le Targum des Prophètes”, *RThPh* 43 (1910), 420-47; 44 (1911), 5-46, esp. 31.

the omission of Hebrew בית, 'house', even though this involved a deviation from the Hebrew original. In the Babylonian tradition God speaks about David's personal eschatological future.

Since the promise concerning David's house cannot be defined as "Torah", it is described as something proper for the sons of men.<sup>371</sup> In the same manner the instructions concerning the measures of the new Temple in Ezekiel are not called Torah, but something proper (cf. TgEzek. 43:11; 44:5).<sup>372</sup>

20 7 וּמָא יוֹסִיף דְּוִיד עוֹד לְמַלְלָא קְדָמְךָ 373 וְאֵת עֲבֹדָתָא 374 בְּעוֹתָא 375 עֲבָדְךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהִים: 376

7:20 *And what more can David say to Thee? For Thou hast fulfilled<sup>376</sup> the prayer of thy servant, O LORD God.*

The Hebrew phrase "Thou knowest thy servant" is made specified, in this context by referring to God's answer of David's prayer.<sup>377</sup> The realization of David's prayers is mentioned in TJon 2 Sam. 23:5 as well.

21 7 בְּדִיל מִיִּמְרֵךְ 378 וְכַרְעוֹתֶיךָ 379 עֲבֹדָתָא יֵת כָּל רַבְרַבְחָא הָאֵלִין 379 לְהוֹדְעָא יֵת עֲבָדְךָ: 7 22 עַל כֵּן רַב אֵת יְיָ אֱלֹהִים 380 אֲרִי לֵית כּוֹתֶךָ וְלֵית אֱלֹהֵי בַר מִנְךָ כֻּכַל דְּשִׁמְעֵנָא אֲמַרו 380 קְדָמָנָא:

7:21 *Because of thy speech and according to thy pleasure Thou hast done all these great things, to make thy servant know it. 7:22 Therefore Thou art great, O LORD God; for there is none like Thee, and there*

<sup>371</sup>Against SifBam § 119 (on Num. 18:20), which explains the word as the Torah which saves people.

<sup>372</sup>McCarter, *II Samuel*, 233 assumes that TJon did not read תּוֹרָה, but הוֹאֵר, 'appearance' (>1, >2).

<sup>373</sup>Ms D reads an alternative beginning of the present verse, viz. וּמָא יוֹסִיף עוֹד קְדָמְךָ, 'And what else is there for King David before Thee'.

<sup>374</sup>Only MS J and Kimḥi rendered in conformity with the Hebrew text יְדַעְתָּ, 'you know' (>29).

<sup>375</sup>Mss d S read רְעוּהָ, 'desire, will'.

<sup>376</sup>Literally: didst.

<sup>377</sup>In Jer. 1:5 a similar expression is explained by stating that God "prepared" Jeremiah for his task.

<sup>378</sup>Mss b y read וּכְלַבְךָ, 'according to your heart', in conformity with the Hebrew wording (>29).

<sup>379</sup>Mss a b f read the singular הִיא, in conformity with the Hebrew singular (>29), although it is not congruent with the preceding plural. MS y solved the problem by rendering two singulars הֵיאָ הֵיאָ.

<sup>380</sup>Because of the asyndeton several MSS render a slightly different construction. MSS d f read וְאֲמָרוּ, 'and they said'; MS f<sub>4</sub> suggests דְּאֲמָרוּ, 'which they said'; MSS b y read the active participle אֲמָרִין, resulting in "we heard them say"; it is omitted by MSS a C, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

*is no God besides Thee, according to all that we have heard them say before us.*

TJon places David's confession of faith within the setting of tradition: the former generations handed down the confession that there is only one God. With regard to the contents of this confession it is remarkable that TJon gives a literal translation of Hebrew כַּמוֹךָ, 'like Thee'. In TJon 1 Sam. 2:2; 2 Sam. 22:32 the preposition is replaced by the more outspoken אֵלֵא and בַּר מִן, 'apart from, beside' to stress pure monotheism (>22).<sup>381</sup>

7 23 וּמִן כַּעֲמֵךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל<sup>382</sup> עִמָּא חַד בַּחִיר בִּארְעָא דִּאֻלוּ שְׁלִיחִין מִן קְרָם־וִיִּי לְמַפְרֵק לִיה עִם וְלִשְׂוֹאָה לִיה שׁוּם וְלִמְעַבְד לְכוּן<sup>383</sup> רַבְרַבִּין וְחִסִּין עַד דְּעִלוּ לְאַרְע בֵּית־שְׁכִינְתְךָ דִּיהַבַּח לְהוֹן מִן קְרָם־וִיִּי עִמְךָ דְּפִרְקַתָּא לְךָ מִמְצָרִים גּוֹיִם וְאַלְהוּי:

*7:23 And who is like thy people Israel, one choice people on earth, whom those who were sent from before the LORD went to save [to become] a people for Him, and to make for Him a name, and to do for you great and strong things, until they came to the land of the House of thy Presence, which Thou hast given to them—from before thy people, which Thou hast saved for Thyself from Egypt, goyim welohaw.*

The Hebrew text of this verse was corrupted by incomplete assimilation to current theology. Originally, David asked what other god did for a people as the God of Israel had done for his. Scholars now assume that "a difficulty was found even in supposing that another god had chosen and done great things for a nation" and an attempt was made to refer the entire text back again to the true God.<sup>385</sup> Hence also the exchange of לוֹ, 'for him', and לְךָ, 'for you'. TJon accepted the text, including the reference to the only God and excluding the references to possible other saving gods, and tried to render a meaningful Aramaic version.

<sup>381</sup>The difference between the translations within Samuel might be due to the fact that 1 Sam. 2:2 and 2 Sam. 22:32 are part of a *haftara* within the annual cycle, while 2 Sam. 7:22 is not. But in TgIsa the use of the prepositions אֵלֵא and מִן is more consistent and not restricted to *haftarot*. For example, Isa. 45:21 is not part of a *haftara* and yet changed into a more outspoken confession.

<sup>382</sup>The reading יִשְׂרָאֵל is attested in several Hebrew MSS, the other versions, and 1 Chron. 17:21, while the reading כִּי־יִשְׂרָאֵל of MSS f m w is attested in other Hebrew MSS.

<sup>383</sup>MS f reads לְהוֹן, 'for them', in accordance with some Hebrew MSS and Vg, and in accordance with the preceding 3rd m.pl. forms.

<sup>384</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>385</sup>So Driver, *Notes*, 278, based on A. Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judenthums*, Breslau 1857, 288-89; followed by McCarter, *II Samuel*, 234-35.

In the first place, TJon maintained the references to the only God and his saving history with Israel. So “He” and “Thou” alternate as personal pronouns for God, while “they” and “you” alternate as pronouns for the people of Israel. Hebrew גוי אחר, ‘one people’—LXX reads “another nation”—is explained with the uniqueness of Israel. The word “choice” is affected by the Hebrew word אחת, ‘one’, which is often interpreted as “very special, dear”.<sup>386</sup> The link between Hebrew אחד, ‘one’, and love (Hebrew אהבה) might be due to *gematria*, since both Hebrew words have the same value of 13.<sup>387</sup>

The plural of the Hebrew phrase הלכר־אלהים, ‘the gods went’, is maintained, although it is applied to the God of Israel. The plural is incorporated in the new subject שליחין, ‘the sent ones’, while the reference to God is retained in the following “from before the LORD”.<sup>388</sup> R. Yose interpreted this plural as a reference to Moses and Aaron (EcclR. 7:1 § 2).<sup>389</sup> A similar solution of the plural is used in 1 Sam. 4:8.

Secondly, the difficult לארצך מפני עמך, ‘to the land, from before thy people’, was conceived of as a reference to the conquest of Canaan, as the Chronicler did.<sup>390</sup> However, TJon chose not to render or even add the verb גרש, ‘to drive out’, and adapt the verse to the version of 1 Chron. 17:21, “to drive out nations from before thy people, whom Thou hast saved from Egypt”. TJon rebuilt the single word לארצך into the phrase “until they came to the land of the House of thy Presence, which Thou hast given to them”, with the result that the clause “from before thy people” has no connection with the preceding sentences.

Finally, the subordinate clause אשר פדית לך ממצרים וגוים ואלהיו, ‘which Thou hast saved for Thyself from Egypt, people and its gods’, was a problem to all ancient versions. All versions considered the last two words to be the object of the sentence, referring back to עמך, ‘thy people’.<sup>391</sup> While this mixing up of numbers is alien to Hebrew

<sup>386</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 1:5; NumR. 3:6; 10:5 (uniqueness); NumR. 14:4; CantR. 2:16 § 1 (object of love).

<sup>387</sup>H. Poot, *Jozef: een messiaanse geschiedenis*, n.p. 1998, 25.

<sup>388</sup>The Chronicler chose a simpler solution and gave a singular הלה האלהים, ‘God went’ (1 Chron. 17:21).

<sup>389</sup>Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 10 also refers to MShem. 27:3, while Komlosh, *המקרא באור החרנים*, 314 refers to Rashi on this verse. Cf. SER 21 (p. 124)

<sup>390</sup>1 Chron. 17:21. Syr and Vg linked it to the preceding “great and terrible things”, and translated that these things were done “against the earth”.

<sup>391</sup>Only the version of 1 Chron. 17:21, in which the word ואלהיו is omitted, interpret the peoples as the Canaanites, “to drive out nations from before thy people, whom Thou hast saved from Egypt”. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 121



prose, many versions simplify the phrase. The LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> read “a people and its tents”, exchanging the *Lamed* and the *He* (>2). Vg reads “a people and its God”, adopting the rabbinic interpretation that God also saved Himself from Egypt.<sup>392</sup> Syr reads “a people, whose God Thou art”, adopting the other rabbinic interpretation that God did not need to save Himself from Egypt.<sup>393</sup> It appears that TJon did not know what to choose and left the phrase untranslated, thereby excluding the interpretation that God saved himself.<sup>394</sup>

An entirely different interpretation of the Aramaic version of the present verse can be given, although it is unlikely within the context of David’s prayer and nowhere attested in rabbinic literature: The last two words might be the Hebrew subject of the verb דעלו, ‘they enter(ed)’. If this is true, TJon takes over the word גוים to specify its meaning:<sup>395</sup> “until the Gentiles and their gods enter the land of the House of thy Presence, which Thou hast given to them from before thy people”. In this interpretation David refers to the conquest of the land by Nebuchadnezzar and states that God will give the land away to the Gentiles. If the connection between Gen. 15 and 2 Sam. 7:19-29 as the *haftara* is taken into account, it might be argued in favour of this interpretation that Abraham, too, received a vision of the future oppression of his offspring in Gen. 15:12-16. The Palestinian Targums apply this oppression to the four gentile kingdoms: the Babylonians, Medes, Greeks and Edomites.

24 7 ואתקנת לך יח עמך ישראל קדמך ◊ לעם עד עלמא ◊ ואת יי הויתא להון  
לאלה<sup>396</sup>: 7 25 וכען יי ◊ אלהים ◊ פתגמא<sup>397</sup> דמלילתא על עבדך ועל ביחיה<sup>398</sup>

and later Jewish exegetes interpret “nations and its gods” as an apposition to Egypt, thereby implying that God saved his people from the Egyptian people and its gods.

<sup>392</sup>R. Yose in EcclR. 7:1 § 2, but opposed by R. Aqiba; ExodR. 15:12; R. Aqiba in ExodR. 42:3, although the version “a people and its gods” is defended in ExodR. 24:1. This version is also adopted in some Hebrew MSS. This idea is also expressed by R. Abbahu, who claims in MTeh. 9:14 that there are five verses that teach that the salvation of Israel is also the salvation of God.

<sup>393</sup>So R. Aqiba in EcclR. 7:1 § 2, although the first interpretation is ascribed to him in ExodR. 42:3.

<sup>394</sup>SER 21 (p. 124) suggested a different interpretation by adding a verb, “whom Thou didst redeem to Thee out of Egypt, and didst cause to perish the nations and their gods”.

<sup>395</sup>So Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 174, n. 44, although they do consider these two words as the object of the subordinate clause.

<sup>396</sup>Omitted in MSS b o.

<sup>397</sup>The first four words of the verse are omitted in MS J\*, although a space is left blank. These words are added in the margin.

<sup>398</sup>MSS b y J S read the personified ביחיה אנש, ‘people of his house’.

אקים עד עלמא ◊ ועבד כמא דמלילתא: 7 26 ויסני שמך עד עלמא ◊ למימר יוי צבאות ◊ אלה ◊<sup>399</sup> על ישראל ובית עבדך דויד יהי מתקן קדמך ◊<sup>400</sup>: 7 27 ארי את יוי צבאות ◊ אלהא ◊ דישראל חויתא לעבדך<sup>401</sup> למימר מלכו<sup>402</sup> אקיים לך על כין הות<sup>403</sup> בלבא דעבדך לצלאה קדמך ◊ ית צלותא הדא: 7 28 וכען יוי ◊ אלהים ◊ את הוא אלהים ◊<sup>404</sup> ופתגמך אנון קשוט ומלילתא עם עבדך ית כל<sup>405</sup> טבתא הדא:

7:24 *And Thou didst establish for Thyself thy people Israel to be a people before Thyself for ever; and Thou, O LORD, didst become their God. 7:25 And now, O LORD God, confirm for ever the word which Thou hast spoken concerning thy servant and concerning his house, and do as Thou hast spoken. 7:26 And thy name will be magnified for ever, saying, 'The LORD Šebaoth is God over Israel'; and the house of thy servant David will be established before Thee. 7:27 For thou, O LORD Šebaoth, the God of Israel, hast told thy servant, saying, 'I will establish you a kingdom'; therefore it was in thy servant's heart to pray this prayer before Thee. 7:28 And now, O LORD God, Thou art God, and thy words are true; and Thou hast spoken all this goodness to thy servant.*

The Hebrew imperfect tense in the phrase "thy words will be true" is replaced by a definite present tense in "thy words are true", in order to protect God's trustworthiness.<sup>406</sup>

7 29 וכען שרי וברוך ית בית עבדך למהוי לעלמא ◊ קדמך ◊ ארי את יוי ◊ אלהים ◊ מלילתא ומברכתך יחברכון בחי עבדך צדיקיא ◊ לעלמינ: ◊

7:29 *And now, be willing<sup>407</sup> to bless the house of thy servant, that it may be for ever before Thee. For Thou, O LORD God, hast spoken,*

<sup>399</sup>The indefinite אלה is replaced by the definite אלהא in MS y, and by the Hebrew אלהים in MSS b f o w B C D J S eb66 (>22); cf. 7:26.

<sup>400</sup>MS D adds לעלם, 'for ever', corresponding to its repetition in 7:24-26. Ms w replaces קדמך by the similar עלמא עד.

<sup>401</sup>Instead of the plain rendering חויתא לעבדך, 'Thou hast told thy servant', MS o retained the original metaphorical phrase ית און עבדך, 'Thou hast opened thy servant's ear'.

<sup>402</sup>Although MS B\* reads the indefinite מלכו, it is corrected into מלכותא, 'the kingdom'. See above, commentary on 7:11.

<sup>403</sup>Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 10 erroneously read חוית, translating "Therefore thou has told in thy servant's heart to pray . . ."

<sup>404</sup>MSS a b c d f m o y Fr B C D J read יוי, while MS S reads האלהא, a strange combination of the Hebrew article and the Aramaic word for God. All these MSS give a more monotheistic translation (>22).

<sup>405</sup>Omitted in MSS a c d f m o w y B C D eb66.

<sup>406</sup>Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 149; E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), Berlin 1988, 83.

<sup>407</sup>Cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. שרא 5. A different translation is given by Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 175, "begin".

*with thy blessing shall the houses of thy servants the righteous ones be blessed in eternity."*

The shift from singular to plural at the end of the present verse is rather peculiar. The entire chapter speaks about David's house and in the Aramaic version the singular is always maintained. It may be due to diversification: Because the first half of the verse concerns the blessing of David's house, the second half of the verse had to refer to something else ( >18). It may also be the result of homiletic actualization, in that David not only prayed for his own family, but also for all the families of righteous Israelites (parallel to  >21). Promises to God's "servants, the righteous" abound in the Targumim (cf. e.g. TO Deut. 32:36, 43; TJon 1 Sam. 2:9; Isa. 63:17).

Smolar and Aberbach interpret the plural translation as a reference to the two houses that led rabbinic Jewry, the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Exilarch of Babylonia. These two leaders, who headed semi-royal dynasties enjoying the support of the Roman and Parthian (later Persian) governments, respectively, were not without opposition. The translation of the present verse would have been a positive action against all the opposition.<sup>408</sup> This interpretation is highly speculative, especially because the expression "thy servants the righteous ones" is a very general one and because TJon did not translate a dual.

## 6.10 Enemies and Friends (2 Samuel 8)

1 8 והוה בחר כין ומחא דויד ית פלשתאי ותברנון ונסיב דויד ית תקן אמחא מידא דפלשתאי:

*8:1 After this David struck down the Philistines and shattered them. David took the arrangement of the cubit out of the hand of the Philistines.*

The phrase *מתג האמה* is disputed, both with regard to its etymology and with regard to its actual meaning. TJon regarded Hebrew *אמה* as the word for "cubit", interpreting Hebrew *מתג*, 'bridle', as a metaphor for management. As a result, David took the "arrangement of the cubit" from the Philistines, which might be a mathematical figure.<sup>409</sup> This translation may refer to the technical superiority of the Philistines (cf. 1 Sam. 13:19-22).

<sup>408</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 89. Similarly, E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible*. 146.

<sup>409</sup>Cf. C.J. Goslinga, "De parallele teksten in de boeken Samuel en Kronieken", *GerThT* 61 (1961), 108-16.

The other versions each have their own interpretation. The Chronicler probably read גת האמה, 'Gath the mother', and explained this with his own words "Gath and her sons" (1 Chron. 18:1). This interpretation may be based on 2 Sam. 15:18 which suggests that David had conquered Gath. Vg interprets the phrase as *frenum tributi*, 'the rein of the tribute', implying that David stopped the Philistines ruling over the Israelites. The rendering of LXX seems to have no connections with the present Hebrew text, for it notes that David took the "common lands".<sup>410</sup>

2 8 ומחא ית מואבאי ומשח להון בערבא רמי יתהון לארעא<sup>411</sup> ומשח חרין ערבין<sup>412</sup> למקטל ומלו ערבא<sup>413</sup> לאחאה והו מואבאי לדויד לעבדין נטלי פּרס:

8:2 *And he struck down the Moabites, and measured them with the lot: he threw them to the ground and measured two lots to kill and filled one lot to be spared. And the Moabites were servants to David, bringing tribute.*

While the Hebrew text speaks of gifts brought by the Moabites, the Aramaic version explicitly describes them as a tribute (so also 8:6).<sup>414</sup> The same shift is found in the version of Symmachus and Vg. However, this traditional explanation of the Aramaic version is undermined by its usage in Talmudic texts, in which the combination of servants and פּרס refers to servants receiving gifts or wages.<sup>415</sup> If this usage is the background, these Moabites must be understood as captive servants receiving wages.

3 8 ומחא דויד ית הדדעור בר רחוב מלכא דצובה כד אול לאשנאה תחומיה בנהר פּרה:

8:3 *And David struck down Hadadezer the son of Rehob, king of Zobah, as he went to change his border at the river Euphrates.*

TJon adds the name of the river Euphrates in conformity with many Hebrew manuscripts, 1 Chron. 8:3, and the other ancient versions. The present verse is mentioned in the list of "words read but not written" in Ned. 37b and Soferim 38b.

<sup>410</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:98 reads a compromise between 1 Chron. 18:1 and LXX version, "he cut off much of their territory".

<sup>411</sup>The words רמי יתהון לארעא are omitted in MS w by homoioteleuton.

<sup>412</sup>Mss b c d f o y Fr read the Hebraism חבלין.

<sup>413</sup>Mss b c d f o y Fr read the Hebraism חבלא.

<sup>414</sup>So Levy, *CWT*, s.v. פּרס; Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 175.

<sup>415</sup>Cf. A. Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judenthums*, Breslau 1857, Madda<sup>2</sup> 1928, 362, quoting Av. 1:3; Ber. 34a; BB 25a.

The Hebrew expression להשיב ידו, 'to return his hand', is stripped from its metaphorical language and rendered by "to change his border". This rendering implies that Hebrew יד referred to a place, as in TJon 1 Sam. 15:12; 2 Sam. 18:18. TJon's version gave David a clear reason to attack Hadadezer, because the latter violated the borders.

417 4 ואחד<sup>416</sup> דויד מניה אלף ושבע מאה פרשין ועסרין אלפין גבר רוגלי ועקר<sup>417</sup> דויד ית כל רחביא ואשאר מנהון מאה רחכין:

8:4 And David captured from him a thousand and seven hundred horsemen, and twenty thousand foot soldiers. And David destroyed all the chariots, but left a hundred chariots.

Although the Hebrew text does not necessarily refer to the hamstringing of horses, the word רכב is usually conceived of as a collective for all the horses. That would mean that David hamstringed all the chariot horses. However, TJon considered it a collective for all the chariots and therefore chose not to use the verb "hamstring" (Pael). It used the Peal of the same stem עקר, meaning "destroy, pull down".<sup>418</sup>

5 8 ואחו אנש ארם דמשק למסעד להדרעזר מלכא דצובה ומחא דויד בארם עסרין וחרין אלפין גברא: 6 8 ומני דויד אסטרשיגין<sup>419</sup> בארם דמשק והוו אנש ארם לדויד לעברין נשלי פרס<sup>419</sup> ופרק יי ית דויד בכל אתר דהליך: 7 8 ונסיב<sup>420</sup> דויד ית שלשי דהבא דהוו על עבדי הדרעזר ואיתינון לירושלם: 8 8 ומבטח ומבירות<sup>420</sup> קרויין<sup>420</sup> הדרעזר נסיב<sup>420</sup> מלכא דויד נחשא סני לחרא: 9 8 ושמע חועי מלכא דחמת ארי מחא דויד ית כל משרית הדרעזר: 10 8 ושלה תועי ית יורם בריה לוח מלכא דויד למשאל ליה לשלם ולברכותיה על דאניח קרבא בהדרעזר וקטליה ארי גבר עביד קרבין עם תועי הוה הדרעזר ועמיה הוו מני כספא ומני דהבא ומני נחשא: 11 8 אף יתהון אקדיש מלכא דויד קדם<sup>421</sup> יי עם כספא ודהבא דאקדיש מכל עממא דכביש: 12 8 מארם וממואב ומבני עמון ומפלשאאי ומימלקאי ומעדי<sup>421</sup> הדרעזר בר רחוב מלכא דצובה: 13 8 וכנש<sup>422</sup> דויד<sup>423</sup> משרין כד חב מלמחוי ית ארם בניא מלח תמנה עטר אלפין:

<sup>416</sup>Ms y and Kimḥi read Hebrew ואסרם, 'and he bound them'.

<sup>417</sup>Mss w y read the Pael ועקר, 'he hamstringed', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>418</sup>Likewise Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:99, who also assumes that David destroyed the chariots.

<sup>419</sup>A shift is made from gifts to tribute, see above, commentary on 8:2.

<sup>420</sup>Mss b y read ומברותי, 'and from Berothai', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Ms a reads בארות, 'and from Beeroth', which is a city of Benjamin (cf. 2 Sam. 4:2).

<sup>421</sup>Ms y reads ומשלל, 'and plunder'; mss a b c d f m o read ומבוזח, 'and plunder'. Both readings indicate that Hadadezer plundered during his campaign at the river Euphrates, and that David took his plunder from him.

<sup>422</sup>Ms o reads ועבד, 'and he made', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>423</sup>Ms o adds חמן, 'there', vocalizing Hebrew שם as שם, in conformity with the Syriac version.

8:5 And when the men of Aram of Damascus came to help Hadadezer king of Zobah, David struck down twenty-two thousand men of Aram. 8:6 Then David appointed praetors in Aram of Damascus, and the men of Aram became servants to David, bringing tribute. And the LORD saved David in whatever place he went. 8:7 And David took the shields of gold which were [carried] by the servants of Hadadezer, and brought them to Jerusalem. 8:8 And from Betah and from Beroth, cities of Hadadezer, King David took very much bronze. 8:9 When Toi king of Hamath heard that David had defeated the whole army of Hadadezer, 8:10 Toi sent his son Joram to King David to inquire after his welfare and to bless him, because he had waged war against Hadadezer and killed him; for Hadadezer was a man often fighting battles against Toi. And he brought with him articles of silver, articles of gold, and articles of bronze. 8:11 These also King David dedicated before the LORD, together with the silver and gold which he dedicated from all the nations he subdued, 8:12 from Edom, Moab, the sons of Ammon, the Philistines, the Amalekites, and from the spoil of Hadadezer the son of Rehob, king of Zobah. 8:13 And David gathered armies, when he returned from striking down Aram in the Valley of Salt: eighteen thousand men.

The first three words of the Hebrew text mean, "And David made a name for himself". The Targumists interpreted the verb עָשָׂה, 'do, make', as a reference to the gathering of soldiers (cf. 1 Sam. 14:48). This translation offers two advantages. It harmonizes the text with 7:9, in which God promises to make a great name for David (>16). It harmonizes the text with 8:5, which states that David struck down twenty-two thousand men of Aram (>16). The eighteen thousand men of the present verse appear to be David's own men.

14 8 ומני באדום אסטרשיגין ◊ בכל אדום מני אסטרשיגין ◊ והוּו כל אנש אדום עבדין לדויד ופרק יוי ית דויד בכל אתר דהליך: 8 15 ומלך דויד על כל ישראל והוּו דויד עבד דיין ◊ דקשוט וזכר<sup>424</sup> ◊ לכל עמיה: 8 16 ויואב בר צרויה ממנא על חילא ◊ ויהושפט בר אחילוד ממנא על דוכרניא:

8:14 And he appointed praetors in Edom; throughout all Edom he appointed praetors, and all the men of Edom became David's servants. And the LORD saved David in whatever place he went. 8:15 And David was king over all Israel. And David administered true justice and righteousness to all his people. 8:16 Joab the son of Zeruiah was appointed over the army; and Jehoshaphat the son of Ahilud was appointed over the records.

<sup>424</sup>Instead of three words MS f only reads דיין וקשוט, 'justice and truth'.

Using the stem of the word מִזְכִּיר to establish its meaning, TJon linked it to the related Aramaic דּוֹכְרֵנָא, 'records'. The result agrees with the traditional translation of מִזְכִּיר, viz. that Jehoshaphat was the king's keeper of the records.<sup>425</sup> The neutral wording that Jehoshaphat was "appointed" over the records allows for the possibility that King David had a considerable number of recorders, secretaries, and other public servants at his disposal, as had the Roman emperors.<sup>426</sup>

17 8 וְצָדוֹק בֶּר אַחִיטּוֹב וְאַחִימֶלֶךְ בֶּר אַבִּיחָתָר כְּהֵנִיא וְשֵׂרִיָּה סַפְרָא:

8:17 *And Zadok the son of Ahitub and Ahimelech the son of Abiathar were priests. And Seraiah was scribe.*

Although Abiathar the son of Ahimelech functions as a priest during David's reign, the name Ahimelech son of Abiathar is mentioned here. This name is also used in 1 Chron. 24:3, 6, 31. Still, TJon made no attempt to harmonize the name with the rest of the Books of Samuel (against >16).

18 8 וּבִנְיָה בֶר יְהוֹיָדָע מִמְנָא<sup>427</sup> עַל קִשְׁתָּיָא וְעַל קַלְעִיָא וּבְנֵי דִוִּיד רַבְרַבִּין הוּוּ:

8:18 *And Benaiah the son of Jehoiada was appointed over the archers and over the slingers. And the sons of David were teachers.*<sup>428</sup>

The relationship between Benaiah and the two subsequent groups of men, which is indicated with a simple ׀ in Hebrew, is made explicit in TJon: Benaiah was appointed their leader. This explication is also given in 1 Chron. 18:17. These two groups, the Cherethites and the Pelethites, are consistently defined as "archers and slingers" (cf. also 2 Sam. 15:18; 20:7, 23; 1 Kgs 1:38, 44).<sup>429</sup> This military translation contrasts with the explanation of Ber. 4a, which says that Benaiah was appointed head of the Sanhedrin, the judgments of which were decisive—a word play on Hebrew כִּרְחִי—and important—a word play on Hebrew פִּלְחִי.<sup>430</sup>

The Hebrew wording, which implies that David's sons were priests,

<sup>425</sup>Cf. T.N.D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy* (CB.OT, 5), Lund 1971, 21-24, who states that the LXX rendering could also be explained as an example of etymologizing. On pages 52-62, he draws attention to similar functionaries in Egypt and establishes the meaning of the Hebrew word.

<sup>426</sup>Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 100-101, who refer to Tacitus, *Annales* XII, 60; XIV, 39; *Hist.* II, 57.95.

<sup>427</sup>Omitted by Kimḥi, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>428</sup>Alternative translation: commanders.

<sup>429</sup>Note that the assonance and the rhyme of the Hebrew combination is maintained in Aramaic, and even increased by the alliteration on the double *Qoph*.

<sup>430</sup>Cf. also MTeh. 3:3.

was unacceptable from the point of view of the Priestly Code, for the sons of Aaron alone could function as priests (Num. 1:51; 3:10, 38; 18:7; Shab. 31a).<sup>431</sup> In 1 Chron. 18:17 the problem is solved by describing David's sons as "first officers" to the king.<sup>432</sup> TJon's rendering resembles this solution, but history shows that the Aramaic title רב־בין was not only interpreted as "commanders",<sup>433</sup> but also as "teachers, rabbis".<sup>434</sup> This conception is best attested by Rabba, "A rabbinical scholar may assert, 'I am a rabbinical scholar; let my business receive first attention', as it is written, 'and David's sons were priests'. Just as a priest receives first, so does a scholar too" (Ned. 62a).<sup>435</sup>

Exactly the same shift from priest to rabbi is made in TJon 2 Sam. 20:26. Ira the Jairite is called רב לַדָּוִד, 'a teacher for David', which is affirmed in several rabbinic sayings (cf. NumR. 3:2; CantR. 1:2 § 1; MQ 16b; Er. 63a-b; Git. 59a).<sup>436</sup> Pseudo-Jerome confirms that both David's sons and Ira were considered teachers.<sup>437</sup> This explanation of the word "priest" might be based on an exegesis of Exod. 19:6, where Israel is called a nation of priests. In MekY, *Bahodesh*, 2 this nation of priests is not depicted as the usual priests, but as priests having time to study Torah.<sup>438</sup> Symmachus' explanation of the present verse, σκολαζοντες, may be the missing link between the priests of the Hebrew text and the scholars of the Aramaic version.<sup>439</sup>

<sup>431</sup>Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 12-13; E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), Berlin 1988, 119-20.

<sup>432</sup>Following the Chronicler's view LXX translated "princes of the court"; Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:110 considered them bodyguards of King David. Syr renders the same word ܪܒܝܢܐܬ.

<sup>433</sup>MekY, *Amalek*, 3 uses the Hebrew equivalent שר; cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. רב־בין; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 12-13; Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 176. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 10 translates "distinguished persons".

<sup>434</sup>Since רב־בין is the usual plural of the word רב in TJon, it can have all the meanings of רב.

<sup>435</sup>Cf. H.J. Schoeps, "Symmachusstudien III," *Bib.* 29 (1948) 31-51, esp. 37. The link between priests en "first" is taken from 1 Chron. 18:17. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 11 made the same connection.

<sup>436</sup>However, Er. 63b seems to state that Ira was a legitimate priest; cf. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 116. Note that Zabud the son of Nathan is still called priest in TJon (1 Kgs 4:5).

<sup>437</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 143, "Ira autem Iairites erat sacerdos David." Id est magister, sicut alibi scribitur, 'filii autem David erant sacerdotes', id est magistri fratrum suorum."

<sup>438</sup>So H.J. Schoeps, "Symmachusstudien III," *Bib.* 29 (1948) 31-51, esp. 37.

<sup>439</sup>Cf. also A. Geiger, "Symmachus als Bibelübersetzer," *JZWL* 1861, 52.



## 6.11 The Son of Jonathan (2 Samuel 9)

1 9 ואמר דויד האית כא עוד דאשחאר לבית שאול ואעביד עמיה טיבו בדיל יהונתן:  
 2 9 ולבית שאול עבדא ושמיה ציבא וקרו ליה לות דויד ואמר מלכא ליה האת ציבא  
 ואמר עבדך: 3 9 ואמר מלכא האית עוד גברא לבית שאול ואעביד עמיה טיבו מן  
 קדם יוי ו ואמר ציבא למלכא עוד ברא ליהונתן לקי<sup>440</sup> בתרתון רגלוהי:

9:1 And David said, "Is there still any one left of the house of Saul, that I may show him goodness for Jonathan's sake?" 9:2 Now the house of Saul had had a servant whose name was Ziba, and they called him to David. And the king said to him, "Are you Ziba?" And he said, "Your servant." 9:3 And the king said, "Is there still someone of the house of Saul, that I may show goodness to him from before the LORD?" Ziba said to the king, "There is still a son of Jonathan, suffering in both his feet."

While the beginning of David's question is translated in accordance with 9:1 (>15), the end of the verse is worded after the example of 9:13.<sup>441</sup>

4 9 ואמר ליה מלכא אן הוא ואמר ציבא למלכא הא הוא בית מכיר בר עמיאל בלו  
 דבר: 5 9 ושלה מלכא דויד ודבריה ו מבית מכיר בר עמיאל מלו דבר: 6 9 ואחא  
 מפיבשת<sup>442</sup> בר יהונתן בר שאול לות דויד ונפל על אפוהי וסגיד ואמר דויד מפיבשת  
 ואמר הא עבדך: 7 9 ואמר ליה דויד לא תדחל ארי מעבד אעביד עמך<sup>443</sup> טיבו בדיל  
 יהונתן אבוך ואתיב לך ית כל אחסנת שאול אבוך ואת תיכול לחמא על פתורי תדירא:  
 8 9 ואודי<sup>444</sup> ואמר מא עבדך ארי אחפנתא על גבר הדיוש<sup>445</sup> דכות:

9:4 The king said to him, "Where is he?" And Ziba said to the king, "He is in the house of Machir the son of Ammiel, at Lo-debar." 9:5 Then King David sent and brought him from the house of Machir the son of Ammiel, from Lo-debar. 9:6 And Mephibosheth the son of Jonathan, son of Saul, came to David, and fell on his face and bowed down. And David said, "Mephibosheth?" And he said, "Behold, your servant." 9:7 And David said to him, "Do not fear, for I will certainly show you goodness for the sake of Jonathan, your father, and I will restore to you all the land of Saul, your father; and you shall eat at

<sup>440</sup>Ms y adds והוא, 'and he is', before the word לקי.

<sup>441</sup>So Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 71; followed by Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 11.

<sup>442</sup>Ms eb66 erroneously adds בר שאול after Mephibosheth's name.

<sup>443</sup>Omitted in MS eb66.

<sup>444</sup>Only in MSS p eb66. The other MSS a b c d f m o w y render the usual וסגיד, 'and he bowed down'.

<sup>445</sup>See commentary on 1 Sam. 24:15.

*my table always.*" 9:8 And he thanked him and said, "What is your servant, that you should turn yourself to a common man such as I?"

The verb שָׁחָה, 'to prostrate', is twice equated with the Aramaic verb יָדָא, 'to confess, to thank' (cf. also 16:4) in TgSam. In both instances the subject of the verb did not bow down to subject himself to someone, or to God, but to thank him. In both cases TJon chose not to give a literal translation, but to stress the connotation of thanks.

9 וקרא מלכא לציבא עולימא דשאול ואמר ליה כל<sup>446</sup> דהוה לשאול ולכל ביתיה<sup>447</sup> יהיבית לבר רבונך: 10 ותפלח ליה ית ארעא את ובנך ועבדך ותעיל ויהי לבר רבונך מוזן ויתפרניס ומפיבשת בר רבונך אכיל תדירא לחמא על פתורי ולציבא חמישת עסר בנין ועסרין עבדין: 11 ואמר ציבא למלכא ככל דיפקיד רבוני מלכא ית עבדיה כין יעביד עבדך ומפיבשת אכיל על פתורי כחד מבני מלכא:

9:9 Then the king called Ziba, Saul's young man, and said to him, "All that belonged to Saul and to all his house I have given to the son of your lord. 9:10 And you shall till the land for him, you and your sons and your servants, and you shall bring it in that it may be food for your lord's son and that he may be provided for. And Mephibosheth the son of your lord shall always eat at my table." Now Ziba had fifteen sons and twenty servants. 9:11 Then Ziba said to the king, "According to all that my lord the king commands his servant, so will your servant do, 'and Mephibosheth is eating at my table,' as one of the king's sons."

The last sentence of this verse is worded as David's direct speech, possibly quoted by Ziba. In several versions this sentence is not rendered as direct speech but as a remark of the narrator. LXX translates "David's table" and Syr "the king's table", while Vg renders "at your table", as if it were the direct speech of Ziba. Similarly, one Hebrew MS reads שלחנו, 'his table'.<sup>448</sup> Pseudo-Jerome harmonizes the Hebrew text and the Latin version by arguing that Ziba repeated David's command, thereby quoting David's own words.<sup>449</sup>

12 וּלמפיבשת ברא זעירא ושמייה מיכה וכל מוּחב בית ציבא עבדין למפיבשת: 13 ומפיבשת יתיב בירושלם ארי על פתורא דמלכא תדירא הוא אכיל והוא לקי בתרתין רגלוהי:

<sup>446</sup>Ms w adds מא, 'what'.

<sup>447</sup>The phrase ביתיה ולכל is omitted in MS w.

<sup>448</sup>Cf. T. Jansma, "Maar Mefibosjet zelf zal aan mijn tafel eten als een van 's konings eigen zoons': Enkele opmerkingen over 2 Sam. IX, 11B", in: M.S.H.G. Heerma van Voss et al. (eds), *Travels in the World of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to Professor M.A. Beek on the Occasion of this 65th Birthday* (SSN, 16), Assen 1974, 119-31, esp. 122.

<sup>449</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 123; so also Rashi *ad loc.*

*9:12 And Mephibosheth had a little son, whose name was Micah. And all who dwelt in Ziba's house became Mephibosheth's servants. 9:13 So Mephibosheth dwelt in Jerusalem, for he ate always at the king's table. Now he was suffering in both his feet.*

The Hebrew narrative concerning Mephibosheth had a sting in its tail: he was not only “suffering” (נכה) in both his feet (4:4; 9:3), he turns out to be “lame” (פסח). David had to accept a lame person in his house, at his table, although it was claimed that the lame and the blind were not welcome in the house (5:8). Since the proverb of 5:8 is considered a metaphor and therefore rendered completely different, and since TJon translated all three references to Mephibosheth's feet by exactly the same word, this nuance has disappeared in the Aramaic version.

## 6.12 More Friends and Enemies (2 Samuel 10)

1 10 והוה בחר כין ומית מלכא דבני עמון ומלך חנון בריה תחותיה: 2 10 ואמר דויד אעביד שיבו עם חנון בר נחש כמא דעבד אבוהי עמי שיבו ושלח דויד לנחמותיה בידא דעבדוהי על<sup>450</sup> אבוהי ואחו עבדי דויד לארע בני עמון: 3 10 ואמרו רברבי בני עמון לחנון רבנהוקן המיקר דויד ית אבוך בעינך ארי שלח לך מנחמין הלא בדיל למחקר ית ארעא<sup>451</sup> ולאילוהה ולמברקה<sup>452</sup> שלח דויד ית עבדוהי לוהך:

*10:1 After this the king<sup>453</sup> of the sons of Ammon died, and Hanun his son reigned in his stead. 10:2 And David said, “I will show goodness to Hanun the son of Nahash, as his father has shown goodness to me.” So David sent his servants to console him concerning his father. And David's servants came into the land of the sons of Ammon. 10:3 But the commanders of the sons of Ammon said to their lord Hanun, “Is David honouring your father, do you think that he has sent comforters to you? Has not David sent his servants to you to spy out the land and to examine it and to evaluate it?”*

TJon did not understand Hebrew הפך in the sense of “turn over, destroy”, but in the sense of “examine carefully”.<sup>454</sup> Therefore, it was translated with the verb בדק, ‘examine, spy out’ (cf. TgJudg. 18:3).

<sup>450</sup>TJon renders “concerning” in accordance with the co-text; MSS b y read לוה, ‘to’, more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29); cf. Bacher, “Kritische Untersuchungen”, 42.

<sup>451</sup>In conformity with some Hebrew MSS. MSS a b c d f o w y read קרהא, ‘city’, in conformity with most Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

<sup>452</sup>Ms f read ולמהפכה, ‘and to turn her over’, cf. the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>453</sup>Note that TJon made no attempt to name the king of Ammon, as 1 Chron. 19:1 did (against >17).

<sup>454</sup>Cf. the saying of Ben Bag Bag, הפך בה והפך בה דכלה בה (Av. 5:22).

10 4 ונסיב<sup>455</sup> חנון ית עבדי דויד וגרע<sup>456</sup> ית פלגות דקניהון ופסק ית לבושהון עד פלגיהון עד אחר בית<sup>457</sup> בהתחון ושלחון: 10 5 וחויא לדויד ושלח לקדמותהון ארי הוו גבריא מהכלמין לחדא ואמר מלכא תיבו ביריחו עד דיצמח דקנכון ותחובון: 10 6 וחוי בני עמון ארי אתגריא<sup>458</sup> בדויד ושלחו בני עמון ואגרו ית ארם בית רחוב וית ארם צובא עסרין אלפין גבר רוגלי וית מלך מעכה אלף גבר ואיש<sup>459</sup> טוב תרי עסר אלפין גברא: 10 7 ושמע דויד ושלח ית יואב וית כל חילא<sup>460</sup> דגבריא<sup>460</sup>: 10 8 ונפקו בני עמון וסדרו קרבא במעלנא דתרעא וארם צובא ורחוב ואיש טוב ומעכה בלחודיהון בחקלא: 10 9 וחזא יואב ארי תקיפו עלוהי עבדי קרבא מאפוהי ומאחורוהי ובחר מכל בחירי ישראל<sup>461</sup> וסדר לקדמות אנש<sup>462</sup> ארם: 10 10 וית שאר עמא יהב ביד אבשי<sup>463</sup> אחוהי וסדר לקדמות בני עמון: 10 11 ואמר אמ<sup>464</sup> תחקף ארם מני ותהי לי לפריק ואם בני עמון יחקפון מנך ואהך למפרק לך: 10 12 תקף ונתקף על עמנא ועל קרוי<sup>465</sup> אלהנא ויירי עבדי דתקינ<sup>465</sup> קדמוהי<sup>465</sup>: 10 13 וקריב יואב ועמא דעמיה לאנחא קרבא באנש<sup>466</sup> ארם ואפכו<sup>466</sup> מן קדמוהי<sup>466</sup>: 10 14 ובני עמון חזו ארי אפכו<sup>466</sup> אנש<sup>467</sup> ארם וערקו<sup>467</sup> מן קדם<sup>467</sup> אבשי ואתו לקרתא<sup>467</sup> ותב יואב מלות בני עמון ואתא לירושלם: 10 15 וחזו אנש<sup>468</sup> ארם ארי אתברו<sup>468</sup> קדם<sup>468</sup> ישראל ואתכנישו כחדא: 10 16 ושלח הדרעזר ואפיק ית אנש<sup>469</sup> ארם דמעיבר פרת ואתו לחילם ושובך רב חילא<sup>469</sup> דהדרעזר קרמיהון:

10:4 *So Hanun took David's servants, and shaved off half their beards, and cut off their clothes in the middle, at the site of their shame, and sent them away. 10:5 When they told David, he sent to meet them,*

<sup>455</sup>Mss a c d f o read ודבר 'and he led'; this verb is more often used for persons, while נסיב is used for inanimate things and animals (>11). The use of נסיב in various MSS may be due to the rude treatment of David's servants.

<sup>456</sup>Mss b d o y read וגרע, 'and he cut off'.

<sup>457</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>458</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 13:4.

<sup>459</sup>Considered part of the name, like Ish-bosheth; cf. also 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, LXX, Vg, Syr, Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:121.

<sup>460</sup>The unusual construction in Hebrew is reduced to a normal genitive construction.

<sup>461</sup>The construct chain with the preposition ב (cf. also 1:21) is replaced by a normal construct chain.

<sup>462</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>463</sup>This is the only occasion where Abishai is called Abshai in the Books of Samuel. Abshai is his usual name in the Books of Chronicles (cf. 1 Chron. 2:16; 11:20; 18:12; 19:11, 15). MSS b y read אביש (>15), in conformity with several Hebrew MSS, LXX, Syr and Vg. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 124 also draws attention to the peculiar spelling.

<sup>464</sup>Mss b y add אנש before the name of Aram, in conformity with 10:9, 13 (>15), personalizing the Hebrew expression (>14).

<sup>465</sup>MS eb66 reads בעיניה, 'in his sight', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>466</sup>Omitted in MS a, which only reads בארם, 'with Aram'.

<sup>467</sup>MS f adds אף אינון, 'they also'.

<sup>468</sup>Omitted in MS a, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>469</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

for the men were greatly ashamed. And the king said, "Remain at Jericho until your beards have grown, and then return." 10:6 When the sons of Ammon saw that they had provoked David, the sons of Ammon sent and hired Aram of the House of Rehob, and Aram of Zobah, twenty thousand foot soldiers, and the king of Maacah with thousand men, and Ish-tob, twelve thousand men. 10:7 When David heard of it, he sent Joab and all the army of the heroes. 10:8 And the sons of Ammon came out and drew up for battle at the entrance of the gate. And Aram of Zobah and of Rehob, and Ish-tob and Maacah, were by themselves in the field. 10:9 When Joab saw that the wagers of war were strong against him, both in front and in the rear, he chose some of the chosen men of Israel, and drew them up against the men of Aram, 10:10 the rest of the people he put in charge of Abishai his brother, and he drew them up against the sons of Ammon. 10:11 And he said, "If Aram is too strong for me, then it is up to you to be a deliverer; but if the sons of Ammon are too strong for you, then I will come and deliver you. 10:12 Be strong and use your strength for our people and for the cities of our God. And the LORD will do what seems right before Him." 10:13 So Joab and the people who were with him drew near to wage war with the men of Aram; and they retreated before him. 10:14 And when the sons of Ammon saw that the men of Aram retreated, they fled before Abishai, and entered the city. Then Joab returned from the sons of Ammon and came to Jerusalem. 10:15 But when the men of Aram saw that they had been shattered before Israel, they gathered themselves together. 10:16 And Hadadezer sent, and brought out the men of Aram who were beyond the Euphrates. And they came to Helam, with Shobach the commander of the army of Hadadezer before them.

TJon identifies the unnamed river as the Euphrates (>18). This identification is the standard translation of Hebrew נהר.<sup>470</sup>

17 10 ואתחזה לדויד וכנש ית כל ישראל ועבר ית ירדנא ואתא לחילם וסדרו אנש<sup>471</sup> ארם לקדמות דויד ואניחו קרבא עמיה: 10 81 ואפכו אנש<sup>471</sup> ארם מן קדם ישראל וקשל דויד מארם שבע מאה רחכין וארבעין אלפין פרשין וית שובך רב חיליה מחהי ומית חמן: 10 19 וחזו כל מלכיא עבדי הדדעור ארי אתברו קדם ישראל ואשלימו עם ישראל ופלחונן<sup>471</sup> ורחילו אנש ארם למפרק עוד ית בני עמון:

<sup>470</sup>Cf. also Josh. 24:2, 3, 14, 15; 1 Kgs 5:1, 4; 14:15; Isa. 11:15; Jer. 2:18; Mic. 7:12; Zech. 9:10; also noted by Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 118. It is noteworthy that the river is also identified as the Euphrates in Isa. 27:12; 48:18; 59:19; 66:12, but the translation in these verses is נהרא פרת.

<sup>471</sup>Omitted in MS w, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

10:17 *And when it was told David, he gathered all Israel together, and crossed the Jordan, and came to Helam. And the men of Aram drew up against David and waged war with him. 10:18 And the men of Aram retreated before Israel; and David killed of Aram seven hundred chariots and forty thousand horsemen, and struck down Shobach the commander of their army, so that he died there. 10:19 And when all the kings who were servants of Hadadezer saw that they had been shattered before Israel, they made peace with Israel, and became subject to them. So the men of Aram feared to save the sons of Ammon any more.*

### 6.13 The Bathsheba Affair I (2 Samuel 11)

According to mMeg. 4:10 the chapters concerning “David and Amnon” are not allowed to be read or translated during the synagogue services (cf. Soferim 39a). In tMeg. 4:31 (3:31) this statement is explained as referring to two chapters, *viz.* the account of David and Bathsheba (2 Sam. 11:2-17) and the account of Amnon and Tamar (2 Sam. 13:1-9). Both chapters are allowed to be read and translated. The Bavli quotes both sources in Meg. 25a-b, but only refers to Amnon. Both passages were considered disrespectful to the Fathers, but the question whether or not to read and translate them remained open. However, since TJon was also used in schools, the Aramaic translation of these chapters in TJon is “not necessarily contrary to halakhah, since the prohibitions did not apply to the written text of the Targum.”<sup>472</sup>

11 ויהוה לזמן סופה דשחא לעדן מפק מלכיא<sup>473</sup> ושלא דויד ית יואב וית עברוהי  
עמיה וית כל ישראל וחבילו ית בני עמון וצרו על רבה ודויד יתיב בירושלם:

11:1 *And around the end of the year, the time when the kings go forth, David sent Joab and his servants with him, and all Israel; and they did damage to the sons of Ammon, and besieged Rabbah. But David remained in Jerusalem.*

<sup>472</sup>So P.S. Alexander, “The Rabbinic Lists of Forbidden Targumim”, *JJS* 27 (1976), 177-91, esp. 187, referring to tMeg. 4:38 (3:38).

<sup>473</sup>“Kings”, according to the Qere, 1 Chron. 20:1, many Hebrew MSS, LXX, MSS of the Vetus Latina, Vg, Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 124-25, while MSS of Syr read the singular “king”. If there was any pun in this strange spelling of the word “kings”, hinting to the messengers presented in the subsequent verses, then TJon did not, or could not, preserve it; cf. G.A. Rendsburg, “Word Play in Biblical Hebrew: An Eclectic Collection”, in: S.B. Noegel (ed.), *Puns and Pundits: Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature*, Bethesda (MD) 2000, 137-62, esp. 157-58.

Apparently “the end of the year” must be understood as early spring, *i.e.* the final part of the preceding year that had started in Nisan.<sup>474</sup>

11 2 והוה לעדן רמשא וקם דויד מעל שיוייה והליך על אגר בית מלכא וחזא אחתא משחטפא מעל אנרא ואחתא שפירת<sup>475</sup> חיוו לחדא: 11 3 ושלח דויד ושאל באחתא ואמר הלא דא בת שבע בת אליעם אתת אוריה חתאה: 11 4 ושלח דויד אוגדין<sup>475</sup> ודברה<sup>475</sup> ואתת לותיה ושכיב עמה והיא מתרכיא מסאובתה וכתבת לביתה: 11 5 ועדיאת אחתא ושלחת וחויאת לדויד ואמרת מעדיא אנא: 11 6 ושלח דויד לות יואב שדר<sup>475</sup> לי ית אוריה חתאה ושדר<sup>476</sup> יואב ית אוריה<sup>476</sup> לות דויד: 11 7 ואתא אוריה לותיה ושאל דויד לשלם יואב ולשלם עמא ולשלם עבדי<sup>477</sup> קרבא:

11:2 And at the time of the evening, when David arose from his couch and walked upon the roof of the king's house, he saw from the roof a woman bathing; and the woman was very beautiful of appearance. 11:3 And David sent and inquired about the woman, and he said, “Is not this Bathsheba, the daughter of Eliam,<sup>478</sup> the wife of Uriah the Hittite?” 11:4 So David sent messengers to lead her; and she came to him, and he slept with her, while she had been purifying herself from her uncleanness. Then she returned to her house. 11:5 And the woman conceived; and she sent and told David, “I am pregnant.” 11:6 So David sent word to Joab, “Send me Uriah the Hittite.” And Joab sent Uriah to David. 11:7 When Uriah came to him, David inquired after the welfare of Joab, and the welfare of the people, and the welfare of the wagers of war.

The combination of “welfare” and “war” was probably considered impossible for the Targumists. Hence their standard solution of “wagers of war”.<sup>479</sup>

11 8 ואמר דויד לאוריה חות לביתך ושטוף רגלך ונפק אוריה מבית מלכא ונפקת בתרוהי סעודתא דמלכא:

11:8 Then David said to Uriah, “Go down to your house, and wash your feet.” And Uriah went out of the king's house, and there followed him the king's meal.

<sup>474</sup>So Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:129.

<sup>475</sup>Ms o reads שלח, in conformity with the Hebrew wording (>29).

<sup>476</sup>In the second Bomberg Bible, as well as in the Warsaw *Mikraoth Gedoloth* of 1862, the word חתאה, ‘the Hittite’, is added. Likewise in Syr. Cf. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 72; Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 11.

<sup>477</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>478</sup>TJon did not note that Eliam was the son of Ahithophel, who betrayed David, in contrast to Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 125.

<sup>479</sup>So Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 11.

While the Hebrew text declares that “a present went out after” Uriah, the Aramaic version renders “a meal”. TJon connected the present verse with Gen. 43:34, probably on the basis of David’s remark that Uriah had to wash his feet. In the verse in Genesis, the word is clearly used for a portion of the meal of Viceroy Joseph (cf. Mak. 19b).<sup>480</sup>

9 11 ושכיב אוריה בחרע בית מלכא עם כל<sup>481</sup> עבדי רבוניה ולא נחת לביתיה:  
 10 11 וחויאו לדויד למימר לא נחת אוריה לביתיה ואמר דויד לאוריה הלא מאורחא  
 את אחי מדין לא נחתא לביתך: 11 11 ואמר אוריה לדויד ארונא<sup>482</sup> וישראל ויהודה  
 יחבין במשליא ורבוניה יואב ועבדי רבוניה על אפי ברא<sup>483</sup> שרין ואנא איעול לבית  
 למיכל ולמשתי ולמשכב עם אחתי חיך<sup>484</sup> וחיי<sup>485</sup> נפשך אם אעביד ית<sup>484</sup> פתגמא הדין:  
 12 11 ואמר דויד לאוריה תיב הכא אף<sup>485</sup> יומא דין ומחר אשלחנך ויחיב אוריה  
 בירושלם ביומא ההוא וביומא דבחרוהי: 13 11 וקרא ליה דויד ואכל קדמוהי ושתי  
 ורוייה ונפק ברמשא למשכב בשוייה<sup>486</sup> עם עבדי רבוניה ולביתיה לא נחת: 14 11  
 והוה בצפרא וכתב דויד אגרתא לוח יואב ושדר<sup>487</sup> ביד אוריה: 15 11 וכתב באגרתא<sup>487</sup>  
 למימר הבו ית אוריה לקביל אפי קרבא תקיפא<sup>488</sup> ותחובון מבחרוהי ויתחמי וימות:  
 16 11 והוה כד צר יואב על קרתא ויחיב ית אוריה לאתרא רידע ארי גברין גברין<sup>489</sup>  
 תמן: 17 11 ונפקו אנשי קרתא ואגיוו קרבא עם יואב ואתקטל<sup>490</sup> מן עמא מעבדי  
 דויד ומית אף אוריה חתאה: 18 11 ושלה יואב וחוי לדויד ית כל עסקי קרבא:  
 19 11 ופקיד ית אונא<sup>491</sup> למימר כשיצויתך ית כל עסקי קרבא למלא עם מלכא:  
 20 11 ויהי אם ידלק רוגזא דמלכא וימר לך מדין אתקרבתון<sup>491</sup> לקרתא<sup>491</sup> לאנחא  
 הלא ידעתון ית דירמון עליהון מן שורא: 21 11 מן קטל ית אבימלך בר ירבשת<sup>492</sup>  
 הלא אתתא רמת עלוהי פלגות רכב רחי מן שורא ומית בחבץ למא אתקרבתון לשורא  
 ותימר אף עבדך אוריה חתאה<sup>493</sup> מית:

<sup>480</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:132 follows this exegesis and renders “some portions of the supper”.

<sup>481</sup>Omitted in MS w.

<sup>482</sup>MS o adds די, ‘of the LORD’, in conformity with the usual vocabulary (cf. e.g. 1 Sam. 3:3), although TJon rarely adds the divine name in the text; see above, Ch. 4, s.v. יי.

<sup>483</sup>MS w reads חקלא, ‘field’, the usual equivalent (>15).

<sup>484</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with some Hebrew MSS (cf. 11:25).

<sup>485</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>486</sup>MSS w y read במשכביה, ‘on his bed’, in conformity with the Hebrew wording (>29).

<sup>487</sup>MS a reads בספרא, in conformity with the Hebrew wording (>29), but Aramaic ספרא means “book” and not “letter”.

<sup>488</sup>Omitted in MS m.

<sup>489</sup>The usual equivalent of אישחיל is “a man fearing sins” (cf. 2 Sam. 23:20; 1 Kgs 1:42, 52; cf. also 1 Sam. 10:26), TJon chose here the usual equivalent of בןחיל (2 Sam. 2:7; 13:28; 17:10 bis) because of the co-text.

<sup>490</sup>MS a reads ונפל, ‘and there fell’, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>491</sup>MS a reads the Peal קריבתון, ‘your were near’.

<sup>492</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 12:11.

<sup>493</sup>Omitted in MS w.



11:9 But Uriah slept at the gate of the king's house with all the servants of his lord, and he did not go down to his own house. 11:10 When they told David, saying, "Uriah did not go down to his own house," David said to Uriah, "Have you not come from a journey? Why did you not go down to your house?" 11:11 Uriah said to David, "The ark, as well as Israel and Judah, dwell in booths, while my lord Joab and the servants of my lord are camping in the open field. Shall I then go to my house, to eat and to drink, and to lie with my wife? By your life, and the life of your soul, I will not do this thing." 11:12 Then David said to Uriah, "Remain here today also, and tomorrow I will let you depart." So Uriah remained in Jerusalem that day, and the next day. 11:13 And David called him, and he ate before him and drank, so that he made him drunk. And in the evening he went out to lie on his couch with the servants of his lord, but he did not go down to his own house. 11:14 In the morning David wrote a letter to Joab, and sent it by the hand of Uriah. 11:15 In the letter he wrote, saying, "Set Uriah opposite the hardest battle, and then draw back from him, that he may be struck down, and die." 11:16 And as Joab was besieging the city, he put Uriah in the place where he knew there were heroic men. 11:17 And the men of the city came out and waged war with Joab; and some of the people were killed, some of the servants of David. Uriah the Hittite also died. 11:18 Then Joab sent and told David all the affairs of the war. 11:19 And he commanded the messenger, "When you have finished telling all the affairs of the war to the king, 11:20 and if the king's anger rise and he says to you, 'Why did you draw yourselves so near the city to fight? Did you not know that they would throw things on you from the wall?' 11:21 Who killed Abimelech the son of Jerubbesheth? Did not a woman throw half of an upper millstone upon him from the wall, so that he died at Thebez? Why did you draw yourselves so near the wall?' then you shall say, 'Your servant Uriah the Hittite is dead also.'"

The mill (Hebrew רִיחִים, Aramaic רחיא) consisted of two stones. The lower millstone, which sat firmly on the floor, was called פֶּלֶחַ חַחֲתִית, 'lower disk' (Job 41:24) or, in Talmudic times, שֵׁכֶב, 'sleeper'. The upper millstone, which was removable, was called פֶּלֶחַ רֶכֶב, 'disk of a chariot' (Judg. 9:53 and this verse), or simply רֶכֶב (Deut. 24:6).<sup>494</sup> TJon divided the expression פֶּלֶחַ רֶכֶב as follows: Hebrew רֶכֶב רַחִים, 'upper stone of the mill' (so also Syr), while Hebrew פֶּלֶחַ was considered to denote merely a slice (a part) of that

<sup>494</sup>Cf. W. Bunte, *Kelim (Gefässe)* (Die Mischna; vi. Seder: Toharot; 1. Traktat: Kelim), Berlin & New York 1972, 454.

stone.<sup>495</sup> In order to render Hebrew פלח TJon chose a word with a similar sound, *viz.* פלגותא.<sup>496</sup>

22 11 ואזל אונגרא ואתא וחוי לדויד ית כל דשלחיה יואב: 23 11 ואמר אונגרא לדויד ארי תקיפו עלנא גבריא ונפקו עלנא לחקלא והוינא שרדין להון<sup>497</sup> עד מעלנא דתרעא: 24 11 ושדו<sup>498</sup> קשתיא בעבדך מעל שורא ואתקטלו<sup>499</sup> מעבדי מלכא ואף עבדך אוריה חתאה מית: 25 11 ואמר דויד לאונגרא וכוין<sup>500</sup> חומר ליואב לא יבאש בעינך ית<sup>501</sup> פתגמא הרין ארי כדן וכדן תקטול חרבא אתקיף קרבך על קרתא ופגרה ותקיפהי: 26 11 ושמעת אתת אוריה ארי מית אוריה בעלה וספדת על בעלה: 27 11 ועבר אבלא ושלח דויד וכנשה לביתיה והות ליה לאתו וילדת ליה בר ובאיש פתגמא רעבר דויד<sup>502</sup> קדם<sup>503</sup> יי:

*11:22 So the messenger went, and came and told David all that Joab had sent him for. 11:23 The messenger said to David, "The men were stronger than we were, and they came out against us in the field. But when we were driving them back to the entrance of the gate, 11:24 the archers shot at your servants from the wall. Some of the king's servants were killed; Uriah the Hittite is dead also. 11:25 David said to the messenger, "Thus shall you say to Joab, 'Let not this thing be evil in your sight, for the sword kills now one and now another. Strengthen your battle against the city, and destroy it.' And encourage him." 11:26 When the wife of Uriah heard that Uriah her husband was dead, she mourned over her husband. 11:27 And when the mourning was over, David sent and brought her to his house, and she became his wife,<sup>504</sup> and bore him a son. But the thing that David had done was evil before the LORD.*

<sup>495</sup> However, פלחא ארעיא is used for the lower millstone in Tg. Job 41:24.

<sup>496</sup> The same translation is given in TgJudg. 9:53, to which the present verse refers, as well as in Josephus, *Antiquities*, 5:252.

<sup>497</sup> Ms y erroneously reads לדויד, 'to David'.

<sup>498</sup> According to the Qere.

<sup>499</sup> Ms a reads ומיהו, 'and they died', in conformity with the Hebrew wording (>29).

<sup>500</sup> MSS c d o read כדנין, which is the word used in the phrase "Thus said the LORD".

<sup>501</sup> Omitted in MS f, because it precedes the subject of the verb.

<sup>502</sup> Omitted in MSS d f.

<sup>503</sup> MS f reads בעיני, 'in the sight of', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). This wording maintains the link between the present verse and 11:25, where David comforted Joab with the words "Let not this thing be evil in your sight"; cf. W. Brueggeman, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*, Minneapolis 1997, 608, n. 13.

<sup>504</sup> Literally: in marriage; see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 18:17.

## 6.14 The Bathsheba Affair II (2 Samuel 12)

This chapter was obviously no *haftara*, see the remarks at the beginning of 2 Samuel 11.

12 1 ושלח יוי ית נתן לוח דויד ואתא לוחיה<sup>505</sup> ואמר ליה תרין גברין הוו בקרתא<sup>◇</sup>  
 חדא חד עתירא וחד מסכינא: 12 2 לעתירא הוו ען וחורין סגי לחדא: 12 3 ולמסכינא  
 לית כל<sup>506</sup> מדעם אלהין אמרתא חדא זעירא דזבנה וקימה ורבת עמיה ועם בנוהי  
 כחדא מפתיה אכלא ומכסיה שתיא ובחניה<sup>507</sup> שכבא<sup>508</sup> והות ליה כברתא<sup>509</sup>: 12 4  
 ואתא ארחא<sup>510</sup> לגברא עתירא וחס למסב<sup>◇</sup> מעניה ומחוריה למעברד לארחא דאתא  
 ליה ונסיב<sup>◇</sup> ית אמרתא דגברא מסכינא ועברדה לגברא דאתא לחיה: 12 5 ותקיף  
 רגוא<sup>◇</sup> דדויד בגברא לחדא ואמר לתן קיים<sup>◇</sup> הוא יי ארי גבר חייב<sup>◇</sup> קטול גברא  
 דעברדה להדא<sup>511</sup>: 12 6 וית אמרתא ישלים על חד ארבעא<sup>512</sup> חלף דעברד ית פחנמא  
 הדין ועל דלא חס: 12 7 ואמר נתן לדויד את גברא כדנן<sup>◇</sup> אמר יי<sup>513</sup> אלהא<sup>◇</sup>  
 דישראל אנא משחתך למהוי מלכא<sup>◇</sup> על ישראל ואנא שזיבתך מידא דשאוול: 12 8  
 ויהיבית לך ית בית<sup>514</sup> רבונך<sup>◇</sup> וית נשי רבונך<sup>◇</sup> בחנך<sup>515</sup> ויהיבית לך ית בית ישראל

<sup>505</sup>Ms y omitted the words *לוחיה ואתא* by homoioarkton.

<sup>506</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>507</sup>Ms b o y read *ובחיקיה*, ‘and in his bosom’, in conformity with the Hebrew wording (>29).

<sup>508</sup>Note that the Aramaic version achieves assonance and rhyme by the use of participles.

<sup>509</sup>The word play between *בת*, ‘daughter’, and the name of Bathsheba is gone in the Aramaic version.

<sup>510</sup>The Hebrew text has three different terms for the traveller, the Aramaic version only two. The first two terms are equated with one and the same Aramaic word. This does not agree with the rabbinic explanation of the three different Hebrew words (cf. GenR. 22:6; Suk. 52b).

<sup>511</sup>Mss b o y simplify the last phrase, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29); MS b y read *דעברד דא*, ‘who has done this’, while MS o reads *הדא*.

<sup>512</sup>Mss b y read *ארבעין*, ‘forty times’. Most MSS of the LXX read “sevenfold”, creating a new word play on Bathsheba’s name (cf. P.W. Coxon, “A Note on ‘Bathsheba’ in 2 Samuel 12,1-6”, *Bib.* 62 (1981), 247-50, esp. 249), quoting a proverbial expression indicating that perfect restitution must be made (Prov. 6:31). Note, however, that “fourfold” is in accordance with the law on theft in Exod. 22:1 (cf. Lk. 19:8). David’s reaction indicates that the rich man had committed such a heinous offence that he deserved capital punishment, but “that because he has in fact committed no *crime*, the state cannot intervene, and so the injured party is left to sue for full compensation under the civil law”; cf. A. Phillips, “The Interpretation of 2 Samuel xii 5-6”, *VT* 16 (1966), 242-44, esp. 243.

<sup>513</sup>Ms o adds *אלהים*.

<sup>514</sup>Hebrew *בית*, as well as the subsequent *בית* before *ישראל*, might be a euphemism for “daughter”, as is explicitly stated in Syr (cf. a similar word play in Meg. 13a, where Hebrew *בית* is used to denote a wife). This euphemism is confirmed by the feminine plural at the end of the verse, *כדנה וכהנה*; cf. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 295. TJon integrates the entire circumlocution into the Aramaic translation.

<sup>515</sup>Ms f<sub>3</sub> provides us with three synonyms of *בחנך*, *viz.* *בחיבך*, *בעובך*, and *בעטפך*.

ויהודה ואם זעיר ואוסיף לך כאלין וכאלין: 9 12 מדין בסרחא על פתגמא<sup>516</sup> דייו<sup>517</sup> למעבר דביש קדמי<sup>518</sup> יה אוריה חתאה קטלחא בחרבא וית ארתיה נסיבתא<sup>519</sup> לך לאתו ויתיה קטלחא בחרבא דבני עמון: 10 12 וכען לא תפסוק<sup>519</sup> חרבא מן אנש<sup>520</sup> ביתך עד עלמא<sup>521</sup> חלף דאשיטתני ונסיבת<sup>521</sup> יה אחת אוריה חתאה<sup>521</sup> למהוי לך לאתו: 11 12 כדנך<sup>522</sup> אמר יוי<sup>522</sup> האנא מקים עלך בישא מביתך ואדבר<sup>523</sup> יה נשך לעינך ואחין לחברך וישכוב עם נשך לעיני שמשא הרא: 12 12 ארי את עברתא בסחרא ואנא אעביד יה פתגמא הרין קדם<sup>523</sup> כל ישראל וקרם<sup>523</sup> שמשא:

12:1 And the LORD sent Nathan to David. He came to him, and said to him, "There were two men in a certain town, the one rich and the other poor. 12:2 The rich man had very large flocks and herds. 12:3 But the poor man had nothing, except for one little ewe lamb, which he had bought. And he raised her and she grew up together with him and with his sons: it used to eat of his morsel, and used to drink from his cup, and used to lie in his bosom. It was like a daughter to him. 12:4 Now there came a traveller to the rich man, and he thought it a pity<sup>524</sup> that he should take one of his own flock or herd to prepare for the traveller who had come to him. So he took the poor man's lamb, and prepared it for the man who had come to him." 12:5 Then David's anger was very strong against the man, and he said to Nathan, "As the LORD is the existing One, the man who has done this to that person deserves to die. 12:6 And he shall restore the lamb fourfold, because he did this thing, and because he had no pity." 12:7 Then Nathan said to David, "You are the man! Thus said the LORD, the God of Israel, 'I anointed you to be king over Israel, and I rescued you from the hand of Saul, 12:8 and I gave you your lord's house, and your lord's wives into your bosom, and I gave you the House of Israel and Judah. And if this were too little, I would add to you as much more. 12:9 Why

<sup>516</sup> Absent in some MSS of the LXX and the Vetus Latina. Even if it was a secondary euphemism, the Aramaic version would never have omitted it, out of reverence for God (>23). Cf. C. McCarthy, *The Targum Sopherim and other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO, 36), Freiburg & Göttingen 1981, 204-206.

<sup>517</sup> Ms y erroneously reads הרין, resulting in "this word".

<sup>518</sup> According to the Qere. MSS a c d y read קדמויה, 'before Him', according to the Ketib, some Hebrew MSS and the Vg. MSS b f read יוי קדם, 'before the LORD', in conformity with some Hebrew MSS and Syr.

<sup>519</sup> Ms y reads a synonym תעדי, 'depart, leave'.

<sup>520</sup> Omitted in MS y, which only reads מביתך, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>521</sup> Omitted in MS y.

<sup>522</sup> Ms o again adds אלהים, cf. 12:7.

<sup>523</sup> Ms y reads וקביל, 'before'.

<sup>524</sup> Literally: he had pity. TJon maintains the correspondence between the man's pity in the present verse and the man's lack of pity in 12:6.

then have you despised the word of the LORD, to do what is evil before Me? You have killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword, and have taken his wife to be your wife.<sup>525</sup> And you have killed him with the sword of the sons of Ammon. 12:10 And now the sword shall never depart from the people of your house, because you have rejected Me, and have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife.<sup>526</sup> 12:11 Thus said the LORD, 'Behold, I will raise up evil against you out of your own house; and I will take your wives before your eyes, and give them to your neighbour, and he shall lie with your wives in the sight of this sun. 12:12 Because you did it secretly, I will do this thing before all Israel and before the sun.' ”

Right at the beginning of this verse, two manuscripts mention an additional punishment for David, referring to his own principle that he should restore the lamb fourfold (12:6).<sup>527</sup>

ולמא דאמרת ישלים על חד ארבע הכי תהוי ארבע נפשו יפקון מבנך בדיל נפשיה  
דאוריה רביא ואמנון ואבשלום ואדניה

*And why did you say, “He shall restore fourfold”? Thus you will be. Four lives will go forth from your sons, because of the life of Uriah: the boy, Ammon, Absalom, and Adoniah.*

This tosefta stresses the fourfold punishment of David with regard to Uriah's life. David was going to lose four of his sons. In Yom. 22b a similar reasoning is found, but it stresses that the punishment would come during David's lifetime, as God said in 12:11 (“before your eyes”). Since Adoniah died after David, Yom. 22b replaced him with Tamar and stated that four of David's children would be hit, not killed, viz. the boy, Ammon, Tamar, and Absalom.

12 13 ואמר דויד לנתן חבית קדם יי ואמר נתן לדויד אף יי אעבר חובך  
לא תמות: 12 14 ברם ארי מפתח פתחתא<sup>528</sup> פומא דסנאי עמא<sup>529</sup> דיין בפתנמא הדין  
אף<sup>529</sup> ברא דאתיליד לך ממת ימות:

12:13 David said to Nathan, “I am guilty before the LORD.” And Nathan said to David, “The LORD on his part<sup>530</sup> has put away your

<sup>525</sup>Literally: in marriage. See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 18:17.

<sup>526</sup>Literally: in marriage. See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 18:17.

<sup>527</sup>Attested in MS c and Codex Montefiori 7, collated in Kasher, תוספתא, 114. The latter MS introduced the addition with the word תוספתא. A similar addition is found at the end of verse 14 in MS S; see below.

<sup>528</sup>Mss a o add a nota accusativi.

<sup>529</sup>Omitted in MS S, because MS S adds the other three casualties in David's family at the end of the verse.

<sup>530</sup>Translation proposed by Driver, *Notes*, 292.

guilt; you shall not die. 12:14 Nevertheless, because by this thing you surely have opened the mouth of the enemies of the LORD's people, also the son that is born to you shall surely die.

Hebrew נָאֵץ נִצַּחַת אֲדָאִיבִי יְהוָה, 'you have utterly scorned the enemies of the LORD', must be understood as a euphemism for scorning the LORD. Similar expressions are found about the enemies of David in 1 Sam. 20:16 and 25:22. Many exegetes believe that the words אֲדָאִיבִי are a later insertion, softening the harsh utterance.<sup>531</sup> Other exegetes, who follow the rendering of TJon and Vg, explain the Piel of the verb נָאֵץ as causative and render: "you have caused the enemies of the LORD to blaspheme."<sup>532</sup>

In 1959 more information was offered by Yaron.<sup>533</sup> He agrees with the exegetes who call the phrase a euphemism, but denies that אֲדָאִיבִי is a later insertion, because this euphemism can also be found in other ancient texts. Yaron quotes a line from the Coptos Decree from the 13th Dynasty of Egypt (dated in the 18th century BCE) which uses the same kind of euphemism: 'His name shall not be remembered in his temple according as it is done toward one like him, who is hostile toward the enemies of his god.'<sup>534</sup> Yaron concludes that this euphemism was generally used and understood and that there is "no ground for objection to the genuineness of the expression."<sup>535</sup>

Yaron mentions the Targum in the beginning of his article. He states that Vg and TJon understood the Piel of the verb נָאֵץ as a

<sup>531</sup>See, e.g., A. Geiger, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judentums*, Breslau 1857, 267; Driver, *Notes* 292; H.P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC), Edinburgh 1899 (repr. 1969), 324-325; C. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO, 36), Freiburg & Göttingen 1981, 184-87; McCarter, *II Samuel*, 296; A. Caquot, Ph. de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT 6), Genève 1994, 480.

<sup>532</sup>Cf. H.W. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher* (ATD, 10), Göttingen <sup>5</sup>1973, 252; C.J. Goslinga, *Het tweede boek Samuël* (COT), Kampen 1962, 221; both referring to Ges.-K. § 52g, where it is asserted that the Piel can also have a causative sense.

<sup>533</sup>R. Yaron, "The Coptos Decree and 2 Sam XII 14", *VT* 9 (1959), 89-91; later confirmed by M. Anbar (Bernstein), "Un euphémisme <<biblique>> dans une lettre de Mari," *Orientalia* 48 (1979), 109-11, who reports the same phenomenon in a letter of Inib-šarrim to his father Zimri-Lim, the king of Mari (*ARM* II 113, 29-31); cf. W. Bacher, "Zu Ed. Königs neuestem Werke", *ZAW* 21 (1901), 318-26, esp. 319; M.J. Mulder, "Un euphémisme dans 2 Sam. XII 14?" *VT* 18 (1968), 108-14; H.J. Stoebe, *Das zweite Buch Samuelis* (KAT VIII.2), Gütersloh 1994, 299.

<sup>534</sup>Yaron, "The Coptos Decree and 2 Sam XII 14", 90.

<sup>535</sup>Yaron, "The Coptos Decree and 2 Sam XII 14", 91.

causative.<sup>536</sup> It is true that the translation of the Targum seems to be based upon a causative meaning of the Piel of the verb, but none of these exegetes take into account that the Targum—supposing it would have recognized the euphemism and realized that the words אָדָרְאִיכִי could be omitted—had to come up with another euphemism, for the translation that David had scorned the LORD, would have been too disrespectful.<sup>537</sup> Moreover, it is even unlikely that the Targum did not recognize it, considering the frequent use of this specific euphemism in Jewish writings of the first centuries CE.<sup>538</sup> TJon most probably recognized the euphemism and gratefully integrated it in its own euphemistic rendering.<sup>539</sup>

The Aramaic expression “to open one’s mouth” in TJon’s translation must be complemented with “to Satan”, as in Ber. 19a; 60a; Ket. 8b.<sup>540</sup> This expression is a description for uttering ominous words and thereby inviting disaster, because Satan might hear the words and realize them. Consequently, TJon’s translation actually consists of two euphemisms: (1) the Hebrew verb אָדָרְאִיכִי is not translated literally,<sup>541</sup> but replaced by the euphemism “to open one’s mouth” without a reference to satan; and (2) the original euphemism of the Hebrew text is incorporated into the Aramaic version.

The prediction of the boy’s death introduced by אָדָרְאִיכִי, ‘also’, gave rise to the addition of the following tosefta-targum at the end of the present verse in MS S (׃8):

<sup>536</sup> Yaron, “The Coptos Decree and 2 Sam XII 14”, 89. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 11 assumed that TJon had a different *Vorlage*.

<sup>537</sup> TJon maintained the euphemism in 1 Sam. 25:22. Furthermore, whenever God is the object of verbs like ‘scorn’, ‘forsake’, or ‘reject’, a euphemism is used in the form of ‘the Word of the LORD’ or ‘the service of the LORD’; cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 131-32. For example, in 1 Sam. 8:7-8 the expression “they have rejected Me from being king” is translated by “they have grown weary of my being king” and the expression “they have forsaken Me” is rendered “they have forsaken my service”. Such a euphemism is attested in the present verse in the Coptic version and in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, which read “you have scorned the word of the LORD”, cf. D. Barthélemy, “La qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel”, in: E. Tov, *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel* (1980 Proceedings IOSCS, Vienna), Jerusalem 1980, 1-44, esp. 5.

<sup>538</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Grammatik*, 109; C. McCarthy, *The Targum Sopherim and other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO, 36), Freiburg & Göttingen 1981, 177, n. 55.

<sup>539</sup> See above, Ch. 3, s.v. “euphemism”.

<sup>540</sup> Cf. McCarthy, *The Targum Sopherim*, 173.

<sup>541</sup> The usual translation of the verb is a Aphel form of Aramaic אָדָרְאִיכִי, ‘make angry’ (cf. Num. 14:11, 23; 16:30; Deut. 31:20; Isa. 52:5; 60:14; Jer. 23:17; 33:24), while אָדָרְאִיכִי, ‘reject’, is a good alternative (cf. Isa. 5:24; Jer. 14:21). In 1 Sam. 2:7 it is rendered by אָדָרְאִיכִי, ‘plunder’.

וכמה דאמרת על חד ארבע כן יהי לכ ארבע נפשן יפקון מבנך חלף נפש דאוריה רביא ואמנון ואבשלום ואדניה

*And just as you said "fourfold", thus it will be. Four lives will go forth from your sons, because of the life of Uriah: the boy, Amnon, Absalom, and Adoniah.*

The language of this tosefta-targum, as well as its form, is adapted to that of TJon (cf. the tosefta-targum to 12:12). Aramaic כן is used frequently, כה rarely occurs. The form of question and answer, typical for the Midrashic genre, is replaced by a normal sentence. Still, the basic information is exactly the same.

15 12 ואזל נתן לביתיה וחבר  $\diamond$  יוי ית רביא דילידת אתת אוריה לדויד ואטען: 12 15  
ובעא דויד רחמין מן קדם  $\diamond$  יוי על רביא וצם דויד צומא ועל ובת ושכיב על ארעא:  
17 12 וקמו סבי ביתיה עלוהי לאקמותיה מן ארעא ולא אבא ולא אכל עמהון<sup>542</sup>  
לחמא: 18 12 והוה ביומא שביעאה ומית רביא ורחילו עבדי<sup>543</sup> דויד לחואה ליה ארי  
מית רביא ארי אמרו הא<sup>544</sup> כד הוה רביא קיים מלילנא עמיה ולא קביל  $\diamond$  מננא  
ואיכרין נימר ליה מית רביא ויעביד בישא: 19 12 וחזא דויד ארי עברוהי מלחשין<sup>545</sup>  
וסבר דויד ארי מית רביא ואמר דויד לעברוהי מית<sup>546</sup> רביא ואמרו מית: 20 12 וקם  
דויד מארעא ומשא<sup>547</sup> ושף ושני כסותיה ועל לבית מקדשא  $\diamond$  דיוי וסגיד ואחא לביתיה  
ושאיל ושויוא ליה לחמא ואכל: 21 12 ואמרו עברוהי ליה מא פתגמא הדין דעברתא  
עד<sup>548</sup> דרביא קיים<sup>549</sup> צמתא ובכיתא וכד מית רביא קמתא ואכלתא לחמא: 22 12  
ואמר עד דרביא קיים צמית ובכיתא ארי אמרית מן ידע דלמא<sup>550</sup> יתרחם עלי מן  
קדם  $\diamond$  יוי ויחי רביא: 23 12 וכען מית למא דנן אנא צאים האכול לאתבותיה עוד  
אנא אזיל לוחיה והוא לא תאיב לוחי: 24 12 ונחם דויד ית בת שבע אתתיה ועל  
לותה<sup>551</sup> ושכיב עמה וילידת בר וקרית<sup>552</sup> ית שמה שלמה ויוי רחים ליה: 25 12

<sup>542</sup>Omitted in MS m.

<sup>543</sup>MS a reads אינשי, resulting in "the men of David".

<sup>544</sup>Omitted in MS b.

<sup>545</sup>MS w reads the Itpeel מתלחשין, 'they were whispering among each other'.

<sup>546</sup>Mss a d o y add the interrogative, reading הֲמִית, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). The other MSS do not read the interrogative, in conformity with some other Hebrew MSS. So, the note in the app.crit of the *BHS* must be: 19<sup>a</sup> 2 Mss מו cf T<sup>Mss</sup>.

<sup>547</sup>Mss b c d y erroneously read וּמִשָּׁח, 'and he anointed'. MS o reads וַאֲסָחִי, 'and he had a bath'.

<sup>548</sup>Interpretation of Hebrew בַּעֲבוּר, cf. also Syr with ܒܘܪ, based on 21:22 (>15).

<sup>549</sup>Omitted in MS eb66.

<sup>550</sup>A second rendering of the expression מי ידע.

<sup>551</sup>MS b has the reading וַעֲלֵת לוחיה, 'and she went in to him', probably meaning 'and she entered his room and he . . .', perhaps out of prudery.

<sup>552</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and Syr. MSS o w y read the masculine וּקְרָא, 'and he called', according to the Ketib.



ושלח ביד נתן נביא<sup>554</sup> וקרא ית שמייה ידידיה בעבור<sup>553</sup> יוי: 26 12 ואניה קרבא<sup>554</sup> יואב ברבת בני עמון וכבש ית קרית<sup>555</sup> מלכותא<sup>555</sup>: 27 12 ושלח יואב אזנרין<sup>554</sup> לות דויד ואמר אגחית<sup>556</sup> ברבה אף כבשית ית קרית<sup>557</sup> מלכותא<sup>557</sup>: 28 12 וכען כנוש ית שאר עמא ושרי על קרחא<sup>558</sup> וכבשה דלמא אכבוש אנא ית קרחא<sup>559</sup> ויתקרי שמי עלה: 29 12 וכנוש דויד ית כל עמא ואול לרבת ואניה קרבא בה וכבשה: 30 12 ונסיב<sup>558</sup> ית כלילא דמלכהון<sup>558</sup> מעל רישיה ומתקליה ככרא דרהבא וביה<sup>559</sup> אבנא טבא והוה על רישא דדויד ועדי<sup>558</sup> קרחא<sup>558</sup> אפיק סגי לחדא: 31 12 וית עמא דבה אפיק ומסר יתהון במסרין ובמורגי ברזלא ובמגורי ברזלא וגר<sup>560</sup> יתהון בשוקיא וכין יעביד לכל קרוי<sup>558</sup> בני עמון ותב דויד וכל עמא לירושלם:

12:15 Then Nathan went to his house, and the LORD struck the boy that Uriah's wife bore to David, and he became severely ill. 12:16 And David sought favour from before the LORD on behalf of the boy. David fasted, and he went in, and spent the night lying on the ground. 12:17 And the elders of his house stood beside him, to raise him from the ground; but he would not, nor did he eat bread with them. 12:18 On the seventh day the boy died. And the servants of David feared to tell him that the boy was dead, for they said, "Behold, while the boy was yet alive, we spoke with him, and he did not accept anything from us. How then can we say to him the child is dead? He may do something evil." 12:19 But when David saw that his servants were whispering, David perceived that the boy was dead. And David said to his servants, "The child is dead." And they said, "He is dead." 12:20 Then David arose from the ground, and washed, and anointed himself, and changed his clothes. He went into the sanctuary of the LORD, and bowed down. He then went to his own house, and when he asked, they set food before him, and he ate. 12:21 Then his servants said to him, "What is this thing you have done? As long as the boy was alive, you fasted and wept; but when the boy died, you arose and ate bread." 12:22 He said, "As long as the boy was alive, I fasted and

<sup>553</sup>Mss a b y read the more Aramaic בריל, 'on account of'.

<sup>554</sup>Omitted in MS y, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>555</sup>The last two words are represented in MS a by קרחא רמיא, 'city of water', in conformity with the ending of 12:27 (>15). Note, however, that all MSS of TJon render קריה מלכותא in 12:27 (>15).

<sup>556</sup>Mss a b c d f o y add קרבא, 'war', in conformity with the preceding and following verse (>15).

<sup>557</sup>In accordance with 21:26, as in some Hebrew MSS and Syr (>15).

<sup>558</sup>In conformity with the Masoretic vocalization, Vg, Syr and Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:161, while the most MSS of LXX vocalized it as Milcom (cf. 1 Kgs 11:5). Some MSS of LXX and Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 127 combine both vocalizations.

<sup>559</sup>In accordance with 1 Chron. 20:2; Syr and Vg.

<sup>560</sup>Mss c o read וגר, 'and he cut'. Thus a parallel with the first sentence is construed: David sawed them and he cut them in pieces.

wept, for I said, 'Who knows? Perhaps mercy will be shown over me from before the LORD, that the boy may live.' 12:23 And now he is dead. Why then should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he will not return to me." 12:24 Then David comforted his wife Bathsheba, and went in to her, and lay with her. And she bore a son, and she called his name Solomon. And the LORD loved him, 12:25 and sent a message by Nathan the prophet, and he called his name Jedidiah, by order<sup>561</sup> of the LORD. 12:26 Now Joab waged war in Rabbah of the sons of Ammon, and he subdued the royal city. 12:27 And Joab sent messengers to David, and said, "I have fought in Rabbah; moreover, I have subdued the royal city. 12:28 And now, gather the rest of the people together, and encamp against the city, and subdue it, lest I subdue the city, and my name be called over it." 12:29 So David gathered all the people together, and went to Rabbah, and fought in it, and subdued it. 12:30 And he took the crown of their king from his head—the weight of it was a talent of gold, and on it was a fine stone—and it was placed on David's head. And he brought the booty of the city, a very great amount. 12:31 And he brought forth the people who were in it, and sawed them with saws and iron picks and iron axes, and he dragged them through the streets. And thus he would do to all the cities of the sons of Ammon. Then David and all the people returned to Jerusalem.

When the final plundering of the city is described, exegetical problems begin. Should 12:31 be read as a cruel execution of the inhabitants of the capital city, as most of the ancient versions did<sup>562</sup> and a few exegetes do,<sup>563</sup> influenced by 1 Chron. 20:3? If this is true, the Ammonite people were killed with saws, picks, and axes. Or is 12:31 a description of severe forced labour, as other exegetes<sup>564</sup> and modern

<sup>561</sup>Following P.A.H. de Boer, "2 Samuel 12:25", in: W.C. van Unnik, A.S. van der Woude (eds), *Studia Biblica et Semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen . . . dedicata*, Wageningen 1966, 25-29, esp. 27. If this translation is correct, the ancient versions reading "by command of, by the word of" did not have a different *Vorlage*.

<sup>562</sup>TJon, LXX<sup>L</sup>, and Vg, with a paraphrastic rendering, by Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 127 with "that he sawed them and cut them into pieces with butchers' knives, as though they used to divide bricks from chaf and mud"; cf. also Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:161: "... tortured them and put them to death."

<sup>563</sup>C.F. Keil, *Die Bücher Samuels* (BC, 2), Leipzig <sup>2</sup>1875, 307-308; A. Schulz, *Die Bücher Samuel. Das zweite Buch Samuel*, Münster 1920, 138.

<sup>564</sup>H.P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC), Edinburgh 1899, repr. 1969, 327; Driver, *Notes*, 296; H.W. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher* (ATD, 10), Göttingen <sup>5</sup>1973, 261; C.J. Goslinga, *Het tweede boek Samuë* (COT), Kampen 1962, 229; A. Caquot, Ph. de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT 6), Genève 1994, 489.

translations<sup>565</sup> believe?<sup>566</sup> If so, the verb שׂים with the preposition ב is explained as 'to set to labour' as in 1 Sam. 8:11.

In 1962 a different solution was offered by G.C. O'Ceallaigh.<sup>567</sup> He suggests to vocalize במגרה as the Piel infinitive of the verb מגר, 'to tear down,' preceded by the preposition ב and followed by a suffix 3 f.sg. The suffix is referring to the city, just as the suffix of בה. The phrase should be rendered, 'And the people who were in it, he brought out and set [them] at tearing it down, even with iron crows and iron mattocks ...'<sup>568</sup>

O'Ceallaigh is right in referring to the Targum as one of the versions that interpret the deeds of David as a cruel execution of the Ammonite people.<sup>569</sup> The Targum even replaces the phrase במלכּם אחרם by a more usual punishment in Roman times: "he dragged them through the streets." This was a Roman punishment for heavy criminals.<sup>570</sup> He also rightly states that all ancient versions follow the Qere מלכּן.<sup>571</sup>

Furthermore, the suggestion that the use of the same word מלכּן in Nah. 3:14 in connection with the phrase 'go into the clay' led to the translation of 'through the streets', is valuable.<sup>572</sup>

<sup>565</sup> E.g. NEB, REB, New Jerusalem Bible, RSV, and NIV.

<sup>566</sup> Since none of the ancient versions denied the possibility of a cruel execution, the conclusion that these exegetes and translators cannot accept this execution because of their modern way of thinking about war and war prisoners, presents itself. "Certainly, if we could honestly relieve David of the act of cruelty, which the Hebrew text here appears to attribute to him, we should be glad to do so: no doubt, it may be shewn to be in harmony with the manners of the age (Am. 1,3 of the Syrians of Damascus), but it is alien to all that we know of the personal character and temper of David"; cf. Driver, *Notes*, 296. However, the place of the object in the following clause, seems to show that "them" is not the implied object in the present clause. Then it must be the city itself that David is ripping up; cf. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 311.

<sup>567</sup> G.C. O'Ceallaigh, "And so David did to all the cities of Amnon", *VT* 12 (1962), 179-89. M.J. Mulder, *Kanaänitische goden in het Oude Testament* (Exegetica, 4), The Hague 1965, 57-64 and 70 thought this solution somewhat dubious.

<sup>568</sup> O'Ceallaigh, "And so David did to all the cities of Amnon", 184. Cf. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 310 who also considers the city to be the object of the verb וישם and renders, 'and ripped [it] with saws ...'

<sup>569</sup> Note that Aramaic מלכּן is both the translation of Hebrew שׂים in 2 Sam. 12:31 (cf. the same equivalence in 1 Sam. 19:5; 28:21), and the translation of Hebrew שׂר in 2 Chron. 20:3.

<sup>570</sup> Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 68.

<sup>571</sup> O'Ceallaigh, "And so David did to all the cities of Amnon", 183.

<sup>572</sup> A. Caquot, Ph. de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT 6), Genève 1994, 489. Cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 12 who assumed that TJon considered מלכּן a *pars pro toto* for "street" (>14).

## 6.15 Amnon and Tamar (2 Samuel 13)

Although the chapter of Amnon was not allowed to be read and translated according to mMeg. 4:10, TJon provides us with a translation (see above, introduction to 2 Sam. 11).

13 1 והיה בתר כין ולאבשלום בר דויד אחתא<sup>573</sup> שפירתא ושמה תמר ורחמה אמנון בר דויד: 13 2 ועקת לאמנון לאתמרעא בדיל תמר אחתיה ארי בתולתא היא והיה מכסא<sup>574</sup> בעיני אמנון למעבד לה מדעם: 13 3 ולאמנון שושבינא ושמה יונדב בר שמעה אחוהי דדויד ויונדב גבר חכים לחדא:

13:1 And afterwards Absalom, David's son, had a beautiful sister, whose name was Tamar. And Amnon, David's son, loved her. 13:2 And it so distressed Amnon that he made himself ill because of his sister Tamar, for she was a virgin, and it was concealed in the sight of Amnon what to do. 13:3 But Amnon had a close friend, whose name was Jonadab, the son of Shimeah, David's brother; and Jonadab was a very wise man.

TJon does not equate Hebrew רע with the neutral חכרא. It introduces the specific term שושבינא, which is the technical term for the best man, who is the friend of the groom and the one who leads the bride to him. This comradeship involves some mutual financial obligations.<sup>575</sup> Furthermore, Aramaic שושבינא is used as the technical term for the "friend of the king" (2 Sam. 15:36; 16:16; 1 Kgs 4:5). In this case, too, TJon does not give a neutral equivalent, but seems to consider the term "friend" as a more specific title or function.<sup>576</sup>

13 4 ואמר ליה מדין את כדין חשוך בר מלכא בצפר בצפר הלא תחוי לי ואמר ליה אמנון ית תמר אחתיה דאבשלום אחי אנא רחים: 13 5 ואמר ליה יהונדב שכוּב על שיויך ואתמרע וייתי אבוך למחוזך ותימר ליה תיתי כען תמר אחתי ותוכילני לחמא וזעביד לעיני<sup>577</sup> סעודתא בדיל דאחוי ואיכול מן ידה: 13 6 ושכיב אמנון ואתמרע

<sup>573</sup>Ms w erroneously reads אחתא, 'wife'.

<sup>574</sup>It may be that Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:163 took מכסא as referring to Tamar, for he assumed that Tamar was closely guarded; cf. H. St. John Thackeray, R. Marcus, *Josephus*, Vol. 5: Jewish Antiquities, Books V-VIII (LCL, 281), Cambridge (MA) 1988, 448, n. b.

<sup>575</sup>Cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. שושבינא.

<sup>576</sup>Cf. R. de Vaux, "Titres et Fonctionnaires Égyptiens à la cour de David et de Salomon", *RB* 48 (1939), 394-405, esp. 404-405, who draws parallels with the usage of this title in Egypt; T.N.D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy* (CB.OT, 5), Lund 1971, 63-69. The title was even used at the courts of the Ptolemies and Seleucidae; cf. Driver, *Notes*, 317-18, who refers to 1 Macc. 10:16, 19-20, etc.

<sup>577</sup>Ms a reads קרמי, 'before me' (>13).

ואתא מלכא למחזייה ואמר אמנון למלכא תיתי כען תמר אחתי ותחלוט לעיני תרתין חלישתא ואיכול מן ידה:

13:4 And he said, "Why are you so miserable morning after morning, O son of the king? Will you not tell me?" Amnon said to him, "Tamar, the sister of my brother Absalom—I love her." 13:5 And Jonadab said to him, "Lie down on your couch, and pretend to be ill. And when your father comes to see you, say to him, 'Let my sister Tamar come and give me bread to eat, and prepare the meal in my sight, that I may see it, and eat it from her hand.'" 13:6 So Amnon lay down, and pretended to be ill. And when the king came to see him, Amnon said to the king, "Let my sister Tamar come now and mix two dumplings in my sight, that I may eat from her hand."

Amnon asked for לבבה, apparently a dish made of dough that was kneaded and boiled. It must, therefore, have been some kind of dumpling or pudding.<sup>578</sup> TJon rendered it by חלישתא, a word for liquid food or food made of liquid batter.<sup>579</sup> The Aramaic version stresses the severity of Amnon's illness by having him ask for boiled, liquid food.<sup>580</sup>

Hebrew לבבה also has an erotic connotation. It is connected with the denominative verb לבב, 'to refresh, to give strength', which is to be expected of food for the sick. But the same verb has an erotic sense in its occurrences in Cant. 4:9, where it means "arouse, excite".<sup>581</sup> Therefore, Amnon already anticipated more than just the restoration of his health in the question to his father.<sup>582</sup> This erotic connotation is completely lost in the Aramaic version.

7 13 ושלה דויד לות תמר לביתא למימר איזילי כען לות<sup>583</sup> אמנון אחויך ועיבדי ליה סעודתא: 8 13 ואולת תמר לבית אמנון אחוהא והוא שכיב ונסיבת ♦ ית לישא ולשת וחלשת לעינהוי ובשילה ית חלישתא: 9 13 ונסיבת ♦ ית מסריתא ואריקת קדמוהי ולא אבא<sup>584</sup> למיכל ואמר אמנון אפיקו כל אנש מעלי ונפקו<sup>585</sup> כל אנש מעלוהי:

<sup>578</sup> McCarter, *II Samuel*, 322.

<sup>579</sup> Note that also the name of the pan, מסרה, affirms the quality of the food, cf. To Lev. 2:5.

<sup>580</sup> It might even refer to a fatal illness, as in EkhaR. 5:15, "Just as the one who comes into the world is nourished with liquid food, so the one who goes is nourished with liquid food." Cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. חלישא.

<sup>581</sup> M.H. Pope, *Song of Songs: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 7C), Garden City 1977, 478-80.

<sup>582</sup> Cf. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 322.

<sup>583</sup> Mss a b c d m o w eb66 read לבית; MS f reads ביה, both in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>584</sup> Usual translation, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 8:19. It also enhances the structure of the chapter, since לא אבה is used thrice (13:14, 16, 25).

<sup>585</sup> Mss b f read the Aphel ונפיקו, in accordance with the preceding verb, resulting in "they brought out".

10 13 ואמר אמנון לתמר אעלי סעודתא לאדרון בית משכבא<sup>586</sup> ואסעד<sup>587</sup> מן ידיך ונסיבת<sup>◇</sup> תמר ית חלישתא דעברת ואעילת לאמנון אחוהא לאדרון בית משכבא: 11 13 וקריבת ליה<sup>588</sup> ולא אבא<sup>589</sup> למיכל ואתקיף בה ואמר לה עולי שכובי עמי אחתי: 12 13 ואמרת ליה בבעו אחי לא תעניני ארי לא תתעביד כין בישראל לא תעביד ית קלנא<sup>590</sup> הדין: 13 13 ואנא לאן אוביל ית חסדאי ואת תחי כחד מן שטיא<sup>591</sup> בישראל וכען מליל כען עם מלכא ארי לא ימנעני מנך: 14 13 ולא אבא לקבלא<sup>◇</sup> מנה ותקיף<sup>592</sup> מנה וענייה ושכיב עמה: 15 13 וסנה אמנון סנאתא רבתא<sup>593</sup> לחדא ארי סגיא סנאתא דסנה מרחמתא דרחמה ואמר לה אמנון קומי איזילי: 16 13 ואמרת ליה על עיסק בשתא רבתא הדא מבחר<sup>594</sup> דעברת עמי את אמר<sup>595</sup> לשלחותי ולא אבא לקבלא<sup>◇</sup> מנה: 17 13 וקרא ית עולימיה משמשניה ואמר שלחו כען ית דא מלותי לברא ואנוף<sup>596</sup> דשא בהרהא: 18 13 ועלה כחונא דפסי ארי כין לבשן בנת מלכא בתולהא כרושין ואפיך יתה משומשניה לברא ואנף דשא בתרהא: 19 13 ונסיבת<sup>◇</sup> תמר קשמא על רישה וכחונא דפסי דעלה בזעת ושויתא ידה על רישה ואולא מיזל<sup>597</sup> וצוחא:

*13:7 Then David sent home to Tamar, saying, "Go to your brother Amnon, and prepare a meal for him." 13:8 So Tamar went to her brother Amnon's house, where he was lying down. And she took dough, and kneaded it, and mixed it in his sight, and cooked the dumplings. 13:9 And she took the pan and poured it out before him, but he would*

<sup>586</sup>This expansive rendering of a sleeping room is the standard translation, cf. also TJon Judg. 3:24; 15:1; 16:9, 12; 2 Sam. 4:7; 1 Kgs 1:15; 2 Kgs 6:12; 11:2.

<sup>587</sup>MSS a b c d f m o w y read ואיכול 'and I will eat', which is the more usual verb for eating. The usage of ואסעד, however, is affected by its connection with סעודתא, reflecting the Hebrew connection between ואברה and הבריה (>30).

<sup>588</sup>MS m reads the more reverential לקרמוי 'before him'; MS f reads קרמוי.

<sup>589</sup>The words ולא אבא are omitted in MSS b c d o w y, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). The addition of these words enhances the structure of the chapter, since the words לא אבא are now used five times (cf. 13:9, 11, 14, 16, 25).

<sup>590</sup>Only in sexual offences, cf. TO Gen. 34:7; Deut. 22:21; TJon Judg. 19:23; 20:10; Jer. 29:23. Otherwise Hebrew נבלה is described as "not fitting" (TgJosh. 7:15); "stupidity" (TJon 1 Sam. 25:25); "lie" (TgIsa. 9:16); "evil" (TgIsa. 32:6). Cf. also A. Phillips, "NEBALAH—a Term for Serious Disorderly and Unruly Conduct", VT 25 (1975), 237-42.

<sup>591</sup>The link between Amnon's deed of נבלה and his future existence of one of the נבלים could not be integrated in the Aramaic version; cf. 1 Sam. 25:25.

<sup>592</sup>MS c reads the Aphel ואתקיף 'and he took hold', as in 13:11 (>15).

<sup>593</sup>MS d reads חקיפא 'strong', which might be a reminiscence of the preceding verbs (13:11, 14).

<sup>594</sup>MSS b d o y read מאוחרנא 'more than the other [deed]'; MS c read מאוחרנא; in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). For the two evil deeds of Amnon, see Deut. 22:28.

<sup>595</sup>The words את אמר are omitted in MS a, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>596</sup>MS d adds the nota accusativi.

<sup>597</sup>See commentary on 1 Sam. 6:12.

not eat. And Amnon said, "Send out every one from me." So every one went out from him. 13:10 Then Amnon said to Tamar, "Bring me the meal into the sleeping room, that I may eat the meal from your hand." And Tamar took the dumplings she had made, and brought them to her brother Amnon, into the sleeping quarters. 13:11 But when she brought them near him, he would not eat. He took hold of her, and said to her, "Come, sleep with me, my sister." 13:12 But she said to him, "Please, my brother, do not violate me, for such a thing is not done in Israel. Do not conduct yourself shamefully. 13:13 As for me, where could I carry my shame? As for you, you would be as one of the fools in Israel. And now, speak now with the king, for he will not withhold me from you." 13:14 And he would not accept from her, and since he was stronger than her, he violated her and slept with her. 13:15 Then Amnon hated her with a very great hatred, for the hatred with which he hated her was greater than the love with which he had loved her. And Amnon said to her, "Arise and go." 13:16 And she said to him, "As for the matter of this very evil deed, more than what you did to me—[how dare] you say to send me away?" But he would not accept from her. 13:17 He called his young man who served him, and said, "Send this one outside, out of my presence, and bolt the door after her." 13:18 And she was wearing a tunic<sup>598</sup> down to the soles, because thus the virgin daughters of the king used to wear sleeved tunics. So his servant brought her out, and bolted the door after her. 13:19 And Tamar put ashes on her head, and tore the tunic which she wore; and she laid her hand on her head, and went away, crying aloud as she went.

Although the usual mourning rite is to throw dust upon one's head (Hebrew אדמה), in the present verse the word אפר, 'soil, ashes', is used. TJon did not harmonize it with the usual expression (cf. 1 Sam. 4:12; 2 Sam. 1:2; 15:32), but translated it literally, by using the Aramaic word for ashes.<sup>599</sup>

20 ואמר לה אבשלום אחוהא האמינן אחוך הוה עמיד וכען אחתי שתוקי אחוך הוא לא תשרין ית לביך לפחנמא הדין ויתיבת תמר ושתקא<sup>600</sup> בית אבשלום אחוהא: 21 ומלכא הויד שמע ית כל פתגמיא האלין ותקיף ליה לחדא: 22 ולא מליל אבשלום עם אמנון<sup>601</sup> למביש ועד טב ארי סני אבשלום ית אמנון על עיסק דעני ית

<sup>598</sup> A long robe with sleeves; cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. כחונג. The Greek versions also assume long sleeved robes, cf. Driver, *Notes*, 299. Likewise Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:171, "long-sleeved tunics reaching to the ankle, in order not to be exposed".

<sup>599</sup> Cf. Smolar, *Aberbach, Targum Jonathan*, 60.

<sup>600</sup> Only in MS p. MSS a b c d f m o w y read וצדיא, 'desolated', which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>601</sup> Part of the Hebrew text of this verse is repeated in the Aramaic version of

תמר אחתיה: 13 23 והיה לזמן<sup>602</sup> תרחין שנין והוּו גזוּוין לאבשלום במישר ◊ חצור דעם בית<sup>603</sup> ◊ אפרים וזמין אבשלום לכל בני מלכא: 13 24 ואתא אבשלום לות מלכא ואמר הא כען גזוּוין לעבדך ייזיל כען מלכא ועבדוהי עם עבדך: 13 25 ואמר מלכא לאבשלום לא ברי לא כען ניזיל כלנא ולא ניתקף עלך ואתקיף<sup>604</sup> ביה ולא אבא למיזל וברכיה: 13 26 ואמר אבשלום ולא<sup>605</sup> ייזיל כען עמנא אמנן<sup>606</sup> אחי ואמר ליה מלכא<sup>607</sup> למא ייזיל עמך: 13 27 ואתקיף<sup>608</sup> ביה אבשלום ושלח עמיה ית אמנן וית<sup>609</sup> כל בני מלכא: 13 28 ופקיד אבשלום ית עולימוהי למימר חוּו כען כד ישפר ◊ לבא דאמנן בחמרא ואימר לכון קטלו ית אמנן ותקטלון יתיה לא תרחלון הלא ארי<sup>610</sup> אנא פקידית יתכון תקפו<sup>611</sup> והוּו לגברין גברין<sup>612</sup>: 13 29 ועבדו עולימי אבשלום לאמנן כמא דפקיד אבשלום וקמו כל בני מלכא ורכבו גבר<sup>613</sup> על כודנתיה ואפכו: 13 30 והוּו עד דאנן באורחא ושמועתא אתת לות דויד למימר קטל אבשלום ית כל<sup>614</sup> בני מלכא ולא אשתאר מנהון חד: 13 31 וקם מלכא ובוּע ית לבושוהי ושכיב על ארעא וכל עבדוהי מעהדין<sup>615</sup> כד מבועין לבושיהון<sup>616</sup>: 13 32 ואחיב יונדב בר שמעה אחוהי דדויד ואמר לא יימר רבוני<sup>617</sup> ית כל עולימיא<sup>618</sup> קטלו<sup>619</sup> אלהין<sup>620</sup> אמנן בלחודוהי מית ארי בלכא דאבשלום הוּו כמינא מיומא דעני ית תמר אחתיה:

13:20 *And her brother Absalom said to her, "Has Amnon your brother been with you? And now, my sister, be quiet. He is your brother. Do not take this thing to heart." So Tamar dwelt silently in Absalom's house. 13:21 When King David heard of all these things, he was very*

MS eb1.

<sup>602</sup>Translation of the pleonastic ימים.

<sup>603</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>604</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 28:23.

<sup>605</sup>MS f<sub>3</sub> suggests בכעו, 'please'; MS c<sub>1</sub> reads ואלו, 'if it would be'. Both readings are a free interpretation of Hebrew וילא; cf. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 30.

<sup>606</sup>Omitted in MS y.

<sup>607</sup>The words ליה מלכא are omitted in MS m.

<sup>608</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 28:23.

<sup>609</sup>MS y omits the nota accusativi, reading only וכל.

<sup>610</sup>Omitted in MSS m o.

<sup>611</sup>Mss a b c d f m o y read the Ithaphal אצקפי, 'strengthen yourselves'.

<sup>612</sup>For this rendering of Hebrew בן־חיל, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 14:52.

<sup>613</sup>Mss b y read אנש.

<sup>614</sup>Omitted in MS m.

<sup>615</sup>MS f reads the Ithpaal מתעהדין, 'taking their stand'. MS a reads עילוהי, 'standing by him'.

<sup>616</sup>Including a suffix 3rd m.pl., as in the Qumranic text and in most ancient version.

<sup>617</sup>MS o reads מלכא, 'king'.

<sup>618</sup>Mss a b c d f m o w y eb1 add בני מלכא, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>619</sup>Mss f m read the passive perfect קטילו, 'they were killed', in accordance with some Hebrew MSS, Syr, Vg, and one MS of LXX.

<sup>620</sup>Mss b f y read ארי, 'because'.



angry. 13:22 But Absalom spoke to Amnon neither good nor bad, for Absalom hated Amnon, because he had violated his sister Tamar. 13:23 And at the end of two years Absalom had sheepshearers in the Valley of Hazor, which is near the House of Ephraim, and Absalom invited all the king's sons. 13:24 And Absalom came to the king, and said, "Behold, your servant has sheepshearers; let the king and his servants go with your servant." 13:25 But the king said to Absalom, "No, my son, let us not all go, lest we be burdensome to you." He seized him, but he would not go but gave him his blessing. 13:26 Then Absalom said, "If not, let my brother Amnon now go with us." And the king said to him, "Why should he go with you?" 13:27 But Absalom seized him, so he sent Amnon and all the king's sons with him. 13:28 Then Absalom commanded his young men, "Mark when Amnon's heart is pleasant with wine. And when I say to you, 'Kill Amnon,' then you shall kill him. Fear not, for I commanded you. Be strong and be heroic men." 13:29 So the servants of Absalom did to Amnon as Absalom had commanded. Then all the king's sons arose, and each mounted his mule, and they retreated. 13:30 And while they were on the way, the tidings came to David, "Absalom has killed all the king's sons, and not one of them is left." 13:31 Then the king arose, and tore his clothes, and lay on the ground, while all his servants were standing by with their clothes torn. 13:32 But Jonadab the son of Shimeah, David's brother, said, "Let not my lord say that they have killed all the young men, for Amnon alone is dead, because this was lying hidden in the heart of Absalom from the day he violated his sister Tamar.

TJon repeatedly uses the verb כמן to denote the plotting of evil against another person.<sup>621</sup> The neutral Hebrew verb שים is also explained as "lying in wait" and therefore given a negative equivalent.

13 33 וכען לא ישוי רבוניו  $\diamond$  מלכא על לביה פתגמא למימר כל בני מלכא אתקשלו<sup>622</sup> אלהין<sup>623</sup> אמנון בלחודויה מית: 13 34 וערק  $\diamond$  אבשלום וחקק<sup>624</sup> עולימא סכואה ית עינויה<sup>625</sup> וחזא והא עם סגי אתן<sup>626</sup> מאורח מאחורויה מסטר שורא: 13 35 ואמר יונדב למלכא הא בני מלכא אתו כפתגמא דעברך כין הוה: 13 36 והוה כשיציותיה

<sup>621</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 24:10.

<sup>622</sup>Mss b y read מירו, 'they died', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>623</sup>In conformity with the Hebrew text, but not with the list of words written but not read in Soferim 38a.

<sup>624</sup>Literal translation of Hebrew נשא, with the same meaning; cf. S.C. Reif, "A Root to Look up? A Study of the Hebrew NS' 'YN'", in: J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (VT.S, 36), Leiden 1985, 230-44.

<sup>625</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions. MS eb1 reads the singular עיניה, 'his eye', in conformity to the Ketib.

<sup>626</sup>MS f reads the perfect ארו, as in 13:35; MS c reads the singular ארא (>9).

למללא והא בני מלכא אתו וארימו קלהון ובכו ואף מלכא וכל<sup>627</sup> עבדוהי בכו בכיאה סניאה לחדא: 37 13 ואבשלום ערק ואול<sup>628</sup> לות תלמי בר עמיהור<sup>629</sup> מלכא דגשור ואחאבל<sup>630</sup> על בריה כל יומיא<sup>631</sup>: 38 13 ואבשלום ערק ואול לגשור והוה תמן תלת שנין: 39 13 וחמידה נפשא דרויד מלכא למפק על אבשלום ארי אתנחם על אמנון ארי מיה:

*13:33 And now, let not my lord the king take the matter to heart as to say that all the king's sons are killed, for Amnon alone is dead." 13:34 And Absalom fled. When the young man who kept the watch lifted up his eyes, and looked, behold, many people were coming from the road behind him, by the side of the mountain. 31:35 And Jonadab said to the king, "Behold, the king's sons have come. As your servant said, so it has come about." 13:36 And as soon as he had finished speaking, behold, the king's sons came, and lifted up their voice, and wept; and the king also and all his servants wept very bitterly. 14:37 But Absalom had fled. He went to Talmi the son of Ammihud, king of Geshur.<sup>632</sup> And David mourned for his son all the days. 13:38 So Absalom had fled, and was gone to Geshur. He was there three years. 13:39 And the soul of David the king longed to go forth against Absalom, for he was comforted about the fact that Amnon was dead.*

Hebrew וחכל is vocalized as a Peal from כלה, 'be weak, long for',<sup>633</sup> and complemented with the usual נפש, because the verb is feminine.<sup>634</sup> The tenor of the Hebrew verse is unclear: was it David's wish to fight against Absalom or to be reconciled with him. TJon took the decision for the first possibility by using the preposition על, 'against'.<sup>635</sup> This is probably triggered by the verb "go forth", often used for armies; by the preposition על in 14:1; and by the story of the woman from Tekoa, who spoke about the pursuit of her second son after the death of the first son (14:7).

<sup>627</sup> Added in the margin of MS eb1.

<sup>628</sup> Omitted in MS b.

<sup>629</sup> According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and most of the other ancient versions.

<sup>630</sup> In contrast to other versions TJon did not add "king" or "David".

<sup>631</sup> The words כל יומיא are replaced with יומין סניאין, 'many days', in MS o, as in some Hebrew MSS, MSS of the Vetus Latina and Vg, and in LXX, but cf. 14:2. Note that the app.crit. of BHS<sup>3</sup> is not complete on this spot.

<sup>632</sup> Talmi was Absalom's grandfather; cf. 2 Sam. 3:3.

<sup>633</sup> And not as a Piel, which would mean "end, fulfil" (>3), as did LXX. Vg renders *cessavit*, 'he hesitated'.

<sup>634</sup> Also added in some MSS of LXX, based on the expression in e.g. Ps. 84:3, כלזה, נפש, 'my soul longed'; cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 12.

<sup>635</sup> Cf. Vg that used the verb *persequi*, 'to pursue'. Syr is also negative in rendering the prepositions ܐܠܘܐ or ܐܠܘܐ.

## 6.16 Absalom's Return (2 Samuel 14)

14 1 וידע יואב בר צרויה ארי בלבא דמלכא למפק על אבשלום: 2 14 ושלח יואב לחקוע דובר<sup>636</sup> מחמן אחתא חכימתא ואמר לה אחאבלי כען ולבשי כען לבושי<sup>637</sup> אבלא ולא תשוּפין משחא ותהן כאתחא דנן יומין סגיאין מתאבלא על מיחא<sup>638</sup>: 3 14 ותהכין לות מלכא ותמללין עמיה כפתגמא הדין ושוּי יואב ית פתגמיה בפומה: 4 14 ואמרת<sup>639</sup> אחתא דמתקוע<sup>640</sup> למלכא ונפלת על אפהא על ארעא וסגידת ואמרת פרוק מלכא: 5 14 ואמר לה מלכא מא ליך ואמרת בקשטא<sup>641</sup> אחתא ארמלתא אנא ומית בעלי: 6 14 ולאמתך<sup>642</sup> תרין בנין ואתנצייא<sup>642</sup> תרויהון בחקלא ולית דמשוייב בניהון ומחא<sup>643</sup> חד ית חד וקטל יתיה: 7 14 והא קמת כל זרעיתא<sup>644</sup> על אמתך<sup>644</sup> ואמרו הבי<sup>645</sup> ית דקטל אחוהי ונקטלניה בחובת<sup>645</sup> נפשא דאחוהי דקטל ונשיצי אף ית ירתא ובען למקטל ית<sup>646</sup> חד יחירי דאשתאר בריל דלא לשואה לבעלי שום ושאר על אפי ארעא:

*14:1 And Joab the son of Zeruiah perceived that it was in the king's heart to go forth against Absalom. 14:2 And Joab sent to Tekoa, and took from there a wise woman, and said to her, "Pretend to be mourning, and put on mourning garments. Do not anoint yourself with oil, but behave like a woman who has been mourning many days for a dead one. 14:3 And you shall go to the king and speak with him according to these words." So Joab put the words in her mouth. 14:4 When the woman, who was of Tekoa, said<sup>647</sup> to the king, she fell on her face to the ground, and bowed down, and said, "Save, O king." 14:5 And the king said to her, "What is your trouble?" She answered, "In truth, I am a widowed woman; my husband is dead. 14:6 And your handmaid had two sons, and the two of them quarrelled in the field. Since there was no one to save them from each other, the one struck the other and killed him. 14:7 And behold, the whole family has risen against your handmaid, and they said, 'Give up the one who killed his brother,*

<sup>636</sup>Mss b y read ונסיב, usually used for animals and things.

<sup>637</sup>The words כען לבושי are omitted by MS w by haplography.

<sup>638</sup>Ms kb15 reads מוּחא, 'death'.

<sup>639</sup>Mss a f w and Kimḥi read ואתחא, 'and she came', in conformity with many Hebrew MSS, LXX, Syr and Vg. It is a more suitable reading.

<sup>640</sup>Omitted in MS c.

<sup>641</sup>Ms o reads ברם, 'however, but'.

<sup>642</sup>Ms eb1 adds אף, 'also', creating a link between the woman's sons and the king's sons.

<sup>643</sup>Mss a b f y read the plural ומרו, 'and they hit', in conformity with a different vocalization of the Hebrew text (>3).

<sup>644</sup>Ms b reads זרעייה, 'my family' (>11).

<sup>645</sup>Mss b y add ונקטול, 'and we shall kill', which is repeated later.

<sup>646</sup>Ms a adds בר, resulting in "my only son".

<sup>647</sup>So in MT and TJon, but some MSS and versions read "came".

*that we may kill him for the guilt concerning his brother's life whom he killed. So we will also destroy the heir.*<sup>648</sup> *They seek to kill my only one who is left in order to leave to my husband neither name nor remnant*<sup>649</sup> *upon the face of the earth."*

TJon dissolves the metaphorical "quench my coal" by rendering the implicit message of the woman. A similar expression in 21:17 is translated according to its co-text.<sup>650</sup>

8 14 ואמר מלכא לאחחא איזילי לביחך ואנא אפקיד עלך: 9 14 ואמרת אחחא דמחקוע למלכא עלי דילי. 651 רבוני מלכא חובא 652 ומלכא וברסי מלכותיה 653 זכאי: 10 14 ואמר מלכא מן דיימר לך מלא ותיתניה לותי ולא יוסיף עוד לאנוקא 654 בך: 11 14 ואמרת ידכר כען מלכא מא 655 דכתיב בספר אוריחא דיין אלהך 656 בדיל 657 רלא לאסנאה אורחא קדם נאיל דמא לחבלא ולא ישיצון ית ברי ואמר קיים 658 הוא יי אם יפול מסער ריש 658 בריך לארעא:

*14:8 Then the king said to the woman, "Go to your house, and I will give orders concerning you." 14:9 And the woman, who was of Tekoa, said to the king, "On me, mine be the guilt, my lord the king, and on my father's house. Let the king and the throne of his kingdom be innocent." 14:10 The king said, "Whoever says a word to you, bring him to me, and he shall never harm you again." 14:11 Then she said, "Let the king now remember what is written in the book of the law of the LORD your God, not to enlarge the way before the avenger of blood to do harm. So let them not finish off my son." And he said, "As the LORD is the existing One, not one hair of your son's head shall fall to the ground."*

<sup>648</sup> According to J.C. de Moor, 'The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1-12', *JSJ* 19 (1998), 76, the words "He had still one other, a beloved son" and "This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inheritance will be ours" in Mk 12:6-7 would have been inspired partially by this passage in the Targum.

<sup>649</sup> Fixed combination with alliteration in Hebrew (cf. Isa. 14:22; Zeph. 1:4), integrated in the Aramaic version of these three texts. In fact, it is a merism that serves as an indication that nothing is left to the husband, not even a small remnant through which there would have been hope for the future; cf. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja* (BKAT, 10/2), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978, 560-61.

<sup>650</sup> Cf. Komlosh, באור התרגום, 325.

<sup>651</sup> Associative rendering adopted from 1 Sam. 25:24 (>15). Omitted in MS a, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>652</sup> MS p omitted אבא בית אבא, 'and on my father's house', which is rendered in MSS a b c d f m o w y.

<sup>653</sup> Also attested in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>654</sup> MS w reads לאעקא, 'to oppress', another clarifying rendering (>11).

<sup>655</sup> Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>656</sup> Omitted in MS a.

<sup>657</sup> Omitted in MSS a b c f o w; see below, commentary on the present verse.

<sup>658</sup> Also attested in one Hebrew MS and Syr, but cf. also 1 Sam. 14:45.

TJon based the translation of this verse on Deut. 19:6, where three cities were appointed as hiding places for unintentional murderers. These three cities had to be scattered over the country, lest the way be too long for the murderer and the avenger could overtake him. In the same way the woman asked the king not to enlarge (Hebrew חִוּבְרָה) the way before the avenger. In fact, she asked for a quick solution to avoid any danger to her son.

Deut. 19:6 suggests that the expression “enlarge the way before the avenger” is a positive expression for the avenger, for the larger the way, the more opportunities the avenger had to catch the murderer. In later times the expression was considered negative: the larger the way, the more difficulties the avenger encountered. Therefore, several manuscripts dropped the negation and translated that David should remember what is written in the book of law, in order to enlarge the way before the avenger of blood.<sup>659</sup>

The woman of Tekoa is called a wise woman. Her wisdom especially finds expression in her manner of addressing the king. She acts as a prophetess<sup>660</sup> by giving an example and confronting the king with the contradiction in his own reasoning. This confrontation is worded in compact sentences that deviate from the prose narrative.<sup>661</sup> By uttering a proverb, she uses the art of wisdom speech to persuade the king.<sup>662</sup> It seems that it was this same style that made TJon add a Scriptural quotation, as though the woman were indeed a prophetess. An identical phenomenon occurs in the rather mysterious words of the wise women of Abel in 2 Sam. 20:18-19, whose words were also explained as a quotation from the book of law.

12 14 ואמרת אחת תמליל כען אמהך קדם רבוני מלכא פתגמא ואמר מלילי:  
13 14 ואמרת אחת ולמא חשיבתא כהדא על עמא די יי וממליל<sup>663</sup> מלכא פתגמא<sup>664</sup>

<sup>659</sup>So mss a b c f o w; but also Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 12; Komlosh, *המקרא באור התרגום*, 318; and Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 7 think that the right text is without negation.

<sup>660</sup>Cf. C.V. Camp, “The Wise Women of 2 Samuel: A Role Model for Women in Early Israel”, *CBQ* 43 (1981), 14-29, esp. 24.

<sup>661</sup>Cf. J.W. Wesseliuss, “De wijze vrouwen in 2 Samuël 14 en 20”, *NedThT* 45 (1991), 89-100.

<sup>662</sup>Cf. Camp, “The Wise Women of 2 Samuel”, 19. TJon’s association of the woman’s proverb and the reference to the Torah may have been prompted by the figure of the Woman Wisdom presented in several poems in Proverbs 1-9; cf. Idem, “The Female Sage in Ancient Israel and in the Biblical Wisdom Literature”, in: J.G. Gammie, L.G. Perdue, *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, Winona Lake 1990, 185-203, esp. 190-91.

<sup>663</sup>Vocalized as a Piel (>3); MS m reads the perfect tense ומליל; MS a reads the Ithpeel ותמליל, which agrees with the Hebrew vocalization (>29).

<sup>664</sup>Mss b c d f read כפתגמא, ‘such a word’, in conformity with the preceding כהדא.

הדין כנבר חייב בדיל דלא לאתבא מלכא ית בדוריה: 14 14 ארי מיתא<sup>665</sup> דמאית  
 הא<sup>666</sup> כמיא דמתאשדין לארעא דלא אפשר להון דיסתפון<sup>667</sup> כין לית אפשר לדינא<sup>668</sup>  
 דקושטא לקבלא ◊ ממון דשקר ודמחשיב מחשבן בדיל דלא לברא מניה בדור:

14:12 Then the woman say, "Let your handmaid now speak a word before my lord the king." And he said, "Speak." 14:13 And the woman said, "Why then have you planned such a thing against the people of the LORD—in speaking this word the king is like a guilty man—in order not to bring back the king's banished one? 14:14 For the death of the dying is like the waters that are poured out on the ground so that it is impossible for them to be gathered together again; thus it is impossible for the court of truth to accept bribes and to devise plans not to scatter the banished one from him.

The utterance of the Tekoan woman concerning death and water is explained by TJon as a (hidden) reference to Amnon, who died and will not return to life. He is like water poured on the ground and not to be gathered again.

The second utterance of the woman, concerning God and his plans in the Hebrew, is explained as a (hidden) reference to the court, *i.e.* to David himself. Hebrew אלהים is equated with דינא, 'court'.<sup>669</sup> Since David had a reliable court (cf. 2 Sam. 8:15), he was considered incorruptible.<sup>670</sup> It was therefore impossible that he should have other plans than to keep Absalom away from him, since Absalom was clearly guilty of murder.

The reasoning of the Tekoan woman is therefore as follows. On the one hand, she describes the actual situation in 14:14, *viz.* Amnon is dead and David is incorruptible; and these two premises lead directly to the conclusion that David will never bring Absalom back for

---

It is, however, a misinterpretation, for David did not give "such a sentence", he did give the sentence concerning the son of the woman.

<sup>665</sup> Ms eb1 reads מוּתָא, 'death'.

<sup>666</sup> Mss b y replace הַא by the copula ׀.

<sup>667</sup> Mss b y read דיתוספון, which is a derivation of אסף, 'add'; cf. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 57.

<sup>668</sup> Ms p vocalizes it as לְדִינָא, 'court', but other MSS vocalize it as לְדִינָא, 'judges'. The latter vocalization is more in accordance with the repeatedly occurring translation of Hebrew אלהים, *e.g.* in 1 Sam. 2:25.

<sup>669</sup> See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 2:25. Because of the other verses in which אלהים is also considered a denotation of earthly judges, it is impossible to explain TJon's translation in the present verse as a reference to God, the Judge of Truth, as Komlosh, *המקרא באור התרגום*, 305 did.

<sup>670</sup> Hebrew נשָׁא is equated with Aramaic קביל, as in 2 Kgs 18:14; Jer. 15:15; 31:19. The combination of Hebrew נשָׁא and the object "soul" is always explained according to its context. The translation of TJon Hos. 4:8 is similar to this verse, *viz.* "in order to add sins upon the sins of their soul".

reconciliation. On the other hand, she asks if there is not a different judgment possible, since King David also protected her second son, the only son she has left. Should King David not also protect Absalom, the second pretender to the throne of Israel after Amnon, the only one left?

14 15 וכען דאחתי למללא קדם מלכא רבוני<sup>671</sup> ית פתגמא הדין ארי דחלוני<sup>672</sup> עמא ואמרת אמתך ◊ אמליל כען קדם ◊ מלכא מא אם יעביד מלכא ית פתגמא דאמתי<sup>673</sup>:

14:15 *And now that I have come to say this thing before my lord the king, because the people feared me, and your handmaid said, 'I will speak before the king now; it may be that the king will do the request of his handmaid.'*

In the Hebrew narrative the Tekoan woman returned to her own case in the present verse. Because the people frightened her, she said to herself that she ought to go to the king. In the Aramaic version the Hebrew *וַיִּירָאוּ*, 'they frightened me', is vocalized as the Qal *וַיִּירָאוּ*, 'they feared me' (>3).<sup>674</sup> So the woman lingered on the case of Absalom for another verse, and set herself up as the representative of the people of Israel. They feared her and allowed her to defend the case of their only pretender Absalom.

14 16 ארי ישמע מלכא לשיזבא<sup>675</sup> ית אמתי<sup>675</sup> מיד נברא לשיצאה יתי וית ברי כחודא מאחסנת עמא ◊ דייוי: 14 17 ואמרת אמתך ◊ יהי כען פתגמא דרבוני ◊ מלכא לניחא<sup>676</sup> ארי כמלאכא דייוי כין רבוני ◊ מלכא למשמע שב וביש ומימרא ◊ דייוי אלהך<sup>677</sup> בסעדך: 14 18 ואחזיב מלכא ואמר לאתתא לא כען תכסא מני פתגמא דאנא שאיל יתיך ואמרת אתתא ימליל כען רבוני ◊ מלכא: 14 19 ואמר מלכא היד יואב עמך בכל דא ואחזיבת אתתא ואמרת<sup>678</sup> היי ◊ נפשך רבוני ◊ מלכא אם אית<sup>679</sup> למסטי<sup>680</sup> לימינא ולסמלא מכל המליל רבוני ◊ מלכא ארי עברך יואב הוא פקדני והוא שוי בפומא דאמתך ◊ ית כל פתגמא האלין: 14 20 בריל לאקפא ית אפי פתגמא עבר עברך יואב ית פתגמא הדין ורבוני ◊ חכים כחכמת מלאכא דייוי ◊ למדע ית כל<sup>681</sup> דבארעא:

<sup>671</sup>Omitted in MS y.

<sup>672</sup>Vocalized as a Peal; MS w vocalized it as a Pael, resulting in "the people made me fear", which is more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>673</sup>MS o reads הדין, 'this', as in the preceding sentence.

<sup>674</sup>Lxx rendered on the basis of the same vocalization "the people will see me".

<sup>675</sup>MS w omits לשיצאה up to יתי by haplography.

<sup>676</sup>MS m omits לניחא up to the second מלכא by haplography.

<sup>677</sup>Mss a b c d m o w y eb1 add יהי, resulting in "and let the speech of the LORD be in your aid".

<sup>678</sup>Omitted in MS eb1.

<sup>679</sup>According to the reading ש in some Hebrew MSS and quotations.

<sup>680</sup>Omitted in MS c.

<sup>681</sup>Omitted in MS w.

21 14 ואמר מלכא ליואב הא כען עבדית<sup>682</sup> יה פתגמא הדין ואזיל אתיב יה עולימא יה אבשלום: 22 14 ונפל יואב על אפוהי על ארעא וסגיד ובריך יה מלכא ואמר יואב יומא דין ידע עבדך ארי אשכחית רחמין בעינך רבוני<sup>683</sup> מלכא דעבד מלכא יה פתגמא דעבדך<sup>683</sup>: 23 14 וקם יואב ואזל לנשור ואיתי יה אבשלום לירושלם: 24 14 ואמר מלכא יסתחר לביתיה ואפי לא יחזי ואסתחר אבשלום לביתיה ואפי מלכא לא חזי: 25 14 וכאבשלום לא הוה גבר שפיר בכל ישראל לשבחא לחדא מפרסת רגליה ועד מוחיה לא הוה ביה מומא: 26 14 ובספרותיה יה רישיה והוי מומן עדן לעדן דמספר ארי יקר עלוהי ומספר ליה ותקיל יה סער רישיה מאתן סלעין במחקלא דמלכא:

*14:16 For the king will hear, and deliver his handmaid from the man who would destroy me and my son together from the heritage of the people of the LORD.' 14:17 And your handmaid thought, 'Let the word of my lord the king set me at rest now, for like an angel of the LORD, so is my lord the king in discerning good and evil,' and the speech of the LORD is in your aid." 14:18 Then the king answered and said to the woman, "Now, do not hide from me anything I ask you." And the woman said, "Let my lord the king speak now." 14:19 The king said, "Is the hand of Joab with you in all this?" The woman answered, and said, "By your own life, my lord the king, one cannot turn to the right hand or to the left from all that my lord the king has said. It was your servant Joab who commanded me, and it was he who put all these words in the mouth of your handmaid. 14:20 In order to change the course of affairs your servant Joab did this thing. But my lord is wise like the wisdom of the angel of the LORD to know all that is on the earth." 14:21 Then the king said to Joab, "Behold now, I granted this thing. Go, bring back the young man, Absalom." 14:22 And Joab fell on his face to the ground, and bowed down, and blessed the king. And Joab said, "Today your servant knows that I have found favour in your sight, my lord the king, in that the king has granted the word of your servant." 14:23 So Joab arose and went to Geshur, and brought Absalom to Jerusalem. 14:24 And the king said, "Let him turn to his own house. He is not to see my face." So Absalom turned to his own house, and did not see the king's face. 14:25 In all Israel there was no other handsome man so highly praised as Absalom. From the sole of his foot to his scalp there was no blemish in him. 14:26 And when he shaved his head—on a yearly basis he shaved it; when it was heavy on him, he shaved it—he weighed the hair of his head: two hundred sela by the king's weight.*

<sup>682</sup>MSS c m read עבדתה, 'you did', like many Hebrew MSS.

<sup>683</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS, and Vg. MS eb1 reads רעבדיה, 'of his servant', in conformity to the Ketib.



The expression *ימים לימים* is interpreted as an indication of the interval of one year (cf. Judg. 17:10; Rabbi's view in Naz. 4b-5a; tSot. 3:16).<sup>684</sup>

27 14 ואחילירו לאבשלום תלחא בנין וברתא חדא ושמה תמר היא הוה אחתא שפירת חיו: 28 14 ויתוב אבשלום בירושלם חרתין<sup>685</sup> שנין ואפי מלכא לא חזא: 29 14 ושלה אבשלום לות יואב לשלחא יתיה לות מלכא ולא אבא למית' לותיה<sup>686</sup> ושלה עוד תנינות ולא אבא למית': 30 14 ואמר לעברוהי חזו אחסנת יואב דסמיכא לדילי וליה תמן<sup>687</sup> סערין איזילו ואדליקוהא בנורא ואוקידו<sup>688</sup> עבדי אבשלום ית אחסנתא<sup>689</sup> בנורא: 31 14 וקם יואב ואתא<sup>690</sup> לות אבשלום לביתא ואמר ליה למא אדליקו עבדך ית אחסנתא דילי בנורא: 32 14 ואמר אבשלום ליואב הא שלחית לותך למימר אתא הלכא ואשלח יתך לות מלכא למימר למא אתיזי מגשור שב לי עוד דאנא תמן וכען אחזי אפי מלכא ואם אית בי חובא<sup>690</sup> יקטלני: 33 14 ואתא יואב לות מלכא וחזי ליה וקרא לאבשלום ואתא לות מלכא וסגיד ליה על אפוהי על ארעא קדם מלכא ונשיק מלכא לאבשלום:

14:27 There were born to Absalom three sons, and one daughter whose name was Tamar. She was a woman beautiful of appearance. 14:28 So Absalom dwelt two years in Jerusalem, without seeing the king's face. 14:29 Then Absalom sent for Joab to send him to the king, but Joab would not come to him. And he sent a second time, but he would not come. 14:30 Then he said to his servants, "See Joab's property is next to mine, and he has barley there; go and set it on fire." So Absalom's servants set the property on fire. 14:31 Then Joab arose and went to Absalom at his house, and said to him, "Why have your servants set the property which is mine on fire?" 14:32 Absalom said to Joab, "Behold, I sent for you, saying, 'Come here, that I may send you to the king, saying: Why have I come from Geshur? It would be better for me if I were still there. And now, let me see the king's face, and if there is guilt in me, let him kill me.'" 14:33 Then Joab went to the king, and told him; and he called Absalom. So he came to the king, and bowed on his face to the ground before the king. And the king kissed Absalom.

<sup>684</sup> A survey is given by Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 544.

<sup>685</sup> Hebrew *ימים* is considered superfluous.

<sup>686</sup> Ms c omits *לותיה* up to the end of the verse by haplography.

<sup>687</sup> Omitted in MS w.

<sup>688</sup> MSS a b c d f o y read *ואדליקו*, 'and they set it on fire', using the same verb as in the previous sentence. The Hebrew text used the same verb twice (>29).

<sup>689</sup> MSS b y read *אחסנתיה*, 'his property' (>10).

<sup>690</sup> Ms a reads *ואול*, 'and he went'.

## 6.17 Absalom's Revolt Incited (2 Samuel 15–17)

1 15 והוה מבחר בין ועבד ליה אבשלום רתכין וסוסון וחמשין גברא רדופין קדמוהי:  
 2 15 ומקרים אבשלום וקאים על כיבש אורח הרעא והוי כל גבר דיהי ליה דין  
 למיעל לקדם  $\diamond$  מלכא למדון  $\diamond$  וקרי אבשלום ליה ואמר<sup>691</sup> אי מדא קרי  $\diamond$  את ואמר  
 מיחד שבטיא<sup>692</sup>  $\diamond$  ישראל<sup>693</sup> עבדך: 3 15 ואמר ליה אבשלום חזי פתגמך תקנין  
 ויאן ושמע לית לך מן קדם  $\diamond$  מלכא: 4 15 ואמר אבשלום מן<sup>694</sup> ימיני דיין בארעא  
 וקדמי  $\diamond$  ייתי כל גברא<sup>695</sup> דיהי ליה דין  $\diamond$  ומצו ואדינניה<sup>696</sup> בקשוש: 5 15 והוי כד  
 קריב גברא למסגד ליה ומושיט ית<sup>697</sup> ידיה ומתקיף ביה ונשיק ליה: 6 15 ועבד  
 אבשלום כפתגמא הדין לכל ישראל דאתן למדון  $\diamond$  קדם  $\diamond$  מלכא ונגיב אבשלום ית  
 לבא דאנשי ישראל: 7 15 והוה מסוף ארבעין שנין ואמר אבשלום למלכא איזיל כען  
 ואשלים ית נדרי דנדרית קדם  $\diamond$  יוי בחברון: 8 15 ארי נרעא נדר עבדך במחבי בנשור  
 בארם למימר אם אחבא יתבני יוי לירושלם ואפלח  $\diamond$  קדם  $\diamond$  יוי:

15:1 After this Absalom got himself chariots and horses, and fifty men to ride<sup>698</sup> before him. 15:2 And Absalom used to rise early and stand on the path of the gateway. And when any man had a suit to come before the king for jurisdiction, Absalom would call him, and say, "From what city are you?" And when he said, "Your servant is from one of the tribes of Israel," 15:3 Absalom would say to him, "See, your affairs are right and proper, but there is no man deputed before the king to hear you." 15:4 And Absalom said, "Who would appoint me judge in the land? Then every man who had a suit or quarrel might come before me, and I would judge in truth." 15:5 And whenever a man approached to bow down for him, he would stretch out his hand, and take hold of him, and kiss him. 15:6 Thus Absalom did to all of Israel who were coming before the king for a suit; so Absalom stole the heart<sup>699</sup> of the men of Israel. 15:7 And at the end

<sup>691</sup>Ms o adds ליה, 'to him'.

<sup>692</sup>Ms a reads דשיבטיא, קרחא דשיבטיא, 'one city of the tribes', giving a more precise answer to Absalom's question (>11).

<sup>693</sup>Ms a reads דביח ישראל, 'of the House of Israel'.

<sup>694</sup>Rendered literally, although introducing a still unfulfilled but possible wish (GKC § 151a); cf. commentary and note on 2 Sam. 19:1.

<sup>695</sup>Omitted in MS ebl.

<sup>696</sup>Ms f<sub>5</sub> does not explain Hebrew צדק as "give a righteous judgment", but as "put in the right" by rendering באיזכנייה ברנייה, 'and I would declare him innocent in his suit'; cf. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 25. This translation denotes Absalom as a partial judge, trespassing Lev. 19:15 (>24). The latter translation agrees with the intention of the Hebrew narrative; cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 13.

<sup>697</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>698</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 8:11.

<sup>699</sup>Note that "heart" does not refer to the feelings (so Josephus, *Antiquities*,

of forty<sup>700</sup> years Absalom said to the king, "Let me go now and fulfil my vow, which I have vowed to the LORD, in Hebron. 15:8 For your servant vowed a vow during my stay in Geshur in Aram, saying, 'If the LORD will indeed bring me back to Jerusalem, then I will worship before the LORD.'"

Hebrew Ketib ישיב ישיב may well be due to dittography. The suggested Qere would restore the phrase in so far that it provides an absolute infinitive, as would be expected, viz. ישוב. But since it is the absolute infinitive of ישב and not of ישוב, it does not fit.<sup>701</sup> However, TJon as well as LXX and Syr render the phrase as if it read השב ישיבני ה.

9 15 ואמר ליה מלכא אזיל בשלם וקם ואול לחברון: 10 15 ושלח אבשלום מאלין בכל שבטיא ד ישראל למימר כמשמעכון יה קל שופרא ותימרון מלך אבשלום בחברון: 11 15 ועם אבשלום אזלו מאתן גברין מירושלם זמינין ואלין לתומהון לוא ידעין כל מדעם:

15:9 The king said to him, "Go in peace." So he arose, and went to Hebron. 15:10 But Absalom sent spies throughout all the tribes of Israel, saying, "When you hear the sound of the horn, then you shall say, 'Absalom is king at Hebron!'" 15:11 With Absalom went two hundred men from Jerusalem who were invited, and were going in their simplicity, and knew nothing at all.

In spite of the great unanimity among the various manuscripts, at least one copyist must have thought it contradictory that Absalom's guests were both invited and ignorant. There is an explanation in the margin of CR, dividing the two hundred men into two groups (>18):

ספןרן אחרן] מקצתהין זמינין ומקצתהון אולין מן תומהון

*another book: part of them were invited and part of them went in their simplicity*

This explanation is in agreement with TanB, *Bereshit*, 7:17, which states that Absalom allowed his own men to mingle with the un-

7:196), but to the understanding of the people; cf. Jer. 5:21; Hos. 4:11. In TO Gen. 31:20, 26 this very expression is translated by the verb מן כסי, 'keep off from, hide from'. This less sharp translation might be due to TO's attempt to secure Jacob's honour (>23).

<sup>700</sup>No explanation of this high number is given in the Targumic tradition. Jewish tradition reckoned it from the institution of the monarchy (NumR. 10:17; Naz. 5a), while Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 132-33 reckoned the forty years from the murder of the priests of Nob. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:196 rendered "four years", according to the Lucian LXX, Syr and Vg.

<sup>701</sup>Cf. also R. Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the Kethib-Qere*, Philadelphia 1937, repr. New York 1971, 42, n. 6.

knowing elders. For this reason, of every two people at the feast one knew of the conspiracy and one did not.

12 15 ושלח אבשלום ית אחיתופל גילונאה מלוכא דרויד מקרתיה <sup>702</sup> מגילו<sup>702</sup> ברבחותיה ית דבחיא<sup>703</sup> והוה מרדא תקיף ועמא אויל וסני עם אבשלום: 13 15 ואתא דמחוי לת דויד למימר אתפני לבא דאנש ישראל בחר אבשלום: 14 15 ואמר דויד<sup>703</sup> לכל עברוהי דעמיה בירושלם קומו ונערוק<sup>704</sup> ארי לא תהי לנא שויבא<sup>704</sup> מן קדם<sup>704</sup> אבשלום אוהו למזיל דלמא יחי וירבקנא ויכמון עלנא ית בשחא וימחי<sup>705</sup> קרהא<sup>705</sup> לפתגם דחרב<sup>706</sup>: 15 15 ואמרו עבדי מלכא למלכא ככל דיימר<sup>707</sup> רבוני<sup>707</sup> מלכא הא עבדך: 16 15 ונפק מלכא וכל אנש<sup>708</sup> ביחיה עמיה<sup>708</sup> ושבק מלכא ית עסר נשין לחינן למטר ביחא: 17 15 ונפק מלכא וכל עמא<sup>709</sup> דעמיה<sup>710</sup> וקמו באחר רחיק:

15:12 And he sent for Ahithophel the Gilonite, David's counsellor, from his city Giloh, while he was slaughtering the slaughterings. And the conspiracy grew strong, and the people with Absalom kept increasing. 15:13 And someone came telling David, saying, "The hearts of the men of Israel have turned after Absalom." 15:14 Then David said to all his servants who were with him at Jerusalem, "Arise, and let us flee! For there will be no escape for us from before Absalom. Go in a hurry, lest he hurry and overtake us, and makes an evil ambush against us, and strikes the city by means of the sword." 15:15 And the king's servants said to the king, "According to all that my lord the king says, behold, your servants." 15:16 So the king went forth, and all the people of his house with him. And the king left ten concubines to keep the house. 15:17 And the king went forth, and all the people who were with him, and they halted at a distant place.

Hebrew ביה is not conceived of as "house", but as the general "place" (>7). This may be based on the interpretation that David was ousted (Hebrew רחק). Both his words concerning the ark and the fact that he went with his head covered point in this direction (cf. NumR. 3:2).

<sup>702</sup>The phrase מקרתיה מגילו is omitted in MS y.

<sup>703</sup>MS a reads מלכא, 'the king'.

<sup>704</sup>MS f reads the verbal form משיבא, 'someone who saves, saviour'.

<sup>705</sup>MS a b y add the nota accusativi.

<sup>706</sup>For לפתגם דחרב, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 15:8.

<sup>707</sup>MSS a f reads דיתרעי, 'he chooses', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). This translation suggests that David chose wholeheartedly for his exile, while the co-text proves that it was forced upon him.

<sup>708</sup>MS y reads ברנלוהי, 'at his feet', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>709</sup>MS b reads אנש ביחיה, 'people of his house', as in the preceding verse (>15).

An similar reading is attested in some Hebrew MSS.

<sup>710</sup>MSS y eb1 read ברנלוהי, 'at his feet', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

18 15 וכל עבדוהי עברין על ירוהי<sup>711</sup> וכל<sup>712</sup> קשתיא וכל קלעיא<sup>713</sup> וכל גתאי שיח מאה גברא דאתו עמיה מגת עברין קדם<sup>714</sup> מלכא: 19 15 ואמר מלכא לאיתי גתאה למא תיזיל אף את עמנא חוב וחיב עם מלכא ארי נכראי את ואם<sup>714</sup> גלי את איזיל לך לאתרך<sup>715</sup>:

*15:18 And all his servants passed by him. And all the archers and the slingers, and all the six hundred Gittites who had come with him from Gath, passed on before the king. 15:19 And the king said to Ittai the Gittite, "Why do you also go with us? Go back, and stay with the king, for you are a foreigner. So if you are exiled, go to your own place."*

Hebrew למקומך forms a peculiar ending to the verse. Three ancient versions seem to have assumed that ממקומך was intended, "also an exile from your own place" (LXX, Syr, Vg). TJon maintained the preposition, but added some words to explain the phrase. Since the Gittites were foreigners in Israel, they could choose where to go in the new situation. They could choose their own place of exile.

20 15 תמלי אחיזתא ויומא דין אטלטילנך<sup>716</sup> עמנא למיזיל ואנא אויל לאתר דליח אנא ידע לאן אנא אויל חוב ואחיב ית אחך עמך ועביד<sup>717</sup> עמהון טיבו וקשוט:

*15:20 Yesterday you came, and shall I today drive you away to go with us, seeing I am going to a place of which I do not know I am going to?<sup>718</sup> Go back, and make your brethren go back with you, and show them goodness and loyalty."*

The last two words of the Hebrew verse do not fit well into the sentence. Following the division of the verse which is also attested in the MT, both TJon and LXX add a verb to these two words and make it into a separate sentence. Whereas TJon uses the imperative with one exception ("I will show" in MS f), LXX refers to God by translating, "and the LORD will show".<sup>719</sup>

<sup>711</sup>MS eb1 reads the singular יריה, 'his hand'.

<sup>712</sup>MS eb1 erroneously reads ועל, 'and against'; MS eb66 reads וכל.

<sup>713</sup>For the Cherethites and the Pelethites, see above, commentary on 8:18.

<sup>714</sup>Mss a c d o and Kimhī read ואף, 'and also', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29); MS y combines both readings in ואף אם. MS eb1 combines the consonants of ואם and the vocalization of ואף.

<sup>715</sup>MS eb1 omits the suffix and reads לאתר, 'to the place'.

<sup>716</sup>According to the Qere, as in many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions; cf. Soferim 38a.

<sup>717</sup>MS f reads ואעביד, 'and I will show', which refers to King David.

<sup>718</sup>For TJon's rendering of Hebrew ואני הולך אשר אני הולך, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 23:13.

<sup>719</sup>It is very likely that the version of LXX is the original one, because it would mean that three words were simply dropped by haplography; cf. Driver, *Notes*, 314.

21 15 ואתיב איתי ית מלכא ואמר קיים ◊ הוא יוי וחיי◊<sup>720</sup> רבוי◊ מלכא אלהי◊<sup>721</sup> באחרא דיהי תמן רבוי◊ מלכא אם למותא אם לחיי ארי תמן יהי עבדך: 22 15 ואמר דויד לאתי איזיל עבור ועבר אתי גתאה וכל גברוהי וכל טפלא דעמיה: 23 15 וכל דירי ארעא בכן קל רב וכל עמא עברין ומלכא<sup>722</sup> עבר בנחלא דקדרון וכל עמא עברין על אפי אורח במדברא<sup>723</sup>: 24 15 והא אף צדוק וכל לויא עמיה נטלין ית ארון קימא דיוי◊ ואקימו<sup>724</sup> ית ארונא<sup>725</sup> דיוי◊<sup>726</sup> וסליק<sup>727</sup> אביחר עד דשלים כל עמא למעבר מן קרחא◊: 25 15 ואמר מלכא לצדוק אתיב ית ארונא דיוי◊ לקרחא◊ אם אשכח רחמין קדם◊ יי ויתיבנני ויחוינני קדמוהי<sup>728</sup> ואפלח◊ קדמוהי◊ בבית מקדשה<sup>729</sup>:

15:21 *But Ittai answered the king and said, "As the LORD is the existing One, and by the life of my lord the king, whatever place my lord the king will be, whether for death or for life, there will your servant be."* 15:22 *And David said to Ittai, "Go then, pass on." So Ittai the Gittite passed on, and all his men and all the little ones who were with him.* 15:23 *And all the inhabitants of the land wept aloud as all the people passed by. And the king passed by through the wadi Kidron, and all the people passed by on the road in the desert.* 15:24 *And behold, also Zadok and all the Levites, bearing the ark of the covenant of the LORD, and they set up the ark of the LORD. And Abiathar stopped<sup>730</sup> until all the people had passed out of the city.* 15:25 *Then the king said to Zadok, "Bring back the ark of the LORD to the city. If I find favour before the LORD, He will bring me back and let me see before Him, and I shall worship before Him in his sanctuary."*

<sup>720</sup> Ms b reads וקיים, 'existing', which deviates from the usual diversification in wording concerning God and humans in oaths (against >18).

<sup>721</sup> According to the Ketib.

<sup>722</sup> Ms y omits ומלכא up to the second עברין by haplography.

<sup>723</sup> Only in MS p; the other MSS read מדברא, resulting in "the road of the desert". The omission of the nota accusativi is also attested in many Hebrew MSS.

<sup>724</sup> Translation of Hebrew ויצקו. TJon might have read ויצנו and rendered it in conformity with 1 Sam. 5:2 and 2 Sam. 6:17 (>1). Or does the Hebrew verb have a different meaning? For this possibility, cf. J. Hoftijzer, "Een opmerking bij II Sam. 15:24 (wayyāsqū)", in: M.S.H.G. Heerma van Voss *et al.* (eds), *Travels in the World of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to Professor M.A. Beek on the Occasion of this 65th Birthday* (SSN, 16), Assen 1974, 91-93, esp. 93.

<sup>725</sup> Ms w adds קימא, 'covenant', as in the preceding sentence (>15).

<sup>726</sup> The words ואקימו till the second דיוי are omitted in MSS b p by haplography.

<sup>727</sup> Ms a reads ואיסחלק, 'and he withdrew'.

<sup>728</sup> MSS a f w read יהיה, 'him, it', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>729</sup> Rendering of Hebrew נוה; cf. Ch. 4, s.v. Aramaic אלפנא. Ms eb1 reads מקדשא.

<sup>730</sup> Cf. Levy, *CWT*, Bd. 2, 168. This translation is in accordance with Sot. 48b, where R. Naḥman assumes that Abiathar consulted the Urim and Thummim, but was not successful. Therefore he retired from the priesthood. The same tradition is preserved anonymously in Yom. 73b. An alternative translation is: went up, cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 133, who assumes that Abiathar went up to pray.

To avoid the suggestion that Hebrew הִירָאִי אֲנִי indicated the priestly prerogatives,<sup>731</sup> TJon used the circumlocution קִדְמָא again (>23). Some manuscripts, however, probably understood אֲנִי as referring to the ark and translated it literally with יְהוָה. Furthermore, the combination אֲנִי וְאֲתִנְוֹהוּ was split (>18), because God is not on the same level as his sanctuary (cf. also TO Exod. 15:13).

26 15 וְאִם כִּדְיִן יִימַר לֹא רֵעוּא<sup>732</sup> קִדְמִי<sup>733</sup> בְּךָ הֵאנָא יַעבִיר לִי כַמָּא דִתְקִין<sup>734</sup> קִדְמוּהִי<sup>735</sup>: 27 15 וְאִמַר מַלְכָא לְצִדּוּק כְּהֵנָּא חֲזוּיָא אַתְּ תוּב לְקִרְתָּא<sup>736</sup> בְּשִׁלְמָא וְאַחִימַעֲיָן בְּרִךְ וַיְהוֹנָתָן בֶּר אַבִּיחָתָר חֲרִין בְּנִיכּוֹן עַמְכוֹן: 28 15 חֲזוּ דֵאנָא מִתְעַכְבּ בְּמִישְׁרֵי<sup>736</sup> מִדְּבֵרָא עַד דִּמְשִׁי פִתְגָמָא מְנַכּוֹן לְחֻוּאָה לִי: 29 15 וְאַתִּיב צִדּוּק וְאַבִּיחָתָר יֵת אֲרוּנָא דִּיּוּיָא לִירוּשָׁלַם וַיְחִיבוּ תַמָּן: 30 15 וְדוּיַד סְלִיק בְּמַסְקָנָא דְשׁוּר<sup>737</sup> זִיחֵיא סְלִיק וּבְכִי רִישִׁי<sup>738</sup> לִיה מַכְרֵךְ וְהוּא אוּיַל וַיְחִיף וְכָל עַמָּא דְעַמִּיָּה כְּרִיכוּ גַבְר רִישֵׁה וְסַלְקִין מַסְקָן<sup>739</sup> וּבְכִן: 31 15 וְלִדְוּיַד<sup>740</sup> אַתְחֻזָּה לְמִימַר אַחִיחֻפֹּל בְּמִרְוּדִיא עִם אַבְשִׁלוּם וְאִמַר דוּיַד קְלָקִיל כְּעֵן<sup>741</sup> יֵת מַלְכָּא דְאַחִיחֻפֹּל יוּי:

15:26 but if He speaks like this, 'There is no delight in you before Me,' here am I. Let him do what seems right before Him." 15:27 The king said to Zadok the priest, "You are the seer.<sup>742</sup> Go back to the city in peace, and your two sons with you, Ahimaaz your son and Jonathan the son of Abiathar. 15:28 Perceive that I will be staying in the valleys of the desert, until word reaches me from you to inform me." 15:29 So Zadok and Abiathar brought the ark of the LORD back to Jerusalem, and they remained there. 15:30 But David went up the ascent of the Mount of Olives, weeping as he went up, with his head

<sup>731</sup>Cf. E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), Berlin 1988, 119.

<sup>732</sup>Although this is the most literal translation of the Hebrew, it directly hints at the anointing of David (cf. 1 Sam. 16:8-10).

<sup>733</sup>Ms c interpreted קִדְמִי as קִדְמָא, 'before the LORD'.

<sup>734</sup>Mss a b c d f o y read רֵעוּא, 'what is his pleasure', in conformity with the preceding sentence (>15).

<sup>735</sup>Ms a reads בְּעִינֵיהּ, 'in his sight', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>736</sup>According to the Qere, and according to 17:16 (>15); so also LXX, Symmachus, Syr, and Vg.

<sup>737</sup>So also Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:202 and MSS of LXX.

<sup>738</sup>Mss a b c d o y give a precision by rendering רִישֵׁה, 'his head'.

<sup>739</sup>Ms a probably expected a participle and attempted to give the plural by adding a *Nun*. The result, מַסְקִין, means something else, viz. "and they went up an ascent". See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 6:12.

<sup>740</sup>Mss b f y omit the preposition, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>741</sup>Omitted in MS y.

<sup>742</sup>TJon did not interpret Hebrew רֵאָה as a verbal form (cf. on the contrary Ezek. 8:6), but as the technical term for a seer. So also Olam Rabbah 14; Yom. 73b; Sot. 48b. On the Hebrew text, see e.g. J. Hoftijzer, "A Peculiar Question: A Note on 2 Sam. xv 27", *VT* 21 (1971), 606-609.

covered. And he was going barefoot. And all the people who were with him covered their head, and they went up, weeping while they were going up. 15:31 And when it was told David, saying, "Ahithophel is among the conspirators with Absalom," David said, "Ruin the counsel of Ahithophel now, O LORD."

The opening of the Hebrew verse is interpreted as a passive construction in TJon, as well as in LXX, Syr and Vg. The verb is not vocalized as a Hiphil, but as the Hophal (>3). The preposition ל is read before the name of David in these translations, as well as in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

The translation of David's impromptu prayer in the ancient versions depended on their understanding of the context. The diversity of the ancient versions reflects their lack of knowledge with regard to the exact meaning of the verb סכל.<sup>743</sup> TJon chose the equivalent קלל, because that verb was also suitable as an equivalent of Hebrew פרר used in the other two verses with reference to the end of Ahithophel's counsel (2 Sam. 15:34; 17:14). Consequently, Aramaic קלל does not reflect the meaning of the Hebrew verb, but is merely an associative rendering (>15).

32 וְהוּא דוֹד אַחַא עַד רִישׁ טוֹרָא<sup>744</sup> דִּיסְגֹד תַּמָּן קְרַם־יִי וְהָא לְקַדְמוּתִיה חוּשִׁי אֲרַכָּא כֹד<sup>745</sup> מְבֹעַ לְבוּשׁוֹהִי וְעַפְרָא רַמִּי<sup>746</sup> בְּרִישִׁיהּ:

15:32 When David came to the top of the mount, where he used to bow down before the LORD, behold, Hushai the Archite came to meet him, with his clothes torn and earth thrown upon his head.

The explanatory addition טוֹרָא, 'hill', seems very natural, given the context. However, it sharply contrasts with the rabbinic discussion concerning this verse as presented in San. 107a. R. Judah said in Rab's name that the Hebrew word ראש could only refer to idols (cf. Dan. 2:32). and that this verse must therefore be explained as "David came to the idol, where he worshipped the gods". This translation was made impossible by TJon's monotheistic and reverential background. Its interpretation seems to be in line with an anonymous tradition in yBer. 4:4 (35a), which contradicts R. Judah's interpretation: David merely bowed down before God.

<sup>743</sup>W.M.W. Roth, "A Study of the Classical Hebrew Verb *SKL*", *VT* 18 (1968), 69-78, esp. 72.

<sup>744</sup>Mss b y and Rashi read the plural "mountains".

<sup>745</sup>Omitted in MSS a b c d f m o w y, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>746</sup>Usual addition, cf. 1 Sam. 4:12 and 2 Sam. 1:2.



33 15 ואמר ליה דויד אם עברת עמי ותהי עלי למטול: 15 34 ואם קרתא  $\diamond$  תחוב ותימר לאבשלום עבדך אנא מלכא איהי עבדא דאבוך ואנא מבכין וכען ואנא עבדך ותקלקיל<sup>747</sup> לי ית מלכא דאחיתופל: 15 35 והלא עמך תמן צדוק ואביתר כהניא ויהי כל פתגמא דתשמע מבית מלכא ותחוי לצדוק ולאביתר כהניא: 15 36 והא תמן עמהון תרין בניהון אחימעץ לצדוק ויהונתן לאביתר ותשלחון בידהון לוהי כל מדעם דתשמעון: 15 37 ואתא חושי שושבינא<sup>748</sup> דדויד לקרתא  $\diamond$  ואבשלום אתא לירושלם: 16 1 ודויד עבר זעיר מריש טורא<sup>749</sup> והא ציבא עולימא דמפיבושת לקדמותיה וזון חמרין חשיקין ועליהון מאתן גריצן דלחים ומאה אתכלין דענבין יבישין<sup>750</sup> ומאה מנן<sup>751</sup> דבילחא וגרב דחמר:

15:33 David said to him, "If you go on with me, you will be a burden for me. 15:34 But if you return to the city, and say to Absalom, 'I will be your servant, O king. As I have been your father's servant formerly, so now I will be your servant.' So you will ruin Ahithophel's counsel for me."<sup>752</sup> 15:35 Are not Zadok and Abiathar the priests with you there? So whatever word you hear from the king's house, you shall tell it to Zadok and Abiathar the priests. 15:36 Behold, their two sons are with them there, Ahimaaz of Zadok and Jonathan of Abiathar. And by them you shall send to me everything you hear." 15:37 So Hushai, David's close friend, came into the city, just as Absalom came to Jerusalem. 16:1 As David had passed a little beyond the top of the mountain, behold, Ziba the young man of Mephibosheth came to meet him, with a pair of asses saddled, and on them two hundred loaves of bread, a hundred clusters of dried grapes, a hundred mines of dried figs, and a skin of wine.

Although Hebrew קיץ, 'summer-fruit', is a very general word, TJon renders it by the more specific word דבילחא, referring to only one kind of fruit, viz. figs. This rendering is probably based on the list in 1 Sam. 25:18, which is similar and where the Hebrew text also refers to figs.

16 2 ואמר מלכא לציבא מא אלין לך ואמר ציבא חמריא לבית מלכא למרכב ולחמא<sup>753</sup> ודבילחא למיכל עולימא וחמרא למשתי דמשלהי במדברא: 16 3 ואמר מלכא ואין<sup>754</sup> בר רבונך  $\diamond$  ואמר ציבא למלכא הא יתיב בירושלם ארי אמר יומא דין יתיבון לי בית ישראל ית מלכותא דאבא: 16 4 ואמר מלכא לציבא הא לך כל

<sup>747</sup>Rendering as in 15:31, although the Hebrew verbs are different (>15).

<sup>748</sup>See above, commentary on 13:3.

<sup>749</sup>Again MS y reads the plural טורי, 'mountains'; cf. 15:31.

<sup>750</sup>Omitted in MS o. See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 25:18.

<sup>751</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 25:18.

<sup>752</sup>Regarding the copula in both instances of ואנא as a *waw apodosis*, cf. GKC § 143d.

<sup>753</sup>According to the Qere and the other ancient versions.

<sup>754</sup>Omitted in MS y.

דלמפיבושת ואמר ציבא מורניא<sup>755</sup> אשכח<sup>756</sup> רחמין בעיניך<sup>757</sup> רבוני מלכא: 5 16 ואחא מלכא דויד עד עלמח<sup>758</sup> והא מתמן גברא נפיק מזרעיה בית שאול<sup>759</sup> ושמיה שמעי בר גרא אויל מיזל<sup>760</sup> ומלטיט: 6 16 ומרגים באבניא ית דויד ויה כל עבדי מלכא דויד וכל עמא וכל גבריא מימיניה ומסמליה: 7 16 וכרין אמר שמעי בלשטותיה פוק פוק<sup>761</sup> גבר חייב קטול וגבר רשיע:

16:2 And the king said to Ziba, "Why do you have these things?" And Ziba said, "The asses are for the king's household to ride on, the bread and the dried figs for the young men to eat, and the wine for those who faint in the desert to drink." 16:3 And the king said, "And where is your lord's son?" Ziba said to the king, "Behold, he remains in Jerusalem, for he said, 'Today the House of Israel will give me back the kingdom of my father.'" 16:4 Then the king said to Ziba, "Behold, all that belonged to Mephibosheth is now yours." And Ziba said, "I give thanks. May I find favour in your sight, my lord the king." 16:5 When King David came to Almath, behold, from there came out a man of the family of the house of Saul, whose name was Shimei, the son of Gera.<sup>762</sup> And he went along, cursing as he went. 16:6 And he was throwing stones at David, and at all the servants of King David, and at all the people and all the heroes on his right and his left hand. 16:7 And thus said Shimei as he cursed, "Go forth! Go forth, you man deserving to die, you evil man!"

In many verses the Aramaic expression קטול חייב is best translated as "deserving to die" (cf. 1 Sam. 20:31; 26:16; 2 Sam. 12:5; 19:29). But in the present verse, as well as in 16:8 and 21:1, the most natural translation would be "guilty of murder". The latter translation is based on the Hebrew of these verses, which contains the expression איש דמים, 'man of blood', and not בן מוה, 'son of death'. Since TJon chose only one phrase as the equivalent of both Hebrew expressions, it seems logical to suppose that this Aramaic phrase has only one meaning.<sup>763</sup> TJon's choice might be the result of its homiletical purpose. If the audience takes the first kings as an example, they must be aware of

<sup>755</sup>See above, commentary on 2 Sam. 9:8.

<sup>756</sup>Ms f reads the perfect tense אשכחיה, 'I have found'.

<sup>757</sup>Ms w reads the plural construct form בעיני, resulting in "find favour in the eyes of my lord the king".

<sup>758</sup>See above, commentary on 3:16.

<sup>759</sup>In MS b the words בית שאול are replaced by בנין.

<sup>760</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 6:12. In MSS a b c d f m o y the root נפק is used in this construction, נפק מפק, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>761</sup>Ms eb1 reads איזיל איזיל, 'go, go'.

<sup>762</sup>The name Gera occurs among the sons of Benjamin in Gen. 46:21.

<sup>763</sup>So also Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 13; Aramaic חובת קטולך is referring to the death penalty of the addressee (2 Sam. 1:16).

the consequences: one cannot be guilty of murder without being liable to the death sentence.<sup>764</sup>

16 8 אָחִיב עֲלֶיךָ יְיָ כִּלְ765 חֻבִּי בֵּית שְׂאוּל דְּמִלְכָּחָה תְּחֻתְּהוּי וְאַצְלַח766 יְיָ יִתְּ מִלְכּוֹתָא בִּידָא דְאַבְשָׁלוֹם בְּרַךְ וְהָא אַח בְּבִשְׁתְּךָ אָרִי גַבְרָ767 חֵיבֵב קְטוּל אַח:

16:8 *The LORD has returned on you the sins of the house of Saul, in whose place you have reigned. And the LORD has made the kingship prosper in the hand of your son Absalom. Behold, you are in your own evil, for you are a man deserving to die.*"

TJon spares David in its translation of Shimei's accusation. Not the deaths in Saul's house are ascribed to David, but the sins of Saul's house are retributed to him.<sup>768</sup> This idea is attested to in the Books of Samuel, since Saul's treatment of the Gibeonites appears to have been avenged during the David's kingship (2 Sam. 21:1; see also the tosefta-targum on 21:17).<sup>769</sup>

16 9 וְאָמַר אֲבִישִׁי בַר צְרוּיָה לְמַלְכָּא לְמָא יִלְשִׁט כְּלָבָא770 מִיחָא הַדִּין יִת רְבוּנֵי771 מִלְכָּא אַעֲבַר כַּעַן וְאַעֲדִי יִת רִישִׁיָּה: 16 10 וְאָמַר מִלְכָּא מָא לִי וּלְכוּן בְּנֵי צְרוּיָה כְּדִין771 יִלְשִׁט אָרִי772 יְיָ אָמַר לִיָּה לְשִׁט יִת דְּוִיד וּמֵן יִימַר מִדִּין עֲבַדְתָּא כִּין: 16 11 וְאָמַר דְּוִיד לְאַבִּישִׁי וּלְכָל עֲבָדוּהִי הָא בְּרִי דְאַוּלִידִיָּה773 בְּעִי לְמַקְשָׁלִי774 וְאַף אָרִי כַּעַן בַּר שִׁיבְטָ775 בְּנִימֵן שְׁבוּקָן מְנִיָּה וְיִלְשִׁט אָרִי אָמַר לִיָּה יְיָ: 16 12 מָא אִם גְּלִיא קְדָם776 יְיָ דְּמַעַת עֵינֵי775 וְיִתִּיב יְיָ לִי שְׁבַתָּא חֶלְף לִוְשַׁתִּיָּה יוֹמָא הַדִּין: 16 13 וְאוּל דְּוִיד וְגַבְרָוּהִי בְּאוּרְחָא וְשִׁמְעִי אוּל בְּסַטְר שׂוּרָא לְקַבְלִיָּה אוּל776 וּמְלִשִׁט וּמְרָגִים בְּאַבְנֵיָּא לְקַבְלִיָּה וּמְשֻׁדֵי עִפְרָא: 16 14 וְאַחָא מִלְכָּא וְכָל עַמָּא דְּעַמִּיָּה כְּד מְשַׁלְתָּן וְנַח777 חֲמֵן778: 16 15

<sup>764</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 6 assume that TJon also wanted to spare King David by this translation.

<sup>765</sup>Ms a adds דְּמִי 'the blood of', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). The result is a conflated rendering, because the equivalent חֻבִּי is not omitted.

<sup>766</sup>Ms w reads וְיִהִב, 'and He shall give', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). Note the imperfect tense.

<sup>767</sup>Omitted in MS o.

<sup>768</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 6.

<sup>769</sup>The Targum's rendering is not as absurd as E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), Berlin 1988, 100 assumes.

<sup>770</sup>See commentary on 1 Sam. 24:15.

<sup>771</sup>According to the Qere and LXX.

<sup>772</sup>According to the Qere; so also LXX and Vg.

<sup>773</sup>See above, commentary on 7:12.

<sup>774</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 20:1.

<sup>775</sup>According to the Qere and some Hebrew MSS, clarified with the addition 'tear'; cf. Soferim 38a. LXX, Syr and Vg translate 'my affliction', in conformity with other Hebrew MSS, which read בְּעֵינֵי; but cf. 1 Sam. 1:11.

<sup>776</sup>See commentary on 1 Sam. 6:12.

<sup>777</sup>Ms w reads וְבַח, 'and he spent the night'.

<sup>778</sup>TJon neither specifies this vague "there", nor adds a place-name to the first

ואבשלום וכל עמא אנש ישראל אהו לירושלם ואחיתופל עמיה: 16 16 והוה כד אהא חושי ארכאה שושבינא<sup>779</sup> דרויר לוח אבשלום ואמר חושי לאבשלום יצלה<sup>ו</sup> מלכא יצלה<sup>ו</sup> מלכא: 17 16 ואמר אבשלום לחושי דא טיבותך דעם חברך למא לא אולהא עם חברך:

16:9 Then Abishai the son of Zeruiah said to the king, "Why should this dead dog curse my lord the king? Let me go over and take off his head." 16:10 But the king said, "What have I to do with you, you sons of Zeruiah? Thus he curses, because the LORD has said to him, 'Curse David!' Who then shall say, 'Why have you done so?'" 16:11 And David said to Abishai and to all his servants, "Behold, my own son whom I begot seeks to kill me; how much more now this son of the tribe of Benjamin. Leave him alone, and let him curse, for the LORD has said him so. 16:12 It may be that the tear of my eye will be revealed before the LORD, and that the LORD will repay me with good for his cursing this day." 16:13 So David and his men went on the road, while Shimei went along on the hillside parallel<sup>780</sup> with him, cursing as he went, and threw stones at him and flung dust. 16:14 And the king and all the people who were with him, arrived weary, and he rested there. 16:15 Now Absalom and all the people, the men of Israel, had come to Jerusalem, and Ahithophel was with him. 16:16 And when Hushai the Archite, David's close friend, came to Absalom, Hushai said to Absalom, "May the king prosper! May the king prosper!" 16:17 And Absalom said to Hushai, "This is your goodness towards your friend.<sup>781</sup> Why did you not go with your friend?"

TJon does not use the equivalent שושבינא in the present verse (as in 16:16), but the more general חברא, 'friend'. Hushai is called David's שושבינא, but the reverse—David being called the שושבינא of Hushai—appears to be impossible.

18 16 ואמר חושי לאבשלום לא אלהין<sup>782</sup> דאתרעי וי ועמא הדין וכל אנש<sup>783</sup> ישראל דיילה<sup>784</sup> אהי ועמיה אחיב: 19 16 ותגינות קדם<sup>ו</sup> מן אנא אפלח<sup>ו</sup> הלא קדם<sup>ו</sup> בריה כמה דפלחית<sup>ו</sup> קדם<sup>ו</sup> אבוך כין איהי פלח<sup>ו</sup> קדמך<sup>ו</sup>: 20 16 ואמר אבשלום לאחיתופל הבו לכן מלכא מא נעביד: 21 16 ואמר אחיתופל לאבשלום עול לוח לחינתא דאבוך

clause, although it is required there. The Lucian tradition of LXX adds "at the Jordan", which is also attested by Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:210. This solution is the most logical one, witness 17:21-22.

<sup>779</sup>See above, commentary on 13:3.

<sup>780</sup>Translation suggested by Driver, *Notes*, 319.

<sup>781</sup>Note that the irony of Absalom's words is maintained in TJon.

<sup>782</sup>Ms eb1 adds ארי, 'because'.

<sup>783</sup>Omitted in MS w.

<sup>784</sup>According to the Qere and some Hebrew MSS; cf. also LXX, Syr and Vg; cf. Soferim 37b.

דשבק למטר ביחא וישמעון כל ישראל ארי אתגריהא<sup>785</sup> באבוך ויתקפון ידי<sup>786</sup> כל דעמך:

16:18 *And Hushai said to Absalom, "No, but whom the LORD and this people and all the men of Israel have chosen, his I will be and with him I will remain. 16:19 And again, before whom should I serve? Should it be before his son? As I have served before your father, so I will serve before you." 16:20 Then Absalom said to Ahithophel, "Give your counsel, [both of] you;<sup>787</sup> what shall we do?" 16:21 And Ahithophel said to Absalom, "Go in to your father's concubine, whom he has left to keep the house. And all Israel will hear that you have challenged your father, and the hands of all who are with you will be strengthened."*

TJon gives a singular rendering of Hebrew plural פלגשי, 'concubine', although the same word in the following verse is translated with a plural. Possibly the translator thought that one concubine was sufficient to challenge the old king.<sup>788</sup>

22 16 ונגדו לאבשלום קנופין † על אנרא ועל אבשלום לוח<sup>789</sup> לחינתא דאבוהי לעיני † כל ישראל:

16:22 *So they pitched a canopy bed for Absalom upon the roof, and Absalom went in to his father's concubines in the sight of all Israel.*

The general word אהל, 'tent', is equated with the specific term קנופין, 'canopy bed'. This Graecism refers to a bed with a thin curtain, which served to protect the sleeping person from mosquitoes.<sup>790</sup> The translation is based on the co-text, from which it can be derived that a tent alone was not enough for Absalom's defiant acts.

23 16 ומלכא דאחיתופל דמליך ביומיא האנון<sup>791</sup> כמא דשאל גברא<sup>792</sup> בפתגמא<sup>793</sup> דיוי † כין כל<sup>794</sup> מלכא דאחיתופל אף לדויד אף לאבשלום: 1 17 ואמר אחיתופל

<sup>785</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 13:4.

<sup>786</sup>See above, commentary on 4:1.

<sup>787</sup>The plural of the imperative and of the *dativus ethicus* (cf. GKC § 119s) indicate that both Ahithophel and Hushai were to give their counsel.

<sup>788</sup>In contrast to the Hebrew text, LXX, Syr and Vg. MSS f eb1 read a singular in both verses, while MS w reads a plural in both verses, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). In unvocalized MSS the number remains unidentified.

<sup>789</sup>MS eb1 reads the unusual and more aggressive preposition על.

<sup>790</sup>Cf. Levy, *CWT*, Bd. 2, 373; Liddell, Scott, *GEL*, 1018.

<sup>791</sup>MS a does not read ביומיא האנון, but בעידנא ההיא, 'at that time' (>14).

<sup>792</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS, Syr, Vg and MSS of LXX. It is mentioned in the list "words read but not written" in Ned. 37b and Soferim 38a.

<sup>793</sup>MS a reads במימרא †.

<sup>794</sup>Omitted in MS w.

לאבשלום אבחר כען חרי עסר אלפין גברא ואקום וארדוף בתר דויד בליליא: 17 2  
 ואהך<sup>795</sup> עלוהי כד הוא משלהי וירדהי<sup>796</sup> מרשלן<sup>797</sup> ואויע יתיה ויערוק<sup>798</sup> כל עמא  
 דעמיה ואקטול ית מלכא בלחודוהי: 17 3 ואתיב כל<sup>799</sup> עמא לוחך<sup>800</sup> יתובון כלהון  
 בתר דיתקטיל<sup>801</sup> גברא<sup>802</sup> דאת בעי כל<sup>803</sup> עמא יהי שלום:

16:23 *Now in those days the counsel of Ahithophel was as if a man inquired of the word of the LORD; so was all the counsel [esteemed], both by David and by Absalom. 17:1 And Ahithophel said to Absalom, "Let me choose twelve thousand men, and I will arise, and pursue after David tonight. 17:2 I will go upon him while he is weary and his hands are weakened. When I will make him tremble, and all the people who are with him will retreat, I will kill the king only. 17:3 And I will bring back all the people to you. All of them will come back, after the man whom you seek will be killed. All the people will be at peace.*

The ultra-short wording and the asyndeton<sup>804</sup> in the Hebrew text is clarified in the Aramaic version. Hebrew *כשור הכל* is not conceived of as a comparison, as other ancient versions did, but as the main clause. Therefore, the particle *כ* is omitted, while the copula *בתר ד* is added after this clause. The resulting sentence fits into the co-text; in fact, the present verse repeats the contents of the preceding verse.

17 4 וכשר פתגמא בעיני<sup>805</sup> אבשלום ובעיני<sup>806</sup> סבי ישראל: 17 5 ואמר  
 אבשלום קרי כען אף לחושי ארכאה ונשמע מא דיימר אף הוא: 17 6 ואהא חושי לות  
 אבשלום ואמר אבשלום ליה למימר כפתגמא הדין מליל אחיתופל הנעביד ית פתגמיה

<sup>795</sup>Ms a reads *ואיחי*, 'and I will come', in conformity with the Hebrew text (י-29), but not in conformity with the Targumic usage of the words *אהא*, 'to come', and *הלך*, 'go'. See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 9:9.

<sup>796</sup>See above, commentary on 4:1. Note the reverse word order and the grammatical construction, which differs from that in the Hebrew text. David is not the subject of the phrase *מרשלן וירדהי*, but his hands are.

<sup>797</sup>Ms y reads the Ithpaal *מחרשלן*, 'being workless'; MS m reads *מכשלן*, 'being made stumble'.

<sup>798</sup>Ms b reads the Aphel *ואערוק*, 'and I will make [them] retreat'.

<sup>799</sup>Mss d f read the nota accusativi.

<sup>800</sup>Ms d and Kimḥi add *כד*, 'when'.

<sup>801</sup>While MS f reads the perfect *דאיתקטיל*, MS a reads *דחיקטיל*, an erroneous reading by metathesis, which can be rendered "after you will have killed".

<sup>802</sup>Omitted in MS w.

<sup>803</sup>Mss a d f read *וכל*, indicating the beginning of a new sentence, in conformity with a few Hebrew MSS, LXX, Syr and Vg.

<sup>804</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 320 assumes that part of the sentence has been omitted by haplography. The complete version would have been preserved in LXX, viz. "all of them will return as a bride returns to her husband: you only seek the life of one man, and all the people will be at peace".

<sup>805</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with a few Hebrew MSS and quotations.

<sup>806</sup>Omitted in MS eb1.

אם לא דכשר<sup>807</sup> בעינך את מליל: 7 17 ואמר חושי לאבשלום לא תקין מלכא דמלך אחיתופל בזמנא הדא: 8 17 ואמר חושי את ידעת ית אבוך וית גברוהי ארי גברין אנון ומריי<sup>808</sup> נפשן<sup>809</sup> כרוב חכיל בחקלא ואבוך גבר עביר קרבין ולא יבת עם<sup>810</sup> עמא: 9 17 הא כען הוא טמיר בחד מן כומציא<sup>811</sup> או בחד מן אתריא ויהי כמפל בהון<sup>812</sup> בקדמיתא וישמע דשמע ויימר הות מחתא בעמא דבחר אבשלום: 10 17 והוא אף גבר גבר<sup>813</sup> דלביה כלבא דאריא ממסא<sup>814</sup> מסי<sup>815</sup> ארי ידע כל ישראל ארי גבר אבוך וגברין גברין<sup>816</sup> דעמיה:

17:4 And the word was suitable in the sight of Absalom and in the sight of all the elders of Israel. 17:5 Then Absalom said, "Call Hushai the Archite also, and let us hear what he has to say." 17:6 And when Hushai came to Absalom, Absalom said to him, saying, "According to this word has Ahithophel spoken. Shall we carry out his word? If it is not suitable in your sight, you speak." 17:7 Then Hushai said to Absalom, "This time the counsel which Ahithophel has given is not right." 17:8 And Hushai said, "You know that your father and his men are heroes, and that they are bitter of soul, like a bereaved bear in the field. Besides, your father is a man who wages wars and he will not spend the night with the people. 17:9 Behold, even now he has hidden himself in one of the pits, or in some of the other places. And when there are casualties among them at the first [attack], whoever hears it will say, 'There has been a slaughter among the people who follow Absalom.' 17:10 And he, even [if he is] a heroic man whose heart is like the heart of a lion, will utterly melt, for all Israel knows that your father is a hero and that those who are with him are heroic men.

<sup>807</sup> Clarified with words from 17:4 (>15).

<sup>808</sup> MSS b y read מריין, making the attributive congruent with the noun, but creating an different grammatical construction. See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 1:10.

<sup>809</sup> MSS a d c f o y eb1 eb124 add אנון, 'they', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>810</sup> Interpreting Hebrew את as the preposition. However, MSS a b f y render the nota accusativi ית.

<sup>811</sup> MSS b f m w eb124 and Kimhi has the deviating spelling קימציא.

<sup>812</sup> The word has no antecedent, neither in the Hebrew text nor in the Aramaic. The Lucian text read בעם, 'among the people'.

<sup>813</sup> Omitted by MS y by haplography. For this rendering of Hebrew בן־חיל, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 14:52.

<sup>814</sup> MSS b y read the infinitive ממס, derived from מסס and not from מסא.

<sup>815</sup> Participle, although MSS a o y replaced it with the more usual imperfect ימסי. Ms f<sub>3</sub> suggests ימסי דמבסא אפשר instead of ימסי ממסא. This can best be translated as "And it is possible that he, even the heroic man whose heart is like the heart of a lion, will utterly melt . . .".

<sup>816</sup> For this rendering of Hebrew בן־חיל, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 14:52.

Hushai warns against a possibly lost battle and the people's reaction to such a defeat. If a rumour would be started that Absalom had been defeated and that there were casualties, then the courage of the people would melt. In the present verse Hushai stresses that even the most heroic man may be discouraged by a defeat. Hebrew הָיָא therefore refers to any man in Absalom's own army.

A different interpretation of the present verse was given by Pseudo-Jerome, and is possibly attested in MS c by adding לֵא before מָסִי. Pseudo-Jerome explains that the phrase "heroic man whose heart is like the heart of a lion" refers to King David, because this is stated in the subsequent verses.<sup>817</sup> Pseudo-Jerome believes that this phrase must be conceived of as irony, meaning the opposite of what is written:

but he [David], also a heroic man whose heart is like the heart of a lion, will not utterly melt, for all Israel knows that your father is a hero, and that those who are with him are heroic men.

The verb מָסָה, when used figuratively in Hebrew and in Aramaic, is construed with the subject לֵב: someone's heart will melt (cf. Josh. 2:11; 5:1; 7:5; Isa. 13:7; 19:1). In the present verse לֵב is no doubt the subject of the verb in the thought of the speaker.<sup>818</sup>

11 17 כָּרִיךְ<sup>819</sup> מַלְכִּית<sup>820</sup> אַחְכַּנְשָׁא יַחְכַּנְשׁוּן עַלְךָ כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל מִדָּן וְעַד בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע כַּחֲלָא דְעַל יַמָּא<sup>821</sup> לְסַגִּי<sup>822</sup> וְאֵת<sup>823</sup> תְּהִי אֲזִיל בְּרִישָׁא<sup>824</sup>:

*17:11 Thus I advise: let all Israel be completely gathered to you, from Dan to Beer-sheba, as the sand which is by the sea for multitude. And you yourself must be going at our head.*

It is uncertain whether the Targumists read Hebrew בַּקְרָב, 'in battle', or בְּקִרְבָם, 'in their midst', as LXX, Syr and Vg did by metathesis (>2).

<sup>817</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 135. Saltman adds a note to this explanation that Ginzberg found a parallel in the 14th century commentary of Gersonides *ad loc.*

<sup>818</sup>So Driver, *Notes*, 322.

<sup>819</sup>MSS a b c d f w y read אָרִי, 'because', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), although MS w adds כָּרִיךְ after the verb.

<sup>820</sup>MS w reads the Aphel אֲמַלִּיכִיה, 'I advise'.

<sup>821</sup>MSS o w read כִּיף יַמָּא, 'on the seashore'.

<sup>822</sup>MS a reads the verb לְמִסְגִי, resulting in "to be as many as the sand by the sea".

<sup>823</sup>Rendering of Hebrew וּפְנִיךְ, which is a *pars pro toto* (>14). At the same time TJon stresses the difference of opinion between Hushai and Ahithophel; cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 14.

<sup>824</sup>MSS a b c d f m y eb66 and probably eb124 read בְּרִישׁ כּוֹלָא, 'at the head of us all'.



The word is replaced with the usual denotation of the leading officer ברישנא, 'at our head'.

12 17 ונהך עלוהי בחד מן אתריא דישחכח<sup>825</sup> תמן ונשרי עלוהי כמא דשרי טלא על ארעא ולא נשאר ביה ובכל גבריא דעמיה אף<sup>826</sup> חד: 13 17 ואם לקרתא ד יחכניש ויחכנשון כל ישראל על קרתא ד ההיא ויקפונה משרין ונעקר יתה וית אבנהא ונרמינה לנחלא עד דלא נשאר חמן<sup>827</sup> אבנא:

*17:12 So we shall go against him in one of the places where he is to be found, and we shall descend on him as the dew descends on the ground. And of him and all the men that are with him not even one will be left. 17:13 And if he gathers into a city, then all Israel will gather itself against that city and armies will encircle it. And we will root it out and its stones, and we will throw it into the brook, until not a stone will be left."*

Hebrew חבלים is explained as a crowd (cf. also 1 Sam. 10:5, 10). In this co-text it is equated with משרין, 'armies'. The latter half of the verse is clarified by some additions. The hyperbole that not even a צרור, 'pebble', will be left is reduced to more proper proportions, viz. that not a (building-)stone will be found.<sup>828</sup>

14 17 ואמר אבשלום וכל אנש ישראל תקין ד מלכא דחושי ארכאה ממלכא דאחיתופל וויי פקיד לקלקלא ית מלכא דאחיתופל תקנא ד בריל דייתי ויי על אבשלום ית<sup>829</sup> בשתא: 15 17 ואמר חושי לצרוק ולאביתר כהניא כדין וכדין מלך אחיתופל ית אבשלום וית סבי ישראל<sup>830</sup> וכדין וכדין מלכית<sup>831</sup> אנא: 16 17 וכען שלחו בפריע וחוו לדויד למימר לא תבית בליליא במישרי מדברא ואף מעבר חעבר דלמא יתהני למלכא ולכל עמא דעמיה:

*17:14 And Absalom and all the men of Israel said, "The counsel of Hushai the Archite is right, more than the counsel of Ahithophel." For the LORD had ordained to ruin the right counsel of Ahithophel, so that the LORD might bring evil upon Absalom. 17:15 Then Hushai said to Zadok and Abiathar the priests, "Thus and thus did Ahithophel counsel Absalom and the elders of Israel; and thus and thus have I counselled. 17:16 And now, send quickly and tell David, saying, "Do not lodge tonight in the valleys of the desert, but by all means pass*

<sup>825</sup> Mss f m o w eb66 eb124 read דנשחכח, 'where we find ourselves'. Mss b y read דנהך, 'where we go'.

<sup>826</sup> Ms f reads ער.

<sup>827</sup> Ms o adds אף, 'even', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>828</sup> Therefore, the present text does not support a meaning "stone" of צרור; against HALAT<sup>3</sup>, s.v. צרור II.

<sup>829</sup> Omitted in MS b.

<sup>830</sup> The phrase וית סבי ישראל is omitted in MS y.

<sup>831</sup> Ms o adds אף, 'also'.

over. This may<sup>832</sup> be profitable for the king and for all the people who are with him.

The Hebrew verb בלע is used as a metaphor to describe a crushing defeat. The army was defeated as if it were swallowed and swept from the earth (cf. also Jer. 51:34, 44). Such metaphorical verbs could be equated with Aramaic קלל, 'ruin' (cf. 20:19-20), or by הרע, 'break, shatter', as in MS a. In that case the translation could have run "by all means pass over, lest the king and all the people who are with him be shattered". However, something urged the translator to use the verb הִנֵּא, 'be useful'.<sup>833</sup> This choice avoided the rare construction of the impersonal passive, which is used in the Hebrew text, followed by the preposition ל־.

The question remains whether TJon regarded "the king" as a reference to King David or to Absalom. The latter had been made king, but is not called king in TgSam. If, however, TJon thought of Absalom, the translation must be, "Do not lodge tonight in the valleys of the desert, but by all means pass over, lest it be profitable for the king (*i.e.* Absalom) and for all the people who are with him." Rashi considered "the king" to be a reference to Absalom and explained the verb בלע metaphorically as: יֹאמֵר לוֹ בִּסְתֵר וּבְבִלְעִיהָ: '(lest) it be said to him in secrecy and off the record (lit. in swallowing)'. Such an explanation is also common amongst modern commentators.<sup>834</sup> If TJon would have followed a similar reasoning, then "be profitable" is a plain rendering of the metaphorically used Hebrew verb בלע.

17 17 ויהונתן ואחיהמען קימין בעין קצרא ואולה אמתא וחוויא להן ואנן ייולון ויהון למלכא דויד ארי לא יכלון לאתחזאה למיעל<sup>835</sup> לקרתא:

*17:17 Now Jonathan and Ahimaaz were staying at the Fuller's Spring. And a handmaid went and told them that they should go and tell King David, because they must not be seen entering the city.*

Both TJon and Syr translate the name of the spring, using the word קצרא, 'fuller' (see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 13:21). The fuller was, amongst other things, a washerman and this part of his trade

<sup>832</sup> Although the word רלמא is mostly used in a negative way ('probably not, lest'), there are some texts which definitely indicate a positive "maybe"; cf. 1 Sam. 9:6; 2 Sam. 12:22.

<sup>833</sup> Levy, *CWT*, s.v. הִנֵּא Ithpe. writes that both Kimḥi and Levita struggled with the meaning of this equation.

<sup>834</sup> Following B. Jacob, "Erklärung einiger Hiob-Stellen", *ZAW* 32 (1912), 278-87, esp. 287.

<sup>835</sup> Ms eb124 erroneously repeats the word למיעל before the preceding לאתחזאה.

he executed by treading the textiles with his feet (רגל).<sup>836</sup> Several scholars have identified it with a place at the junction of the Valley of Hinnom and the Valley of Kidron, South of Jerusalem.<sup>837</sup> Pseudo-Jerome's explanation might be based on the Aramaic version, since he assumed that the girl went to the spring as if to wash her clothes.<sup>838</sup>

Smolar and Aberbach assume that קצרא could also be the Latin word *castra*, 'camp', suggesting that the place-name could refer to the spring of the Roman camp, which was clearly identifiable long after the destruction of Jerusalem.<sup>839</sup> However, they neglect the fact that TJon never used the word קצרא in the sense of "camp" and that the word קצרא does not necessarily refer to a *Roman* camp.

Although the Hebrew text uses participles to suggest that communication was regularly maintained between David and his friends in the city, TJon reduced it to a single act by rendering the verbs in the perfect tense. The handmaid only went to the waiting men once.<sup>840</sup>

18 17 וחזא יתהון עולימא וחזי לאבשלום ואולו חרויהון בפריע ועלו לבית גברא בעלמת<sup>841</sup> וליה גובא בדרחיה ונחחו תמן: 17 19 ונסיבתה אהחא ופרסת יה פרסא על פומא דבירא ושטחת עלוהי דקילן ולא אחידע פתגמא<sup>842</sup>:

*17:18 But a young man saw them, and told Absalom. So both of them went away quickly, and came to the house of a man at Almath, who had a well in his courtyard, and they went down into it. 17:19 And the woman took and spread a covering over the well's mouth, and scattered dates upon it. And nothing was known of it.*

Hebrew הריפות was connected with חרף, 'new, fresh'.<sup>843</sup> It appears from yTer. 4:6 that הריפות were considered the first dates, while סיפוח was used for the dates harvested later in the season.<sup>844</sup>

20 17 ואתו עבדי אבשלום לות אתתא<sup>845</sup> ואמרו אן אחימעץ ויהנתן ואמרת להון אתתא כבר עברו ירנא ובעו ולא אשכחו וחבו לירושלם:

<sup>836</sup>Cf. e.g. R.J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*, Vol. 4, Leiden 1956, 82-86.

<sup>837</sup>Cf. Driver, *Notes*, 324; HALAT<sup>3</sup>, s.v. עיררגל.

<sup>838</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 135.

<sup>839</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 112-13.

<sup>840</sup>Similarly S. Bombeck, *Das althebräische Verbalsystem aus aramäischer Sicht* (EHS.T, 591), Frankfurt a.M. 1995, 159.

<sup>841</sup>See above, commentary on 3:16.

<sup>842</sup>Ms m reads מדעם, 'anything'.

<sup>843</sup>So Ker. 11a, although it is explained as "grain which has experienced a change through grinding".

<sup>844</sup>Cf. Levy, *CWT*, s.v. דקילא. Note, however, that the other ancient versions all have divergent translations.

<sup>845</sup>Mss a b c d f m o w y add the word לביחא, cf. the Hebrew text (>29).

17:20 When Absalom's servants came to the woman, they said, "Where are Ahimaaz and Jonathan?" And the woman said to them, "They have already crossed the Jordan." And when they sought and could not find them, they returned to Jerusalem.

Hebrew מיכל is obscure. The ancient versions differ over the meaning of the phrase. TJon took the most simple solution by rendering "Jordan", which is implied in the subsequent verses.<sup>846</sup> Note that Hebrew המים in 17:21 is also identified with the Jordan (>15).<sup>847</sup>

17 21 והוה בתר מיזלהון וסליקו מגובא ואולו וחויאו למלכא דויד ואמרו לדויד קומו ועברו בפריע ית ירדנא ארי כרין מלך עליכון אחיתופל: 17 22 וקם דויד וכל עמא דעמיה ועברו ית ירדנא עד מיהר צפרא עד חד לא שנא דלא עבר ית ירדנא: 17 23 ואחיתופל חזא ארי לא אתקיים מלכיה ווריו ית חמרא וקם ואל לביתיה לקרתיה ופקיד על אנש ביתיה ואתחניק ומית ואתקבר בקברא דאבוהי: 17 24 ודויד אתא למחנים ואבשלום עבר ית ירדנא הוא וכל אנש<sup>848</sup> ישראל עמיה: 17 25 וית עמשא שוי<sup>849</sup> אבשלום חלף יואב על חילא ועמשא בר גברא ושמיה יתרא ישראלאה<sup>850</sup> דעל לות אביגיל<sup>851</sup> בת נחש אחתה דצרויה אמיה דיואב: 17 26 ושרא ישראל ואבשלום בארע גלעד: 17 27 והוה כד אתא דויד למחננס ושובי בר נחש מרבח בני עמון ומכיר בר עמיאל מל<sup>852</sup> דבר וברזולי גלעדאה מרוגלים: 17 28 מככין וקולין ומן דחסף וחסין וסערין וקמחא וקליא ופוליא ושלפחין<sup>853</sup> וקליאי: 17 29 ודבש ושמן וען ונובנין דחלב חורין<sup>854</sup> קריבו לדויד ולעמא דעמיה למיכל ארי אמרו עמא כפין ומשלחיה וצחי<sup>855</sup> במדברא:

17:21 After they had gone, the men came up out of the well, and went and told King David. They said to David, "Arise, and quickly cross the Jordan, for thus and thus has Ahithophel counselled against you." 17:22 Then David arose, and all the people who were with him, and they crossed the Jordan. By morning dawn not one was left who

<sup>846</sup> So Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 14.

<sup>847</sup> So also Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 135.

<sup>848</sup> Ms f reads the more specific word גבר, 'men'. While אנשא refers to the population in general, including women and children, Aramaic נברא only means the male, combative people; cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 367.

<sup>849</sup> Mss a b c d f m o w y eb66 read the more usual מני, 'appointed'.

<sup>850</sup> There is no attempt to harmonize the gentilic "Israelite" with Ithra's other gentilic "Ishmaelite" in 2 Chron. 2:17, in contrast to RuthR. 4:1; MTeh. 9:11; Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 136.

<sup>851</sup> TJon makes the name identical to that of Nabal's wife; cf. 1 Sam. 25. Only MSS f w y read the spelling in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>852</sup> In conformity with many Hebrew MSS, cf. also 9:4-5.

<sup>853</sup> Ms y reads וסערין, 'and barley'.

<sup>854</sup> Ms. Sassoon 368 reads בקרין, 'cheese of cows', instead of חורין; and נובנין דחלב חורין; cf. M. Goshen-Gottstein, *שקיעים מחרנומי המקרא הארמיים*, Vol. 1, Ramat-Gan, 1983, 141-42.

<sup>855</sup> Ms y reads וצחי, 'and they were thirsty'.

had not crossed the Jordan. 17:23 When Ahithophel had seen that his counsel was not established, he saddled his ass, and arose and went off home to his own city. And he gave orders concerning the people of his house,<sup>856</sup> and hanged himself, and he died. He was buried in the tomb of his father. 17:24 While David came to Mahanaim,<sup>857</sup> Absalom crossed the Jordan, and all the people of Israel with him. 17:25 Now Absalom had set Amasa over the army instead of Joab. Amasa was the son of a man named Ithra the Israelite, who had gone in to Abigail the daughter of Nahash, sister of Zeruah, Joab's mother. 17:26 And Israel and Absalom encamped in the land of Gilead. 17:27 When David came to Mahanaim, Shobi<sup>858</sup> the son of Nahash from Rabbah of the sons of Ammon, and Machir the son of Ammiel from Lo-debar, and Barzillai the Gileadite from Rogelim<sup>859</sup> brought 17:28 cushions,<sup>860</sup> jars, earthen pottery, and wheat, barley, flour, parched grain, beans, lentils, parched grain,<sup>861</sup> 17:29 honey, butter, sheep, and cheese of cow's milk to David and the people who were with him to eat, for they said, "The people must be hungry and weary and thirsty in the desert."

## 6.18 Absalom's Revolt Put Down (2 Samuel 18–19)

2 18 ומנא<sup>862</sup> דויד ית עמא דעמיה ומני עליהון רבני אלפי רבני מאותא: 18 1 ושלח<sup>863</sup> דויד ית עמא תלחא ביד יואב ותלחא ביד אבישי בר צרויה אחודי דיואב ותלחא ביד איחי גחאה ואמר מלכא לעמא מפק אפוק אף אנא עמכון: 18 3 ואמר עמא לא חפוק ארי אם מערק נערוק לא ישוון עלנא לב ואם יתקטלון פלגנא לא ישוון עלנא לב ארי כען את<sup>864</sup> יכיל למסעד כותנא עסרא אלפין וכען טב ארי תצלי עלנא מקרחא ◊ למסעד:

<sup>856</sup>Explained as a verbal will in BB 147a.

<sup>857</sup>Whereas Vg translates the name with "Castra", TJon maintains the Hebrew name. In Gen. 32:24 TO similarly maintained the Hebrew name, although the meaning of the name is explained there.

<sup>858</sup>There is no attempt to further identify Shobi in TJon (against >18). Whereas Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 137 identifies him as the brother of Hanun (cf. 10:1-2), the aggada identifies him with Hanun himself, cf. MTeh. 3:3.

<sup>859</sup>The place-name is not translated, in contrast to the Fuller's Spring in 17:17.

<sup>860</sup>No משכבא, 'bed', or שׁוּיָא, 'couch, bed'; probably because it is mentioned within this list of food and utensils. David and his men did not need beds, but cushions on which they could sit during the meal.

<sup>861</sup>Note that the word "parched grain" occurs twice in the same verse without being diversified; cf. AZ 38b.

<sup>862</sup>Mss m w x y read the Pael ומני, resulting in "and David appointed the people who were with him".

<sup>863</sup>Mss m y read the Peal.

<sup>864</sup>A few Hebrew MSS read אתה instead of עתה, cf. LXX, Symmachus and Vg. TJon appears to have rendered both readings.

18:1 Then David mustered the people who were with him, and appointed over them commanders of thousands and commanders of hundreds. 18:2 And David sent forth the people, one third by the hand of Joab, one third by the hand of Abishai the son of Zeruiah, Joab's brother, and one third by the hand of Ittai the Gittite. And the king said to the people, "I myself will also go out with you." 18:3 But the people said, "You shall not go out. For if we finally retreat, they will pay no attention to us. And if half of us are killed, they will not pay attention to us either. For now, you are able to assist like ten thousand of us. And now, it is better that you pray for us from the city in order to assist."

In the Hebrew text the people told David that there were ten thousand like them, but that David was unique. Some Hebrew and LXX MSS, as well as Symmachus and Vulgate, stress the uniqueness of David by reading אהה instead of עתה, so that David was compared with "ten thousand like us". TJon, giving both readings, clarifies David's significance with the addition of the verb למסעד, 'to assist'.

The last sentence of the Hebrew verse is rather vague. David was probably expected to send help from the city, but actual help from the city is mentioned nowhere in the rest of the narrative. TJon clarifies the people's intention by referring to prayer. That is the assistance that David was able to deliver. The repetition of the word סעד, 'assist', stresses the importance and usefulness of prayer, because by prayer David was able to act like ten thousand soldiers.<sup>865</sup>

866 4 ואמר להון מלכא דחקין ◊ בעיניכון אעביד וקם מלכא על כיבש אורח תרעא  
 וכל עמא נפקן למאון ולאליפין: 18 5 ופקיד מלכא ית יואב וית אבישי וית איתי למימר  
 אסתמרו לי בעולימא באבשלום: 867 עמא שמעו כד פקיד מלכא ית כל רברביא  
 על עיסק אבשלום: 18 6 ונפק עמא לחקלא לקדמוח ישראל והוה קרבא בחורשא  
 דביית אפרים: 18 7 ואתברו תמן עמא 868 ישראל קדם ◊ עבדי דויד והות תמן מחתא  
 רבתא ביומא ההוא עסרין אלפין: 18 8 והוו תמן עבדי קרבא מתבדרין על אפי כל 869  
 ארעא ואסניאת חית חורשא לקטלא 870 בעמא מדקטילת חרבא ביומא ההוא:

18:4 The king said to them, "Whatever seems right in your sight I will do." So the king stood on the path of the gateway, while all the people

<sup>865</sup>Cf. M. Maher, "The Meturgemanim and Prayer", *JJS* 41 (1990), 226-46, esp. 246.

<sup>866</sup>The complete phrase "on the path of the gateway" is taken from 2 Sam. 15:2 (>15). The same phrase is used in 1 Sam. 4:13, 18.

<sup>867</sup>Omitted in MS o.

<sup>868</sup>Omitted in MS eb66.

<sup>869</sup>Omitted in MS c.

<sup>870</sup>Kimḥi reads the Peal למקטל.

went out by hundreds and by thousands. 18:5 And the king ordered Joab and Abishai and Ittai, "Deal gently for my sake with the young man, with Absalom." And all the people heard when the king gave orders to all the commanders about the sake of Absalom. 18:6 So the people went out into the field against Israel. And the battle took place in the forest of the House of Ephraim. 18:7 And the people of Israel were shattered there before the servants of David, and the stroke was great on that day, twenty thousand men. 18:8 There the wagers of war were scattered over the face of all the country; so the beasts of the forest killed more people than the sword killed that day.

A simple explanation is given for the phrase that the forest consumed part of the people. The verb *אכל* was connected with the wild animals of the forest.<sup>871</sup> Additionally, the figuratively used verb was replaced by the usual verb *קטל*, 'kill'. Because the replacement took place in both occurrences, the repetition of the verb was maintained.

18 9 ואתערע אבשלום קדם<sup>872</sup> עברי דויד ואבשלום רכיב על כודנתא ועלת כודנתא<sup>873</sup> תחות סוכא דבוטמא רבתא ואתאחר<sup>874</sup> רישיה בבוטמא ואחלי<sup>875</sup> בין שמיא ובין ארעא וכודנתא דתחותיה עברת: 18 10 וחזא גברא חד וחוי ליואב ואמר הא חויתא ית אבשלום תלי בבוטמא: 18 11 ואמר יואב לגברא דמחוי ליה והא חויתא ומדין לא מחיתיה חמן ורמיתיה לארעא ועלי פון<sup>876</sup> למתן לך עסר סלעין דכסף ואספניקי חדא: 18 12 ואמר גברא ליואב ואלו<sup>877</sup> אנא תקיל על ידי<sup>878</sup> אלף סלעין דכסף לא אושיט ידי בבר מלכא ארי קדמנא פקיד מלכא יתך וית אבישי וית איתי למימר אסתמרו ל<sup>879</sup> בעולימא באבשלום:

18:9 And Absalom accidentally came in front of the servants of David. Now Absalom was riding upon a mule, and the mule went under the branch of a great terebinth, and his head was caught fast in the terebinth. And he was left hanging between heaven and earth, while the mule that was under him went on. 18:10 And a certain man saw it, and told Joab, "Behold, I saw Absalom hanging in a terebinth." 18:11 Joab said to the man who was telling him, "What, you saw him! Why then did you not strike him there and throw him to the ground? I would

<sup>871</sup>This explanation was adopted by Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 137. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:238 explained that more soldiers fell in flight than on the field of battle.

<sup>872</sup>The words *כודנתא ועלת* are omitted in MSS b w, by haplography.

<sup>873</sup>MS f reads the Ithpaal *ואיחר*.

<sup>874</sup>In conformity with *ויהל* of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, and the other ancient versions, but cf. 18:10.

<sup>875</sup>Omitted in MS o, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>876</sup>According to the Qere and many Hebrew MSS. MS m reads the negation *ולא*.

<sup>877</sup>MSS b y read *כפי*, 'my palms', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>878</sup>The unusual word *מי* was replaced with the more usual wording of 18:5.

have given you about ten selas of silver and one girdle." 18:12 But the man said to Joab, "Even if I were feeling in my hands the weight of a thousand selas of silver, I would not stretch out my hand against the king's son, for before us the king commanded you and Abishai and Ittai, 'Deal gently for my sake with the young man, with Absalom.'

David's commandment concerning his son Absalom was translated in conformity with the Aramaic version of 18:5, because it is a direct quotation (>16). Note, however, that the verb was taken from 18:5, while the prepositions are in conformity with the Hebrew of the present verse.<sup>879</sup>

13 18 או עבדיה<sup>880</sup> בנפשי שקרא וכל מדעם לא יחכסא מן מלכא ואת תתעדד מקביל:

18:13 Or if I had dealt treacherously by myself, and there would be nothing hidden from the king, then you would have set yourself on the opposite side.

TJon translates the present verse with the supposition that the man talked about his potential killing of Absalom. He could have killed him, but if the whole event would be discovered by the king, he would find Joab as his opponent.

14 18 ואמר יואב הלא מבכין אנא<sup>881</sup> אשרי<sup>882</sup> קדמך ונסיב ונסיב ונסיב ונסיב<sup>883</sup> בידיה וקבענון בלבא דאבשלום עד כען קיים בנו<sup>884</sup> בוטמא: 15 18 ואסחררו עסרא עולימין נשלי זיניה דיואב ומחו ית אבשלום וקטלוהי: 16 18 ותקע יואב בשופרא ותב עמא מלמרדף בתר ישראל ארי זער<sup>885</sup> יואב ית עמא: 17 18 ונסיבו ית אבשלום ורמו יתיה בחורשא לנו כומצא<sup>886</sup> רבא ואקימו עלוהי גגור אבנין רב לחדא וכל ישראל אפכו נבר לקרווהי: 18 18 ואבשלום נסיב ואקים ליה בחיוהי ית קמתא דבמישר מלכא ארי אמר לית לי בר קיים<sup>887</sup> בדיל לאדכרא שמי<sup>888</sup> וקרא לקמתא

<sup>879</sup> Complementary rendering (>15). Cf. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 72.

<sup>880</sup> MSS a b c d f m y add פון, 'perhaps, about', to indicate that the man is only talking about a possibility.

<sup>881</sup> Omitted in MSS b y.

<sup>882</sup> TJon probably derived Hebrew אחילה from the verb חלל, as Vg and one MS of LXX did.

<sup>883</sup> MS f<sub>3</sub> suggests the Greek loan-word לוֹנְכִיִּין, 'lances'.

<sup>884</sup> Plain translation of the metaphorical בלב, 'in the heart'. This translation does not maintain the repetition of לב.

<sup>885</sup> MSS a b d y read the synonym מנע, 'he withdrew'.

<sup>886</sup> MS f<sub>3</sub> suggests the reading גימצא, 'pit', while MSS b f m o y eb66 read קומצא, 'pit, grave'.

<sup>887</sup> Omitted in MSS a f, which only reads ברא (>29). MS f<sub>3</sub> suggests בר דכר, 'a male son', making a link with the subsequent verb דכר, 'remember'.

<sup>888</sup> Kimḥi reads the nota accusativi before שמי.



על שמייה ואחקרי<sup>889</sup> לה אתרא<sup>890</sup> דאבשלום עד יומא דרין:

18:14 And Joab said, "Shall I not now begin before you?" And he took three darts in his hand, and thrust them into the heart of Absalom, while he was still alive in the middle of the terebinth.<sup>891</sup> 18:15 And ten young men, Joab's armour-bearers, surrounded Absalom and struck him, and killed him. 18:16 Then Joab blew the trumpet, and the people came back from pursuing Israel, for Joab restrained the people. 18:17 And they took Absalom, and threw him into a great pit in the forest, and raised over him a very great heap of stones. And all Israel retreated, every one to his own town. 18:18 Now Absalom in his lifetime had taken and set up for himself the pillar which is in the King's Valley, for he said, "I have no living son to keep my name in remembrance." He called the pillar after his own name, and it is called Absalom's Place to this day.

Whereas 14:27 informs us about Absalom's children, three sons and a daughter, the present verse implies that Absalom had no sons to keep his name in remembrance. TJon harmonizes these two verses by adding the word קיים, 'living'. Apparently, Absalom's sons had died before growing up. Josephus gives a similar explanation, suggesting the children's death as a possibility and not as reality.<sup>892</sup> NumR. 9:24 offers a different solution, *i.e.* Absalom's sons were unworthy to follow in their father's footprints.<sup>893</sup>

19 18 ואחימעץ בר צדוק אמר ארהוט כען ואבסר ית מלכא ארי אחפרע ליה יוי מיד<sup>894</sup> בעלי דבבוהי: 20 18 ואמר ליה יואב לא גבר<sup>895</sup> כשר לבסרא את יומא

<sup>889</sup>In conformity with the Masoretic vocalization. MSS a b c d f o read וקרא, vocalizing Hebrew ויקרא as a consecutive imperfect (>3). The latter vocalization is adjusted to grammar.

<sup>890</sup>Consistent translation of Hebrew י, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 15:12.

<sup>891</sup>Neither in the present, nor in the subsequent verse does TJon explain the numbers of the darts and the spears of the young man. This is done in NumR. 9:24; Sot. 9b, tSot. 3:16-17, which says that Absalom was struck three times in his heart, because he had stolen the heart of his father, the heart of the court, and the heart of the people. He was killed by ten young men, because he had stolen the ten concubines of his father.

<sup>892</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:243, "saying that if his children should perish, his name would remain in connexion with the column".

<sup>893</sup>The same explanation was given by R. Isaac b. Abdimi in Sot. 11a; and by Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 138.

<sup>894</sup>Ms a adds כל, 'all'.

<sup>895</sup>Omitted in MS w.

הדין ותבסר ביומא אחרן ויומא הדין לא תבסר<sup>896</sup> אלהין<sup>897</sup> דבר מלכא מית: 18 21  
ואמר יואב לכושי איזיל חוי למלכא<sup>898</sup> דחזיתא וסניד כושי ליואב ורהט:

18:19 Then said Ahimaaz the son of Zadok, "Let me run, and carry tidings to the king that the LORD has taken vengeance for him from the hand of his enemies." 18:20 And Joab said to him, "You are not the right man to carry tidings this day, but you may carry tidings another day. On this day you have no other tidings but that the king's son is dead." 18:21 Then Joab said to Cushī, "Go, tell the king what you have seen." And Cushī bowed to Joab, and ran.

TJon, as well as LXX, Vg and Syr, vocalized Hebrew לכושי as לְכוּשִׁי, reading it as a personal name<sup>899</sup> The Tiberian vocalization in the subsequent verses (18:22, 31-32), however, reflects the view that Hebrew לכושי was considered a gentilic name.<sup>900</sup> The Hebrew text wrote and vocalized it as a gentilic name, and such was also the explanation of Pseudo-Jerome.<sup>901</sup> Likewise, Kimḥi remarks that Hebrew לכושי is not a personal name and that the messenger was either of Ethiopian origin or a dark-skinned Israelite. It should be noted that TJon shows a tendency to remove Cushites from the narrative if they play a positive role<sup>902</sup>

22 18 ואוסיף עוד אחימעץ בר צדוק ואמר ליואב ויהי מא ארהוט כען אף אנא בתר  
כושי ואמר יואב למא דנן את רהיט ברי ולך לית בסורא מתיחבא: 18 23 ויהי מא<sup>903</sup>  
ארהוט ואמר ליה רהוט ורהט אחימעץ באורח משרא<sup>904</sup> וקדים<sup>905</sup> ית כושי: 18 24  
וודיד יתיב בין חרין תרעיא והליך סכואה על אנר תרעא<sup>905</sup> על שורא וקפ<sup>906</sup> ית<sup>907</sup>  
עינהי וחזא והא גברא רהיט בלחודוהי: 18 25 וקרא סכואה וחוי למלכא ואמר מלכא

<sup>896</sup>From TJon until תבסר is omitted in MS eb66 by haplography, but added in the margin.

<sup>897</sup>TJon did not render in conformity with the Qere על-כן, but substituted כִּי־אם for כִּי־על; against the list of words read but not written in Soferim 38a.

<sup>898</sup>Mss eb66 eb75 add the word כֵּא, 'what'.

<sup>899</sup>Cf. Jer. 36:14; Zeph. 1:1. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:246 also renders a personal name, but clearly confused Cushī with Hushai, David's close friend.

<sup>900</sup>In MS p and the Tiberian tradition. The remainder of the Yemenite tradition, as well as the Babylonian tradition, vocalized it as the personal name Cushī.

<sup>901</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 138-39.

<sup>902</sup>Cf. TJon Jer. 38:7, 10, 12; 39:16; Amos 9:7.

<sup>903</sup>Omitted in MS c. Mss a b c d f m o w y eb66 add בכרין, 'in that way, by doing so'.

<sup>904</sup>MS o read the Aphel ואקדים, 'and he was early'.

<sup>905</sup>Mss a c read the plural חרעיא, 'gates'.

<sup>906</sup>Literal translation of Hebrew נשא, with the same meaning; cf. S.C. Reif, "A Root to Look up? A Study of the Hebrew NS' 'YN", in: J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (VT.S, 36), Leiden 1985, 230-44.

<sup>907</sup>Omitted in MS c.

אם בלחודוהי הוא<sup>908</sup> בסורתא בפומיה ואול מיזל וקריב: 18 26 וחזא סכואה נברא אחרנא רהיש וקרא סכואה לנשר<sup>909</sup> חרעא<sup>910</sup> ואמר הא נברא<sup>911</sup> רהיש בלחודוהי ואמר מלכא אף דין מבסר: 18 27 ואמר סכואה אנא חזי ית<sup>912</sup> רהטא דקדמאה כרהטא דאחמעץ בר צדוק ואמר מלכא נבר טב<sup>913</sup> דין ואף בסורא טבא<sup>914</sup> יית: 18 28 וקרא אחמעץ ואמר למלכא שלם וסגיד למלכא על אפוהי על ארעא ואמר בריך יי אלהך<sup>915</sup> דמסר ית נבריא דארימו ית ידהון ברבוני<sup>916</sup> מלכא: 18 29 ואמר מלכא שלם<sup>913</sup> לעולימא לאבשלום ואמר אחמעץ חזיתי המנא סניאה בתר<sup>914</sup> דשלה<sup>915</sup> עברא דמלכא יואב ית עברך ולא ידעית מא:

18:22 Then Ahimaaz the son of Zadok said again to Joab, "Come what may, let me also run after Cush." And Joab said, Why will you run, my son? There are no tidings to be given." 18:23 "Come what may, let me run." And he said, "Run." And Ahimaaz ran by the way of the valley, and outran Cush. 18:24 Now David was sitting between the two gates, and the watchman went up to the roof of the gate, up to the wall. And when he lifted up his eyes and looked, behold, a man running alone. 18:25 And the watchman called out and told the king. And the king said, "If he is alone, there are tidings in his mouth." And he came nearer and nearer. 18:26 And the watchman saw another man running, and the watchman called to the gatekeeper, and said, "Behold, a man running alone." And the king said, "This one also carries tidings." 18:27 And the watchman said, "I recognize the running of the foremost as the running of Ahimaaz the son of Zadok." And the king said, "He is a good man, and also carries good tidings." 18:28 Then Ahimaaz called, and said to the king, "Peace!" And he bowed to the king with his face to the earth, and said, "Blessed be the LORD your God, who has surrendered the men who raised their hand against my lord the king." 18:29 And the king said, "It is well with the young man Absalom?" Ahimaaz said, "After Joab, the king's servant, sent your servant, I saw a great tumult, but I do not know what it was."

TJon harmonizes the present verse with the subsequent verses. The

<sup>908</sup> Ms m reads the feminine היא, adjusting it to the subsequent בסורתא.

<sup>909</sup> In conformity with the Masoretic vocalization, which read "the porter", rather than "the gate", as do LXX and Syr.

<sup>910</sup> Ms a reads קרהא, 'city'.

<sup>911</sup> Ms d adds אחרון, 'other', in agreement with LXX, Vg and Syr, in conformity with the beginning of the present verse.

<sup>912</sup> Omitted in MS o.

<sup>913</sup> The interrogation is indicated by the tone of the voice, cf. 1 Sam. 16:4. Ms f reads השלם, adding the interrogative particle, in conformity with 18:32 (>15).

<sup>914</sup> Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>915</sup> MSS o y add the nota accusativi, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), thus leaving two objects in a phrase with one subject.

great tumult, obviously referring to Absalom's death, was seen after the sending of Ahimaaz, but definitely before the sending of Cush—according to Ahimaaz' report. That is why Ahimaaz claimed not to know anything about Absalom's fate, whereas Cush appeared to know the entire issue.<sup>916</sup>

30 18 ואמר מלכא אסתחר אתעתד כדן<sup>917</sup> ואסתחר וקם: 31 18 והא כושי אתא ואמר כושי יתבסר רבוני<sup>918</sup> מלכא ארי אתפרע לך יי יומא דין מיד כל דקמו עלך: 32 18 ואמר מלכא לכושי השלם לעולימא לאבשלום ואמר כושי יהון כעולימא סנאי<sup>919</sup> רבוני<sup>918</sup> מלכא וכל דקמו עלך לבישא: 19 1 ורגזו מלכא וסליק על עליית חרעא ובכא וכדן<sup>918</sup> אמר במיזליה ברי אבשלום ברי ברי אבשלום לוי<sup>919</sup> דמיתת אנא חלופך ואח קיים יומא דין אבשלום ברי ברי:

18:30 And the king said, "Turn aside,<sup>920</sup> and stand here." So he turned aside, and stood still. 18:31 And behold, Cush came. And Cush said, "Tidings for my lord the king, for today the LORD has taken vengeance for you from the hand of all who rose against you." 18:32 The king said to Cush, "Is it well with the young man Absalom?" And Cush said, "May the haters of my lord the king, and all who rose against you for evil, be like the young man." 19:1 And the king was deeply shocked, and went up to the chamber over the gate, and wept. And thus he said, while he went, "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! Would I had died instead of you and you were alive today! O Absalom, my son, my son!"

The Hebrew text of David's elegy—according to the Masoretic punctuation—consists of three, chiasmatically constructed, cola. The first and the last colon merely call "my son" and "Absalom" with some variations, while the middle line utters the wish that Absalom would not have died. The Aramaic version is expanded with an extra colon, parallel to the middle one. In this way, TJon created the antithetical parallelism of אָנָּא || אַחַּתְּהָּ and אַחַּתְּהָּ || קַיִּים in the two Aramaic middle cola. Thus TJon created an elegy containing an ABBA-structure, like the elegy for Abner (3:33-34):

<i>O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom!</i>	ברי אבשלום ברי ברי אבשלום
<i>Would I had died instead of you</i>	לוי דמיתת אנא חלופך
<i>and you were alive today!</i>	ואח קיים יומא דין
<i>O Absalom, my son, my son!</i>	אבשלום ברי ברי

<sup>916</sup>A similar explanation is given by Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:250.

<sup>917</sup>Mss a b y read הכא, 'here'; MS d reads בדן, 'here'.

<sup>918</sup>MS a reads וכרין, usually reserved for divine utterances.

<sup>919</sup>MS o reads צבית, 'I wished'.

<sup>920</sup>Against Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 110, n. 300, who translate the verb by "recline".

The expanded colon is an attempt to complete David's wish. He did not only wish to die instead of Absalom, his most sincere wish was that Absalom would be still alive.<sup>921</sup> Hebrew מִיִּיתָן is recognized as the introduction of a rhetorical question, expressing a wish (cf. GKC § 151a). It is therefore equated with an Aramaic introduction of a wish—a declarative statement instead of a rhetorical question (>14).<sup>922</sup>

19 2 ואתחזה ליואב הא מלכא בכי ומתאבל<sup>923</sup> על אבשלום: 19 3 הוזה תשועתא ביומא ההוא לאבלא לכל עמא ארי שמע עמא ביומא ההוא למימר אתנסיס מלכא על בריה: 19 4 ומתגנבין עמא ביומא ההוא למיעל לקרתא כמא דמתגנבין עמא ומתכלמין<sup>924</sup> במיפכהון<sup>925</sup> בקרבא:

19:2 It was told Joab, "Behold, the king is weeping and mourning over Absalom." 19:3 So the salvation on that day was turned into mourning for all the people, for the people heard that day, saying, "The king is grieving for his son." 19:4 And the people stole into the city that day as people steal in who are ashamed when they retreat in battle.

TJon maintains the metaphorical verb גנב, 'steal'. This is not very surprising since the explanation of the metaphor is given in the second half of the verse.

19 5 ומלכא כריך ית אפוהי וצוח מלכא בקל רב ברי אבשלום אבשלום ברי ברי: 19 6 ואתא יואב לוח מלכא לכיתא ואמר אבהיתא יומא דין ית אפי כל עבדך דשויבו ית נפשך יומא דין<sup>926</sup> וית נפש ברך<sup>927</sup> ובנתך נפשך ונפש לחינתך: 19 7 למרחם ית סניך ולמסני ית רחמך ארי חויתא יומא דין ארי לית לך רברבין ועבדין ארי<sup>928</sup> ידענא יומא דין ארי אלו<sup>929</sup> אבשלום קיים וכלנא יומא דין<sup>930</sup> מתקמלין ארי

<sup>921</sup> According to Sot. 10b seven of the eight times 'my son!' were meant to raise Absalom from the seven divisions of Gehenna. "As for the last time, some say to unite his head to his body and others say to bring him into the world to come."

<sup>922</sup> Where the original sense of מִיִּיתָן is still plainly discernible, this interrogative introduction is translated literally, e.g. in TgJudg. 9:29. The use of the particle מִ followed by the imperfect, which expresses that which is still unfulfilled but possible and desirable, is also rendered literally elsewhere, e.g. in TJon 1 Sam. 20:10; 2 Sam. 15:4; 23:15.

<sup>923</sup> Participle indicating the duration of the act; in conformity with two Hebrew MSS and Syr. MSS c d o read the perfect (>29).

<sup>924</sup> MSS a b c d f o w y read דמתכלמין, 'who are ashamed'.

<sup>925</sup> MS o reads במהפכהון, 'when they turn'.

<sup>926</sup> MS a omits the second דין יומא.

<sup>927</sup> Singular in MS p. All other MSS read the plural (>29).

<sup>928</sup> MSS b y add the personal pronoun אנא.

<sup>929</sup> According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the other ancient versions.

<sup>930</sup> MS eb66 omits דין יומא וכלנא ארי אלו אבשלום קיים by haplography, but it is added in the margin.

בכין כשר בעיניך: 19 8 וכען קום פוק ומליל על לבא דעבדך ארי במימרא דיוי קיימית ארי<sup>931</sup> ליתך נפיק אם יבית גבר עמך בליליא ותהי בישא לך דא מכל בשתא דאתח עלך מזעורך<sup>932</sup> עד כען: 19 9 וקם מלכא ויתבי בתרעא ולכל עמא אתחזה<sup>933</sup> למימר הא מלכא יתיב בתרעא<sup>934</sup> ואתא כל עמא לקדם<sup>935</sup> מלכא וישראל אפך<sup>936</sup> גבר לקרוהי: 19 10 והו כל עמא מתוכחין בכל שבטיא דישראל למימר מלכא שיזבנא מיר בעלי דבבנא<sup>937</sup> והוא פרקנא מידא דפלשתאי וכען ערק מן ארעא מלות<sup>938</sup> אבשלום: 19 11 ואבשלום דמשחנא עלנא מית בקרבא וכען למא אתון<sup>939</sup> שתקין לאחבא ית מלכא: 19 12 ומלכא דויד שלח לצדוק ולאביתר כהניא למימר מלילו עם סבי יהודה למימר למא תהון בתראין לאחבא ית מלכא לבייתיה ופתגם כל ישראל אתא לוח מלכא לבייתיה: 19 13 אחי אתון קריבי ובסרי<sup>938</sup> אתון ולמא תהון בתראין לאחבא ית מלכא: 19 14 ולעמשא תימרן הלא קריבי ובסרי<sup>939</sup> את כדין יעביד לי יוי<sup>940</sup> וכדין יוסיף אם לא רב חילא<sup>940</sup> תהי<sup>940</sup> קדמי<sup>940</sup> כל יומיא חלף יואב: 19 15 ואתפני לבא דכל אנש יהודה כנברא חר ושלחו למלכא חוב את וכל עבדך:

19:5 And the king had covered his face, and the king cried with a loud voice, "O my son Absalom! O Absalom, my son, my son!"<sup>941</sup>  
 19:6 Then Joab came indoors to the king, and said, "You have today ashamed the faces of all your servants, who have saved your life today, and the lives of your sons and daughters, and the lives of your wives, and the lives of your concubines, 19:7 by loving those who hate you and hating those who love you. For you have made it clear today that commanders and servants do not exist for you, for today I perceive that it would be precious to you, if Absalom were alive and all of us were dead today. 19:8 And now, arise, go out and speak to your servants. For I swear by the speech of the LORD, if you do not go out, not a man will spend the night with you, and this will be worse for you than all the evil that has come upon you from your youth until now." 19:9 Then the king arose, and took his seat in the gate. And all the people were told, saying, "Behold, the king is sitting in the gate."

<sup>931</sup> Mss a f eb66 eb75 add the copula אַם, 'if'.

<sup>932</sup> Ms reads the Hebraism מנעורך, 'from your youth'.

<sup>933</sup> Passive voice in MS p; all other MSS read the active חויאו, 'they told', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>934</sup> Ms m omitted בתרעא יתיב מלכא הא מלכא למימר עמא אתחזה by haplography.

<sup>935</sup> Omitted in MS f; MS f<sub>4</sub> suggests א"ש.

<sup>936</sup> A better preposition than the Hebrew construction with מעל; cf. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 415.

<sup>937</sup> Mss m o read אַחנא, 'we', in accordance with the preceding phrases in this verse (>15).

<sup>938</sup> For the expression "my bone and flesh", see above, Ch. 3 (>13).

<sup>939</sup> For the expression "my bone and flesh", see above, Ch. 3 (>13).

<sup>940</sup> Ms f reads אַמניך, 'I shall appoint you'.

<sup>941</sup> This couplet simply condenses the content of the earlier elegy; cf. W. G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOT.S, 26), Sheffield 1984, 363.

*And all the people came before the king, but Israel had fled every man to his own town. 19:10 And all the people were were rebuking each other throughout all the tribes of Israel, saying, "The king delivered us from the hand of our enemies, and he saved us from the hand of the Philistines. And now he has fled out of the land from Absalom. 19:11 But Absalom, whom we anointed over us, has died in battle. And now, why do you say nothing about bringing the king back?" 19:12 And King David sent word to Zadok and Abiathar the priests, saying, "Speak with the elders of Judah, saying, 'Why should you be the last to bring the king back to his house, when the word of all Israel has come to the king, to his house? 19:13 You are my brothers, you are my relatives and my flesh; why then should you be the last to bring back the king?' 19:14 And say to Amasa, 'Are you not my relative and my flesh? May the LORD do so to me, and more also, if you are not commander of the army before me all the days, in place of Joab.'" 19:15 And the hearts of all the men of Judah swayed as one man, so that they sent word to the king, "Return, both you and all your servants."*

Aramaic ואחפני is in the passive voice, as though TJon vocalized וַיִּשַׁע, as in some Hebrew MSS (>3). Therefore, the nota accusativi is omitted. Ms d adds the nota accusativi, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), but against the grammar.

16 19 ותב מלכא ואתא עד ירדנא ודבית<sup>942</sup> יהודה אתו לגלגלא למיזל לקדמות מלכא לאעברא ית מלכא ית ירדנא: 17 19 ואוחי שמעי בר גרא בר שיבט<sup>943</sup> בנימין דמיעלמת<sup>943</sup> ונחה עם אנש יהודה לקדמות מלכא דויד: 18 19 ואלף גברא עמיה משבטא<sup>944</sup> דבית<sup>944</sup> בנימין וציבא עולימא דבית שאול וחמישה עשר בנוהי ועסרין עבדוהי עמיה וגו<sup>945</sup> ירדנא קדם<sup>945</sup> מלכא: 19 19 ואעברו מנותא לאעברא ית בית<sup>946</sup> מלכא ולמעבד דתקין<sup>946</sup> בעינוהי<sup>946</sup> ושמע<sup>946</sup> בר גרא נפל קדם<sup>946</sup> מלכא במעבריה בירדנא:

*19:16 So the king returned to the Jordan. And those of the House of Judah came to Gilgal to meet the king and to bring the king over the Jordan. 19:17 And Shimei the son of Gera, from the tribe of Benjamin, from Almath, made haste to come down with the men of Judah to meet King David, 19:18 and with him were a thousand men of the*

<sup>942</sup>Omitted in MS a, which only reads ויהודה (>29).

<sup>943</sup>See above, commentary on 3:16.

<sup>944</sup>Ms f omits both שבטא and דבית, reading only מבנימן, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). MSS b y omits בית, reading only בנימן.

<sup>945</sup>A synonym of עבר, cf. TJon Isa. 10:29; Nah. 1:12. Abraham ben Asher, אור הככל, *id est Lumen Intellectus*, Venice 1568, quotes the reading וקפצו, 'and they jumped', a rare verb in the Targum; cf. M. Goshen-Gottstein, *שקיעים מדרגתי המקרא*, הארמיות, Vol. 1, Ramat-Gan 1983, 71.

<sup>946</sup>Omitted in MS w.

tribe of the House of Benjamin. But there was Ziba the young man of Saul, with his fifteen sons and his twenty servants, and they waded through the Jordan before the king. 19:19 And fords allowed them to cross in order to bring over the king's house, and to do what was right in his sight. And Shimei the son of Gera fell down before the king, while he was crossing the Jordan.

The Aphel **ואעברו** does not really fit into the sentence. MSS b c d y read the Peal **ועברו**, 'and they crossed'. MS f reads the singular **ואעבר**, 'and he made cross', probably to indicate that Ziba made his men cross the Jordan to bring over the king.

20 19 ואמר למלכא לא יחשיב עלי דיילי רבוני חובא  $\diamond$  ולא תדכר יח דסרח עבדך ביומא דגלא<sup>947</sup> רבוני  $\diamond$  מלכא מירושלם לשואה מלכא על לביה: 21 19 ארי ידע עבדך ארי אנא חביח  $\diamond$  והא אחיתי יומא דין קדמי לכל בית יוסף למיחח לקדמות רבוני  $\diamond$  מלכא: 22 19 ואתיב אבישי בר צרויה ואמר החלף דא לא יתקטיל שמעי ארי לט<sup>948</sup> ית משיחא דיוי: 23 19 ואמר דויד מא לי ולהון בני צרויה ארי תהון לי יומא דין לסטן<sup>949</sup> יומא דין יתקטיל גברא בישראל ארי הלא ידענא ארי יומא דין אנא מלכא על ישראל: 24 19 ואמר מלכא לשמעו לא תמות<sup>950</sup> וקיים ליה מלכא: 25 19 ומפיבושת בר שאול נחת לקדמות מלכא ולא שטף<sup>951</sup> רגלוהי ולא ספר ספמיה<sup>952</sup> וית לבושהי לא חור<sup>953</sup> למן יומא דגלא מלכא עד יומא דאתא בשלמא: 26 19 והוה כד אתא לירושלם לקדמות מלכא ואמר ליה מלכא למא לא אולתא עמי מפיבושת: 27 19 ואמר רבוני  $\diamond$  מלכא עבדי שקר בי ארי אמר עבדך אחשוק לי חמרא וארכוב עליה ואיזיל<sup>954</sup> עם מלכא ארי מחגר<sup>955</sup> עבדך: 28 19 ואמר על עבדך מלין דלא כשרן קדם $\diamond$  רבוני  $\diamond$  מלכא ורבוני  $\diamond$  מלכא חכים<sup>956</sup> כמלאכא דיוי $\diamond$  ועביד דתקין  $\diamond$  בעינד $\diamond$ : 29 19 ארי לא הוה כל בית אבא אלהין גברי חייבי קטול<sup>957</sup> לרבוני מלכא ושויהא יח עבדך באכלי פתורך ומא איה לי עוד זכו $\diamond$  ולמקבל עוד קדם  $\diamond$  מלכא: 30 19 ואמר ליה מלכא למא תמליל עוד פתנמך אמרית את וציבא תפלון ית אחסנתא:

<sup>947</sup>Precision, partly because the verb **צא** is used to denote the beginning of a military campaign. So also in 19:25.

<sup>948</sup>MS f reads **לטט**, from the root **לטט**.

<sup>949</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 29:4.

<sup>950</sup>For the use of the stem **מיה**, see commentary on 1 Sam. 14:44.

<sup>951</sup>The Hebrew text twice contains **עשה**, 'do'. TJon gives a more precise translation (>11).

<sup>952</sup>Kimḥi cites **שפיוהיה**, 'his lips'.

<sup>953</sup>MS a reads **שטף**, 'bathed', in conformity with the preceding verb.

<sup>954</sup>MSS a b c d f o read **ואיהך**, 'and I will go'; MSS m y read **ואיהך**; MS w reads **ואיהי**, 'and I will be'.

<sup>955</sup>Most probably a Pael participle, cf. Dalman, *Handwörterbuch*, s.v. MS b reads **מחגר** and MS w reads **מחגר**, both Aphel participles. MS y reads the adjective **חגר**, 'lame, crippled'.

<sup>956</sup>TJon adds the ground according to 2 Sam. 14:20 (>13; >15).

<sup>957</sup>For the expression "deserving to die", see above, commentary on 2 Sam. 16:7.



19:20 And he said to the king, "Do not make plans against me. Mine is the guilt, my lord. And do not remember that your servant was doing wrong<sup>958</sup> on the day my lord the king went into exile from Jerusalem; let not the king bear it in mind. 19:21 For your servant knows that I am guilty. And behold, I have come this day, the first of all the house of Joseph to come down to meet my lord the king." 19:22 Abishai the son of Zeruiah answered, "Should not Shimei be killed for this, because he cursed the LORD's anointed?" 19:23 But David said, "What have I to do with you, you sons of Zeruiah, that you should this day be an adversary to me? Shall any one be killed in Israel this day? For do I not know that I am this day king over Israel?" 19:24 And the king said to Shimei, "You shall not die." And the king gave him his oath. 19:25 And Mephibosheth the son of Saul came down to meet the king. He had neither bathed his feet, nor shaved his upper lip, nor washed his clothes, from the day the king went into exile until the day he came back in peace. 19:26 And when he came to Jerusalem to meet the king, the king said to him, "Why did you not go with me, Mephibosheth?" 19:27 He said, "My lord, O king, my servant deceived me, for your servant said to him, 'I will saddle an ass for myself, that I may ride upon it and go with the king.' For your servant is lame. 19:28 But he has said words against your servants which are unsuitable before my lord the king. But my lord the king is as wise as the angel of the LORD and must do what seems right in your sight. 19:29 For all my father's house were but men deserving to die for my lord the king, but you set your servant among those who eat at your table. What further right of complaint have I before the king? 19:30 And the king said to him, "Why do you go on speaking your words? I say: you and Ziba shall divide the inheritance."

David's decision to divide the land between Mephibosheth and Ziba was criticized in rabbinic circles. They thought it clear that David had not pronounced a well-considered sentence, but had paid heed to slander. They therefore linked his decision to divide Saul's inheritance to the later division of the land of Israel (Shab. 56b; Yom. 22b). This very reasoning also resulted in an addition to the Leiria edition of TJon:<sup>959</sup>

תוספתא ובהיא שעתא נפקת קלא ואמר' רחבעם וירבעם יפלוגן מלכות'

*addition: and at that very moment a voice came down and said, 'Jeroboam and Rehoboam will divide the kingdom'*

<sup>958</sup>The Aramaic verb סרה has the connotation of mudslinging.

<sup>959</sup>Ms d in Sperber's edition; also mentioned in Kasher, תוספתא, 114.

Similar criticism is uttered by Pseudo-Jerome, who states that David did not remember the friendship of Jonathan, or the covenant that they had made.<sup>960</sup>

19 31 ואמר מפיבשת למלכא אף ית כולא יסבֿ בתר דאתא רבוניֿ מלכא בשלמא לביתיה: 19 32 וברזלי גלעדא נחה מרגלים ועבר עם<sup>961</sup> מלכא<sup>962</sup> ירדנא<sup>963</sup> לליוותיה<sup>964</sup> ית ירדנא: 19 33 וברזלי סיב לחרא בר תמן שנין והוא סובר ית מלכא במתביה במחנים ארי גבר רב הוא לחרא:

19:31 *And Mephibosheth said to the king, "Oh, let him take it all, now that my lord the king has come home in peace."* 19:32 *Now Barzillai the Gileadite had come down from Rogelim. He crossed the Jordan with the king, to escort him over the Jordan.* 19:33 *Barzillai was a very aged man, eighty years old, and he had provided for the king during his dwelling in Mahanaim, for he was a very rich<sup>965</sup> man.*

In 2 Kgs 4:8 the woman of Shunem who used to provide for Elisha is called great, too. In that verse TJon renders "fearing sins", while Hebrew רב in the present verse is equated with Aramaic רב. This difference may well be the result of the negative view on Barzillai in rabbinic circles (Shab. 152a).<sup>966</sup> However, R. Judan esteemed him highly, for "he who gives a piece of bread to the righteous is as though he had fulfilled the five Books of the Torah" (GenR. 58:8).

19 34 ואמר מלכא לברזלי את עבר עמי ואסובר יתך עמי<sup>967</sup> בירושלם: 19 35 וברזלי למלכא כמא יומי שני חיי ארי אסק עם מלכא לירושלם: 19 36 בר תמן שנין אנא יומא דין האדע בין טב לביש אם ישעם עבדך ית מא דאיכול וית מא דאשחי אם אשמע עוד בקל כנרין ותשבחן<sup>968</sup> ולמא יהי עבדך עוד למשול על רבוניֿ מלכא:

19:34 *And the king said to Barzillai, "Come over with me, and I will provide for you with me in Jerusalem."* 19:35 *But Barzillai said to the king, "How many years have I still to live, that I should go up with the king to Jerusalem?"* 19:36 *I am eighty years old. Can I discern*

<sup>960</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 140.

<sup>961</sup>Mss b y regarded Hebrew אַא as a nota accusativi. Note that they did not render an Aphel in the preceding verb, as did Vg.

<sup>962</sup>Mss b y add a nota accusativi.

<sup>963</sup>Omitted in MS f.

<sup>964</sup>Pael only in MS p. All other MSS, including the Babylonian eb66 eb75, read the Aphel לַאֲלִיּוּתָהּ, with identical meaning.

<sup>965</sup>Literally: great.

<sup>966</sup>So Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 158: Rab called Barzillai a liar. See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 25:1.

<sup>967</sup>Omitted in MS w.

<sup>968</sup>MS a personalized the phrase by rendering ובתשבחן בכינרין ובתשבחן, 'the voice of the singers with lutes and praise songs'.

*between good and bad? Or can your servant taste what he eats or what he drinks? Or can I still listen to the sound of lutes and praise songs? Why then should your servant become another burden to my lord the king?*

TJon did not consider Hebrew שרים ושרות to be singing persons. These two words, although represented by one masculine and one feminine equivalent,<sup>969</sup> are replaced with impersonal instruments in order to preserve David's honour (cf. Ber. 24a).<sup>970</sup>

37 19 כועיר יעבר עברך יה ירדנא עם<sup>971</sup> מלכא ולמא ישלמני מלכא<sup>972</sup> חשלומחא הדא: 38 19 יתיב כען עברך ואמות בקרחי<sup>973</sup> ואחקבר<sup>974</sup> בקברא דאבא ודאמא והא עברך כמהם יעבר עם רבוני<sup>975</sup> מלכא ועביד ליה ית<sup>974</sup> התקין<sup>974</sup> בעינד<sup>975</sup>: 39 19 ואמר מלכא עמי יעבר כמהם ואנא אעביד ליה ית התקין<sup>974</sup> בעינד<sup>975</sup> וכל התבעי<sup>975</sup> מני אעביד לך: 40 19 ועבר כל עמא יה ירדנא ומלכא עבר ונשיק מלכא לברזלי וברכיה ותב לאחריה: 41 19 ועבר מלכא לגלגלא וכמהן עבר עמיה וכל עמא דבית<sup>976</sup> יהודה אעברו ית מלכא ואף פלגות עמא ישראל: 42 19 והא כל אנש ישראל אתן לות מלכא ואמרו למלכא מדין כסיוך<sup>976</sup> מננא אחנא אנש יהודה ואעברו ית מלכא וית אנש ביתיה ית ירדנא וכל גברי דויד עמיה: 43 19 ואתיב כל אנש יהודה על אנש ישראל ארי קריב לי מלכא מן דילך ולמא דנן תקיף לך על פתגמא הדין המיכל אכלנא מנכסי<sup>977</sup> מלכא אם מתנא<sup>978</sup> מני<sup>979</sup> לנא: 44 19 ואתיב אנש ישראל ית אנש יהודה ואמר עסרא חולקין אית לי במלכא ואף ברודי אנא רעינא<sup>980</sup> מנך ומדין אישיחני ולא הוה פתגמי קדמותא לי לאחבא ית מלכי ותקיף פתגם אנש יהודה מפתגם אנש ישראל:

*19:37 Your servant will go a little way over the Jordan with the king. Why should the king recompense me with such a reward? 19:38 Let your servant now return, that I may die in my own city and be bur-*

<sup>969</sup>Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 15.

<sup>970</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:274 also conceived of Hebrew שרים ושרות as instruments. For similar cases, see E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context* (BZAW, 174), Berlin 1988, 99-102.

<sup>971</sup>Mss a b read the more reverent קדם, 'before'.

<sup>972</sup>Ms d add a nota accusativi.

<sup>973</sup>TJon clarifies the terse style of the Hebrew verse.

<sup>974</sup>Ms w reads כמא, 'according to'.

<sup>975</sup>Only in MS p. Ms a reads דתיחרי, 'whatever you find pleasure in, whatever you choose'; MSS b c d f o m y eb66 eb75 read דהרמי, followed by עלי, 'whatever you impose on me' (cf. 2 Kgs 18:14); MS w reads דתימר עלי, 'whatever you say against me'.

<sup>976</sup>A less sharp expression than Hebrew נגב; cf. also TO Gen. 31:20, 26, but on the contrary 2 Sam. 15:6.

<sup>977</sup>Clarifying addition in order to avoid any misinterpretation (>11).

<sup>978</sup>Hebrew נשאת is treated as a Niphal participle (cf. Zech. 5:7; 1 Chron. 14:2), with the force of a substantive; cf. Driver, *Notes*, 339.

<sup>979</sup>Hebrew נשא is vocalized as a Qal (>3).

<sup>980</sup>Clarifying verb, because Hebrew נגב indicates the beginning of an additional thought. The addition is partly based on the preposition כ.

ied in the grave of my father and my mother. Behold, your servant Chimham will go over with my lord the king. Do for him whatever seems right in your sight." 19:39 And the king said, "Chimham shall go over with me, and I will do for him whatever seems right in your sight. And all that you ask of me I will do for you." 19:40 Then all the people went over the Jordan, and the king went over. Then the king kissed Barzillai and blessed him, and he returned to his own home. 19:41 The king went on to Gilgal, and Chimham went on with him. And all the people of the House of Judah, and also half the people of Israel, brought the king on his way. 19:42 And behold, all the men of Israel came to the king and said to the king, "Why have our brethren the men of Judah held you away from us, and brought the king and the people of his house over the Jordan, and all David's men with him?" 19:43 All the men of Judah answered the men of Israel, "Because the king is more near of kin to me than to you. Why then are you angry over this matter? Have we eaten at all from the property of the king? Or has he portioned out any gift to us?" 19:44 And the men of Israel answered the men of Judah, and said, "I have ten shares in the king. And I have more pleasure in David than you. Why then did you despise me? And was not my word to bring back my king first?" But the words of the men of Judah were fiercer than the words of the men of Israel.

## 6.19 The Aftermath of the Revolt (2 Samuel 20)

20 וַחֲמַן אַחֲרָע<sup>981</sup> גַּבַּר רִשְׁעִי וְשִׁמְיָה שֶׁבַע בָּר בְּכָרֵי גִבְרָא מִשְׁבַּט־א<sup>982</sup> דְּבֵית־<sup>983</sup> בְּנִימִין וְחֻקֵּי בְּשׁוֹפְרָא וְאָמַר לִית לָנָא חוֹלֵק בְּדוּיָד<sup>984</sup> וְלֹא אַחְסָנָא לָנָא<sup>985</sup> כְּבָר יִשִׁי גַבַּר לְקִרוּוְהִי יִשְׂרָאֵל: 20 וְאַסְחַלְקִי<sup>986</sup> כָּל אַנְשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִבְּתַר דּוּיָד לְמִזִּיל<sup>987</sup> בְּתַר שֶׁבַע בָּר בְּכָרֵי וְאַנְשֵׁי<sup>988</sup> יְהוּדָה לֹוּ עִם<sup>989</sup> מַלְכָּהוּן מִן יַרְדֵּנָא וְעַד יְרוּשָׁלַם: 20 וְאַחֲזָא דּוּיָד לְבֵיתִיהָ לְיְרוּשָׁלַם וְדִבְרֵי<sup>990</sup> מַלְכָּא יִתְ עֶסֶר נִשְׁיָן לְחִינְיָ<sup>991</sup> דְּשִׁבְקִי<sup>991</sup> לְמִטְרָא בֵּיתָא

<sup>981</sup>TJon derives Hebrew נקרא from the verb קרה.

<sup>982</sup>Omitted in MS f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>983</sup>Omitted in MS o, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29), reading only רבנימין.

<sup>984</sup>Omitted in MS m.

<sup>985</sup>Omitted in MS m.

<sup>986</sup>Mss a b c d f m o y read the Peal וסליק, 'they went up', more in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>987</sup>Clarifying addition, omitted in MSS a d f (>29).

<sup>988</sup>MS a adds דביה, 'of the House', in conformity with the Aramaic version of other verses.

<sup>989</sup>MS a conceived Hebrew אַח as the nota accusativi.

<sup>990</sup>MS d reads the Hebrew word פילגשני.

<sup>991</sup>In conformity with the wording of 15:16.

ומנינין בית משרא ומסובר<sup>992</sup> להון ולוחהון<sup>993</sup> לא על והואה נשירן ומתקרן עד יום מוההון ארמלן דבעלהון קיים: 20 4 ואמר מלכא לעמשא כנוש<sup>994</sup> קדמי<sup>995</sup> ית אנש יהודה תלתא יומין ואת הכא קום: 20 5 ואול עמשא למכנש<sup>995</sup> ית דבית<sup>996</sup> יהודה ואחר מן זמנא דאמר ליה: 20 6 ואמר דויד לאבישי כען דלמא<sup>997</sup> יבאש לנא שבע בר בכרי מן אבשלום את<sup>998</sup> דבר<sup>998</sup> ית עבדי רבונך<sup>999</sup> ודרוף בתרהי דלמא ישכח<sup>999</sup> ליה קרוין<sup>999</sup> כריכן ויעיק לנא:

*20:1 Now there happened to be there a wicked man, whose name was Sheba, the son of Bichri, from the tribe of the House of Benjamin. And he blew the trumpet, and said,*

*“We have no portion in David,  
and we have no inheritance in Jesse’s son.  
Every man to his city, O Israel!”*

*20:2 So all the men of Israel withdrew from David to go after Sheba the son of Bichri. But the men of Judah joined their king from the Jordan to Jerusalem. 20:3 And David came to his house at Jerusalem. And the king took the ten concubine wives whom he had left to guard the house, and put them in a house under guard. And he used to provide for them, but did not go in to them. So they were guarded, and they were called until the day of their death “widows of a living husband”.<sup>1000</sup> 20:4 Then the king said to Amasa, “Gather before me the men of Judah within three days, and stand here yourself.” 20:5 So Amasa went to gather those of the House of Judah, but he delayed beyond the set time which he had said to him. 20:6 And David said to Abishai, “Now, Sheba the son of Bichri might do us more harm than Absalom. You must take your lord’s servants, and pursue him, lest he find himself fortified cities, and oppress us.”*

Hebrew והציל עיניו is understood by LXX and Syr as “dig out our eyes”.

<sup>992</sup> Poal participle; against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 197, who translate “provision was made for them”.

<sup>993</sup> Even though a separate feminine form of the personal suffixes is missing from the 3rd person plural (cf. Dalman, *Grammatik*, 110), MS y introduced them in the present verse by reading ולוחהון, ולוחהן, and בעלהן.

<sup>994</sup> Equivalent affected by the military context (>10).

<sup>995</sup> Equivalent affected by the military context (>10), cf. 20:4.

<sup>996</sup> Omitted in MSS a f, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>997</sup> See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 27:1. Omitted in MSS b f y, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>998</sup> MS o reads וכען, as do several Hebrew MSS. MS a adds כען after דבר, giving a conflated rendering; cf. LXX.

<sup>999</sup> MS w reads the less usual Peal.

<sup>1000</sup> Hebrew ultra-short wording is expanded and clarified; see above, Ch. 3, *s.v.* brachylogy. Furthermore, TJon seems to have vocalized חיות חיות, ‘living widows’ (>3), as did LXX.

The Lucian text reads the Niphal instead of the Hiphil, translating "escape from us". TJon and Vg paraphrase the sentence with the same intentions, and respectively render "oppress us" and "put us to flight". TJon might have based its translation on Hebrew והצר, a Hiphil form of צר, 'to oppress' (>1).<sup>1001</sup> Hebrew עינו would logically be considered a *pars pro toto*.

7 20 ונפקו בתרוהו גברי<sup>1002</sup> יואב וקשתיא<sup>1003</sup> וקלעיא וכל גבריא ונפקו מירושלם למרדף בתר שבע בר בכרי: 8 20 אנון עם אבנא רבתא דבגבעון ועמשא אתי לאפיהון ויואב אסיר מורו לבושהו ועלוהו אספניקי חרב מורזא על חרציה בלדנה<sup>1004</sup> והוא אזיל ופסע:

20:7 *And the men of Joab, and the archers and slingers, and all the heroes went out after him. They went out from Jerusalem to pursue Sheba the son of Bichri. 20:8 When they were at the great stone which is in Gibeon, Amasa came towards them. Now Joab was girded, wearing his clothes, and over them was a belt with a sword in its sheath girded upon his loins. And he went striding on.*

The Hebrew sentence is obscure, but TJon hardly improves it by using two verbs for Joab's girding. The last word, though feminine in Hebrew and thus referring to the sword, is considered to refer to Joab.

9 20 ואמר יואב לעמשא השלם את אחי ואחדה יד ימין יואב בדקנא דעמשא למנשק ליה: 10 20 ועמשא לא אסתמר בחרבא דביד יואב ומחהי בה<sup>1005</sup> בסטר ירכיה ושפך מעוהו לארעא ולא תנא ליה ומית ויואב ואבישי אחוהי רדפו<sup>1006</sup> בתר שבע בר בכרי: 11 20 ונברא קאים עלוהו מיעולימי יואב ואמר מן דרעי ביואב ומן דלדויד יזייל<sup>1007</sup> בתר יואב: 12 20 ועמשא מטרף בדמא בנו כיבשא וחזא גברא ארי קם כל עמא ואסחר ית עמשא מן כיבשא לחקלא ורמא עלוהו לבושא כד חזא כל ראתי עלוהי וקאים:

20:9 *And Joab said to Amasa, "Is is well with you, my brother?" And Joab took hold of Amasa's beard with his right hand in order to kiss him. 20:10 So Amasa did not take heed of the sword which was in Joab's [left] hand. And he struck him with it in the place of his loins,*

<sup>1001</sup> So Kittel *apud* Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 15. Hebrew צר is indeed equated with Aramaic עיק, e.g. in 1 Kgs 8:37; 2 Kgs 6:1.

<sup>1002</sup> Ms f reads אינש, 'the people'.

<sup>1003</sup> For the Cherethites and the Pelethites, see above, commentary on 8:18.

<sup>1004</sup> Ms o reads the variant בנדה, 'in its sheath'.

<sup>1005</sup> Omitted in MS w.

<sup>1006</sup> MSS a b c d f o y read the singular, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29) and some MSS of the LXX; the plural is in conformity with 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the ancient versions.

<sup>1007</sup> Clarifying addition (>10); omitted in mss d o.

and shed his bowels to the ground—he did not need to repeat<sup>1008</sup> it—and he died. Then Joab and Abishai his brother pursued Sheba the son of Bichri. 20:11 And one of Joab’s men was standing by him, and said, “Whoever favours Joab, and whoever is for David, let him go after Joab.” 20:12 And Amasa lay wallowing in his blood in the middle of the road. And when the man saw that all the people stopped, he turned Amasa aside out of the road into the field, and threw clothes over him, since any one who came by saw him and stopped.

TJon makes no attempt to remove the redundancy in the Hebrew text.

13 20 כד אפנייה<sup>1009</sup> מן כבשא עבר כל גברא בתר יואב למרדף בתר שבע בר בכרי: 14 20 ועבר בכל שבטיא ד ישראל לאבל ובית מעכה וכל ברין ואחכנישו<sup>1010</sup> ואתו אף אנון בתרוהי: 15 20 ואתו וצרו עלוהי באבל ובית<sup>1011</sup> מעכה וצברו מליהא על קרחא ד ואקפה משרין<sup>1012</sup> וכל עמא ד עם יואב מתעשתין<sup>1013</sup> לחבלא שורא: 16 20 וקרת אחתא חכימתא מן קרחא ד שמעו שמעו אמרו כען ליואב קרב עד הכא ואמליל עמך: 17 20 וקריב לותה<sup>1014</sup> ואמרת אחתא האת יואב ואמר אנא ואמרת ליה שמע<sup>1015</sup> פתגמי אמתך ד ואמר שמע אנא: 18 20 ואמרת למימר אדכר<sup>1016</sup> כען מא דכתיב בספר אורייתא<sup>1017</sup> למשא<sup>1018</sup> בקרחא ד בקדמין למימר הכדין הוה לך למשא<sup>1019</sup> באבל אם משלמין:

20:13 When he had turned him aside from the road, all the people went on after Joab to pursue Sheba the son of Bichri. 20:14 And he passed through all the tribes of Israel to Abel and Beth-maacah, and all the Berites. And they also gathered together, and came after him. 20:15 And they came and besieged him in Abel and Beth-maacah. They cast up a mound against the city, and troops surrounded it. And all the

<sup>1008</sup>Note a similar remark concerning Abishai, Joab’s brother, in 1 Sam. 26:8.

<sup>1009</sup>Interpreted as a Hiphil form of ינה and expanded with a suffix. Ms o reads אפכיה, ‘he turned him’.

<sup>1010</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and the other versions.

<sup>1011</sup>With copula, in conformity with 20:14 (>15) and some Hebrew MSS; likewise MSS of LXX, Syr and Vg; MSS o w y omit the copula, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1012</sup>Deriving the Hebrew word from חיל, ‘army’; cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 16.

<sup>1013</sup>As if derived from חשב instead of שחח; cf. also LXX.

<sup>1014</sup>Ms a adds the name of Joab.

<sup>1015</sup>MSS m eb66 add the nota accusativi.

<sup>1016</sup>Conserving the meaning of the Aphel, the present verb must be in the 1st person singular. Likewise אידכר of MSS m eb66, although they read the Peal, “I remember”.

<sup>1017</sup>Ms a and Kimḥi add דמשה, ‘of Moses’.

<sup>1018</sup>MSS a c f add בשלמא, ‘for peace’.

<sup>1019</sup>Ms y reads שלמין, ‘if they are peaceful’.

men who were with Joab were planning to destroy the wall. 20:16 Then a wise woman<sup>1020</sup> called from the city, "Hear! Hear! Tell Joab now, 'Draw near, that I may speak to you.'" 20:17 And he drew near to her, and the woman said, "Are you Joab?" He said, "I am." Then she said to him, "Listen to the words of your handmaid." And he said, "I am listening." 20:18 And she said, saying, "I remind [you] now of what is written in the book of the law to first ask in the city! In other words: Was it not proper for you to ask in Abel, if they were willing to make peace?"

As in 14:11 a wise woman is introduced, confronting the authorities with compact sentences, deviating from the prose narrative.<sup>1021</sup> Once more this style of speaking led TJon to add a Scriptural quotation,<sup>1022</sup> as though the woman were a prophetess. TJon assumed that she was referring to Deut. 20:10, where the people of Israel are ordered to first offer terms of peace to a city they attack.<sup>1023</sup> The Hebrew verb **חָמַם** is naturally equated with **שָׁלַם**, but the Aramaic equivalent is now used in the sense of "make peace" (>6). Through this line of thought TJon managed to turn the ultra-short Hebrew verse into an intelligible reference to the Torah.

19 20 אַחַנְנָא<sup>1024</sup> מְשַׁלְמִין בְּהַיְמִנּוּתָא עִם יִשְׂרָאֵל דָּאֵת בְּעֵי לְחַבְלָא קְרַתָּא דְּהוּא כְּרַךְ רַב<sup>1025</sup> וְאָמַר בִּישְׂרָאֵל לְמָא תְּקַלְקִיל אַחַסְנָה עִמָּא דְּיוּי:

20:19 We are willing to make peace in faithfulness to Israel; a city which you are seeking to destroy, that is a large fortified city and a mother in Israel. Why do you want to ruin the inheritance of the people of the LORD?

Although TJon rarely changes from the 1st person singular to the plural when referring to a group (cf. 19:43-44), in the present verse it was thought necessary. This change explained that the woman spoke of the city which was threatened with destruction. The Hebrew metaphor of "killing a city" is therefore replaced with the explanation "destroying a city", in conformity with the wording of verse 20. The change from singular to plural may also be made to preclude the pop-

<sup>1020</sup>TgSam does not identify this wise woman, as Kalla Rabbati 53a does.

<sup>1021</sup>Cf. J.W. Wesseliuss, "De wijze vrouwen in 2 Samuël 14 en 20", *NedThT* 45 (1991), 89-100.

<sup>1022</sup>Hebrew **בְּרֵאשִׁיטָה** is rendered twice, first as a reference to the Torah, secondly more literal with Aramaic **בְּקֵרְמִין** 'at first'.

<sup>1023</sup>GenR. 94:9; Tan., *Vayyera*, 12; likewise Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 142-43. Cf. Komlosch, **בְּאִיר הַחַרְטוּם**, 328; Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 34.

<sup>1024</sup>Ms c reads the singular **אִנְנָא**, 'I', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1025</sup>Omitted in MS f.



ular belief that the woman spoke about herself.<sup>1026</sup> The singular is likewise avoided by the double translation of Hebrew אַם בִּישְׂרָאֵל, ‘a mother in Israel’. It is both translated literally and explained with the words כִּרְבַּרְבָּ, ‘a large fortified city’.

20 20 וַאֲחִיב יוֹאֵב וְאָמַר<sup>1027</sup> חָס חָס לִי אִם אֶקְלָקֵל<sup>1028</sup> וְאִם אֲחַבִּיל: 21 20 לֹא כִּין פִּתְגָמָא אַרִי גַבְרָא מְשׁוּרָא דְבֵית דִּי אַפְרַיִם שְׁבַע בַּר בַּכְרִי שְׁמִיה אַרִיִּים יָדִיה בְּמַלְכָא בְדוּיָד הַבּוּ יִתִּיה בְּלַחֲרוּדֵיהּ וְאַחַךְ מַעַל קָרְתָא דִּי וְאָמַרְתָּ אַתְתָּא לְיוֹאֵב הָא רִישָׁהּ מִתְרַמִּי לָךְ מִן שׁוּרָא: 22 20 וְאַתְתָּא אַתְתָּא לֹוח כָּל עֵמָא בַּחֲכֻמְתָּהּ וּפְסָקוּ יָת רִישׁ שְׁבַע בַּר בַּכְרִי וְרַמּוּ לֹוח יוֹאֵב וְתַקַּע בְּשׁוּפְרָא וְאַתְבַּרְרוּ מַעַל קָרְתָא דִּי גַבְרַי לְקָרְוֵיהּ וְיוֹאֵב תַב לִירוּשָׁלַם לֹוח מַלְכָא:

20:20 Joab answered, “Far be it, far be it from me, that I should ruin and destroy! 20:21 The matter is not so, for a man from the hill country of Ephraim, called Sheba the son of Bichri, has lifted up his hand against the king, against David. Give up him alone, and I will go away from the city.” And the woman said to Joab, “Behold, his head shall be thrown to you over the wall.” 20:22 Then the woman went to all the people in her wisdom. And they cut off the head of Sheba the son of Bichri, and threw it out to Joab. So he blew the trumpet, and they dispersed from the city, every man to his own town. And Joab returned to Jerusalem to the king.

The woman promised to surrender Sheba’s head to Joab in order to rescue the city from destruction. She went to the inhabitants of her city and successfully “convinced them that the prevention of imminent destruction and bloodshed is more important than the obligations of hospitality”.<sup>1029</sup> The entire negotiations of the woman are summarized in the Hebrew text with the single word בַּחֲכֻמְתָּהּ, ‘in her wisdom’. This ultra-short description gave rise to the quest for an explanation of how the woman could have achieved her goal. The explanation found its way into two Targumic manuscripts:<sup>1030</sup>

<sup>1026</sup>The first phrase, interpreted as “I completed the faithful of Israel”, in combination with the expression “a mother in Israel”, gave rise to the assumption that this wise woman was Serah bat Asher; cf. PesK. 11:13; Tan., *Bereshit*, 4:12; cf. Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 142-43.

<sup>1027</sup>Omitted in MS c.

<sup>1028</sup>For this equation, see above, commentary on 17:16.

<sup>1029</sup>A. Brenner, *The Israelite Woman: Social Role and Literary Type in Biblical Narrative*, Sheffield 1985, 36. Cf. also A. van der Lingen, *Vrouwen rond de koningen van oud-Israël*, Zoetermeer 1996, 112. Note that the comment in LevR. 19:6 is critical of the act of surrendering Sheba.

<sup>1030</sup>Integrated in the text of MS S and MS Oxford 2329, collated by Kasher, *תוספתא*, 114-15.

ואתה איתחא לכל עמא בחכמתא ואמרת להון חמש גברין בעא מנכון למיקטל ולא תתחבל קרתנא] ואמרו ניתן וחבת<sup>1031</sup> ואמרת ארבעין ואמרו ניתן וחבת ואמרת עשרין ואמרו ניתן וחבת ואמרת עשרה ואמרו ניתן וחבת סאמרת גברא דשמיה שבע בר בכרי ולא נפק מפומיה עד דפסקו ית רישיה ורמיה ליואב ותקע בשופרא ואתברדו מעל קרתנא]

*Then the woman went to all the people in her wisdom. And she said to them, "He is asking from you fifty men to kill. Then he will not ruin the city." And they said, "It is given." And she answered and said, "Forty." And they said, "Given." And she answered and said, "Twenty." And they said, "Given." And she answered and said, "Ten." And they said, "Given." And she answered and said, "A man named Sheba the son of Bichri." And no [sound] went out from his mouth while they cut off his head, and threw it out to Joab. So he blew the trumpet, and they dispersed from the city, every man to his own town.*

This explanation is also attested in several rabbinic sources (GenR. 94:9; QohR. 9:18 § 2; TanB, *Bereshit*, 4:12; AgBer. 22:3). The numbers in the woman's negotiation vary, starting either with a thousand men or with a hundred, while AgBer and the Targumic variant roughly follow Abraham's negotiations, starting with fifty and ending with ten (>15). The remark on the silence of Sheba in this explanation is based on Ezek. 19:9, a lamentation for an exiled prince of Israel, saying that "his voice should no more be heard upon the mountains of Israel". This connection is also made in the most critical comment on Sheba's surrender in LevR. 19:6.

The explanatory expansion of the verse took Joab's words *לִי הֵס לְךָ* from 20:20, and connected them with Abraham's similar words to the LORD in Gen. 18:25. The reasoning is as follows: Abraham used the words *לִי הֵס לְךָ* and negotiations concerning the number of the guilty ones to convince God not to punish the innocent together with the guilty; so when Joab used the same words he must have been persuaded by a similar kind of negotiation. For the rest, it is interesting to see how the Midrashim reversed this reasoning by using Joab's circumstances as an example for Abraham's negotiations. "If Joab refused to hold the entire city accountable and discriminated between the guilty and the innocent, how much more so must the Judge of all the earth?"<sup>1032</sup>

<sup>1031</sup>Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1032</sup>J. Blenkinsopp, "The Judge of All the Earth: Theodicy in the Midrash on Genesis 18:22-33", *JJS* 41 (1990), 1-12, esp. 9.

על 23 ויִאָב מִמָּנָא עַל כָּל חֵילָא דִּישְׂרָאֵל<sup>1033</sup> וּבְנֵיה בַר יְהוּידָע מִמָּנָא<sup>1034</sup> עַל קִשְׁתֵּיָא<sup>1035</sup> וְעַל קִלְעֵיָא: 24 וְאִדּוֹרָם<sup>1036</sup> מִמָּנָא עַל מִסְקֵי מִסִּין וְיְהוֹשֻׁפָט בַּר אַחִילּוּד מִמָּנָא עַל דְּכַרְנִיָא<sup>1037</sup>:

20:23 Now Joab was appointed over all the army of Israel, and Benaiah the son of Jehoiada was appointed over the archers and the slingers.  
20:24 And Adoram was appointed over the tax collectors, and Jehoshaphat the son of Ahilud was appointed over the records.

Hebrew מִסְּ basically means “forced labour”.<sup>1038</sup> TJon naturally equated it with Aramaic מִסָּן, which means “forced labour”, but also “tribute, taxes”. The verb added by TJon means “to raise” and is also used in the Hebrew Bible, e.g. in 1 Kgs 5:27. Although the system of forced labour was still known in the Roman Empire, the burden of taxation was heavy for the provinces and equally felt by all people.<sup>1039</sup> One could not live without noticing tax collectors.<sup>1040</sup> TgHab. 3:17 even depicts the end of the Roman Empire with the words “the Romans shall be destroyed and shall no longer collect tribute from Jerusalem”.<sup>1041</sup>

<sup>1033</sup>TJon introduced the genitive construction required; cf. Driver, *Notes*, 348.

<sup>1034</sup>Omitted in MSS b f y, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). However, the first מִמָּנָא functions as a double duty verb.

<sup>1035</sup>For the Cherethites and the Pelethites, see above, commentary on 8:18.

<sup>1036</sup>Ms o reads אִדּוֹנִירָם, ‘and Adoniram’, in conformity with 1 Kgs 4:6.

<sup>1037</sup>See above, commentary on 8:16.

<sup>1038</sup>Cf. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 434, who also refers to T.N.D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy* (CB.OT, 5), Lund 1971, 128-39.

<sup>1039</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 100; M. Avi-Yonah, *Geschichte der Juden im Zeitalter des Talmud in den Tagen von Rom und Byzanz* (SJ, 2), Berlin 1962, 92-93; L.H. Feldman, *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* (AGJU, 30), Leiden 1996, 473-75.

<sup>1040</sup>Cf. the situation depicted in the New Testament; Mt. 5:46; 9:10-11; 10:3; 11:19; 18:17; 21:31-32; Mk 2:15-16; Lk. 3:12; 5:27-30; 7:29, 34; 15:1; 18:10-13; 19:2.

<sup>1041</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 22-23, thought that this refers to the census which Quirinius held in 6 or 7 CE. This is not necessarily the case. The hated Roman census was levied repeatedly; cf. M. Avi-Yonah, *Geschichte der Juden im Zeitalter des Talmud in den Tagen von Rom und Byzanz* (SJ, 2), Berlin 1962, 94-96. However, since the Jews were banished from Jerusalem after Hadrian’s Edict (135 CE, cf. E. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*, New York 1961, 305; Avi-Yonah, *Geschichte der Juden*, 50-51, 79-81) it is likely that this rendering of Hab. 3:17 dates from before Bar Kokhba’s Revolt.

20 25 ושוא<sup>1042</sup> ספרא וצדוק ואביתר כהניא: 20 26 ואף עירה<sup>1043</sup> דמתקוע<sup>1044</sup> הוה רב<sup>1045</sup> לדויד:

20:25 Sheva was scribe, and Zadok and Abiathar were priests. 20:26 And Ira who was from Tekoa was also David's teacher.

## 6.20 The Gibeonites' Revenge (2 Samuel 21:1-14)

The pericope of the Gibeonites was not read as a fixed *haftara* in any of the cycles. However, it used to be available as the *haftara* on the seventh Taanith ("fast") in times of drought, after the Torah reading of Deut. 28:1-29:9.<sup>1046</sup> This information is based on a testimony ascribed to Rav Sar Shalom, who lived in Egypt in the 12th century. The links between 2 Sam. 21:1 and Deut. 28:12, 23 (as explained in the Targumim), 48 are obvious.

1 21 והוה כפנא ביומי דויד תלח שנין שתא בתר שתא ובעא דויד רחמין<sup>1047</sup> מן קדם יי ואמר יי על שאול ועל בית חייבי קפול על דקמל ית גבענאי:

21:1 Now there was a famine in the days of David for three years, year after year. And David sought mercy from before the LORD, and the LORD said, "It is because of Saul and because of the house of those deserving to be killed,<sup>1048</sup> because he killed the Gibeonites."

On the basis of this verse, ancient scholars wondered when Saul had killed the Gibeonites. Rabbinic belief that Scripture was complete urged them to seek an answer within the Hebrew Bible itself. The murder of the Gibeonites was soon linked to Saul's murder of the priests of Nob.<sup>1049</sup> Saul only killed the priests of Nob, but since they provided for the Gibeonites,<sup>1050</sup> he endangered their lives as well.

<sup>1042</sup>According to the Qere and many Hebrew MSS. Ms b reads וששא, 'and Shusha' or 'and Shavsha', in conformity with 1 Chron. 18:16, some MSS of the LXX and the Vetus Latina; MSS f o read ושישא, 'and Shisha', in conformity with 1 Kgs 4:3 (>15); cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:110 (Seisa) and 7:293 (Sousa).

<sup>1043</sup>Ms y adds the Hebrew ד'אירי, 'the Jairite', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1044</sup>According to 2 Sam. 23:26 and 1 Chron. 11:28 (>15).

<sup>1045</sup>See above, commentary on 8:18.

<sup>1046</sup>Sh. Albeck, *האשכול*, *ספר*, Jerusalem 1935, 132; J. Musafia, *תשובה חנאנים*, Jerusalem 1967, 27.

<sup>1047</sup>Note that TJon did not use Hebrew אדפני as the object of the sentence; cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 16.

<sup>1048</sup>For the rendering "deserving to be killed", see above, commentary on 16:7.

<sup>1049</sup>ExodR. 30:16; LevR. 22:6; NumR. 5:3; 8:4; Yev. 78b-79a; BQ 119a; cf. ySan. 6:9; yQid. 4:1. The same connection is made by Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 143-44.

<sup>1050</sup>The Gibeonites had been made hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation and for the altar of the LORD (Josh. 9:27). Consequently, they

Their deaths were therefore also reckoned against him. This reasoning is attested in a marginal note in CR:<sup>1051</sup>

ספרן אחרן על דקטל ית כהניא דהוו מצפקין מזון לגבעונאי

*another book: because he killed the priests who used to supply sustenance to the Gibeonites*

Several sources point out that the Gibeonites were proselytes (cf. TgEsth. Sheni 9:25). They did not convert for the sake of heaven, but only to stay alive.<sup>1052</sup>

21 וקרא מלכא לגבעונאי ואמר להון וגבעונאי לא מבני ישראל אנון<sup>1053</sup> אלהין משאר אמוראי ובני ישראל קיימו להון ובעא שאול לקטלוהון בדקני לבני<sup>1054</sup> ישראל ויהודה: 3 21 ואמר דויד לגבעונאי מא אעביד לכון ובמא אכפר<sup>1055</sup> ובריכו ית אחסנת עמא דיו:

*21:2 So the king called the Gibeonites and said to them—now the Gibeonites were not of the sons of Israel, but of the remnant of the Amorites; although the sons of Israel had sworn to them, Saul had sought to kill them in his zeal for the sons of Israel and Judah. 21:3 And David said to the Gibeonites, “What shall I do for you? And how shall I make expiation?” And they blessed the heritage of the people of the L?”*

An explanation of the verb ברך is given in a marginal note of CR:<sup>1056</sup>

ספרן אחרן ובעו רחמין דהעדי כפנא מאחסנת עמא דיו

*another book: and they sought mercy, that the famine would disappear from the heritage of the people of the LORD*

Whereas TJon literally translated the Gibeonites' blessing of the people of Israel, the present variant avoided such wording.<sup>1057</sup> Instead of a blessing, the verb is understood to be plea to stop the famine in accordance with David's own prayer in 21:1.

21 ואמרו ליה גבעונאי לית אנחנא צריכין<sup>1058</sup> למסב ד כסף ודהב מן שאול ומן ביתיה ואף לא אנש למקטל בישראל ואמר מא אתון אמרין אעביד לכון:

depended on the sanctuary and the priests for their provisions.

<sup>1051</sup> Cf. Kasher, תוספתות, 115.

<sup>1052</sup> Cf. yQid. 4:1 (65c); ySan. 6:9 (23d); Yev. 78a.

<sup>1053</sup> Omitted in MS w.

<sup>1054</sup> Ms S reads לדביה, 'for those of the House'.

<sup>1055</sup> Ms b B reads איהכפר, 'expiation will be made', although the reading אכפר is added in MS B.

<sup>1056</sup> Cf. Kasher, תוספתות, 115-16; Bacher, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 126.

<sup>1057</sup> Also NumR. 8:4 explained the verb simply as a blessing.

<sup>1058</sup> Ms o erroneously reads בריכין, '[we] are blessing'.

21:4 *The Gibeonites said to him, "We need to receive neither silver or gold from Saul or from his house, nor a man to be killed in Israel." And he said, "Whatever you say, I will do for you."*

The terse style of the Hebrew verse is expanded. Furthermore, TJon rendered the 1st person plural, according to the Qere, as in NumR. 8:4.<sup>1059</sup>

21 5 ואמרו למלכא גברא דשיצינא ודחשיב עלנא אשחיצינא מלמרר בכל החום ארעא<sup>1060</sup> דישראל:

21:5 *They said to the king, "The man who nullified us and plotted against us—we have been stopped from dwelling in the territory of the Land of Israel—,*

The awkward Hebrew construction, hardly improved in the Aramaic version, is partly explained in a marginal note of CR.<sup>1061</sup> Again the explanation is given that Saul indirectly killed the Gibeonites by killing the priests of Nob (cf. 21:1).

ספרן אחרן ודחשב למפסק חייתנא יחשב ליה כאילו אשתיצנא מלמרר וגומ' *another book: who plotted against us to cut off our sustenance, it must be reckoned to him as if he stopped us dwelling etc.*

21 6 יהיבון לנא שבעה<sup>1062</sup> גברין מבנהי ונצלובנון קדם יי בנבעהא דשאל בחירא דיי ואמר מלכא אנא אחין:

21:6 *let seven of his sons be given to us, so that we may hang<sup>1063</sup> them up before the LORD at The Hill of Saul, the chosen of the LORD." And the king said, "I will give them."*

The meaning of the Hebrew verb יקע is disputed. It appears from Num. 25:4 that it refers to a public execution in the open air. But whether the execution was carried out by breaking arms and legs,<sup>1064</sup> or by

<sup>1059</sup>However, NumR. 8:4 maintains the singular of the Ketib as well, by stating that David spoke with the Gibeonites both privately and collectively; cf. MTeh. 17:10.

<sup>1060</sup>For the addition of ארעא before ישראל, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 11:3. Omitted in MS f, which only reads דישראל (>29).

<sup>1061</sup>See also Kasher, הוספתו, 116; Bacher, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 26.

<sup>1062</sup>TJon does not explain the number seven, as did NumR. 8:4; ySan. 6:9; and yQid. 4:1. The latter sources blame Saul of having killed seven Gibeonites, together with the priests of Nob: "two hewers of wood, two drawers of water, a superintendent, a scribe and an attendant". The Gibeonites were thought to be Temple personnel.

<sup>1063</sup>The verb may also be translated by "crucify", cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 98.

<sup>1064</sup>So A.S. Kapelrud, "King and Fertility: A Discussion of II Sam 21:1-14", *NTT*

crucifixion or hanging,<sup>1065</sup> is uncertain.<sup>1066</sup>

21 7 וחס מלכא על מפִּיבִּשֶׁת בר יהונתן בר שאול על שבועתא דיִי דביניהון בין דויד ובין יהונתן בר שאול: 21 8 ודבר<sup>1067</sup> מלכא ית תרין בני רצפה בת איה דילידת לשאול ית ארמני וית מפִּיבִּשֶׁת וית חמשא בני מירב דרביאת מיכל בת שאול דילידת לעדריאל בר ברזלי דממחולת:

*21:7 But the king spared Mephibosheth, the son of Saul's son Jonathan, because of the oath of the LORD which was between them, between David and Jonathan the son of Saul. 21:8 The king took the two sons of Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, whom she bore to Saul, Armoni and Mephibosheth; and the five sons of Merab—whom Michal the daughter of Saul raised—, whom she bore to Adriel the son of Barzillai the Meholathite.*

Two things induced TJon to add the name of Merab in the present verse.<sup>1068</sup> First, the name of Adriel is mentioned here, and he was Merab's husband (1 Sam. 18:19). Secondly, it was said about Michal that she had no child until the day of her death (2 Sam. 6:23). Respect for the text restrained the translators from simple substitution. The name of Michal could not be interpreted as the name of her elder sister.<sup>1069</sup> TJon's solution agrees with several rabbinic sources.<sup>1070</sup>

21 9 ומסרונן ביד גבעונאי וצלמנן בשורא קדם יי ונפלו שבעתהון<sup>1071</sup> כחדא ואנן אחקשלו ביומי חצדא בקדמאין בשריות חצד סערין: 21 10 ונסיבת<sup>1072</sup> רצפה בת איה ית סקא ופרסתיה לה על שגרא משריות חצדא עד דנחת עליהון משרא מן שמיא ולא שבקת עופא דשמיא למנת עליהון ביממא וית חית<sup>1072</sup> ברא בלייא: 21 11 ואתחווה לדויד ית דעברת רצפה בת איה לחינתא דשאול: 21 12 ואול דויד ונסיב<sup>1072</sup> ית גרמי

56 (1955), 113-22, esp. 119-20, referring to the Qal of the same verb in Gen. 32:26. So also *HALAT*<sup>3</sup>, s.v.

<sup>1065</sup>Suggested by the exegesis in San. 34b-35a; TJon of 1 Sam. 31:10; 2 Sam. 21:6, 13; and the LXX of the present verse.

<sup>1066</sup>Other alternatives can be found in McCarter, *II Samuel*, 442.

<sup>1067</sup>Mss a b c d f o y B C J read ונסיב, 'and he took'; this verb is mainly used for animals and things.

<sup>1068</sup>Note that two Hebrew MSS and some MSS of LXX and Vg, and Syr substitute the name of Merab for Michal's name.

<sup>1069</sup>The reverse happened with the name of Samson in substitution for Bedan (1 Sam. 12:11) and with the name of David for Elhanan (2 Sam. 21:19).

<sup>1070</sup>GenR. 82:7; NumR. 8:4; San. 19b-20a; ySan. 2:6 (20b); 6:9; yQid. 4:1; MShem. 11:3; 22:4; cf. V. Aptowitz, "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata", *ZAW* 29 (1909), 241-52, esp. 250-51. Likewise Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 143-44. Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:89 supposed that these five children were born in her first marriage.

<sup>1071</sup>According to the Qere (>29); cf. the other versions.

<sup>1072</sup>Mss o y use the word חיי.

שאלו ויה גרמי יהונתן בריה מלוח יחבי<sup>1073</sup> יביש גלעד דגנבו יתהון משורא<sup>1074</sup> דבית  
 שן דצלבונון תמן פלשתאי ביומא דקטלו פלשתאי יח שאול בגלבע: 21 13 ואסיק<sup>1075</sup>  
 מתמן יח גרמי שאול ויה גרמי יהונתן בריה וכנשו יח גרמי צליביא: 21 14 וקברו יח  
 גרמי שאול ויהונתן<sup>1076</sup> בריה בארע שיבט<sup>1077</sup> בנימין בצלע בקברא דקיש אבוהי  
 ועברו כל דפקיד מלכא וקבילו<sup>1078</sup> ויי<sup>1079</sup> צלות דירי ארעא בחר כין:

*21:9 And he surrendered them into the hands of the Gibeonites, and they hanged them on the mountain before the LORD. And the seven of them fell together; they were killed in the first days of harvest, at the beginning of barley harvest. 21:10 Then Rizpah the daughter of Aiah took sackcloth, and spread it for herself on the rock, from the beginning of harvest until rain fell upon them from the heavens. And she did not allow the birds of the air to rest upon them by day, or the beasts outside by night. 21:11 When David was told what Rizpah the daughter of Aiah, the concubine of Saul, had done, 21:12 David went and took the bones of Saul and the bones of his son Jonathan from the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead, who had stolen them from the wall of Beth-shan, where the Philistines had hanged them, on the day the Philistines killed Saul on Gilboa. 21:13 And he brought up from there the bones of Saul and the bones of his son Jonathan; and they gathered the bones of those who were hanged. 21:14 And they buried the bones of Saul and his son Jonathan in the land of the tribe of Benjamin in Zela, in the tomb of Kish his father; and they did all that the king commanded. And after that the LORD accepted the prayer of the inhabitants of the land.*

## 6.21 Heroes as Adversaries (2 Samuel 21:15-22)

21 15 והוה עוד קרבא לפלשתאי עם ישראל ונחת דויד ועברוהי<sup>1078</sup> עמיה ואניחו  
 קרבא עם פלשתאי ואשחלהי דויד: 21 16 וישבי<sup>1079</sup> בנב דבבני<sup>1080</sup> גברא<sup>1081</sup> ומתקל

<sup>1073</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 23:11.

<sup>1074</sup>Omitted in MS S, which only reads מדבית. MS f<sub>5</sub> suggests מרחוב, 'from the square', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29); not in harmony with 1 Sam. 31:10.

<sup>1075</sup>MS J reads וסליק ואפיק, 'and he went up and brought down'.

<sup>1076</sup>MS b adds the nota accusativi; MSS c B reads ויה גרמי יהונתן, 'the bones of Jonathan', as did some Hebrew and Greek MSS, in conformity with 21:12, 13 (>15).

<sup>1077</sup>Omitted in MS S, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1078</sup>MS S reads ונכרוהי, 'and his heroes'.

<sup>1079</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS, LXX and Vg.

<sup>1080</sup>MS w erroneously reads רב בני, which made Ishbi-benob commander of the sons of the heroes.

<sup>1081</sup>MSS f o w J read the plural גבריא, 'heroes'.



סופניה מתקל<sup>1082</sup> חלה מאה סלעין דנחשא והוא אסיר אספניקי חרתא ואמר למקטל  
 ית דויד:

*21:15 The Philistines had war again with Israel, and David went down together with his servants, and they waged war with the Philistines. And David grew weary. 21:16 And Ishbi-benob, one of the sons of the hero—whose shaft weighed three hundred selas of bronze and who was girded with a new sword belt—said to kill David.*

Hebrew הרפה is rendered by the simple גברא, 'hero'. In some Vg manuscripts a similar translation is given, i.e. "from the family of the giants". These translations do not agree with the rabbinic assumption that הרפה had to be identified with ערפה, Orpah, the daughter-in-law of Naomi.<sup>1083</sup>

17 21 וסעד ליה אבישי בר צרויה ומחא ית פלשתאה וקטליה בכין קימו גברי דויד  
 ליה למימר לא תפוק עוד עמנא לקרבא ולא תטפי ית מלכותא דישראל:

*21:17 But Abishai the son of Zeruiah came to his aid, and struck the Philistine and killed him. Then David's men swore to him, saying, "You shall no longer go out with us to battle, for you shall not extinguish the kingship of Israel."*

The men of David spoke about the lamp of Israel. TJon replaced this figurative word with a direct reference, viz. the kingdom. Usually the lamp burning in a house is a figure of the continued prosperity of its owner.<sup>1084</sup> TJon consistently explained it with "kingship", probably since the kingship and the Davidic dynasty symbolized the welfare of the Israelite state.<sup>1085</sup>

M. Gaster discovered a large expansion of the present verse, which describes the battle between David and Ishbi-benob, and the subsequent assistance of Abishai.<sup>1086</sup> It is part of a legend concerning the battle between Ishbi-benob and his mother on the one hand, and David and Abishai on the other hand.<sup>1087</sup> The tosefta is presented

<sup>1082</sup>Omitted in MSS c d f y J, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1083</sup>This identification is made in RuthR. 2:20; Sot. 42b; TanB, *Bereshit*, 11:8; and a tosefta-targum on 1 Sam. 17:4. See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 17:4.

<sup>1084</sup>So Driver, *Notes*, 354.

<sup>1085</sup>So also TJon 1 Kgs 11:36; 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19.

<sup>1086</sup>Now Codex Manchester, Gaster 1478; edited with vocalization and translation by M. Gaster in his "Das Buch Josua in hebräisch-samaritanischer Rezension", *ZDMG* 62 (1908), 209-79, 494-549, esp. 528-30 (edition) and 530-32 (translation); cf. Kasher, *הוספדות*, 116-18.

<sup>1087</sup>Gaster, "Das Buch Josua", 533 mentioned several sources and books in which (part of) this legend is integrated. Partial parallel versions can be found in San. 95a; Midrash Hagadol to Deut., כ"י חנא, introduction; GenR. 59:11; TanB, *Bereshit*, 7:8; MTeh. 18:30; cf. Kasher, *הוספדות*, 118-19.

here in six "scenes", all beginning with the phrase **בה בשעתא**. These scenes are translated and commented upon separately.

### Scene 1

יומא בתראה דפסח דשמאל  
 [15] והות עוד קרבא לפלשתאי עים ישראל ונחת דוד ועבדוהי ואניחו קרבא עם  
 פלשתאי ואשתלהי דוד  
 [16] וישבי בנוב דמן בני עורפא גיברחא ומתקאל סופיניה מתקאל חלת מאה סלעין  
 דנחשא והוא אסיר אספניקי חדתא ואמר למקטל ית דוד  
 [17] ונחתו תרויהון לסדרא קרבא דין עם דין כחדא דוד בר ישי מלכא דישראל וישבי  
 בנוב דוד בר ישי מלכא דישראל] נחת מסדרי קרבא דישראל] וישבי בנוב רשיעא  
 נחת מסדרי קרבא דיפלשתאי ואשתלהי דוד בר ישי ריש קרבא דישראל הוא דוד בר  
 ישי שפיר ברויה ויאז בחזויה חכים בחוכמתא וסוכלתן בעיצה ריש גיבריא הוה תקע  
 בשופרה מויע לרשיעיא מסיע לענותניא תמני מאה קטילין דמתחות רגלוהי בזמן חדא  
 ועימיה ישבי בנוב ולא יכיל ליה ואשתלהי וכד חזא ישבי בנוב ית דוד דאשתלהי נחת מן  
 רתיכוהי וארים יתיה מן ארעא לרום שמיא מהלך יומא חד וכד חזא דוד דחיל מיניה  
 וזקף עינוהי לשמי מרומא<sup>1088</sup> ונחת עננא וחפת ית דוד בר ישי מלכא דישראל] ואסיק  
 יתיה לשמיא<sup>1089</sup> ואמר בבכו מניך מארי<sup>1089</sup> עלמא<sup>1089</sup> לא יחחל שמך רבא דאתקרי על  
 אבהתנא ושזבינני מירא דפלשתאה ערלה הדין וקביל<sup>1089</sup> מיניה מארי<sup>1089</sup> עלמא<sup>1089</sup> בדיל  
 זכות<sup>1089</sup> אבןרהם] יצחקן ויעקבן] משה ואהרן] ופרק יתיה מן ידוהי ויתקדש שמיא  
 רבא על ידיה

*The last day of Pesach, from Samuel:*

(verse 15) *The Philistines had war again with Israel, and David went down together with his servants, and they waged war with the Philistines. And David grew weary.*

(verse 16) *And Ishbi-benob, one of the sons of Orpah, the heroine—whose spear weighed three hundred selas of bronze and who was girded with a new sword belt—said to kill David.*

(verse 17) *And the two of them went down to the battle-line, the one with the other, together: David the son of Jesse, the king of Israel, and Ishbi-benob. David the son of Jesse, the king of Israel, went down from the battle-lines of Israel, and Ishbi-benob, the wicked one, went down from the battle-lines of the Philistines. And David the son of Jesse, the head of the army of Israel, grew tired—he is David the son of Jesse, beautiful in looks and handsome in appearance, wise in wisdom and understanding in counsel, head of the heroes; he blew the trumpet, frightening the wicked, helping the humble; eight hundred killed ones, who were under his feet, in one time. And with him was Ishbi-benob, but he could not overpower him, and he*

<sup>1088</sup>Here the MS repeats the phrase **יומא מהלך שמיא לרום** ארעא מן ארעא לרום שמיא מהלך יומא חד. It is placed in brackets, apparently to indicate that it ought to be omitted.

<sup>1089</sup>Here the MS repeats the phrase **עינוהי לשמי מרומא** וזקף עינוהי לשמי מרומא. It is placed in brackets, apparently to indicate that it ought to be omitted.

*grew weary. And when Ishbi-benob saw that David grew weary, he went down from his chariot, and made him ascend from the earth to the height of heaven, one day's journey. And when David saw this, he feared him and lifted his eyes to the heaven above, and a cloud came down and covered David the son of Jesse, the king of Israel, and sent him up to heaven. And he said, "Please, Master of the World, let not your great Name be profaned, which is called over our fathers, and save me from the hand of this uncircumcised Philistine." And the Master of the World accepted his [prayer] on account of the merit of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, of Moses and Aaron, and He saved him from his hands, so that his great Name would be sanctified by him.*

A tosefta-targum to 1 Sam. 17:4 describes Goliath as a descendant of Orpah. The idea of Orpah's lineage was mentioned by Pseudo-Philo, and attested to in several rabbinic explanations.<sup>1090</sup> Goliath is mentioned in 21:19. And since the four adversaries in this section are all called "sons of Rapha", they were considered brothers. Rabba expounded, "As a reward for the four tears which Orpah dropped upon her mother-in-law, she merited that four mighty warriors should issue from her" (Sot. 42b). The identification of Ha-Rapha and Orpah is based on the likeness of the consonants.

The poetical depiction of David the son of Jesse is based on the Targumic version of 2 Sam. 23:8. The phrases "beautiful in looks and handsome in appearance, wise in wisdom and understanding in counsel, head of the heroes" are literal quotations. The phrase "he blew the trumpet" might be an explanatory translation of the unknown לְפִימִקְלָא in TJon 2 Sam. 23:8.<sup>1091</sup> If the word was split into לְפִיּוֹם קְלָא, it could have been interpreted as the making of a sound, by voice or by trumpet. The phrase "frightening the wicked and helping the humble" is identical with the Aramaic version of 2 Sam. 23:8 in the Cairo Genizah MS T.-S. B8.2, described by Díez Macho.<sup>1092</sup> The reference to the eight hundred slain in one battle is also taken from the Aramaic version of 2 Sam. 23:8, although it is no literal quotation.<sup>1093</sup>

The detail that Ishbi-benob made David ascend is given without any explanation in the present tosefta. In the legend Ishbi-benob ap-

<sup>1090</sup>Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*, 61:6; RuthR. 1:20; Tan., *Vayyigash*, 8; MShem. 20:4; Sot. 42b; San. 95a; TgEsth. Sheni 4:13; cf. Kasher, תּוֹסֵפְתוֹת, 105; Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 4, 85-86.

<sup>1091</sup>A more extensive discussion of this word is given in E. van Staalduijn-Sulman, "The Aramaic Song of the Lamb", in: J.C. de Moor, W.G.E. Watson (eds), *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOATS 42), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1993, 265-92.

<sup>1092</sup>A. Díez Macho, "Fragmento de una nueva recensión del Targum Jonatán ben 'Uzziel a los Profetas (= T.-S. B. 121)", *Sefarad* 16 (1956), 405-406, esp. 406, n. 2.

<sup>1093</sup>Kasher, תּוֹסֵפְתוֹת, 119 mentioned a parallel in Aboth Dibre Nathan.

appears to assume that David would never come down (see below, Scene 3). David's subsequent journey to heaven is described in terms of an ascension (cf. e.g. Acts 1:9).<sup>1094</sup> Several sources, however, mention that Ishbi-benob threw David up in the air and struck either a sword or a spear in the ground, hoping that David would fall upon it and be killed.<sup>1095</sup> The distance of a day's journey is disputed. R. Yose supposed it was three Persian miles with great ease, while others argued that it might have been nine Persian miles.<sup>1096</sup>

The title "Master of the World" or "Lord of the World" is not typically Targumic. It occurs in some toseftot, e.g. to 2 Kgs 4:1. The epithet "uncircumcised Philistine" is borrowed from the narrative on Goliath (cf. 1 Sam. 17:26, 36), but also occurs in the tosefta on 1 Sam. 17:43.

David was heard on account of the merits of the fathers. The five names mentioned here connect the present tosefta with the one on 1 Sam. 17:43, where these five names appeared to be written on the five stones of David.

## Scene 2

בה בשעתא ההיא טוב זקף דוד עינוהי לשמי מרומא וחזא והא איסרהון דישראל ואיסרהון דפלשתאי דמניחין קרבא דין עם דין ומשרי ומצלי ובכי ומתחנן וכן אמר בצלותיה יי אלהי ואלהא ואלהא דאבהתי אלהיה דאבא יש לא תמסריני בידא דפלשתאה ערלא הרין דלמא יקטול יתי ויזיל וישחבב בבית דנן טעותיה ויימר טעותי מסרתיה בידי וקטלחיה ולא יימר חס ושלום לית אלה פריק בישראל וליהודה<sup>1097</sup> ולא תתחשב נפשי עם קטולי דהניא ועם תבעיה<sup>1098</sup> מיחיא ריבוניה דעלמא כוליה אם אית רעוא קדמך תיעול צלותי ובעותי לקדמך ושלח לי פריק ואעביד קלא על כל בני וקריבי וייתי חד מבני צרויה ויסעדיני

<sup>1094</sup>Note especially the cloud covering the ascension as it will cover the return of the Davidic Messiah according to Mk 13:26 par. which was no doubt based on Dan. 7:13, cf. J. Luzárraga, *Las tradiciones de la nube en la biblia y en el judaismo primitivo* (AnBib, 54), Rome 1973, 220-25.

<sup>1095</sup>See Kasher, תוספתא, 119.

<sup>1096</sup>In a discussion in Sifre Zuta to Num. 11:31; cf. MekY, *Vayassa'*, 4. However, Kasher, תוספתא, 119 also cites Sifre Zuta to Num. 10:33, which says that the sons of Israel went a distance of twenty-nine miles a day. However, a day's journey is not far, since a tosefta-targum to Ezek. 1:1 mentions that the distance between the earth and the lowest level of heaven is about 500 years; cf. Kasher, תוספתא, 181, 191.

<sup>1097</sup>Allusion to 1 Sam. 17:46. The combination of the prepositions ב and ל is based on the different traditions of the same verse: Some Hebrew MSS, LXX, Vg and most TJon MSS read בישראל, the other Hebrew MSS and versions read לישראל. The present tosefta combined the two readings by using the combination "Israel and Judah".

<sup>1098</sup>Kasher, תוספתא, 120 proposed to read the active participle תבעי, 'those who demand'.

*At that moment David again lifted his eyes to heaven above, and saw, and behold, the Guardian Angel of Israel and the Guardian Angel of the Philistines, who were waging war, the one with the other. And he began to pray, to weep and to plead, and he said in his prayer, "O LORD my God, the God who chose me, the God of my father Jesse, do not surrender me into the hand of this uncircumcised Philistine, lest he kill me and go to praise in the house of his idol Dagon, and say, 'My idol has surrendered him into my hand, and I killed him,' and lest he say—far be it!—, 'There is no saving God in Israel or for Judah.' And let not my soul be reckoned among the murderers of the priests and those who demanded their deaths, O Lord of all the World. If it is the will before Thee, let my prayer and my request go up before Thee, and send me a redeemer. Make a sound over all my sons and my relatives, and bring one of the sons of Zeruah that he might assist me.*

The second scene of this tosefta resembles the latter part of the tosefta on 1 Sam. 17:43. In both stories David lifted his eyes to heaven above and saw angels either discussing or waging battle. In both stories it is stressed that the real battle was fought in heaven. The present tosefta does not use the normal word for angel, מלאכא, but gives the word איסרא.<sup>1099</sup> The motif of a battle between guardian angels is based on Dan. 10 and generally known from apocalyptic and Midrashic books.

The formulation of Ishbi-benob's prayer is in total agreement with the usual vocabulary of TgSam. Dagon is called "idol", both in the narrator's speech and in the prayer itself (see above, Ch. 4, s.v. טעוהא).

The link between the name of David's adversary Ishbi-benob and the murder of the priests of Nob is implicit in the present tosefta. This link is discussed in the parallel versions of San. 95a and MTeh. 18:30, where R. Judah explained the name of Ishbi-benob as: "Because he comes for the sake of Nob." Since the murder of the priests had not yet been punished, and since David himself had acknowledged his guilt in the murder (1 Sam. 22:22), the consequences had to be revealed in due time.

### Scene 3

בה בשעתא ההיא מתיבא רוחא דקדשא ואמרה ליה דוד בר ישי לא הכדין כתיב בספר אוריתא אשר לא ישא פנים ולא יקח שוחד וקוף כען עינד וחזי נשמתהון דתמן וחמשה כהנין בנוהי דאחימלך בר אחיטוב דסעדין לישיבי בנב ואמרין על ידי דוד אקטלינא ואף פומך אסהיד כך למימר אנכי סבותי בכל נפש בית אביך והא גור דינדך אהחתם לאיתקטלא יומא דין אלא קביל ערך דלא אשתאר לאחימלך בר אחיטוב אלהין בר חדא ושמייה אביתר וייתי אבישי בר צרויה דלא הות בעיצת כהניא ויקטול יתיה מתיבא ואמר ליה עד אימתי עני וכן אמר ליה עד שבעה דרין וקבל

<sup>1099</sup> Kasher, תוספתא, 119 refers to Yom. 77a and Pes. 111b to explain the word.

עלוהי וקם על רתיכיא ונחת ועל לנו סדרי קרבא דישר[אלן] וכד חזא ישבי בנב עני  
 וכן אמר מן הוא דאנא סברית יתיה אכלוהו עופא דשמיא ונבילתיה לא מטא לארעא  
 עני דוד ואמר ליה שמיא דבעלמא ד כד נפקיה לקדמותך שמיחי ולא צלותי יתך  
 כען סליקית ואתקבלת ד צלותי קדם ד מלך עלמיא ד יהי שמיא רבא מברך לעלמא ד  
 ולעלמי ד עלמיא ד וימסר יתך בידי ויקטלינך

*At that moment the holy Spirit answered and said to him, "O David son of Jesse, is it not written in the book of the law of Moses, 'He who does not lift faces'<sup>1100</sup> and does not take a bribe'<sup>1101</sup> Lift up your eyes now, and see the souls of the eighty five priests, the sons of Ahimelech the son of Ahitub, who are assisting Ishbi-benob and saying, 'By the hands of David he killed us.' And also your own mouth witnessed against you,<sup>1102</sup> saying, 'I have occasioned [that Saul fell upon] every soul of your father's house.'<sup>1103</sup> And behold, the sentence in your case is sealed<sup>1104</sup> that [you] are to be killed today, and accept [this judgment] over you because none is left to Ahimelech the son of Ahitub, except one son, whose name is Abiathar. Then He will bring Abishai the son of Zeruiah, who was not in the counsel against the priests, and he will kill him." And he answered and said to Him, "Until when?" He responded and said, "Until seven generations." And he accepted [the judgment] over himself. And he stood on his chariot and went down to the battle-lines of Israel. When Ishbi-benob saw him, he responded and said, "Who is he, of whom I thought that he would be food for the birds of heaven, and that his corpse would not touch the ground again?" David responded and said to him, "You, greatest fool in the world! When I went forth to meet you, I was a fool and had not prayed. With regard to you, now I have gone up<sup>1105</sup> and my prayer has been accepted before the King of all eternity—may his great Name be blessed for ever and for all eternity—and He will surrender you in my hand, that I will kill you."*

Once more David's guilt in the murder of the priests of Nob is stressed (cf. TJon 1 Sam. 22:22). It is noteworthy that some Midrashic texts do not blame David for it. On the one hand, LevR. 26:7 states that Saul fell by the sword because he had lifted up his sword against the priests of God. On the other hand, ExodR. 30:16 mentions pardon from the priests' side: "None was greater than Saul . . . yet who was it that claimed [vengeance] of him for the bloodshed of which he was

<sup>1100</sup>Literal rendering. The meaning is: 'who is impartial'.

<sup>1101</sup>Quotation of the Hebrew text of Deut. 10:17.

<sup>1102</sup>Turning David's own words against him, cf. TJon 2 Sam. 1:16.

<sup>1103</sup>Quotation of the Hebrew text of 1 Sam. 22:22.

<sup>1104</sup>For this expression, cf. Sot. 35b; Ar. 15a.

<sup>1105</sup>Or, if Kasher's emendation סליק is accepted: "But now my prayer has gone up and has been accepted . . ." But in the first scene it is said that David went up to heaven.

still guilty at the time of his death? Not Israel, but the Gibeonites, for it says, 'Let seven men of his sons be delivered unto us' (2 Sam. 21:6). The priests had pardoned him, but not the Gibeonites." The tosefta does not only blame David, but it also refers to the punishment. Like Ahimelech the priest was left with one son (1 Sam. 22:20), so the seventh generation of David's dynasty would be killed, except one remaining son, *i.e.* Joash (cf. 2 Kgs 11:1-3).<sup>1106</sup>

Ishbi-benob's question at the moment that David was back on the ground is worded in the style of David's question concerning Goliath, "Who is this uncircumcised Philistine . . ." (1 Sam. 17:26). This style of questioning emphasizes the astonishment of the speaker.<sup>1107</sup>

Kasher points out parallel sources of the phrase "may his great Name be blessed for ever and for all eternity". It is found in the *Kaddish*, as well as in several manuscripts of Fragmentary Targum.<sup>1108</sup>

#### Scene 4

בי בשעתא ההיא צוח גבריאל מלאַןכאַן בְּצוּחַתָּא רַבְתָּא וְאָמַר רִיבּוּנִיָּה דְעִלְמָא  
 כּוּלִיָּה דּוּד בְּרִי יְשִׁי מְשִׁיחָא מְלַכָּא דִּישְׂרָאֵל הוּא דְאִית בְּעִלְמָא מְתַקְשִׁיל כֵּן הָבִי לִי  
 רְשׁוּ דְאִזִּיל וְאַסְעִיד יְתִיה

*At that moment the angel Gabriel called with a loud call, and said, "O Lord of all the World, David the son of Jesse, the anointed one, the king of Israel, he is in the world being killed. Now give me permission that I may go and assist him.*

Gabriel is one of the leaders of the angels (cf. tosefta-targum to Isa. 21:5). In tosefta-targumim Gabriel and Michael are the most famous angels,<sup>1109</sup> while Raphael is also regularly mentioned in other rabbinic sources.<sup>1110</sup>

#### Scene 5

בַּה בְּשַׁעְתָּא הָהִיא טוּרִיא נְדוּ וּרְמַתָּא אֹדְעֵעוּ וְהוּדְעוּהִי פְתַנְמָא בְּרוּחָא דְקֻדְשָׁא  
 לְאַבְיָשִׁי בְּרִי צְרוּיָה וְהוּא שְׂרִי בְּמִשְׁרֵית אַרְמָאָה וְהוּא עֲבִיד קְרִבִּין עִם אַרְמָאָה בְּאַרְבַּע  
 מָאָה פְּרָסִין וְהוּא יוֹמָא מְעַלִּי דְשַׁבְתָּא הוּוּ בְּתַר תְּשַׁע שַׁעִין וְחַלְחָא כְּדִי יְתִיב אַבְיָשִׁי  
 בְּרִי צְרוּיָה לְמִיחָף יֵת רִישָׁה וְנַחַת כְּנִישְׁתָּא דִּישְׂנַרְאֵל דְּהוּא דְּמִיא לִינָה וְקִאִימָא קְדָם  
 אַבְיָשִׁי בְּרִי צְרוּיָה חֲכִים בְּחִמְחָא גִיבֵר בְּנִיבְרוּחָא לְמָא אַתְּ קִאִים שְׁלוּהּ וְדוּד מְלַכָּא

<sup>1106</sup>The same connection is made in San. 95b. R. Huna, however, taught that the final punishment of the crime in Nob was given by Sennacherib, when he besieged Jerusalem on account of Nob (San. 95a based on Isa. 10:32).

<sup>1107</sup>Cf. Mk 4:41 and Lk. 8:25.

<sup>1108</sup>See Kasher, תּוֹסַפּוֹת, 120, who also refers to D. De Sola Pool, *The Old Jewish-Aramaic Prayer: The Kaddish*, Leipzig 1909, 43-53.

<sup>1109</sup>Cf. Kasher, תּוֹסַפּוֹת, 308 (index).

<sup>1110</sup>M. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ, 34), Tübingen 1992, 434 (index), *s.v.* "Namen".

דישנראלן בצערא ווהה מחקטל בה

*At that moment the mountains made place, and the heights trembled.<sup>1111</sup> And by the holy Spirit He made the thing known to Abishai the son of Zeruiah, while he was dwelling in an Aramaean camp, and waging war with the Aramaean four hundred Persian miles away. And it was the day before Shabbath, one third after the ninth hour, when Abishai the son of Zeruiah sat down to wash<sup>1112</sup> his head. And the congregation of Israel, which was like a dove, went down and stood before Abishai the son of Zeruiah, "O you wise one in wisdom and a hero in heroism, why are you standing there so relaxed, while David, the king of Israel, is in trouble, and is being killed in it?"*

The text of the fifth scene is somewhat ambivalent. On the one hand, the holy Spirit is the messenger sent to Abishai who was staying in Aramaean camp. Scripture itself does not mention this event.<sup>1113</sup> The image of the dove is more often related to the Spirit of God (Mt. 3:16; Mk 1:10; Lk. 3:22; Jn 1:32). On the other hand, the dove is explicitly identified with the people of Israel. This imagery is partly based on the allegorical exegesis of Canticles, in which the woman, sometimes called a dove (Cant. 5:2; 6:9), is conceived of as the image of Israel. The dove also functions as a symbol of the poor people of Israel in Ps. 74:19.<sup>1114</sup>

The numbers given in the present scene are intended to indicate the awkward situation in which Abishai found himself. It happened on a Friday afternoon, getting on towards Shabbath, but he was four hundred Persian miles away from David. The length of a Persian mile is about 4 miles or 8000 cubits.<sup>1115</sup> The entire situation was impossible for two reasons: first, Abishai was too far away to save David in his fatal battle; secondly, even if Abishai could cover four hundred Persian miles, he would have to rest until the end of the Shabbath. These numbers therefore stress the greatness of the subsequent miracle.<sup>1116</sup>

<sup>1111</sup>Theophany language, cf. e.g. 2 Sam. 22:8, 37; and with slightly different terms, TJon Judg. 5:5 (Pal. Tg Judg. 5:5); Isa. 54:10; Nah. 1:5.

<sup>1112</sup>See for this translation Levy, *CWT*, s.v. חָפַיָּה. This translation is in conformity with the parallel versions of San. 95a and MTeh. 18:30.

<sup>1113</sup>According to 2 Sam. 10 it was Joab who fought the Aramaeans.

<sup>1114</sup>Cf. C.T. Begg, "The Covenantal Dove in Psalm lxxiv 19-20", *VT* 37 (1987), 78-81. The same image is used in the Midrashic literature, cf. e.g. CantR. 6:9 § 5; MekY, *Beshallah*, 3:86-92; 7:27-36; MTeh. 18:11. Cf. the parallel version in San. 95a and MTeh. 18:30.

<sup>1115</sup>Cf. Kasher, תוספתא, 121. The discussion about Persian miles in MekY, *Vayassa*, 4 proves that the numbers in the present scene are an exaggeration.

<sup>1116</sup>GenR 69:11 states that even if Abishai were on the other side of the world, God would have brought him back in time. Cf. Tan., *Vayyigash*, 8.



Again part of TJon 2 Sam. 23:8 is quoted. Abishai is called “wise in wisdom and a hero in heroism”, a phrase originally used for King David (see above, Scene 1).

### Scene 6

בה בשעתא ההיא קם אבישי בר צרויה ולבש מניה זיניה ואתקן במאני קרביה ורכיב על כורנתא דיליה דאיתעבידו ביה ניסין וגבורין<sup>1117</sup> וקפצת ליה ארעא ארבע מאה פרסין ורהט ואחא ונחת ועל לגו סידרי קרבא דפלשתאי וסעיד ית מלכא דוד ומחא ית ישבי בנב פלשתאה וקטליה עד לא תיפוק נפשיה דפלשתאה מתיב וכן אמר ליה לך אנא אמר דוד בר ישי ולך אמר אבישי בר צרויה הלא אחון אינון גיברי ישראל דמתקרן גיברין איכא הוא גיברותכון דביחרין גרוון<sup>1118</sup> קטלתן יתי מתיב אביש בר צרויה וכן אמר ליה בשעתא דאנא קטיל יתך ורמי יתך לשאול חיזיל וחבשר לעורפא אימך חיבחה<sup>ו</sup> בקברא דדירא בנו שאול וחימר ליה חרין גיברי ישראל קטלו יתי אלהין דוד בר ישי דמן שמיא סעדין ליה כען את הוה צבי דנא דרך לך שעתא חד עד דיתקטיל ית דוד מלכא דישנראלן דהכדין כתיב קרא ומפרש וסעיד ליה אבישי בר צרויה ומחא ית פלשתא[ה] וקטליה בכין קיימו גברי דוד ליה למימר לא תיפוק עוד עימנא לאנחא קרבא ולא חיטפי ית מלכותא דישנראל

*At that moment Abishai the son of Zeruiah rose, and girded himself with his arms and prepared himself with battle equipment. And he rode upon his she-ass, on which miracles and mighty deeds were done, for the earth shortened for him the four hundred Persian miles. And he ran and arrived. He went down and entered in the middle of the battle-lines of the Philistines. And he assisted King David, and smote Ishbi-benob the Philistine and killed him. Before the soul of the Philistine went out, he answered and said to him, “To you I say, David son of Jesse, and to you I say, Abishai son of Zeruiah: Were you not heroes of Israel, who were really called heroes? Where then is your heroism, that you had to kill me with two whelps?” And Abishai the son of Zeruiah answered, and said to him, “At the moment I kill you, I throw you into Sheol. Go and tell Orpah your mother in the grave—the guilty one—who is dwelling in Sheol, and say to her,<sup>1119</sup> ‘Two heroes of Israel killed me, but they<sup>1120</sup> were assisting David the son of Jesse from heaven.’ Now, you had been wishing that I would allow you one hour that you might kill David, the king of Israel.” Hence it is written, read and interpreted: And Abishai the son of Zeruiah assisted him, and he struck the Philistine and killed him. Then David’s men swore to him, saying, “You shall no more go out with us to battle, for you shall not extinguish the kingdom of Israel.”*

<sup>1117</sup>For the expression ניסין וגבורין, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 2:1, 4.

<sup>1118</sup>Following Kasher, חוספחות, 121, I read גרין, ‘whelps’.

<sup>1119</sup>Literally: him; but I suppose that Ishbi-benob had to say this to his mother.

<sup>1120</sup>That is: God. Cf. H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Vol. 1: Mattäus, München <sup>6</sup>1974, 443.

The fact that a she-ass is used by Abishai is strange, because most warriors used male asses in the Biblical stories. So did David's men (1 Sam. 16:20; 2 Sam. 16:1-2; 17:23), and so did later soldiers (*e.g.* in 2 Kgs 7:7, 10). The Messiah is also depicted as riding upon a male animal (Zech. 9:9; cf. Mt. 21:5; Jn 12:15). Only prophets used to ride on she-asses, *e.g.* Balaam (Num. 22:21-33). The parallels of this tosefta-targum all mention a male ass, mainly David's ass used by Abishai (cf. San. 95a); only Aboth Dibre Nathan stated that Abishai rode upon the she-ass of the king.<sup>1121</sup>

The motif of the two whelps appears in another connection in the parallel versions of San. 95a and MTeh. 18:30: Ishbi-benob rode after David and Abishai, until they came in a place called ברתר, 'with two'. Then the two men said to each other, "With two, whelps can kill a lion."<sup>1122</sup> In the present tosefta this conversation is omitted, but Ishbi-benob does refer to it by complaining that the two of them are fighting him.

Abishai commands Ishbi-benob that he should tell his mother who killed him. In Pseudo-Philo, David gave a similar command during his fight with Goliath. Before throwing his stone, David reminded Goliath of their grandmothers Ruth and Orpah. He then prophesied that Goliath and his three brothers would be killed and sent to their mother. They would say to their mother, "The one born from your sister did not spare us."<sup>1123</sup> Abishai's comment on Ishbi-benob's mother being in the grave refers to an episode of this legend which is not mentioned in the present tosefta-targum. When Abishai went to assist David, he first rode to the land of the Philistines and met Orpah. She intended to kill him, but he took her spindle and threw it at her head, and killed her. By telling Ishbi-benob that his mother had died, Abishai made him feel weak, enabling David and himself to kill Ishbi-benob.<sup>1124</sup>

The conclusion of the narrative appears to be one of the rare occasions<sup>1125</sup> in which the translator forgot himself and acted as a Midrashic exegete. After telling the entire story the translator felt urged to explain that this is the way in which the Biblical verse had to be read and explained.<sup>1126</sup> The several hints in the tosefta to the

<sup>1121</sup>Cf. Kasher, תוספתא, 121.

<sup>1122</sup>This is not only a metaphor in itself; note that Judah is called a lion's whelp in GenR. 97 (NV), on the basis of Gen. 49:9.

<sup>1123</sup>Pseudo-Philo, LAB, 61:6.

<sup>1124</sup>Cf. San. 95a and MTeh. 18:30.

<sup>1125</sup>Cf. A. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targumic Exegesis* (TSAJ, 27), Tübingen 1992, 71.

<sup>1126</sup>A similar phenomenon is found in the official text of TJon 1 Sam. 2:1-3. The

complete legend, combined with this Midrashic conclusion, suggest that this tosefta is the Aramaic summary of a legend that was already in existence.

21 18 והוה בחר כין והוה עוד קרבא בנוב עם פלשאאי בכין<sup>1127</sup> קטל סבכי דמן חושת ית סף דבכני<sup>1128</sup> גברא<sup>1129</sup>: 21 19 והוה עוד קרבא בנוב עם פלשאאי וקטל דויד בר ישי מחי פרוכית בית מקדשא<sup>1130</sup> ית גלית גחאה<sup>1131</sup> ואע דמורניתיה כאכסן דגרידאין:

*21:18 After this there was again war with the Philistines at Gob. Then Sibbecai who was from Hushath killed Saph, who was one of the sons of the hero. 21:19 And there was again war with the Philistines at Gob. And David the son of Jesse, weaver of the curtains of the sanctuary, killed Goliath the Gittite, the wood of whose spear was like a weaver's heddle-rod.*<sup>1132</sup>

In line with the Midrashic interpretation, TJon harmonized this verse with the account of David and Goliath in 1 Sam. 17. The Chronicler overcame the problem by reading גלית אחי לחמי את, 'Lachmi the brother of Goliath', instead of גלית את הלחמי את (1 Chron. 20:5). The identification of David and Elhanan is based on the Hebrew text, as Samuel bar Nahmani declared, "Elhanan is David, whom the Holy One, blessed is He, was graceful to; son of Yaare, that is, son who grew up in a forest; Oregim, that he dealt with the curtains of the sanctuary" (RuthR. 2:2). The explanation of Oregim is based on an interpretation of 1 Chron. 4:21, in which the weaving is ascribed to David.<sup>1133</sup>

The identification of Elhanan and David solved the question who the real conqueror of Goliath was. However, it created another problem: Why did David go to battle again, if his men had urged him not to

combination of קרא ומפרש is based on Neh. 8:8.

<sup>1127</sup>The words from בכין to the end of the verse are omitted in MS S. The words from בכין to the word פלשאאי in the following verse are omitted in MS c by haplography.

<sup>1128</sup>As in 21:16 MS w reads רב בני, 'commander of the sons'.

<sup>1129</sup>As in 21:16 MSS read w f B C J read the plural גבריא.

<sup>1130</sup>MSS a b f y C J and Kimḥi add לחמי לוח, 'who was from Bethlehem', in order to give a proper rendering of Hebrew הלחמי (>29). The same phrase is added in the margin of MS B.

<sup>1131</sup>MS eb66 reads פלשאאה, 'the Philistine', as he is called in 1 Sam. 17:23; 21:10; 22:10 (>16).

<sup>1132</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 17:7.

<sup>1133</sup>Another explanation of Oregim is given as well, viz. that David "wove", i.e. explained, the Torah (RuthR. 2:2). It is worthwhile to point out a similar exegesis in Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 144-45, who gives his own aggadic identification of David and the Latin names in the present verse.

go anymore (21:17)? This problem is solved in a tosefta, which, however, gave rise to still another contradiction which had to be smoothed out: Why is a summary of the account of David and Goliath put in the present chapter, whereas David killed Goliath at the beginning of his career, before he was made king?<sup>1134</sup>

והוה עוד קרבא בגוב עם פלשתאי מתיב יואב בר צרויה ואמר ליה לאביש אחוהי ולישאר גיבריא דישראל דוד בר ישי נפק בישינין ועל ביומין וסני קרבין ערעו והלא הוא חלש למיחת לסידרי קרבא כען חד מינא לא יעביד מילויה ולא יקיים גזירתיה ואיתחזיה פתגמא ברוחא דקודשא לדוד בר ישי ורכיב על רתיכויה ונחת לגו קרבא ונחתו בתרווי יואב ואבעשי גיבריא דישראל ואסתחר דוד לאחורויה ואחזינון ורמא ית קשתיה מיניה בנכילו על ארעא עני וכן אמר יואב בר צרויה אבישי<sup>1135</sup> בר צרויה גיברא דישראל נחת מן רתיכך והב לי קשתי דנפלת מיני ונחת יואב בר צרויה ואיתקף בה בקשתיה דדוד ולא יכיל לארמא יתיה מן ארעא ואושיט דוד ריש אצבעת רגליה דימינא וארים יתיה ואחית על ידיה לשמאלא עני וכן אמר להון גיבריא דישראל איכא הוא גיברותכון דאתון אמרין גיברין אנחנא דקשתי לא יכילתון למיתון לי מן ארעא והלא קשתי<sup>1136</sup> על חד תרין בחרבי על חד ארבע<sup>1137</sup> בקשתי ובמורניתי ואינון תלן לי ידא<sup>1138</sup> דשמאלא ואתון אמרין דוד גבר חלש הוא ותקף רוגזא דדוד ונסיב ית קשתתהון מינהון ותברינן ואחדרינן ונחת מבתרויה יונוגב בר שמעא אחוהי דדוד בכין קטל דוד בר ישי מחי פרוכיא בית מקדשא ית גלית גיחאה ואעא דמורניתיה כאכסן דגרדיאין

*And there was again war in Gob with the Philistines. Joab the son of Zeruiah responded and said to his brother Abishai and to the rest of the heroes of Israel, "David the son of Jesse went forth in years and entered in days, and many battles occurred. And is not he too weak to go down to the battle-lines? Now, one of us must not act on his words and not fulfil his decision." But the word was told by the holy Spirit to David the son of Jesse, and he rode upon his chariot and came down in the midst of the battle. And Joab and Abishai, the heroes of Israel, went down after him, but David turned around and saw them. And he deceitfully threw his bow from him to the ground, and responded and said, "Joab son of Zeruiah, Abishai son of Zeruiah, hero of Israel, come down from your chariot and give me my bow, that I let fall from me." And Joab the son of Zeruiah came down*

<sup>1134</sup>The tosefta is found in the same MS Codex Manchester, Gaster 1478 after the complete Aramaic version of 21:17; edited by Kasher, תוספתות, 118.

<sup>1135</sup>Here the text has another יואב. It is put in brackets, probably to indicate that it was to be erased.

<sup>1136</sup>Meant as a derivation of the verb קשי, 'to be hard, to be tough'. We must therefore read קשית.

<sup>1137</sup>Emendation, also proposed by Kasher, תוספתות, 112. The text reads ארעא, 'earth', which does not make any sense.

<sup>1138</sup>It is best to add the preposition על before ידא, resulting in "with my left hand".

and seized the bow of David, but he was not able to lift it from the ground. And David stretched out the tip of the toe of his right foot, and lifted it up and brought it to his left hand. He then answered and said to them, "Heroes of Israel, where is your heroism that you are saying, 'We are heroes!' and you are not able to bring me my bow from the ground? With my sword, is it not twice as hard? Four times [harder] with my bow and my spear? And these are held up by my left hand! And you are saying, 'David is a weak man!'" And David's anger was fierce, and he took their bows from them and shattered them, and made them turn back. Jonadab the son of Samma, David's brother, also came down from after him. Therefore:<sup>1139</sup> David the son of Jesse, weaver of the curtains of the sanctuary, killed Goliath the Gittite. And the wood of his spear was like the weaver's heddle-rod.

Although his men had urged David not to fight anymore in battle, implying that he was too weak, King David again went out to fight the Philistines. The present tosefta describes the distrust of Joab and Abishai, shown in their act of tailing David. It also shows that David was not too weak for battle, although his general and the elite troops thought so. David proved his strength by throwing his bow from him and asking Joab to hand it over to him. When Joab appeared not to have the strength to lift up David's bow, David showed that he was stronger. He lifted up his bow with a toe, and carried it with his left hand. Then he boasted that he was even stronger: it takes twice as much strength to operate with a sword; and even four times more to handle a bow or a spear. And these weapons are mostly held up by the weaker left hand.

The Aramaic expression נפק בישינן ועל ביומין is ambivalent. On the one hand, על ביומין is the translation of Hebrew בא בימים, which means "advanced in years".<sup>1140</sup> On the other hand, the combination of נפק and עלל is often used to refer to the beginning and the end of warfare (e.g. in 2 Sam. 5:2). If both connotations of the expression must be done justice, Joab's words mean that David had years of battle experience, but that he was growing old all the same.

The text of David's statement about his weapons seems corrupt. It runs והלא קשתי על חר תרין בחרבי על חר ארעא בקשתי ובמורנית. Kasher assumed that David's bow is the subject of the first phrase, and therefore had to omit בקשתי in the second phrase. He arrived at the translation, "Is not my bow twice [in weight] my sword, and [my sword]

<sup>1139</sup> A Midrashic device; cf. the tosefta-targum on 21:17 and the official text of 1 Sam. 2:1-3.

<sup>1140</sup> It is used in TO Gen. 18:11; 24:1; TJon Josh. 13:1; 23:1-2; 1 Kgs 1:1. So also Kasher, תוספתא, 112.

twice the wood of my spear.<sup>1141</sup> His second solution is, "Is not my bow twice my sword, and [my sword] fourfold my spear."<sup>1142</sup> Both solutions do not take the subsequent phrase into account, which begins with the plural ואינין, referring to the weapons just mentioned, "These are held up by my left hand." The bow is indeed held in the left hand, while the right hand pulls back the string. Likewise, the spear is carried in the left hand, until it is thrust with the right.<sup>1143</sup> My proposal implies therefore that the sword functions as the subject of the first phrase, although the verb is impersonal, and that the two other weapons function as such in the second phrase. With the above-mentioned emendations, the order in David's boasting seems reasonable, for he concludes with the weapons that are most hard to deal with.

The text of the present tosefta makes it likely that the phrase "the wood of his spear was like a weaver's heddle-rod" must be applied to David himself. In the first place, David was called the weaver and it seems therefore logical that he held the heddle-rod. In the second place, the handling of his spear is said to be four times harder than the lifting up of a bow. His spear must therefore have had enormous proportions. The comparison of the spear with a heddle-rod was complemented with the ground: their weight.<sup>1144</sup>

The phrase about Jonadab the son of David's brother Samma (cf. 2 Sam. 13) seems superfluous. Jonadab does not play any role at the beginning of the tosefta. However, he is said to withdraw after David's reproach. In Syr and some manuscripts of the LXX Jonadab does play a role in 21:21, in killing the fourth giant. Looking forward to the subsequent story, the narrator stated that no one assisted David this time.

Several expressions link the present tosefta with the one on 21:17. In both stories the holy Spirit betrayed the plans to the main character. In both toseftot a person's heroism is doubted: David is not able to conquer Ishbi-benob on his own, but Joab is not able to carry David's bow. The main characters of both stories are almost identical: only Joab was added in the present tosefta. Some details in wording are identical in both narratives, such as the introduction of the direct speech with כן אמר בן.

<sup>1141</sup>Kasher, תוספתות, 112, emending Aramaic ארעא into אעא.

<sup>1142</sup>Kasher, תוספתות, 112, emending Aramaic ארעא into ארבע.

<sup>1143</sup>Cf. Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Discovery*, London 1963, 6 (bow) and 14 (at the top of the page: spear).

<sup>1144</sup>So the comparison was conceived of as a metaphor; see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 17:7.

20 וְהָיָה עוֹד קָרְבָּא בְנַח וְהָיָה גִבֹר<sup>1145</sup> דְּמִשְׁחָן<sup>1146</sup> וְאַצְבַּעַת יְרֻחַי וְאַצְבַּעַת רַגְלֵיהּ שִׁית וְשִׁית עֶסְרִין וְאַרְבַּע מִנִּין וְאַף הוּא אֲתִילִיד לְגִבְרָא<sup>1147</sup>: 21 וְחִסֵּיד יִתְּשָׂרָאֵל וְקִטְלִיהּ יְהוֹנָתָן בֶּר שְׁמַעָה<sup>1148</sup> אַחֻוּי דְרוּיִד: 21 יִתְּ אַרְבַּעָא אֲלֵין אֲתִילִידוּ לְגִבְרָא<sup>1149</sup> בְּנַח וְאַחְמִסְרוּ בִידָא דְרוּיִד וּבִידָא דְעַבְדֵיהּ:

21:20 And there was again war at Gath, where there was a man of stature, who had six fingers on each hand, and six toes on each foot, twenty-four in number; and he also was born from the hero. 21:21 And when he taunted Israel, Jonathan the son of Shima, David's brother, killed him. 21:22 As regards these four, they were born from the giant in Gath, and they were surrendered into the hand of David and into the hand of his servants.

## 6.22 David's Psalm (2 Samuel 22)

### 6.22.1 The Date of TJon 2 Sam. 22:32

Because there is no reference to the fall of Babylonia in 640 CE at all in TJon, this date was suggested by Churgin as the *terminus ad quem* for the conclusion of TJon's editorial phase. Rejecting this argumentation as an *argumentum e silentio*, S.H. Levey reconsidered the data for a *terminus ad quem*. He saw a reference to the Arabs and their Islamic religion in Tg 2 Sam. 22:32.<sup>1150</sup> His arguments are mentioned and discussed below.

1. The Aramaic phrase לִיָּה אֵלֵהּ אֵלֵא יִי is "an exact translation" of the Arabic creed in Islam: *lā ilāha illā 'llāh*.<sup>1151</sup>

However, the striking similarity between the Arabic creed and Tg 2 Sam. 22:32 does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the Tg 2 Sam. 22:32 was based upon the Islamic creed. First, the replacement of a rhetorical question by an assertive statement is not an unusual phenomenon in the Targumim (>13). Thus the repeated rhetorical question in Exod. 15:11, "Who is like You?", is represented by two assertive sentences in TO: "There is no

<sup>1145</sup>Omitted in MS B\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1146</sup>Neither Qere, nor Ketib. TJon rendered according to the parallel 1 Chron. 20:6, אִשְׁמֵרָה, 'man of stature' (cf. Vg); cf. Num. 13:32. So Driver, *Notes*, 355; followed by Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 17.

<sup>1147</sup>As in 21:15, 18 MSS w d read the plural לְגִבְרָא, 'to the heroes'.

<sup>1148</sup>According to the Qere and many Hebrew MSS. MS S reads the Ketib שְׁמַעֵי.

<sup>1149</sup>As in 21:15, 18, 20 MSS w d read the plural לְגִבְרָא, 'to the heroes'.

<sup>1150</sup>See above, § 1.3.2.2.

<sup>1151</sup>S.H. Levey, "The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets", *VT* 21 (1971), 186-96, esp. 192. Note that the Islamic creed is also found in Surah 2:255; 3:2, 4 in a different word order: "Allah, there is no God but Him".

one besides You . . . , there is no one except You". Syr gives the same replacement in the second half of 2 Sam. 22:32, using the preposition  $\text{כִּי}$ , and one of the extant manuscripts possibly dates from the fifth century.<sup>1152</sup>

Secondly, the use of the preposition  $\text{אַלֵּא}$  in Tg 2 Sam. 22:32 is rare, but not necessarily influenced by other sources. Usually, every Hebrew preposition meaning 'except' is equated with Aramaic  $\text{בְּרַ מִן}$ .<sup>1153</sup> But when a verse contains more of these Hebrew prepositions, and the words  $\text{בְּרַ מִן}$  are already used in the Targum verse, the second choice is  $\text{אַלֵּא}$  (>18). In the single creeds of TO Deut. 4:35 (cf. one variant in TO Deut. 4:39), TJon 1 Kgs. 8:23 and Isa. 45:5 the word  $\text{בְּרַ מִן}$  is used. In the double creeds of TO Exod. 15:11; TJon 1 Sam. 2:2; 2 Sam. 22:32; and Isa. 45:21 both  $\text{בְּרַ מִן}$  and  $\text{אַלֵּא}$  are given. The only exception is Tg 2 Sam. 7:22 where the first half ("there is no one like You") is translated literally with the preposition  $\text{כִּוְהַ}$ , and the second half ("there is no God but You") is rendered with the usual preposition  $\text{בְּרַ מִן}$ .

Thirdly, "an exact translation" of the Islamic creed in Aramaic would be:  $\text{לֵא אֱלֹהֵא אֵלֵא יִי}$ . The negation  $\text{לֵיַה}$  corresponds to the Arabic *laisa*.<sup>1154</sup> Note, however, the same kind of alliteration as in the Islamic creed in one fragment of the Taylor-Schechter collection (Sperber's siglum Fr) in the last phrase of 2 Sam. 22:32:  $\text{לֵיַה אֱלֹהֵא אֵלֵא אֱלֹהֵא}$ .

Finally, the formulation of the Islamic creed is based upon Biblical pronouncements. They can be found in 2 Sam. 7:22 ("There is no God but You"); 1 Kgs. 8:23 ("Oh Lord, God of Israel, there is no one like You");<sup>1155</sup> Isa. 45:5 ("Except Me, there is no God"); Judith 8:20 ("We know that there is no other God but Him"); and 1 Cor. 8:4 ("We know that . . . there is no God except One"). The *Shema*' and the first Article of Faith in Christianity speak about the one and only God as well.<sup>1156</sup>

<sup>1152</sup>P.A.H. de Boer (ed.), *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version*, Vol. 2.2: Samuel, Leiden 1978, iv.

<sup>1153</sup>In creed-like verses, it is used as rendering of  $\text{בְּלֹהִי}$  (1 Sam. 2:2); of  $\text{זִילֵה}$  (2 Sam. 7:22; Isa. 45:5); of  $\text{מְבַלְעֵד}$  (Isa. 44:6; 45:21); of  $\text{אַפְסַ$  (Isa. 45:14; 46:9) and of  $\text{כְּמוֹ}$  (1 Kgs. 8:23; cf. Isa. 46:9). The conjunctions  $\text{אֵךְ}$  and  $\text{כִּי־אִם}$  are always equated with the conjunction  $\text{אַלֵּהִיִן}$ . See *BCTP* on these words.

<sup>1154</sup>Used, for example, in Saadia Gaon's Arabic translation of Ps. 18:32, cf. Levey's argument 5.

<sup>1155</sup>Note the same word order in Surah 3:2: "Allah, there is no God but He".

<sup>1156</sup>See Th. Nöldeke, F. Schwally, *Geschichte des Qorāns*, Vol. 1, Hildesheim &



2. The Targum uses the verb ירה, 'to confess'.<sup>1157</sup>

But the verb ירה also occurs in Tg 1 Sam. 2:2 where the same confession is put into different words: ליה בר מנך, "there is no one besides You". Tg 1 Sam. 2:2 constitutes the basis for the rendering of 2 Sam. 22:32 (>15). The entire utterance of all the nations confessing the LORD as the only God makes complete sense after the reference to the broken siege of Sennacherib, who scorned the LORD (1 Kgs. 18:19-25) and put Him on the same powerless level as all the other gods (1 Kgs. 18:33-35). Besides, this verb does not only mean 'to confess' but also 'to praise', cf. Hab. 3:18.<sup>1158</sup>

3. The response of the people of Israel to this confession in Tg 2 Sam. 22:32 runs ועמך ימרון ליה דתקיף אלא אלהנא, 'And your people will say: There is none who is strong except our God', and seems to be a rejoinder of the Islamic 'Allāh 'akhbār, "Allah is mighty".

But the relationship between the Islamic pronouncement 'Allāh 'akhbār and the Targumic translation that "there is no one strong except our God" is not one of direct dependence. When it is used metaphorically, the Targum consistently renders the word צור, 'rock', with its plain meaning 'strong'.<sup>1159</sup> Also Syr, Vg and Symmachus give this rendering (>13).

4. The messianic context in the Targum deals with peoples, nations and tongues who confess their faith in the one God. This could be an allusion to the conversion of all the nations which were conquered in the name of Allah.

The context of Tg 2 Sam. 22:32 is indeed a messianic one, partly

New York 1970, 7 who refers to 2 Sam. 22:32; D. Masson, *Monothéisme coranique et monothéisme biblique: Doctrines comparées*, Poitiers 1976, 42-43, who refers to Deut. 4:35-39; 6:4; Judith 8:20; A.I. Katsch, *Judaism in Islam: Biblical and Talmudic Backgrounds of the Koran and its Commentaries*, New York 1980, 193, who refers to 1 Sam. 2:2, Ber. 10a, and Tan., *Vayyar*, 24b; R. Syrén, *The Blessings in the Targums: A Study on the Targumic Interpretations of Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33* (AAAbO, Ser. A, Vol. 64/1), Åbo 1986, 154-5, who refers to Tg Gen. 49:22-23; TO Exod. 15:11; TpsJ Deut. 33:26 and Tg 2 Sam. 22:32.

<sup>1157</sup>S.H. Levey, "The Date", 192, n. 5.

<sup>1158</sup>R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VT.S, 51), Leiden 1994, 143; B. Grossfeld, "Biblical Hebrew דתקיף in Ancient and Modern Translations", *JAB* 1 (1999), 31-51.

<sup>1159</sup>Thus it is translated in Deut. 32:4, 15, 18, 30, 37; 1 Sam. 2:2; 2 Sam. 22:3, 32, 47; 23:3.

borrowed from the context of Tg 1 Sam. 2:2.<sup>1160</sup> It therefore mentions nations and tongues which will acknowledge the LORD as the only living God. The reference to confessing nations is not necessarily based on the conversion to Islam of all the conquered nations. The idea of a conversion of the nations to the acknowledgement of the Lord is as old as the prophecies of Isaiah (e.g. 2:1-4) and was very vivid in the Second Temple Period.<sup>1161</sup>

5. The Arabic translation of Ps. 18:32 (= 2 Sam. 22:32), given by Saadia Gaon (892–942), also conceives of this text as an assertive statement: *Laisa ilāhun gaira 'rrābi*, “There is no god besides the Lord”, just like TgSam en Syr.

There is, however, no reason to assume a relationship of dependence between the three translations. Saadia Gaon’s Arabic translation of Psalm 18:32 obviously followed the same exegetical method as TJon and Syr did (cf. counter-argument 1).

6. The translation of the creed in 2 Sam. 22:32 is not the only similarity between the works of Saadia Gaon and Targum Jonathan. In TgIsa. 11:4 the name of Armilus is added to the statement that the descendant of Jesse shall slay the wicked. The wicked is identified with Armilus, the anti-Messiah: “Born of a union between Satan and a beautiful statue, this final ruler of Rome-Edom will kill the Messiah son of Joseph only to fall victim to the ultimate, Davidic redeemer.”<sup>1162</sup> “The first reference to Armilus, however, which we can date with certainty and whose authorship is unquestioned, is that of Saadia Gaon.”<sup>1163</sup>

The name of Armilus does indeed constitute a relationship between Targum Jonathan and the early Arabic period. The first datable reference to Armilus lies in the Islamic period, either in the seventh century if *Sefer Zerubbabel* can be dated that

<sup>1160</sup>Cf. MTeh. 18:26.

<sup>1161</sup>D. Flusser, “Paganism in Palestine”, in: S. Safrai, M. Stern, *The Jewish People in the First Century*, Vol. 1 (CRI, 1/1), Assen & Amsterdam 1976, 1065-1100, esp. 1096. The same idea is expressed by Paul in his messianic song in Phil. 2:1-11: “. . . and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (2:11). The combination of the three words “peoples, nations and tongues” is borrowed from one of the eschatological visions of Daniel (7:14).

<sup>1162</sup>D. Berger, “Three Typological Themes in Early Jewish Messianism: Messiah Son of Joseph, Rabbinic Calculations and the Figure of Armilus”, *AJS Review* 10 (1985), 141-64, esp. 155.

<sup>1163</sup>S.H. Levey, “The Date”, 195.

early,<sup>1164</sup> or in the tenth century if the philosophical treaty *Book of Beliefs and Opinions* of Saadia Gaon is the first writing in which Armilus is mentioned.<sup>1165</sup>

On the other hand, the significance of this relationship should not be overestimated. First, the name only occurs in the two editions of the Bomberg Bible (1515-17, 1524-25), and with a different spelling in *Codex Reuchlinianus*.<sup>1166</sup> The word could therefore have been borrowed from one of the aforementioned works, "but as a late interpolation which has affected a few texts, rather than as the result of a consistent process of editing".<sup>1167</sup>

Secondly, if Armilus is the Aramaic version of the Latin name Romulus, the founder of Rome (and the name of the last emperor of Rome), as D. Berger convincingly demonstrated,<sup>1168</sup> there is no reason to limit its circulation to the Islam period.<sup>1169</sup> Romulus, the founder of the capital Rome, whose name in Greek means "the destroyer of the people",<sup>1170</sup> could have been the incorporate personality of the entire Roman Empire, which indeed was a threat to the Jewish people. This incorporation could have taken place in every period since the capture of Jerusalem.

Consequently, the similarity between the Islamic creed and Tg 2 Sam. 22:32 (and also TO Ex. 15:11; Tg 1 Sam. 2:2) is striking, but gives no reason to assume a relationship of dependence. The Targum, on the one hand, came to this formulation by its usual exegetical methods. The Arabs, on the other hand, took the most beautiful

<sup>1164</sup>D. Berger, "Three Typological Themes in Early Jewish Messianism", 156; countered by S.H. Levey, "The Date", 194-95.

<sup>1165</sup>S.H. Levey, "The Date", 195.

<sup>1166</sup>Such as ארמלנון, ארמלוס, and ארמלנו, probably a further corruption of the combination of title and name *Romulus Augustus*.

<sup>1167</sup>Cf. R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (VT.S, 51), Leiden 1994, 145; B. Chilton, *Targum Approaches*, Lanhan etc. 1986, 106, n. 9; Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 50.

<sup>1168</sup>D. Berger, "Three Typological Themes in Early Jewish Messianism", 158-60. The variants ארמלנון, ארמלוס, and ארמלנו make the link with Latin *armillae*, 'armbands', i.e. the armbands with which Caesar Gaius used to appear, improbable; against Klein and Hitzig *apud* R.P. Gordon, *Targum to the Twelve Prophets*, 145, n. 28.

<sup>1169</sup>R.P. Gordon, *Targum to the Twelve Prophets*, 145.

<sup>1170</sup>D. Berger, "Three Typological Themes in Early Jewish Messianism", 159. The same word play is used in San. 105a for the name of the first king of Edom, Balaam. His name is explained as בלע עמ, "swallower of the people".

formulation to express their faith in one God, using the strong alliteration of *Alif*, *Lām* and *Hā'*. Therefore, the cause of this similarity must be found in the widespread belief that there is no God but One.

### 6.22.2 The Structure of 2 Sam. 22

The Hebrew text of David's Psalm consists of 50 verses, excluding the prose introduction of verse 1, which is in prose.<sup>1171</sup> Most of the verses primarily contain bicola, a minority shows tricola or two bicola.<sup>1172</sup> "The total length of the Aramaic text is longer than that of MT. This is partly due to the structure of the language, but also partly to the conception the author had in mind. At a number of places this impelled him to elaborations."<sup>1173</sup> In some verses these elaborations destroy the structure of the poetry (cf. verse 3), in other cases the expansions may be considered independent Aramaic poems (cf. e.g. verses 9 and 26-27).

The major divisions of the Aramaic poem are marked by poetical devices borrowed from the Hebrew text, the introduction of אַמְרָ (verses 4, 7 and 21),<sup>1174</sup> and two large expansions introducing a creed (verses 32 and 47).<sup>1175</sup> These major divisions were also used by Rodrigues Pereira, who more or less presented the following table:<sup>1176</sup>

<sup>1171</sup>A.S. Rodrigues Pereira, *Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E.-c. 600 C.E.): Selected Jewish, Christian and Samaritan Poems*, Leiden (diss.) 1996, 30-31; 55; P. Sanders, "Ancient Colon Delimitations: 2 Samuel 22 and Psalm 18", in: M.C.A. Korpel, J. Oesch (eds), *Delimitation Criticism (Pericope, 1)*, Assen 2001, 277-311, esp. 290.

<sup>1172</sup>Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 55; Sanders, "Ancient Colon Delimitations", 309-11.

<sup>1173</sup>Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 55.

<sup>1174</sup>Cf. R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum of the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi (V.T.S., 51)*, Leiden 1994, 82.

<sup>1175</sup>However, the major divisions in the Hebrew poem may be different; cf. e.g. P. van der Lugt, *Strofische structuren in de Bijbels-Hebreeuwse poëzie: De geschiedenis van het onderzoek en een bijdrage tot de theorievorming omtrent de strofenbouw van de Psalmen*, Kampen 1980, 473.

<sup>1176</sup>Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 56. For unknown reasons he omitted verses 4-6.

<i>marker</i>	<i>verses</i>	<i>contents</i>
	1	prose introduction
ואמר	2-3	hymnic introduction of praise
ואמר דוד	4-6	hymnic introduction of distress
ואמר דוד	7-20	God's saving power allusions to the Exodus
אמר דוד	21-32	God helps according to merits allusions to patriarchs and Exodus
up to בכך	33-46	God saved King David
בכך	47-49	eschatological epilogue
על כן	50-51	messianic epilogue

A few things in this scheme attract attention. There are two introductions and two epilogues, all of them introduced by a clear marker. There are three major canticles: the first two are written in such language that all Israel could identify itself with the speaker. These two canticles contain allusions to the patriarchs and to the Exodus, and conclude with a summons to acknowledge the LORD (22:32). The third canticle seems to apply to David himself. This division between the entire nation of Israel and King David alone<sup>1177</sup> was introduced in the Aramaic verse 1, "that the LORD saved Israel from the hand of all their enemies and also David from the sword of Saul". It recurs in the first summons, verse 32, which is reminiscent of the miracles done for both the people of Israel and its Anointed One. The same division is attested in the epilogues: the first epilogue repeats the summons of verse 32, concentrating on God's saving power against the nations, while the second epilogue speaks of God's goodness to his Anointed One.<sup>1178</sup> It is especially noteworthy that the middle strophes of the middle part (verses 26-27) elaborate on what seems to be the theme of the Aramaic psalm, *viz.* God rewards a person according to his merit.

The Aramaic poem has its own poetical devices and its own key words.<sup>1179</sup> On the basis of these devices and key words—together with the integrated original devices and markers—a division into smaller sub-canticles is possible. I disagree with Rodrigues Pereira about the

<sup>1177</sup>This division is quite natural, since the theme of the first major canticle is a storm theophany of the LORD, which can easily be linked with the theophany language of Exodus, while the theme of the third major canticle is best applied to David's vindication from his enemies. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 474 draws the conclusion that the first canticle was "an old song of deliverance", while the third canticle (more or less) was a royal victory song.

<sup>1178</sup>So also Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, 310.

<sup>1179</sup>So also Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 30-51, esp. 51.

position of verse 32, which I consider the beginning of canticle V. I have two reasons for this. First, the markers *אמר* and *בכן* clearly indicate the beginning of a canticle. Secondly, just as canticle III concludes with references to, and repetitions of the introductions,<sup>1180</sup> so the beginning of the third major canticle refers to the epilogues. Furthermore, verse 31 is appropriate as a conclusion to canticle IV, because of its allusions to the introductions, especially to verse 3, *e.g.* *תקוף* and the combination of *רחץ* and *על מימריה*. The splitting up of the epilogues is not likely either, because the expression *על כן* is already used in the Hebrew text and only mark the beginning of a new strophe. A slightly different division is therefore suggested here, which also functions as the basis of the subsequent commentary.<sup>1181</sup>

<i>cant.</i>	<i>sub-c.</i>	<i>verses</i>	<i>markers</i>	<i>theme</i>
I		2-3	<i>ואמר</i>	introduction of praise
II		4-6	<i>ואמר דוד</i>	introduction of distress
III			<i>ואמר דוד</i>	EXODUS
	III.1	7-9	fire, wrath	God's threat as fire
	III.2	10-12	clouds	God's glory in clouds
	III.3	13-16	fire, wrath	God's threat as fire
	III.4	17-20	object: 1st p.	God's salvation effective
IV			<i>אמר דוד</i>	ISRAEL
	IV.1	21-25	purity	according to my merit
	IV.2	26-27	names	in the past
	IV.3	28-31	God, LORD	in the future
V			<i>בכן</i>	KING DAVID
	V.1	32-35	God, LORD	God helped me fight
	V.2	36-39	2nd/1st p.	God helped me pursue
	V.3	40-43	2nd/1st p.	God helped me defeat
	V.4	44-46	2nd/1st p.	God will help me reign
VI		47-51	<i>בכן</i>	epilogue

<sup>1180</sup>Many words of 17-20 are repetitions of 22:2-3, 6; so also Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 41.

<sup>1181</sup>The structure proposed here is based on the findings of the Kampen School, presented in *e.g.* M.C.A. Korpel, J.C. de Moor, "Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry", *UF* 18 (1986), 173-212; revised in: W. van der Meer, J.C. de Moor (eds), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOT.S, 74), Sheffield 1988, 1-61; M.C.A. Korpel, J.C. de Moor, *The Structure of Classical Hebrew Poetry: Isaiah 40-55* (OTS, 41), Leiden 1998. Because the Aramaic poem is based on the Hebrew original, the structure of the Hebrew text was given preference, cf. P. Sanders, "Ancient Colon Delimitations: 2 Samuel 22 and Psalm 18", in: M.C.A. Korpel, J. Oesch (eds), *Delimitation Criticism* (Pericope, 1), Assen 2001, 277-311.

In spite of all the poetical and semi-poetical expansions of TJon, the Aramaic poem appears to have a fairly regular structure. All the sub-canticles consist of two or three strophes. The introductions and the epilogue all have three strophes, too. The three major canticles consist of respectively four, three and four sub-canticles.

### 6.22.3 Commentary

David's Psalm<sup>1182</sup> is read as the *haftara* after the Torah reading of the Song of Moses (Deut. 32). The Hebrew texts of these poems show a number of agreements, such as the divine titel "Rock" (Deut. 32:4; 2 Sam. 22:2-3) and the confession of one God (Deut. 32:39; 2 Sam. 22:32). These agreements are translated alike in both Aramaic chapters. However, the agreements are enhanced by the Aramaic version of David's Psalm. The separation of Israel and their special position among the nations is recalled in TJon 2 Sam. 22:27, and even combined with the name of Jacob (cf. Deut. 32:8-9). The image of fire is linked to God's anger in 2 Sam. 22:9, on the basis of the same connection in Deut. 32:22. God's arrows are explained as "plagues" in 2 Sam. 22:15; this explanation comes close to the Hebrew text of Deut. 32:23-24. And finally, the conclusion of the Song of Moses, in which the nations are summoned to praise the mighty deeds of God to his people, is integrated in the summons of 2 Sam. 22:32. Consequently, the translation of 2 Sam. 22 appears to be influenced by the Hebrew text of Deut. 32.

On the seventh day of Passover David's Psalm is read again, after the reading of Exod. 13:17-15:26, which concludes with the Song of Deliverance after the Exodus.<sup>1183</sup> These two poems also show agreements in the Hebrew text, such as the theophanic language, the confession of one God (Exod. 15:11; 2 Sam. 22:32), and the awe of the foreign nations (Exod. 15:14-15; 2 Sam. 22:44-46). These agreements are greatly enhanced by the Aramaic versions. God is called *רוֹקְפִי*, 'my strength', in both poems, although the Hebrew text reads two different words (TO Exod. 15:2; TJon 2 Sam. 22:2); the pharaoh is introduced in TJon 2 Sam. 22:9, after he was mentioned in Exod. 15:4; in both poems God's anger is compared with fire (TO Exod. 15:7; TJon 2 Sam. 22:9); the confession of TO Exod. 15:11, *לִיְהוָה בַּר מִיַּךְ*, is introduced in TJon 2 Sam. 22:32, although the 2nd person

<sup>1182</sup>A comparison between TJon 2 Sam. 22 and TgPs. 18 is made in M. Smelik-Oldenhof, W.F. Smelik, "Twin Targums: Psalm 18 and 2 Samuel 22", in: A. Rapoport-Albert *et al.* (eds), *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman*, Sheffield 2001, 244-81.

<sup>1183</sup>According to MS 9<sup>b</sup> only 2 Sam. 22:1-14, 50-51 was read.

does not really fit there; allusions to the Exodus are clearly discernible in 2 Sam. 22:9, 17, 27. In conclusion, the translation of 2 Sam. 22 appears to be influenced by the Hebrew and Aramaic text of Exod. 15.

In the triennial cycle, part of David's Psalm (10-33) was read after the Torah reading of Exod. 32:15ff., the breaking of the two tables by Moses when he discovered the golden calf. The theophanic language of the Psalm and the reference to the Torah and its institutions (22:23) justifies this choice. The wording of 10-13 is reminiscent of God's revelation on Sinai (Exod. 19-20). This connection is even enhanced in the Aramaic version. However, there is no trace of influence from the Torah reading of Exod. 32 on the Aramaic translation of David's Psalm.

In some traditions of the triennial cycle David's Psalm was read after the Torah reading of Deut. 32. This combination still exists in the annual reading.

22 1 ושבחָ דָּוִד בְּנִבְאוֹהָ קִרְםָּ יְיָ 1184 יְהוָה פָּחַמְי תִּשְׁבַּחְתָּהּ הָרָא עַל כָּל יוֹמָי  
דְּשִׁיבָהּ יְיָ יִתְּ 1185 יִשְׂרָאֵל מִדְּכָל בְּעָלֵי דְבַבְיָהוֹן 1186 וְאַף 1187 לְדָוִד מִחַרְבַּא  
דְּשָׂאוֹל:

*22:1 And David praised in a prophetic spirit before the LORD with the words of this praise song, concerning all the days that the LORD saved Israel from the hand of all their enemies, and also David from the sword of Saul.*

Right from the beginning it is clear that the Aramaic poem is concerned both with the people of Israel and with King David.<sup>1188</sup> These two subjects are the result of a diversification in the conclusion of the verse. Hebrew *מִכָּף כָּל־אִיבָיו* is applied to the entire nation, whereas Hebrew *מִכָּף שָׂאוֹל* is only applied to David (>18).<sup>1189</sup> This diversification might also be based on the supposition that a song of praise for one's own rescue is a sign of selfishness (cf. MTeh. 18:5).<sup>1190</sup>

Like Hannah's Song (1 Sam. 2:1-10), David's Psalm is introduced

<sup>1184</sup>The phrase *יְיָ בְּנִבְאוֹהָ קִרְםָּ* is omitted by MS o.

<sup>1185</sup>Mss a C J S read *יְיָ וְיִתְּ*, implying that the LORD saved both David and the people of Israel. Likewise, MS Fr reads *כָּל יְיָ וְיִתְּ*.

<sup>1186</sup>Erroneously omitted in MS 9<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>1187</sup>Mss b c d Fr B C J add the verb *שִׁיבָהּ*, as a repetition of the double duty verb *שִׁיבָהּ*; MSS 9<sup>b</sup> S read *דָּוִד שִׁיבָהּ*, adjusting the object.

<sup>1188</sup>"R. Judan taught in the name of R. Judah, 'All that David said in his Book of Psalms applies to himself, to all Israel, and to all the ages.'" (MTeh. 18:1).

<sup>1189</sup>So also Komlosh, *הַמְקָרָא בְּאִיר הַחַרְמוֹם*, 313.

<sup>1190</sup>So Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 18.



as prophecy (Meg. 3a, Ber. 34b).<sup>1191</sup> Many themes and key words used in Hannah's Song recur in the present Psalm, but eschatology and apocalyptic scenes are not stressed. The major part of the psalm is a description of God's saving power, sometimes illustrated with examples from Israel's history.

### I Introduction of Praise (2-3)

ואמר

יְיָ תִּקְפֵי ◊ וּרְחַצְנִי וּמְשִׁיבֵי יְהִי:

אלהי ◊<sup>1192</sup> דאחרעי בי<sup>1193</sup>

קרבני לדחלתיה<sup>1194</sup>

תִּקְפֵי ◊ דְּמִן קְדְמוֹהֵי ◊ מְתִיבֵי לִי תִּקּוּף ◊ וּפְרָקוּן

לאַתְּגַבְרָא עַל בְּעֵלֵי דְבַבִּי ◊

רְחַצְנִי ◊ דַּעַל מִימְרֵיהֵי ◊ אַנְא רְחִיץ בְּעַדָן עֵקָא

מִנִּין עֵלֵי מְבַעֲלֵי דְבַבִּי ◊

ואמר לארמא קרני בפרקניה

סמכני דהוה מימריה ◊ סמך לי<sup>1195</sup>

כד הויתי עריק ◊ מן קדם ◊ רדפי

פרקי<sup>1196</sup> מבעלי דבבי ◊

ואף מיד כל חטופין<sup>1197</sup> פריק ◊<sup>1198</sup> יחי:

22:2 *And he said, "The LORD is my strength and my trust and the one who rescues me. 22:3 My God, who chose me and drew me near to his fear. My strength, from before whom strength and salvation were given to me to overpower my enemies. My trust, on whose speech I trust in times of distress, shielding me against my enemies; He promised to raise my horn in his salvation. My support, whose speech was supporting me, when I was fleeing before my pursuers. My salvation from my enemies, and He saved me even from the hand of all robbers."*

Almost all metaphors are replaced with plain language. Only the metaphor of the horn is maintained, as in 1 Sam. 2:1. It seemed to be a well-known image for the users of the Aramaic translation.

Verse 3 is an Aramaic poem *sui generis*, although the verse-lines

<sup>1191</sup> Cf. 11QPs<sup>a</sup>, in which David's psalms are called 'prophecy'.

<sup>1192</sup> TJon followed the vocalization of Ps. 18:3, cf. Vg and most MSS of LXX.

<sup>1193</sup> This phrase is taken from 22:20

<sup>1194</sup> The phrase דאחרעי בי קרבני לדחלתיה is omitted in MS o.

<sup>1195</sup> This phrase is taken from 22:19.

<sup>1196</sup> Ms Fr reads שיבני, increasing the internal coherence of the canticle by an inclusion between verse 2 and the conclusion of verse 3.

<sup>1197</sup> Ms 9<sup>b</sup> and Kimḥi add ואנסין, 'and plunderers'.

<sup>1198</sup> MSS c b f m o w y x Fr B C J S eb66 and Kimḥi read the verb שיזיב, increasing the internal coherence of the canticle by an inclusion between verse 2 and the conclusion of verse 3.

are rather long. It exhibits nearly the same structure five times over: a subject plus suffix 1st person sg., followed by a subordinated clause introduced by ׀. Four times the root of the first word is repeated (פרק and סמך, רחץ, תקף),<sup>1199</sup> four times accompanied by a reference to the enemies (three times by בעלי דבבא, once by רדפי). Within this structure, the verse gives a translation of every Hebrew designation of God, followed by a homiletic explanation of the epithet.<sup>1200</sup>

Note the alliteration in the phrase ואמר לארמא קרני בפרקניה. An inclusion is made in most manuscripts by using the verb שזיב in the conclusion of verse 3. One manuscript even made a link with the prose introduction of verse 1:<sup>1201</sup>

ואף מיד כל חטופין שזיב יחי ומידא דשאוּל מלכא הוּה פריק לי

*And He saved me even from the hand of all robbers, and from the hand of King Saul He rescued me*

## II Introduction of distress (4-6)

אמר דויד<sup>1202</sup>

בתשבחא אנא מצלי<sup>1203</sup> קדם ׀ יי

רבכל עדן<sup>1204</sup> מבעלי דבבי ׀ פריק ׀ יחי:

ארי אקיפתני עקא

כאתא דיתבא על מחברא

וחיל לית לה למילד

והיא מסכנא לממת<sup>1205</sup>

סיעת<sup>1206</sup> הייבין ׀ בעיתת יחי:

משרית רשיעין אקפוני

קדמוני<sup>1208</sup> דמוינין במני קטול:

22:4 *And David said, "I am praying in a praise song before the LORD, who in all times saved me from my enemies. 22:5 For distress surrounded me, like a woman who sits on the birth-stool, and she lacks the strength to give birth, and she is in danger of dying. A company of*

<sup>1199</sup>Or even five times, if Aramaic דחלתא, 'fear', is considered a designation of God; cf. Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 33.

<sup>1200</sup>Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 31.

<sup>1201</sup>Codex London 636, edited by Kasher, חוספתוה, 122.

<sup>1202</sup>The introduction אמר דויד is omitted in MS o.

<sup>1203</sup>MS Fr reads פתח פומי ומצלי, 'I open my mouth and I pray'.

<sup>1204</sup>MS Fr adds עקא, 'distress'; cf. 22:5.

<sup>1205</sup>The phrase והיא מסכנא לממת is omitted in MS o.

<sup>1206</sup>See above, 1 Sam. 10:10. MTeh. 116:3 states that the Hebrew word can either mean "cords" or "band".

<sup>1207</sup>MS Fr reads שקרין, 'liars'.

<sup>1208</sup>Mss a Fr 9<sup>h</sup> C S read ערעוני, 'they met with me'.

*sinner terrified me, 22:6 armies of the wicked surrounded me, those who were armed with murder weapons confronted me.*"

Verse 4 begins with the addition **ואמר דוד**, marking the beginning of a new canticle.

Verse 5 is expanded with a simile, which is a small poem in itself. Note the parallelism between birth and death, and the rhyme and metre in this strophe. The expansion is based on a Midrashic explanation of Hebrew **משבר**. It is first translated with "distress", but also vocalized as **משבר**, 'birth-stool' (>3). This explanation appears to be the standardized translation of the Hebrew word (cf. 2 Kgs 19:3; Isa. 37:3; Hos. 13:13).<sup>1209</sup>

All metaphors in verses 5 and 6 are dissolved. The waves of death are explained with the new simile of labour pains. The three other metaphors, however, are personalized as guilty people, wicked people and people carrying murder weapons.<sup>1210</sup> These wicked people, described with rhyme on *-at* and *-in*, bind the latter half of verse 5 and verse 6 together. These wicked people are at the same time an explanation of the "enemies" in verse 4. So, whereas the tight structure of the Hebrew poem is loosened, the whole passage has gained in poetic expression.<sup>1211</sup>

### III.1 God's saving power: threat and fire (7-9)

אמר דוד<sup>1212</sup>  
 כר עיקא לי אנא מצלי קדם ◊ יי  
 וקדם ◊ אלהי ◊ אנא מתחנן  
 ומקביל ◊ מהיכליה צלותי  
 ובעותי קדמויה ◊ מתעברא<sup>1213</sup>;  
 ואתרניפת ואתרנושת<sup>1214</sup> ארעא  
 שכלולי שמיא זעו  
 ואתרכינו ארי תקיף<sup>1215</sup> רגזיה<sup>1216</sup>;

<sup>1209</sup>So Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 19. But cf. 1QH 3:7-8.

<sup>1210</sup>The latter group came into existence by vocalizing Hebrew **מקש** as a Hophal participle; cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 19. These people are not identified, contrasting MTeh. 18:10, which introduces the four empires of Dan. 7.

<sup>1211</sup>Cf. Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 35.

<sup>1212</sup>The phrase **אמר דוד** is omitted in MS o.

<sup>1213</sup>MS o reads **בארני בארני**, 'and He accepts in his ear', combining the verb of the first half of the present verse with a literal translation of the Hebrew word (>29). MS Fr adds **בעידן צלותי**, 'at the time of my prayer'.

<sup>1214</sup>MS Fr adds the verb **ואיזרעעה**, 'was terrified'; cf. 22:37.

<sup>1215</sup>MS o adds **תננה**, resulting in "the smoke of his anger". This addition is taken from the subsequent verse, in which MS o omitted the first line concerning the pharaoh.

<sup>1216</sup>Mss B J reads **מימריה**, 'his speech'. MS Fr reads a completely different last

סליק זרונה דפרעה<sup>1217</sup>  
 כהננא<sup>1218</sup> קדמוהי<sup>1219</sup>◇  
 בכין שלא<sup>1220</sup> רנויה  
 כאשא בערא דמן קדמוהי<sup>1221</sup>◇  
 משיצא<sup>1221</sup> מזופתיה  
 כגומרין רנור דלקא ממימריה:◇

22:7 David said, "When I am in distress, I pray before the LORD, and before my God I plea. And He accepts my prayer from his temple, my request is done before Him. 22:8 The earth was stirred and shaken, the foundations of the heavens trembled. They were bent down, because his anger was fierce, 22:9 [because] the pride of Pharaoh went up like smoke before Him. Then he sent his anger, like a burning fire which came from before Him; destroying was his threat, like coals of blazing fire in his speech.

Once more TJon indicated the beginning of a new section with the words אבר דייד. The repetition of אקרא in verse 7 is represented by two synonyms (>18) without disturbing the syntax or the chiasm. The double duty verb רשמע is rendered by the usual equivalent in its place, but made explicit in the second line. Note that these verbs show a grammatical parallelism of a Pael participle in the first and an Ithpaal/Ithpeel participle in the second colon.<sup>1222</sup> Note also that TJon repeated the original chiasm of the first bicolon in the second bicolon. With regard to the contents of the translation, it is noteworthy that TJon regarded "my request was done" as the synonym of "my prayer was accepted". The former phrase also occurs in David's Last Words (cf. 23:5).

Verse 8, a strophe on its own, is full of alliteration because of the triple use of the Ithpeel and the subsequent ארעא, replacing the rhyme in the Hebrew text. There is also an alliteration in שכלולי שמיא, which is absent from Hebrew.<sup>1223</sup> The official text of verse 8 consists of only one tricolon, but one manuscript largely expanded the strophe, partly with a phrase of 22:16:<sup>1224</sup>

line, see commentary.

<sup>1217</sup>Mss a b c d y Fr B 9<sup>b</sup> C J S add the adjective רשיעא, 'wicked'.

<sup>1218</sup>MS S adds בערה, 'burning', enhancing the coherence of the verse.

<sup>1219</sup>MS Fr reads באפוהי, 'in his nose' (>29). The word is omitted in MS f.

<sup>1220</sup>MS o omitted the words זרונה until שלא.

<sup>1221</sup>MS S reads משייב, 'saving'.

<sup>1222</sup>Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 36.

<sup>1223</sup>Cf. Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 36.

<sup>1224</sup>Partly integrated in Sperber's critical apparatus with siglum Fr; entirely edited by Kasher, הוספתו, 122.

ואחרגית ואחרגושת ארעא  
 שכלולי שמיא זעו  
 ואיזדעזעו טוריא  
 ואיחהפיכו עימקי ימא  
 ארי תקוף רוגייה דאלהא חייא וקיימא

*The earth was stirred and shaken, the foundations of the heavens trembled, the hills trembled, and the depths of the sea were bent, because of the strength of the anger of the living and eternal God*

The parallel earth || heaven is present in the Hebrew text. A new parallel was added, *viz.* hills || depths of the sea. Apart from the obvious contrast between height and depth, the parallel between mountain and sea often occurs in Biblical and extra-Biblical poetry.<sup>1225</sup>

The metaphoric language of verse 9 is turned into three similes. The strophe is structured around these similes: the first lines of all bicola contain the tenor, the second line the vehicle, introduced by the preposition כ. The verse is connected with the Exodus from Egypt, because of its similarity with the Song in Exod. 15.<sup>1226</sup> The same metaphor in 22:13 is translated in a similar manner (>15). The “bending down” (ואתרכיניו) of heavens is a specific reference to the revelation on Sinai, just as it is used in the expansive TJon on Judg. 5:4.<sup>1227</sup> At the same time it creates a poetic concatenation with verse 10.

### III.2 God's saving power: glory in the clouds (10-12)

וארכין שמיא ואתגלי יקריה  
 וענן אמטתא כיבש קדמוהי:  
 ואתגלי בנבורתיה על כרובין קלילין,<sup>1228</sup>  
 ודבר<sup>1229</sup> בתקוף על כנפי רוחא:  
 אשרי שכנינתיה<sup>1230</sup> בערפילא  
 ענן יקר<sup>1230</sup> סחור סחור ליה  
 מחית מין תקיפין<sup>1230</sup>  
 מרכפת עננין קלילין ברום עלמא<sup>1231</sup>:

<sup>1225</sup>Cf. A. Berlin, *Enmerkar and Ensuĕkešdanna. A Sumerian Narrative Poem* (Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund, 2), Philadelphia 1979, 51; E. Oßwald, A.S. van der Woude, *Poetische Schriften* (JSRZ, 4), Gütersloh 1974, 262; M.-J. Seux, *Hymnes et prières aux dieux de Babylonie et d'Assyrie* (Littératures anciennes du Proche-orient), Paris 1976, 54.

<sup>1226</sup>So Komlosh, *המקרא באור החרגום*, 312-13. Cf. MTeh. 18:13, where this part of Psalm 18 is also linked to the pharaoh's pursuit of the people after the Exodus.

<sup>1227</sup>Cf. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 399-405.

<sup>1228</sup>Omitted in MS o.

<sup>1229</sup>According to the reading וידא of Ps. 18:11, cf. Syr and Vg.

<sup>1230</sup>MSS a 9<sup>h</sup> read קלילין, 'swift'.

<sup>1231</sup>The phrase ברום עלמא is omitted in MS o.

22:10 *And He bent down the heavens and his Glory was revealed, and a dark cloud covered before Him.* 22:11 *And He revealed himself in his heroism upon the swift cherubim, and he rode in his strength on the wings of the wind.* 22:12 *He made his Presence reside in a thick cloud, a glorious cloud was all around Him, bringing down mighty waters from a mass of swift clouds in the world's height.*

Verses 10-12 show a strong internal coherence by the repetition of several words and the usage of synonyms: שְׁמַיָּא || בְּרוּם עֵלְמָא; twice אֲתַגְלִי; twice יָקַר || שְׁכִינְתָּהּ; twice עָנַן || עַרְפִּילָא (cf. GenR. 13:12); twice קָלִילִין || הַקּוֹף; קָלִיפִין || הַקּוֹף.

TJon does not specifically combine these verses with the Exodus, as in ARN<sup>a</sup> 34:7, where 22:10 is quoted to demonstrate that God descended to the earth at the time of the Exodus.<sup>1232</sup>

As usual TJon is very careful in avoiding misinterpretations. Neutral verbs like “reveal” and “dwell” are used. The verb דָּבַר must show that God is not carried by the wings of the wind, but that He is actively involved in their movement (so also CantR. 1:9 § 4). The order of the verbs in verse 11 is reversed, because the revelation of God is connected with the cherubim, rather than with the wind (cf. also 1 Sam. 4:4; 2 Sam. 6:2). This connection is enhanced in the London manuscript, which also restored the order of the Hebrew verbs:<sup>1233</sup>

ואשרי שכניתיה על כרובין קלילין ואיתגלי ביקר על כנפי רוחא ודברו בתקוף  
*and He made his Presence reside upon the swift cherubim, and He revealed himself in glory upon the wings of the wind, and he drove them with strength*

### III.3 God's saving power: threat and fire (13-16)

מזיו יקריה<sup>1234</sup> ◊  
 מבהקין שמי שמיא  
 מוּפִיחִיה  
 כנומרין דנור דלקא ממימריה:  
 אכלי מן שמיא יוי<sup>1235</sup>  
 ועלאה ארים מימריה<sup>1236</sup> ◊  
 ושלא מחתיה<sup>1237</sup> כנרין ובררנן  
 ברקין ושגישנן:

<sup>1232</sup>So also MekY, *Beshallah*, 3.

<sup>1233</sup>Sperber's siglum Fr, collated by Kasher, תוספתות, 122.

<sup>1234</sup>Ms London 636 adds וקיימא חייא דאלהא חייא וקיימא חייא, as in 22:8; cf. Kasher, תוספתות, 122.

<sup>1235</sup>Omitted in MS 9<sup>h</sup>.

<sup>1236</sup>Ms Fr reads the more usual קליה, 'his voice' (cf. 1 Sam. 2:10).

<sup>1237</sup>Ms Fr adds בהון, 'on them', cf. עליהון in 1 Sam. 2:10.

ואתחזיו עמקי ימא  
 אתגליאו<sup>1238</sup> שכלולי חבל  
 במזופיתא<sup>1239</sup> מן קדם יוי  
 ממימר תקופה רגזיה:

22:13 *From the splendour of his Glory the heavens of heavens were shining, from his threat, like coals of blazing fire out of his speech.*  
 22:14 *The LORD thundered from heaven, the Most High raised his speech.* 22:15 *He sent his plague like arrows, and scattered them; lightning, and confused them.* 22:16 *The depths of the sea were seen, and the foundations of the world were revealed, at the threat from before the LORD, from the speech of his angry strength.*

Verses 13-16 have several words and phrases in common with verses 7-9, such as the comparison of God's threat with coals (22:9, 13), the verb שלח (22:9, 15), שכלולי (22:8, 16), and תקופה רגזיה (22:8, 16). The present strophes are linked by the parallelism of heavens (13,14) and the combination of sea and world (16), while the double use of מזופיתא forms an inclusion (13,16). Note the newly created alliteration in ארום מימריה (14), which is noteworthy because also the word קלא could have been used (cf. 1 Sam. 2:10).

After the mentioning of the pharaoh in 22:9, it is only natural to think of the dividing of the Red Sea.<sup>1240</sup> The association with the Song in Exod. 15 makes this even more likely.

### III.4 God's saving power: effective (17-20)

שלח נביוהיה מלך תקיף  
 דיתיב<sup>1241</sup> בחקופה רומא<sup>1242</sup> דברני  
 שיזבני מעממין<sup>1243</sup> סגיאין:  
 שיזבני מסנאי ארי תקפוני<sup>1244</sup>  
 מבעלי דבבי ארי אתגברו עלי:  
 יקדמוני<sup>1245</sup> ביום שלטולי  
 וזהו מימרא דיוי סמך לי:  
 ואפיק לרוחא יתי  
 שיזבני ארי אתרעי בי:

<sup>1238</sup>Erroneously omitted in MS p.

<sup>1239</sup>MS Fr reads במזופית רוצ, 'at the threat of his spirit'.

<sup>1240</sup>Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 40.

<sup>1241</sup>MS London 636 adds בשכינתיה, 'in his Presence'.

<sup>1242</sup>MS London 636 reads בשמי מרומא, 'in the heavens above'.

<sup>1243</sup>MS j reads מעמקין, 'from the depths'.

<sup>1244</sup>MS S reads אקפוני, 'they surrounded me'.

<sup>1245</sup>MSS f o Fr and Kimḥi read הקדמוני, 'they confronted me'. The imperfect may be caused by dittography, since the previous verse ends with " . MS S reads יערעני, 'they meet me', as in 22:6.

22:17 A strong king sent his prophets, He who dwells in strength on high led me out, He rescued me from many nations. 22:18 He rescued me from my haters, for they overpowered me; from my enemies, for they challenged me. 22:19 They confronted me on the day of my expulsion, but the speech of the LORD was supporting me. 22:20 He brought me forth into an open place, He saved me because He chose me.”

The association with the Exodus is still present (cf. also MTeh. 18:20). Hebrew *יָצַא*, ‘he drew me out’, reminded the translator of Moses’ name (cf. Exod. 2:10),<sup>1246</sup> so he introduced the prophets, Moses and Aaron, in verse 17.<sup>1247</sup> The “many waters” are conceived of as a metaphor, and explained as “many nations”,<sup>1248</sup> in accordance with Mid-rashic exegesis.<sup>1249</sup> It is therefore not necessary to assume that TJon read *מעמים* instead of *במים*.<sup>1250</sup>

The short phrase *עו מאיבי עו* (22:18), translated as a unit in accordance with the Masoretic punctuation,<sup>1251</sup> is explained as *מסנאי ארי* *הקפני*. The result is a colon that runs exactly parallel to the subsequent colon.<sup>1252</sup> The bicolon of verse 18 also runs parallel to the last colon of verse 20.

The last sub-canticle has many words and phrases in common with the introductions, especially with the first one (22:2-3). Apart from the main key words such as *תקיף* and *שייב*, the following phrases appear in both sections: *אליה דאתרעי בי* || *ארי אתרעי בי* (20); *לאחגברא על* (3) || *אחגברו עלי* (3); *סמך לי* (3, 19); *קדמוני* || *יקדמוני* (6). These inclusions confirm the conclusion that a new canticle starts in verse 21.

<sup>1246</sup>Thus it is interpreted in Kalla Rabbati 53a.

<sup>1247</sup>Moses and Aaron are called “the prophets” in strophe IV.4 of the *tosefta-targum* on 1 Sam. 17:43. The association might also be based on the Hiphil form of the Hebrew verb, which requires a second object.

<sup>1248</sup>This occurs often, e.g. in TJon Isa. 23:3; 28:17; Ezek. 26:19; 31:4, 5, 7, 15; 32:2, 14, obviously triggered by texts like Isa. 17:12-13; Jer. 51:13, 55.

<sup>1249</sup>E.g. in CantR. 8:7 § 1; cf. H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.*, Vol. 3: Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis, München<sup>6</sup> 1974, 821, commenting on Rev. 17:15.

<sup>1250</sup>Against Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 21.

<sup>1251</sup>Cf. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 21.

<sup>1252</sup>Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 40; against Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 201.



## IV.1 God rewards according to one's merit (21-25)

אמר<sup>1253</sup> דוד  
 ישלמיני<sup>1254</sup> יי כזכותי  
 כברירות ידי יחיב לי:  
 ארי נשרית אורחן התקנן קדם<sup>◇</sup> יוי  
 ולא הליכית ברשע קדם<sup>◇</sup> אלהי<sup>◇</sup>:  
 ארי כל דינוהי<sup>◇1255</sup> גלן לקבל<sup>1256</sup> למעברדון  
 וקימוהי לא ערית מנהון:  
 והוית שלים ברחלחיה  
 והוית נשר נפשי מחובין<sup>1257</sup> ◇:  
 ואחיב יוי לי כזכותי  
 כברירותי קדם<sup>◇</sup> מימריה<sup>◇</sup>:

22:21 David said, "The LORD will recompense me according to my innocence, according to the purity of my hands He will repay me. 22:22 For I kept the ways which are right before the LORD, and have not walked in wickedness before my God, 22:23 for all his judgments were revealed before me to do them, and his statutes—I did not depart from them. 22:24 I was perfect in his fear, and I was keeping my soul from guilt, 22:25 and the LORD repaid me according to my innocence, according to my purity before his speech.

A sub-canticle with strong internal coherence introduces a new canticle with the marker **אמר דוד**. The theme is set out in the first verse-line, *viz.* God's reward according to the person's deeds. Three inclusions mark the division of the sub-canticle, **כזכותי || כזכותי ידי כברירות ידי || יחיב לי** and **ואחיב יוי לי** (21, 25). It is noteworthy that the three bicola of 22:21-23 show rhyme, while the antithetical parallelism of verse 22 is enhanced by the addition of the word **דתקנן**.

The perfectness of the speaker is clarified by the addition **ברחלחיה**, 'in his fear'. The fear of the LORD was considered the highest ideal.<sup>1258</sup> This fear is clarified by the subsequent phrase concerning the author's innocence and the addition concerning God's Torah **למעברדון**, 'to do them'. Not the intention of a person is most important, but his actual deeds.<sup>1259</sup>

<sup>1253</sup>Ms B\* added יוי, but it has been erased.

<sup>1254</sup>Ms Fr reads יגמלני, 'He will do to me', in conformity with the Hebrew wording (>29).

<sup>1255</sup>Ms Fr reads דיני רעותיה, 'the judgments of his will'.

<sup>1256</sup>Ms k reads the reverent קרמי, 'before me'.

<sup>1257</sup>Mss d o add כל יומי; mss c S add כל יומין, 'all the days'. The words נשר נפשי were omitted in MS J\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1258</sup>Cf. Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 157-58.

<sup>1259</sup>Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 21, quoting the proverb from mAv. 1:17

TJon introduced a word play between verses 21 and 24, by using the root שלם as a translation of the Hebrew verb גמל (21) and the adjective חמים (24). This word play recurs in verse 26. The tenses of verses 21 and 25 were diversified (>18) to avoid redundancy: The LORD will repay in the future (21) in the same way as He did in the past (25). The repayments in the past are elaborated on in the next sub-canticle (26-27), which refers to the patriarchs and the pharaoh, whereas the repayments of the future, including salvation for the people of Israel, are elaborated on in the third sub-canticle (28-31).

#### IV.2 God rewarded in the past (26-27)

אברהם דאשחכח חסיד קדמך  
 בכין אסניתא למעבר חסדא<sup>1260</sup> עם זרעיה  
 יצחק דהוה שלים בדחלתך  
 בכין אשלימתא מימר<sup>1261</sup> רעותך עמיה:  
 יעקב דהליך בברירותא קדמך  
 בחרתא<sup>1262</sup> בנויה מכל עממיה  
 אפרישחא זרעיה מכל פסולא<sup>1263</sup>  
 פרעה ומצראי<sup>1264</sup> דחשיבו מחשבון<sup>1265</sup> על עמך  
 לבליתנון כמחשבתהון<sup>1266</sup>:

*22:26 Abraham, who was found loyal before Thee—therefore, Thou hast increasingly acted loyally with his seed. Isaac, who was perfect in thy fear—therefore, Thou hast perfected the speech of thy pleasure with him. 22:27 Jacob, who was walking in purity before Thee—Thou hast chosen his sons from all the peoples, Thou hast separated his seed from all the rubbish. Pharaoh and the Egyptians, who were planning plans against thy people—Thou hast confused them according to their plans.*

This sub-canticle is the exact centre of the poem. The three terms “loyal”, “blameless” and “pure” form a set of synonyms, while the

that “not the intention of the judged person is important, but the deed”.

<sup>1260</sup>Ms c reads טובון, ‘goodness’, thereby breaking with the repetition of roots.

<sup>1261</sup>Ms Fr reads למיעבד, ‘to do’, resulting in “and Thou perfectly didst thy will with him”. In MS B the same word is added after רעותך, resulting in “and Thou hast perfected the speech of thy will to do with him”.

<sup>1262</sup>Ms C begins the colon with the word בכין, in conformity with the preceding two bicola (>15).

<sup>1263</sup>The entire phrase אפרישחא זרעיה מכל פסולא is omitted in MS o.

<sup>1264</sup>Ms Fr reads ומשירותיה, ‘and his armies’.

<sup>1265</sup>Mss a c d o Fr B C J S add the specification בישן, ‘wicked’.

<sup>1266</sup>Mss a b c f o Fr C translate the preposition ב, resulting in “in their plans”, omitting the connection with the preceding sub-canticle.

fourth one, “crooked”, expresses a contrast.<sup>1267</sup> TJon underlines the unity of content by explaining the four attributes with the examples of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the pharaoh (>19).<sup>1268</sup> However, the first two examples differ from the latter two. The first pair contains בכך in each second line. The translation of these lines remains close to the Hebrew text, including the double use of the stem: loyal || show loyalty; perfect || to perfect. The double use of the same stem in the latter two examples, pure || show pure, is replaced with three synonymous parallels, purity || choose || separate.<sup>1269</sup> The contrast between Jacob and the pharaoh appears to reflect a second allusion to the Exodus. Verse 27 does mention Jacob, but immediately continues with the people of Israel and its separation from all other peoples.

It is not astonishing that the three positive terms are linked to the three patriarchs.<sup>1270</sup> The term “loyal” often refers to Abraham (cf. Neh. 9:8),<sup>1271</sup> while Jacob is called perfect in LevR. 36:3.<sup>1272</sup> Similar terms are also used in strophe VI.3 of the tosefta-targum on 1 Sam. 17:43, Abraham the righteous and Jacob the perfect, but Isaac is called the ‘bound one’.

### IV.3 God rewards in the future (28-31)

וית עמא<sup>1273</sup> בית ישראל<sup>1274</sup>  
 דאתקרן בעלמא<sup>1275</sup> הדין עם חשיך<sup>1276</sup>  
 את עחיד<sup>1276</sup> למפרק<sup>1276</sup>  
 ובמירך<sup>1276</sup> תקיפא דמתגברין עליהון תמאיך:

<sup>1267</sup>Cf. Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 42.

<sup>1268</sup>In contrast to the very general explanation of Ned. 32a, where R. Isaac applies these verses to every believer.

<sup>1269</sup>Cf. the parallels “pure” || “delighted” in J. Assmann, *Sonnenhymnen in Thebanischen Gräbern* (Theben, 1), Mainz am Rhein 1983, 45; and the parallel pure || unique in M.E. Cohen, *The Canonical Lamentations of Ancient Mesopotamia*, 2 Vols., Ann Arbor 1988, 314-16.

<sup>1270</sup>MTeh. 18:22 only refers to Abraham (R. Judah) and Moses (R. Nehemiah).

<sup>1271</sup>Cf. GenR. 44:1. Neh. 9:8 seems to be the basis for similar expressions in Sir. 44:20; Jub. 17:18; 1 Macc. 2:52.

<sup>1272</sup>Cf. J. Bowman, “The Exegesis of the Pentateuch among the Samaritans and the Rabbis”, *OTS*, 8 (Leiden 1950), 220-62, esp. 237. The three patriarchs are all called perfect in PesR. 48:3.

<sup>1273</sup>The phrase from עמא to הדין is omitted in MS o, cf. the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1274</sup>Omitted in MS J\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1275</sup>M. Goshen-Gottstein, *שקיעים מחרומו המקרא הארמיים*, Vol. 1, Ramat-Gan 1983, 142, quotes a Targum Jerushalmi from the Sassoon-collection with the rendering עם סנוף, ‘weak people’, while the same manuscript informs us that “our Targum” renders לעונה נפש, ‘the poor of soul’.

<sup>1276</sup>MS J reads למיפרקון פורקן עלמין, ‘to save them with an eternal salvation’.

ארי את הוא מריה<sup>1277</sup>  
 נהוריה דישראל יי,<sup>1277</sup>  
 ויוי יפגני מחשוכא לנהורא  
 ויחזיני,<sup>1278</sup> בעלמא<sup>1279</sup> דעתיד<sup>1279</sup> למיתי<sup>1279</sup> לצדיקיא:  
 ארי במימריך<sup>1280</sup> אסני<sup>1281</sup> משרין  
 במימר<sup>1282</sup> אלהי<sup>1282</sup> אכביש<sup>1283</sup> כל כרכין תקיפין:  
 אלהא<sup>1284</sup> דכיונא אורחיה  
 אורייתא דיוי בחירא היא  
 תקוף הוא לכל דמתרחצין על מימריה<sup>1284</sup>.

22:28 *And the people of the House of Israel, who are called 'a poor people' in this world, Thou wilt save, but by thy speech Thou wilt humiliate the strong, who were overpowering them. 22:29 For Thou art Master, the light of Israel is the LORD. And the LORD will bring me out of the darkness to the light, He will show me the world to come for the righteous. 22:30 For by your speech I multiply<sup>1285</sup> armies, by the speech of my God I subdue all strong fortified cities, 22:31 the God, whose way is straight. The law of the LORD is choice, a strength is He for all who trust upon his speech.*

Three strophes, praising God for his salvation for Israel, conclude the canticle concerning God's rewards. The strophes are linked together by several words and phrases. The most striking link is formed by the references to God, *i.e.* אלהא, יי, and מימרא. Further binding factors are הדין (28, 29); עלמא דעתיד למיתי || עלמא הדין (28, 29); את (28, 29); עתיד (28, 29); the root תקף (28, 30, 31); and ארי (29, 30).

The expression that God's eyes are upon the haughty is explained by the subsequent verb humiliate. The expression is not repeated in the Aramaic version, but replaced with מימרא. The combination עם עני is interpreted as the people of Israel, although the adjective "poor" is limited to the period of this world.<sup>1286</sup> The omission of God's eyes,

<sup>1277</sup>Omitted in MS b.

<sup>1278</sup>MS Fr reads ואשריני, 'He made me dwell'. Note the perfect tense in combination with the world to come.

<sup>1279</sup>MS a adds לאחסנא נהורא, resulting in "to give the light as inheritance to the righteous".

<sup>1280</sup>MS J reads ובסעד מימ, 'with the aid of [thy] speech'.

<sup>1281</sup>MS Fr reads אכניש, 'I will gather'; cf. אכביש in the subsequent colon.

<sup>1282</sup>MS o reads אלהנא, 'our God', cf. 22:32.

<sup>1283</sup>MS Fr adds ואיתבר, 'and I will shatter'.

<sup>1284</sup>Mss a b c d f o Fr B C J S read עלויה, 'on Him', instead of מימריה.

<sup>1285</sup>An alternative translation is given by Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 44, *viz.* 'I can pass armies'. The variant reading אכניש, 'I will gather', shows that the meaning "to multiply" was current.

<sup>1286</sup>Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 22 refers to San. 98a for the same view. Cf.

as well as the adjective “poor” for the people of Israel, gave rise to an expansion of this verse:<sup>1287</sup>

ויהו<sup>1288</sup> עמא בית ישראל  
 דמיתקרן בעלמא הדין עם חשיך  
 את עתיד למפרק יתהון  
 ולמיקרי להון עם חביב  
 דבכל עידן עינך במכיכי רוחא מחייתבא  
 ובמימך תקיפא דמתגברין עליהון תמאיך

*and the people of the House of Israel, who are called ‘a poor people’ in this world, Thou wilt save them, and call them ‘a beloved people’. For in all times thine eye makes itself dwell upon the poor in spirit, but by thy speech Thou wilt humiliate the strong, who were overpowering them.*

The term ‘a poor people’ is paralleled by ‘a beloved people’, with a vague allusion to the renaming of Hosea’s children (Hos. 2:1). The expression “thine eye is upon someone” is interpreted favourably, as it is used in Ps. 32:8, and attributed to God’s love towards his people. Again they are called a poor people, albeit with a different word for poor, but now the name is conceived of as a favourable title, “the poor in spirit”. These poor in spirit are contrasted to the strong, overpowering adversaries. The expression “poor in spirit” is based on the Aramaic translation of Isa. 57:15.<sup>1289</sup> The phrase בכל עדין links the sub-canticle with the introductions (cf. verse 4).

A word play is introduced in verses 28-29: while the people of Israel are called a poor people (חשיך), salvation from the darkness (חשוכא) is predicted. However, the terms darkness and light are interpreted eschatologically: the colon concerning the salvation from the darkness is paralleled by one concerning the world to come.<sup>1290</sup> A similar connection between darkness/light and eschatology is made in Hannah’s Song, where darkness is explained as Gehenna (1 Sam. 2:9). Other parallels are found in the New Testament, where repentance is compared to going from the darkness into the light of Christ (1 Pet. 2:9).

SEZ 3 (p. 176).

<sup>1287</sup> Ms London 636, partly given as Sperber’s siglum Fr, but edited by Kasher, תוספתא, 122.

<sup>1288</sup> Error for ויהו.

<sup>1289</sup> Cf. TPsJ Deut. 7:7; TgPs 34:19; cf. TgIsa. 66:2; Mt. 5:3. Synonymous expressions are חשיכי עמי, ‘the poor of my people’, often followed by the explanation “who do my will”; cf. TJon Isa. 10:2; 11:4; 14:32; Zech. 11:11 and Qumranic עני רוח, 1QH<sup>a</sup> VI.3; 1QM XIV.7; see also 1QS IV.3.

<sup>1290</sup> Cf. P. Humbert, “Le Messie dans le Targum des Prophètes”, *RThPh* 43 (1910), 420-47; 44 (1911), 5-46, esp. 33-34.

Whereas the sub-canticle concludes with a clear reference to the introduction, *viz.* “trust upon his speech” (verses 31, 3), the themes and the future tense already anticipate the eschatology of verses 49-51.<sup>1291</sup>

### V.1 God helped me fight (32-35)

בכין<sup>1292</sup> על נסא ופרקנא  
 דהעביר<sup>1293</sup> למשיחך ולשארא דעמך<sup>1294</sup> דישתארון<sup>1295</sup>  
 יודון כל עממיא אומיא ולישניא  
 ויימרון  
 לית אלה<sup>1296</sup> אלא יי  
 ארי לית בר מנך  
 ועמך<sup>1297</sup> יימרון<sup>1298</sup>  
 לית דתקיף<sup>1300</sup> אלא אלהנא<sup>1301</sup>:  
 אלהא<sup>1302</sup> דסעיד לי בחילא  
 ומתקין שלים אורח<sup>1302</sup>:  
 משוי רגלי<sup>1303</sup> קלילין כאילהא  
 ועל בית תקפי יקימני:  
 מליף ידי למעבד<sup>1304</sup> קרבא  
 ומתקיף<sup>1305</sup> כקשת<sup>1306</sup> נחשא דרעי:

22:32 Therefore, on account of the miraculous salvation that Thou wilt provide for thy Anointed One and for the remnant of thy people that will remain, let all the nations, peoples and languages confess

<sup>1291</sup> Cf. Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 43.

<sup>1292</sup> Although MS B\* reads בכין, MS B<sup>m</sup> suggests ארי, ‘because’. The entire introduction from בכין ויימרון is omitted in MS o (>29).

<sup>1293</sup> MS Fr reads the *passivum divinum* ראיחעביר, ‘that were done’ (>23).

<sup>1294</sup> MS J adds the name ישראל.

<sup>1295</sup> MSS b d read the perfect דאישתארון, ‘that were left’, probably to avoid a future “remnant” of the people.

<sup>1296</sup> Kimḥi quotes כיו instead of יי אלא, in contrast to the monotheistic tendency of TJon (>22). See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 2:2.

<sup>1297</sup> MSS c d Fr S add בית ישראל, ‘house of Israel’, in conformity with verse 28.

<sup>1298</sup> The phrase לית ארי to ימרון is omitted in MSS o Fr (>29). The phrase לית<sup>1299</sup> ארי מנך is omitted in MS C.

<sup>1300</sup> MS Fr reads אלה, ‘God’.

<sup>1301</sup> MS a reads כאילהנא, ‘as our God’, instead of אלא אלהנא, in contrast to the pure monotheism of TJon (>22).

<sup>1302</sup> According to the Qere, cf. many Hebrew MSS, LXX, Syr, Vg and Ps. 18:33.

<sup>1303</sup> According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS, the other ancient versions, Ps. 18:34; and the list of words written with a *Waw*, but to be read without it in Soferim 38a.

<sup>1304</sup> MSS a Fr C read the more usual verb לאנאה, ‘to wage’.

<sup>1305</sup> MS Fr reads וחבר עממיא דהקיפין, ‘and He scattered strong nations’ (cf. 22:40).

<sup>1306</sup> Considered a metaphor (>13); not in MS C, which reads קשת.

and say, 'There is no God but the LORD, for there is no one beside Thee.' And let thy people say, 'There is no one who is strong, but our God.' 22:33 The God, who helps me with strength, and makes my way perfect; 22:34 making my feet as swift as the hinds, and He sets me on my stronghold;<sup>1307</sup> 22:35 training my hands to do battle, and strengthening my arms like a bow of bronze.

The marker "therefore", as well as the introduction to the confession of God, indicate the beginning of a new sub-canticle. The confession itself is expanded with a phrase from Hannah's Song (1 Sam. 2:2), while the introduction is an expansion of Hannah's introduction.<sup>1308</sup> It is remarkable that in this text all the nations acknowledge the LORD as the only God, while only the people of Israel add the phrase that says that *our* God is strong (>18).

The entire introduction, including the combination of the Anointed One and the remnant of Israel, is reminiscent of the eschatological expectations of TgHab. 3:17-18. While 3:17 depicts the fall of four empires, based on Dan. 2 and 7, the subsequent verse describes the praise song after these events.<sup>1309</sup>

For the kingdom of Babylon shall not endure, nor exercise suzerainty over Israel. The kings of Media shall be killed, and the warriors of Greece shall not prosper. The Romans shall be destroyed, and no longer collect tribute from Jerusalem.<sup>1310</sup> Therefore, on account of the miraculous salvation that Thou wilt do for thy Anointed One and the remnant of thy people that will remain, let them praise, saying, "The prophet said, 'And I will rejoice in the speech of the LORD, I will exult in the God who is bringing my salvation.'"

TJon twice clarifies the metaphoric language. In verse 34 the ground "swift" was added, while the metaphor of verse 35 was expanded with the preposition "like". The bow is used as a symbol of power.<sup>1311</sup>

<sup>1307</sup>TJon did not conceive of Hebrew במה as 'back', although that meaning would have enhanced the poetical quality of the verses 34-35. In that case four parts of the body were mentioned: feet, back, hands, arms; all plural.

<sup>1308</sup>The translation techniques used in verse 32 are further discussed in the preceding section, concerning the date of TJon.

<sup>1309</sup>Cf. J. Shunary, "הוספת משיחאי בהרגום יונתן לנביאים", *Tarbiz* 42 (1972-73), 259-265, esp. 265.

<sup>1310</sup>See above, commentary on 2 Sam. 20:24.

<sup>1311</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 2:4.

## V.2 God helped me pursue (36-39)

ויהבת לי תקוף<sup>1312</sup> פרקתי<sup>1313</sup>  
 ובמימרך אסניתני:  
 אסניתא פסעתי קדמי<sup>1314</sup>  
 ולא אודעזעא רכובתי:  
 רדפיה<sup>1315</sup> סנאי<sup>1315</sup> ושצתנן  
 ולא תבית<sup>1316</sup> עד דגמרתנן:  
 ושיציתנן וגמרתנן ולא יכילי<sup>1317</sup> למקם<sup>1318</sup>  
 ונפלו קטילין חחות פרסת רגלי:

22:36 *Thou hast given me strength, Thou hast saved me, and with thy speech Thou hast made me great. 22:37 Thou hast made my step great before me, and my knee did not shake. 22:38 I pursued my haters and destroyed them, and I did not turn back until I finished them. 22:39 I destroyed and finished them, so that they could not rise, the killed ones fell under the soles of my feet.*

In canticle V there are three sub-canticles that shift from the 2nd person singular to the 1st person. This shift is also present in the Hebrew text. Furthermore, the entire canticle is marked by references to the body. Verses 34-35 mention the feet, the back, the hands and the arms. The present sub-canticle mentions the feet again, alongside with their steps (39, 37). The neck occurs in verse 41, while the ear is mentioned in verse 45.

The coherence of the present strophes is enhanced by TJon. The verbal form *אסניתני* in verse 36 is repeated in verse 37. The verbal forms *שיציתנן* and *גמרתנן* in verse 38 are repeated in verse 39, as well as the negation *ולא*. Three verses contain rhyme at the end of the cola (36, 37, 38).

Hebrew *ענתך* was derived from the verb *ענה*, 'to answer'. TJon represented it by the usual, reverential *מימרא*, 'speech'.<sup>1319</sup>

<sup>1312</sup>Ms Fr reads *סעיד*, 'help'.

<sup>1313</sup>The Hebrew expression "shield of thy salvation" is explained with the noun "strength" and the verb "Thou hast saved me". MSS o S have retained the Hebrew combination of two nouns and read *תקוף פורקך*, 'the strength of thy salvation' (>29), but also maintained the verb "Thou hast saved me". Also MSS b J retained two nouns, but placed the *atnach* differently, resulting in "Thou hast given me strength, and by thy salvation and by thy speech Thou hast made me great".

<sup>1314</sup>Ms y reads *קדמך*, 'before Thee'; MSS a b c d f o B C J S read *תחתוי*, 'under me', enhancing the internal coherence of the sub-canticle (cf. 22:39).

<sup>1315</sup>Ms Fr adds the preposition *בחר*, 'after'.

<sup>1316</sup>Ms Fr adds the preposition *מנהון*, 'from them'.

<sup>1317</sup>Cf. Ps. 18:39.

<sup>1318</sup>MSS c d o Fr B S add the preposition *קדמי*, 'before me'.

<sup>1319</sup>In contrast to GenR. 1:12, where it is derived from the noun *עונה*, 'modesty'.



## V.3 God helped me conquer (40-43)

וסעדתיני<sup>1320</sup> בחילא למעבר קרבא<sup>1321</sup>  
 תברתא ד עממיא<sup>1322</sup> דקימין לאבאשא לי תחוזי:  
 וסנאי ד תברתא<sup>1323</sup> ד קרמי ד מחורי קרל  
 בעלי דבבי ד ושצתנון:  
 בען סעיד וליה להון פריק  
 ומצלן קרם<sup>1324</sup> יי ולא מתקבלא<sup>1325</sup> ד צלותהון:  
 ודוששתנון כעפרא דארעא  
 כסי<sup>1326</sup> שוקין בעטית בהון רפסתנון:

*22:40 Thou hast helped me with strength to fight the battle, Thou hast scattered under me nations which rose to harm me. 22:41 Thou hast scattered before me my haters, who turned their back, my enemies, and I destroyed them. 22:42 They asked for help, but there was no saviour, and they prayed before the LORD, but their prayer was not accepted. 22:43 I trampled them like the dust of the earth, like the dirt in the streets I stepped on them; I crushed them.*

TJon follows the Hebrew delimitation of the verses, but the Aramaic poetry is again characterized by repetitions, rather than by synonyms. The verb סעד of verse 40 is repeated in verse 42, while the verbal form תברתא of verse 40 is repeated in verse 41. The verbal form שיציתנון, used in verses 38 and 39, recurs in verse 41. So it stands for three Hebrew synonyms.<sup>1327</sup>

The first word of verse 42 seems to be read as ישועו, as in Psalm 18:42. Like all the other ancient versions TJon interpreted it as “asked for help” in the first colon, while it is added in the second colon as “prayed”.

<sup>1320</sup>Reading וחזורני instead of וחזרני (>1).

<sup>1321</sup>Ms Fr adds עם עממיא דתקיפין ‘with strong nations’ (cf. 22:35). Note that the same MS omits the following תברתא עממיא, but adds the verb תברה after לי.

<sup>1322</sup>Ms J adds the adjective תקיפין ‘strong’.

<sup>1323</sup>A MS Fr reads יהבתא ‘Thou hast given’, while another MS Fr reads בסרח ‘Thou hast surrendered’.

<sup>1324</sup>Neither in the present verse nor in 2 Sam. 23:1 is Hebrew על considered a divine epithet. See A. Cooper, “Divine Names and Epithets in the Ugaritic Texts”, in: S. Rummel (ed.), *Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*, Vol. 3 (AnOr, 51), Rome 1981, 333-469, esp. 451-58.

<sup>1325</sup>*Passivum divinum*; but MS f reads the active participle קביל ‘He accepted’ and MSS b c d o Fr B J read the active participle מקביל ‘He was accepting’.

<sup>1326</sup>MSS c o S read כטיין ‘like clay’.

<sup>1327</sup>Cf. Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 48.

## V.4 God will help me reign (44-46)

והשיבנני מפלוגת עמא<sup>1328</sup>  
 תמניני<sup>1329</sup> רישא לעממיא<sup>1330</sup>  
 עם דלא ידעית יפלחונני:<sup>◇</sup>  
 בני<sup>1331</sup> עממיא<sup>1332</sup> יחכדבון לי  
 לשימע אודן ישחמעון לי:  
 בני עממיא יסופון<sup>1333</sup>  
 ויוועון<sup>1334</sup> מבירניההון:

22:44 *Thou wilt save me from the strife of the nation. Thou wilt appoint me head of the nations; a nation that I do not know will be subjected to me.* 22:45 *Sons of the nations will feign to me; as soon as their ear hears, they will listen to me.* 22:46 *Sons of the nations will perish, and they will come trembling out of their palaces.*

Again the Aramaic poetry is characterized by repetition rather than by synonyms. Aramaic עם is the equivalent of Hebrew עם, נג and נכר. The translation of Hebrew ממסגרוהם ויחגרו (22:46) relies heavily on Mic. 7:17, where TJon provides the same translation.

## VI Epilogue (47-51)

בכין<sup>1335</sup> על נסא ופרקנא דעבדחא לעמך<sup>1336</sup>  
 אודיו ואמרו  
 קיים<sup>◇</sup> הוא יי וברייך תקיפא<sup>◇</sup>  
 דמן קדמוהי<sup>◇</sup> מתייהב לנא תקוף<sup>◇</sup> ופרקן<sup>1337</sup>  
 ומרמם אלה<sup>◇</sup> תקוף פרקנא:

<sup>1328</sup>Mss a f Fr J read the plural עממא, 'peoples', in conformity with the rest of the sub-canticle, and according to some Hebrew MSS and LXX. The omission of the suffix is in conformity with Ps. 18:41.

<sup>1329</sup>Ms a reads נשרחני, 'Thou hast kept me', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29). The reading תמניני is in conformity with Ps. 18:44, Syr and the Lucian recension of the LXX.

<sup>1330</sup>Mss o Fr read עממא, 'to all the nations'.

<sup>1331</sup>The entire verse 45 is missing from MS C.

<sup>1332</sup>Ms B adds יסופון, 'they will perish', as in the subsequent verse.

<sup>1333</sup>In accordance with the reading יכלו instead of יבלו (>1); cf. Syr.

<sup>1334</sup>Ms Fr adds ויצרון, 'and they will be terrified'.

<sup>1335</sup>The entire phrase from בכין to ואמרו is omitted in MS o.

<sup>1336</sup>Mss a b y C J add ביה ישראל, 'the House of Israel', cf. 22:28; MS S only adds the name Israel, resulting in "to thy people Israel".

<sup>1337</sup>The phrase from ופרקן until תקוף is omitted in MS J by haplography. The same error appears in MS S, but there the last word is transformed into ופרקן יחי, 'and He saved me'.

אלהא <sup>1338</sup> דעביד פורענוחא לי  
 ותבר <sup>1339</sup> עממיא דקימין לאבאשא לי <sup>1340</sup> תחתי:  
 ופרקי <sup>1341</sup> מסנאי  
 ועל <sup>1342</sup> דקימין <sup>1343</sup> לאבאשא לי תגברני  
 מגוג <sup>1344</sup> ומשרה עממין <sup>1345</sup> חטופין דעמיה <sup>1346</sup> תשובני:  
 על כין אודי קדמך <sup>1347</sup> יוי בעממיא  
 ולשמך אימר <sup>1347</sup> תשבחא:  
 מסגי <sup>1348</sup> למעבר פרקן עם מלכה  
 ועביד טיבו למשיחיה  
 לדויד ולזרעה <sup>1349</sup> עד עלמא:

22:47 Therefore, on account of the miraculous salvation that Thou didst for thy people, they gave thanks and said, 'Existing is the LORD, and blessed be the Strong One, from before Whom strength and salvation was given to us, and exalted be God, the strength of our salvation.'

22:48 The God who took vengeance for me, and scattered under me the nations that were rising to harm me. 22:49 He saved me from my haters, He made me overpower those who were rising to harm me, He will save me from Gog and the armies of the robbing nations that are with him. 22:50 Therefore, I will give thanks before Thee, O LORD, among the nations, and to thy name I will say praise. 22:51 [He who] gives great salvation with his king, and shows goodness to his Anointed One, to David and to his seed for ever."

The epilogue consists of three strophes, linked together by the verb ידה, 'confess, thank' (47, 51), and the root פרק, 'save' (47, 49, 51). This epilogue also refers to the first introduction by the phrase רמן קדמויה ופרקן (cf. 22:3, 47). At the same time, the connection with the last verse of Hannah's Song (1 Sam. 2:10) is strongly enhanced by the insertion of Gog and his companions (22:49) and by the rendering דקימין לאבאשא (22:48, 49).

<sup>1338</sup> Ms S adds ופריק, resulting in "The God who made vengeance and saved me".

<sup>1339</sup> Ms k adds חקוף, resulting in "He broke the strength of the nations".

<sup>1340</sup> The phrase דחקיפין כקשחא דנחשא is replaced with דקימין לאבאשא לי. This phrase was borrowed from 22:35.

<sup>1341</sup> Ms Fr uses the synonym ומשיובי, 'and He rescued me'.

<sup>1342</sup> Ms Fr reads על ואף.

<sup>1343</sup> Omitted in MS C.

<sup>1344</sup> Omitted in MS o.

<sup>1345</sup> Omitted in MS o.

<sup>1346</sup> Ms Fr reads דאזו לאנחא עמי, 'that came to wage war with me'; partly based on 1 Sam. 2:10.

<sup>1347</sup> Ms a reads אומר, 'I will sing'.

<sup>1348</sup> According to the Ketib; cf. the other ancient versions.

<sup>1349</sup> Ms J replaces the *synecdoche* "his seed" by ולבנויה, 'his sons'.

Verse 47 is introduced with words that are reminiscent of verse 32. The content of verse 47 is attributed to the people of Israel, hence the plural forms. Singular verbs, linked to the person of David himself, are used in verse 51. This separation of plural and singular is reduced by an expansion of verse 47 in MS London 636:<sup>1350</sup>

בכּן על ניסא ופורקנא  
 דאיתעביד למשיחך ולשארא דעמך דישתארון  
 ישבחון ויודון ויימרון  
 קיים הוא אלהא חייא רבא<sup>1351</sup> ניברא ודחילא  
 ובריך תקיף דמן קדמוהי מתייהב לי תקיף ופורקן  
 ומרמם אלה תקיף פרקנא

*therefore, on account of the miraculous salvation that was provided to thy Anointed One and the remnant of thy people that will be left, let them praise and give thanks, and let them say, 'Enduring is the living, heroic and terrible God, and blessed be the Strong One, from before Whom strength and salvation was given to us, and exalted be God, the strength of our salvation'*

Both the Anointed One and the remnant of the people of Israel are mentioned as objects of God's salvation (cf. 22:32). The perfect tense is replaced by the imperfect, referring to the future (cf. 22:32). Some adjectives are used to further denote the saving God, viz. "living",<sup>1352</sup> and "great, heroic and terrible".<sup>1353</sup>

The insertion of Gog in verse 49 introduces eschatology into the epilogue.<sup>1354</sup> Eschatological expectations were already expressed in 22:28-29, where the future deliverance of the people of Israel is described, as well as the world to come. The humiliation of the foreign countries in 22:44-46 is worded in the imperfect tense, in contrast to the rest of the psalm. Therefore, it is likely that this great victory of Israel and its king is placed in the future, in agreement with many prophecies. In any case, the victory over Gog was left to the King Messiah in the eschaton.<sup>1355</sup> It is therefore not unlikely that even the

<sup>1350</sup>See Kasher, תוספתו, 122; also partly integrated in the app.crit. of Sperber's edition.

<sup>1351</sup>Omitted in Kasher's edition.

<sup>1352</sup>The phrase אלהא חייא seems to be the equivalent of Hebrew אלהים חיים (Deut. 4:4; 5:26; 1 Sam. 17:26, 36; Jer. 10:10; 23:36) or אלהים חי (2 Kgs 19:4, 6; Isa. 37:4, 17), but TO and TJon consistently equates these Hebrew expressions with ייי קיימא.

<sup>1353</sup>This phrase is an equivalent of Hebrew הגדול הגבור והנורא (Deut. 10:17; Neh. 9:32).

<sup>1354</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 2:10.

<sup>1355</sup>Cf. Rodrigues Pereira, *Aramaic Poetry*, 50.

last verse is a reference to messianic times. Although Aramaic משיחא is the literal rendering of Hebrew משיח, verse 51 also speaks of David's seed.

## 6.23 The Last Things (2 Samuel 23:1-8)

### 6.23.1 The Structure of TJon 2 Sam. 23:1-8

The first seven verses of 2 Sam. 23 consist of a poem, which is called "David's Last Words".<sup>1356</sup> The Hebrew poem appears to be a parable on kingship and can be summarized as follows: "The rule of a lawful king is like the life-giving warmth of the sun for crops (= the king's loyal subjects), but it is like the death-dealing heat of the sun for thorny weeds (= the disloyal)."<sup>1357</sup> The same message is given in Ps. 72:5-7 and Prov. 16:14-15.

TJon translated and expanded the poem in order to clarify its meaning. The result of TJon's interpretative rendering is an independent Aramaic poem, albeit with some prosaic phrases.<sup>1358</sup> The Hebrew text is not interpreted as the last words of David, but as the words of David concerning the last things to happen.<sup>1359</sup> It is therefore not surprising that several eschatological themes come into view, such as the Messiah, the reward of the righteous, the punishment of the wicked, and the world to come. Moreover, the following verse (23:8) is also interpreted in this light: it is not one of David's heroes who is depicted there, but David himself as the Messiah who is to come.<sup>1360</sup> The interpretative translation of verse 8 is equally in poetic language,

<sup>1356</sup>The structure and contents of TJon 2 Sam. 23:1-8 is discussed in E. van Staaldvine-Sulman, "Reward and Punishment in the Messianic Age (Targ. 2 Sam. 23:1-8)", *JAB* 1 (1999), 273-96. A short discussion of verse 8 is given in E. van Staaldvine-Sulman, "The Aramaic Song of the Lamb", in: J.C. de Moor, W.G.E. Watson (eds), *Verses in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOATS 42) Neukirchen-Vluyn 1993, 265-92.

<sup>1357</sup>McCarter, *II Samuel*, 483.

<sup>1358</sup>The same phenomenon is attested in TJon 2 Sam. 22 (see preceding sections); in TO Gen. 49:8-12, cf. J.W. Wesseliuss, "Biblical Poetry through Targumic Eyes: Onkelos' Treatment of Genesis 49:8-12", in: J. Dyk (ed.), *Give Ear to my Words: Psalms and Other Poetry in and around the Hebrew Bible. Essays in Honour of Professor N.A. van Uchelen*, Amsterdam 1996, 131-45; and in TN Deut. 32:1-43, cf. S. Segert, "Rendering of Parallelistic Structures in the Targum Neofiti: The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1-43)", in: D. Muñoz León (ed.), *Salvacion en la Palabra: Targum - Derash - Berith*, Madrid, 1986, 515-32.

<sup>1359</sup>This interpretation is also given in SER 2 (p. 7).

<sup>1360</sup>J. Shunary, "הוספה משיחא בהרומים ינתן לנביאים", *Tarbiz* 42 (1972-73), 259-265, esp. 260 also recognized the unity of TJon 2 Sam. 23:1-8. It is noteworthy that SER 2-3 (pp. 7-16) discusses the Last Words of David, including verse 8.

and appears to belong to the same Aramaic poem.

The Aramaic poem consists of an introductory strophe (verse 1a) and 16 strophes grouped into 5 canticles.<sup>1361</sup> The poem appears to have a regular structure: the first and the last canticles are divided into four strophes, the second and the fourth canticles into three strophes, while the third canticle consist of only two strophes (1 + 4/3/2/3/4 strophes). The canticles can easily be distinguished, because in each canticle a different personal pronoun is used. The first and third canticle are mainly in the first person singular (= David); the second canticle is in the second person plural (= the righteous); the fourth canticle in the third person plural (= the wicked); and the last canticle in the third person singular (= David). Consequently, the regular structure extends to the subjects of the canticles: David – the righteous – David – the wicked – David, in overview:

Canticle	strophes	verses	person	subject
Intro	1	23:1a		
I	4	23:1b-3	I	David
II	3	23:4	you	the righteous
III	2	23:5	I	David
IV	3	23:6-7	they	the wicked
V	4	23:8	he	David

### 6.23.2 Commentary

#### Introduction (23:1a)

ואלין פחגמי נבואת<sup>1362</sup> דויד  
 דאתנבי לסוף עלמא  
 ליומי<sup>1363</sup> נחמתא דעתידין למית

*23:1a And these are the prophetic words of David, which he prophesied for the end of the world, for the days of consolation which are to come:*

The introduction to the poem is maintained and expanded into a tricolon. The Hebrew word האחרנים is considered a reference to the end of days, probably because האחרנים can also mean ‘end, future’

<sup>1361</sup> According to the rules of Kampen School structural analysis, cf. J.C. de Moor, “Structure and Redaction in Isaiah 60,1–63,6”, in: J. van Ruiten, M. Vervenne (eds), *Studies in the Book of Isaiah: Festschrift Willem A.M. Beuken* (EThL, 132), Leuven 1997, 325–46, with the literature cited 329, n. 10.

<sup>1362</sup> Omitted in MS S.

<sup>1363</sup> Both עלמא and ליומי are omitted in MS S, resulting in “for the consoling end, which is to come”

and is sometimes used in eschatological prophecies.<sup>1364</sup> It is rendered here with 'end of the world'.

The Hebrew 'Songs of David' which were found in the Cairo Geniza and which may go back to the Qumran sect were possibly acquainted with this eschatological interpretation of 2 Sam. 23 because David is stating in these songs, *ניבאת ברוחך על פי עבדך כי קרבת קץ ועוד לא*, 'Thou [God] hast prophesied through thy spirit by the mouth of thy servant that the end is near and will not tarry anymore'.<sup>1365</sup> This manner of referring to the end of the world is apparently based on current terminology like 'the end of days', 'the end-time',<sup>1366</sup> 'the end of ages' or 'the end of the world', found quite frequently in post-Biblical Jewish literature and the New Testament, often also in abbreviated form.<sup>1367</sup>

This eschatological interpretation of the last words of David parallels the explanation of Jacob's last words in TN Gen. 49:1, interpreting the words *באחרית הימים* as follows:<sup>1368</sup>

<i>I will show you the mysteries that are hidden,</i>	וחווי לכון רוויא סתימייא
<i>the ends that are concealed;</i>	קיציידיה <sup>1369</sup> גניזייא
<i>what is the reward for the just,</i>	מתן אגריהון דצדיקייא
<i>the punishment for the wicked,</i>	ופורענזוהון דרשעיא
<i>and what the joys of Paradise are.</i>	ושלווחה דערן

The expression "days of consolation" (or: "years of consolation" in verse 4) is a typically Targumic expression, which rarely occurs in other Jewish literature. In Tg 2 Sam. 23:1 it is used as a parallel to "the end of the world" in the introduction to this messianic poem. Similar expressions are used in TgJer. 31:6, 26 to prophesy about

<sup>1364</sup>Cf. Isa. 8:23; 30:8 (parallel to לעד ערעלם (לעד ערעלם). P.A.H. de Boer, "Texte et traduction des paroles attribuées à David en 2 Samuel xxiii 1-7", *VT.S* 4 (1957), 47-56, esp. 49, suggested that the Hebrew phrase meant "The following words are the words of David".

<sup>1365</sup>D. Flusser, S. Safrai, "שירי דוד' החיצונים", in: B. Uffenheimer (ed.), עינים במקרא (Studies in Memoriam of Joshua Grintz), Tel Aviv 1970, 84, line A14.

<sup>1366</sup>Dan. 11:35, 40; 12:4, 9.

<sup>1367</sup>For Qumran, e.g. J.J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, London & New York 1997, 52-70.

<sup>1368</sup>Similar translations are found in TPsJ and FT to this verse, cf. J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture* Cambridge 1969, 277 and 281.

<sup>1369</sup>The word קץ is a technical term for the 'end of the world', i.e. the beginning of the Messianic Era (e.g. in Ket. 111a; Meg. 3a), cf. H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.*, Bd. I: Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, München <sup>6</sup>1974, 671; H. Kosmala, "'At the End of the Days'", in: L. Landman, *Messianism in the Talmudic Era*, New York 1979, 302-12, esp. 305.

the end of the Babylonian Exile.<sup>1370</sup> The end of the exile is often interpreted in a messianic way in the homilies of Pesiqta Rabbati.<sup>1371</sup> The word consolation functioned as a comprehensive expression for the messianic times.<sup>1372</sup> The phrase “day of consolation” occurs only once in the Talmud, in an eschatological sense: “Our Rabbis taught: Seven things are hidden from men. These are they: the day of death and the day of consolation and the depth of judgment . . .”<sup>1373</sup>

### I God’s Promise to Appoint the Messiah (1b-3)

אמר דויד בר ישׁי<sup>1374</sup>  
 ואימר גברא דמרבא למלכו<sup>1375</sup>  
 משיח במימר אלהיה דיעקב<sup>1376</sup>  
 ותקין למנני בחיך בסים<sup>1377</sup> תשבחתיה דישׂראל:  
 אמר דויד  
 ברוח דנבואה קדם יי<sup>1378</sup>  
 אנא ממליל אלין<sup>1379</sup>  
 ופתנמי קדשיה  
 בפומי<sup>1380</sup> אנא סדר:

<sup>1370</sup>Cf. TgIsa. 8:2; 41:27. More texts are mentioned in C.T.R. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah* (AramB, 12), Edinburgh 1987, 131, n. 6.

<sup>1371</sup>E.g. PesR 29/30; 31:9-10; 33:6.

<sup>1372</sup>E.g. in Lk. 2:25; TPsJ Gen. 1:21. Cf. R. le Déaut, *La Nuit Pascale: Essai sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode xxi 42* (AnBib, 22), Rome 1963, 233, n. 53, 251, 370; M. McNamara, *Targum and Testament; Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*, Grand Rapids 1972, 139. So also the comments on the homilies of PesR in H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.*, Bd. II: Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte, München <sup>6</sup>1974, 125.

<sup>1373</sup>Pes. 54b: “... יום המיתה ויום הנחמה ועומק הדין...” Cf. Strack, Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, Bd. II, 126.

<sup>1374</sup>The entire phrase אמר דויד בר ישׁי is omitted in MS eb30\*, but added in the margin.

<sup>1375</sup>For this absolute form, see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 18:17. Neither in the present verse nor in 2 Sam. 22:42 is Hebrew על considered a divine epithet. See A. Cooper, “Divine Names and Epithets in the Ugaritic Texts”, in: S. Rummel (ed.), *Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*, Vol. 3 (AnOr, 51), Rome 1981, 333-469, esp. 451-58.

<sup>1376</sup>Mss d f read דישׂראל, as in 23:3.

<sup>1377</sup>Ms y reads the Pael participle מבוסם, ‘sweet’.

<sup>1378</sup>Mss b c y and Kimḥi read דיין, ‘of the LORD’, instead of יי קדם.

<sup>1379</sup>Ms B clarifies the vague אלין דהושבתן אלן with מילין דהושבתן, ‘the words of the praise song’.

<sup>1380</sup>Ms w replaced the *concretum pro abstracto* by rendering בפומי פומי, ‘with the speech of my mouth’ (>13). Ms C reads אומי, ‘I swear’.



אמר דויד  
 אלהא<sup>1381</sup> דישראל עלי מליל  
 תקיפא דישראל  
 דשליט בבני אנשא  
 קושטא דאין  
 אמר למנאה<sup>1382</sup> לי מלכא  
 הוא משיחא עתיד<sup>◇</sup> דיקום  
 וישלוט בדחלתא דיוי:

23:1b David the son of Jesse said, and the saying of the man dignified to the kingdom,<sup>1383</sup> anointed by the Speech of Jacob's God, and right to convey<sup>1384</sup> with a sweet palate the praises of Israel. 23:2 David said, "By a prophetic spirit from before the LORD I am speaking these things, and his holy words I am arranging<sup>1385</sup> in my mouth." 23:3 David said, "The God of Israel spoke about me,<sup>1386</sup> the Strong One of Israel, Who is Ruler among the sons of men, judging the truth. He said to appoint me<sup>1387</sup> king, that is, the Messiah who is to rise and will rule in the fear of the LORD.

<sup>1381</sup>MS o reads אמר אלהא, 'God said', in accordance with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1382</sup>Omitted in MS C, resulting in "and He promised me the king, that is, the Messiah".

<sup>1383</sup>The rendering "kingdom of the Messiah" is impossible, because למלכו is no construct form; contra S.H. Levey, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation*, Cincinnati & New York, 1974, 40; A. Landman, *Messias-interpretaties in de Targumim*, Kampen 1986, 64.

<sup>1384</sup>Cf. E.M. Cook, "Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets ...", *CritRR* 3 (1990), 343-48, esp. 345; contra Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 203, who render the Peal of this verb as a Pael: "appoint"; and contra Levey, *The Messiah*, 40, who renders it with a passive voice: "to be appointed". An alternative rendering can be found in Landman, *Messias-interpretaties in de Targumim*, 64: "to count ... with sweet [voice] the praises of Israel."

<sup>1385</sup>The verb "to arrange" is also used in TJon 1 Sam. 8:21; Isa. 6:7 in the sense of "to repeat the opinion of another person".

<sup>1386</sup>Contra Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 203 and Landman, *Messias-interpretaties in de Targumim*, 64, who render: "unto me". The verb מלל with עם means "to speak unto" (cf. e.g. TJon 1 Sam. 3:17 (*bis*); 14:19), but מלל with על means "speak about" (cf. TJon 1 Sam. 3:12; 19:3, 4; 2 Sam. 7:19, 25; Jer. 12:6; 18:20). The only exception is the expression על לבה מליל, 'speak to the heart of ...' (TJon Judg. 19:3; 2 Sam. 19:8; Isa. 40:2).

<sup>1387</sup>The combination מנא ל, can mean "to appoint for someone, to assign to someone" (cf. TJon 1 Sam. 2:1; 8:5-6) or "to appoint someone" (cf. TJon 1 Sam. 8:11-12; 18:13), identical to the combination מנא ה (TJon 1 Sam. 17:8 variant; 8:1; 2 Sam. 6:21 variant). The latter meaning, in accordance with the exegesis of Kimḥi who read the nota accusativi ה, is chosen here because David is appointed king [1bB-1cA] and is depicted as the Messiah in verse 8. Cf. also Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 24; Landman, *Messias-interpretaties in de Targumim*, 64; contra Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 203.

Canticle I consists of verses 1b-3, divided into four strophes. While there are two links between verse 1 and verses 2-3 in Hebrew, *viz.* 'the God of Jacob' (23:1) || 'the God of Israel' (23:3) and the words for speaking, parallelism is intensified in Aramaic canticle. First, each strophe begins with the word אַמַר, twice as a translation of a Hebrew word (1, 3), twice added in order not to confuse the *meturgeman* and the speaker of these prophecies.<sup>1388</sup> Furthermore, the translation of עַל, 'high', with לְמַלְכוּת, 'kingdom' (1) creates a parallel with the double use of מִשַׁל, 'ruling' (3) and with the added מַלְכָּה, 'king' (3). Similarly, the addition of מְשִׁיחָה, 'Messiah' (3) creates a parallel with מְשִׁיחַ, 'Messiah' (1).

The combination of נֶאֱמַר with a human name is rare in the Hebrew Bible. In most cases this word is used in combination with God's name, נֶאֱמַר יְהוָה. Therefore, this phrase led TJon to render the last words of David as a prophecy, as an utterance coming from God. The entire Hebrew construction . . . וְנֶאֱמַר הַגִּבֹר B בֶּן A נֶאֱמַר only occurs here and in Num. 24:3, 15.<sup>1389</sup> In TO the double נֶאֱמַר is rendered with a double אִמַר, but in TJon the two are translated differently (>18). Balaam's prophecies, too, are interpreted by TO as references to the Messiah: '... that a king will rise from Jacob and a Messiah will be dignified from Israel and he will kill the leaders of Moab and will rule over all the sons of men' (TO Num. 24:17). In Balaam's prophecies, the phrases "will rule over all the sons of men" (TO Num. 24:17) and "beautiful of appearance" (TO Num. 24:15) are paraphrastic renderings in TO, but literal renderings of respectively TJon 2 Sam. 23:3 and 1 Sam. 17:42 (cf. also TJon 1 Sam. 17:43 variant and 2 Sam. 23:8). The impression arises that the translation of TO Num. 24 is dependent on the messianic language of (TJon) Samuel.

A further motivation for the prophetic interpretation is the mention of the God's Spirit in verse 2. In TJon the Spirit of the LORD is connected with prophecy and rendered "a prophetic spirit".<sup>1390</sup>

LXX and Vg regarded Hebrew עַל as a preposition: David was appointed [king] *over* the anointed, *i.e.* the people of Israel.<sup>1391</sup> TJon

<sup>1388</sup> However, the word אַמַר functions as a poetical marker as well; see above, commentary on 2 Sam. 22.

<sup>1389</sup> A similar expression is found in Prov. 30:1.

<sup>1390</sup> Cf. J.P. Schäfer, *Die Vorstellung vom Heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur* (SANT, 28) München 1972; Idem, "Die Termini 'Heiliger Geist' und 'Geist der Prophetie' in den Targumim und das Verhältnis der Targumim zueinander", *VT* 20 (1970), 304-14. The same connection can be found in the works of Josephus, cf. J. Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus", *JJS* 25 (1974), 239-62, esp. 262.

<sup>1391</sup> Cf. J.A. Bewer, "Notes on 1 Sam 13 21; 2 Sam 23 1; Psalm 48 8", *JBL* 61

considered it to be an independent preposition with the meaning “upwards” and explained it with the words “to the kingdom”.<sup>1392</sup> This explanation does not chime with the usual rabbinic exegesis which regarded על as a noun meaning “yoke”.<sup>1393</sup> The yoke of repentance made David worthy.

Aramaic בחיך is vocalized בְּחִיךְ, ‘in your lives’, in MS p. However, the other Yemenite, as well as the Babylonian manuscripts and MSS C J, vocalize it בְּחִיךְ, ‘palate’.<sup>1394</sup> With such vocalization the phrase בחיך בסימ fits perfectly into the sentence: David was destined to convey the psalms of Israel with his sweet voice. David is called “sweet of voice” in Tg 1 Chron. 11:11<sup>1395</sup> This translation is in harmony with EcclR. 7:19 § 4, “When the ten righteous men wished to compose the Book of Psalms, the Holy One, blessed be He, said to them, ‘You are all pleasant, pious and worthy to utter hymns before Me, but let David utter them for all of you because his voice is sweet.’”<sup>1396</sup>

Hebrew נעים means “pleasant, lovely”, and is connected with music in Ps. 81:2. The Aramaic equivalent, בסימ, ‘sweet’, must instead be associated with flavour and smell. There is a subtle link between music and a sweet odour. The poet of Ps. 141 asked for his prayer to be counted as incense before God (141:2); the Aramaic version rendered בסימ בסימ, ‘sweet gifts’.<sup>1397</sup> Rev. 5:8 gives a less subtle, yet similar explanation, “golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints”. It is interesting to notice that TJon let Hebrew נעים refer to David—he is the sweet singer of Israel’s praise songs—while rabbinical exegesis implies the translation “sweet are the songs of Israel”.<sup>1398</sup>

The translation of verse 3 is divided into two strophes because of the double use of the Hebrew word מושל (>18). The first מושל was

(1942), 45-50, esp. 47-48. The addition of the word “LORD” can be a common translation technique of the LXX, as Bewer, “Notes”, 47 suggests, but may also be based on a second reading of the same word since 4QSam<sup>a</sup> reads אל instead of על.

<sup>1392</sup>Driver, *Notes*, 356 considers this to be the original meaning of the Hebrew text. He refers to Hos. 7:16; 11:7.

<sup>1393</sup>AZ 5a; MQ 16b; SER 2 (p. 7-8); NumR. 18:21; MTeh. 18:6; followed by Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 145.

<sup>1394</sup>This Hebraism is mentioned in Dalman, *Handwörterbuch*, s.v.

<sup>1395</sup>Note the combination בסימ בסימ in TgPs. 81:2.

<sup>1396</sup>Cf. also CantR. 4:4 § 1; MTeh. 1:6.

<sup>1397</sup>The word בסמין was added wherever the Hebrew text speaks of incense; cf. TJon 1 Sam. 2:28; 1 Kgs 3:3; 9:25; 11:8; 13:2 22:44; 2 Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4, 35; 16:4; 17:11; 18:4; 22:17; 23:5, 8.

<sup>1398</sup>D. Instone Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (TSAJ, 30), Tübingen 1992, 51, who cites ySukk. 5:4; ARN<sup>b</sup> 27, 44; cf. also MekY, *Shirata*, 3.

considered a reference to God and the second to the Messiah.<sup>1399</sup> To incorporate this understanding into the text, several words had to be added. Theological arguments did not play a direct role, since the same phrase, "will rule over all the sons of men", is attributed to the Messiah in TO Num. 24:17.

TJon did not fully agree with the Talmudic and the Masoretic division of verse 3 after מושל אדם. The word צדיק is rendered in the first half of the verse—God is "judging the truth"<sup>1400</sup>—and in the second half—the Messiah is judging in the fear of the Lord. The verb נושׁל is interpreted as a reference to the Messiah, as in TJon Isa. 16:1; Jer. 30:21; Mic. 5:1.<sup>1401</sup>

The equation "judging the truth" may have been the result of the interpretation of 23:4 and 23:6-7, which describe reward and punishment. It is usually God who is depicted as the highest judge, pronouncing the final judgments over all the world.<sup>1402</sup> Still, the combination of the throne of judgment in 23:7, combined with the punishment of the wicked, and the throne in 23:8, upon which the Messiah is seated, leaves room for a judging Messiah.<sup>1403</sup> Of interest is also 4Q491, a self-glorifying hymn describing a "deified" royal judge in terminology borrowed from Isa. 50, 53, Ps. 82 and Dan. 7. Unfortunately his identity is not revealed in this fragmentary text, but the style of the hymn closely resembles the hymns glorifying David found in the Cairo Geniza, but probably copied from a Qumran manuscript. In these hymns, too, both God and David are praised as judges.<sup>1404</sup> According to 11Q13, the messianic figure of Melchizedek is the judge who will carry out God's judgment of Belial and his helpers.<sup>1405</sup>

<sup>1399</sup>A similar interpretation, referring to God and man, is given by R. Abbahu: "The God of Israel said to me, spoke the Rock of Israel: I rule man, who rules Me? It is the righteous, for I make a decree and he may annul it" (MQ 16b; cf. ExodR. 15:20; DeutR. 10:3).

<sup>1400</sup>Cf. the same rendering of צדיק and צדק in TgJer 11:20 and 20:12.

<sup>1401</sup>Cf. J. Shunary, "חוספה 'משיחא' בחרגום 'נתן לנביאים'", *Tarbiz* 42 (1972), 259-65, esp. 260.

<sup>1402</sup>M. Maher, "God as Judge in the Targums", *JSJ* 29 (1998), 49-62, esp. 55.

<sup>1403</sup>A similar interchange of judges occurs in the New Testament, cf. e.g. the king-father in Mt. 22:1-14 and the Son of man in Mt. 25:31-46. In Rev. 3:21 the two seem to be sitting together on the throne.

<sup>1404</sup>Cf. Flusser, Safrai, "שירי דוד החיצונים"; M. Hengel, "Zur Wirkungsgeschichte von Jes 53 in vorchristlicher Zeit", in: B. Janowski, P. Stuhlmacher (eds), *Der leidende Gottesknecht: Jesaja 53 und seine Wirkungsgeschichte* (FAT, 14), Tübingen 1996, 49-91, esp. 88-90.

<sup>1405</sup>Cf. A.S. van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI", *OTS* 14 (1965), 354-73; É. Puech, "Notes sur le manuscrit de XIQMelchisédeq", *RdQ* 12

The expression “ruler in the fear of the Lord” gave rise to a messianic interpretation of this verse, partly because the fear of the Lord is one of the characteristics of the Messiah according to Isa. 11:2-3,<sup>1406</sup> and partly because righteousness is a messianic designation.<sup>1407</sup> The idea that David himself would be the Messiah in the future world is also expressed in GenR. 96 (NV), based on Ezek. 37:25, “And David my servant shall be their prince for ever.”<sup>1408</sup>

## II The Reward for the Just (23:4)

טוביכון צדיקיא  
עבדתון לכון עובדין טבין  
דאתון עתידין ל<sup>1409</sup>אזהרא  
בזיהור יקרכון<sup>1410</sup>

כניהור צפרא דאזיל ותקין  
וכשמשא דעתיד ל<sup>1411</sup>אזהרא  
בזיהור<sup>1412</sup> יקריה  
על<sup>1413</sup> חד תלת מאה ארבעין ותלתא

(1987), 483-513, esp. 510-13; J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT, 2. Reihe, 104), Tübingen 1998, 389-412.

<sup>1406</sup>J. Shunary, “תוספת משיחא בהרגום ינתן לנביאים”, *Tarbiz* 42 (1972-73), 259-265, esp. 260, n. 3 refers to another messianic interpretation of this verse, viz. the reading  $\varphi\sigma\beta\omicron\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  of the *Codex Vaticanus* of the LXX.

<sup>1407</sup>Based on Isa. 53:11; Jer. 23:5; 33:15; the singular צדיק is interpreted as “Messiah” in some MSS of TgIsa 53:2, cf. K. Koch, “Messias und Sündenvergebung in Jesaja 53 – Targum”, *JSJ* 3 (1972), 117-48, esp. 128. For Luke the term righteous is messianic, cf. C.K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles* (ICC), Edinburgh 1994, 377, referring to Acts 3:14; 7:52; 22:14. Other NT authors show a more vague usage of the term, cf. F.F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, London <sup>2</sup>1952, 109, referring to Mt. 27:19; Lk. 23:47; 1 Jn 2:1. Idem, *The Book of the Acts* (NICNT), Grand Rapids 1988, 81, n. 29 refers to 1 Hen. 38:2; 46:3; 53:6 and PsSal. 17:35.

<sup>1408</sup>Cf. yBer. 2.3. Cf. J. Klausner, “The Source and Beginnings of the Messianic Idea”, in: L. Landman (ed.), *Messianism in the Talmudic Era*, New York 1979, 25-37, esp. 21; Idem, “The Name and Personality of the Messiah”, in: L. Landman (ed.), *Messianism in the Talmudic Era*, 215-26, esp. 219.

<sup>1409</sup>Mss o y read לאנהרא. Ms B adds לאתקיימא before it, resulting in “you are destined to be raised and to shine”.

<sup>1410</sup>Mss b y read יקריה, ‘his glory’, probably referring to God, since Aramaic יקרא is one of God’s attributes. Mss B 10 J add יקריה before it, resulting in “to let your glory shine in the splendour of his glory”.

<sup>1411</sup>Mss y reads לאנהרא. Ms o reads דמוהר בלא עננין, ‘that shines without cloud’, instead of דעתיד לאזהרא (>29).

<sup>1412</sup>Mss a b c f y read כזיהור, ‘like the splendour of his glory’.

<sup>1413</sup>From על up to דאתין is omitted in MS o.

בניהור<sup>1414</sup> שבעת<sup>1415</sup> יומיא

יתיר מכדיין<sup>1416</sup> תתרבון ויישב לכון  
 דהויתון מחמדין לשני נחמתא דאתין  
 הא כאכרא<sup>1417</sup> דמסבר<sup>1418</sup> בשני בצרתא  
 דייחות<sup>1419</sup> מטרא על ארעא:

23:4 *Blessed are you, righteous! You have done good deeds for yourselves, so that you are to shine in your glorious splendour, like the light of the dawn that grows brighter, and like the sun which is to shine in its glorious splendour, 343 times<sup>1420</sup> more in the light of the seven days. More than this you will be dignified, and it shall be good to you who are longing for the years of consolation to come. Behold, like a farmer who is hoping in dry years that rain will come down upon the land."*

The second canticle consists of verse 4 and is divided into three strophes. The strophes are linked by repetitions of phrases and words. The phrase "in the splendour of your/his glory" is added twice. The beginning "blessed are you" corresponds to "it shall be good to you". The preposition כַּ marks the beginning of the existing simile, and is also added to the last strophe, "like a farmer", to indicate the beginning of a new simile. Both similes are extended with the addition of the subjects of the simile, "you righteous ones", and a verbal construction, "shine in splendour" and "longing for the years of consolation" respectively (>13).

TJon did not regard the 'ruler' of verse 3 as the subject of the simile in verse 4.<sup>1421</sup> The subject is turned into the righteous people,

<sup>1414</sup>Ms b adds כוכביא 'stars'. Likewise MS 10, which added the copula ׀.

<sup>1415</sup>Ms y adds שבעת כוכביא ושבעת יומיא דמבראשיה 'as the splendour of seven stars [in] seven days'; likewise, MS J reads בניהור שבעת כוכביא ושבעת יומיא דמבראשיה 'in the light of seven stars and the seven days of the beginning'. Similarly, MS B reads בניהור כוכביא וניהור שבעת יומיא 'in the light of the stars and in the light of the seven days'.

<sup>1416</sup>MS S reads עברין 'deeds'. This short wording can mean "More deeds, and you will be dignified ..."

<sup>1417</sup>MS w erroneously reads כאברא 'like a member', while MS o reads כברא 'like a son'.

<sup>1418</sup>Both כאכרא and דמסבר are omitted in MS S, which results in the addressees being the ones living in years of drought and hoping for the rain to come down.

<sup>1419</sup>Kimḥi quotes דייחות עד, "until the rain comes down upon the land".

<sup>1420</sup>Idiomatic expression, cf. Dalman, *Handwörterbuch*, s.v. חדא; contra Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 203, who render "the first of 343".

<sup>1421</sup>In contrast to Jn 8:12; 9:5, where the Messiah is called the light of the world; cf. R.D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel* (New American Commentary, 7), Nashville 1996, on this verse.

*i.e.* the hearers of this translation.<sup>1422</sup> Based on Prov. 4:18<sup>1423</sup> and Dan. 12:3, the future of the righteous was depicted in terms of “the lights of heaven”. Additionally, the parallel in God’s utterances that the light was good (כי טוב, Gen. 1:4) and that the righteous are good (כי טוב, Isa. 3:10) gave rise to the thought that the righteous were to shine like the light of creation (Hag. 12a).<sup>1424</sup> Similarly, other verses with “light” or “darkness” in the poetical parts of TgSam are interpreted as references to the reward of the just and the punishment of the wicked.<sup>1425</sup> In TJon 1 Sam. 2:9 the “wicked will be judged in Gehenna in the darkness” and in 2 Sam. 22:29 the LORD brings the righteous from the darkness to the light “and shows the world that is to come for the just”.<sup>1426</sup> The fact that the interpretation of the first simile uses the same word זָהַר, ‘shine’, as the simile itself corroborates Smelik’s thesis that this verb ought to be taken literally and not metaphorically.<sup>1427</sup>

The Targum of 2 Sam. 23:4 chimes with TgIsa. 30:26 and TgJudg. 5:31, although the Hebrew texts of these passages have little in common.<sup>1428</sup> In these three passages the sun is said to shine 343 times brighter, but only in the Hebrew text of Isa. 30:26 the vehicle is mentioned, *viz.* the primeval light of the creation week.<sup>1429</sup> This “light of seven days” is added to Tg 2 Sam. 23:4 (>15). The number 343 may be the multiplication of the dualis שבעתים, understood as  $7 \times 7^{1430}$  com-

<sup>1422</sup>So also SEZ 15 (p. 198).

<sup>1423</sup>Even the use of the word תָּקִין is based on Hebrew נָכִין in Prov. 4:18; cf. R.P. Gordon, *Studies in the Targum of the Twelve Prophets: From Nahum to Malachi* (V.T.S., 51), Leiden 1994, 100-101.

<sup>1424</sup>Note that the text of Isa. 3:10 is used in the translation of this verse, cf. TJon on this verse, אִמְרוּ לְצַדִּיקָא טוֹבִיכֹן Many other parallel texts can be found, cf. W.F. Smelik, “On the Mystical Transformation of the Righteous into Light in Judaism”, *JSJ* 26 (1995), 122-44, esp. 125, n. 15. This light-darkness symbolism has many antecedents, cf. *e.g.* J.J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, London 1997, 112-29.

<sup>1425</sup>Cf. Yev. 109b; San. 7b where the word “night” is interpreted as Gehenna; BM 83b, the rising of the sun (Ps. 104:22) is interpreted as meant for the righteous; Mt. 13:43, “the righteous will shine like the sun in the Kingdom of their father”.

<sup>1426</sup>Similar phrases with light and darkness are used in the New Testament with messianic connotations, cf. *e.g.* 1 Pet. 2:9.

<sup>1427</sup>W.F. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges* (OTS, 36), Leiden (diss.) 1995, thesis X.

<sup>1428</sup>Smelik, ‘On the Mystical Transformation’, 134.

<sup>1429</sup>The creation week is explicitly mentioned in MS J, which renders “the seven days of the beginning”.

<sup>1430</sup>Cf. an identical multiplication of the dualis of 2 Sam. 12:5 in MTeh. 3:4, where David is not to restore the lamb four times, but sixteen times. The dual form is taken to imply a square of four, *i.e.* four times four; cf. W.G. Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms* (Yale Judaica Series, 13), New Haven 1959, Vol. 2, 409, n. 30.

plemented with the factor seven of שבעה הימים.<sup>1431</sup> Why this multiplication took place in TJon is obscure, since according to the traditional Jewish literature, the primeval light is to shine only sevenfold<sup>1432</sup> or 49 times<sup>1433</sup> as brightly. In 1910, Paul Humbert suggested that the number 343 could be a *gematria* of the first letters of the words הנרלים המארה שני המארה, 'the two great lights', from Gen. 1:16 (ג ש מ is 343).<sup>1434</sup> The meaning would be that, during the reign of the Messiah, the moon will shine like the sun and the sun like the light of the two great lights during the week of creation.<sup>1435</sup>

The sentence "a morning without clouds, when through the brightness after rain there is verdure from the earth" is interpreted as a separate simile. The "morning without clouds" is rendered with "years of drought", referring to present times<sup>1436</sup>, while the rain is seen as the fulfilment of hope, referring to the world to come (>18). This simile is extended on both sides: the persons who are longing for the years of consolation are compared to "the farmer who is hoping of rain" (>13). The comparison of "rain" and "the days of consolation" also occurs in TgJer. 12:5, where God is said to bring "blessings and consolations like the waters which run down in a flood in Jordan" (cf. Ps. 133). In TgJer. 31:6 the "longing for the years of consolations" is explained as longing for the possibility to go to the Temple and appear before God again, the (messianic) days of the restoration of Jerusalem and the regular service of God.<sup>1437</sup>

In later Jewish literature, rain and dew are often associated with

<sup>1431</sup>So Rashi in his commentary on Judg. 5:31; cf. Smelik, "On the Mystical Transformation", 135, n. 66; P. Humbert, "Le Messie dans le Targum des Prophètes", *RThPh* 43 (1910), 420-47, esp. 432. A similar triple multiplication is made in the exegesis of 2 Sam. 6:1, where the 30.000 is doubled by the word ער, and tripled by the verb "to gather".

<sup>1432</sup>So 1 Hen(gr) 91:16; TestAbr 7:2-5; Pes. 68a; San. 91b; ExodR. 18:11; 50:5; GenR. 3:6 by implication.

<sup>1433</sup>Cf. ExodR. 15:21; YalqS § 4 on Zech. 4:2; PesR. 42:4 (cf. PesR. 8:4); Midrash Kohen 26 (ed. A. Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash*, Bd. 2, Leipzig 1853); cf. 3 Hen(gr) 12:3.

<sup>1434</sup>An alternative explanation is based on those MSS which mention the seven stars, *i.e.* planets: seven times brighter than the seven planets during the seven days of creation; cf. Humbert, "Le Messie dans le Targum des Prophètes", 432. A. Landman, *Messias-interpretaties in de Targumim*, Kampen 1986, 65, n. 7 made the calculation of 336 days of the lunar year plus the 7 days of the creation week; but it is uncertain why the lunar year is used in this calculation.

<sup>1435</sup>Humbert, "Le Messie dans le Targum des Prophètes", 432-33.

<sup>1436</sup>Not in the Antwerp Polyglot, which also gives the literal rendering: "like the sun that is shining without clouds in his glorious splendour . . ."

<sup>1437</sup>Cf. NumR. 11:5, where the morning is conceived of as the end of Israel's suffering in the messianic age.



the resurrection of the dead.<sup>1438</sup> This is clearly attested to in the second *beracha* of the Eighteen Benedictions, discussed in yBer. 5:2 (9a-b): “Just as resurrection is life for the world, so too is the descent of rain life for the world.”<sup>1439</sup> Ms B confirms the association with the resurrection by reading *ולאזהרא ולאיתקיימא* and *דאזון עתידין לאיתקיימא* ‘you will be raised and shine ...’

The phrase “and it shall be good for you” is again a reference to the reward of the righteous. In the Babylonian Talmud the phrases *מדה טובה* and *מדה פורענות* are used as technical terms for the reward for the righteous and the punishment for the wicked respectively.<sup>1440</sup> The word *טוב* is used in the present verse, while the word *פורענותא* appears in verse 7.

### III The Foundation of the Messianic Kingdom (23:5)

אמר דויד  
 יתיר מכדין ביחי קדם ◊ אל◊  
 ארי קים עלם קיים לי  
 למהוי<sup>1441</sup> מלכותי קיימא  
 כמה דקיימין סררי בראשית  
 ונשירא לעלמא דאתי  
 ארי כל צורכי וכל<sup>1442</sup> בעותי  
 קדמוהי מחעבדין<sup>1443</sup>  
 בכין כל מלכו עור<sup>1444</sup> לקבלה<sup>1445</sup>  
 לא חתקיים:

*23:5 David said, “More than this is my house before El, for He has established an eternal covenant for me, that my kingdom shall be lasting, as the order of creation are lasting, and secured for the world to come. Because all my needs and all my prayer are fulfilled before Him,*

<sup>1438</sup>H. Sysling, *Tehiyat Ha-Metim: The Resurrection of the Dead in the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch and Parallel Traditions in Classical Rabbinic Literature*, Zutphen 1996, 161; D.J. van der Sluis *et al.*, *Elke Morgen Nieuw: Inleiding tot de Joodse gedachtenwereld aan de hand van het Achttiengebied*, Arnhem 1978, 68 and 151-53.

<sup>1439</sup>R. Hiyya b. Abba derived this association from Hos. 6:2-3. Cf. yTaan. 1:1 (63a); PesR. 20:4; GenR. 13:4-6; DeutR. 7:6; Tan., *Toledot*, 19; MHG Ber. 27:28; PRE 34; Ber. 33a; Taan. 2a-b; 7a; Hag. 12b; TgPs. 68:10.

<sup>1440</sup>*E.g.* Shab. 97a; Yom. 76a; San. 92a. Cf. P. Lenhardt, P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Rabbi Akiva: Texte und Interpretationen zum rabbinischen Judentum und Neuen Testament* (ANTZ, 1), Berlin 1987, 37. Cf. TgJer. 31:6.

<sup>1441</sup>From *למהוי* up to *צורכי* is omitted in MS y.

<sup>1442</sup>The word *כל* is omitted in MS S (>29).

<sup>1443</sup>MS w adds *בכל*, ‘completely’.

<sup>1444</sup>Omitted in MSS y C S.

<sup>1445</sup>Omitted in MS eb30. MS eb1 reads *לקיבל*, ‘opposing me’.

therefore, every kingdom still opposite will not be established.

Canticle III consists of verse 5 and is divided into 2 strophes. Because of the first person, the phrase "David said" is added, as in the verses 2-3. The two strophes are linked by the possessive "my", which is also added in מלכותי and בעותי, the double use of מלכותא, and the repetitive use of the stem קים.

The first three words, כִּי־לֹא כֵן, presented great difficulties for TJon. If translated literally, David's house was *not* like the bright morning light and it remains unclear what it is that should be compared to this light. Not wanting to deviate too much from the original, TJon rendered "more than this", *i.e.* more than the bright morning light, which can also function as the interpretation of "not like".<sup>1446</sup>

The two verbs ערך and שומר are divided over two periods of time, the beginning of the world and the world to come (>18).<sup>1447</sup> The fact that David's kingdom is said to be "arranged" must have reminded TJon of creation. The Hebrew word ערך and its Aramaic rendering סדר are frequently used in connection with the creation of the world, *e.g.* in Pes. 54a referring to Isa. 30:33.<sup>1448</sup> The order of creation was believed to be established by God and could only be altered by a miracle (TgJer. 31:35-6; Shab. 53b).<sup>1449</sup> The fact that his kingdom is said to be "secured" must have reminded TJon of the world to come, as in Tg 1 Sam. 2:9 where God is said to "secure the bodies of his servants from Gehenna". This diversification is based on Hebrew בכל: if David states that his kingdom is secured "in everything", then he must mean both this world and the world to come.<sup>1450</sup>

The end of verse 5 caused problems for TJon, too. The presence of one negation was inexplicable. In addition, the Hebrew כִּי seemed to make no sense at all.<sup>1451</sup> The Peshitta omits the negation and renders:

<sup>1446</sup>Perhaps a kind of *Converse Translation*, as M.L. Klein, "Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique", *Bib.* 57 (1976), 515-37 called this phenomenon.

<sup>1447</sup>A different division is attested to in SER 3 (p. 13), where the covenant is arranged with Scripture, Mishnah, halakhot and aggadot, while the words of the Torah are "secured", *i.e.* lasting for ever and ever.

<sup>1448</sup>The expression כִּי־לֹא כֵן itself occurs in Shab. 53b.

<sup>1449</sup>There is a connection between the Messiah and creation in Pes. 54a and Ned. 39b, which say that the name of the Messiah was created before the world was created. This pronouncement is based on Ps. 72:17, "His name shall endure forever, before the sun his name shall exist." Similar pronouncements can be found in TdE 29 (31); Hen(Eth) 48:3; TJon Zech. 4:7. Cf. Klausner, "The Name and Personality of the Messiah", 217; Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 117-18.

<sup>1450</sup>So Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 25.

<sup>1451</sup>Most modern translations take the second כִּי as a rhetorical exclamation, 'For all my salvation and all my desire - how would He not let sprout (them)?'

“For all my salvation and all my wish will succeed.”<sup>1452</sup> The main stream Septuagint uses the negative word of the next verse, בליעל, as the subject of the second half of this sentence and renders: “For it is all my salvation and all [my] wish that the unethical person will not flourish”. TJon appears to have used a combination of both solutions. In the first translation the negation is omitted: “For all my needs and all my prayer are done before Him.” And in the second translation a negative word, “opposite”, is added: “Therefore, every kingdom still opposite will not be established.”<sup>1453</sup> This verse is an exception to the rule that the Targumim give one interpretation only.<sup>1454</sup>

#### IV The Punishment of the Wicked (23:6-7)

ורשיעיא עבדי חטאה דמן לכובין  
 דבמפקהון רכיכין למקטף  
 וכד-<sup>1455</sup> אנש חאים עליהון  
 ושביק להון אזלין ותקפין  
 עד דליה אפשר למקרב להון ביד:  
 ואף כין-<sup>1456</sup> כל אנש  
 דמשרי למקרב בחובין  
 אזלין ותקפין עלוהי  
 עד דחפן-<sup>1457</sup> ליה כלבוש דברזל  
 דלא יכלין ליה באעי מורגין ורומחין  
 בכין לית פורענותהון ביד אנש  
 אלהין באישחא עתידין לאחוקרא-<sup>1458</sup>  
 יתוקדין-<sup>1459</sup> באתגלאה בית דינא רבא  
 למתב-<sup>1460</sup> על כרסי דינא למדן ית עלמא ◊:

23:6 *And the wicked, doing sin, resemble thornbushes, which are in*

<sup>1452</sup>Cf. Vg's double negation which resulted in the same meaning.

<sup>1453</sup>Cf. 2 MSS of Origenes' Hexapla which render: "All that opposes me ..."

<sup>1454</sup>Cf. A. Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targumic Exegesis* (TSAJ, 27), Tübingen 1992, 179.

<sup>1455</sup>MSS c o read respectively בר דכל and וכל בר, resulting in "that/and every son of man". MS C, too, adds בר before אנש.

<sup>1456</sup>Omitted in MSS a b d y B S. MS eb1 erroneously changes the word order into כל כין.

<sup>1457</sup>MS S reads דכפן, 'until they force him'.

<sup>1458</sup>Equivalent of a Hebrew absolute infinitive. This equation is corrected in MSS m p w eb1 eb30 and Kimḥi; they read ארוקרא (>29). The result is an omission after עתידין, 'destined to', followed by "they shall surely be kindled". The omission is complemented by Kimḥi, who adds למיקד, 'to burn'.

<sup>1459</sup>Omitted in MS y, resulting in "who will be kindled in the revelation of the High Court".

<sup>1460</sup>MS J reads דעתיד למחב, 'which will sit'.

their budding soft to cut off. But when a man spares<sup>1461</sup> them, and leaves them, they will grow stronger, until it is impossible to approach them by hand. 23:7 And thus is every man, too, who begins to approach sins: they will grow stronger over him, until they cover, like an iron garment, him whom<sup>1462</sup> they could not overpower with the wood of spears and javelins. Therefore, their punishment will not be by a man's hand, but by the fires which are to be kindled. They will be kindled in the revelation of the High Court, [which is] to sit on the throne of judgment, to judge the world."

Canticle IV consists of the verses 6 and 7, which include both parts of the simile on the wicked. As in Canticle II, these strophes have extremely long sentences and tend to be prosaic rather than poetic. As in Canticle II, these strophes divide the Hebrew metaphor into two different similes: one in verse 6 about the wicked and one in verse 7 about sin (>18). The strophes are linked by several expressions, e.g. בירד and ער, אוליך ותקפין, חרבין || חטאה.

A shift in meaning is noticeable in the use of the phrase "iron and the wooden shaft of a spear". In the Hebrew text, the iron and wood are used to cut off the thornbushes which cannot be touched by hand. In the version of TJon, "iron" is used to depict the strength of thorns and weeds: although this man could not be overpowered with spears and javelins, he could be conquered by sin. The battle against sin appears to be more difficult than the battle against flesh and blood.<sup>1463</sup>

The idea that sins grow stronger if they are not combatted, is rather widespread in rabbinic literature. One sin grows by producing other sins (Av. 4:2).<sup>1464</sup> Sin is like a weak woman, but grows stronger like a man (GenR. 22:6). R. Aqiba stated that sin is like a cobweb, but gradually grows strong as a web of hawsers (GenR. 22:6).

Thorns and thistles as images of the wicked (verse 6) are common in Scripture<sup>1465</sup> and TJon often expands and clarifies this imagery.<sup>1466</sup>

<sup>1461</sup>Note that the sparing of the Amalekite king Agag by Saul is a good example of this simile; TJon uses the same verb חס in 1 Sam. 15:3, 9, 15.

<sup>1462</sup>An alternative translation is given by Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*, 203, "they cover him like an iron garment which they cannot (pierce) with the wood of lances and spears".

<sup>1463</sup>Cf. the Pauline usage of battle-idiom to describe the battle against sin and evil, e.g. in Eph. 6:10-17.

<sup>1464</sup>Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*, 25.

<sup>1465</sup>Cf. L. Ryken et al. (eds), *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*, Downers Grove (IL) 1998, 650, 865.

<sup>1466</sup>Cf. J. Ribera Florit, *El Targum de Isaías: La versión aramea del profeta Isaías* (Biblioteca Midrásica, 6), Valencia 1988, 30-31.

TJon's similes in verses 6-7 resemble Jesus' parable of the weeds (Mt. 13:24-30, 36-43).<sup>1467</sup> The weeds, or thornbushes, are the sons of evil (23:6; Mt. 13:38)<sup>1468</sup> or evil itself (23:7; Mt. 13:41); judgment will be meted out at the end of the world (23:7; Mt. 13:39) by the Messiah (23:8; Mt. 13:41); the sons of evil will be punished not by human hands (23:7; Mt. 13:28, 39; cf. MTeh. 8:1), but by fire (23:7; Mt. 13:42); then the righteous will shine like the sun (23:4; Mt. 13:43). The difference between Jesus' parable of the weeds and TJon's simile seems to be TJon's estimation that thornbushes are soft enough to be cut off in their budding (23:6) as opposed to the sower's refusal to gather the weeds before harvest time (Mt. 13:28). Jesus summons his hearers to let both evil and good grow up until harvest time and not to judge until the close of the age.<sup>1469</sup>

The notion of "punishment by fire" is well-known and often paralleled in Jewish and Christian literature.<sup>1470</sup> Matthew also uses this idea (13:42), although he refers to the 'outer darkness' in other instances (e.g. 22:13).<sup>1471</sup> Elsewhere the term Gehenna is used and compared to a smoking furnace (MekY, *Bahodesh*, 9; Er. 19a; Qid. 40a; BB 79a; GenR. 26:6; cf. Rev. 20:11-15). Other fiery punishments are also mentioned: a consuming day (GenR. 26:6), a burning sun (AZ 3b; GenR. 78:5) or fire from within the wicked person himself (GenR. 26:6).

### V Depiction of the Messiah (23:8)

אלין שמהת גבריא דהוו עם דויד  
גברא ריש משריחא  
תיב על כרסי דינא  
וכל נבייא וסבייא<sup>1472</sup> מקפין ליה<sup>1473</sup>

<sup>1467</sup>Cf. Strack, Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, Bd. I, on these verses.

<sup>1468</sup>Cf. also Ps. 92:8; just like the righteous are compared to grain or grass, cf. Mt. 13:38; TgIsa. 28:25; 32:20; 44:4; Ezek. 19:10.

<sup>1469</sup>Cf. the proverbial saying that together with the thorn the cabbage is destroyed (BQ 92a). Therefore, some rabbis in Roman times tended to let the "weeds" grow until God's last judgment in order not to collaborate with the Roman government (BM 83b).

<sup>1470</sup>SER 3 (p. 14) assumes that Hebrew כשכו must be interpreted as the heavenly session of judgment.

<sup>1471</sup>Qumran has shown that this was not felt as a contradiction (IQS II.7-8; IV.13).

<sup>1472</sup>Ms T.-S. B8.2 reads וספריא, resulting in the combination of "prophets and scribes". This is a strange combination, since the word "scribes" is often used as the translation of the word "prophets" in the Hebrew text; cf. A. Díez Macho, "Fragmento de una nueva recensión del Targum Jonatán ben 'Uzziel a los Profetas (= T.-S. B. 121)", *Sefarad* 16 (1956), 405-406, esp. 406, n. 2.

<sup>1473</sup>The phrase וכל נבייא וסבייא מקפין ליה is omitted in MS o.

משיח במשח קדשא  
 בחיר ומפנק  
 שפיר בריויה  
 ויא' בחזויה  
 חכים בחכמתא  
 וסכלתן<sup>1474</sup> בעיצא  
 גבר בגברותא  
 ריש גבריא<sup>1475</sup>  
 הוא מתקן במני זינא  
 נפיק בפום קלא<sup>1476</sup>  
 ונצח בקרבא  
 ומחזיב על ידי מורניחיה  
 חמני מאה קטילין בומן חרא<sup>1477</sup>

23:8 *These are the names of the heroes who were with David, the hero, head of the armies, sitting on the throne of judgment, and all the prophets and elders surrounding him; anointed with the holy anointing oil,<sup>1478</sup> chosen and pampered,<sup>1479</sup> beautiful in looks and handsome in appearance, wise in wisdom and intelligent in council, a hero in heroism, head of the heroes; he is prepared with sets of armour, going out as the champion, and victorious in battle; and wields his spear against eight hundred slain in one time.*

The Hebrew poem concludes with verse 7. However, “the extremely difficult Hebrew text of verse 8 offered the Targumists an opportunity to digress upon the theme of the last judgment, presided by *David redivivus*.”<sup>1480</sup> The Hebrew verse 8 is used to form the last canticle

<sup>1474</sup>Ms S reads וצמחן.

<sup>1475</sup>Equivalent of Hebrew שליש, see below, commentary on 23:9.

<sup>1476</sup>Or: בפומקלא, derived from the Babylonian loan-word *pungullu*, ‘very strong’, cf. W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, Wiesbaden 1965-1981, Bd. 2, 875. A more extensive discussion of this word is given in E. van Staaldvine-Sulman, “The Aramaic Song of the Lamb”, in: J.C. de Moor, W.G.E. Watson (eds), *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOATS 42) Neukirchen-Vluy 1993, 265-92.

<sup>1477</sup>Ms T.-S. B 8/2 adds the phrase לרשיעיא ומייע לרשיעיא, ‘helping the humble and frightening the wicked’, somewhere in the text; cf. A. Díez Macho, “Fragmento de una nueva recensión del Targum Jonatán ben ‘Uzziel a los Profetas (= T.-S. B. 12<sub>1</sub>)”, *Sefarad* 16 (1956), 405-406, esp. 406, n. 2. This phrase is also used in a similar song on David’s merits, viz. a tosefta-targum on 2 Sam. 21:17 (Scene 1).

<sup>1478</sup>The phrase “anointed with the holy anointing oil” is taken from Ps. 89:21.

<sup>1479</sup>Or: loved, tender; cf. Prov. 4:3, “When I was a son with my father, *tender*, the only one in the sight of my mother”.

<sup>1480</sup>E. van Staaldvine-Sulman, “The Aramaic song of the Lamb”, 283. The same phenomenon occurs in the TO Gen. 50:1, which can be regarded as an epilogue to the poetical chapter of Gen. 49, according to E. Katsumata, “Priests and

of the Aramaic poem on reward and punishment and is divided into four strophes. It is connected with the other strophes by its beginning “these are ...” (1, 8), the “throne of of judgment” (7, 8), the word “anointed” (1, 3, 8) and the whole messianic depiction (Canticles 1, 3, 5).

TJon regarded verse 8 as a reference to David himself and made it into a song on David’s merits.<sup>1481</sup> The word *ישב בשבחה*, literally “sitting on the seat”, was interpreted in the light of verse 7, where the same word *בשבחה* is rendered as “the throne of judgment” (>15). The word *החכמי* is derived from the stem *חכמ*, ‘wise’, and rendered with a laudatory poem on the Messiah (>6).<sup>1482</sup> The qualities of the Davidic Messiah are based on David’s own qualities described in 1 Sam. 16:18 (cf. San. 93b). Several ingredients of this poem can also be found in tosefta-targumim on 1 Sam. 17:43 and 2 Sam. 21:17, as descriptions of David.<sup>1483</sup> The rest of the verse is translated in accordance with 1 Chron. 11:11 and consists of the depiction of a very successful warrior.<sup>1484</sup>

The appearance of “beauty” in this list of qualities may surprise modern readers, but “Biblical tradition does couple military prowess with beauty”.<sup>1485</sup> The entire depiction of David sitting on his throne and surrounded by his prophets and elders, is reminiscent of the depiction of King Jehoshaphat, sitting on his throne, arrayed in his robe ‘and all the prophets were prophesying before him’ (1 Kgs 22:10). This depiction is repeatedly used to describe the throne of a king, even the throne of God (Rev. 4:4).

Part of the description of David’s merits seems to have led a life

---

Priesthood in the Aramaic Bible”, paper read at the third meeting of the IOTS, Basel August 2-3, 2001.

<sup>1481</sup>So in MQ 16b (cf. SER 3, p. 15), although a different interpretation is given for the names used. The interpretation of MQ 16b is partly included in the version of Tg 1 Chron. 11:11. In that version David is depicted as king, chief rabbi of Jerusalem, and a master of vocalism. See below, the subsequent section. Against the interpretation of yMak. 2:6; NumR. 23:13; PesR. 11:3; TanB, *Bereshit*, 4:12; *Bamidbar*, 10:9; 1:3; where the verse is thought to refer to Joab. Note that Joab is not mentioned at all in the list of 2 Sam. 23.

<sup>1482</sup>Cf. also PsSal 17:29-30; SER 3 (p. 15).

<sup>1483</sup>Van Staaldvine-Sulman, “The Aramaic song of the Lamb”, 265-92; Kasher, *היכפחה*, 116-121.

<sup>1484</sup>In accordance with MQ 16b and GenR 94:9.

<sup>1485</sup>M. Dahood, “Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs”, in: L.R. Fisher (ed.), *Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible* (AnOr, 49), Vol. 1, Rome 1972, 71-382, esp. 167. Cf. M.C.A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (UBL, 8), Münster 1990, 427-28. The beauty of the martial messianic king is also stressed in TgPs. 45:3-11.

of its own. Three bicola of this poem appear to be an acrostic on the word "anoint", while three cola also occur in the acrostic tosefta-targum on 1 Sam. 17:43:

משיח במשח קדשא  
 בחיר ומפנק  
 שפיר בריויה  
 ויאי בחזויה  
 חכים בחכמתא  
 וסכלתן בעיצא

### 6.23.3 The Messiah in Tg. 1 Chron. 11:11

The eschatological elements in TJon 2 Sam. 23:8 stand out well against the deviating translation of its parallel text, Tg 1 Chron. 11:11. The latter verse consists of the same basic translation, but is expanded with some explanatory lines. In the added lines David is depicted as a human ruler, chief rabbi and a singer. The poetical structure of the poem is broken by the added lines. The acrostic on the word משח is not recognizable anymore.

<i>These are the names of the heroes</i>	אלין שמהת גבריא דהוו עם דויד
<i>who were with David</i>	
<i>the hero, head of the armies</i>	גברא ריש משריתא
<i>sitting on the throne of judgment,</i>	יחיב על כרסי דינא
<i>and all the prophets and sages</i>	וכל נבייא וחכימא מקפין ליה
<i>surrounding him,</i>	
<i>dignified with the holy anointing oil;</i>	מרבי במשח קדשא
<i>—when he went out to battle,</i>	כד הוה נפיק לקרבא
<i>he was supported from above.</i>	הוה מסתייע מלעילא
<i>And when he returned to the Law School,</i>	ובמחביה לאולפן אורייתא
<i>the teaching came out according to</i>	הוות סלקא שמעתא אליביה
<i>his opinion—</i>	
<i>chosen and pampered,</i>	בחיר ומפנק
<i>beautiful in looks</i>	שפיר בריויה
<i>and handsome in appearance,</i>	ויאי בחזויה
<i>wise in wisdom</i>	חכים בחכמתא
<i>and intelligent in council,</i>	וסכלתן בעיצא
<i>a hero in heroism,</i>	גבר בגברותא
<i>the head of the Law School,</i>	ריש מתיבתא
<i>sweet of voice,</i>	בסים בקלא
<i>and a master in the art of singing,</i>	ורבן בשירתא
<i>commander over all the heroes,</i>	וסרבן על כל גבריא



<p>he was prepared with sets of armour, and he carried his spear on which was hung the sign of the battle-lines of Judah, and he went out according to the voice of the Holy Spirit and was victorious in battle, and turned in by means of his spear 300 slain in one time.</p>	<p>הוא מתקן במני זינא ונטיל מורניתיה בדיה חלי אחא דטקם משרית יהודה ונפק על פום קל רוחא דקודשא ונצח בקרבא ומחביב על ידי מורניתיה תלת מאה קטילין בזמן חדא</p>
--	---

The first deviation from Tg 2 Sam. 23:8 is the most remarkable one: the word משיח, 'anointed', is replaced by מרבי, 'dignified'. This verb is explained in the subsequent cola as רבא = commander, רבא = rabbi, and רבן = master in the art of singing. The two large expansions do not describe David as the Warrior-Judge of Tg 2 Sam. 23:8, but as the Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem and responsible for the Jewish Liturgy. This depiction is in full accordance with Talmudic and Midrashic tradition. In MQ 16b, where an explanation of 2 Sam. 23:8 is given, David is also described as one of the Sages.<sup>1486</sup> Still, this depiction is within messianic range, because the Messiah was believed to teach the Torah anew and to lead the people of Israel back to true worship.<sup>1487</sup>

The combination of heroism and the teaching of Torah is strange at first sight. However, it is a variation on the Talmudic description of David: "When he was sitting engaged in the Torah, he rendered himself pliant as a worm, but when he went marching out to war he hardened himself like a lance" (MQ 16b).<sup>1488</sup> This connection appears to be stronger when the Hebrew text is taken into account. Aramaic גיבר is the rendering of Hebrew שלישי. This Hebrew word is conceived of as "the three", i.e. the three parts of the Hebrew Bible (cf. SER 3 (p. 15)).<sup>1489</sup> Consequently, the phrase "head of the heroes" actually means "head, i.e. interpreter of the TeNaKh".

The deviation at the end of the verse concerns the weapons of David. The spear is mentioned twice, once with the signs of Judah

<sup>1486</sup>Cf. Tg 1 Chron. 11:2; yBer 1:1; yMak. 6:7; SER 3; Vg: "sedens in cathedra sapientissimus". The same phenomenon applies to the person of Joab, e.g. in GenR. 94:13; NumR. 23:13; PesR 11:3.

<sup>1487</sup>Cf. W.D. Davies, *Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come* (JBL.MS, 7), Philadelphia 1952, 85. For the Teacher/Interpreter of the Law at the end of days, cf. J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, New York 1995, 102-35.

<sup>1488</sup>Cf. also SER 3 (p. 16). The Vg mixed up these two similes and renders, "ipse est quasi tenerrimus ligni vermiculus"; cf. V. Aptowitzer, "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata", ZAW 29 (1909), 241-252, esp. 252.

<sup>1489</sup>Cf. M. Kadushin, *Organic Thinking: A Study in Rabbinic Thought*, 1938; repr. New York n.d., 25.

and once as the weapon of David's greatest victory. The signs of the army of Judah might be the first explanation of the loan-word פּוֹמָקֵלָא. If so, the Targumist could have derived it from the Latin *fasciculus*, as was suggested by Bacher.<sup>1490</sup> Another explanation of this loan-word is by the rendering "according to the voice of the Holy Spirit".

The translation of Tg 1 Chron. 11:11 must be dated later than the text in Tg 2 Sam. 23:8. First, the structure of the poem is broken by the expansions. Especially the repetition of כִּי between adjectives and substantives is made irregular. Secondly, the depiction of the most important person in Israel, King David, is harmonized with Talmudic exegesis and is reminiscent of later Jewish thinking, in which the rabbi was the most influential person in Jewish society. Finally, the messianic tendency of Tg 2 Sam. 23:8 is strongly reduced, a phenomenon which can be traced to rabbinical Jewry after the second Jewish War.<sup>1491</sup>

#### 6.23.4 Reward and Punishment in the Messianic Age

The Aramaic poem of TJon 2 Sam. 23:1-8 expresses two articles of the Jewish faith: (1) reward and punishment and (2) the coming of the Messiah. These two articles of faith are interwoven in such a way that the image arises of a Messiah who will execute the last judgment—an image which is not often found in Judaism.<sup>1492</sup> The Targum of Isaiah 11 also depicts the Davidic Messiah as the wise judge who, surrounded by the righteous and therefore in the hereafter, will judge the poor and needy. Several of the Messiah's epithets in TJon 2 Sam. 23:8 were derived from Isa. 11:2. The depiction of the Messiah as the last Judge is an old picture, based on the visions in Daniel 7 and mainly occurring in the Second Temple Period,<sup>1493</sup> although the

<sup>1490</sup>Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 40; Idem, "Zwei Korruptelen: Ein Beitrag zur talmudisch-midrassischen Lexicographie", *MGWJ* 25 (1876), 237-40, esp. 240; followed by S. Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*, Bd. 2, Berlin 1898-99; repr. Hildesheim 1964, 432; J. Levy, *WTM*, Bd. 4, Berlin & Wien <sup>2</sup>1924, 81.

<sup>1491</sup>E. Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible* (BZAW, 174), Berlin & New York 1988, 213; Van der Sluis *et al.*, *Elke Morgen Nieuw*, 311; P. Schäfer, "Die messianischen Hoffnungen des rabbinischen Judentums zwischen Naherwartung und religiösem Pragmatismus", in: C. Thoma (ed.), *Zukunft in der Gegenwart: Wegweisungen in Judentum und Christentum* (JudChr, 1), Bern & Frankfurt a.M. 1976, 95-125, esp. 97.

<sup>1492</sup>L. Jacobs, *Principles of the Jewish Faith: An Analytical Study*, London 1964, 374: the days of the Messiah are believed to have finished before the renovation of the world and the Day of Judgment.

<sup>1493</sup>G.S. Oegema, *Der Gesalbte und sein Volk: Untersuchungen zum Konzeptualisierungsprozeß der messianischen Erwartungen von den Makkabäern bis Bar*

judging Messiah does appear in the Talmud.<sup>1494</sup> R. Aqiba was of the opinion that the thrones of Dan. 7:9 were for God Himself and for David, but he was alone in this (San. 38b). For most rabbis, however, “the essential thing is not the Messiah, but *the Messianic age*. After all, it is God Himself who will bring redemption in the Messianic age.”<sup>1495</sup>

Although it seems that TJon did not render the original meaning of the Hebrew poem, *viz.* the king who is like the sun, life-giving for the loyal subjects, but death-dealing for the disloyal, the differences are not as great as might be supposed at first sight. The picture of the sun, healing the righteous people and burning the wicked, is also used in rabbinic literature for the Last Judgment. R. Simeon b. Lakish said: “There is no Gehenna in the future world, but the Holy One, blessed be He, brings the sun out of its sheath, so that it is fierce: the wicked are punished by it, the righteous are healed by it.” (AZ 3b; cf. GenR. 78:5).<sup>1496</sup> The double function of the sun appears to be an eschatological motif referring to reward and punishment.

## 6.24 David’s Heroes (2 Samuel 23:9-39)

9 וּבַתְרוּחֵי אֱלֶעָזָר בֶּר דּוֹדוֹ בֶּר אַחֹוּהִי<sup>1498</sup> בַּחֲלָחָא גְבַרְיָא עִם דּוֹד כַּד חֲסִירוֹ  
פִּלְשְׁתִּי וַאֲחַכְנִישׁ חֲמַן לֵאגָחָא קֶרְבָּא וּסְלִיקַן אַנְשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל:

23:9 *And next to him was Eleazar the son of Dodo, son of Ahohi, among the three heroes with David, when they defied the Philistines;<sup>1499</sup> and they gathered themselves there to wage war, and the men of Israel withdrew.*

The result of TJon’s interpretation of 23:8 is that David is listed as the first hero, even the first of “the three”. The same result is extant

*Koziba*, Berlin 1989, 161-169. The Messiah as the Last Judge occurs in 1 Hen(gr) 90:20-42; 46:3-5; 48:2-7; 49:1-4; 53:3; 54:1-69:12; Mt. 13:41; 24:30-31; 25:31-46; 2 Thess. 4:13-18; ApBar. 35:1-46:6; 70:9; 72:1-73:1; Rev. 14:14-16; 19:11-16; 22:12-17; 4 Ezra 11:1-12:3; 13:2-13; Sib. 5:414-443; AscIs. 3:13; 4:18.

<sup>1494</sup>*E.g.* San. 93b. Cf. Klausner, “The Name and Personality of the Messiah”, 467-68; Oegema, *De Messias in Talmued en Midrasj*, 73; J. Neusner, *Messiah in Context: Israel’s History and Destiny in Formative Judaism*, Philadelphia 1984, 216-18.

<sup>1495</sup>Klausner, “The Name and Personality of the Messiah”, 226.

<sup>1496</sup>Mal. 3:19-20 [4:1-2] functions as proof-text.

<sup>1497</sup>According to the Qere. MSS c d f o read אַחֲבֹרֵי, translating the name with “his father’s brother”; cf. 1 Sam. 10:14, 16.

<sup>1498</sup>MSS m w read אַחֹוּהִי, ‘Ahoah’; cf. 23:28.

<sup>1499</sup>The Philistines were considered the object, as in LXX and Vg, although both the Hebrew and the Aramaic text are ambiguous.

in the interpretation of MQ 16b and Vg, whereas LXX gives the name Iebostos, followed by Josephus with the name Isebos.<sup>1500</sup> These names come close to the reading Jashobeam of 1 Chron. 11:11.

Hebrew שלשה, 'the three' (23:9, 13 Qere, 18, 19, 23), is consistently rendered with תלחא גבריא, 'the three heroes'.<sup>1501</sup> This full expression occurs in 23:9, 16 and is repeated in the subsequent verses (>15). Consequently, Aramaic גבריא must be regarded as an addition. Hebrew שלישים is not associated with the number three, but consistently translated with גבריא, 'heroes'. This meaning is in harmony with the usage of the word in 1QM 11:9, where the soldiers on chariots are called שלישים.<sup>1502</sup> TJon leaves aside what kind of soldier is meant by the Hebrew word,<sup>1503</sup> but renders it with the general word "hero" (>7).

10 23 הוא קם וקטל בפלשתאי עד דלא יאח ידיה ואדביקת ידיה עם חרבא ועבר יו פרקנא רבא ביומא ההוא ועמא חבו בתרוהי ברם לחלצא קטיליא: 11 23 ובתרוהי שמה בר אני טוראה<sup>1504</sup> ואתכנישו פלשתאי לחיתא<sup>1505</sup> וחות חמן אחסנת חקלא מליא טלופחין ועמא אפך מן קדם פלשתאי: 12 23 ואתעחד בנו אחסנתא<sup>1506</sup> ושיובה וקטל<sup>1507</sup> ית פלשתאי ועבר יו פרקנא רבא: 13 23 ונחתו תלחא<sup>1508</sup> גבריא מנבר<sup>1509</sup> רישי משריתא ואתו לחצרא לוח דוד למערת עדלם ומשרית<sup>1510</sup> פלשתאי שריא במישר

<sup>1500</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:308.

<sup>1501</sup> Verse 19 renders this expression in the absolute form, whereas verse 23 gives a deviating spelling.

<sup>1502</sup> Cf. HALAT<sup>3</sup>, s.v. For a possible, but contested occurrence in Ugarit, see G. del Olmo Lete, J. Sanmartín, *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica*, vol. 2, Barcelona 2000, 493.

<sup>1503</sup> Cf. the literature in HALAT<sup>3</sup>, s.v.; P. Särkiö, "'The Third Man' – David's Heroes in 2 Sam. 23,8-39", *SJOT* 7 (1993), 108-24; and the alternative renderings "three-man squad", proposed by D.G. Schley, "The *Šālīšim*: Officers or Special Three-Man Squads?", *VT* 40 (1990), 321-26, and "knight", suggested by O. Margalith, "A Note on *Šālīšim*," *VT* 42 (1992), 266.

<sup>1504</sup> Translation of Hebrew הררי, derived from הר, 'mountain'. Mss d f read דמן הר, 'who was from the mountain'; MSS b c o do not translate, but give הרר, 'who was from Harar'. This reading was added in MS y and Kimḥi.

<sup>1505</sup> Translation of Hebrew חיה, 'town, village'.

<sup>1506</sup> Ms d reads אחסנת חקלא, 'a property of land', in conformity with 23:11 (>15).

<sup>1507</sup> Ms T.-S. B 8/2 reads ומחא, 'and he smote'; cf. A. Díez Macho, "Fragmento de una nueva recensión del Targum Jonatán ben 'Uzziel a los Profetas (= T.-S. B. 12<sub>1</sub>)", *Sefarad* 16 (1956), 405-406, esp. 406, n. 2.

<sup>1508</sup> According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions; see above, commentary on 23:9.

<sup>1509</sup> Omitted in MS w. See above, commentary on 23:9.

<sup>1510</sup> Hebrew חיה in 23:11 is interpreted as "village", while the same word in the present verse is translated "army".

גבריא<sup>1511</sup>: 23 14 ורוד כבין בחקרא<sup>1512</sup> ואסטרטיג פלשתאי בכין בית לחם: 23 15  
 וחמידת נפשא דרוד ואמר מן<sup>1513</sup> ישקיני מיא מגובא דבית לחם דבתרעא: 23 16  
 וכועו תלחא גבריא במשרית פלשתאי ומלו מיא מגובא דבית לחם דבתרעא ונסיברו  
 ואיתיו לות דוד ולא אבא<sup>1514</sup> למשתיהון ואמר לנסכא יתהון קדם יי:

*23:10 He rose and killed among the Philistines until his hand was weary, and his hand cleaved to the sword. And the LORD wrought a great salvation that day, and the people returned after him, only to strip the killed ones. 23:11 And next to him was Shammah, the son of Agee the Mountainite. And the Philistines gathered together at Village, where was a property of land, full of lentils; but the people fled before the Philistines. 23:12 And he took his stand in the midst of the property, and saved it. And he killed the Philistines, and the LORD wrought great salvation. 23:13 And the three heroes, from the heroes, heads of the armies, went down, and came about harvest time to David at the cave of Adullam, when the army of the Philistines was encamped in the Valley of the Heroes. 23:14 And David was then in the citadel, and the praetor of the Philistines was then at Bethlehem. 23:15 And David's soul desired and he said, "Who would give me water to drink from the well of Bethlehem which is by the gate?" 23:16 Then the three heroes broke through the camp of the Philistines, and drew water out of the well of Bethlehem which was by the gate, and took and brought it to David. But he would not drink it, he promised to pour it out before the LORD.*

TJon avoids a water libation by King David, because David was not a priest.<sup>1515</sup> In RuthR. 5:1, however, David is excused by R. Kappara, because the libation would have happened on Sukkoth and the sanctuary in Shiloh had been destroyed.

17 23 ואמר חס לי מן קדם יי מלמעבדי דא הדר גבריא דאולו בנפשתהון ולא אבא  
 למשתיהון אלין עברו תלחא גבריא:

*23:17 He said, "Far be it for me from before the LORD, that I should do this! The blood of the men who went at risk of their lives?" So he would not drink it. These things did the three heroes.*

<sup>1511</sup>See above, commentary on 5:18. Several words are rendered with the general word "heroes" in TJon. This led to a surprising combination in the present verse, which can suggest that the Valley of the Heroes is called thus because of the heroic deed of the three.

<sup>1512</sup>See above, commentary on 5:7. The use of the word "citadel" may have caused Josephus' explanation that David was in Jerusalem; *Antiquities*, 7:311.

<sup>1513</sup>Rendered literally, although introducing a still unfulfilled but possible wish (GKC § 151a); cf. commentary and note on 2 Sam. 19:1.

<sup>1514</sup>Ms f adds the name of David.

<sup>1515</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 7:6.

“The omission of the verb in the question, הֲרָם etc., is nothing more than ellipsis: there is no break in the thought although the expression is not complete.”<sup>1516</sup> It is remarkable that TJon did not complement the verb.

18 23 וְאִבְשַׁי אַחֲוֵי דְיוֹאֵב בֶּר צְרוּיָהּ הוּא רִישׁ גְּבְרִיאָא<sup>1517</sup> וְהוּא תְּבִיב יֵת מוֹרְנִיתֵיהּ  
עַל תְּלַת מֵאָה קְשִׁילִין וְלִיָּהּ<sup>1518</sup> שׁוּם בְּתַלְתָּא<sup>1519</sup> גְּבְרִיאָא: 19 23 מִן גְּבְרִיאָא<sup>1520</sup> הוּוּ  
יְקִיר וְהוּוּ לְהוֹן לְרַבָּא וְלַתְּלַת<sup>1521</sup> גְּבְרִין<sup>1522</sup> לֹא מִשָּׂא: 20 23 וּבְנֵיהּ בֶּר יְהוּדַע<sup>1523</sup>  
גְּבַר דְּחִיל חֲשָׁאִין<sup>1524</sup> דְּלִיהּ עוּבְרִין<sup>1525</sup> מִקְבָּצָאֵל הוּא קְטַל יֵת תְּרִין רַבְרְבֵי מוֹאֵב<sup>1526</sup>  
וְהוּא נַחַת וְקְטַל יֵת אַרְיָא בְּנוֹ<sup>1527</sup> גּוּבָא בְּיוֹמָא דְתַלְנָא:

23:18 *And Abishai, the brother of Joab, the son of Zeruiah, was head of the heroes. And he wielded his spear against three hundred killed ones, and won a name beside the three heroes. 23:19 He was more renowned than the heroes, and became their commander, but he did not attain to the three. 23:20 And Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada was a man fearing sins, who did deeds, of Kabzeel. He killed the two commanders of Moab, and he went down and killed a lion in a pit on a snowy day.*

Although Ber. 18a-b combines the two אַרְיָאֵל of Moab with the two temples of Jerusalem, TJon supposed that the word referred to important persons. It is rendered with “commanders”, while Syr give the interpretation of “heroes”. Although Vg translates the word as “lions”, Pseudo-Jerome offers the explanation that the lions were two very strong men of Moab.<sup>1528</sup> The LXX complemented the phrase and

<sup>1516</sup>So A.D. Crown, “Aposiopesis in the O.T. and the Hebrew Conditional Oath”, *Abr-Nahrain* 4 (1963-1964), 96-111, esp. 104, against GKC § 167a.

<sup>1517</sup>See above, commentary on 23:9.

<sup>1518</sup>Some Hebrew MSS read וְלֹא, already rejected in Soferim 38a.

<sup>1519</sup>See above, commentary on 23:9.

<sup>1520</sup>See above, commentary on 23:9. Although the Hebrew text reads הַשְּׁלֹשָׁה, ‘the three’, it is clear from the co-text that the entire group of heroes is meant. Only MSS a f o add תְּלַת, ‘three’, before the word (>29).

<sup>1521</sup>See above, commentary on 23:9.

<sup>1522</sup>Ms eb1 reads גְּבוּרִין.

<sup>1523</sup>All MSS except MS p add בֶּר, in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>1524</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS, Syr and Vg. This positive image of Benaiah is in harmony with Ber. 18a-b and TanB, *Devarim*, 10:7, although the Ketib is followed there. See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 10:29.

<sup>1525</sup>Only MS a adds כִּנִּי before the word עוּבְרִין, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29); MSS f w add טְבִיבִין, ‘good’, after the word. This addition agrees with Ber. 18a-b, in which the word פְּעִלִים is conceived of as “workers according to the Torah”.

<sup>1526</sup>MSS c o read the adjective, respectively the singular מוֹאֲבָאֵה and the plural מוֹאֲבָאֵי, ‘Moabite’.

<sup>1527</sup>MS a uses the Hebrew word בְּתוֹךְ.

<sup>1528</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 147, “leones Moab, id est duos fortissimos viros

supposed that Benaiah killed “the two sons of Ariel of Moab”.<sup>1529</sup>

21 23 והוא קטל ית גברא מצראה גברא<sup>1530</sup> דחוזא ובידא דמצראה מורניתא ונחת עלוהי בחוּטרא וְאִנְס ית מורניתא מידא דמצראה וקטליה במורניתיה: 22 23 אלן עבד בניה בר יהודיע וליה שום בתלחא גבריא: 23 23 מן גבריא<sup>1531</sup> יקיר ולתלח גבורן<sup>1532</sup> לא מטא ומנייה דויד על משמעתיה:

*23:21 And he killed an Egyptian man, a man of appearance. The Egyptian had a spear in his hand, but Benaiah went down to him with a staff, and snatched the spear out of the Egyptian's hand, and killed him with his own spear. 23:22 These things did Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, and won a name beside the three heroes. 23:23 He was more renowned than the heroes, but he did not attain to the three heroic deeds. And David appointed him over the bodyguard.*

It is odd that Hebrew השלשה, ‘the three’, is rendered by גבורן לתלח, ‘three heroic deeds’, in this verse. In the rest of 2 Sam. 23 the equivalent is תלח גברין, ‘three heroes’ (see above, commentary on 23:9). Only MS o restored the usual equivalence.

24 23 עשהאל אחוהי דיואב בגבריא אלחנן בר דדו<sup>1533</sup> דמבית לחם: 23 25 שמה דמן חרוד אליקא דמן חרוד: 23 26 חלין דמן פלטה<sup>1534</sup> עירא בר עקש דמתקוע: 27 23 אביעור<sup>1535</sup> דמן ענתות מבני<sup>1536</sup> דמן חושת: 23 28 צלמון דמן אחוח מהרי דמן נטופא<sup>1537</sup>: 23 29 חלב<sup>1538</sup> בר בענה דמנטופא<sup>1539</sup> אתי בר ריבי מגבעתא דבני בנימין: 23 30 בניה דמפרעתחן הדי<sup>1540</sup> דמנחלי געש: 23 31 אביעלבון דמיערבת עומות דמברחום: 23 32 אליחבא<sup>1541</sup> דמשעלבון בני ישן יהונתן: 23 33 שמה<sup>1542</sup> טוראה<sup>1543</sup> אחיאם בר שרר דמיהר גבוה:

Moab”. The subsequent lion is considered a commander, too, viz. Joab.

<sup>1529</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:315 seems to combine the Aramaic and the Greek version, by rendering “two famous brothers”.

<sup>1530</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS, LXX, Syr and Vg.

<sup>1531</sup>See above, commentary on 23:9.

<sup>1532</sup>MS o reads גִּבּוּרִין, ‘heroes’.

<sup>1533</sup>MS o again translates אַחְוֵהּ, ‘the brother of his father’; cf. 23:9.

<sup>1534</sup>MS o reads פִּרְעָתָן, ‘Pirathon’; cf. 23:30.

<sup>1535</sup>Verses 27-38 are omitted in MS S, because the Aramaic names did not deviate much from the Hebrew ones. Such omissions are quite often attested, cf. 1 Sam. 30:28-30 in MS f and 2 Sam. 5:15-16 in MSS m w y B C J T.

<sup>1536</sup>MS c reads מְכוּנַי, ‘Mekunnai’.

<sup>1537</sup>MSS a c d f o y spell the name as נְטוּפָה, ‘Netophath’.

<sup>1538</sup>MS f reads חֵלֵד, ‘Heled’.

<sup>1539</sup>MSS b f o y spell the name as נְטוּפָה, ‘Netophath’; cf. 23:28.

<sup>1540</sup>MS eb1 reads חִידַי, ‘Hiddai’.

<sup>1541</sup>The entire verse is absent in MS eb1.

<sup>1542</sup>MSS b d y add הָרַר, ‘who was from Harar’ (>29), giving a conflated rendering.

<sup>1543</sup>MS o reads הָרַר, ‘who was from Harar’ (>29); cf. 23:11. MS f appears to

23:24 Asahel the brother of Joab was among the heroes; Elhanan the son of Dod of Bethlehem; 23:25 Shammah, who was of Harod; Elikah, who was of Harod. 23:26 Helez, who was of Palat; Ira the son of Ikkesh, who was of Tekoa; 23:27 Abiezer, who was of Anathoth; Mebunnai, who was of Hushath; 23:28 Zalmon, who was of Ahoah; Mahrai, who was of Netopha; 23:29 Heleb the son of Baanah, who was of Netopha; Ittai the son of Ribai, who was of The Hill of the sons of Benjamin; 23:30 Benaiah, who was of Pirathon; Hiddai, who was of the brooks of Gaash; 23:31 Abialbon, who was of Arbath; Azmaveth, who was of Barhum; 23:32 Eliahba, who was of Shaalbon; the sons of Jashen; Jonathan; 23:33 Shammah the Mountainite,<sup>1544</sup> Ahiam the son of Shara, who was from Har-gaboah;

Although Hebrew הררי is translated into Aramaic, Hebrew אררי is rendered by a Hebrew combination of words, viz. הר גבוה, 'high mountain'. It is clear from this rendering that TJon connected אררי with הררי, although it offered no identical translation.

34 23 אליפלט בר אחסבי בר מעכת<sup>1545</sup> אליעם בר אחיתופל גילונאה: 23 35 חצרי-<sup>1546</sup>דמן כרמלא פערי דמן ארב: 23 36 יגאל<sup>1547</sup> בר נתן דמצובה בני משבט גד: 23 37 צלק דמן<sup>1548</sup> עמון נחרי דמן בארות נטיל<sup>1549</sup> זיניה דיואב בר צרויה: 23 38 עירא דמן יתר גרב דמן יתר: 23 39 אוריה חתאה כל גבריא תלחין ושבעה:

23:34 Eliphelet the son of Ahasbai the son of Maakath; Eliam the son of Ahithophel the Gilonite; 23:35 Hezrai, who was of Carmel; Paarai, who was of Arab; 23:36 Igal the son of Nathan, who was of Zobah; Baneer from the tribe of Gad; 23:37 Zelek, who was from Ammon; Nahrai, who was of Beeroth, the armour-bearer of Joab the son of Zeruiah; 23:38 Ira, who was of Jattir; Gareb, who was of Jattir; 23:39 Uriah the Hittite. Thirty-seven heroes in all.

Hebrew שלשים is plainly read and translated with תלחין, 'thirty'. It is also vocalized as שלשים and rendered with גבריא, 'heroes' (see above, commentary on 23:9).

In the Hebrew text thirty-seven names appear, but there are a few problems. All verses contain two names, except 23:32, which has three names. One of the names is "sons of Jashen", which refers to

agree with this rendering, but erroneously reads חרוד, 'Harod'; cf. 23:25.

<sup>1544</sup>See above, 23:11.

<sup>1545</sup>MS o reads מעכתי, which is a bit closer to the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1546</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and the other ancient versions.

<sup>1547</sup>The entire verse is absent in MS p.

<sup>1548</sup>MSS a b c d f m o w y eb1 read the more usual דמכני, 'from the sons of'.

<sup>1549</sup>Singular, in conformity with the Qere, many Hebrew MSS, LXX, Syr and Vg. Only MS f attests the plural נטילין.



a minimum of two people, and the subsequent name is the simple “Jonathan” without any family references.<sup>1550</sup> In 1 Chron. 11:34, Jonathan is combined with the following name, resulting in “Jonathan, the son of Shagee the Hararite”. If this correction is accepted, and if there were two sons of Jashen, the number would be thirty-seven, as the Hebrew text states.<sup>1551</sup> TJon did not accept the Chronicler’s correction, but did not mention the first hero either. This means that in TJon, too, the number is thirty-seven. The only problem that remains is one missing hero of “the three”. And if David is counted among “the three”, then 23:13 does not make sense.

Finally, the fact that Joab is not mentioned separately in this list, whereas he is prominently present in all the stories of King David, and implicitly present as brother (23:18, 24) and master (23:37), was not changed in TJon. Several rabbinic sources solved his absence by identifying the unknown Josheb-basshebeth of 23:8 with the renowned Joab.<sup>1552</sup>

## 6.25 Counting the People (2 Samuel 24)

1 24 ואוסיף רגזא ◊ דיוי למתקף בישראל וגרי ית דויד בהון למימר איזיל מני ית 1553  
 ישראל וית דביח ◊ יהודה: 2 24 ואמר מלכא ליואב 1554 רב חילא ◊ 1555 דעמיה הליך  
 כען בכל שבטיא ◊ דישראל מרן ועד באר שבע ומני 1556 ית עמא ואדע ית חשבן עמא:  
 3 24 ואמר יואב למלכא ויוסיף יוי אלהך ◊ על עמא כאלין וכאלין מאה זמנין ועיני  
 רבוני ◊ מלכא חוין ורבוני ◊ מלכא למא אתרעי בפתגמא הדין: 4 24 וחקיף 1557 פתגמא  
 דמלכא על יואב ועל רבני חילא ◊ נפק יואב ורבני חילא ◊ קדם ◊ מלכא למני 1558  
 ית עמא ית ישראל: 5 24 ועברו ית ירדנא ושרו בערוער דרום קרתא ◊ דבגו נחלא  
 דבשיבט ◊ גר וביעור 1559: 6 24 ואתו לגלעד ולארע דרומא לחדשי ואתו לדן יען

<sup>1550</sup>This may be the cause for the number thirty-eight in Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:307.

<sup>1551</sup>If יתן is emended into a single name, as McCarter, *II Samuel*, 488 did, then the number would be thirty-six.

<sup>1552</sup>Cf. yMak. 2:6; NumR. 23:13; PesR. 11:3, TanB, *Bereshit*, 4:12; *Bamidbar*, 10:9; 1:3. See above, commentary on 23:8.

<sup>1553</sup>Ms d adds רביה, ‘House’; MS f adds רביה, ‘those of the House’.

<sup>1554</sup>Omitted in MS c.

<sup>1555</sup>Ms eb1 reads חיליה, ‘his army’.

<sup>1556</sup>A common rendering of Hebrew פקך, cf. *e.b.* TJon Josh. 8:10; Judg. 20:15, 17; 21:9; 1 Kgs 20:15, 26, 27; 2 Kgs 3:6, but note that the same verb is used in 24:1.

<sup>1557</sup>Mss a J read ואיחקף Ithpaal, ‘and it became strong’.

<sup>1558</sup>Erroneously omitted in MS J.

<sup>1559</sup>Mss b c d o w y and Kimḥi thought that Hebrew אל also belonged to the name and translated “Eliezer”, as did some Hebrew MSS, LXX and Syr.

ומתמן אסתחר לצידון: 24 7 ועל<sup>1560</sup> לקריון כריכין<sup>1561</sup> וכל קריון חואי וכנענאי  
ונפקו לדרום יהודה לבאר שבע:

24:1 Again the anger of the LORD was strong against Israel, and he incited David against them, saying, "Go, count Israel and those of the House of Judah." 24:2 So the king said to Joab, the commander of the army, who was with him, "Go now through all the tribes of Israel, from Dan to Beer-sheba, and count the people, that I may know the number of the people." 24:3 But Joab said to the king, "May the LORD your God add to the people a hundred times as many as they are, while the eyes of my lord the king still see it. But my lord the king, why does he delight in this thing?" 24:4 But the king's word prevailed against Joab and the commanders of the army. So Joab and the commanders of the army went out before the king to count the people of Israel. 24:5 They crossed the Jordan, and began in Aroer, south of the city that is in the middle of the brook, which is in the tribe of Gad, and in Jazer. 24:6 And they came to Gilead, and to the land south<sup>1562</sup> of Hodshi. And they came to Dan-jaan, and from there they went around to Sidon. 24:7 They entered the fortified cities, and all the cities of the Hivites and Canaanites. And they went out to the South of Judah, to Beer-sheba.

This is one out of two instances in which TJon does not give the name Tyre, but offers the translation "fortified cities".<sup>1563</sup> In both instances the Hebrew text runs *מבצר צר*. The meaning of the former word prevailed, while the latter seems to be connected with the verb *צור*, 'to bind, to gird'. The combined usage of these words was considered a reference to several walled cities.<sup>1564</sup>

9 24 8 והליכו בכל ארעא ואחו מסיפ<sup>1565</sup> תשעה ירחין ועסרין יומין לירושלם: 9 24

<sup>1560</sup>Mss b y B C read *ואחו*, 'and they came', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1561</sup>Mss f o G read *למבצר צור*, 'to the fortress of Tyre' (>29), instead of *לקריון כריכין*, while MSS c d combine both readings.

<sup>1562</sup>Again an unknown geographical indication is translated with "south"; see above, commentary on 1 Sam. 9:4.

<sup>1563</sup>So also in TJon Josh. 19:29. The name of Tyre is maintained in 2 Sam. 5:11; 1 Kgs 5:1; 7:13, 14; 9:11, 12; Isa. 23:1, 5, 8, 13, 15, 17; Jer. 25:22; 27:3; 47:4; Ezek. 26:2, 3, 4, 7, 15; 27:2, 3, 32; 28:2, 12; 29:18; Joel 4:4; Amos 1:9, 10; Zech. 9:2, 3.

<sup>1564</sup>There is no reason to believe that Tyre's destruction caused the translation in the present verse; against Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 117. Tyre is mentioned often in TJon, as well as in the New Testament. It seems to have been well-known, also in the Talmudic age; cf. A. Neubauer, *La géographie du Talmud*, Paris 1868, 293-94.

<sup>1565</sup>MS eb1 reads the singular *מיסוף*, 'at the end'.

ויהב יואב ית חשבון מנין עמא למלכא והוו ישראל תמני מאה אלפין נבר נבר<sup>1566</sup> שלפי סיפא ואנש יהודה חמיש מאה אלפין נברא:

24:8 So they went through all the land. At the end of nine months and twenty days they came to Jerusalem. 24:9 And Joab gave the calculation of the number of people to the king: Israel had eight hundred thousand heroic men, who drew the sword, and the men of Judah had five hundred thousand.

Hebrew מספר and מפקד, referring to the number of the people of Israel and Judah, caused rabbis to wonder why two words were used. The solution in CantR. 6:9 § 4 seems to be close to the Aramaic version. It states that Hebrew מספר refers to the lists of names, and to the calculation, while Hebrew מפקד means that the total sum was given. This would mean that Joab gave both the separate calculations of the tribes and cities, and the total sum. A different solution is given in NumR. 2:11 and PesR. 11:3, in an attempt to harmonize the present verse with the divergent parallel in 1 Chron. 21:5. Joab would have given only a certain number out of the total sum of his calculations. The smaller number is given in the present verse, while the sum is attested in 1 Chron. 21:5. TJon did not follow this harmonization.<sup>1567</sup>

10 24 וחש<sup>1568</sup> דויד בלביה בחר כין<sup>1569</sup> דמנא ית עמא ואמר דויד קדם<sup>1570</sup> וי חביא<sup>1571</sup> לחדא דעברית הרא<sup>1570</sup> וכען וי אעבר<sup>1571</sup> ית<sup>1572</sup> חובא<sup>1573</sup> דעברך ארי אסכלית<sup>1573</sup> לחדא: 11 24 וקם דוד בצפרא ופתגם נבואה<sup>1574</sup> מן קדם<sup>1575</sup> וי הוה עם גד נבייא<sup>1574</sup> חזויא<sup>1574</sup> דדויד למימר: 12 24 איזיל ותמליל עם דויד<sup>1575</sup> כדנן<sup>1576</sup> אמר וי חרא מתלת אנא רמי עלך בחר לך חרא מנהון ואעביד לך: 13 24 ואתא גד לות דויד וחוי

<sup>1566</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 14:52.

<sup>1567</sup>Cf. PesK. 2:8, where a combination of both solutions is given.

<sup>1568</sup>See above, commentary on 1 Sam. 24:6.

<sup>1569</sup>No MS omitted this word, although it seems superfluous. Whether TJon maintained the construction out of respect for the text or because it still existed, is unknown. Phoenician parallels are mentioned by M. Dahood, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs", in: L.R. Fisher (ed.), *Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible* (AnOr, 49), Rome 1972, 81, n. 39.

<sup>1570</sup>Omitted in MS f o (>29). MS B\* reads פתגמא הרא, 'this thing'.

<sup>1571</sup>Mss a b c d f m o w y eb1 B C J add כען, 'now', in conformity with the Hebrew text.

<sup>1572</sup>Omitted in MS c.

<sup>1573</sup>MS f reads the Aphel אסכלית, 'I have acted foolishly'.

<sup>1574</sup>MS c reads again נבייא, 'prophet'.

<sup>1575</sup>MS c adds למימר, 'saying'.

<sup>1576</sup>Harmonization with the rest of the account, for God gave only one punishment (>16).

ליה ואמר ליה היתין<sup>1577</sup> לך שבע<sup>1578</sup> שנין כפנא בארעך אם תלתה ירחין תהי עריקין קרם סנאך וְהוּא רדיף לך<sup>1579</sup> ואם מהוי תלתא יומין מותא<sup>1580</sup> בארעך כען דע וחוי מא אחיב שלחי<sup>1581</sup> פתגם: 24 14 ואמר רייד לגר עקת לי לחרא נתמסר כען ביד מימרא דיני ארי סניאין רחמוהי ובירא דאנשא לא אתמסר:

*24:10 But David was troubled in his heart, after he had counted the people. And David said before the LORD, "I am terribly guilty in what I have done. But now, O LORD, take away the guilt of thy servant; for I have acted very foolishly." 24:11 And when David arose in the morning, a prophetic word from before the LORD came to Gad the prophet, David's seer, saying, 24:12 "Go and speak with David, 'Thus says the LORD, One of three things I will impose upon you; choose one of them, that I may do it to you.'" 24:13 So Gad came to David and told him, and said to him, "Shall seven years of famine come to you in your land? Or will you be fleeing three months before your hater, while he is pursuing you? Or shall there be three days of death in your land? Now, consider and decide what I shall answer to Him who sent me."<sup>1582</sup> 24:14 Then David said to Gad, "I am in great distress; let us be surrendered now into the hand of the speech of the LORD, for his mercy is great. But let me not be surrendered into the hand of man."*

The wording of the Hebrew text indicates that David chose the three days' pestilence. The expression "the hand of the LORD" is the standard Biblical way of referring to a plague (cf. e.g. 1 Sam. 5:6). Extra-Biblical parallels appear to confirm this.<sup>1583</sup> TJon did not stress the connection between the LORD's hand and the subsequent plague. On the contrary, the vague Hebrew expression was appropriately rendered by the literal translation of "hand" and the addition of "speech".

<sup>1577</sup>Mss b c d f o B J read הַחֵעוּל, 'shall it enter?' Ms a reads חֵעוּל אִם, 'whether it shall enter'. Ms y reads the Aphel הַחֵעִיל, 'shall it bring in?'

<sup>1578</sup>No attempt to harmonize the seven years of the present verse with the three years of 1 Chron. 21:12, followed by LXX.

<sup>1579</sup>Ms w reads the more usual בַּחֶרֶךְ, 'after you'.

<sup>1580</sup>Mss a o B J read מוֹתָא, 'epidemic', which is an adjustment to the Hebrew text (>29), but also to 24:21, 25 (>16).

<sup>1581</sup>Ms w adds the nota accusativi, while MS f adds the preposition לְ before the word.

<sup>1582</sup>If there were any connection between Hebrew דָּבַר, 'pestilence', and Hebrew דָּבַר, 'word', in this verse, implying that the prophet suggested that David would indeed choose the third penalty, then this connection is not maintained in the Aramaic version. Cf. M. Garsiel, "Word Play and Puns as a Rhetorical Device in the Book of Samuel", in: S.B. Noegel (ed.), *Puns and Pundits: Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature*, Bethesda (MD) 2000, 181-204, esp. 198.

<sup>1583</sup>So McCarter, *II Samuel*, 511.

24 15 ויהב יי מוחא<sup>1584</sup> בישראל מעדן<sup>1585</sup> דמתנכיס תמידא ועד דמחסק ומית מן  
 עמא מן ועד באר שבע שבעין אלפין גברא:

*24:15 So the LORD sent death among Israel, from the time that the continual offering is slaughtered until it is sacrificed. And there died from the people, from Dan to Beer-sheba, seventy thousand men.*

In contrast to the prophecy of Gad, who mentioned three days of pestilence in the land, TJon gave the halakhic explanation of the verse, according to which the epidemic lasted only for part of the morning. The same explanation is given by R. Hanina (Ber. 62b), who said, "From the time of slaughtering the continual offering until the time of sprinkling the blood."<sup>1586</sup> R. Joḥanan did not completely agree, but said: "Right up precisely to midday". The latter explanation is also given in Syr and LXX, followed by Josephus.<sup>1587</sup>

24 16 ואושיט ידיה מלאכא<sup>1588</sup> לירושלם לחבלותה וחב יי מן בשחא ואמר  
 למלאכא<sup>1589</sup> דמחביל בעמא מסת כען אנח ידך ומלאכא<sup>1589</sup> דיין הוה שרי בבית אררי  
 דארון<sup>1590</sup> יבוסאה:

*24:16 And when the angel stretched forth his hand toward Jerusalem to harm it, the LORD turned back from the evil, and said to the angel who was harming among the people, "Enough now! Stay your hand." And the angel of the LORD was by the threshing floor of Arvan the Jebusite.*

Although TJon renders the name of the owner of the threshing floor according to the spelling of the Qere—and according to the rest of the chapter—, it gives a different vocalization and omits the ending ה. If the name does stem from the Hittite *arawa(nni)*, 'freeman,

<sup>1584</sup>Ms C reads מוחא, 'epidemic', which is closer to the Hebrew text (>29), but also to 24:21, 25 (>16); cf. 23:13.

<sup>1585</sup>Mss a f add עידן, 'the time'.

<sup>1586</sup>Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 149 gives a similar explanation, but refers to the continual offering of the evening. Three explanations are mentioned in PesR. 11:3. The first agrees with TgSam, while the second and third have equally short times with "from the time the east lights up until the first beams of the rising sun" and "from the time the globe of the sun appears on the horizon until it clears the horizon". Cf. MTeh. 17:4.

<sup>1587</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:326. McCarter, *II Samuel*, 506 considered the LXX reading the most original, assuming that its *Vorlage* must have been סער instead of מעד.

<sup>1588</sup>Ms o adds דיין, 'of the LORD'.

<sup>1589</sup>Ms eb1 adds דימחביל, 'who was harming'.

<sup>1590</sup>Ms y reads דארנן, 'of Arnon', an error for its usual reading דארון; cf. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen", 48. Likewise, MS B. Note that this variant is close to the spelling of the Chronicler.

aristocrat',<sup>1591</sup> then the Aramaic vocalization is closer to the original name than the Masoretic one. Furthermore, TJon did not accept the article before the name, as both Ketib and Qere do in the present verse.<sup>1592</sup>

17 24 ואמר דויד קדם יי כד חזא ית מלאכא דמקטיל בעמא ואמר הא אנא חבית דאנא סרחית ואלין עמא דאנון<sup>1593</sup> כענא ביד רעיא מא עברו תהוי כען מחתך בי ובכית אבא:

24:17 *And David said before the LORD, when he saw the angel who was killing among the people. And he said, "Behold, I have sinned myself, and I have spoilt the whole thing. But these people, who are like sheep in the hand of the shepherd, what have they done? Let thy plague be against me and against my father's house."*

The metaphor "sheep" of the Hebrew text is augmented and turned into a simile. The people of Israel are like sheep, depending on the shepherd, *i.e.* David. Consequently, TJon stresses the contrast between the innocent people who were suffering a terrible disease and the shepherd, who was guilty. The image of the shepherd is also adopted by Josephus.<sup>1594</sup>

18 24 ואתא גר לות דויד ביומא ההוא ואמר ליה סק אקים קדם יי<sup>1595</sup> מדבחא בבית אדרי דארון<sup>1596</sup> יבוסאה: 19 24 וסליק דויד כפתנמא דגד<sup>1597</sup> כמא דמליל<sup>1598</sup> יי: 20 24 ואסחכי ארון וחזא ית מלאכ וית עברוהי עברין עלוהי ונפק ארון וסגיד למלאכ על אפוהי על ארעא: 21 24 ואמר ארון מדין אתא רבוני דמלאכ לות עבדיה ואמר דויד למזבן מנך ית בית אדרי למבני מדבחא קדם יי ויתכלי מותנא מעל עמא: 22 24 ואמר ארון לדויד יסב דויסיק רבוני דמלאכ דתקינ דבינוהי<sup>1599</sup> חזי תוריא כשרין<sup>1600</sup> לעלחא ומורגיא ומני תוריא לאעיא: 23 24 כולא יתב ארון<sup>1601</sup> למלאכ דבעא מניה מלאכ<sup>1602</sup> ואמר ארון למלאכ יי<sup>1603</sup> אלהך דיקביל דקרנך ברעוא:

<sup>1591</sup>So Rosén *apud* McCarter, *II Samuel*, 512.

<sup>1592</sup>The name with the article in Aramaic would be spelled ארונא, which means "the ark".

<sup>1593</sup>Omitted in MS d.

<sup>1594</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:328.

<sup>1595</sup>The phrase יי קדם is omitted in MSS B\* J\*, but added in the margin of MS B.

<sup>1596</sup>According to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS and Vg; MS B reads ארין, cf. 24:16.

<sup>1597</sup>MS B adds ההוא, 'on that day'; cf. 24:18.

<sup>1598</sup>Unexpected weak translation of Hebrew צוה, 'command'. MSS a b c d f m o w y eb12 eb66 C J read דפקי, '[as] He commanded'.

<sup>1599</sup>Plural according to the Qere, many Hebrew MSS, the other ancient versions.

<sup>1600</sup>Halakhic clarification that the oxen met the demands for sacrifices; omitted in MS o, in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1601</sup>MS B adds מלאכ, 'O king', in conformity with the Hebrew text (>29).

<sup>1602</sup>MSS c d f w y omit the phrase מלאכ דיקביל.

<sup>1603</sup>MS f reads דויד מימרא, 'the speech of the LORD'.

24:18 And Gad came that day to David, and said to him, "Go up, rear an altar before the LORD on the threshing floor of Arvan the Jebusite." 24:19 So David went up according to Gad's word, as the LORD had spoken. 24:20 And when Arvan looked down, he saw the king and his servants coming on toward him; and Arvan went forth, and bowed down to the king with his face to the ground. 24:21 And Arvan said, "Why has my lord the king come to his servant?" David said, "To buy the threshing floor of you, in order to build an altar before the LORD, that the epidemic may be averted from the people." 24:22 Then Arvan said to David, "Let my lord the king take and sacrifice what seems right in his sight. See the oxen fit for the burnt offering, and the threshing sledges and the tools of the oxen for the wood. 24:23 All that the king has asked him Arvan gives to the king." And Arvan said to the king, "May the LORD your God accept your sacrifice with pleasure."<sup>1604</sup>

The combination of המלך למלך appears to be considered illogical. TJon changed the word order and turned המלך into the subject of the added clause "that the king has asked him". Only MS B put the word מלכא back in, thereby giving a conflated rendering. Several manuscripts omit the added clause, only reading למלך, as did some Hebrew MSS, LXX and two MSS of the Vetus Latina.

24 24 ואמר מלכא לארון לא ארי מובן אובן מנך בדמין ולא אסיק קדם יי אלהי עלון<sup>1605</sup> מן וזבן דויד ית בית אדרי ויה תוריא בכסף סלעין חמשין:

24:24 But the king said to Arvan, "No, for I will surely buy it from you for a price. I will not bring up burnt offerings before the LORD my God for nothing." So David bought the threshing floor and the oxen for fifty selas.

The incongruity between the present verse and 1 Chron. 21:25, giving the price of 50 and 600 shekels respectively, was not solved by TJon. Several solutions are mentioned in Jewish literature.<sup>1606</sup> First, the threshing floor was 50 shekels, but the entire Temple Mount was 600. Secondly, the threshing floor cost 600 shekels, but David paid 50 shekels for each tribe. Finally, the threshing floor was sold at 600 shekels, the oxen and the wood for 50.<sup>1607</sup>

<sup>1604</sup>TJon's paraphrastic rendering of Hebrew ירצך is according to its exegetical techniques (>14); cf. TgAmos 5:21. Note that Josephus, *Antiquities*, 7:331 gives exactly the same rendering, "that God would graciously accept the sacrifice".

<sup>1605</sup>MS B adds וניכסה 'and slaughterings', according to 24:25.

<sup>1606</sup>Cf. SifBam § 42 (on Num. 6:26); NumR. 11:7; Zev. 116b.

<sup>1607</sup>The latter solution is mentioned by Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 150.

24 25 ובנא תמן דויד מדבחא קדם יי ואסיק עלון ונכסתו קדשין וקביל יי צלוח  
 דירי ארעא ואתכלי מותנא מעל<sup>1608</sup> ישראל:

*24:25 And David built there an altar before the LORD, and brought up burnt offerings and holy sacrifices. And the LORD accepted the prayer of the inhabitants of the land, and the epidemic was averted from Israel.*

No comment is offered concerning the unusual place to bring burnt offerings (cf. 1 Chron. 21:29-30). No connection is made between the threshing floor of Arvan and the later site of the Temple (cf. 1 Chron. 22:1; 2 Chron. 3:1).

<sup>1608</sup>Ms o adds עמא, 'the people'.



*This page intentionally left blank*

## Chapter 7

---

### Conclusions

In the history of Targumic research the Aramaic version of the Books of Samuel has received little notice. Of course, it was mentioned in studies on TJon in general, at first to establish TJon's relationship to the Masoretic Text and later to investigate TJon's characteristics and theology. Three Hungarian scholars, however, paid more attention to TgSam—two on the threshold of the Second World War and one in the early 70s—and described part of its exegetical background and features. The present study elaborates on these items, focusing on TgSam's exegetical techniques and environment. Besides, special attention is paid to TgSam's treatment of Hebrew poetry. The results of the research into these three subjects—exegetical techniques, exegetical environment and time of origin, treatment of poetic sections—are presented in this chapter.

#### 7.1 Characteristics of TJon Samuel

Although TgSam can be classified as a Jewish translation, and was used in Jewish communities next to other Jewish theological literature, it has a character of its own. Although TgSam shares part of its many exegetical techniques with Midrashic and Talmudic debates, it has its own criteria for applying these techniques and for being consistent in their application. The character and criteria of TgSam can be summarized in the following key phrases: reverence for God and his people; reverence for the sacred text; theology of revelation; susceptibility to poetic and rhetorical devices; unity.

##### 7.1.1 Reverence for God and His People

The most overwhelming feature of TgSam is its reverence for the God of Israel. This feature emerges from the constantly present reverential expressions between God and man, between the heavenly and the earthly realm, such as קרם and מימרא.<sup>1</sup> The same preposition קרם is used to show reverence to kings and leaders.<sup>2</sup> The consistency with which exegetical techniques are used to protect God's honour and uniqueness points to a major concern on the part of the translators. In this respect it is also noteworthy that TgSam rarely added a direct reference to God, but instead preferred the *passivum divinum*.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, Ch. 3, >23.

<sup>2</sup>See above, Ch. 4, s.v. Aramaic קרם.

<sup>3</sup>Additions of the *passivum divinum* can be found in 1 Sam. 2:1, 2, 5, 25; 15:29;

TgSam even introduced metaphors—instead of explaining them—in order to avoid wrong theological concepts.<sup>4</sup>

Related to this reverence for God is TgSam's emphasis on monotheism. This is expressed in the uniform translation of Hebrew אלהים, אדני and the tetragrammaton, *viz.* TgSam's preference for יי or one of its variant spellings.<sup>5</sup> Monotheism plays a role in the distinction between God and idols, between God's priests and idol priests, and even between prophets and scribes.<sup>6</sup>

Reverence for the God of Israel also resulted in reverence for the people of Israel, especially for the righteous among them, *i.e.* those who kept the Torah. Their behaviour is, as far as possible, cleared from evil and errors. Their deeds and words are adjusted to contemporary halakha, albeit not in every possible case.<sup>7</sup> Euphemisms are introduced to avoid terms of abuse.<sup>8</sup> In this respect it must be noted that TgSam uses a certain amount of polarization between good and bad.<sup>9</sup> Whereas the Biblical heroes are depicted as being as righteous as possible, the wicked Israelites and Israel's enemies are depicted as being as evil as possible. Terms of abuse are replaced by euphemisms with regard to heroes, but maintained with regard to villains.<sup>10</sup> The tendency to polarize appears to be stronger than TgSam's longing for clarity and consistency in its translation.

### 7.1.2 Reverence for the Sacred Text

The Aramaic version of TJon is based on what was later called the Masoretic Text. Within this textual tradition TJon provided a translation for nearly every Hebrew word, keeping as closely as possible to the original order. This characteristic made it possible and useful to make a *bilingual* concordance to TJon of the Prophets.<sup>11</sup>

Omissions are very rare. The most frequently occurring omission

2 Sam. 22:3, 7, 26, 47; 23:4. Active forms which are substituted by the *passivum divinum* can be found in 1 Sam. 1:5, 6; 2:4 (twice), 5 (twice), 9, 30; 3:8, 10, 21; 6:9; 9:6 (twice), 15, 17; 10:26; 13:14; 15:16; 18:17, 21; 24:21; 26:10, 19; 2 Sam. 12:22; 21:22; 22:10, 11, 42; 23:5, 7 (twice); 24:14 (twice). See above, Ch. 3, >23.

<sup>4</sup>1 Sam. 7:6; 13:1; 2 Sam. 7:14; 22:9. See above, Ch. 3, >25.

<sup>5</sup>See above, Ch. 4, *s.vv.* Hebrew ארין, Hebrew אלהים, and Aramaic יי.

<sup>6</sup>See above, Ch. 3, >22; Ch. 4, *s.vv.* Hebrew נבא, אלהי ם, Aramaic יי.

<sup>7</sup>See above, Ch. 3, >24; Ch. 4, *s.vv.* Hebrew זבח, אפוד.

<sup>8</sup>1 Sam. 24:3, 16; 25:22; 26:20; 2 Sam. 3:8; 9:8, 12:14. See above, Ch. 3, *s.v.* "euphemisms", >23, >24.

<sup>9</sup>See above, Ch. 4, *s.v.* Hebrew שלל.

<sup>10</sup>See above, Ch. 3, >24.

<sup>11</sup>J.C. de Moor *et al.* (eds), *Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets*, Leiden 1995-. Cf. W.F. Smelik, "Concordance and Consistency: Translation Studies and Targum Jonathan", *JJS* 49 (1998), 286-305.

is that of the interrogative prefix in order to substitute an affirmative statement for a rhetorical question, but these omissions are not attested in the majority of manuscripts.<sup>12</sup> Transpositions are even more rare in TgSam. They are used once to avoid the juxtaposition of the word "God" and the adjective "evil" (1 Sam. 16:15-16), and once more to explain a phrase as metaphorical language in order to avoid the mentioning of a libation without a priest (1 Sam. 7:6). In some verses the paraphrastic rendering makes it impossible to determine which Aramaic word represents the Hebrew original.<sup>13</sup> However, in other paraphrases the equivalence is still clear.<sup>14</sup>

Reverence for the text<sup>15</sup> often caused the translators to refrain from adding the outcome of halakhic discussions to the text. Such discussions are represented in some tosefta-targumim, e.g. on the guilt of Eli's sons (1 Sam. 2:22) and on the legitimacy of David's marriages (1 Sam. 18:19). Reverence held the translators back from identifying and naming anonymous people in the Hebrew Bible, unless the new name could be derived from the Biblical text itself. Michal is not identified with Merab (2 Sam. 21:8), although the Hebrew text is rather corrupt here. The unknown judge Bedan is identified with Samson, because the Hebrew name suggests that the judge was a descendant of Dan, as was Samson (1 Sam. 12:11).<sup>16</sup>

Reverence for the text of the Books of Samuel even deterred the translators from harmonizing that text with the Books of Chronicles, unless it fitted into the framework of their own exegetical techniques and theological motives. The version of the Chronicler appears to be less important than that of the prophetic books of Samuel. Names and numbers are not adjusted to the Chronicler's version, and textual problems are solved, rather than being replaced by the Chronicler's text.<sup>17</sup> The Midrashic debates on how to harmonize the parallel stories of Samuel and Chronicles, which must have been held alongside the redaction process of TgSam, are not represented in the Aramaic version. The reverence for the Hebrew text and the reticence of the translators were greater than their desire for harmony.

<sup>12</sup>This prefix is only omitted in 1 Sam. 2:27. It is replaced by the particle כִּי in 1 Sam. 1:8 (Kimḥi); 1 Sam. 10:24 (MSS a f); 15:17 (MS a); 15:22 (MS b); 16:11 (Fr); 17:25 (Fr). See above, Ch. 3, s.v. "Rhetorical Questions".

<sup>13</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 2:4-5, 8-10; 10:7.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 3:12; 9:6; 2 Sam. 23:1-8.

<sup>15</sup>However, note that TgSam's reverence was not as overwhelming as R. Aqiba's was; see below, § 7.2.1.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 2:27; 4:7; 12:10; 28:7, 13; 31:4; 2 Sam. 3:5; 6:23; 10:16; 17:27; 20:16; 21:16, 19; 23:8. See above, Ch. 3, >17.

<sup>17</sup>See above, § 3.4.

This reverence for the Hebrew text remained during the redaction process of TgSam and the later copying process of the manuscripts. In many cases a translation is provided—in a textual tradition or even in a single manuscript—which is more in agreement with the Hebrew text than the majority translation. The various Hebraisms, attested in several manuscripts, fit in with this impression of TgSam's character.<sup>18</sup>

### 7.1.3 Theology of Revelation

The theological motive behind TgSam's reverence for the Hebrew text is best described with the word "revelation". The Hebrew Bible was conceived of as God's revelation to the people of Israel, and was therefore considered important, down to the smallest detail. Every word, even every letter, had to be translated and clarified.

This theology of revelation induced some other characteristics of TgSam. First, the text always had a meaning which should be clarified for the benefit of the readers and hearers. If there were exegetical problems, the letters and words had to be explored until the meaning of the text was discovered. The translators had several techniques at their disposal to achieve this goal.<sup>19</sup>

A related goal was that of achieving unambiguity in the translation. The vast majority of the verses show only one translation, although various explanations are known from Midrashic or Talmudic literature. In the exceptional cases where TgSam gives a multiple translation of a word or phrase, the final rendering of the verse did not result in an ambiguous translation. Multiple translations exist that do not contradict each other.<sup>20</sup> They are added for the sake of clarity or reverence, such as the various translations of a double duty verb and the cases of diversification to distinguish between the heavenly and the human realm. Sometimes multiple translations explain the two shades of the original Hebrew word.<sup>21</sup> Other multiple translations explain each other, mostly because a metaphor is juxtaposed with its explanation.<sup>22</sup>

Secondly, the belief that the Hebrew text was God's revelation led to the conclusion that the Bible is a coherent book without contradictions, since ultimately there was only one Writer. Several techniques were used to show the harmony of the Biblical texts, especially of the

<sup>18</sup>See above, Ch. 3, >29.

<sup>19</sup>See above, Ch. 3, >1-5.

<sup>20</sup>2 Sam. 18:3; 23:3.

<sup>21</sup>1 Sam. 9:5.

<sup>22</sup>1 Sam. 2:1-4, 31; 2 Sam. 22:5.

Torah and the Prophets, and other techniques were used to increase the unity and coherence of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>23</sup>

One of the techniques to stress the unity and the coherence of Scripture would be consistency in the choosing of Aramaic equivalents for Hebrew words. One look at the Hebrew-Aramaic Indexes of the *Bilingual Concordance*, however, shows that the Aramaic version did not rigidly use one equivalent for one word. Apart from the fact that a one-to-one translation would hinder the clarity of the Aramaic version, distinguishing between the various meanings of a Hebrew word served other goals. Chapter 4 shows that a distinction was made to polarize between good and evil; between God and the idols; between the heavenly and the earthly realms; and to adapt Biblical heroes to contemporaneous halakha.

On the other hand, TgSam achieved a high level of consistency. The semantic studies of Chapter 4 show that a policy existed with regard to the choice of equivalents. In almost all cases of various equivalents for one Hebrew word a general rule could be obtained, revealing under which circumstances TJon's translators chose which equivalent. Exceptions are rare in the main version, although variant readings in the particular manuscripts show that not every copyist was aware of these rules.

Thirdly, some texts were considered more revelatory than others. Especially poetic parts of TgSam were taken as prophecy. These parts are treated differently, in so far as a thorough explanation is added and that repetition of words and strong parallelism are diversified. The Song of Hannah is turned into an apocalypse, describing the history of Israel until the final defeat of all their enemies. The Song of David becomes a song of thanksgiving concerning God's miraculous deeds to the Patriarchs and the people of Israel, when they were enslaved in Egypt. This song, too, ends with the description of the final defeat of all the aggressive enemies. The Last Words of David are converted into a depiction of the final judgment on the righteous and the wicked, as well as the reign of the Messiah. In these poetic sections the influence of R. Aqiba's school is noticeable: when words are repeated or parallels are used, each is given a different meaning in order to reduce the thought of redundancy in Scripture.

Fourthly, the same belief in God's revelation made the translators strive for relevance. If God revealed his will in the Hebrew Bible, it

---

<sup>23</sup>See above, Ch. 3, >15-16. One must bear in mind that TgSam is a translation of the Hebrew text of the Books of Samuel. The translators accepted the Hebrew text and did not add the many Midrashic harmonizations with the Books of Chronicles; see above.

must also have a relevance to contemporary times. Place-names and customs are modernized,<sup>24</sup> vague sentences are typologically assigned to well-known events in Israel's history,<sup>25</sup> and some formulations make the reader feel that he himself is addressed.<sup>26</sup> The latter phrases occur mainly in the poetic sections which are conceived of as prophecy by TgSam. This again stresses the fact that some texts were considered more revelatory, and therefore more relevant for the contemporary readers.

#### 7.1.4 Susceptibility to Poetic and Rhetorical Devices

The translators of TgSam show themselves surprisingly susceptible to poetic and rhetorical devices. In many cases TgSam conscientiously represented the poetic and rhetorical devices of the Hebrew text, or compensated for the loss of them. Sometimes rhetorical figures could not be preserved, because key words were used in various senses or the Hebrew grammar could not be expressed in the Aramaic language. At other times TgSam did not preserve figures of speech, because the use of metaphors and ultra-short formulations would endanger the clarity of the version; or the internal coherence of the Biblical text would be lost; or these devices would result in a wrong theology; or the good name of a Biblical hero was at stake.

With regard to the phonetic features of poetry it is clear that TgSam often compensated for their loss. Alliteration, assonance, and even rhyme are used to represent the Hebrew poetry by Aramaic poetry. Alliteration and assonance can be found in many poetic and prose sections of TgSam;<sup>27</sup> rhyme is especially incorporated in the translation of 2 Sam. 22. It must be noted that TJon repeatedly uses repetition to render Hebrew synonyms.<sup>28</sup> The Aramaic poetry is therefore less complex than Hebrew poetry.

The structural features of Hebrew poetry, such as parallelism and chiasms, were easier to preserve. The Aramaic version differs from its Hebrew original in two respects, *viz.* in the length of its sentences because of small clarifying additions, and in the use of repetitive instead of synonymous parallelism. The latter difference is due to TgSam's tendency to simplify the translation, equating several Hebrew words with one Aramaic rendering. Sometimes the structure of a Hebrew strophe is enhanced in the Aramaic version, *e.g.* by introducing

<sup>24</sup>See above, Ch. 3, >19.

<sup>25</sup>See above, Ch. 3, >20.

<sup>26</sup>See above, Ch. 3, >21.

<sup>27</sup>*E.g.* 1 Sam. 2:7-8; 17:4; 2 Sam. 1:22-23.

<sup>28</sup>*E.g.* 1 Sam. 24:16; and the use of the stem 𐤏𐤓 in 2 Sam. 22.

strongly antithetical parallelism.<sup>29</sup>

The semantic features of the poetic sections are often replaced by a clear and unambiguous translation. TgSam rarely adds a semantic device in its poetry.<sup>30</sup> The aim of achieving clarity appears to be strong with regard to semantic features.<sup>31</sup>

The conclusion can be drawn that TgSam tried not only to translate the meaning of the Hebrew Books of Samuel, but also to preserve the original rhetorical flavour of its original, as much as possible. The lists of rhetorical devices in Chapter 3 show that the preservation of any figure of speech was always subordinate to the version's clarity, coherence, reverence and theological integrity (see below, § 7.3.1).<sup>32</sup>

### 7.1.5 Unity

Neither the lists of rhetorical devices and exegetical techniques of Chapter 3 nor the semantic studies of Chapter 4 indicate any discontinuity in the translation of the Books of Samuel. What can be said is that the most expanded chapters belong to the first twenty chapters of 1 Samuel and to the last chapters of 2 Samuel—a phenomenon that often occurs in the Aramaic versions of Biblical books. The chapters in-between are significantly less expanded. It is also noteworthy that most exceptions to the rule that TgSam followed the Qere are found in the second half of 2 Samuel.<sup>33</sup> It seems that the redaction of TgSam became less strict as the work progressed. Finally, the chapters of TgSam that were used as a *haftara* in the annual cycle are more expanded than the others. The influence of the synagogal readings can be traced, although these chapters still belong to the same translational tradition and use the same exegetical techniques.

Therefore, the conclusion is justified that TgSam forms a unity. The enormous consistency with which Hebrew words are translated and the constantly present reverence for God and his people support this conclusion. It also supports the assumption that this Aramaic translation was not created by one person at a particular point in time, but that it reached its final stage through a long redaction process.<sup>34</sup>

The semantic studies in Chapter 4, carried out in the Former

<sup>29</sup>Cf. 2 Sam. 18:33; 22:22.

<sup>30</sup>Except in 2 Sam. 22:5, 9.

<sup>31</sup>See above, § 3.2.4.6.

<sup>32</sup>See above, §§ 3.2.3.6 and 3.2.4.6.

<sup>33</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 2:16, but not in MSS a b c f<sub>4</sub> m w y eb1 B D J S; 2 Sam. 15:21; 22:47. Furthermore in 1 Sam. 18:14 (MSS p eb66); 22:22 (MS eb66); 2 Sam. 12:9 (MSS a c d y); 12:24 (MSS o w y); 18:12 (MS m); 21:21 (MS S).

<sup>34</sup>Cf. a similar conclusion for TgJudg in Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 642.



Prophets with special regard to TgSam, show a great amount of unity within TJon to the Former Prophets. The translation of the Hebrew words and the usage of the Aramaic words indicate that the redaction process was closely similar for these books. TgSam appears to be stricter only with regard to idols, prophets and high places.<sup>35</sup> Every reference to idols uses the Aramaic ܡܥܘܪܐ, even in the mouth of their worshippers.<sup>36</sup> It is remarkable that even in the toseftot in TgSam all idols are called ܡܥܘܪܐ.<sup>37</sup> Every high place in the Books of Samuel is turned into a banqueting hall or fortress, in contrast to the Targum to the Books of Kings.<sup>38</sup>

## 7.2 The Early History of TgSam

The early history of TgSam is veiled, but some remarks can be made concerning the time and place of origin. Exegetical techniques, exegetical solutions and the relationship between TgSam and the lectionary cycles throw some light on the redaction process of this book.

### 7.2.1 Exegetical Techniques

With regard to the exegetical techniques used one must conclude that most of TgSam was written in the tradition of R. Ishmael. TgSam's reverence was not as overwhelming as R. Aqiba's was. The Targumic translational policy allowed deviant vocalizations, the replacement of collective singular nouns with plurals, or the adaptation of verbal tenses to the interpretation chosen. The Aramaic version also shows that particles and idiomatic expressions were considered normal linguistic features, and did not need special attention in the translation. TgSam did not avoid all parallelism and repetition, as R. Aqiba did in order to shun any thought of redundancy in the Bible. In this respect TgSam adopted R. Ishmael's view that the Bible had been written in ordinary human speech.

Some exegetical techniques were in use earlier, *e.g.* in the time of the origins of the New Testament. Matthew must be mentioned especially,<sup>39</sup> but similar techniques are also found in the Gospel of John, Romans and Hebrews.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>35</sup>See above, Ch. 4, *s.v.* Hebrew אלהים, במה, and גבא.

<sup>36</sup>The Philistines spoke about "Dagon, our idol" (1 Sam. 5:7; cf. 6:5) and Goliath cursed David by his idols (1 Sam. 17:43 and 1 Sam. 17:8 in the MSS a b c d w<sub>1</sub>). See above, Ch. 4, *s.v.* Hebrew אלהים.

<sup>37</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 17:8; 2 Sam. 21:17.

<sup>38</sup>See above, Ch. 4, *s.v.* Hebrew במה.

<sup>39</sup>See above, Ch. 3,  $\gamma$ -3;  $\gamma$ -12;  $\gamma$ -15;  $\gamma$ -18;  $\gamma$ -19;  $\gamma$ -23.

<sup>40</sup>See above, Ch. 3,  $\gamma$ -15;  $\gamma$ -18;  $\gamma$ -24.

### 7.2.2 Exegetical Choices

The exegetical choices made in TgSam can be compared to literature in the Second Temple Period and rabbinic times. The few correspondences with Qumranic literature cannot lead to any firm conclusion.<sup>41</sup> Similarities between TgSam and Pseudo-Philo's book lead to the conclusion that some toseftot may be related to Pseudo-Philo's stories.<sup>42</sup> But some similarities in the main text of TgSam are remarkable as well.<sup>43</sup> Many correspondences between TgSam and Josephus' *Antiquities* exist.<sup>44</sup> This concerns a Targumic way of interpreting the Hebrew text in most of the verses, which could be explained by supposing a similar exegetical environment of the two works. However, some exact correspondences<sup>45</sup> suggest that Josephus must have known some type of proto-TgSam.<sup>46</sup> Apart from the similarities in the use of exegetical techniques between TgSam and the New Testament, there are striking agreements in the use of words.<sup>47</sup> Corresponding exegetical choices are mainly found in the poetic sections of TgSam and in some toseftot.<sup>48</sup> The most remarkable agreement is the paraphrastic rendering of 2 Sam. 23:6-7 which is quite similar to a parable of Jesus (Mt. 13:24-30, 36-43).

Some exegetical solutions point to R. Aqiba's school. The debate concerning the holiness of the shewbread was held within this school. In both 2 Sam. 7:23 and 23:8 a teaching of R. Aqiba himself was incorporated in the Targumic text: "God did not save Himself from Egypt" and "The Messiah will sit on a throne to judge the world". Other teachings of R. Aqiba are found in tosefta-targumim (to 1 Sam. 15:17; 17:8, 18) or even contradicted (tosefta to 1 Sam. 2:6). This meagre result does not confirm Smolar and Aberbach's general statement that halakha in TJon is in conformity with the teaching of the school of Aqiba.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>41</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 8:16; 10:26; 2 Sam. 23:1.

<sup>42</sup>Cf. the toseftot to 1 Sam. 4:12; 17:4, 8, 43.

<sup>43</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 2:1-10; 3:7; 6:9; 12:3; 20:16.

<sup>44</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 1:15; 2:22; 7:6; 8:20; 9:6, 13, 21; 14:34, 35; 16:12; 17:35, 43 (tosefta), 23:28; 26:16; 31:10; 2 Sam. 5:18, 21; 8:4; 10:6; 11:8, 21; 12:30; 13:18; 15:30; 18:18, 29; 19:36; 23:20; 24:15.

<sup>45</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 8:20; 17:35; 26:16; 2 Sam. 11:21; 13:18; 23:20.

<sup>46</sup>A similar conclusion is drawn by R. Marcus, *Josephus with an English Translation* (The Loeb Classical Library), Vol. 5, viii, cited in W.H. Brownlee, "The Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan", *JJS* 7 (1956), 169-86, esp. 181-82.

<sup>47</sup>See above, Ch. 4, *s.vv.* Hebrew צַדִּיק, Aramaic חֹבֵּא, גִּבּוֹר, יִקְרָא, and מִיִּמְרָא.

<sup>48</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 2:1-10; 13:14; 17:43 tosefta; 2 Sam. 21:19 tosefta; 22:17; 23:1-8.

<sup>49</sup>Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*, 1.

Agreements between TgSam and teachings of other rabbis point to the second and third centuries CE. Of the second century R. Yose b. Halafta (1 Sam. 1:11; 2 Sam. 7:23), R. Ishmael (1 Sam. 9:13), R. Eleazar of Modi'im (1 Sam. 14:24), R. Isaac (1 Sam. 15:32) and R. Hiyya (1 Sam. 22:18; 2 Sam. 1:18) must be mentioned; of the third century R. Naḥman (1 Sam. 3:3), Rav and R. Judah (1 Sam. 8:9), R. Samuel b. Naḥman (1 Sam. 9:24), R. Abba b. Kahana (2 Sam. 6:1) and R. Joḥanan (2 Sam. 6:6). The Targumic exegesis of 1 Sam. 13:1 agrees with the fourth century R. Huna, while the paraphrastic rendering of 2 Sam. 23:6-7 agrees with the first century parable of Jesus (Mt. 13:24-30, 36-43).<sup>50</sup> These rabbis are of Palestinian origin, except Rav, R. Judah and R. Hiyya.

Other, vague resemblances between TgSam and rabbinic teachings point to the third and fourth centuries CE. In this respect R. Simeon b. Lakish (2 Sam. 22), R. Abba b. Kahana (1 Sam. 2:10) and R. Judah (2 Sam. 22:1) of the third, and R. Phinḥas (1 Sam. 1:1) and R. Huna of the fourth century must be mentioned. These rabbis were also living in Palestine, except R. Judah.

Agreements between the tosefta-targumim and rabbinic teachings point to the same centuries and the same place of origin as the official text of TgSam. Teachings of R. Eliezer b. Yose (1 Sam. 2:6; 17:43), R. Aqiba (1 Sam. 15:17; 17:8, 18) and R. Joshua b. Korḥa (1 Sam. 18:19) of the second century; and of R. Joshua b. Levi (1 Sam. 2:6), R. Samuel b. Naḥman (1 Sam. 2:22; 17:18; 2 Sam. 6:19), R. Abbaye (1 Sam. 3:14), R. Joḥanan (1 Sam. 28:19) and R. Judah (2 Sam. 21:19) are incorporated in several toseftot. Again the majority of these rabbis are Palestinian; only R. Abbaye and R. Judah are of Babylonian origin.

These agreements suggest that the basic TgSam originated between the first and the third centuries CE, most probably in Palestine. The great consistency of the translation, as well as the absence of any discontinuity in it, suggest a redaction process. However, the clear distinction between Targum and Midrash, the absence of harmonization with the text of Chronicles and the restricted use of some exegetical techniques, such as the *onomasticon*, make the assumption

<sup>50</sup>In an article on the comparison between the Targumim and the New Testament Chilton concludes from the absence of a common, literary understanding of Biblical passages that the Targumim had not fully emerged by the first century. However, common wording associated with the same text of Scripture, common phrasing and common thematic emphasis show that "the Targumim represent traditions which were a formative influence on the tradition of the Gospels at an early stage"; cf. B.D. Chilton, "Four Types of Comparison Between the Targumim and the New Testament", *JAB* 2 (2000), 163-88, esp. 184.

of a very long and intensive redaction process in Palestine improbable. The time when the text of TgSam was considered authoritative must have come fairly soon after its initial origin. This conclusion is supported by the fact that later copyists made their corrections within the translational tradition of TgSam. This tradition was obviously known and respected, even in later centuries. The many literal correspondences found between Pseudo-Jerome's commentary on the Books of Samuel and TgSam<sup>51</sup> suggest that by the ninth century CE<sup>52</sup> the main redactional process had definitely been finalized.

In short, it seems reasonable to apply Smelik's conclusion concerning the date of TgJudg to the date of TgSam: "It seems reasonable to assume the proto-Targum of Judges existed prior to the Bar Kokhba revolt, underwent at least one revision in the second half of the second century CE, and was perhaps occasionally revised in the Amoraic period so as to bring TJon into agreement with later exegesis."<sup>53</sup>

### 7.2.3 Lectionary Cycles

Some chapters from the Books of Samuel are used in the annual cycle. It is remarkable that these chapters are more or less the most expanded chapters of TgSam. More than half of all the verses of TJon 1 Samuel, and less than half of the verses of TJon 2 Samuel contain one or more expansions compared to the MT. If the standard expansions, *i.e.* words like קרם or מִי־מֵרָא, are not taken into account, a third of the verses of 1 Samuel and a fifth of the verses of 2 Samuel are expanded.<sup>54</sup> The most expanded chapters are 1 Sam. 1, 2, 4, 11, 15, 16, 20, 21; 2 Sam. 7, 21, 22 and 23.<sup>55</sup> Seven of these twelve chapters

<sup>51</sup>Cf. 1 Sam. 2:7; 3:7; 6:19; 9:7, 13; 10:3, 12; 12:11; 13:1; 15:29; 17:18; 18:13; 22:18; 2 Sam. 2:9; 3:8; 5:6, 21, 24; 6:23 (tosefta); 8:18; 17:17, 20; 18:8; 20:18; 21:5, 8; 23:20.

<sup>52</sup>Cf. A. Saltman, *Pseudo-Jerome: Quaestiones on the Book of Samuel*, Leiden 1975, 12.

<sup>53</sup>Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 642. For similar views, see B.D. Chilton, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOT.S, 23), Sheffield 1983, 2-4, 97-102; Idem, *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes* (AramB, 11), Edinburgh 1987, xx-xxv; Idem, "Two in One: Renderings of the Book of Isaiah in Targum Jonathan", in: C.G. Broyles, C.A. Evans (eds), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretative Tradition* (VT.S, 70/2), Leiden 1997, 547-62; J.C. de Moor, "Multiple Renderings in the Targum of Isaiah", paper read at the third meeting of the IOTS, Basel August 2-3, 2001, forthcoming in *JAB* 3 (2001).

<sup>54</sup>These figures have been obtained by simply counting the words in the Hebrew and Aramaic texts, and comparing the outcome.

<sup>55</sup>I took the chapters of 1 Samuel which contain more than 40% expanded verses

are used as *haftarot* in the annual cycle. Only the *haftara* of 1 Sam. 12 does not belong to these twelve chapters. This chapter is largely expanded, but most expansions are standard ones.

Such a relationship between *haftarot* and expanded chapters of Tg-Sam does not exist within the context of the triennial cycle. Some *haftarot*, unique to the triennial cycle, are largely expanded, e.g. 1 Sam. 4 and 16, but others are expanded below the average, e.g. 1 Sam. 5 and 2 Sam. 5.

There is no direct relationship between tosefta-targumim and any cycle. Toseftot are added to fifteen chapters of the Books of Samuel. Some chapters belong to the annual cycle, e.g. 1 Sam. 2, 12; 2 Sam. 21, 22. Some chapters belong to the triennial cycle, e.g. 1 Sam. 4 and 11. Some chapters do not belong to any cycle, e.g. 1 Sam. 3, 10, 18; 2 Sam. 12.

Within the annual cycle there is no evidence that the Torah reading had a strong influence on the translation of the *haftarot*. Agreements between the Torah reading and its corresponding *haftara* exist in the Hebrew text, but are not stressed or enhanced in the Aramaic version. A literal agreement is found between Num. 16:1–18:32 and 1 Sam. 11:14–12:22, but this may be the result of associative translation based on the agreement found in the Hebrew text. The only exception is 2 Sam. 22. The translation of this psalm is clearly affected by the Song of Deliverance (Exod. 15) and the Song of Moses (Deut. 32).<sup>56</sup>

There is no evidence either that the Torah readings of the triennial cycle influenced the Aramaic translation of the accompanying *haftarot*. Only some vague resemblances between Gen. 29–30 and 1 Sam. 1 must be mentioned, although these may be due to the agreements between the Hebrew text of these passages.

The fact that the annual cycle affected the redaction process of TgSam could lead to the conclusion that TgSam was finally revised in Babylonia,<sup>57</sup> unless one accepts Mann and Sonne's theory that the annual cycle was also used in Judea.<sup>58</sup> If the latter is true, TgSam could have reached its final stage in Judea, before it was adopted by Babylonian Jewry.

---

and the chapters of 2 Samuel which contain more than 25% expanded verses, in order to get a significant difference from the average chapter. The average chapter of 1 Samuel is expanded 33%, while the average chapter of 2 Samuel is expanded 19%.

<sup>56</sup>See above, commentary before 2 Sam. 22:1.

<sup>57</sup>Supported by P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, London 1947, 119.

<sup>58</sup>J. Mann, I. Sonne, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, Vol. 1, 1940; repr. New York 1971, xxiii.

### 7.3 Poetry, Prophecy, Eschatology, Messianism

The translation of Hebrew poetry in TJon has been the subject of a long debate. The difference in style between the fairly literal version of TJon in general and the expansive translation of some poems is striking. The fact that two poems (1 Sam. 2:1-10; 2 Sam. 23:1-8) are turned into apocalyptic prophecies also requires attention. In this section the triggers for these facts are presented.

#### 7.3.1 Poetry

The large poetic sections (2 Sam. 1:19-27; 22; 23:1-7) and most of the smaller poetic fragments (*e.g.* 1 Sam. 15:29; 2 Sam. 3:33-34; 18:33) of the Hebrew text are translated in poetry. The Song of Hannah (1 Sam. 2:1-10), although containing a certain amount of poetic and rhetorical devices, is basically represented in prose. This may be due to its genre in the Aramaic version, for it is turned into an apocalyptic vision and Biblical apocalypses are not written in poetry—at least, to a large extent.

Furthermore, it is remarkable that some poetic sections are largely expanded and that other sections are translated fairly literally. On the one hand, the elegies on Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. 1:19-27), Abner (2 Sam. 3:33-34) and Absalom (2 Sam. 19:1) are clarified with some supplementary words, but have almost the same length and poetic structure as the Hebrew originals. On the other hand, the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. 2:1-10), Samuel's prophecy concerning God's reliability (1 Sam. 15:29), David's Psalm (2 Sam. 22) and David's Last Words (2 Sam. 23:1-7) are much more expanded and sometimes differ from their Hebrew original in structure and character.

A connection between these extremely expansive translations and the lectionary cycles cannot be established.<sup>59</sup> Whereas the Song of Hannah and the Psalm of David belong to the annual cycle, David's Last Words is not a part of either cycle. However, the latter poem is extremely expanded.

The expansive translations of some poetic sections have led some scholars to believe that two different schools of translators had been at work in TJon. One school adhered to a literal translation as far as possible, while the other school had handled its text quite freely. The latter school could especially be traced in prophetic and poetic sections.<sup>60</sup> However, assumption of two schools of translators is im-

<sup>59</sup>Cf. also Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*, 176-79.

<sup>60</sup>Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, Vol. 4b, 3; following Frankel, "Zu dem Tar-

probable. First, it does not explain why some poems are translated quite literally and others not. Secondly, it gives no reason why two styles of translation were allowed within one Aramaic version. Thirdly, it does not take into account Churgin's helpful, but also partial, explanation that the poetic and prophetic portions of the Bible were rendered more freely because of their difficult and terse style.<sup>61</sup>

It must be noted that some of the Hebrew poems surpass what is expected in the direct context, especially the Songs of Deborah (Judg. 5), Hannah (1 Sam. 2:1-10), and David (2 Sam. 22), and David's Last Words (2 Sam. 23:1-7).<sup>62</sup> These four major poems in the Hebrew text contain very general statements concerning the relationship between Israel and its God, while they also refer to a future which would normally be unknown in the period of the speaker. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that they are placed at certain crucial points in Israel's history: the Song of Deborah at the beginning of the period of Judges, the Song of Hannah which acts as prelude to the account of the institution of the monarchy, and the two poems of David which end the account of the founding of David's dynasty and also introduce the narrative of its continuation under his successors.<sup>63</sup> Finally, the connections between these four poems in the Hebrew text must not be overlooked. To mention a few: God as the Rock (1 Sam. 2:2; 2 Sam. 22:3), the images of theophany (Judg. 5:4-5; 2 Sam. 22:8-16), the parable of the rising sun (Judg. 5:31; 2 Sam. 23:4) and the anointed king (1 Sam. 2:10; 2 Sam. 22:51; 23:1).<sup>64</sup>

It is therefore likely that the translators of the Former Prophets aimed not only to clarify the terse style of Hebrew poetry, but also to represent the larger significance of the source text, notably their transcending the immediate context, their placement at crucial points in Israel's history, and their mutual relationships. This resulted in a translation that evidently transcended its context and referred to all the peaks and low points of Israel's history.

A general overview can be extracted from these four major poems:

---

gum", 41-43; see above, § 1.2.3; followed by A.S. Rodrigues Pereira, *Studies in Aramaic Poetry (c. 100 B.C.E.-c. 600 C.E.): Selected Jewish, Christian and Samaritan Poems*, Leiden (diss.) 1996, 27.

<sup>61</sup>Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 36, see above § 1.2.7.

<sup>62</sup>Cf. J.W. Wesselius, "Completeness and Closure in Targumic Literature: The Emulation of Biblical Hebrew Poetry in Targum Jonathan to the Former Prophets", paper read at the third meeting of the IOTS, Basel August 2-3, 2001, forthcoming in *JAB* 3 (2001). The same is true for Jacob's Last Words (Gen. 49), which is expansively translated in TO.

<sup>63</sup>Cf. Wesselius, "Completeness and Closure in Targumic Literature".

<sup>64</sup>See § 5.3.3 on the similarities between Hannah's and David's Song.

the Patriarchs (2 Sam. 22:26-27), the wicked pharaoh and the Exodus (2 Sam. 22:9, 27), Moses and Aaron (2 Sam. 22:17), Sinai and the Torah (Judg. 5:4-5), the Judges (Judg. 5), Samuel (1 Sam. 2:1), the rise of the Davidic dynasty (2 Sam. 22; 23:1-3, 5), the Temple (1 Sam. 2:1), the series of oppressing enemies, including Rome (1 Sam. 2:1-5), rabbinic teaching (Judg. 5:2, 9), resurrection of the righteous (Judg. 5:31; 1 Sam. 2:6; 2 Sam. 23:4), punishment of the wicked (1 Sam. 2:8-9; 2 Sam. 23:6-7), the war against Gog (1 Sam. 2:10; 2 Sam. 22:49), and the reign of the Messiah (1 Sam. 2:10; 2 Sam. 23:8). The similarities between the Hebrew poems are maintained and expanded in the Aramaic version, especially in the Songs of Hannah and David.

Consequently, it is not necessary to ascribe the two styles to two schools of translators. It suffices to state that TJon represents as far as possible the true nature of the original text, including its poetic characteristics and its proleptic nature.

### 7.3.2 Prophecy, Eschatology, Messianism

It is clear that those Hebrew poems—or parts of Hebrew poems—that transcend their context and seem to refer to a future beyond that of the poet, are considered prophecy concerning the future in TJon. In TgSam this applies to the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. 2:1-10) and the Last Words of David (2 Sam. 23:1-7), as well as some verses of David's Psalm (2 Sam. 22:28-29, 49). Nonetheless, the entire Psalm of David is headed "And David praised in a prophetic spirit . . ." (2 Sam. 22:1). This poem, equally transcending its context, but mainly referring to the past, is also considered prophecy. Prophecy appears to be defined as the interpretation of events, in history, in the present times and in the future.<sup>65</sup>

Since he considered Hannah's Song to be prophecy, the Targumist had no difficulty in associating the various lines with various aspects of Israel's future. By associative rendering and applying Daniel's historical scheme of the four empires to the first half of Hannah's Song the latter is turned into a summary of all the foreign powers that conquered Israel. Supported by some imperfections in the second half of Hannah's Song the translator looked to a more distant future. Words like "Sheol" (1 Sam. 2:6), "darkness" (2:9) and "ends of the world" (2:10) also resulted in an eschatological interpretation. The combination of the ends of the world and the title of the Messiah induced the depiction of the final war between Gog and the Messiah (2:10).

<sup>65</sup>Comparable to Josephus' definition of prophecy, cf. L.H. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Samuel", *Abr-Nahrain* 30 (1992), 103-41, esp. 103.



David's Psalm is considered a prophecy concerning the past of Israel and David. However, some verses are applied to Israel's future. This future direction is affected by the imperfects in the Hebrew text (2 Sam. 22:28-29, 49). The contrast "light || darkness" gave rise to a remark about the world to come (22:29). The war against Gog is inserted in the Aramaic version (22:49), probably induced by the combination of the Messiah and the final words "forever" (22:51).

In David's Last Words it is easier to distinguish the separate triggers for prophetic, eschatological and messianic interpretation.<sup>66</sup> Apart from its general content, transcending its context, some words gave rise to a prophetic explanation. Hebrew האחרנים is considered a reference to the end of days, probably because האחרנים can also mean "end, future" and is sometimes used in eschatological prophecies. The combination of נאם and a human name is rare in the Hebrew Bible. In most cases this word is used in combination with God's name, יהוה נאם. Therefore, this phrase also led the Targumist to render the last words of David as a prophecy, an utterance from God. This is paralleled in TO Num. 24:15-17. A further motive for the prophetic interpretation is the mentioning of the Holy Spirit in 2 Sam. 23:2. In rabbinic theology God's Spirit is connected with prophecy. This is paralleled in the works of Josephus, but also in Tg 1 Sam. 2:1-10 where it is said of Hannah that she spoke in the Spirit of prophecy.

Eschatology comes within sight with some other words, which are used figuratively. The image of sunlight gave rise to the interpretation of the Last Judgment. On the basis of Prov. 4:18 and Dan. 12:3, the future of the righteous was depicted in terms of "the lights of heaven". This is paralleled in many rabbinic discourses where "light" is interpreted as the future of the righteous and "darkness" or "night" is seen as a simile for Gehenna (cf. TJon 1 Sam. 2:9 and 2 Sam. 22:29). Within the sphere of the Last Judgment, the use of the word "rain" was another trigger, because rain as well as dew is often associated with the resurrection of the dead. The fact that David's kingdom is said to be 'secured' (נִטָּר) led the translator to think of the world to come, as in 1 Sam. 2:9 which says that God "secures the bodies of his servants from Gehenna". The combination of weeds (thorns) and fire is well-known and often used as a simile for the Last Judgment in both Jewish and Christian literature. Gehenna is compared to a smoking furnace or punishment by means of the sun, the heat of the day or a consuming fire within the wicked person himself. The strongest parallel can be found in Jesus' parable of the weeds (Mt. 13:24-30, 36-43).

<sup>66</sup>Cf. E. van Staalduine-Sulman, "Reward and Punishment in the Messianic Age (Targ. 2 Sam. 23.1-8)", *JAB* 1 (1999), 273-296.

The entire picture in the Hebrew poem—the sun healing the righteous people and burning the wicked—is also used for the Last Judgment. On the basis of Mal. 3:19-20, R. Simeon b. Lakish used it as a depiction of the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked.

Nothing specifically messianic is mentioned yet. The messianic idea is brought in by means of the following triggers. The word משיח (verse 1) in combination with this eschatological setting gives rise to a messianic interpretation (see also 1 Sam. 2:10). The same applies to the idea of a “ruler in the fear of the Lord”. According to Isa. 11:2-3, the fear of the Lord will be one of the characteristics of the Messiah. Other characteristics mentioned in Isa. 11:2 are used in the depiction of the Messiah of 2 Sam. 23:8, *viz.* wisdom, council and might. A further trigger is formed by the words “arranged || secured” in connection with David’s kingdom. These adjectives are only suitable for the kingdom of the Messiah. Finally, the combination of David and the unknown Hebrew word *Josheb-bashebeth*, after the use of בשבה in the preceding verse for the thrones of the judges, led the translator to interpret David as the Last Judge, surrounded by elders and prophets, judging the world.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## INDICES

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Abbreviations

---

Abbreviations according to S.M. Schwertner, *Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete*, Berlin <sup>2</sup>1992. For the books of the Bible, deuterocanonical and Judaic literature, common abbreviations are used (see Schwertner, xxxi-xli). In addition, the following abbreviations have been adopted:

⋈3	reference to the exegetical techniques in Chapter 3
◇	reference to Chapter 4
AramB	M. McNamara (ed.), <i>The Aramaic Bible</i> , Edinburgh
BCTP	J.C. de Moor (ed.), <i>A Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets</i> , Leiden
CR	<i>Codex Reuchlinianus</i>
CritRR	Critical Review of Books in Religion (Atlanta)
FT	Fragmentary Targum (instead of TFrag)
HUC.MS	Hebrew Union College Monograph Series
JAB	Journal for the Aramaic Bible
MS A*	original reading
MS A <sup>c</sup>	corrected reading
MS A <sup>m</sup>	marginal reading
SSJC	Sources for the Study of Jewish Culture (Jerusalem)
Tg	the targum of a specific book, e.g. in TgSam
y	Palestinian (Talmud) (instead of Yalquṭ Shimoni)
YalqS	Yalquṭ Shimoni

The abbreviations for the states of the United States of America are conform to the U.S. Postal Service.

The first time a work is cited full bibliographical details are given. Afterwards abbreviated titles are used for ca. 10 pages. After that full bibliographical details are repeated, if necessary. The following short-titles are used throughout the volume:

Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen":

W. Bacher, "Kritische Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum", *ZDMG* 28 (1874), 1-72; 29 (1885), 157.

Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*:

P. Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, New Haven 1907; repr. Yale (YOS.R 14) 1980.

Dalman, *Grammatik*:

G.H. Dalman, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*, Leipzig <sup>2</sup>1905.

Dalman, *Handwörterbuch*:

G.H. Dalman, *Aramäisches-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*, Frankfurt a.M. <sup>2</sup>1922.

Driver, *Notes*:

S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, Oxford <sup>2</sup>1913.

Frankel, "Zu dem Targum":

Z. Frankel, "Zu dem Targum der Propheten", *Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars "Fraenkel'scher Stiftung"*, Breslau 1872, 1-48.

Ginzberg, *Legends*:

L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 6 Vols., Philadelphia <sup>12</sup>1968.

Harrington, Saldarini, *Former Prophets*:

D.J. Harrington, J.J. Saldarini, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (AramB, 10), Wilmington (DE), 1987.

Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve*:

H. Helfgott, *Sámuel második könyve Tárgumának viszonya a maszórai szöveghez*, Budapest 1940.

Jastrow, *Dictionary* :

M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, 2 vols., New York 1950.

Josephus, *Antiquities*:

H. St. John Thackeray, R. Marcus, *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities*, Books V-VIII (Loeb Classical Library, 281), Cambridge & London 1988.

Kasher, תוספתות:

R. Kasher, תוספתות תרגום לנביאים (SSJC, 2), Jeruzalem 1996.

Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום:

Y. Komlosh, המקרא באור התרגום, Tel Aviv 1973.

Levy, *CWT*:

J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums*, 2 Bde., Leipzig 1867-1868.

Levy, *WTM*:

J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim and Midraschim*, Berlin & Wien <sup>2</sup>1924.

McCarter, *I Samuel*:

P.K. McCarter, *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (AB, 8), New York 1980.

McCarter, *II Samuel*:

P.K. McCarter, *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (AB, 9), New York 1984.

Pseudo-Jerome, *Quaestiones*:

A. Saltman, *Pseudo-Jerome: Quaestiones on the Book of Samuel*, Leiden 1975.

Pseudo-Philo, *LAB*:

G. Kisch, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, Notre Dame 1949.

Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung*:

E. Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung des ersten Buches Samuelis und ihr Verhältniss zu MT., LXX und Trg.*, Berlin 1897.

Smelik, *The Targum of Judges*:

W.F. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges* (OTS, 36), Leiden 1995.

Smolar, Aberbach, *Targum Jonathan*:

L. Smolar, M. Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, New York & Baltimore 1978.

Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*:

A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*, 4 vols., Leiden 1959-73, repr. Leiden 1991.

Van Staaldaine-Sulman, *Samuel*:

E. van Staaldaine-Sulman, *Samuel* (BCTP, 3-5), Leiden 1996.

Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve*:

M. Vogel, *Sámuel első könyve Targumának viszonya a maszórai szöveghez*, Budapest 1939.



# Index of Authors

---

- Aber, F. 124  
Aberbach, D. 190  
Aberbach, M. 1, 2, 17, 19, 20, 35, 38-40, 45-6, 89, 106-7, 115, 118-121, 123, 126, 140, 142-4, 146, 150, 152, 157, 165, 171, 174, 181-2, 187, 190, 206, 218, 220, 229, 232, 248, 255, 257, 259-60, 265, 278, 283, 285, 289, 292-3, 308, 322, 324, 337, 356, 358, 367-8, 378, 409, 413, 417, 421, 435-6, 440-1, 461, 476, 479, 484, 487, 497, 504, 509-10, 513, 533-4, 538-9, 544, 554, 558, 562, 568, 582, 590, 599, 605, 611, 614, 617, 652, 693, 709  
Abraham ben Asher 602  
Abrahams, I. 385  
Abusch, T. 444  
Adler, M. 29  
Aharoni, Y. 264, 305, 462  
Albeck, Sh. 60, 615  
Albright, W.F. 119  
Alexander, P.S. 1, 88, 91, 110, 118, 123, 198, 545  
Alfonso Fontela, C. 55  
Althann, R. 301  
Anbar (Bernstein), M. 553  
Anderson, G.W. 20-1  
Antonioli Martelli, V. 54, 57  
Aptowitz, V. 3, 12-14, 18, 31, 35, 45, 146, 253, 344, 358, 415, 482, 618, 684  
Arnold, W.R. 493  
Assmann, J. 654  
Avi-Yonah, M. 264, 305, 614  
Avishur, Y. 181  
Ayerst, W. 33-4  
Büchler, A. 59-62, 186, 342, 401  
Bühlmann, W. 64, 66, 70, 72, 84, 125  
Bacher, W. 1-2, 5-7, 31, 44, 47, 102, 115, 130, 147-8, 157, 176, 256, 258, 269, 346-7, 351, 356-7, 402, 409, 416, 426, 434, 448, 454, 456, 469, 472, 474, 493-4, 499, 542, 553, 563, 573, 616-7, 685, 696  
Bakhuizen van den Brink, J. N. 128  
Balz, H. 164  
Barr, J. 90, 95-97, 104, 119, 120, 134-136, 139, 203, 247, 399, 424  
Barrett, C.K. 672  
Barthélemy, D. 3, 49, 294, 300-1, 554  
Bauer, W. 162, 172  
Beattie, D.R.G. 4, 29-30, 37-8, 41, 87, 89, 95, 100, 107, 118 130, 138  
Becker-Spörl, S. 206  
Begg, C.T. 627  
Bergen, R.D. 673  
Berger, D. 637-8  
Berlin, A. 648  
Bernstein, M.J. 375  
Bewer, J.A. 307, 669-70  
Beyer, K. 380  
Billerbeck, P. 125, 163, 346, 628, 651, 666-7, 680  
Bjoernstaehl, G.G. 54  
Blau, L. 269  
Blenkinsopp, J. 122, 516, 613, 669  
Blidstein, G.J. 228  
Blumberg, H.J. 150, 170, 279  
Boccaccini, G. 87  
Bombeck, S. 76, 249, 443, 450, 590  
Bons, E. 99-101, 103, 105, 111  
Bonsirven, J. 87  
Boström, O.H. 3  
Botterweck, G.J. 255  
Bowker, J. 2, 87, 96, 98, 666  
Bowman, J. 654  
Box, G.H. 167-8  
Braude, W.G. 82, 674  
Brauner, R.A. 332  
Brederek, E. 111  
Bregman, M. 61  
Brenner, A. 612  
Bressan, G. 510  
Brierre-Narbonne, J.J. 33-4  
Brock, S.P. 110  
Brockington, L.H. 3  
Brongers, H.A. 74, 82, 84-5, 227  
Brown, J.P. 3, 140, 158, 358, 431, 484, 510  
Brownlee, W.H. 709  
Broyles, C.G. 711  
Bruce, F.F. 672  
Brueggeman, W. 201, 549

- Buber, S. 24  
 Budde, K. 404  
 Bunte, W. 548  
 Burchard, C. 382  
 Burkitt, F.C. 167  
 Burney, C.F. 369  
 Camp, C.V. 568  
 Caquot, A. 242, 294, 296, 301, 343, 468,  
 553, 557-8  
 Carlebach, J. 8, 21  
 Carmignac, J. 344  
 Carmilly-Weinberger, M. 22, 24, 26  
 Carson, D.A. 110  
 Caspari, W. 343  
 Cathcart, K.J. 41, 118, 121, 167  
 Ceresko, A.R. 68, 362  
 Charlesworth, J.H. 527  
 Chernick, M.L. 100  
 Chester, A. 109, 140-142, 165  
 Childs, B.S. 117  
 Chilton, B.D. 2, 35, 39, 41, 121, 160,  
 166, 168, 180, 638, 709, 711  
 Churgin, P. 1-2, 17-23, 25-26, 30, 36, 38-  
 9, 45-6, 83, 85, 89, 98, 104, 106, 109,  
 111, 115, 119, 136, 142-145, 148,  
 187-189, 323, 327, 337, 417, 421,  
 496, 514, 523, 539-40, 546, 569, 595,  
 614, 714  
 Claassen, W.T. 234  
 Clines, D.J.A. 409  
 Cohen, M.E. 654  
 Collado-Bertomeu, V. 88  
 Collins, J.J. 207, 209, 213, 218-9, 356,  
 527, 666, 674, 684  
 Conrad, D. 332-3, 430  
 Cook, E.M. 16, 38, 41, 87, 667  
 Cook, J.E. 112, 199, 200, 213  
 Cooper, A. 513, 660, 667  
 Cornelius, I. 368  
 Cornill, C.H. 29, 89  
 Coxon, P.W. 550  
 Cross, F.M. 284  
 Crown, A.D. 78, 296, 510, 689  
 Curtis, E.L. 112, 122-3  
 Díez Macho, A. 2, 31, 37, 43, 49, 87, 98,  
 106-7, 110, 112, 114, 118, 120, 124,  
 265, 622, 680-1, 687  
 Díez Merino, L. 4, 39, 88, 121  
 Dagg, A.I. 470  
 Dahood, M. 336, 682, 694  
 Dalman, G.H. 26, 179, 230, 325, 366,  
 385, 492, 496, 500, 554, 603, 608,  
 670, 673  
 Daube, D. 87  
 Davies, W.D. 684  
 Day, J. 162, 293-4,  
 De Boer, P.A.H. 3, 20-1, 45, 74, 84, 106,  
 126, 187, 229, 237, 253, 262, 271,  
 277, 301, 310, 321, 324-5, 328, 330,  
 339, 347, 358-9, 362, 385, 396, 399-  
 400, 402, 422, 431, 438, 472, 476,  
 557, 635, 666  
 De Hoop, R. 415  
 De Lagarde, P. 4, 25, 44-5, 49, 57, 241  
 De Moor, J.C. 34-5, 76, 117, 122, 139,  
 150, 186, 189, 212, 216, 220, 294,  
 301, 313, 320, 340, 350, 365, 367,  
 377, 382-3, 459, 507, 527, 567, 622,  
 641, 664-5, 681, 702, 711  
 De Robert, Ph. 242, 294, 296, 301, 343,  
 468, 525, 553, 557-8  
 De Rossi, I.B. 54-57  
 De Saby, S. 54  
 De Sola Pool, D. 626  
 De Vaux, R.P.H. 21, 559, 521  
 De Vries, E. 243  
 De Ward, E.F. 224  
 Del Olmo Lete, G. 343, 687  
 Delcor, 241-2  
 Demsky, A. 500  
 Deutsch, E. 2, 121, 218,  
 Dietrich, M. 212  
 Dietzfelbinger, Ch. 382  
 Dirksen, P.B. 21, 128  
 Doeve, J.W. 94, 128  
 Dohmen, Ch. 255  
 Donner, H. 108  
 Dorival, G. 112, 117, 128, 232  
 Doron, P. 110, 112, 115, 123  
 Dragga, S. 293  
 Driver, G.R. 307  
 Driver, S.R. 3, 11, 23-4, 45-6, 78, 89,  
 161, 190-1, 206, 220-1, 242, 251,  
 262, 276, 288, 290, 295, 298, 303-  
 4, 308-9, 313, 335-6, 341, 343, 346,  
 355, 357-8, 362, 389-391, 396, 403,  
 405, 410, 422, 424, 430-1, 433, 435,  
 439, 443, 446, 450, 474-5, 488-9,  
 493, 496, 500, 504, 513, 520, 530,

- 552-3, 557-559, 576, 583, 585, 587,  
590, 606, 614, 620, 634, 670
- Dyk, J. 64, 664
- Ehrlich, A.B. 3, 191, 474
- Eissfeldt, O. 444-5
- Elbogen, I. 269
- Emerton, J.A. 167-8, 250, 264, 305, 564,  
597
- Enelow, H.G. 87-8
- Epstein, I. 268
- Evans, C.A. 84, 95, 415, 527, 711
- Ewald, 399
- Feigin, S.I. 252
- Feldman, L.H. 122, 170-1, 212, 218, 614,  
715
- Felman, M. 29
- Fernández Marcos, 112, 121
- Fischel, H.A. 67
- Fishbane, M. 112, 117, 119
- Fisher, L.R. 360, 437, 682, 694
- Flashar, M. 134, 136
- Flesher, P.V.M. 138, 168, 170, 180
- Flint, P.W. 207, 209, 213, 218, 356
- Flusser, D. 340, 365, 369, 637, 666, 671
- Fokkelman, J.P. 63-4, 66, 80, 201, 301
- Folmer, M.L. 181
- Forbes, R.J. 307, 590
- Fossum, J.E. 166
- Fouts, D.M. 252
- Fraade, S.D. 39-40
- Frankel, Z. 1-2, 8-10, 21, 30, 45-6, 89,  
92, 109, 113, 115, 120, 123, 126, 169,  
193, 291, 407, 434, 503, 713
- Freedman, D.N. 241, 295, 484
- Freedman, H. 150
- Gabrieli, G. 54
- Gaebelein, F.E. 343
- Gammie, J.G. 568
- Garsiel, M. 76, 228, 239, 459, 695
- Gärtner, B. 381
- Gaster, M. 620
- Gauthier-Pilters, H. 470
- Geiger, A. 10, 16, 376, 530, 535, 539,  
553
- Gerleman, G. 108
- Gevirtz, S. 388, 480
- Ginsburger, M. 121
- Ginzberg, L. 146, 187, 225, 238, 241,  
243, 267, 279, 281, 345, 377, 459,  
622
- Glessmer, U. 207, 209, 213, 218
- Gnilka, J. 164, 509
- Goldberg, A. 109, 117
- Goldin, J. 228
- Goldman, S. 408
- Golomb, D.M. 41, 93, 138, 173, 200
- Goodblatt, D. 159-60, 165
- Gordis, R. 95, 574
- Gordon, R.P. 2, 20, 29-30, 35, 37, 41,  
49, 51, 94, 107, 121, 128-9, 230, 243,  
264, 305, 400-1, 636, 638-9, 674
- Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. 16, 35, 51, 121,  
270, 335, 591, 602, 654
- Goslinga, C.J. 79, 104, 132, 242, 252,  
293, 296, 310, 408, 412, 499, 534,  
553, 557
- Grabbe, L.L. 115, 165, 220
- Granfield, P. 115
- Grätz, H. 87
- Greenberg, M. 78, 145
- Grosheide, H.H. 34, 321, 340, 373, 507,  
527
- Grossfeld, B. 106, 115, 121, 138-9, 159-  
60, 171, 178, 181-2, 190, 195, 206,  
215, 218, 255-6, 266, 268, 298, 356,  
455, 636
- Groves, J.W. 117
- Gunn, D.M. 72, 477
- Hühn, E. 33-4, 374
- Halbe, J. 427
- Hamp, V. 121
- Handy, L.K. 241
- Harl, M. 112, 117, 128, 232
- Harrington, D.J. 1, 38, 41-43, 47, 92,  
106, 118-9, 123, 173, 187, 200, 208,  
210, 212-3, 216, 218, 227, 237, 261,  
269-70, 276, 283, 288, 299, 308, 316,  
407, 417-8, 451, 476, 480, 482-3,  
492, 496, 532-534, 539, 608, 651,  
667, 673, 679
- Harris, R. 64
- Hartmann, B. 95, 97, 136, 399, 424
- Hayward, C.T.R. 3, 35-6, 41, 102, 110-  
112, 115, 118, 150, 167, 171, 400,  
458, 667
- Healey, J.F. 121, 167, 241
- Heerma van Voss, M.S.H.G. 262, 541,  
577
- Heinemann, J. 61, 381

- Helfgott, H. 1-2, 22, 24-26, 28-9, 34, 45, 47, 96, 109, 114, 434, 479, 482, 485, 487, 490, 496-7, 501, 504, 512, 515, 520-1, 523, 528, 531, 533, 539-40, 546, 554, 558, 565, 568, 573, 581, 587, 591, 606, 609-10, 615, 634, 643, 646, 651-2, 655, 667, 677, 679  
 Heller, B. 21  
 Hengel, M. 671  
 Hertzberg, H.W. 242, 252, 293, 296, 343, 386, 499, 553, 557  
 Hillers, D.R. 500, 503  
 Hoffner, H.A. 500  
 Hoftijzer, J. 577-8  
 Hohnjec, N. 381  
 Holloway, S.W. 500  
 Houtman, A. 49, 508-9, 511  
 Houtman, C. 11, 224  
 Humbert, P. 33-4, 205, 214, 528, 656  
 Instone Brewer, D. 88, 115, 670  
 Jacob, B. 589  
 Jacobs, L. 87-8, 685  
 Jacobson, H. 293-295, 380, 459  
 Janowski, B. 671  
 Jansma, T. 97, 106, 109, 111, 541  
 Japhet, S. 122, 132, 140-1  
 Jastrow, 325, 500  
 Jellinek, A. 675  
 Jeremias, J. 382, 414  
 Johnson, R.M. 508  
 Jones, H.S. 158  
 Joosten, J. 181  
 Jospe, R. 88  
 Jungmann, J.A. 115  
 Kadari, M.Z. 3, 78, 192  
 Kadushin, M. 121, 684  
 Kahle, P.E. 7, 14-17, 35, 43, 46, 49, 158, 712  
 Kalimi, I. 71, 104, 112, 132, 416  
 Kalmin, R. 415  
 Kapelrud, A.S. 617  
 Kasher, R. 31, 44-5, 47, 50-3, 60, 62, 88, 99, 106, 113-6, 118, 127, 142, 185, 208-9, 213-4, 223, 238, 281, 291, 320, 342-6, 348-50, 352, 356-7, 363-5, 373, 392, 394, 462, 520, 522, 552, 604, 612, 616-7, 620, 622-9, 631-3, 645, 647, 649, 656, 663, 682  
 Katsch, A.I. 636  
 Katsumata, E. 681  
 Kaufman, S.A. 37, 306  
 Keel, O. 486  
 Keil, C.F. 557  
 Kennicott, B. 54-57  
 Kessler, M. 340  
 Kirkpatrick, A.F. 391  
 Kisch, G. 8, 380  
 Kittel, R. 11, 29  
 Klausner, J. 672, 677, 686  
 Klein, G. 6, 348, 356, 493  
 Klein, M.L. 50, 60-1, 92, 107-8, 110-2, 123-4, 128, 166-8, 177, 337, 343, 425, 470, 506, 677  
 Klein, R.W. 242, 252, 296  
 Klein, S. 3, 36  
 Klostermann, E. 23, 269  
 Knutson, F.B. 437  
 Koch, K. 34, 173, 199-200, 204, 207, 215, 382, 672  
 Koenig, J. 98, 110  
 Komlós, O., see: Komlós, Y.  
 Komlós, Y. 1-2, 26-8, 45-7, 85, 89, 97, 102, 106-7, 110-2, 114-5, 118-21, 123-4, 126-7, 146, 180, 182, 187-8, 193, 196, 200, 210, 213, 223, 252-3, 260, 272, 308-9, 317, 322-3, 327, 330, 361, 399, 408, 425-6, 433, 444, 454, 461, 480, 483, 496, 505-6, 509, 518, 520, 531, 567-9, 611, 640, 643, 648  
 Korpel, M.C.A. 76, 83, 639, 641, 682  
 Kottsieper, I. 212  
 Krauss, S. 158, 352, 685  
 Krinetzki, L. 348  
 Kundert, L. 382  
 Kutscher, E.Y. 16, 37  
 Kuyt, A. 38, 64, 90, 138  
 Landeszman, Gy.G. 22, 24, 26  
 Landman, A. 34, 667, 675  
 Landman, L. 33, 666, 672  
 Langeveld, A.  
 Lapide, P. 102, 125  
 Lauterbach, J.Z. 87, 97, 100  
 Layton, S.C. 500  
 Le Déaut, R. 2, 35, 38, 102, 106, 109-10, 114, 117-8, 127, 370, 381, 667  
 Lehman, G.I. 121  
 Lehrman, S.M. 268  
 Lemche, N.P. 360  
 Lenhardt, P. 174, 676

- Levey, S.H. 33-37, 41, 47, 634-8, 667  
 Levine, E. 1, 19, 36, 121, 164, 292, 331,  
 334-5, 453, 476, 533-4, 539, 578,  
 582, 606, 685  
 Levy, J. 224, 260, 263, 269, 306, 308,  
 318, 322, 324, 352, 367, 385, 396,  
 400, 408-9, 418-9, 440-1, 445, 447-  
 8, 479, 500, 518, 533, 539, 559-60,  
 562, 577, 584, 589, 590, 627, 685  
 Lewis, T.J. 397  
 Lidell, H.G. 158, 584  
 Lipiński, E. 151  
 Loewinger, D.S. 22  
 Loewinger, S. 3, 12  
 Long, B.O. 74  
 Lorein, G.W. 64, 209, 345, 368  
 Lübbe, J.C. 91  
 Lund, J.A. 51  
 Lust, J. 356  
 Luzárraga, J. 623  
 Luzzato, A. 54  
 Luzzatto, S.D. 52, 123, 392  
 Mach, M. 626  
 Mach, R. 154  
 Maher, M. 118, 121, 174-7, 181-2, 225,  
 229, 593, 671  
 Mahler, M. 108  
 Maisler, B. 324  
 Malamat, A. 430  
 Mann, C.S. 119  
 Mann, J. 59-60, 62, 712  
 Marcus, R. 165, 496, 559, 709  
 Margalith, O. 687  
 Marmorstein, A. 121, 349  
 Martínez Borobio, E. 43, 49-53, 62, 185  
 Martin, M. 49  
 Masson, D. 636  
 Mauchline, J. 343, 386  
 Maxwell Miller, J. 161  
 Maybaum, S. 121  
 McArthur, H.K. 508  
 McCarter, P.K. 80, 151, 220, 242, 252,  
 262, 265, 274-5, 294-6, 303, 306,  
 310, 313, 324, 334, 336, 344, 347,  
 358, 387-8, 396, 405, 407, 410-1,  
 414, 422-3, 427, 437, 439, 444, 484-  
 5, 496, 499, 511, 529-30, 550, 553,  
 558, 560, 601, 618, 640, 692, 695-7  
 McCarthy, C. 95-6, 121, 123, 131-2, 167,  
 222, 232, 318, 465, 511, 551, 553-4  
 McHardy, W.D. 21  
 McNamara, M. 4, 29-30, 35, 37-8, 41,  
 43, 87, 89, 95, 100, 107, 118-9, 130,  
 138, 168, 268, 379, 667  
 Meier, S.A. 365  
 Menken, M.J.J. 97, 110-1  
 Merx, A. 49  
 Mettinger, T.N.D. 538, 559, 614  
 Metzger, B.M. 115  
 Mez, A. 35  
 Michel, O. 381  
 Milgrom, J. 274  
 Millard, A.R. 485  
 Mittman-Richert, U. 203  
 Montalbano, F.J. 241  
 Moore, G.F. 121, 167  
 Moran, W.L. 342  
 Morrison, C.E. 3, 82, 94, 97, 103, 110,  
 112, 125, 188, 212, 301, 326  
 Morrison, M.A. 444  
 Mortara Ottolenghi, L. 54, 57  
 Muñoz León, D. 121, 664  
 Mulder, M.J. 1, 31, 59-60, 88, 118, 199,  
 320, 553, 558  
 Munck, J. 165  
 Munnich, O. 112, 117, 128, 232  
 Musafia, J. 60, 615  
 Myers, J.M. 122, 169  
 Nöldeke, Th. 160, 635  
 Nahum, Y.L. 43  
 Nestle, E. 160  
 Neubauer, A. 56, 324, 693  
 Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 380  
 Nida, E.A. 75, 107  
 Nitsche, S.A. 343  
 Noegel, S.B. 76, 228, 239, 459, 545, 695  
 Noort, E. 316  
 Noss, Ph.A. 82  
 Nowack, W. 343, 385  
 O'Caellaigh, G.C. 558  
 Odeberg, H. 461  
 Oegema, G.S. 34, 527, 685-6  
 Oesch, J. 639, 641  
 Olofsson, S. 155  
 Olyan, S.M. 508-9, 511  
 Omanson, R.L. 82  
 Oßwald, E. 648  
 Owen, D.I. 444  
 Pérez Fernández, M. 172, 315, 325

- Patte, D. 94-5, 97-9, 102, 105, 109, 112,  
 114, 117-9, 121, 126  
 Pedersen, J. 145  
 Perdue, L.G. 568  
 Perrot, C. 59-62, 320  
 Person, R.F. 71  
 Peterman, J.H. 4  
 Petter, G.J. 295  
 Phillips, A. 142, 550, 561  
 Poorthuis, M.J.H.M. 508, 511  
 Poot, H. 190, 531  
 Pope, M.H. 560  
 Porter, G.G. 116  
 Potin, J. 168  
 Potok, Ch. 205  
 Praetorius, F. 29  
 Puech, É. 671  
 Rabin, C. 73  
 Rabinowitz, I. 39  
 Rainy, A.F. 360  
 Rapoport-Albert, A. 642  
 Rappaport, S. 182  
 Redford, D.B. 164  
 Rehm, M. 3, 122, 132, 140  
 Reif, S.C. 250, 264, 305, 564, 597  
 Reinink, G.J. 375  
 Rendsburg, G.A. 545  
 Rengstorf, K.H. 203  
 Renz, J. 300  
 Ribera Florit, J. 49, 84-5, 89, 95, 100,  
 102, 121, 150, 170, 173, 679  
 Ridderbos, H.N. 381  
 Rodrigues Pereira, A.S. 30, 37, 45, 161,  
 175, 202, 373, 639-41, 645-7, 650-1,  
 654-5, 657, 660, 663, 714  
 Rogerson, J.W. 11  
 Röllig, W. 300  
 Rosenberg, A. 4  
 Rosenthal, F. 380  
 Roth, E. 55, 57  
 Roth, W.M.W. 579  
 Rowland, C. 382  
 Rummel, S. 68, 513, 660, 667  
 Runia, D.T. 168  
 Runions, J.E. 272  
 Ryken, L. 679  
 Safrai, S. 340, 365, 369, 637, 666, 671  
 Salardini, A.J. 1, 38, 41-43, 47, 92, 106,  
 118-9, 123, 150, 170, 187, 216, 227,  
 237, 261, 269-70, 276, 279, 283, 288,  
 299, 308, 316, 407, 417-8, 451, 476,  
 480, 482-3, 492, 496, 532-4, 539,  
 608, 651, 667, 673, 679  
 Saltman, A. 270, 587, 711  
 Samely, A. 2, 87, 102, 104, 109, 114-7,  
 157, 198, 294, 629, 678  
 Sand, A. 116  
 Sanders, P. 155, 639, 641  
 Sanmartín, J. 343, 687  
 Särkiö, P. 687  
 Schäfer, J.P. 170, 218, 669, 685  
 Schaeffler, R. 8  
 Scherer, K. 64, 66, 70, 72, 84, 125  
 Schlatter, A. 203  
 Schley, D.G. 687  
 Schneider, G. 164  
 Schoeps, H.J. 539  
 Schulz, A. 557  
 Schürer, E. 614  
 Schwally, F. 635  
 Schwartz, E. 3, 163, 237, 242, 261, 311,  
 326, 328, 355, 357, 433, 466,  
 Schwartz, J. 508, 511  
 Schweitzer, E. 116  
 Schweitzer, J. 21  
 Scott, R. 158, 584  
 Segert, S. 664  
 Sepmeijer, F. 76, 262  
 Seux, M.-J. 648  
 Shachter, J. 150  
 Shapira, A. 217  
 Shepherd, D. 104, 121  
 Shinan, A. 107, 118  
 Shunary, J. 121, 658, 664, 671-2  
 Silbermann, S. 29  
 Simon, U. 122, 171, 187, 199, 344  
 Simons, J. 161-2, 276  
 Smelik, W.F. 6-9, 16, 32, 35, 38, 49-50,  
 53, 72, 76, 83, 85, 89-90, 96-9, 103-4,  
 106-15, 118, 120, 122-4, 126-7, 139,  
 141-2, 144, 146-8, 151-3, 156, 158,  
 160, 166, 168, 170, 175-7, 179-82,  
 195, 198, 223, 259, 291, 311, 316,  
 323-5, 349, 355, 365, 375, 391, 397,  
 425, 464, 526, 572, 591, 638, 642,  
 648, 674-5, 702, 707, 711, 713  
 Smelik-Oldenhof, M. 642  
 Smith, H.P. 241, 252, 272, 293, 553, 557  
 Smolar, L. 1-2, 17, 19, 20, 35, 38-40,  
 45-6, 89, 107, 118-21, 123, 126, 140,

- 142-4, 146, 150, 152, 157, 165, 174,  
181-2, 187, 220, 229, 232, 248, 255,  
257, 259-60, 265, 278, 283, 285, 289,  
292-3, 308, 322, 324, 337, 358, 367-  
8, 378, 409, 413, 417, 421, 435-6,  
440-1, 461, 476, 479, 484, 487, 497,  
504, 509-10, 513, 533-4, 538-9, 544,  
554, 558, 562, 568, 582, 590, 599,  
605, 611, 614, 617, 652, 693, 709
- Snyder, L.L. 4  
Sokoloff, M. 179  
Sonne, I. 59, 60, 62, 712  
Sperber, A. 1-2, 4, 6, 13, 29-33, 43-5, 47,  
49, 51-2, 62, 89, 96, 101-2, 106, 110,  
112, 118, 120, 123, 126-7, 130, 140,  
185, 277, 647, 656, 663, 713  
St John Thackeray, H. 35, 165, 496, 559  
Stenning, J.F. 29, 49, 85, 89, 165  
Stern, H.S. 441  
Stern, M. 637  
Stevenson, Wm.B. 179, 216, 385, 524  
Stoebe, H.J. 242, 294, 296, 358, 385, 553  
Stolz, F. 343  
Stone, M.E. 380  
Strack, H.L. 87, 100, 103, 125, 163, 346,  
628, 651, 666-7, 680  
Strecker, G. 116  
Stuhlmacher, P. 671  
Stummer, F. 3, 35, 146, 190, 196, 253,  
281, 323, 344, 420, 482, 520  
Syrén, R. 37, 636  
Sysling, H. 1, 31, 38, 59, 60, 88, 118-9,  
138, 199, 213, 320, 445, 676  
Taber, C.R. 107  
Tadmor, H. 284  
Tal, A. 3, 37-8  
Talmon, S. 335  
Taradach, M. 2  
Ter Haar Romeny, R.B. 128  
Teugels, L. 61  
Thenius, O. 400, 422  
Thierry, G.J. 336  
Thoma, C. 218, 685  
Thompson, J.A. 342  
Tidwell, N.L. 142  
Toeg, A. 316  
Tov, E. 94, 554  
Trebolle Barrera, J. 2  
Tsevat, M. 303  
Tsumura, D.T. 189, 220, 295  
Tuinstra, E.W. 107, 127  
Tur-Sinai, N.H. 252, 444  
Uffenheimer, B. 340, 365, 369, 666  
Vajda, I. 209  
Van Bekkum, W.J. 375  
Van Dam, C. 316  
Van der Horst, P.W. 349, 381-3  
Van der Kooij, A. 3, 20, 85, 90, 94, 96-7,  
99-100, 102, 110, 112, 119, 128  
Van der Lingen, A. 612  
Van der Lugt, P. 639  
Van der Meer, W. 641  
Van der Sluis, D.J. 676, 685  
Van der Toorn, K. 166, 168, 241, 381,  
397  
Van der Woude, A.S. 527, 557, 648, 671  
Van Duin, C. 21  
Van Grinsven, P. 98, 300  
Van Rooy, H.F. 117  
Van Ruiten, J. 665  
Van Staalduijn-Sulman, E. 20, 24, 34,  
45, 47, 64, 70, 73, 114, 134-5, 139,  
182, 191, 340, 350-2, 355, 365-6,  
373, 380-3, 487, 525, 622, 664, 681-  
2, 716  
Van Unnik, W.C. 331, 557  
Van Zijl, A.H. 296, 301  
Van Zijl, J. 49, 51  
Vanderkam, J.C. 373  
Vanstiphout, H.J.L. 375  
Vermes, G. 2, 85  
Vermes, P. 167  
Vervenne, M. 665  
Vilar-Hueso, V. 88  
Vincent, L.-H. 510  
Vogel, M. 1, 2, 19, 22-3, 25, 27-8, 45, 47,  
144, 146, 187-9, 191, 193, 196, 208,  
213, 216, 218, 223, 229-30, 237, 241,  
252-3, 267, 269, 273-4, 277, 279,  
283, 288, 293, 298, 300, 304, 308-9,  
311, 313, 324-6, 336, 352, 389, 396,  
398-400, 403-4, 406-9, 417, 421-2,  
425, 432-4, 436, 440, 453, 457, 461,  
474  
Voight, W. 333, 430  
Von der Osten-Sacken, P. 174, 676  
Von Soden, W. 352, 681  
Wächter, L. 336  
Wansbrough, H. 34  
Warren, A.L. 155

- Watson, W.G.E. 2, 34, 45, 64-8, 74, 77, 451  
189, 220, 301, 340, 350, 365, 387,  
415, 481, 601, 622, 664, 681
- Watts, J.W. 201
- Weinfeld, M. 284
- Weiss, R. 296, 297
- Wellhausen, J. 241-2, 252, 293, 385, 422
- Wesselius, J.W. 64, 199, 568, 611, 664,  
714
- Wiegand, A. 154
- Wilcox, M. 305
- Wildberger, H. 567
- Williamson, H.G.M. 110
- Winton Thomas, D. 21, 49, 84, 247, 310,
- Witkamp, L. Th. 381-2
- Wolfsohn, L. 29
- Yadin, Y. 347, 633
- Yaron, R. 406, 437, 553-4
- Yeivin, I. 43
- York, A.D. 35
- Zakovitch, Y. 295
- Zimmermann, J. 217-8, 527, 672
- Zlotowitz, B.M. 166
- Zunz, L. 2
- Zvieli, B. 2,26
- Zwickel, W. 199-200, 204, 207, 212, 215
- Zwiep, I.E. 38, 64, 90, 138



# Index of Subjects

---

- Aaron 206, 288, 291, 374-6, 378-9, 715  
Abba b. Kahana, R. 197-8, 218, 256, 515, 710  
Abbahu, R. 224, 532, 671  
Abbaye, R. 233, 710  
Abdon 294  
Abehu, R. 252  
Aboth Dibre Nathan 622  
Abraham 205-6, 374-5, 379, 451, 472, 482, 506, 523, 613, 654  
Abraham ibn Ezra 122  
absolute infinitive 76, 427, 443, 574, 678  
Abtinias 261  
acronym, see: notaricon  
acrostic 72, 364-5, 366, 377, 683  
actualization 19, 31, 92, 117, 122, 137, 170, 183, 534  
Adam 451  
adiectio 66, 70-2, 75, 77-8, 85  
Aggadat Bereshit 60  
Agrippa 367  
aischrology 85  
Albam 98  
Alfonso de Zamora 350, 365  
allegory 69, 119  
alliteration 64-5, 68, 129, 134, 138, 480, 486-7, 538, 567, 635, 645, 647, 706  
allusion 81, 86, 640, 643, 654, 656  
'al tiqre 89, 95, 99, 131, 252, 515  
ambiguity 9, 138, 234, 704  
amplification 77  
anacoluthon 74, 336  
anadiplosis 66  
anagram 96, 99  
analogy 77  
anaphora 66  
angel 147-8, 626  
Anna 204  
Annexionsvergleich 83  
antanagoge 74  
anthropomorphism 11, 27-8, 89, 166, 177  
Antichrist 345  
anticlimax 71  
Antioch IV Epiphany 209  
antiphrase 83  
antithesis 79  
antonomasy, see: epithet  
apokoinou-construction 72  
apophase 71  
aporía 71  
aposiopesis 78  
apostrophe 71  
apostive 78  
Aqedah 371  
Aqiba, R. 17-8, 39, 88, 97, 99, 100-2, 116, 128, 134, 137-8, 214, 328, 349, 357, 381, 413, 436, 532, 679, 686, 705, 708-9  
Aquila 8-9, 335-6, 395, 461, 483, 494, 500  
Arabic 15, 634-5, 637  
Arabs 36  
Aristeas 331  
Armilus 637-8  
Arukh 270  
Asa 499  
ascension 623  
Ashkenazi tradition 350-2  
associative translation 14, 18, 80-1, 109-11, 116, 440, 477, 506, 712  
assonance 64-5, 129, 134, 138, 480, 486, 538, 550, 706  
asyndeton 72, 529, 585  
Athbash 98  
Augustine 345  
Babylon 208-9, 373, 377, 658  
Babylonia 15-8, 36-8, 46, 59, 218, 532, 634, 710, 712  
Babylonian Aramaic 392  
Babylonian Exile 667  
Babylonian fragments 43  
Babylonian manuscript 15, 43, 49, 62, 670  
Babylonian Targum 17  
Babylonian text 43, 50  
Babylonian tradition 49, 62, 528, 597  
Babylonian vocalization 14-5, 43  
Balaam 334, 638, 669  
Bar Kokhba 37-9, 218, 614, 711  
Barak 293  
barbarism 37  
Baruch ben Abraham 54  
basic text 92, 94

- bear 368-9  
 Benedictus 171, 203  
 Berekiah, R. 258, 515  
 Biblia Hebraica 11, 29  
 Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia 21, 555, 565  
 Biblical hero 27, 42, 122, 126, 183, 226, 444, 465, 705  
 Bomberg Bibles 4-5, 7, 10, 31  
 brachylogy 78, 608  
 Breslau 8, 21  
 Budapest 5, 8, 21-2, 24, 26, 45  
 Buxtorf edition 7  
 cabbalah 300  
 catachresis 83  
 Cestius Gallus 322  
 chiasm 73-4, 138, 412, 419, 481, 501, 599, 647, 706  
 Chronicles 71, 104, 122-3, 132-3, 137-8, 140-1, 169, 476, 510, 514, 531, 535, 543, 692, 696, 703, 710  
 clarity 92, 98, 137, 183, 706-7  
 Clement of Alexandria 300  
 climax 71  
 Codex Reuchlinianus 4-8, 23, 32, 44-5, 101, 223, 232, 238, 252, 281, 285, 287, 289, 291, 293, 344, 346, 354, 356-7, 398, 415, 418, 430, 448, 462, 476, 479, 482, 493-4, 499, 520, 523, 574, 616-9, 638  
 collective 102, 108, 501  
*comparison* 633  
 complementary translation 111  
 conduplicatio 67  
 confession, see: creed  
 consonant 95-6, 98-9  
 constructio ad sensum 74, 101-2, 305  
 converse translation technique 92, 112, 128  
 copyist 7, 129, 705  
 correction 130  
 creed 36, 634-5, 637, 658  
 cremation 476  
 Dan 345-6, 368  
 date of Targum Jonathan 35, 48, 634, 708  
 Day of Atonement 447  
 Dead Sea Scrolls, see: Qumran  
 Deborah 714  
 Derash 88  
 detractio 66, 72-73, 75, 78-79, 86  
 Deuteronomy 482  
 diacope 68  
 dibbur 168  
 different division 105  
 dittography 55  
 diversification 28, 70, 115-7, 135, 138, 166, 237, 329, 677  
 dove 627  
 dragon 371  
 drought 60, 615, 675  
 dynasty 25, 334, 526, 714-5  
 Eastern Aramaic 38  
 Edomites 532  
 Egypt 59, 553, 705  
 Eichmann, Adolf 22  
 Eighteen Benediction 676  
 Elazar b. Azariah, R. 101-2  
 Eleazar of Modi'im, R. 312, 710  
 Eleazar, R. 144, 252-3  
 Eliezer b. Yose ha-Gelili, R. 87-8, 98, 100, 102-3, 105, 110, 113, 115, 214, 379, 381, 433, 445, 470, 710  
 Elijah 372  
 Elijah, R. 253  
 Elisha 605  
 Elizabeth 203  
 ellipsis 73, 75, 433, 689  
 emancipation 8  
 enumeration 70  
 envelope 67  
 epaneleipsis 67  
 epiphora 66  
 epistrophe 66  
 epithet 77, 369, 375, 409, 660, 667, 685  
 epizeuxis 68  
 eponym 84  
 equality by association 79  
 eschatology 25, 218, 644, 656, 658, 666-7, 713, 715-6  
 Esther 200, 211  
 etymological association 99, 113  
 etymology 143  
 euphemism 10, 23, 85-6, 124, 406, 415, 430, 441, 465, 551, 553, 554, 702  
 Eupolemus 300  
 Europe 59  
 Eusebius 269, 300  
 exaggeration, see: hyperbole  
 exclamation 81, 88

- exclusion 100, 137  
 exegetical techniques 1-2, 10, 27, 29, 33,  
     41-2, 48, 86-94, 129, 138, 701, 704,  
     707-9  
 exemplum 71  
 Exilarch of Babylonia 40, 534  
 Exodus 247, 640-3, 648-9, 651, 654, 715  
 exonym 99  
 expletive 71  
 extended simile 106-7  
 extension 100, 137  
 festival 58  
 figura etymologica 77  
 Fragmentary Targum 15-6, 626  
 Gabriel 626  
 Galilean Aramaic dialect 37-8  
 Gehenna 19, 120, 162, 202, 213, 216-7,  
     600, 656, 674, 680, 686  
 gematria 98, 531, 675  
 generalization 100, 438, 450  
 Genesis 482  
 Genesis Apocryphon 16, 46  
 German 4, 12  
 Gersonides 587  
 Gideon 443  
 glory 165, 167  
 Gog 149, 200-2, 213, 217-8, 662-3, 715-6  
 Goliath 238, 630  
 gradatio, see: climax  
 gradatio, see: sorite  
 Greece 208-9, 218, 532, 658  
 Hadrian 614  
 haftara 50, 54, 57-60, 110, 186, 197, 219,  
     245-6, 258, 263, 283, 288, 320, 342,  
     401, 506, 515, 523, 530, 532, 550,  
     615, 642, 707, 712  
 haftara, annual cycle 59-60, 186, 245,  
     288, 337, 515, 523, 707, 711-2  
 haftara, German tradition 62  
 haftara, Italian tradition 50, 60, 342-3  
 haftara, Karaite tradition 62  
 haftara, Roman tradition 62  
 haftara, Sefardi tradition 60-1, 245, 320  
 haftara, triennial cycle 59, 61-2, 186,  
     219, 235, 245-6, 258, 263, 283, 337,  
     342, 506, 523, 643, 712  
 halachic adjustment 14, 19, 27, 42, 120,  
     126  
 Haman 200, 208, 211-2, 320, 500  
 Ḥanan b. Abba, R. 521  
 Ḥanin, R. 482  
 Hanina, R. 696  
 haplography 55-7  
 harmonization 13, 19, 27, 112-4, 134,  
     137, 694  
 harmony 92, 109, 122, 137, 703-4  
 Hasmonaean reign 165  
 Hebraism 7-8, 32  
 Heman 206-7  
 hendiadys 74, 106, 387, 396, 472  
 Hezekiah 317, 349  
 Hilary 345  
 Hillel 87-88, 101, 110, 379, 381  
 Ḥilpa, R. 482  
 Hippolyte 345  
 Hisda, R. 520, 522  
 Hiyya b. Abba, R. 131, 421, 482, 676,  
     710  
 Holy Spirit, see: Spirit  
 homoiokatarhton 64  
 homonym 473  
 Ḥuna R. 273, 299, 514, 516, 710  
 Hungarian 2, 12, 22, 25, 47, 701  
 hyperbaton 73, 336, 588  
 hyperbole 82, 86  
 hypophora 74  
 hysteron proteron 79, 86, 104, 108, 475  
 identification, see: onomasticon  
 idol 19, 624, 702, 705, 708  
 Immanuel of Rome 119  
 immutatio 66, 74-75, 81-86  
 inclusion 68, 481, 645, 650, 652  
 interrogative prefix 82, 108, 598, 703  
 irony 83, 339, 587  
 Isaac 205-6, 371, 374-5, 378-9, 381, 482,  
     654  
 Isaac b. Abdimi, R. 596  
 Isaac, R. 336, 654, 710  
 Ishmael, R. 87-88, 97, 99, 100-1, 110,  
     113, 116, 137-8, 269, 349, 708, 710  
 Islam 36, 95, 349, 634-8  
 Jacob 374-5, 482, 642, 654  
 Jehoshaphat 682  
 Jephthah 295  
 Jeremiah b. Eleazar, R. 515  
 Jerome 35, 97, 143  
 Jesus 203, 279, 370, 382, 445, 710  
 Jezebel 518  
 Joḥanan, R. 131, 216, 233, 279, 356-7,  
     462, 497, 518, 696, 710

- John the Baptist 203, 381  
 Jonah, R. 270  
 Jonathan ben Uzziel 17  
 Jonathan, R. 258  
 Joseph 205, 547  
 Josephus 2, 35, 44, 111, 122  
 Joshua b. Korḥa, R. 392, 710  
 Joshua b. Levi, R. 214, 710  
 Judaeen Aramaic 38  
 Judah 368, 482  
 Judah ha-Nasi, R. 182, 260, 413-4, 472, 508, 579, 624, 643, 654, 710  
 Judan, R. 643  
 Judea 712  
 judgment 162, 205, 217, 460, 671, 680-1, 685-6, 705, 716-7  
 Kaddish 626  
 Kahana, R. 233  
 Kappara, R. 688  
 Ketib 25, 42, 95-6 131, 209, 221, 390, 422, 436, 511, 555, 564, 571, 574, 577, 617, 634, 662, 689, 697  
 key word, see: conduplicatio  
 Korah 214, 283, 288, 290  
 Kurdistan 349  
 lamb 368-70, 374, 381-3  
 Leah 187  
 Levi ben Gershom 56  
 Levi, R. 251, 522  
 Levita 589  
 Levites 205-6, 261  
 lion 629  
 literalism 134  
 litotes 81  
 Maccabee 210  
 Magnificat 203, 212  
 Mary 203  
 mashal 98, 106-7  
 Masoretic punctuation 105, 599, 651  
 Masoretic Text 12-3, 20, 23, 25, 29, 32, 94-5, 145, 230, 293, 437, 480, 483, 702  
 Masoretic tradition 418  
 Masoretic vocalization 484, 556, 596, 598  
 Media 209, 218, 532, 658  
 Megilloth 57  
 Meir, R. 182  
 Melchizedek 671  
 Memar Marqah 243  
 Memra 124, 165-8  
 Menachem b. Salomo 256, 335  
 merismus 74, 79, 84-5  
 Messiah 18-9, 25, 33-4, 36, 70, 119, 201-2, 208, 213, 217-8, 228, 345, 351, 367, 373, 381-4, 527-8, 623, 636, 663-4, 668-9, 671-3, 677, 680, 684-6, 705, 709, 713, 715-7  
 Messiah b. Ephraim/Joseph 218, 637  
 metabasis 68  
 metanoia 77  
 metaphor 14, 27-8, 42, 83, 85-6, 105-7, 127, 135, 180, 202, 206, 255, 299, 419, 439, 442, 447, 490, 527, 533, 542, 567, 589, 595, 600, 629, 633, 636, 644, 646, 648, 651, 657-9, 704, 706  
 metaphorical perception 127  
 metathesis 95-7, 474, 585, 587  
 metonymy 78, 84, 108, 486  
 Michael 626  
 middot 87-8, 91, 138  
 Mishnat Rabbi Eliezer, 87  
 modernization 42, 118, 135  
 monotheism 42, 82, 122, 183, 236, 259, 530, 533, 579, 657, 702  
 Mordecai 200, 211  
 Moses 205-6, 288, 291, 374-5, 460, 642, 651, 654, 715  
 multiple translation 10, 28, 90-1, 96, 98-9, 103, 105, 107-8, 112-3, 118, 120, 125, 130, 704  
 Naḥman, R. 577, 710  
 Nahum of Gimzo, R. 100  
 Nathan, R. 492  
 Nebuchadnezzar 208-9, 532  
 Nehemiah, R. 99, 654  
 Nehorai, R. 193  
 New Moon, see: Rosh Ḥodesh  
 New Testament 2, 34, 59, 118-9, 125, 154, 165, 171, 357, 382, 509, 666, 708-10  
 New Year, see: Rosh Hashanah  
 nimshal 28  
 notaricon 95, 98, 520-1  
 Nuzi 444  
 occupatio, see: apophases  
 omission 7, 55, 91-2, 102, 109, 112, 127, 131, 134

- onomasticon 19, 27, 42, 114, 238, 293-4,  
 591-2, 703, 710  
 Onqelos 8-9, 17, 38  
 Orpah 346, 368, 622  
 oxymoron 77  
 Palestine 15-7, 32, 37, 40, 46, 59, 710-1  
 Palestinian Targum 15-7, 138, 158, 532  
 Palestinian vocalization 15  
 Papa, R. 520  
 parable 445, 508, 680, 716  
 parallelism 68-70, 73, 75, 85, 109-11,  
 117, 129, 138, 480, 483, 646-8, 650,  
 652, 654, 705-8  
 paranoia 432  
 paraphrase 11-2, 28, 70, 73, 89, 703  
 parasha 110  
 parataxis 73, 104  
 parenthesis 71  
 parody 369  
 paronomasia 67, 76, 95, 97, 99, 137, 228,  
 334, 442, 446, 545, 653, 656, 695  
 paruṭah 392, 394  
 passive voice 9-10, 33, 98, 193, 210, 221,  
 235, 454, 601-2  
 passivum divinum 125-6, 165, 183, 235,  
 266, 390, 424, 657, 660, 701-2  
 Passover 58, 60, 146, 322, 440  
 Patriarch of Jerusalem 40, 534  
 Patriarchs 640, 653, 705, 715  
 Paul 102, 203  
 Pentateuchal Targum 455  
 Pentecost 146  
 Persia 208-9  
 personification 85-6, 106, 108  
 Pesach, see: Passover  
 Peshat 88  
 Peshitta 3, 94, 181  
 pharaoh 154  
 pharaoh 246, 460, 642, 650, 653, 654,  
 715  
 Philo of Alexandria 120, 167, 331  
 Phinḥas, R. 710  
 phonetic figure 2, 64-6, 706  
 plain language 107, 109, 135  
 pleonasm 78  
 Pliny 182  
 plural 13, 31, 42, 101-2, 502, 531, 708  
 poetical devices 129, 480, 501, 640, 701,  
 713  
 poetical structure 70, 326, 330, 366, 434,  
 480, 639, 664, 683  
 poetry 18, 25, 28, 30, 65, 68, 70, 138,  
 183, 199, 301, 327, 329, 350, 364,  
 387, 639-40, 665, 706-7, 713-4  
 polarization 183, 702  
 polysyndeton 70, 72  
 Positive Christianity 4  
 praeteritio, see: apophases  
 prayer 40, 175-7, 195, 198, 255, 579, 593,  
 670  
 precision 14  
 precision in number 101, 137  
 precision of meaning 103, 122, 135  
 priesthood 205-6, 577  
 Primasy Adrimetanensis 345  
 prolepsis 68, 79-80, 385, 467  
 prophecy 30, 149, 169-71, 183, 188, 198-  
 9, 205, 488, 644, 669, 705, 708, 713,  
 715-6  
 prophet 629, 702  
 prophetess 568, 611  
 prophetic spirit, see: Spirit of prophecy  
 prose 65, 183, 501, 568, 639, 706  
 pseudepigrapha 2  
 Pseudo-Philo 2, 44  
 Pumbedita 9  
 punishment 40, 93, 119, 214, 550, 552,  
 558, 664, 676, 682, 686, 715, 717  
 Purim 60, 320  
 Qere 25, 42, 95-6, 131, 140, 209, 217,  
 221, 245, 247, 256, 258, 280, 313,  
 347, 359, 387, 393, 398, 402, 420,  
 422-3, 429, 436, 439, 454, 456-7,  
 497, 511, 545, 549, 555, 558, 564-5,  
 571, 574, 576, 578, 580, 582-4, 594,  
 600, 615, 617, 634, 657, 686-7, 689-  
 91, 696-7, 707  
 Qumran 12, 15-6, 36-7, 40, 46, 143, 165,  
 218, 261, 344, 445, 509, 527, 563,  
 666, 671, 709  
 Rab 9, 193, 357, 451, 605  
 Rabba 233, 291, 355, 470, 539  
 Rabbi 572  
 Rachel 187, 397  
 Raphael 626  
 Rav 710  
 Rav Sar Shalom 615  
 redundancy 68, 70, 78, 115, 117, 610,  
 705, 708

- refrain 68, 480  
 repetitio 66-70, 76  
 repetition 434, 641, 649, 653, 660-1, 705, 70  
 responsion 67  
 resurrection 213, 676, 715-6  
 revelation 84, 109, 117, 137, 701, 704-5  
 reverence 92, 103, 121-2, 137, 167, 701-4, 707  
 reverential circumlocution 123  
 reward 40, 93, 119, 214, 664, 676, 682, 686, 717  
 rewritten Bible 131  
 rhetorical devices 63-4, 92, 107, 109, 129, 138, 504, 701, 703, 706-7, 713  
 rhetorical question 10, 13, 28, 81-2, 86, 108, 191, 327, 329, 450, 452, 524, 528, 600, 634  
 rhyme 64-5, 138, 538, 550, 646, 652, 659, 706  
 Roman emperors 538  
 Roman Empire 209, 358  
 Roman government 283, 534  
 Roman times 17, 35, 39, 218, 302, 504, 558, 680  
 Rome 154, 200, 208, 212, 218, 638, 658, 715  
 Romulus 638  
 Rosh Hashanah 60, 186, 197, 447  
 Rosh Hodesh 60, 270, 401, 407-9  
 Saadia Gaon 637-8  
 Samson 345, 368  
 Samuel b. Naḥman 206, 258, 260, 273, 275, 358, 370, 428, 521, 630, 710  
 Sanhedrin 206, 252-3, 538  
 Sarah 186, 219, 523  
 Satan 345, 371, 465, 554, 637  
 scesis onomaton 70  
 Second Temple Period 17, 59, 164, 285, 356, 637, 685, 709  
 Sedecla 459  
 Sefardi tradition 349-53, 515  
 Sefer Zerubbabel 637  
 Seleucid empire 209-10  
 semantic figures 64, 66, 76, 86, 707  
 Sennacherib 208, 626, 636  
 sententia 71  
 Septuagint 3-4, 9  
 Serach ben Jehuda 5  
 Shabbath 58, 60, 320, 414, 627  
 Shabbath Mevarekhin 60, 401  
 Shabbath Zakhor 60  
 Shammai 214  
 Shekhinah 124, 165-8  
 Shema' 190, 269, 356, 635  
 Shila 216  
 Simeon b. Lakish, R. 202, 686, 710, 717  
 Simeon, R. 39, 413-4  
 simile 10, 26, 77, 439, 673  
 Simon b. Eleazar, R. 59  
 simplification 111, 122, 156, 163, 170, 183  
 Sinai 643, 648, 715  
 singular 13, 101-2  
 Somnium Mordechai 54  
 sorite 66  
 specialization 104, 122, 139-40, 183  
 Spirit, holy 627, 633, 685, 716  
 Spirit of prophecy 169, 179, 340, 716  
 structural devices 75, 120  
 structural figure 64, 66, 706  
 Sukkoth 440, 688  
 superlative 84  
 Symmachus 335-6, 424, 464, 494, 500, 535, 539, 592-3  
 symploce 66  
 synecdoche 84-6, 178, 587, 609, 662, 667  
 Taanith 615  
 tabernacle 146  
 Tabernacles, see: Sukkoth  
 Tacitus 164, 538  
 Tamid 287, 356  
 Targum Jerushalmi 6, 15  
 tarte mašma' 89; 98-9  
 tautology 78, 408  
 Temple 206, 526, 675, 715  
 Ten Commandments 191, 323  
 Theodotion 17, 395, 431, 461, 494  
 theological motives 1-2, 10, 48, 86, 89, 93, 121  
 theophany 627, 640, 642-3, 714  
 Theophilus of Antioch 300  
 Thummim 281, 311, 316, 577  
 Tiberian tradition 597  
 Tiberian vocalization 43, 58, 597  
 Tiqqene Sopherim 131-2, 232  
 Torah 40, 205-6, 285, 363, 393, 414, 457, 472, 476, 482, 529, 605, 702, 705, 712, 715

- tosefta-targum 7, 44, 50, 54-7, 62, 114,  
 158, 208-9, 320, 345, 348, 350-2,  
 354, 364, 366, 368, 372, 375, 379-80,  
 382-4, 392, 394, 462, 555, 622, 623-  
 4, 626, 629-33, 683, 703, 708-10, 712  
 Trajan 39  
 translation technique, see: exegetical  
 technique  
 transmutatio 66, 73-75, 79-80, 86  
 transposition 91-2, 112-3, 125, 197, 341,  
 703  
 type A targum 199  
 type B targum 199  
 typology 119, 706  
 Ugarit 12, 343, 360, 387  
 understatement 83  
 Urim 281, 311, 577  
 variatio 80  
 vocalization 27, 54, 56, 65, 95, 97, 124,  
 145, 221, 235, 348, 433, 480, 568-70,  
 644, 697, 708  
 Vorlage 13, 18, 24-5, 29-33, 42, 45, 54,  
 75, 94, 174, 222, 240, 242, 293, 297,  
 313, 357, 410, 511, 554  
 Vulgata 3  
 Western Aramaic dialect 38  
 Western manuscripts 50, 62, 130  
 Western tradition 130  
 Wiederaufnahme 71  
 wisdom 568, 612  
 Wissenschaft des Judentums 8  
 word play, see: paronomasia  
 world to come 172, 462, 528, 656, 664,  
 674, 677, 716  
 Wulfila 128  
 Yehuda b. Ilai, R. 99, 148  
 Yemenite manuscripts 49-50, 670  
 Yemenite tradition 597  
 Yose b. Ḥalafta, R. 193, 710  
 Yose, R. 9, 260, 623  
 Zealot 39, 367, 378  
 Zechariah 171, 203-4  
 Zervihel 375, 378  
 zeugma 72-3

# Index of Biblical References

---

Index of Biblical and Targumic references: no distinction is made between Biblical and Targumic references, since most texts of the Hebrew Bible refer to both the Hebrew and the Aramaic version of the text.

GENESIS	25:1 61	49 681
1:1 90, 215	25:18 324	49:1 666
1:4 674	27:1 61, 219, 235	49:3-4 206
1:16 675	27:29 111	49:5 171
1:21 667	27:41 194	49:8 482
2:21 451	29-30 712	49:8-12 664
4:14 113	29:26 319	49:9 345, 368, 629
8:21 194	29:31 61, 186	49:16 206, 210
11:30 523	30:2 187, 190	49:17 345
12:15 208	30:21 61	49:20 335, 486
14:5 513	30:22 61, 187, 190	49:22-23 636
14:13 165	31:7 386	49:27 61, 263
14:24 472	31:15 191	50:1 681
15 523, 532	31:17 359	
15:1 61	31:20 574, 606	EXODUS
15:6 375	31:26 574, 606	1:15 382
15:10 493	31:34 397-8	1:16 265
15:12 451	31:36 385	2:4 528
15:12-16 532	31:37 402	2:10 651
16:7 324	32:6 470	2:23 292
18:10 437	32:15 470	3:9 81, 271
18:11 632	32:24 592	3:20 168
18:14 437	32:26 618	7-12 246
18:23 324	33:6 470	7:1 460
18:25 613	33:8 391	8:2 101
19:3 464	33:11 443, 464	9:3 168
19:9 464	33:18 182	10 245
19:31 319	34:1 251	10:1 62
19:33 319	34:7 561	10:1-2 245
19:34 319	34:30 245	10:2 246
19:37 319	35:19 276	12:8 314
20:6 386	37:33 103, 425	12:41 128
21 60, 186, 219	39 219	12:48 440
21:1 61, 186	39:7 61	13 146
21:1-34 60, 186	41:44 82	13:10 146
22 126, 375	42:13 103, 425	13:16 479
22:8 105, 379	42:26 359	13:17-15:26 60, 642
22:10 378-9	42:36 103, 425	15 643, 648, 650, 712
22:17 102	43:14 103, 425	15:1 112
24:1 355, 632	43:34 547	15:2 642
24:26 112	44:15 111	15:3 334, 348-9
24:60 388	44:30 386	15:4 642
25 506	46:21 581	15:7 642



15:11 37, 108, 635-6, 638, 642	4:26 221	11:26 217
15:13 578	6:5 221	13:32 634
15:14-15 642	7:3 275	14:11 554
15:17 138, 518	7:11 144	14:23 554
15:22 324	7:31 221	15:17 484
15:25 472	8 219	15:27-31 88
17:14 320	8:1 62	16 283
17:14-16 331	8:16 221	16:1 62, 214
18:21 283	8:25 275	16:1-3 214
19-20 643	9 515	16:1-18:32 60, 288, 712
19:3 276	9:1 515, 516	16:15 9, 288, 290
19:6 539	9:1-11:47 60, 245, 515	16:30 222, 232, 554
20:1 81, 323	9:19 275	16:32 214, 296, 373
20:2 192, 259	9:20 221	18:7 538
20:24 254	10:9 195	21:16-19 113
21:6 224	10:14 476	22:21-33 629
21:14 427	11:9-12 346	22:22 465
21:30 290	12:6-8 223	22:32 465
22:1 550	16:25 221	23:19 334
22:8 224	18:18 391	24 669
23:22 490	19:15 573	24:3 669
24:10 148	19:26 122, 314-5	24:15 669
26:1 524	20:27 463	24:15-17 716
26:6 524	21:9 476	24:17 669, 671
26:7 524	21:17-23 509	24:20 217
26:12 524	21:18 189	26:10 214
26:13 524	23 60	28:3 300
28:6-12 421	23:17 277	29:1-4 197
28:26 512	23:24 186	29:35 146
28:29-30 417	24:8-9 414	32:11 441
28:36-38 379	26:30 372	33:25 118
29:22 275	26:42-44 218	35:31 290
30:9 221		
32 643	NUMBERS	DEUTERONOMY
32:14 62	1:51 538	1:39 441
32:15 62	3:10 538	2:9 490
32:15ff. 643	3:26 73	2:11 513
32:32 444	3:38 538	2:19 490
33:21 518	3:50 252	4:2 331
34:20 132	4:17 62	4:4 663
36:8 524	4:17ff. 246	4:35 635
36:13 524	4:25 524	4:35-39 636
38:14 262, 524	6:5 193	4:39 635
40:7 255	9:2 440	5:21 113
40:11 218	9:4 440	5:26 663
	9:5 440	6:8 479
	9:6 440	7:7 656
LEVITICUS	9:10 440	7:16 433
1:9 221	9:14 440	10:17 625, 663
2:5 560	10:35 128	11:6 296
3:9 275	11:6-7 116	11:18 479

12:5 254	33 345	18:7 188, 206
13:1 331	33:17 388	18:14 516
14:9 346	33:22 345, 368	18:14-15 516
16:1 440	33:26 636	18:16 162, 513
17:14 62	34:3 217	19:8 473
17:14-20 258		19:29 693
17:24 62	JOSHUA	20:8 169
18:3 220	1:5 10	21:18 497
18:4 440	1:11 420	21:20-21 188
18:21-22 234	2:11 141, 587	21:40 179
18:22 166	3:5 415	21:43 234
19:5 474	3:11 140	21:44 372
19:6 568	3:13 140	22:8 156
20:10 62, 342	4:2 147	22:16 141
21:10 376	5:1 587	22:22 141
21:10-25:19 60	5:2 490	22:27 145
21:23 476	5:9 379	22:34 141
22:5 475, 479	5:10 440	23:1-2 632
22:21 561	5:14 140, 148	23:14 234
22:28 561	7:5 587	24:2 544
23:2 509	7:7 81, 108	24:3 544
23:4 285	7:15 81, 561	24:10 32
23:10-15 415	7:21 156	24:14 544
24:1-4 394	7:23 147	24:15 544
24:6 548	7:24 147	24:19 141, 237
25:9 228	7:25 476	24:25 472
25:17-19 60, 331	8:2 156	
25:19 320	8:10 153, 692	JUDGES
28:1-29:9 60, 615	8:27 156	1:15 443
28:12 615	8:31 145	2:1 147-8, 151
28:23 615	8:34 443	2:4 151
28:48 615	9:4 427	2:12 174
31:20 554	9:5 420	2:14 292
32 62, 642-3, 712	9:11 420	2:15 168
32:1 171,199	9:27 615	2:16-19 151, 258, 526
32:1-43 664	10:12 169	2:17 526
32:1-52 60	10:13 482	2:18 152
32:4 154, 636, 642	11:14 156	3:4 176
32:8 132, 496	11:17 169	3:6 147
32:8-9 642	11:23 55, 147, 428	3:8 292
32:15 154, 636	12:4 513	3:12-30 294
32:18 154, 636	13:1 355, 632	3:21 147
32:22 642	13:8 176	3:24 430, 561
32:23-24 642	13:12 513	3:26 311
32:30 154, 388, 636	14:4 188	4-5 293
32:31 154	15:8 162, 513	4:2 292
32:36 43, 533	15:9 516	4:4 526
32:37 636	15:9-10 516	4:9 292
32:39 213, 217, 642	15:24 322	4:14 148
32:50-51 107	15:36 385	5:1-3 149, 171
	17:15 513	5:11 178

- 5:14 15  
 7:8 420  
 7:22 169  
 7:25 169  
 8:16 72, 103  
 8:21 470  
 8:24 156  
 8:26 470  
 9:9 266  
 9:9-15 514  
 9:11 266  
 9:13 266  
 9:16 316  
 9:19 316  
 9:29 323, 600  
 9:33 278  
 9:38 325  
 9:46 141  
 9:53 548-9  
 9:56 298  
 10:7 292  
 11:1 295  
 11:17 32  
 11:27 298, 526  
 11:37 285  
 12:3 396  
 12:7 6  
 12:9 154  
 12:13-15 295  
 13:5 97, 111, 193  
 13:6 147-8  
 13:7 97  
 13:19 147  
 14:3 147  
 15:1 153, 561  
 15:3 298  
 15:9-20 81  
 15:15 154  
 16:9 561  
 16:12 561  
 16:14 347  
 16:17 193  
 16:23-24 142  
 16:27 251  
 17-18 397  
 17:10 572  
 18:3 154, 542  
 18:23 245  
 18:24 142  
 18:25 192  
 18:30 146  
 19:1 147  
 19:3 668  
 19:7 464  
 19:10 32  
 19:12 140  
 19:22 143, 459  
 19:23 561  
 19:25 32  
 19:28 147  
 20:2 316  
 20:6 163  
 20:10 420, 561  
 20:13 32, 143  
 20:15 692  
 20:17 692  
 20:33 169  
 21:6 152  
 21:9 692  
 21:15 152  
 1 SAMUEL  
 1 67, 197, 711-2  
 1-2 51, 186  
 1-12 51  
 1-15 41  
 1:1 40, 42, 61, 78, 99,  
     127, 151, 159, 206,  
     229, 263, 265, 279,  
     710  
 1:1-2 15  
 1:1-10 61  
 1:1-2:10 58, 60, 186  
 1:2 75, 523  
 1:2ff. 61  
 1:3 78, 97, 146, 189, 196,  
     258  
 1:5 66, 112, 125, 191,  
     531, 702  
 1:5-6 187  
 1:6 66, 112, 125, 702  
 1:7 206, 222  
 1:8 42, 70, 82, 206, 703  
 1:9 79, 190, 354  
 1:10 175, 586  
 1:11 12, 61, 70, 96, 124-6,  
     153, 204, 418, 582,  
     710  
 1:11-22 61  
 1:12 67, 175, 195  
 1:13 130, 175, 194, 455  
 1:14 82  
 1:15 206, 255, 271, 418,  
     709  
 1:16 67, 157, 163  
 1:18 73, 177  
 1:19 153, 186-7  
 1:20 76, 180, 222  
 1:21 157  
 1:22 111, 172  
 1:23 67  
 1:24 114, 129, 197  
 1:24-28 203  
 1:25 73, 114, 144, 197  
 1:26 81, 108, 145, 175,  
     442  
 1:27 175, 222  
 1:28 42, 174  
 1:31 18  
 2 711-2  
 2:1 113, 125, 127, 149,  
     160, 170-1, 175, 179,  
     188, 200-5, 207, 210,  
     217, 232, 279, 628,  
     644, 668, 701, 715  
 2:1-2 198, 202  
 2:1-3 10, 199-200, 629,  
     632  
 2:1-4 70, 704  
 2:1-5 55, 200, 202, 715  
 2:1-6 198, 202  
 2:1-10 28, 67-8, 136, 171,  
     173, 175, 198-9, 643,  
     709, 713-6  
 2:2 7, 37, 82, 111, 113,  
     125, 155, 201, 203,  
     205, 214-5, 530,  
     635-8, 657-8, 701, 714  
 2:2-5 120  
 2:3 42, 68, 197, 200, 202,  
     232  
 2:4 125, 198, 217, 628,  
     658, 702  
 2:4-5 199, 703  
 2:4-7 79  
 2:5 79, 120, 125, 154,  
     187, 198, 203, 438,  
     500, 701-2  
 2:6 154, 172, 200-1,  
     213-4, 237, 709-10,  
     715

- 2:6-7 198-9  
 2:6-10 55, 212  
 2:7 201-2, 211, 554, 711  
 2:7-8 65, 706  
 2:7-10 34  
 2:8 129, 154, 172, 202-3,  
 211-2,  
 2:8-9 202, 715  
 2:8-10 197-9, 703  
 2:9 42, 93, 120, 125, 154,  
 200-2, 216-7, 449,  
 534, 656, 674, 677,  
 702, 715-6  
 2:9-10 202  
 2:10 198, 200-3, 205-7,  
 216, 229, 460, 649,  
 662-3, 710, 714-5, 717  
 2:11 60  
 2:12 230  
 2:12-17 189  
 2:13 20, 42, 73, 104, 144,  
 148-9  
 2:14 7, 158  
 2:15 144  
 2:16 42, 96-7, 707  
 2:17 189, 226  
 2:18 126, 142, 189  
 2:19 146  
 2:20 180  
 2:21 60, 153  
 2:21-28 61, 219  
 2:22 52, 158, 175, 189,  
 219, 289, 358, 703,  
 709-10  
 2:22-30 61, 219  
 2:23 81  
 2:24 81  
 2:25 125, 167, 569, 701  
 2:26 7, 65, 101, 203  
 2:27 14, 109, 115, 166,  
 703  
 2:27-30 272  
 2:28 102-3, 126, 142, 163,  
 670  
 2:28-31 62  
 2:29 124, 160, 222, 227  
 2:30 125-6, 239, 702  
 2:31 52, 107, 227, 704  
 2:31-36 296  
 2:35 61  
 2:38-31 219  
 3 234, 712  
 3:1 170, 223, 229  
 3:2 18  
 3:3 105, 226, 547, 710  
 3:4 68  
 3:4-8 80  
 3:5 62, 219  
 3:7 124, 157, 282, 709,  
 711  
 3:8 125, 702  
 3:10 125, 702  
 3:12 234, 668, 703  
 3:13 131  
 3:13-14 163  
 3:14 6, 710  
 3:15 170  
 3:17 668  
 3:18 177  
 3:19 203  
 3:19-20 60  
 3:19-21 234  
 3:19-22 61  
 3:20 62, 219, 234  
 3:21 125, 702  
 4 235, 477, 523, 711-2  
 4-6 51, 246  
 4-7 207  
 4:1 185, 349  
 4:2 97  
 4:3 113  
 4:4 114, 349, 516, 649  
 4:7 703  
 4:7-8 66  
 4:8 83, 106, 123, 168,  
 247, 272, 460  
 4:8-9 114, 116  
 4:9 52, 67, 354  
 4:10 140, 487  
 4:11 349  
 4:12 15, 44, 114, 238,  
 349, 477, 562, 579,  
 709  
 4:13 80, 111-2, 593  
 4:14 271  
 4:15 51, 235, 239  
 4:15ff. 61  
 4:16 159, 238, 477  
 4:17 159, 168-9, 238,  
 477-8  
 4:18 80, 111-2, 239, 266,  
 593  
 4:19 240, 478  
 4:20 13  
 4:20-22 523  
 4:21 478  
 4:21-22 239  
 5 50, 712  
 5-6 168, 395  
 5:2 577  
 5:3-4 372  
 5:4 240  
 5:5 146  
 5:6 244-5, 247, 250, 695  
 5:7 142, 243, 247, 708  
 5:8 105  
 5:9 51  
 5:10 245, 471  
 5:11 245, 351  
 5:12 242, 244  
 5:13-6:2 61  
 5:17 351  
 5:19 351  
 5:20 351  
 6:1 178, 350-1  
 6:1-7:17 245  
 6:2 146  
 6:4 242-3  
 6:5 142, 242, 247, 708  
 6:6 62, 246, 272  
 6:6-14 62, 245  
 6:7 512  
 6:7-8 207  
 6:8 51, 125  
 6:9 51, 54, 96, 298, 702,  
 709  
 6:10 62, 246, 248  
 6:10-12 349  
 6:11 242  
 6:12 249, 400, 497-8, 512,  
 561, 578, 581-2  
 6:13 207, 251  
 6:14 251  
 6:15 251  
 6:17 242  
 6:18 178  
 6:19 44, 116, 245, 251,  
 711  
 6:20 141  
 7 254, 256

7:1 161, 277, 354	9:12 27	11:9 287
7:2 254, 516	9:13 24, 51, 709-11	11:11 6, 14, 44, 286-7
7:5 175	9:15 106, 125, 702	11:12 83
7:6 27, 127, 688, 702-3, 709	9:16 13, 15, 81, 321	11:14 54
7:8 175	9:17 99, 113, 125, 273, 702	11:14-12:22 58, 60, 288, 712
7:9 144, 175, 177, 337	9:20 469	11:14-12:25 283
7:10 217, 257	9:21 318, 434, 454, 709	11:15 145
7:12 99, 257	9:22 271	12 712
7:14-15 206	9:24 710	12:1 263
8 149, 258	10 712	12:2 6, 157, 180, 258
8:1 62, 668	10:1 100, 151	12:3 9, 178, 275, 288, 709
8:3 20, 104, 148, 176, 289	10:3 169, 711	12:3-5 70
8:4-8 62	10:5 149-50, 158, 161-2, 588	12:4 290
8:5 258	10:6 149, 179, 703	12:5 52
8:5-6 263, 668	10:9-13 399	12:6 288
8:6 175	10:9-16 162	12:6-10 272
8:7 167	10:10 149, 161-2, 170, 179, 285, 399, 588, 645	12:6-12 81
8:7-8 554	10:10-11 149, 171	12:7 154
8:8 81, 272, 453	10:10-12 150	12:7-12 72
8:9 20, 51, 104, 149, 710	10:11 149-50, 433	12:9 294, 424
8:11 20, 104, 149, 258, 261, 282, 290, 558, 573, 668	10:12 106-7, 170, 711	12:10 51-2, 292, 703
8:11-12 262	10:13 149	12:11 115, 295, 547, 618, 703, 711
8:11-18 70, 282	10:14 686	12:12 284
8:12 104	10:15 277	12:14 296
8:13 261	10:16 686	12:15 262, 288
8:14 103, 261	10:18 272	12:17 106, 108, 175, 297
8:15 261-2	10:20-21 71	12:18 9, 74, 123-5, 175
8:16 103, 261, 449, 516, 709	10:21 278	12:19 75, 141, 175, 297-8
8:17 71, 261-2	10:22 27, 126, 157, 180, 273, 399, 528	12:20 297-8
8:18 176	10:23 340	12:21 107
8:19 167, 464, 491, 560	10:24 62, 82, 151, 176, 318, 339, 703	12:23 175, 430
8:20 180, 289, 709	10:25 20, 104, 149	12:25 296
8:21 106, 668	10:26 125, 161, 163, 319, 436, 547, 702, 709	13 302
9 126, 143, 263, 337	10:27 40	13-14 158, 161, 277
9-10 76	10:29 689	13-20 15
9:1 40, 354	11 62, 711-2	13:1 80, 83, 127, 273, 301, 321, 702, 710-1
9:1-10 61	11:1-2 81	13:2 140, 179, 301
9:2 340, 449, 516	11:1-13 283	13:3 161-2
9:4 40, 52, 100, 264, 305, 693	11:2 284	13:4 302, 457, 543, 584
9:5 99, 151, 187, 373, 704	11:3 286	13:6 302, 429
9:6 125, 170-1, 234, 589, 702-3, 709	11:4 161	13:9 315
9:7 125, 165, 420, 711	11:6 179	13:10 463
9:8 166, 307, 347, 585	11:7 9, 285	13:11 305
9:9 71		13:12 175
		13:13 334
		13:14 125, 151, 702, 709
		13:17 264

- 13:17-18 265  
 13:19-22 535  
 13:21 589  
 14:1 268  
 14:3 126, 142  
 14:4 65  
 14:7 66  
 14:8 76  
 14:10 310  
 14:11 76, 158  
 14:15 51  
 14:17 153  
 14:18 312  
 14:19 65, 142, 249, 311,  
     668  
 14:22 159  
 14:24 363, 438, 710  
 14:25 24  
 14:27 313, 317  
 14:27-28 312  
 14:30 161  
 14:32 156, 328  
 14:32-35 122  
 14:33 314  
 14:34 144, 709  
 14:35 709  
 14:37 180  
 14:38 83, 106, 180  
 14:39 145, 180  
 14:43 316  
 14:44 316, 420, 603  
 14:45 145, 309, 316, 567  
 14:47 160, 176, 273, 282  
 14:48 537  
 14:52 237, 319, 390, 488,  
     563, 586, 694  
 14:52-15:33 58, 60, 320  
 14:52-16:1 60  
 15 67, 320, 337, 389, 711  
 15-17 51  
 15:1 321, 502, 512  
 15:1-34 60, 320  
 15:2 54, 153, 388, 432  
 15:2-9 60, 320  
 15:2-34 60  
 15:3 328  
 15:4 39-40, 153  
 15:6 118, 181, 272, 329,  
     428  
 15:7 456  
 15:8 422, 575  
 15:9 32, 96, 463  
 15:10 55, 169  
 15:11 67, 152, 163, 175,  
     334  
 15:12 536, 596  
 15:13 326, 470  
 15:15 329  
 15:16 125, 702  
 15:17 52, 82, 155, 272-3,  
     321, 375, 454, 703,  
     709-10  
 15:18 329  
 15:19 156  
 15:20 108, 176  
 15:21 156  
 15:22 82, 331, 703  
 15:22-23 327, 331  
 15:23 23, 79, 108, 129,  
     150, 163, 296, 307,  
     331-2  
 15:23 69  
 15:24 125, 167  
 15:25 332  
 15:25-26 313  
 15:26 299, 331-2  
 15:27 430  
 15:27a 332  
 15:28 461  
 15:29 125, 152, 169, 172,  
     334, 383-4, 701, 711,  
     713  
 15:31 60, 320, 334  
 15:32 710  
 15:33 73-4  
 15:34 161  
 15:35 152, 333-4, 401  
 16 50, 337, 339, 711-2  
 16:1 320, 337  
 16:2 337  
 16:4 598  
 16:5 337  
 16:7 340  
 16:8-10 578  
 16:11 82, 703  
 16:12 311, 339, 341, 364,  
     390, 709  
 16:12-13 60, 320, 337  
 16:13 179  
 16:14 179, 341  
 16:15 179  
 16:15-16 125, 703  
 16:16 179, 341  
 16:18 682  
 16:18-22 386  
 16:20 629  
 16:21-22 40, 342  
 16:22 106, 177  
 16:23 179  
 17 50, 60, 342-3, 630  
 17:4 44, 64, 129, 351-2,  
     354, 359, 368, 620,  
     622, 706, 709  
 17:6 130, 357  
 17:7 364, 630, 633  
 17:8 27, 56, 115, 142,  
     153, 169, 238, 273,  
     353, 367, 369, 372,  
     379-80, 382, 384,  
     668, 708-11  
 17:11 361  
 17:12 188, 354  
 17:15 249  
 17:16 120, 287  
 17:18 39, 709-10  
 17:20 360-1, 449  
 17:21 56  
 17:23 81, 344, 630  
 17:25 82, 357, 360, 392,  
     703  
 17:26 81, 172, 284, 357,  
     361, 379, 383, 623,  
     626, 663  
 17:28 179  
 17:33 79  
 17:34-37 68, 368-9  
 17:35 357, 709  
 17:36 172, 361, 379, 623,  
     663  
 17:37 62  
 17:38 387  
 17:39 55  
 17:40 55  
 17:41 249  
 17:42 44, 72, 364, 367,  
     669  
 17:42-43 56  
 17:43 39, 52, 72, 120,  
     142, 154, 273, 328,  
     340, 345, 351, 354,

- 364-5, 372, 380,  
 382-3, 421, 434, 480,  
 623-4, 651, 654, 669,  
 682-4, 708-10  
 17:44 111, 370, 383  
 17:45 112, 372  
 17:46 71, 141, 383, 390,  
 623  
 17:47 112, 383  
 17:49 66, 160  
 17:50 68, 372  
 17:51 344, 372, 504  
 17:53 384  
 17:54 147  
 17:55 78, 145  
 18 712  
 18:3 405  
 18:5 176, 340, 359  
 18:6 111  
 18:7 80, 180, 387, 417,  
 465  
 18:8 79  
 18:9 106, 432  
 18:10 51, 149, 179  
 18:11 397, 410, 449  
 18:13 180, 289, 506, 668,  
 711  
 18:14 96, 176, 707  
 18:15 14, 176, 180, 289,  
 354  
 18:16 506  
 18:17 39, 125, 172,  
 319-20, 395, 448, 502,  
 549, 552, 667, 702  
 18:18 437, 527  
 18:19 52-3, 81, 394, 487,  
 618, 703, 710  
 18:21 125  
 18:21 393, 702  
 18:23 502  
 18:25 56, 160, 390, 392,  
 487  
 18:27 392, 514  
 18:30 176  
 19-20 126  
 19:2 74, 402  
 19:3 668  
 19:3-4 178, 404  
 19:4 53, 396, 668  
 19:5 382, 463, 558  
 19:6 145, 402  
 19:8 169  
 19:9 179  
 19:10 389  
 19:13 398  
 19:16 397  
 19:18 23, 157  
 19:19 157, 399  
 19:20 97, 149-51, 179  
 19:20-21 66  
 19:20-23 399  
 19:21 149  
 19:22 157, 399  
 19:23 149, 157, 179, 249,  
 399  
 19:24 73, 149-50  
 20 270, 401, 711  
 20-21 51  
 20-25 41  
 20:1 157, 163, 399, 402,  
 423, 426, 444, 452,  
 504, 582  
 20:3 78, 124, 145  
 20:4 53  
 20:5 51, 404, 406  
 20:6 14, 153  
 20:7 77, 404-5  
 20:9 77, 405, 407  
 20:10 600  
 20:12 406  
 20:13 77, 407  
 20:15 160  
 20:16 160, 419, 553, 709  
 20:18 54, 160  
 20:18-42 58, 60, 401  
 20:18-21:1 56, 60, 401  
 20:19 411  
 20:21 145  
 20:21-22 411  
 20:23 103  
 20:27 407, 410  
 20:29 51-2  
 20:30 97, 179  
 20:31 452, 581  
 20:32 412  
 20:33 389  
 20:34 179, 438  
 20:35 113  
 20:38 78  
 20:42 52, 407  
 21 50, 711  
 21:2 52  
 21:6 23, 39  
 21:8 6, 53, 420  
 21:10 126, 142, 630  
 21:11 80, 111  
 21:12 83, 387-8, 465  
 21:14 400, 446  
 21:16 178  
 22-24 302  
 22:2 169  
 22:6 420  
 22:7 420  
 22:8 432  
 22:10 180, 417, 420, 630  
 22:13 180, 417, 432  
 22:15 180, 447  
 22:16 317  
 22:17 32, 66, 370, 420  
 22:18 126, 142, 227, 422,  
 710-1  
 22:18-19 463  
 22:19 73, 324-5  
 22:20 626  
 22:22 96, 624-5, 707  
 22:23 402  
 23:2 180  
 23:4 180  
 23:5 147, 423  
 23:6 126, 142  
 23:9 126, 142, 432  
 23:11 23, 425, 478, 516,  
 619  
 23:12 103, 425  
 23:13 425, 576  
 23:14 435  
 23:15 402  
 23:19 161, 427, 435, 449  
 23:23 280, 427  
 23:26 13, 432  
 23:28 73, 709  
 24 454  
 24:3 85, 303, 449, 516,  
 521, 702  
 24:4 332  
 24:5b-6 430  
 24:6 694  
 24:10 388, 432, 564  
 24:11 333  
 24:12 51-2, 163, 304, 432

- 24:15 10, 273, 394, 454,  
     540, 582  
 24:15-16 434  
 24:16 126, 702, 706  
 24:17 433  
 24:18 154  
 24:20 455  
 24:20-21 333  
 24:21 125, 332, 702  
 25 591  
 25:1 13, 458, 605  
 25:3 446  
 25:10 107  
 25:12 438  
 25:15 153  
 25:18 468, 580  
 25:22 52, 85, 124, 160-1,  
     446, 553-4, 702  
 25:24 81, 108, 178, 567  
 25:25 76, 143, 500, 561  
 25:26 78, 145, 161, 363,  
     446, 472  
 25:27 178  
 25:28 103, 124, 163, 172,  
     379  
 25:29 172, 213, 402, 445  
 25:30 151, 443  
 25:31 72, 104, 363  
 25:33 363, 379  
 25:34 145, 440-1, 446,  
     492  
 25:36 438, 440  
 25:37 107  
 25:41 391  
 25:43 391, 487  
 25:44 391  
 26:1 53, 158, 161, 449  
 26:2 516  
 26:3 161, 449  
 26:4 359  
 26:5 449  
 26:6 359, 449  
 26:8 610  
 26:10 125, 145, 702  
 26:11 100, 451  
 26:12 84, 310, 451  
 26:15 709  
 26:16 145, 451, 581, 709  
 26:18 163  
 26:19 23, 125, 173, 177,  
     259, 702  
 26:20 10, 14, 33, 97, 126,  
     273, 702  
 26:21 454  
 26:22 147  
 26:25 176  
 27:1 194  
 27:3 449, 487  
 27:5 178  
 27:8 324, 489  
 27:9 7, 70, 72, 470  
 27:10 181  
 27:11 20, 52, 104, 148  
 27:12 172, 174  
 28-2 Sam. 12 41  
 28:3 459, 465  
 28:4 457  
 28:6 108, 150-1, 180, 461,  
     464  
 28:7 703  
 28:9 459  
 28:10 145  
 28:11 463  
 28:12 217  
 28:13 147, 703  
 28:15 150  
 28:16 85, 173  
 28:17 443  
 28:18 179  
 28:19 67, 273, 445, 483,  
     710  
 28:20 468  
 28:21 396, 558  
 28:23 464, 563  
 28:24 144  
 29 395  
 29:4 603  
 29:5 80, 288  
 29:6 145, 465, 506  
 29:7 53, 177  
 29:8 160, 174  
 29:9 147  
 30 156  
 30:5 449, 487  
 30:7 126, 142, 469  
 30:8 180, 471  
 30:9 80, 468  
 30:10 471  
 30:12 99, 438, 463  
 30:16 156  
 30:18 487  
 30:19 156  
 30:20 147, 156  
 30:22 156, 245  
 30:23 73  
 30:24 468  
 30:25 20, 74, 104, 148  
 30:26 156, 160, 173, 443  
 30:28-30 472, 512, 690  
 30:29 181  
 31:3 482  
 31:4 130, 463, 703  
 31:6 104, 133  
 31:8 483, 491  
 31:9 53, 74, 504  
 31:9-10 242  
 31:10 618, 709  
 31:12 14, 133, 147, 237,  
     354  
 2 SAMUEL  
 1 477  
 1:2 237-8, 474, 477, 562,  
     579,  
 1:2-5 238  
 1:3 479  
 1:3-4 238, 477  
 1:4 238, 477  
 1:8 474  
 1:10 486  
 1:12 487  
 1:16 581, 625  
 1:17-27 68  
 1:18 53, 710  
 1:19 67-8, 96, 480, 483,  
     487, 491  
 1:19-17 186  
 1:19-21 39-40  
 1:19-27 18, 28, 67-8, 71,  
     205, 481, 713  
 1:20-21 481  
 1:21 67, 85, 128, 480,  
     483-5, 543  
 1:21-23 65  
 1:22 65, 480  
 1:22-23 706  
 1:22-24 481  
 1:23 44, 77, 114-5, 238,  
     480, 483, 486  
 1:24 64, 67, 105, 480, 483



- 1:25 67-8, 480, 483, 487  
 1:25-26 481  
 1:26 483, 503  
 1:27 67-8, 480-1  
 2:1 116, 180  
 2:1-5:5 68  
 2:3 179  
 2:4 488, 507  
 2:7 237, 319, 354, 503,  
 547  
 2:9 711  
 2:10 301, 650  
 2:12-13 74  
 2:16 84, 487  
 2:19-28 67  
 2:20 67  
 2:21 491  
 2:23 67-8, 262  
 2:27 103, 145  
 2:29 128  
 3:1 249  
 3:2 449  
 3:2-5 67, 70  
 3:3 489, 565  
 3:5 523, 703  
 3:8 126, 153, 394, 434,  
 702, 711  
 3:14 393  
 3:15 26, 147  
 3:16 581, 590, 602  
 3:22 156  
 3:24 249  
 3:27 480  
 3:29 487  
 3:30 499  
 3:33 7, 158, 434, 442  
 3:33-34 68, 599, 713  
 3:34 81  
 3:35 496  
 3:37 100  
 3:38 111  
 3:39 13, 25, 72, 298, 321,  
 368, 391, 394  
 4:1 584-5  
 4:2 7, 130-1, 158, 536  
 4:4 9, 159, 542  
 4:7 561  
 4:8 14, 402  
 4:9 145  
 4:10 103
- 5 712  
 5:1 84  
 5:2 151, 180, 506, 632  
 5:3 84  
 5:4 507  
 5:4-5 80, 301  
 5:5 507  
 5:6 106, 164, 711  
 5:6-8 164, 508  
 5:7 133, 178, 512, 688  
 5:8 7, 80, 96, 507, 509,  
 542  
 5:9 510  
 5:10 65  
 5:11 97, 693  
 5:11-12 80  
 5:11-16 80  
 5:12 18, 133  
 5:13 506  
 5:13-6:1 61  
 5:13-7:29 51  
 5:15-16 54-7, 473, 690  
 5:17 506  
 5:17-6:1 61  
 5:18 514, 688, 709  
 5:19 180, 513  
 5:20 107, 161, 169, 518  
 5:21 133, 709, 711  
 5:22 513  
 5:23 180  
 5:24 147-8, 711  
 6 349, 515, 523  
 6-7 515  
 6:1 54, 132, 506, 515,  
 523, 675, 710  
 6:1-19 56, 60, 515  
 6:1-7:3 58, 60, 515  
 6:1-7:17 60, 515  
 6:2 98, 179, 349, 425,  
 506, 649  
 6:3-4 161  
 6:3-6 349  
 6:5 27, 126  
 6:6 13, 710  
 6:7 179  
 6:8 518  
 6:9 518  
 6:11 353, 519  
 6:12 519  
 6:13 132, 144
- 6:14 126, 133, 142  
 6:16 133, 181  
 6:17 577  
 6:19 98, 100, 710  
 6:20 127, 142, 517  
 6:21 151, 668  
 6:23 52, 56, 113, 494,  
 618, 703, 711  
 7 228, 523, 711  
 7:2 524-5  
 7:5 74, 82, 133  
 7:5-16 527  
 7:7 133, 155  
 7:8 151  
 7:9 537  
 7:10 518  
 7:11 34, 258, 443, 533  
 7:11-16 34, 443  
 7:12 34, 52, 582  
 7:13 34  
 7:14 10, 34, 83, 127, 155,  
 702  
 7:16 34, 518  
 7:17 170  
 7:17-29 61, 523  
 7:18 281, 391  
 7:19 97, 172, 527, 668  
 7:19-29 532  
 7:22 122-3, 140, 208, 214,  
 530, 635  
 7:23 122, 128, 133, 190,  
 237, 709-10  
 7:24-26 533  
 7:25 140-1, 668  
 7:26 518, 526, 533  
 7:27 175  
 7:28 141  
 7:29 40  
 8:1 104, 133  
 8:2 108, 536  
 8:3 25, 39-40, 133, 326  
 8:4 709  
 8:5 537  
 8:6 158, 535  
 8:12 156  
 8:13 26, 98, 147  
 8:14 158  
 8:15 20, 104, 148, 569  
 8:16 614

- 8:18 133, 146, 469, 482,  
     576, 609, 614-5, 711  
 9:3 542  
 9:4-5 591  
 9:8 126, 434, 581, 702  
 9:10 175  
 10 14, 627  
 10:1 132  
 10:1-2 592  
 10:6 52, 709  
 10:9 157-8, 516, 543  
 10:10 132  
 10:12 65  
 10:13 543  
 10:14 159  
 10:16 703  
 10:18 480  
 11 128, 181, 550, 559  
 11:1 52, 133  
 11:2-17 545  
 11:4 147  
 11:8 709  
 11:11 78, 145, 415  
 11:14 181  
 11:16 237, 354  
 11:17 487  
 11:19 52  
 11:20 103  
 11:21 293, 709  
 11:25 492, 549  
 11:27 177  
 12 712  
 12:1-4 72  
 12:2 65  
 12:3 64-5  
 12:5 108, 145, 179, 452,  
     581, 674  
 12:6 551  
 12:7 551  
 12:9 96, 707  
 12:11 147, 552  
 12:12 555  
 12:14 56, 85, 101, 124,  
     160, 173, 441, 552,  
     702  
 12:18 298  
 12:21 26  
 12:22 125, 589, 702  
 12:24 96, 707  
 12:25 170  
 12:26-29 510  
 12:27 556  
 12:30 56, 133, 156, 709  
 12:31 40, 118, 557-8  
 13 67, 128, 633  
 13:1-9 545  
 13:3 580, 583  
 13:6 177  
 13:9 67, 262, 561  
 13:11 67, 561  
 13:14 67, 560-1  
 13:16 67, 298, 560-1  
 13:18 177, 709  
 13:19 249  
 13:23 52, 169  
 13:25 67, 464, 560-1  
 13:27 464  
 13:28 237, 319, 354, 547  
 13:32 432  
 13:34 96  
 13:35 564  
 13:39 104, 152  
 14 77  
 14-24 41  
 14:1 565  
 14:2 178, 565  
 14:5 81, 108  
 14:6-11 72  
 14:7 52, 565  
 14:9 442  
 14:11 79, 145, 611  
 14:13 77, 163  
 14:14 224, 569  
 14:15 178  
 14:16 173  
 14:17 147  
 14:19 25, 145  
 14:20 147, 603  
 14:21 53  
 14:22 96  
 14:25 387  
 14:27 596  
 14:33 229  
 15:1 260  
 15:2 20, 104, 112, 148,  
     178-9, 239, 593  
 15:3 178  
 15:4 20, 148, 154, 600  
 15:6 20, 104, 148, 178,  
     606  
 15:8 96  
 15:11 116  
 15:12 65  
 15:13 147  
 15:14 324-5, 432  
 15:15 607  
 15:16 56  
 15:18 469, 482, 535, 538  
 15:20 426  
 15:21 96, 145, 707  
 15:23 217  
 15:25 157  
 15:26 177  
 15:30 709  
 15:31 580  
 15:32 237, 477, 562  
 15:36 559  
 16:1 402  
 16:1-2 629  
 16:4 541  
 16:5 249, 497  
 16:7 603  
 16:8 176, 581  
 16:9 10, 126, 434  
 16:12 25, 131  
 16:16 83, 176, 559, 583  
 16:17 42  
 16:19 174, 178  
 16:22 140  
 17 510  
 17:2 73, 159, 503  
 17:3 79, 104, 108  
 17:4 586  
 17:8 192  
 17:9 169  
 17:10 237, 319, 354, 547  
 17:13 82, 84  
 17:16 373, 578  
 17:17 99, 711  
 17:18 497  
 17:21 503, 591  
 17:21-22 583  
 17:23 629  
 17:25 132  
 17:27 703  
 18:3 25, 96, 175, 253, 704  
 18:4 13  
 18:5 594-5  
 18:7 169  
 18:8 711

- 18:10 594  
 18:11 103  
 18:12 96, 707  
 18:13 103  
 18:14 7, 82, 155, 158  
 18:17 140, 147  
 18:18 326, 536, 709  
 18:20 14, 96  
 18:22 597  
 18:26 108  
 18:29 79, 108, 709  
 18:31-32 597  
 18:32 160-1, 598  
 18:33 74, 707, 713  
 19:1 403, 573, 688, 713  
 19:5 217  
 19:6-7 67  
 19:7 66  
 19:8 14, 668  
 19:9 140  
 19:10 175  
 19:13 106  
 19:17 497  
 19:18 107  
 19:23 465  
 19:24 317  
 19:25 603  
 19:28 147  
 19:28-29 178  
 19:29 452, 581  
 19:36 180, 709  
 19:42-43 245  
 19:43-44 611  
 20:1 131, 140  
 20:3 79, 147  
 20:4 178, 608  
 20:5 55  
 20:6 147, 455  
 20:7 66, 469, 482, 538  
 20:10 480  
 20:14 25, 610  
 20:16 73, 703  
 20:18 79, 251, 342, 711  
 20:18-19 568  
 20:19 53, 173  
 20:20 68, 611, 613  
 20:21 77  
 20:22 56, 140, 504  
 20:23 469, 482, 538  
 20:24 40, 658  
 20:25 132  
 20:26 132, 146, 539  
 21 50, 711-2  
 21-23:8 51  
 21:1 44, 71, 581-2, 615,  
     617  
 21:1-14 60  
 21:2 71  
 21:3 173  
 21:4 25  
 21:5 711  
 21:6 77, 618, 626  
 21:8 113, 703, 711  
 21:9 40  
 21:12 425, 475, 619  
 21:13 618-9  
 21:15 60, 634  
 21:15-22 513  
 21:15-23:4 60  
 21:16 630, 703  
 21:16-19 44  
 21:17 56, 169, 230, 567,  
     582, 631-3, 681-2, 708  
 21:18 623  
 21:19 113, 132, 347, 618,  
     622, 703, 709-10  
 21:20 96, 133, 623  
 21:21 96, 633, 707  
 21:22 125, 555, 702  
 21:23 129  
 22 25, 28, 37, 56-7, 67-8,  
     84, 121, 171, 173,  
     175, 186, 199, 201,  
     642, 664, 669, 706,  
     710-5  
 22:1 10, 62, 84, 117, 149,  
     161, 170-1, 180,  
     201-2, 640, 710, 712,  
     715  
 22:1-14 5, 60, 642  
 22:1-51 60  
 22:2 155, 642  
 22:2-3 202, 640-2, 651  
 22:3 51-2, 125, 155, 161,  
     202, 204, 490, 636,  
     639, 641, 644, 662,  
     667, 702, 714  
 22:4 161, 175, 202, 639  
 22:4-6 640-1  
 22:5 84, 98, 143, 153,  
     645, 704, 707  
 22:5-6 65, 202  
 22:6 84, 641, 650  
 22:7 125, 175-6, 202, 639,  
     702  
 22:7-9 641, 650  
 22:7-20 640  
 22:7-28 202  
 22:8 202, 627, 649-50  
 22:8-16 714  
 22:9 26, 72, 103, 127,  
     154, 202, 639, 642-3,  
     702, 707, 715  
 22:10 125, 178, 649  
 22:10-12 641  
 22:10-13 643  
 22:10-33 62, 643  
 22:10-51 62  
 22:11 125, 202, 702  
 22:12 202  
 22:13 648, 680  
 22:13-16 641  
 22:14 201-2  
 22:15 168, 642  
 22:16 179, 202, 647, 650  
 22:16-17 202  
 22:17 643, 709, 715  
 22:17-18 202  
 22:17-20 641  
 22:18 161  
 22:19 644  
 22:20 644  
 22:21 53, 58, 154, 202,  
     639  
 22:21-23 65  
 22:21-25 641  
 22:21-32 640  
 22:22 69, 707  
 22:23 20, 148, 202, 643  
 22:24 202  
 22:25 52-3  
 22:26 125, 201-2, 375,  
     702  
 22:26-27 120, 202,  
     639-41, 653, 715  
 22:27 642-3, 715  
 22:28 121, 172-3, 201-2,  
     657, 661  
 22:28-29 663, 715-6

- 22:28-31 641, 653  
 22:28-32 34  
 22:29 93, 125, 154, 169,  
 172, 202, 674, 716  
 22:30 202  
 22:31 202, 641  
 22:32 36-7, 47, 111, 122,  
 155, 201-2, 208, 214,  
 530, 634-9, 641-2,  
 655, 663  
 22:32-35 641  
 22:33 153, 202  
 22:33-46 640  
 22:34 202, 483  
 22:34-35 659  
 22:35 202  
 22:36 84, 202  
 22:36-38 65  
 22:36-39 641  
 22:37 627, 646  
 22:38 161  
 22:38-39 660  
 22:40 153, 198, 202  
 22:40-43 641  
 22:41 161, 178, 202, 659  
 22:42 125, 667, 702  
 22:44 180  
 22:44-46 641-2, 663  
 22:45 55, 659  
 22:47 96, 125, 145, 155,  
 201-2, 490, 636, 639,  
 702, 707  
 22:47-49 640  
 22:47-51 641  
 22:48 141, 202  
 22:48-49 202  
 22:49 161, 201-2, 715-6  
 22:49-51 202, 657  
 22:50-51 5, 60, 640, 642  
 22:51 62, 201-2, 714, 716  
 23 682, 711  
 23:1 149, 172, 391, 660,  
 666, 682, 709, 714  
 23:1a 665  
 23:1-2 170  
 23:1-3 715  
 23:1b-3 665  
 23:1-5 34  
 23:1-7 50, 68, 171, 199,  
 713-5  
 23:1-8 25, 28, 50, 70,  
 120-1, 173, 186, 202,  
 382, 664, 685, 703,  
 709, 713  
 23:2 58, 179, 263, 716  
 23:2-3 677  
 23:2-16 58  
 23:3 105, 154-5, 282, 636,  
 669, 673, 682, 704  
 23:4 53, 93, 121, 125,  
 154, 665-6, 671, 674,  
 680, 702, 714-5  
 23:4b-9a 58  
 23:5 70, 117, 125, 141,  
 172, 528, 647, 665,  
 702, 715  
 23:6 249, 680  
 23:6-7 665, 671, 709-10,  
 715  
 23:7 125, 172, 249, 671,  
 680-2, 702  
 23:8 25, 72, 132, 180,  
 219, 340, 351, 367,  
 373, 381, 383-4, 622,  
 628, 664-5, 668-9,  
 671, 680, 682-6, 692,  
 703, 709, 715, 717  
 23:8-39 70  
 23:9 681, 687, 689-91  
 23:11 53, 80, 130, 687,  
 690-1  
 23:11-17 81  
 23:12 155  
 23:13 180, 513, 687, 692  
 23:14 158, 510  
 23:15 600  
 23:16 103, 126, 687  
 23:18 180, 687, 692  
 23:19 687  
 23:20 25, 163, 283, 319,  
 436, 547, 709, 711  
 23:23 687  
 23:24 692  
 23:25 78, 691  
 23:26 615  
 23:27-38 56, 473, 512,  
 690  
 23:28 686, 690  
 23:30 690  
 23:32 132, 691  
 23:37 692  
 24 50-1, 132, 147, 453  
 24:1 179, 692  
 24:7 178-9  
 24:9 132, 237, 354  
 24:10 430  
 24:11 170  
 24:12 393  
 24:13 132  
 24:14 125, 167, 702  
 24:15 709  
 24:16 96, 123, 152, 697  
 24:18 697  
 24:21 696  
 24:24 114, 132  
 24:25 696  
 1 KINGS  
 1:1 632  
 1:15 561  
 1:35 151  
 1:38-2:4 58  
 1:38 469, 538  
 1:42 163, 436, 547  
 1:44 469, 538  
 1:52 163, 436, 547,  
 2:8 497  
 2:39 455  
 3:2-4 144  
 3:3-4 20  
 3:3 670  
 3:4 271  
 3:27 291  
 4:1 320  
 4:5 158, 539, 559  
 4:7 158  
 4:19 158  
 5:1 544, 693  
 5:4 544  
 5:7 158  
 5:13 173  
 5:18 465  
 5:27 614  
 5:30 158  
 6:29 523  
 7:13 693  
 7:14 693  
 8:5 144  
 8:13 518  
 8:21 518  
 8:22 269

8:23 635	20:10 142	11:12 479
8:32 154, 309	20:15 692	11:15 153
8:37 178, 609	20:26 692	12:4 670
8:38 269	20:27 692	12:12 153
8:50 163	20:35 262	12:17 163
8:54 269	21:10 143	13:21 249
8:56 234, 372	21:13 143	14:4 670
8:57 299	21:15 262	14:28 103
9:8 132	21:21 441	15:4 670
9:11 693	22:10 682	15:35 670
9:12 693	22:11 328	16:4 670
9:23 158	22:23 150	17:11 670
9:25 670	22:32 271	17:13 150
9:27 473	22:44 670	17:15 298
10:2 470		18:4 670
11:5 556	2 KINGS	18:14 569, 606
11:8 670	2:12 279	18:17 208
11:14 465	2:17 464	18:22 349
11:23 465	3:6 692	18:25 208
11:25 465	3:13 150	18:32-35 208
11:36 620	3:19 179	18:33-35 142
11:38 228	3:27 173	19:3 646
12:4 174	4:1 623	19:4 663
12:25 194	4:8 163, 436, 605	19:6 663
13:2 670	4:16 437	19:15 208
13:4 170	4:17 437	19:20 225
13:25-29 150	4:27 192, 285	19:22 208
14:7 151	4:29 304	19:35 148
14:10 441	4:42 264-5	19:35-37 118
14:15 544	5:15 141, 443	19:36 208
15:4 620	5:16 262, 464	20:5 151
15:23 499	5:22 151, 188	22:14 157
16:2 151	5:23 464	22:17 670
16:7 298	5:24 153	23:2 150
16:11 441	6:1 609	23:21 440
18:4 151	6:5 271	23:23 440
18:19 150	6:12 561	23:5 670
18:19-25 636	7:7 629	23:8 670
18:22 150	7:10 629	
18:23 9	8:1 173	1 CHRONICLES
18:24 372	8:9 470	2:16 543
18:29 149	8:19 620	2:17 132
18:33 9	9:1-3 276	2:51-54 182
18:33-35 636	9:8 441	4:21 630
18:34 404	9:33 518	4:38 355
19:2 317	9:34 153	5:1-2 206
19:5 249	9:37 76	6:16-30 214
19:7 249	10:11 146	6:27-28 188
19:21 9	10:15 304	6:31-38 214
19:21 9	11:1-3 626	6:33 206
19:21 9	11:2 561	6:38 214

- 6:60 497  
 7:17 295  
 7:40 348  
 8:3 535  
 10:3 474  
 10:6 104, 133  
 10:12 133, 475  
 10:13 463  
 11:2 684  
 11:11 132, 219, 670,  
     682-5, 687  
 11:13 80  
 11:20 543  
 11:28 132  
 11:28 615  
 11:34 132, 692  
 11:5 507  
 11:6 133, 510  
 13:6 132, 516  
 13:9 133, 518  
 14:2 18, 133, 512, 606  
 14:12 133, 513  
 14:15 148  
 15:17 206  
 15:26 132, 520  
 15:27 133, 519  
 15:29 133, 519  
 16:3 133, 520, 521  
 16:26 142  
 17:4 82, 133, 524  
 17:6 133, 525  
 17:21 133, 530-1  
 18:1 104, 133, 535  
 18:3 133  
 18:6 132  
 18:12 543  
 18:16 615  
 18:17 133, 538, 539  
 19:1 132, 542  
 19:11 543  
 19:15 543  
 20:1 133, 545  
 20:2 133, 556  
 20:3 557  
 20:5 132, 630  
 20:6 133  
 21 132  
 21:5 132, 694  
 21:12 132, 695  
 21:16 123
- 21:25 114, 132, 698  
 21:29-22:1 132  
 21:29-30 699  
 22:1 115, 699  
 23:6 428  
 24:3 538  
 24:6 538  
 24:21 695  
 24:25 695  
 24:31 538  
 25:5 206, 207  
 29:11 334
- 2 CHRONICLES  
 2:17 591  
 2:42-49 436  
 3:1 115, 699  
 5:12 207  
 16:14 476  
 20:3 558  
 20:18 318  
 20:19 214  
 21:19 476  
 23:11 282  
 24:24 500  
 30:1 440  
 30:2 440  
 30:5 440  
 32:27 281  
 32:29 142  
 35:1 440  
 35:16 440  
 35:17 440  
 35:18 440  
 36:15 226
- EZRA  
 4:12 518  
 4:14 400  
 6:19 440  
 8:29 274
- NEHEMIA  
 8:8 630  
 9:8 654  
 9:32 663  
 11:30 162
- ESTHER  
 3:1 320  
 4:13 345, 622
- 6:6 194  
 8:1-2 211  
 8:11 490  
 9:25 616
- JOB  
 7:19 373  
 14:16 444  
 27:6 444  
 31:37 335  
 34:36 279  
 38:31 335  
 41:24 548-9
- PSALMS  
 2 527  
 2:2 357  
 9:1 344  
 14:1 194, 210  
 16:11 212  
 18 28  
 18:3 644  
 18:11 648  
 18:32 36, 635, 637  
 18:33 657  
 18:34 657  
 18:39 659  
 18:41 661  
 18:42 660  
 18:44 661  
 22:18 116  
 26:8 226  
 32:8 656  
 33:4-6 167  
 34:19 656  
 36:7 310  
 42-49 214  
 42:3 132  
 45:3 340, 373  
 45:3-11 682  
 46:10 210  
 49:11 211  
 50:4 508  
 62:9 255  
 68:10 676  
 68:18 388  
 68:28 327  
 69:29 444  
 72:5-7 664  
 72:17 677  
 74:19 627

75:3-4 216	QOHELET	19:1 587
75:5-6 206	1:4 210	19:4 424
75:11 206	3:14 331	19:13 316
78:66 243	5:2 172	19:16 500
81:2 670	12:5-7 210	19:18 132
82 224, 671		19:21 220
84 214	CANTICLES	21:2 170
84:3 565	2:5 520	21:5 485, 626
85 214	4:9 560	21:6 187
88 214	5:2 627	21:7 470
89:18 206	5:15 216	21:9 68, 377
89:21 681	6:9 627	21:12 154, 210
89:25 206		23:1 693
89:44 490	ISAIAH	23:3 651
91:7 388	1:1 170	23:5 693
92:8 680	1:3 76	23:8 693
92:11 206	1:20 262	23:13 693
95 372	2:1-4 637	23:15 693
96:7 68	3:2 150	23:17 693
97:11 103	3:5 394	24:15 154
104:22 674	3:10 674	24:16 68, 210
110:4 228	3:20 479	24:18 111
112:9 206	4:3 444	25:8 373
118:22 369	5:20 154	26:4 154
118:27 382	5:24 554	26:15 217
119:62 470	6:7 263, 668	26:19 217
119:109 396	7:3 188	26:21 148
119:147 470	7:14 98, 111	27:1 217
133 675	8 105	27:12 544
139 113	8:2 667	28:7 150
139:20 461	8:16 444	28:16 369
141:2 670	8:23 105, 666	28:17 651
143:1 345	9 105	28:25 680
144:1 345	9:15 150	29:10 150
148:14 206	9:16 561	29:11 170
148:14 206	10:2 656	29:15 210
152:4 368	10:29 602	30:6 470
	10:32 626	30:8 666
PROVERBS	11:2 685	30:26 674, 217
1:11 74	11:2-3 671, 717	30:33 677
4:3 681	11:4 37, 637, 656	32:6 442, 561
4:18 674, 716	11:15 544	32:20 680
6:31 550	13:7 503, 587	33:14 217
7:9 470	14:13 210	33:17 217, 278
10:2 233	14:22 567	33:18 150
10:22 324	14:32 656	33:22 217
16:14-15 664	16:1 671	36:18-20 142
19:23 212	16:7 520	37:3 646
21:1-4 210	17:12-13 651	37:4 663
30:1 669	18:6 111	37:12 142
31:19 499, 500	19 62	

37:17 663	53:7 369	11:17 232
37:21 225	53:9 217	11:19 382
37:22 459	53:11 672	11:20 671
37:36 148	54:1 211-2, 523	12:5 675
38:5 255	54:1-10 60	12:6 668
38:20 204	54:2 524	13:15 152
40:2 668	54:10 627	13:18 479
40:3 105	55:4 151	14:7 309
40:4 169	56:5 326	14:8 479
40:18 141	57:6 152	14:17 459
40:28 141	57:10 455	14:21 554
41:16 514	57:15 365, 656	15:1 460
41:18 169	59:19 544	15:6 152
41:27 667	60:7 189	15:15 125, 569
41:29 298	60:14 232, 554	16:7 269
42:1 367-8	60:15-61:3 61	16:16 429
42:13 148	61:1 321	18:8 152
42:16 169	61:6 189	18:10 152, 298
42:18-19 508	62:11 110	18:12 455
43:10 208, 367	63:14 169	18:14 82, 108
43:11 208	63:17 535	18:20 668
43:24 163	64:3 208	18:22 271
44:4 680	65:5 217	20:12 671
44:6 208, 635	66:2 656	20:16 152, 271
44:8 154	66:4 248	21:9 465
44:9 298	66:12 544	23:5 672
45:5 208, 220, 635	66:24 217	23:12 308
45:6 208		23:17 554
45:7 154, 216	JEREMIAH	23:36 663
45:14 208, 635	1:5 529	25:7 232
45:15-46:3 61	1:18 179	25:15 377
45:21 208, 530, 635	2:5 298	25:22 693
45:24 208	2:13 298	26:7-8 150
46:3-47:4 61	2:18 544	26:11 150
46:9 208, 635	2:23 470	26:13 152
47:10 208	2:25 455	26:16 150
47:8 208, 335, 377	2:28 142	26:19 152, 298
47:9 377	3:5 298	27:3 693
48:12 208	4:6 62	28:9 234
48:14 377	4:18 298	29:23 561
48:18 544	4:28 152	29:26 149
49:12 264	5:21 574	30:21 671
50 671	6:24 503	31:6 666, 675-6
50:5 271	6:31 76	31:15 276
52:5 232, 554	7:18 232	31:19 152, 569
52:11 377	7:32 226	31:26 666
53 671	8:10 150	31:35-36 677
53:2 672	8:20-22 10, 113	31:36 82, 108
53:4 163	10:10 663	31:37 82,108
53:5 163	11:13 142	33:15 672
	11:16 374	



- 33:20 82, 108  
 33:24 232, 554  
 34:5 476  
 36:14 597  
 37:13 465  
 37:14 465  
 38:7 597  
 38:10 597  
 38:12 597  
 38:19 465  
 39:16 597  
 42:10 152  
 44:7 298  
 46:16 465  
 47:4 693  
 48:4 271  
 48:19 239  
 48:31 520  
 48:34 271  
 49:19 123  
 49:20 382  
 49:29 470  
 49:32 470  
 50:31-32 377  
 50:35-38 500  
 50:44 123  
 50:46 271  
 51:1 98  
 51:7 377  
 51:13 651  
 51:24 486  
 51:34 373, 589  
 51:44 589  
 51:54 271  
 51:55 651  
 51:56 210  
 52:15 465
- LAMENTATIONS
- 1:1 212  
 4:5 335  
 4:21 118  
 4:22 211
- EZEKIEL
- 1:1 170, 623  
 1:26 128  
 3:17 99, 187  
 5:7 149  
 5:10 217  
 5:15 217
- 7:26 150  
 8:3 170  
 8:6 578  
 11:12 148-9  
 11:19 217  
 12:13 19  
 12:28 234  
 13:2 149, 401  
 14:22 73, 152  
 15:5 262  
 16 19  
 16:41 217  
 18:25 209  
 18:29 209  
 19:9 613  
 19:19 680  
 20:11 213  
 20:13 213  
 20:16 148  
 20:18 149  
 20:21 213  
 21:26 251  
 23:10 217  
 23:30 298  
 24:14 152  
 25:5 470  
 25:11 217  
 26:2 693  
 26:3 693  
 26:4 693  
 26:15 693  
 26:19 179, 651  
 27:2 693  
 27:3 693  
 27:32 693  
 28:2 141, 142, 693  
 28:6 142  
 28:9 141, 142  
 28:12 693  
 28:22 217  
 28:26 217  
 29:4 346  
 29:18 693  
 30:5 324  
 30:12 292  
 30:14 217  
 30:19 217  
 31:4 651  
 31:5 651  
 31:7 651
- 31:15 651  
 31:16 152  
 32:2 651  
 32:14 651  
 32:31 152  
 33:2 187  
 33:7 187  
 37:12 58  
 37:25 672  
 38-39 217  
 40:2 170  
 42:13 274  
 43:11 529  
 44:5 339, 529  
 44:19 274  
 46:24 518
- DANIEL
- 1:8 194  
 2 199, 208, 658  
 2:10 111  
 2:23 112  
 3:29 208  
 3:31 208  
 3:4 208  
 3:7 208  
 4:16 461  
 4:37 210  
 5:19 208  
 6:26 208  
 7 199, 208-9, 646, 658,  
 671, 685  
 7:4-5 369  
 7:9 686  
 7:10 388  
 7:13 623  
 7:14 208, 637  
 7:27 215  
 8:9-10 210  
 8:11-14 356  
 10 624  
 11:3 356  
 11:16 96, 483  
 11:20 190  
 11:35 666  
 11:40 666  
 11:41 96, 483  
 12:1 444-5  
 12:2 214  
 12:3 674, 716  
 12:4 666

12:9 666	MICAH	14:1-11 61
HOSEA	1:3 148	14:3 148
1 19	1:5 391	14:13 310
1:5 475	5:1 280, 428, 506, 671	MALACHI
2:1 656	5:3 506	2:6 379
2:20 210	6:7 388	3:16 444
3 19	7:4 187	3:19-20 686, 717
3:1 520, 521	7:12 544	
4:8 569	7:17 661	MATTHEW
4:11 574	NAHUM	1:19 154
6:2-3 676	1:5 627	1:23 98
7:1 163	1:8 216	2:4 171
7:16 670	1:12 602	2:4-6 458
9:8 187	3:3 347	2:6 506
11:7 670	3:13 500	2:23 97, 111
13:13 265, 646	HABAKKUK	3:4 105
JOEL	1:12 210	3:16 627
1:9 189	2:1 187	4:15-16 105
1:13 189	3:1 199	5:2 656
2:13 152	3:13 148	5:20 171
2:14 152	3:17 614	5:46 614
2:17 189	3:17-18 658	6:12 163
4:4 693	3:18 636	7:1 125
4:8 292	ZEPHANIAH	7:7 125
AMOS	1:1 597	8:12 217
1:3 558	1:4 567	8:32 243
1:9 693	3:16 503	9:10-11 614
2:1 476	HAGGAI	10:3 614
5:12 290	2:5 73	10:6 159
5:21 453, 698	ZECHARIAH	11:19 614
7:3 152	3:1-2 465	12:1-4
7:5 266	4:7 677	12:32 172
7:6 152	4:14 228	13:22 172
8:11 226	5:7 606	13:24-30 680, 709-10, 716
9:7 597	8:14 152	13:28 680
9:13 226	8:15 110	13:36-43 680, 709-10, 716
OBADIAH	9:1 264	13:38 680
21 118	9:2 693	13:39 680
JONAH	9:3 693	13:41 680, 686
2:1 373	9:9 110, 116, 629	13:42 680
2:7 215	9:10 544	13:43 154, 680
3:3 310	9:13 210	13:49 154
3:9 152	10:4 316, 369	13:54-58 279
3:10 152	11:11 656	14:19 269
4:2 152, 311	12:10 218	15:36 269
	13:9 214	16:21 171
		18:17 614
		18:23-35 163
		20:1-19 118
		20:18 171

- 21:1-7 116  
 21:5 110, 629  
 21:14 509  
 21:15 171  
 21:31-32 614  
 22:1-14 671  
 22:13 217  
 23:35 154  
 24:30-31 686  
 25:14-30 445  
 25:30 217  
 25:31-46 671, 686  
 26:26 269  
 27:19 672  
 27:41 171
- MARK**  
 1:10 627  
 2:15-16 614  
 4:41 626  
 6:1-3 279  
 6:41 269  
 11:18 171  
 11:27 171  
 12:1-12 369  
 12:6-7 567  
 12:10-11 527  
 13:26 623  
 14:1 171  
 14:22 269  
 14:43 171  
 15:1 171
- LUKE**  
 1:22-40 203  
 1:32 34  
 1:32 527  
 1:47 203  
 1:49 203  
 1:51 203  
 1:52 203  
 1:53 203  
 1:67 171, 204  
 1:71 204  
 1:74 204  
 1:76 204  
 1:80 203  
 2 204  
 2:25 667  
 2:27 171  
 2:36 203
- 2:36-38 171  
 2:38 204  
 2:40 203  
 2:41-52 203  
 2:52 203  
 3:12 614  
 3:22 627  
 3:31 203  
 4:7 59  
 4:22 279  
 5:27-30 614  
 6:1-4 414  
 7:29 614  
 7:34 614  
 7:41-42 163  
 8:25 626  
 8:44 332  
 9:16 269  
 10:20 444, 445  
 11:4 163  
 13:4 163  
 15:1 614  
 16:9 125  
 18:10-13 614  
 18:38 203  
 19:2 614  
 19:8 550  
 19:11-27 215  
 19:12-28 445  
 20:19 171  
 20:41-44 203  
 22:2 171  
 22:4 158  
 22:19 269  
 22:52 158  
 22:66 171  
 23:10 171  
 23:47 672
- JOHN**  
 1:29 381  
 1:32 627  
 3:33 177  
 6:11 269  
 8:12 673  
 9:5 673  
 12:15 110, 629  
 12:41 166  
 19:23-24 116
- ACTS**  
 1:9 623  
 2:30 203  
 2:41 177  
 3:14 672  
 4:1 158  
 5:24 158  
 5:26 158  
 7:52 672  
 8:14 177  
 8:15 59  
 8:27 59  
 8:32 381  
 10:2 220  
 13:15 59  
 13:21 300  
 13:22 305  
 16:20-38 158  
 22:14 672
- ROMANS**  
 3:10-18 110  
 9:7 102  
 11:1 299  
 12:2 172
- 1 CORINTHIANS**  
 2:7 172  
 5:7 381  
 8:4 635  
 11:22 164  
 11:23 176  
 11:24 269  
 15:54 373
- 2 CORINTHIANS**  
 1:22 357  
 6:15 143
- GALATIANS**  
 3:16 102  
 3:29 102  
 4:27 212
- EPHESIANS**  
 1:14 357  
 4:8 198  
 5:14 198  
 6:10-17 679

PHILIPPIANS	JAMES	5:8 670
1:10 217	4:6 198	5:10 215
2:1-11 637		7:17 370
2:11 637	1 PETER	13:2 369
3:5 164	1:19 381	13:4 369
	2:6-8 369	13:5-6 369
2 THESSALONIANS	2:9 656, 674	13:8 382, 444-5
4:13-18 686		14:8 377
	2 PETER	14:9-13 372
2 TIMOTHY	2:7 154	14:14-16 686
2:12 215	2:17 217	14:16-18 377
3:9 114		15:3 382
	1 JOHN	17:8 444-5
HEBREWS	2:1 672	17:15 651
1:5 34		19:11-16 686
1:5 527	3 JOHN	20:6 215
3-4 372	4:8 190	20:7-10 218
3:7 198		20:8 218
10:5 198	JUDE	20:11-15 680
11 126	1:13	20:12 444-5
11:4 154		20:15 444-5
11:19 126	REVELATION	21:22 383
11:32 293	3:5 444-5	21:27 444-5
12:23 444-5	3:21 671	22:1 383
13:6 198	4:4 682	22:5 215
	5:5 381	22:12-17 686
	5:6 382	

# Index of Jewish Sources

Index of several ancient Jewish Sources: apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, Qumranic texts, Josephus' *Antiquities* and *Jewish War*, Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, early Midrashim (Mekhilta, Sifra, Sifre), Midrash Rabba and other Midrashim (Samuel, Tanḥuma, Psalms), Mishna, Talmud Bavli, Talmud Yerushalmi and Tosefta, other tractates and sources, and finally—although he was no Jew—Pseudo-Jerome's *Quaestiones in Librum Samuelis*.

<i>Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha</i>	JUDITH	1QH III.7-8 646
ASCENSION OF ISAAH	8:20 635-6	1QH <sup>a</sup> VI.3 656
3:13 686	1 MACCABEES	1QH <sup>a</sup> X.20-21 445
4:18 686	1:31-40 252	1QM I.6 148
BARUCH	1:33 510	1QM VII.4-5 509
6 377	2:52 654	1QM XI.9 687
APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH	3:45 510	1QM XI.16 217
35:1-46:6 686	4:30 210, 345	1QM XIV.7 656
70:10 686	10:16 559	1QM XIV.17 216
72:1-73:1 686	10:19-20 559	1QS II.7-8 680
4 EZRA	13:42 165	1QS IV.3 656
11:1-12:3 686	14:27-45 165	1QS IV.13 680
13:2-13 686	2 MACCABEES	1QS <sup>a</sup> II.3-10 509
1 HENOCH	4:10-17 252	4QSam <sup>a</sup> 222, 225, 253,
38:2 672	PSALMS OF SOLOMON	277, 284, 332, 434,
45 368	17:29-30 682	454, 457, 511, 517,
46:3 672	17:35 672	532, 543, 554, 567,
46:3-5 686	SIBYLLINE ORACLES	594, 600, 609, 670
48:2-7 686	5:414-443 686	4Q160 230
48:6 368	SIRACH	4Q161 217
49:1-4 686	18:5-6 331	4Q174 527
49:2 368	44:17 154	4Q246 527
51:3 368	44:20 654	4Q285 217
53:3 686	47:3-7 379	4Q491 217, 671
53:6 368, 672	47:4-6 345	11Q10 104
54:1-69:12 686	TESTAMENT OF THE PATRIARCHS	11Q13 671
55:4 368	T.Abr 7:2-5 675	11QPs <sup>a</sup> 199, 644
89 381	T.Lev. 10:5 154	11Q Temple XLV.12-14 .
90:20-42 686	T.Jud. 18:1 154	509
91:16 675	T.Dan. 5:6 154	Dam. 15:15-17 509
3 HENOCH	T.Benj. 7:4 154	<i>Pseudo-Philo</i>
12:3 675	T.Benj. 9:1 154	LIBER ANTIQUITATUM
JUBILEES	T.Benj. 11:4 368	BIBLICARUM
17:18 654	<i>Qumran</i>	50:2 146
	1QApGen XX.2-8a 373	50:3 189
		51 205
		51:3-6 200
		51:5 217

53:1 231	6:22 255	7:98 535
53:2 230	6:35 263	7:99 536
54:1 236	6:46 266	7:110 615
54:3 349, 351	6:48 267, 270	7:121 543
54:3-4 44, 114	6:63 281	7:129 546
54:4 238	6:86 291	7:132 547
55:6 249	6:90 295	7:161 556-7
55:10 253	6:115 312	7:163 559
56:2-3 274	6:118 313	7:171 562
56:4 270	6:120 150	7:196 573-4
57:2 290	6:121 314-5	7:202 578
58 335	6:126 318	7:210 583
58:1 320	6:130 318	7:238 594
58:2-3 274	6:133 320	7:243 596
59:2 338	6:140 182	7:246 597
59:4 340	6:152 332	7:250 599
61:1 294	6:155 74	7:274 606
61:2 44, 114, 349, 356, 380	6:160 339	7:293 615
61:4 379	6:163 340	7:307 692
61:5 375, 378, 380	6:166 340	7:308 687
61:6 345, 622, 629	6:171 346	7:311 688
61:7 372	6:182 362	7:315 690
61:8 378	6:183 361	7:326 696
61:9 386	6:187 383	7:328 697
62:2 389	6:190 372	7:331 698
62:11 406	6:192 386	8:417 171
63:1 412	6:193 388	10:143 300
63:2 415	6:244 415	11:128 171
64:3 151, 459	6:261 412	12:2 331
64:6 148	6:270 422	12:142 171
64:9 463	6:281 428	JEWISH WAR
65:2 475	6:284 430, 432	2:267 367
65:4 474	6:294 300	2:290 367
	6:296 436	2:345-404 367
	6:297 437	2:346 367
<i>Josephus</i>	6:308 448	2:409 367
ANTIQUITIES	6:315 452	4:128 367
5:10 188, 203, 222, 226	6:344-350 273	5:361-419 367
5:11 189	6:360 468	6:93-110 367
5:16 252	6:363 469	6:94-95 356
5:252 549	6:364 470	6:420-27 322
5:345 195	6:365 468	
5:347 193	6:370 474-5	<i>Early Midrashim</i>
5:348 230	6:374 475	MEKHILTA DERABBI
5:351 234	6:378 300	SHIM'ON B. YOHAI
5:353 236	7:62 510	15:21 287
6:1 243	7:71 513	MEKHILTA DERABBI
6:4 243	7:76 514	YISHMA'EL
6:16 253	7:77 514	<i>Amalek</i> , 1 325
6:19 284	7:89 618	

<i>Amalek</i> , 3 312	38:14 186, 212, 522	30:16 615, 625
<i>Bahodesh</i> , 2 539	43:9 472	30:18 210
<i>Bahodesh</i> , 7 233	44:1 654	42:3 532
<i>Bahodesh</i> , 9 680	44:17 208, 451	50:5 675
<i>Beshallah</i> , 3 627, 649	44:23 182	51:7 208
<i>Beshallah</i> , 6 327	45:10 281, 527	LEVITICUS RABBA
<i>Beshallah</i> , 7 627	48:8 287	1:1 148
<i>Mishpatim</i> , 20 509	49:5 146	2:3 188
<i>Nezikin</i> , 8 224	54:4 273	4:5 508
<i>Pisha</i> , 14 128	54:6 419	4:20 162
<i>Pisha</i> , 16 269	55:3-8 371	10:6 363, 379
<i>Shirata</i> , 1 180	55:6 216, 281, 527	10:7 372
<i>Shirata</i> , 2 508	56:4 379	10:8 276
<i>Shirata</i> , 6 131	58:2 230	13:5 208
<i>Shirata</i> , 8 155	58:7 268	18:1 372, 445
<i>Shirata</i> , 10 138	58:8 605	19:6 612-3
<i>Vayassa</i> <sup>4</sup> , 4 623, 627	59:11 620	21:2 373
<i>Vayassa</i> <sup>4</sup> , 5 287	67:8 194	22:6 615
SIFRA	69:11 627	22:9 143
Introd. 1:7 87	72:1 186-7, 211	25:8 315
Introd. 5 87	78:5 680, 686	26:7 460, 462-3, 625
10:1 176	78:15 470	36:3 654
SIFRE BAMIDBAR	82:7 494, 618	NUMBERS RABBA
§ 40 216-7	82:10 276	2:11 322, 694
§ 42 114, 698	85:12 223, 258, 289, 291	3:2 539, 575
§ 84 128	94:9 611, 613, 682	3:6 190, 531
§ 88 113, 116	94:13 684	4:20 180, 373, 433, 494,
§ 112 88	96 (NV) 672	515-8, 521-2
§ 119 529	96:5 445	5:3 615
§ 139 445	97 (NV) 345, 629	5:9 252-3
SIFRE ZUTA	98:2 218	8:4 615, 617-8
Num. 10:33 623	98:4 206, 214	9:24 596
Num. 11:31 623	98:6 482	10:1 315
SIFRE DEVARIM	99:2 276	10:5 190, 193, 531
§ 26 176	99:3 356	10:17 574
§ 357 445	EXODUS RABBA	11:2 291
<i>Midrash Rabba</i>	1:17 218	11:3 318
GENESIS RABBA	1:22 188, 375, 528	11:5 216, 445, 675
1:12 659	2:6 216, 281, 527	11:7 114, 698
3:6 158, 675	3:16 188, 375	12:11 218
6:9 482	3:37 225	14:1 256
13:4-6 676	15:7 216	14:4 190, 531
13:12 649	15:12 128, 532	14:21 68
17:5 451	15:16 208	16:5 193, 355
22:6 550, 679	15:20 671	18:10 267, 275, 290
26:6 680	15:21 675	18:13 214, 415
34:10 194	18:11 675	18:17 409
34:13 463	24:1 532	18:20 214
	25:8 216	18:21 670
	27:4 218	19:9 473

- 23:13 682, 684, 692
- DEUTERONOMY RABBA
- 2:1 176
- 2:7 216, 281, 527
- 7:6 676
- 10:3 671
- 10:4 215
- 16:1 148
- QOHELET RABBA
- 1:4 291, 293
- 1:18 143, 212, 345
- 3:2 445
- 5:2 194
- 5:19 146
- 7:1 128, 440, 531-2
- 7:16 323
- 7:19 670
- 9:18 68, 77, 613
- LAMENTATIONS RABBA
- Proem 23 330
- 1:1 322
- 1:2 186, 212
- 1:17 186, 212
- 2:3 205, 218
- 3:64 336
- 5:15 560
- CANTICLES RABBA
- 1:2 539
- 1:3 214
- 1:9 649
- 2:6 531
- 2:16 190
- 4:4 363, 379, 670
- 4:5 291
- 4:8 267
- 5:15 315
- 6:2 230
- 6:9 627, 694
- 8:7 651
- RUTH RABBA
- 1:4 273
- 1:20 345, 622
- 2:2 630
- 2:5 188
- 2:19 168
- 2:20 620
- 4:1 591
- 4:8 488
- 5:1 80, 688
- 5:6 507
- 7:12 333
- ESTHER RABBA
- Proem 7 320
- 4:9 320
- 7:13 320
- 10 374
- 10:3 194
- Other Midrashim*
- MIDRASH SAMUEL
- 1:6 189
- 1:8 146, 191
- 1:9 192
- 5:12 214
- 5:17 218
- 7:4 223
- 10:77 243
- 11:1 44, 114, 238, 349, 351
- 11:3 618
- 13:1 255
- 14:89 285
- 17:95 299
- 20:4 345, 622
- 22:4 399, 618
- 23 436
- 25:4 487, 488
- 27:3 531
- MIDRASH TANHUMA
- Bereshit*, 4:12 612-3, 682, 692
- Bereshit*, 6:7 500
- Bereshit*, 7:8 620
- Bereshit*, 7:17 574
- Bereshit*, 9:14 216
- Bereshit*, 11:8 345, 357, 620
- Bereshit*, 11:9 363
- Shemot*, 1:11 312
- Shemot*, 1:16 281, 528
- Shemot*, 27 [24] 225
- Vayyiqra*, 2:5 281
- Vayyiqra*, 3:8 345
- Vayyiqra*, 4:3 155
- Vayyiqra*, 5:10 348
- Vayyiqra*, 8:4 460
- Bamidbar*, 1:3 682, 692
- Bamidbar*, 3:27 516
- Bamidbar*, 4:5 193, 355
- Bamidbar*, 5:27 214
- Bamidbar*, 5a:4 214
- Bamidbar*, 10:9 682, 692
- Devarim*, 5:2 415
- Devarim*, 6:18 479
- Devarim*, 10:7 689
- MIDRASH TEHILLIM
- 1:2 281, 528
- 1:6 670
- 2:12 379
- 3:3 538, 592
- 3:4 674
- 3:4-5 415
- 4:8 409
- 7:2 44, 114, 238, 275
- 8:1 208, 210, 680
- 9:11 591
- 9:14 532
- 17:4 696
- 17:10 218, 617
- 17A:16 291
- 18:1 643
- 18:5 379, 643
- 18:6 670
- 18:7 202, 428
- 18:10 646
- 18:11 627
- 18:13 648
- 18:20 651
- 18:22 654
- 18:26 155, 637
- 18:30 620, 624, 627, 629
- 21:4 214
- 24:7 312
- 26:7 447
- 27:2 311, 515
- 27:6 256
- 29:2 255
- 45:4 214
- 52:4 415
- 52:5-7 415
- 57:3 332
- 58:1 451
- 59:4 494
- 62:4 82
- 72:2 291
- 75:5 206
- 78:11 243
- 92:9 485



103:17 148	TAMID	24a 181, 606
108:2 281, 528	3:3 274	27a 287
116:3 645	YADAYIM	30b 192
119:47 453	4:4 285	31b 144, 193
119:76 255	YOMA	33a 676
121:2 216	3:11 261	34a 535
138:1 460	7:5 417, 421	34b 199, 644
<i>Mishna</i>	8:6 39	58a 355
AVOTH	ZEVAHIM	60a 554
1:3 535	5:7 143-4	62b 433, 453, 696
1:12 379, 381	14:4-5 143	ERUVIN
1:17 652	<i>Talmud Bavli</i>	13a 331
3:16 445	ARAKHIN	19a 680
3:17 357	13b 212	53a-b 318
4:2 679	15a 625	53b 281, 462
5:1 168	AVODA ZARA	63a-b 539
5:22 542	3b 680, 686	GITTIN
BESA	5a 670	59a 281, 539
5:2 181	11a 476	HAGIGA
GITTIN	24b 256	4b 460
1:1 324	25a 275	12a 100, 674
HAGIGA	25b 482	12b 445, 676
1:1 509	38b 592	HULLIN
HALLA	44a 514	7b 269
2:7 484	BABA BATHRA	17b 314
KELIM	4a 502	66b 346
13:3 306	14b 205, 516	91b 375
MEGILLA	25a 535	135a 440
3:4 320	56a 182	137a 440
4:10 545, 559	79a 680	KALLA RABBATI
NAZIR	147a 592	52a 192
9:5 193	BABA MESI'A	53a 611, 651
PEA	33b 680	53b 528
8:5 440	48b 357	KERITOT
PESAHIM	83b 674	6a 206
7:1 440	BABA QAMMA	11a 590
SANHEDRIN	92a 680	13b 195
2:5 400	98a 307	KETUBBOT
10:3 214	199a 615	8b 554
SOTA	BERAKHOT	9b 39, 358
8:1 345	3b 417, 470	65a 192
8:5 509	10a 636	72b 500
SUKKA	12b 462	110b 453
4:1 255	14a 212	111a 666
4:9-10 255	18a-b 689	MAKKOT
	19a 554	19b 547
		23b 291

- MEGILLA  
 2b 187  
 3a 17, 199, 644, 666  
 9b 144  
 9b-10a 143  
 14a 187-8, 205, 211, 331  
 15b 211-2  
 21a 331  
 25a-b 545  
 25b 243  
 29b 59  
 30a 320  
 31a 60
- MENAHOT  
 95b 23, 39, 413-4
- MO'ED QATAN  
 16b 105, 539, 670-1, 682,  
 684, 687
- NAZIR  
 4b-5a 572  
 5a 574  
 66a 193, 204
- NEDARIM  
 32a 654  
 37b 535, 584  
 38a 267  
 39b 677  
 62a 306, 539
- NIDDA  
 38b 487  
 51b 346
- PEA  
 16b 216
- PESAHIM  
 3a 190  
 36b 521  
 47a 331  
 53a 440  
 54a 677  
 54b 667  
 64b 322  
 68a 675  
 74a 440  
 111b 624
- QIDDUSHIN  
 40a 680  
 49a 63  
 72b 230
- 78b 229-30  
 82b 261
- ROSH HASHANA  
 11a 186  
 16b-17a 214  
 18a 6, 233, 447  
 22b 514  
 25a-b 293  
 28b 331
- SANHEDRIN  
 6b 154, 379  
 7a 224  
 7b 217, 674  
 19b 392, 394  
 19b-20a 618  
 20b 253, 260  
 21a 494, 522  
 22b 278  
 26b 216  
 34b-35a 618  
 38b 237  
 42a 168  
 46b 476  
 48b 499, 686  
 52b 476  
 67b 102  
 72b 433  
 89b 371  
 91a-b 508  
 91b 675  
 92a 676  
 93a 348, 370  
 93b 318, 682  
 95a 345, 500, 620, 622,  
 624, 627, 629  
 95b 626  
 98a 655  
 99a 218  
 105a 638  
 106b-107a 415  
 107b 507  
 108a 6, 233  
 109b 214  
 111b 143
- SHABBAT  
 31a 538  
 53b 677  
 55b 189, 223  
 55b-56a 289
- 56a 39, 258, 358  
 56b 604  
 63a 285  
 97a 676  
 152a 436, 605  
 152b 372, 445
- SHEVU'OT  
 26a 100
- SOFERIM  
 37b 209, 583  
 38a 256, 263, 387, 439,  
 497, 564, 576, 582,  
 584, 657, 689  
 38b 243, 535  
 39a 545  
 42a 401
- SOTA  
 9b 596  
 10b 600  
 11a 596  
 20a 331  
 35a 518  
 35a-b 252  
 35b 253, 518, 520, 625  
 36b 327  
 42b 343-5, 347-8, 356,  
 359, 620, 622  
 48b 577-8
- SUKKA  
 52b 550
- TA'ANIT  
 2a-b 676  
 5b 299, 419  
 7a 676  
 17a 278
- YEVAMOT  
 63b 297  
 77a 399  
 78b 615-6  
 79a 615  
 105a 233  
 109b 217, 674
- YOMA  
 9a 223  
 9a-b 223  
 22b 285, 299, 322-3, 373,  
 552, 604  
 38a 261

- 38b 216  
73b 577-8  
76a 676  
77a 624  
78b 278  
85b 433  
87a 224  
ZEVAHIM  
54b 157, 399  
102a 216, 281, 528  
112b 126  
114a-b 143  
116b 114, 698  
117a 143  
118a 126  
118b 299, 301  
119a 144  
*Talmud Yerushalmi*  
BERAKHOT  
1:1 684  
2:3 672  
4:1 287  
4:18 328  
5:2 676  
7:1 269  
9:5 146  
BIKKURIM  
3:3 299  
KETUBBOT  
13:1 223  
MAKKOT  
2:6 682, 692  
6:7 684  
MEGILLA  
1:9 17  
1:12 275  
1:13 143  
1:39 331  
NEDARIM  
5:7 279  
QIDDUSHIN  
1:7 500  
1:9 182  
4:1 615-8  
ROSH HASHANA  
2:5 6  
2:6 233  
2:9 293  
SANHEDRIN  
1:2 6, 233  
2:3 441  
2:4 253, 373, 433, 494,  
521  
2:6 618  
2:8 278  
3:10 487  
6:9 615-8  
10:1 214  
10:2 421  
10:4 214  
SHEVI'IT  
6:1 182  
SHEVU'OT  
4:1 487  
SOTA  
1:4 223  
1:10 482  
9:7 113  
SUKKA  
5:4 670  
5:14 521  
TA'ANIT  
1:1 676  
2:1 281, 371  
TERUMOT  
4:6 590  
YOMA  
8:1 278  
*Tosefta*  
AVODA ZARA  
3:19 514  
4:5 453  
BERAKHOT  
4:18 281, 372  
BESA  
2:15 440  
MEGILLA  
3 243  
3:31 545  
3:41 63, 101, 168, 545  
4:41 331  
ROSH HASHANA  
1:18 293  
SANHEDRIN  
4:5 258, 274  
7 (end) 87  
13:3 214  
SHABBAT  
7:17/18 476  
SHEVU'OT  
1:7 100  
SOTA  
3:16 572  
3:16-17 596  
7:22 509  
9:2-8 113  
9:4 116  
SUKKA  
3:3 255  
3:14-16 255  
*Other Sources*  
AGGADAT BERESHIT  
19:60 146  
22:3 613  
29:2 146  
41 189, 223  
42:4 223  
AVOTH DE RABBI  
NATHAN  
ARN 7 445  
ARN<sup>a</sup> 14:5 445  
ARN<sup>a</sup> 26:a 453  
ARN<sup>a</sup> 34:7 649  
ARN<sup>a</sup> 37:55 87  
ARN<sup>b</sup> 26:1 436  
ARN<sup>b</sup> 27 670  
ARN<sup>b</sup> 31b 214  
ARN<sup>b</sup> 44 670  
PESIQTA DERAV  
KAHANA  
2:8 286, 322, 694  
3:6 336  
3:16 474  
11:13 612  
18:1 409  
18:3 522  
20:1 522

- PESIQTA RABBATI 18 281, 447, 528 p. 92 385  
 2:5 82 21 531-2 p. 93 389-90  
 6:4 82 29 (31) 677 p. 94 393, 401  
 8:4 675 SEDER ELIYAHU ZUTA p. 95 412  
 8:5 311 3 656 p. 98 421  
 10:14 322 5 216 p. 102 151  
 11:3 322, 682, 684, 692, 694, 696 15 674 p. 103 459  
 12:9 479 YALQUT SHIM'ONI p. 104 474  
 15:3 318 § 4 675 p. 108-109 483  
 20:4 676 § 102 349, 351 p. 109 117  
 29/30 667 § 115 297 p. 110 489, 494  
 31:9 218 § 129 399 p. 110-11, 494  
 31:9-10 667 § 157 176 p. 111 495  
 32:1 409 § 427 148 p. 113-14 507  
 32:2 522 § 567 148 p. 114 509  
 33:6 667 § 763 148 p. 115 514  
 40:1 197 § 811 176 p. 115-16 514-5  
 42:4 675 p. 116 148, 518-19  
 43:7 189-90, 211 *Pseudo-Jerome* p. 118 494, 523  
 43:8 191 p. 119 525  
 46:1 186, 189, 518 QUAESTIONES IN p. 121 531  
 48:3 299-300, 375, 654 LIBRUM SAMUELIS p. 123 541  
 PIRQE DERABBI p. 66 146 p. 124 543  
 ELIEZER p. 67 143, 189 p. 124-25 545  
 28 208 p. 68 197 p. 125 546  
 33 459, 462 p. 69 212 p. 127 556-7  
 34 676 p. 70 216 p. 132-33 574  
 SEDER OLAM RABBA p. 71 223 p. 133 577  
 8 419 p. 75 231 p. 134 83  
 20 148 p. 76 234 p. 135 587, 590-1  
 14 578 p. 77 251 p. 136 591  
 SEDER ELIYAHU p. 78 253 p. 137 592, 594  
 RABBA p. 79 267 p. 138 596  
 2-3 664 p. 80 270, 276 p. 138-139 597  
 3 670, 677, 680, 682, 684 p. 81 149, 200, 277-8 p. 140 605  
 4 445 p. 82 279 p. 142-43 611  
 5 (p. 21) 215 p. 83 149, 293 p. 143 539  
 9 146 p. 84 296, 302 p. 143-44 615  
 11 233 p. 85 303 p. 144-45 630  
 12 252-3 p. 86-87 315 p. 145 670  
 17 255, 312 p. 87 180 p. 147 689  
 p. 89 329, 334 p. 149 696  
 p. 90 340, 345 p. 150 698

## ERRATA AND CORRIGENDA

E. van Staalduine-Sulman, *The Targum of Samuel*

p.1 l.18	reveal	read: reveals
p.22 l.12	thousand	read: thousands
p.102 l.1	other	read: others
p.106 l.23	4:8	read: 5:6
p.110 n.184	SS	read: §§
p.127 l.27	a the	read: the
p.129 l.4	try	read: tried
p.150 l.6	prophets	read: prophet
p.168 l.7	מלא	read: מלתא
p.216 l.5	ot	read: or
p.219 l.8	sons	read: son
p.221 l.16	the order or	read: the order of
p.221 l.18	actual	read: actual
p.222 l.3	was was	read: was
p.232 l.2	are	read: were
p.232 l.16	Consequently ,	read: Consequently,
p.244 l.22	טחורין	read: טחורין
p.267 n.562	prophecies	read: prophecies
p.295 l.28	starts	read: start
p.307 l.14	and and	read: and
p.360 l.22	he people	read: the people
p.372 l.17	Philstine	read: Philistine
p.383 l.1	the this	read: this
p.385 l.13	interpretes	read: interprets
p.401 l.5	spirt	read: spirit
p.477 l.11	reported	read: reported
p.509 l.1	the the	read: the
p.513 l.2	daughter	read: daughters
p.535 l.8	with with	read: with
p.565 l.22	to to	read: to
p.579 l.6 v.o.	32).	read: 32),
p.602 l.2	were were	read: were
p.703 l.4	The	read: They
p.706 l.11	poetric	read: poetic