

A CASE OF EXTISPICY, OR: A SCANDAL IN 1 SAM 19:11–17

BY

Nesina GRÜTTER

Universität Basel
Theologische Fakultät
Nadelberg 10
4051 BASEL
nesina.gruetter@unibas.ch

ABSTRACT

This article presents a study of an LXX reading in 1 Sam 19:13, 16 that leads to a new interpretation of 1 Sam 19:8–17 as documenting a further case of divination attested in the Former Prophets. The combination of a religio-historical approach and text-critical methodology applied here results in a new understanding of the *teraphim* and the topic of women's agency against the background of the ancient Near East and the adjoining areas in the northeastern Mediterranean on the one hand, and new insights into the textual criticism of the passage on the other.

Keywords: 1 Samuel, Ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean religion, Textual criticism, *teraphim*, Women's agency, Divination

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article présente une analyse d'une lecture de ^{LXX}1 S 19,13.16 qui conduit à une nouvelle interprétation de 1 S 19,8-17 comme témoignant d'un autre cas de divination attesté dans les Prophètes antérieurs. La combinaison d'une approche de l'histoire des religions et de la méthodologie de la critique textuelle appliquée ici conduit à une nouvelle compréhension des *teraphim* et du thème de l'agentivité des femmes (*women's agency*) dans le contexte du Proche-Orient ancien et de la région du nord-est de la Méditerranée, d'une part, et à de nouvelles perspectives concernant la critique textuelle du passage, d'autre part.

Mots-clés : 1 Samuel, religions du Proche-Orient ancien et de la Méditerranée, critique textuelle, *teraphim*, agentivité des femmes / *women's agency*, divination

INTRODUCTION

In 1 Sam 19:11–17 Michal, in her double role as David’s wife and Saul’s daughter, convinces her husband to flee from her father to save his live. After his disappearance from the scene she does the following:

M: ¹³*wattiqqaḥ mîkal ʿet-hatt^erāpîm wattāsem ʿel-hammittâ w^eʿet k^ebîr hāʾizzîm sāmâ m^era^ašōtāyw watt^ekas babbāged.*

¹³And Michal took the *teraphim* and put <it> on the bed; she put the *k^ebîr* of goats on its head end, and covered <it / all / both> with the garment / cover.¹

While most of the exegetical literature focuses on the *teraphim*,² this article is dedicated to the other object mentioned which, likewise, has been debated from rabbinic and early Christian times until today. In modern scholarship the *k^ebîr* in the Masoretic Text (MT), a *dis legomenon* (attested only in 1 Sam 19:13, 16), has almost unanimously been identified as any kind of item made of goat hair or goat skin and interpreted as an additional deceptive object besides the *teraphim*. However, an evaluation of the reading ἥπαρ “liver” preserved in the Septuagint (LXX) leads to a new solution: At one time, the Hebrew text was about extispicy, with Michal as protagonist of the story. I will develop this argument in three steps: In the first part, I present the ancient readings besides *k^ebîr* and show that the LXX reflects a linguistically correct Hebrew reading which merits serious consideration. In the second part, I propose an initial interpretation of 1 Sam 19:11–17 with the reading “liver”, concentrating on a close reading of the passage on the one hand and on the phenomenon of extispicy in the environment of the Hebrew Bible on the other, and framing these two focal points with methodological reflections. In the third part, I integrate these insights into a conclusive interpretation with a threefold focus: the implications for a new understanding of the *teraphim*, the topic of

¹ MT cited according to BHS. For longer passages, the translations come from the NRSV (1989) unless otherwise stated. The translations of v. 13 and v. 16 are my own. Where the English language requires additions, these are indicated by pointed brackets <>. The term *k^ebîr* is transcribed – at the present time, a translation would imply too much interpretation. Note further: For v. 13 and v. 16, fragments from the Cairo Genize and quotes from medieval rabbinic commentaries provide ʿal instead of ʿel (cf. the textual apparatus of BHS), and the LXX renders ἐπι. By translating “on” I do not suggest a conjecture of the MT, but I presuppose the confusion of ʿel and ʿal occurring especially in Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. However, explanations of the phenomenon differ; cf. BROWN, DRIVER, and BRIGGS 1907, 41 and 757; JOÛON and MURAOKA 2003, 456; GINSBURG 1899, 149–188.

² For a survey of the discussion and current bibliographical references see BERLEJUNG 2018.

women’s agency, and the consequences to be drawn regarding the text-critical decision at stake. In the end, this results in an improved understanding of 1 Sam 19:11–17.

1. AN OVERVIEW OF THE ANCIENT READINGS

Traditionally, commentators prefer the reading *k^ebîr* in the MT. If other ancient readings are discussed, they are treated as more or less successful interpretations of the MT. In contrast to this, here I will show that the manifold readings can be traced back to a single reading decision. This involves the following steps: assessing the LXX’s reading retroverted into Hebrew (1.1), discussing the equivalents provided in the Greek manuscripts and by the ancient versions (1.2), examining the text transmitted by Flavius Josephus (1.3), analyzing the MT’s reading (1.4), and finally, arranging the manuscript evidence in an interim conclusion which shows the need for further investigation of the reading “liver” (1.5).

1.1 The goats’ liver in the Septuagint

While the MT reads *k^ebîr*, the LXX presents the unexpected rendering ἦπαρ “liver”:³

¹³*wattiqqaḥ mîkal ’et-hatt^erāpîm wattāsem ’el-hammitṭâ w^e’et k^ebîr hā’izzîm šāmâ m^era^ašōtāy^w watt^ekas babbāged*

¹³And Michal took the *teraphim* and put <it> on the bed; she put the goat *k^ebîr* on its head end, and covered <it / all / both> with the garment.

¹³καὶ ἔλαβεν ἡ Μελχὸλ τὰ κενοτάφια καὶ ἔθετο ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην καὶ ἦπαρ τῶν αἰγῶν ἔθετο πρὸς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκάλυψεν αὐτὰ ἱματίῳ.

¹³And Melchol took and laid the cenotaph on the bed, and she put the goat **liver** by its head and covered them with a garment.

The ἦπαρ of the LXX⁴ goes back to the Hebrew equivalent *kābēd* “liver”. Thus, the difference between the *Vorlage* (כבד) and the consonantal text of the MT (כביר) comes down to a combination of 1) a *defective* spelling versus a *plene* spelling and 2) a *dalet* versus a *resh*.

³ The LXX text follows BROOKE et al. 1927 (often abbreviated: B-McL); the translation follows NETS (2009).

⁴ Also, in the verbatim retake three verses further:

M: ¹⁶[...] *w^ehinnē hatt^erāpîm ’el-hammitṭâ ûk^ebîr hā’izzîm m^era^ašōtāy^w.*

G: ¹⁶[...] καὶ ἰδοὺ τὰ κενοτάφια ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης, καὶ ἦπαρ τῶν αἰγῶν πρὸς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ.

- 1) The use of *matres lectionis* increased over time. The *Vorlagen* recognizable behind the different books of the LXX often have more defective spellings than the consonantal text of the MT.⁵ Not only the LXX's Hebrew source of the books of Samuel, but also the fragments of 4QSam^b (representing a text which is close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX) attest to a spelling considerably more defective than that of the MT. Our passage is only attested in 4QSam^b – albeit very fragmentary and with a lacuna at the decisive place⁶ – and is not found in the other three Samuel manuscripts from Qumran.⁷
- 2) In certain periods and in the handwriting of certain scribes, *dalet* and *resh* look alike.⁸ Therefore, the letters are often confused in the Hebrew manuscripts, and disambiguation was often left up to the reader, whether a copyist or a translator. In such cases, the term *reading* has a very literal meaning!⁹

Accordingly, ἡπαρ τῶν ἀγῶν can be reverted to *kbd h'z(y)m* “goat's liver”. This reading is linguistically correct: When referring to goats, the Hebrew Bible makes use of the plural *'izzîm* to differentiate sub-types (e.g., kid, billy goat, she-goat) and when referring to primary and secondary products of the animal (e.g., goat's milk, tent curtains of goat [hair]).¹⁰ This characteristic Hebrew element was transferred into Greek. However, for 1 Sam 19:13, 16, I translate both Hebrew *'izzîm* and Greek τῶν ἀγῶν with the singular (“goat”) to provide a more idiomatic rendering in English.¹¹

Also of interest here is Ezek 21:26, which is the only other passage in the Tanakh that names the words *liver* and *teraphim* together: “For the king of Babylon stands at the parting of the way, at the fork in the two roads, to use divination; he shakes the arrows, he consults the teraphim, he inspects the liver.” However, the LXX of Ezekiel renders the key terms

⁵ Tov 1997, 144.

⁶ Fragment 5 corresponds to 1 Sam 19:10–13, 15–17; see CROSS et al. 2005, pl. XXIV.

⁷ The four manuscripts 1QSam and 4QSam^{a-b-c} testify to different orthographic traditions; see LANGE 2009, 214–224.

⁸ Tov 1997, 163–164.

⁹ This is the reason why I choose the term “reading” instead of “variant”. Another reason is that in some schools of textual criticism “variants” are by definition secondary, while “reading” is neutral.

¹⁰ Cf. Gen 37:31; 38:17, 20; Exod 26:7; Lev 4:23, 28; Judg 13:15, 19; Prov 27:27; Dan 8:5, 8.

¹¹ The same phenomenon is mirrored in most of the ancient versions, but there are exceptions. Consequently, I translate the respective evidence (see 1.2) literally for the sake of clearly indicating the difference between singular and plural.

with the *terminus technicus* ἥπατοσκοπέω “to inspect the liver” and *tʿrāpîm* with γλυπτοί “carved <objects>”, thus differing from 1 Sam 19:13, 16^{LXX}.¹² I will return to Ezek 21:26 later in the argumentation.

1.2 The equivalents provided in the Greek manuscripts and by the ancient versions

With respect to ἤπαρ τῶν αἰγῶν in verses 13 and 16, there is little variation in the LXX manuscripts.¹³ The most widely attested is ἤπαρ αἰγῶν, most probably a stylistic improvement.¹⁴ Considerably different, on the other hand, are the alternative translations by the later Greek versions (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion) – figuring as doublets, conflations, marginal notes, or secondhand corrections in a few manuscripts and in some daughter translations of the LXX. There are three ancient renderings for the word preceding the genitive “goats” that can be examined:

χοβερ:

A transcription of *kb(y)r*, assigned to Theodotion.¹⁵

το παν πληθος:

An interpretation of *kb(y)r* as deriving from *kbr* “to be much”,¹⁶ difficult to translate (“the total multitude?”), assigned to Aquila¹⁷ or handed down unassigned.¹⁸

¹² The Greek equivalents for *tʿrāpîm* differ in the books of the Septuagint as well as in other ancient sources; see GRILLET and LESTIENNE 1997, 93-96.

¹³ Assessment based on the manuscript evidence for 1 Sam 19:13, 16 provided by BROOKE et al. 1927 and FIELD 1875 – cited according to B-McL’s critical apparatus [dissolved into the Handschriften-Siglen of the Göttinger edition with the aid of KREUZER and SIGISMUND 2011].

¹⁴ For v. 13, read by the Lucianic manuscripts boc₂e₂ [corresponds to group 19-82-93-108-127] as well as by the mss xc [247-376] and i [56]; for v. 16 by i [56] and e₂ [93].

¹⁵ Marginal note in j [243] to v. 13.

¹⁶ In the Tanakh only late (Job 35:16; 36:31): “to multiply” (Hiph’il), see *kbr* in GESENIUS¹⁸, 526. Broadly attested in Aramaic: “to be much” (Pe’al) and derived verbal stems, see *kbr* in the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (<http://cal.huc.edu>, accessed 27 June 2019); *kbr*₁ in DNWSI, 486.

¹⁷ Preserved as the first part of the two-reading conflation το παν πληθος και στρογγυλωμα (των) τριχων ascribed to Aquila. For v. 13, attested by l [370], z [554], and by Theodoret’s Catena Nicephori (minor variation in brackets).

¹⁸ Marginal note in j [243] to v. 13 and v. 16.

το στρογγύλωμα (των) τριχῶν:

This reading, which can be translated as “the round(-ed) item of hair”,¹⁹ is attributed to Symmachus²⁰ and Aquila²¹ as well as handed down without assignment.²² Finally, it made its way into the main text of the Armenian Version, the Quotations of the Syrohexapla,²³ and an alternative reading of the Vetus Latina,²⁴ always as the second part of the conflation reflecting the Greek ἤπαρ τῶν αἰγῶν καὶ το στρογγύλωμα (των) τριχῶν.²⁵ The wording cannot be linked to the MT’s reading *kbyr*, but can be explained otherwise: Since the early revisors often replaced lexemes by vocabulary occurring in other verses,²⁶ the genitive of θρίξ “hair” points to a Hebrew equivalent *šē’ār*, *ša’arâ*, or *šē’ar* “hair”. For all of these, it is the standard rendering in the LXX.²⁷ Furthermore, I consider στρογγύλωμα to be an equivalent for a derivate of the Hebrew *’gl* “to be rounded” (Niph[‘]al), “to roll” (Pi[‘]el), because in the LXX the adjective στρογγύλος “round” is attested three times as an equivalent for the Hebrew *’āgōl* “round” (1 Kgs 7:10, 21; 2 Chr 4:2).²⁸ Therefore, I propose το στρογγύλωμα (των) τριχῶν “the round(-ed) item of hair” to attest neither to the MT nor to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX, but to an alternative reading, originating as a gloss and providing an early interpretation of the word *kb(y)r*, which ended up in the running text of a Hebrew manuscript.

¹⁹ The verb στρογγύλλω “to round off, make round” can also mean “to twirl, spin”, see στρογγύλλω in LSJ, 1655. There are so far no further attestations of the derived noun στρογγύλωμα; thus, the translations “pillow” or “mosquito-net” proposed by LSJ are nothing more than educated guesses.

²⁰ Marginal note in *b* [108] to v. 16.

²¹ Second part of the conflation mentioned above. Perhaps also partially reflected in the corrupted conflation το παν στρογγύλωμα (B-McL; FIELD: στρογγύλωμα) attested by a marginal note in *i* [56] to v. 13.

²² For v. 13, attested by the Complutensian Polyglot (without τῶν), and by a marginal note in *b* [108], further recognizable in the corrupted conflation καὶ στρωγύλωμα τριχῶν το αἰγῶν (following ἤπαρ) preserved in *g* [158].

²³ For v. 13 and v. 16 in Barhebraeus’ Scholia on the OT: *wkbd’ d’z’ smt’ sdwhy wglylt’ ds’r’* “she put the liver to/as his head-rest/pillow and the round(-ed) <item> of hair”, and for v. 16 in Išō’dad of Merv’s Commentary on 1 Samuel: *kbd’ lm d’z’ wglylt’ ds’r’ l’ sdwhy* “the goat’s liver for sooth and the round(-ed) <item> of hair to/as his head-rest/pillow”, transcription of the quotations in BROCK 1996 [1966], 10.

²⁴ Marginal note to v. 13 in the Codex Gothicus Legionensis: *iecur caprarum, et ligamentum capilli posuit at caput eius* “the goat’s liver and the bandage/tie of hair”: MORANO RODRÍGUEZ 1989, 25; further discussion, see *ibid.* XXVIII and LIV.

²⁵ Attested as later corrections to v. 13 and v. 16 in *y* [121].

²⁶ JOOSTEN 2019, 57.

²⁷ See θρίξ in HRCS, 655.

²⁸ A hypothesis supported by further evidence detectable in the prehexaplaric record, cf. εἰς τὴν στρογγύλωσιν [sic!] for *hamma’gālālā* (1 Sam 17:20), ἐν τῇ στρογγύλωσει for *bamma’gāl* (1 Sam 26:5), στρογγυλοῦν for *’āgōl* and στρογγύλα for *’āgullōt* (1 Kgs 7:31): FIELD 1875.

That is, το στρογγύλωμα (των) τριχῶν represents the earliest attempt to paraphrase and thus interpret the word *kb(y)r*. It documents the beginning of a story that continues to unfold in the ancient versions not based on the LXX:²⁹ Targum Jonathan offers *nwd' d'z'* “skin bag of goat”,³⁰ the Peshitta *mšk' d'z'* “skin of goats”,³¹ and the Vulgate *pellem pilosam caprarum* “skin covered with hair of goats”.³²

1.3 The text transmitted by Flavius Josephus

In his *Antiquities of the Jews*, written in Rome at the end of the first century CE, Flavius Josephus gives a paraphrase of 1 Sam 19:11–17 (*Ant.* 6.215–219), setting his own theological accents and fancifully decorating the narrative – e.g., by omitting the *teraphim* respectively the respective Greek equivalent completely and introducing the liver as a dummy, quivering (all night long!) to be interpreted by the messengers at daybreak as David’s shortness of breath. Verse 13 is reworked in *Ant.* 6.217:³³

[...] ἔπειτα σκευάσασα τὴν κλίνην ὡς ἐπὶ νοσοῦντι
καὶ ὑποθεῖσα τοῖς ἐπιβολαίοις ἦπαρ αἰγός [...]

[...] Then, she made up the bed as for a sick person
and put a goat liver beneath the covers [...]

Although the text gives a slight impression of a cock-and-bull-story, it still attests to the liver-version of the narrative. Thus, it comes down to the question of whether Josephus’ ἦπαρ αἰγός is an adaptation of the LXX’s ἦπαρ τῶν αἰγῶν or of the Hebrew reading *kbd h'z(y)m*. For centuries, the nature of Josephus’ source text has been a constant topic of debate:³⁴ Is his statement that he translated a Hebrew text true?³⁵ Or has he made use of a Greek translation? And moreover, what kind of Hebrew or Greek text did he have access to, given the textual pluriformity of the books of

²⁹ But once in an LXX manuscript also: A marginal note to v. 16 in j [243] attests the apposition τοῦ της δορας της αιγειας adhering to το παν πληθος, explaining “the total multitude as the one of skin of goats”.

³⁰ Additional manuscript findings according to SPERBER 1959: *gwnk' dm'zy* “thick garment of goat-hair”; *gwnk' d'zy'* (also misspelled: *d'yz'y*) “thick garment of goats”.

³¹ Plural indicated by *syame*. Additional manuscript findings according to BOER 1978: *mšk' s'r'* “skin of hair” [sic!].

³² In v. 13; in v. 16 only *pellis caprarum* “skin of goats”; cf. GRAYSON et al. 2013.

³³ Greek text according to NIESE 1888.

³⁴ BROCK 1996 [1966], 210–216; KAUFMAN 2012, 26–30.

³⁵ In the prologue (*Ant.* 1.5) Josephus claims that his work has been interpreted (μεθρηνηνευμένην) from the Hebrew Scriptures – a statement repeated later on, e.g., in *Ant.* 10.218, when he states to have intended to do no more than translate/paraphrase (μεταφράζειν) the Hebrew books into the Greek language; cf. NODDET 2001, XV.

Samuel and Kings? Most scholars assume that he was working on the basis of both traditions, sometimes following one tradition and sometimes the other. Others argue strongly either for a Greek source close to a proto-Lucianic LXX-text³⁶ or for a Hebrew source, probably a scroll glossed with variant readings at the margins, originally to be linked to the Temple of Jerusalem.³⁷ For the question at hand, I limit myself to a simple conclusion: In any event, Josephus did not have access to the reading *kb(y)r*. Otherwise, he surely would have chosen to render it in a way fitting his interpretation of the plot much better than the *perpetuum mobile*-liver.

1.4 The reading of the MT

Consequently, the question must be asked: Can we know whether – and if so, how – the Tiberian Masoretes understood the word they vocalized as *k^ebīr*?³⁸ The evaluation of the MT's reading is not straight forward. A look into contemporary dictionaries and modern commentaries reveals that the later revisors and early translators were the first (but definitely not the last) to base their renderings of the *dis legomenon* on a pseudo-linguistic approach departing from a root *kbr* or/and on an educated guess.³⁹ To avoid circular reasoning, I concentrate on the hard facts: For the construct state *k^ebīr* two absolute forms are possible: *kābīr*,⁴⁰ formally an adjective, and *k^ebīr*,⁴¹ possibly an aramaizing form or even an unknown Aramaic loanword.⁴² Given the Tiberian pointing

³⁶ ULRICH 1978, 223-259; for a critical review, see Tov 1999b [1979], 271-283.

³⁷ NODET 2006; 2001, XIV-XLIV.

³⁸ The term vocalization is anachronistic, but established and useful because of its clarity; cf. Tov 1997, 107. Further, in this short paragraph on etymological reconstruction, only *ā*, *ī*, and *ū* are used to indicate vowel length (also for potential *plene spelling* otherwise indicated by *â*, *î*, and *û* within this study). However, the Tiberian vocalization *k^ebīr* can be applied to both spellings, *kbr* and *kbyr*. In any case, the *plene* spelling is not an etymological one, but one of secondary nature and does therefore not provide any additional data. See further BANGE 1971; ZEVIT 1980.

³⁹ Most striking is a critical review of the respective dictionary entries (see **kābīr* in HALAT, 437; GESENIUS¹⁸, 526; DIETRICH and ARNET 2013, 238) and their references to further related entries: The etymological proposals are all based on a twisting of the root **krb* into **kbr* to establish links to words in cognate languages somehow connected to textile production and are to be rejected from a linguistic point of view because they rely on a procedure that, ironically, lines up with midrashic exegesis involving virtual metathesis, an approach well documented in the Septuagint, the Peshitta, and the Targumim; cf. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN 1963; KAMINKA 1928, 22-38.

⁴⁰ **qātil* < **qatīl*, the lemmatized form in the dictionaries.

⁴¹ **q^etīl* < **qatīl*, **qutīl*, or **qitīl*, in the case of **q^etīl* < **qatīl*, a Tiberian lengthening to **qātil* in the absolute state would again be possible.

⁴² MEYER 1992 [1969], 28 (§ 37,4); BAUER and LEANDER 1965 [1922], 470-471 (§ 61,2-3).

*kabbīr*⁴³ of an adjective *kbyr* “much, rich, mighty”⁴⁴ the pointing *k^ebīr* (construct state) indicates a distinctive interpretation, most probably a specific term. This is as far as well-informed considerations regarding the Tiberian Masoretes’ understanding can bring us; all further deliberation is hypothetical: The root *kbr* is attested in many Semitic languages.⁴⁵ In our case, even starting from a basic meaning “to be much”⁴⁶ does not help very much, since the possible derivatives of such a general verb may develop in different stages and assume concrete meanings that are difficult to work out only by reference to roots and patterns.⁴⁷ In the case of Biblical Hebrew, a corpus language, the problem is aggravated because of the scarce diachronic and synchronic data. In addition, it is difficult to judge the value of a specific Tiberian pointing,⁴⁸ and *k^ebīr* (construct state) may be an old reading or a secondary vocalization.⁴⁹

Yet, interesting issues emerge when the limited information regarding the word *k^ebīr* or *kābīr* is combined with the evidence of the prehexaplaric renderings for *kb(y)r* and the LXX’s translation elsewhere. Three aspects can be mentioned here:

- 1) *k^ebīr* / *kābīr* and *χοβερ* may indicate the same understanding (showing a difference owing to dialectal variety)⁵⁰ – but they may not.
- 2) The translation *το παν πληθος* reflects an interpretation based on a derivation from *kbr*, but there is no way to reconstruct the exact vocalization. The same applies to *πληθος* “multitude” in Exod 8:20^{LXX} (here, the LXX’s *το παν πληθος* is a translation based on a reading *kbr*, the formal equivalent in the MT is the adjective *kābēd* “heavy”).

⁴³ Cf. *kbr* in GESENIUS¹⁸. Also in Aramaic: *kbyr* (*kabbīr*); see *kbr* in the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (<http://cal.huc.edu>, accessed 27 June 2019).

⁴⁴ Isa 16:14; 17:12; 28:2; and Job 8:2; 15:10; 31:25; 34:17, 24; 36:5.

⁴⁵ See KBR in COHEN 2012, 1176–1177.

⁴⁶ Cf. the Aramaic and Hebrew evidence mentioned above and the etymological sections under *kbr* I in HALAT, 438; *kbr* in GESENIUS¹⁸, 526; DIETRICH and ARNET 2013, 238.

⁴⁷ Cf., e.g., English: *to set* – *setter* | *set-up* (specific terms borrowed by other languages), German: *setzen* – *Absatz* | *Setzling* (both nouns call for contextual disambiguation). Correspondingly, one should not expect to gain reliable semantic information about *k^ebīr* from the other lexemes in the Tanakh that seem to be derivatives of *kbr*: *mākbār* (2 Kgs 8:15), *mīkbār* (seven times in Exod 27–39) – both with the consonantal spelling *mkbr* –, and *k^ebārāh* (Amos 9:9).

⁴⁸ The question appears in various debates among specialists; see JOOSTEN 2015b.

⁴⁹ The latter phenomenon is best further subdivided into four categories: midrashic alterations, grammatical modernizations, forgotten words, and miscellanea; see JOOSTEN 2015a, 24.

⁵⁰ On this phenomenon, see JOOSTEN 2015a, 23.

- 3) The ancient Hebrew paraphrase preserved in the translation το στρογγύλωμα (των) τριχων is an interpretation of *kb(y)r*, probably based on contextual considerations. The MT's reading *k^ebîr* may equally descend from an educated guess – but it may also reflect the knowledge of a word that later was lost.

Thus, to come back: Can we know whether – and if so, how – the Tiberian Masoretes understood the word they vocalized as *k^ebîr*? I would say no. But aware of scholars challenging the antiquity of the Tiberian vocalization altogether, I would add: In my opinion, the MT's reading *k^ebîr* lines up with the other readings that can be linked to the period from the third century BCE to the second century CE. It does not show any particularity forcing a later dating (i.e., into the Middle Ages).

1.5 Interim conclusion

Going through the ancient readings, I have argued that the manifold readings fall into two groups, resulting from one reading decision point branching into opposite paths. Both have a text-historically prominent representative: One is the MT, the other is the LXX. Usually, a textual difference may be explained in two opposite directions and therefore calls for a bidirectional assessment of the data.⁵¹ Accordingly, I first sum up the manuscript evidence, then I apply this evidence to arguments fitting two contrasting explanations.

The difference between the MT's *k^ebîr* and the LXX's ἥπαρ “liver” in 1 Sam 19:13, 16 goes back to a reading *kb(y)r* compared to a reading *kbd*. Two alternative translations by the later Greek versions, χοβερ and το παν πληθος, attest to the reading *kb(y)r*, thereby homogeneity in pronunciation and understanding can neither be proved nor disproved. These three reading traditions may all go back to the time span from the third century BCE to the second century CE. At the same time, the word *kb(y)r* was largely unknown, as can be concluded on the basis of the retrovertable paraphrase preserved in το στρογγύλωμα (των) τριχων “the round(-ed) item of hair” (?), the translation with το παν πληθος “the total multitude” (?) as well as by the renderings of the Peshitta, the Vulgate, and the Targum: They all witness *different* ancient interpretations of *kb(y)r*. By contrast, the textual transmission based on the reading “liver” continued most notably in Greek manuscripts (and in daughter versions of the LXX) as well as in Josephus’

⁵¹ SCHENKER 2010.

Antiquities. It shows no alternative interpretations: Small variation occurs only with respect to the following genitive and is most probably of stylistic nature. These facts allow for two contrasting explanations:

Explanation I of the manuscript evidence

The MT preserves the pristine reading. The Tiberian pointing hands down a pronunciation of a construct form (*k^ebîr*) of a specific term known in some particular regions at the turn of the era. Perhaps $\chi\omicron\beta\epsilon\rho$ attests to the same information preserved in dialectical variation. However, the knowledge of the word was geographically and temporally restricted. Therefore, the ancient translators gave different interpretations, often based on a derivation from *kbr*, or made an educated contextual guess. In contrast, the LXX's translation $\tilde{\eta}\pi\alpha\rho$ "liver" simply goes back to someone reading the familiar word *kbd* "liver" instead – abetted by the graphic similarity of *resh* and *dalet* and possibly further influenced by knowledge of the Hebrew text of Ezek 21:26, where "liver" follows as the second word after "*teraphim*". We cannot know if the person in question was the translator himself or a copyist of a Hebrew scroll in the line of transmission. The latter scenario would gain in probability if it could be proven that Josephus' account is based on a Hebrew text. But as things stand, we have to be content with the conclusion that the LXX's reading $\tilde{\eta}\pi\alpha\rho$ "liver" was born of ignorance: It ends in a cock-and-bull story at best or at worst (the judgment remains a matter of taste).

Explanation II of the manuscript evidence

The LXX attests to the pristine reading *kbd* "liver". It refers – in a way yet to be explained – to extispicy, a practice once widespread in the ancient Near East and northeastern Mediterranean. However, at the turn of the era at the latest, this reminiscence was not theologically convenient anymore. Thanks to the graphic similarity of *resh* and *dalet*, the reading *kb(y)r*, a midrashic alteration, could easily be established. The renderings by the representatives of the (proto-)Masoretic text tradition, among them the later Greek versions (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion) as well as the Peshitta, the Vulgate, and the Targum document two sides of the same coin: On the one hand, they prove the successful implementation of this invented reading, since all refer unanimously to *kb(y)r*. On the other hand, their various interpretations of the word (reflected also in different pronunciations) may be taken as an indicator of its artificial nature. By contrast, the LXX's translation was produced before the dogmatic change took place. As time went by, the cultural knowledge implicitly addressed

by 1 Sam 19:11–17 was lost, as can be demonstrated by Josephus' text: Independent of whether his narrative is based on a Hebrew or a Greek source, he no longer understood the reference to extispicy.

While the first interpretation is broadly accepted, the second has not yet been seriously considered,⁵² and I develop further arguments for it in the next section.

2. FRAMING THE READING “LIVER”

First Samuel 19:11–17 presupposes the knowledge of the objects mentioned, while modern exegesis lacks such knowledge and is therefore forced to speculate. This is also the case for my reconstruction, but I approach the question differently. I started by showing that the LXX reflects a linguistically correct Hebrew reading which merits serious consideration. Here, I offer preliminary observations for an interpretation of 1 Sam 19:11–17 with the reading “liver” in five steps, providing methodological prolegomena on the use of the LXX and the MT in this study (2.1), a close reading of 1 Sam 19:11–17 (2.2), a general overview of extispicy practiced in the cultural environment of the Hebrew Bible (2.3), a sketch of three scenarios for a probable understanding of the reading “liver” in 1 Sam 19:13, 16 as referring to extispicy (2.4), and a methodological postscript focusing on my word choice and its implications regarding literary criticism (2.5).

2.1 Methodological prolegomena

Dealing with readings means dealing with texts. What do we know about our text(s)? What is the relationship between the LXX and the MT of the books of Samuel? Nowadays, the boundaries between textual criticism and literary criticism have become much more porous. Therefore, a methodological reflection on what seems to be – at first glance – the use of an LXX reading for an MT passage is needed.

The textual history of the books of Samuel is a very complex one, due to the multiplicity and the intricacy of their textual witnesses. The MT and the LXX are not based on exactly the same consonantal forerunner text.⁵³ Yet, both versions' histories are intertwined: At different stages the Greek manuscripts have now and then been corrected towards the Hebrew text,

⁵² In his commentary, AULD 2011 opts for “liver” as the pristine reading of the MT, but without argumentation and further exegesis.

⁵³ For a survey, see AEJMELEAUS 1995; HUGO 2010; LANGE 2009, 239-242.

closely resembling the MT, but in the meantime the Hebrew text was also subjected to internal changes.⁵⁴ However, the translation technique of the LXX of the books of Samuel can be considered very literal, mostly characterized by a word-for-word-procedure,⁵⁵ and therefore a retroversion of the LXX's Hebrew *Vorlage* can be constructed with a high probability, allowing for a comparison of its Hebrew wording with that of the MT. While two passages in 1 Samuel show large quantitative differences clearly attesting different literary stages (1 Sam 1–2 and 1 Sam 16–18),⁵⁶ the passage under discussion is less conspicuous in this respect: In 1 Sam 19:11–17 the differences between the consonantal text of the MT and the identifiable Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX are quite small and do not affect the basic structure of the narrated episode (see 2.2). Thus, in a first step, the reading “liver” can be assessed without differentiating between the LXX's Hebrew *Vorlage* and the MT.

2.2 The context: A close reading of 1 Sam 19:11–17

On the way to an interpretation of 1 Sam 19:11–17 with the reading “liver”, we must set aside certain presuppositions and try to read the familiar text as if it were the first time. Then, we have to admit that we do not know how to envisage the objects “*teraphim*”, “goat's *k^ebîr* / liver” and “garment / cover”, and the context does not help to clarify their meanings either.⁵⁷

¹¹And [on that night] Saul sent messengers to the house of David, to guard him and to put him to death in the morning. And Michal his wife reported to David: “If you do not rescue your life tonight, tomorrow you will be put to death.” ¹²And Michal let David down through the window; and he went and

⁵⁴ Beautifully shown in different case studies on the first book of Samuel by Anneli AEJMELAEUS, e.g. 2020; 2016; 2008.

⁵⁵ AEJMELAEUS 1995; HUGO 2010. This translation manner results, among other things, in numerous *calques* or Hebraisms such as the equivalent πρὸς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ for *m^era^ušōtāyw* in our passage: The translator rendered the suffix of the 3ms stereotypically with αὐτοῦ, which in the target text can refer grammatically only to David. However, since πρὸς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ is the LXX standard equivalent for all occurrences of *m^era^ušōtāyw* (Gen 28:11, 18; 1 Sam 26:7, 11–12, 16; 1 Kgs 19:6), the NETS translation by *its head* is well founded.

⁵⁶ For 1 Sam 1–2 (Hannah's song) see HUTZLI 2010; 2007; for 1 Sam 17–18 (David and Goliath) see AEJMELAEUS 2020 and TOV 1999a [1985].

⁵⁷ This is the translation of the MT. Where I consider the *Vorlage* of the LXX to reflect another Hebrew wording, I provide different or additional wordings in brackets and indicate missing equivalents by underlining the respective words of the MT's translation. The differences between MT, LXX, the Latin versions, the Targum, and Josephus' rendering of 1 Sam 19 are outlined in detail by BEGG 2005.

he fled and he got away. ¹³And Michal took the *teraphim* and put <it> to the bed; she put the goat's *k'êbîr* [liver] on / to its head end, and covered <it / all / both> with the garment. ¹⁴And Saul sent messengers to take David, and she [they] said: "He is sick." ¹⁵And Saul sent the messengers to see David, saying, "Bring him up on the bed to me to put him to death." ¹⁶And the messengers came, and behold: the *teraphim* at the bed and the goat's *k'êbîr* [liver] on / at its head end. ¹⁷And Saul said to Michal, "Why have you deceived me this way, and sent off my enemy and he got away?" And Michal said to Saul, "He himself said to me, 'Dispatch me. Why should I put you to death?'"

The story is told very economically. A close reading reveals a number of blanks,⁵⁸ as the following questions illustrate: How does Michal know Saul is after David's life? How does Michal know that David has to escape that night? Where are the messengers located in v. 11? (They do not see David escaping through the window.) Where are they located in v. 14? (They see the assemblage of objects only in v. 16.)⁵⁹ What does the assemblage of objects mean to the messengers in v. 16? Where does the dialogue between Saul and Michal in v. 17 take place? Why is the assemblage of objects not mentioned at all in v. 17?

We encounter difficulties when trying to establish clear references at the levels of word, sentence, and text. Everything beyond the bare statement that Michal is doing something at David's sleeping place after having him released through the window, is already part of interpretation. Our understanding is equally limited in the subsequent passage, where we read about Saul persecuting David as far as Ramah and – like the community there – falling into a prophetic frenzy (Hitpa'el of *nb'*) while David fled (1 Sam 19:23–20:1). Even though we do not know the cultic tradition or religious practices referred to,⁶⁰ we would never call the states depicted in Ramah a mere farce with the single purpose of letting David get away. Rather, we realize we lack the cultural-religious background at all textual levels. The same holds true for Michal's assemblage of objects. I reject a predefined reduction to mere backdrop in a game of hide and seek – opposing wide streams of the exegetical tradition, including most contemporary commentaries, which adapt the interpretations of the objects

⁵⁸ Not many commentators transparently display the gaps *they* see and fill in 1 Sam 19:11–17, but see DIETRICH 2015, 477–480.

⁵⁹ Also, albeit less central to us: How many messenger groups/troops are there? When and what do the messengers (and which ones?) report to Saul?

⁶⁰ From the texts it can only be deduced that the verb *nb'* in the Hitpa'el usually refers to different externally visible aspects of prophetic activity as a circumstance of rapturous excitement or ecstatic inspiration and frenzy; JEREMIAS 1997 (especially section III.6, 703–704).

in various ways but still in order to fit that pattern.⁶¹ In contrast, I start by probing whether the reading “liver” could possibly refer to extispicy; then I zoom out to the big picture, trying to fill at least some of the gaps in light of the cultural context(s) of the Hebrew Bible.

2.3 Reading the liver: Extispicy in the ancient world

Extispicy was widespread and popular for a long time. For all epochs thematized by the Hebrew Bible, this divination practice is attested at least somewhere in the regions between Mesopotamia and the northeastern Mediterranean, whether in the archaeological record, in the written sources, or both.

Most widely documented is extispicy in Mesopotamia, with evidence spanning from the third millennium BCE to the Seleucid Era, covering some Sumerian and most of the Akkadian text corpus. The sources are of different types, reaching from queries and reports, letters from scholars, clay liver models, ritual texts, omen compendia, and commentary series to occasional mentions in royal inscriptions, narrative accounts, and administrative texts. Unique is the long-standing transmission of textually fixed omnia as complex specialist literature. What began with the collection of omnia in the Old Babylonian period and was further systematized in compendia during the second millennium BCE was refined by a process of canonization and compilation in the Neo-Assyrian period and thereafter, figuring also as a major part of the educational curriculum of scribes and scholars.⁶² Extispicy was often combined with other (of the many) Mesopotamian divinatory practices, so it was not the only, but perhaps the most pervasive and successful one.⁶³ The procedure was regularized and ritually embedded. To answer the client’s question, the *bārû*-priest systematically examined the viscera of a sacrificial sheep, with an emphasis on the analysis of the liver. The results were evaluated by means of highly complex hermeneutics.⁶⁴ Nevertheless, for one thing, there are traces of simpler and faster procedures,⁶⁵ for another, considerable differences between theory and praxis have to be assumed.⁶⁶

⁶¹ This culminates in the assumption that human-sized *teraphim* may really have existed (even in studies focused on the archeological record and explicitly stating a lack of human-sized findings that might be correlated with the word *teraphim*) by referring to 1 Sam 19:11–17, cf. HÜBNER 1992, 93; apologetic: TOORN and LEWIS 1995, 771-777.

⁶² HESSEL 2012a, 1-10; KOCH 2015, 59-66; MAUL 2003, 69-82.

⁶³ KOCH 2010, 45.

⁶⁴ MAUL 2013, 43-147.

⁶⁵ HESSEL 2012a, 2; MAUL 2013, 50, 103-104.

⁶⁶ BACHVAROVA 2012; HESSEL 2012b.

In the Middle and Late Bronze Ages, this tradition radiated into the allied and conquered territories, as archaeological findings in the northern Levant and Anatolia show: Collections of extispicy omen compendia as well as liver models (less often lung models) are attested at various sites, including Megiddo, Hazor, Ugarit, Ebla, Emar, Mari, Enkomi (Cyprus), and Hattuša. Some of the artifacts even are Hittite, Hurrian, or Ugaritic bilinguals or translations.⁶⁷

Why the interest in Mesopotamian extispicy? How did it fit to regional traditions of divination? Did the foreign craft supplement local practices? Or was it borrowed as a whole? And afterwards, was it subjected to assimilation, inculturation, or transformation? For the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages, questions of cultural continuity in the Levant and the northeastern Mediterranean are especially difficult to answer. On the one hand, the political eruptions led to the downfall of cities such as Ugarit and Mari along with their scribal traditions, on the other hand, most cultural aspects of the societies were oral by definition. This also explains the difficulties in clarifying potential links between Mesopotamian and Greek extispicy. The latter is documented by vase-paintings⁶⁸ beginning in the late sixth century BCE and attested in texts since the fifth century BCE.⁶⁹ The reconstructions of the technique based on pictorial and narrative evidence remain vague, and attempts at comparison with the Mesopotamian tradition depend mainly on historiographical hypotheses of transcultural dissemination. Similar considerations apply in connection with Etruscan haruspicy⁷⁰ and different extispicy traditions known in Rome, the northern Mediterranean, and Egypt in the Roman and the Early Christian era.⁷¹

When it comes to variation in traditions, a further remark to be made considers the sacrificial animal. In the Greek context, not only lambs, but also kids and calves were used for extispicy.⁷² This contrasts with the Mesopotamian extispicy, which mainly concentrated on sheep.⁷³ In Anatolia and the Levant, the goat has been among the traditional sacrificial animals for millennia.⁷⁴ A limitation of extispicy to sheep is improbable

⁶⁷ BACHVAROVA 2012; MEYER 1993; 1987.

⁶⁸ JOHNSTON 2008, 125-128.

⁶⁹ For a collection of citations, see BLECHER 1905; for a recent re-discussion, see BACHVAROVA 2012, 144-148.

⁷⁰ HAASE 2006; ROLLINGER 2017.

⁷¹ FURLEY and GYSEMBERGH 2015; VRUGT-LENTZ 1971.

⁷² Explicitly by *Pausanias* 6.2.5:1.

⁷³ In the Mesopotamian record, possible references to extispicy of goats are highly controversial. In contrast the use of birds is clearly documented, see HEESSEL 2012a, 5.

⁷⁴ DAHM 2006; FREY-ANTHES 2010; POSTGATE and WESZELI 2017; HOUT 2017.

in this region – an assumption that is supported, for example, by Lev 3: In the regulations for sacrifices, a special treatment of the lobe of the liver is ordered for cattle (*bāqār*), small cattle (*ṣôn*), and goats (*ʿēz*).⁷⁵ Furthermore, it cannot be ruled out that the clay liver models found in these regions were also used in connection with goats, since the livers of sheep and goats are almost identical.⁷⁶ Therefore, to associate the reading *kbd hʿz(y)m* “goat’s liver” with practices of extispicy is reasonable in the context of the Levant.⁷⁷

2.4 Three scenarios for a reading *kbd hʿz(y)m* as referring to extispicy

As stated above, an exegesis of 1 Sam 19:11–17 cannot be built upon hard facts, but relies upon interpretation. This also applies to the proposed interpretation departing from the reading *kbd hʿz(y)m*. In order not to narrow the mindset hastily, I develop three alternative scenarios. I construct them as rooted in different periods and pointing to varied socio-cultural backgrounds. This procedure of controlled speculation will lead to new options for the interpretation in the third part of this study.

*Scenario I: A memory from the Late Bronze Age / Early Iron Age*⁷⁸

If 1 Sam 19:11–17 were to reflect memories from the early pre-monarchic period, the reading would point to an environment of internal pluralism.⁷⁹ The period is characterized by the merging of different ethnic and social groups, the interweaving of old Late Bronze Age urban and new Iron Age village traditions, and the partial continuation of cultural heritage,⁸⁰ of which extispicy was a part – especially in the northern regions joining the Syrian cultural area. In this respect, 14th/13th-century Ugarit is especially interesting: In the library of a diviner, four inscribed liver models have been found, recording the results of extispicies.⁸¹ Two of them indicate for whom

⁷⁵ The orders concerning the lobe of the liver in the sacrificial laws of the Hebrew Bible have been seen in connection to extispicy, however, further interpretations differ: CRYER 1994, 295-298; LORETZ 1985, 26; JEFFERS 1996, 158-160.

⁷⁶ The sheep liver differs from the goat liver only by its somewhat slimmer form and the clearly developed *processus papillaris*: NICKEL, SCHUMMER, and SEIFERLE 1987, 241-242. The surface changes evaluated for extispicy, which are mostly due to bacilli infestation, are also in principle the same, only the frequency varies.

⁷⁷ The fact that the sacrificial animal is indicated here as a goat probably refers to a specific sacrificial practice, but the missing sources do not allow a reconstruction.

⁷⁸ LB: 1550-1200/1150 BCE, Iron I: 1200/1150-1000 BCE, and Iron IIA: 1000-926/900 BCE or 950/900-800/785/748 BCE. Dates follow BERLEJUNG 2019, 87-189.

⁷⁹ ALBERTZ and SCHMITT 2012, 2-16.

⁸⁰ BERLEJUNG 2019, 88-98.

⁸¹ For further interpretation of the find context, see MEYER 1990, 247-251.

the request was made by means of the indication “liver of PN”: *kbd . dt ypt bn ykn* “liver of Ypt, son of Ykn” (KTU 1.143), and *kbd ḥ[...]* “liver of Ḥ[...]” (KTU 1.155).⁸² This finding is revealing in two respects: First, it attests the use of the general term *kbd* in the context of extispicy in the Northwest Semitic cultural area – in contrast to the Akkadian texts, which use *amūtu* when referring to the liver used for extispicy, and not the general term *kabattu*.⁸³ Second, not only the liver of the animal, but also the clay model, has been designated *kbd* “liver”.

From Old Babylonian Mari we know that extispicy results classified as important were sent to the king. How did this work, given the danger of decomposition? The verb used in the respective reports, mentioning the “preparation” of the viscera for dispatch, literally means “to burn, dye red”.⁸⁴ Consequently, it is likely that the texts point to the manufacture of clay liver models recording the results that were fired and sent off.⁸⁵ Against this background, the reading *kbd h'z(y)m* can be understood as referring to a liver model documenting the answer of Michal’s request regarding David’s well-being or his chances of escape. *Nota bene*: In pre-deuteronomistic eras, divination, also in the biblical context, is best understood as a means of privileged access to divine knowledge, lacking a negative connotation.⁸⁶

*Scenario II: A glimpse into the later Iron Age*⁸⁷

This scenario works with an alternative pre-exilic milieu specifically pointing to the period of the increasing presence of the Neo-Assyrian Empire in the Levant, when Assyrian influence in Israel and Judah can be traced in the material culture. Since the Assyrian governing of vassal states and provinces was marked by interest in profit and not in the assyrianization of the conquered peoples, these findings are best interpreted as testifying to a willing adoption of an impressive and fancy lifestyle.⁸⁸ In such an environment, the elites of Jerusalem and Judah were also well aware of intellectual aspects of Assyrian culture, such as extispicy, which played an important role in political decision making.⁸⁹ Read against this

⁸² For further analysis of the texts, see DIETRICH and LORETZ 1990, 6-8, 16-17.

⁸³ See *amūtu(m)* in AHw I, 46-47.

⁸⁴ See *ṣarāpu(m)* I in AHw III, 1083-1084; *ṣarāpu* B in CAD XVI, 104-105.

⁸⁵ MAUL 2013, 147.

⁸⁶ HAMORI 2015, 19-40.

⁸⁷ From the end of Iron IIB or from Iron IIC (Iron IIB: 926/900-722/700 BCE or 800/785/748-722/700 BCE, Iron IIC: 722/700-587/6 BCE).

⁸⁸ BERLEJUNG 2012, 50.

⁸⁹ Cf., e.g., the reports and queries of the Sargonid era (722-609 BCE) in STARR 1990.

background, Michal's statement "If you do not rescue your life tonight, tomorrow you will be put to death" (v. 11) gains further relevance: In the Mesopotamian tradition, requests for extispicy were elaborated very skillfully.⁹⁰ In the struggle for precision, it was customary to define the time period for which the extispicy was valid.⁹¹ This was done by the diviner, but sometimes the god(s) corrected the stipulated term (*adunnu*), communicating a different period of validity through traces on the liver.⁹² Therefore, not only may the reading *kbd h'z(y)m* refer to extispicy, but Michal's statement may even reflect the nuanced answer she received: The extispicy, which is in this case the result of the request for a successful flight, is favorable to *this* night.

*Scenario III: A discourse from the Neo-Babylonian/Persian period*⁹³

A further possibility is to read 1 Sam 19:11–17 in an exilic or post-exilic setting. In contrast to the Assyrian policy of deportation, which resettled and mixed the conquered peoples and resulted, for example, in a further internationalization of Samaria,⁹⁴ the Babylonian one was relatively moderate and one-sided: In the case of Judah, ca. 20% of the people were deported and settled in groups in Babylonia. The emptied territory was not filled by groups from other parts of the empire but left to the remaining ones.

For the exiled, concepts of reliable family ties in general and the continuity of the Davidic line in particular became central, at least for the deportees concerned not with assimilation but with identity demarcation. When their hope of return came true in the Persian period, they were concerned with the restoration of the temple and the cult in Jerusalem, but they also implemented religious modifications developed in the Babylonian exile (e.g., circumcision, sabbath observance, dietary laws and possibly monotheism and aniconism of the worship of Yhwh). Thus, the minority of repatriates was confronted with the customs of the long-established majority, who in the past decades had no reason to fundamentally change the religious practices of earlier times.⁹⁵ This caused tensions which left traces in the biblical record, as explicitly declared in the books of Haggai, Esra, and Nehemia, and implicitly attested in the theological literature concerned with a respective reworking of older traditions (often identified

⁹⁰ MAUL 2013, 157-183.

⁹¹ STARR 1990, XVI-XVII.

⁹² HEESSEL 2010; KOCH 2005, 459-479.

⁹³ 587/586-333/332 BCE.

⁹⁴ BERLEJUNG 2012, 45-51.

⁹⁵ BERLEJUNG 2019, 154-178.

as Deuteronomistic material). The negative assessment of certain divinatory practices in accordance with Deut 18:10–11 is an example of the latter. Thus, we can read passages like 1 Sam 15:22 (divination⁹⁶ and *teraphim*); 28:3, 9 (necromancers and spiritists) as a back projection with the purpose of critiquing contemporary practices with the aim of changing them: The practices followed in the present are rhetorically devalued by attributing them to the dynasty rejected by Yhwh in the past, the Saulides. The father breaks his own interdictions against necromancers (1 Sam 28:3–20), his daughter uses extispicy and *teraphim*, forms of divination based on devices rhetorically devalued in Samuel’s speech in 1 Sam 15:22–23.

In a nutshell: In the exilic or early post-exilic milieu, reading *kbd h’z(y)m* still makes sense. The different divinatory techniques of earlier times have not suddenly disappeared. Otherwise, the (post-)exilic issue of the systematic rejection of at least some of these practices would have no point of reference. Read in context, 1 Sam 19:11–17 fits into the strategic othering of certain practices by attributing them to Saul’s rejected dynasty – as is done in a comparable manner in Ezek 21:26. There, three practices customary in Israel, *qilqal baḥiṣṣîm* (“arrow shaking”)⁹⁷, *šā’al batt’rāpîm* (“consulting teraphim”)⁹⁸, and *rā’â bakkābēd* (“extispicy”)⁹⁹, are devalued by ascribing them to the enemy, the king of Babylon. This is done intentionally, and not erroneously.¹⁰⁰

2.5 Methodological postscript

In the previous section I constructed three hypothetical windows into the world of the text’s implicit audiences. All three settings allow for the interpretation of reading *kbd h’z(y)m* as referring to extispicy. Given both the controversial debate over the origins of the books of Samuel¹⁰¹ and the *longue durée* of extispicy in the Hebrew Bible’s cultural environment, our equation remains under determined. But if one understands the three scenarios as possible *approximations*, there is potential to spiral towards

⁹⁶ The root in question, *qsm*, is often used as a general term referring to divination based on devices, for certain passages, the (probably original) meaning “casting of lots” should be assumed; see JEFFERS 1996, 96-98.

⁹⁷ Referring to belomancy/rhodomancy, attested in the eastern Mediterranean including the Levant; see DIETRICH and LORETZ 2010; JEFFERS 1996, 190-195.

⁹⁸ So far the word *teraphim* (understood as a divinatory device as in Ezek 21:26 and elsewhere) is only attested in the Hebrew Bible.

⁹⁹ A practice also widespread in the west, not restricted to the Mesopotamian culture.

¹⁰⁰ As suggested for the case of belomancy/rhodomancy in Ezek 21:26 by SCHMITT 2014, 113.

¹⁰¹ For a detailed overview, see DIETRICH 2014, 233-259.

an interpretation.¹⁰² In order to illustrate the benefits of such an approach within only a few pages, I had to limit myself to three scenarios and decided to arrange them in a chronological sequence. For the sake of readability, I have chosen formulations that do not exclude the reading of the scenarios as consecutive. But an assumption of such a sequence is not mandatory for further interpretation. The reading *kbd h'z(y)m* as referring to extispicy is plausible for more than one epoch and thus theoretically compatible with more than one model of textual growth. My aim so far was not to show how the reading referring to extispicy was understood, but to show that it could have been understood at different times, and thereby to open our minds to a new interpretation of 1 Sam 19:11–17 with the reading “liver”.

3. AN INTERPRETATION OF 1 SAM 19:11–17 WITH THE READING *KBD* “LIVER”

Here, I will integrate the insights gained so far into a final interpretation, which will also result in a new understanding of the *teraphim* (3.1). Then, I evaluate the newly gained perspectives in regard to women’s agency reflected in 1 Sam 19:11–17 (3.2). Finally, I outline the consequences to be drawn regarding the text-critical decision at stake (3.3).

3.1 A final interpretation

In order to better understand 1 Sam 19:11–17, we have to fill the gaps by correlating the text with possible worlds in which the plot could take place. Is it the world in which we live, in which the divine sphere is pushed back so far that all action is of this-worldly nature? Or is it a world in which the divine sphere has an active role and is involved in two-way communication? If we consider the reading “liver” to refer to extispicy, we opt for the latter possibility. But to reread the plot from that perspective, we need at least a vague impression of that hypothetical world. To achieve that, we can reintroduce the three scenarios as blurred, overlapping pictures. This enables us to further follow the trail of scholars who presume a ritual dimension of the *teraphim* still somehow tangible in the passage, mostly proposing interpretations referring to healing rituals and ancestor worship.¹⁰³ The reading “liver” and its allusion to extispicy, however, suggests an understanding of the *teraphim* as a divinatory device as well. This view

¹⁰² AST 1808, 179–180.

¹⁰³ LORETZ 1992; ROUILLARD and TROPPER 1987; WILLI-PLEIN 2002/2003.

is further strengthened by almost all the biblical passages about *teraphim*: They mention the lexeme alongside at least one other divinatory device, such as the ephod, arrows, dreams, and spirits.¹⁰⁴ Here, the biblical findings coincide with those from the surrounding area, which, as already mentioned, also knows the parallel or successive consultation of different procedures, especially in the case of extispicy. Accordingly, 1 Sam 19:11–17 implicitly reports that Michal gathered divine knowledge from two different sources: On the one hand, from a specialist in extispicy who provided her with the results documented on the liver or the liver model, on the other hand, from consulting the *teraphim*. As in the ensuing narrative about Saul in Ramah, the story behind the plot is much richer and implies a flow of information among people not reported as well as an intervention of the divine (answering Michal's request here is paralleled by the spiritual besetting extending also to Saul there). In this scenario it also becomes clear why David is easily convinced: He sees the divinatory devices and knows where Michal got her information from. Only after he leaves does she cover them up – on his sleeping place, probably the least accessible part of the dwelling.¹⁰⁵ Finally, the messengers uncover Michal's complicity in v. 16: Not only did she help David improve his chances of escape by her playing for time in stating that he was sick, she even equipped him with the best resources he could get, supporting him with divination. Therefore, a new insight can be reported in the case of the *teraphim*: Since its purpose in the story was not to be a substitute for David in a game of hide and seek, the postulate of a human-sized specimen, inconsistent with all other biblical passages and defying possible identifications in the material records, turns out to be a fever dream.

However, a reconstruction of the divinatory rituals presupposed by the passage is impossible, simply because this is not the topic of the narrative. In the received form of the text, this narrative focuses on those who helped David escape, and in a threefold progression (Jonathan in 1 Sam 19:1–7, Michal in 1 Sam 19:11–17, and Samuel in 1 Sam 19:18–24). It fits seamlessly into the account of David's rise, which is an important part of the dramatic novella about David and Saul. Moreover, it lines up with different stories, set in the pre-exilic time, dealing, indeed, with divination as a way of communicating with God¹⁰⁶ and lacks the dichotomy into prophecy

¹⁰⁴ Judg 17:5; 18:14, 17–18, 20; 1 Sam 15:23; 2 Kgs 23:24; Ezek 21:26; Hos 3:4; and Zech 10:2. In fact, Gen 31:19, 34–35 documents the only passage about *teraphim* that does not fit into this pattern.

¹⁰⁵ For observations on the architecture implied by the plot, see WILLI-PLEIN 2002 [1995], 85–87.

¹⁰⁶ CRYER 1994; HAMORI 2015; THELLE 2013.

and divination, or into legitimate and illegitimate divination practices, that is so often suggested by Deuteronomistic sections and reproduced in the research history.¹⁰⁷

3.2 On women's agency

The reading “liver” opens the narrow scene of the one evening towards the multifaceted story behind the plot, and it invites further exploration of the implied world. Here, I concentrate on the reflection of women's agency. Therefore, I examine the portrayal of Michal as an artifact of cultural imagination. At a minimum, it can be considered as a position that is culturally conceivable, at a maximum, as an illustration bearing some resemblance to reality.

Contrary to the prejudice popular in scholarship, divination by women is well attested in the Hebrew Bible and in the sources of the ancient Near East. In both records, it is neither considered exceptional nor inferior to divination by men.¹⁰⁸ Thus, is Michal depicted in a way that she can be envisioned as having asked the *teraphim* herself? This question gives rise to a more ample one: What are the rights and duties that a female member of the royal family had?

The responsibilities of a royal woman in the monarchies of the ancient Near East ranged from policy and economy to religious and cultic affairs. High-performing women became quite influential and played an important role alongside their husbands.¹⁰⁹ Some women advanced considerably in their rank and even reached heights that allowed them to install their sons as royal successors contrary to the planned order.¹¹⁰ The literary Michal meets these expectations; she is the typified power-conscious woman. But, given that she is the daughter and not the son designated to be the future king, she uses the only chance she has to reach the highest and most influential position available to a woman, that of the Queen Mother: She bets everything on the vassal she has been married to, knowing that under certain conditions, marriage to a princess could lead a man to vie for succession to the throne.¹¹¹ Royal women's use of their access to specialists in divination to promote the success of their husbands and

¹⁰⁷ HAMORI 2015, 20-31; NISSINEN 2010.

¹⁰⁸ HAMORI 2015, 8-18, 35-40, 219-223.

¹⁰⁹ SOLVANG 2003, 8-70.

¹¹⁰ A famous example is the mother of Esarhaddon and grandmother of Ashurbanipal, Zakutu (with the native name Naqi'a), originally a palace woman of Sennacherib; see MELVILLE 1999.

¹¹¹ SOLVANG 2003, 22.

sons are documented in letters,¹¹² and men in the royal family explicitly consulting female relatives for their divinatory skills in literary sources.¹¹³ So, considering the ancient Near Eastern background, both interpretations are equally probable: The *teraphim* allude to Michal's own access to divine knowledge or to a second specialist involved.

In any case, Michal is portrayed as a well-positioned actor in the game of power. This is mirrored in the dialogue in v. 17. While her lie about David threatening her is traditionally addressed as a problem of personal morality and doubtful female virtue, focusing on family loyalties as an apolitical matter, that is an anachronistic approach to the realities of the ancient Near East. The actual crux of the text is ignored and thus the message missed: The point is that Saul does not accuse her of being a liar – because the messengers didn't report the discovery made in v. 16! That means that Michal is portrayed as a successful strategist, having allies in the palace supporting her political vision of David as king as well as her ascent to the very top.

3.3 A final re-assessment of the text-critical decision at stake

Now, I continue my arguments in favor of explanation II for the manuscript evidence (1.5), showing that the LXX attests not simply a different reading compared to the MT, but the pristine one. I begin with an important observation: Both readings have substantial implications for the theological interpretation. Yet, the difference cannot be reduced to a simple error in the textual transmission. Moreover, we cannot pin the issue on a phenomenon of textual plurality, given that the passage of 1 Sam 19:11–17 in the MT and in the *Vorlage* of the LXX testifies to the same textual structure (2.1). Hence, the two readings must be evaluated with regard to their logical dependence: In which direction has the change taken place? To answer this question, a closer look at the reading *kb(y)r* is necessary.

As stated above, we do not know whether – and if so, how – the Tiberian Masoretes understood the word they vocalized as *k^ebîr*. From a heuristic perspective, the only way to get any further is to follow the ancient paths: The manuscript evidence revealed that the word *kb(y)r* was largely unknown and that the interpretations by the early Greek translations and the ancient versions differ in detail. Nonetheless, they share the direction

¹¹² A systematic overview is a *desideratum*, but one may start the paper chase with a look at Mari (ARM 10,120 and ARM 10,4, discussed in RÖMER 1971, 37-38, 50-56) and Niniveh (SAA 9,5 and SAA 10,109, discussed in NISSINEN 1998, 22-29, 89-95).

¹¹³ Mostly dream interpretation; see HAMORI 2015, 12-15.

of interpretation: They all offer some kind of item made of goat hair or goat skin. In consequence, we have to ask how the reading *kb(y)r h'z(y)m* triggers associations with fur, fibers, and textiles instead of, for example, objects made of horn or bone or even a shaped sculpture. Of course, in the context of a sleeping place, the former considerations can be judged as educated guesses. Yet, in the context of *teraphim* the latter objects make equally good sense.

My thesis is that the shared direction of interpretation reflects the successful implementation of Pentateuchal model texts for a theologically palatable reception of the books of Samuel in the time they became authoritative (to avoid the anachronistic term canonical). At that time, divinatory devices naturally present at David's home were no longer theologically acceptable. A remedy was to reread the passage through new glasses, on the one side having a correction of Rachel, and on the other, a correction of Rebekah: At first glance, the stories of Rachel and Michal can be read as two versions of the same motif, namely the occurrence of *teraphim* together with a daughter outsmarting her father with a trick. This *lecture* is found often, even today.¹¹⁴ However, the comparison is misleading and the parallels are only seemingly so: in Rachel's case, the *teraphim* would be the reason for the trick, while in Michal's case, they would be the means. Nevertheless, this weak point was willingly overlooked, since it shifted the focus away from the *teraphim* as a divinatory device towards the action of hiding the *teraphim* as a deceptive move. And by concentrating on deception, a further bridge to the Pentateuch was offered by Rebekah, who dresses up Jacob as Esau: "Then Rebekah took the best garments of her elder son Esau, which were with her in the house, and put them on her younger son Jacob; and she put the skins of the kids (*'ōrōt g^edāyê hā 'izzîm*) on his hands and on the smooth part of his neck" (Gen 27:15–16). Read with this in mind, the word *kb(y)r* appears as a midrashic invention: Intuitively connected with **kbr* and related words,¹¹⁵ it evokes in contemporary readers or listeners associations with textiles made of goat's hair or goat's wool, somewhat thick, dense, or densely woven in any form. With Rebekah, Michal suddenly got a famous role model using fabric derived from goats to feign the presence of a male relative.¹¹⁶ Hence, with a small change from *kbd* to *kb(y)r*, the reference to extispicy was erased and the understanding of the *teraphim* as a mere backdrop further strengthened. In other words: the

¹¹⁴ For an overview, see RUDNIG-ZELT 2010, 389-390.

¹¹⁵ Cf. the results of the comparative study of *kbr* in 1.4.

¹¹⁶ GRÜTTER (forthcoming).

reading *kb(y)r* witnesses a theologically motivated alteration of the pristine reading preserved in the LXX.

For a comprehensive argumentation in favor of explanation II, I will now demonstrate the considerable and insoluble difficulties in assuming a change from *kb(y)r* to *kbd* (explanation I). First and foremost, a simple error in the textual transmission must be ruled out, since the reading *kbd* is not only formally correct but meaningful in content when read against the cultural background of the ancient Near East and northeastern Mediterranean with their *longue durée* of extispicy. Consequently, to explain the textual difference by loss of lexical knowledge and the assumption of someone reading the familiar word *kbd* “liver” instead of the rare *kb(y)r* comes down to betting on a lucky punch and, at the same time, introduces a wildcard: In this case, the “new” reading *kbd* “liver” shows so many advantages for an appropriate understanding of the passage that the pristineness of the “older” reading *kb(y)r* can only be defended by claiming that an original meaning *kb(y)r* had existed, fitting the context even better than *kbd* “liver”, but that this knowledge is irretrievably lost. Such an assumption cannot be verified and only leads to further etymological speculations.

Accordingly, to postulate a case of contextual exegesis, proposing that the LXX’s translation ἥπαρ “liver” simply goes back to someone reading the familiar word *kbd* “liver” instead – abetted by the graphic similarity of *resh* and *dalet* and possibly further influenced by knowledge of the Hebrew text of Ezek 21:26, where “liver” follows after “*teraphim*” – becomes equally difficult, since it is in fact based on the same claim just outlined. But still, to give the argument another try: This would mean that the topic of divination in 1 Sam 19:11–17 was secondary and was brought up either accidentally – which seems very unlikely given the cultural context – or deliberately, which would force us to explore possible motifs. The most promising approach is to see the aim in devaluing the Saulides and to propose an exilic or early post-exilic milieu (2.4). However, the link must have been established by someone who knew the Hebrew text of Ezek 21:26, since the Greek translation uses other equivalents for *teraphim* and the reference to extispicy (1.1). Nevertheless, this approach cannot account for the reading *kb(y)r* being the pristine reading. And to solve this problem by simply deciding to view the interpretation of the passage as telling of a game of hide and seek as original would again leave us with the problem of a human-sized *teraphim*. A further variation of this line of argumentation could try to date the reading “liver” to the Hellenistic period and attribute it to the translator influenced by Greek culture. This

is very unlikely, since against this background the *teraphim* would not be identifiable as a divinatory device: Inner-biblical polemic successfully shifted the understanding in a direction of idolatry, as the various translations of the term in the Septuagint show. In addition, if the translation is thought to originate in Egypt, we are speaking of a region where extispicy was not traditionally known – the first supporting documents are Greek papyri dating to the first four centuries CE.¹¹⁷

In sum, the different starting points for a counterargument end up in an aporia. Consequently, *kbd* changed to *kb(y)r*, and this shift is to be explained as theologically motivated with the aim of erasing the reference to divinatory devices present in David's house. But was this intervention really necessary? With a look into Josephus' Antiquities, we might say that deuteronomic theology alone would have ultimately produced the same result: Josephus omits the reference to *teraphim* or the respective Greek equivalent reporting Michal's action, but not the liver. Even he, living in Rome at a time when extispicy in its Etruscan form (*haruspicina*) was very popular, could no longer understand the reference within a Jewish context.

Finally, I have to re-address the methodological issue of what I have called the use of an LXX reading for an MT passage (2.1). In the end, should we correct the MT towards a reading "liver"? There is evidence that the LXX and the MT of the books of Samuel testify two different editions, whereby the LXX is considered to reflect the older Hebrew text.¹¹⁸ Therefore, the readings *kbd* and *kb(y)r* must be investigated further in order to clarify whether they are part of this larger phenomenon.¹¹⁹ A hasty correction of the MT could result in a blending of editions and therefore paradoxically result in creating a text of Samuel that never existed.

CONCLUSION

In the first part, I showed that the difference between the MT's *k^ebîr* and the LXX's ἥπαρ "liver" in 1 Sam 19:13, 16 goes back to a reading *kb(y)r* compared to a reading *kbd*. Interpretations of the passage in 1 Sam 19:11–17 generally follow the first reading without considering the reading preserved in the LXX. This is a methodological flaw, since the retroversion of the LXX results in a linguistically correct reading. Data of this kind

¹¹⁷ PSI 1178 (1st c. CE), P.Ross.Georg. I 21 (2nd c. CE), and P.Amh. Gr. 2 14 (4th c. CE). For further discussion, see FURLEY and GYSEMBERGH 2015.

¹¹⁸ AEJMELAEUS 2012, 203-204.

¹¹⁹ SCHENKER 2013, 179-150.

calls for a bidirectional evaluation of the manuscript evidence. Along these lines, I developed explanation II, which assumes the reading *kbd* “liver” to be the pristine one. In the second part, I underpinned this hypothesis by showing that this reading is not only formally correct, but also makes good sense against the cultural background of the ancient Near East and northeastern Mediterranean with their *longue durée* of extispicy. In the third part, I demonstrated that seriously considering the reading *kbd* “liver” helps to better understand the plot by furnishing a new perspective on the *teraphim* and on women’s agency. Finally, I demonstrated that reading *kb(y)r* over against *kbd* reflects a deliberate change motivated by theological interests.

WORKS CITED

- AEJMELAEUS, Anneli. 1995. “The Septuagint of 1 Samuel.” In *VIII. Congress of the IOSCS: Paris 1992*, edited by Leonard Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich, 110–29. *SBLSCS* 41. Atlanta, Ga.
- . 2008. “A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek – Deconstructing the Textus Receptus.” In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 353–66. *JSJ.S* 126. Leiden et al. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004165823.i-756.124>.
- . 2012. “How to Reach the Old Greek in 1 Samuel and What to Do with It.” In *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, edited by Martti Nissinen, 185–205. *VTSup* 148. Leiden et al. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004221130_010.
- . 2016. “Lectio Difficilior and the Difficulties of the Critical Text: A Case Study from the Septuagint of 1 Samuel 14:47.” In *XV Congress of the IOSCS: Munich, 2013*, edited by Wolfgang Kraus, Michael van der Meer, and Martin Meiser, 61–70. *SBLSCS* 64. Atlanta, Ga.
- . 2020. “Rewriting David and Goliath?” In *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*, edited by Anneli Aejmelaus, Drew Longacre, and Natia Mirotadze, 165–80. *De Septuaginta Investigationes* 12. Göttingen. <https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666522093.165>.
- ALBERTZ, Rainer, and Rüdiger SCHMITT. 2012. *Family and Household Religion in Ancient Israel and the Levant*. Winona Lake, Ind.
- AST, Friedrich. 1808. *Grundlinien der Grammatik, Hermeneutik und Kritik*. Lands-hut.
- AULD, A. Graeme. 2011. *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville, Ky.
- BACHVAROVA, Mary R. 2012. “The Transmission of Liver Divination from East to West.” *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 54: 143–64.
- BANGE, Ludger Anton. 1971. *A Study of the Use of Vowel-Letters in Alphabetic Consonantal Writing*. München.
- BAUER, Hans, and Pontus LEANDER. 1965 [1922]. *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. Hildesheim.

- BEGG, Christopher. 2005. "David's Fourfold Escape According to Josephus." *Anton.* 80/3: 433–452.
- BERLEJUNG, Angelika. 2012. "The Assyrians in the West: Assyrianization, Colonialism, Indifference, or Development Policy?" In *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, edited by Martti Nissinen, 21–60. VTSup 148. Leiden et al. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004221130_003.
- . 2018. "Masks in the Old Testament? Masks in Ancient Palestine/Israel!" In *The Physicality of the Other: Masks from the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean*, edited by Angelika Berlejung and Judith E. Filitz, 141–68. ORA 27. Tübingen.
- . 2019. "Geschichte und Religionsgeschichte des antiken Israel." In *Grundinformation Altes Testament: Eine Einführung in Literatur, Religion und Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, edited by Jan Christian Gertz, 6th ed., 59–192. UTB 2745. Göttingen.
- BLECHER, Georgius. 1905. *De Extispicio Capita Tria Scripsit et Imaginibus Illustravit Georgius Blecher: Accedit de Babyloniorum Extispicio Caroli Bezold Supplementum*. RVV 2, 4. Giessen.
- BOER, Pieter Arie Hendrik de, ed. 1978. "Samuel." In *Vetus Testamentum Syriace iuxta Simplicem Syrorum Versionem II,2: Liber Judicum, Liber Samuelis*. Leiden.
- BROCK, Sebastian P. 1996 [1966]. *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel: With a Foreword by Natalio Fernández Marcos*. QHen 9. Turin.
- BROOKE, Alan England, Norman McLEAN, and Henry St John THACKERAY, eds. 1927. *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, With a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint. Vol. II. The Later Historical Books: Part I. I and II Samuel*. Cambridge.
- BROWN, Francis, Samuel Rolles DRIVER, and Charles A. BRIGGS. 1907. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford.
- COHEN, David, ed. 2012. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques: ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques: Tome 3 = Fascicule 10 (H, T/T', F, F, Y, K)*. Leuven.
- CROSS, Frank Moore, Donald W. PARRY, and Richard J. SALEY. 2005. "4Q Sam^b." In *Qumran Cave 4. XII. 1-2 Samuel*, edited by Emanuel Tov, 219–46. Pls. XXIV-XXV. DJD 17. Oxford.
- CRYER, Frederick H. 1994. *Divination in Ancient Israel and its Near Eastern Environment: A Socio-Historical Investigation*. JSOTSup 142. Sheffield.
- DAHM, Ulrike. 2006. "Opfer (AT)." In *Das wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet*. <http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/24240/>.
- DIETRICH, Manfred, and Oswald LORETZ. 1990. *Mantik in Ugarit: Keilalphabetische Texte der Opferschau, Omensammlungen, Nekromantie*. ALASP 3. Münster.
- . 2010. "Rhabdomantie im Mykenischen Palast von Tiryns – Das Fragment eines kurz-keilalphabetisch beschrifteten Elfenbeinstabs (Ti 02 LXIII 34/91 VI D12.80 = KTU3 6.104)." *UF* 42: 141–59.
- DIETRICH, Walter, and Samuel ARNET, eds. 2013. *Konzise und aktualisierte Ausgabe des Hebräischen und Aramäischen Lexikons zum Alten Testament*. Leiden et al.

- DIETRICH, Walter. 2014. "Die Vorderen Propheten." In *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments*, edited by Walter Dietrich, Hans-Peter Mathys, Rudolf Smend, and Thomas Römer, 167–282. ThW 1. Stuttgart.
- . 2015. *Samuel (1 Sam 19,1-22,1)*. BKAT 8/2.7. Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- FIELD, Frederick. 1875. *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt: Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. Oxford.
- FREY-ANTHES, Henrike. 2010. "Ziege / Ziegenbock." In *Das wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet*. <http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/35346/>.
- FURLEY, William D., and Victor GYSEMBERGH. 2015. *Reading the Liver: Papyrological Texts on Ancient Greek Extispicy*. STAC 94. Tübingen. <https://doi.org/10.1628/978-3-16-153891-9>.
- GINSBURG, Christian David. 1899. "On the Relationship of the So-Called Codex Babylonicus of A.D. 916 to the Eastern Recension of the Hebrew Text." In *Recueil des travaux rédigés en mémoire du jubilé scientifique de Daniel Chwolson*, edited by Christian David Ginsburg, Isaac Markon, and Albert Harkavy, 149–88. Berlin.
- GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN, Moshe Henry. 1963. "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism – The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint." *Textus* 3/1: 130–58. <https://doi.org/10.1163/2589255X-00301009>.
- GRILLET, Bernard, and Michel LESTIENNE, eds. 1997. *Premier livre des Règnes*. BdA 9/1. Paris.
- GRÜTTER, Nesina. forthcoming. "Von Haaren, die auf Ziegen wachsen. Etymologische und textiltheoretische Erwägungen zu כביר (1 Sam 19,13.16)." *Trumah. Zeitschrift der Hochschule für Jüdische Studien Heidelberg* 25.
- GRYSON, Roger, Bonifatius FISCHER, and Robert WEBER, eds. 2013. *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*. 5th ed. Stuttgart.
- HAASE, Maraile. 2006. "Haruspices." In *Brill's New Pauly* (online version). 2011. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e503830.
- HAMORI, Esther J. 2015. *Women's Divination in Biblical Literature: Prophecy, Necromancy, and Other Arts of Knowledge*. AYBRL. London/New Haven. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvggx4g3>.
- HEESSEL, Nils P. 2010. "The Calculation of the Stipulated Term in Extispicy." In *Divination and Interpretation of Signs in the Ancient World*, edited by Amar Annus, 163–75. OIS 6. Chicago, Ill.
- . 2012a. *Divinatorische Texte. Bd. 2. Opferschau-Omina*. KAL 5 (WVDOG 139). Wiesbaden.
- . 2012b. "The Hermeneutics of Mesopotamian Extispicy – Theory vs. Practice." In *Mediating between Heaven and Earth: Communication with the Divine in the Ancient Near East*, edited by Carly L. Crouch, Jonathan Stökl, and Anna Elise Zerneck, 16–35. LHBOTS 566. London/New York.
- HOUT, Theo P. J. van den. 2017. "Ziege. B. Bei den Hethitern." In *RLA* 15, 5/6: 267–72.
- HÜBNER, Ulrich. 1992. *Spiele und Spielzeug im antiken Palästina*. OBO 121. Fribourg/Göttingen.
- HUGO, Philippe. 2010. "Text History of the Books of Samuel: An Assessment of the Recent Research." In *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The*

Entangling of the Textual and Literary History, edited by Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker, 1–19. VTSup 132. Leiden et al. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004179578.i-304.8>.

- HUTZLI, Jürg. 2007. *Die Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel: Textkritische und literarische Analyse von 1. Samuel 1–2 unter Berücksichtigung des Kontexts*. AThANT 89. Zürich.
- . 2010. “Theologische Textänderungen im massoretischen Text und in der Septuaginta von 1–2 Sam.” In *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History*, edited by Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker, 213–36. VTSup 132. Leiden et al. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004179578.i-304.53>.
- JEFFERS, Ann. 1996. *Magic and Divination in Ancient Palestine and Syria*. Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 8. Leiden et al.
- JEREMIAS, Jörg. 1997. “*nābī* Prophet.” In TLOT 2: 697–710.
- JOHNSTON, Sarah Iles. 2008. *Ancient Greek Divination*. Blackwell Ancient Religions. Malden, Mass./Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444302998>.
- JOOSTEN, Jan. 2015a. “The Tiberian Vocalization and the Edition of the Hebrew Bible Text.” In *Making the Biblical Text: Textual Studies in the Hebrew and Greek Bible*, edited by Innocent Himbaza, 19–32. OBO 275. Fribourg/Göttingen. <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-134486>.
- . 2015b. “The Tiberian Vocalization and the Hebrew of the Second Temple Period.” In *Hebrew of the Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of a Sixth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*, edited by Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar and Pierre van Hecke, 25–36. STDJ 114. Leiden et al. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004299313_004.
- . 2019. “Biblical Greek and Post-Biblical Hebrew in the Minor Greek Versions: On the Verb $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ ‘to Render Intelligent’ in a Scholion on Gen 3:5, 7.” *JSCS* 52: 53–61. <https://doi.org/10.2143/JSCS.52.0.3287090>.
- JOÜON, Paul, and Takamitsu MURAOKA. 2003. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 4th reprint of the 1st edition 1991, with corrections. SubBi 14. Roma.
- KAMINKA, Armand. 1928. *Studien zur Septuaginta an der Hand der zwölf kleinen Prophetenbücher*. SGFWJ 33. Frankfurt a.M.
- KAUHANEN, Tuukka. 2012. *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel*. De Septuaginta Investigationes 3. Göttingen.
- KOCH, Ulla Susanne. 2005. *Secrets of Extispicy: The Chapter “Multābiltu” of the Babylonian Extispicy Series and “Niširti Bārūti” Texts, Mainly from Aššurbanipal’s Library*. AOAT 326. Münster.
- . 2010. “Three Strikes and You’re out! A View on Cognitive Theory and the First-Millennium Extispicy Ritual.” In *Divination and Interpretation of Signs in the Ancient World*, edited by Amar Annus, 43–59. OIS 6. Chicago, Ill.
- . 2015. *Mesopotamian Divination Texts: Conversing with the Gods: Sources from the First Millennium BCE*. Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record 7. Münster.
- KREUZER, Siegfried, and Marcus SIGISMUND. 2011. “Die handschriftliche Bezeugung des Septuagintatextes von 2 Sam / 2 Kgt 1-14 nach der Edition von

- Brooke/McLean mit den Handschriften-Siglen nach Rahlfs.” Online: <https://www.isbtf.de/brookemclean-elektronisch/>.
- LANGE, Armin. 2009. *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer. Band 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*. Tübingen.
- LORETZ, Oswald. 1985. *Leberschau, Sündenbock, Asasel in Ugarit und Israel*. UBL 3. Altenberge.
- . 1992. “Die Teraphim als ‘Ahnen-Götter-Figur(in)en’ im Lichte der Texte aus Nuzi, Emar und Ugarit. Anmerkungen zu *ilānū/ilh*, *ilhm/’lhym* und DINGIR. ERÍN.MEŠ/*inš ilm*.” *UF* 24: 133–78.
- MAUL, Stefan M. 2003. “Omina und Orakel. A. In Mesopotamien.” In *RLA* 10, 1/2: 45–88.
- . 2013. *Die Wahrsagekunst im Alten Orient: Zeichen des Himmels und der Erde*. Munich.
- MELVILLE, Sarah C. 1999. *The Role of Naqia/Zakutu in Sargonid Politics*. SAAS 9. Helsinki.
- MEYER, Jan-Waalke. 1987. *Untersuchungen zu den Tonlebermodellen aus dem Alten Orient*. AOAT 39. Kevelaer.
- . 1990. “Zur Interpretation der Leber- und Lungenmodelle aus Ugarit.” In *Mantik in Ugarit: Keilalphabetische Texte der Opferschau, Omensammlungen, Nekromantie*, edited by Manfred Dietrich and Oswald Loretz, 241–80. *ALASP* 3. Münster.
- . 1993. “Die Eingewideschau im vor- und nachexilischen Israel, in Nordsyrien und Anatolien.” In *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament. Internationales Symposium Hamburg 17.-21. März 1990*, edited by Bernd Janowski, Klaus Koch, and Gernot Wilhelm, 531–46. *OBO* 129. Fribourg/Göttingen. <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-151649>.
- MEYER, Rudolf. 1992 [1969]. *Hebräische Grammatik, Band II: Formenlehre, Flexionstabellen*. Reprint of the 3th ed. SG 764/a/b. Berlin. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110864267>.
- MORANO RODRÍGUEZ, Ciriaca. 1989. *Glosas marginales de Vetus Latina en las Biblias Vulgatas Españolas. 1-2 Samuel*. TECC 48. Madrid.
- NICKEL, Richard, August SCHUMMER, and Eugen SEIFERLE. 1987. *Lehrbuch der Anatomie der Haustiere. Band 2: Eingeweide*. 6th ed. Berlin et al.
- NIESE, Benedictus, ed. 1888. *Flavii Josephi Opera, Vol. II*. Berlin.
- NISSINEN, Martti. 1998. *References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources*. SAAS 7. Helsinki.
- . 2010. “Prophecy and Omen Divination: Two Sides of the Same Coin.” In *Divination and Interpretation of Signs in the Ancient World*, edited by Amar Annus, 341–51. *OIS* 6. Chicago, Ill.
- NODET, Étienne, ed. 2001. *Flavius Josèphe: Les Antiquités juives, Volume III: Livres VI et VII*. Paris.
- . 2006. “Josephus and the Books of Samuel.” In *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism: Louis H. Feldman Jubilee Volume*, edited by Shaye J. D. Cohen and Joshua J. Schwartz, 141–67. *Ancient Judaism and*

- Early Christianity 67. Leiden et al. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004153899.i-312.33>.
- POSTGATE, J. Nicholas, and Michaela WESZELI. 2017. “Ziege (Goat). A. In Mesopotamien.” In *RLA* 15, 5/6: 262–67.
- ROLLINGER, Robert. 2017. “Haruspicy from the Ancient Near East to Etruria.” In *Etruscology*, edited by Alessandro Naso, 1: 341–55. Boston. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781934078495-020>.
- RÖMER, Willem H. Ph. 1971. *Frauenbriefe über Religion, Politik und Privatleben in Mari: Untersuchungen zu G. Dossin, Archives Royales de Mari X (Paris 1967)*. AOAT 12. Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- ROUILLARD, Hedwige, and Josef TROPPER. 1987. “TRPYM, rituels de guérison et culte des ancêtres d’après 1 Samuel xix 11-17 et les textes parallèles d’Assur et de Nuzi.” *VT* 37: 340–61. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853387X00301>.
- RUDNIG-ZELT, Susanne. 2010. “Vom Propheten und seiner Frau, einem Ephod und einem Teraphim – Anmerkungen zu Hos 3:1-4, 5.” *VT* 60: 373–99. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853310X511678>.
- SCHENKER, Adrian. 2010. “Man bittet um das Gegenargument! Von der Eigenart textkritischer Argumentation.” *ZAW* 122: 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zaw.2010.005>.
- . 2013. “Was heisst es, den hebräischen mit dem griechischen Bibeltext zu vergleichen?” In *Die Göttinger Septuaginta. Ein editorisches Jahrhundertprojekt*, edited by Reinhard Gregor Kratz and Bernhard Neuschäfer, 155–84. AAWG N. F. 22. Berlin.
- SCHMITT, Rüdiger. 2014. *Mantik im Alten Testament*. AOAT 411. Münster.
- SOLVANG, Elna K. 2003. *A Woman’s Place is in the House: Royal Women of Judah and their Involvement in the House of David*. JSOTSup 349. London/New York.
- SPERBER, Alexander, ed. 1959. *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts: Vol. II: The Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets*. Leiden et al.
- STARR, Ivan. 1990. *Queries to the Sungod: Divination and Politics in Sargonid Assyria*. SAA 4. Helsinki.
- THELLE, Rannfrid. 2013. “Reflections of Ancient Israelite Divination in the Former Prophets.” In *Israelite Prophecy and the Deuteronomistic History: Portrait, Reality, and the Formation of a History*, edited by Mignon R. Jacobs and Raymond F. Person, Jr., 7–33. AIL 14. Atlanta, Ga.
- TOORN, Karel van der, and Theodore J. LEWIS. 1995. “*ʿrāpîm*.” In *ThWAT VIII: 765–78*.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1997. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 2nd, revised and expanded edition. JBS 8. Jerusalem.
- . 1999a [1985]. “The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in the Light of the Septuagint.” In *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by Emanuel Tov, 333–62. VTSup 72. Leiden et al. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004275973_024.
- . 1999b [1979]. “The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam^a.” In *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by Emanuel Tov, 271–83. VTSup 72. Leiden et al. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004275973_020.

- ULRICH, Eugene. 1978. *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*. HSM 19. Missoula, Mont.
- VRUGT-LENTZ, Johanna ter. 1971. "Das Christentum und die Leberschau." *VC* 25: 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.1163/157007271X00028>.
- WILLI-PLEIN, Ina. 2002/03. "Anmerkungen zur Frage der Herkunft des Terafim." *ZAH* 15/16: 172–75.
- . 2002 [1995]. "Michal und die Anfänge des Königtums in Israel." In *Sprache als Schlüssel: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, edited by Michael Pietsch and Tilmann Präckel, 79–96. Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- ZEVIT, Ziony. 1980. *Matres Lectionis in Ancient Hebrew Epigraphs*. ASORMS 2. Cambridge, Mass.