A GREEK FRAGMENT OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL:
BEINECKE LIBRARY MS 544 (RA 846)*

Benjamin G. Wright, Jr.

In *Oudtestamentische Studien* 14, W. Baars published a short article on a Greek fragment of the books of Samuel, which he hoped would “serve the purpose of saving the text from being quite forgotten.”¹ The fragment had been offered for sale as no. 2475 by E. von Scherling in the 1954 fascicle of *Rotulus*, a magazine for manuscript sellers. Since he was not aware of the fragment’s location, Baars had to base his publication on an unclear photograph of one side of the fragment provided in the sale notice. Although his notes are careful, and for the most part correct, Baars was handicapped by the poor quality of the photo, not to mention the lack of any photo of the reverse. This publication is intended to finish the job that Baars began.

The location of the fragment continued to be something of a mystery even after Baars’s notice. In his article “Septuaginta Forschungen seit 1954,”² John Wevers gave a summary of Baars’s conclusions, although he also had no information on the manuscript’s whereabouts. Not until J. von Haelst’s notice in 1976 of its ownership by the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University did its location become public knowledge.³ Although inventoried at the Beinecke as Ms 544, the

¹ I would like to thank Lehigh University for providing funds for a trip to New Haven to examine the fragment. Thanks are also due to Robert A. Kraft and Lynn R. LiDonnici who read drafts of this paper and made valuable comments and to the members of Prof. Kraft’s graduate seminar whose questions helped me to sharpen my focus on some of the problems with this manuscript.


³ Theologische Rundschau N.S. 33 (1968) 54.

⁴ J. von Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976). The route of the papyrus from 1954 until its donation in 1965 to Yale by Walter Beinecke is not completely clear, but can probably be reconstructed on the basis of
fragment has been assigned the number 846 by the Göttingen Septuagint Project, and I will refer to it by this latter number in what follows.

The fragment is part of one leaf of a quire from a codex constituting parts of four pages, made of a thin, fine parchment. The small, upright uncial writing fits well with the 4-5th century date given in the Rotulus sale notice and accepted by Baars. Each page is formatted in two columns of 43 lines each and measures 21.5 x 17.5 cms. Parts of all four columns are preserved on each side of the fragment with the writing area of each column occupying approximately 17.6 x 6.5 cms. The preserved text encompasses 1 Sam 24.11-17; 24.20-25.20; 31.12-13; 2 Sam 1.1; 1.6-7, 17-18, 26-2.4 or parts of these passages. Thus, Baars’s estimation that 2 pages of the quire originally intervened between the texts preserved in this fragment appears correct.

Although Baars knew only one side of the fragment, he correctly reasoned that the text of the most completely preserved columns was continuous from the preceding side. He divided the leaf into two folio pages, beginning with the earliest section of 1 Samuel, which would have been on the reverse side of his photograph, and numbered them pages 1 and 2, each with sides a and b, and with columns 1 and 2. In my discussion I have retained those designations. The following chart shows the passages which are preserved in each page, side, and column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio 1a, col. 1 = 1 Sam 24.11-24.17</th>
<th>Folio 2a, col. 1 = 1 Sam 31.2-2 Sam 1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a, col. 2 = 1 Sam 24.20-25.7</td>
<td>2a, col. 2 = 2 Sam 1.6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b, col. 1 = 1 Sam 25.7-25.14</td>
<td>2b, col. 1 = 2 Sam 1.17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b, col. 2 = 1 Sam 25.15-25.20</td>
<td>2b, col. 2 = 2 Sam 1.26-2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

conversations with Robert Babcock, the curator of the Beinecke collection, and an article by Thomas Marston in the 1965 Yale University Library Gazette ("A Collection of Early Manuscript Leaves," vol. 40, 5-11). The fragment seems to have been acquired by one Mark Lansburgh, and subsequently passed into the hands of E. P. Goldschmidt in Toronto. It was bought by the Toronto/New York firm of H. P. Krause and sold to Walter Beinecke who donated it to Yale in 1965.


5Baars, *ibid.*, gives 21.5 x 18 cms. based on the Rotulus photo. An entire page (all four columns) would have measured approximately 43 x 35 cm.

6Baars, *ibid.*
1. Transcription and textual commentary

In the transcription I have endeavored to present a close rendering of the text, including scribal marks and corrections. The scribe who penned the main text often used a shorthand form of α at the end of a line, and occasionally also wrote καί with a single representation. I have written out these shorthand forms. Each occurrence is noted in the textual notes on the transcription. Partial or uncertain letters are designated by a sublinear dot; square brackets indicate an editorial reconstruction of missing letters or words; curly brackets indicate that a letter is written on top of the preceding letter. Interlinear corrections are put on a separate line above the text, positioned as in the manuscript. Differences between my readings and Baars' are pointed out in the textual notes. In the transcription, line numbers are given in the right margin, and in the left margin chapter and verse numbers according to the Brooke-MacLean-Thackeray edition of Samuel. In the footnotes I give a line-by-line commentary pertaining to scribal aspects of the manuscript.

The text appears to have been penned by one scribe. There is no word division, but I have divided words to facilitate their reading. With one apparent exception (fol. 1a, col. 2, ll. 7-8), the scribe usually divided words at the end of a line, at what could be construed as syllable breaks. Frequently α at or near the end of a line is written as a single stroke that tails off from the preceding letter (see photographs). Except for the correction of αυτω in the top margin of fol. 1a, col. 2, all corrections, both marginal and interlinear, appear to come from a second hand. Some corrected letters differ from those of the main text, and the color of the ink is also different. The αυτω correction may be by a third hand, but because of its similarity with the main hand and the similar ink color, I suggest it should be attributed to the main scribe.

A general system governs the positioning of corrections. Substitutions for a word or part of a word in the main text are written in the margin and positioned interlinearly by the sign ` (e.g. fol. 1a, col. 1, ll. 8 and 11). Words or letters which are meant to be inserted into the text are usually written between lines (fol. 1a, col. 1, l. 10; fol. 1a, col. 2, ll. 1, 2). In three cases, words which otherwise might have been written between the lines are treated like substitutions, except that in these instances a

different siglum is used — ἡ (fol. 1a, col. 2, l. 36; fol. 1b, col. 1, l. 33; fol. 1b, col. 2, l. 4). In two cases (fol. 1b, col. 2 and fol. 2b, col. 2) entire phrases are meant to be inserted. The sign for an insertion is always placed in the interlinear space, and refers the reader to the margin, where a second sign directs the reader to the correction in the top margin.

Several other features characterize this fragment. *Nomina sacra* and related vocables are abbreviated, χρ[ιστο]ς, κ[υριο]ς, πρς in the only occurrence for πατηρ in the genitive, and ον[θωρι]ς. Some proper names such as Ι[σραι]λ and Δ[ανει]δ are also shortened; but others, such as Σαυλ, Σαμουηλ, or Ναβαλ are not. Some punctuation marks are used — a double point (:) and a raised dot (·) indicate a full stop; in one instance, the double dot ends a question (fol. 1b, col. 1, l. 29). Most of these marks are easily recognizable in the transcription and will be expressly mentioned only if they are especially noteworthy. Diacesis is used over initial *iota*, in a few cases medially (see fol. 1a, col. 1, l. 3; fol. 1b, col. 2, l. 27; fol. 2a, col. 1, l. 3). An apostrophe is used after proper names which do not decline in Greek. Apparent breathing marks occur in three instances (fol. 1a, col. 2, l. 30; fol. 1b, col. 1, l. 26; fol. 1b, col. 2, l. 2). Paragraphoi are marked in a few cases (fol. 1a, col. 2, ll. 12, 14, 18; fol. 2a, col. 1, l. 11). A superlinear stroke is occasionally used to indicate a *nu* at the end of a line whether in a final or medial form. Its use appears governed by consideration of line length.8

FOLIO 1a, col. 1

1 R. 24.11 κω χειρα μου επι κυ μου στι χς
24.12 κυ ουτος εστιν· και ιδου το >9
περνυγιον της διπλοιδος
εν τη χειρα μου εγω αφηρηκα
το ρεπρυγιον και ουκ απεκτα
και σε και γνωθι και ιδε σημε
ρον στι ουκ εστιν κακια εν

---

8On the use of punctuation and other text arranging sigla, see Thompson, *Introduction*, 60-64.

9An arrowhead (>) appears at the end of the line to fill out the vacant space. Three others appear in fol. 1a, col. 1, l. 19; col. 2, l. 33; and fol. 2b, col. 2, l. 4. On the use of the arrowhead, see Thompson, *ibid.*, 63.
τη χειρι μου ουνε aσεβεία10 και
αθετηςις και ουκ[χ]11 ημαρτηκα
συ ν
24.13 χιν μου λαβειν αυτην δικα14
σαι κς ανα μεσον εμου και σου
και εκ δικησε15 με κς εκ σου η
κρι
ναι
24.14 δε χειρ μου ουκ εσται επι σε κα
θως λεγεται η παραβολη η αρ
χαια εξ ανομων εξελευσεται16
πλημμαλεια· και η χειρ μ[ο]ν
24.15 ουκ εσται επι σε και νυν οπισω
tινος εκ' πορευη συ βασιλευ η
ηλ οπισω τινος καταδιωκεις
οπισω κυνος τεθνηκοτος και17
24.16 οπισω ψυλλου ενος· γενοιτο
κς εις κριτην και εις δικαστη18
ανα μεσον εμου και σου ιδοι
κς και κρινει την κρισιν μου και19
25

10 A scribal siglum over aσεβεία indicates a marginal correction to aσεβημα.
11 In ουν, a chi was written over an original kappa.
12 A sign resembling English “z” with a slash over it appears in the left margin. Its function is not clear. It occurs several times in the extant portions of the manuscript (fol. 1a, col. 1, l. 27; fol. 1a, col. 2, l. 31; fol. 1b, col. 1, l. 24; fol. 1b, col. 2, l. 12; fol. 1b, col. 2, l. 20).
13 An interlinear correction changes και συ δεσμευεις to και συ συνδεσμευεις.
14 A scribal siglum over δικασαι indicates a marginal correction to κριναι.
15 Between the preposition and the verb stem on εκδικησει occurs what looks like an apostrophe. Apostrophes are found elsewhere, e.g. l. 19 and l. 26.
16 The letters αι at the end of the line are written with a single stroke.
17 και is written shorthand.
18 A superlinear stroke suspends final μυ.
19 και is written shorthand.
24.17 δικασαί με εκ’ χειροφ σου· και συν
ζ’ [εγενετο] ὡς ετελεσεν 20 ΔΔ’ τα
ρηματα ταυτα λαλω[ν] προς Σα
ουλ’ και ειπεν Σαουλ’ η φραση
σου αυτη τεκνον ΔΔ και ηρε21
REMAINDER OF COLUMN LOST

FOLIO 1a, col. 2

αυτω22
συ23

24.20 σει σοι αγαθα καθως τεποιη
ιδου

24.21 κας σημερον και νυν24 εγω γινω
γ’ σκω οτι βασιλευω25 βασιλευσεις.
και στησεται εν χερσιν σου

24.22 βασιλεια ιηλ και νυν ομοσον
μοι εν κω οτι ουκ εξολοθρευςεις
to σπερμα μου οπισω μου και ου
εις26 κ αφαινησις το ογομα μου εκ του

24.23 οικου του πρς μου και ομοσεν

20 Interlinear συν turns the simplex ετελεσεν into a compound.

21 At the end of the line, the epsilon of ηρε is preserved with ην written as a superlinear stroke.

22 αυτω above the line is meant to replace σοι.

23 Συ is to be added interlinearly after καθως.

24 ιδου is to be inserted interlinearly after νυν.

25 Νυ is added above the line to βασιλευω.

26 αφαινησις is corrected to αφαινεις (?) by means of interlinear εις.
ΔΔ τω Σαουλ· και απηλ· θεν Σα  
ουλ· εις τον τόπον 27 αυτον· και ΔΔ  
oikov  
kαι 28 οι ανδρες αυτου ανεβησα  
eis την μεσαρα στενην· και  
apethanen Samounl· και συν  
αθροιζονται πας ηη· και κοπτο 29 πτου  
tai αυτων και θαγδυσιν 30 αυτων  
eν οικω αυτω εν αρμαθαιμ· και 31  
ανεστη ΔΔ· και κατεβη 32 εις τη 33 ανε  

25.1  
erimou maan και ην ανος εν  
tη μααν και τα ποιμια αυτου  
en τω Καρμηλω· και ο ανος με  
γας σφοδρα και τουτω προβατα  
τρισχειλω· και αιγες χειλιαι και 34  
egενηθη εν τω κιρειν το ποι  
e  

25.2  
μπιον αυτου 35 εν τω Καρμηλω  
kαι ονομα τω ανω Ναβαλ· και  
onoma τη γυναικε αυτου Αβιγαι  
α· και η γυνη αυτου ογαθη συν  
esei και καλη τω ιδει σφοδρα και 36  

25.3  

27 A scribal mark indicates correction of τοπον to οικον. 
28 This and several other lines have a paragraphos at the beginning. 
29 At the end of the line, μω is written as a superlinear stroke. 
30 θαγδυσιν is corrected in the margin to θαπτουσιν. 
31 και is written shorthand. 
32 κατεβη is corrected in the margin to ανεβη. 
33 τη at the end of the line should have a superlinear stroke indicating a final μω, but it is 
obscured by the crossbar of a ταυ bleeding through from the other side. 
34 Final και is written shorthand. 
35 Interlinear epsilon corrects αυτου to εαυτου. 
36 και is written shorthand.
ο ἄνος σκληρός καὶ πονηρός εν επιτηδεύμασιν καὶ ο ἄνος κοινοὶ 37
νικός, καὶ ηκουσεν ΔΔ᾿ εν τῇ ερήμῳ οτι κιρεῖν Ναβαλ ο Καρ >

25.5 μηλος το ποιμνιον αυτου καὶ ΔΔ] απεστειλεν δεκα παιδαρι
α καὶ εἰπεν: τοις παιδαριοις αυτου ανα 

βητε] εἰς τὸν Καρμήλον καὶ α πελθητες προς Ναβαλ’ καὶ ερω
tησατε α]μθν επι τω ονοματι

25.6 μου εις ειρη]νην και ερείτε
tαδε εις ορα]ς και συ úγιαινω
tο οικος σου] και παντα τα σα

25.7 υγιαινοντα κα]ι νυν ñδου ακη

FOLIO 1b, col. 1

1 R. 25.7 κοια στι κιρουσιν σου νυν οι ποι μανεις σου οι ησαν καὶ ημω 42 μεθ ημω 43 εν τη ερημω και ουκ ἀπεκακο 44 λυσαμεν αυτους και ουκ ενε

37 The gap between iota and kappa may have resulted from an erasure.
38 A scribal mark inserts Δευδ after εἰπεν.
39 αυτου written between lines follows παιδαριοις.
40 A vertical stroke at the tear appears to be the right hand stroke of eta. It may indicate a reading απελθητες corrected in the margin to ηκετε.
41 Nu at the end of the line is written as a superlinear stroke.
42 Baars, "Fragment," 203 noted that on the Rotulus photo there did not seem to be enough room for the word sequence σου οι ησαν. The eta, however, is obscured by a fold in the manuscript.
43 Nu at the end of the line is written as a superlinear stroke.
44 απεκαλυπαμεν has a breathing mark before initial alpha.
τείλαμεθα αυτοις ουθεν πα
σας τας ημερας οντων αυτων σαν
εν τω καρπιω ερωτησον
τα παιδαρια σου και απαγ γελ
λουσιν σοι και ευριστω τα παι
dαρια σου χαριν εν οφθαλμοις
σου στι εφ ημεραν αγαθην η
δη
cαμεν δος ο εαυ ευρη η χειρ
tω —
εν τω τω τω σου ΔΔ και ερχονται

λα εν τα παιδαρια και απαγ γελλου
λουσιν σιν τους λογους τουτους προς
α
Ναβαλ και τι παντα τα ρηματα
tω —
tαυτα εν υνομαι ΔΔ και α
νεπιδησεν και απεκριθη

45Nu at the end of the line is written as a superlinear stroke.
46Here, as in all cases of double gamma, a stroke separates the two letters. The first lambda of απαγ γελλουσιν is inexplicably crossed out. The same verb occurs in 1. 14, but there the second lambda is not crossed out. The corrector may not have felt it necessary to eliminate what he took elsewhere to be an extraneous lambda.
47A stray sigma appears here. Is it a doublet of the first letter of σοι?
48An interlinear correction turns ευριστω into ευριστωσον.
49Interlinear δη is meant to follow δος.
50The definite article τω is added between the lines before ΔΔ.
51ΔΔ is written above the line following παιδαρια.
52The double gamma of απαγ γελλουσιν is separated by a stroke. The verb is corrected in the margin to λαλουσιν. Baars mistakenly reads here αναγγελλουσιν.
53The scribe corrects και to κατα by crossing the iota to make it a tau, and by writing the alpha above the line. Baars did not see the crossed iota, and simply read tau. 
54τω has been added above the line before υνομαι.
Ναβαλ' τοις παισιν ΔΔ· και ει
pen τις ο ΔΔ και τις ο ἱεσσαί·
ςημερον πεπληθυμενοι εις το
θυματα μου αι τοις κι
ρουσιν τα προβατα μου και δω
των ευθειαν και απεστραφη
σαν τα παιδαρια ΔΔ εις οδον αυ
των και ανεστρεψαν και η ι
θαι και ανη γειεν τω ΔΔ'
κατα τα ρηματα ταυτα και ει
ta πεν ΔΔ τοις ανθρασιν αυτου
ζωσασθαι εκαστος την ρομ[φαιαν
αυτου και ανεβησαν οπις ο ΔΔ
ως ὁ ανθρας και διακοσιοι εκα
θισαν μετα των σκευων και
tη Αβγαια γυναι[ι]κι Ναβαλ α

55 ατ of ιεσσαί is written shorthand. Baars incorrectly reads here a single sigma.

56 A corrector provided ειςιν at the end of the line. The nu is written as a superlinear stroke.

57 The corrector added nu to τα. Baars reads του, but the manuscript clearly has omega.

58 λημψονται is written over what Baars, "Fragments," 203 took to be an erasure. An examination of the manuscript suggests that it could be an erasure or simply a discoloration of the leather. A marginal correction changes the word to λημψοι.

59 και is written shorthand.

60 The relative pronoun α has a rough breathing mark.

61 Double gamma is divided by a stroke.

62 A marginal correction places παντα before τα ρηματα.
πην γείλεν ἐν τοῖς παιδαριοί

οὐν λέγων ἵδοι[ ΔΔ απεστείλεν

αγγελοὺς εἰ̂ς τής ἐρημοῦ εὐλο

γῆσαι τὸν κ[ν] ἰμῶν καὶ εἴῃ

FOLIO 1b, col. 2

- ἕ, καὶ εσπευνεν

25.15 κλείνεν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἀνδρεῖς

αγαθοὶ ἡμῖν σφοδρὰ οὐκ ἁπεκα[64]

λυσάν ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ ενετείλαν

ἐίς τὸ ἡμῖν πασάς[65] τας ἡμ[ε]ρας ἁς

οὐδὲ ἡμέθα παρ ἀυτοῖς καὶ εντω [ει]

25.16 ναι ἡμᾶς εν σχῆ ὡς τεχνος

ησαν περὶ ἡμᾶς την νυκτα

καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν πασάς τας

ας

ἡμερὰς ἡμέθα[66] παρ ἀυτοῖς ποι

25.17 μανιντες τὸ ποιμίνιον καὶ

νυν-τίδε[67] καὶ[68] γνωθι καὶ ἰδε τι συ

ζ᾽ ἡ ποιει[69] οτι συντετελεσται

ἡ κακία εἰς τὸν κ[ν] ἰμῶν καὶ

63 Double gamma is divided by a stroke.

64 The initial alpha of ἁπεκαλύσαν has a smooth breathing mark.

65 A marginal correction adds εἰς οὐδὲν (with ηὐ written as a superlinear stroke) before πασάς.

66 ας is written above the line before ἡμέθα.

67 τίδε is deleted by means of a dot over each letter and a stroke crossing out each letter.

68 καὶ is written shorthand.

69 The first word of the line appears to have been ἐποιει(ʔ), corrected to ποιεις. But the erasure of at least one letter before the final sigma causes a difficulty. It is impossible to say what letter originally stood there.
εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν ἱος λοιμὸς καὶ οὐκ ἦστιν λαλητὸς.

25.18 ὁ σαι πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἐλαβεν ἀβιγαία ω ἁρτοὺς καὶ β οιγεία οἱ νουν καὶ ροβατα πεποίημεν

5ο οὐκαὶ εἰ οὐφέλ οιφιτοὺ καὶ γομρ

25.19 εὐς σταφίδος καὶ σ παλαθος καὶ εὐθείον τοις παιδαρίοις αὐτῆς προπορευεσθε ερεπροσθεν μου καὶ ἰδον εγὼ ὁπίσω υμῶν παραγείνω

70 The mark preceding ἦστιν could be either a breathing mark or perhaps a stroke serving as a word divider.

71 An interlinear scribal notation refers to a notation in the margin which evidently points to the top margin in order to add καὶ εσπενον (?) before καὶ ελαβεν. The added verb, not clearly written, appears to be εσπενον or εσπενεν. The correction comes at the top of the column. It is preceded by a siglum which resembles a rho enclosed by markings, the meaning of which is unclear. Is it simply the inverse of the marginal siglum?

72 The number before ἁρτοὺς is uncertain. It looks like a beta lying on its side, or perhaps an omega.

73 The number before προβατα is ι not δ as Baars has it.

74 The letter in the margin before the line, seems to be a dotted out sigma.

75 γομρ is corrected to γομρ by means of interlinear omicron.

76 The expected εν before σταφίδος is supplied in the margin.

77 om εις after σταφίδος is supplied by means of interlinear alpha.

78 παλαθος is corrected to the feminine παλαθος by interlinear alpha.

79 Final πι is written as a superlinear stroke.

80 Interlinear εις is added to αὐτῆς.

81 A superlinear dot separates πι and πι in εμπροσθεν.

82 Baars reads παραγείνομαι. The manuscript has παραγείνομαι.
GREEK FRAGMENT OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL

25.20 Ναβαλ', μαί καὶ τὸ αὐνδρὶ αὐτής οὐσὶς· πιγ' γείλειν καὶ εγενθῇ αὐ
τῇ ἐπιβεβηκεῖν [ἐπὶ τὴν ὀνον κ[αὶ καταβαινοῦσῃ ἐν
σκῆ[πῃ τοῦ ὄρους καὶ ἰδοὺ ΔΔ καὶ
οἱ αὐνδρὲς·····REMAINDER OF COLUMN LOST

FOLIO 2a, col. 1

1 R. 31.12 ῥευθῆσαν ὀλὴν τὴν νύκτα καὶ ἐλαβὸν τὸ σῶμα σαουλʹ καὶ τὸ
σῶμα τοῦ νῦν αὐτοῦ ἱώναζαν
apo τοῦ τειχοῦς βαβθ'σσομ' καὶ
φερουσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς ἱαβεὶς καὶ
κατακαίοντοισιν αὐτοὺς εκεὶ καὶ
λαμβανοῦσιν τα ὁστα αὐτονον',
καὶ ἔπασσαν ύπο τὴν αρουραν
ἱαβεὶς καὶ νηστευοῦσιν. ζῆ ἡ
μέρας: καὶ εγενητο μετὰ το από
θανείν ἱσσαουλ', καὶ ΔΔ ανεστρε
ψειν τυπταν τὸν αμαληκ', καὶ
ἐκαθίσεν ΔΔ ἐν Σεκελακ' [ἡ
μέρας δύο:

83Naβαλ is added between the lines after αὐντής.
84Double gamma is separated by a stroke.
85καί is written shorthand.
86Baars reads the present tense νηστευοῦσιν, but the manuscript has the future νηστευοῦσιν.
87Iota of ἀποθανείν is obscured by a fold in the manuscript. It could not have been seen by Baars, who reads ἀποθανεῖν.
Τὤ - ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ -
     Α  
     - ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ -
     Β
καὶ νε
2 R. 1.1 Εγετὸς μετὰ τὸ αποθανεῖν σα
     ουλ' καὶ Δ[Δ'] ανεστρεψεν τυ
     πτων [τον Αμαλέκ' καὶ εκαθί
     σευ[ΔΔ'] εν Σεκελακ' ἡμερας
δ[υο ... REMAINDER OF COLUMN LOST

FOLIO 2a, col. 2

4 LINES MISSING
2 R. 1.6 Σα[υλ'] επεστηρικτο επι το δο
     ρυ αυ[τοι και ιδου το αρματα
     και οι ἕπαρχαι συνηψαν αυ
     τω [και επεβλεψεν επι
     τ [α ... REMAINDER OF COLUMN LOST

FOLIO 2b, col. 1

4 LINES MISSING
2 R. 1.17 εθρηνησεν ΔΔ' τον ]θρη
     νον τουτον επι σαουλ' ] και επι
     Ιωαναναθαν του υιου αυτο]υ και ει

88 After the end of 1 Samuel there is an enlarged tau which may be a paragraph mark (see, Thompson, Introduction, 59). Could it be shorthand for τέλος? The book is thus provided with a subscription and a superscription to 2 Samuel, which follows immediately.

89 ἐγετο is corrected to καὶ εγετο by a superlinear καὶ written shorthand and νε above the place of the intended insertion.
πεν τον διδαξαί τον υιονος ιηουδα
ιδου γεγραπται επι βιβλιου

5

ς 90

REMAINDER OF COLUMN LOST

FOLIO 2b, col. 2

.˙. εις Χεβρων

1.26 αλω επι σοι αδελφε μου ινα
θαν οραωθη 91 μοι σφοδρα εθαν
μεσσωθη η αγαπη σου εμοι
ν υπερ αγαπησις 92 γυναικον >
Pος επεσαν δυνατοι και απω

2.1 λοντο σκευη πολεμικα : και
Τ 93 εγενετο μετα ταυτα επερω
τησ η ΔΔ εν και λεγον ει α
ναβω εις μιαν των πολεων ι
ουδα και ειπεν κς προς αυτο
αναβηθη και ειπεν ΔΔ : που ανα
και

2.2 β]ω και ειπεν εις Χεβρων ανε 94

90 In the margin there is a siglum identical to that on fol. 1b, col. 2, l. 16. It could refer to a correction notation in fol. 2b, col. 2, l. 13, but this is unlikely since it is far removed from that line. The corresponding siglum for l. 13 would probably have been noted in the left margin which is not preserved. Thus, this mark most likely refers to some intended correction, which is now missing.

91 Final sigma is written above the line at the end of ωραωθη.

92 The case of αγαπηςις is changed by a superlinear μ which replaces final sigma. An arrowhead at the end of the line fills the space left empty.

93 An enlarged ταυ, probably a paragraph marker (the same ταυ – τελος(?)) at the end of 2 Sam 1), is written in the margin.

94 There is a και written shorthand above the line, to be inserted before ανε[βη].
2. Textual affiliations

In general, this manuscript is heavily corrected, and it appears to contain a number of errors resulting from carelessness. Several examples illustrate this. In 24.21 (fol. 1a, col. 2, l. 3) and 25.10 (fol. 1b, col. 1, l. 24), the scribe wrote βασιλευω and αυτω to which the corrector added a final nu in accord with the manuscript tradition. Perhaps the scribe’s exemplar had nu’s written as a superlinear stroke which he did not recognize and consequently left out. In 25.16 (fol. 1b, col. 2, l. 9), the relative pronoun ας is missing, almost certainly as a result of parablepsis. In 25.1 (fol. 1a, col. 2, l. 17) and 19 (fol. 1b, col. 2, l. 22), dative pronouns turn up instead of the required

---

95 The corrector’s siglum ultimately refers to εις Χεβρων in the top margin of the column. The correction is prefixed with the same sign found in folio 1b, col 2.

96 αι at the end of the line is written shorthand.

97 The corrector makes an original αχινωμι into αχιναββ by putting strokes on the microns turning them into alphas and by crossing out nu and inserting beta above the line.

98 The repetition of αι ανδρες seems the only way to account for the space at the beginning of the line. No textual variants in the rest of the Greek tradition help here.

99 Immediately to the left of the tear is what appears to be a crossed out chi. This may have originally been the first letter of Χεβρων, which should come here and presumably began the subsequent line. This does leave a large vacant space, however, that has not been filled.

100 Note the spelling αδρες for ανδρες.
genitive pronouns, most likely as a result of attraction to the case of the regulating noun. All in all, the text exhibits 42 unique variants. The second hand corrected 22 of these, and left 20 (of which 8 are orthographic) uncorrected. The corrector produced 6 variants, found nowhere else.101 One unique reading remains unclear. 25.18 (fol. 1b, col. 2, ll. 16-21) contains several items in a list with numbers. 846 has numerals here. The first number in the list is without exception 200 in the Greek manuscript tradition. 846, however, uses an uncertain numeral. It is certainly not 200, which occurs later in the verse as a sigma, the usual symbol for 200. The numeral looks like a beta lying on its side, or perhaps an omega with a stroke closing off the top. In the textual apparatus I have marked the letter as uncertain.

For the present, I can only offer a few comments about the relationship of this manuscript to the Greek manuscript tradition of Samuel-Kings. They are provisional general assessments of the variants in 846, rather than a close examination of each individual manuscript in the tradition or a division of variant-types, such as longer and shorter texts, word order variants, or substitutions. I have worked with the groups of manuscripts which scholars recognize in the Samuel-Kings corpus: Bya²; boc²e²; dlpqtz; fmsw; Acx.102 For the main text of 846, I have collated the Brooke-McLean-Thackeray edition of 1-2 Samuel. For each manuscript group the chart below provides the number of times that 846 agrees with the group and varies from the printed text (usually B). It also shows the number of times that 846 and the group vary from Brooke-McLean-Thackeray, but also differ from each other. As a subset of the number of agreements, I provide a basic breakdown of cases in which 846 reads with each group alone, rather than with the manuscript group in conjunction with other groups. The Bya² group presents a different problem because Brooke-McLean-Thackeray used B as their base text. For these manuscripts, I have provided

101These unique variants do not seem to evince revision toward the MT. Only one case represents unambiguously the Hebrew. In 24.20 846 has σοι where the MT also has second person after several third person pronouns. 846 corrects to the Greek textual tradition -οντο. The other agreements with the Hebrew can be explained as scribal mistakes, such as the example just cited in 25.16 where the lack of the relative pronoun ας agrees with the Hebrew, but is more likely an error by parablepsis.

102For a discussion of these manuscript groupings, see Bo Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta* (Studia Theologica Lundensia 22, Lund, 1963); Eugene Charles Ulrich, Jr., *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 19, Chico, Ca: Scholars 1978). The manuscript sigla here and in the following textual apparatus are given according to Brooke-McLean-Thackeray.
the number of times that 846 and Bya\(^2\) agree and disagree when Brooke-McLean-Thackeray present them as the minority reading accepted as the main text.

For the correcting hand there are two numbers for each manuscript group: the readings which the second hand corrects in agreement with one of the groups, and readings corrected away from that group. Also provided are the number of corrections toward a group which agree only with that group rather than with a number of groups. The figures are set out as follows:

For the main text of 846 – No. of agreements with the group (No. of readings with that group alone)/No. of disagreements

For the corrector of 846 – No. of corrections toward the group (No. of readings that agree with that group alone)/No. of corrections away from that group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>846*</th>
<th>846(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bya(^2)</td>
<td>9 (5)/9</td>
<td>Bya(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boc(^e)(^2)</td>
<td>19 (7)/102</td>
<td>boc(^e)(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dlpqtz</td>
<td>6 (1)/30</td>
<td>dlpqtz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fmsw</td>
<td>9 (1)/24</td>
<td>fmsw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acx</td>
<td>11 (2, perhaps 3)/37</td>
<td>Acx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures show that the main text of 846 tallies largely with the textual tradition usually identified as Old Greek. It seems to be closest to Bya\(^2\), the major Old Greek group, and to fmsw, which is usually seen as a secondary witness to the Old Greek.\(^{103}\) 846 does contain readings characteristic of the other groups, but has no strong affiliations with them. For example, it parts company with boc\(^e\)\(^2\) on many more occasions than it reads with this group. If a characterization is warranted, the text can be called mixed with its primary textual tradition that of the Old Greek.

The corrector shows a propensity to correct toward readings found in boc\(^e\)\(^2\), but many more instances remain uncorrected than corrected. I am not certain that the corrector has in front of him a "Lucianic text" as Wevers states.\(^{104}\) The many disagreements with the boc\(^e\)\(^2\) group that remain seem to suggest that the corrector relied on a mixed text, as did the scribe of the main text.

\(^{103}\)Ulrich, *Qumran*, 12.

\(^{104}\)Wevers, "Septuaginta-Forschungen," 54. He states, "Baars weist daraufhin, dass der Text recht ausgiebig korrigiert wurde und zwar von einem Korrektor, der den lukianischen Text vorliegen hatte."
Here is a complete roster of all variants found in this manuscript:105

1 Sam 24.11 ἐπουσω [...] κω 846

24.12 διπλοίδος σου] > σου 846 boc Chr
χειρι] χειρα 846
ασβεία 846*] ασβήμα 846* οιχ 846*] οικ 846*
δεσμευεις 846*] συνδεσμευεις 846* boc e2

24.13 δικασαι 846*] κριναι 846* boc e2 Chr Thdt
εκδικησαι] εκδικησει 846* aa2 Luc
και (3Φ) By] η δε 846 N bcdgilkmpqtvxyz b'c2e2 Boh(vid) Thdt
σοι BAaxy] σε 846 N bd-gijl-qstvwzab'c2 Thdt

24.14 πλημμελια] -λεια 846 B(ab)

24.15 συ (1Φ) post εκπορευη 846 ae(α)fmw
καταδιοκεις συ (2Φ) ] > συ 846 A b-fmneswxyz e2 OA OB OE

24.16 δικαστην] τρ εις 846 g
και ανα μεσον σου (2Φ)] > ανα μεσον 846 boc2e2 OB
μοι] με 846 cd1rpqtz*

24.17 συνεπελεσεν 846*] ετελεσειν 846* e (ετέλεςε)

24.20 αυτω 846*] σοι 846*
πετωκας 846* BAb*ya2] pr συ 846* ad-jlmnpqstvwzb'2 OA OC

24.21 τιδου 846*] > 846*
βασιλεων 846*] βασιλευω 846*

24.22 εξολοθρευεις] εξολοθρευεις 846 B(?)
αφανεις 846 (?)] αφανης 846* boc2e2

24.23 τοπον 846*] οικον 846* boc2e2
μεσαρα] μεσαρα 846 c(αν) (ex corr) mnsww

105 The lemmata were given according to Brook-McLean-Thackeray except when some modifications were necessary for the sake of clarity.
25.1 θαπτοσίν 846[*] θαπτοσίν 846
αυτον] αυτον 846(?)
αυτον] αυτο 846
κατεβη 846[*] ανεβη 846

25.2 ποιμνια ΒΑ χυας] προβατα 846 Ν a-jl-qstvwbz^2e^2 ΟΑ ΟΕ
τρισχιλια] -χειλια 846
χιλια] χειλια 846 B^*
κειρειν] κειρειν 846
αυτου (2^*) 846[*] εαυτου 846

25.3 Αβιγααια] Αβιγααα 846
αγαθη (2^) Ba^2] καλη 846 ΑΝ a-jl-qstv-zb^2e^2 ΟΑ
ειδει] ιδει 846
κυνικος] κοινικος 846 n

25.4 κειρει] κειρειν 846

25.5 ειπεν 846[*] + ΔΔ 846^* Α ΟΑ ΟC
παιδαριος 846[*] + αυτου 846^*
καρμηλον] pr των 846 boc^2e^2
απελθατε] απελθητες 846[*] η 846^* οc^2e^2

25.6 No variants

25.7 κειρουσιν] κειρουσιν 846
ποιμνες] ποιμνες 846
καρμηλω ΒΑ anva^2] πτ τω 846 N bdefijlmnopqstwzb^2e^2

25.8 απαγγελουσιν 846[*] απαγγελουσιν 846^*
eυπετωσιν 846^*] ευπετω 846^* boc^2e^2 Thdt
ηκομιν] ηκομεν 846 ν
δη 846[*] > 846^*
tω Δαυειδ 846^*] > τω 846* ΑΝ boza^2e^2 Thdt

25.9 παιδαρια 846^* Biya^2b^2] + ΔΔ 846^* ΑΝ a-hjl-qstvwxz^2e^2 ΟΑ ΟC ΟE
λαλουσιν 846[*] απαγγελουσιν 846^*
kαι παντα 846* Β] κατα παντα 846^* ΑΝ abd-jl-qstvwz^2b^2e^2 ΟA
tω ονοματι 846[*] > τω 846^* cx
25.10 εἰσιν 846°] > 846
αὐτοὺς] αὐτῶν 846° f ΟC

25.11 λημυσομαι 846°] λημυσονται 846°
κειρουσιν] κειροσιν 846
μου (4th)] post probeta 846 cv

25.12 κηλθον] κηλθον 846 Agz
τα (2°) 846*] pr pantα 846° AN bcf
gf ms (sub asterisk) moswxc2c2 e2 OC

25.13 ζωσαθε] ζωσαθαι 846 A
ανδρες] ανδρας 846
οι διακοσιοι > οι 846 befmoswzc2 c2 e2

25.14 Αβειγαια] Αβιγαια 846 A
κυριον Βα] pr τον 846 AN b-jl-qstv-c2 e2
εξεκλεινε] εξεκλεινε 846 B A

25.15 ημιν (2°) 846* Boya2]
+ εις 846
+ ουδεν 846° AN abd-jl-nqstvwzb c2 e2 OC OE dv
ημιν] ημεθα 846

25.16 και την νυκτα] > και 846 OA OC
ας 846°] > 846* (parablepsis)

25.17 νυν 846°] ιδι 846°
potiσεις] ποιεις 846° h2a] εποιεις 846°
ουτος] αυτος 846 boxc2 e2 OA OE

25.18 και εσπευσεν αβειγαια και ελαβεν] και επευν (-ον?) και ελαβεν αβιγαια 846°
kai elabven abegiai 846 c
και ελαβεν αβειγαια 846°

diaqesoius] ?? 846
σφρ] ουφει 846
γομορ 846°] γομρ 846°
en 846°] > 846* OL
staphidos 846°] staphidion 846° ba2c2 (staphilon oe2)
palathias 846°] palathous 846°

25.19 αυτης 846°] αυτη 846°
παραγινομαί] παραγενομαί 846
αυτῆς (2ο) 846*] + Ναζαλ 846 A 
A b e f m o s w x c e ΩA OC(w)
Αβεγαία] Αβεγαία 846

25.20 No variants

31.12 ίοναθάν] post αυτοῦ 846
τείχους BA ac*jx] pr τοῦ 846 MN j*n bd-im-qstwyza'b'c'ε²
31.13 τὴν ιαβείς] > τὴν 846 bcoν'με'ε²
νηστευούσιν] νηστευούσιν 846

2 Sam 1.1 καὶ οἱ [846] > 846* def(n)mp-tw
eγνετο 846'] εγέτο 846*

1.6 No variants

1.7 No variants

1.17 No variants

1.18 No variants

1.26 ὀραίωθης 846'] ὀραίωθη 846*
ἀγαπησις] ἀγατή 846 ab'b(n)cgvx
ὑπὲρ ἀγαπησιν 846'] υπὲρ ἀγαπησίς 846*

2.1 καὶ επερωτησεν] > καὶ 846 ν OC

2.2 καὶ ανεβή 846'] > καὶ 846*
eκεὶ Δανειδ] > εκεί 846 bcixc²ε² ΩA OC OE
eἰς χεβρων 846'] > 846* Acx
αξινοομ 846] αξινααβ 846*
Αβεγαία] Αβεγαία 846 A

2.3 οἱ μετ' αυτοῦ] [οἱ ἀνδρε]ς μετ' αυτοῦ ?? 846
2.4 ἀνδρες (1ο) BAa² Thdt1/2] οδδρες 846

2.5 No variants