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ABSTRACT

"The ‘New Perspective’ on Appraisal: Evaluation in the Book of Judges as Revealed by the Narrative Appraisal Model"

Mary L. Conway
McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario
Doctor of Philosophy (Christian Theology), 2013

The book of Judges fairly bristles with ‘heroes’ of ambivalent moral character, and acts of dubious propriety, such as Gideon’s use of signs to determine YHWH’s will, Jael’s murder of Sisera, and the sacrifice of Jephthah’s daughter. The terse narrative and the reticent narrator frequently leave the ethical character of these actions in doubt. My goal in this dissertation is to identify evidence available in the text, both literary and linguistic, in order to evaluate the characters and actions of various participants in the narratives of the “major” judges. On the basis of this evidence I will not only draw evaluative conclusions about the characters of the judges and the Israelite people themselves, but also about their varying perceptions of YHWH that these characters hold.

In order to facilitate these goals, I will take an interdisciplinary approach. I will employ the concept of narrative perspective from literary criticism and consider the evaluative stance of the implied author, the narrator, and the various characters in the narrative. I will also draw heavily on the Appraisal Theory of J. R. Martin and P. R. R. White, which in turn derives from Systemic Functional Linguistics. By merging these two approaches I will develop a new model which I call Narrative Appraisal which will then be applied to the Hebrew text of Judges. The Narrative Appraisal Model can clarify individual evaluative instances as well as patterns of linguistic features at the level of discourse that elucidate the implied author’s stance.

The lexicogrammatical and ideational evidence produced by this methodology reveals contrasts and trajectories within and across the narratives which, when analyzed, give insight into the characters of the Israelites, the character of YHWH, and the relationship between the Israelite people and their God. It also helps to identify the unifying ideological stance of the book. In simplified terms, this ideology affirms the holiness, justice, mercy, and faithfulness of YHWH, the need for the Israelites to maintain absolute loyalty and obedience to him, the legitimacy of discipline, the engrained tendency of humanity to defy their God and follow their own ways, the ultimate failure of human leadership in the form of judges, and the essential need for YHWH to intervene with a new model of leadership.
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1 The “New Perspective” on Appraisal: Evaluation in the Book of Judges as Revealed by the Narrative Appraisal Model

1.1 Introduction

Although the book of Judges is sometimes viewed as a wonderful collection of stories about Old Testament “heroes,” to others it seems to be a shocking account of apostasy, murder, and mayhem. Ehud is viewed both as a heroic deliverer and as a devious assassin, and although the text itself praises Jael as “blessed among women” (Judg 5:24), commentators do not hesitate to deem her vicious or deviant. Gideon is variously evaluated as a hero and a failure, and Jephthah’s sacrifice of his daughter is at odds with his role as a valiant warrior who repels the Ammonite invasion. Although Samson seems to be driven by passion and revenge, he has nevertheless been viewed as a type of Christ. Other minor participants and the Israelites themselves are often equally difficult to assess. How are we to evaluate these characters and the actions in which they engage?

Exegesis of the Hebrew Bible is a complex task, and is heavily dependent not only on our grasp of the ancient social context but also on our understanding of Hebrew grammar and narrative. Too many grammars devote their entire attention to levels at and below the clause; often commentaries fail to take into consideration the nature of Hebrew narrative. It is essential that exegetes look at Hebrew grammar at the level of discourse, and incorporate into their study new insights into the way language works, and especially into the way that Hebrew language and narrative works. One area that is of great significance to interpretation is the language of appraisal and evaluation—the terms tend to be used interchangeably. As Sarangi points out:
The view that language functions at both descriptive and evaluative levels is a long-standing one. Different scholars have captured these functions under different categories—which can roughly be labeled informational and affective—and have debated their inter-relationship. It makes sense to see these functions not as two separate entities but as intricately intertwined along a communication continuum, very much like a double helix.¹

Appraisal involves such issues as authorial stance, expression of affect, and judgments made in the text of people and behaviors. In exegetical terms, it is important to understand which words and deeds are considered ethical and which are condemned, which characters are role models and which are censured, and which statements are to be taken at face value and which may be influenced by the speakers perspective.² This is what Powell calls

the evaluative point of view, which governs a work in general. This refers to the norms, values, and general worldview that the implied author establishes as operative for the story. To put it another way, evaluative point of view may be defined as the standards of judgment by which readers are led to evaluate the events, characters, and settings that comprise the story.³

There are many well-known episodes in the book of Judges which raise questions of this type, such as Jephthah’s sacrifice of his own daughter in fulfillment of a vow or Gideon’s use of signs to determine YHWH’s will, but the issue pervades the discourse of the entire book. In order to understand the text’s ideology—the norms, values, and general worldview that are operative for the story—the reader must take into account the evaluative strategies that the implied author uses.

Hebrew narrative is multiperspectival;⁴ evaluations are occasionally given by the

---

² Thompson and Hunston (“Evaluation,” 6) give three general reasons why evaluation is important: “1. to express the speaker’s or writer’s opinion, and in doing so to reflect the value system of that person and their community; 2. to conduct and maintain relations between the speaker or writer and hearer or reader; 3. to organize the discourse.”
³ Powell, Narrative Criticism, 23–24, italics original.
⁴ More will be said about this important issue in the Methodology chapter.
narrator who directly addresses the audience, but more often expressed through the actions and dialogue of various characters, including YHWH himself. It is generally accepted that in the biblical texts the narrator is reliable and omniscient, accurately reporting events and dialogue and developing character. Indeed, there are few if any indications in the text of Judges that the narrator functions as anything other than the mouthpiece of the implied author. It must nevertheless be acknowledged that the narrator is in some sense part of the “world of the story” and that the ultimate perspective is that of the implied author him/herself. Since the historical author/redactor(s) of Judges is/are unknown, I will use the term “authorial stance” to refer to the implied author. In addition, each individual character within the narrative world has an evaluative perspective or stance in regard to people and events. Although some interpreters choose to read resistantly, against the grain of the narrative, for the purpose of this study I am assuming a compliant reading, that expected of the implied reader by the implied author, since the text must be understood on its own terms before it can be accepted or rejected. The book of Judges is deeply interested in what is right or wrong in the eyes of YHWH as opposed to what is good in the eyes of humanity. As Younger notes,

Canonically, the Law (esp. as expressed in Deuteronomy) serves as the filter for evaluating the actions of the individuals within the stories. While it is easy to fall into the trap of moralizing these stories, it is also easy to underestimate their didactic value, for they are not mere chronicles.

---

5 Tate, Biblical Interpretation, 95.
6 Alter, Biblical Narrative, 157–58; Tate, Biblical Interpretation, 87–88, 94–96; Powell, Narrative Criticism, 24–25. Note that this study is not an attempt to establish the authorial intent of the historical author/redactor, or to argue any particular view of authorship/redaction. I am concerned with the perspective of the implied author, a construct of the text itself.
7 See Powell, Narrative Criticism, 24.
9 Younger, Judges and Ruth, 124. See ch. 3 for more on the role of Deuteronomistic thought in Judges.
However, even if the narrator's direct commentary and his representation of events and
dialogue can be trusted as reflecting that of the implied author, it is not always clear just
what this implied author's commentary, or the speeches and situations that he/she
recounts, imply about the appropriateness of various actions or the uprightness of various
characters. This may be in part because, in the original culture, understanding and
acceptance of the evaluative stance is simply assumed, or the evaluation is subordinated
to the dominant idea or the plot. Thompson and Hunston argue that "the less obtrusively
the evaluation is placed in the clause, the more likely it is to successfully manipulate the
reader." It may also be due to the terseness of Hebrew narrative, or simply because
modern readers are unfamiliar with the methods used by the authors/redactors to encode
evaluation in Hebrew narrative. Consequently, many exegetes have relied on their own
moral instinct to draw conclusions about evaluative issues, but the criteria used in such
judgments are often slanted by their own religious and cultural upbringing. Consideration
of the original historical-social context is absolutely necessary, but even this does not
help to decide every case. Literary criticism has made progress in using characteristics of
the text itself to search for clues, but, as valuable as its insights often are, its methodology
is often based on moral and aesthetic opinions or impressions rather than data, and
differing literary critics offer differing judgments based on their own interpretive lenses.

In recent years, however, linguists have begun to look for indications of evaluative stance
in the vocabulary and grammar of the text itself; although this does not eliminate

---

10 This would be more obvious to an ancient Hebrew speaking reader/listener than to a modern English
speaking one.
12 For example, Mieke Bal's feminist agenda has a significant impact on her interpretation of the narratives
in Judges in Bal, Death and Dissymmetry.
subjectivity, it constrains it, and at least provides the evidence for the conclusions made, thus making the interpretive process more transparent. Work has been done in English that considers the role of both syntax and lexis, in addition to ideational content, in realizing the semantics of evaluation in text.

In order to access the ideology of the text of Judges, particularly the narratives of the six so-called “major” judges, I will apply aspects of Martin and White’s Appraisal Theory, which has been designed for use in English, combined with an understanding of perspective or point of view from Narrative Criticism, one form of literary criticism. This will result in a new model—what I call Narrative Appraisal—which will be applied to the Hebrew text. As Thompson and Hunston explain:

Ideologies do not exist in silence, but neither are they usually expressed overtly. They are built up and transmitted through texts, and it is in texts that their nature is revealed. ... Because ideologies are essentially sets of values—what counts as good or bad, what should or should not happen, what counts as true or untrue—evaluation is a key linguistic concept in their study.

Rather than intuitively deriving the ideology of Judges, the Narrative Appraisal Model, a combination of elements of linguistic and narrative criticism, yields evidence that, when

---

13 Page, “Appraisal in Childbirth Narratives,” 213: “The subsystems identified in APPRAISAL analysis are less concerned with structural features and instead emphasize semantic criteria. This is helpful as a move towards examining a different dimension in the construction of a speaker’s opinion, but given the levels of subjectivity involved, the categorization is rather less determinate and cannot be carried out without close attention to contextual factors.”
15 The terms “evaluation theory” and “appraisal theory” tend to be used interchangeably. The term “attitudinal stance” is also sometimes used. There is also some overlap here with “point of view” in literary analysis. Thompson and Hunston prefer the term “evaluation” since it expresses a “user orientation” and “allows us to talk about the values ascribed to the entities and propositions which are evaluated” (Thompson and Hunston, “Evaluation,” 5). For more on the varied terminology and the different branches of Evaluation Theory see Thompson and Hunston, “Evaluation,” 2–5. As in any developing area of study, the terminology and emphasis is varied and inconsistent. Without trying to explain all the variants, this study will adopt Martin and White’s terminology for simplicity and because this is the model that will be implemented.
used in conjunction with social and historical analysis of the text, will provide a more robust basis for drawing exegetical conclusions.

1.2 Thesis

My thesis is that the ideology of the book of Judges, including its view of the character of God, the character of the Israelites, and the relationship between God and Israel, can be more clearly understood by applying Narrative Appraisal Theory to the text, in particular, the narratives of the major judges. This model combines elements of linguistic and narrative analysis while remaining sensitive to the social and historical context of the text.

1.3 Previous Approaches to Judges

1.3.1 Historical-Critical Approaches

Approaches to the book of Judges after the advent of historical-critical research were initially dominated by an emphasis on source criticism. Scholars examined not only the compilation and arrangement of the individual narratives into the composite structure of the book as a whole, but also analyzed the internal content of the episodes for clues to their origin and history. Noth, in his *Deuteronomistic History*, argued that the deuteronomistic editor used earlier sources to create the period of the Judges in order to fill the historical gap between the conquest and the monarchy, and “composed for each

---

17 Unfortunately, a consideration of the entire book of Judges would exceed the space limits of this study. I decided to focus on the six major judges since they are represented in the core narratives of the book and integrate most of the cyclic elements of the paradigm in Judg 2, which, as will be demonstrated, forms the evaluative baseline for these judges. The major judges are also deemed to represent the moral and spiritual status of Israel as a whole. The first introduction, the Abimelech narrative, the double conclusion, and the “minor” judges are indispensable in developing an understanding of the book as a whole, and will be considered subsequently. Due to the limitation of this study to the major judges, some of the themes of the book, such as kingship, cannot be dealt with in depth here. Judges 5 is poetry, albeit narrative poetry, and therefore a slightly modified version of the methodology may be developed for this chapter.

18 The “old literary criticism.”
story of deliverance a framework that validated the viewpoint presented in the
introductory overview."¹⁹ According to Noth, the Dtr's approach was ideologically
motivated:

The programmatic statement for the book of Judges in Judg. 2:11ff. ... presents
an anticipatory survey of the cyclic nature of the course of history. ... [It reflects]
the concern throughout to depict and interpret the historical process showing
clearly how God's retributive activity takes its course against the whole people.²⁰

Noth's emphasis was continued, although extensively modified, by scholars in
subsequent years such as Wolfgang Richter, Walter Dietrich, Rudolf Smend, and Frank
Moore Cross.²¹ The concept of the Deuteronomistic History still has much to contribute
to an understanding of Judges, although many of its conclusions have been nuanced.

In 1988, Baruch Halpern criticized source and redactional approaches to the
Deuteronomistic History because they overemphasized the ideological factors that
influenced the Dtr but neglected the historiographic factors.²² Halpern concluded, "A
realistic contribution of the editors of Judges must recognize their intent to construe
history—history, to be sure, on a broad horizon, but history whose first frame of
reference is the events and causes being narrated."²³ Thus, the narratives of Judges were
not merely traditional fables and hero stories which were conscripted to serve ideological
purposes, but had a historical basis—theologically motivated history, but history
nonetheless.

¹⁹ O'Brien, "Judges and the Deuteronomistic History," 236, 238.
²⁰ Noth, Deuteronomistic History, 6. See also p. 89.
²¹ See Richter, Traditions geschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch; Dietrich, Prophetie und
Geschichte; Eine Redaktion geschichtliche Untersuchung zum Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk;
Smend, "Das Gesetz und Die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur Deuteronomistischen Redactionsgeschichte"; Cross,
Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic.
²³ Halpern, First Historians, 138.
Historical-critical approaches to the study of Judges operated, however, more at the level of redaction and its overall deuteronomistic ideology than at the level of narrative. O’Brien claims that the methodology neglected the individual stories in its pursuit of this goal. Consequently, a reaction set in that changed the way that many scholars studied the book and encouraged them to view Judges from a more literary perspective. Gradually, approaches other than historical-critical analysis of the Hebrew Bible gained currency.

1.3.2 Literary Criticism

1.3.2.1 Rhetorical and Narrative Criticism

In 1967, J. P. U. Lilley published a seminal article that advocated a new approach to the study of Judges based on the assumption that the book was a unified literary whole with an organized structure. In his view, Judges represents a deteriorating situation, “one of increasing failure and depression,” in which Israelite society, especially its relationship with God, degenerates from a relatively ideal state. This social and spiritual decline is paralleled by a literary fragmentation in which the individual episodes deviate farther and farther from the paradigm set up in Judg 2:11–21. Thus, the structure of Judges is not merely cyclic, but a spiral progression in which the stories of the judges reflect more and more confusion and disarray. Although Lilley’s article does not venture into detailed exegesis, a number of scholars have since taken up his challenge and published monographs which apply literary criticism to Judges.

---

One common literary approach to the Bible is rhetorical criticism. Phyllis Trible based her classic study of Jonah on a long tradition of rhetoric that began with Greco-Roman rhetoric and culminated in the well-known proposal of James Muilenburg. She explains that rhetoric can have two different overlapping meanings: the art of composition, which includes structure and style, and the art of persuasion. Trible herself uses this approach in her study of Jephthah's daughter and the Levite's concubine in *Texts of Terror*. Rhetoric focuses on the surface structures of the text and "disavows the separability of form (structure), content, and meaning." A number of interpreters of Judges have used a similar methodology, including Robert O'Connell, who defines rhetoric as "the ideological purpose or agenda of the Judges compiler/redactor with respect to the implied readers of the book." He illustrates this rhetoric primarily by the redactor's use of plot development and characterization in the narratives.

A distinct but related approach is narrative criticism, the significance of which was brought to the attention of the interpretive community by Robert Alter in *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. According to Bowman, in this synchronic approach interpretations are based on empirically observable data within the text, not on the speculated intentions of the author, the hypothetical reconstructions of the historian, or the ideological agenda of the reader. By focussing on the narrative itself, the reader discovers the dynamics of the story itself.

---

28 Muilenburg, "Form Criticism," 1–18.
29 Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 32, 41.
31 Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 66. Trible's method includes an analysis of structure and boundaries, repetition, discourse, plot development, characterization, syntax, and vocabulary (pp. 102–5).
34 Alter, *Biblical Narrative*.
35 Bowman, "Narrative Criticism of Judges," 18. Admittedly, it is unlikely that the ideological agenda of the reader is ever entirely absent.
Narrative criticism also considers plot, characterization, and various points of view, all of which can point to the ideology of the text. Appropriate actions result in success, whereas sinful ones bring suffering; admirable characters are blessed but evil ones are punished; prophets praise faithful kings and condemn immoral ones.\textsuperscript{36} Overall, however, the "dominant and evaluative perspective belongs to the narrator."\textsuperscript{37} In his book \textit{The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading}, Meir Sternberg has completed an intensive study of the characteristics of narrative and their contribution to meaning. Although he considers the narrator reliable, he admits that the narrator does not tell the complete truth. He thus asks: "Considering the scarcity of evaluation on the narrator's part—far less in evidence than the fragmentary but ongoing representation—how can a mixed audience be expected to form the proper attitude to the action and the agents, with God at their head?"\textsuperscript{38} Although narrative criticism is extremely important, interpreters must utilize all the resources available in order to accomplish their task.

In an attempt to better understand the book of Judges, a number of studies which use variations on a literary approach have recently been completed.

\textbf{1.3.2.2 Literary Approaches to Judges}

Polzin's three volume work, \textit{A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History}, takes a unique heteroglossic approach to literary criticism in addition to considering structure and rhetorical factors. The first volume, \textit{Moses and the Deuteronomist} (1980), includes the book of Judges. Polzin's study is based on the approach of the Russian

\textsuperscript{36} I am not assuming a mechanical theory of retribution and reward here. See note 39 in ch. 2.
\textsuperscript{37} Bowman, "Narrative Criticism of Judges," 29.
\textsuperscript{38} Sternberg, \textit{Poetics of Biblical Narrative}, 54. See also Alter Alter, \textit{Biblical Narrative}, 158.
structuralist-formalists such as Bakhtin and Boloshinov, and especially Uspensky.\(^{39}\)

Polzin considers the changes in perspective or points of view in the text and identifies a significant problem of the Deuteronomic History: "Wherein does the ultimate semantic authority of this complex lie?"\(^ {40}\) Polzin defines "ultimate semantic authority" as the ideological and evaluative point of view, the unifying ideological stance of the implied author. He questions whether it is located in the narrator, in the reported words of others in the narrative, in God's prophets, in the words of God himself, or in some fusion of these sources. According to O'Brien, "In Polzin's view, the combination of reported speech and narrative in Deuteronomy establishes a subtle dialogue between the 'authoritarian dogmatism' voiced by Moses and the 'critical traditionalism' of the narrator."\(^ {41}\)

Polzin argues that in Judges the narrator acts in two very different ways: as an omniscient narrator who even knows the thoughts of God himself, but also as a limited narrator who only relates what could have been observed by one of the characters or by an observer present at the time.\(^ {42}\) This results in both stability in God's point of view and instability in that of the participants. Polzin concludes, "The distanced and estranged viewpoint of the body of the stories about the judges, as opposed to the evaluative utterances that form the framework, puts the reader into the very experiencing of chaos and ambiguity that is portrayed as the inner experience of Israel during this period."\(^ {43}\)

In the three volume work, Polzin attempts to put Judges into the context of the entire deuteronomistic history. Although I do not endorse all of Polzin's conclusions, his

\(^{39}\) See especially Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition*.


\(^{41}\) O'Brien, "Judges and the Deuteronomistic History," 253.

\(^{42}\) Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 164.

\(^{43}\) Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 166.
valuable insights into the multiple perspectives inherent in Hebrew narrative will be integrated into the Narrative Appraisal model.

In *The Book of the Judges: An Integrated Reading*, Barry Webb (1987) utilizes rhetorical analysis, which he defines as "a detailed literary analysis of the book in its final form" and which includes an examination of factors such as structure, characterization, literary technique, and point of view. Webb concludes that the primary theme relates to the failure of YHWH to give Israel the land due to "their persistent apostasy, and the freedom of Yahweh’s action over against Israel’s presumption that it can use him." He rightly disagrees with Noth’s understanding of retributive justice and a simplistic relation of repentance and forgiveness, and argues that "Yahweh does not so much dispense rewards and punishments as oscillate between punishment and mercy." In his study, Webb raises some interesting questions about normative voice and authorial stance in Judges, asking: "Do the characters express views or attitudes which are contrary to ones expressed elsewhere in the story, either by the characters or by the narrator himself? ... Where different points of view are expressed, which find wider endorsement in the work and which are implicitly rejected?" He attempts to answer these questions by applying literary methodology.

Lillian Klein (1988) claims to stop short of interpretation in her monograph *The
Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges and conducts a narrative literary reading of Judges that focuses on irony as its primary literary technique and structuring device.\(^{49}\) Her premise is “that the book of Judges is a structured entity in which elements are shaped to contribute to the integrity and significance of the whole.”\(^{50}\) Klein also deals with questions of normativity and ideology, however:

The narrator is ‘absent’, but the omniscient narrator is indeed present, despite the apparent detachment. The narrator’s is practically the only reliable voice in the book, verified by the narrator’s function as spokesman. I do not therefore assume Yahweh’s sanction when unprincipled and undependable characters claim divine support, even when they act on behalf of Israel.\(^{51}\)

The determination of Yahweh’s attitude toward events may be both clarified and complicated by the utilization of irony. She concludes: “As each of the judges—major and minor—discloses new limitations for ethical judgment, it becomes increasingly clear that Yahweh is the only judge in the book of Judges.”\(^{52}\) Given this conviction, it is essential that the reader be aware of all the literary and linguistic techniques that the text offers for assessing the narrator’s, and Yahweh’s, perspective on people and events.

In The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing (Hebrew 1992; English 1999), Yairah Amit’s stated goal is to avoid engaging in “speculative reconstruction of the book’s sources” and to demonstrate that, with few qualifications, the episodes that comprise the book are “significant in their present combination and reworking.”\(^{53}\) In her view the redactor/editor is not merely a collector and assembler of parts, but is a creative

\(^{49}\) According to Klein, “Rather than proposing an interpretation of Judges, I have attempted to set forth the ironic and literary structure of the book and to show how they function in the text” (Klein, Irony in Judges, 7).

\(^{50}\) Klein, Irony in Judges, 11.

\(^{51}\) Klein, Irony in Judges, 12.

\(^{52}\) Klein, Irony in Judges, 190–91.

\(^{53}\) Amit, The Art of Editing, 360.
contributor to the overall purpose of the work.\textsuperscript{54} In the tradition of the implied reader and implied author, Amit posits an "implied editor": "implied editing emphasizes the multi-faceted and multi-layered, but nevertheless single-minded, entity which stands behind any biblical work."\textsuperscript{55} She sees the primary purpose of biblical historiography as education, and many of the characters in the history as role models whom target audiences, both naive and sophisticated, should emulate. Thus, since "all of the events related are a means of understanding the past, of guiding the present, and of shaping the future,"\textsuperscript{56} the message of the story must be clear and understandable. She uses the example of David in 2 Samuel to illustrate this point:

It is not surprising that the criticism directed against David in 2 Samuel 11 is not only conveyed in an oblique way, or by means of a sophisticated process of reading that fills in the gaps; it also appears explicitly at the end of the story: ‘But the thing that David had done was evil in the eyes of the Lord’ (v. 27b). On the other hand, it is reasonable to assume that the sophisticated reader will already feel the criticism implied in the irony of the opening verse (‘In the spring of the year, the time when kings go forth to battle... and David remained at Jerusalem’), which is also interwoven throughout the story.\textsuperscript{57}

Unfortunately, such helpful editorial comments by the narrator are few and far between in Judges. Israel is frequently indicted for “doing evil in the eyes of YHWH” by committing apostasy, but specific evaluations of the individual characters and actions in the narrative are often conspicuous by their absence. For example, whether Jephthah was right to sacrifice his daughter must be adduced by the application of more subtle techniques.

Robert O’Connell argues in \textit{The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges} (1996) for a coherent reading of the final form of Judges by examining the “rhetoric” of the book,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{54} Amit, \textit{The Art of Editing}, 16–17.
  \item \textsuperscript{55} Amit, \textit{The Art of Editing}, 17.
  \item \textsuperscript{56} Amit, \textit{The Art of Editing}, 10.
  \item \textsuperscript{57} Amit, \textit{The Art of Editing}, 12–13.
\end{itemize}
which he defines as "the ideological purpose or agenda of the Judges compiler/redactor with respect to the implied readers of the book." After an examination of plot structure, characterization, and narrative strategies he concludes that the "rhetorical purpose of the book of Judges is ostensibly to enjoin its readers to endorse a divinely appointed Judahite king" who upholds deuteronomic ideals. O'Connell evaluates the appropriateness of actions and the uprightness of characters by means of techniques of characterization, but also by detailed plot analyses which include consideration of the consequences of actions. For example, he argues: "Ironically, the performance of Jephthah's vow in 11:34–36, 39a, in the aftermath of the resolution of Plot A, only dissolves the situational stability that would have resulted had Jephthah not made the vow. The vow turns Jephthah from a deliverer of Israel into but another oppressor." Thus, Jephthah's sacrifice of his daughter is evaluated negatively on the basis of pragmatic rather than moral considerations. The act is deemed "pathetic" because the "vow achieves nothing toward his success against the Ammonites." O'Connell does, however, give some consideration to issues such as covenant fidelity and social justice.

Gregory Wong gives an interesting overview of these four key monographs and the conclusions that they reach about the rhetorical purpose of Judges:

Thus, for Webb, the answer to Israel's repeated apostasy is YHWH's surprising mercy to preserve an undeserving people out of his freedom. For Klein, however, the rapid disintegration of the nation exacerbated by the leadership of flawed judges represents an implicit call to return to YHWH and to YHWHistic values and judgments. For O'Connell, the solution is more political in nature as the author

---

prepares his readers to endorse a divinely appointed Judahite king who would uphold deuteronomic ideals. For Amit, however, while the book’s author may see the advantage of continuous leadership, monarchy is at best a less-than-desirable compromise solution.\(^{64}\)

He points out the curious fact that all four scholars use similar literary approaches, but arrive at distinctly different suggestions as to the theme of Judges and the message that it conveys about the apostasy and failure of Israel. This, and perhaps also Gregor Andersson’s critique of synchronic literary criticism,\(^{65}\) suggests that there may be a need for other relevant methodologies if deeper insight into the message of Judges, both as a whole and in its component narratives, is to be attained.

Whereas other major monographs simply assume that the book of Judges should be read as a literary whole, Wong sets out in *The Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges* (2006) to “justify this assumption of unity on the basis of significant relationships between narratives.”\(^{66}\) He examines narrative structure, recurring themes and motifs, allusions, wordplays, points of view, plot, and characterization.\(^{67}\) Wong concludes that the prologue and epilogue are related thematically, and serve as a “paradigmatic introduction and evaluative conclusion” to the central portion of the book, and that the book’s attitude toward kingship is a complex link which connects all three sections.\(^{68}\) However, he also argues that there is no reason that the introduction and conclusion

\(^{64}\) Wong, *Compositional Strategy*, 16–17.

\(^{65}\) Andersson (*The Book and Its Narratives*, 191) challenges the validity of synchronic literary studies such as those of Amit, O’Connell, Webb, Klein, and Polzin: “An important reason behind the endeavours to find a consistent larger text seems to be that scholars are searching for some kind of coherent message or theme in the book or in the DH. However, in this study the significant observation has been made that the form of the book resists such an interpretation. This is so both because the larger unit contains autonomous narratives and because of the non-didactic character of the individual stories.” Wong, however, considers that his thesis is “fundamentally flawed and unsustainable” (Wong, *Compositional Strategy*, 18).


\(^{67}\) Wong, *Compositional Strategy*, 22.

\(^{68}\) Wong, *Compositional Strategy*, 226.
cannot have been post-Deuteronomic additions inserted when the DH was divided into separate books.\footnote{Wong, Compositional Strategy, 227.} Early on, he makes a significant comment about the Judges narratives:

> The narratives in Judges are surprisingly devoid of direct evaluative statements. Consequently, divergent interpretations are to be expected as interpreters have to sift through each narrative looking for subtle contextual clues to help them evaluate the events and characters involved.\footnote{Wong, Compositional Strategy, 18–19.}

If interpreters wish to take advantage of all existing indications of evaluative stance in Judges, it may be necessary to look beyond traditional literary strategies for determining them. One possible methodology that has received significant attention and development in recent years is linguistic criticism, to which approach we will now turn.

### 1.3.3 Linguistic Approaches to Evaluation

#### 1.3.3.1 Theoretical Linguistic Context

Many linguists who study evaluation—or appraisal theory—take a “broadly functional approach” and their work is based on the systemic functional linguistics (SFL) of Halliday, although it modifies it in a number of respects.\footnote{Thompson and Hunston, “Evaluation,” 2.} Evaluation theory constitutes an “overlay” on SFL, or perhaps a “distillation” of its theory which is applied to a specific purpose. Although space precludes an extensive overview of SFL, those aspects which are relevant to evaluation will be briefly discussed. Evaluation is related to, although distinct from, the study of modality (the likelihood and obligation of events) and evidentiality (the evidence for making claims) in that all these approaches consider the writer’s opinion about entities (expressed by nominal groups) or propositions (expressed by clauses).\footnote{Thompson and Hunston, “Evaluation,” 3. See Halliday and Matthiessen, Functional Grammar 3, for a fuller overview of SFL.} Halliday gives a great deal of attention to modality (modalization and
modulation) but significantly less to considerations of attitudinal meaning, although he does include them in his discussion of the interpersonal metafunction. Martin and White focus on interpersonal meaning in written discourse.\(^7^3\) The following diagram is a generalized representation of their view of the system of functional grammar:\(^7^4\)

Interpersonal meaning is realized in different ways and at different levels of abstraction. In written text this moves from graphology to lexicogrammar, the level of words and structures, to discourse semantics, the level of meaning beyond the clause. Martin and White emphasize that each subsequent level is not "made up" of elements of the previous level, but "realized" through them at a more abstract level of organization.\(^7^5\) They place evaluation within discourse semantics for three reasons: 1. "the realization of an attitude

---

\(^7^3\) Martin and White, *Language of Evaluation*, 7. Martin and White view the structure of context and register within the model somewhat differently than Halliday and Matthiessen. See below.

\(^7^4\) A composite diagram based on those in Martin and White, *Language of Evaluation*, 32 and Halliday and Matthiessen, *Functional Grammar* 3, 25 (see also 30). The result is Martin and White's own interpretation and adaptation of Halliday and Matthiessen.

tends to splash across a phase of discourse, irrespective of grammatical boundaries,” 2. an attitude “can be realized across a range of grammatical categories,” and 3. it involves grammatical metaphor, which involves “tension between wording and meaning.”

Halliday’s level, “context,” which implies the extra-linguistic context of situation, is redefined and subdivided by Martin and White into two levels: “register,” which consists of patterns of discourse patterns, and “genre,” “a system comprising configurations of field, mode and tenor selections which unfold in recurring stages of discourse—a pattern of register patterns.” According to Thompson, “What is being talked about” is the field, “the people involved in the communication and the relationship between them” is the tenor, and “how the language is functioning in the interaction” is the mode. Halliday and Matthiessen explain further that field is “the culturally recognized repertoires of social practices and concerns” and tenor is “the culturally recognized repertoires of role relationships and interactive patterns.” These role relationships include institutional roles, power, familiarity, speech role, valuation (“the assignment of positive and negative value loadings to different aspects of field”), and affect (“the role adopted by the interactants in terms of emotional charge”). Mode concerns “the part language is playing in any given context … [or] how the linguistic resources are deployed.”

---

76 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 11. Martin and White’s notion of context differs from that for Halliday, for whom context is the extra-linguistic context of situation.
77 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 27, 32. See Halliday and Hasan (Language, Context, and Text, 12–13) for a description of the three features of the context of situation.
78 Thompson, Functional Grammar, 40.
79 Halliday and Matthiessen, Construing Experience through Meaning, 320.
80 Matthiessen, Teruya, and Lam, Key Terms, 217.
81 Halliday and Matthiessen, Construing Experience through Meaning, 321.
In recent years, evaluation theory, as a subset of systemic functional linguistics, has received increased attention in the literature.

1.3.3.2 Evaluation and Appraisal

As early as 1972, the general issue of evaluative language was raised by linguists such as Labov, who studied the Black English vernacular. Labov argues that perhaps the most important element in addition to the basic narrative clause ... is what we term the evaluation of the narrative: the means used by the narrator to indicate the point of the narrative, its *raison d’être*: why it was told, and what the narrator is getting at. There are many ways to tell the same story, to make very different points, or to make no point at all.

Labov refers to this as the “So what?” of a narrative. Labov’s work, however, is more concerned with narrative form than with linguistic evidence of the characters/author as evaluators.

The year 1989 was a significant milestone in the development of evaluation theory. In 1989, Biber and Finegan lamented the fact that there had been so little work on attitudinal stance in English, whether in evidentiality or in affect. Their own study, implementing quantitative corpus-based multi-dimensional analyses, was an attempt to correct this deficiency, and examined “the extent to which different kinds of texts employ different grammatical categories for the marking of stance.” In the same year, the journal *Text* published a special issue on the semantics of affect. This investigated the

---

87 Biber and Finegan, “Styles of Stance in English,” 94.
88 Biber and Finegan, “Styles of Stance in English,” 95.
ability of language to express different emotions.\textsuperscript{89} As Martin explains, "At about this time, a group of functional linguists in Sydney began work on developing a comprehensive framework for analysing evaluation in discourse."\textsuperscript{90} The term "Appraisal" was chosen since the theory examined not only affect, but also various types of judgment not directly tied to emotion. These scholars worked within the more qualitative framework of systemic functional linguistics.\textsuperscript{91}

Writing in 2000, Thompson and Hunston define the term "Evaluation" as the broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about. That attitude may relate to certainty or obligation or desirability or any of a number of other sets of values.\textsuperscript{92}

Martin was the first to subdivide the \textsc{Appraisal} system into three sub-categories: \textsc{Affect}, \textsc{Judgment}, and \textsc{Appreciation}.

\subsection*{1.4 Conclusion}

Since issues of authorial stance and evaluative perspective are both complex and subtle, every available resource should be utilized in order to maximize the accuracy of interpretation. This is especially true in dealing with narrative text from an ancient culture and language. Traditional historical-critical and literary approaches to the text have much to contribute, but nevertheless fall short in some respects as outlined above. A successful methodology must incorporate the best understanding of Hebrew grammar and syntax, narrative structure, the sociohistorical context, as well as techniques for realizing evaluative stance. To this end, I will adapt Appraisal Theory to Hebrew and revise the

\textsuperscript{89} Martin, "Introduction," 171.
\textsuperscript{90} Martin, "Introduction," 171.
\textsuperscript{91} Martin, "Introduction," 172.
\textsuperscript{92} Thompson and Hunston, "Evaluation," 5.
model to incorporate the nature of Hebrew narrative before applying it to the stories of the major judges.\footnote{Unfortunately, the consideration of the first introduction, the song of Deborah in ch. 5, the Abimelech narrative, and the double conclusion would exceed the space available for this study. These will be considered at a later date.} In Chapter 2: Methodology, I will give a detailed overview of Martin and White's original Appraisal Theory, and also the adaptations and modifications that I have made to their model in order to apply it more effectively to Hebrew narrative, creating what I term the "Narrative Appraisal Model."
2 Methodology

2.1 Introduction

Regardless of the fact that it incorporates material from various sources, Judges nevertheless has an overall authorial stance. Olson enumerates a number of significant allusions in the story of Samson that refer back to earlier judge narratives and look forward to the conclusion of the book.\(^1\) He concludes, “These literary echoes suggest that the present form of the story was shaped and edited at a late stage of the book’s composition, when much of the other material in Judges had already been written and set in place.”\(^2\) This indicates that the final author/redactor had a clear agenda in mind when arranging and editing his material; Judges is not merely a collection of early hero narratives. The range of evaluative perspectives within the book is part of its purpose, a technique that the author/redactor uses to challenge his/her audience to draw conclusions about what is appropriate and what is inappropriate behavior. Martin and White’s Appraisal Theory provides a helpful way of identifying evaluative stances of an author/speaker; however, their model was designed and tested primarily on non-literary works with a clearly rhetorical purpose such as contemporary journalistic articles, reviews, and political speeches. In these cases, the author/speaker is known, the audience is known, and the text represents an attempt to influence more or less directly the evaluative opinions of the audience. It is the real author’s stance that is primarily in view and the interpersonal ENGAGEMENT\(^3\) between the author/speaker and the audience that is of major interest.

---

\(^1\) Olson, “The Book of Judges,” 840–42.
\(^2\) Olson, “The Book of Judges,” 842. See also Wong, Compositional Strategy, passim.
\(^3\) Small capitals indicate a system or subsystem in APPRAISAL. See below.
Martin and White do experiment with some poetry and literary narrative. In the case of poetry, the text again represents the more or less direct attempt of the poet to engage with the audience/reader. Narrative is, however, very different. This becomes apparent in Martin and White’s analysis of a short passage from Annie Proulx’s novel, *The Shipping News*. Narrative contains many evaluative perspectives other than that of an author, although, of course, all these perspectives are filtered through that of the implied author as he/she uses the interplay of evaluative stances to accomplish his or her ultimate thematic or ideological goal. The narrator evaluates characters and characters also evaluate each other, according to different agendas and with varying degrees of accuracy. Martin and White’s model provides a valuable methodology for identifying evaluative language in text with a more or less direct rhetorical purpose, but the specific nature of narrative demands a modification of the model. There is indeed a rhetorical purpose and an ideological agenda in narrative, but it is expressed more subtly. Much more will be said about this below. For a full presentation of Appraisal, see Martin and White’s *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. I will draw heavily on this text, but will focus on my own adaptation of the model to narrative, which I will distinguish from Martin and White’s by calling it “Narrative Appraisal.”

2.2 The Narrative Appraisal Model

2.2.1 Representation of APPRAISAL in System Networks

The semantic network of APPRAISAL is represented in diagrammatic form, so that the relationships of the component parts are evident. Multidimensionality is indicated by brace brackets and indicates a logical ‘and’. Choices are represented by straight brackets.

---

and indicate a logical ‘or’.\textsuperscript{5} According to Painter:

Within systemic-functional linguistics (SFL), the idea that a speaker always adopts a position in relation to the addressee and a stance in relation to what is said is a longstanding and fundamental one, modeled in terms of an ‘interpersonal’ linguistic resource that is always in play when the parallel ‘ideational’ one construes meaning.\textsuperscript{6}

Thus, the entry condition for the network is very broad; all language is potentially evaluative and can be processed through the system.

A semantic network is descriptive rather than prescriptive, and therefore I have made some modifications to the network of Martin and White in order to represent the semantics of evaluation in Hebrew narrative more effectively.\textsuperscript{7} I present here the original APPRAISAL system; below is my own adaptation of it for comparison. I will subsequently explain the elements of the original model and my adaptation of it.

\textsuperscript{5} Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 14. See Berry (An Introduction to Systemic Linguistics, 1:144–84) for a discussion of the properties of systems, and disjunctive and simultaneous systems.

\textsuperscript{6} Painter, “Developing Attitude,” 184.

\textsuperscript{7} Some of the minor modifications are based on Martin and Rose, Working with Discourse, 25–72 and Matthiessen, Tenny, and Lam, Key Terms, 57. These mainly involve the addition of names for systems and the clarification of terminology. For example, the term “fear” in their INCLINATION system has been changed to “reluctance.” In Martin and White, “fear” as anticipation of an irrealis state is an aspect of INCLINATION, whereas “fear” as a reaction to a realis state falls under HAPPINESS. The renaming avoids confusion. See Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 48.
The Basic Systems of APPRAISAL (adapted from Martin and White) 

--- 

8 The diagram is from Matthiessen, Teruya, and Lam, *Key Terms*, 57. Note that the slightly curved parentheses are the equivalent of square parentheses and indicate "either/or"; they are to be distinguished from the brace brackets which indicate "both/and." Martin and White do not provide a complete system network, but individual sections of it are located in Martin and White, *Language of Evaluation*, 38, 67, 134, 154. This is a combined version. Note that *The Language of Evaluation* was actually published in 2005, not the 2007 that Matthiessen, Teruya, and Lam indicate.
Narrative Appraisal (Part B)

Note that I have not fully utilized the GRADUATION subsystem in this study, but have focussed on FORCE: VOLUME, partly due to considerations of space and the vast amount of other data that needs to be considered. At this stage I am also more interested in the existence of raised force in an evaluation than an analysis of the specific techniques by which it is inscribed. A more detailed study of individual narratives would allow development of this area of the model.
2.2.2 Summary of Changes

Since evaluation in Judges is concerned almost exclusively with assessing people and processes, rather than things, I have decided not to use the APPRECIATION subsystem in this study. Some of the terminology of the original model has been changed where it seemed counter-intuitive or confusing. I have expanded the system to show more delicacy, since this helps to articulate categories more clearly and thus helps to avoid ambiguity and the overlapping of categories. I have added the uniperspectival/multiperspectival and realis/irrealis choices and modified the FORCE system slightly. I have also added the entire INCLINATION system; although Martin and White discuss it briefly, they do not develop it or include it in their network. These changes will be discussed in further detail below.

2.3 The Appraisal Model and Its Adaptation to Hebrew Narrative

2.3.1 Introductory Issues

Some aspects of Martin and White’s methodology make it challenging to apply to the study of the Hebrew Bible. Most of the work in appraisal theory has been done on journalistic and political texts; also, a number of the examples included in their study have been taken from user reviews of movies or books on internet sites. Most are from the contemporary mass media. These texts 1. are from contemporary culture, 2. are frequently quite brief, often only a few sentences, 3. usually have evaluation as their

---

10 This elimination is specific to the text I am using; the subsystem could easily be reinstated if necessitated by a text in which APPRECIATION is relevant.
11 See Thompson (Functional Grammar, 77–78) regarding this ambiguity.
13 E.g., Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 2–3, 36, 57, 77, 175–76, 212–14, 240–41, etc.
primary, or at least a major, purpose, 4. are often very informal, and 5. usually have an obvious author expressing a personal opinion. Admittedly, literary examples are taken from novels by Annie Proulx and Dorothy Sayers, but they are short extracts rather than sustained literary texts.\(^\text{14}\)

The Old Testament books, however, are from an ancient and foreign culture, are longer and more complex texts, do not necessarily have evaluation as their main purpose, and are far more formal and restrained in tone. There are also major questions around authorship. Martin and White frequently use terms such as "authorial voice" and "internal voice of the speaker/writer" which are readily identifiable in the texts that they analyse.\(^\text{15}\) In the Hebrew Bible, however, the historical author is unknown in many cases; in fact, there may have been multiple authors and/or redactors. As a collection of literary texts, questions also arise regarding the role of the author, implied author, narrator, characters, implied reader, and even the ultimate divine author.\(^\text{16}\) The text in its final literary form will be used, since it is beyond the purview of this study to attempt to reconstruct hypothetical redactional levels.

Another challenge in applying appraisal theory to the Hebrew Bible is the obvious language difference. Although it seems self-evident that every language has some methods of encoding evaluative material, the actual methods may be quite different in ancient Hebrew than in contemporary English. The specific realizations of evaluation itemized by Martin and White must therefore be reassessed before they are applied to Hebrew text. In this study, it was first of all noted where Hebrew uses lexical and


\(^{15}\) Martin and White, *Language of Evaluation*, 103, 111.

\(^{16}\) Tate, *Biblical Interpretation*, 80–82.
syntactic constructions that parallel those in English as described in Martin and White's work. Then, related methods of achieving a similar function that are unique to Hebrew were added. For example, adjectives are used as modifiers in a similar way in both Hebrew and English. Then, it was noted that stative verbs and construct chains, although not typical of English, can carry out a similar modifying function to adjectives in Hebrew, so these were also considered (e.g., כוחות "strong"; הווה "to-be-strong"; פֹּלַ יַי הָאָ ר "sons/men of strength"). Admittedly, since both SFL and Appraisal Theory were developed for the English language, there may be a mismatch between Hebrew and English; there is no one-to-one correlation between languages. Every effort was made, however, to incorporate the Hebrew methods of accomplishing similar goals.

Another major challenge in applying evaluation to Hebrew is subjectivity; in fact it has been suggested that subjectivity is a fundamental issue inherent in appraisal. Bednarek points out that "the study of evaluation could be seen as being part of the greater study of subjectivity."\(^{17}\) For example, she points out that the relationship between evaluation and affect is far from straightforward, in part because there may be a disconnect between the emotions which the evaluators express and their actual feelings, between what they say and what they really mean.\(^{18}\) If this is true in contemporary English, is it not even more significant in ancient Hebrew narrative? The culture is unfamiliar to the modern interpreter and there are no native speakers of the language to clarify language in use. Subjectivity is actually significant in two ways: within the world of the story, and from the external perspective of the interpreter. First, in regard to the

---


evaluations made by characters within the text, it is clear that evaluation is by its very nature subjective, but then all language use is inherently subjective. Language is a social construct that people use to represent their perspective on reality within personal, social, and cultural constraints; it is a construal of reality, not reality per se.\textsuperscript{19} The inclusion of the idea of point of view into the Narrative Appraisal model takes the situatedness of the individual characters as evaluators into consideration. Evaluation by characters may also be deliberately deceptive. Thus, a character may express an emotion that is not a direct reflection of their true attitude toward an event, or state an opinion that is ironic or deliberately misleading. The inclusion of the concept of reliability of the narrator and various characters into the model can increase the interpreter's awareness of this possibility.

Second, the subjectivity of the external interpreter of the text may indeed cause their conclusions about evaluative lexis, syntax, and ideational content to be flawed. Is it possible to define objective criteria that will measure it? Given an evaluative stance, there are only a finite number of ways that it can be encoded in a given language, even though the paralinguistic indicators of stance such as tone of voice and physical gestures used in oral language are not available in written texts. This is also true, however, of many other functions of communication in written form, not only evaluative language, and yet written text is able to communicate with considerable effectiveness, and linguistic and literary analysis is able to deconstruct the methods used in the process. All interpretation has a subjective element, but appraisal theory actually reduces the influence of subjectivity in at least three ways. By forcing a more complete analysis of \textit{all} instances of

\textsuperscript{19} See Halliday and Hasan, \textit{Language, Context, and Text}. 
evaluative language, the application of the model helps to avoid the possibility that the interpreter will select only those examples which are obvious or which suit his/her interpretive agenda. Postmodernism has raised our awareness of the situatedness of all interpretation, but, through the rigorous detailing of its evidence in appraisal charts, appraisal theory actually makes the process of interpretation more transparent. Also, the focus on evaluative prosodies (see below) at the level of discourse tends to minimize the impact of one or more potentially inaccurate interpretations of evaluation at the atomistic level.

2.3.2 Narrative Perspective: Levels of Evaluation and Reliability

As noted in the Introduction, a number of literary critics have attempted to deal with the issue of evaluation in biblical narrative, with varying success. Literary criticism is a wide and diffuse field of study, involving a variety of methodologies. It is prone to subjectivity and accusations of “What counts for evidence?” As noted above, the advantage of Appraisal Theory is that their use of a detailed model encourages the interpreter to use all available evidence, not just those factors that the interpreter’s presuppositions make him or her prone to notice, and that it clearly lays out the evidence that the interpreter is using to reach conclusions. Thus, the model, while not truly objective, constrains subjectivity. One of its shortcomings, however, is that it was not designed for the multiple points of view that appear in narrative texts, but focuses almost entirely on the direct engagement between the author/speaker and the audience, that is, authorial stance. In order to overcome this difficulty, I am incorporating the ideas of narrative perspective or point of view into my version of the model in order to address this particular concern. As Bar-Efrat rightly comments,
The point of view is one of the means by which the narrative influences the reader, leading to the absorption of the implicit values and attitudes. ... On the whole, the reader identifies less with the characters of the narrative than with the author, seeing the characters through the author's eye and adopting that stance towards them. ... The effectiveness of the narrative is, therefore, dependent to a considerable extent on the technique of the viewpoint.20

Although the real author of Judges is unknown, this applies equally well to the implied author. I do not intend to include all aspects of narrative theory in my model, since the concept of perspective is sufficient for the purpose of this study. I will, however, briefly review, where they are relevant, some of the key concepts of characterization, since they are pertinent to determining the realizations of evaluation in the text.

In spite of their inclusion of a few short excerpts from literary narrative texts, Martin and White do not do full justice to the other levels of evaluation that contribute to the author's stance, and thus do not explore the full potential of the narrative form:

We acknowledge of course that a narrator's voice may align with that of one or another character in a story, and that analysis of the source of appraisal may have to be adjusted to take this into account. We won't pursue this issue of 'point of view' here, but would stress in passing that evaluation is one of the main narrative resources used to indicate whose voice a writer is narrating from.21

In not pursuing the issue of point of view further, Martin and White do not take into consideration the fact that different characters in the story may have different perspectives on appraisal, albeit with differing degrees of reliability, and the fact that the implied author can use this interplay of perspectives to achieve an overall evaluative and ideological goal.22 They seem to equate the narrator and real author ("As narrator, for

---

20 Bar-Efrat, Narrative Art in the Bible, 16.
21 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 72.
22 Alter (Biblical Narrative, 116–17) discusses different levels of reliability in a reader's understanding of the author's characterization of participants. Characterization based on inferences from actions and appearances have the lowest reliability. The direct speech of participants which allows the reader to weigh a character's claims about themselves and others is more reliable, and most reliable are the narrator's explicit statements which give the reader certainty. See also Amit, Reading Biblical Narratives, 75–76.
example, Proulx is relatively sympathetic to Quoyle…") and do not use the concept of "implied author." They do state:

Normally we interpret speakers and writers as the source of evaluations, unless attitude is projected as the speech or thoughts of an additional appraiser. ... We need to keep in mind of course that it is the speaker or writer who tells us what someone else feels, and so continues to function as an ‘ultimate’ source of appraisal.

As well as specifically inscribed projected speech and thought, I also include ideational content. For example, in the context of both the immediate narrative and the larger context of the Deuteronomic History, it is reasonable to assume that when the narrator remarks that the Israelites served the Baals, he is invoking the conclusion that YHWH is displeased (AFFECT) and evaluates the behavior as improper (JUDGMENT) even though God does not express these responses verbally and they are not explicitly inscribed by the author/narrator. As Powell notes,

Since characterization is more often a process of showing than telling, traits sometimes must be inferred. Such inference does not involve ‘psychologizing’ of characters on the basis of insights extraneous to the text, but rather calls for recognizing assumptions that the text makes of its implied reader.

It is reasonable to assume that the implied reader of Judges was expected to make these connections.

Thus, in any narrative there are various perspectives from which the events and characters can be evaluated, and which are also associated with various levels of reliability. Within the world of the story, the individual characters or groups have differing assessments of other characters or groups and the actions in which they engage.

---

24 Martin and White, *Language of Evaluation*, 71, 90 n. 5. Here the term "speaker" refers to the author of a speech, not a speaker within a narrative.
An example of this would be the Moabite oppression of Israel in the time of Ehud. Whereas the oppression may be unethical from the perspective of the Israelites (−propriety), it is ethical from the point of view of YHWH who is using the Moabites to discipline Israel for their sin (+propriety). Similarly, Gideon’s reduced troop of 300 men might appear weak to him (−capacity), but the fact that YHWH is the one who will win the battle for Israel makes God’s evaluation of +capacity for the Israelite army possible. As Powell rightly points out, “We can also speak of the evaluative point of view of any given character or character group within the story. In this sense, the term refers to the norms, values, and general worldview that govern the way a character looks at things and renders judgments upon them.”

This is especially evident when the projected speech of the character is recorded, and the perspective of the narrator is being temporarily “pushed aside” in order for the character’s attitude to take center stage. An action may be deemed proper by one character and improper by another. One character may experience joy at the outcome of a battle, another despair, depending on their situatedness and perspective on the events. Bar-Efrat points out that a significant function of the Hebrew term הָנַּה (“behold”), especially after a verb of seeing, is to point out that the scene is being viewed from the perspective of one of the characters. However, these characters may be honest or deceptive, fair or biased, good or evil, wise or foolish, and thus their evaluations may have a relatively low level of reliability. A character’s evaluations may be countered or corrected by the narrator, who may have a different point of view. Thus a character may esteem himself highly for performing a certain action, but the narrator, and

26 Powell, Narrative Criticism, 53.
27 See Bar-Efrat, Narrative Art in the Bible, 41.
28 Bar-Efrat, Narrative Art in the Bible, 35–36. See also Fokkelman, Reading Biblical Narrative, 140–43.
ultimately the implied author, may undermine this opinion by the way the projected
speech is introduced, by the comments of others, or by the outcome of the character’s
actions (see the Samuel example below). Some characters, such as prophets, act as
mouthpieces for God, and the reader may have a higher level of trust in their judgments;
however, even the opinions of prophets may sometimes be questionable. The
conversation of Saul and Samuel in 1 Sam 15:10–35 is the exemplary case indicating the
fallibility of prophets. In v. 11 YHWH is quoted as saying, נִמְצָא רָאִיתָפִּים אֵשַׇׁאָאָו לַקָּלָה (“I regret that I have made Saul king”). In v. 29, however, Samuel states emphatically,
EXPR Nִmָא לֹא הָעַרַּיָּאוֹ לֹא יְשָׁרֵי הָלָא יֵשְׁמִי לֹא אָכָא הָוָא לְקָלָה (“Also the Glory of Israel will not
lie or change his mind; for he is not a man that he should change his mind”). In the final
verse of the pericope, however, the narrator concludes, יִהוּדָאָא יִרְמַהְלָה אֵשַׇׇאָאָו עָלְי (“And the Lord regretted that he had made Saul king over Israel”). Although most
English translations obscure the fact, the same Hebrew root, נִמְצָא, is used in all three
verses that represent the viewpoints of YHWH, Samuel, and the narrator. In this passage at
least, the fact that YHWH’s and the narrator’s words stand in tension with those of Samuel
indicates that Samuel’s statement may not have universal application. The fact that he
does not repent/change his mind about Saul’s dismissal confirms that sometimes YHWH
has reason to stand firm in his decisions; but the final outcome, Saul’s removal as king
after YHWH anointed him, confirms that God can indeed repent/change his mind when he
deems fit.

30 For more on this interesting passage and its implications, see Amit, Reading Biblical Narratives, 100–1; Fokkelman, Reading Biblical Narrative, 59–61. Interestingly, Bar-Efrat (Narrative Art in the Bible, 84)
uses Samuel in general to support his view that “because of his special standing as God’s emissary,
whatever a prophet says carries particular weight, and it can be assumed that the author identifies fully with
the prophet.”
Almost all narrative in the Hebrew Bible is presented from the perspective of an external narrator, unlike modern narrative which frequently tells the story from the point of view of a character within the narrative world. Although the narrator often tends to focus on a single character and the events surrounding him or her, the narrator does not necessarily reflect the values and opinions of that character, letting the character speak for him/herself or reporting that character's opinions without implying agreement. This is indicated by the fact that they refrain from expressions of emotional involvement and do not attempt to hide the failings and weaknesses of the characters.\(^{31}\) The narrator is unobtrusive, and seldom makes his presence felt.\(^{32}\) The narrator in the biblical narratives has traditionally been considered reliable and I will adhere to this presupposition in this study unless there is evidence in the text to indicate otherwise.\(^{33}\) As Fokkelman states, "The narrator is at a level of communication that is essentially different than, and higher than, the characters."\(^{34}\) The narrator is not completely detached and objective but reflects the stance of the implied author.\(^{35}\)

The role of YHWH as character and evaluator is a unique one; although to many readers he is the ultimate author of the text, he is also a speaking character within it.\(^{36}\) In spite of his status as a character, his evaluative authority exceeds that of other characters,

\(^{31}\) Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Narrative*, 32.
\(^{32}\) Only occasional comments such as "until this day" remind the reader of the narrator's existence. See for example Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 23–32.
\(^{34}\) Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Narrative*, 61.
\(^{35}\) See Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 32–33.
and even the narrator. Paradoxically, he is quoted and portrayed as the ultimate authority within the world of the story, even beyond that of the narrator, and even above the implied author who controls the text. Bar-Efrat explains,

Judgment by God is not like that by one of the characters in the plot, and is far more effective and convincing even than judgment by the narrator; for God is the absolute and supreme authority, and this naturally reflects upon the value and importance of His judgments (although it should not be forgotten that we know what God’s attitude is only on the narrator’s authority). 37

It is true that the authority of YHWH is filtered through the implied author and the narrator, and yet the implied author construes YHWH in such a way as to yield authority to him. As Amit argues, “We can see that the word of God and of the narrator form the criteria of credibility, while the speech of any other figure must be evaluated, either by comparison or by analysis.” 38 This is the way that the implied author has chosen to present his story.

The implied author, the persona of the unknown real author who depicts and manipulates the narrator as well as the characters, is the ultimate source of authority in the text, and in so far as his/her agenda can be reconstructed, determines the ideology of the text as a whole. As a construct of the text, the implied author “becomes known to us through what the narrator says, through the speech of the characters (which is formulated by the author) and through the organization of the narrative materials.” 39 Thus, the implied author’s stance can often be inferred from the consequences of events as he/she arranges them in the narrative: a good outcome suggests a positive evaluation, a

37 Bar-Efrat, Narrative Art in the Bible, 19. Later, Bar-Efrat writes, “Amongst the instances of direct characterization uttered by the protagonists, particular attention should be paid to those attributed to God. Characterization voiced by God has absolute validity, like that pronounced by the narrator, or perhaps even more so” (p. 54).
38 Amit, Reading Biblical Narratives, 96.
39 Bar-Efrat, Narrative Art in the Bible, 14.
disastrous one, a negative appraisal.\textsuperscript{40} Also, after the individual appraisals have been identified in the text, the implied author’s stance can be inferred by the overall patterns of appraisal in the narrative, for example, in evaluative prosodies, when the appraisal of a character or by a character changes, or when evaluations of or by characters are set in contrast to each other. Thus, there are different “levels” of evaluation, with different degrees of reliability.\textsuperscript{41} Taking a “bottom up” approach, within the world of the story the evaluations of characters have a limited and situated reliability, high ranking characters that serve as spokespeople of YHWH have a more dependable reliability although they are not infallible, and the narrator is consistently reliable but defers to the character of YHWH who has ultimate reliability. Outside the world of the story, the implied author has the ultimate authority, since we only know of YHWH from him/her, and yet the implied author also willingly subsumes his/her authority under that of YHWH whom he/she depicts.\textsuperscript{42} Because of these levels of evaluation, assessments may be construed not only by different appraising items in the text, but also by different perspectives on the same

\textsuperscript{40} I am not advocating a mechanical process of retribution and reward; YHWH is free to exercise both justice and mercy. However, Deut 27–28 sets the tone for the Deuteronomistic History by promising blessing to those who obey the covenant and curses for those who transgress it, ultimately resulting in exile. The relevance for Judges is obvious here. YHWH’s gift of the land is conditional on obedience (“Now it shall be, if you diligently obey the Lord your God, being careful to do all His commandments which I command you today … He will bless you in the land which the Lord your God gives you” [28:1, 8]), but disobedience will ultimately result in exile (“But it shall come about, if you do not obey the Lord your God … [that] the Lord shall cause you to be defeated before your enemies … [and] the Lord will bring you and your king, whom you set over you, to a nation which neither you nor your fathers have known” [28:15, 25, 36]). The general pattern in the book of Judges is that when the Israelites commit apostasy and forget YHWH their God, they are disciplined by YHWH’s use of the nations to oppress them. When they are obedient and faithful, as in Gideon’s reduction of his troops and trust in God, the outcome tends to be victory and deliverance. However, in his mercy YHWH also acts in spite of or even through the judge’s failings to deliver Israel, as we shall see in the case of Samson, for example.

\textsuperscript{41} See Alter (\textit{Biblical Narrative}, 116–17) for more on levels of reliability, which he terms “a scale of means.”

\textsuperscript{42} See Polzin, \textit{Moses and the Deuteronomist}, 23.
event or person at the same time. I call these evaluations multiperspectival rather than
uniperspectival, and they are designated in the appraisal charts as described below.

2.4 The Narrative Appraisal Model

2.4.1 Direct Textual Realization

All of the manifestations of APPRAISAL may be realized in the text in a variety of
lexicogrammatical ways. Martin and White comment: “Because we are developing
attitude as a discourse semantic system, we can expect its realizations to diversify across
a range of grammatical structures.”43 However, as Thompson points out, “With appraisal
(or ‘evaluation’) we are even more on the edge of grammar: much of appraisal is
expressed by lexical choices and there are few grammatical structures that can be seen as
having evolved with a primarily evaluative function.”44 This is perhaps even more true in
Hebrew. One of the main techniques for realizing evaluation in English is modality.
However, although English has a range of modal possibilities (“may,” “might,” “should,”
“ought to,” “could,” etc.), Hebrew uses an undifferentiated imperfect (or “prefix
conjugation” or *yiqtol*) form to cover many of these possibilities, among others. Modal
nuances are certainly possible, but they must normally be determined from the context
rather than from the actual form of the verb.45 Hebrew does use some syntactical
structures to convey evaluative intent, but, as in English, the burden of appraisal rests on
lexis and ideational content. Hebrew offers a variety of ways for expressing evaluative
language, as the following categories and examples demonstrate.46

44 Thompson, *Functional Grammar*, 75.
45 See, among others, Gianto, “Mood and Modality in Classical Hebrew”; Hatav, *The Semantics of Aspect
(such as modal verbs) are omitted. Realizations of evaluative language that are not suggested by Martin and
2.4.1.1 Attitudinal Lexis

As Bar-Efrat notes, the connotation of words is one way that the narrator’s attitude is expressed; this also applies to the individual characters. Unfortunately, there is no Hebrew equivalent of the *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains.* The United Bible Societies is in the process of creating one, *A Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew,* but it is as yet incomplete. In the meanwhile, the only reference with information on semantic domains is Swanson’s *Dictionary of Biblical Languages,* which simply includes domains from Louw-Nida as part of the listing for each word. Since it simply transfers Greek categories into Hebrew, however, it must be used with caution. Of course, lexis must be interpreted within its context of situation and co-text.

**Examples:**

Among the Hebrew lexis given for L-N 25C Love, Affection, Compassion (25.33–25.58) are:

1. **לְבָנָה** (love, i.e., have an affection based on a close relationship)
2. **לְבָנָה** (close friend, i.e., a special confidant and companion, implying a loving, familial relationship)
3. **לְבָנָה** (lover, i.e., one who is beloved and a romantic kindred spirit)
4. **לְבָנָה** (loyal love, unfailing kindness, devotion)

White but seem applicable to Hebrew are marked by an asterisk (*). Thompson and Hunston also identify three general areas which contain evaluative information—lexis, grammar, and text—and survey the literature for suggested realizations within these categories. Their conclusions overlap Martin and White, but do offer distinctive suggestions, some of which have been included (Thompson and Hunston, “Evaluation,” 14–22).

---

47 Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible,* 33.
48 Louw and Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon.*
49 For an overview of this project see United Bible Societies and Blois, “A Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew.”
50 Swanson, *Dictionary of Biblical Languages.* The words are listed alphabetically, not by domains, with the Louw-Nida domain reference given for each word. However, it is possible to do an electronic search for all words that are tagged with a specific domain to assemble a list of lexis within that domain, although the process is a bit awkward.
2.4.1.2 Modification of Participants and Processes

Participants and processes in any text are closely related. A frequently quoted question by Henry James asks, "What is character but the determination of incident? What is incident but the illustration of character?"\(^{51}\) Bar-Efrat phrases it, "Action is the implementation of character."\(^{52}\) Although character determines words and actions, the reader of the biblical text has no direct access to the character of a participant except through his/her words and actions; therefore, the inscribed actions of a participant determine or create character from the perspective of the reader. Thus, character traits may be determined not only directly in a statement by the narrator or another character, but also indirectly by their appearance, words, and actions.\(^{53}\) As Bar-Efrat explains further,

The narrator does not give a direct report of the characters' innermost thoughts and feelings. There is simply a description of their external behavior, their actions and their conversations. To all intents and purposes, the narrator is simply capturing the situation as it is revealed to the outside observer.\(^{54}\)

The Hebrew language contains very few adjectives as modifiers for participants, but tends to focus on processes. For example, Hebrew narrative seldom describes participants as "evil" (for example, "the evil Samson") and avoids modifying actual persons or groups as inherently "being evil" (that is, evil is not predicated of people as in "Samson was

51 James, "The Art of Fiction," 292.
52 Bar-Efrat, Narrative Art in the Bible, 77.
53 See, for example, Powell, Narrative Criticism, 52–53.
54 Bar-Efrat, Narrative Art in the Bible, 23. Bar-Efrat notes that the role of appearance is less significant in Hebrew narrative than in modern fictional narrative. Reference is seldom made to a character's external appearance, and when it is, it is more significant to plot than to characterization (pp. 49–53).
It does, however, frequently condemn them for “doing the evil thing.” By implication, those who do evil things may be evaluated as evil themselves. However, other forms of modification are also available. Waltke and O’Connor give an overview:

An *adjectival modifier* is a construction that qualifies a noun or its equivalent. Such a construction is “adnominal” (“to the noun”), in contrast to a construction that modifies a verb (*adverbial*, “to the verb”). There are many ways in which nominal forms may be qualified in the surface structure. Consider, for example, these phrases, all with shapes attested in Hebrew (though not all the equivalents are attested).

- **adjective**: foreign gods
- **construct**: gods of foreignness
- **adjectival apposition**: gods, the foreigners
- **hendiadys**: gods and foreigners
- **prepositional phrase**: gods in foreignness
- **adverbal apposition**: gods (with reference to) foreignness
- **relative clause**: gods that are foreign
- **relative clause**: gods belonging to foreigners

The favoured expression among these in Hebrew is a construct, ָָָּ (Gen 35:2, etc.).

This does not imply that there are no variations of nuance among these realizations; in fact, the variations may well have semantic significance. However, it means that there is a different range of methods for encoding modification of people and objects within Hebrew than in English.

**Examples:**

ימֹּּ (Judg 9:16)
*If you have acted with truth and integrity...* (although modifying the process, this by implication also modifies the participants who act)

וָּּ (Judg 9:4)
*And he hired with it worthless and reckless fellows.*

Waltke and O’Connor also point out various ways of modifying processes: adverbial accusatives (nouns modifying verbs), infinitive constructs, infinitive absolutes,

---

particles, prepositional phrases, subordinate clauses,\textsuperscript{56} and, of course, adverbs, including interrogative adverbs.\textsuperscript{57} In functional terms, many of these would be classified as “modifiers” or “adjuncts.” Hebrew is adverb poor, with the exception of interrogatives such as בַּדַּע (“what?”) and גַּאָה (“where?”), negations such as לָא and לָא, and a few temporal words such as בְּהַל (“now”). One occasionally meets other adverbials such as כָּכָא (“thus”) and בָּא (“there”), but the one that seems to have the greatest effect on evaluation in Judges is the intensifier כָּכָא (“very, exceedingly”). Thus, other forms of modification of processes are far more significant, particularly prepositional phrases and subordinate clauses.

Examples:

\begin{verbatim}
(1 Sam 28:12)  "She cried with a loud voice.
(2 Sam 12:1)  "I will surely go with you."
\end{verbatim}

2.4.1.3 *Stative Verbs

Some of the descriptive work in Hebrew is taken up by stative verbs such as בָּא (“to be evil”) and בָּא (“to be small, insignificant”). These verbs perform the function of the English verb “to be” plus a predicate adjective. In fact, Joüon and Muraoka refer to

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotemark[56] Waltke and O’Connor give the example of Job 9:15: תָּפָר אָבוּר הָאָמְרִים לְאָלַל אֵל הַיָּה (Though I were innocent, I could not answer [him].)
\footnotemark[57] Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, 74–75.
\end{footnotes}
statives as “conjugated adjectives,”58 and Waltke and O’Connor remark that “where English relies on an adjectival predicate; most distinctively, Hebrew stative verbs often correspond in English to predicate adjectival constructions.”59

Examples:

(1) הָלַכָּה אֶל לְעֹד לְעֹבֵד אָנָיוֹתָה (Judg 2:14)
   And they were not able to stand before their enemies.

(2) יִתְּנָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל (Judg 2:20)
   And the anger of YHWH was hot against Israel.

2.4.1.4 Affective Mental and Behavioral Processes

Mental processes that realize AFFECT are verbs such as שָׂמַח (“to rejoice”) and רָאָה (“to fear”). Affective behavioral processes are expressed in verbs such as בָּכָה (“to weep”).

Examples:

(3) יִהְוָה לְפָתָח (Judg 18:20)
   The priest’s heart became glad. (mental)

(4) יָשֻׂה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֵל יְ HvW (Judg 10:10)
   Then the sons of Israel cried out to YHWH. (behavioral)

2.4.1.5 *Conditional “if ... then ...” statements.

According to Perkins, in some “if...then...” statements “there is no indication as to whether the condition is (or will be) fulfilled or not, whereas in [others] it is implied that the condition is not fulfilled.”60 These are of some interest in the book of Judges since it is not uncommon for people to ask for confirmation of uncertainty by using “if...then...”

---

58 Joüon and Muraoka, Biblical Hebrew, 1:127.
59 Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, 256.
60 Perkins, Modal Expressions, 111.
statements to request a miraculous sign confirming a proposed or irreal situation or evaluation. Thus, they are of significance in evaluation that involves AFFECT: SECURITY as well as JUDGMENT: tenacity.\footnote{Note that SECURITY is in small capitals since it is the basis of a further subsystem, but tenacity is in lower case because it is not.} In fact, Perkins calls “if” a “modal particle” in English.\footnote{Perkins, \textit{Modal Expressions}, 111.} It seems to have a similar function in Hebrew.

**Example:**

אָשֶׁר טַלְלָה עַל-הַגָּן הַלְּבֹּת יָעַל כְּפַלַּה יָהֹב יָתַשְׁתָּ הַרְחֵשׁ בְּהֵרַע זָפָּרֶחֶר פָּאַש דְּבָרָה (Judg 6:37)

If there is dew on the fleece only, and it is dry on all the ground, \textit{then I will know that you will deliver Israel through me, as you have spoken.}

**2.4.1.6 Rhetorical Questions**

Questions of the rhetorical kind are not asked to elicit information, but for their impact or effect. Thus, they can be useful in encoding evaluation. In the example in Judg 2:2 below, God is well aware of what the Israelites have done, but his rhetorical question could express AFFECT: dissatisfaction: +displeasure or JUDGMENT: SANCTION: - propriety.

**Examples:**

לֹא עָשִׂיתֶם בְּכֶלֶל הַגָּן נַעֲשָׂתי (Judg 2:2)

"But you have not listened to my voice. \textit{What is this you have done?}"

וַיֹּאמֶר יָתַשְׁתָּ כְּפַלַּה מֵאָבָּב כְּפַלַּה מִיַּבְּכֵסָה כְּנַעָבָּד (Judg 9:28)

Then Gaal the son of Ebed said, \textit{"Who is Abimelech, and who is Shechem, that we should serve him?"}

**2.4.1.7 Grammatical Metaphors**

The particular use of grammatical metaphor included here is the “nominalised realization of qualities (joy, sadness, sorrow) and processes (grief, sobs).”\footnote{Martin and White, \textit{Language of Evaluation}, 46.} In Hebrew
this includes such lexis as עַצִּיָּה ("misery"), אָשִּׁיָּה ("happiness"), and בְּנוֹת (“weeping”).

Example:

לֹא יָשְׁבָה אֶרֶץ הַלָּוֶד אֶלְחַכְכָהּ מְשַׁמְּחַה וּבְעוֹז לֻבָּּה (Deut 28:47)
You did not serve YHWH your God with joy and a good heart.

2.4.1.8 Lexical metaphor

Lexical metaphors include tropes such as metaphors and similes. According to Halliday and Matthiesen, lexical metaphor involves the mapping of one lexico-semantic domain onto another. They explain:

Lexical and grammatical metaphor are not two different phenomena; they are both aspects of the same general metaphorical strategy by which we expand our semantic resources for construing experience. The main distinction between them is one of delicacy. Grammatical metaphor involves the reconstrual of one domain in terms of another domain, where both are of a very general kind. … Lexical metaphor also involves the reconstrual of one domain in terms of another domain, but these domains are more delicate in the overall semantic system. … Lexical metaphors typically involve a shift towards the concrete.

Bar-Efrat claims that “the object [of metaphor] is not to describe but to arouse or express a particular attitude. … The emotions which exist with regard to one side of the comparison are transferred to the other, thus filling the second sphere with the emotions associated with the first.”

---

64 Previously, lexical metaphor was defined as meaning that is a product of the interaction of the tenor ("the idea being expressed or the subject of the comparison") and the vehicle ("the image by which this idea is conveyed or the subject communicated") (Holman and Harmon, A Handbook to Literature, 298). According to Richards,

In many of the most important uses of metaphor, the co-presence of the vehicle and tenor results in a meaning (to be distinguished from the tenor) which is not attainable without their interaction. … The vehicle is not normally a mere embellishment of a tenor which is otherwise unchanged by it but … vehicle and tenor in co-operation give a meaning of more varied powers than can be ascribed to either (Richards, Philosophy of Rhetoric, 100).

SFL has changed this understanding of metaphor.

65 Halliday and Matthiessen, Construing Experience through Meaning, 233.

66 Bar-Efrat, Narrative Art in the Bible, 56–57.
Example:

Let those who love him be like the rising of the sun in its might.

They would come in like locusts for number

2.4.1.9 *Semi-fixed expressions

A semi-fixed expression is a term used by Channel in her analysis of evaluative language. It is used in this study as an idiom or set phrase which has become fossilized by repeated use and acts more or less as an evaluative lexical unit. Thus, “they forsook YHWH” (יָשָׁרָהוּ מִיְּדֵי ה') is used five times in Judges alone (2:12, 13; 10:6, 10, 13) and carries with it a negative evaluation of the subjects of the phrase.

Examples:

The anger of the YHWH burned against Israel.

They served the Baals and the Asheroth.

2.4.1.10 *Negatives

According to Labov, negatives are not an inherent part of narrative, since narrative describes what happens, and negatives are what does not happen. Therefore negatives “provide a way of evaluating events by placing them against the background of other events which might have happened.” They thus may expand the dialogic space to

---

67 Channell, “Corpus Based Analysis,” 39: “The focus is on [the evaluative] function where it is carried by individual lexical items, or by semi-fixed expressions, rather than on examples where the function is carried by whole sentences or stretches of text.”

68 Labov, Language in the Inner City, 381. Labov identifies four types of evaluation in narrative: intensifiers, comparators, correlatives, and explications (pp. 380–87). He classifies negatives as a type of “comparator.”
include alternatives (ENGAGEMENT: HETEROGLOSS: EXPAND), and may raise the force of an evaluation by contrasting it with its opposite (GRADUATION: TYPE: FORCE). These negatives may carry the evaluative function alone, or in conjunction with other elements: the first example below is also a rhetorical question.

Examples:

(Judg 6:14)

Have I not sent you?

(Judg 8:35)

They did not show loyalty to the sons of Israel...

All of the textual realizations given above can be used to express many different types of evaluation, both AFFECT and JUDGMENT, as will be explained further below.

2.4.2 Indirect Realization

All of the above techniques are methods in which evaluation is "directly inscribed in discourse through the use of attitudinal lexis." This is not always the case, however. Martin and White argue that, even where specific evaluative language is not used, ideational elements can be intentionally included which carry their own implicit attitudinal loads; thus, they "invoke" attitudes. The audience is then able to infer from these the stance of the author. Thompson also argues for the relevance of invoked evaluation: "The following description of a character in a novel has no overtly evaluative language, but it is clearly meant to make us evaluate him as menacing: ‘He could silence

---

69 The role of negatives in raising the force of an evaluation must be assessed with caution, however, since their impact is inconsistent even in English, with which we are much more familiar. For example, consider: They sinned/transgressed < > They did not obey me; She forgot < > She did not remember; He was evil < > He was not good; They were weak < > They had no power. The effect seems to raise the evaluative force of verbs but lower it for modifiers.

70 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 61.

a room full of people just by being there."\textsuperscript{72} In response to accusations of subjectivity, Martin and White respond: "Avoiding invoked evaluation of this kind amounts to a suggestion that ideational meaning is selected without regard to the attitudes it engenders—a position we find untenable."\textsuperscript{73} They remind us that this kind of subjectivity is not individual but social, a product of communities of interpretation contemporaneous with the text, and thus avoids a merely idiosyncratic reading. Invocation, more so than inscription, is dependent on its co-text and context of situation, and interpreters must immerse themselves in Israelite culture and Hebrew language in order to assess indirect evaluations as accurately as possible.\textsuperscript{74}

Although Martin and White do not formally define the term "token" in their monograph, this is the word that they use to identify ideational content that invites/evokes or provokes an evaluation or attitudinal response.\textsuperscript{75} On their website, however, they go into more detail:

The picture is complicated, however, by the possibility that the JUDGEMENT assessment may be more indirectly evoked or implied—rather than explicitly inscribed—by what can be termed ‘tokens’ of JUDGEMENT. Under such tokens, JUDGEMENT values are triggered by superficially neutral, ideational meanings which nevertheless have the capacity in the culture to evoke judgmental responses (depending upon the reader’s social/cultural/ideological reader position).\textsuperscript{76}

One example given by Martin and White is taken from Proulx’s novel, The Shipping News. Partridge evaluates Quoyle’s newspaper article with, among others, the expression:

\begin{quote}
Thompson, Functional Grammar, 78.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 62.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 66.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 64. See also pp. 61–68. In his later book (Martin and Rose, Working with Discourse) Martin uses the term “invite” instead of “evoke.”
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
"No quotes." In and of itself this could be considered a neutral comment. However, in the context of contemporary newspaper copy writing, an article without quotations or a television news story without "sound bites" is understood to be a disaster. In the charts summarizing the evaluative content of texts, they use the symbol "t" to indicate a token, or implied evaluation (e.g., "t, –capacity"). According to the authors, their function is to extend the prosodies "inscribed by the explicitly evaluative items." Great care must be exercised in using evaluative tokens since they are more subject to interpretive bias than overtly inscribed evaluative language, especially when occurring in isolation from other evaluative coding. Thus, it is best to limit their identification to within prosodies or in connection with other lexical and syntactic items so that the evaluative stance is reinforced by more "objective" criteria.

Of course, no evaluative token is independent of the textual and social context. For example, in Judges the clause complex "There was no king in Israel; all the people did what was right in their own eyes" occurs twice (17:6; 21:25). Taken in isolation, especially in a contemporary democratic society, these passages might well invite (evoked) a positive evaluative response, since it seems that everyone followed their conscience and tried to do what was right. In the original context, however, they most likely invited a negative evaluative response, in spite of the "did what was right" language. Doing "right in their own eyes" is negative if it is contrasted to walking obediently in the commandments of YHWH: doing right in his eyes.

77 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 70, in conjunction with the evaluation chart on p. 75.
78 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 75.
79 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 76.
80 See Deut 12:8, 28; Boda, A Severe Mercy, 142.
2.4.3 Prosody

Evaluative language does not always occur in discrete instances scattered through a text. Rather, these manifestations tend to overlap, accumulate, and expand as the discourse progresses; they can "spread out and colour a phase of discourse as speakers and writers take up a stance." Martin and White base their use of prosody on Halliday's description of interpersonal meaning. Halliday states:

This interpersonal meaning ... is strung throughout the clause as a continuous motif or colouring. ... The effect is cumulative; with each one the speaker reaffirms his own angle on the proposition. ... We shall refer to this type of realisation as 'prosodic', since the meaning is distributed like a prosody throughout a continuous stretch of discourse.

Since evaluation is a component of the interpersonal metafunction, it is logical that it is expressed in this way. Elsewhere Halliday expands on this idea:

The speaker's attitudes and assessments, his judgments of validity and probability; his choice of speech function, the mode of exchange in dialogue—such things are not discrete elements that belong at some particular juncture but semantic features that inform continuous stretches of discourse. It is natural that they should be realized not segmentally but prosodically.

Thus, as Macken-Horarik concludes, "The coupling of so-called neutral messages with heavily appraised ones puts the less attitudinal ones into an evaluative schema if only because of the 'company these words keep'." This has the effect of raising the reliability of interpretation of more neutral evaluations.

There are three types of prosodic realization outlined by Martin and White:

---

82 Halliday, "Modes of Meaning," 205.
85 Compare the concept of prosody with Battistella's idea of "markedness assimilation" and Longacre's idea of "peak" or "zone of turbulence." See Battistella, Markedness, 69–70; Longacre, Joseph, 18.
“saturation,” “intensification,” and “domination.” Saturation occurs where the prosody manifests itself opportunistically in various forms wherever it can in the clause or discourse. Intensification is the amplification of prosody through repetition, sub-modification, exclamation, or use of superlatives in order that it may have a greater impact. Finally, domination occurs when the prosody is distributed over connected parts of the discourse. The following diagram illustrates these three types of prosody.

Two examples from the book of Judges include:

Saturating Prosody:

O Lord, how shall I deliver Israel? Behold, my family is the least in Manasseh, and I am the youngest in my father’s house.  


88 Judg 6:15; see also 6:13, 16, 23, 39.
Intensifying prosody is rare in Hebrew narrative. As Martin and White explain: “With this kind of Prosodic realisation then, although the relevant interpersonal meanings may be realized locally . . . they colour a longer stretch of discourse by dominating meanings in their domain.”\(^90\) I have chosen to also use the term “discourse prosody” for instances in which the prosody extends beyond the level of a clause or clause complex, sometimes over extended stretches of text.

2.5 Components of the Narrative Appraisal Network

When the original author(s)/redactor(s) composed the text of Judges, they would—unconsciously, of course—have followed a semantic network in order to choose the realizations that best reflected their semantic idea. For example, if the author wanted to instantiate the semantic concept of insecurity in the text with regard to Gideon, he/she would have to make lexicogrammatical choices in Hebrew to inscribe this evaluation, or include ideational tokens to evoke it. The hypothetical networks involved would start with the semantic concept and move, left to right, toward the realization in the text. A partial and very simplified sample network follows:

\(^89\) Judg 6:27; see also 6:22.
\(^90\) Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 21.
The system network in this study does not include the final column, since the options for realization are so large that the network would become hopelessly complex. Instead, examples of realizations have been included in the charts below in the form of instantiations from the text. The interpreter, however, is retracing the author/redactor's steps from right to left, beginning with the instantiation in the text and decoding the process by which the author/redactor has arrived at this choice. Thus, the Appraisal chart in the Appendix is actually a reversal of the process, moving from the realization on the left to the semantic concept on the right, reflecting the interpretive process.

2.5.1 The ATTITUDE System

In this study we will consider two components of ATTITUDE: AFFECT and JUDGMENT. Although the model also includes APPRECIATION as a component, which is defined as “evaluations of semiotic and natural phenomena, according to the ways in which they are valued or not in a given field,” it is very infrequent in Judges and limitations of space prevent its discussion.91 We are primarily concerned with the

---

91 For more information on appreciation see Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 56–61.
emotions and evaluation of behavior of people and groups, and APPRECIATION deals with "evaluations of things" rather than behaviors.\(^{92}\) Admittedly, the evaluation of objects does occasionally play a role in Hebrew narrative, such as in Judg 8:24–27. Here, Gideon makes an ephod with which the Israelites \(\text{נשость} \) ("played the harlot") and which became \(\text{מנהג} \) ("a snare") to Gideon and his house. This aspect of evaluation would be worth following up in a more extensive study of Judges.

2.5.1.1 Affect

Martin and White define AFFECT (traditionally called "emotion") as "concerned with registering positive and negative feelings."\(^{93}\) The feelings of people—and especially YHWH—in Judges are very relevant to determining the acceptability of behaviors, since inappropriate behaviors often cause negative feelings in those who observe or are affected by them, just as appropriate behaviors result in positive feelings.

AFFECT may be expressed in the text as a "quality" which describes a participant ("an evil servant"), which is attributed to a participant ("the king was angry"), or which illustrates the manner of processes ("the woman went sorrowfully"). It may be expressed as a "process," either mental ("their sins angered him") or behavioral ("the old man wept"). AFFECT may also be included as a "comment" on a situation ("sadly, the child died").\(^{94}\) It should be noted, however, that some of these realizations are much less common in Hebrew than in English.

In creating their classification system for AFFECT, Martin and White considered

\(^{93}\) Martin and White, *Language of Evaluation*, 42.
six factors which are outlined here:

i. Are the feelings popularly construed by the culture as positive or negative?
ii. Are the feelings realized as a surge of emotion involving some paralinguistic or extralinguistic manifestation, or more internally experienced as a kind of emotive state or ongoing mental process?
iii. Are the feelings construed as directed at or reacting to some specific emotional trigger or as a general mood?
iv. Are the feelings graded toward the lower valued end of a scale of intensity or towards the higher valued end, or somewhere in between?
v. Do the feelings involve intention rather than reaction with respect to a stimulus which is irrealis rather than realis?
vi. Are the emotions representative of un/happiness, in/security, or dis/satisfaction. 95

These factors were combined into the realization example tables represented below, to which representative examples from Hebrew have been added. Due to the variety of ways of realizing ATTITUDE, it is impossible to include every potential realization or to develop a complete set of realization statements; therefore realization examples have been given. Wherever possible, examples have been taken from the book of Judges, but occasionally, where these are unavailable, examples have been drawn from other narrative texts in the Hebrew Bible. Unlike in Martin and White’s study, isolated lexis will not be listed since individual words do not have absolute meaning without context. 96 The realization examples indicate how ideational tokens and syntax also construe meaning as well as lexis.

2.5.1.1.1 Happiness

Happiness not only “involves the moods of feeling happy or sad,” but also whether these feelings involve a general undirected mood or are expressed in surges of behavior, and whether they are directed “at a Trigger by liking or disliking it.” 97 For

---

95 See Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 46–49.
96 Martin and White (Language of Evaluation, 52) do point out, however, that lexis must be considered in context.
97 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 49.
example, the Israelites’ misery in Judg 2:4 was a negative emotion experienced within themselves expressed behaviorally by weeping, but YHWH’s anger in Judg 2:14 was a negative emotion directed against the Israelites, triggered by their sinfulness, and expressed in an act of discipline. Although Martin and White’s distinction between “surge of behavior” and “disposition” is interesting, the difference is too subtle to be helpful in Hebrew narrative, and so has not been included in the AFFECT tables here and following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAPPINESS</th>
<th>misery (undirected mood: ‘in me’)</th>
<th>antipathy (directed feeling: ‘at you/it’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>יִשָּׁאַו הָעָם אֶתְכֹּלֶלִים וַיִּכְרָע</td>
<td>יִתְוַר אֶת הַיָּוֵה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל יִתְמָנֵה בְּרַעְשֵׁי יִשָּׁאַו אָוַה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And the people lifted up their voices and they wept. (Judg 2:4)</td>
<td>The anger of YHWH burned against Israel and he gave them into the hand of plunderers and they plundered them. (Judg 2:14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>וַיּוֹרָרָה אֶת הַיָּוֵה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיָּתְמָנֵה בְּרַעְשֵׁי יִשָּׁאַו אָוַה</td>
<td>יִתְוַר אֶת הַיָּוֵה בְּיִשָּׁאַו מִמֵּאָתָיו וְרַעְשֵׁי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They were severely distressed. (Josh 2:15)</td>
<td>YHWH was sorry because of their groaning on account of those who tormented and those who oppressed them. (Judg 2:18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בָּלָה אֵשֶׁר יְתַחְתָּא יְרַעְשֵׁי הַתְּחוּרָה לְנָא</td>
<td>יִתְוַר אֶת הַיָּוֵה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So they forsook the LORD (Judg 2:13)</td>
<td>Wherever they went, the hand of the LORD was against them for evil (Judg 2:15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It so happened when they were in high spirits, that they said, “Call for Samson, that he may amuse us.” (Samson is not the target of their mood of happiness, although tormenting him is a side effect of it) (Judg 16:25)

Then the land was at rest for forty years. (Judg 3:11)

The priest’s heart became glad. (Judg 18:20)

Then her husband arose and went after her to speak to her heart in order to bring her back.98 (Judg 19:3)

After this it came about that he loved a woman in the valley of Sorek, whose name was Delilah. (Judg 16:4)

2.5.1.1.2 Security

Feelings of “peace and anxiety in relation to our environs” are classified as SECURITY.99 These emotions can also be expressed as ongoing dispositions or moods and as surges of behavior, whether actions or words. In Martin and White’s version of the model, the difference between disquiet and surprise on the one hand, and between confidence and trust on the other, is not clearly articulated, but seems to be related once again to directed and undirected emotions.100 That is, based on the examples given, “disquiet” seems to refer to an internal mood or state, whereas “shock” seems to be a response directed to external events; “confidence” appears to refer to an undirected trust in oneself, but the term “trust” is limited to trust directed towards others beyond oneself.

98 Reading לֵאָשָׁה with the gere.
99 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 49.
100 “Disquiet” and “surprise/shock” might seem to indicate a mood vs. a surge of emotion, but this cannot be so since this distinction is represented by the columns of Martin and White’s original chart (Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 50).
For example, Gideon’s anxiety in regard to his family and neighbours is a general negative state of anxiety within him, and is not directed at specific people or events. It is expressed behaviorally by his decision to carry out his actions by night. Since these assumptions are not explicitly articulated in Martin and White, they are included in square brackets in the charts below.

I have also changed the terminology of Martin and White’s classifications of disquiet and surprise to uneasiness and mistrust. Since the model is built around polarities, the opposition of terms uneasiness/confidence and mistrust/trust makes more sense than the opposition of disquiet/confidence and surprise/trust. This change became particularly necessary in the analysis of the Gideon narrative, as described in ch. 6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECURITY101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uneasiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[undirected: 'in me']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And if it happens that a man should come and ask you, and say, ‘Is a man here?’ then you will say, ‘There is not.’ (Judg 4:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Lord, how shall I deliver Israel? Behold, my family is the least in Manasseh, and I am the youngest in my father’s house. (Judg 6:15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

101 The somewhat artificial nature of the category boundaries is particularly evident in regard to SECURITY. The distinction between behavior/disposition (especially disposition) and directed/undirected is rather fuzzy. One could assert that the anxiety was directed against his household and the townspeople, but it seems to be directed to them very generally and vaguely, to the point where the insecurity has become a general state of mind. No specific reasons or incidents are mentioned. An argument might be made, however, for directed insecurity. The distinction between perceived and actual threat is also relevant. An actual threat falls more into the category of HAPPINESS: misery, which can be realized by the lexis “fear.” However, INCLINATION may also involve fear or threats (see below) so there is overlap here as well. Since INCLINATION is anticipated (irreal) rather than immediate (real), and because it may not actually involve being afraid but may result from other motives such as ethical or compassionate ones, I will use the term “reluctance” in this context rather than “fear.” Perhaps the greatest value of the model is to raise awareness of factors that contribute to affect and the effect they have on meaning rather than to categorize them discretely and definitively.
### mistrust [directed feeling: ‘at you/it’]

So Gideon said to him, “If now I have found favor in your sight, then show me a sign that it is you who speak with me.” (Judg 6:17)

And it happened that as he was too fearful of the household of his father and the men of the town to do it by day he did it by night. (Judg 6:27b)

Then he said to Zebah and Zalmunna, “What kind of men were they whom you killed at Tabor?” (Judg 8:18)

### +security

**trust [directed feeling: ‘at you/it/him/her’]**

He returned to the camp of Israel and said, “Arise, for YHWH has given the camp of Midian into your hands.”

(Judg 7:15)

Then Micah said, “Now I know that YHWH will do good to me because I have the Levite for a priest.” (Judg 17:13)

### confidence [undirected: ‘in me/us’]

They came to Laish, to a people secure and trusting. (Judg 18:19)

---

2.5.1.1.3 Satisfaction

The emotion of Satisfaction “deals with our feelings of achievement and...

---

---

102 Martin and White (Language of Evaluation, 50) term this “surprise.” I have modified the meaning somewhat to show the polarity more accurately and have called it “mistrust.”

103 It is apparent in context that this is confidence, not trust, because of the sudden dominance of 1cs verbs in the prosody and markedly reduced references to YHWH.

104 Although the NASB uses the gloss “trusting,” there is no indication that they trusted in someone/thing outside themselves. Therefore this is tagged as confidence.
frustration in relation to the activities in which we are engaged”, 105 it is “concerned with telos (the pursuit of goals).” 106 In this case, the feelings can be experienced directly as a participant in them or indirectly as a spectator of them. For example Jephthah expresses his dissatisfaction (—satisfaction: displeasure) as a participant when his daughter comes out first to greet him, frustrating his hopes of a positive sequel to his victory—perhaps a sacrifice of some animal in thanksgiving. His emotion is expressed in a behavioral surge when he tears his clothes and cries out. 107 There are few if any examples of discontent or interest from the perspective of a spectator in Judges; virtually all the instantiations of satisfaction involve participants of one kind or another who have a vested interest in what is going on. Even Yhwh, who might be considered a “spectator” of human activities in one sense, is deeply involved with his people and consequently expresses dissatisfaction at their failings.

SATISFACTION

—satisfaction
discontent 108 (spectator)

The LORD came down to see the city and the tower which the sons of men had built. The LORD said, “Behold, they are one people, and they all have the same language. And this is what they began to do, and now nothing which they purpose to do will be impossible for them. (Gen 11:5–6)

105 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 50.
106 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 49.
107 Obviously, Jephthah also experiences unhappiness in this situation. He is heart-broken and sorrowful. Jephthah doubtless also experiences fear of what he must do (disinclination). At times it is difficult to differentiate between emotional responses and, indeed, more than one can be present at any one time. This is tagged in the appraisal charts below. As with most models, some artificiality and fuzziness creeps in. Models are necessarily simplified representations of reality, not reality per se.
108 Martin and White (Language of Evaluation, 51) call this “ennui” which seems less appropriate.
displeasure (participant)

When he saw her he tore his clothes and said, “Alas, my daughter, You have brought me very low, and you are among those who trouble me.” (Judg 11:35)

But it greatly displeased Jonah and he became angry. (Jonah 4:1)

If it is disagreeable in your sight to serve the LORD, choose for yourselves today whom you will serve (Josh 24:15)\(^{109}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interest (spectator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admiration(^{110}) (participant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And Samson said to his father, “Get her for me, for she is right in my eyes.” (Judg 14:3)

Now the lords of the Philistines assembled to offer a great sacrifice to Dagon their god, and to rejoice (Judg 16:23)

2.5.1.1.4 Inclination

Martin and White also describe the “irrealis AFFECT” of INCLINATION and suggest English lexical examples:\(^{111}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLINATION</th>
<th>Surge (of behavior)</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>desire (positive)</td>
<td>suggest, request, demand</td>
<td>miss, long for, yearn for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear (negative)</td>
<td>tremble, shudder, cower</td>
<td>wary, fearful, terrorized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lexis “suggest, request, demand” is odd for “desire: surge of behavior,” since a person who does these things is not really carrying out a surge of behavior but is trying to control the inclination of another person to act, not physically demonstrating their own inclination to do so. Martin and White define a surge of behavior as “some kind of

\(^{109}\) Joshua is urging them to respond behaviorally to their feelings, but at this point they have neither acted nor spoken.

\(^{110}\) Martin and White’s term “pleasure” was later changed to “admiration” in Martin and Rose, Working with Discourse, 67. I prefer this term.

\(^{111}\) Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 48.
embodied paralinguistic or extralinguistic manifestation." Suggesting, requesting, and demanding are linguistic manifestations. For example, in 2 Sam 3:13 ("I demand one thing of you, namely, you shall not see my face unless you first bring Michal, Saul's daughter, when you come to see me"), "demand" says nothing about the inclination of David to bring Michal, but tries to affect Abner's inclination to do this. The verse as a whole, however, does express his desire for her, so David's act of demanding an action of someone else does indeed express his own desire as well, though not behaviorally, unless speaking is included as a behavior. Perhaps the demanding in this case could be tagged as a token (ideational content) rather than lexis; it is more appropriately classified as an example of +inclination: encouragement, however (see below). It is difficult to suggest appropriate lexis for the mental process "desire" that expresses itself in behavior. Perhaps the physical processes "persevere in xing" or "persist in xing," or the like, where \( x \) is an action, as indicated in the chart below. Martin and White's term "fear" as an option for \(-INCLINATION\) is distinct from fear as a realization of \(-HAPPINESS\) in that it has an anticipated, irreal stimulus rather than an actual one. Note also that "fear" may not involve actually being afraid; the disinclination may result from other motives such as ethical or compassionate ones. I have therefore chosen to use the term "reluctance" for clarity.\(^\text{113}\)

Martin and White do not develop the \textit{INCLINATION} subsystem fully or place it within their system network; however, here I have decided to include it as a choice under \textit{AFFECT} since it plays a significant role in the narratives of Judges. A number of

\(^{112}\) Martin and White, \textit{Language of Evaluation}, 47.

\(^{113}\) See footnote 101 above.
significant adaptations and expansions had to be made since the simplified table that Martin and White provide proved unworkable in practice. I used the spectator/participant breakdown used in the SATISFACTION subsystem and have included samples of English lexis to illustrate the nature of the evaluation. It may prove helpful to further subdivide the categories based on whether the affect was triggered by a person or an action (participant or process), but I have decided not to do so at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLINATION</th>
<th>inclination for some action or person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reluctance (participant)</td>
<td>( \text{יֵלָאֱשָפְלָה} \text{ תְנַהְרָא} \text{ חָרָא} \text{ כ} \text{ ד} \text{ רָא} \text{ כ} \text{ שָׁנָה} \text{ נָעַר} ): But the youth did not draw his sword, for he was afraid, because he was still a youth. (Judg 8:20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hesitation</td>
<td>( \text{יָדֶר} \text{ מִסְפָּרָא} \text{ מִשָּׁל} \text{ הָמָרָבָמָּה} \text{ יִלָּכֶה} \text{ בַּרְנִי} ): Sisera alighted from his chariot and fled away on foot. (Judg 4:15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unwillingness</td>
<td>( \text{יָאָמָר} \text{ בַּל} \text{ לִבְּנַת} \text{ הָאָמָה} \text{ ל} \text{ אֵשֶׁת} \text{ אֲשִׁמֵל} \text{ אֵין} \text{ בַּכָּם} ): But Gideon said to them, “I will not rule over you... (Judg 8:23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td>( \text{יָאָמָר} \text{ אֶל} \text{ אֶלְּחָב} \text{ אֵרָּה} \text{ הָי} \text{ לֶחֶט} \text{ הָי} \text{ וְלָכְדָה} \text{ וְלַכְדָה} \text{ ל} \text{ אָלַל} \text{ ל} \text{ אָלַל} ): Then Barak said to her, “If you will go with me, then I will go; but if you will not go with me, I will not go.” (Judg 4:8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recalcitrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lethargy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turn away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withdraw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now why are you discouraging the sons of Israel from crossing over into the land which the Lord has given them?” (Num 32:7)

Then the people of the land discouraged the people of Judah, and frightened them from building (Ezra 4:4)

When our enemies heard that it was known to us, and that God had frustrated their plan (Neh 4:9)

Baasha king of Israel came up against Judah and fortified Ramah in order to prevent anyone from going out or coming in to Asa king of Judah. (2 Chr 16:1)

So Sarai said to Abram, “Now behold, the Lord has prevented me from bearing children. (Gen 16:2)

Balak said to Balaam, “I called you to curse my enemies, but behold, you have persisted in blessing them these three times! (Num 24:10)

...and their heart was inclined to follow Abimelech, for they said, “He is our brother.” (Judg 9:3)

She said, “I will surely go with you... (Judg 4:9)

the Canaanites persisted in living in that land. (Judg 1:27)

Indeed, my spirit within me seeks You diligently (Isa 26:9)

My soul longed and even yearned for the courts of the Lord (Ps 84:2[3])
encouragement (spectator)

But charge Joshua and encourage him and strengthen him (Deut 3:28)

He set the priests in their offices and encouraged them in the service of the house of the Lord. (2 Chr 35:2)

Surely there was no one like Ahab who sold himself to do evil in the sight of the Lord, because Jezebel his wife incited him. (1 Kgs 21:25)

They strengthened the kingdom of Judah and supported Rehoboam the son of Solomon for three years. (2 Chr 11:17)

2.5.1.2 Judgment

JUDGMENT "deals with attitudes towards behavior, which we admire or criticise, praise or condemn." It involves assessment of character and behavior which may be divided into SOCIAL ESTEEM, which deals with admiration and criticism, "typically without legal implications," and SOCIAL SANCTION, which has to do with praise and condemnation, "often with legal implications." Martin posits that JUDGMENT (and APPRECIATION) may be considered "institutionalizations of AFFECT" which act in the process of socialization: "JUDGMENT as affect recontextualized to control behavior (what we should and should not do), APPRECIATION as AFFECT recontextualized to manage taste (what things are worth)."

---

114 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 42.
115 Martin and Rose, Working with Discourse, 68.
116 Martin and Rose, Working with Discourse, 68; see also Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 52.
2.5.1.2.1 Social Esteem

The positive aspects of JUDGMENT: SOCIAL ESTEEM, include normality (how unusual or special someone is), capacity (how capable someone is), and tenacity (how resolute someone is). Martin and White rightly point out that indicators of JUDGMENT—whether ESTEEM or SANCTION—are context dependent. For example, one evaluating community may positively esteem a person who demonstrates caution, whereas another may consider a cautious person weak or indecisive. This is sometimes reflected in differing lexical nuances (“cautious” vs. “hesitant,” perhaps) but often the same word can have opposite meanings in different cultures or local communities.118

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL ESTEEM</th>
<th>normality (importance)</th>
<th>how special?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+normality</td>
<td>And he said to him, “YHWH is with you, valiant warrior.” (Judg 6:12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behold now, there is a man of God in this city, and the man is held in honor. (1 Sam 9:6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-normality</td>
<td>Then Gaal the son of Ebed said, “Who is Abimelech, and who is Shechem, that we should serve him? Is he not the son of Jerubbaal, and is Zebul not his lieutenant? Serve the men of Hamor the father of Shechem; but why should we serve him? (Judg 9:28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

118 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 52. It is partially for this reason that examples from Judges are given as full verses rather than individual words throughout this study.
| capacity (ability) how capable? |  
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| +capacity                     | ...and if you know any capable men among them, then put them in charge of my livestock. (Gen 47:6) |
|                               | ...for no god of any nation or kingdom was able to deliver his people from my hand (2 Chr 32:15) |
| -capacity                     | אלא יכל לו לברך לפנים אובדיה: And they were not able to stand any more before their enemies. (Judg 2:14) |
|                               | He said to him, “Lord, how will I deliver Israel? Behold, my clan is the most powerless in Manasseh, and I am the least in my father’s house.” (Judg 6:15) |

| tenacity (dependability) how dependable? |  
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| +tenacity                              | God did so that night. (Judg 6:40) |
|                                       | ...for they were considered reliable (Neh 13:13) |
| -tenacity                              | יאמר אלי כי אני מקדמים וראות עדות על כללה שלך ולעדה לאהוב Then the Ephraimites said to him, “What have you done to us, not to call us when you went to fight against the Midianites?” (Judg 8:1) |

### 2.5.1.2.2 Social Sanction

**Social sanction** includes judgments of veracity (how truthful someone is) and propriety (how ethical someone is).  

Martin and White explain:

Social sanction on the other hand is more often codified in writing, as edicts, decrees, rules, regulations, and laws about how to behave as surveilled by church and state—with penalties and punishments as levers against those not complying with the code. Sharing values in this area underpins civic duty and religious observances.

This has obvious relevance for the book of Judges, since YHWH’s sanction is based on

---

whether Israel observes those laws which he has established rather than on regulations and standards collectively determined by the community.

### SOCIAL SANCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>veracity (truth) how honest?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+veracity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As YHWH had spoken and as YHWH had sworn to them. (Judg 2:15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now I know that you are a man of God and that the word of the LORD in your mouth is truth. (1 Kgs 17:24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-veracity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...and the lords of Shechem dealt treacherously with Abimelech. (Judg 9:23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>propriety (ethics) how far beyond reproach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And the people served YHWH all the days of Joshua. (Judg 2:7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...and that man was blameless, upright, fearing God and turning away from evil. (Job 1:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And he hired with it worthless and reckless fellows. (Judg 9:4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They turned aside quickly from the way that their fathers walked in observing the commandments of Yhwh. (Judg 2:17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For they did infamy and vileness in Israel. (Judg 20:6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.5.2 The ENGAGEMENT System

According to Martin and White, who base their taxonomy on Bakhtin’s dialogism, ENGAGEMENT includes “those meanings which in various ways construe for

---

120 Note that Martin and Rose (Working with Discourse, 48–59) have considerably modified the system of ENGAGEMENT originally presented in Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 92–135 to focus on the methods of introducing other voices rather than the effect on dialogic space that the other voices construe. I have chosen to continue using the Martin and White version.
the text a heteroglossic backdrop of prior utterances, alternative viewpoints, and anticipated responses. ... The taxonomy is directed towards identifying the particular dialogistic positioning associated with given meanings. 121 Some statements, such as "bare assertions," are monoglossic rather than heteroglossic. Their phrasing makes no obvious reference to, or implied acknowledgement of, other points of view. 122 These statements may be subdivided into two groups. The first is those in which the content is "taken-for-granted," presuppositions or givens which are no longer considered to be at issue, and therefore construe a reader who is in agreement with the statement. The second is those which, although they have a monoglossic form, are focal points for discussion and therefore very much "at issue," not taken-for-granted. 123 These construe a reader who may need to be convinced and are often followed by supportive arguments.

The ENGAGEMENT system focuses on heteroglossic utterances. The first distinction concerns whether an utterance makes allowances for alternative positions: those which do are dialogically expansive and those which do not are dialogically contractive. 124 Martin and White emphasize that the lexical choices which indicate these stances must not be taken in isolation, but in context, since they "may vary systematically under the influence of different co-textual conditions, and across registers, genres, and discourse domains." 125 Note that although the subdivisions of the ENGAGEMENT system may prove valuable when considering some texts, these subcategories are often too delicate for application to the narrative of Judges. Modality is a key factor in determining

121 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 97.
122 White, "Beyond Modality," 263.
125 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 103.
the type of engagement, and modality in Hebrew is a poorly understood topic. Although much research has been done in this area, there is little scholarly consensus as to how forms such as the *yiqtol* and *weqatal* function in context with other modal indicators to determine such factors as obligation or commitment to the truth of a proposition.\(^{126}\)

A significant modification has been made in the Narrative Appraisal model to Martin and White’s original engagement system. They consider engagement as it applies to the interaction of the speaker/writer and audience/reader in texts that are more directly rhetorical, as explained in the Introduction to this study. The situation in narrative is more complex. Although the dialogue of characters within the narrative world could be analyzed in order to determine how one character uses strategies to influence or align with another, there is sometimes no actual dialogue reported. Also, outside the world of the story it is ultimately the implied author who is attempting to align the implied reader to his/her ideology or evaluative stance, and who is using the interactions of characters within the story to achieve this goal. The heteroglossia thus occurs between the implied author and the implied reader by means of the various characters or groups of characters. Thus it is far more relevant to examine how the implied author engages the implied reader by his reporting of events and portrayal of characters.

The definitions of Martin and White’s original subcategories will be given briefly, largely in Martin and White’s own terms, followed by my reinterpretation of the

---


categories as they apply to the implied author and implied reader. Note that not all types of engagement are equally represented in Judges; some tend to dominate.

2.5.2.1 *Contract*

Contractive utterances, by their use of lexical or syntactical strategies, adopt a stance toward a proposition which implies its truthfulness. In other words, the authorial voice endorses the proposition and "aligns itself with the external voice which has been introduced as the source of that proposition." Thus they are dialogically contractive since they close down the dialogic space, tending to discourage alternative voices and positions. **CONTRACT** can be subdivided into Disclaim and Proclaim. In Disclaim, "the textual voice positions itself as at odds with, or rejecting, come contrary position." This denial can be expressed by negation or by countering with a concession or counter expectation (e.g., "Although the enemy was stronger, he defeated them"). In Narrative Appraisal, negation applies to a situation in which the implied author, by means of the outcome of events or the account of the narrator, specifically denies the attitudinal voice of a character or group of characters. Countering occurs when an opposing voice to that of the implied author is presented through a character or group in order that it might be contradicted. In Proclaim, a position is represented as "highly warrantable (compelling, valid, plausible, well-founded, generally agreed, reliable etc.)" and the textual voice suppresses alternative viewpoints. The three types of Proclaim are concurring, which involves formulations that construe the addresser and addressee as being in alignment,

---

127 For more detailed explanations, see Martin and White, *Language of Evaluation*, 104–133.
128 Martin and White, *Language of Evaluation*, 103. The authors do not specify whether the "external" voice is external to the specific discourse (e.g., one voice in a conversation) or external to the entire text. Both cases are probably applicable, depending on the genre.
using such terms as “obviously” or “of course” or a rhetorical question. In Narrative Appraisal I reinterpreta this to mean that the implied author is concurring with the voice of a character or group. Pronouncing occurs when the appraiser asserts the truth of the matter by overtly intervening in the text using such terms as “the truth is...,” “there is no doubt...,” “indeed,” or “certainly.” I modify this to mean that the implied author intervenes and clearly asserts an evaluative position through the narrator. Endorsing is a situation in which the textual voice draws on an outside authority to support a view. In Narrative Appraisal I understand this to mean that the implied author is using the authority of YHWH as a speaking character or a representative of YHWH—a prophet or the angel of YHWH—to support an evaluative view.

2.5.2.2 Expand

Expansive utterances have the opposite effect to contractive utterances. In these situations the authorial voice distances itself from the proposition, implying flexibility, uncertainty, or doubt. The stance implies that the proposition is still at issue and therefore encourages alternative views. These texts are dialogically expansive. EXPAND can be further categorized as Entertain or Attribute. Entertain in the original model accounts for situations in which the appraiser acknowledges his or her own subjectivity and deliberately presents a position as only one of a range of possibilities, therefore entertaining dialogic alternatives (“may be,” “perhaps,” and modals). This category is of limited use in Judges, since the implied author has a clear ideological purpose and is

---

133 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 98, 126.
134 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 103.
135 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 98.
unlikely to admit to subjectivity and entertain alternative attitudinal voices. The possible exception, as we shall see, is in the Samson narrative. On the other hand, Attribute acknowledges the subjectivity of another voice that is but one of a number of possibilities and can be subdivided into Acknowledge and Distance. In the case of Martin and White's Acknowledge, the framing device ("says," "reports," "believes," "thinks," etc) gives no indication as to where the speaker stands in regard to the proposition.\textsuperscript{136} In Narrative Appraisal the implied author does sometimes acknowledge other voices without commenting on their appropriateness, at least at that stage of the narrative. In Distance the framing device explicitly distances the appraiser from the attributed material. Martin and White identify the English lexical item "claims" as the marker of distancing.\textsuperscript{137} Hebrew has no real lexical equivalent of "claim" but the distancing of the implied author could possibly be expressed through the narrator in other ways than by this verb; however, no clear examples were found in the texts studied. Thus, EXPAND is the general term for evaluative language that makes room in various ways for other heteroglossic voices. In the text of Judges, it is perhaps not surprising that most of the ENGAGEMENT was contractive. The implied author tends to endorse or concur with Deuteronomic ideals, and allows little space for alternative views, eventually countering them when expressed by the characters.

2.5.3 The Graduation System

According to Martin and White, "a defining property of all attitudinal meanings is their gradability."\textsuperscript{138} This applies to all aspects of ATTITUDE in that they "construe greater

\textsuperscript{136} Martin and White, \textit{Language of Evaluation}, 112.
\textsuperscript{137} Martin and White, \textit{Language of Evaluation}, 113.
\textsuperscript{138} Martin and White, \textit{Language of Evaluation}, 135.
or lesser degrees of positivity and negativity."\textsuperscript{139} There is also a possible application to the ENGAGEMENT system, in that engagement can vary according to the level of the speaker/writer’s intensity or according to the degree of the speaker/writer’s investment in their statement;\textsuperscript{140} however, I will limit the use of GRADUATION to instantiations of ATTITUDE since I am approaching ENGAGEMENT from a very different perspective than Martin and White. FORCE involves graduating according to intensity or amount with regard to things that are scalable (e.g., “a slightly foolish person”), whereas FOCUS considers graduating according to prototypicality where things are normally not inherently scalable, that is, “the degree to which they match some supposed core or exemplary instance of a semantic category”\textsuperscript{141} (e.g., “a true king”). FORCE is described at a greater level of delicacy in terms of TYPE, MODE, and VOLUME.\textsuperscript{142}

2.5.3.1 \textit{FORCE: Type}

\textbf{QUANTIFICATION} involves scaling in terms of amount (including size, weight, and number) and extent (including distribution in time and space).\textsuperscript{143} Examples include “nine hundred iron chariots” (Judg 4:3) and “You have given this \textit{great} deliverance” (Judg 15:18). \textbf{INTENSIFICATION}, on the other hand, describes the degree of prominence of qualities or processes, for example, “utterly exhausted,” “annoyed me \textit{greatly},” or in lexicalized form, “\textit{crystal} clear.”\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{139} Martin and White, \textit{Language of Evaluation}, 135.
\textsuperscript{140} Martin and White, \textit{Language of Evaluation}, 135–36.
\textsuperscript{141} Martin and White, \textit{Language of Evaluation}, 137.
\textsuperscript{142} I have modified the organization of Martin and White’s system here somewhat. In fact, Martin and White (\textit{Language of Evaluation}, 154) give a different system network for graduation than Martin and Rose (\textit{Working with Discourse}, 48). I have combined elements of both that are most descriptive of Hebrew narrative.
\textsuperscript{143} Martin and White, \textit{Language of Evaluation}, 148–49.
\textsuperscript{144} Martin and White, \textit{Language of Evaluation}, 141–43.
2.5.3.2 Force: Manner

MANNER entails the way in which the intensification is realized. Isolation refers to the scaling that is realized by a separate item from the one which expresses ATTITUDE. It can refer to qualities (*slightly* unhappy, *fairly* unhappy, *utterly* unhappy), processes (he angered me *a bit*, she angered me *somewhat*, it angered me *greatly*), and modalities (*just* possible, *fairly* possible, *very* possible). Infusion refers to situations where “there is no separate lexical form conveying the sense of up-scaling or down-scaling. Rather, the scaling is conveyed as but one aspect of the meaning of a single term.” For example: “it disquieted me,” “it startled me,” “it frightened me,” “it terrified me.” Repetition also construes the scaling of force, and can be exact, or involve the repeating of semantically related lexis (e.g., Isa 6:3: “Holy, holy, holy is YHWH of hosts”; Ps 2:5: “Then he will speak to them in his anger [ Sexo] and terrify them in his fury [Nakab]”). Lexical metaphor can also raise or lower the intensity of an evaluation, as in “[The Midianites] would come in like locusts for number” (Judg 6:5).

2.5.3.3 Force: Volume

Volume refers to the degree of up-scaling or down-scaling of the intensity or quantity of FORCE. Thus a person may be “slightly angry,” “somewhat angry,” “angry,” “very angry,” or “extremely angry.” In the first two examples the VOLUME is lowered or down-scaled and in the last two it is raised or up-scaled. In cases where no scaling is evident (e.g., “angry”) I consider the volume to be median. Of course, since Hebrew does

---

not use many direct modifiers, these levels can be realized in different manners as noted above.

2.6 APPRAISAL Analysis Charts\textsuperscript{147}

The APPRAISAL analysis is based on Martin and White's model; however, some modifications and additions have been made. In their appraisal analysis tables, Martin and White list the appraising items in the text, the appraiser, and the thing or person appraised. Due to the section of text they have selected, many of the instantiations of appraisal relate to APPRECIATION, but they also include some AFFECT and JUDGMENT:

\textsuperscript{147} See the Appendix.
My own charts, as discussed above, focus on AFFECT and JUDGMENT. The realizations of evaluation have been given in both English and Hebrew. I have also chosen to give the full text of the chapter since evaluation, especially lexis, is only fully understood in context, and extracting isolated words or phrases may prove confusing for readers. Martin
and White note that AFFECT is normally considered in terms of “trigger” and “emoter.”

They explain:

**Affect** can be coded in a framework of this kind by treating the emoter as appraiser, and the trigger of the emotion, if recoverable, as appraised. This makes sense if we interpret the appraiser as the person who is feeling something (whether emoting, judging or appreciating), and the appraised as the person, thing or activity that is being reacted to.\(^{148}\)

I will continue this convention and represent AFFECT and JUDGMENT in the same chart, but will use bold font for the affective items for clarity.

It is possible for one appraising item to construe more than one response, although the item construes these from the perspectives of different people involved in the situation who are viewing the item; for example, Gideon’s tearing down of the altar construes Gideon in terms of \(+\textit{propriety}\) from the perspective of YHWH and \(-\textit{propriety}\) from the viewpoint of the men of the city. The act of tearing down their shrine could also trigger an affective response of \(-\textit{displeasure: dissatisfaction}\) in the men of the city. In the appraisal chart the multiperspectival elements are indicated as follows (from Judg 10:7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraising Items (Hebrew)</th>
<th>Lexical Syntactic Tokens</th>
<th>Appraising Items (English NASB modified)</th>
<th>WHO to Appraised / Trigger</th>
<th>Appraiser / Emoter</th>
<th>AFFECT</th>
<th>JUDGMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כָּרָא יִרְאָה</td>
<td>Fixed lexical form “sold into the hands of”</td>
<td>and he sold them into the hands of the Philistines and into the hands of the sons of Ammon.</td>
<td>C: Ed Narr</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>+propriety (justice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּרָא יִרְאָה</td>
<td>C: Ed Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>-satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּרָא יִרְאָה</td>
<td>C: Ed Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>-capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In another example, the lexical item “sold into the hands of” yields both a \(+\textit{propriety}\) evaluation by YHWH of his own action since it is just punishment for sin but also

---

indicates YHWH's affectual response of satisfaction: displeasure, triggered by the Israelites' apostate behavior and evidenced by his punishing them. It also demonstrates a capacity evaluation of the Israelites by the narrator who states that they have been conquered by the Philistines and Ammonites. The "Lexical evidence / Syntactic evidence / Token" column with its associated coding has been added for clarity, "token" indicating ideational content. The column headed "C/E/M" indicates engagement. Codes used in the appraisal chart are C: contractive, E: expansive, and M: monoglossic; codes following C or E and a colon are: De: deny, Ct: counter, Cc: Concur, Pr: pronounce, Ed: endorse, Ac: acknowledge, Di: distance, Et: entertain (see the system network).

Graduation is recorded if focus is evident or the evaluation is raised or lowered in force, but the column is left blank if the option is neutral. In Judges, the use of force is common but focus is of little significance. I have indicated an up-scaling of force by using a bold font (Arial Black). If there is more than one strategy evident for increasing the volume, I use both a bold font and upper case letters. To represent down-scaling or lowering of the volume I use italics for the evaluation. The existence of different levels of evaluation is indicated in the appraisal charts by an "M" in the "M/U" column, where "M" stands for "multiperspectival" and "U" for "uniperspectival." The symbol "t" indicates that the element is a "token": an invoked rather than an inscribed evaluation. Where appropriate, I have chosen to use the tilde (~) instead of a + or - to indicate ambiguous evaluations rather than drawing conclusions on the basis of controversial evidence. Ambiguity can actually be a deliberate literary device used to create tension

149 For more information see Section 2.5.2 above.
150 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 75.
151 None of these occur in Judg 6, but a number occur in Judg 3 and 4, for example.
or to challenge the implied reader to think through certain issues. The symbol ∞ is used to indicate an irreal situation evaluation, that is, one that is anticipated or hoped for but has not yet occurred.\(^{152}\) It is assumed that all evaluations involving INCLINATION are irreal.\(^{153}\) Prosodies are indicated by a label at the beginning, a heavy right border on the column, and shading of evaluative notations.

Originally, I intended to divide the verses into paragraphs according to Longacre’s model of Hebrew discourse, which is too complex a subject to treat in detail here.\(^{154}\) However, it soon became apparent that evaluative prosodies tended to extend across paragraph divisions and even overlap. Also, as Dawson notes, Longacre is not always clear in *Joseph* just how his paragraphs are determined:

In the long run, the section on paragraphs yields little readily accessible material; and comprehension of this material is rendered the more difficult owing to lack of thorough explanation of how paragraphs enter into the interworkings of clauses and texts, which we see so succinctly and lucidly displayed in his ‘clines’.\(^{155}\)

For these reasons this practice was discontinued.

### 2.7 Procedure: Moving from the Appraisal Charts to Interpretation

The Appraisal Charts which form the Appendix contain a vast amount of detailed data. A word of explanation is in order as to how I analyzed this data and moved from it to the interpretations in the chapters that follow. There is no such thing as uninterpreted
data in any discipline, whether in statistical mathematics or theology, and all
interpretation of necessity involves a subjective element. I used three main techniques for
processing the data: the analysis of direct statements, the identification of patterns, and
the recognition of correlations between evaluations and the narrative structure. The first
involves the relatively rare occasions when the narrator makes a direct statement about a
character or event, such as the repeated variations on the phrase, “The Israelites did the
evil thing in the eyes of YHWH.” This construes a clear –propriety evaluation.

The second approach involves discerning patterns in the data. In some places a
cluster of similar evaluations occurs, such as the numerous indications of –security:
distrust in the early stages of the Gideon narrative or the many construals of +normality
in regard to the wife of Manoah in Judg 13. These prosodies indicate that the implied
author is focussing on a particular evaluative aspect of a character. Disruptions of a
pattern may also be very significant, as in the case of the first +propriety evaluation of
the Israelites in the introduction of the Jephthah narrative in Judg 10:10 after nine
chapters of –propriety appraisals. A change from one pattern to another also signals that
the implied reader should sit up and take notice, as in Judg 8:5 when Gideon, who has
been construed in Judg 7 by a prosody of +security: trust, is now evaluated in a prosody
of +security: confidence. Contrasts between evaluative patterns of characters can be
significant, such as that between Manoah and his wife, Deborah and Barak, or Deborah
and Jael. Patterns are also evident in the book as a whole, such as the increasingly
negative evaluations of the major judges, although it would be premature to draw
definitive conclusions in other cases without a full consideration of the chapters that have
not been dealt with in this study (Judg 1, 5, 9, 17–21). These patterns and changes in
patterns indicate that the implied author is communicating an evaluative message about the characters to his/her reader.

These patterns may be noteworthy, or at least suggestive, in isolation, but when there is a correlation with the plot of the narrative they become even more significant. This constitutes the third technique. The change in Gideon from +security: trust to +security: confidence correlates to a clear change in participant reference in the narrative that occurs between 8:4 and 8:5; the narrator changes from recounting the actions of Gideon and his men to focussing on the actions of Gideon himself. The two occasions when Ehud “turns from” or “passes by” the idols in Judg 3 (+propriety) frames the killing of Eglon, in which the true אֱלֹהִים (“God”) conveys a מִרְדָּע (“thing/sword”) by means of Ehud to a foreign king who expects a מִסר (“message”) from false אֱלֹהִים (“gods”), reinforcing the +propriety of Ehud’s courageous deed in the centre. 156 It is this combination of evaluative analysis and literary structure that reveals the more subtle strategies that the implied author uses to convey his/her ideological agenda.

2.8 Conclusion

In the following chapters, I will use the data provided in the Appraisal Chart to analyze the varying perspectives of the characters in the major judge narratives, and to conclude from the way the implied author uses the interaction of characters’ evaluative points of view the stance of the implied author him/herself. The Appraisal Chart includes a considerable mass of data, not all of which has been used in the accompanying analysis. This is because it is not possible to determine which evaluative elements are most

156 See the more detailed analyses in the Gideon and Ehud chapters.
significant at the level of discourse in contributing to the ideology of the implied author and which play a more limited or local role until all the elements have been tabulated and evaluated. In an in depth analysis of any one narrative, more detail could of course be included, but within the scope of this study it was necessary to be selective. For each section, an introduction will be followed by an analysis of the text, using not only the Narrative Appraisal Model but also literary criticism and socio-historical analysis, and a summative conclusion suggesting what the implied author has conveyed about his/her ideology through the interaction of the characters.
3 The Second Introduction (Judges 2:6–3:11)

3.1 Introductory Remarks

Although space does not permit a detailed study of the passage here, the first introduction to Judges (1:1–2:5) sets the tone for the book to follow. The initial success and faithfulness of the Israelites under Joshua is gradually replaced by failure and compromise, and concludes with the reprimand of the angel of YHWH at Gilgal for disobedience and covenant breaking (2:1–5). The second introduction, however, is particularly significant to evaluation in the book of Judges since it sets up the basic framework for the ensuing judge cycles and concludes with the brief narrative of the paradigmatic judge, Othniel.¹ Here the implied author, speaking through the narrator, establishes the baseline or standard for the “major” judges that follow. According to Younger,

The cycle introduced in this section (2:6–3:6) is obviously an imposed interpretive pattern of the events of the period of the judges reflecting the theological perspective of the narrator. ... The theological perspective narrated is that of Yahweh. Thus it is evaluative, and the assessment is condemning. ... The Israelites of this period are characterized en masse as religiously incontinent (znb, 2:17), corrupt (šḥ, 2:19), and stubborn or obstinate (qṣḥ, 2:19). These are the narrator’s own evaluative terms; they reveal Yahweh’s perspective.²

Thus, the implied author evaluates the time of Joshua positively (+propriety): “The people served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders who survived Joshua, who had seen all the great work of the Lord which He had done for Israel” (2:7). Soon, however, trouble begins as the Israelites “do the evil thing” (2:11); the descending spiral begins. Polzin points out that whereas the first introduction has a linear temporal

¹ As Block (“Will the Real Gideon,” 364) notes, “The collection of hero stories has its own prologue (2:6–3:6), in which the theological agenda for the following hero stories is set.”
² Younger, Judges and Ruth, 85–86.
structure, the second establishes a cyclic structure with an "omniscient panchronic" perspective that actually extends back into the final years of Joshua's campaign when even that exemplary generation did not succeed in conquering all the land.\(^3\) It is intended to answer the angel's question in 2:2: "What is this you have done?" Thus, it gives a prospective overview of the central chapters of the book in which details of specific judges are given. Admittedly, the pattern is followed with less and less completeness in each subsequent cycle, but it nevertheless sets the implied author's standard or norm for these narratives and thus establishes one method by which they can be contrasted with one another.

3.2 The "Double Introduction" and the Deuteronomistic Question

Many scholars, commencing with Noth,\(^4\) argue that the book of Judges was first compiled as a sequential narrative "influenced by the thought and language of Deuteronomy" and as part of the overarching Deuteronomistic History during the late monarchy or exile,\(^5\) and was a compilation and adaptation of a collection of early hero stories and other materials with a superimposed framework.\(^6\) According to Noth, it originally included chapters 2–12 only and later underwent further additions and editing.\(^7\) Other commentators, however, deny that the book as a whole or its framework is Deuteronomistic, although they concede that some elements of the introduction may be.\(^8\)

---

\(^3\) Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 151–3. "It is no exaggeration to state that Judges 2:23 reaches back on the temporal plane of the text and embraces the entire Book of Joshua, even as it provides the evaluative background for the entire Book of Judges" (p. 153). Note that Polzin limits the second introduction to 2:6–3:6.

\(^4\) See Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, passim.

\(^5\) Auld, "What Makes Judges Deuteronomistic?," 120.


\(^7\) See Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 20–25, 42–47.

As Auld comments, "The most explicitly and uncontestably Dtr portions of the Judges text [include] Judg 2:6–3:6." Exum states, "The deuteronomistic framework presented in 2:11–23, and immediately illustrated by the judge Othniel in 3:7–11, provides the theoretical and theological context and a preview of the stories that follow." She concludes, however, that by the Samson narrative "the deuteronomistic framework breaks down altogether." Still others, such as Stone, deny any significant Deuteronomic element in the book. Although it would be simplistic to say that the book of Judges is thoroughly Deuteronomistic, it does show influence arising out of thought in the Deuteronomistic tradition, especially in the paradigm and framework. For example, there are numerous echoes in Judges of Deut 7: the recalling of the signs and wonders performed by YHWH in the deliverance from Egypt, the dispossession of the nations by the Israelites and the conquest of the land, the warnings against intermarriage and following foreign gods, the danger that YHWH's anger will burn against them and the threat of discipline, the exhortations to keep his commands and statutes, to name but a few. Judges has been canonically placed as part of what is generally called the Deuteronomistic History. Although Gooding's chiastic analysis of the book is rather overdone, his is right to argue that, in terms of the final redactor, "this was the work of one mind which saw the significance of the history recorded in the sources, perceived the trends it exhibited and carefully selected and positioned each piece of source material." It

9 Auld, "What Makes Judges Deuteronomistic?," 123. See also Auld, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, 142. Auld later comments, however, "It is incumbent on us to reevaluate the evidence, and ask again whether these were not late additions to an already complex book, rather than constitutive elements of its substratum—and we must go on to ask what this means for the label Deuteronomistic, or just how far Deuteronomistic is an appropriate description of such passages." (p. 125).
10 Exum, "The Centre Cannot Hold," 411.
11 Exum, "The Centre Cannot Hold," 423. See also Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 49.
is likely that the final redactor—whom I call the implied author—arranged the text of Judges meaningfully to fit the context of the Deuteronomic History and was influenced by Deuteronomistic thought. As Boda rightly notes, “If Judges is part of this larger literary complex, the historical context for reading the texts in Judges must be discerned from evidence found within this entire literary complex, which ends with the exilic experience of Judah in the sixth century BC.”

The introduction to the book of Judges, complete with Deuteronomistic elements, sets the tone for its final literary form; thus, it is appropriate to make reference to other books in the Deuteronomistic History in explicated Judges itself.

Gooding suggests a two-part (1:1–2:5; 2:6–3:6) introduction, a series of narratives that make up the body of the book (3:7–16:31), and a two-part (chaps 17–18; 19–21) epilogue. It is often stated that the first introduction has a political focus, whereas the second has a theological one. For example, Exum explains, “Whereas the first part of the introduction (chap. 1) deals with Israel’s military problem, the second (chap. 2) raises a religious problem, providing an ‘ideological account’ in contrast to the more ‘objective account devoid of excuses or moralistic explanations.’” Webb also remarks that whereas in the first introduction the events unfold from the perspective of the Israelites,

---

13 According to Webb (Judges, 9) “That the stretch of material comprising our present book of Judges is part of a larger narrative, and to that extent incomplete in itself, is almost too obvious to warrant attention.” For more on the role of the Deuteronomist in the compilation of Judges, see any of the standard commentaries. Webb (Judges, 20–32, 53) offers a helpful overview. It is not the purpose of this study to fully explore the stages of Judges’ composition and the Deuteronomist’s role in that process.
14 Boda, “Judges,” 1047; see also Webb, Judges, 53.
16 Exum, “The Centre Cannot Hold,” 413, quoting Polzin, Moses and the Deuteronomist, 146.
in the second introduction we see the events through YHWH’s perspective. I have chosen to include the brief narrative of Othniel as part of the second introduction, since it establishes the norm or ideal against which all the subsequent judges will be evaluated.

### 3.3 Definition of “Judge”

A word on the nature of the office of “judge” is relevant before entering on an analysis of specific judges. There is considerable debate about the meaning of the term. As Bal aptly notes, “The problem typifies the circularity inherent in the enterprise of interpretation: the unique source available for the concept’s interpretation is the very book that requires interpretation by means of this concept.” Although the term “judge” would seem to imply a judicial function, only Deborah is portrayed as being involved in such activities. The semantic field of the root ḫṣṣ includes making decisions, administering justice, ruling or governing, and exercising authority. The judges are referred to as both saviors and deliverers (מָצָא), and this has led some to conclude the existence of two distinct offices, although other commentators consider the terms overlapping or synonymous. Butler suggests a double role for judges which includes both military leadership and political/judicial functions. Others consider the role of judge to be synonymous with that of “king” (מלך).

---

19 *HALOT*, 1623.
The root špt means not only “to judge” in the narrow sense, and not only “to govern” in the broader sense, but it also means in the broadest sense “to establish justice.” ... This designation [“bringer of justice”] suggests that the judges were persons entrusted with the enactment of God’s will for the world.” ²⁴

Aside from natural gifting, their “qualification,” that suits the judges for their functional role, Block stresses their “authorization,” which consists in being raised up by YHWH, even if the Spirit is not explicitly mentioned as initiating and participating in their activities. ²⁵ In this sense they are “charismatic” leaders, even if they are often less than the heroic “swashbuckling, charismatic military leaders” that Niditch describes. ²⁶ Boda describes them as “charismatic chieftains” who are associated with “saving or rescuing” and “dispensing justice.” ²⁷ Their function is varied and complex, and the situational role they fulfil contrasts with the dynastic leadership that was to come later with the establishment of the monarchy.

3.4 Analysis of the Text

3.4.1 The Paradigm: Judges 2:6–3:6

Judges 2:7 concludes the narrative of the generation of Joshua and the elders. Here the evaluation is clearly positive: the Israelites served YHWH “all the days of” (לְהַלְּכַת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ הַקָּדוֹשׁ) Joshua and “all the days of” (לְהַלְּכַת היֻּשָׁרִים) of the elders who outlived him. The repetition of “all the days” raises the force of the assessment that the Israelites acted with obedience (+propriety) and faithfulness (+tenacity), a consequence of the fact that they had actually seen “all the great works of YHWH which he had done for Israel.” Verse 7 links this behavior to YHWH’s character: a relative clause notes that they were those who had

²⁴ McCann, Judges, 4. See also Stone, “Judges,” 187–89.
²⁵ Block, Judges, Ruth, 36.
²⁶ Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 1.
²⁷ Boda, “Judges,” 1053.
seen his ability to perform great acts (+capacity) and his compassion (+propriety) in doing them “for Israel” (+normality). Although even Joshua’s generation was not without some shortcomings, it is clearly established by the implied author as the standard by which the subsequent generations will be evaluated. Verse 10, however, sharply contrasts this group with “another generation” which followed it and which is modified by a similar but negative relative clause: “who did not know YHWH, nor yet the work which He had done for Israel,” a phrase which has implications of covenant violation.

The narrator then recounts a series of events that develop into a significant discourse prosody (vv. 10–15)detailing the inappropriate behavior of the Israelites (−propriety). The Israelites “did the evil thing” (v. 11, l'îlî-l'îlî-pî). The fact that this is not simply “evil,” but evil “in the eyes of YHWH,” emphasizes the fact that YHWH is the

28 Since YHWH is characterized throughout the Deuteronomic History as both just (punishing evil) and compassionate (having mercy on sinful humanity), both justice and compassion are considered manifestations of +propriety. See Exod 20:5–6; 34:6–7; Deut 5:9–10; 7:9–10; Num 14:18; Ps 103:8–10; Jonah 4:2, etc. As Boda, “Judges,” 1098, notes, “While the anger of God expresses Yahweh’s character of justice, at the same time this justice is disciplinary, revealing his gracious desire to free his people from sin’s bondage.”

29 Admittedly, there may be some qualification of Joshua’s success since YHWH did not drive out all the nations before Joshua (2:23). The corruption may have first set in during the leadership of Joshua, but in comparative terms the nation under Joshua was far more obedient and faithful than later under the judges. The implication could also be that YHWH simply did not drive them out before Joshua in order to test the subsequent generations, and to teach them battle strategy (3:1); thus exonerating Joshua’s generation.

30 No reason or excuse is given for this ignorance, and thus it in itself constitutes a negative evaluation. Butler, Judges, 42–43 notes, “Without knowing God or the tradition of the fathers, the new generation follows the only example they have before them, the example of the Canaanite Baal worshipers.” Schneider (Judges, 33) denies that Joshua is partly at fault for failing to provide continuing leadership.


32 There are 93 occurrences of the phrase בֵּעִיָּי יְהוָה in the Hebrew Bible, distributed as shown in the table below (exported from Logos Bible Software 4). The Phrase בֵּעִיָּי יְהוָה occurs in 54 of these cases. Schneider (Judges, 31) is right to point out that the translation “in the eyes of YHWH” is to be preferred over “in the sight of YHWH” and other more colloquial versions since the use of “the eyes of” links the evaluation more clearly to other relevant motifs in the book and the entire Bible that focus on eyes, especially in the Samson narrative and the double conclusion. See the table following:
ultimate judge. The implied author uses YHWH’s perspective and authority to endorse his/her assessment (C:Ed) because YHWH sets the definitive standard for ethical behavior, which is norm-referenced in respect to his covenant, not peer-referenced in respect to the surrounding culture. Failure to meet this standard can be seen in the chaos typical of the two conclusions to the book of Judges (Judg 17:6; 21:25) when “everyone did what was right in their own eyes.”

In fact, as Schneider notes, “Not only were the Israelites doing what was wrong, but they came to the point where they felt that they, not their deity, judged good from bad.” The use of the article on הָרְשָׁע indicates that the reference to “evil” here is not a generic reference to morally evil actions such as theft or even murder, but to the specific and ultimate evil of apostasy and covenant violation. This is reinforced not only by the immediately following clause “and served the Baals” (v. 11), but also by the lexical choices of the narrator (they “forsook” YHWH (עָנָב, vv. 12, 13); followed “other gods” (אֱלֹהִים, v. 12); “provoked [YHWH] to anger” (כִּ֖שֵׁם, v. 12)

33 See Younger, Judges and Ruth, 124.
34 Schneider, Judges, 31.
35 See Younger, Judges and Ruth, 88; Schneider, Judges, 46; Boda, A Severe Mercy, 138–39; Boda, “Judges,” 1099.
and also by the selected ideational content (following the gods of the surrounding nations; bowing down to them; serving Baal and Ashtaroth) in vv. 12–13. In vv. 14–15, both the affective and volitional responses of YHWH to Israel’s actions reinforce this evaluation of −propriety: his anger burns against the Israelites (חַשְׁם: −happiness: antipathy), and he not only “gives” and “sells” them into the hands of “plunderers” and “enemies,” but also “is against them for harm” as a consequence of their behavior (−satisfaction: displeasure). Through the narrator’s recounting of the fact that the Israelites had been given due warning prior to the dispensing of punishment (v. 15, “as YHWH had spoken/promised and as YHWH had sworn to them”), the implied author stresses not only the +veracity of YHWH, but also his justice and covenant faithfulness (+propriety) in contrast to the Israelites.

This intense saturating prosody of −propriety on the part of the Israelites, and the emphasis on the justice (+propriety) of YHWH in upholding the covenant and disciplining them for their failure, establishes a tone which makes v. 16 an unexpected surprise to the reader: “Then YHWH raised up judges who delivered them.” There is no explicit mention of repentance here or in v. 18, or of “crying out” (נָשָׁה) on the part of the

---

36 No theological assumption is made here as to whether the possibility of YHWH is actual or an anthropomorphism. This has no effect on the evaluative process.
37 McCann (Judges, 35–37) rightly points out that a simplistic concept of retribution is not at work here, or for that matter, within the entire Deuteronomistic History. Grace must be factored into the equation. McCann also suggests the possibility that “what appears to be divine punishment in an active sense is actually the people’s experience of the destructive effects of their own selfish choices” (p. 36). See also Polzin, Moses and the Deuteronomist, 152: “The Mosaic covenant is not a mechanistic predictor of success or failure whereby an adherent’s obedience unequivocally brings blessing, and disobedience or inimical opposition necessitates failure.” There is little evidence in the book of Judges that repentance plays a major role in Yhwh’s deliverance, except perhaps in the case of Jephthah. First Samuel 12:9–11 suggests, however, that the cries of Israel may have been more than just a response to suffering, although this is not explicitly articulated in Judges. Polzin suggests that what is at play here is more a pattern of punishment/mercy than one of disobedience/repentance (p. 155). Greenspahn (‘The Theology of the Framework of Judges,’ 386) also denies a Deuteronomistic theology of simple retribution, and sees rather a scheme of “punishment-and-grace.”
Israelites as there is in the judge cycles; thus, the emphasis is on YHWH’s compassion and mercy. Yet, as we have noted above, +propriety can be demonstrated by YHWH in terms of compassion as well as justice, as is well documented throughout the OT. This verse also indicates YHWH’s affectual response to the trigger of Israel’s suffering: +happiness: affection. Immediately, however, v. 17 reverts to focus once more on the –propriety of Israel, which reasserts itself in spite of God’s mercy. The introductory particle בָּשָׁם (“yet”), which BDB notes can imply contradiction or adversative force, introduces the negative prosody. The choice of lexis for verbs, “did not listen” (יָשָׁם לָא), “played the harlot” (נַחֲלָה) and “turned aside” (לָשֵׁב), clearly indicates the Israelites’ disobedience (–propriety) and unfaithfulness (–tenacity), and the force of the evaluation is raised by the adverbial “quickly” (גָּם הָרֹא) and the subsequent contrast with the obedience of the previous generation.

Nevertheless, the text proceeds in v. 18 to point out a second time, and more emphatically by means of a saturating prosody, the compassion of YHWH (+propriety) and his love for his people (+happiness: affection). This evaluation is invoked by the raising up of Judges and God’s presence with them, as well as the reference to deliverance that the implied author predicates of YHWH on behalf of Israel (C:Ed). It is also explicitly inscribed in the text when the narrator recounts the affective consequences of Israel’s suffering (–happiness: misery): YHWH was “moved to pity/compassion” (כִּבּוּ). No sooner has this been established, however, than again the implied author

---

38 See Boda, “Judges,” 1094.
39 There is surely more in play here than the simple additive force that Muraoka outlines (Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures*, 143–46). BDB, 169: “5. connecting two ideas which express (or imply) a contradiction, בָּשָׁם acquires sometimes an adversative force (cf. נַחֲלָה לָא end), yet, but, though.” See also HALOT, 1:195: a “particle of association and emphasis.”
subjects the Israelites to a significant negative appraisal through the narrator (−propriety). Once again their “turning back” (חזרה), their “following other gods,” their “serving them” and “bowing down to them” are itemized in a discourse prosody, only this time the comparative structure using (השחיתו והמאכלה) emphasizes that their corruption is even more extreme than that of their ancestors. It is ironic that the faithlessness of Israel to YHWH and his covenant is stressed in vv. 12 and 13 in that they “forsook/abandoned” (עדד) him (−tenacity: faithfulness), in v. 17 in that they “turned aside quickly” (−tenacity: faithfulness), and in v. 19 in that they “turned back” (−tenacity: faithfulness), and yet their refusal to “give up” (הפך) their unethical practices demonstrates determination (+tenacity: stubbornness) later in v. 19. Of course, the context, the cultural context, and the context of situation always act to determine whether the evaluation is ultimately appropriate, and in the context it is clear that +tenacity in this form is an undesirable attribute for the Israelites as their previous −tenacity. The intensity of the negative appraisal is increased in vv. 19–20 when the implied author changes the method of appraisal from the narrator simply describing the situation (−propriety), to the narrator relaying the emotions of YHWH about the impropriety second hand (his “anger burned against Israel,” רעיה לא על ישראל: −happiness: antipathy; −satisfaction: displeasure), to the evaluation of the Israelites by YHWH himself in direct speech (−propriety). Here the appraisal is directly inscribed and completely unambiguous: “This nation has transgressed my covenant … and has not listened to/obeyed my voice.”

Thus, the prosody in vv. 19–20 steadily builds to a climax of −propriety in respect of the

---

41 Webb (Judges: Integrated, 121) remarks that In the first introduction the characters are portrayed externally in behavior and speech but in the second introduction YHWH’s state of mind is described directly (anger, but also pity), showing his personal attachment to Israel and his reluctance to judge them.
Israelites, resulting in YHWH’s determination to no longer drive out the nations before them. YHWH’s goal is that his irreral appraisal of Israel, “whether they will keep the way of YHWH (∞ + tenacity) and walk in it” (∞ + propriety), would become real. A rephrasing of this ideal (“to see whether they would obey YHWH’s commands”) in 3:4 concludes a survey of the nations involved in this test, forming an inclusio with 2:22. By using the phrases “the way of YHWH” and “YHWH’s commands” in these two verses the implied author reemphasizes that the norm for ethical behavior is set by YHWH (C: Ed), not the Israelites, and not the surrounding people. Nevertheless, in the very next verses the implied author begins to give the results of the testing: syncretism with the nations of the land. The ideational content in vv. 5–6 clearly invokes a –propriety judgment in terms of Deuteronomistic ideology as well as the first verses of Judges. The Israelites “lived/dwelled among” (הָבָה) the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites although they had been specifically instructed to dispossess the same litany of nations and “utterly destroy them” or “certainly devote them to the ban” (Deut 7:1–4). As Webb aptly notes, “The nations which were originally left (at the time Joshua died) to test Israel’s faithfulness will now be left permanently as a punishment for their unfaithfulness.” They intermarried with the pagan inhabitants, although they had repeatedly warned not to do so (Ex 34:16; Deut 7:4; Josh 23:12–13), and they served their gods, the ultimate evil of apostasy. This brought YHWH’s

---

42 For some reason the Girgashites are not mentioned in Judges along with the other six nations.
43 Webb, Judges, 33.
44 Note that Othniel, the ideal judge, married Achsah, an Israelite, not an outsider. See Schneider, Judges, 39.
Thus, after the introductory passage giving a positive evaluation of the generation of Joshua and the elders, the implied author uses the second introduction to present a repeated evaluative pattern of negative assessments of the Israelites, condemning their apostasy (−propriety), interspersed with positive assessments of YHWH, stressing his compassion (+propriety). It is doubtful that the repetition of sin and mercy in 2:6–20 represents a specific chronological sequence of historical events; rather it indicates the general pattern or paradigm that the history of Israel will follow over the subsequent cycles. Indeed, כֵּלְלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל in v. 15 (woodenly translated “in all which they went”) is usually translated with the indefinite “wherever” or “whenever,”45 and יִרְבָּךְ יהוה in v. 18 with the indefinite temporal use of נָּכָּה is normally translated “whenever.”46 Of course, other evaluative statements are made in this passage, particularly regarding tenacity, but the dominant pattern seems to be the fluctuation between the opposite poles of propriety, as illustrated in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse Range</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
<th>Mercy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:6–9</td>
<td>Generation of Joshua and the elders</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td>righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10–15</td>
<td>Another generation of Israelites</td>
<td>−propriety</td>
<td>sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:16</td>
<td>YHWH raises up judges</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td>mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:17</td>
<td>Israelites turn aside</td>
<td>−propriety</td>
<td>sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:18</td>
<td>YHWH raises up judges</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td>mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:19–21</td>
<td>Israelites turn back</td>
<td>−propriety</td>
<td>sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:22–3:4</td>
<td>Testing the Israelites</td>
<td>evaluative test established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:5–6</td>
<td>Results of the test</td>
<td>−propriety</td>
<td>sin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45 NRSV, NASB, TNIV, etc.; see BDB, 82, 481.
46 See HALOT, 471.
This oscillation between sin and mercy in the second introduction sets the pattern for the rest of the cycles in the body of the book of Judges.

3.4.2 Othniel, the Paradigmatic Judge: Judg 3:7–11

The narratives of all the major judges begin with the phrase “The Israelites did the evil thing in the eyes of YHWH” or alternately “The Israelites again did/continued to do the evil thing in the eyes of YHWH,” as does the account of Othniel in Judg 3:7; however, yet another negative prosody, assessing the Israelites in terms of their ethical propriety and finding them wanting, actually begins earlier in 3:5 and continues to 3:8. This has the effect of blurring the start of the Othniel account and suggests that this judge, rather than being one of the major judges, is actually a part of the introductory paradigm. In O’Connell’s view he is “the embodiment of the institution of judge/deliverer.” The brief and almost stereotypical nature of his story—as Auld aptly states, it “tells us everything and tells us nothing”—also supports this view, as we shall see below.

47 Judges 3:7; 3:12; 4:1; 6:1; 10:6; 13:1. Greenspahn (“The Theology of the Framework of Judges,” 394–95) argues that the phrase means “continued to do” since evidence of repentance is lacking. This argument is inconclusive since the prefix conjugation could indicate either a continuous or iterative action. He also denies that אָרְנָה (“the evil”) refers to apostasy and idolatry, contrary to the stance taken in this study.

48 See Exum, “The Centre Cannot Hold,” 414. It is interesting that Othniel is apparently not a native Israeliite (see for example Younger [Judges and Ruth, 66 n. 17, 69], who argues that Caleb, Othniel, and Achsah are proselytes from a different ethnic group). There may be a subtle hint here that positive evaluation has more to do with membership in and loyalty to the covenant than with ethnic identity or membership.

49 O’Connell, Rhetoric of Judges, 84.

50 Auld, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, 147.

51 Klein (Irony in Judges, 14) remarks that the Othniel narrative provides a basis for analogy in the succeeding narratives: “In the exposition, the cyclical pattern of the main (major) narratives is both described (2:16–19) and dramatized (3:7–11).” She notes further on p. 16: “Recognition of the expository structure automatically removes the story of Othniel from the central text, and the central section of the book is shown to be concerned only with judges who are not obedient to the covenant and Yahweh.”
Many of the accusations against the Israelites in vv. 6–11 echo earlier passages that present the generic pattern of Israelite failure: “they served their gods” (propriety; 3:6; see 2:12, 17, 19), “they did the evil thing in the eyes of YHWH” (propriety; 3:7; see 2:11), “they forgot YHWH” (propriety; 3:7; see the similar 2:12, 13: “they forsook YHWH”), “they served the Baals and the Asherahs” (propriety; 3:7; see 2:11, 13). The anger of YHWH is kindled (happiness: antipathy; 3:8, see 2:14, 20) and he sells them into the hands of the enemy (justice; 3:8; see 2:14) in both sections. These cohesive ties again tend to link the account of Othniel with the basic paradigm. The Othniel account is the first to use the phrase “the Israelites cried to YHWH” extending the summary of cyclical elements in ch. 2, although the content of this cry is not specified.52

The implied author presents this brief, stark, and stereotypical pericope to better serve as a foil for the increasingly complex and flawed judges that follow. The account of this judge, including YHWH’s anger, the raising up of Othniel, and the Spirit coming on him, are succinct and offer no details. The mention of his victory over Cushan-Rishathaim and his conflict with the Arameans is terse to the point of abruptness: he “saved them” (וַיָּכֹּ֣בְּם֙ לְמַלְאָ֔כָיו) because “he went to war” (וַיָּשֶֽׁׁב לְמַלְאָ֖ךְ) and “his hand was strong over” (וַיִּשְׁחְדַּ֧ךְ בָּם֙) them. His prior military prowess is not explicitly mentioned; thus, in terms of this pericope, YHWH implicitly receives all the glory for the victory.53 The contrast to the detailed commissioning and the richly described battle accounts of Barak,

52 Whether this cry implies repentance is disputed. According to Boda (“Judges,” 1100), “It is clear that the cry involved admission of culpability, a recognition of deserved punishment, a request for help, and a penitential response.” This may be inferred from the broader context of the OT, including the story of Jephthah and the summary of the judges in 1 Sam 12:8–11, but is not inscribed in the text here. This issue will be discussed further in the chapter on Jephthah.
53 See Schneider, Judges, 42.
Gideon, Jephthah, or Samson are striking; three stark verses suffice to appraise Othniel as +capacity and +normality. There are no negative evaluations here, and no ambiguity or tension in his character. This does not imply that Othniel is a pure fabrication who merely serves the function of the paradigm, since he is also positively portrayed elsewhere, but it does suggest that the implied author is portraying the ideal judge through the narrator (Othniel himself never speaks): he is associated with the tribe of Judah, the Spirit of YHWH comes on him (+normality), he is a strong military leader who saves the people (+capacity), and the land has peace throughout his lifetime—all this without committing apostasy or transgressing morally (by implication, +propriety).

3.5 Conclusion

The second introduction serves to set the theme and pattern for the five major judge cycles in Judges. By evaluating the previous generation as +propriety (obedience to YHWH) and +tenacity (faithfulness to YHWH’s covenant), the implied author sets the standard by which the later generations will be contrasted. Three clear prosodies of –propriety emphasize the sinfulness of the later generations of Israelites, alternating with temporary periods of peace when the judges worked to keep sin under control. It is notable, however, that there are no instances of +propriety attributed to these Israelites; their “rest” seems to consist of the passive absence of overt sin rather than the active


55 McCann (*Judges*, 43) points out that only here in Judges does the Spirit’s presence result in the immediate accomplishment of God’s will.

56 Schneider (*Judges*, 35) distinguishes between an ideal judge and a model judge. She argues that Othniel is not ideal since the earlier anecdote narrating his interaction with Achsah “casts a slight blemish on him” (see also pp. 12–17). He is however a model judge, a standard against which other judges will be measured.
presence of righteousness. Overall, sin dominates. YHWH, however, is evaluated a number of times as +propriety. It is interesting that this ethical propriety is exhibited in two different but related ways: justice (punishing sinners in 2:15; 3:8, 9 and rewarding obedience in Judg 2:7, 10) and mercy (compassion for suffering sinners; 2:16, 18). In 2:22–3:4 YHWH explicitly states that he will continue to test the Israelites in order to evaluate their obedience and faithfulness, but their syncretistic lifestyle—living among the Canaanites, intermarrying with them, and serving their gods—bodes ill for their future (3:5–6).

Through the Othniel pericope (3:7–11), the implied author summarizes concisely the cycle of sin and deliverance that he/she has presented in ch. 2: the people commit apostasy (−propriety), YHWH becomes angry (−happiness: antipathy), they are sold into the hands of the enemy (+propriety [justice]), they cry out in their suffering (−happiness: misery), a deliverer is raised up (+happiness: affection), the people are saved, and peace is established (+security: trust)—at least for a time. Just as the previous generation set the standard for evaluating the behavior of the subsequent generations (obedience and faithfulness), so Othniel, the ideal judge, sets the standard for evaluating the subsequent

57 Both O’Connell, *Rhetoric of Judges*, 40–41; Butler (*Judges*, 48) notes that “crying to YHWH” does not appear in the paradigm, which notes YHWH’s compassion in response to their groaning, and conclude that the cries in later cycles were actually motivated by suffering, not repentance. Butler relates this groaning to that of the Israelites during the Exodus. (See also McCann [*Judges*, 46] who sees each judge cycle as a new exodus.) Whether the Israelites were truly repentant, and whether repentance was necessary for YHWH’s intervention is a contentious issue, which will be discussed further in regard to Jephthah.

58 Scholars break down this cycle in various ways. For example, O’Connell (*Rhetoric of Judges*, 2–3, 21–25) speaks of a 12 part cyclic religious-historical schema/paradigm (2:11–15, 16–19) with up to twenty cycle motifs, consisting of two sections: an alienation phase (expressed in covenant language) and a restoration phase (expressed in terms of YHWH’s grace). Webb (*Judges: Integrated*, 175) outlines six elements of the paradigm or framework: Israel does what is evil in Yahweh’s sight; Yahweh gives/sells them in to the hand of oppressors; Israel cries to Yahweh; he raises up a deliverer; the oppressor is subdued; the land has rest.
judges (controlled and empowered by God's spirit and free from explicit sin). The second introduction provides the benchmark to which all the later judges and generations will be compared and found wanting.\(^5^9\) The positive nature of the evaluation of Othniel in the first introduction will carry over into the positive appraisal of Ehud that immediately follows.

4 The Ehud Narrative (Judges 3:12-30)

4.1 Introductory Remarks

Although the Ehud narrative begins with the expected phrase “Now the Israelites again did the evil thing in the eyes of the Lord” and presents some straightforward evaluations of the Israelites as sinful and weak (−propriety), it gives a much more detailed and nuanced portrayal of both leaders, Ehud and Eglon, before concluding with a positive appraisal of the Israelite army as a whole in a prosody of +capacity evaluations. By positioning the complex Ehud after the transparently ideal judge Othniel of the introduction, the implied author establishes both continuity and contrast between the two Israelite leaders. There is also a contrast between the Israelite Ehud and the Moabite Eglon in terms of their religious orthodoxy.

Scholarly views on Ehud are much more mixed than those on Othniel, or even the later judges. 1 Brettler states that Ehud acts “without committing any wrongdoing (from the Israelite perspective) in the political or religious sphere.”2 Waltke does not criticize Ehud for his treachery because “half-truths, lies, deception, and treachery are all part of holy war.”3 Younger, however, considers that “Ehud is clearly not of the moral character of Othniel” and Klein thinks that YHWH does not approve of Ehud’s valuing of ends over means.4 Others are more forthright in their negative evaluations of Ehud’s character:

1 Early in the history of interpretation, Josephus commented in his Antiquities 5.4: “Ehud also was on this account dignified with the government over all the multitude, and died after he had held the government eighty years. He was a man worthy of commendation, even besides what he deserved for the forementioned act of his” (Josephus and Whiston, The Works of Josephus, 5.4.3). For a summary of some more recent attitudes towards the propriety of Ehud’s actions see Wong, “Ehud and Joab: Separated at Birth?,” 406–7.
3 Waltke and Yu, An Old Testament Theology, 598; see also p. 515 n. 12.
4 Younger, Judges and Ruth, 122; Klein, Irony in Judges, 38. Note that Younger also says, “For Othniel, there is no need for deceptive stratagems, outside help, special vows, and so on. It is a simple, straightforward victory through the Spirit of Yahweh’s empowerment” (p. 105).
Polzin considers him to be “repugnant, deceitful, and cruel” and Webb calls him a “devious assassin.” Christianson is ambivalent towards Ehud, viewing him both positively as a “potent and unified heroic symbol,” and negatively as sneaky, deceitful, and violent. Commentators have tried to resolve the ethical dilemma of Ehud in three general ways: by justifying his actions as appropriate and necessary in the context, by attributing his inappropriate actions to a primitive early stage of the history of Israelite religion, and by condemning his actions as inappropriate but asserting that YHWH is able to use even an immoral person as an agent of his moral will. The actual text may yield a different view.

Although the above opinions may seem to result from contradictory or ambiguous evidence in the text, a close examination of its evaluative patterns and literary techniques shows that the implied author is not presenting a confusing portrait of Ehud and Eglon that cannot be interpreted with any certainty, but is deliberately undercutting the way these leaders would initially appear to the implied reader of that day and then carefully constructing a clear alternative view of their characters: Ehud is esteemed and Eglon is shamed. An initial characterization of Ehud that suggests that he is of dubious normality is ultimately subverted to reveal him as a chosen instrument of YHWH who is clever, capable, and acting appropriately. The first impression of Eglon as a powerful and respected ruler is undermined to reveal him as a weak and pathetic tool of YHWH.

6 Christianson, “A Fistful of Shekels,” 64, 73. Christianson’s definition of a hero is someone who is, among other things, “self-reliant” (p. 66) and “autonomous” (p. 68). His comparison of the Ehud narrative to American western movies and American ideas of heroism is unusual and obviously raises the question of whether his conclusions are applicable in an ancient Hebrew culture. He is interested in “what understandings are possible for modern readers” within the rhetorical limits of the narrative (p. 69).
7 See, for example, McKenzie, The World of the Judges, 14, 18–20.
4.2 Analysis of the Text

4.2.1 A Note on Satire

Analysis of evaluation in the Ehud narrative may be complicated by the possibility that the story is satirical. Holman and Harmon define satire as “A literary manner that blends a critical attitude with humor for the purpose of improving human institutions or humanity,” and trace it back to the literature of Greece and Rome. Abrams explains it as “the literary art of diminishing a subject by making it ridiculous and evoking toward it attitudes of amusement, contempt, indignation, or scorn. ... It uses laughter as a weapon.” Many scholars classify the Ehud narrative as political satire, although some demur. Sasson fears that by “treating Ehud as a satire rather than, say, a narrative with potential humorous touches, recent commentators have in effect created a new perception of the story, one that conflates ancient Israel’s reaction to it with that of their own,” but Brettler argues that satire was relevant to the ancient context. Nevertheless, scholars must acquire “ancient literary competence,” that is, “the implicit awareness of the conventions that make such understanding possible” when the biblical

11 Sasson, “Ethically Cultured Interpretations,” 591. Sasson makes an interesting comment relevant to evaluation: “If we yield to the temptation to force satire into a potentially unpalatable Ehud narrative through deliberate skewering of its language, contents, or design, it should not be too difficult to do the same for Jael’s murder of Sisera. We might then also find many other traditions that could benefit from ethical refinement” (p. 592).
12 Brettler, “Ehud Story as History and Literature,” 299–302. Brettler argues that even if there was no specific genre as “satire” in the ancient world “it would have been possible to write a particular form with certain characteristics even if there was no name for that form” (p. 301). He points out that “a group of texts may be isolated within the Biblical corpus that share the typical characteristics of satire. These might include Isaiah 14:4–23, a satirical lament for a ‘Babylonian’ ruler, most likely Sargon of Assur. It is thus appropriate to compared Judges 3:12–30 to other satirical works in order to understand the social setting of the Ehud story” (p. 301).
text that they are studying is ancient and from a radically different culture. The interpreter must consider both what the text actually says and how the implied author says it, since the he/she is using the text to communicate his/her ideology to the implied reader. Although Soggin states, "Diese grundsätzlich humoreske Einstellung sollte die Erörterung ethischer und theologischer Fragen und Probleme ... verbieten," satire is one effective method of achieving that very goal.

4.2.2 The Ehud Narrative

The implied author begins his narrative by once again viewing the Israelites' behavior from YHWH's perspective, calling on divine standards to endorse the narrator's evaluations (C:Ed). The standard opening in 3:12 gives a strong -propriety assessment of the Israelites who "did the evil thing," that is, committed apostasy by worshipping the Baals and forsaking YHWH. The force of the evaluation is raised significantly not only by the adverbial use of ("again"; or "continued to do"), but also by the emphatic repetition of the entire phrase in a causal clause at the end of the verse: "On account of the fact that they had done the evil thing in the eyes of YHWH." This clause also serves to assert the -satisfaction: displeasure of YHWH but also his +propriety (justice) in that his discipline, oppression by the Moabites, is legitimated by the Israelites' sinful behavior. A significant initial appraisal of Eglon, king of Moab, occurs in vv. 12–13: the implied author's lexical choices—he is "strengthened" (i'tn Hiphil) by YHWH, "smites"

---

14 Soggin, "Ehud und 'Eglon," 95: "This fundamentally humorous setting should prohibit discussion of ethical and theological questions and problems."
15 See Judg 2:11–12; 3:7.
16 Schneider (Judges, 45–46) argues that the phrase means "continued to do" and not "again did," since would be used for "again." This would imply that the former judge, in this case Othniel, had little or no impact on the people's adherence to the covenant even though they had been freed from oppression.
Israel, and “possesses” (רוֹם) the city—all indicate a +capacity assessment. The Moabite king is represented as a powerful foreign tyrant, someone to be reckoned with. It must be remembered, however, that he achieves this status only by the enabling of YHWH. The ideational content in v. 14—the eighteen year servitude of the Israelites under Eglon—reinforces this notion of the king’s power while at the same time illustrating the Israelites’ humiliation (−normality). The Israelites, in their misery, cry to YHWH (−happiness: misery) and he raises up a deliverer, Ehud, demonstrating his +propriety (compassion).

Ehud is positively assessed as a “deliverer” (נָשִּׁית) from the very beginning (+normality). By representing this choice as YHWH’s (C:Ed), the implied author presents Ehud as divinely endorsed, as ambiguous as Ehud may at times appear to be to modern readers in the ensuing scenes. The implied reader must bear this in mind when processing the numerous seemingly enigmatic messages about Ehud in the subsequent narrative. Actually, the first question about Ehud is raised by the absence of an expected element in the narrative. In the stories of Othniel, Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson, the Spirit of YHWH is specifically said to come on the judge, but not in the case of Ehud. True, the Spirit is not explicitly mentioned in the case of Barak, but Deborah, a prophetess, accompanies this judge into battle as God’s representative. No such divine presence and guidance is recorded for Ehud; although he was indeed “raised up” by YHWH (3:15), YHWH is noticeably silent during Ehud’s actual exploits, as many

17 Note that other forms of engagement do not become significant until the story of Deborah and Barak.
19 Boda, “Recycling Heaven’s Words,” 11–12.
20 Amit (The Art of Editing, 176) states that “God’s role throughout the events is already given explicit and specific expression in the expositional stage.”
commentators have noted. It is, however, and argument from silence—literally—to assume that YHWH disapproves of Ehud based on this fact.

The narrator also informs the implied reader, however, that Ehud is from the tribe of Benjamin. Whereas Benjaminites in the plural are usually identified in Hebrew as נְכֵן נְכֵרָהֹניִּים, the term נְכֵן נְכֵרָהֹניִּים with the article is only used in four places for a single Benjaminite, including in this verse. A number of commentators think that this phrasing is significant in and of itself, but based on the distribution of forms this is unlikely. There is no doubt, however, that irony is intended, whatever the exact morphology; as we shall see, the “son of the right hand” is in fact “restricted in the right hand,” or “left handed.” The intent is obviously humorous, but it may also suggest some doubt about the physical capabilities of Ehud, at least at this point in the narrative (−capacity). The fact that Ehud is a Benjaminite is also meaningful since there are numerous signals in Judges and elsewhere that members of this tribe are less than respected by the other tribes.

21 Those who see this silence as condemning Ehud include Block, Judges, Ruth, 171; Klein, Irony in Judges, 38–39. Younger (Judges and Ruth, 122–25) tries to evade the question, although earlier he states that Ehud’s actions constitute a “daring personal initiative” (p. 115, italics added), suggesting that Ehud acted independently of YHWH’s guidance and approval. Amit (The Art of Editing, 172–73, 196) admits that, superficially, the story leaves little room for divine involvement, but then argues that numerous coincidences indicate God’s involvement in Ehud’s tactics. She refers to this as “dual causality” (p. 178). Jobling (“Right-Brained Story of Left-Handed Man,” 127) however, rightly notes that “narrative [is known for] characteristically obscuring and problematizing cause and effect relationships.”

22 Judg 3:15; 2 Sam 16:11; 19:16 [H17]; 1 Kgs 2:8. Block cites 1 Chr 27:12 (Block, Judges, Ruth, 160 n. 53), but the form used there does not have the definite article, even if the kethiv/qere distinction is taken into consideration. Block states (p. 160) that the “anticipated” form is not בָּנִי יְרוֹמֵן, “son of the right hand” but בָּנִי יְרוֹמֵן, “son of my right hand,” but this form is used for a single Benjaminite in only three places, 1 Sam 9:12 and 21 and in the superscript of Ps 7 [H1]. In 1 Sam 9:1 נְכֵן נְכֵרָהֹניִּים is used and in 2 Sam 20:1 and Esth 2:5 נְכֵן נְכֵרָהֹניִּים. The term נְכֵן נְכֵרָהֹניִּים “sons of my right hand” is often used for groups of Benjaminites. It therefore seems rather risky to draw too many conclusions from the exact form of the gentilic.

23 Although the reason for his left-handedness is debated. See below.

24 In the physical sense, although this seems to be a −capacity evaluation at first, in the context of the story as a whole it proves to be an actual advantage in dealing with Eglon (+capacity).
of Israel.\textsuperscript{25} In Judg 1:8, the tribe of Judah captures Jerusalem,\textsuperscript{26} but in 1:21 Benjamin fails to completely drive out the Jebusites, one of the first disappointments in the long record of Israel's military failure that continues to the end of the chapter. In the second conclusion to the book (Judg 19–21), the Benjaminites become enmeshed in the corrupt affair of the Levite's concubine, and are nearly annihilated from Israel. Later, in 1 Samuel, Saul the Benjaminite becomes the first king of Israel, but also the first failure as a king of Israel, and the monarchy passes to the house of Judah on David's ascension to the throne.\textsuperscript{27} Although some of these references come chronologically later in the story of Israel, the compilers and redactors of the Deuteronomistic History as a whole, including the Deuteronomic implied author/redactor of Judges itself, nevertheless arranged their material to constitute a polemic against Benjamin.\textsuperscript{28} Thus, the implied author's omission of the Spirit's endorsement, as well as his stressing that Ehud is a Benjaminite, results in an evaluation of \textit{normality: status} at this point in the story.

\textsuperscript{25} Wong (\textit{Compositional Strategy}, 120–21) proposes that "the incongruity revealed by the wordplay may carry deeper symbolic significance in portraying Ehud as someone whose actions and choices are liable to fall short of the standard expected of him on the basis of who he is." On the other hand, Stone ("Judges," 246) suggests that the implied author's characterization of Ehud as a left-handed son of the right hand sets him apart from the otherwise negative portrayal of Benjaminites in Judges and constitutes a positive evaluation.

\textsuperscript{26} Josh 15:63 states that it was the Judahites who did not drive out the Jebusites from Jerusalem. Judg 1:8 states that Judah captured Jerusalem, struck it with the sword, and set the city on fire, but the Joshua reference may indicate that the destruction was not complete, especially since after the attack the Judahite army moved down to the hill country (v. 9). This may explain why the Benjaminites found it necessary to deal with the city once again in Judg 1:21. Perhaps Judah passed on the "clean-up operation" to Benjamin. In light of Josh 15:63 it would appear that Judah is partly culpable.

\textsuperscript{27} See 1 Sam 13, 15. In 1 Sam 9:1 מָרַדְקָאָבֵי נַעֲרָיִים is used for Saul, which may imply a negative evaluation in the use of the term, considering the pro-Davidic and anti-Saulide polemic that many scholars see in Judges. For more on this polemic see Sweeney, "Davidic Polemics in the Book of Judges"; Brettler, "The Book of Judges: Literature as Politics."

\textsuperscript{28} See Boda, "Judges," 1103; O'Connell, \textit{Rhetoric of Judges}, 284–85; Schneider, \textit{Judges}, 47–48. Schneider also takes the fact that Ehud is never actually called a judge as a negative point against him and the tribe of Benjamin (p. 52).
Related to his Benjaminite tribal membership (a “son of the right hand”) is the identification of Ehud as נער יד ימין, an obvious play on words, even though the meaning of the phrase נער יד ימין has been disputed in the literature. The word נער appears only twice in the OT, in Judg 3:15 and 20:16, and has been interpreted as meaning “shut up,” “bound,” or “hindered.” Thus the complete phrase has variously been interpreted by BDB as “a man bound, restricted, as to his right hand, i.e. left-handed,” by HALOT as “impeded on the right side = left-handed” and by DCH as “shut in respect of his right hand,” meaning “left handed” or perhaps “ambidextrous.”

The LXX has Ἄμφοτερος δεξιός which is glossed as “ambidextrous,” and the Syriac has “crippled.”

Smelik, in his translation of the Targum, renders the literal Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew phrase found there as “with an emaciated right hand,” commenting, “The context requires the element of surprise which is unlikely in the case of an able bodied warrior.”

Thus, some scholars have interpreted the phrase as meaning “impeded or crippled in his right hand,” and others as simply meaning “left-handed.” Even so, being left-handed was often considered an abnormal and negative characteristic in the ANE. On the other hand, Halpern, on the basis of the only other occurrence of the phrase (Judg 20:16) in which a group of 700 picked troops is designated with the same term, as well as comparison with 1 Chr 12:2 in which he considers the more normal term for left-handedness (שמאל, from שנמל) is used, convincingly concludes that נער יד ימין does not indicate a disability or abnormality but refers to specially trained and valued warriors.

---

29 It is unclear why someone who is restricted in one hand should be considered ambidextrous, although Halpern’s argument (see below) offers one explanation.

30 Butler, Judges, 54.

31 Smelik, The Targum of Judges, 372. Younger (Judges and Ruth, 114) and Butler (Judges, 70) disagree, arguing that Ehud must appear normal to the guards. It is not clear why this must be so.

“schooled in the use of the left hand for war.” It is impossible for the contemporary interpreter to be certain how the original implied reader would have understood this phrase, at least at this point in the story. If Halpern is correct—and his argument is convincing—and Ehud uses his left arm because its skill had been specially developed, Ehud is construed as +capacity from the beginning. However, even if his right arm was disabled, his later strategy of tricking Eglon by means of a thrust with his left hand indicates that this actually constitutes a +capacity assessment in this situation. In either case, Ehud is more than he appears to be as far as Eglon is concerned.

So far we have seen that the implied author’s initial appraisal of Ehud was negative in regard to his normality, but positive in regard to his capacity. The greatest debate in the literature, however, concerns his propriety. Ehud carries out a number of actions which have been evaluated as devious to the point of ethical misconduct. He makes an unusual “two-mouthed” (רִפְעִי הָיְם) sword, which may symbolize duplicity or simply foreshadow several plays on words that the implied author utilizes, as we shall see, to subtly convey meaning. He then proceeds to hide it under his garment (3:16), obviously with the intent to deceive. “Stabbing a person in the back” is considered far more nefarious in modern western culture than a fair face-to-face fight, but was using what amounts to ambassadorial privilege to assassinate a king considered more

__________________________
33 Halpern, First Historians, 41. For an interesting critique of Halpern’s interpretation of the Ehud narrative see Sasson, “Ethically Cultured Interpretations.”
35 The only time this plural form appears in the OT. Ps 149:6 uses עִשֵּׂרֵים בְּלַיְלָה for two-edged sword. The advantage of a straight, two-edged sword over a curved, one-edged one, would be to facilitate a straight thrust in close quarters. See Block, Judges, Ruth, 163.
36 See Wong, Compositional Strategy, 121–22.
reprehensible in ancient Israel than killing in a fair face-to-face fight on the battlefield?

There are two situations in 2 Samuel which offer interesting comparisons to Ehud’s assassination of Eglon: Joab’s killing of both Abner and Amasa with a sword in the belly.\textsuperscript{37} As Wong notes, “All three essentially concern assassinations carried out through the use of deception.”\textsuperscript{38} Wong points out, however, that whereas the narrator is reticent concerning the propriety of Ehud’s action, there is ample literary evidence in the text to condemn Joab’s two assassinations as dishonorable.\textsuperscript{39} Since the 2 Samuel accounts allude to Judg 3, he concludes that Ehud’s deception must also have been evaluated negatively.\textsuperscript{40} There is, however, one significant difference in the Ehud account that Wong does not consider: Eglon was an oppressive foreign king, not a fellow Israelite. This changes the ethical implications of Ehud’s act. I will return to this issue below in order to justify my final decision regarding Ehud’s deception, but for now I will simply note that in terms of the ancient Israelite culture it must be deemed \textit{propriety}.

Ehud’s two encounters with the idols (ךֵּדֵי) at Gilgal that form an inclusio around his attack on Eglon are also ethically problematic to many interpreters.\textsuperscript{41} *HALOT*

\textsuperscript{37} Abner and Amasa are killed by Joab in 2 Sam 3:22–34; 20:8–10.

\textsuperscript{38} Wong, “Ehud and Joab: Separated at Birth?,” 399. Wong proceeds to point out several similarities with the Ehud narrative and argues that the 2 Samuel accounts depend on the Judges version. For example, Joab manages to lure his victims into a private encounter. He says he needs to speak to Abner privately, and kills Amasa with his left hand so that his intestines fall out. Similar vocabulary is also used.

\textsuperscript{39} See Wong, “Ehud and Joab: Separated at Birth?,” 407–10. For example, he points out that only one verse is used to describe the assassination whereas twelve describe David’s negative reaction to it, and that Joab is cursed by David, forced to mourn publicly, and is described as an evildoer. He points out that the author seems to share David’s view (p. 407).

\textsuperscript{40} Wong (“Ehud and Joab: Separated at Birth?,” 410) concludes: “If Joab’s two assassinations are indeed meant to be understood negatively, then by virtue of the fact that each makes allusions to Ehud, one can infer that there must have been aspects of Ehud’s assassination that were also viewed negatively by the author of the Joab accounts. And since the allusions seem to concentrate especially on the use of deception, one can only conclude that this use of deception by Ehud must have been what was viewed negatively by the author of the Joab accounts.”

\textsuperscript{41} Kotter suggests that the name “Gilgal” means “circle (of stones),” and that this may be the same place where Joshua set up a memorial of stones after crossing the Jordan into the Promised Land in Josh 4:20.
suggests that the Judg 3:19 and 26 instances indicate a place name although the word itself is glossed as “divine images,” the LXX has τῶν γλυπτῶν, “carved images,” the Vulgate has Idola, “idols,” but the Targum identifies them as “quarries” (נַחַלֵי). Some interpret the idols innocuously as boundary markers, others more definitively with the worship of foreign gods. If indeed the stones are merely boundary markers, then the double reference to them is likely a geographical clarification or an organizational strategy for the narrative. In fact, however, this interpretation is unlikely considering that every other use of the lemma ידִיל in the Hebrew Bible is clearly a reference to carved images with a cultic purpose, and this interpretation fits the Judges context. In light of this, the reluctance of many scholars to acknowledge that the idols are idols is somewhat curious. Even if it is acknowledged that they are idols, however, the situation is still unclear to many. The implied author may have been criticizing the Israelites and their leader for tolerating foreign idols in the land that YHWH gave them, or implying even greater condemnation on them for setting up their own images of false gods.

O’Connell, for example, states, “The predominant deuteronomical concern, that of cultic disloyalty, remains implicit in Ehud’s failure to remove from the land the twice mentioned idols that frame the portrayal of Eglon’s assassination (3:19a and 3:26b).”

The site became an important cultic centre and, still later in the writings of Hosea and Amos, a symbol of apostasy (Kotter, Wade R. “Gilgal,” ABD 2:1022–23).

For example, NASB translates the two instances in Judges as “idols” and the other 21 occurrences as “idols” or “graven/carved images”; NRSV translates the two in Judges as “sculptured stones,” whereas all other occurrences are “idols,” “images” or “carved/cast images”; and the ESV uses “idols” in Judges and “images,” “carved images” or “idols” elsewhere.

See Lenzi, Secrecy and the Gods, 225 n. 25; Butler, Judges, 71; Block, Judges, Ruth, 163–64; Younger, Judges and Ruth, 116–17; Webb, Judges: Integrated, 131. 246 n. 29; Polzin, Moses and the Deuteronomist, 160; Brettler, Creation of History, 191 n. 10.

Deut 7:5, 25; 12:3; 2 Kgs 17:41; Isa 10:10; 21:9; 30:22; 42:8; Jer 8:19; 50:38; 51:47, 52; Hos 11:2. For some reason, Sasson’s detailed footnote on these explicates the word נַחַל (“standing stone”), which does not appear in these texts (Sasson, “Ethically Cultured Interpretations,” 566–67 n. 15).

O’Connell, Rhetoric of Judges, 84.
fact, he blames Ehud’s failure for the apostasy that followed his judgeship and resulted in oppression by King Jabin of Hazor (4:1–2). This may explain the unusual placement of the death notice of Ehud which comes after the brief account of Shamgar and at the end of the introduction to the Deborah/Barak cycle which notes that the Israelites again did evil. If so, the context does not exclude the possibility that Ehud himself may be consulting the idols for divinatory purposes. If O’Connell is correct, this would yield a propriety evaluation for Ehud. On the other hand, the visits to the idols might merely have been part of a ruse used in order to convince Eglon that he did indeed have a message “from the gods/God.” As Boda points out, “The appearance of a message or messenger from the deity is a regular feature of the major judge accounts from this point on.” I will discuss this possibility below.

As noted above, the evidence is indeed strongest that the stones are idolatrous images; however, this need not reflect negatively on Ehud; another interpretation is quite possible. Verse 19 states that Ehud “turned back from the idols” (רָוחָן נַעַר מֹרְאֵה פַּסְפֵּסים). The Hebrew root ñv is typical Deuteronomistic terminology used for repentance and turning away from evil and toward YHWH; thus, as well as or instead of a possible role in geographical clarification, the implied author may be suggesting that Ehud rejected the apostasy of Israel and the idolatry of Moab. According to Polzin, his “decisive actions for Israel begin with a characteristic ‘turning away from the idols (šûb min happ’šîlim),’” as one “turns away from the evil way (šûb midderek harā‘āh)” (1 Kgs 13:33; 2 Kgs

---

46 Boda, “Judges,” 1105; see also Boda, “Recycling Heaven’s Words,” 43–68.
47 In phrases such as “to return to YHWH with all the heart” and “turn from the evil way.” See Weinfeld, Deuteronomist School, 335 and 351.
48 Perhaps a deliberate double entendre. The Ehud narrative has many of these.
17:13) and ‘returns to Yahweh’ (Deut 30:10).”

Verse 26, typically translated “he passed by the idols” (יַעַרְבְּרָבָּר אֲחַרְבָּרֶם), could merely describe his return route, but in conjunction with v. 19 could also metaphorically portray his rejection of idols since he passes by them without giving them any obeisance or recognition. Polzin goes so far as to suggest the possible translation, “he transgressed or broke the idols,” implying a “narrative recuperation and restoration from the apostasy of Israel.”

He sees clear Deuteronomistic overtones in the language; however, I am not claiming that לֶבֶר in v. 26 is typical use of Deuteronomistic vocabulary, only that the language is metaphorical. Interestingly, in both phrases the pleonastic pronoun (יָאָה) is expressed, something that is not required by the grammar, suggesting that the appropriate understanding might be an emphatic “he himself,” effectively contrasting Ehud’s own appropriate behavior in rejecting idols with the majority of Israelites who were doing the evil thing, apostasy, in the eyes of YHWH (3:12). The fronted and expressed pronoun in (יַעַרְבְּרָבָּר מָרְבָּרֶם) (v. 19) does not function here to break the sequence of וַיָּיְגֵרְו for a change of scene or an off-line comment. According to van der Merwe, however, the expressed pronoun can be used for “reactivating characters (or entities) that are compared or contrasted.” It can also be used for “confirming the personal or exclusive role of a

49 Polzin, Moses and the Deuteronomist, 160.
50 Polzin, Moses and the Deuteronomist, 160. Polzin, however, suggests that Ehud may actually perform these positive symbolic actions unknowingly. See also Boda, “Judges,” 1107 n. 19; Stone, “Judges,” 240-41. 246.
51 Weinfeld (Deuteronomist School, 340) only notes that the term לֶבֶר is Deuteronomistic in the sense of transgressing the covenant of YHWH.
52 Muraoka, Emphatic Words and Structures, 48: “The personal pronouns with verbum finitum serves to express an intense concern with, special interest in, or concentrated, focused consciousness of, the object referred to by the pronoun on the part of the speaker or writer. And moreover, sometimes the speaker or writer wants a listener or reader to share his concern, interest, or consciousness, which derives from the very nature of linguistic activity.” See also Stone, “Judges,” 240-41.
53 Merwe, Naudé, and Kroez, Hebrew Reference Grammar, §47.2.2. e, italics original. See also Joüon and Muraoka, Biblical Hebrew, 146a.1: “The pronoun is added to bring out antithetical contrast; one member of
specific discourse active entity in an event." Therefore, the pronoun may stress the distinctiveness of Ehud in his rejection of the idols, contrasting him with the general apostasy in Israel. In v. 26 it is clear that the fronted proper noun subject "Ehud" serves to break the sequence of wayyiqtols for a change of scene, but less clear that the expressed immediately following is merely there as "a necessary formal prop for an inserted circumstantial clause." Muraoka uses Driver to support his argument, who states: "Judg. iii. 26 and Ehud escaped he having passed over etc. (not the mere addition of a fresh act like מָצַר, but the justification of the preceding בָּגָל)." It is more logical in the light of the previous use of the pleonastic pronoun in v. 19, which also concerns the idols, that the use is emphatic: "Now Ehud escaped while they were delaying, and he himself passed by the idols." The verbs "escaped" and "passed by" follow each other logically, so the pronoun is used emphatically, not in order to break the verbal sequence. This would result in a positive evaluation of Ehud.

In sum, the term קָפֵר consistently refers to idols used for cultic purposes; there is no evidence that Ehud allowed, set up, or condoned the idols, the lexis (שֶָבֶר, נָצֵר) and context imply that he repudiated idolatry, and the pleonastic pronoun emphasizes Ehud’s distinctive role in dealing with the idols that contrasts with the apostasy of Israel. As we shall see below, Ehud’s attitude to the idols also contrasts with the eagerness of Eglon to engage with them. When all the evidence is considered, it seems most likely that the

---

54 Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze, Hebrew Reference Grammar, §47.2.2. b, italics original.
55 Muraoka, Emphatic Words and Structures, 31.
56 Muraoka, Emphatic Words and Structures, 31 n. 73.
57 Driver, The Tenses in Hebrew, 205.
implied author is suggesting that Ehud is acting with propriety in the two idol incidents that frame the assassination of Eglon. The reason for this subtle inference instead of a forthright statement regarding Ehud’s orthodoxy—aside from the usual reticence of the narrator—is a literary one: the visits to the idols at Gilgal have even further significance for the narrative, and serve as the basis for the double-entendres and intrigue which will result in the defeat of Eglon.

Immediately after returning to Eglon from the idols, Ehud announces in v. 19, “I have a secret for you, O king” (דָּבָר יִהְיוּךְ לָךְ אָלַלְךָ לְמָךְ). As numerous commentators have pointed out, the Hebrew can have several meanings: 1. word, 2. matter or affair, 3. thing or something. It is quite possible that Eglon thought that Ehud intended to pass on a “secret word/message,” especially if Ehud had mentioned to the court that he had come back from the idols at Gilgal. As Lenzi explains, it was commonplace in the ANE to believe that secret messages from the gods could be received. Although Lenzi believes that the Hebrew is simply a toponym, he acknowledges the possibility that it might also be a shrine. The divine council and the secret royal council were believed to be in contact through divination, and a diviner would give the king situationally specific guidance that would assist him in his plans and strategies, thus “the diviner [was] indispensable as the one who made the divine communication possible.” This explains why Eglon was so interested in hearing what Ehud had to say, and the secret nature of

---

58 See also Webb, Judges, 172–73.
59 For example, Block, Judges, Ruth, 165.
60 See Neef, “Eglon als ‘Kälbermann’?,” 290. Kraeling (“Difficulties in the Story of Ehud,” 206) gives a reasonable explanation of how Ehud’s visit to Gilgal fits into the narrative structure of the story and why the assassination was not attempted in the first visit when Ehud presented tribute to Eglon.
61 Lenzi, Secrecy and the Gods, 225.
communication would explain his clearing the room of attendants, since the “information discussed and the orders that issued forth from the council were held in the strictest confidence.” Lenzi rightly argues that, even if literary devices such as double-entendre are used in the narrative, the terms רֶבֶן-סֵפֶר (“secret message”) and רֶבֶן-שֵׁת (“message from God/the gods”) must have had a surface meaning in the culture that would cause Eglon to believe that Ehud had a secret oracle from the divine realm for the king.

As the outcome of the encounter illustrates, however, Ehud intends to give Eglon a “secret thing,” his hidden two-mouthed sword. Ehud rephrases his announcement in v. 20: “I have a word/thing from God/the gods for you” (רֶבֶן-וְלָכָה יְהוָה לְךָ), making it even more ambiguous, since לָכָה can be understood as meaning “God,” that is YHWH, but also “gods,” that is the gods of Moab. One play on words might be considered accidental, but several in the space of a few verses make it much more likely that the implied author included them intentionally as a literary technique. Thus, Eglon may well have understood the message to be “I have a secret message from the gods for you” whereas Ehud probably intended the message to mean “I have a secret thing from God for you.” The duplicity of Ehud seems virtually certain. Webb goes so far as to call Ehud a “devious assassin,” Younger concludes, “Ehud is clearly not of the moral character of Othniel,” and Klein asserts, “Yahweh’s spirit is never involved in duplicity, even to the

---

63 Lenzi, Secrecy and the Gods, 62.
64 Lenzi, Secrecy and the Gods, 226–27.
65 See the comments on 3:16.
66 See Younger, Judges and Ruth, 117–18. Interestingly, Sasson (“Ethically Cultured Interpretations,” 574) suggests that Eglon himself was aware that YHWH had strengthened him and assumed that the message was from YHWH: “Eglon, we shall soon learn, is eager to listen to the God of Israel who had commissioned him.”
68 Younger, Judges and Ruth, 122.
advantage of Israel” and concludes that this is the reason that no mention is made in the narrative of the Spirit coming on Ehud. Ehud is thus condemned by the implied author for deceitfulness since he misleads Eglon in order to kill him ... or is he? According to Bartusch,

While lying and deception strike the modern interpreter as always morally objectionable, they are dishonorable actions in the (ancient) Mediterranean culture only among one’s kin group. It is acceptable, however, to lie for the purpose of deceiving an outsider who, it is held, has no right to the truth.

Similarly, Chalcraft argues that since Ehud was devious to a Moabite, not an Israelite, the action was heroic, and Lambert argues that in tribal societies “all actions are based on specific loyalties, the lines of which are structurally determined. One supports one’s fellow-clansman in a dispute, regardless of moral questions. The only consideration is, ‘he is my fellow clansman.’” Deist also argues that “cheating and deceiving an opponent was not viewed as a crime or a sin. On the contrary, a person who could achieve that was looked upon as a wise person.” Butler concludes, “One must doubt that any early reader of the narrative would have heard any condemnation of Ehud’s action.” In the context of the ANE and the Ehud narrative itself, the implied author is in fact carefully undermining any initial assumptions that Ehud is a dubious Benjaminite

---

70 Bartusch, *Understanding Dan*, 147.
71 Chalcraft, “Deviance and Legitimate Action,” 183–85, here 184: “Ehud’s potential deviance is legitimate for the narrator because of its context. Ehud moves over to the out-group, behaves deviantly and in the process qualifies for heroic status within the in-group.” In a roughly similar situation, Joab’s killing of Amasa with a sword in his left hand (2 Sam 20:8–12) is unacceptable because both men are Israelites. See Sasson (“Ethically Cultured Interpretations,” 580–81) for a comparison of these two passages.
73 Deist, “Murder in the Toilet,” 269.
74 Butler, *Judges*, 73.
who acts without the guidance of the Spirit and building up a *propriety* characterization of Ehud.

Not only does the implied author undermine early misconceptions that the implied reader might have about the character of Ehud, he/she also undercuts the initial depiction of Eglon as a powerful ruler—only much more ruthlessly—by means of satire as well as *double-entendres*.75 There are indications that the king of Moab would not have been dismissed immediately by the original implied audience as simply a buffoon; the implied author portrays his borrowed power and status and then carefully and deliberately destroys his dignity and character, most likely entertaining his audience immensely in the process.76 In 3:12-13 the narrative begins with several clear indications of *capacity* in regard to the king of Moab; in fact, YHWH himself “strengthened” Eglon (יהוה חזק אוגר) against Israel. His prowess is also indicated by the verbs predicated of him and his army—he “smote” Israel and his troops “possessed” the city—and also by the ideational content that Israel served him for eighteen years (all *capacity*).

In the next reference to Eglon in v. 17 he is described as “a very כריב man.”77 In an ancient society where deprivation and famine were not uncommon, the term כריב could have very positive connotations.78 Although the older BDB offers only “fat” as a

---

75 Contra Webb (Judges, 165), who states, “But from the moment the one-to-one relationship between Ehud and Eglon (protagonist versus antagonist) is established, Eglon begins to look very foolish indeed.”

76 Contra Block, Judges, Ruth, 158.

77 McKenzie (The World of the Judges, 123) claims that “the narrator takes morbid joy in noting that Eglon was excessively fat.” It is unclear how he deduces “morbid joy” from this statement in which the narrator is typically taciturn.

78 See Butler, Judges, 54, 70; Sasson (“Ethically Cultured Interpretations,” 575), who suggests that this is why Eglon can manage without guards; and Neef (“Eglon als ‘Kälbermann’?,” 288), who states “Die Charakterisierung Eglons als ‘beleibt’ soll ihn weder der Lächerlichkeit preisgeben noch seine Unbeweglichkeit noch seinen gutmütigen Charakter beschreiben [The characterization of Eglon as “obese” should not disclose him to ridicule nor describe his immobility nor his good character].” See also Stone, “Judges,” 245.
translation, HALOT and DBL also gloss the word as “healthy,”79 and the recent DCH as “fat, fleshy, i.e. nourished, healthy.” LXX uses the term ἀστεῖος, meaning “handsome, charming, refined.”80 Calling Eglon “fat” in the sense of “healthy” or “robust” would have been complementary (+capacity), and the modifier ἀλλὰ (“very/exceedingly”) would raise the force of the evaluation. It may sound derogatory to modern western ears to label someone ἄρτη (“fat”), which often implies self-indulgence, stupidity, and laziness, and modern interpreters sometimes jump immediately to the conclusion that Eglon is being mocked. Younger comments that “Eglon has fattened himself on the tribute he has extorted from Israel” and Block is quick to deem Eglon “a comic buffoon” and comments on his “mental obtuseness.”81 Neef, however, justifies a re-evaluation of Eglon: “Dies ist deshalb notwendig, da Eglon in der wissenschaftlichen Literatur fast durchweg als Karikatur eines Königs beschrieben wird.”82 As Diest argues, “It is not for nothing that the Ehud narrative stresses the prior honourable status of Eglon and his soldiers by describing them as ‘fat’ people.”83 When one considers Lenzi’s discussion of the role of diviners in ANE society it is likely that Eglon acted reasonably in receiving what could have been an important oracle from an apparently harmless diviner. The implied author, however, is about to subtly and deliberately undermine the initial assessment of Eglon by means of double meanings, innuendo, and suggestion.

79 In fact, DBL comments: “note: in some cultures fat has a negative implication, so use other positive adjectives.”
80 Butler, Judges, 54; see also 70. See also RDAG, 145.
81 Younger, Judges and Ruth, 117–118; Block, Judges, Ruth, 158–59. See also McKenzie, The World of the Judges, 123.
82 Neef, “Eglon als ‘Kalbermann’?,” 284: “This is necessary because Eglon is described in the academic literature almost exclusively as a caricature of a king.”
83 Deist, “Murder in the Toilet,” 269, italics original.
The implied author unsheathes his literary sword and Eglon becomes the target of scathing satire and scatological humour. Commentators have often pointed out the cultic and sacrificial imagery used to depict Eglon, and the fact that the narrative is heavily satirical, so these literary aspects need not be reviewed in detail here. The implied author’s intent is to shame the enemy; as Deist points out, “Arguments were not conducted with the aim of rationally convincing the opponent, but with the express aim of publicly shaming him.” The term נורמ Dew could also have insultingly implied comparison of Eglon to a stall-fed fattened calf (normality). Interestingly, there are two other words for “fat” used in reference to Eglon and the Moabites. In v. 22 the slain king’s “fat” (תַּנָּחֵים) closed over Ehud’s blade, and in v. 29 his ten thousand soldiers are described as “all fat (תַּנָּחֵים) and all valiant men.” The first term, תַּנָּחֵים, is a cultic term normally used for the fat covering the entrails of a sacrificed animal, and has positive connotations in that it can represent the choicest or best parts of animals, produce, or the land, and because the term is also used for the human flesh of mighty warriors in 2 Sam

84 Contra Neef (“Eglon als ‘Kälbermann’?,” e.g. 291–92), who ultimately goes too far in his attempts to preserve the dignity of Eglon and ignores the implied author’s strategies that are designed to undermine his honor.
85 Younger, Judges and Ruth, 115–16; Boda, “Judges,” 1104, 1106; Brettler, The Book of Judges, 31. Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 57–58, argues that there is also pervasive sexual imagery that feminizes the enemy, Eglon.
86 See, for example, Webb, Judges: Integrated, 129–30; Block, Judges, Ruth, 156–57; Brettler, “Ehud Story as History and Literature,” 285–304. Compare Butler, Judges, 57: “Brettler uses the humorous, satirical genre elements to cast doubt on the story’s historicity. However, truth may often be funnier than fiction. Reality offers as much room for laughter as does farce.”
87 Deist, “Murder in the Toilet,” 269.
88 “Eglon” is often considered to be a diminutive form of חלב, “calf.” See Butler, Judges, 69; Block, Judges, Ruth, 158. Neef (“Eglon als ‘Kälbermann’?,” 288, 293) however, argues against this interpretation of the name. Brettler (“Ehud Story as History and Literature,” 299) on the other hand, also associates animal imagery with political satire.
89 HALOT, 315–16. See for example, Exod 29:13, 22; Lev 3:3, 4, 9, 10, 14, 15; 4:8, 9; 7:3, 4; 8:16, 25; etc. See also DCH, which notes that the word is used for the fat of Edomites slaughtered as a sacrifice in Isa 34: 6–7. See also Butler, Judges, 71.
1:22 and Job 15:27 (+normality or +capacity). The sacrificial imagery that results, however, ultimately depicts Eglon negatively as a fatted calf who is slaughtered (–normality and –capacity). The second, כבש, which describes the Moabite warriors, is used for fat, well-fed animals and is also used of productive land and rich pasture. In Ezek 34:16 it is used in conjunction with “the strong” (יואנה stopwatchorem) and in contrast to those who are scattered and broken (ה.Tables ... לולע... .). It can therefore imply “well-nourished” or “robust” (+normality, +capacity), and this is how it is usually translated. However, in the context of this almost farcical satire the narrator may well also be using double entendre to paint the extraordinary verbal picture of ten thousand ungainly, overweight men wobbling around the field of battle (–normality, –capacity). Significantly, however, whichever meanings apply to Eglon and the Moabites, both serve to demean them: if the terms refer to calves fattened for sacrifice or obese and ineffectual soldiers, they are shamed, but if the terms mean robust and healthy warriors, more credit redounds to the Israelites for defeating them.

In v. 27 Ehud calls out the Ephraimites and the section ends, beginning in v. 28, with a significant prosody of +capacity in regard to the Israelite army that he leads, beginning with Ehud’s confident assertion, “YHWH has given your enemies, Moab, into...
your hands.” One wonders how Ehud knows this, since there is no record of his being given a message from YHWH as in later accounts. This does not totally preclude the possibility that he received one, either directly or through a prophet, but it is more likely that the implied author is construing Ehud as +security: trust in his relationship with YHWH. It would seem that, for Ehud, God is capable, dependable, and gracious and his character can be relied on. YHWH’s enabling of the Israelites leads to the great victory.

The lexical choices of the implied author contribute to the portrayal of the power of the Israelite army: the Israelites “seize” (לך) the fords of the Jordan, they “do not allow” (לא נתן) anyone to cross the fords of the Jordan, they “strike down” (דב) Moab, and they “subdue” (כע) Moab on that day. The force of the evaluation is raised by several modifiers, normally scarce in Hebrew narrative: the men they conquered were about ten thousand (גוים אלפים), robust (חלי), valiant (כועש, נبيل) men. The account ends with the peremptory statement, “And not one man escaped” (ללא נמלט איש). The success of the Israelites is consolidated by the statement that they remained undisturbed for eighty years, the longest time of peace in the book of Judges, both statements of ideational content that invoke the strength of the Israelite army. A major victory is achieved and Israel has peace.

It is in the light of this great victory, which the implied author through Ehud faithfully attributes to YHWH, that the killing of Eglon must be revisited in terms of its propriety. Webb oversimplifies when he states, “The grotesquely comic character of the

---

93 Ehud’s successful co-operation with the Ephraimites at the fords of the Jordan will become significant later when both Gideon and Jephthah encounter Ephraim, again at the fords of the Jordan, but under very different circumstances.

94 Christianson (“A Fistful of Shekels,” 62) points out that this is the only judge narrative in which the enemy is strengthened by YHWH, and that this would increase Ehud’s achievement.
story makes moral judgments irrelevant.” The implication is that YHWH has raised up this deliverer for a specific purpose, and the success of Ehud and his army at the end of the narrative is the implied author's way of endorsing Ehud's actions. The lengthy peace in the land also serves as a sign of YHWH's approval of Ehud's tactics. As Deist notes, “The Deuteronomists incorporated this narrative in their story book without editing it theologically, suggesting that these redactors could endorse the sentiments expressed in the narrative.” Thus, Ehud must be assigned a +propriety evaluation.

4.3 Conclusions

4.3.1 Summary of Evidence

Israel is clearly construed as -propriety at the beginning of the Ehud narrative. Ehud is introduced in a somewhat ambivalent manner, with suggestions of -normality (his Benjaminitic heritage) and possibly -capacity (his being “bound in the right hand”). Eglon, on the other hand, is introduced as clearly +capacity in his oppression of the Israelites. As the narrative progresses, however, the implied author begins to undermine these initial presentations of the two key characters. What may have been taken as -capacity in Ehud—his left-handedness—is shown to be a strength, and the willingness of his troops to follow his able leadership is an indication of +normality. Moreover,

95 Webb, Judges: Integrated, 131. See also Webb (Judges, 168) where the same paragraph is used. However, מ"מ may indeed “have such positive connotations in its present context” as well as negative ones, in spite of Webb's objections (p. 172).
96 Contra Christianson (“A Fistful of Shekels,” 72), who makes the interesting comment: “In some respects the Ehud story shares the moral ambiguity of Unforgiven. Ehud may be constructed as ‘good’ partly because God has raised him up, but, like The Magnificent Seven’s Chris (Yul Brynner), he is raised out of nowhere. And God’s role is no guarantor of Ehud’s ‘goodness’.”
97 The presence of victory and peace are not invariable mechanical indicators of YHWH's approval. The context and other indicators must be taken into consideration. Here, Ehud is specifically raised up by YHWH to deliver Israel, and, as discussed, there is nothing in the text to undermine his success which resulted in a lengthy peace.
98 Deist, “Murder in the Toilet,” 269.
99 Tanner (“The Focal Point of Judges,” 153) makes the statement that Ehud “was seen in a positive light.”
Ehud’s clever strategy against outsiders is approved rather than condemned, and his turning from the idols and acting as a messenger of לְאָדֹם (God) against the לְאָדֹם (gods) of Moab demonstrate his propriety. Thus, Ehud is effectively contrasted with Eglon at the same time as he is compared favorably to Othniel, the faithful, obedient, and successful ideal judge.

4.3.2 Conclusion

Interestingly, Globe claims that “Ehud embodies Deuteronomistic virtue” and achieves the “heroic ideal.” On the other hand, Younger, among others, struggles with implications of the ethical propriety of Ehud’s actions for the character of YHWH. He says, “In a sense, God sanctions Ehud’s courage by allowing his enemy to fall to his scheme,” but shortly thereafter states, “His devious methods are not endorsed or condoned by God (i.e. this is scarcely God’s preferred method).” It would be interesting to know what he considered YHWH’s preferred method to be—and why. For many interpreters, the idea that a holy God would use a devious assassin to achieve his goals is problematic, but then “devious assassin,” along with other common descriptors of Ehud, is loaded language, language that the book of Judges does not use, even in its Hebrew equivalent. If critics of Ehud described him as a courageous freedom fighter, or a member of an underground resistance movement in an oppressed culture, his actions might sound more acceptable. One wonders how many soldiers in similar contemporary situations would win medals for acts such as his. According to the text itself, Ehud is a

---

101 Younger, Judges and Ruth, 125.
“deliverer,” raised up by YHWH, trusting in YHWH, and giving YHWH the glory for his military victory.

In fact, the implied author effectively contrasts the leadership of Ehud and Eglon. Ehud, in spite of coming out of the dubious tribe of Benjamin and having no written record of the Spirit’s enabling,\(^{102}\) is raised up by YHWH to deliver Israel from oppression after the penalty for its previous apostasy has been paid. His left-handedness, whether the result of physical incapacity or physical training, provides the strategy needed to accomplish his assigned task. Although the implied author suggests his own rejection of idol worship, Ehud is canny (devious?) enough to use Eglon’s reliance on foreign gods to gain the opportunity to remove the king from power. Having dispensed with their ruler, he leads the Israelites as YHWH’s warrior to a resounding victory over Moab and brings rest to the land for eighty years.\(^{103}\) Eglon, on the other hand, is portrayed by the implied author as a powerful king, if only by God’s enabling.\(^{104}\) Having served his disciplinary purpose, his own false religion is used against him to not only dispense with him, but also to shame him, the victim of bathroom humour and satire. In the ANE, honor is a zero sum commodity, and the honor due to YHWH is taken from those who oppose him. Although there are some suggestions of doubt surrounding Ehud’s background at the beginning of the narrative, the implied author undermines these to present a portrait of the judge as a heroic deliverer. Younger states, “Starting with Ehud, there is a mixture of positive and

\(^{102}\) Interestingly, Neef (“Eglon als ‘Kälbermann’?,” 290, 294) argues that since Ehud’s murderous act leaves no traces behind to incriminate him, YHWH must have acted miraculously to protect him, and this indicates God’s involvement in his actions.

\(^{103}\) Brettler (“The Book of Judges: Literature as Politics,” 407) argues that Othniel and Ehud are similar: exemplary southern judges that contrast with the less adequate northern judges.

negative attributes with a decline of the positive and an increase in the negative as the reader goes deeper into the cycles.\textsuperscript{105} It would seem, however, that with Ehud the negative attributes are more assumed by modern interpreters than real. The decline starts after his rule. A more negative characterization of judges will become evident in the next story, that of Deborah and Barak.

\textsuperscript{105} Younger, \textit{Judges and Ruth}, 122.
5 The Deborah/Barak/Jael Narrative (Judges 4)

5.1 Introductory Remarks

The “ideal” judge Othniel sets the standard of comparison for all the subsequent major judge narratives that follow. Although many interpreters are uncomfortable with Ehud’s methods and his actions are not directly commanded by God, he is raised up by YHWH, acts faithfully for YHWH, and has the courage and initiative to accomplish deliverance and rest for Israel. Barak, as we shall see, also does nothing actively improper, but his lack of initiative and courage contrast sharply not only with Ehud’s previous exploits,1 but also with his contemporaries Deborah and Jael, women who ultimately dominate Barak in significance. In the next chapter, we will examine how Gideon begins with lack of trust and courage, overcomes these characteristics with the help of YHWH, but in the end perverts his newfound initiative to serve the ends of his personal vengeance. After that, the downward spiral will continue with Jephthah and Samson.

In his presentation of Barak in Judg 4, the implied author uses evaluative language by the narrator and by reliable characters to characterize the military leader as ineffectual, but also offers a number of counter characterizations that serve as foils for his weakness. The fact that the two most significant counter voices are female goes even further in the context of a patriarchal society to highlight his inadequacies. Barak is never accused of apostasy nor indicted for specific sins as later judges are; nevertheless his cycle is a step further in the downward spiral that constitutes the book of Judges.

1 Perhaps this explains the reference to Ehud in 4:1, after the intervening judgeship of Shamgar. It may be a deliberate technique for provoking a comparison between Ehud and Barak.
5.2 Analysis of the Text

The Barak narrative begins with the usual elements of the paradigm: after Ehud’s death Israel again does the evil thing (v. 1, -propriety), and YHWH disciplines them (-satisfaction: displeasure) through the oppression of a foreign power, this time Jabin, the Canaanite king of Hazor. The introduction of Jabin initiates a +capacity prosody that sets him up as a formidable opponent: in addition to unspecified foot soldiers, he has 900 iron chariots, powerful military technology in the ANE. Since the Israelites do not have this advantage, and because YHWH is using the Canaanites to discipline Israel for apostasy (+propriety), Jabin is able to oppress Israel powerfully for twenty years (v. 2).

The Israelites cry out to YHWH because of their suffering (happiness: misery).

At this point, based on the Othniel and Ehud narratives (3:9, 15), the reader would expect YHWH to raise up a deliverer, but instead the implied author introduces Deborah and a +normality prosody (vv. 4–6) construes her as a woman of status and authority. Although v. 4a is often translated simply as “Deborah, a prophetess,” the word נביה is already in feminine form. Thus, the designation of her as נביה is not necessary to

---

2 Interestingly, Schneider (Judges, 63) and Butler (Judges, 86) see Ehud’s death (v. 1) as part of YHWH’s punishment of the Israelites for their apostasy.

3 See v. 13. The number 900 may refer to “9 units” or be hyperbole. In any case, the chariots constituted a force great enough to keep the Israelites in subjugation. See Block, Judges, Ruth, 190–91.

4 It is unclear exactly what the term “iron chariots” refers to. Drews (“Chariots of Iron,” 15–23) points out that they were very unlikely to have been constructed entirely of iron, or even to have been plated in iron. He suggests that the chariots may have had iron bands on their wheels as “tires,” or iron scythes attached to the wheels in order to cut down foot soldiers, although even these interpretations would have been anachronistic. He also suggests that the modifier “iron” may be a gloss added by a later redactor, familiar with chariots, to explain why they frightened the Israelites so much, not realizing that the Israelite army had no chariots at all and were at a distinct disadvantage when attacked by even ordinary chariots. Whatever the explanation, the text both here and in Judg 1:19 makes it clear that these enigmatic chariots gave the enemy a military advantage.

5 As Schneider (Judges, 63) notes, the oppressor “he” in v. 3 could refer to Jabin and/or YHWH.

6 E.g., NRSV, NASB, AV, NKJV, JPS, and ESV. NLT, GNT, TNIV, and the Message call her a “prophet” and remove the gender issue entirely. Only the HCSB among the versions checked refers to her as “a woman who was a prophetess.” See also Schneider, Judges, 67–68.
understanding that this prophet is female, nor is it necessary to label her as the wife of Lappidoth, for this is expressed by the following construct form נִזֶּה לָפֶפְדוֹת. The נִזֶּה is included in order to emphasize her gender; it results in the translation: “Deborah, a woman, a prophetess, the wife of Lappidoth.” Whatever their gender, prophets had a special role and status in ancient Israel and this, as discussed in ch. 2, gives her words a higher level of reliability than other characters. Although female prophets were not unknown in this patriarchal society, they were uncommon, resulting in a +normality evaluation. Moreover, Deborah “was judging Israel at that time” (v. 4) and the “Israelites would go up to her for judgment” (v. 5). Deborah’s judgment may not have been the military judgeship of the male judges, but nevertheless involved her in a position of responsibility; therefore these comments constitute more tokens of her +normality.

Whether Deborah was a typical judge in the same sense as the other male judges is a matter of some dispute. Some commentators consider her a female judge of some sort. For example, Matthews suggests that Deborah is a postmenopausal female who functions as an elder and judge, Bal describes her as a “poet-prophet,” the one who

7 Niditch (Judges: A Commentary, 60, 65) translates נִזֶּה לָפֶפְדוֹת based on the root as “a woman of fire,” and Schneider (Judges, 66) as “a fiery one,” comparing the name to Barak’s which means “lightning.” Others have suggested that it is a geographical location. The fact that a man named Lappidoth does not enter the narrative does not necessarily mean he didn’t exist, however. It may be significant in terms of gender roles that Jael’s husband Heber also does not appear. See Schneider, Judges, 76.
8 See also Goldingay, “Motherhood, Machismo,” 23. The same phrasing is used for a male prophet in Judg 6:8 in the Gideon cycle at the same place in which a deliverer would be expected. In this case it may serve to distinguish the prophet from the angel of YHWH who appears next, in both cases the phrases לֶבֶדֵר אֱלֹהִים נִזֶּה לָפֶפְדוֹת and נֶבֶדֵר אֱלֹהִים נִזֶּה לָפֶפְדוֹת may emphasize that YHWH has sent a prophet instead of a deliverer. In this case, a woman would be the more unusual. See Boda, “Recycling Heaven’s Words,” 11. See Butler, Judges, 90–91 regarding the significance of Deborah’s gender.
9 Others were Miriam (Exod 15:20), Huldah (2 Kgs 22:14), and Noadiah (Neh 6:14). See Block, Judges, Ruth, 192 n. 180.
10 See Butler (Judges, 90–94) for a more detailed discussion of this matter. See also Younger, Judges and Ruth, 140; Hackett, “Violence and Women’s Lives,” 356–57.
11 Matthews, Judges and Ruth, 64.
delivers “the right word—bringing about order”\textsuperscript{12} and McCann posits that she is a prophetess and the only judge who clearly functioned in a legal capacity, but proposes that she would still be a co-judge with Barak and Jael even if judges are primarily deliverers.\textsuperscript{13} Niditch interprets Deborah as the judge and Barak as her military commander.\textsuperscript{14} Butler takes the middle road and states that “Deborah is first and foremost a woman. Next she is a prophetess, the role she will play in the following narrative. Then she is wife … Finally, Deborah functions as a judge in central Israel.”\textsuperscript{15} On the other hand, other scholars doubt or deny her judgeship. O’Connell opines that Deborah is “more like an agent than a full-fledged character” and states that “one cannot help but to suspect that the one called to deliver Israel as a military judge was Barak and not Deborah.”\textsuperscript{16} Block questions her judgeship, saying that “she is first and foremost, if not exclusively, a prophet.”\textsuperscript{17} Even if Deborah were a judge in some sense, however, Boda is right to point out that her judging is unlike other judges in the book of Judges.\textsuperscript{18} He concludes,

Deborah functions here in a manner consonant with the title the narrator has given her: אשה נביאת ("a woman, a prophet") who would dispense justice through prophetic enquiry. … A prophetic figure would be dispensing justice (למשתת) because such a figure could seek the will of the deity and so offer the correct decision in difficult cases.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{12} Bal, \textit{Murder and Difference}, 59.
\textsuperscript{13} McCann, \textit{Judges}, 51.
\textsuperscript{14} Niditch, \textit{Judges: A Commentary}, 64–65.
\textsuperscript{15} Butler, \textit{Judges}, 92–93. In terms of the narrative, Butler views Deborah and Jabin as the main characters, Barak and Sisera as their subordinates, and Jael as the hero (Butler, \textit{Judges}, 86).
\textsuperscript{16} O’Connell, \textit{Rhetoric of Judges}, 242–43.
\textsuperscript{17} Block, \textit{Judges, Ruth}, 192–95.
\textsuperscript{18} Boda, “Recycling Heaven’s Words,” 10–11.
\textsuperscript{19} Boda, “Recycling Heaven’s Words,” 11. See also Goldingay, “Motherhood, Machismo,” 24.
Whatever the exact nature of her “judging,” there can be no doubt that Deborah was a respected woman of status and authority within the Israelite community (+normality).

Deborah’s gender could cause her to be viewed as an anomaly who was only raised up to act in this one special situation, or because the man of the moment, Barak, had failed to assume responsibility. However, Deborah has been judging Israel and giving decisions for some time. The verbal form used to describe Deborah’s sitting in the seat of judgment is a participle (qotel) in a predicative construction. The first phrase of 4:5 could be translated either “she used to sit/she would sit” (frequentative or habitual action, followed by a finite wayyiqtol with the same value), or “and she was sitting” (durative or continuous aspect describing the scene which then begins the action with a finite wayyiqtol with the same value). Thus, the clause complex could be translated either “Now she used to sit under the oak of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in the hill country of Ephraim, and the Israelites would go up to her for judgment” (frequentative > frequentative) or “Now she was sitting under the oak of Deborah

---

20 See Block, Judges, Ruth, 197.
21 Note that the following discussion draws on the standard Hebrew reference grammars, which use differing terminology and, more importantly, have different understandings of the Hebrew verb, which in many respects remains an enigma. Jolion and Muraoka (Biblical Hebrew, passim) use the term “aspect” in a very general sense, whereas Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeeze (Hebrew Reference Grammar, 352) refer to “aktionsart.” Waltke and O’Connor (Hebrew Syntax, 502–3) treat the customary, iterative, etc. as variant nuances within the imperfective aspect. Since there is no consensus on aspect in Hebrew, I am interacting with these grammars on their own terms. For a comprehensive discussion of aspect in Greek, see Porter, Verbal Aspect. See also the recently published Cook, Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb.
22 Waltke and O’Connor (Hebrew Syntax, 547) state, “Relative waw with a prefix form represents a situation that is usually successive and always subordinate to a preceding statement.”
23 As do NASB, NRSV, JPS, NKJV, HCSB, NLT, GNT, and ESV.
24 Waltke and O’Connor (Hebrew Syntax, 547) state, “Relative waw with a prefix form represents a situation that is usually successive and always subordinate to a preceding statement.” In 37.6.d they explain, “More often, the participle describes an ongoing state of affairs, involving repeated (#14–15) or continuous (#16–17) action.” According to Jolion and Muraoka (Biblical Hebrew, 118) “Since Hebrew customarily continues a non-finite tense (infinitive, §124 q; participle, §121 j) with a finite tense with energetic Waw, a wayyiqtol in that case implies no idea of succession, e.g. Gn 39.18 ‘when I raised my voice and called out; 1 Kg 8.7 ‘the cherubim were spreading (םחרבים) their wings … and were covering (השנים)’.”
between Ramah and Bethel in the hill country of Ephraim, and the Israelites were going up to her for judgment” (durative > durative). A translation “...was sitting/used to sit ... went up...” (durative/frequentative > instantaneous) is inappropriate since this would imply that the wayyiqtol had a different value than the participle: instantaneous instead of durative. Even if the participle were durative and forming the background for the finite verb which indicates a discrete action, it is very unlikely that the Israelites would spontaneously and without precedent go up to Deborah on this one occasion if she had not been functioning in that role over a period of time. Therefore the sequence should not be taken to imply that that the Israelites only “went up” (וַיָּעָהוּ) to her for judgment on this one special occasion concerning the problem of Jabin’s oppression. Also, the Canaanites had been oppressing Israel for twenty years—why suddenly decide to do something about it now? Thus it is probable that Deborah had been judging Israel for some previous time and that the Israelites habitually went to her for advice on various matters (+normality). As we shall see, however, the status and significance of Deborah do not make her the focus of the entire narrative. As Butler rightly comments, “Still, her exceptional qualifications do not make her the heroine of the narrative; she is only the transitional character needed to prepare for Jael’s emergence and Barak’s decline.” She is, however, essential to these subsequent events. Deborah’s status and resulting authority is again construed, this time lexically, by her actions in v. 6: she “sent” (נָבַל) and “summoned” (נָבָל) Barak (+normality).
When Deborah speaks in v. 6, the implied author is using Deborah’s prophetic authority (+normality), and through her, YHWH’s divine authority, to endorse his perspective on Barak (C:Ed). The implied author has Deborah challenge him, “Did not YHWH God of Israel command...?” This is a rhetorical question that anticipates the answer “yes” and may well imply that Barak has already been instructed by YHWH but has not yet followed the instructions given (−propriety). Since the implied answer to the question is “yes,” Deborah proceeds to quote YHWH’s actual words of command to “Go!” (דָּבָכ), “March!” (חָלַק), and “Take!” (חָלַק) (v. 6). Thus Deborah is consistently represented as a woman who has had status and authority in Israelite society over a period of time, a capable spiritual and administrative leader—but not a military leader. Although she “judges” Israel, this term does not automatically imply military rank or competence. That is Barak’s role.

30 See O’Connell, *Rhetoric of Judges*, 108. The translations of נָחַץ by the NASB (“the Lord, the God of Israel, has commanded”) and the NRSV (“The Lord, the God of Israel, commands you”) are possible but not necessary here in light of the נזֶה that introduces the clause and may indicate a rhetorical question, since there are two primary ways to translate such a construction. Boda, “Judges,” 1116, argues that נזֶה “functions emphatically when introducing an exhortation—‘Indeed, the LORD, the God of Israel, commands you,’” and concludes that “there is no reason then to posit that Barak had disobeyed an earlier divine commission.” This interpretation is possible, but not required. The three grammars that he refers to, as well as Jodon and Muraoka, *Biblical Hebrew*, 161.c, give the rhetorical question as an option: Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, 40.3.b n. 48; Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze, *Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 43.2.1.2.b; and Gesenius, Kautzsch, and Cowley, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, 150.e. In fact, GKC suggests in regard to Judg 4:6 that it “serves merely to express the conviction that the contents of the statement are well known to the hearer, and are unconditionally admitted by him,” implying that Barak may have already possessed this information but needed to be reminded by Deborah. Sivan and Schniedewind’s argument (Sivan and Schniedewind, “A Study of the Asseverative L’ and Hal’o,” 216) that this is an example of II נזֶה (asseverative) and not I נזֶה (rhetorical) is suggestive but not as conclusive as some other examples they offer, since the parallel to Judg 4:6 they suggest is in Kings, not an immediate poetic parallel as in Ps 56:14 (p. 213), and the translation of 4:6 does not entail the ignoring of other particles as in 1 Sam 10:1 (pp. 215–16). Verse 14 uses the same נזֶה construction: נָחַץ לָךְ הָעָד (“Has not YHWH gone out before you?”).

31 Although only the first is in the form of an imperative, the sequential nature of the verbs results in the second and third, which are suffix conjugation with waw-consecutive, acting functionally as commands. The final reference to Deborah in the prose account is in Judg 4:14. This implies that she remained on Mount Tabor when Barak set out with his army for the battle with Sisera. See Butler, *Judges*, 95.
So far, all the reader has been directly told about Barak is that he is the "son of Abinoam, from Kadesh of Naphtali" (v. 6). We can, however, infer from Deborah's challenge of Barak discussed above that he has previously received instructions from YHWH, very likely by means of Deborah herself in her prophetic role, to muster an army of ten thousand men from Naphtali and Zebulun in order to attack Sisera and his troops, but has either ignored or refused the commission (~inclination: reluctance, ~propriety).

Although a force of ten thousand may seem adequate to Deborah, who demonstrates her trust by relaying to Barak that YHWH is in control (v. 7, +security: trust), from Barak's evaluative perspective it may seem weak (~capacity) in comparison to Jabin's 900 iron chariots, likely explaining his reluctance to go to war. Although the Israelites are indeed in human terms weak and need God's assistance, the fact that YHWH will "draw out" (משר) Jabin and "give him" (ד) into their hands makes them, for all practical purposes, powerful (+capacity). YHWH's reassurances leave Barak with little alternative but to obey.

It therefore comes as a shock to the implied reader when Barak not only resists YHWH's explicit instructions and promises of both support and success once again, but does so in terms that all too clearly reveal his reluctance and cowardice: "If you will go with me, then I will go; but if you will not go with me, I will not go." (~.17 ~7i::i-o~)

Here, in heteroglossic terms (ENGAGEMENT), the

---

33 See Schneider, Judges, 70; Wong, Compositional Strategy, 158; Goldingay, "Motherhood, Machismo," 27. Contra Niditch (Judges: A Commentary, 65), who claims that this reflects Barak's wisdom, and Block (Judges, Ruth, 199–200), who suggests that the request is a plea for the presence of God in the person of the prophet and argues that the honor being given to a woman is merely a confirming sign. The context makes this very unlikely (see Butler, Judges, 99); the parallels that Block points out between Moses' and Barak's commissioning, although real, seem overstated. Sternberg (Poetics of Biblical Narrative, 274) characterizes Barak as "faint hearted" and argues that "it is he who plays the woman." Fewell and Gunn ("Controlling Perspectives," 398) suggest, "Perhaps his conditional response reflects not so much
implied author introduces for the first time an explicit counter-voice within Israel (C:Ct), the voice of reluctance and weakness, which he/she will proceed to undermine. Since this is the only time that Barak is quoted directly in the entire narrative, his words have great impact and constitute a brief but powerful prosody. The two conditional statements reveal his lack of security and initiative, and his continued reluctance to obey God reveals the ethical impropriety of his words (+reluctance, −propriety); the repetition and contrast significantly raise the force of this appraisal. The reader cannot help but contrast Barak with Ehud, who is consistently self-motivated even without explicitly inscribed instructions from YHWH, to the point that he has been criticized by many scholars for his self-confidence and initiative. Both Othniel and Ehud acted courageously and without hesitation, suggesting that they had complete trust in YHWH’s character—his capacity, faithfulness, justice, and compassion—and thus relied on him to deliver them. The implied author may be suggesting that in Barak’s view the character of YHWH is less laudable. Perhaps the repeated subjugations of Israel are beginning to have their impact on Israel’s trust, as we shall see more clearly in the Gideon narrative.

In the immediate context, however, the contrast is with Deborah, and it is a stark contrast. Her response in v. 9 is “I will certainly go with you” (לְךָ אֵלֵךְ), in which the use of the infinitive absolute makes her determination emphatic (+inclination:

---

cowardice, say, as it does a questioning of her authority” in a patriarchal society. However, if, as argued above, Deborah had been acknowledged in a position of authority for some time, this is less likely.

34 See Alter (Biblical Narrative, 74), who states that “the point at which dialogue first emerges will be worthy of special attention, and in most instances, the initial words spoken by a personage will be revelatory, perhaps more in manner than in matter, constituting an important moment in the exposition of a character.” See also Fokkelman, Reading Biblical Narrative, 68.

35 See the previous chapter.
The eagerness) in contrast to Barak’s affective state.\textsuperscript{36} The objection may be raised that Barak merely—and wisely—wanted YHWH’s representative to accompany him in his exploits, as Saul waited for Samuel in 1 Sam 10:8; 13:8, and was severely disciplined when he acted precipitately. This is extremely unlikely, however. At no time did Deborah ask Barak to wait for her arrival and she was apparently already to hand; thus, the situations are not parallel. There is no record of her expressing reluctance to go with him that might have provoked Barak’s response. More compelling evidence of Barak’s reluctance, however, is Deborah’s response to Barak’s conditional statement.\textsuperscript{37} Deborah will go, but she immediately qualifies the positive tone of her promise with the conjunction “nevertheless” (רַחֲמָלָה): “nevertheless the honor/fame (רַחֲמָלָה) shall not be yours” (רַחֲמָלָה).\textsuperscript{38} This can only be a disciplinary response to improper behavior (confirming the –propriety of v. 8); in an honor/shame society the loss of honor, especially “into the hand of a woman,”\textsuperscript{39} was a severe blow. The implied author uses Deborah’s prophetic authority to endorse this negative evaluation of Barak (C:Ed).\textsuperscript{40} Finally, reassured by Deborah’s presence, Barak finally sets out to muster his troops.

\textsuperscript{36} Merwe, Naudé, and Kroese, \textit{Hebrew Reference Grammar}, 20.2; Merwe, Naudé, and Kroese, \textit{Hebrew Reference Grammar}, 20: “This construction usually intensifies the verbal idea. In this way BH speakers/narrators express their conviction of the verity of their statements regarding an action.”

\textsuperscript{37} Webb’s comment on Deborah’s reaction here is interesting: “Deborah is clearly taken aback, as her rejoinder in verse 9 shows. Saving Israel by force of arms is man’s work” (Webb, \textit{Judges}, 184).

\textsuperscript{38} The Hebrew noun רַחֲמָלָה in this context most likely falls within Laniak’s categories of “Self” (honor-as-reputation) or “Status” (honor associated with the symbols of authority, prestige, and rank) although he does not discuss this particular lexis (Laniak, \textit{Shame and Honor}, 18–21). For an interesting discussion of the relationship between shame and affect, including the connection of shame to the perceived negative judgment of others, see Stiebert, \textit{Construction of Shame}, 3–23. Stiebert rightly cautions, however, that a blanket description of both ancient and modern Mediterranean cultures as “honor-shame societies” is simplistic, including the limitation of female honor/shame to issues of sexuality in the Hebrew Bible. Individual cultures show considerable variation (pp. 38, 59, 71–75, 82). See also Butler, \textit{Judges}, 98.

\textsuperscript{39} The context of this prediction leads the reader to expect that Deborah will be the one to get the honor that Barak forfeits. Ironically, Jael is the woman referred to.

\textsuperscript{40} Stone (“Judges,” 254) argues that Deborah’s words are not a rebuke. She is simply stating that his honor will come from his triumph in the battle, not in the manner that he expects from “striking the killing blow
At this point the implied author intervenes with an off line comment by the narrator (v. 11) whose relevance is for the moment unclear, but which gives background information necessary for understanding the forthcoming events of the story: Heber the Kenite has “separated himself” (הָזְכֵל) from his relatives, who are in-laws of Moses, and moved into the vicinity of Kedesh, which is near Sisera’s camp, the destination of Barak and Deborah. Whether Heber’s “separation” was merely in search of water, pasture, or trade, or whether it represents a defection from his own clan and/or his Israelite in-laws is not clear (~propriety), although later in v. 17 the narrator mentions that there was “peace between King Jabin of Hazor and the clan of Heber the Kenite,” indicating the possibility of a treaty with Israel’s enemy in spite of a preexisting association with Israel. It is also unclear whether these Kenites had been physically living among the Israelites or simply in peaceful association with them. According to Butler in his commentary on Judg 1:16,

against the opposing leader.” This argument is unconvincing, however. He himself later states that “the ‘honor’ indeed bypassed Barak (4:9) and went to a woman. ... The real honor goes to an obscure woman who rejected her husband’s compromise with Canaan” (p. 258).

41 Butler, Judges, 100. Soggin (“Heber der Qenit”, 91) among others, argues that “Heber” is a designation of a clan rather than an individual, but this does not impact significantly on the meaning of the passage.

42 According to Halpern (“Kenites,” 4:19): “The issue here is lineage fission—the Kenites in the N were a branch community of those near Arad.” O’Connell (Rhetoric of Judges, 110) argues, however, that Heber was a “covenant malefactor who began his maleficence by departing from the Kenites, who lived in Judah (cf. 1:16).” See also Vaux, Ancient Israel, 7: “When a nomadic group becomes too numerous to continue living together on the same grazing grounds, it sometimes divides into two groups which then live quite independently of one another.”

43 Fensham (“Did a Treaty between the Israelites and the Kenites Exist”) concludes that one did indeed exist, and Butler, Judges, 100, argues that a treaty existed between Israel and the Kenites (“...the text implies at least a formal oral agreement, which would be tantamount to a treaty”) and also between Heber the Kenite and Sisera “...with whom her husband had a mutual nonaggression, support, or peace treaty.” According to Block (Judges, Ruth, 206), “Not only had he separated from the main clan of the Kenites, who were allies of Israel (1:16), but he had also formally bound himself by treaty to their enemy.” See also Schneider, Judges, 72–73 and Soggin (Judges, a Commentary, 66–67), who argues for an alliance. Lambert (“Tribal Influences in Old Testament Tradition,” 46) points out that alliances can “cross-cut the clan lines and perhaps transcend them.” Matthews (Judges and Ruth, 69) assumes that Heber’s camp is “neutral” territory, however.
The narrator connects Judah to the Moses tradition by incorporating the Kenites as part of Judah. In so doing he prepares for the appearance of Kenites in chap. 4–5 with Deborah and Barak, and possibly for the father-in-law narrative of chap. 19. The Kenites not only go with Judah; they also settle down with Judah.44

We will return to the issue of the Kenites later in our discussion of the narrative.

Meanwhile, in an off line comment, Sisera is informed of Barak’s aggressive preparations on Mount Tabor,45 and the narrator offers a condensed but effective +capacity prosody describing Sisera’s force and once again mentioning the 900 lethal iron chariots (v. 13). Back in the Israelite camp it is again Deborah who takes the initiative, commanding Barak as a spokeswoman for YHWH to “arise!” (+normality). The causal clause provides Barak with further motivation to act; she declares (v. 14) that “YHWH has given Sisera into your hands,” then once again challenges him with a rhetorical question, “Has not YHWH gone out before you?” Clearly Deborah has no doubts about the reliable character of YHWH. Deborah’s trust is intended to stimulate a similar trust in Barak (∞ t, + security: trust), which he finally demonstrates by leading his men down Mount Tabor into victorious battle (+security: trust). This is the last mention of Deborah in the prose account; it would appear that she did not accompany Barak into the battle. Having achieved her goal of initiating the military action, she metaphorically passes the torch to Jael. As predicted by Deborah, however, Barak gets no credit for Israel’s success, for the next verse (v. 15) states clearly that YHWH, not Barak, routed Sisera. The battle is not over, however, for Sisera escapes on foot (−capacity).

44 Butler, Judges, 23–24.
45 A number of commentators assume that the anonymous “they” refers to the Kenites in Jabin’s camp. See, for example, Halpern, First Historians, 86.
46 The translations are about equally divided as to whether to translate this clause as a rhetorical question or an emphatic statement. See the discussion on 4:6.
What follows is a long, intense −capacity prosody construing Israel’s enemy as weak and defeated. Whereas in v. 13 the modifier כ was used twice to describe all of Sisera’s formidable iron chariots and all his army, demonstrating his power, in vv. 15–16 it is used three times to emphasize the defeat of all the same chariots and all the same army, ending with the final emphatic phrase “not even one remained” (לא נישאכרında), a description of complete annihilation of the army. Twice Sisera himself is depicted as fleeing on foot (−capacity; vv. 15, 17), raising the force of the appraisal of his personal helplessness.47 It should be noted, however, that between these two verses the off line comment about Barak adds some relevant information; for the first time he shows +inclination: eagerness, probably encouraged by his early success. Meanwhile, Sisera’s desperate attempt to escape takes him to the nearby tent of Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, which seemed a likely place of refuge due to the peace between Heber and Jabin.48

The implied author now introduces a second assertive woman, the one hinted at in 4:9. At this stage of the narrative there is nothing to indicate that Jael is anything but loyal to Jabin in accordance with her husband’s treaty with the King, but Jael’s later acts reveal that although an outsider, or at least marginal to Israelite culture, Jael is construed as concurring with the implied author’s negative view of the enemy, Sisera. Thus her suggestion to him to “turn aside” is an attempt to bring Sisera under her control and destroy him, and it is appropriate for the implied reader to read her agreement with the

47 Of course, this also serves as resumptive repetition after the narrative interruption of v. 16, but the repetition nevertheless stresses his helplessness.

48 Halpern (First Historians, 86) suggests that Barak lured Sisera to Jael’s tent, but his argument is not convincing. Matthews and Benjamin (Social World of Ancient Israel, 87) suggest that the site is some sort of sanctuary to which Sisera fled.
implied author’s stance back into this scene, especially the reader that has heard the story before (C:Ce).49 Jael’s first action is a demonstration of her motivation and resourcefulness;50 without waiting for Sisera to approach her and give her instructions for his protection (+inclination: eagerness),51 she goes out to meet Sisera and immediately takes control of the situation by giving him a repeated command, שורר אֶתְכֶם מִרְכֵּבָה אֶלֶך, and reassuring him (+inclination: encouragement, ∞+security: trust).52 This immediately aligns her with Deborah and contrasts her with Barak in terms not only of her gender, but also of her initiative and status.53 Jael’s commands also contrast her with Sisera, who, although he uses an imperative form to request a drink from her (v. 19), qualifies it with קִז, a particle which here indicates a pleading proposal rather than a direct command, especially in conjunction with the adjunct וַחֲסָר, “of a little water,”54 which modifies the drink requested.55 This construes a –normality appraisal for Sisera. However,

49 In an ancient, primarily oral, culture with an implied audience rather than reader this would be quite likely.
50 According to Block (Judges, Ruth, 206): “From beginning to end, Jael controls the events described.” Matthews (Judges and Ruth, 68–73) gives an overview of the rules of hospitality and the numerous ways in which both Jael and Sisera transgress them in their encounter. See also Matthews, “Hospitality and Hostility in Judges 4.”
51 Jael’s initiative raises interesting questions: Did Jael have foreknowledge of the victory of Barak and the flight of Sisera to her tent? Was she expecting him? Had she been warned by an Israelite who knew she was sympathetic to their cause? Unfortunately, there is no way of knowing the answers.
52 Of course, Jael’s anticipatory assessment of Sisera as ∞ +happiness; ∞ +security: trust is ironic; she fully intends to put him in a position where he will be very unhappy and very insecure.
53 This also reminds the reader of Ehud.
54 Emphasis added.
55 It is doubtful whether in these extreme circumstances Sisera would merely be concerned with the polite customs of hospitality and the deference due to a hostess. It is more likely that he fully recognizes his dependence on Jael’s good will if he is to survive. Some have argued that the particle קִז is logical rather than precative (See Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, 578–79, 683–84), and HALOT, 656, labels קִז as an emphatic particle. Jøsøen and Muraoka (Biblical Hebrew, 1:350) argue that קִז “is mostly used for the purpose of adding a usually weak entreating nuance, which is roughly equivalent to a stressed and lengthened Please in English. One can sometimes render קִז by I beg (you), For pity’s sake!” Recently, however, Christiansen (“The Biblical Hebrew Particle נא”) has provided a more linguistically nuanced analysis of the function of קִז as a propositive or exhortative marker which when used with the jussive or cohortative signals a proposed course of action which is not effectively translated “please.” When used with the imperative it is “more strongly marked for politeness that functions to cancel the generalized
perhaps emboldened by Jael’s apparent helpfulness in providing milk and covering him, Sisera becomes more assertive in giving her his next instructions, which take the form of a command.\textsuperscript{56} Schneider suggests that his confidence was boosted by Jael’s pretension of respect and honor toward him.\textsuperscript{57} From the perspective of Sisera, Jael would seem \textit{propriety} for being helpful and protective, but the implied author through the narrator portrays her as deceptive in the context of the narrative as a whole. As in the story of Ehud, however, this does not necessarily imply a \textit{proverty} assessment of Jael, even though her husband is at peace with Jabin and his commander Sisera. Jael may have loyalties towards the Israelites from the Kenites’ previous association with the Israelites. As Lambert notes, the conflict of family ties and alliances creates “a potential for choice of loyalties under certain conditions.”\textsuperscript{58} Matthews and Benjamin argue that after the rout of Sisera, any treaty between him and Heber would have been abrogated in any case.\textsuperscript{59} Whatever Jabin’s and Jael’s absent husband’s views, from the implied author’s perspective this is a \textit{propriety} act.

In light of the fact that Sisera is totally at Jael’s mercy and completely dependent on her compliance with his wishes, the context reinforces his \textit{normality} appraisal. The commander’s instructions that Jael should be requested to answer the putative question

---

implicature of the imperative form ... [and] nullifies the bald directness and face-threatening aspect of the imperative” (p. 391). He explains that, with the imperative form, \textit{נָשַׁל} “seems to function productively as a morphemic polite article” (p. 387) and remarks that it “serves to turn a potentially harsh command—the generalized implicature of the imperative—into a proposal. The implicature of the propositive particle is that the addressee may choose whether to comply with the request, since it is only a proposal and not a direct command” (p. 392). The use of the modifier “little” (יָמָֽשְׇ) here increases the likelihood that Sisera’s tone is one of deference.

\textsuperscript{56} See Bal, \textit{Death and Dissymmetry}, 213.
\textsuperscript{57} Schneider, \textit{Judges}, 80.
\textsuperscript{58} Lambert, “Tribal Influences in Old Testament Tradition,” 47.
\textsuperscript{59} Matthews and Benjamin, \textit{Social World of Ancient Israel}, 90.
“Is there a man here?” with “There is not,” is therefore highly appropriate in the context. Ironically, in hiding behind the skirts of a woman, Sisera does not act like a “man,” at least in terms of a patriarchal society (—security: uneasiness). Additionally, by the time anyone arrives to ask such a question, Sisera will be dead and, indeed, no man will be there. Matthews puts it well, “The irony is particularly acute given that [Sisera] had fled the battle and abandoned his men, and was now relying on a woman to protect him, thereby emasculating himself.”60 Sisera is weak and dependent, and thus construed as both —capacity and —normality.

Jael’s murder of Sisera in v. 21 has been the subject of major interpretive controversy that focuses on two closely related questions: What was Jael’s motivation? Was her action ethical? Some suggest a political motive. Butler comments, “Much of the story’s narrative tension and resolution hangs on the struggle Jael faces in choosing which allegiance to honor at the present moment.”61 Boda suggests that Jael is an Israelite sympathizer,62 but Block asserts, “The narration offers no hint of any spiritual motivation on her part or any concern for Israel.”63 O’Connell assumes her motive is “zeal for YHWH.”64 Lowery suggests, “Caught in a dilemma of conflicting loyalties, she evidently made a political choice, since the text makes no mention of a personal motive.”65 Matthews and Block suggest, in fact, that she might have been open to a charge of adultery if Sisera were found in her tent.66 Personal motivation may have been a factor;

60 Matthews, Judges and Ruth, 73; see also Bal, Murder and Difference, 92.
61 Butler, Judges, 100.
64 O’Connell, Rhetoric of Judges, 110.
65 Lowery, “Jael,” 3:611.
66 See Matthews, Judges and Ruth, 70; Block, Judges, Ruth, 207.
however, if Jael believed that if the Canaanites won the battle, she would be subject to rape by the victors, as McCann, among others, suggests.67 According to Matthews, “As a member of Heber’s household, Jael is obligated to honor his alliances and to do what she can to strengthen them. This does not apply, however, when the ally proves to be a threat to the household.”68 It is unlikely, however, that Jael’s action was a random act of violence, and most probable that she sympathized with the Israelites for some, albeit unknown, reason. Lambert explains that when individuals or groups attach themselves to other clans, they may change not only their tribal affiliation but also their ideology, and “there will be a growth of new value systems.”69 This may well have happened during the Kenites’ previous association with Israel. Just what Jael’s motive was, however, must of necessity remain conjectural. In the context of the narrative, in fact, her motivation may be deliberately obscured. It is, after all, YHWH who gave Sisera into the hands of a woman, and at least YHWH’s motive is clear; Jael was merely his agent. As O’Connell states, “YHWH, who predicted her actions and positioned her tent, was the one ultimately in control of the circumstances leading to Jael’s success.”70 It is true that YHWH was temporarily using Jabin and Sisera to punish the Israelites, but now he is responding to their cry and delivering them from their oppression; thus, Sisera’s actions are now –propriety and YHWH acts to deliver his people.

67 McCann, Judges, 54. See also Goldingay, “Motherhood, Machismo,” 30.
68 Matthews, Judges and Ruth, 71; see also 72. In Matthews and Benjamin, Social World of Ancient Israel, 87–95, the authors suggest that Jael was in danger of rape and warned Sisera away (“Turn aside from your plan,” p. 91) and thus was not deceiving him but justifiably protecting herself.
70 O’Connell, Rhetoric of Judges, 113.
Was Jael’s action ethical,\(^71\) or did it consist of deceit, murder, treaty violation, and/or violation of the code of hospitality?\(^72\) Some commentators, such as Younger, try to have it both ways. He states that “Jael emerges as the real heroine of the narrative” but also describes her as “a lone assassin who accomplishes her ends by deception.”\(^73\) Block is typical of commentators who are convinced that Jael’s behavior is unethical. He points out that YHWH “exits the narrative” before the plot focuses on “the deliberate activity of an individual, a newcomer to the scene, a second woman, Jael,”\(^74\) thus implying YHWH’s non-involvement and disapproval. Later, he is more explicit in his opinion:

Her actions are not only deviant and violent but socially revolutionary, challenging prevailing views of female roles in general and the relationship of husband and wife in particular. However, just because the author records her deeds does not mean he approves of them.\(^75\)

Block explains that YHWH is able to turn even inappropriate events to his purpose.\(^76\) Yes, Jael’s act was violent, but violence in war is commonplace; it is unclear why her act was deviant if she was merely using the tools available to her at the time; and social revolution, even if it challenges “prevailing views” is not always unethical. Nor is Jael’s practice of deception necessarily more unethical than the deception involved in an ambush, which is common military practice, or even Gideon’s instructions to his men to deceive the enemy into believing that his 300 followers were a great army in Judg 8:16–18. In fact, Matthews and Benjamin are clear in their commendation of Jael, stating that

---

\(^71\) I am considering ethics in terms of the original implied audience, although some commentators impose modern ethics on the ancient situation or fear that this behavior might be deemed normative for modern audiences. It is not my task in this study, however, to bring the practical and theological implications of this conclusion into 21\(^{st}\) century ethics.

\(^72\) See Schneider, *Judges*, 76.


\(^74\) Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 206.


“Jael does not misuse hospitality to lure Sisera to his death. On the contrary, it is Sisera who violates hospitality.”

As noted above, it is possible that v. 21 contains an allusion to Ehud, a similarly self-motivated and “devious” character. The narrator recounts how Jael went in to Sisera נקז, which could be translated “surreptitiously” or “secretly,” and in Judg 3:19 Ehud has a “secret (רַפֵּשׁ) word” for Eglon. Although the lexis is different, they derive from the same semantic field. Other similarities have also been noted. Jael thrusts (ועִלּוּ) the tent peg into Sisera’s temple, and Ehud thrusts (נְזַחָּל) his sword into Eglon’s belly. Both Jael and Ehud seem to act autonomously, with no direct instructions from a silent YHWH. In the light of these similarities, and even though commentators have interpreted the actions of both as ethically questionable, it is likely that the implied author is suggesting that Jael’s actions are also +propriety.

It is interesting that Ehud and Jael, the first two major judges if we grant that Othniel is part of the paradigm, are the only ones that achieve unqualified success and deliverance for Israel. Beginning with Gideon the judges’ victories are increasingly tainted by subsequent events. As we shall see Gideon leads the nation back into idolatry, Jephthah commits a cultic atrocity and ends up slaughtering thousands of Israelites, and Samson only “begins” to deliver the Israelites from the Philistines. If, as argued previously, a positive outcome is often an

---

77 Matthews and Benjamin, *Social World of Ancient Israel*, 94.
78 See also Boda, “Judges,” 1119; Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 205.
79 According to HALOT, 572, the Hebrew נקז is used in this sense in 1 Sam 18:22; 24:5; Ruth 3:7.
80 See for example O’Connell, *Rhetoric of Judges*, 121.
82 See the previous chapter for this assessment of Ehud. Contra Exum (“The Centre Cannot Hold,” 416), who states, “Jael gives Sisera refuge and then kills him, reflecting and outdoing Ehud’s grotesque murder of Eglon.”
indication of divine approval, then the actions of Jael and Ehud must be deemed +propriety. A significant difference between the two characters, however, is that whereas Ehud’s motives for assassinating Eglon were clear, Jael’s motives for assassinating Sisera, as discussed above, are anything but transparent.

From the Israelite perspective, Sisera is the oppressive enemy and his slaughter by Jael is therefore a proper act; unfortunately the narrator is too reticent to give any clearly inscribed indication of his/her perspective on this question. Probably Jael’s husband, Heber the Kenite, would disapprove if he were allowed to speak since there was peace between him and Jabin; thus, the fact that the narrator chooses to keep him absent and silent may be telling. The verse that immediately follows the death of Sisera, introduced by a prefix conjugation with a sequential waw, is also significant to the evaluation: “So God subdued on that day Jabin the king of Canaan before the Israelites.” The implied author is indicating here that YHWH was acting in and through Jael to deliver Israel. Even though the text of Judg 4 does not explicitly inscribe a comment on Jael’s ethics, in the context of the book of Judges as a whole, and taking both Judg 4:9 (“the honor shall not be yours on the journey that you are about to take, for the Lord will sell Sisera into the hands of a woman”) and Judg 5:24 (“Most blessed of women is Jael, The wife of Heber the Kenite; Most blessed is she of women in the tent”) into consideration, there is no doubt that her disposal of Sisera should be evaluated as +propriety.

Barak is also the subject of appraisal in the closing verses of Judg 4. The text states in v. 15 that YHWH was the one who routed Sisera and his army, giving no credit to

---

83 See n. 39 in ch. 2.
84 The implied author has chosen to include Judg 5:24 as a commentary on Judg 4, as indicated by the last verse of Judg 5 which incorporates it into the Deborah-Barak cycle.
Barak. In v. 22, Barak arrives on the scene too late to contribute to its success and is depicted in a situation parallel to that of Sisera in v. 18: Jael goes out to meet him, once again showing her initiative (+inclination: eagerness), and also demonstrates her superior status relative to Barak in the subsequent verse by the command that she addresses to Barak, and his compliance with it (−normality). Barak is not even afforded the dignity of being allowed to comment on the death of Sisera; perhaps he was literally speechless. Butler opines that the narrative “paints a narrative portrait of Israel’s general in the weakest possible tones.” According to Bal, “At the end of the narrative, there are no men left.” Although the story of Deborah, Barak, and Jael is admittedly not designed as a feminist manifesto, it does portray women in a positive light. The primary purpose of Deborah and Jael, however, is to serve as a foil to the inadequacies of the leadership of Barak.

5.3 Conclusions

5.3.1 Summary of Evidence

The Israelites at the beginning of the Deborah/Barak narrative are once again depicted as −propriety and −capacity. Instead of focusing on a male military leader, as in the Othniel and Ehud narratives, the opening of this cycle is dominated by the prophetess Deborah, who is construed as +normality: status and +security: trust, a
faithful woman ready to do YHWH’s will. In contrast, when Barak is brought into the story he is evaluated as \(-\text{normality: status}\) and \(-\text{inclination: reluctance}\). The impropriety \((-\text{propriety})\) of the condition he places on his obedience—the reassuring presence of Deborah—is signaled by the loss of honor that he will eventually sustain. Barak is initially contrasted with Sisera, a capable warrior \(+\text{capacity}\), although even this commander is ultimately outdone and undone by a woman, Jael \(-\text{normality: status}, -\text{capacity}\). Barak, arriving on the scene after Sisera has been destroyed, is met by the heroic Jael and loses the honor of the victory \(-\text{normality: status}\). The decline in the quality of the judges begins to become apparent as Barak is contrasted with Othniel and Ehud who preceded him.

5.3.2 Conclusion

In this narrative, the implied author has effectively used the contrasts between characters to evaluate the Israelite judge, Barak. The contrasts in gender, initiative, trust, and effectiveness demonstrate as clearly as an overt evaluation that Barak, if not actively sinful, is definitely weak. There is no record of Barak worshipping idols or committing heinous crimes, but his very passivity and faithlessness reflect badly on him, even if he does eventually contribute to the battle and Israel is ultimately victorious. There are indications that Barak has a lower opinion of the character of YHWH than Deborah or the judges who preceded him. It is interesting that in the last verse the implied author tells the reader through the narrator that the hand of the “Israelites” pressed more harshly on Jabin, until “they” had destroyed the king of Canaan (v. 24). There is no further mention of Barak, and the usual death notice is completely missing; Barak more or less fades into
oblivion. Although Barak is mentioned in Judg 5, it seems that he is damned by faint praise; Deborah and Jael seem to be the focus of more explicit attention and admiration.

If Othniel was the ideal judge, and Ehud was courageous and successful, Barak is the first to elicit definite negative evaluation. He is reluctant, weak, and ineffectual, arriving on the scene of victory after the victory has already been won. The presence of not one but two strong female characters only serves to highlight his inadequacies. Those female characters are interesting in their own right, as well as serving as foils to Barak, the more so because they are female in a patriarchal society. Deborah is a courageous woman of status and initiative, well respected in her community. She acts out of clear motivation: a desire to serve and obey YHWH, and by so doing, serve her people also. Her character is in stark contrast to the reluctant Barak. Deborah consciously and deliberately starts a chain of events that leads to Israel’s deliverance. Jael, however, is far more enigmatic. Although she is also a woman of initiative and courage, she acts alone and her motivation is far from clear. She is willing to place the interests of Israel before her own husband and people, and by so doing ultimately serves the purposes of YHWH; whether this was her intended purpose is impossible to ascertain. Jael ends a series of events—whether deliberately and consciously is unknown—that leads to Israel’s deliverance. In the midst of these events, but hindering as much as helping them forward, is the ineffectual Barak. His military endeavors ensure that he is not a complete failure, but he is a poor shadow of the ideal Othniel and the courageous and effectual Ehud. If this is the best male leadership that Israel is capable of producing, the future bodes ill for the Israelites.
6 The Gideon Narrative (Judges 6–8)

6.1 Introductory Remarks

The story of Gideon has a number of interpretive challenges, one of which is the question of the practice of “putting out a fleece”—that is, setting up an arbitrary test to which God must respond—as a method of obtaining divine guidance. Some commentators use the passage to support the practice while others have argued that God did not endorse Gideon’s action. However, the “fact” still remains: in the narrative, was not Gideon’s action honored by God, implying his approval of this behavior? Later in the book, Gideon performs two other actions which seem to stand at opposite poles of propriety; he first adamantly states that YHWH will rule over Israel, not he himself, but then immediately proceeds to set up a cult object that leads the Israelites into idolatry. How are these actions to be understood?

As already noted, in Judges the implied author uses the voice of the narrator to reflect his/her own ideological perspective, which is in turn subordinated to the perspective of the character YHWH who is used to endorse the implied author’s stance. The implied author uses the paradigm and the paradigmatic judge, Othniel, to set the standard for evaluation of subsequent judges. Ehud is portrayed as similar to Othniel in that he is courageous and commits no sins. Although both appear to act without YHWH’s direct intervention and without dialoguing with YHWH about their actions, Othniel is endowed with YHWH’s spirit and Ehud is raised up by YHWH. Both act faithfully to serve and honor YHWH. They both achieve clear victories and the land has rest; indeed, one of the indicators of propriety is the outcome of events. Barak, on the other hand, is presented by the implied author as the first judge to display clear weakness, if not sin, and perhaps
also doubt in the character of YHWH. He is contrasted to two highly motivated women whose actions are primarily responsible for the defeat of Sisera; Barak merely seems to conduct a clean-up operation before fading from the picture. As the implied author proceeds through the cycles the plots become more elaborate, the characters become more complex, and the failings of the judges become more obvious. Whereas in the story of Barak the implied author uses comparisons between characters to point out the judge’s weakness, in the story of Gideon he uses contrasts within the character of Gideon himself.\textsuperscript{1} Under the ministrations of YHWH Gideon moves from weak, untrusting, and apostate to strong, trusting, and faithful, but when success causes his ego and desires to take control of his actions he degenerates into arrogance and tyranny. His realization of his error does not prevent him from finally leading his people back into apostasy.

6.2 Analysis of the Text

As is evident from the accompanying appraisal analysis chart, the story of Gideon begins with a significant cluster of negative evaluations. First, the Israelites are assessed negatively in regard to their ethical propriety: they “did the evil thing” (v. 1; –propriety). This is a general assessment of their way of life, which is characterized by apostasy, rather than a specific assessment of one situation or action. The subsequent evaluation of the Midianites and Amalekites as +capacity is dependent on the fact that YHWH is using

\textsuperscript{1} In her article, Castelbajac (“Le Cycle de Gédéon,” 146–47) contrasts two antithetical portraits of Gideon-Jerubbaal, based on different sets of traditions: “Les figures militaire et religieuse de Gédéon, qui se dédoublent respectivement en chef de guerre résolu et en chef de guerre doutant de sa vocation, ainsi qu’en champion du culte de Yahvé et en tenant du baalisme.” She argues that one set of traditions depicts Gideon with the royal trait of cunning eloquence in conflict resolution (p. 149). This Gideon, a proto-king of Israel, is a hero in the fight against Baal (p. 154). The second Gideon is a Canaanite leader who erroneously rejects the royal office offered by YHWH and is responsible for setting up idolatrous worship (p. 155). Rather than attributing these traits to different traditions that were combined to create the current narrative, it is better to attribute them to the stages in the development of the complex character of Gideon, torn between loyalties in a syncretistic culture.
them as agents and enabling them to do his will. Although YHWH brings about the
subjugation of Israel to Midian, he receives a \textit{+propriety} evaluation because his
discipline is justified by Israel’s apostasy. The fact that Midian is doing the will of YHWH
\textit{(+propriety)} does not, of course, prevent them from being viewed negatively
\textit{(-propriety)} from the perspective of the Israelites. The word \textit{$\overline{w}y$} (“destroy”) is
predicated of the Midianites twice in close proximity (vv. 4–5), and they are
metaphorically compared to locusts, insects which are feared and loathed due to their
propensity to destroy food supplies and, consequently, life itself. The effect of all this on
Israel is also negative, they were brought “very low” \textit{(-normality)}, and the emphatic
adverb \textit{t$\overline{v}$} (“very, exceedingly”) stresses the intensity of their affective state.\textsuperscript{2} In their
inability to overcome the enemy \textit{(-capacity)} their behavioral response was that they
cried to YHWH, which indicates \textit{-happiness: misery}.

As well as depicting the Israelite’s misery, the opening verses also indicate
Israel’s insecurity, a characteristic that will become very significant when Gideon is
introduced, and a discourse prosody of \textit{-security: distrust} begins. The ideational
statement that “the hand of Midian was strong against Israel” (v. 2),\textsuperscript{3} followed directly by
the result clause indicating that the Israelites made hiding places for themselves in the
hills, clearly indicates their \textit{-security: mistrust}. This mistrust is directed not only against
the enemy, who may attack at any moment, but also at God due to their doubt that YHWH
was acting on their behalf against Midian since the Israelites were under constant
persecution by the Midianites. Although the implied author never actually states in so
\begin{footnotes}
\item[2] As Block \textit{(Judges, Ruth, 253)} notes, “Israel ‘became small’ \textit{(wayyiddal)}, which says as much about her
emotional state as about her economic condition.”
\item[3] The insecurity here is both affect and fact: the Israelites felt insecure because they in fact were insecure.
\end{footnotes}
many words that the Israelites were insecure, the ideational evidence is overwhelming. The syntax of ( "and it was that whenever Israel had sown, that the Midianites would come up..." ), a temporal clause with followed by verbs in the suffix conjugation, is best translated in a modal sense: "Whenever ... they would ...," indicating a habitual or recurring situation. This depiction of insecurity is developed by further ideational tokens, the litany of destructive actions of the Midianites in vv. 3–4: laying siege, destroying crops, and seizing livestock. The force of this threat is heightened by the description of both the Midianites as “like locusts for number” and of their camels which were “uncountable” (v. 5). The result of all this was that . This phrase is sometimes translated “Israel was impoverished,” but the “smallness” or “insignificance” implied by may well refer to the Israelites rather than their produce (–normality), and also carries overtones of “helplessness” or “powerlessness.”

Therefore this phrase may well be the closest that the narrator comes to actually stating that the Israelites were vulnerable and insecure, a conclusion reinforced by the fact that at this point the Israelites cry out to . The nature of this cry is not specified; it may have been a cry of repentance or a cry for help, but also in the context was surely an expression of suffering (–happiness: misery).

The narrative action continues in v. 7 when sends a prophet to respond to Israel’s cry with a judgment speech. The implied author channels the message through both a prophet and , using their authority and reliability to endorse his appraisal of the Israelites (C:Ed). In a detailed discourse prosody in vv. 8–9, recounts his

4 See Waltke and O’Connor, Hebrew Syntax, 485, 643.
5 TNIV, NRSV, NASB has “Israel was brought very low.”
6 See HALOT, 221–23.
compassion and faithfulness to Israel, a strategy designed to stimulate trust in him now in the midst of further difficulties (∞+security: trust). This purpose is succinctly summarized in v. 10 when YHWH states: “I am YHWH your God; you shall not fear the gods of the Amorites in whose land you live.” YHWH’s recital of the great acts that he has performed for Israel—deliverance from slavery and the gift of freedom, bringing them out of oppression in Egypt and leading them into the abundance of the Promised Land—serves not only to illustrate his great power, but also to reassure the Israelites that he is able to deliver them in the present and future as he has in the past.

YHWH’s perspective is also clearly chastisement, however. His recounting of Israel’s history is designed to eliminate argument and sets up a powerful comparison between YHWH’s ethical and compassionate behavior on Israel’s behalf in delivering them from their oppressors and remaining with them through the wilderness (+propriety), and their unfaithful and unethical behavior (−propriety) in ignoring their God and disobeying him—for the phrase כל נא שמעו בקהל can imply both “not listening” and “not obeying”—and their resultant helplessness. In the light of this negative portrayal of Israel, the evaluation of Gideon (+normality, +capacity) by the angel of YHWH who appears to Gideon in v. 11 might be interpreted as ironic: How can a timid young man hiding in his threshing floor for fear of the enemy be called “most valiant

7 Claassens (“The Character of God in Judges 6–8,” 57) rightly points out that the repetition of 1 cs verbs in YHWH’s account of his actions on behalf of Israel emphasizes his identity, and Israel’s primary sin as apostasy.
8 See HALOT, 1572.
9 Soggin (Judges, a Commentary, 112) comments that the passage (6:7–10) “does not have any connection with the context,” but it is clearly connected to the cycle of oppression and deliverance.
10 For the purposes of this study, the angel of YHWH and YHWH will be considered the same. Indeed, in the text the appellations switch back and forth. See Newsom, “Angels (Old Testament),” 1:250.
warrior” (גֵּרֶם נַחֲלָה)? It is more likely, however, that God is evaluating Gideon on his potential, from a broader divine perspective, rather than present realities.12

At this point the narrative moves from a general overview of the insecure Israelite population to a close focus on one specific and very insecure Israelite who lives in Ophrah, Gideon the son of Joash (v. 11). Martin and White explain that “the security variable covers emotions concerned with ecosocial well-being—anxiety, fear, confidence, and trust.”13 Martin and White do not define these terms explicitly, but from their examples it seems that “confidence” refers to self-confidence, an inwardly based sense of security, and “trust” to an outwardly directed sense of security based in others, and this is the way that these terms will be used here.14 These emotions can be inscribed directly in Hebrew by lexis such as אָרָם (Judg 6:23: “to fear”), חֶרֶב (Judg 7:3: “to be anxious/trembling”), or בֵּטְחָה (Judg 9:26; 11:20: “to feel secure, trust”), but also by behavioral processes such as נָס (Judg 7:22, 8:12, etc: “to flee”) and also by grammatical means such as the use of jussive or cohortative verbs. It can also be invoked by ideational content: the fact that the Israelites made hiding places in the mountains in Judg 6:2 is a clear indication of their insecurity in the face of their Midianite oppressors.

Gideon’s insecurity is invoked by his unusual act of threshing wheat within a

11 See Amit, The Art of Editing, 252. For further comments on the significance of this appellation and its connection to v. 14 see Soggin, Judges, a Commentary, 119. Block’s interpretation that the angel is flattering Gideon to gain his co-operation, and that Gideon recognizes the similarity of his call to that of the great leader Moses, is less likely (Block, Judges, Ruth, 262). Although many scholars have pointed out the similarities between the calls of Gideon and Moses this similarity should not be overstressed (see for example Martin, “The Role of the Spirit,” 33–34; Wong, “Gideon: A New Moses?”). As Butler (Judges, 200 comments), “I would rather see Gideon as becoming an antitype to Moses.” Space does not permit a full development of the comparison here.
12 Stone, “Judges,” 275, however, deems this a rebuke.
13 Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 49.
wine press, which begins a long discourse prosody of security: mistrust (in YHWH) and a shorter prosody of security: uneasiness (in himself); although the wind in an open space would be more effective for blowing away chaff, it would also leave him exposed to the Midianites and risk losing his entire crop to them if observed.\textsuperscript{15} Syntactical evidence such as the “if...then...” statement, here expressed in Hebrew by the particle of existence ויהי, and the interrogative adverbs “why?” and “where?” inscribe his security: mistrust, as does his use of lexis such as the verb “abandon/forsake” (נתן לפסサポート) and his accusation that YHWH has “given them into the hand” (יִתְּנוּ אֶל מְדִינָי) of Midian.\textsuperscript{16} YHWH’s responses in v. 14 are intended to encourage (+inclination: encouragement): “Go in this your strength and deliver Israel,” and “Have I not sent you?” Whereas the first seems to posit a situation in which Gideon must rely on his own strength, the second comment clarifies the situation by reminding Gideon that his strength is dependent on YHWH’s commissioning him (∞ +security: trust).

The challenges that Gideon offers in this section of the dialogue to the character of YHWH are crucial to understanding the thrust of the passage as a whole, and are worthy of closer inspection. Gideon’s challenges develop more fully the doubt about YHWH suggested by Barak in the last narrative, but now Israel’s continuing suffering has brought the question to the forefront of Gideon’s mind. The implied author sets Gideon up as a counter voice (C:Ct), the voice of doubt, which he/she will later undermine though YHWH’s responses (which reflect the implied author’s perspective: C:Ed) and the outcome of events in the rest of the narrative. In spite of the prophet’s statement that

\textsuperscript{15} See Butler, Judges, 201.

\textsuperscript{16} See Webb, Judges, 230, for an analysis of Gideon’s misunderstandings in his speech to YHWH.
YHWH is with him (+normality), Gideon challenges the claim with a variety of rhetorical strategies. Perhaps Gideon should know that he is being disciplined and therefore why YHWH’s miracles are not evident, but apparently does not. Verse 13, with its “if...then...” conditional statement and its two interrogative adverbs, "why?" and "where?", not only inscribes Gideon’s insecurity (−security: mistrust), but also presents his challenge to YHWH on several fronts. His truthfulness is questioned (−veracity) since, if indeed YHWH were “with them,” the Israelites would not be experiencing so many difficulties. His dependability is disputed, since he had brought them up out of servitude in Egypt but had now apparently abandoned them (−tenacity). His ability is questioned (−capacity), not only because YHWH’s miracles have apparently ceased, but also since Israel’s oppression by a foreign country empowered by foreign gods implies that YHWH is less powerful. Finally, the ethics of YHWH’s behavior are contested (−propriety), since he is allowing his own people to suffer. This complex assault which opens God’s character up to dispute does not, however, motivate YHWH to defend himself; he merely reiterates his command, and insists that Gideon has the strength to deliver Israel. In doing so, however, he addresses Gideon’s insecurity and misery and affirms his capability—but to no avail. Gideon is still doubtful.

YHWH’s attempt to change Gideon’s affectual state does not immediately succeed, as inscribed in v. 15 where once again Gideon challenges YHWH (C:Ct). The self-depreciating attitude that Gideon exhibits in this verse might be attributed to a cultural

---

17 Ironic, considering what Block (Judges, Ruth, 256) calls the “people’s persistent perfidy.” He remarks, “If God raises a deliverer for Israel, it is an entirely gracious act. There has been no hint of repentance nor any announcement of divine forgiveness.”
form of politeness when addressing a superior. Gideon’s subsequent hesitancy and insistence on testing YHWH make it unlikely, however, that this is all his protestations indicate; there is a ring of truth about his conventional statements. Gideon immediately questions God’s instructions and expresses inadequacy (−capacity) and self-doubt (−security: uneasiness). The expression יְאֹרֶץ יַעֲזָרְנָה is a “formula for beginning a conversation with a person of higher rank” and indicates Gideon’s sense of inferiority. His question “How shall I deliver Israel?” clearly inscribes his sense of inadequacy and may be sarcastic as well. Gideon here is clearly still relying on his own self-confidence rather than placing his trust in YHWH, probably because of his deep disappointment with his perception of YHWH’s recent handing of his responsibility for Israel. This is followed by two superlative adjectives, ‘לְלָן (“the lowest/most helpless”) and ‘שָׂעְרֵי (“the smallest/youngest”), expressing the inferior position of his clan, and of himself within that clan; thus, Gideon effectively deems himself the “lowest of the low” (−capacity, −normality). YHWH responds encouragingly (+inclination: encouragement) and

18 Compare Moses (Exod 3:11–4:17) and Isaiah (Isa 6:5–7). See note 11. The implied comparison may suggest a more positive evaluation.
19 Stone (“Judges,” 275) attributes Gideon’s hesitancy to a reluctance “to overthrow the entire family structure of his people” since only the heads of houses and elders had the authority to lead the people. This may be so, but it only gives a reason for his sense of inadequacy, and does not deny it.
20 According to Butler (Judges, 203), “[Gideon] calls his family the poorest one in the tribe, yet his father owns property and supports a worship place for Baal as we will soon learn. Far from being the poorest or weakest in the tribe, Gideon’s father is a clan leader and one of the strongest economically and politically in the tribe.” Without seeing into the mind of Gideon, it is impossible to determine whether he is putting on an act of helplessness, either to give an appearance of humility or to get out of responsibility (see for example Schneider, Judges, 105, 108), or whether he genuinely does feel insecure in the face of Midianite oppression in spite of his family’s advantages.
21 HALOT, 122–23. This is an abbreviated way of saying, “if any harm results from my addressing you, may it come on me, Lord.”
22 This evaluation may perhaps be ironic. It may seem that Gideon is merely putting on an act of poverty and inferiority since his father has cattle and owns a shrine, and the family seems to have some status in the community. It may simply be that this is the language of deference and modesty. However, in the context of Gideon’s excessive doubt and reluctance throughout the narrative, it is likely that he actually feels inadequate to the task of confronting the army of the Midianites. See Butler, Judges, 203; Schneider, Judges, 105; Soggin, Judges, a Commentary, 119–120.
affirms, “Surely I will be with you, and you shall defeat Midian as one man” (v. 16). Although the ꞌopard may possibly be a causal conjunction (“because”) rather than an emphatic demonstrative particle (“indeed” or “surely”), the emphatic fronting of the subordinate clause would have much the same effect. In either case, it is the presence of YHWH that ensures success and inspires trust (∞+ security: trust).

Circumstances, however, have caused Gideon’s doubt to become deeply entrenched; he is still uncertain, and, for the first time, asks YHWH for a sign (−security: mistrust). Through this series of signs, the implied author will provide a way for YHWH to reassert the orthodox theological view of God’s care for Israel and undercut Gideon’s doubting challenges. Another “if...then” statement follows (v. 17), in which Gideon posits an irreal state in which he is favored by God (∞+normality)—the way that Gideon would like the situation to be rather than how it actually appears to be to him—and asking for supernatural confirmation. It is interesting in the light of subsequent events that Gideon simply asks for a sign, and does not specify what that sign should be. Verse 21 confirms Gideon’s desired (irreal) evaluation of himself as one favored by God (+normality): the angel of the Lord causes fire to spring from his staff and consume the offered meal. In this case the confirmation is directly connected to an evaluation of Gideon. This fact will become significant later in the passage. This first sign, asking for assurance that it is indeed YHWH who is speaking to him, almost backfires when his realization that he has seen God face-to-face only increases his fear and insecurity (v. 22, −security: mistrust). This provokes YHWH’s most explicit reassurance: “Peace to you,

---

23 See Klein, Irony in Judges, 53.
24 See HALOT, 470.
do not fear; you shall not die.” This response, although brief, is packed with motivations for \(\infty\) **security**: **trust**. It begins immediately with a positive assurance of peace and then continues with two negated verbs that raise the force of the reassurance: “do not fear” (לא תירא) and “you will not die” (돌ימכם). A negated negative promise (e.g. “You will not die”) is often more powerful than a simple positive promise (e.g., “You will live”) since a negated negative actively confronts the negative situation and undermines it, whereas a positive promise simply avoids the negative situation. This direct confrontation of Gideon’s insecurity seems finally to have some effect, since it is followed by a token of \(\infty\) **security**: **trust**, the building of an altar named “YHWH is peace.”

Verse 25 lets the implied reader know that Gideon was a very unlikely choice to deliver Israel: he was not only fearful, resentful, and cynical, but also the son of a man who owned a shrine to the pagan god Baal.\(^{25}\) Thus, before setting out to destroy the Midianites, Gideon is given a task to do closer to home which is also a test of his character (\(\infty\) **propriety**). He is to tear down the altar to Baal and the Asherah next to it on his father’s land and build an altar to YHWH (vv. 25–26), thus establishing the propriety of his own worship before presuming to deal with pagan foreigners.\(^{26}\) It is both interesting and significant that at the same time that Gideon is testing YHWH, YHWH also repeatedly tests Gideon.\(^{27}\)

Verse 27 illustrates Gideon’s obedience to YHWH (\(\infty\) **propriety**) but again reinforces Gideon’s timid nature by stating that he was “too afraid” to do it by day and

---

\(^{25}\) Martin (“The Role of the Spirit,” 33) unconvincingly suggests that Gideon was an appropriate choice since he was “aware” of the Exodus tradition and, through his syncretistic father, was “aware” of the idolatry of Israel.

\(^{26}\) It is probably also true, as Matthews (Judges and Ruth, 86) suggests, that the destruction of the pagan altar is intended to make clear that the victory to come will be credited to YHWH, not Baal.

\(^{27}\) See Butler, Judges, 205.
did it by night—security: mistrust) in spite of the angel’s reassurance (v. 23), perhaps not without some justification since the men of the town attempted to kill him on discovering his deed (satisfaction: displeasure, happiness: antipathy). Joash, his father, is supportive, however, and he offers a negative evaluation of the false god, Baal. Block suggests that the destruction of Baal’s altar has convinced Joash of the “folly of his pagan ways.” It may also be, however, that he values his son’s life more than a god who has not yet relieved the Israelites of Midianite oppression; Joash threatens the men of the city, just as they threatened Gideon, with death (happiness: antipathy). Joash’s sneering rhetorical question (“Will you contend for Baal, or will you deliver him?”) and his “if...then...” statement (“If he is a god, let him contend for himself/he will contend for himself” in v. 31 both accuse Baal of a total lack of ability to defend himself (capacity). In contrast to the pathetically incompetent Baal, the powerful “Spirit of YHWH” comes upon Gideon, enabling him for his task (v. 34) and indicating his special status (normality: chosenness), and Gideon is encouraged enough to muster Israelite troops (v. 35).

In spite of all the affirmations of YHWH’s support that Gideon has received, however, he still distrusts God. This uncertainty and distrust runs like a thread

---

28 Stone (“Judges,” 277) may well be correct when he states, “Though he did what the Lord commanded, he merely complied, not truly obeying.”

29 Block, Judges, Ruth, 270.

30 According to Webb (Judges, 236), “Joash, the erstwhile patron of a heretical cult, morphs before our eyes into a proto-Elijah, challenging his fellow citizens to avenge Baal themselves and be executed as murderers, or risk having him exposed as powerless by doing nothing (v. 31).”

31 Emphasis added.

32 See Butler (Judges, 207) for an argument that Joash’s remark should not be translated “Let Baal contend” in the jussive, but “Baal will contend.”

33 Interestingly, Butler (Judges, 209) notes: “The deity’s personal name, Yahweh, which has dominated the story almost entirely to this point slips from view. The more generic, less personal, more transcendent term Elohim, “God,” is used. By replacing Yahweh with Elohim, the narrator places some distance between
throughout Judg 6,34 hearkening back to Gideon’s extremely doubtful prosody in his challenge to YHWH in v. 13. Therefore, Gideon once again asks for a sign to confirm the truthfulness of YHWH’s promises (\(\infty+\text{veracity}\)), and his compassion towards Israel (\(\infty+\text{propriety}\))—”If you will deliver Israel through me, as you have promised…”—the first sign of the fleece.35 He wants evidence of God’s truthfulness: that he will act according to what he has spoken; of God’s dependability: that he can be counted on to accomplish his plans; and of God’s ethical propriety: that he will address and relieve the oppression and suffering of Israel.36 The magnitude of Gideon’s distrust and the importance of the requested reassurance are indicated by the double “if...then...” construction, and in the double use of the phrase “You will deliver Israel” (vv. 36–37) in both the protasis and the apodosis. The response by the narrator in v. 38, voicing the confidence of the implied author in YHWH’s character, is the simple phrase: “And it was so.”

Gideon, however, is yet again unconvinced (\(-\text{security: mistrust}\)). He requests another sign, the reverse of the first, even though there are numerous inscribed indications that he himself realizes that this action is not appropriate: the use of cohortative and jussive verbs, the particle of entreaty and deference (אַעֲשֶׂה), and the expressed realization that the repeated request might well anger YHWH (v. 39,

---

34 This is part of Pattern B, The Character of Gideon, which will not be discussed in detail here.
35 Soggin (Judges, a Commentary, 121) notes that asking for a sign is not inappropriate in and of itself in the OT context, and points out a situation in which Ahaz is criticized for not asking for a sign (Isa 7:10–25). The appropriateness of Gideon’s specific requests for signs must be evaluated in context.
36 It is interesting that Gideon does not recognize the justice and propriety of YHWH’s discipline in response to Israel’s sin. It may be that he is not aware of that sinfulness, or that he thinks YHWH’s discipline is excessive.
the sign of the fleece was a down payment or token that YHWH was willing and capable of doing what he promised. It now becomes apparent that the mocking of Baal’s inadequacy in v. 31 serves as a foil to YHWH’s power and majesty. Ultimately, in Judg 8:28, God will accomplish in actual fact what he promises here through the signs: Midian will be finally subdued and Israel will have rest for forty years and YHWH’s character will be vindicated, but much will occur in the narrative before this victory.

It is important to clarify the exact nature of Gideon’s signs involving the fleece and what the implied author is communicating through his recounting of them. The evaluative language in the text makes it clear that what is at stake, that what Gideon doubts, and that what the sign is intended to confirm, is the character of YHWH. Gideon distrusts not only God’s ability to defeat the enemy (−capacity), but also his truthfulness, reliability, and morality (−veracity, −tenacity, and −propriety). What the results of the double sign of the fleece confirm is the character of YHWH: his +capacity, +veracity, +reliability, and +propriety. Unlike the first sign in v. 17, they say absolutely nothing

---

37 Some point out that the first sign was more likely to be fulfilled since the fleece would tend to absorb more water than the beaten ground. This may have provoked Gideon to ask for the less likely second test. See for example Soggin, Judges, a Commentary, 133.

38 According to Butler (Judges, 210), “We see only what God did. We do not hear how Gideon reacted. We never hear a word from God. Thus in this test narrative, we find a bit of distance developing between Gideon and God.” There is no doubt that Gideon’s repeated testing tries YHWH’s patience even as he responds to it in order to accomplish his goal in delivering Israel.

39 For a very different interpretation of the fleece episode, see Bluedorn, Yahweh Versus Baalism, 113–124, in which Bluedorn argues that Gideon’s “real intention” was to “diminish YHWH’s role in the forthcoming deliverance and elevate his own role instead” (p. 119). Scherer (“Gideon—Ein Anti-Held?,” 269–273) disputes this claim and states, “Er will Gott nicht zwingen, seinem persönlichen Erfolgsstreben zu dienen; er braucht vielmehr Gewißheit darüber, ob Gott wirklich durch ihn Israel erretten will. ... Gideon leidet nicht an einem Übermaß an Selbstbewußtsein und Geltungsdrang, sondern an einem Mangel an Gewißheit über sich selbst und seinen Auftrag. [He does not force God to serve his personal ambition to succeed; rather, he needs certainty about whether God really wants to save Israel by him. ... Gideon does not suffer from an excess of self-consciousness and desire for recognition, but to a lack of certainty about himself and his mission.]”
about Gideon or the appropriateness of his actions. There is no evidence in the text that the fact that God honored the arbitrary and doubting request for signs and responded to them constitutes approval of the practice of using signs to determine the will of God; to the contrary, it is clear that Gideon knew the will of God—after all, he had been told what to do by God in a face-to-face encounter—but nevertheless doubted. More importantly, Gideon should have known the character of God: his justice and holiness, demonstrated in his intolerance of apostasy and his disciplinary response to sin, and his mercy and faithfulness, evidenced in his previous gracious interventions in the history of Israel. If anything, the fact that YHWH honored Gideon’s request says more about his patience and mercy than about Gideon’s practices.

By the end of ch. 6 the implied author has demonstrated that YHWH’s efforts at building up Gideon’s courage have succeeded, temporarily at least; Gideon has finally accumulated enough evidence to trust in YHWH (+security: trust). The next morning he sets out to confront the Midianites (7:1). It therefore may come as a surprise to the reader that the implied author immediately has YHWH begin to remove some of the basis for Gideon’s assurance that enabled him to finally set out for war against the Midianites (7:2). Human nature being what it is, there is always the risk that the trust that YHWH has so carefully cultivated in Gideon will degenerate into self-confidence, so YHWH will continue to test Gideon as Gideon continues to test him, not only because YHWH may well doubt Gideon’s commitment, but also because he is continuing to build up his faith. YHWH makes his -satisfaction: displeasure abundantly clear when he states explicitly:

40 As Block ("Will the Real Gideon," 360) rightly points out, the signs were not genuine attempts to determine God’s will, but an attempt to manipulate God and try to get out of the responsibility of attacking the Midianites.
“The people who are with you are too many for me to give Midian into their hands, lest Israel glorify itself against me, saying, ‘My own power/hand has delivered me’” (v. 2). These words would construe a putative future evaluation of security: confidence for Israel rather than the +security: trust that God desires. Thus, YHWH uses two tests to reduce the size of the Israelite army to the point where their security must be in their God and not themselves. The first test has a direct relationship to the affective state of the people: all who are afraid (יָאָר) and trembling (דְרָכָ, indicating their lack of confidence (security: uneasiness), are dismissed (v. 3). It is perhaps possible that the fear and trembling indicates their lack of trust in YHWH, but following directly on v. 2, which clearly deals with the issue of self-confidence (“...saying, ‘My own power has delivered me.”’), it is more likely that it indicates lack of trust in themselves. The meaning of the second test has long been the subject of debate; is there some criteria relevant to trust that forms the basis of the decision, or is the choice purely random? It is most likely that the test is random. In the first test, YHWH specifically gives the criteria, fear and trembling, that relate to self-confidence (v. 3, -security: uneasiness); in the second, however, the basis for the choice is not given: “Therefore it shall be that he of whom I say to you, ‘This one shall go with you,’ he shall go with you; but everyone of whom I say to you, ‘This one shall not go with you,’ he shall not go” (v. 4) (both groups: normality: chosenness). It appears that the choice is arbitrary. Also, YHWH does not state which group will go and who will remain until after the test has been given, and subsequently

41 Amit (The Art of Editing, 265) points out the frequent use of “hand” imagery in the Gideon narrative, and concludes that the purpose is to emphasize “the supremacy of the power operating the hand—God.” The power of Gideon’s own hand would undermine this.

42 For various interpretations of the criteria for choice see Amit, The Art of Editing, 258–59; Block, Judges, Ruth, 276–77; Schneider, Judges, 111–12; Younger, Judges and Ruth, 189.
selects the smaller group (−capacity) to go up against the enemy (v. 7). His goal is simply to reduce the army to the point where they simply cannot rely on their own strength and numbers but must of necessity trust in God.

In v. 9 the implied author makes an important change in the narrative; he alters the focus from Gideon and his men to Gideon alone—all the subsequent references are to him, not his troops—and YHWH begins dealing with the issue of trust. It is obviously easier to “trust” when you are backed by 32,000 warriors than when you have a mere 300, therefore YHWH seeks to inspire trust in Gideon (v. 7, ☞security: trust) by assuring him that he will deliver him with this reduced force and also by asserting that he will give the Midianites into his hands. However, it appears that with the reduction of his force YHWH knows that Gideon’s trust in him is once again wavering (v. 10, ☞security: trust); a conditional “if…then…” construction is used here to entertain this probability: “If you are afraid to go down, then …” (v. 10–11, ☞inclination: encouragement).43 This is confirmed when Gideon does indeed take his servant and go down to spy out the Midianite and Amelekite camp (v. 11: ☞security: trust).44 It is significant here that the implied author uses virtually identical language and imagery to describe the enemy as was used in the introduction to the Gideon narrative: in 6:5 the enemy come in “like locusts for number” (עֲזוּבֵל וְאָרָבַּה לְבֵב) and their camels were “innumerable” (אַשְׁנֹת מָפָרָה); in 7:12 the enemy is “as numerous as locusts” (כַּעֲזוּבֵל לְבֵב) and their camels “innumerable” (אָרָבַּה מָפָרָה), but one more intimidating image is added: “as numerous as sand on the seashore” (כְּהֶוֹל שֵׂעֵל שָׁפָט הָיוֹת לְבֵב). Thus, the later imagery evokes the fearful character of the

43 As Block (Judges, Ruth, 278) notes, “The clause is cast as hypothetical, but obviously the problem is real.”
44 See O’Connell, Rhetoric of Judges, 159–60.
Israelites (security: mistrust) at the beginning of the episode and applies it to Gideon with greater force, suggesting that even more reassurance is necessary to convince Gideon that YHWH is indeed trustworthy and able to take care of him. It should perhaps be noted at this point that earlier in the narrative (ch. 6) YHWH’s character was provisionally justified by the signs of the fleece—that is, the miraculous signs served as a warrant or guarantee of later victory—but not fully vindicated until Judg 8:28 when the Midianites were finally defeated. This may explain the constant need to bolster Gideon’s trust.45

In the camp Gideon hears a dream related by an enemy soldier that predicts the destruction of the Midianite camp. The implied author is insinuating here that since YHWH sent him to hear the dream and its interpretation, it was a message from YHWH, and thus reliable (+veracity). In fact, the interpretation of the soldier’s friend will prove to be a significant juncture in the character development of Gideon: “This is nothing less than the sword of Gideon the son of Joash, a man of Israel; God has given Midian and all the camp into his hand” (v. 14). The Midianite clearly credits God (יהוה) with the ensuing victory, and yet he first emphasizes the role of the “sword of Gideon” as an agent in achieving that goal. In fact, the significance of Gideon himself is stressed by using no less than three phrases to designate him: “Gideon,” “the son of Joash,” and “a man of Israel.” This, and the phrase בְּנֵי, which is usually glossed “no other than,” “nothing but,” or “nothing less than,”46 clearly construe Gideon as +normality, implying that he will have a significant role in the defeat of Midian. The immediate impact of this

45 Amit (The Art of Editing, 235) rightly remarks that the numerous signs also serve to emphasize the subordinate role of Gideon in the victory in comparison to YHWH’s powerful role.

46 See HALOT, 136.
information on Gideon is twofold and positive. First, he worships YHWH (v. 15), then he calls his troops to action. Both of these acts, as well as his subsequent statement when calling the troops to action that “YHWH has given the camp of Midian into your hands,” demonstrate his final acceptance of YHWH’s assurance of victory (+security: trust)—at least for the immediate future. The long term impact will be rather more negative, as we will see. The implied author may be hinting at this future negativity here by portraying an ironic situation in which Gideon is willing to believe more readily the statement of an enemy soldier than the direct statement of God himself; Gideon seems to value human rather than divine input. Indeed, we have not heard the last of the “sword of Gideon.”

In v. 15b the implied author returns the focus to Gideon in the context of his army—or what remains of it—and begins to give a positive portrayal of Gideon acting and speaking as an exemplary leader of his men, concuring with the implied author’s ideology of faithful obedience (C:Cc): “Arise, for YHWH has given the camp of Midian into your hands.” Gideon does appear to trust YHWH as he sets out with his tiny contingent toward the enemy camp and encourages them to advance as YHWH instructed (+inclination: encouragement; +propriety), for if his 300 men are carrying trumpets in one hand and a pitcher enclosing a torch in the other, there is no hand left to carry a weapon (v. 20: –capacity); Gideon is forced to rely on YHWH’s promises and a ruse that merely makes his army seem powerful rather than on the actual strength of his forces. Nevertheless, a problem is suggested as Gideon relays the battle cry to his men: “For

---

47 Interestingly, Boling (Judges, 148) suggests that the reconnaissance of the camp assured Gideon that the enemy could be stampeded, and thus reduced the need for trust in YHWH. There is no evidence in the text for this interpretation, however.
48 As Matthews (Judges and Ruth, 92–93) notes, it is also ironic that the enemy soldier shows more faith in YHWH’s ability to bring victory than Gideon does.
YHWH and for Gideon!” (v. 18). It appears that the interpretation of the Midianite’s dream, with its references to Gideon which construe +normality, may have taken hold of Gideon’s mind so that he now arrogantly views himself as working in collaboration with YHWH. The implied author may be giving the reader a hint, but the evidence is at present uncertain (~propriety). The link to the content of the dream becomes clearer, however, in v. 20 when Gideon’s three companies cry, “A sword for YHWH and for Gideon!” (~propriety). This may bode ill for Gideon’s character, especially when the implied author takes the time to make it clear in v. 22 through the narrator that it is YHWH who causes the destruction of the Midianite camp without the Israelites having to participate in the battle at all.

At this point Gideon calls back the men of Naphtali, Asher, and Manasseh to pursue the fleeing enemy (v. 23). Since in Judg 6:35 these three tribes, along with Zebulun, constituted the original mustering of the troops before YHWH reduced their numbers to levels that would prohibit boasting, we can assume that these warriors are a

---

49 For various opinions on the significance of this cry, see Boda, “Judges,” 1157; O’Connell, Rhetoric of Judges, 165–66; Schneider, Judges, 115; Block, Judges, Ruth, 282; McCann, Judges, 67–68. 50 Klein (Irony in Judges, 56–57) argues, “The battle exemplifies the optimal Yahweh-Israel relationship in the book of Judges: human submission in faith so that Yahweh can act through his people.” She suggests that the battle cry of Gideon is not as problematic as its “interpretation” by Gideon’s men, who attribute the victory not to “the divine and human leaders of the war [but] to its means, the sword.” However, she comments that “Yahweh is tolerant of such human error.” Although Klein does state that Gideon’s inclusion of his own name is “suggestive of subsequent actions,” her interpretation of the battle cry underestimates its significance in the overall evaluative pattern.

51 A number of commentators have commented on the propriety of this recall of the troops that YHWH had sent away. See Butler, Judges, 215; Klein, Irony in Judges, 57–58; Bluedorn, Yahweh Versus Baalism, 148. This action may demonstrate a lack of trust in YHWH after he deliberately reduced their numbers in order to avoid self-reliance on the part of Gideon; it may also be that the battle has in effect already been won and the recall of the troops merely to “clean up” is not inappropriate. In view of Gideon’s subsequent actions, however, it is possible that Block (Judges, Ruth, 283) is right when he asserts, “Having achieved the divinely intended goal with the three hundred core troops, Gideon appeared to forget the point of Yahweh’s reduction of the troops. Instead of operating by faith and seeking guidance from God, he relied on human strength and mobilized the troops of Naphtali, Asher, and all Manasseh.”
subset of the same men who are now returning to the battle, with the notable addition of
the men of Ephraim (v. 24). Judges 7:24–25 consists of a prosody of numerous actions
on the part of the Ephraimites that demonstrate +capacity: they "took," they "captured,"
they "killed," they "pursued," and they brought back the heads of Oreb and Zeeb to
Gideon. Since the Ephraimites were not involved in the earlier events designed to elicit
trust in God, it is impossible to determine with certainty whether their actions express
confidence in YHWH or merely confidence in their own strength, although their offended
complaint to Gideon that they were not called out earlier (−satisfaction: displeasure)
suggests that it is honor, their own reputation as mighty warriors, that primarily concerns
them (8:1). When Ehud called out the Ephraimites to the banks of the Jordan in Judg
3:27–28, the result was successful military co-operation; this time when Ephraim is
called to the Jordan the alliance is more contentious. Gideon’s response to their
challenge, “God has given the leaders of Midian, Oreb and Zeeb into your hands; and
what was I able to do in comparison with you?” (v. 3), which construes the Ephraimites
as +capacity and +normality, seems to be self-effacing and indicative of trust in YHWH
rather than himself (+security: trust). However, his words are obviously influenced by
the need to appease his angry fellow Israelites and perhaps should not be given too much
weight, especially in the light of subsequent events. Kirkpatrick argues that Gideon
recognizes that although his honor acquired in successful battle is secure, his ascribed

---

52 See Butler, Judges, 212–13 on 7:7–8. The rest of the 10,000 men had not gone “home” but to their
“place” and to their “tents.”
53 A desire for plunder, as well as honor, could also be at issue, although the two ideas are intertwined. See
the detailed analysis by Kirkpatrick, “Questions of Honor in the Book of Judges,” 19–40. See Boda,
“Judges,” 1160; Matthews, Judges and Ruth, 94; Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 103.
54 Contra Matthews (Judges and Ruth, 94–95), who argues that the humility is genuine. The expressions of
Gideon’s self-confidence that immediately follow this incident also suggest that the humility is assumed for
diplomatic purposes.
honor is negligible since he is from a minor family in his tribe, and he thus exercises
discretion as the better part of valor.\footnote{Kirkpatrick, “Questions of Honor in the Book of Judges,” 30: “Thus the contest is ended with Gideon retaining his acquired honor from the battle while deferring to Ephraim on the basis of the unequal ascribed honor of their families.”} His efforts at diplomacy are nevertheless
successful, and the Ephraimites’ anger subsides \(+\text{happiness: cheer}\).\footnote{Stone (“Judges,” 289) puts Ephraim at fault for wasting time in capturing the two chieftains and not following Gideon’s orders to guard the crossing of the Jordan. He blames them for striving after the very honor and credit that YHWH warned of at the beginning of the narrative.} In spite of a few hints that Gideon harbors more arrogance than he should, his leadership to this point has
been exemplary.

The verses that follow (8:4–5), however, constitute a major turning point in the
character of Gideon.\footnote{See Webb, Judges: Integrated, 151: “In this first movement then, Gideon is a reluctant conscript, who distrusts his own competence and relies wholly upon Yahweh. ... A rather different Gideon appears in the second movement, beginning in 8.4”; see also Webb, Judges, 251; Boda, “Judges,” 1161: “Here is the beginning of a trend of self-interest and revenge among the later judges.” See also Klein, Irony in Judges, 61; Butler, Judges, 218; Block, Judges, Ruth, 287. Contra Stone (“Judges,” 297), who states, “Interpreters making a facile connection between Gideon ‘in the Spirit’ (7:1–8:3) and Gideon ‘motivated by self’ (8:4–21) perpetrate anachronistic exegesis. The narrator offers no critique of Gideon in 8:4–21. This episode of the story presents as exemplary a portrayal as the earlier portion.” In fact, Stone argues vehemently that Gideon’s behavior is commendable until he mistakenly refuses the offer of kingship as superior to charismatic leadership, a theme of the third redactional level. Stone identifies three primary stages in the diachronic formation of the text: 1. The Storyteller’s version, which celebrates the exploits of outstanding, but often violent, individuals (pp. 197–98); 2. The Moralist’s version (Stone argues against a Deuteronomistic redactor), which recontextualizes the “heroic tradition [which] was becoming an unusable past” (p. 201) in order to serve the purpose of clan or tribal order; and 3. The Monarchist’s edition, in which “the editor achieves this decentering of the heroic ideal by framing it as something that worked in its era, but ultimately failed and had to be replaced by something else, that something else being the Judean, Davidic monarchy” (p. 203). It is interesting that although Stone ultimately argues that the purpose of Judges in its final form is to support the monarchy, in discussing Gideon’s violent punishment of Succoth and Penuel and in exacting revenge for his brothers he seems to resort to an earlier stage of redaction, that of the heroic Storyteller or the tribal Moralist, to justify Gideon’s actions (see for example pp. 292, 294, 296–97).} He, along with his 300 chosen men, set out to pursue the kings of Midian, Zebah and Zalmunna, who have so far escaped the net thrown out by the
Israelites to ensnare the escaping enemies. The implied author sets the scene through the
narrator: the company and its leader, Gideon, cross the Jordan “weary yet pursuing”
Both terms are plural and refer to both "him" (Gideon) and "the 300 men who were with him" (הなん תועשלים מאש אשר אשער יתפילו). In v. 5, however, Gideon asks the people of Succoth for food and gives his own perspective on the situation: "for they are weary, and I am pursuing" (כני עניים כי המתקיב עזב). The implied author allows a counter voice to emerge once more (C:Ct), the voice of arrogance and self-confidence. The change in wording indicates that Gideon differentiates himself from his men and implies that only they are weary (-capacity), but he is strong enough to determinedly pursue his goal (+security: confidence). After this point, two changes are clearly apparent in the narrative in vv. 7–19: Gideon acts on his own and in his own interests, and YHWH disappears from the account. Webb argues that Gideon does not follow the requirements for a legitimate "avenger of blood" as an agent of YHWH's justice, but acts out a personal vendetta. From v. 7 on Gideon has apparently left his companions behind, as indicated by numerous first person singular verbs and pronouns in his own speech ("I will thrash," "when I return safely," "I will tear down," "you taunted me," "my brothers, the sons of my mother") and third person singular verbs in the narrator's account ("he went up," "he spoke," "he attacked," "he pursued them," "he captured," "he routed," "he came," "he took," "he disciplined," "he tore down," "he killed," "he said"). The identity of "he" is clarified in v. 11 ("Gideon") and v. 13 ("Gideon the son of Joash") lest the reader forget. Interestingly, in v. 11 the narrator recounts that יד דוד, "he attacked the camp." Since there has been no mention of

---

58 In fact, the act of "crossing the Jordan" may be symbolic of Gideon's trespass into impropriety since רודר can have the sense of "overstep" or "contravene" (HALOT, 779; see Judg 2:20). See Butler, Judges, 218; Younger, Judges and Ruth, 197.
59 See McCann, Judges, 68–69.
his men since the comment that they were weary and Gideon was pursuing, and as far as
the narrative is concerned Gideon appears to have left them behind, it seems remarkable
that he attacked an enemy camp alone, even if it was “unsuspecting,” and later not only
captured the two kings but also routed the whole army (v. 12). It is likely, of course, that
Gideon had companions with him all along, but since the narrator does not mention them
or YHWH, and attributes all the actions to Gideon himself, the implication is that he
accomplishes the deeds in his own strength and initiative. Certainly the nature of
narrative requires that the main participant be referred to on a regular basis, but the
concentration of references to Gideon alone in this section is striking, and an indication
that the implied author is construing him as arrogant (+ security: confidence).

The ideational content here also serves to evaluate Gideon. Succoth and Penuel
were Israelite towns.61 Judges 6:14 makes it clear that Gideon was commissioned by
YHWH to free Israel from its oppressive enemy, Midian, not to turn against his own
brothers (8:16–17); thus, his action could be deemed improper even if the men of Succoth
had provoked him by their reluctance to offer sustenance.62 Gideon’s rampage of revenge
begins with his own fellow countrymen even before he turns his attention to the crimes
that the foreign kings Zeba and Zalmunna have allegedly committed against his family.

---

61 Contra Soggin (Judges, a Commentary, 156), who claims, without documentation and contrary to many
scholars (see for example Block, Judges, Ruth, 288–89; Boda, “Judges,” 1163; Butler, Judges, 218–19),
that Succoth and Penuel were not allied to Israel but to Midian. He states unconvincingly that Gideon’s
actions are merely about reprisal in war, and that “it is impossible to discern any theological or ethical
dimension” in the passage. Malamat (“The Punishment of Succoth and Penuel,” 70) argues that the two
towns were at least linked by some kind of vassal treaty to Gideon. Block, Judges, Ruth, 293: “But in his
rage he went beyond the threat and slaughtered all the men of the city. Gideon’s behavior could be justified
if Penuel were a Canaanite city, but these were fellow Israelites!”

62 As Boda (“Judges,” 1163) notes, “The once timid Gideon has now become a violent tyrant and instigates,
for the first time in Judges, military action against fellow Israelites.” See also O’Connell, Rhetoric of
Judges, 166, 168; Webb, Judges, 256–57.
Schneider points out that the primary reason Gideon gives for punishing Succoth is not their failure to assist in the battle by providing the warriors with provisions, but the fact that they mocked Gideon (הָעָטְשָׁה, "you taunted me," v. 15). He even goes beyond his original threat to Penuel to tear down their tower (8:9) and ends up killing all the men in the city in an excess of revenge (8:17). Although the implied author is reticent about the propriety of Gideon’s actions, simply recounting the events through the narrator, these contextual indications suggest that they are construed by the implied author as—propriety.

It is also interesting that vv. 7–19 are framed by two references to YHWH. In v. 7 Gideon states, “Therefore, when YHWH has given Zebah and Zalmunna into my hand, I will ...,” which implies his trust in God (+security: trust), at least to a point. Thereafter, however, YHWH is ignored in favor of an emphasis on Gideon’s threats and accomplishments until v. 19 in which Gideon expresses concern about men who had been killed at Tabor (−security: uneasiness). There is no previous reference to this event in the narrative, and the reader is perhaps intended to assume that the men were killed by the kings in their desperate flight. The fact that this information comes out of nowhere, however, further stresses the idea that it is of significance to Gideon alone, a matter of personal interest and revenge. Gideon says to Zebah and Zalmunna, “They were my brothers, the sons of my mother. As YHWH lives, if only you had let them live, I would not kill you” (emphasis added). Here, in v. 19, Gideon no longer acknowledges the

---

63 Schneider, Judges, 123. Schneider also observes, “Gideon represents a paradigm shift where personal revenge becomes the prime motivation for the subsequent leaders” (p. 124).
64 Butler, Judges, 219.
65 See Schneider (Judges, 124–25) for speculation as to the significance of these brothers being called the sons of Gideon’s mother rather than the sons of Joash.
sovereignty of YHWH, but merely uses God’s name as an oath which reinforces his own agenda and expresses his determination that he is committed to having revenge for the death of his brothers (+veracity). Numerous commentators have pointed out the silence of YHWH in the later exploits of Gideon, and from it infer YHWH’s disapproval. The focus is now on Gideon, demonstrated by the two 1cs pronominal suffixes (םָּרָע ... רֹאשׁ) and the 1cs verb (יָזָרַךְ). The fact that this immediately follows the two kings’ comment that Gideon’s brothers were like him, “each one resembling the son of a king” (v. 18), further stresses the status and authority of Gideon himself (+ normality) at the expense of YHWH.

Gideon subsequently orders his young son, Jether, to kill the two kings, perhaps in order to humiliate them, but the youth is afraid and refuses. Zebah and Zalmunna then confront Gideon as the implied author uses them to acknowledge another view of Gideon’s capacity without committing to its validity (E:Ac): “Rise up yourself, and fall on us; for as the man, so is his strength” (כָּנָה). The Message translates loosely but in a way that conveys the sense effectively: “Do it yourself—if you’re man enough!” This is nothing less than a challenge to Gideon to prove his strength and self-sufficiency (∞+capacity), and he rises to the bait. His response, his immediate execution of the

66 See, for example, O’Connell, Rhetoric of Judges, 166; Butler, Judges, 220; Block, Judges, Ruth, 294–95; Claassens, “The Character of God in Judges 6–8,” 58, 62.
67 See for example Amit, The Art of Editing, 238; Block, Judges, Ruth, 289–90; Schneider, Judges, 122.
68 This is in sharp contrast to the focus on YHWH created by the 1cs verbs in 6:8–10 as noted by Claassens, “The Character of God in Judges 6–8,” 57.
69 The contrast of Jether to Gideon’s other sons, Abimelech and Jotham) is instructive (See Boda, “Judges,” 1164), as is a possible contrast between the young Gideon and Jether: “Portraying Jether as an alter ego of Gideon’s former (preferred) self, the lad had not yet grown up and developed a stomach for violence” (Block, Judges, Ruth, 295).
70 It is easier to see in this passage the interplay of vengeance, insult, and humiliation than it is to see the “heroic ethos of war” and the “nuances of just war” that Niditch (Judges: A Commentary, 105) apparently perceives.
enemy kings, is a clear expression, not of his trust in YHWH, but of his own ability (+capacity) and confidence (+security: confidence). Is it any wonder that the Israelites call out, “Rule over us!” (+inclination: encouragement)? After all, they have concluded, “You have delivered us from the hand of Midian” (v. 22; emphasis added). Here, YHWH receives no credit at all.

In classical Greek tragedy there is a moment known as “anagnorisis” in which a character makes a critical discovery about him/herself. It is a moment of self-awareness, of revelation. In Sophocles’ Oedipus Rex, it occurs when Oedipus realizes that he himself is the murderer whom he has been seeking. Although I make no claim that the Gideon narrative is classical tragedy, or that Greek tragedy had some direct or indirect influence on the author/redactor of Judges, I do suggest that the concept of anagnorisis is a useful one for understanding what happens to Gideon at this stage of the narrative. Of course, all such conclusions must ultimately be consistent with the text of Judges as we have it and the culture that produced it.

After the prosody of +security: confidence that has just been discussed, Gideon suddenly says in v. 23, “I will not rule over you, nor shall my son rule over you; YHWH shall rule over you,” construing –inclination: reluctance for himself and –propriety for

---

71 Stone (“Judges,” 299) rightly notes that “rule,” even dynastic rule, does not imply monarchy as such.
72 As Webb (Judges: Integrated) 146 notes, “Gideon’s personal success so elevated him in the estimation of his fellow Israelites that they offer him dynastic rule.” Boda points out that in the ANE the warrior who successfully led troops in battle typically became king (Boda, “Judges,” 1165). Amit, The Art of Editing, 236, 263 argues that whereas the people want an orderly dynastic rule, the divine preference is for leadership is temporary leaders for desperate times only under the fixed rule of YHWH.
73 Anagnorisis is also known as “discovery” or “recognition.” Aristotle says, “‘Recognition’, as indeed the word implies, [is] a change from not-knowing to knowing, …” (Aristotle, Aristotle’s Poetics, 124).
the Israelites. Following directly upon this prosody and the climactic statement of the people, “You have delivered us from the hand of Midian” (v. 22) in which the credit due to YHWH is displaced and lavished on Gideon, it is more than possible that this declaration is the external verbal expression of an internal anagnorisis, a moment of self-discovery in which Gideon realizes that he has been on a rampage of self-interested revenge and arrogant pride. His self-confidence and self-importance dissolve into shock and remorse. An appropriate subtext to his emphatic response might be, “‘I will not rule over you’—I am not your ultimate sovereign and defender, YHWH is—’nor shall my son rule over you’—I have no right to establish a dynasty as the Canaanite kings do—’YHWH shall rule over you’—he is the one who delivered you and to whom you owe supreme loyalty.” Ironically, it is this moment of self-awareness and repentance (propriety) that may explain the immediate fabrication of the idolatrous ephod in vv. 24–27.

Gideon was raised in a syncretistic culture. In 6:1 we heard the standard denunciation, “Then the Israelites did the evil thing in the sight of the Lord,” indicating their participation in apostasy (propriety). In 6:25 we learned that Joash’s family was no exception to the general rule, for Gideon was instructed to “pull down the altar of Baal which belongs to your father, and cut down the Asherah that is beside it.”

---

74 Stone (“Judges,” 299–300) argues that this is the first time when Gideon acts inappropriately based on his assumption that if YHWH rules, then humans cannot rule. He states, “In the remainder of the story, the author casts Gideon’s refusal in a catastrophically negative light” (p. 299).

75 Contra Block (Judges, Ruth, 299), who remarks, “While verbally appearing to acknowledge the sovereignty of God, the answer belies his previous actions,” the answer is a direct result of his realization of the significance of his previous actions. See Webb, Judges: Integrated, 152/Webb, Judges, 263: “The impiety from which Gideon recoils is of his own making.” O’Connell, Rhetoric of Judges, 168–69 is more suspicious of Gideon’s intentions.

76 See Butler, Judges, 205; Polzin, Moses and the Deuteronomist, 171; Schneider, Judges, 107; Matthews, Judges and Ruth, 86.

77 See Boda, “Judges,” 1144.
Joash show some awareness of YHWH and his cult, but have obviously combined those beliefs and practices with those of the surrounding Canaanites. Joash’s challenge to Baal and his followers after the destruction of his altar by Gideon (v. 31) may signal a turning point in their religious loyalties but does not necessarily erase the influence of years of syncretistic worship. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that, even though Gideon’s moment of self-discovery has shown him that he has been appropriating the honor and loyalty due to YHWH alone, he would misguidedly and pathetically try to restore that honor to God by making a golden ephod for use in his worship. However, good intentions do not justify disobedience and idolatry (propriety). The Israelites participated eagerly in the scheme (eagerness). The golden earrings used in its construction were the spoils of war garnered from the enemy (v. 24), and the resulting 1,700 shekels of gold that the Israelite soldiers offered may well have been considered herem, the spoils of war especially devoted to YHWH. The exact function of the ephod that Gideon made is unclear; it may have been used in divination in order to ascertain the will of God, or it may have been an idol for a shrine where YHWH was worshipped. In either case, it may have been intended sincerely, albeit mistakenly, as a token of loyalty to YHWH and trust in him that was intended to replace the altar of Baal and the Asherah.

---

78 See 6:7, 13.
79 Gideon’s act calls to mind Aaron’s making of the golden calf in Exod 32.
80 Boling, Judges, 161, suggests that the actual term herem is not used here because of the misuse of the spoils of war. See also Boda, “Judges,” 1165–66; Matthews, Judges and Ruth, 97.
81 See Boda, “Judges,” 1165–66; Webb, Judges: Integrated, 152–53; Webb, Judges, 264–65. Klein, Irony in Judges, 64–66 suggests that the weight of gold (1700 shekels) is too much to indicate a priestly garment such as that in Exod 28, and argues that it was a type of idol, a “worldly symbol of rule.” For various interpretation of the significance of the ephod, see Amit, The Art of Editing, 261–62; Block, Judges, Ruth, 300; Martin, “The Role of the Spirit,” 37; Stone, “Judges,” 300–302.
82 Contra Claassens (“The Character of God in Judges 6–8,” 65), who interprets the request for golden ornaments as a desire for material goods and the ephod as a sign of self-glorification. See also Klein, Irony in Judges, 65.
This may be suggested by v. 27 which says, "it became (ל + יהוה) a snare to Gideon and his household" (emphasis added) and also by the fact that the ephod did not lead Israel astray until after Gideon’s death. There is no doubt, however, that as well-intentioned as Gideon’s motives were in constructing the ephod, it was a tragic error, for it eventually became a “snare” (חֵרֵב) to Gideon and his family, and all the Israelites “played the harlot” (זָעַר) with it, a term indicating that Israel once again has fallen into apostasy (propriety). It is ironic that Gideon begins by confronting idolatry when he tears down the altar of Baal and ends by contributing to idolatry when he sets up the ephod. Nevertheless, “Midian was subdued before the Israelites” and the land was undisturbed for 40 years during the judgeship of Gideon (v. 28, normality). This statement gives the definitive proof of YHWH’s veracity, tenacity, and propriety that Gideon had challenged in Judg 6.

Gideon died “at a good old age and was buried” (v. 32), and this would seem to indicate a normality assessment of Gideon himself, but the narrative provides a number of suggestions that all is not well. In v. 30 the implied author points out through the narrator Gideon’s many wives and sons, and in v. 31 he/she notes the birth of Abimelech by Gideon’s concubine, a foreshadowing of trouble to come. Some scholars suggest that the references to his many wives and sons, and his naming of his son Abimelech (“my father is king”), indicate that Gideon is in fact living a kingly lifestyle, and create doubt as to whether his rejection of kingship and the affirmation of YHWH’s rule was sincere.

---

83 Amit (The Art of Editing, 230–31) sees contradictory ideologies in the Gideon cycle and attributes them to different editorial strata. It is possible, however, that the paradoxical evaluations of Gideon reflect both inconsistency in his character in spite of the victory over the Midianites and a foreshadowing of the darker days of Abimelech which lie ahead.

84 See Block (Judges, Ruth, 302–3), who argues that Gideon’s protestation was insincere and that he did in essence assume the role of a monarch. On this issue, see also Boda, “Judges,” 1166; O’Connell, Rhetoric of...
however, the sincerity of his rejection does not preclude the fact that it was short-lived and ineffectual—and it does not excuse him or rehabilitate him into a genuine “hero.”

Gideon was a typical Israelite, not a paragon of virtue, and the implied author seems to be indicating that the clarity and force of Gideon’s self-discovery eventually faded and his motives once again became mixed. In fact, it is recognized by many that the judges are symbolic or typical of the Israelite people as a whole, who certainly had infamously short memories when it came to covenant loyalty to YHWH. We learn that as soon as Gideon was dead, the Israelites “turned back” (שבב), “played the harlot” (נ紧密结合), made Baal-berith their god, and “did not remember” (לאת תור) YHWH (v. 33–34, all –propriety). The fact that they did not show “covenant loyalty” (חזק) to the house of Gideon (v. 35) is perhaps intended to acknowledge the good things that Gideon did accomplish, and the good aspects of his character, but the negative intimations serve to undermine the final +propriety evaluation of Gideon “according to all the good that he had done for Israel” (הכליל отношении אושר נשיא עמיישראלי) and leave it with a hollow ring.

6.3 Conclusions

6.3.1 Summary of Evidence

After the usual inscription of a –propriety evaluation for the Israelites at the beginning of the Gideon narrative, they are characterized by a –security: mistrust

---


85 Gideon is never truly “heroic,” in spite of Niditch’s claims that he is the “quintessential biblical hero” (Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 89). However, she also admits that Gideon is “one of the most pleasingly insecure of the biblical heroes” (p. 92).

86 See for example Martin, “Judging the Judges,” 121: “The increasingly problematic character of the judges parallels the increasingly disobedient character of the Israelites.”

87 See Block (Judges, Ruth, 306–7), who interprets the covenant as one of kingship between Gideon and the Israelites, not a covenant with YHWH.
discourse prosody, and the speeches of YHWH that follow are intended to generate in them an attitude of +security: trust instead. The introduction of Gideon as YHWH’s potential deliverer serves to concentrate the insecurities of all Israel into one person, their leader, by means of numerous instantiations of –security: mistrust and –security: uneasiness. Gideon proceeds to challenge YHWH, accusing him of –tenacity, –propriety, and –veracity. Gradually, YHWH’s reassurances build up Gideon’s trust and motivate him to tear down the altar of Baal, an act that, although deemed –propriety in the eyes of the men of the city, is evaluated as +propriety in the eyes of YHWH. Although Gideon relapses several times into –security: mistrust, as indicated by the signs of the fleece and the visit to the enemy camp, he ultimately emerges as a valiant and faithful leader of Israel (+inclination: eagerness) in spite of the reduction of his army, a strategy which forces him to rely on YHWH alone. His overwhelming success and the resulting admiration of his followers, however, results in the inflation of his own ego (+security: confidence) to the point where he pursues his own personal vendettas at the expense of YHWH’s honor and will (–propriety). The offer of kingship shocks Gideon into a realization of his error (+propriety, –inclination: reluctance), and in a confused and syncretistic attempt to restore the honor to YHWH he ultimately leads the Israelites back into apostasy (–propriety). Nevertheless, YHWH is confirmed as +propriety, +veracity, and +tenacity in his discipline and deliverance of Israel.

6.3.2 Conclusion

The narrative of Gideon must be placed in the context of the downward spiral of the book of Judges as a whole. Othniel was the paradigmatic, ideal judge, and Ehud achieved significant success in spite of a dubious tribal background. Barak was not
apostate or actively sinful, but his weakness and reluctance were sharply contrasted with
the initiative and determination of both Deborah and Jael. The implied author portrays
Gideon’s character as much more deeply flawed, however, and he wavers between
moments of faithfulness and trust in YHWH that result in deliverance on the one hand, and
moments of apostasy and self-reliance that result in disaster on the other.\textsuperscript{88} We hear little
of the actions of the individual tribes of Israel in the early judge narratives, but here in the
Gideon story the Ephraimites begin to assert themselves and fractures in the Israelite
community begin to form that will deepen as the book proceeds.

The implied author intends to show, according to his/her Deuteronomistic
ideology, that obedience to and trust in YHWH will bring both honor and success to the
judge and peace to the people of Israel. The implied author is also clearly using Gideon’s
forthright challenges to YHWH as a means to deal with the issue of theodicy; the
successful resolution of these challenges serves to defend the character of YHWH against
accusations of impropriety when Israel faces difficulties and suffering which are, after all,
brought on by their own misdeeds and alleviated through YHWH’s mercy. The implied
author also has much to say about the quality of leadership in Israel. As Butler points out,
“Gideon shows the best and worst of the leadership that brought final chaos.”\textsuperscript{89} Tanner
rightly argues that the Gideon cycle is the focal point of the book of Judges, and that
Gideon himself “represents a significant shift in the ‘quality’ of the judges that served
Israel.”\textsuperscript{90} That shift originates within Gideon, as it does within the heart of every Israelite.
The implied author achieves his/her goal this time, not by contrasting Gideon with other

\textsuperscript{88} See Block, “Will the Real Gideon,” 359–66.
\textsuperscript{89} Butler, Judges, 192
\textsuperscript{90} Tanner, “The Focal Point of Judges,” 152–53, although he gives ch. 8 rather short shrift.
more commendable characters, but by showing his internal inconsistency and pointing out his overt contradictions. Whether this trajectory will continue with Jephthah and Samson will be the subject of the following chapters.
7 The Jephthah Narrative (Judges 10:16–12:7)

7.1 Introductory Remarks

So far our analysis of the major judges has supported the downward trajectory that many commentators have identified in the characters of the Judges, and also in the people of Israel to the extent that the judges represent them. The implied author has depicted Othniel as the ideal judge, with Ehud a close second; from the literary perspective of the book, Israelites during these judgeships were closer to the generation of Joshua and probably had a better memory of the wonders that YHWH had performed for Israel and the deliverance that he had provided for them. As the memories began to fade, however, and the influence of the surrounding nations became more persistent, commitment to and trust in YHWH began to diminish. Barak may be representative of those Israelites who begin to distrust YHWH’s character. He is the first to indicate clear signs of weakness in the judges, although with the aid of Deborah and Jael he was able to deliver Israel. The implied author next depicts the complex character of Gideon, who openly challenges YHWH’s commitment to his people and doubtless gives voice to the doubts of the oppressed Israelites themselves. He/she shows conflicts and contrasts within Gideon himself; he had the potential to be a great man of God, but when his self-confidence grew to dominate over his trust in and obedience to YHWH he led Israel into apostasy, in spite of the fact that God is vindicated in Gideon’s eyes and he ultimately resisted the offer of kingship. Abimelech is typical of disgruntled Israelites and, although space does not permit a detailed discussion of his narrative here, the implied author construes him in a consistently negative manner. His rule constitutes a vivid picture of what Gideon might have become had he decided to accept the Israelites’ offer to “reign
over us.” And yet, the Israelites persist in “doing the evil thing” and testing YHWH’s compassion and forbearance to the utmost; indeed, YHWH shockingly asserts that he will no longer deliver them. This is the cue for Jephthah to enter the scene.¹

The Jephthah narrative constitutes perhaps the most challenging evaluative task in the entire book of Judges. Did YHWH accept or reject Israel’s confession and repentance in Judg 10:11–16? Did he give Israel victory over Ammon because of Jephthah’s vow to sacrifice his daughter in Judg 11:29–32? Since the Spirit of YHWH came on Jephthah just before he made his vow, does this imply that YHWH approves of child sacrifice? These and other questions give rise to some of the most contentious discussions in the literature. What Chisholm calls the narrator’s “icy reportorial style, devoid of editorializing,”² and Niditch deems his fascinating and shocking neutrality,³ makes answering these questions a challenge. Jephthah nevertheless fits into the implied author’s trajectory of downward movement; he is not even raised up by YHWH but is the desperate choice of people who believe their God has unjustly abandoned them. Whereas Gideon was able to function as a faithful leader and capable negotiator long enough for YHWH to lead Israel to deliverance through him, Jephthah is a leader with a chip on his shoulder and an inflated sense of his own ability as a negotiator. Although he seems to have a good understanding of the facts of Israel’s history, he nevertheless seems ignorant of the deeper significance of its faith, and sacrifices his own daughter in a pagan attempt to negotiate with God.

¹ Space does not permit a discussion of the minor judges here, but Butler’s comment (Judges, 257) is suggestive: “These minor judges appear to establish times of peace and prosperity, while the two militant individuals demonstrate military and physical strength but lead Israel to civil war and loss of national freedom and security. The structure appears to show the power of leaders from the smaller tribes and the danger of power coming from the more significant tribes of Benjamin, Ephraim, and Dan.”
³ Niditch, War in the Hebrew Bible, 33.
Unlike the Gideon narrative, in which the implied author shows YHWH working through the judge’s strengths—his military prowess and his leadership and diplomatic skills—in the Jephthah episode he/she shows YHWH working in spite of the judge’s weaknesses. Although Jephthah’s early disadvantages and marginalization create sympathy in the implied reader, by the end of the narrative he evokes only scorn.

7.2 Analysis of the Text

The Jephthah narrative begins with the more emphatic rendering of the narrator’s accusation, “they again did/continued to do the evil thing” (10:6), which also appears in Judg 3:12 and 13:1. This constitutes the beginning of a -propriety discourse prosody, which in this passage is additionally stressed by the deliberate and lengthy iteration of foreign gods which Israel worships: “the Baals and the Ashtaroth, the gods of Aram, the gods of Sidon, the gods of Moab, the gods of the sons of Ammon, and the gods of the Philistines”; the names read like a grocery list of apostasy. 4 The prosody concludes with the double denunciation that they both forsook YHWH and failed to serve him, sinning actively by what they did and passively by what they failed to do. The Israelites provoke YHWH (—satisfaction: displeasure; —happiness: antipathy) and justify his discipline (+ propriety; v. 7). Verses 8–9 paint a graphic picture of Israel’s resulting suffering (—happiness: misery; —security).

Israel, in dire straits, therefore cries out to YHWH. 5 This cry, however, is strikingly different from the implied author’s relating of all Israel’s previous attempts to provoke a merciful response from God: it contains the first of two confessions of sin. The reader of

---

4 See Webb, Judges, 301, for the significance of these groups.
5 Butler, Judges, 204: “Yahweh thus becomes the last resort when all other worship has failed.”
Judges is well aware of Israel’s prior failings and persistence in sinning from the previous judge cycles, but now the narrative pattern has been broken. This confession construes the first explicit +propriety evaluation (except for some irreal evaluations indicating a hope for the future) since the time of Joshua in Judg 2:7. The implied author may be implying that the confession is a repeat performance of many previous similar confessions, or it may indicate a positive change in the Israelites’ attitude from simple cries for deliverance to cries of confession demonstrating awareness of sin, or it may even be an aberration that merely interrupts a continuing flow of disobedience. Even if the implication is that all the previous cries have contained confession and repentance, in terms of the narrative the issue is now brought into focus as the main point at issue. Thus, we hear the Israelites actually agree with the implied author’s evaluation of their condition as they admit to apostasy: “indeed we have forsaken our God” (v. 10, C:Cc).

Ironically, whereas Gideon forthrightly challenged the mercy of YHWH, here the Gileadites use the merciful character of God as the foundation for their appeal; they confess their sins and lay their case before him, trusting in YHWH to come to their aid. However, a number of commentators have questioned, not without reason, whether this confession is genuine or merely a confession of convenience, an expedient way to force YHWH into an act of deliverance. A complete answer to this question will need to await our discussion below, but the evidence begins to accumulate in v. 11. For the first and

---

6 "The people served YHWH all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders who survived Joshua."
7 The כ is emphatic in this case. Since the conjunction י is present, it does not need to serve as a subordinate conjunction in the sense of “for/because.” The readings “and if,” “and that” and “and because” do not fit the context. See Jolûn and Muraoka, Biblical Hebrew, §164b. For support of this interpretation see Butler, Judges, 254.
8 For example, Block (Judges, Ruth, 346–47), who notes that there is no appeal for forgiveness or request for grace and points out the “the purely utilitarian and manipulative nature of their cry.”
only time in Judges, YHWH speaks directly to the judge without a mediator, perhaps indicating his growing frustration with his rebellious people. YHWH’s response to the confession is not encouraging; confession is good, but it is only the first step towards obedience, and if words are not followed by deeds the confession has little meaning. YHWH’S understandable misgivings that this will happen are emphatically pointed out as he catalogues the numerous times he has come to the aid of the Israelites, delivering them from the Egyptians, the Amorites, the Ammonites, the Philistines, the Sidonians, the Amalekites, and the Maonites, only to have them display their ingratitude by turning away from him and returning to their sin yet again (v. 12). It would seem that the first option above is the correct one: the confession is merely a repeat performance of many previous similar confessions. Both the rhetorical question and the repetitions in vv. 11–12 stress the righteousness (+tenacity: faithfulness; +propriety: compassion) of God’s own actions in contrast to those of the Israelites in v. 13 (−tenacity: faithfulness; −propriety). God’s decision, “I will no longer deliver you,” as a response to their serving other gods, implies −satisfaction: displeasure (v. 14) toward the Israelites, even after their confession of sin.

However, God’s attitude to his people is not only one of anger and disappointment; it is also one of unhappiness, not in this case at the Israelites’ suffering, but at their rejection of him. It is likely, especially in light of v. 16 to follow, that a

9 See Webb, Judges, 303.
10 It is worth noting that 1 Sam 12: 10 seems to indicate a broader pattern of confession and repentance in Judges beyond this one occurrence. Greenspahn argues against this, however: “The ‘crying out’ to which the word refers cannot therefore be assumed to include repentance. Indeed, one could reasonably argue that the cries so described have no spiritual or theological component, but are simply ‘the loud and agonized ‘crying’ of someone in acute distress, calling for help and seeking deliverance’” (Greenspahn, “The Theology of the Framework of Judges,” 392, quoting Hasel, “Zā‘āq,” 115).
comparison is being set up here as well as a contrast. Verses 8–9 clearly depict the
Israelite’s misery (—happiness: misery), resulting from the oppression of the Philistines
and Ammonites, and YHWH alludes to their suffering when he recalls their oppression in
v. 12, but v. 13 examines the other side of the coin. YHWH’s pronouncement יָהּ הנֹאֵם יִתְנַשֵּׁה, “Yet you have forsaken me,”11 following on the description of Israel’s suffering that
resulted from their forsaking of YHWH, is an indication of the suffering that Israel has
caused their God in return,12 especially with the expressed emphatic pronoun “you”
(הָנֹאֵם). YHWH’s cry, probably sarcastic, “Let them deliver you” with the emphatic
expressed pronoun (הָנֹאֵם), indicates —happiness: antipathy in v. 14. However, YHWH
once again makes reference to the Israelites’ misery, “your distress” (יִפְתָּח), at the end of
v. 14. Thus, the —happiness: misery of YHWH in vv. 13 brought about by his people is
surrounded by the —happiness: misery of the Israelites in vv. 12 and 14 brought about by
their own sin, forming a type of inclusio which focuses on the affective response of God.
Consequently, both of YHWH’s responses—his act of will (his refusal to deliver) and
affective response (his anger, dissatisfaction, and misery)—suggest that he views the
confession of the Israelites in v. 10 as inauthentic and expedient. Thus, the evaluation in
v. 10 is a +propriety evaluation from the perspective of the Israelites, but from YHWH’s
normative point of view it constitutes a —propriety assessment. Although it might seem
at first that the implied author is portraying the Israelites as concurring with his/her view

11 The 2mp of the suffix conjugation virtually never takes a directly suffixed pronoun, preferring to suffix
the pronoun to יָהּ in virtually all cases. Therefore, the יָהּ cannot be interpreted as an emphatic variation
in and of itself. However, the emphatic force of the expressed יָהּ may well carry over to יָהּ in the
context.
12 It is beyond the purview of this work to argue for the passibility of God. See, among others, Fretheim,
The Suffering of God; Moltmann, “Crucified God”; Pinnock, Most Moved Mover; Sanders, The God Who
Risks. In any case, even if the language is anthropomorphic, the text would be interpreted—albeit
metaphorically—in the same way.
when they repent, in actual fact he/she is presenting them as another counter voice: the voice of hollow compliance. It is merely a verbal confession without evidence of repentance.

The dialogue now switches back to the voice of the Israelites, however, and in v. 15 they respond to God’s surprising refusal to help with another confession: “The sons of Israel said to the Lord, ‘We have sinned, you do to us whatever seems good to you; only please deliver us this day.’” This appears to be bargaining born of desperation. The Israelite’s plea might be paraphrased colloquially as, “OK, we admit have sinned, do what you like just as long as you deliver us, and deliver us now.” Rather than submissive trust, the attitude implied by the request is one of entitlement, reflecting the arrogant assumption of the Israelites that YHWH had always rescued them before, and would surely do so again, as long as they negotiated effectively and uttered the right words. Surely he wasn’t serious about refusing to come to their aid? Their understanding of the character of God had led them to believe that he would accede to their request; now, inexplicably, YHWH was acting out of character. It must have occurred

---

13 According to Schneider (Judges, 160), the Israelites “take the initiative” at this point. However, their action is far more reactive than proactive.

14 See Stone (“Judges,” 333), who notes the significance of the particle יָפ and the immediate time reference in what he terms a “‘fox-hole’ prayer” (p. 334).

15 This is not to imply that the later expressions of repentance in Ezra 9, Nehemiah 1, 9, and Daniel 9 manipulative expressions of entitlement in the same way that the Judges examples are. There is evidence in the Deuteronomic History that only after the trauma of exile would the Israelites come to understand and exhibit true repentance. The only two places where the book of Deuteronomy uses the root יָפ “repent,” are in 4:30 and 30:2. The first pericope speaks of the exile, and indicates that this distress would cause Israel to return/repent with all their heart and soul (4:29). The second also states regarding Israel, “You [will] return to the Lord your God and obey him with all your heart and soul” (30:2). See the fuller discussion in Boda, A Severe Mercy, 104–14; Boda, “Renewal,” 7–13. Boda identifies in these passages a need for “full engagement of the inner affections of the penitential community” (“Renewal,” 8). As the title of this article suggests, renewal is necessary in heart, word, and deed. The Israelites in Judges do confess their sin verbally and then discontinue their inappropriate actions, worshipping YHWH. The tendency for their changed ways to deteriorate more and more rapidly into apostasy indicates, however, that the heart, true engagement of the inner affections, may be lacking.
to these stunned people, however, that something was wrong in their approach. The next statement complicates the issue: “So they put away the foreign gods from among them and served YHWH” (v. 16). Unlike the previous situation in which Israel cried out to YHWH, this cry consists not only of confession but also of repentance. From the Israelite perspective their actions are clearly *propriety* and should achieve the desired result.

The structure of the pericope is interesting:

- Confession without repentance (v. 10)
- Rebuke (v. 11–12a)
- The paralleling of Israel’s misery and YHWH’s misery (v. 12b–13)
- Rebuke (v. 14)
- Confession with repentance (v. 15–16a)

It is possible that the revelation that their actions were the cause of YHWH’s suffering turns the tide and moves the Israelites to genuine repentance, placing their God ahead of their own interests; on the other hand, they seem far more concerned about their own suffering than YHWH’s. It is more likely that the depiction of YHWH’s misery is intended by the implied author for his/her implied reader, illustrating the pain that Israel’s sin has caused their God. God’s refusal of aid increases the desperation of the Israelites following the second rebuke, causing them to offer more in the way of evidence of their sincerity.

Verse 14 may be further indication that the repentance is authentic. In this second rebuke, YHWH declares: “Cry out to the gods which you have chosen, let them deliver you” (v. 14). Just as they have abandoned YHWH, so now he threatens to abandon them. The Israelite’s reply, כְּפָלְיוֹנָה בָטָה מְפֹרָשׁ לֵאמֹר מְפֹרָשׁ, has the personal pronoun expressed: “you do to us whatever seems good in your eyes.” It is possible that the change in behavior is merely an expression of their desperation, and that the expressed מְפֹרָשׁ is
emphatic, an attempt to put pressure on YHWH. Alternately, it could be that the Israelites are now renouncing false gods and re-committing themselves to the true God, yielding themselves into his hands and submitting to what is right in his eyes.\(^\text{16}\) Thus, the repentance may well be genuine.

Fortunately, the narrator’s comment that follows at the end of the pericope sums up the evaluation from YHWH’s perspective: \(\text{נְכָרָא} \text{כֶּעָשָׁה יִשְׂרָאֵל} \) (v. 16).

Unfortunately, rather than settling the dispute, this clause is one of the most contentious in the book of Judges and seems to further complicate rather than clarify the issue. Although the meaning of the sentence may have been transparent to the original hearers/readers of the passage, it is no longer clear to interpreters who are not native speakers of ancient Hebrew. Woodenly, the phrase may be rendered, “And/but his soul was short with the misery/trouble of Israel.” Many of the versions translate in such a way as to indicate YHWH’s compassion for Israel (e.g. NRSV: “and he could no longer bear to see Israel suffer”; similarly NASB, TNIV, JPS); while some give an alternate translation that demonstrates YHWH’s annoyance with his people (e.g. ESV: “and he became impatient over the misery of Israel”; similarly HCSB); commentators are similarly divided.\(^\text{17}\) Boda cogently summarizes the structure of the first section of this clause:

---

\(^{16}\) Variations on the phrase “in x’s eyes” are significant throughout Judges, especially in the story of Samson and the double conclusion, and reflect the evaluative perspective. They appear in Judg 2:11; 3:7, 12; 4:1; 6:1, 17; 10:6, 15; 13:1; 14:3, 7; 17:6; 19:24; 21:25.

\(^{17}\) For the view that the repentance was genuine see Boling (Judges, 190), who translates, “and the plight of Israel became intolerable to him”; and Goslinga (Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 379), who states “Once Israel had repented, the Lord no longer looked on their sins. These were hid from His eyes, as it were, and in His deep love He could not permit their suffering to continue.” For the view that the repentance was insincere see O’Connell, Rhetoric of Judges, 187; Block, Judges, Ruth, 348–49: “The repentance is external only; theirs is a conversion of convenience”; Gillmayr-Bucher, “Framework and Discourse,” 696: “YHWH’s annoyance with Israel’s repentance casts a new light on the relationship between Israel and its deity”; Younger, Judges and Ruth, 244: “That is, far from being a statement that Yahweh is overcome with compassion once more and intends to deliver Israel (as in previous cycles), in this context the phrase ‘the soul is short’ \((qasar \ nps)\) expresses the frustration, exasperation, and anger in the face of an intolerable situation”; Janzen (“The
"The first part of this phrase (יְּנוּם יָמִים) consists of a collocation which refers to either becoming impatient or frustrated (Zech 11:8; Num 21:4; cf. Judg 16:16; Job 21:4) with the preposition beth introducing that which is responsible for this impatience/frustration."  

According to HALOT, the noun נעמ has a range of meanings in different contexts, which includes "trouble," "care," "anxiety," "need," "harm," and even "acquisition." The noun נעול from the same root can mean "work, worker."

Deuteronomy 26:7 is the only other place where the collocation is used with נעמ as the object of the preposition ב and in the context (אִם אֶתְנָגֵט לְאִתָּךְ אָדָם) clearly refers to the compassionate response of YHWH to the misery and suffering resulting from their toil in Egypt. Based on this comparison Boda concludes that the Judges reference is "an instance of Yahweh's gracious internal misery over the people's suffering." This is possible; however, uncertainty is always a factor when conclusions must be drawn on the

Sacrifice of Jephthah's Daughter," 347), who remarks that "it makes little sense to suggest that God became exasperated with the suffering that God had inflicted. Instead, has the sense here of 'evil' … YHWH's response to Israel's cry, then, is to become exasperated with the continual evil of the nation's apostasy"; Webb (Judges: Integrated, 45–48), who gives a cogent analysis of the verse (see also Webb, Judges, 305–7); and Polzin (Moses and the Deuteronomist, 178), who pulls no punches when he refers to "Yahweh's annoyance with an Israel who believes in the efficacy of a timely, even desperate repentance," and "Israel's rather self-serving conversion as an apparent attempt once more to use Yahweh to insure their peace and tranquility, and Yahweh's argument that a slighted and rejected God will be used no longer." See also Paul ("Samson on the Brink of Death," 664), who compares the term כְּפֶר in the Jephthah and Samson narratives and concludes that it denotes "impatience," Stone ("Judges," 333–34) also compares YHWH to Samson and concludes that YHWH does not exercise compassion but actually caves in to their pleading as Samson does to Delilah and comes to their aid "against his better judgment" (p. 334), a "shocking collapse of divine resolve" (p. 336). He nevertheless concludes from the ultimate negative outcome of Jephthah's leadership, "The test makes it clear that however responsive God is to his people, they do not control or manipulate him, God cannot be held hostage to his own promises or even to his mercy" (337).

18 Boda, "Judges," 1186.
19 HALOT, 845.
20 Boda, "Judges," 1186. Note that Boda also argues: "The word (יְנוּם) in the second part of this phrase can mean 'trouble' (e.g., Gen 41:51) or 'difficult labor' (e.g., Qoh 1:3), but also can have an ethical force, referring to mischief (e.g., Ps 140:10). This has led some to see here not a reference to Yahweh's gracious response to Israel's cry and suffering, but rather his rejection." It is not necessary, however, to translate נעמ as "mischief" in order to conclude that the verse implies rejection rather than compassion.
basis of limited instantiations in the text.\textsuperscript{21} Also relevant to an understanding of the evaluative nuances of the Judg 10:16 text is a passage in the book of Judges itself, in the story of Samson, which reads: \textsuperscript{21} (Judg 16:16: “It came about when she pressed him daily with her words and urged him, that his soul was impatient to the point of death”). Here is a situation where the repeated urgings of Delilah to Samson, similar to the repeated cries of Israel to YHWH, result in irritation rather than compassion; in spite of the fact that Samson loved her (see Judg 16:4), his subsequent actions are provoked by frustration.

In the context of Judges, and based on the Israelites’ track record—one in which they persistently sin and suffer discipline and are relieved by the merciful intervention of YHWH only to revert once again to disobedience and apostasy—it is most likely that YHWH’s response is one of righteous frustration, not compassionate relenting, even though the Israelites’ repentance, evidenced by their changed behavior, may have been sincere. YHWH’s affective responses to the Israelites throughout this passage have been characterized by displeasure and antipathy, not pity and concern.\textsuperscript{22} The book of Judges is a litany of deliverance followed by regression.\textsuperscript{23} The primary issue that the implied

\textsuperscript{21} In LXX\textsuperscript{a} the verse is translated καὶ οὐκ εὐρέστησεν ἐν τῷ λαῷ καὶ ὀλγοψύχησεν ἐν τῷ κόπῳ Ἰσραήλ, which Butler (\textit{Judges}, 254) translates “and he was not pleased among the people and he was discouraged with Israel’s troubles,” and which NETS (Pietersma and Wright, \textit{Nets}, 220) renders as “and he was not well pleased with the people, and he was worried about the suffering of Israel.” Although the NETS translation is rather equivocal, suggesting both anger and concern, both translations suggest that YHWH’s response was not merely one of compassion and mercy. Butler concludes that it is not possible to say whether the relationship between YHWH and Israel has been restored and that the narrator is deliberately ambiguous (p. 267).

\textsuperscript{22} YHWH’s response of misery is an undirected emotion experienced “in him,” not a directed “at them” emotion.

\textsuperscript{23} As Webb (\textit{Judges: Integrated}, 46) points out, “The putting away of foreign gods is part of the routine with which he has become all too familiar with previous experience. … After deliverance has been granted, Israel has abandoned him for these gods again. … Yahweh’s interjection anticipates the putting away of the foreign Gods as an expected accompaniment of the appeal for help, and rejects both.”
author is bringing into focus here is the faithfulness and tenacity of Israel, not primarily
the sincerity of their repentance; in fact, this may be why he/she made the issue of
sincerity so difficult for the reader to resolve. What frustrates YHWH is not their
repentance per se, but the constant crying out to him, expecting his compassion as a
purely mechanical response to their distress, and then quickly reverting to their old
apostate ways. As Boda notes, “This divine upbraiding suggests that the divine response
of grace is not an abstract impersonal principle, but rather a personal covenantal response
rooted in the mystery of God’s character of justice and mercy.”24 His soul was impatient
with the misery of Israel because it was misery they repeatedly brought on themselves by
their own disobedience and fickleness. Thus, the implied author construes the Israelites’
repentance itself as +propriety from the point of view of the Israelites and YHWH
(C:Cc), but YHWH exhibits −satisfaction: displeasure at the Israelites’ assumption that
they can use their repentance as a ploy, a negotiation technique to try and force YHWH’s
hand and manipulate him once more into acceding to their desperate appeals (vv. 15–16).
As we shall see below, this attempt by the elders to negotiate with YHWH for help is
paralleled in the subsequent narrative by the elders’ attempt to negotiate with Jephthah as
a substitute deliverer after YHWH’s rejection. In fact, negotiation will be an ongoing
theme in the narrative as the implied author illustrates the Israelite tendency to glibly
assume that they can always argue and manipulate themselves out of the trouble they
create for themselves. Although the grace of God is undeniable, it is necessary to take
into account his justice and righteous anger also.25

25 The text of Judges, and indeed the rest of the canon (e.g., Jer 44:22), frequently depicts the righteous
anger and discipline of YHWH.
The likelihood that the phrase “his soul was short with the misery of Israel” indicates rejection, not compassion, on YHWH’s part increases significantly when the following events are considered. It is interesting that at this point YHWH disappears from the scene; he does not take an audible or active part in the narrative until Judg 11:29 when the Spirit of YHWH comes on Jephthah, an event which we will discuss below. Either he has had enough of their God-defying sins and self-serving negotiations, or he is testing the reality of their repentance by leaving them to their own devices, or both. Since the implied author depicts the Israelites immediately going and seeking human help from elsewhere when the Ammonites advance (vv. 17–18), he/she must be implying that divine help has been refused to them. Verse 18 is significant, especially when it is contrasted to Judg 1:1: “The sons of Israel inquired of the Lord, saying, ‘Who shall go up first for us against the Canaanites, to fight against them?’” (emphasis added). Here the situation is similar, but the question is directed differently: “The people, the leaders of Gilead, said to one another, ‘Who is the man who will begin to fight against the sons of Ammon?’” (emphasis added). If the Israelites expected help from YHWH, would they not have inquired of him as their ancestors did? YHWH, their deliverer, has refused to help them and has distanced himself from them, so instead of maintaining their attitude of repentant dependence on their God and trusting in his mercy, they immediately turn from him to each other and choose their own deliverer.

26 Butler (Judges, 268) remarks that “the people of Israel have to go to battle without a divine or human leader.”
27 Admittedly, Mizpah was a cultic site associated with inquiry of YHWH (Arnold, “Mizpah,” ABD 4:879). The phrasing here, however, seems to preclude inquiry of God. See also Judg 20:18.
28 See Schneider, Judges, 167; Block, Judges, Ruth, 350–51.
29 According to Block (Judges, Ruth, 350), “Jephthah’s emergence is treated as a purely human development.”
“that day” according to their request (v. 15) was indeed a test of their faithfulness and the staying power of their repentance, they fail miserably (−propriety). The leaders of Gilead proceed to rely on their own solutions to the problem of the Ammonites. They decide that the man they choose to lead them in battle, not YHWH their God, will be שָׁם, “head,” over all the people.

In Judg 11:1 Jephthah finally enters the narrative in an off-line paragraph (↑ plus non-verb) which provides information about his background and character.\(^{30}\) Interestingly, this information places a positive evaluation (+capacity: physical; הַגֵּדַר וַיִּלְיָד, “a valiant warrior”) cheek by jowl with a negative evaluation (−normality: status; אַשְׁרֵי נַגִּב, “son of a harlot”).\(^{31}\) The positive assessment, however, has more to do with Jephthah’s physical courage and ability than with his moral character. Subsequently, his lack of status within his society is further stressed by his banishment from his family and the denial of his inheritance. It might seem that the narrator construes Jephthah sympathetically as a victim, but for the fact that he attracted קָנָשֵׁי רוֹמֵים, “worthless/unprincipled men,”\(^{32}\) to his side; Niditch calls him a “social bandit.”\(^{33}\) Thus, Jephthah is tarnished with guilt by association (−propriety). Nevertheless, the leaders of

---

\(^{30}\) There is some question as to whether Jephthah was an Israelite or of mixed parentage. Nothing is said about his mother’s ancestry, and his father is listed as “Gilead,” which seems to refer to a person although it is also a geographical location. See Schneider, Judges, 163–64. Schneider interestingly suggests: “If Gilead was not a specific person but was a term that implied that any man in Gilead could be his father, given his mother’s occupation or actions, then it is possible that those referred to as his brothers in Judg 11:2–3 were Gilead in general, or its ruling elite” (p. 167). See also Block, Judges, Ruth, 353.

\(^{31}\) It is ironic from a literary perspective that a harlot’s child is chosen to represent Israel, who consistently prostitutes herself with other gods.

\(^{32}\) The use of the same word in regard to Abimelech in Judg 9:4 adds to the negative evaluation of Jephthah. See Butler, Judges, 281. Contra Stone (“Judges,” 341), who says the term does not necessarily mean they are immoral or criminal.

\(^{33}\) Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 130.
Gilead recognize his military prowess and leadership qualities and do not scruple to seek his aid.\textsuperscript{34}

Interestingly, the implied author has set up an obvious parallel between Jephthah’s response in v. 7 (“Did you not hate me and drive me from my father’s house? So why have you come to me now when you are in trouble?”), and \(\text{YHWH} \)”’s response to a request for aid in 10:13–14 (“Yet you have forsaken me and served other gods; therefore I will no longer deliver you. Go and cry out to the gods which you have chosen; let them deliver you in the time of your distress”).\textsuperscript{35} In both situations the Israelites reject their potential deliverers when times are good and then return to them, begging pathetically for assistance, when oppression overwhelms them. In both cases they are chastised and bluntly rejected. Further, the Israelites’ response to Jephthah (11: 8: “We have now returned to you, that you may go with us and fight with the sons of Ammon and become head over all the inhabitants of Gilead”) parallels their previous repentant response to \(\text{YHWH} \)” (10:15–16: “‘We have sinned, do to us whatever seems good to You; only please deliver us this day.’ So they put away the foreign gods from among them and served the Lord”). In the Deuteronomistic History \(\text{y} \) often has theological overtones of repentance,\textsuperscript{36} and thus calls to mind the repentant behavior of the people in 10:16 even

\textsuperscript{34} DeMaris and Leeb (“[Dis]Honor and Ritual Enactment,” 180) state: “In Jephthah’s case, we meet a terrible uncertainty, because the honor he has gained by excellence is high, but the honor derived from his birth—his ascribed or inherited honor status—is incredibly low.” They clarify the two aspects of honor relevant to Jephthah: “In a social world characterized by honor and shame, a man may possess two sorts of honor: ascribed honor and acquired honor. Ascribed honor comes from family, name, house, the honor of the world into which a man is born. Acquired honor comes from those things a man accomplishes on his own. Jephthah has been successful; he is a man of acquired honor” (p. 182; italics original).

\textsuperscript{35} See also Stone, “Judges,” 342; Webb, Judges, 313–14; and Block, Judges, Ruth, 354, although he does not draw conclusions from the parallels.

\textsuperscript{36} See HALOT, 1429; Weinfeld, Deuteronomistic School, 335, 351.
though the lexis is not actually used in that verse. Though less definitive, the
Israelites' submissive offer to Jephthah that he “become head” over Gilead resonates with
their submissive offer to YHWH to allow him to “do to us whatever seems good to you” in
10:15. In light of this parallelism, Jephthah’s somewhat cynical response to the leaders in
11:9, asking for reassurance of their commitment to him, hints at YHWH’s cynicism,
borne of experience, regarding the authenticity of the Israelites’ earlier repentance. The
Israelites are now treating Jephthah like YHWH, trusting in him after their negotiations
with YHWH fail and he refuses to help them. Once again the text construes a
multiperspectival assessment: from the perspective of the elders their actions constitute
+propriety, the natural result of wisdom and necessity, but an analysis at the level of
discourse demonstrates that from the perspective of the implied author and YHWH their
actions construe a –propriety assessment, a counter voice to trust in YHWH (11:8,
C:Ct).

The assurance of the elders that “YHWH is witness between us” (v. 10) takes on a
highly ironic nuance in this context, for what can YHWH witness to except the Israelites’
consistent inability to stand by their promises and their loyalties? In this case, however,
the elders of Gilead follow through and make Jephthah לבן שאר ונכין, “head and chief”
over them (+veracity). The narrator’s final comment in this pericope that Jephthah
“spoke all his words before YHWH at Mizpah” is somewhat curious since there is no

38 The terminology for Jephthah’s leadership is interesting. The elders first offer him the position of צבאי, “commander/ruler/leader/superior” (v. 6; see HALOT, 1122). After his hesitation they offer to make him שאר ונכין, “head/leader/chief over all the inhabitants” (v. 8; see HALOT, 1166). After reaching an
agreement with Jephthah, he is ultimately made לבן שאר ונכין “head and commander” (v. 11). It seems that
Jephthah’s reluctance may have caused them to “up the ante.” See Butler, Judges, 281–83; Willis, “The
Nature of Jephthah’s Authority.”
evidence as to what “all his words” consisted of, and why he spoke them before YHWH, and why there is no response from God recorded. It may imply God’s approval of the appointment of Jephthah, and if so it serves to parallel YHWH with Jephthah once more as the two potential deliverers. It remains to be seen whether Jephthah will be as effective as YHWH in this respect. These striking parallels between YHWH and Jephthah might suggest that Jephthah is here being compared to YHWH, and established as some sort of positive “god figure” who is to be respected and admired. On the contrary, it is YHWH who is being compared to Jephthah. The Israelites treat their God the same way that they treat Jephthah: rejecting him when he makes understandable demands on them, denying him his inheritance, returning to him for assistance when times get difficult and they need his help, manipulating him and negotiating with him with offers of honor and sovereignty if he will only do as they ask.

Jephthah seems to concur with the implied author at first that the elders’ approach to him is inappropriate, but he is later convinced to do as they wish. Jephthah’s initial -normality status in the eyes of his tribe has clearly been changed to +normality and he has given the reader the first indications of his proclivity for negotiation. Indeed, Jephthah himself is a born negotiator; whether he is a successful one remains to be seen. Since he has been offered the role as head and chief over Gilead, Jephthah doubtless feels that his negotiation with the elders was successful, but the reader cannot help wondering whether it was the elders’ negotiation with him that was successful—they have the

---

39 As Webb (Judges: Integrated, 53) notes, the leadership question that was asked at Mizpah in 10:18 is answered at Mizpah in 11:11. For the possible significance of Mizpah see Schneider, Judges, 169. Block, Judges, Ruth, 356: “First, how could Jephthah be sworn in ‘before the Lord’ at Mizpah? We have had no hint prior to this that a sacred shrine was located in Transjordanian Mizpah.”

40 See Deut 9:26, 29; 1 Kgs 8:51, 53, among others, for the concept that Israel is YHWH’s inheritance.
accomplished military leader they need. Judges 11:12–28 then consists of Jephthah’s long arbitration with the Ammonites regarding their dispute over land in Transjordan which ranged from the Arnon River to the Jabbok River. The dominant element of assessment in view here is propriety: who is ethically justified in claiming the disputed territory? Who is the interloper? As is typical in ethical disputes, the evaluations offered by the participants are multiperspectival: each viewing his own perspective as correct, and the opponent’s as wrong. In this situation the dominant perspective is Jephthah’s; the king of Ammon is given only one verse to present his argument as compared to Jephthah’s 16 verses. The accounts of the kings of the Edomites, the Moabites, and the Amorites are given, but only secondarily through the perspective of Jephthah. It is interesting that Jephthah starts by saying, “What is between you and me that you have come to me to fight against my land?” (v. 12, emphasis added). The newly appointed leader of Gilead already seems to consider the land his and the Ammonite invasion a personal affront (+normality: status). When the king of the Ammonites rejects his claim and considers Israel at fault (−propriety), Jephthah once again exercises his penchant for negotiation by rehearsing, through his envoys, the entire history of Israel from the time of the Exodus in order to substantiate his right to the land, emphasizing Israel’s appropriate behavior

41 See Block (Judges, Ruth, 357–64) for one detailed analysis of the content and strategy of his speech. Andersson (The Book and Its Narratives, 86) comments on the excessive length of the speech and suggests that its significance is to display “Jephthah’s strength and his leadership qualities through his rhetorical skills.” This is questionable since his speech is unsuccessful in achieving its goal.

42 It is also true that Jephthah and the king of the Ammonites are only allowed to present their accounts through the narrator, but in biblical narrative the narrator is considered reliable. Such a quality cannot be naively assigned to Jephthah or the Ammonite king.

43 Once again, Jephthah’s speech is reminiscent of Yhwh’s in 10:11–14. The historical information is consistent with the accounts in Num 21:22–35; 23–34; Deut 1:4, showing that Jephthah has some knowledge of Israelite traditions. Schneider (Judges, 172–73) suggests that this was what motivated Yhwh to endorse his leadership and descend on him in spirit. Butler (Judges, 280) insightfully comments, however, “His long speech to the king of the Ammonites shows that he knows Israel’s theology, but his
when passing through or around the territory of Edom and Moab (+propriety) and justifying the conquest of Amorite land by YHWH when its king, Sihon, inappropriately refused them passage. What had originally been Amorite land had been justly given to Israel by YHWH (+propriety), and the Ammonites had no claim to it (−propriety).

Jephthah’s version of the Israelites’ arrival in Transjordan is quite accurate according to the Deuteronomistic History and thus concurs with the implied author’s stance that Israel is the rightful possessor of the land.

Verse 24, “Do you not possess what Chemosh your god gives you to possess? So whatever the Lord our God has driven out before us, we will possess it,” has been the subject of much discussion since Chemosh/Kemosh was the deity of the nation of Moab, not Ammon, who worshipped Milcom/Molech. Mattingly points out that “the problem has been variously solved by assuming that the verse contains a Kemosh-Milcom equation, a Moabite-Ammonite equation, an ad hominem argument, an interpolation, a scribal blunder, or an example of diplomatic protocol.” Block suggests, “Jephthah is either engaging in propaganda for purposes of his own or is simply incorrect. ... His theology is fundamentally syncretistic.” As subsequent events will demonstrate, the possibility of Jephthah’s syncretism is a real one. O’Connell also suggests a number of possible explanations, but settles on the one that “the disputation was addressed to a king of Ammon who had recently taken Moabite territory and was thus entitled to claim

---

46 Block, Judges, Ruth, 362. See also Webb (Judges, 322), who argues that “the Ammonites had already occupied the former Moabite territory south of [the Amon], and were intent on occupying the Israelite territory to the north of it as well. ... That is why Jephthah can speak to the king of Ammon as the successor to the kings of Moab.”
Moabite land and to defer to Moabite deities. This issue is significant to an appraisal of Jephthah since differing solutions would indicate that the implied author is construing him as either a knowledgeable historian or an ignorant buffoon, a faithful Yahwist or a faithless syncretist (~capacity or ~propriety). Even if the accuracy of the god’s name is disregarded, it could also imply that Jephthah is a polytheist, putting a foreign god on a par with the God of the Israelites by acknowledging his parallel right to apportion land to his own people. Butler rightly argues that the best interpretation is that of Brown:

[Jephthah] placed their conflict within a larger context—a cosmic contest between their respective gods. ... The Deuteronomic author (or the narrator) continues to press home his polemic against idolatry and to ridicule those who worship any god but the “one Lord” (Deut 6:4) as well as to reaffirm God’s promise of the land for Israel.” ... If Chemosh were really a god, he would protect his interests.

The implied author is using Jephthah to set up a challenge to Chemosh similar in kind to that in which Joash challenges Baal in the Gideon narrative (Judg 6:31) and also reminiscent of the contest between YHWH and Dagon in the Samson narrative to follow. It is worth noting that Jephthah does refer to YHWH as “our God” (v. 24) and later acknowledges YHWH as judge, apparently over both Israel and Ammon (v. 27). However, no matter how knowledgeable Jephthah is as a historian and defender of Israel’s right to the disputed land, his efforts at negotiation come to naught (~capacity). This may be, as Klein suggests, because the actions up until v. 29 where the Spirit comes on Jephthah are solely determined by the people themselves, and do not have YHWH’s endorsement.

Block rightly notes that “although Jephthah’s intentions in seeking a diplomatic solution

48 Although this tends to be counteracted by Jephthah’s statement in v. 27: “May YHWH, the Judge, judge today between the Israelites and the sons of Ammon.”  
49 Butler, Judges, 286.  
51 Klein, Irony in Judges, 86.
were honorable, his tone was far from conciliatory."

The king of the Ammonites refuses to listen to his arguments (—inclination: reluctance), and Jephthah leads the Israelites in an attack against Ammon (v. 29).

This introduces another highly challenging passage in the narrative: the sacrifice of Jephthah’s daughter. Concern has been expressed by commentators not only because Jephthah engaged in human sacrifice, but also because his vow to do so follows so closely on the narrator’s statement that “the Spirit of YHWH came upon Jephthah” (v. 29). To some, this seems to imply that YHWH endorsed or even instigated human sacrifice in spite of clear condemnation of this act in other parts of the Hebrew Bible. Does the narrative portray human sacrifice as +propriety? An investigation of the Hebrew syntax of the passage at the level of discourse clarifies the intent of the implied author and assists in evaluating the actions it depicts.

When the Spirit of YHWH “comes upon” someone, it can indicate both distinction and enabling (+normality: chooseness; +capacity). Although the decision to make Jephthah the leader of Gilead was clearly the choice of the elders inquiring among themselves after YHWH had disappeared from the scene, the coming of the Spirit on Jephthah at this point indicates that YHWH now endorses his leadership; as Block points out, however, it is unclear whether Jephthah is aware of YHWH’s presence and enabling

---

52 Block, Judges, Ruth, 358.
53 Exum (“The Case of Jephthah,” 66) states: “One could more plausibly argue that Jephthah makes his vow under the influence of the spirit of YHWH.”
54 See Lev 18:21; 20:2–5; Deut 12:31; 18:10; Jer 7:30–31; 19:5; possibly also some of the references to “innocent blood” such as Jer 7:6; 19:4. Klein (Irony in Judges, 91) states that the role of sacrifice in Israelite religion is primarily one of celebratory gifting and communion, and that the sacrifice of a child as part of a contract does not fit this pattern. For a summary of different opinions regarding the acceptability of human sacrifice in Israel, see Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 133.
55 See Block, Judges, Ruth, 364–65.
in his life. According to Martin, “The coming of the Spirit ... corresponds to the promise that God will be ‘with’ his chosen leader and is a manifestation of the presence of Yahweh.” God disciplines his people, often by distancing himself from them for a time, but he never ultimately reneges on his covenant commitments to them, and he is free to show mercy on whomever he chooses. Although Jephthah is not YHWH’s own choice, he is nevertheless given the opportunity to accomplish deliverance for Israel as YHWH’s agent. Schneider suggests that Jephthah’s unusual knowledge of Israelite history is what motivated YHWH to endorse his leadership and descend on him in spirit, and Butler argues that it is YHWH’s response to Jephthah’s faithfulness to Israel and its God demonstrated in his support of their claim to the land. Webb, on the other hand, argues that the entire speech was a manipulative effort directed by Jephthah at YHWH himself in the hope of eliciting such a favorable response. Be that as it may, shortly after the coming of the Spirit, Jephthah makes his infamous vow, and some interpreters have concluded that the making of the vow is the result of the Spirit’s coming, implying approval of the act. An examination of Hebrew verb sequences in the passage clearly

56 Block, Judges, Ruth, 365.
57 Martin, “The Role of the Spirit,” 27. See also Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 133.
58 See Deut 4:31; Exod 33:19, among others.
59 Schneider, Judges, 172-73.
60 Butler, Judges, 286.
62 Exum suggests the possibility of a causal connection and implicates the deity in the tragedy (“The Centre Cannot Hold,” 417–18, 422). For a reception history of the Jephthah narrative giving various interpretations of the role of the spirit and the appropriateness of the vow, see Marcus, Jephthah and His Vow, 8–9 and Neef, “Jeptha und seine Tochter (Jdc Xi 29–40),” 206–11. Trible (“A Meditation in Mourning,” 60) states: “This formulaic speech clearly establishes divine sanction for the events that follow and predicts their successful resolution.” In an apparent contradiction, however, Trible later states, “Neither Yahweh nor the people of Gilead require the vow. Furthermore, his speech has disrupted the flow of the narrated discourse. It has broken in at the very center to press for divine help that ironically is already Jephthah’s through the spirit of the Lord. The making of the vow is truly an act of unfaithfulness” (p. 61). It would seem that the events that Trible is referring to are those of the battle, not the vow and sacrifice. On the other hand, Logan (“Rehabilitating Jephthah,” 668) holds that “not only did [the author] condone Jephthah’s actions, he
shows, however, that this is not the case; there is a clear disjunctive break between the coming of the Spirit and the making of the vow that precludes any causal connection between the two.63

applauded them.” Logan argues that the author is a “spokesman for the traditionalist Yahwist view” (p. 668) and “sacrifice was part of the traditionalist Yahwist cult” (p. 673). She is correct to point out that “preexilic Yahwism included groups who not only viewed such sacrifice as authentically Yahwist but also considered it a form of worship highly pleasing to YHWH” (p. 672). What she fails to realize is that while such sacrifices and vows may have been part of Israelite practice, and may have been considered appropriate by some, this “traditional” practice was apostate and syncretistic, as Judges so clearly depicts, and did not reflect Deuteronomistic Yahwism.

Since the grammar of this passage is significant, Longacre’s explanation is worth quoting at length:

A chain of (necessarily verb-initial) clauses that contain preterites is the backbone of any Old Testament story; all other clause types contribute various kinds of supportive, descriptive, and depictive materials. In the case of clauses that begin with a noun (and cannot therefore contain a verb in the preterite), such background material serves to introduce or highlight something about the noun in question, whether it refers to a participant or to a prop in the story. Clauses that contain a non-preterite (perfect) verb portray secondary actions; for example, actions that are in some way subsidiary to the main action, which is described by the preterite. ... We will use the phrase on the storyline or on-the-line versus off the storyline or off-the-line to indicate a basic dichotomy that divides these two sorts of materials used in building a story (Longacre, Joseph, 63).

Although the question of what is on or off the storyline is important, so is the function of disjunctive breaks in the narrative. Verse 27 constitutes the last verse in Jephthah’s negotiation with the Ammonites. The יָתַל clause returns the narrative to the backbone from the secondary action and points out what might have happened, but did not; it simultaneously marks the end of the paragraph and sets up a disjunctive break in the sequence of events. Longacre states, “A chain of preterites may also be preceded by a clause with a negative verb (Joseph, 68). He later adds, “Negative verbs do not often occur in material that precedes a chain of preterites, but are more commonly found scattered somewhere in the interior of such a chain or at its close. Often they express a construction that could be called negated antonym paraphrase. That is, they express a situation negatively, followed by a more positive expression of it in a clause whose preterite is on the storyline of the paragraph” (p. 74). This last situation is not applicable to the passage under discussion.

Although nothing in this observation precludes the waw plus non-verb with negative from introducing a chain of preterites, Heller (Discourse Constellations, 437) clarifies the situation: “Independent QATAL clauses may also function as terminal markers in two different ways. First, a concluding QATAL clause with a prefixed י has a common rhetorical function of highlighting what might have occurred but did not occur in the preceding paragraph...’ The ינ clause is on the narrative backbone. According to Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze (Hebrew Reference Grammar, §46.1.2.1.2) a fronted י is a grammatical necessity and does not break the narrative backbone; rather it is part of the verbal constituent of a clause. The negated verb precludes the possibility of a waw-consecutive. Verse 29 is a chain of wayyiqtols that focuses on Jephthah “passing through/over” (וַיַּעֲשֵׂה) several locations. The noun plus independent qatal clause again marks the end of the paragraph and signals a disjunctive break. According to Longacre, Joseph, 65, “Very commonly a clause with noun plus a perfect precedes a chain of preterites.” However, according to Heller, Discourse Constellations, 434, “Independent q clauses more often mark the end of paragraphs. ... The decision of whether an independent QATAL clause marks the beginning or end of a paragraph is solely dependent upon the narrative context and whether the focus of the QATAL clause is the same as the WAYYIQTOL clause immediately after it (in which case it begins the subsequent paragraph).” Verse 30 sets up the infamous vow and includes the “off-the-line” reported speech of Jephthah as he negotiates with YHWH. The following diagram is an analysis of the passage using Longacre’s verb clines:
There is also an indication of a disjunctive break at the end of the account of Jephthah’s vow: the end of the quoted words, and the use of two והנה clauses near the end of the speech, can indicate a paragraph terminus. Thus, when the narrative resumes with yet another והנה, it suggests resumptive repetition referring back to the last use of the term in v. 29 before the last disjunctive break, and enclosing a counter-voice (C:Ct), an episode that probably took place at Mizpah, a local cultic site suitable for making vows. The recounting of Jephthah’s vow constitutes an interlude in the story of the Israelites’ “crossing over” to fight with Ammon, and the conclusion “YHWH gave them into his hand” does not imply that the victory was the result of the vow made between the disjunctive breaks. Similarly, v. 32 construes YHWH, not Jephthah, as the source of the victory (+capacity)—even if the antecedent of the implied “he” in the 3ms verb נвен is ambiguous—thus attributing the victory to YHWH and not to Jephthah’s machinations.

64 See the section in Longacre, Joseph, 78: “Vahi clauses near paragraph end.”
Admittedly, Jephthah’s vow was premised on the protasis of a conditional: “If you will give the Ammonites into my hand...” (v. 30), and the fact of the victory itself might be used to substantiate the interpretation that YHWH responded to the vow; however, the second disjunctive break and the fact that no reference is made in the text to the victory fulfilling the vow makes this unlikely. There is no implication that the Spirit of YHWH motivated or approved of the infamous vow even before it became a matter of human sacrifice.

It is well to note that the Spirit of YHWH enables, but it is up to the recipient to decide how to use or abuse that enabling. As Martin correctly concludes,

As in the case of Gideon, the coming of the Spirit upon Jephthah does not nullify his personal volition nor eliminate all of his doubts. Even after Gideon receives the Spirit, he seeks a reassuring sign from God; and after Jephthah receives the Spirit, he makes an unwise vow that he hopes will guarantee his victory. ... The giving of the Spirit, therefore, does not guarantee that the recipient will pursue righteousness and act always in accordance with God’s purposes.

All these factors lead to the conclusion that the vow was made on the basis of a lack of trust in YHWH, a human attempt to reinforce a shaky relationship between Jephthah and

---

66 Butler, *Judges*, 287: “Surely the narrator would have made this connection clear had it been intended. God’s coming is to give the enemy into Jephthah’s hand, not to justify Jephthah’s pagan vow.” Admittedly, in the case of Ehud, for example, victory in battle does indicate YHWH’s endorsement of the judge’s actions; however, in the case of Ehud there is no compelling reason to separate his victory from his action in killing Eglon.

67 Martin, “The Role of the Spirit,” 39–40. Martin further states, “The stories of Gideon and Jephthah seem to demonstrate that the power that flows from the Spirit to initiate and complete Yahweh’s salvific mission can produce in the recipient a confidence that continues to manifest itself even after the initial mission has been accomplished. This confidence may then serve the recipient’s own desires and purposes, which may be opposed to the purposes of God” (p. 40). This may explain his unwise action against the Ephraimites, his own people. McCann (*Judges*, 82) suggests another qualification: “The spirit may be an effective power, but it seems that it is not automatically effective, at least not in terms of effecting deliverance.... The progression from Othniel to Samson suggests diminishing faithfulness on the part of the judges upon whom the spirit comes.... This diminishing faithfulness is paralleled by diminishing returns, in terms of deliverance.” Chisholm (“Jephthah’s Fulfilled Vow,” 411) remarks, “When one surveys the evidence in the Book of Judges, it becomes apparent that the Spirit empowered recipients for physical conflict, but possession of the Spirit did not insulate the recipient from foolish behavior.”
his God, in fact, a human attempt to force the divine hand. Block correctly remarks that
"this is not the normative biblical pattern," for the evaluative elements in the narrative
ultimately condemn Jephthah's behavior. The fact that Jephthah directs his negotiation to
YHWH in the making of his vow does not automatically imply God's ethical approval
since YHWH does not even respond; thus, it is assigned a _propriety evaluation.

Of course, as many have pointed out, Jephthah may not have intended to sacrifice
a human being of any kind, let alone his own daughter. The syntax of the vow allows
for the possibility that he anticipated sacrificing an animal. The substantive participle in
the Hebrew נג מ (woodenly: "the coming out thing that comes out") is in the
masculine singular. Since Hebrew has no neuter grammatical gender, the masculine is
used when the situation refers to something of unknown or unspecified gender. It must
have occurred to Jephthah, however, that it was at least possible that his daughter would
come out to welcome him home. DeMaris and Leeb go so far as to argue that it was
"precisely the possibility that his daughter might be the victim that gives honor to
Jephthah in making this vow. The costliest sacrifice brings the highest honor." Amit
argues that the context suggests that Jephthah did intend to offer a human sacrifice,

---
68 Block, _Judges, Ruth_, 379.
69 Marcus ( _Jephthah and His Vow_, 11 and passim) argues that the girl was not sacrificed, as does Stone,
"Judges," 358–60. Stone earlier offers the translation of v. 31: "...and he/it shall become Yahweh's, and/or
I will offer up him/it as a burnt offering" (p. 347). This not only obscures the fact that in Hebrew the
masculine pronoun used generally can include references to females, but also assumes the "or" possibility
for the 1 without argument, even though Hebrew has specific lexis for "or" (or). See Schneider, _Judges_, 174–75;
Butler, _Judges_, 287–88; Block, _Judges, Ruth_, 366–67. Block ( _Judges, Ruth_, 368) points out the
interesting fact that, unlike all other Israelite vows in that there is no logical connection between the
condition and the consequence. The significance of this, however, is unclear. Andersson ( _The Book and Its
Narratives_, 87), however, asks, "Does not Jephthah give a straightforward and desperate business proposal?
He asks God for victory and protection, and in return he lets fate or God set the price."
70 As Chisholm ("Jephthah's Fulfilled Vow," 405) points out, the phrase can refer to both persons and
inanimate objects.
71 DeMaris and Leeb, "(Dis)Honor and Ritual Enactment," 184–85, italics original.
alleging that the phrase יִהְבְּךָלָעָל, “to meet me,” implies a human response to Jephthah’s return. 72 Trible states, “To those acquainted with the traditions of her people, her appearance and activity are no surprise,” 73 and Boda argues that women were precisely those who would have been expected to come out and receive news of a battle, in order to either celebrate or mourn. 74 The weight of this evidence reinforces the –propriety evaluation for Jephthah’s vow.

In evaluating Jephthah’s trust in YHWH, his efforts to negotiate with God and manipulate him into giving him victory, indicated by the “if…then…” conditional statement, construe a –security: mistrust assessment of Jephthah. 75 This is the result of Jephthah’s understanding of YHWH’s character: just as Gideon did previously, he considers YHWH to be an unreliable source of support for Israel (v. 30; –tenacity: faithfulness). 76 However, whereas Gideon simply demanded special signs as reassurance that God would follow through on his promise, Jephthah resorts to even more inappropriate means to bribe or manipulate YHWH into cooperation, viewing him not a God who is faithful and gracious, but a fickle God whose favor must be bought to be

72 Amit, The Art of Editing, 88. See also Chisholm, “Jephthah’s Fulfilled Vow,” 405.
75 See Block, Judges, Ruth, 366.
76 As Trible (“A Meditation in Mourning,” 61) remarks, “Rather than acting with conviction and courage, he responds with doubt and demand.” Contra Exum (“The Case of Jephthah,” 78–79), who states that the vow illustrates his piety and confidence in YHWH since Jephthah constantly invokes him. Exum views Jephthah sympathetically and attributes the tragedy to YHWH, who exhibits silence and aloofness to Israel’s fate and chooses not to intervene as in the case of Isaac. DeMaris and Leeb (“[Dis]Honor and Ritual Enactment,” 187) argue that the vow is necessary because YHWH has promised Jephthah nothing. However, trust is, by its very nature, not based on certainty. Jephthah wants to gain certainty he is not entitled to by inappropriate means. Their conclusion, “Far from being a faithless or superfluous gesture, Jephthah performs the ultimate act of faith—he relies not on his own strength to win the battle, but entrusts the victory to Yahweh,” does not follow logically from the situation. DeMaris and Leeb’s argument is based on the assumption that Jephthah values his own honor over the life of his daughter or trust in YHWH, which in itself may well be true.
relied on. Since Jephthah’s assuming of leadership is dependent on his victory in battle, he tries to “make assurance double sure” in order to achieve honor and status.\(^{77}\) As O’Connell aptly notes, Jephthah models Israel’s “utilitarian view of covenant devotion to YHWH.”\(^{78}\)

Verse 34 begins the account of the actual sacrifice. The appearance of Jephthah’s only daughter, joyfully dancing and celebrating, is designed by the implied author to construe the great worth of the girl (+normality) and the wretchedness and dismay (–happiness: misery) that Jephthah experiences on realizing that she will become the object of his sacrifice. The description emphatically triplicatively emphasizes her uniqueness: she is his “only,” his “one daughter,” and he had no other child.\(^{79}\) His grief appears genuine, and he tears his clothes and cries, “Alas!”\(^{80}\) And yet, in his next words, the implied author reveals his “patriarchal, self-centered perspective”\(^{81}\) when Jephthah blames her for his suffering: \(^{82}\) from Jephthah’s perspective she is the subject of the two actions, not the object, the acted upon, the victim: “You have surely brought me low”\(^{83}\) and “You [expressed pronoun] are among those who bring disaster on me” (v. 35). Thus, Jephthah’s evaluation of his daughter is

---

\(^{77}\) Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, 4.1.83.

\(^{78}\) O’Connell, *Rhetoric of Judges*, 186.

\(^{79}\) See Logan, “Rehabilitating Jephthah,” 678.


\(^{82}\) Klein (*Irony in Judges*, 95–96) concludes: “As a personification of Israel, Jephthah’s unwillingness to accept responsibility for his errors and his displacing them on the victim are subtle comments on the condition of Israel.”

\(^{83}\) The Codex Vaticanus translates הָאָתָה הָאָתָה כְּלָלָה כְּלָלָה as ταραξάτε ἑταραξάτε με, suggesting that the underlying Hebrew text may have read נָפְרֹת נָפְרֹת, using the same verb as the following phrase. The root consonants are the same but in a different order. This would translate as “you have surely brought disaster on me.”
one of propriety, blaming her for the tragic outcome of the vow he himself had made.\textsuperscript{84} The sympathetic portrayal of the girl’s submissive compliance, ambiguous portrayal of the propriety of the vow, and unsympathetic portrayal of her father’s self-exonерating accusations suggests, however, that the implied author is again presenting Jephthah’s speech as counter voice to his/her own (C:Ct), intending to undermine it.

The curious thing about the entire conversation between Jephthah and his daughter is that it focuses entirely on the ethical obligations surrounding the vow, not on the ethical propriety of the sacrifice.\textsuperscript{85} Jephthah bemoans, “I have given my word to YHWH, and I cannot take it back” (v. 35), and his daughter agrees, “You have given your word to YHWH; do to me as you have said” (v. 36). Indeed, his daughter herself assumes that the vow was the cause of the military victory; this is implied when she adds “\textit{since} YHWH has avenged you of your enemies…” (emphasis added). Perhaps the terrifying possibility of bad luck or retaliation resulting from the breaking of a vow overcomes their understandable reluctance to sacrifice the young girl. Cartledge cites other ANE literature to illustrate that the failure to promptly fulfill the vow could result in sickness, trouble, and the wrath of the gods.\textsuperscript{86} After the time of mourning that her father permits, his

\textsuperscript{84} Contra Niditch, \textit{Judges: A Commentary}, 134 and Logan (“Rehabilitating Jephthah,” 679) who claims, “Jephthah does not blame his daughter; he names her as the source of his own personal disaster” (italics original). Trible (“A Meditation in Mourning,” 63), however, argues that the syntax implies censure, condemnation, and blame.

\textsuperscript{85} Exum (“The Case of Jephthah,” 67) states that the content is more disturbing than the vow itself, but she is speaking of the reaction of contemporary readers, not the emphasis of the text itself. Marcus (\textit{Jephthah and His Vow}, 55) cites the interpretation that the appearance of Jephthah’s daughter after the victory, and the resulting necessity of sacrificing her, was YHWH’s punishment of Jephthah for making the vow.

\textsuperscript{86} Cartledge, \textit{Vows in the Hebrew Bible}, 86. See also Neef, “Jephta und seine Tochter (Jdc Xi 29–40),” 211–17 on the obligations of those who make vows in the OT.
daughter returns and she is offered as a burnt sacrifice;\textsuperscript{87} Jephthah begins to reap the dubious rewards of presuming to negotiate with, or manipulate, YHWH.

Some commentators have tried to sidestep the difficult question of human sacrifice by an Israelite judge, and have claimed that Jephthah did not actually sacrifice his daughter, but merely condemned her to perpetual virginity.\textsuperscript{88} Space does not permit a complete discussion of their arguments here, but this view is untenable.\textsuperscript{89} When Jephthah made his vow he clearly promised "it shall be the Lord's, and I will offer it up as a burnt offering" (יהוה יְהוָה יָאֹרֵעַ וְצִおよびֶבֶס, v. 31). Subsequently, "he did to her according to the vow which he had made" (וַיֶּשׁ לְהַ אָחָד וְצִおよびֶבֶס נֵרָה, v. 39).\textsuperscript{90} A woman must be alive to have relations with a man; the fact that his daughter died, and therefore had no children, effectively cut off Jephthah's family line, a great tragedy in Israelite culture,\textsuperscript{91} and the

\textsuperscript{87} The postponement is interesting in light of Hyman ("Four Acts of Vowing in the Bible," 237), who points out that "the promises are spoken voluntarily by the vower and must be fulfilled without delay (Num. 30:3; Deut. 23:22)." It may reflect Jephthah's uncertainty as to the propriety of the vow as well as his obvious reluctance to sacrifice his own daughter.

\textsuperscript{88} For a discussion of this issue see Schneider, Judges, 182–83; Marcus, Jephthah and His Vow, 33–37.

\textsuperscript{89} In support of this, Block (Judges, Ruth, 367) notes: "At this time the Israelites worshiped Milkom, the Ammonite god, and Chemosh, the god of the Moabites, whose leaders are known to have sacrificed children (2 Kgs 3:27)." See also Chisholm, "Jephthah's Fulfilled Vow," 407–8; Logan, "Rehabilitating Jephthah," 666. Logan, however, argues that "not only did [the narrator] condone Jephthah's actions, he applauded them" (p. 668). Interestingly, Cartledge, Vows in the Hebrew Bible, 179–80 argues that Jephthah is setting up a dangerous game of gambling with high stakes here, seeming to offer a precious sacrifice (his daughter) in order to deceive and influence YHWH to give him the victory while secretly hoping that an animal will be the first out of his house when he returns. He concludes, "If this conjecture is to be allowed, then Jephthah's words do not constitute a rash vow at all: they are a cunning attempt to promise one thing while hoping for a lesser outcome." This would explain why Jephthah blamed his daughter: she foiled his carefully constructed plan by rushing to meet him.

\textsuperscript{90} Interestingly, Block (Judges, Ruth, 375) suggests that the lack of detail about the sacrifice is a deliberate decision by the narrator to soften the horror of the event, not evidence that it didn't occur. Block notes that in the "sacrifice" of Isaac more detail is given because YHWH intervenes and the abomination of child sacrifice is never actually carried out. See also Exum, "The Case of Jephthah," 70.

\textsuperscript{91} See DeMaris and Leeb ("[Dis]Honor and Ritual Enactment," 186) for the view that Jephthah's line could not carry on through his daughter in any case. This seems uncertain in view of the daughters of Zelophehad (Num 27:1–7) whose inheritance remained within the tribe of the family of their father as long as they married within their own tribe (Num 36:6–7; 10–12).
daughters of Israel lamented or commemorated the fate of Jephthah's daughter.92 Perhaps it is not very difficult to believe that an Israelite judge could commit so grave an error as to sacrifice his own daughter when one considers the degeneration in the characters of the judges since Othniel.

But, given that the daughter is indeed sacrificed as a burnt offering, is the implied author construing it as an error, an unethical act? Interpreters, both ancient and contemporary, have suggested that Jephthah had a more ethical option. Targum Jonathan points out that Jephthah had better alternatives and thus condemns the sacrifice. The relevant section of the Targum reads:

> And at the end of two months she returned to her father and he fulfilled on her his vow, which he had vowed. She had not known any man. And it became a decree in Israel that no one may offer up his son or his daughter for a burnt offering, as Jephthah the Gileadite did, who did not ask Phinehas the Priest. For if he had asked Phinehas the priest, he would have rescued her with a monetary consecration. And Jephthah judged Israel for six years. Then Jephthah the Gileadite died from mortal wounds because he had not spared his daughter and had not gone to appease Phinehas the priest who could have undone his vow for him. And his limbs fell from him and his limbs were buried in the cities of Gilead.93

From the perspective of these early interpreters, Jephthah not only could have, but should have opted out of his vow. To the author of the Targum, the issue of illicit human sacrifice takes precedence over the fulfilment of a vow, which, even if it were legitimate, could have been legally undone by the priest. More recently, Block suggests that

92 Not “celebrated” as in ASV. The infinitive construct ̀_property is from the root ̀property whose meaning is uncertain in many cases but which seems to signify “recount” here. See HALOT, 1760. For one interpretation of the resulting festival, see Day (“From the Child Is Born the Woman,” 66), who concludes that it is a rite of passage signaling “women’s moral development through an adolescent stage of total self-sacrifice to mature recognition that they must take their own well-being as well as others’ well-being into account when making moral decisions.” For a different interpretation that links the festival to assimilation of foreign sacrificial practices, see Janzen, “The Sacrifice of Jephthah’s Daughter,” 351.

Jephthah could have refused to carry out the vow and brought the consequences on himself instead of his daughter, an option that, if it was contemplated, he chose not to carry out.94 Niditch, on the other hand, argues that in this context of just war the sacrifice is an example of רומח, and cannot be avoided; the absence of the root, however, makes this unlikely.95 Chisholm concludes, “The Lord did not demand the fulfillment of a vow that violated His Law,”96 and Janzen points out that in the DtrH, “obeying is better than sacrificing.”97 The subsequent co-text may also suggest that the sacrifice was unethical. If YHWH had honored the sacrifice and the keeping of the vow, one would expect that subsequent events would continue to work out in Israel’s favor. Immediately after the sacrifice, however, serious trouble arises, this time from within the Israeliite ranks, and the tenuous stability achieved by victory over the Ammonites is immediately placed at risk by Jephthah.98 The final word must be given to the Deuteronomistic implied author, however. According to Janzen, “Jephthah’s sacrifice of his daughter is obviously a sin from the Deuteronomistic point of view, and so in this context it is hardly something that YHWH would accept.”99 Verses such as Deut 12:31; 18:10, make it clear that from the Deuteronomistic perspective human sacrifice is unacceptable, as does the rest of the canon: Lev 18:21; 20:2–5; Jer 7:30–31; 19:5, and possibly also some of the references to “innocent blood” such as Jer 7:6; 19:4. If the implied author chose not to inscribe his/her opinion directly in as many words, it was most likely because this practice, borrowed

---

94 Block, Judges, Ruth, 377. For another view see Chisholm, “Jephthah’s Fulfilled Vow,” 413.
98 O’Connell, Rhetoric of Judges, 181.
from the cultic practices of foreign gods, was so clearly understood by the implied reader to be an offence to YHWH. Thus, the actual sacrifice as well as the vow must be deemed -propriety.

When they are summoned after the battle, the Ephraimites express dissatisfaction and anger (-satisfaction: displeasure; -happiness: antipathy) that they were not called earlier to participate in the defeat of the Ammonites, resenting the loss of honor and plunder, to the point where they threaten Jephthah with violence (Judg 12:1). This is not the first time that Ephraim has claimed to have been left out—they tried the same strategy with Gideon in Judg 8:1—calling into question their own veracity rather than Jephthah’s. When Gideon was faced with the Ephraimitite challenge during the time when he exemplified an ideal leader, he responded as a truly effective negotiator. His self-effacing remarks and his acknowledgement of the Ephraimites’ ability and contribution to the battle successfully tempered their anger and aggression and good relations were soon restored with honor accruing to both Gideon and the Ephraimites. When the Ephraimites once again constitute one of the early voices of a divided Israel (C:Ct), however, Jephthah, exhibits no such negotiating skill. He responds with equal animosity (-happiness: antipathy); there are no self-effacing remarks here, and no conciliatory compliments. Jephthah portrays himself as the harried underdog who nevertheless heroically saves Israel at the risk of his own life, and the Ephraimites as

100 Although this occurs after the battle in the narrative sequence, some suggest that this incident actually occurred during the battle. See Boda, “Judges,” 1197.
102 Janzen (“The Sacrifice of Jephthah’s Daughter,” 352) argues that Ephraim is behaving just like the foreign Ammonites in “claiming land that YHWH had given to others.” Of course, it is also possible that Jephthah is untruthfully saying that he called them, just to protect himself. There is no evidence in the text that he did.
reluctant and ineffectual non-deliverers who failed to respond when called. Not surprisingly, Jephthah’s attempts to negotiate fail once again and he makes a pre-emptive strike against his fellow Israelites when they taunt him (12:4). As Schneider rightly points out, this is a preview of the full-blown civil war that will end the narratives of the judges: “Israel’s decline continues to the point that by the end of the episode Israel has become its own enemy.” Whereas Ehud’s association with the Ephraimites at the fords of the Jordan was co-operative and successful, and Gideon effectively quelled the potential revolt of the Ephraimites at the Jordan in such a way that both parties preserved honor, Jephthah’s counter-challenge at the fords of the Jordan brings only death and division. As Kirkpatrick notes, “Jephthah, finally, strips Ephraim of status and honor, destroying the ideal manifested by Ehud. Thus, while Jephthah acquires honor by his actions, these actions do not contribute positively to the book.” The internecine warfare that leads to the death of 42,000 Israelites casts a long shadow over Jephthah’s tenure and provides further evidence through the implied author via the narrator that YHWH is not pleased with the judge (propriety).

An interesting literary pattern appears in the ideational content of the narrative which involves Jephthah’s four attempts to negotiate a solution to Israel’s problems, as summarized in the table below. Although Logan deems Jephthah “verbally gifted” and

---

103 Webb (Judges: Integrated, 73) states that YHWH is uninterested in these “power politics,” and that he only had God’s endorsement as a temporary deliverer. Exum’s statement that Jephthah is “unable to forestall internecine warfare” is curious, since Jephthah’s impatience and lack of diplomacy actually helped to provoke it (Exum, “The Case of Jephthah,” 64).

104 Schneider, Judges, 159.


107 Wong (Compositional Strategy, 130–31) points out that Jephthah treats his own people more harshly than he treated the foreign oppressors of Israel.
considers his vow “an astute piece of negotiation,”¹⁰⁸ and Webb refers to him as “a person to be reckoned with” and calls him “a master ... at using words strategically,”¹⁰⁹ it is not at all clear that Jephthah was a skilled negotiator at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiation</th>
<th>Who initiates the negotiating</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jephthah and the elders of Gilead (relationship)</td>
<td>Elders approach Jephthah after Ammon threatens Israel</td>
<td>Ammonite threat, Israel has no military leader</td>
<td>(11:6–11)</td>
<td>Jephthah agrees</td>
<td>??: Israel has a new leader but not YHWH’s choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephthah and the king of Ammon (enemies)</td>
<td>Jephthah, after the Ammonites attack Israel</td>
<td>Dispute over control of land</td>
<td>(11:12–13)</td>
<td>Ammonites demand the return of the land</td>
<td>Unsuccessful: Jephthah tries to negotiate again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11:14–28)</td>
<td>Ammonites disregard messages and remain on the offensive</td>
<td>Unsuccessful: Israel must go to war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephthah and YHWH (relationship)</td>
<td>Jephthah on his own initiative</td>
<td>Desire to control outcome of battle; lack of trust in relationship</td>
<td>(11:30–31)</td>
<td>No response from YHWH</td>
<td>??: Israel wins but daughter dies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephthah and Ephraim (relationship)</td>
<td>Ephraim complains to Jephthah</td>
<td>Ephraim feels dishonoured; lack of trust in relationship</td>
<td>(12:1–4)</td>
<td>Taunting from Ephraim</td>
<td>Unsuccessful: 42,000 Israelites die</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, the elders of Gilead negotiate with Jephthah to encourage him to become the leader of the people. Second, Jephthah negotiates with the king of Ammon over title to the

¹⁰⁹ Webb, Judges, 324–25. Webb also commends Jephthah: “In true statesman-like fashion Jephthah had been willing to give peace a chance.” In fact, Webb earlier states, “It is unlikely, however, that he is genuinely seeking peace, since armed conflict has already begun, and he has been engaged by the Gileadites specifically to “fight … it seems more likely that his intention is to seize the moral high ground by establishing the rightness of his cause … His tone is anything but conciliatory” (p. 317).
disputed land. This effort does not yield the desired result, the Ammonites do not give up the land, and Jephthah is forced to lead Israel into battle, resolving the issue by violent action. Third, Jephthah attempts to negotiate with YHWH himself in order to ensure the outcome of the battle. This attempt to bargain with God—if you give me victory I will give you a sacrifice—appears to be successful in that Israel wins the war, but who is to say that the war would not have been won in any case? The bargain does result, however, in the violent death of Jephthah’s daughter and family line. The final act of negotiation occurs between Jephthah and the Ephraimites, and since no resolution is achieved by Jephthah’s recriminations, it results in more violent action and the death of 42,000 Israelites in spite of the fact that Jephthah’s troops finally “win” the battle. Only the first negotiation, the one that placed Jephthah as head over Israel, initially seems to have had a positive outcome, but if Jephthah’s judgeship went on to cause such death and destruction, perhaps the outcome was not as successful as it seemed to be at the time. It is also interesting to note that in every case of negotiation except the vow, the bargaining was stimulated by the words or actions of some other group of people; the situation was more or less forced on Jephthah. The vow was made, however, on Jephthah’s own initiative, after the Spirit had come upon him, and when he should have felt secure that the battle would be won through YHWH’s enabling and approval. Jephthah is a weak leader, an inept negotiator, and a man whose understanding of his faith is more historical than relational. The fact that he led the Israelites to victory over the Ammonites is more a result of YHWH using him in spite of his flaws than a result of

---

111 Webb (*Judges*, 335) gives an interesting comparison of the sacrificial offering of Isaac and Jephthah’s daughter.
his strengths as a judge. His own personal legacy is cultic abomination and internecine warfare.

Jephthah judged Israel for only six years, possibly the shortest rule of all the judges, then he “died and was buried in [one of] the cities of Gilead” (Judg 12:7). The previous judge, Gideon, was buried in the tomb of his father Joash, and the subsequent one, Samson, in the tomb of his father Manoah, but Jephthah is simply “buried,” not even in a specific place, but somewhere in “the cities of Gilead,” an outsider to the last.113

7.3 Conclusions

7.3.1 Summary of Evidence

The opening of the Jephthah narrative contrasts sharply the −tenacity and −propriety of the Israelites with the +tenacity and +propriety of YHWH. The long list of foreign gods—the Baals and the Ashtaroth, the gods of Aram, the gods of Sidon, the gods of Moab, the gods of the sons of Ammon, and the gods of the Philistines—that Israel served is set in contrast with the lengthy list of nations—the Egyptians, the Amorites, the sons of Ammon, the Philistines, and also the Sidonians, the Amalekites and the Maonites—from which God delivered them. The −happiness: misery of Israel, caused by their oppression, is compared to the −happiness: misery of YHWH, caused by his people’s rejection. God finally states that he will no longer deliver the Israelites (−satisfaction: displeasure), forcing them to appeal to another potential leader that they

112 Butler (Judges, 297) makes a gruesome suggestion: “The Hebrew text has a plural in reference to the ‘towns’ of his burial. Does that mean his body was severed into parts and scattered in various burial places?”

113 The critical apparatus suggests a textual issue here, and based on the LXX the original reading may have been “in his city.” However, the result is still non-specific.
had also previously wronged and rejected, Jephthah. The parallels between the Israelites’ interactions with Jephthah and with YHWH effectively point out the manipulative intentions of the people. Although YHWH ultimately endorses their choice and works in spite of Jephthah’s shortcomings to deliver Israel, the cost is high. Jephthah’s ineffectual negotiation (−capacity) and syncretistic actions (−propriety) lead to the death of his young daughter and internecine warfare with the Ephraimites (−happiness: antipathy).

7.3.2 Conclusion

In the Jephthah narrative, the implied author depicts the Israelites as having a partial or superficial understanding of the character of YHWH. They have most likely heard of his great deliverances of Israel in other times and situations, and construe him in their minds as a compassionate and merciful God who can be counted on to once again deliver them from oppression. YHWH is indeed merciful and compassionate, but the Israelites do not take into consideration his holiness and justice, which are equally significant aspects of his character, and thus they persist in sinning (10:6). They assume that God will adhere to his side of the covenant without adhering to theirs. They suppose a mechanical relationship between confession and deliverance, between repentance and deliverance, and do not understand the need for a change in the inner affections that give rise to sincere confession and repentance. Thus, their relationship with YHWH is once again damaged and he withdraws himself from them until, in his freedom, he deems their punishment sufficient, relents, and has mercy on his own terms. The Israelites also do not seem to understand the uniqueness and supremacy of YHWH, the one true God. They serve “the Baals and the Ashtaroth, the gods of Aram, the gods of Sidon, the gods of Moab, the gods of the sons of Ammon, and the gods of the Philistines” (10:6). More and
more they are enculturated into the Canaanite worldview and less and less are they in a relationship with YHWH that reflects his goal in their original deliverance from Egypt and that is reaffirmed in Deut 29:13 on entering the land, “that he may establish you today as his people and that he may be your God.” 114 YHWH reminds them of this in Judg 10:11–13. This syncretistic attitude is also reflected in the man they choose to deliver them in YHWH’s stead.

The implied author presents Jephthah as a man who, in spite of a superficial knowledge of and token faith in YHWH, consistently takes matters into his own hands and relies on his own inadequate negotiating skills rather than allowing YHWH to take control. Both Stone’s assessment that Jephthah consistently acts with “patience and care” but was “ensnared by one of his virtues” and Niditch’s designation of Jephthah as a “tragic hero” and a “politically savvy negotiator” are far too positive and sympathetic. 115 Butler is perhaps more to the point when he comments: “The narrator skillfully characterizes Jephthah as a person with ambivalent qualities, not someone who is totally bad,” 116 or even O’Connell, who unambiguously asserts, “The vow turns Jephthah from a deliverer of Israel into but another oppressor.” 117 The fact that he is introduced more or less sympathetically by the implied author as a deprived and marginalized character and somehow manages to lead Israel—albeit with a significant amount of intervention from YHWH—to a measure of success against Ammon does not excuse his pervasive inadequacies and horrendous errors. He is an ineffectual negotiator and a self-serving

114 See also Exod 6:7.
115 Stone, “Judges,” 356, 357; Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 130. Stone attributes the dedication of his daughter (not sacrifice) to Jephthah’s honoring of “equivalent gift-giving in tribal societies” (p. 357).
116 Butler, Judges, 295.
117 O’Connell, Rhetoric of Judges, 181.
manipulator whose lack of faith in YHWH causes him to sacrifice his innocent daughter and turn the tribes aggressively against each other in useless slaughter. Such an inadequate character can nevertheless result in YHWH working through him, and in spite of him, to accomplish some good.

It would be a mistake to place all the blame on Jephthah, however. The Ephraimites seem more interested in honor and booty than in the welfare of the whole people of Israel under YHWH. The Israelites' persistent apostasy reaps its own rewards as the nation continues its downward spiral towards disaster; in fact, the implied author depicts Jephthah as an embodiment of Israel and its failures. As Janzen rightly concludes, “Nor is it only the judge who acts like a foreigner in the sacrifice of his daughter; all of Israel, and even the victim, are culpable to some degree in this foreign sacrifice.” It is significant that at the end of Jephthah’s tenure there is no reference to the land having rest. Israel is left in dire straits, and YHWH is about to raise up the last major judge, Samson, who, unlike Jephthah, will start out in life with all the advantages necessary to being a powerful and effective leader. As Jephthah only “began” to fight against the Ammonites (10:18) so Samson will only “begin” to deliver Israel from the Philistines (13:5).

---

118 Janzen (“The Sacrifice of Jephthah’s Daughter,” 341) points out, “In the worldview of Dtr, if Israel worships foreign gods or worships YHWH in the manners in which the Canaanites worshipped their gods, the nation will also act in the evil ways in which foreigners act.”
119 See Janzen, “The Sacrifice of Jephthah’s Daughter,” 342–44.
8 The Samson Narrative (Judges 13:1–16:31)

8.1 Introductory Remarks

By the time the implied author of Judges arrives at the last major Israelite judge, the situation in Israel has changed significantly. The people that entered the land with Joshua were full of hope and enthusiasm, expecting to find prosperity and rest after YHWH had driven out the nations before them. This plan did not run smoothly, however, and persistent apostasy led to increasingly reduced success. Misunderstanding of YHWH’s merciful character has caused the Israelites to take advantage of his grace and damage their relationship with their God; their pleas for mercy have actually caused the Israelites to experience greater chastisement. As the Samson narrative begins, the Canaanites have not been driven out; in fact, they have been used by YHWH to test and discipline the Israelites. Divisions have begun to appear within Israel; Abimelech has attempted to force monarchic rule on Israel and the Ephraimites have become a recurring problem. Repeated cycles of oppression have not caused the people to repent in any sustained way, and they have sunk into a state of apathy and acceptance of the status quo: Philistine domination.

In all the narratives of the judges up to Gideon, the implied author has depicted YHWH using the judges, however flawed, to deliver Israel. After repeated relapses into idolatry, however, YHWH became impatient with the misery of Israel and resisted the cries for help by the people of Gilead, who turned to Jephthah as an alternate deliverer. Although Jephthah was not his choice, he nevertheless acted in mercy and ultimately

---

1 That is, Samson is the last “major” judge in the book of Judges. He was followed by “minor” judges, and Samuel also judged Israel (1Sam 4:18).
delivered Israel in spite of the judge’s inadequacies. However, with the advent of Samson, a leader with all the privileges and enabling that a mere human could hope for, and yet who demonstrated the greatest weaknesses of all the judges, the implied author recounts how YHWH adopts another strategy. As Exum notes, “There is no explicit censure of Samson for any of his actions, which is surprising if his morality or his faithfulness be a major theological concern. Indeed, not only is there no ethical censure, but YHWH seems to have a hand in Samson’s unrestrained behavior.” Surprisingly, YHWH does not deliver Israel in spite of his improprieties, but actually by means of them. Thus we have the unusual situation in which a leader is evaluated—by the text, if not explicitly by the narrator—with consistent negativity and yet whose negative actions are actually the source of Israel’s hope—whether they realize it or not—and thus, ironically, have a positive dimension. It is almost as if YHWH has given up on the Israelites and their judges behaving well and is now ironically using their weaknesses and sins to redeem them. However Samson, unlike earlier judges who acted more directly in conjunction with God as deliverers, can only “begin” to save Israel; he sets up a negative situation which YHWH then paradoxically uses to complete his goal. In fact, the “eyes motif” in this narrative is a deliberate device used by the implied author to link the evaluative perspectives of YHWH and Samson in a paradoxical symbiosis. Throughout

3 Although Niditch (Judges: A Commentary, 144) claims, “As a warrior hero, Samson will deliver Israel from its enemies,” it is not nearly as simple as that.
4 This involves the phrase “in the eyes of” as well as other references to sight and eyes. See the discussion below. The phrase itself appears in Judges in 2:11; Judg 3:7, 12 (2x); 4:1; 6:1, 17; 10:6, 15; 13:1; 14:3, 7; 17:6; 19:24; 21:25.
5 According to Olson (“The Book of Judges,” 842), the “in the eyes of” motif also serves to forebode the anarchy in the conclusion of Judges: “The phrase is unusual when applied to humans as an object, but it appears to be an intentional echo of a key phrase that frames the last section of Judges (chaps. 17–21).”
the book of Judges, the behavior of the Israelites has been evil “in the eyes of YHWH,” but in the story of Samson the phrase is twice used of Samson himself (14:3, 7): “right in the eyes of Samson” and “right in my eyes [referring to Samson].” The interplay of evaluations in the narrative is complex but significant.

8.2 Analysis of the Text

Yet again, the Israelites do the evil thing in the eyes of YHWH. Curiously, although they have suffered oppression from the Philistines for forty years at the start of the narrative (14:1), there is no record of the Israelites crying out for help. In fact, Schneider points out that Samson was the only person to judge at a time when the enemy was actually in control, not just threatening to take control, and yet the people are silent.⁶ In contrast to the Jephthah story in which the people cry out but God rejects their manipulative cry, in this case YHWH takes the complete initiative and graciously initiates their rescue before he is even asked. As Webb points out, “In the Samson episode the Israelites show little sign of even wanting to be rescued.”⁷ It would appear that the situation has become so desperate that the Israelites are unable to cry out, or they are so religiously depraved that they are unaware that this option is even available. Perhaps they have simply given up hope. As we shall see below, the tribe of Judah is even willing to hand over Samson to the Philistines in order to avoid trouble. This may suggest why, in this judge’s case, the Spirit has to “rush” or “come mightily” upon Samson to have any impact (πἀγας: Judg 14:6, 19; 15:14).⁸

---

⁶ Schneider, Judges, 217.
⁷ Webb, Judges: Integrated, 163.
⁸ Stone (“Judges,” 391) equates this special terminology of the Spirit’s influence to the giving of power for acts of supernatural strength, rather than for human strength in battle.
In the midst of this apathy, the angel of YHWH is suddenly seen by a woman of the tribe of Dan (v. 3). She is known only as “the wife of Manoah,” and yet the implied author endows this nameless woman with more courage and intelligence than her rather comically portrayed husband. Even this exceptional woman, however, does not immediately recognize the angel of YHWH but refers to him as “a man of God” (13:16). Verse 3 begins a strong saturating prosody of +normality in regard to Manoah’s wife that extends to v. 5 and sporadically beyond. Although she was previously unnamed, unknown, and barren (−normality), she, rather than her husband, is honored by a special visitation from the angel of YHWH. Now, the shame of her barrenness will be removed, and she will give birth to a son (+normality), an evaluation that is emphasized by its repetition almost exactly in vv. 3 and 5. These two evaluations surround an unusual instruction that the mother herself is to take on herself the vows of a Nazirite, since her son is to be specially dedicated to God from the womb. As Klein remarks, this opening “lures the reader into renewed optimism” about the fate of Israel. Thus, the text construes a significant +normality evaluation for Samson, also. Interestingly, however, this assessment is immediately qualified by the phrase that follows: 


12 Klein, Irony in Judges, 109.

13 According to Amit (The Art of Editing, 274), “The author’s wish [is] to emphasize the tremendous redemptive powers available to Samson, contrasted with the utter failure of his leadership.”
“and he shall begin to deliver Israel from the hands of the Philistines” (emphasis added). Manoah’s wife rushes home to tell her husband the startling news.

As O’Connell rightly points out, “Since the Nazirite obligation imposed upon Samson by YHWH is the essential information disclosed about Samson in the character exposition (13:5, 7), it sets the standard for evaluating his subsequent abdications of duty.” Reading canonically, Samson’s Nazirite status, indicating his chosenness by YHWH for a special purpose, parallels Israel’s election for a specific purpose: to be a blessing to the nations (Gen 12:1–3; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14). As Klein explains,

That Samson, like Israel, has been dedicated to Yahweh from his conception makes his—and Israel’s—blithe obliviousness to ethical values all the more poignant. Both Israel and Samson are nazirites in that they are dedicated to Yahweh from ‘conception’, and both seem more concerned with personal gratification (including the pleasures of worldly values) than with the less tangible covenant.

As many have noted, the judges often represent the behavior and character of the Israelites as a whole. Thus, Samson’s dishonoring of his chosenness by infringing his Nazirite vows parallels Israel’s dishonoring of its election by breaking the covenant and worshipping foreign gods.

The exact nature of Samson’s Nazirite status has long been a topic of discussion. It is important to understand its requirements, however, in order to determine whether and how Samson violated its stipulations and thus his propriety. According to Num 6:1–

---

14 Whether there is any literary significance, in the nature of a double entendre, to the fact that בְּשֵׁר in the Hiphil may also mean in other contexts “to allow to be profaned” or “to render invalid” is uncertain (HALOT, 320).
16 See Klein, Irony in Judges, 118.
17 E.g., Olson, “The Book of Judges,” 842–43, among many others.
the vow could be made by either a man or a woman and was both voluntary and temporary. In Samson’s case, however, the status was imposed on him as YHWH’s chosen leader (+normality). The three requirements were that Nazirites should abstain from any products made from grapes, should not cut their hair, and should not go near a dead person—although the term ἄνθρωπος could well extend to other living things; the word is used of animals in Gen 1:20, 21, 24; 2:19; 9:10, 16; Lev 11:10, 46; Ezek 47:9, although admittedly the context of Num 6:1 suggests humans. Only the cutting of hair, however, was specifically required of Samson by the angel (v. 5). The prohibition on wine was given to his mother alone (v. 4), but it seems likely that it was intended to keep her unborn child free of the product and would have been extended to Samson after his birth. No mention is made of contact with dead bodies, but this may have been assumed since Samson was intended to be a Nazirite. According to Boda, the angel’s stipulations echo all three areas of prohibition and therefore all these requirements are in force in regard to Samson.18 Some commentators make much of the fact that Samson’s mother did not pass on information about the restriction on hair cutting to Manoah,19 but it could reasonably be assumed that he would know the usual Nazirite requirements. It is, however, curious that she does not tell her husband of Samson’s calling to be a deliverer, at least at that time. Chisholm concludes from this that Samson was unaware of his calling throughout his life, and even suggests that YHWH “purposely veiled His intention. He was content to work behind the scenes, delivering a people who did not seek deliverance through a deliverer who failed to see himself as such.”20 Samson was well aware of his Nazirite

status (16:17), however, and it is an argument from silence that he did not know of his God-given purpose. It is just as likely that he did, since he is twice said to have “judged Israel” (15:20; 16:31) and one of the functions of a judge is to be a military leader. Thus, Samson is ethically responsible for behaving in ways appropriate to his chosenness.

In v. 7, Samson is again construed as special to YHWH when Manoah’s wife repeats the declaration that he will be a Nazirite to God (+normality), an agent whose life is specially initiated and whose life will be especially dedicated to YHWH from the womb. In his mother’s recounting, however, there is a further hint of negativity that may not bode well for Samson’s future: he will be a Nazirite “from the womb to the day of his death.” In no other judge cycle is the death of the judge in view until the day of its actual occurrence; Samson’s death, however, is in view even before his birth. We can only speculate why Manoah’s wife adds this phrase to the angel’s words; but perhaps the narrator is suggesting a mother’s instinctive foreboding in regard to her son.

In v. 8, Manoah becomes actively involved in the scene, and entreats YHWH to send the angel back “to us.” His +inclination: eagerness may be motivated by a desire to appease his sense of self-importance or doubt as to the veracity of his wife’s narrative; he has already been told how to rear the child to be born. Ironically, the angel does return—and appears to the woman, alone, once more. Fortunately for him, his wife rushes to include him in the conversation. Unfortunately, the angel’s reply puts him firmly in his place (−normality): “Let the woman pay attention to all that I said” (v. 13; emphasis added).21 His subsequent attempts to detain the angel, perhaps in order to gain some

---

21 The Nazirite restrictions were placed on the woman to follow and the information was perhaps more relevant to her, but Manoah was to be deeply involved in the raising of the boy and thus knowledge of the requirements were necessary for him also.
control over or concession from him, and his attempts at inappropriate sacrifice to him (vv. 15–16), are also rejected, and construe Manoah as *propriety*. His failure to even recognize the identity of the messenger of *YHWH* also point out the meagerness of his spiritual sensitivity (vv. 16, 21). His flustered panic when the angel ascends in the flames (*insecurity: shock; capacity: mental*), when contrasted to his wife’s logical analysis which offers no less than three arguments against the likelihood of their death (vv. 22–23), emphasizes the woman’s *security: trust* and *capacity: mental*. The intent is once again clearly to depict the inadequacy of male leadership in Israel,22 and to illustrate the comparatively positive contribution of not only illustrious women like Deborah and Jael, but even nameless women such as Manoah’s wife, who step into the breach, listen to, and obey their God.23

In due time, Samson is born, and the narrator makes note of the fact that “*YHWH blessed him*” (v. 24, *normality*). It is significant that the implied author has taken virtually the entire chapter to establish and reemphasize several times the specialness of Samson even though the birth and childhood of no other judge is even mentioned. The intent is to show that Samson has every advantage: his life is miraculously initiated by *YHWH* in a barren woman, he is consecrated to God from birth, he has a dedicated and faithful mother, and he is blessed by *YHWH*. And yet, the narrator’s statement that רוח יهوּד לאָנשָׂים, “the spirit of *YHWH* began to stir him,” is reminiscent of v. 5, “he will begin to deliver Israel.” The root חלִיל is the same. Normally, the presence of *YHWH* implies *normality* and *capacity*, but by including the qualification of לָנֹשָׂים, the

---

23 See Schneider (*Judges*, 199–201) for a further discussion of the contrast between Manoah and his wife.
implied author lowers the force of the evaluation and again introduces a note of foreboding into the narrative.

Just as Jephthah seemed to commit an inappropriate action after the Spirit came upon him, so similarly Samson makes what appears to be an unwise move after the Spirit begins to stir him (Judg 13:25–14:1). Bowman comments,

Possession of the spirit of the Lord seems to result only in the personal protection of Samson from a variety of threats, some of which are caused by his own antics.... It again appears that divine power is constrained by the exercise of human freedom.... Divine success appears contingent upon an appropriate human response.24

Samson sees a Philistine woman, desires her, and demands that his parents arrange a marriage between the two (+inclination: eagerness). Samson’s parents seem to have a greater knowledge of the law than many people of their day who were willing to integrate all too readily with the Canaanites,25 and rightly object that marriage with a woman from the uncircumcised Philistines is improper (−propriety). The implied author acknowledges this point of view without commenting on it here (E:Ac). Here, however, there is no convenient disjunctive break between the coming of the Spirit (13:25) and the apparently unwise actions of Samson (14:1); although there is a chapter break in the

24 Bowman, “Narrative Criticism of Judges,” 38–39. According to Soggin (Judges, a Commentary, 236), “The only virtue which the spirit seems to have given Samson is physical strength pure and simple—certainly not wisdom or ethical consistency.” Also Butler, Judges, 330: “The coming of the Spirit does not indicate a moral or devotional purity but a power to accomplish acts for God.”
25 See Deut 7:1–5; Exod 34:16. Within the book of Judges itself intermarriage is condemned, as Judg 3:6 indicates in its context. As representative of Israel, Samson’s ongoing lust for foreign women symbolizes Israel’s apostasy with foreign gods. See Smith, “The Failure of the Family in Judges. Part 2, Samson,” 431. Smith notes, “Just as Samson went back to his pagan Philistine wife following his own cooling off period, so Israel went back to their sin following a time of deliverance, to once again do evil in the sight of the Lord. A common weakness of Samson and Israel is that neither learned from painful experiences of covenant-making with the enemy” (p. 432).
current text, the narrative continues across it in a series of uninterrupted *waw*-consecutives and the one infinitive does not disrupt the sequence:

Unlike the case of Jephthah, however, it is not problematic in the narrative that the coming of the Spirit seems to provoke inappropriate behavior, and thus it should not be problematic to the interpreter. In fact, in one of his few unreserved moments, the implied author states explicitly through the narrator (C:Pr), “However, his father and mother did not know that it was of the Lord, for he was seeking an occasion against the Philistines” (v. 4). This comment signals a series of significant multiperspectival evaluations that continue throughout the Samson narrative. The first is Samson’s desire to take a Philistine wife (vv. 2–4). Interestingly, whereas the implied author has Manoah and his wife give this intention a –*propriety* assessment (v. 3), he/she has both Samson (v. 3) and YHWH (v. 4) construe this as a +*propriety* evaluation, but for very different reasons. Samson states that the woman of Timnah is ‘*נייחא נישרה בתשע* ‘right in his eyes.” In the Qal, *ne’er* can mean “to be right” or “to please.” Is there a play on words here between what is sensually right or pleasing to Samson’s appetites and what is strategically right or pleasing to YHWH’s purposes? The pronoun in v. 4, * Assy, “it/she was of YHWH,” is feminine, and therefore could refer to the woman of Timnah or to the situation (as in Josh

26 *HALOT*, 449.
11:20), but not to Samson, who is never affirmed. This may suggest a separation between
the way the implied author represents YHWH’s evaluation of Samson himself
(−propriety) and the situation (+propriety), and also an overt distinction between the
way the implied author has his parents and the law construe Samson and his intentions to
marry a Philistine because she looks good to him (−propriety) and YHWH and his
intentions to provoke an occasion against the Philistines in order to liberate Israel by
having Samson marry a Philistine woman (+propriety): the woman is “right in the eyes”
of Samson AND YHWH, but for different reasons. As Butler remarks, “God retains
freedom to accomplish his purposes through the people and means he chooses,”27 or, as
Chisholm phrases it, “He had a higher purpose that entailed circumventing the norm.”28
Olson goes so far as to conclude YHWH’s active involvement in Samson’s disobedience,
“Remarkably, God steers Samson to disobey God’s own covenant prohibitions against
intermarriage.”29

Later, Samson passes through the vineyards of Timnah on the way to see the
woman he desires. It is often argued that it is a violation of Samson’s Nazirite status to go
anywhere near grapes, which are used for making wine, and thus the action would be
inappropriate. Since Num 6:3–4 states of the Nazirite, “nor shall he drink any grape juice
nor eat fresh or dried grapes. All the days of his separation he shall not eat anything that
is produced by the grape vine, from the seeds even to the skin,” it appears that Samson is
foolish at best to go near vineyards. The fact that he did not mention the incident (v. 6)

27 Butler, Judges, 333.
acknowledges that … he technically transgresses his own covenant (Yahweh himself is compromised); his
justification is Israel’s prior transgression.”
suggests that Samson knew full well that his action was inappropriate even were there no roaring lions in the vicinity (−propriety). Samson subsequently returns to the dead carcass, even though contact with dead bodies is forbidden to those who are under a Nazirite vow. When the implied author again states through the narrator that “he did not tell them that he had scraped the honey out of the body of the lion” (v. 9) he/she is once again implying −propriety. The implied author seems to be at pains to point out Samson’s disregard of the special status that YHWH has bestowed on him. We shall return to this idea below. Between these two incidents the narrator again remarks that the woman of Timnah was “pleasing in the eyes of Samson” (v. 7). This time, however, the reader has been informed of YHWH’s intentions, and understands that his selection is also pleasing in the eyes of YHWH, even if not in the eyes of his parents; the implied author is entertaining this alternate viewpoint (EːEt). 30

While Samson is in the vineyard, however, the implied author relates another episode in which the Spirit comes upon Samson (v. 6; +normality). The root used for the Spirit’s coming in 13:25 was תּוֹם, “to stir, trouble.” 31 Although this is the only time in the Hebrew Bible that this verb is used in the Qal stem, its meaning is not disputed. In 14:6, however, the root is הלל, whose meaning has been the subject of much more discussion. It is used in the Qal 25 times, 8 times with יהוה as the subject, of which three are in the Samson narrative. It is variously translated as “rushed on,” “came on mightily,” “came on in power,” “took control of,” and “gripped.” There may be a literary parallel here with the preceding description of the lion who roared (מעז) towards Samson; this

30 See Wong, Compositional Strategy, 96–103, in which he compares the Danites doing what was right in their own eyes with Samson doing what was right in his own eyes.
31 HALOT, 952.
root is used in the prophetic literature as a metaphorical description of YHWH advancing in judgment or power upon the people to accomplish his goal.\textsuperscript{32} This suggests that the Spirit is advancing with power on Samson to accomplish YHWH’s purpose (+\textit{normality}); indeed, there is no disjunctive break here, and the coming of the Spirit is the immediate cause of the strength Samson finds to tear the lion to pieces (+\textit{capacity: physical}). The unusual verb, “rushed,” or “came mightily,” may be an expression of the desperate need Samson has for deliverance; his death in this instance would accomplish nothing for YHWH or Israel. However, it may also be because YHWH is “forcing the issue” with the Philistines, and so comes on Samson in a special way to provoke an occasion against them. It is the encounter with the lion that sets up the possibility of the riddle at the marriage celebration which in turn causes a confrontation with the Samson’s Philistine hosts. A third possibility exists, however. Considering the apathy of the Israelites and their reluctance to defy their Philistine oppressors or even to cry out to YHWH for help, the implied author may be suggesting that it took extra encouragement, or even coercion, for God to carry out his plan of deliverance in this case; thus, the Spirit “forced entry into” or “took control of” Samson. This would construe a –\textit{inclination: reluctance} evaluation in the relevant places where the term occurs.\textsuperscript{33}

The narrator proceeds to recount the marriage celebrations between Samson and his Philistine wife,\textsuperscript{34} and the bridegroom’s challenging riddle provides the first means by which YHWH can establish “an occasion against the Philistines.” He certainly succeeds in

\textsuperscript{32} See Jer 25:30; Hos 11:10; Joel 4:16; Amos 1:2.

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{HALOT}, 1026: “intransitive, to force entry into (with \( \text{??} \)), sbj. \( \text{סב} \text{ יבש הובש} \) (:: KBL to be fit, strong, effective) Judg 14:6, 19; 15:14; 1 Sam 10:6, 10; 11:6; with \( \text{ך} \) 1 Sam 16:13; 18:10.”

\textsuperscript{34} It is obvious that the celebration included drinking, and possible that Samson again broke his Nazirite vow in order to indulge. See Schneider, \textit{Judges}, 206.
accomplishing this goal and their affective response is one of satisfaction: displeasure.

Samson’s companions at the wedding are Philistines, and the inability to respond to his riddling challenge would reflect badly on them (capacity: mental; normality), reducing their honor in the eyes of the Israelites. This is not merely a good-natured game, nor is it just a matter of monetary loss, although that would be significant, honor was a zero sum commodity in the ANE, and the honor that Samson will gain if he wins the competition would be subtracted from that of his Philistine overlords (v. 4). This makes their violent threats against Samson’s wife more understandable: they will burn down her house over her family’s heads if she cannot coax the answer from him (happiness: misery; v. 16). Although many have condemned the woman of Timnah for betraying her husband, she can hardly be construed as propriety, since not only is she fighting for her very life, but she is ultimately fulfilling YHWH’s plan to help the Israelites.

Samson’s wife proceeds to manipulate him, construing him from her perspective as unloving and reluctant to please her (happiness: antipathy, inclination: reluctance). After seven days of pleading, he finally concedes to her requests and gives her the answer to the riddle, and when confronted by the companions with the answer realizes that she must have been the source. His attitude to her immediately changes: his accusation to the men—"if you had not plowed with my heifer, you would not have

---

35 For the role of riddles in ancient society, and an analysis of this particular riddle, see McDaniel, "Samson’s Riddle," passim; Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 156–57; and Schipper ("Narrative Obscurity of Samson’s Hydh," 348–53), who discusses a variety of interpretive possibilities of the riddle’s answer.
37 According to Kirkpatrick ("Questions of Honor in the Book of Judges," 22), "The ancient world conceived of honor as a limited commodity. One acquired honor only at the expense of another’s honor. Thus, social interactions were a constant battlefield to protect honor and/or gain more honor from others."
found out my riddle” (v. 18)—may be an accusation of marital infidelity.38 Even if Samson’s statement only means that the companions have taken unfair advantage of his bride in pressuring her to discover the answer, however, Samson construes both his companions and his new wife as —propriety. His response to the loss of honor entailed by both the loss of the riddle competition and the possible sexual impropriety of his wife is immediate. Interestingly, it is once again instigated by the Spirit of YHWH coming mightily on him (נָרָא), and once again the backbone of the narrative, excluding the quoted speech, is a continuous chain of waw-consecutive imperfects. This is another instance in which the Spirit’s empowering can be directly linked to the subsequent action of Samson. What, from the Philistines’ perspective, is an inappropriate and violent reaction in involving the murder of thirty men of Ashkelon (—propriety; v. 19) is ironically, from YHWH’s perspective, an appropriate step in the process of “seeking an occasion against the Philistines” (+propriety). It is also, of course, an expression of Samson’s anger (—happiness: antipathy). He deserts his wife and returns to his parents’ home.

After some time, however, either his love, his sexual desire, or his desire to claim what is his own motivates him (+inclination: eagerness) to return to the woman of Timnah and demand his conjugal rights,39 which are frustrated by the fact that her father

38 See McDaniel, “Samson’s Riddle,” 53–57; Crenshaw, “Filial Devotion or Erotic Attachment?,” 490–94; Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 158. McDaniel argues, with comparisons to other passages in the Hebrew Bible, that “many of the words present in Samson’s riddle have been granted a sexualized meaning. This does not prove that a sexual use is present in Judges 14 … [but] a sexual reading of the Samson story cannot be dismissed on linguistic grounds” (McDaniel, “Samson’s Riddle,” 54). Crenshaw, who refers to “obscene double entendre” (“Filial Devotion or Erotic Attachment?,” 490), goes so far as to call “ploughed with my heifer” a “metaphor for copulation” (p. 493) although he doubts that the Philistines would have been foolish enough to actually carry out a sexual act with Samson’s wife (p. 494).

39 His response, יָאַר עַבְרָא אֵל אֵשֶׁת–ָּקָדָשׁ, most likely indicates sexual desire, since נָבִּּה is often used sexually in such contexts. See Block, Judges, Ruth, 439.
has already given her to another man (15:1–2). The offer of her younger sister does nothing to placate him (v. 3, -happiness: antipathy), and he threatens revenge. Samson declares, “This time I shall be blameless in regard to the Philistines when I do them harm.” Samson’s revenge is once again construed from the perspective of the Philistines as -propriety, but from the perspective of Samson and YHWH as +propriety, albeit for strikingly different reasons: YHWH continues to seek an occasion against the Philistines, but Samson is merely seeking personal revenge.40 What follows may seem like a cruel prank to the modern reader would have been a severe blow to people in an ANE society, for their survival depended on the success of their crops. The phrase “the standing grain, along with the vineyards and groves” indicates grain, grapes, and olives, three of the most significant products of that time.41 Probably because they cannot vent their fury on Samson for destroying their very means of subsistence, the Philistines respond ruthlessly in their turn by burning both his wife and her father with fire (v. 6). The emphatic -surely, -happiness: antipathy, -satisfaction: displeasure, making his subsequent statement, “and after that I will quit” (v. 7), sound rather anticlimactic in English.42 The NRSV’s rendering captures the meaning more effectively: “I swear I will not stop until I have taken revenge on you.” This declaration

40 According to Stone (“Judges,” 398), “Classical clan vengeance sought to equalize a community thrown out of balance by some injustice or negligence, restoring shalom ... to the community. But with Samson, we observe how one power play simply throws the balance off in the other direction, resulting in countervengeance, which accelerates the cycle of violence even more.” This would explain YHWH’s use of Samson to provoke the Philistines. However, Stone does argue that Samson’s revenge is often appropriate in Iron Age I with no centralized government (p. 402–3). Again, Stone seems to favor interpretation of the text at the earlier stages of compilation and editing rather than the last redactional form. Although I am not implying that revenge ever went out of fashion, it may have been viewed differently by the late monarchial period (“the late eighth century at the earliest”) in which Stone places the final form of the text (p. 190).


42 Although, as Webb points out, vengeance can be the demonstration of a principle of justice in biblical law, it is unlikely that “then I will quit” indicates that Samson is here acting “in a considered and measured way” and has “begun to grow up” (Webb, Judges, 380).
and the ruthless slaughter that follows are clear indications of Samson’s antipathy and satisfaction: displeasure (vv. 7–8). However, the slaughter also serves to provoke a full-fledged “occasion” against the Philistines. Up until now, their anger has been focused more directly on Samson, as a personal matter between him and his bride’s extended family circle, but now the dispute escalates and begins to involve other tribes as the Philistines advance in arms against the Judahites (v. 9). It is soon to fizzle out, however.

In vv. 10–11 the implied author finally lets the reader know why YHWH has had to resort to using Samson to provoke an occasion against the Philistines, for, as Niditch aptly puts it, “Samson has become a lightning rod for Philistine aggression.” Judah, who had been ready and willing to be the first to “go up against” the enemy in Judg 1, has by now capitulated to their oppressors and apparently wants nothing more than a quiet life, for they chide Samson, “Do you not know that the Philistines are rulers over us? What then is this you have done to us?” (–inclination: reluctance, –satisfaction: displeasure). Either the Judahites have been so defeated by the Philistines that they have given up hope of freedom, or they have been so Canaanized in their thinking that they no longer want freedom. In either case, they have strayed far from faith in YHWH’s purposes, far enough that they are willing to betray Samson into the hands of the enemy, and the implied author depicts them as the voice of apathy, concession, and compromise.

---

43 See Boda, “Judges,” 1222.
44 Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 159.
45 Smith ("The Failure of the Family in Judges. Part 2, Samson," 425) suggests that living under the Philistines gave them the opportunity to evade covenant obligation and live as they pleased. Thus their inaction was motivated by complacency rather than fear of their oppressors. Boda ("Judges," 1223) argues that they were demoralized and cowering before the Philistines.
The context suggests that the Judahites have given up on any concept of YHWH as a God of power and victory; perhaps they no longer view his character as merciful since they have accepted Philistine oppression and no longer plead for deliverance. Their action also shows how deep the schisms between the Israelite tribes have become.

Whereas Samson would construe their betrayal as -propriety, in YHWH's extended plan it is once again a +propriety evaluation (v. 12). God is actually using Samson's lust and short temper, and Judah's complacency, disloyalty, and defeatism, to place Samson in a situation where he can accomplish his purpose. Rather than accomplishing his will through the Israelites' obedience and faith, as in Othniel and Deborah, or in spite of the Israelites' failings, as in Gideon and Jephthah, YHWH now appears to have accepted the reality that the Israelites will never repent in any sustained and meaningful way and is now actually working through the failings of his people and leaders. Olson sees the significance of this ongoing strategy; in regard to Samson's initial marriage he states:

Remarkably, God steers Samson to disobey God's own covenant prohibitions against intermarriage in order to help Israel act against the Philistine oppressors. Yet we remain shy in exercising such freedom and want to absolve God by suggesting the language does not require divine causation but only divine permission or allowance.

46 Stone ("Judges," 404) also points out that the Judeans probably felt no particular loyalty to the Danites or viewed them as "second-class members of the Israelite coalition." It may be further indication of an Israel that was becoming more fragmented.

47 Thus, while it is true, as Boda ("Judges," 1203) argues, that Samson "places himself in vulnerable and compromising circumstances and so endangers the success made possible by the empowerment of the Spirit of Yahweh," it is also true that YHWH has a "contingency plan" and is ultimately able to use just these compromising circumstances to ensure the achievement of his purposes.

48 Olson, "The Book of Judges," 849. According to Klein (Irony in Judges, 116–17), "Samson's desire for the Timnite woman is not justified by Yahweh, it is attributed to Yahweh by the reliable narrator: 'He was seeking an occasion against the Philistines' (14:4). The narrator is reliable—within human limitations of knowledge. Significantly, he does not present Yahweh as a divinity of magical or unlimited powers, for Yahweh seeks to stir man to enact the divine will. In the covenant relationship binding both man and God, Yahweh does not effect his will by divine fiat, and man's free will is stressed. Yahweh's seeking does not imply that Yahweh incited Samson's desire for the Timnite woman. Rather, it suggests that Samson's irregular actions nevertheless accord with Yahweh's will. ... Sometimes, as in the Samson narrative, man
The same is true of the subsequent actions of Samson. These acts are nevertheless consistent with the pattern of downward spiralling in the moral character of the judges and the Israelites. Samson himself seems uninterested in any purpose but his own, and his arrogance is illustrated by his contrasting use of pronouns. The Judahites ask him: "What then is this that you have done to us?" Samson replies: "As they did to me, so I have done to them." He is unconcerned about the impact of his actions on the people he leads, but only on the impact of the actions of others on himself. In this case, however, the normality assessment is attributed to Samson by himself, and constitutes self-centeredness rather than specialness. As Amit rightly points out, "None of Samson’s mighty acts bear a national character, but ... they are directly connected with his personal involvements and private vendettas."\(^{49}\)

Regardless of Samson’s self-interest, however, YHWH deems his actions as propriety since they advance his purpose, although the Judahites obviously consider them as -propriety since they disrupt the status quo and might bring down the wrath of their Philistine overlords onto them (v. 12). On the other hand, the Israelites attempt to justify what is actually outright betrayal by "merely" giving their leader into the hands of the Philistines, and not actually killing him themselves (v. 13, +propriety), regardless of the fact that the ultimate outcome would probably be the same. Judah’s actions here are a far cry from their willingness to do battle against the enemy in Judges 1.

From the perspective of YHWH, however, it is necessary to keep Samson alive until he achieves his purpose against the Philistines. To this end the Spirit of YHWH once again comes upon him mightily (v. 14; +normality), endowing him with the capacity not only to break free from his bonds, but also to initiate an attack on the Philistines (v. 15; +capacity: physical). Rather than giving the credit to YHWH, however, Samson bursts out with a Philistine-mocking (+capacity: physical) and self-glorifying (+satisfaction: admiration) taunt. His self-aggrandizement does not stop with belittling the Philistines, however, but extends to the following encounter with God himself. Unfortunately, Samson’s physical exertions have made him thirsty (v. 18, -happiness: misery), and motivate him to cry out to YHWH for the first time—in fact, this is the first record of any communication between Samson and his God. Whereas in the previous judge cycles the Israelites corporately cried out to YHWH in their misery, here, as we have seen, it does not even occur to Judah to cry out to God for deliverance, and when Samson himself cries out, what at first appears to be an acknowledgement of YHWH’s role in his deliverance (+satisfaction: admiration) rapidly turns into a sarcastic question as to whether God is now going to let him die of thirst (-satisfaction: displeasure). Samson seems to view YHWH as simply a means of satisfying his desires

50 Niditch (Judges: A Commentary, 153) suggests that Samson is only “feigning capture,” but offers no argument to support this. See also Niditch, “Samson as Culture Hero, Trickster, and Bandit,” 619, where she compares him to the classic literary “trickster.” She also parallels Samson’s role as judge, in which he “not only does not judge but dies not even appear to unite the people behind himself to fight the Philistines in some quasi-organized way,” with that of a “social bandit” who challenges those in oppressive positions of power (pp. 622–23).

51 According to Block (Judges, Ruth, 447): “His appeal sounds like an impudent harangue on Yahweh. In keeping with his self-centered approach to life in general and his adopted Philistine ethic, Samson’s designation of himself as Yahweh’s servant rings extremely hollow.” It is hard to see how “Samson is humbled into acknowledging in prayer that it is YHWH, not he, who controls the circumstances of his life,” as O’Connell (Rhetoric of Judges, 216) suggests, or that his simple use of the phrase “this great deliverance” indicates a “right of passage” for Samson in which “he has begun to recognize the larger significance of his conflict with the Philistines” for Israel, as Webb (Judges, 389–90) argues. YHWH’s
and achieving personal revenge. There is no evidence that he respects the holiness of God or is conscious of serving his purpose. This demeaning of God becomes the more obvious when his actual words are considered: “You have given this great deliverance by the hand of your servant, and now shall I die of thirst and fall into the hands of the uncircumcised?” (v. 18; emphasis added). The implication could well be: “I have done service for you, now it is your turn to do service for me; turn and turn about!” Klein aptly notes that “Samson takes his consecration to Yahweh as if it were the opposite: Yahweh’s consecration to him.” The interpretation that this is not sarcastic but a genuine plea for help is unlikely on close examination. If Samson dies of thirst, he will be—well—dead, and will thus not fall into the hands of the Philistines and be defeated by them. The illogic of Samson’s statement suggests that the implied author is either depicting Samson’s sarcasm, or perhaps even mocking his presumption. YHWH graciously responds to his request, but his motivation in so doing may have had more to do with keeping Samson alive to accomplish his purpose than with approving of his arrogant demand.

Judges 16:1–3 is yet another example of Samson’s self-serving lust in action. This time he is not seeking a legitimate marriage within which to satisfy his desires, but simply to assuage them in a one-night stand with a local harlot (—propriety) while he is on some unspecified business in Gaza. He is most assuredly not considering the welfare of the people he leads. Of course, this does not preclude the possibility that YHWH will

---

provision of water to Samson in the wilderness also emphasizes the paralleling of Samson with the nation of Israel. See Boda, “Judges,” 1225.

52 Klein, Irony in Judges, 126.
53 As Younger (Judges and Ruth, 293) states: “The last hope of Israel in Judges is, then, a ‘judge/deliverer’ who chases women instead of enemies and who avenges personal grievances instead of delivering his nation from the oppression.”
use the situation to again provoke the Philistines. The defeat at Lehi apparently still rankles with the Philistines of Gaza (−happiness: antipathy) and, hearing of Samson’s presence, they set an ambush to trap him.\(^{54}\) It is interesting that on this occasion there is no mention of the Spirit coming mightily, or otherwise, on Samson, and yet he pulled up the gates and carried them a tremendous distance to a mountain near Hebron (+capacity: physical). Luciani limits YHWH’s seeking of an occasion against the Philistines to the woman of Timnah episode and states that the visiting of the prostitute in Gaza has no other purpose than to satisfy the libido of Samson.\(^{55}\) Perhaps this explains the Spirit’s non-involvement. It is more likely, however, that the seeking of an occasion includes all of Samson’s provocative actions towards the Philistines that culminate in the destruction of the Temple of Dagon.

Samson’s next encounter with a woman is different; he was attracted to the woman of Timnah because “she looked right in his eyes,” probably referring to her physical attractiveness, and to the harlot of Gaza because she could satisfy his lust. The text states, however, without any preamble concerning her appearance, that Samson “loved” Delilah (+happiness: affection).\(^{56}\) Amit perceives that “in this affair Samson will be acting out of subjective involvement.”\(^{57}\) Although no specific reason is given for Samson’s love, the root הָעַרַב is used in the Hebrew Bible in relational contexts,

\(^{54}\) As Schneider (Judges, 217–18, points out), the text does not explicitly state that the prostitute and those lying in ambush were Philistines, but Gaza certainly contained many Philistines and it is likely that they were.

\(^{55}\) Luciani, “Samson: L’amour Rend Aveugle,” 325–26: “Alors que l’épisode de la Timnite est l’occasion de mettre en œuvre un plan divin (voir 14:4: trouver un prétexte contre les Philistins) et que la passe avec la prostituée de Gaza ne semble pas avoir d’autre but que d’assouvir la libido de Samson.”

\(^{56}\) It is unclear whether she and Samson were married, but the text also does not state that she was a prostitute.

\(^{57}\) Amit, The Art of Editing, 285.
including the love between individuals, parent and child, husband and wife, and God and his people. Thus, it is all the more poignant when Delilah immediately—at least in narrative time—sells out her lover for 1100 pieces of silver, multiplied by the unknown number of Philistine lords (+inclination: encouragement), fully aware that her compatriots are going to “afflict” him (v. 5)—in fact, she repeats this information in her request to Samson (v. 6). By informing the implied reader that YHWH is actually acting through Samson’s aggressiveness actions, the implied author aligns him/herself with Samson and creates a counter voice in Delilah (C:Ct) that is acting against Israelite interests. For perhaps the first time the narrator evokes sympathy in the reader for the normally aggressive and self-serving Samson. Delilah’s wheedling indicates that she is determined that Samson should accede to her wishes (+inclination: encouragement).

Four vignettes follow, according to the typical 3+1 pattern of Hebrew literature, in which Samson repeatedly lies to Delilah and frustrates her attempts to have him subdued, and, incidentally, to gain her silver. Although many of the components of the vignettes remain the same (Samson’s statement that he will become weak and like any other man, the Philistines lurking patiently in the next room, the application of the restraint, Delilah’s cry, the misleading suggestion by Samson, and his statement, “then I will become weak and be like any other man”), there are also interesting differences. As Alter notes, the “three plus one” pattern often includes “some intensification or increment from one occurrence to the next, usually concluding either in a climax or a reversal.”

---

58 See HALOT, 18.
59 Perhaps five, since there were five main Philistine cities.
60 See Amit, Reading Biblical Narratives, 62–65; Alter, Biblical Narrative, 95–96.
61 Although in the fourth episode this appears only in the LXX, not the MT.
62 Alter, Biblical Narrative, 96.
the first episode (v. 9), Delilah asks both how he may be bound and where his great strength is, in the second and third she simply asks how he may be bound (vv. 10, 13), and in the fourth she demands to know “where your great strength is” (v. 15), perhaps indicating a change in focus to the basic issue of the *source* of his strength. In the first two escapes, lexical metaphor (simile) is used not only to illustrate Samson’s strength but to raise the force of the evaluation ( [+capacity: physical; v. 9: “as a string of tow snaps when it touches fire”; v. 12: “like a thread”) but in the third there is no such metaphor, perhaps indicating symbolically that his strength to resist is also declining. In the third request, Delilah drops the ה particle in her request and in the fourth, she does not actually request the information, but chastises him with failing to provide the information, moving from someone who confidently expects an honest answer (v. 8, [+security: trust]) to someone who is annoyed at not receiving one (v. 15, −security: mistrust; [+dissatisfaction: displeasure]). More significantly, her techniques of persuasion change as the contest of wills progresses. First, Delilah simply demands to know the answer, and in the second and third attempts she accuses Samson of lying and deceit, probably hoping to use guilt to motivate an honest response (+inclination: encouragement). In the fourth she not only emphatically accuses him of deceit ( בִּהְלֵלָה נַחֲלֵהלַת ב: “these three times you have deceived me”), but intensifies her accusations to include the ultimate threat of a wife, playing on both his guilt and his affection: “You don’t love me!” (v. 15), accusing Samson of −happiness: antipathy.63 As Delilah becomes less trusting of Samson’s replies, she becomes more forceful to compensate for

---

63 The same technique was used on Samson by the woman of Timnah in Judg 14:16. In that case, however, the woman was fighting for the life of herself and her family, whereas Delilah is fighting for 5500 pieces of silver.
her lack of success, and over the subsequent days not only repeatedly presses (נָעַלָּה) Samson, but also urges (נָעַלָּה) him. Finally, Samson is driven to the point where his “soul was impatient to the point of death” (v. 16: רַעַד יָדָם לָעַל; —happiness: misery) and he acquiesces to telling her the truth about his Nazirite status (+veracity). Although it may seem foolish and unusual that Samson gives in to Delilah’s request after hearing her call for the Philistines three times, the reader must remember that the Philistines remained in hiding, not coming out to bind him until they were sure that he was helpless. 64 He may have thought Delilah was simply testing him to see how much he loved and trusted her.

Schneider suggests that he is playing with Delilah and trying to be humorous and “complacent in his knowledge that his strength would protect him,” 65 Smith argues that symbolically “Samson’s unexplained willingness to go along with her trickery mirrors Israel’s foolish repetition of failure after each judge cycle,” 66 but Niditch may well be right to suggest that Samson is “growing bolder and bolder, convinced finally that his power is unassailable, hair or no hair.” 67 As v. 20 indicates, he feels invincible: “I will go out as at other times and shake myself free.” Not knowing that YHWH had left him, he certainly expects to escape once again. 68

The entire confrontation between Samson and Delilah offers a number of multiperspectival evaluations (vv. 8, 9, 12, 14, 18, 19) consisting of events that are construed as —propriety in the eyes of Samson—and normally would have been to the

64 Stone (“Judges,” 417, quoting Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 166–69) suggests that the text construes the stages in an erotic game and that “Samson, after making love, promptly dropped into a deep sleep.”

65 Schneider, Judges, 221–22.

66 Smith, “The Failure of the Family in Judges. Part 2, Samson,” 433. See also Boda, “Judges,” 1232: “Samson is depicted as the ultimate fool, unable to recognize that he is being led like a lamb to the slaughter.”


68 See Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 171.
ancient audience—but which are deemed **propriety** by both Delilah and YHWH, again for very different reasons that relate to each appraiser’s perspective and goals. To Samson it was ethically reprehensible for a wife to betray her husband for money. It also was improper in terms of YHWH’s ethical standards, but in the context of “seeking an occasion against the Philistines” it is pragmatically appropriate (**propriety**). YHWH uses this improper action to achieve a proper goal, actually working through the sins and weaknesses of the Israelites and Philistines, not just in spite of them, to achieve a positive outcome. Thus evaluations can be made not only from different perspectives, but these perspectives can operate at different levels. What is improper from the personal, short term level, or micro-level from the perspective of YHWH can nevertheless be proper at the corporate, long-term level or macro-level from the perspective of YHWH. It is often claimed that YHWH “turns” evil events into good results, but from the appraisal perspective, this is simply equivalent to viewing the evaluation from different perspectives or from the same perspective at different levels.

With Samson’s hair gone, he is now helpless. Verse 19 contains a textual issue that may affect evaluation.69 After the servant shaves off Samson’s hair, the text states: וַיִּזְמֹר לֵעָוָה וַעֲפָר דָּוָה מַכְלֵי, “then [Delilah] began to afflict him and his strength had left him” (→capacity: physical). Based on the LXX, some have suggested emending the first two words to רַחֲמִי לֵעָוָה, thus, “then he became weak and his strength left him.” If the MT is correct, however, the text paints a picture of Delilah as a perverse tormentor who, as soon as he becomes vulnerable, begins to test the success of her newest strategy to weaken Samson by afflicting him (→propriety). Since whatever her actions are, however,

69 *HALOT*, 853: “nif: 3. to **become weak** cj. Ju 1619 for לִצַּר לֵעָוָה לְעָוָה rd. ? with Sept. רַחֲמִי לֵעָוָה → pi. 2 c.”
they do not wake him from his sleep (v. 20), it is more likely that הִנָּה here should be translated “humiliate” or “subject.” Although less extreme, this action still construes her as –propriety, and Samson is soon tortured, notwithstanding her lesser crime, by being blinded. She reduces Samson to a helpless slave of the Philistines, and the chosen one of YHWH, who is appraised as +normality in the early parts of the narrative, is clearly construed as –normality: status (v. 21); in fact, “YHWH had departed from him” (v. 20; –normality: chosenness). Into the bleakness of this picture, however, one small ray of light is shed: “the hair of his head began to grow again” (v. 22), suggesting that Samson’s capacity and normality may be restored.

Since all the way through the Samson narrative YHWH has been seeking an occasion against the Philistines, when they gather in v. 23 to celebrate the success of their god, Dagon (+satisfaction: admiration), the confrontation between the Samson and the Israelites and the Philistines assumes cosmic proportions; the ultimate battle is between YHWH and Dagon. This reality is emphasized threefold in vv. 23–24 where the Philistines declare, “Our god has given Samson our enemy into our hands,” when they praise their god, and when they emphatically repeat, “Our god has given our enemy into our hands.” They construe Dagon as +normality: status, for the god that wins in battle is the greater god. Although the Philistines may think that Samson is their enemy and their god’s enemy, he is in reality only the agent of YHWH.

70 HALOT, 853.
71 Smith (“The Failure of the Family in Judges. Part 2, Samson,” 433) aptly notes, “In the end of the Samson-Delilah story Delilah became the mirror image of Ehud. She is of the opposite sex and on the opposite side. As Ehud tricked the enemy leader Eglon, so Delilah tricked her enemy to get rid of the one who was harassing her people, and Samson is the one who was duped. The gender change of the “hero,” however, makes Samson look worse than Eglon.”
72 See Galpaz-Feller, “‘Let My Soul Die with the Philistines’,” 316.
The implied author carefully sets the scene for Samson’s final act (v. 25), recounting the high spirits of the Philistines (+happiness: cheer), the degradation of Samson as he entertains his captors (~normality: status), and the thousands of spectators looking on from the top of the temple to enjoy his humiliation (+satisfaction: interest). Samson manages to position himself next to the supporting pillars and, for only the second recorded time, calls out to YHWH. The implied author presented his first prayer as a self-serving and arrogant demand for water, and his second as a self-serving and arrogant demand for personal revenge (C:Ct). Those who expect Samson to finally express humility and reverence towards God as a result of his setbacks will be disappointed. Thus, the actual text of his prayer deserves closer inspection:

אַלְךָ יְהוָה יַקְרֶנָה אֶת הָאָגוֹזָה אֶת הָעַשְׂנֵמֶן הָאָגָלְעֵהוּ אֶאָכָלָה בָּעַשָּׂר לָשׂנֶת מַשֵּׁי
מִכְלָלָשָׁמָה ... הָמָוה נֶפֶשׁ בָּעַכְלָלָשָׁמָה

“O Lord God, please remember me and please strengthen me only this time, O God, that I may at once be avenged of the Philistines for my two eyes. ... Let me die with the Philistines!”

Whereas Samson addressed YHWH merely as אֲדֹּתָה, “you,” in his first prayer, here he does use the covenant name of God, and later, אָלִילֵיָה. However, it is difficult to overlook the fact that there are no less than five references to Samson in the prayer: four personal

---

73 Boda (“Judges,” 1235) notes that the large number of people on the roof of the temple would probably weaken its structure.
74 Contra Amit (The Art of Editing, 305–6), who claims, “Now, as at Enhakkore, the prayer expresses the deliverer’s dependence upon God. Samson wreaks vengeance upon the Philistines through the power of prayer and not through the power of his hair. ... The wording of Samson’s prayer alludes to the recognition of his sin and his consciousness of his destiny.”
75 The wording here is interpreted in different ways. Schneider (Judges, 225) translates this to mean “to take revenge on the Philistines if only for one of his two eyes.” Galpaz-Feller (“‘Let My Soul Die with the Philistines’,” 317–18) suggests that Samson is moderating his revenge, and that “he will be content with the revenge coming to the enemy for putting out one of his eyes, and not the revenge they truly deserve for putting out both of them.” See also Galpaz-Feller, Samson: The Hero and the Man, 222. Galpaz-Feller’s suggestion that “Samson acknowledges his vengeful nature. This time, he decides to channel it wisely,” is not convincing. As Webb states, “It is not a cry of repentance, and there is nothing noble about it. All Samson wants is vengeance for the personal wrongs he has suffered” (Webb, Judges, 414).
pronoun suffixes and one 1cs cohortative verb. Younger concurs: "This is a truly egocentric prayer. Although ostensibly addressed to Yahweh, it is dominated by first-person pronouns, which occur five times in this short prayer."76 Here Samson definitely construes himself as +normality; his status and his reputation the focus and point at issue although the double use of נז "nullifies the bald directness and face-threatening aspect of the imperative."77 Most striking, however, is the content: Samson explicitly states that he wants personal revenge for the harm done to him: "remember me ... strengthen me ... that I may be avenged ... for my two eyes" (−happiness: antipathy). Samson makes no mention whatsoever of the shame brought on the reputation of YHWH by the Philistines' treatment of Samson and wanting revenge for that.78 He is unable to rise above the personal and immediate to see the significance of the situation, which is a contest between two "gods" for sovereignty, indeed, reality. This is not the first time in Judges that the implied author has brought the divine contest into focus; in the Ehud pericope it is implied by the double entendre inherent in "God/gods" (אֱלֹהִים), in the Gideon narrative the dispute is between YHWH and Baal, and in the Jephthah episode between YHWH and Chemosh.79 The central issue here is whether YHWH or Dagon is the true god. Samson's final words, "Let me die with the Philistines" (v. 30), are again focused on himself. Block points out, "In his plea for God to remember and strengthen him, he seems totally

76 Younger, Judges and Ruth, 323.
77 Christiansen, "The Biblical Hebrew Particle Nà'", 391.
78 Exum ("The Theological Dimension of the Samson Saga," 42) asserts: "Nevertheless, it would be unfair to accuse Samson of thinking only of retaliation. More likely, as G. E. Mendenhall [Mendenhall, The Tenth Generation, 76–77] has argued, nqm is not vengeance which asserts the self as arbiter, but rather vindication, the legitimate exercise of force where the normal legal institutions of society are obstructed. Thus, Samson acts as the legitimate agent of YHWH's punishment." This may be so in the sense that YHWH is indeed using Samson to vindicate his name, but the text indicates that Samson himself is primarily concerned with his personal vindication, revenge for the loss of his two eyes.
oblivious to the national emergency and unconcerned about the divine agenda he was raised up to fulfill.”"80 Nevertheless, through the weaknesses and arrogance of Samson over 3,000 Philistines are killed, and, more importantly, the temple of Dagon is destroyed and YHWH is shown to be supreme. As Klein states, “In finding the strength to enact his personal revenge, however, Samson ironically enacts Yahweh’s ethical will.”81 It is not entirely clear whether the narrator’s statement, “So the dead whom he killed at his death were more than those whom he killed in his life,” is intended by the implied author to be a validation or a vilification of Samson; most likely it points out the value of his final accomplishment (+normality), humiliation of Dagon and the Philistines, although it certainly reflects badly on his previous actions. Nevertheless, YHWH has achieved his occasion against the Philistines and triumphed, not because of Samson’s strength, obedience, and wise decisions,82 nor in spite of his weaknesses and sins, but actually by means of his self-centered aggression and desire to do what was “right in his eyes” rather than in the eyes of YHWH, which, ironically, was ultimately right in the eyes of both.

8.3 Conclusion

8.3.1 Summary of Evidence

After the typical opening of the Samson narrative, the implied author is at great pains to demonstrate at length the privileges of the final judge’s upbringing and his preparation for his task (+normality: chosenness). In spite of his election, potential, and physical strength (+capacity) however, Samson repeatedly behaves in ways that illustrate

80 Block, Judges, Ruth, 467.
81 Klein, Irony in Judges, 118.
82 Exum (“The Theological Dimension of the Samson Saga,” 41) notes: “Samson’s own strength enables him neither to live, chs. xiv–xv, nor to die (by pulling down the house upon the Philistines), ch. xvi. The saga teaches that life and death are solely in the hand of YHWH.”
his -propriety, endangering his Nazirite vows, consorting with Philistine women, and
pursuing personal revenge. His physical appetites and personal desires take precedence
over his God-given purpose—or at least they seem to. Ironically, rather than working
through the judge’s strengths, as in the case of early judges such as Othniel and Ehud,
YHWH actually works through Samson’s weaknesses, using them to provoke an occasion
against the Philistines. This is necessitated by the Israelites’ continuing apostasy
(-propriety) and now their growing apathy and acceptance of Canaanite oppression and
values (-inclination: reluctance). Thus, many of Samson’s actions that would normally
warrant a -propriety evaluation from a Deuteronomistic perspective are actually deemed
+propriety from the perspective of YHWH’s ultimate plan to deliver Israel and
demonstrate his superiority to the Philistine god, Dagon.

8.3.2 Conclusion

By the time of Samson, the relationship between the Israelites and their God has
deteriorated so much that they have apparently given up all hope of possessing the land
that YHWH promised them. They acquiesce to Philistine domination, and either no longer
realize that they could cry out to YHWH for deliverance or have lost faith that he is
willing or able to provide it. The Judahites, whom YHWH chose to “go up” in battle first
in Judg 1:2, who defeated ten thousand men at Bezek (1:4), and who captured and burned
Jerusalem (1:8) have been reduced to betraying their own leaders to the Philistines in
order to avoid trouble (15:9–12). A few faithful people, such as Manoah’s wife, are open
to YHWH’s messengers and willing to follow his instructions faithfully, but spirituality in
Israel is at a very low ebb. If the people have any understanding of the character of their
God, it nevertheless makes no perceptible difference in the way they live their lives.
The implied author portrays Samson himself as having the greatest privileges and the greatest potential of all the judges, but the hope inspired in the reader by his auspicious childhood is disappointed. Although raised as a Nazirite from birth, and set aside for YHWH’s purposes, Samson seems to have little understanding of his own role in that purpose or comprehension of the God he serves. Before Samson’s birth, the angel of YHWH had told his mother, “He shall begin to deliver Israel from the hands of the Philistines” (Judg 13:5). There is no mention of “rest” for Israel at the end of his rule, and the Philistines remained a significant power for some time afterwards. However, a significant theological victory was achieved by the destruction of Dagon’s temple and the shaming of the Philistines and their god.83 Niditch argues that the burial notice in v. 31, in which all his father’s household bury him in the tomb of his ancestors, “confirms that the author seeks to portray him positively.”84 Greene argues that “the issue of the relationship between divine sovereignty, human responsibility and punishment, was either not a significant issue for the contemporary reader, or one that the narrator chose to let him ponder.”85 At least he served as a successful agent of YHWH’s purposes.

However, the significance of the Samson narrative, and indeed all the other narratives, goes beyond what it says about the judge him or herself; it has important implications for Israel as a whole since the judge is representative of the Israelite people. As Webb aptly states, “Samson’s awareness of his separateness to God, and yet his disregard for it, his fatal attraction to foreign women, his willfulness and his presumption

84 Niditch, Judges: A Commentary, 172.
all hold the mirror up to the behavior of Israel itself. So too does his fate.”\textsuperscript{86} Samson is the last of the judges. Although it does not fall within the purview of this study to examine the double conclusion to the book, it is well known that Israel descends into chaos and internecine warfare. Amit notes that “Samson’s ‘leadership’ and the description of anarchy at the end of the book complement one another, the sequence seeming to imply that the period of Samson led to anarchy.”\textsuperscript{87} If Samson’s rule led to anarchy in spite of YHWH’s special choice and anointing, and the Israelites continued their downward spiral into chaos despite their election and special relationship with God, perhaps the message of the implied author is to illustrate the fact that the only hope of Israel is in YHWH’s intervention in their sinful and chaotic lives. Samson will only “begin to deliver Israel” but YHWH must bring the task to completion.


\textsuperscript{87} Amit, \textit{The Art of Editing}, 288.
9 Conclusion

9.1 Introduction

It is of great interest in Biblical Studies to locate the “ultimate semantic authority” of a text, what Polzin calls the “unifying ideological stance of the work’s ‘implied author.’”¹ Martin and White’s Appraisal Model is very useful in identifying and analyzing evaluative language in texts in which the author/speaker is more or less directly engaging the reader/audience in order to create communities of shared feelings and values. It searches for instantiations of evaluation in the text which reveal the author/speaker’s own values. It focuses on the interpersonal in language and how author/speakers align themselves with, or disalign themselves from, their material and their reader/audience. ² Contemporary examples of texts that fit this pattern are reviews, journalistic articles, speeches, and even poetry. The ENGAGEMENT section of the model is particularly useful in examining the interpersonal dimension of language and determining just how the author/speaker attempts to influence the reader/audience into accepting his or her evaluation of participants, processes, and things. However, although the authors state that the motivation for their book arose out of work in narrative,³ the model in its original format is not ideally suited to dealing with narrative, especially ancient narrative from a different culture and in a different language. The examples of application of the model to narrative that have been provided in Martin and White do not do justice to the many points of view inherent in narrative, whether these are the viewpoints of the characters, the narrator, the implied author, or the actual author, if known. It has therefore

---

¹ Polzin, Moses and the Deuteronomist, 20.
² Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 1.
³ Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, xi.
been necessary to revise the model in order to make it relevant to the text of Judges. The revisions in the resulting Narrative Appraisal Model have included a greater focus on ATTITUDE, especially AFFECT and JUDGMENT, a clarifying of terminology, the expansion of the INCLINATION subsystem, the inclusion of the PERSPECTIVE subsystem, and the modification of the ENGAGEMENT system to apply to the implied author’s purpose in using the perspectives of characters to achieve his/her ideological goal.

9.2 Critique of the New Narrative Appraisal Model: Advantages and Disadvantages

The revised Narrative Appraisal Model is not completely without shortcomings, but then every model is a generalization or abstraction of reality that intends to bring out relevant features, not a duplication of reality itself. The fact that the model relies heavily on ideational content (invoked evaluation) requires that the interpreter be familiar with the historical socio-religious context. The temporal and cultural distance from the time of Judges, however one dates the book, makes this more of a challenge than dealing with texts that reflect contemporary social contexts and issues. Nevertheless, we know enough about the historical context, the immediate co-text, and the canonical context of the book of Judges within the Deuteronomistic History to safely conclude, for example, that when the narrator says, “they followed other gods from among the people around them,” it is an invoked -propriety judgment.

Although the model constrains subjectivity, subjectivity is not completely eliminated. The boundaries of categories are sometimes fuzzy, and it is sometimes difficult to tell which affect is being expressed; a decision must be made based on the best evidence available. For example, it is sometimes difficult to decide from context
whether an appraising item indicates —HAPPINESS: antipathy or —SATISFACTION: displeasure. Antipathy is more a response to the character of the person who triggers the emotion, whereas displeasure is triggered by the negative outcome of their actions, but sometimes the narrative does not give enough context for a clear decision to be made.

The nature of the Hebrew language and Hebrew narrative also makes accurate assessments of evaluative language more challenging. Since the classical Hebrew corpus is limited and there are no native speakers, the margin of error for interpreting its evaluative statements is increased. Modality is a key element in Martin and White’s model, but unlike English with its many modal auxiliaries (could, should, would, ought, must, might, may, etc.) that indicate obligation and probability, Hebrew uses the *yiqtol* workhorse to express all these nuances, often aided only by context.⁴ Also, Hebrew narrative has the tendency to “show” rather than “tell” the reader about the characters and events, and the narrator is usually reticent to express a directly inscribed value judgment. In spite of these limitations, however, the revised model was able to provide enough evidence that meaningful interpretive decisions could be made.

Despite some remaining challenges, the revised Narrative Appraisal Model proved to be more useful than Martin and White’s original model, at least when applied to narrative text. The increased delicacy in the system network helped to eliminate ambiguity and subjectivity in interpretation. The model takes into consideration the unique characteristics of the Hebrew language. Most importantly, it takes into consideration the unique nature of narrative with its multiple perspectives and varying levels of reliability, as well as differentiating between the multiple points of view within

⁴ At least, translators attempt to derive all these English nuances from the Hebrew *yiqtol*. 
the story and the perspective of the implied author outside the world of the story. Thus, it integrates linguistic and narrative criticism to the advantage of both.

9.3 Interpretive Conclusions

According to Fokkelman, it is a natural and essential part of reading narrative to consider authorial stance:

The essential question we usually ask ourselves when we are reading texts we consider important: what exactly is the view of the writer? What faith or ideology inspires him, or rather, inspires the text? Apparently, the text exactly matches his intentions, given the fact that he has released it, sent it out into the world.5

The book of Judges, after reaching its final form, has been preserved and passed down for thousands of years. The concept of authorial intent has fallen out of fashion in literary theory,6 but it is still possible, based on the text itself and without even knowing who the final author/redactor is, to infer what the implied author is communicating through the interaction of evaluative viewpoints in the narrative, both within each cycle and among all the cycles of the major judges. This constitutes the ideology or theology of Judges.

One trend that has often been noted, the increasing corruption of the major judges, is confirmed by the Narrative Appraisal Model. The implied author has established a significant pattern, the famous "downward spiral," to convey to the implied reader a message about the ethical decline of both the people of Israel and its judges. In fact, the individual judges themselves embody in large part the characteristics of the Israelites over whom they rule. Othniel is the ideal judge, Ehud is appraised positively in spite of some ambiguities, but Barak is the first to show clear signs of weakness. The successful

5 Fokkelman, Reading Biblical Narrative, 149.
6 See the seminal article by Wimsatt and Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy," among others. See also Webb (Judges, 48), who aptly refers to "the issue of authorial intention in another guise—the ideology expressed in the way a piece of literature like Judges has been written."
leadership that Gideon achieves in the middle of his career after a very dubious beginning is marred not only by his overweening arrogance but also by his ill-advised attempt to honor YHWH after his victory, ultimately leading Israel back into apostasy. Abimelech’s rule, although we have not taken time to study it here, demonstrates what the outcome of Gideon’s over-confidence and self-interest could have been had he not awoken to the dangers of his own behavior. The story of Jephthah illustrates the desperate search for responsible leadership by a people that has tried YHWH’s patience beyond endurance. They are forced to look on the very margins of Israelite society and negotiate with a bandit leader who, apparently considering himself the ANE parallel to Henry Kissinger, tries to ensure his success by using the foreign cultic practice of human sacrifice to negotiate with God. Finally YHWH pulls out all the stops and raises up Samson, who is given all the privileges necessary for him to develop into a faithful leader of Israel, but who nevertheless abuses his God-given potential by using it to satisfy his own desires for women and revenge.

This study also illustrates that YHWH initially works through the strengths of the leaders of his people: Othniel’s military leadership, Ehud’s courage and cleverness, Deborah’s faith and wisdom by which she strengthens the less effectual Barak. But even here it is an outsider, Jael, who plays a central role in the victory over Sisera, and YHWH begins to work in spite of the weaknesses of his leaders. Despite Gideon’s hesitance and lack of trust, YHWH is able to increase his faith to the point where he delivers Israel, even though Gideon later distorts his trust into arrogance. With Jephthah, God begins to work in spite of the weaknesses of Israel’s leaders. Jephthah’s charismatic, if ethically dubious, leadership of a band of “worthless fellows” results in his being chosen by the leaders of
Gilead to deliver Israel, and yet YHWH uses this less than ideal choice to stave off foreign attack, at least for a while. Finally, not in spite of, but actually by means of Samson’s sensual desires, defiance of his Nazirite vows, and lust for personal revenge, YHWH is able to win a theological victory over the Philistine god Dagon and at least “begin” to deliver Israel.

Another pattern that is revealed by the model is a change in the participants’ understanding of the character of YHWH. From the brief sketch of Othniel we can only assume that his that his actions were performed as a natural outcome of his Spirit endowment and trust in YHWH. We are given more detail about Ehud and know that he was raised up by YHWH and ultimately gave him the credit for his successful deliverance of Israel from the Moabites. In between, even though there is no direct mention of YHWH or his spirit, the implied author subtly but effectively suggests Ehud’s faith and orthodoxy by the word-play on הבש and by Ehud’s “turning from” and “passing by” the idols.

Problems first become evident in the Barak narrative, indicated by the judge’s reluctance to follow YHWH’s instructions to enter into battle with Sisera and his iron chariots. In contrast to Deborah’s trusting obedience, Barak seems to doubt either YHWH’s capacity or his reliability, or perhaps his commitment to Israel in even allowing the enemy threat. Whatever his motivation, YHWH’s displeasure with him is consequently indicated by giving the honor that would have been Barak’s to an outsider, a woman.

The Gideon narrative represents the climax of this theme, since in it Gideon openly confronts YHWH and challenges his character in terms of his veracity, faithfulness, and justice. Ironically, rather than seeing their own apostasy and sin as the source of their suffering, they doubt YHWH’s commitment to his covenant with Israel. Although God’s
character is ultimately vindicated, it is evident that repeated instances of enemy
oppression are taking their toll on the Israelites’ trust in their God. In the next narrative,
the Gileadites display only a partial understanding of YHWH, and focus in on his mercy at
the expense of his holiness and justice, and Jephthah himself seems to confuse YHWH
with a Canaanite deity, a god who needs to be placated or influenced by performing
human sacrifice. By the time of Samson, most of the Israelites seem to have forgotten
their God altogether, and do not even cry out to him in their distress. Samson himself
shows little understanding of the character of YHWH and is far more interested in the
satiation of his own appetites for women and revenge, calling on God only to meet his
own needs. The words of the narrator in Judg 2:10, “All that generation also were
gathered to their fathers; and there arose another generation after them who did not know
YHWH, nor yet the work which he had done for Israel,” is even more fully realized in the
Israel of Samson’s time.

As well as these overall trajectories, the model also reveals significant evaluative
patterns within each narrative that the implied author has established to communicate his
ideology. As well as individual evaluative items, each narrative contains significant
contrasting patterns of appraisal that further the implied author’s agenda. The second
introduction sets the evaluative norm, the base line by which all the major characters will
be judged: ultimate and exclusive loyalty to YHWH, trust in his protection, and obedience
to his covenant. Othniel is the ideal judge, virtually untouched by both the inherent
weaknesses and overt sins of later judges. Yet within this passage there is a contrast: the
contrast between the propriety of the previous generation, who “served YHWH” and had
“seen all the great work of YHWH which he had done for Israel” (Judg 2:7), and the
impropriety of the new generation, who “forsook YHWH” and “did the evil thing … and served the Baals … and followed other gods” (2:11–12). Further contrasts are set up throughout the major judge narratives to emphasize the implied author’s evaluative perspective.

Ehud contrasts with both Othniel who precedes him and Eglon with whom he must contend. Both Othniel and Ehud were “raised up” by YHWH and both delivered Israel, but whereas Othniel was from a reputable family, straightforward, paradigmatic, and was endowed with the Spirit of YHWH, Ehud starts with the disadvantage of his Benjaminite status and the absence of any reference to the Spirit’s guidance. Nevertheless, Ehud also wins a clear defeat over the enemy and achieves rest for Israel.

Ehud the Israelite leader is also contrasted with Eglon the Moabite leader. Ehud is active, clever, and successful in delivering Israel from Moabite oppression; Eglon is portrayed as sedentary, credulous, and loses his life in his engagement with the Israeliite leader Ehud. Eglon longs for secret messages from his gods, Ehud passes by and turns from idols in order to set Israel free from YHWH’s discipline that was itself a consequence of serving other gods: apostasy, the “evil thing.” Thus, Israeliite leadership is set in opposition to Canaanite leadership, the worship of the true God in contrast to the worship of foreign gods.

The next narrative, the tale of Deborah and Barak, Jael and Sisera, sets up a number of interesting contrasts that illustrate the evaluative perspective of the implied author. First, the exemplary Deborah is contrasted with the more questionable Barak. Whereas Deborah is trusting and eager to follow YHWH’s wishes, Barak is hesitant and unwilling to go to war without Deborah’s presence to reassure and guide him. This is the
first time that a strong female character has appeared in a major judge cycle, and not only paves the way for Jael's assertive actions but serves as a foil for Barak's less effectual mode of leadership. Sisera's more confident and aggressive style of military leadership also highlights Barak's more uncertain personality. Deborah and Jael make an interesting comparison. Both are assertive, confident women with a clear sense of purpose. In spite of these similarities, however, there are striking differences. Deborah is an insider, an Israelite whose actions are clearly +propriety; Jael is an outsider whose methods are more ambiguous. Deborah's primary purpose is to serve and obey YHWH; Jael's motivations and allegiances are unknown. And yet, Deborah disappears from the narrative when Jael begins to act. Although Barak is ultimately part of a successful campaign, he raises questions about the quality of Israelite leadership and foreshadows the less satisfactory judges that follow. This narrative also begins to suggest the idea that YHWH works through the strengths and positive traits of characters when he can, but is willing to use whatever human instruments are available when the need arises. Even beyond the boundaries of this cycle, the lackluster Barak contrasts both with the ideal military leader, Othniel, and also with the courageous, risk-taking Ehud, who is much more similar to the enigmatic but heroic Jael.

Gideon is interesting in that he contrasts strongly with himself. At the beginning of his story he is hesitant and lacking in trust, afraid of the Philistines but doubting whether YHWH is the answer to Israel's problems. Gradually and patiently, YHWH builds up his faith until he is able to lead a small band of soldiers against a formidable enemy. As soon as he tastes success, however, his trust becomes distorted into self-confidence and the lust for power. He sets out on a rampage of personal revenge which is only halted
by the offer of kingship, an offer that shocks him into realizing that he is usurping the rightful place of YHWH as Israel’s leader and the gratitude and honor that should be YHWH’s alone. Then, in a muddled and ill-advised attempt to restore reverence for YHWH, he establishes a shrine that only leads Israel further into apostasy and ultimately results in the tyrannical reign of Abimelech, which is the nadir of Israelite leadership up to this point. Gideon moves from insecurity to trust to arrogant over-confidence, and undermines “all the good that he had done for Israel” (Judg 8:35) by turning faithfulness into failure.

Israel and Israelite leadership are in dire straits in Judg 10. They have stretched YHWH’s patience to the limit and he refuses to help when the Ammonites threaten to attack. The contrast here is between YHWH’s choice of leadership and the Israelite’s choice of leadership; in fact, the implied author arranges his narrative to deliberately contrast Jephthah and YHWH at various points. The Israelites turn to Jephthah as an alternative deliverer when YHWH rejects them. Jephthah is on the margins of Israelite society, symbolizing the tendency for Israel to seek help farther from the center of their Yahwistic identity. The fact that YHWH in his freedom chooses to endorse the unsatisfactory Jephthah by sending his Spirit on him in order to bring some success and mitigate the damage that this judge will bring about does not mean that he is ever the leader that God desires. He is a man who likes to negotiate but negotiates badly, purports to worship YHWH by offering the offense of human sacrifice, and even manages to turn military success into internecine warfare. For all their flaws, the deliverers raised up by God to this point have all brought a measure of peace to the land, but at the end of Jephthah’s rule there is no mention of rest.
Samson, the final judge, is a contrast between divinely appointed potential and human failure. Chosen by God before his birth, set apart to God by his Nazirite status, endowed by God with a special measure of his Spirit, Samson is nevertheless controlled by his passions. According to Webb, "Whatever natural desires and peculiarities of temperament may be contributing factors, the underlying cause is the presence and activity of Yahweh's spirit, propelling Samson into conflict with the Philistines and the eventual fulfillment of his destiny." Whether YHWH actually motivated Samson’s lust and desire for revenge, or whether he simply worked through them, or both, involves the murky issue of dual causality that cannot be fully addressed here. The fact remains that YHWH was actively seeking an occasion against the Philistines, and when human leadership fails, God is able to work through, not merely in spite of, human weakness and sin to accomplish his goals. Samson embodies the sins and weaknesses of Israel as a whole, their repeated disobedience and failure, and yet, even in the face of abject human failure, YHWH is able to “begin” to deliver them. Once again at the end of the Samson narrative there is no rest for Israel, and the remaining chapters of the double conclusion will trace Israel’s further descent into anarchy and self-destruction. Some consider Samuel to have been the final judge, who passes on the role of leadership to the first king, Saul, who is also a failure. Even though David is YHWH’s choice of king, and establishes the united empire of David and Solomon, that too will eventually degenerate into internecine warfare between Israel and Judah and result in the discipline of exile.

---

7 As in יֹכְדָה לְפָעַל רֹדֵךְ יְהוָה, “came upon him powerfully.”
8 Webb, Judges, 359.
9 For example, Tsumura, The First Book of Samuel, 242; Guillaume, Waiting for Josiah, 241; Hester, First and Second Samuel, 27; Bergen, I, 2 Samuel, 141.
The prophets look forward to a Messianic king who will one day restore Israel, but this is far in the future. Judgeship in Israel has been a failed experiment.

9.3.1 The Unifying Ideological Stance

Throughout the narratives of the major judges, the implied author has manipulated and interwoven the evaluative points of view of the various characters, presented to the implied reader through the lens of the reliable narrator, in order to present his/her own perspective on the status of Israel and its leaders before their God. A study of the evaluative language and ideational content of the book of Judges, combined with the concept of authorial perspective and narrative points of view that honors the narrative genre of the material, has served to clarify the ideology of the implied author.

It is reasonable to conclude that the narrator is indeed reliable in the narratives of the judges.\textsuperscript{10} There are many situations in which the evaluative stance of individual characters is undermined by the implied author’s arrangement of points of view, but none which suggest that the narrator is similarly unreliable. The paradigm given by the narrator in the second introduction sets the standard for evaluation of subsequent episodes. Ultimate loyalty to YHWH and obedience to his covenant is required; forsaking YHWH, serving the Baals, and following other gods from the surrounding nations are condemned as the ultimate “evil thing” (Judg 2:11–15). This is consistent with the emphasis of the rest of the Deuteronomic History, and nothing in the outcome of events within the book of Judges as the implied author has arranged his material suggests otherwise. When the

\textsuperscript{10} This is not to say that the narrator is omniscient, or that the implied author would choose to reveal his complete agenda through the narrator even if he were. Polzin (\textit{Moses and the Deuteronomist}, 189) states, “The narrator, who apparently displays an omniscient control of the story, then deliberately undercuts his own omniscience by his careful use of ambiguous phraseology.” The implied author controls the narrator, however, and his use of ambiguity may well be a deliberate literary technique, as discussed in the previous chapters.
Israelites worship other gods, they are consistently disciplined by means of oppression by foreign armies until YHWH in mercy decides that their misery has been enough punishment and responds to their cry for help. The implied author has the narrator quote YHWH as the ultimate authority and aligns him with YHWH's standards; the narrator clearly views events through the eyes of YHWH. In fact, the implied author consistently subordinates his own evaluations to those attributed to YHWH within the text, never giving the implied reader reason to think otherwise.

The evaluations of many characters, on the other hand, are frequently undermined by the implied author. For example, Barak’s hesitancy is undermined by Deborah when she tells him that the honor will go to a woman (4:9); Gideon’s arrogance is undermined by his own refusal to accept the offer of kingship (8:23), and his rededication to YHWH by the narrator who states that his ephod caused all Israel to play the harlot with it (8:27); Jephthah’s orthodoxy is undermined by his daughter’s sacrifice, and his capabilities as negotiator and leader by the fiasco with Ephraim in which 42,000 died; and Samson’s character is undermined by repeated hints that he is defying his Nazirite vows and the laws of YHWH even before he utters his demanding and self-serving prayers. Those with whom the implied author aligns himself, such as Deborah, the prophet that appears to Gideon, the angel of YHWH, and YHWH himself, are presented by the implied author as accurate, faithful, and of unimpeachable character.

The general ideological stance of the judges narratives as a whole is thus conveyed by the implied author primarily through the narrator, but also through the outcome of events and through trustworthy characters. In simplified terms, this ideology affirms the holiness, justice, mercy, and faithfulness of YHWH, the need for the Israelites
to maintain absolute loyalty and obedience to him if his people are to prosper and the
land have rest, the legitimacy of discipline when the Israelites abandon YHWH for the
gods of other nations, the engrained tendency of humanity to defy their God and follow
their own ways, the ultimate failure of human leadership in the form of judges, and the
essential need for YHWH to intervene with a new model for leading and guiding his
people. Of course, this is an extreme oversimplification; the ideology of Judges is
characterized by many nuances and subtleties, some of which have been suggested
throughout this study, although it would take a much more detailed study of each
individual narrative to bring out all of the ideological implications of the text. As Auld
has said, “It is the readers of this book who must judge throughout, from beginning to
end, and not just in the middle where some few of the characters are said to ‘judge
Israel’.”11 The Narrative Appraisal Model has shown itself to be a useful tool in that
endeavor.

9.4 Suggestions for Further Research

Although the Narrative Appraisal Model has yielded meaningful results, it may
benefit from further refinement or modification. One of the thorniest problems inherent in
dealing with Hebrew is the issue of modality. Martin and White’s original model includes
modalisation and modulation as significant factors. In spite of a number of studies of
Hebrew modality from a number of theoretical perspectives, no consensus has been
achieved.12 A clearer understanding of this aspect of Hebrew grammar would enable the

12 See, for example, Callaham, *Modality and the Biblical Hebrew Infinitive Absolute*; Cook,
“Mood/Modality in Biblical Hebrew Verb Theory”; Cook, *Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb*; Giano,
“Mood and Modality in Classical Hebrew”; Hatav, *The Semantics of Aspect and Modality*; Livnat, “From
Epistemic to Deontic Modality: Evidence from Hebrew”; Ljungberg, “Tense, Aspect, and Modality in
interpreter to disambiguate the function of the *yiqtol*, *weqatal*, and other modal forms, and might possibly shed light on the use of evaluative language as a result.

The Narrative Appraisal Model could be further enhanced by incorporating ideas of prominence and markedness in Hebrew, as well as word order and flow of information within the textual metafunction. This would give a clearer picture of the force of evaluative statements made. The inclusion of a study of transitivity, especially of mental processes, might enhance the understanding of evaluations and the points of view from which they are made.

Another area of study that may shed light on evaluative perspective in Hebrew narrative is Perspective Criticism, which derives from Uspensky’s structuralist categories which are used to examine point of view. This theory, which has previously been used by Polzin, examines perspective on the ideological, phraseological, spatial, temporal, and psychological planes to arrive at an understanding of the “ultimate semantic authority” of the text. Yamasaki has recently applied this methodology to Biblical text including the Gideon narrative. The phraseological plane in particular uses linguistic categories in order to identify indicators of point of view.

---

as well as the standard grammars, such as Jołon and Muraoka, *Biblical Hebrew*; Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze, *Hebrew Reference Grammar*; Waltke and O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*; and Dallaire, “The Syntax of Volitives in Northwest Semitic Prose.”


14 See Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition*; Yamasaki, “Perspective Criticism: The Power of Point of View.”


16 Yamasaki, *Perspective Criticism: Point of View and Evaluative Guidance in Biblical Narrative*. See also Yamasaki, *John the Baptist in Life and Death*.

17 Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*, 56.
Where appropriate and compatible, some of the insights included in these methodologies could be incorporated into the Narrative Appraisal Model in order to make it function more effectively. Nevertheless, the Narrative Appraisal Model in its present form is able to identify many evaluative items and highlight significant evaluative patterns at the level of discourse that can aid in the understanding of the ideology of Hebrew narrative.
### 10 Appendix: Appraisal Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>The Second Introduction</th>
<th>The people served YHWH (M Narr)</th>
<th>Invoked evaluation</th>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>Invoked evaluation</th>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>When Joshua had dismissed the people, the Israelites went each to his inheritance to possess the land.</th>
<th>M Narr</th>
<th>Israelites</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>+propriety</th>
<th>+tenacity</th>
<th>1, +propriety (compassion)</th>
<th>+capacity</th>
<th>+normality: chosenness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When Joshua had dismissed the people, the Israelites went each to his inheritance to possess the land.</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td>+tenacity</td>
<td>1, +propriety (compassion)</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The people served YHWH (M Narr)</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td>+tenacity</td>
<td>1, +propriety (compassion)</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders who survived Joshua,</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td>+tenacity</td>
<td>1, +propriety (compassion)</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Israel served YHWH which he had done for Israel</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td>+tenacity</td>
<td>1, +propriety (compassion)</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>great</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td>+tenacity</td>
<td>1, +propriety (compassion)</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Israel served YHWH which he had done for Israel</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td>+tenacity</td>
<td>1, +propriety (compassion)</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the son of Nun, died at the age of one hundred and ten.</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All that generation also were gathered to their fathers; and there arose another generation after them who did not know YHWH, and the work which he had done for Israel.

Then the Israelites did the service of the Baals, and served YHWH, the God of their fathers, and followed other gods of the peoples who were around them who did not know YHWH.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Text (Hebrew)</th>
<th>Text (English, NASB modified)</th>
<th>The World</th>
<th>of</th>
<th>the</th>
<th>Story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>214.1</td>
<td>Kept them in the hand of their enemies</td>
<td>and he gave them into the hands of plunderers who plundered them</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Israeliites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.1</td>
<td>'anger burned'</td>
<td>against Israel</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israeliites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.1</td>
<td>Fixed lexical expression: 'gave them into the hands'</td>
<td>and he gave them into the hands of plunderers who plundered them</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israeliites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.1</td>
<td>[plunderers: plundered]</td>
<td>[plunderers who plundered them.]</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Plunderers</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.1</td>
<td>Fixed lexical expression: 'sold them into the hands of their enemies'</td>
<td>and he sold them into the hands of their enemies around them,</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.1</td>
<td>'able to stand'</td>
<td>so that they were no longer able to stand before their enemies</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israeliites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215.1</td>
<td>Modifier [no longer]</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>+veracity</td>
<td>(Applies to 3 rows below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215.1</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td>Wherever they went</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israeliites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215.1</td>
<td>Invoked Evaluation</td>
<td>the hand of YHWH was against them</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israeliites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215.1</td>
<td>Invoked Evaluation</td>
<td>[the hand of YHWH was against them]</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israeliites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215.1</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td>for evil harm</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israeliites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215.1</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td>as YHWH had spoken and promised</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>The</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Invoked Evaluation</td>
<td>Then YHWH raised up judges</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>+happiness: affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>who delivered them</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>+happiness: affection</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“who delivered”</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>+happiness: affection</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from the hands of those who plundered them</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>plunderers</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+happiness: affection</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>Yet</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“listen/obey”</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negated</td>
<td>[not]</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the way in which</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“play the harlot”</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after other gods</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and bowed themselves down to them</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they turned aside</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their fathers had walked obeying the commandments of YHWH</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“before the harlot”</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from the way in which their fathers had walked obeying the commandments of YHWH</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they did not do as their fathers</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negated</td>
<td>[not]</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Text (English, NASB modified)</td>
<td>The World of Graduation</td>
<td>The World of Appraisal/Trigger</td>
<td>The World of Appraised/Emotion</td>
<td>The World of Affect</td>
<td>Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>יִרְבְּרֵךְם המֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל.</td>
<td>&quot;When YHWH raised up judges for them, YHWH was with the judge&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Saturating Prosody (compassion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>כִּי יִרְבְּרֵךְם</td>
<td>and delivered them</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>+happiness: affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מַעֲרִיזֵנִי</td>
<td>from the hand of their own oppressors</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>+happiness: affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בִּשְׂדֵנָם</td>
<td>more than their fathers</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>+happiness: affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מֵאֵחָז בְּדַבָּרָם</td>
<td>more corruptly</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Discourse Prosody -propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מִדְּרֵךְם</td>
<td>That they would turn back</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>-tenacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מֵאֵחָז בְּדַבָּרָם</td>
<td>more corruptly than their fathers</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>-propriety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Text (English, NASB modified)</th>
<th>The World of Graduation</th>
<th>The World of Appraisal/Trigger</th>
<th>The World of Appraised/Emotion</th>
<th>The World of Affect</th>
<th>Story</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>תֶּרֶם גַּם הַגַּם</td>
<td>But it came about when the judge died, that they would turn back</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>-tenacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מֵאֵחָז בְּדַבָּרָם</td>
<td>more corruptly</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>-propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Appraising Items (English, NASB modified)</th>
<th>The Gradation</th>
<th>World of the Emoter</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>give up, opposed</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stubborn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they did not keep up their practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So the anger of YHWH burned</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>against Israel.</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>because this nation has transgressed my covenant which I commanded their fathers and has not obeyed my voice.</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Tenacity or faithfulness to evil, therefore ultimately a negative evaluation from the point of view of the narrator and YHWH.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>נָתַןָה לְבִיתוֹ בְּאֶרֶץ פִּילְסִיס</td>
<td>He did this only to teach warfare to the descendants of the Israelites who had not had previous battle experience.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>The nations listed below</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>1, =propriety (YHWH did not leave them alone because the nations were good, just to use them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>הַפִּילְסִיסִים יָאִ一直都</td>
<td>the five rulers of the Philistines, all the Canaanites, the Sidonians, and the Hivites living in the Lebanon mountains from Mount Baal Hermon to Lebo Hamath.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>תַּלְפֵּשׁ יָאִ一直都</td>
<td>They were left to test the Israelites to see whether they would obey YHWH’s commands, which he had given their ancestors through Moses.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>^=propriety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 35    | הַקַּנְדָּשִים לְבִיתוֹ בְּאֶרֶץ פִּילְסִיס | The Israelites lived among the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Perizzites, Hivites and Jebusites. | M | Narr | Israelites | Narrator | Discourse
Prosody |
| 36    | הַקַּנְדָּשִים לְבִיתוֹ בְּאֶרֶץ פִּילְסִיס | They took their daughters in marriage and gave their own daughters to their sons, and served their gods. | M | Narr | Israelites | Narrator | 1, =propriety |

Narr = narrator
M = male

Propriety

283
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Actor's Role</th>
<th>Other Actor</th>
<th>Other Actor's Role</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>The Israelites did the evil thing in the eyes of YHWH;</td>
<td>Invoked Evaluation</td>
<td>The Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>t, satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>The anger of YHWH burned against Israel</td>
<td>Invoked Evaluation</td>
<td>The Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>t, capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>But when they cried out to YHWH,</td>
<td>Invoked Evaluation</td>
<td>Oppressors</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>t, happiness: misery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>he raised up for them a deliverer,</td>
<td>Invoked Evaluation</td>
<td>Israel's</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>t, happiness: affection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Othniel son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother, who saved them.</td>
<td>Invoked Evaluation</td>
<td>Othniel</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Othniel</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>t, normality: chosenness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>The Spirit of YHWH came on him, so that he became Israel's judge and went to war</td>
<td>Invoked Evaluation</td>
<td>Othniel</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>t, normality: chosenness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Modifying use of</td>
<td>YHWH gave Cushan-Rishathaim king of Aram into his hands,</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israel’s misery</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>+happiness: affection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>word</td>
<td>and his hand was strong over him.</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+propriety (compassion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>word</td>
<td>So the land had peace for forty years, until Othniel son of Kenaz died.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>YHWH’s deliverance</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>+normality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ehud**

| 312 | Modifying use of | Now the Israelites again | C:Ed | Narr | force > raise | -propriety |
| 312 | word | did the evil thing | C:Ed | Narr | Israelites | Narrator | -expression |
| 312 | word | in the eyes of YHWH | C:Ed | Narr | Israelites’ sin | YHWH | t − satisfaction: displeasure |
| 312 | word | ‘strengthen’ | C:Ed | Narr | Eglon | Narrator | +capacity |
| 312 | word | ‘the evil thing’ | C:Ed | Narr | Israelites | Narrator | -propriety (justice) |
| 312 | word | ‘exile’ | C:Ed | Narr | Israelites’ sin | YHWH | t − satisfaction: displeasure |

| 313 | word | ‘sound’ | M | Narr | Eglon and his troops | Narrator | +capacity |
| 313 | word | ‘possess’ | M | Narr | Eglon and his troops | Narrator | +capacity |

| 314 | word | ‘serve’ | M | Narr | Israelites | Narrator | -normality: chosenness |

<p>| 314 | word | ‘live’ | M | Narr | force &gt; raise | Eglon’s oppression | Israelites | -happiness: misery |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>Ehud</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Then he presented the tribute to Eglon, the king of Moab. Now Eglon was a very fat man.</td>
<td>וכסף קרב עם אחיוMoab וכסף י francaיח קרב,</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>And it happened that just as he finished presenting the tribute, he sent away the people who had carried the tribute.</td>
<td>והתחילה שניים פנים יservername בחמשים י livre מכוספארו מנהל</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>But he himself turned back.</td>
<td>סירב</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Ehud</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>And he said, &quot;I have a secret/ private word/ thing for you, O king.&quot; And they went out from before him, all those who stood in attendance on him.</td>
<td>ובעשת נינה אחר בדימום או יﾑפה נווה יקר</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ehud</td>
<td>Ehud</td>
<td>Ehud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 This seems to some to be -capacity evaluation, but Halpern's argument that it implies a specially trained warrior is convincing (Halpern, First Historians, 41), and indeed later in the context of the story it proves to be an actual advantage in dealing with Eglon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
<th>(Event)</th>
<th>Actor 1</th>
<th>Actor 2</th>
<th>Actor 3</th>
<th>Tag 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ehud came to him. Now he was sitting in his cool roof chamber/privy that was for him alone. Then Ehud said, &quot;I have a word thing from God concerning you.&quot; And he arose from the seat.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Ehud</td>
<td>Ehud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Then Ehud stretched out a hand, his left, and he seized the sword from against his right thigh and thrust it into his belly.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Ehud</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>And it went in, the hilt after the blade, and the hilt closed over the blade, for he did not draw the sword out of his belly; and the feces closed over the blade, for he did not draw the sword out of his belly; and the feces closed over the blade</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Eglon</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Then Ehud went out the vestibule/porch/privy and he shut the doors of the roof chamber behind him, and he locked them.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Eglon</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Now he went out, and his servants came in, and they looked, and beheld, the doors of the roof chamber were locked. So they said, &quot;Surely he is covering his feet in the cool chamber/privy.&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Eglon</td>
<td>Servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>They waited to the point of embarrassment but behold, he was not opening the doors of the roof chamber. Therefore they took the key and opened them, and behold, their lord was fallen to the ground dead and their lord was fallen to the ground dead</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Eglon's delaying</td>
<td>Servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Their lord was fallen to the ground dead and their lord was fallen to the ground dead</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Eglon's body</td>
<td>Servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Eg</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Eg</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Now Ehud escaped during their delaying, and he passed by the idols and he escaped to Sarah.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Ehud</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Repetition, Inclusion (See v. 19)</td>
<td>[and he passed by the idols]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Euhd's summons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Invoked Evaluation</td>
<td>And it happened that he came and he blew on the ram's horn in the hill country of Ephraim, the Israelites went down with him from the hill country.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Euhd</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Command(!)</td>
<td>He said to them, &quot;Follow after me.&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Euhd</td>
<td>Euhd</td>
<td>Euhd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for YHWH has given your enemies, Moab, into your hands.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Euhd</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Euhd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Euhd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So they followed after him and they seized the fords of the Jordan to Moab,</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Discourse Prosody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and did not allow anyone to cross over.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>t, +capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(al) negated (not)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>“strike down”</td>
<td>They struck down Moab at that time</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about ten thousand men,</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a thousand men,</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“robust”</td>
<td>all robust</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Moabites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(all) Adverbial (all)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“valiant” and all valiant men,</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Moabites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(all) Adverbial (all)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“escaped” and not one man escaped,</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(al) negated (not)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(al) Adverbial (all)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>“subdue”</td>
<td>So Moab was subdued on that day</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Moabites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under the hand of Israel.</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*“Command (I)” is used for imperative forms, “Command” is used for negated imperfects (there is no negative imperative in Hebrew) and imperfects that follow in sequence on after imperatives and have the force of an imperative. Function is prioritized over form.*
Deborah and Barak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Israelites</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>Discourse Prosody</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And the land was undisturbed</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td>for eighty years</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>YHWH's defeat of Moab</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>+normality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But the Israelites again did the evil thing</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>-propriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So YHWH sold them into the hand of Jabin</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabin's power</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Jabin</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because he had nine hundred chariots of iron</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Jabin</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+propriety (justice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now he oppressed the Israelites</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Jabin</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+propriety (justice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now Ehud had died.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Jabin</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now Deborah was a woman, and judges Israel at that time. (Judg 4:4)

She was used to sit under the oak of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in the hill country of Ephraim, and the Israelites would go up to her for judgment. (Judg 4:5)

Then she summoned Barak son of Abinoam, from Kadesh of Napthali. (Judg 4:6)

She said to him, "Did not YHWH God of Israel command, "Go! and march on Mount Tabor and take with you ten thousand men from the sons of Napthali and from the sons of Zebuhim."

And I will draw along to you, to the River Kishon, Sisera, commander of the army of Jabin, and his chariotry and his infantry/host/multitude. (Judg 4:7)

7 Although YHWH sees the Israelites as capable in his strength, Barak’s subsequent remarks show that he does not consider an army of 10,000 powerful in comparison to one with iron chariots.
Then Barak said to her, "If you will go with me then I will go.

Then she said, "I will go if you will go with me, I will not go."

Then Barak said to her, "If you will go with me then I will go.

Then she said, "I will go if you will go with me, I will not go."

Barak called Zebulun and Naphtali together to Kedesh, and ten thousand men went up on foot.

Deborah also went up with him.

Now Heber the Kenite had separated himself from the Kenites, from the sons of Hobah the father-in-law of Moses, and had pitched his tent as far away as the oak in Zaanannim, which is near Kedesh.

They told Sisera that Barak the son of Abinoam had gone up to Mount Tabor.

---

8 See Judg 4:15, 17. Not ‘at his feet’ = ‘after him’
And Sisera called/sent his chariots, his chariotry.

---

Command / Invoked evaluation

Then Deborah said to Barak, “Arise, because this is the day on which YHWH has given Sisera into your hand.”

---

Rhetorical question

Has not YHWH gone out before you?”

---

Modifier

So Barak went down from Mount Tabor and ten thousand men after him.

---

“routed”

YHWH routed Sisera

---

Modifiers x3

and all his chariots and all his army with the edge of the sword

---

Modifiers

before Barak

---

Modifiers

on foot

---

force > raise

---

force > raise x3

---

force > raise x2

---

+capacity

---

+normality: status

---

t, +security: trust

---

t, +capacity

---

t, +security: trust

---

t, +capacity

---

t, +security: trust

---

+veracity

(see v. 14)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Now Barak pursued after the chariot and after the army until/as far as Harosheth Huppim.</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Barak</td>
<td>Sisera's army</td>
<td>eagerness</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And all the army of Sisera fell before the sword</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td>Sisera's army</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>-capacity</td>
<td>(all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not even one remained.</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td>Sisera's army</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>-capacity</td>
<td>(not)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Now Sisera had fled on foot to the tent of Jael, the wife of Heber, the Kenite,</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Jael</td>
<td>-CAPACITY</td>
<td>(fled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>because there was peace between Jabin, king of Hazor, and the house of Heber, the Kenite.</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Jael</td>
<td>t, +security: trust</td>
<td>because [there was] peace between Jabin, king of Hazor, and the house of Heber, the Kenite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Then Jael went out to meet Sisera</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Jael</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>t, +inclination: eagerness</td>
<td>see 4:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and she said to him, &quot;Turn aside, my lord, turn aside to me;</td>
<td>2 Commands (I)</td>
<td>Jael</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>+normality: status</td>
<td>and she said to him, &quot;Turn aside, my lord, turn aside to me;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do not be afraid.&quot;</td>
<td>Negated</td>
<td>Jael</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>+inclination: encouragement</td>
<td>do not be afraid.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So he turned aside to her, to her tent, and she covered/concealed him with a covering</td>
<td>&quot;turn aside&quot;</td>
<td>Jael</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>+security: trust</td>
<td>So he turned aside to her, to her tent, and she covered/concealed him with a covering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>And he said to her, &quot;Please give me to drink a little water because I am thirsty.</td>
<td>&quot;to be thirsty&quot;</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>thirst</td>
<td>-happiness: misery</td>
<td>And he said to her, &quot;Please give me to drink a little water because I am thirsty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb/Phrase</td>
<td>Part of Speech</td>
<td>Subject/Modifier</td>
<td>Object/Modifier</td>
<td>Adverb/Manner</td>
<td>Adjective/Synonym</td>
<td>Location/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisera:</td>
<td>Imperative (request)</td>
<td>give me to drink</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Particle of request</td>
<td>[give me to drink]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Particle of request</td>
<td>[Please]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Particle of request</td>
<td>[little]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>So she opened the leather bottle of milk and she provided a drink for him and she covered him.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Jael</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Command (1)</td>
<td>Then he said to her, “Stand at the opening of the tent.”</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional “if then” statement</td>
<td>And if it happens that a man should come and ask you, and say, “Is a man here?” then you will say,</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Defeat, pursuit</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘There is not”</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Then Jael, wife of Heber, took the stake of the tent and she set the hammer in her hand, and she went in to him with stealth/secretly and she drove the stake into his temple and it went down through into the ground</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Jael</td>
<td>Israelis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modifier ‘secretly’</td>
<td>Now he had been sleeping deeply and he was weary/unconscious and he died.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stative verb as modifier ‘to be weary/unconscious’</td>
<td>And behold, Barak had been pursuing Sisera and Jael went out to meet him.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Sisera’s fleeing</td>
<td>Barak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“purse”</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Death of Sisera?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“purse”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Although this is an imperative, and the ק may merely represent social politeness, Sisera’s desperate situation and its double qualification demonstrate that it is more likely a pleading request, not a command. According to Christiansen, “The Biblical Hebrew Particle Nא,” 391 the particle is exhortative or propositive, and when used with the imperative “nullifies the bald directness and face-threatening aspect of the imperative.”

10 There will actually be “no man” there, for Sisera will be dead.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>C:</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>Israelites</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>Jabin</th>
<th>+normality: status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“fall”</td>
<td>So he went in to her and, behold, Sisera was fallen</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>-capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“dead”</td>
<td>dead,</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Sisera</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>-capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Repetition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>C:Ed</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>+normality: status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“humbled”</td>
<td>So God humbled on that day Jabin king of Canaan before the Israelites.</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infinite absolute with “pressed”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>C:</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>Israelites</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>+capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“pressed”</td>
<td>The hand of the Israelites went/pressed more and more</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modifier “harsh”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>C:</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>Israelites</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>+capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“harshly upon Jabin the king of Canaan”</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>-normality: status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modifier “destroyed off”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>C:</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>Jabin</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>-capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“destroyed off”</td>
<td>until they had destroyed Jabin the king of Canaan.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Jabin</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gideon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>C:Ed</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>Israelites</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>Jabin</th>
<th>+propriety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“did the evil thing”</td>
<td>Then the Israelites did the evil thing.</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>-satisfaction: displeasure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Invoked evaluation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>C:</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>Israelites</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>+satisfaction: displeasure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in the eyes of YHWH</td>
<td>in the eyes of YHWH.</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Invoked evaluation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>C:</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>+propriety (justice)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and YHWH gave them into the hands of Midian</td>
<td>and YHWH gave them into the hands of Midian.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Midian</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modifier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>C:</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>+satisfaction: displeasure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>seven years.</td>
<td>seven years.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modifier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>C:</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>Midianites</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>+capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“was strong”</td>
<td>The hand of Midian was strong against Israel.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Midianites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Invoked evaluation. | Because of Midian the Israelites made for themselves the dens which were in the mountains and the caves and the strongholds. | M | Narr | Midianites | Israelites | Discourse Prosody
|:-------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----|------|---------|----------|------------------------|
| ימי מִדְיַן | תְמוּנָה בָּאוּ לָהֶם לְפָעֲמֵי מִדְיַן | M | Narr | Midianites, Amalekites | Israelites | t, -security: mistrust
| So they would lay siege against them | M | Narr | Midianites, Amalekites | YHWH | +capacity
| and destroy the produce of the earth | M | Narr | Midianites, Amalekites | YHWH | -propriety (justice)
| as far as Gaza. | M | Narr | force > raise | force > raise | (applies to 2 rows above)
| and leave no sustenance in Israel as well as no sheep, ox, or donkey. | M | Narr | Midianites, Amalekites | Israelites | t, +propriety (justice)
| (applies to 3 rows above) | M | Narr | Destruction of sustenance | Israelites | t, -security: mistrust
| For they would come up with their livestock and their tents, they would come in | M | Narr | force > raise | force > raise | +capacity
| Lexical metaphor as Modifier | M | Narr | Midianites repeated attacks | Israelites | t, -security: mistrust
| Countable? | M | Narr | Midianites, Amalekites, camels | Narrator | +capacity
| [no] Negation | [no] Negation | M | Narr | Midianites, Amalekites | YHWH | +propriety (justice)

11 Qere.
| 6.6 | "brought low" | So Israel was brought very low, because of Midian, and the Israelites cried to YHWH. | M M Narr | Midianites, Amalekites Israelites | -propriety

| 6.7 | "cried" | Now it came about when the Israelites cried to YHWH on account of Midian, that YHWH sent a man, a prophet to the Israelites, and he said to them, "Thus says YHWH, the God of Israel, 'It was I who brought you up from Egypt and I delivered you out of the house of slavery, because of Midian, etc., etc." | M M Narr | Midian Israelites | -happiness: misery

| 6.8 | Invoked evaluation | that YHWH sent a man, a prophet to the Israelites, and he said to them, "Thus says YHWH, the God of Israel, 'It was I who brought you up from Egypt and I delivered you out of the house of slavery, etc., etc."

---

12 This example of metaphor might also be "-valuation" in the area of APPRECIATION, if the invading hoards were considered "things" (Martin and White, Language of Evaluation, 56–61).
| 3.2.2 | "hand/power" | from the hand/power of the Egyptians | C-Ed | Prophet > YHWH | YHWH | Israelites | +security: trust
| 3.2.2 | "oppressor" + Invoked evaluation | and from the hand/power of all your oppressors, | C-Ed | Prophet > YHWH | YHWH | YHWH | 
| 6.10 | Invoked evaluation | and I said to you, "I am YHWH your God, you shall not worship the gods of the Amorites in whose land you live" | C-Ed | Prophet > YHWH | YHWH | YHWH | t, +normality: status
| 6.10 | Command | you shall not worship the gods of the Amorites in whose land you live | C-Ed | Prophet > YHWH | YHWH | YHWH | +normality: status
| 6.11 | Invoked evaluation | Then the angel of YHWH came and sat under the oak that was in Ophrah, which belonged to Joash the Abiezrite as his son Gideon was beating out wheat in the wine press in order to save it from the Midianites. | M | U | Midianites | Gideon | Discourse Prosody: trust
| 6.12 | Invoked evaluation | The angel of YHWH appeared to him and said to | C-Ed | Angel of YHWH | Gideon | (angel of) | t, +normality: chosenness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Rhetorical</th>
<th>Discourse Prosody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then Gideon said to him, &quot;O my lord, if YHWH is with us, then why has all this happened to us? But now YHWH has abandoned us.</td>
<td>And where are all His miracles which our fathers told us about, saying, 'Did not YHWH bring us up from Egypt?'</td>
<td>He said to him, &quot;O Lord, how shall I deliver Israel?&quot;</td>
<td>Command (1) command: &quot;Go in this thy strength and deliver Israel from the hand of Midian.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative + invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Interrogative + invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Interrogative + 1st verb</td>
<td>YHWH looked at him and said, &quot;Go and deliver...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional if, then...</td>
<td>&quot;Go in this thy strength and deliver Israel from the hand of Midian.&quot;</td>
<td>Rhetorical question: &quot;Have I not sent you?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative + invoked evaluation</td>
<td>&quot;deliver&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;deliver&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| According to Butler, Judges, 201: "Such a greeting indicated material wealth and personal good fortune (Gen 26:28; Judg 1:22; Ruth 2:4; 1 Sam 16:18; 18:12, 14; 20:13; 2 Sam 7:3; 2 Kgs 18:7; 1 Chr 9:20, 22:11, 16, 15:2; 2 Chr 20:17; Zech 10:5; compare Num 14:43)."

13 For the purposes of this study, the angel of YHWH and YHWH will be considered the same. Indeed, in the text the appellations switch back and forth. See Newsom, "Angels (Old Testament)," 1:248–253; Butler, Judges, 200.
Behold, my family is the most poor/helpless in Manasseh, and I am the smallest in my father's house."

But YHWH said to him, "Surely I will be with you, and you shall defeat Midian."

So Gideon said to him, "If now I have found favor in your sight, then make for me a sign that it is you who speak with me."

"Please do not depart from here until I come back to you, and bring out my offering and lay it before you."

"And he said, "I will remain until you return." But YHWH said to him, "Surely I will be with you, and you shall defeat Midian."

"If now I have found favor in your sight, then make for me a sign that it is you who speak with me."
<p>| 6.19 | Then Gideon went in and prepared a young goat and unleavened bread from an ephah of flour; he put the meat in a basket and the broth in a pot. | M | Narr | M | Angel of God | Angel of God | Angel of God | +normality: status |
| 6.20 | 3 Commands (I) | The angel of God said to him, &quot;Take the meat and the unleavened bread and lay them on this rock, and pour out the broth.&quot; And he did so. | M | Narr | Gideon | Narrator | 1, +propriety |
| 6.21 | When Gideon saw that he was the angel of YHWH, he said, &quot;Alas, O Lord God! | C-Ct | Gideon | Angel of YHWH | Gideon | +security: mistrust |
| 6.22 | Interjection | For now I have seen the angel of YHWH face to face. | C-Ct | Gideon | Angel of YHWH | Gideon | 1, +security: mistrust |
| 6.23 | YHWH said to him, &quot;Peace to you, you shall not die.&quot; | C-Ed | YHWH | YHWH | Gideon | +security: trust |
| 6.24 | Then Gideon built an altar there to YHWH and named it YHWH is Peace. To this day it is still in Ophrah of the Abiezrites. | M | Narr | YHWH | Gideon | t, +security: trust |
| 6.25 | Now on the same night YHWH said to him, &quot;Take your father's bull and a second bull seven years old, and give the flesh of the first bull to the men of Succoth, and the flesh of the second to the men of Shobach. | C-Ed | YHWH | force &gt; raise | YHWH | YHWH | +normality: status |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word(s) from Hebrew</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Tense/Tagm</th>
<th>Actor(s)</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>וְעָתוכֵּם אֶת־מַעְרֵפָּתֵךְ לְאָבֶד הָאֵלָה</td>
<td>and pull down the altar of Baal which belongs to your father.</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>וְעָתוכֵּם אֶת־מַעְרֵפָּתֵךְ לְאָבֶד הָאֵלָה</td>
<td>and cut down the Asherah that is beside it</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>וְעָתוכֵּם אֶת־מַעְרֵפָּתֵךְ לְאָבֶד הָאֵלָה</td>
<td>and build an altar to YHWH your God on the top of this stronghold in an orderly manner</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>וְעָתוכֵּם אֶת־מַעְרֵפָּתֵךְ לְאָבֶד הָאֵלָה</td>
<td>and take a second bull and offer a burnt offering with the wood of the Asherah which you shall cut down.</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>צֵדוּף</td>
<td>Adverbial.</td>
<td>&quot;in an orderly manner&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ot, +propriety&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>וַתְּכָרֵךְ אֶת־בְּנֵיכֶם כָּשֵׁר עַד־אַלְיֵי אֵלָה</td>
<td>Then Gideon took ten men of his servants and did just as YHWH had spoken to him;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>וַתְּכָרֵךְ אֶת־בְּנֵיכֶם כָּשֵׁר עַד־אַלְיֵי אֵלָה</td>
<td>and because he was too afraid of his father's household and the men of the city, which had got by day</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Father's household</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Superlative modifier</td>
<td>[too afraid...to do]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>מִכְּהֵן בְּבָאִל שְׁכֵנֵי בֶּן־יָוָן</td>
<td>When the men of the city arose early in the morning, behold, the altar of Baal was torn down,</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Gideon's destroying altar</td>
<td>Men of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>מִכְּהֵן בְּבָאִל שְׁכֵנֵי בֶּן־יָוָן</td>
<td>and the Asherah which was beside it was cut down.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Gideon's destroying altar</td>
<td>Men of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>מִכְּהֵן בְּבָאִל שְׁכֵנֵי בֶּן־יָוָן</td>
<td>and the second bull was offered on the altar which had been built.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Gideon's sacrificing the bull</td>
<td>Men of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>They said to one another, &quot;Who did this thing?&quot;</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>C:Cr</td>
<td>Men of the city</td>
<td>Gideon's destroying altar, etc</td>
<td>Men of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>And when they searched about and inquired,</td>
<td>C:Cr</td>
<td>Men of the city</td>
<td>Gideon's destroying altar</td>
<td>Men of the city</td>
<td>&quot;security: mistrust&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then the men of the city said to Joash, "Bring out your son, that he may die."

But Joash said to all who stood against him, "Will you contend for Baal, or will you deliver him?"

Whoever will plead for him shall be put to death."

If he is a god, then let him contend for himself, because someone has torn down his altar."

Logically, this applies to the men of the city's perspective rather than YHWH's.
Therefore on that day he named him Jerubbaal, that is to say, “Let Baal contend against him.”

Then all the Midianites and the Amalekites and the sons of the east assembled themselves; and they crossed over and camped in the valley of Jezreel.

So the Spirit of YHWH came upon Gideon.

He sent messengers throughout Manasseh, and they also were called together to follow him; and he sent messengers to Asher, Zebulun, and Naphtali, and they came up to meet them.

Then Gideon said to God, "If..."

"If you will deliver Israel through me,..."

There is some dispute as to whether this is in fact a jussive. “He will contend” may be a better translation, and may even imply that Joash has confidence in Baal. See for example Butler, Judges, 207. However, the implications for the evaluation of Baal are much the same: Baal does not contend with Gideon.

This positive evaluation would be according to a cultural norm, in that YHWH’s spirit comes on those he is pleased with and departs from those he is displeased with (e.g. Saul).

16 There is some dispute as to whether this is in fact a jussive. “He will contend” may be a better translation, and may even imply that Joash has confidence in Baal. See for example Butler, Judges, 207. However, the implications for the evaluation of Baal are much the same: Baal does not contend with Gideon.

17 This positive evaluation would be according to a cultural norm, in that YHWH’s spirit comes on those he is pleased with and departs from those he is displeased with (e.g. Saul).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6:17</th>
<th><strong>Conditional</strong></th>
<th><strong>... behold, I will put a fleece of wool on the threshing floor. If there is dew on the fleece only, and it is dry on all the ground,</strong></th>
<th>C.Ct</th>
<th>Gideon</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>Gideon</th>
<th>security: mistrust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Modifiers</strong></td>
<td><strong>[only]...[all]</strong></td>
<td>C.Ct</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>security: mistrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>&quot;deliver&quot;</strong></td>
<td><strong>that you will deliver Israel through me,</strong></td>
<td>C.Ct</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>security: trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>&quot;speak promise&quot;</strong></td>
<td><strong>as you have spoken promised,</strong></td>
<td>C.Ct</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>security: mistrust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6:18</th>
<th><strong>Invoked evaluation</strong></th>
<th><strong>And it was so. When he arose early the next morning and squeezed the fleece, he drained the dew from the fleece, a bowl full of water.</strong></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>YHWH (confirmed)</th>
<th>Gideon</th>
<th>security: mistrust</th>
<th>principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6:38</th>
<th><strong>Negated passive verb</strong></th>
<th><strong>Then Gideon said to God, Do not let your anger burn against us,</strong></th>
<th>C.Ct</th>
<th>Gideon</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>Gideon</th>
<th>security: mistrust</th>
<th>principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6:39</th>
<th><strong>Cohortative verb</strong></th>
<th><strong>that I may speak once more,</strong></th>
<th>C.Ct</th>
<th>Gideon</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>Gideon</th>
<th>security: mistrust</th>
<th>principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The only reason that there are two evaluations here is that the fulfilment of the sign confirmed both of the issues inscribed in the protasis of the condition above.

18 The only reason that there are two evaluations here is that the fulfilment of the sign confirmed both of the issues inscribed in the protasis of the condition above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Invoked</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Gideon</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>God did so that night: for it was dry only on the fleece, and dew was on all the ground.</td>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>[only]</td>
<td>[all]</td>
<td>1. +security: trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Then Jerubbaal (that is, Gideon) and all the people who were with him, rose early and camped beside the spring of Harod, and the camp of Midian was on the north side of them by the hill of Moreh in the valley.</td>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. +security: trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>YHWH said to Gideon, &quot;The people who are with you are too many for me to give Midian into their hands, Conjunction, evaluation</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–satisfaction: displeasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Now therefore come, proclaim in the hearing of the people, saying, 'Whoever is afraid, let him return and depart from Mount Gilead.'&quot;</td>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–propriety (arrogance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>&quot;afraid&quot; and trembling, let him return and depart from Mount Gilead.&quot;</td>
<td>Jussive verb with &quot;return&quot; &quot;depart&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–inclination: reluctance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So 22,000 people returned, but 10,000 remained.</td>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. –security: uneasiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Then YHWH said to Gideon, &quot;The people are still too many.&quot;</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. +security: confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Actor(s)</td>
<td>Audience(s)</td>
<td>Function(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 YHWH said to Gideon, &quot;You shall separate everyone who laps the water with his tongue as a dog laps, as well as everyone who kneels to drink.&quot;</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>t, ~normality: chosenness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 Now the number of those who lapped, putting their hand to their mouth, was 300 men; but all the rest of the people kneeled to drink water.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>300 men</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>t, ~capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 YHWH said to Gideon, &quot;I will deliver you with the 300 men who lapped; and I will give the Midianites into your hand, so let all the other people go, each man to his place.&quot;</td>
<td>C.Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>YHWH, Gideon</td>
<td>YHWH, Gideon</td>
<td>0 t, +security: trust, t, +normality: chosenness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 So the 300 men took the people’s provisions and their trumpets into their hands.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>300 Israelites who lapped</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>t, +normality: chosenness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 See Butler, Judges, 212-13 re vv. 7-8.
Midian was below him in the valley.

Now the same night it came about that YHWH said to him, "Arise, go down against the camp.

for I have given it into your hands.

"But if you are afraid to go down, [then] go with Purah your servant down to the camp, and you will hear what they say; and afterward your hands will be strengthened...

and you will hear what they say; and afterward your hands will be strengthened.

and you will go down against the camp.

So he went with Purah his servant down to the outposts of the army that was in the camp.

Now the Midianites and the Amalekites and all the sons of the east were lying in the valley as numerous as locusts;

and their camels were without number.

"as numerous as the sand on the seashore.
When Gideon came, behold, a man was relating a dream to his friend. And he said, "Behold, I had a dream; a loaf of barley bread was tumbling into the camp of Midian, and it came to the tent and struck it so that it fell, and turned it upside down so that the tent lay flat."

His friend replied, "This is nothing less than the sword of Gideon the son of Joash, a man of Israel." When Gideon heard the account of the dream and its interpretation, he worshiped YHWH in the midst of the elders of Israel.

He divided the 300 men into three companies, and he put trumpets and empty pitchers into the hands of all of them, with torches inside the pitchers.

---

21 The implication here is that since YHWH sent him to hear the dream and its interpretation, it was a message from YHWH, and thus true.

22 See note above.
| 
| He said to them, “Look at me and do likewise. And behold, when I come to the outskirts of the camp, do as I do.”
| 7.17
| Cc | Gideon | Gideon | Gideon | t, +normality: status
| 
| When I and all who are with me blow the trumpet, then you also blow the trumpets all around the camp and say, ‘For YHWH and for Gideon.’
| 7.18
| Cc | Gideon | Gideon | Gideon | t, +normality: status
| 
| So Gideon and the hundred men who were with him came to the outskirts of the camp at the beginning of the middle watch, when they had just posted the watch, and they blew the trumpets and smashed the pitchers that were in their hands.
| 7.19
| M | Narr | Dream/ YHWH | Gideon | t, +inclination: eagerness
| 
| When the three companies blew the trumpets and broke the pitchers, they held the torches in their left hands and the trumpets in their right hands for blowing.
| 7.20
| M | Narr | Israelites | Narrator | t, +capacity
| 
| and cried, “A sword for YHWH and for Gideon!”
| 7.21
| Cc | Gideon’s army | Gideon | Narrator | t, –propriety (arrogance)
| 
| Each stood in his place around the camp, and all the people raised a loud cry.
| 7.21
| M | Narr | Israelite army | Midianite army | –inclination: reluctance
| 
| crying out
| M | Narr | Israelite army | Midianite army | –happiness: misery
| 
| fleeing, as they fled.
| M | Narr | Midianite army | Narrator | –capacity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>7.22</th>
<th>Invoked evaluation</th>
<th>When they blew 300 trumpets, יהוה set the sword of one against another even throughout the whole army.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>יהוה</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>+capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>flee</em></td>
<td>and the army fled</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Midianite army</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>-capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>[דַּעְשָׁנ] as far as Beth-shittah toward Zererah, as far as the edge of Abel-meholah, by Tabbath.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>set</td>
<td>pursue</td>
<td>The men of Israel were summoned from Naphtali and Asher and all Manasseh, and they pursued Midian.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>רוח מְאֹד</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>+inclination: eagerness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperatives (!)</td>
<td>Gideon sent messengers throughout all the hill country of Ephraim, saying, &quot;Come down against Midian and take the waters before them, as far as Beth-barah and the Jordan.&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>+normality: status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>take</td>
<td>So all the men of Ephraim were summoned and they took the waters as far as Beth-barah and the Jordan.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Ephraimites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>set</td>
<td>capture</td>
<td>They captured the two leaders of Midian, Oreb and Zeeb,</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Ephraimites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>set</td>
<td>kill</td>
<td>and they killed Oreb at the rock of Oreb,</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Ephraimites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>-capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>set</td>
<td>kill</td>
<td>and they killed Zeeb at the wine press of Zeeb,</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Ephraimites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>-capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pursue</td>
<td>while they pursued Midian;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Midian</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>-capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>and they brought the heads of Oreb and Zeeb to Gideon from across the Jordan.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Ephraimites</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Rhetorical question</td>
<td>Then the men of Ephraim said to him, “What is this thing you have done to us, not calling us when you went to fight against Midian?”</td>
<td>C: Ct</td>
<td>Ephraimites</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Ephraimites</td>
<td>satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>And they (united) with him vigorously.</td>
<td>C: Ct</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Ephraimites</td>
<td>satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 8.2 | Rhetorical question | But he said to them, “What have I done now in comparison with you?"         | C: Cc | Gideon  | Ephraimites | Gideon  | +capacity               |
|-----|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|------------------------|
|     | Rhetorical question | Is not the gleaning of the grapes of Ephraim better than the vintage of Oreb? | C: Cc | Gideon  | Ephraimites | Gideon  | +security: trust        |
|     | Lexical metaphor  | [Is not the gleaning of the grapes of Ephraim better than the vintage of Oreb?]| C: Cc | Gideon  | force > raise | Gideon | +security: trust (applies to 2 rows above) |

| 8.3 | Invoked evaluation | “God has given the leaders of Midian, Oreb and Zeeb into your hands;  | C: Cc | Gideon  | Ephraimites | Gideon  | +capacity               |
|-----|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|------------------------|
|     | Rhetorical question | and what was I able to do in comparison with you?                         | C: Cc | Gideon  | Ephraimites | Gideon  | +capacity               |
|     | Rhetorical question | “anger spirit ... subsided”                                               | C: Cc | Gideon  | Ephraimites | Gideon  | +capacity               |
|     | Rhetorical question | Then their anger spirit toward him subsided when he said that              | C: Cc | Gideon  | Ephraimites | Gideon  | +capacity               |

| 8.4 | “weary” | Then Gideon and the 300 men who were with him came to the Jordan and crossed over, weary | M | Narr | Gideon and the 300 men | Narrator | -capacity               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.5</th>
<th>N Particle</th>
<th>He said to the men of Succoth, “Please give loaves of bread to the people who are following me.&quot;</th>
<th>C: Cc</th>
<th>Gideon</th>
<th>force &gt; lower</th>
<th>Gideon</th>
<th>+normality: status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb Cluster</td>
<td>Actor</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Modifiers</td>
<td>Discourse Prosody</td>
<td>Discourse Prosody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>expressed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td>the 300 men</td>
<td>Gideon's success</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>-capacity</td>
<td>Discourse Prosody</td>
<td>Discourse Prosody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>for they are weary,</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pursue</strong> with <strong>expressed pronoun</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The leaders of Succoth said,</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leaders of Succoth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Succoth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Succoth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Succoth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Succoth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Succoth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Therefore, when YHWH has given Zebah and Zalmunna into my hand,</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>YHWH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>then I will thrash your bodies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leaders of Succoth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>with the thorns of the wilderness and with briers.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>force &gt; raise</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>force &gt; raise</strong></td>
<td><strong>force &gt; raise</strong></td>
<td><strong>force &gt; raise</strong></td>
<td><strong>force &gt; raise</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>He went up from there to Penuel and spoke similarly to them; and the men of Penuel answered him just as the men of Succoth had answered.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Narrator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Penuel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Penuel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Penuel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Penuel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>So he spoke also to the men of Penuel, saying,</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I will tear down this tower.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Penuel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gideon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Penuel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Penuel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Penuel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Men of Penuel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Now Zebah and Zalmunna were in Karkor, and their armies with them, about 15,000 men, all who were left of the entire army of the sons of the east; for the fallen were 120,000 swordsmen.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Narrator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Arms of Zebah and Zalmunna</strong></td>
<td><strong>Narrator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Narrator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Narrator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Narrator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Narrator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t, -capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>Gideon went up by the way of those who lived in tents on the east of Nobah and Jogbehah, and attacked the camp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>When Zebah and Zalmunna fled, he pursued them and captured the two kings of Midian, Zebah and Zalmunna, and routed the whole army.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>Then Gideon the son of Joash returned from the battle by the ascent of Heres.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>And he captured a youth from Succoth and questioned him. Then the youth wrote down for him the princes of Succoth and its elders, seventy-seven men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>He came to the men of Succoth and said, &quot;Behold Zebah and Zalmunna, concerning whom you taunted me, already in your hand, that we should give bread to your men.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- The table represents the text in a structured format, likely for parsing or analysis purposes.
- The comments under the 'Comment' column vary, indicating different interpretations or annotations related to the narrative.
- The table includes elements such as 'taunted,' 'captured,' and 'routed,' highlighting key actions in the narrative.

---

24 - pc Mss G וס (apparatus)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>Gideon</th>
<th>Gideon's men</th>
<th>Gideon2</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Men of Succoth</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>-happiness: antipathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>-propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Death of men</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>-security: mistrust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>+veracity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>+normality: status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Zebah and Zalmunna</td>
<td>Zebah and Zalmunna</td>
<td>+normality: status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

25 Gideon himself adds this phrase to the comment of the men of Penuel.

26 Ju 816 for ἔρημος [made men to know, caused to learn = disciplined] rd. ἔρην [was/made apprehensive??] (< Barr Phil. 19f> (HALOT)); ** prb crrp, G* ἀπὸ ἀναβάσεως ἀρτές = πασός (Apparatus) = “from Ares ascent”; Targum has הרה “dragged”
| (step) | Expressed Pronoun | Invoked Evaluation | for as the man, so is his strength. | E:Ac Zebah and Zalmunna | Gideon | Zebah and Zalmunna | +capacity
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-------------------|-------
| "kill" | So Gideon arose and killed Zebah and Zalmunna, and took the crescent ornaments which were on their camels' necks. | M Narr | Gideon | Narrator | +capacity

8:22 Command (f) Then the men of Israel said to Gideon, "Rule over us," C.Ct Israelites | Gideon’s success | Israelites | +inclusion: encouragement

8:23 Specification both you and your son, also "deliver" for you have delivered us from the hand of Midian." C.Ct Israelites | force > raise | force > raise | +normality: (status)

But Gideon said to them, "I will not rule over you," C: Ce Gideon | force > raise | force > raise | +propriety

nor shall my son rule over you, C: Ce Gideon | force > raise | +propriety

Rolshen, 316
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:24</td>
<td>נוֹן נֵבְרָה נֹמֶל הַשָּׁלֹשֶׁת</td>
<td>And Gideon said to them, “I would request of you, that each of you give me an earring from his spoil.” (For they had gold earrings, because they were Ishmaelites.)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>-normality: status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:25</td>
<td>נוֹן נֵבְרָה נֹמֶל הַשָּׁלֹשֶׁת</td>
<td>They said, “We will surely give them.”</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:26</td>
<td>נוֹן נֵבְרָה נֹמֶל הַשָּׁלֹשֶׁת</td>
<td>So they spread out a garment, and each one of them threw an earring there from his spoil.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:27</td>
<td>נוֹן נֵבְרָה נֹמֶל הַשָּׁלֹשֶׁת</td>
<td>The weight of the gold earrings that he requested was 1,700 shekels of gold, besides the crescent ornaments and the pendants and the purple robes which were on the kings of Midian, and besides the neck bands that were on their camels’ necks.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:28</td>
<td>נוֹן נֵבְרָה נֹמֶל הַשָּׁלֹשֶׁת</td>
<td>Gideon made it into an ephod, and placed it in his city, Ophrah.</td>
<td>C:Ct</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:29</td>
<td>נוֹן נֵבְרָה נֹמֶל הַשָּׁלֹשֶׁת</td>
<td>and all Israel played the harlot with it there.</td>
<td>C:Ct</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>נוֹן נֵבְרָה נֹמֶל הַשָּׁלֹשֶׁת</td>
<td>so that it became a snare to Gideon and his household.</td>
<td>C:Ct</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Gideon and his household</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

27 HALOT, 244: הַשָּׁלֹשֶׁת with ל
28 The only reason there are three evaluations recorded here is that the victory over Midian resolved the challenges to YHWH’s character that Gideon offered separately in Judges 6.
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And the land was undisturbed for forty years in the days of Gideon.

Then Jerubbaal the son of Joash went and lived in his own house.

Now Gideon had seventy sons who were his direct descendants, for he had many wives.

His concubine who was in Shechem also bore him a son, and he named him Abimelech.

And Gideon the son of Joash died at a good old age and was buried in the tomb of his father Joash, in Ophrah of the Abiezrites.

Then it came about, as soon as Gideon was dead, that the Israelites turned back and played the harlot with the Baals, and made Baal-bethel their god. Thus the Israelites did not remember YHWH their God, who had delivered them from the hands of all their enemies on every side.

And Gideon was forty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned over Israel twenty-two years. And Jerubbaal (that is, Gideon) was one hundred years old when he died. And he was buried in Ophrah in the domain of Joseph. Then it came about after the death of Gideon, that the Israelites fell away and played the harlot with the Canaanites, and the Canaanites played the harlot with the Israelites, so that they could not anymore do anything in Israel. Therefore the hand of the LORD was against the Israelites all the days of the lifetime of Gideon.
Jephthah

| 10.6 | “do the evil thing” | Then the Israelites continued to do the evil thing | C:Ed, Narr | Israelites, Narrator | Discourse Prosody
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>in the eyes of YHWH, and served the Baals and the Asherah, the gods of Aram, the gods of Sodom, the gods of Moab, the gods of the sons of Ammon, and the gods of the Philistines; against Israel.</td>
<td>C:Ed, Narr</td>
<td>Israelites, Narrator</td>
<td>t, -propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeating (the gods of x)</td>
<td>thus they forsok YHWH and did not serve him.</td>
<td>C:Ed, Narr</td>
<td>Israelites, Narrator</td>
<td>-propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negated “serve”</td>
<td>Fixed lexical expression “serve”</td>
<td>C:Ed, Narr</td>
<td>Israelites, YHWH</td>
<td>-happiness: antipathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed lexical form “sold into the hands of”</td>
<td>and be sold them into the hands of the Philistines and into the hands of the sons of Ammon.</td>
<td>C:Ed, Narr</td>
<td>Israelites, YHWH</td>
<td>-propriety (justice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>“shattered”</td>
<td>They shattered</td>
<td>M, Narr</td>
<td>Philistines and Ammonites, Narrator</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“crushed”</td>
<td>and crushed the Israelites that year.</td>
<td>M, Narr</td>
<td>Philistines and Ammonites, Narrator</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then the Israelites continued to do the evil thing, and served the Baals and the Asherah, the gods of Aram, the gods of Sodom, the gods of Moab, the gods of the sons of Ammon, and the gods of the Philistines; against Israel. The anger of YHWH burned around them, and be sold them into the hands of the Philistines and into the hands of the sons of Ammon. They shattered and crushed the Israelites that year.
for eighteen years all the Israelites who were beyond the Jordan in Gilead in the land of the Amorites. The sons of Ammon crossed the Jordan to fight also against Judah, Benjamin, and the house of Ephraim, so that Israel was distressed. Then the Israelites cried out to Yahweh, saying, "We have sinned against you, and indeed, we have forsaken our God and served the Baals." "We have sinned against you." "Indeed, we have forsaken our God and served the Baals." "And served the Baals."

---

29 This evaluation refers to the act of confessing sin, not to the sin.
30 See the explanation for this assessment in the Jephthah chapter.
31 This evaluation and the three subsequent ones refer to the sin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>From the Egyptians, from the Amorites, from the sons of Ammon, and from the Philistines?</th>
<th>C:Ed</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>force &gt; raise x4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>&quot;oppressed&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Sidonians, Amalekites, Moabites, Israelites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;cried out&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;delivered&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;desired in the time of your distress,&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Israelites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(appeles to 2 rows below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressed emotion</th>
<th>[you]</th>
<th>C:Ed</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>force &gt; raise</th>
<th>(appeles to 2 rows below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>&quot;Yet you have forsaken me, and served other gods,&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Israelites, YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>therefore I will no longer deliver you.</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>YHWH, YHWH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(appeles to 2 rows below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Commands (1)</th>
<th>&quot;Go and cry out to the gods which you have chosen,&quot;</th>
<th>C:Ed</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>force &gt; raise</th>
<th>YHWH, YHWH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>&quot;cry out to the gods which you have chosen,&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Israelites, YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;let them deliver you,&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>YHWH, YHWH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(appeles to 2 rows below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Express emotion</th>
<th>[them]</th>
<th>C:Ed</th>
<th>YHWH</th>
<th>force &gt; raise</th>
<th>Israelites, YHWH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;distress&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Israelites, YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the time of your distress,&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ed</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Israelites, YHWH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(appeles to 2 rows below)
| 10:15 | Invoked evaluation | The Israelites said to the Lord, "We have sinned, you do to us whatever seems good in your eyes." | C, Cc | Israelites | Israelites | Israelites | t, +propriety32 |
| 10:16 | Invoked evaluation | So they put away the foreign gods from among them and served YHWH, and and but his soul was short with the mercy of Israel. | C, Cc | Narr | Israelites | Israelites | t, +propriety |
| 10:17 | Invoked evaluation | Then the sons of Ammon were summoned and they camped in Gilead. And the Israelites gathered together and camped in Mizpah. | M | Narr | Israelites | YHWH | t, -security: misery |
| 10:18 | Question, invoked evaluation | The people, the leaders of Gilead, said to one another, "Who is the man who will begin to fight against the sons of Ammon?" | C, Q | Leaders of Gilead | Lack of military leadership | Leaders of Gilead | t, -security: uneasiness |

---

32 This evaluation refers to the Israelites' confession of sin, not to their sinning.
33 This evaluation refers to the Israelites' sin.
34 See Judg 1:1 where the Israelites inquire of YHWH. Compare Judg 20:18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>Jephthah</th>
<th>Jephthah's half-brothers</th>
<th>Narrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>“valiant”</td>
<td>Now Jephthah the Gileadite was a valiant warrior, but he was the son of a harlot. And Gilead was the father of Jephthah.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>“drove out”</td>
<td>Gilead’s wife bore him sons, and when his wife’s sons grew up, they drove Jephthah out.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>“led”</td>
<td>So Jephthah fled from his brothers and lived in the land of Tob.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>It came about after a while that the sons of Ammon fought against Israel.</td>
<td>C: Ct</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>When the sons of Ammon fought against Israel, the elders of Gilead went to get Jephthah from the land of Tob;</td>
<td>C: Ct</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>“chief/commander”</td>
<td>and they said to Jephthah, “Come and be our chief/commander that we may fight against the sons of Ammon.”</td>
<td>C: Ct</td>
<td>Elders of Gilead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discourse: Prosody: ~normality: status

Narrator: capacity

Prosody: +normality: status

Narrator: ~propriety

Prosody: t, ~propriety

Inclination: encouragement

Security: mistrust

Security: +normality: status

Normality: status

Normality: status
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>English Text</th>
<th>Rhetorical</th>
<th>Invoked Evaluation</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>NARR</th>
<th>Oath Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Then Jephthah said to the elders of Gilead, “Did you not hate me and drive me from my father’s house?”</td>
<td>Rhetorical question with “hate”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“trouble”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>The elders of Gilead said to Jephthah, “For this reason we have now returned to you, that you may go with us and fight with the sons of Ammon and become head over all the inhabitants of Gilead.”</td>
<td>“returned”</td>
<td></td>
<td>that you may go with us and fight with the sons of Ammon and become head over all the inhabitants of Gilead</td>
<td>over all the inhabitants of Gilead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>So Jephthah said to the elders of Gilead, “If you take me back to fight against the sons of Ammon and YHWH gives them up to me, will I become your head?”</td>
<td>Conditional “if...then...” statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>The elders of Gilead said to Jephthah, “YHWH is witness between us.”</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation: Oath formula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>Then Jephthah went with the elders of Gilead, and the people made him head and chief over them.</td>
<td>Both “head” and “chief”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 Oath formula. GKC 149a, W-O 40.2.2.
Now Jephthah sent messengers to the king of the Ammonites, saying, "What is between you and me, that you have come to me to fight against my land?"

The king of the Ammonites said to the messengers of Jephthah, "Because Israel took away my land when they came up from Egypt, from the Ammon as far as the Jabbok and the Jordan;"

But Jephthah sent messengers again to the king of the sons of Ammon, and they said to him, "Thus says Jephthah, "Israel did not take away the land of Moab nor the land of the sons of Ammon."

For when they came up from Egypt, and Israel went through the wilderness to the Red Sea and came to Kadesh, then Israel sent messengers to the king of Edom, saying, "Please let us pass through your land,"

---

36 The messengers speak on behalf of Jephthah.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[88]</th>
<th>Me particle</th>
<th>[Please]</th>
<th>C: Message rs &gt; Jephthah &gt; King of Edom</th>
<th>force &gt; raise</th>
<th>King of Edom</th>
<th>Jephthah</th>
<th>t, -propriety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Invoked evaluation:** but the king of Edom would not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[88]</th>
<th>&quot;would not&quot; negated</th>
<th>[not]</th>
<th>C: Message rs &gt; Jephthah &gt; King of Edom</th>
<th>force &gt; raise</th>
<th>Israel's request</th>
<th>King of Edom</th>
<th>-inclination: reluctance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Invoked evaluation:** And they also sent to the king of Moab.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[88]</th>
<th>&quot;was not willing&quot; negated</th>
<th>[not was not willing]</th>
<th>C: Message rs &gt; Jephthah &gt; King of Moab</th>
<th>force &gt; raise</th>
<th>Israel's request</th>
<th>King of Moab</th>
<th>-inclination: reluctance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Invoked evaluation:** but he was not willing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[88]</th>
<th>Invoked evaluation</th>
<th>C: Message rs &gt; Jephthah &gt; King of Moab</th>
<th>force &gt; raise</th>
<th>Israel's request</th>
<th>King of Moab</th>
<th>-inclination: reluctance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

So Israel remained at Kadesh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[88]</th>
<th>Invoked evaluation</th>
<th>C: Message rs &gt; Jephthah &gt; King of Moab</th>
<th>force &gt; raise</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Jephthah</th>
<th>t, +propriety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Invoked evaluation:** Then they went through the wilderness and around the land of Edom and the land of Moab, and came to the east side of the land of Moab, and they camped beyond the Arnon, but they did not enter the territory of Moab, for the Arnon was the border of Moab.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>118</th>
<th>Invoked evaluation</th>
<th>C: Message rs &gt; Jephthah &gt; Israel</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Jephthah</th>
<th>t, +propriety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Cohortative verb:** And Israel sent messengers to Sihon king of the Amorites, the king of Hebron, and Israel said to him, "Please let us pass through your land to our place."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>119</th>
<th>Cohortative verb</th>
<th>C: Message rs &gt; Jephthah &gt; Israel</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>t, -propriety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Invoked evaluation:** But Sihon did not allow Israel to pass through his territory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>120</th>
<th>Invoked evaluation</th>
<th>C: Message rs &gt; Jephthah &gt; Sihon</th>
<th>Sihon king of Amorites</th>
<th>Jephthah</th>
<th>t, -propriety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**[88]"trust" negated [not trust]**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Message rs</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>so Sihon gathered all his people and camped in Jahaz and fought with Israel.</td>
<td>Sihon</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Sihon, Jephthah</td>
<td>t, +propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>'YHWH, the God of Israel, gave Sihon and all his people into the hand of Israel,'</td>
<td>Sihon</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Sihon, Jephthah</td>
<td>t, +propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defeated</td>
<td>and they defeated them;</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Israel, Jephthah</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessed</td>
<td>so Israel possessed all the land of the Amorites, the inhabitants of that country.</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Israel, Jephthah</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessed</td>
<td>'So they possessed all the territory of the Amorites, from the Ammon as far as the Jabbok, and from the wilderness as far as the Jordan.'</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Israel, Jephthah</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>'Since now YHWH, the God of Israel, drove out the Amorites.'</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>YHWH, Jephthah</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical question (implied)</td>
<td>from before His people Israel.</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Israel, Jephthah</td>
<td>t, +normality: chosenness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical question</td>
<td>are you then to possess it?</td>
<td>Ammon</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Ammon, Jephthah</td>
<td>-propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical question</td>
<td>'Do you not possess what Chemosh your god gives you to possess?'</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Israel, Jephthah</td>
<td>+propriety?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>'So whatever YHWH our God has driven out before us, we will possess it.'</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Israel, Jephthah</td>
<td>-capacity or -propriety?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical question</td>
<td>'Now are you any better than Balak the son of Zippor, king of Moab?'</td>
<td>Ammon</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Ammon, Jephthah</td>
<td>-normality: status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implication is that if Ammon possesses what their god gave them, Israel is justified in keeping what YHWH gives them. For discussion of the designation of Ammon’s god as Chemosh instead of Milcom, see the chapter write up.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Rhetorical question</th>
<th>Infinitive absolutes</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>C:</th>
<th>Ce</th>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Balak of Moab</th>
<th>Jephthah</th>
<th>+propriety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>'Did he ever strive with Israel, or did he ever fight against them?'</td>
<td>'While Israel lived in Hebron and its villages, and in Aroer and its villages, and in all the cities that are on the banks of the Amon, three hundred years, why did you not recover them within that time?'</td>
<td>'Therefore have not sinned against you, but you are doing me wrong by making war against me.'</td>
<td>C:</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>force</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>-propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>'therefore'</td>
<td>'may YHWH, the Judge, judge today between the Israelites and the sons of Ammon.'</td>
<td>'But the king of the sons of Ammon did not listen to the message which Jephthah sent him.'</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Jephthah's message</td>
<td>King of Ammon</td>
<td>-inclination: reluctance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>'listened'</td>
<td>But the king of the sons of Ammon did not listen to the message which Jephthah sent him.</td>
<td>'Then the Spirit of YHWH came upon Jephthah, then he passed through Gilead and Manasseh; then he passed through Mizpah of Gilead. Now from Mizpah of Gilead he went on to the sons of Ammon.'</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>t, +normality: chosenness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>'walked'</td>
<td>Then Jephthah made a vow to YHWH and said, 'If you grant my request, and do not fail me in what I ask you.'</td>
<td>Then Jephthah made a vow to YHWH and said,</td>
<td>C: Ct</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>-security: mistrust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Conditional statement</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td>Main Character</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>-tenacity: faithfulness</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>&quot;If you will indeed give the sons of Ammon into my hand,...&quot;</td>
<td>if...then... then it shall be that whatever comes out of the doors of my house to meet me when I return in peace from the sons of Ammon, it shall be YHWH's, and I will offer it up as a burnt offering.&quot;</td>
<td>C-Cl</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>C-Cl</td>
<td>Jephthah Narrator</td>
<td>(applies to two rows above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>Then Jephthah crossed over to the sons of Ammon to fight against them, and YHWH gave them into his hand.</td>
<td>He struck them from Aroer to the entrance of Mamre, twenty cities, and as far as the land of Geshur.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>t, +capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>So the sons of Ammon were subdued before the Israelites.</td>
<td>When Jephthah came to his house at Mizpah, behold, his daughter was coming out to meet him with tambourines and with dancing.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>J’s daughter</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+happiness: cheer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11.34 | besides her he had no son or daughter. | If she indeed go that way, she shall not return. | M | Narr | force > raise will have her commerce, and she shall return. | M | Narr | force > raise | (+NORMALITY: STATUS)}
When he saw her, he tore his clothes, and said, "Alas, my daughter!"

You have brought me very low, and you are among those who bring trouble on me; for I have given my word [opened my mouth] to YHWH, and I cannot take it back."

So she said to him, "My father, you have given your word to YHWH; do to me as you have said, for I may go to the mountains and weep because of my virginity, I and my companions."

Then he said, "Go." So he sent her away for two months.

At the end of two months she returned to her father, who did to her as she had said.

She said to her father, "Let this thing he done for me, let me alone two months, that I may go to the mountains and weep because of my virginity, I and my companions."

So she said to him, "My father, you have given your word to YHWH; do to me as you have said, since YHWH has avenged you of your enemies, the sons of Ammon."

Therefore she said to her father, "Let this thing he done for me, let me alone two months, that I may go to the mountains and weep because of my virginity, I and my companions."

Then he said, "Go." So he sent her away for two months.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Then the men of Ephraim were summoned, and they crossed to Zaphon and said to Jephthah, “Why did you cross over to fight against the sons of Ammon without calling us to go with you?”</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Ephraimites</td>
<td>Ephraimites</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Jephthah's failure to call them earlier</td>
<td>-propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>Jephthah said to them, “If and my people were at great strife with the sons of Ammon; Ephraimites’ reluctance Jephthah t, -reverence: antipathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>“When I saw that you were not a deliverer, and I took my life in my hands and crossed over against the sons of Ammon and YHWH gave them into my hand.”</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Ephraimites</td>
<td>Jephthah’s call to Jephthah</td>
<td>-reverence: antipathy</td>
<td>-propriety (applies to 2 rows above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 11.40 | that the daughters of Israel went yearly to commemorate account the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in the year. | M | Narr | Ephraimites | Jephthah | Jephthah and his people | -satisfaction: displeasure | -propriety |

| Question, invoked evaluation | We will burn your house down on you.” | C.C. | Ephraimites | Jephthah | Ephraimites | t, -happiness: antipathy |

| Armor goes to Jerusalem, and in the army of Ephraimites | C.C. | Ephraimites | Jephthah | Ephraimites | t, -satisfaction: displeasure |


| [you did not deliver me] “deliver” negated | C.C. | Jephthah | Jephthah’s force > raise | Ephraimites | Jephthah | -propriety |

| “deliver” negated | C.C. | Jephthah | Jephthah’s force > raise | Ephraimites | Jephthah | -propriety |

| While I saw that you were not a deliverer, and I took my life in my hands and crossed over against the sons of Ammon and YHWH gave them into my hand.” | C.C. | Jephthah | Jephthah’s force > raise | Ephraimites | Jephthah | +capacity |

| YHWH gave them into my hand.” | C.C. | Jephthah | YHWH | Jephthah | t, -propriety |

| Then why have you come up to me this day to fight against me?” | C.C. | Jephthah | Ephraimites | Jephthah | Ephraimites antagonism | t, -satisfaction: displeasure |
| Invoked evaluation | Then Jephthah gathered all the men of Gilead and fought Ephraim, and the men of Gilead defeated Ephraim, because they said, “You are fugitives of Ephraim, O Gileadites, in the midst of Ephraim and in the midst of Manasseh.” The Gileadites captured the fords of the Jordan opposite Ephraim. And it happened when any of the fugitives of Ephraim said, “Let me cross over,” the men of Gilead would say to him, “Are you an Ephraimite?” If he said, “No,” then they would say to him, “Say now, ‘Shibboleth.’” But he said, “Sibboleth,” for he was not able to speak this way. Thus there fell at that time 42,000 of Ephraim. Thus there fell at that time 42,000 of Ephraim. | M, Narr | Ephraim’s taunt | Jephthah | t, –happiness: antipathy | +capacity | t, –normality: status | +capacity | t, –happiness: antipathy | –capacity | –capacity | –propriety |
| Invoked evaluation | Men of Gilead | Narrator | +capacity | –capacity | –propriety |
| Invoked evaluation | Gileadites | Ephraim | t, –normality: status | +capacity | t, –happiness: antipathy | –capacity | –capacity | –propriety |
| Invoked evaluation | Gileadites | Narrator | +capacity | t, –normality: status | +capacity | t, –happiness: antipathy | –capacity | –capacity | –propriety |
| Invoked evaluation | Ephraimites | Gileadites | t, –happiness: antipathy | –capacity | –capacity | –propriety |

38 HALOT, 465: usu. rd. יָכֶש (to be capable) with MSS (: Driver ALUOS 3:16: rd. יָכֶש; to be able.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>Appeared to Manoah and his wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel of the Lord</td>
<td>Appeared to Manoah's wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israelites</td>
<td>Appeared to the woman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>Judge of Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>Invoked by Jephthah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gileadites</td>
<td>Invoked by Jephthah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narration Structure**

- **Samson**
- **Israelites**
- **Jephthah**
- **Narrator**

**Propriety**

- **Normality**
- **Displeasure**
- **Satisfaction**
- **Status**
- **Capacity**

**Discourse**

- **Prosody**
- **Semantics**
- **Lexical Evaluation**
- **Expression**
- **Repetition**
- **Drinking**
- **Eating**
- **Meditation**

**Events**

- **Manoah and His Wife**
  - Manoah's wife
  - Manoah's wife
  - Manoah's wife
  - Manoah's wife
  - Manoah's wife

**Evaluation**

- **Normality**
  - Manoah and His Wife
  - Manoah and His Wife
  - Manoah and His Wife
  - Manoah and His Wife
  - Manoah and His Wife
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Current Ed</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetition of v. 3</td>
<td>C-Ed</td>
<td>Angel of YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>Angle of YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and no razor shall come upon his head</td>
<td>C-Ed</td>
<td>Angel of YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and give birth to a son</td>
<td>C-Ed</td>
<td>Angel of YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and he shall begin</td>
<td>C-Ed</td>
<td>Angel of YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; lower</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to deliver Israel from the hands of the Philistines</td>
<td>C-Ed</td>
<td>Angel of YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then the woman came and told her husband, saying</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>Angel of YHWH</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>+normality: status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man of God came to me and his appearance was like the appearance of the angel of God</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>Angel of YHWH</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>+normality: status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And I did not ask him where he came from</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>Angel of YHWH</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>+security: trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But he said to me, 'Behold, you shall conceive</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>Angel of YHWH</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and give birth to a son</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>Angel of YHWH</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and now you shall not drink wine or strong drink nor eat any unclean thing</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>Angel of YHWH</td>
<td>Manoah's wife</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13:6 Then the woman came and told her husband, saying, "A man of God came to me and his appearance was like the appearance of the angel of God, and he said to me, 'Behold, you shall conceive and give birth to a son, and no razor shall come upon his head, for the boy shall be a Nazirite to God.' And he shall begin and he shall begin to deliver Israel from the hands of the Philistines."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>from the womb to the day of his death</th>
<th>C: Manoah's wife &gt; Angel of Yhwh</th>
<th>force &gt; raise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td>to the day of his death</td>
<td>C: Manoah's wife &gt; Angel of Yhwh</td>
<td>force &gt; lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then Manoah entreated YHWH and said, "O Lord, please let the man of God whom you have sent go to us again that he may teach us what to do for the boy who is to be born."

So the woman hurried and told her husband, "Behold, the man who came the other day has appeared to me."

Then Manoah arose and followed his wife, and when he came to the man he said to him, "Are you the man who spoke to the woman? And he said, "I am." Manoah said, "Now when your words come to pass, what shall be the boy's mode of life and his vocation?"

Then Manoah entreated YHWH and said, "Let the woman..."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>“She should not eat anything that comes from the vine nor drink wine or strong drink, nor eat any unclean thing; let her observe all that I commanded.”</td>
<td>Subject: She</td>
<td>Object: anything that comes from the vine nor drink wine or strong drink, nor eat any unclean thing</td>
<td>The angel of YHWH said to Manoah.</td>
<td>t, normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>Then Manoah said to the angel of YHWH, “Please let me detain you.”</td>
<td>Subject: Manoah</td>
<td>Object: the angel of YHWH</td>
<td>force &gt; detaint</td>
<td>+inclination: eagerness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>The angel of YHWH said to Manoah, “Though you detain me, I will not eat your food.”</td>
<td>Subject: The angel of YHWH</td>
<td>Object: Manoah</td>
<td>inelicitation: reluctance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>Manoah said to the angel of YHWH, “What is your name, so that when your words come to pass, we may honor you?”</td>
<td>Subject: Manoah</td>
<td>Object: the angel of YHWH</td>
<td>+normality: status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>But the angel of YHWH said to him, “Why do you ask this?”</td>
<td>Subject: the angel of YHWH</td>
<td>Object: him</td>
<td>t, -propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>So Manoah took the young goat with the grain offering and offered it on the rock to YHWH.</td>
<td>Subject: Manoah</td>
<td>Object: the young goat with the grain offering</td>
<td>+normality: status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For it came about when the flame went up from the altar toward heaven, that the angel of YHWH ascended in the flame of the altar. When Manoah and his wife saw this, they fell on their faces to the ground.

Now the angel of YHWH did not appear to Manoah or his wife again. Then Manoah knew that he was the angel of YHWH. So Manoah said to his wife, "We will surely die, for we have seen God." But his wife said to him, "If YHWH had desired to kill us, he would not have accepted a burnt offering and a grain offering from our hands, nor would he have shown us all these things, nor would he have let us hear things like this at this time." Then the woman gave birth to a son and named him Samson; and the child grew up and YHWH blessed him. And the Spirit of YHWH began to stir him in Mahaneh-dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Then Samson went down to Timnah and saw a woman in Timnah, one of the daughters of the Philistines.</td>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>So he came back and told his father and mother, “I saw a woman in Timnah, one of the daughters of the Philistines, now therefore, get her for me as a wife.”</td>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>E:Ac</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>E:Ac</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah</td>
<td>Samson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Then his father and his mother said to him, “Is there no woman among the daughters of your relatives, or among all our people, that you go to take a wife from the Philistines?”</td>
<td>Rhetorical question, Invoked</td>
<td>E:Ac</td>
<td>Manoah and his wife</td>
<td>Manoah</td>
<td>E:Ac</td>
<td>Manoah</td>
<td>Samson's request</td>
<td>Manoah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>But Samson said to his father, “Get her for me, for she is right in my eyes.”</td>
<td>Imperative, Invoked</td>
<td>E:Ac</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>E:Ac</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>However, his father and mother did not know that he had known the Woman of Timnah.</td>
<td>“know” negated</td>
<td>C:Pr</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Manoah and his wife</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>C:Pr</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>(Samson's marriage to) the Woman of Timnah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was she of Yhwh</td>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>C:Pr</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>(Samson's marriage to) the Woman of Timnah</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>C:Pr</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Samson himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for he was seeking an opportunity against the Philistines.</td>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>C:Pr</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>YHWH</td>
<td>C:Pr</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now at that time the Philistines were ruling over Israel.</td>
<td>“ruling”</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Then Samson went down to Timnah with his father and mother, and came as far as the vineyards of Timnah.</td>
<td>Invoked</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Samson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Characters</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Lion</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Annotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>The Spirit of YHWH rushed on forced entry into him, so that he tore him</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Sanon</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>as one tears a young goat</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>t, +CAPACITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>though he had nothing in his hand, but he did not tell his father or mother what he had done.</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Sanon</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>t, ~propriety (see v. 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>So he went down and talked to the woman, and she was right pleasing in the eyes of Samson.</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah</td>
<td>E: Et</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+normality: status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>When he returned later to take her, he turned aside to look at the carcass of the lion, and behold, a swarm of bees and honey were in the body of the lion.</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Sanon</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>t, ~propriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>So he scraped the honey into his hands and went on, eating as he went.</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Sanon</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>t, ~propriety (see v. 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>Then his father went down to the woman, and Samson made a feast there, for the young men customarily did this.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When they saw him, they brought thirty companions to be with him.

Then Samson said to them, "Let me now propound a riddle to you, if you will indeed tell it to me within the seven days of the feast, and find it out, then I will give you thirty linen wraps and thirty changes of clothes."

"But if you are unable to tell me, then you shall give me thirty linen wraps and thirty changes of clothes."

They said to him, "Propound your riddle, that we may hear it."

So he said to them, "Out of the eater came something to eat, And out of the strong came something sweet." But they could not tell the riddle in three days.

Then it came about on the fourth day that they said to Samson's wife, "Entice your husband, so that he will tell us the riddle in three days." And they said to him, "Propound your riddle, that we may hear it."

Command (I) Samson's wife, "Entice your husband, so that he will tell us the riddle."

"Have you invited us to impoverish us?"

Rhetorical question, "Is this not so?"

"Wept" Samson's wife wept before him, and said, "You only hate me, Woman of Timnah."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Modifier</th>
<th>C:Ct</th>
<th>Woman of Timnah</th>
<th>C:Ct</th>
<th>Woman of Timnah</th>
<th>Samson</th>
<th>-happiness: control</th>
<th>Repeated/</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Woman of Timnah</th>
<th>Refusal to tell</th>
<th>Samson</th>
<th>-inclination: reluctance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>&quot;wept&quot;</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Threat of companions</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah</td>
<td>-happiness: misery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>&quot;mocked&quot;</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Companions</td>
<td>Companions</td>
<td>+capacity: mental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>&quot;mocked&quot;</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>+normality: chosenness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Modifier:** Provides additional information to the base concept.
- **Woman of Timnah:** Mentioned in the narrative.
- **C:Ct:** Character/such as (NC: name)
- **Refusal to tell:** Tells the sons of his people that he will not reveal the riddle.
- **Samson:** Told his wife, "If you had not plowed with my heifer, you would not have found out my riddle."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text (Hebrew)</th>
<th>Lexical collocation</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>&quot;cheap&quot;</td>
<td>And his anger burned, and he went up to his father’s house.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>-happiness: antipathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>&quot;allowed&quot;</td>
<td>But Samson's wife was given to his companion who had been his friend.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah’s father</td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>t, -propriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Infinitive absolute</td>
<td>But after a while, in the time of wheat harvest, Samson visited his wife with a young goat, and said, &quot;I will go in to my wife in her room.&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>t, +inclination: eagerness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Infinitive absolute</td>
<td>Her father said, &quot;I really thought that you hated her intensely, so I gave her to your companion.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah’s father</td>
<td>Samson’s leaving</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah’s father</td>
<td>+security: confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Infinitive absolute</td>
<td>[intensely]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah’s father</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>-happiness: antipathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Comparative modifier</td>
<td>Is not her younger sister more beautiful than she?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah’s father</td>
<td>Daughter’s unavailability</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah’s father</td>
<td>+inclination: encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Jussive verb</td>
<td>Please let her be yours instead.&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah’s father</td>
<td>Daughter’s unavailability</td>
<td>Woman of Timnah’s father</td>
<td>+inclination: encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>&quot;forbidding&quot;</td>
<td>Samson then said to them, &quot;This time I shall be blameless in regard to the Philistines.</td>
<td>E:Et</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Samson, YHWH</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>&quot;forbidding&quot;</td>
<td>Samson then said to them, &quot;This time I shall be blameless in regard to the Philistines.</td>
<td>E:Et</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>-propriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Synopsis</td>
<td>Lexical collocation “do harm”</td>
<td>When I do them harm,”</td>
<td>E: Et</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Withholding of wife</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>t, -happiness: antipathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Samson went and caught three hundred foxes, and took torches, and turned the foxes tail to tail and put one torch in the middle between two tails.</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Withholding of wife</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>t, -happiness: antipathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>When he had set fire to the torches, he released the foxes into the standing grain of the Philistines, thus burning up both the shocks and the standing grain, along with the vineyards and groves.</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Withholding of wife</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>t, -happiness: antipathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Then the Philistines said, “Who did this?”</td>
<td>Expository question</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>Burning of crops</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>-satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And they said, “Samson, the son-in-law of the Timnite, because he took his wife and gave her to his companion.”</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>Withholding of wife</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>t, -satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So the Philistines came up and burned her and her father with fire.</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Burning of crops</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>t, -happiness: antipathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- propriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Samson said to them, “Since you act like this, I will surely take revenge on you, then after that I will quit.”</td>
<td>Emphatic HALOT 471</td>
<td>E: Et</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Burning of family</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>-satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E: Et</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>t, -propriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>He smote them</td>
<td>Modifier “smote”</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Withholding of wife</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>-happiness: antipathy</td>
<td>+capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with a great slaughter; and he went down and lived in the cleft of the rock of Etam.</td>
<td>Modifier “slaughter”</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>+capacity (applies to 2 rows above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with a great slaughter; and he went down and lived in the cleft of the rock of Etam.</td>
<td>Modifier “great”</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>+capacity (applies to 3 rows above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Narr</th>
<th>Slaughter of Philistines</th>
<th>Philistines</th>
<th>t, –happiness: antipathy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:9</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Then the Philistines went up and camped in Judah, and spread out in Lehi.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Narr</td>
<td>Slaughter of Philistines</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>t, –happiness: antipathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:10</td>
<td>Exegetical Question, invoked evaluation</td>
<td>The men of Judah said, &quot;Why have you come up against us?&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>Advance of Philistines</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>t, –security: mistrust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:10</td>
<td>Exegetical Question, invoked evaluation</td>
<td>And they said, &quot;We have come up to bind Samson in order to do to him as he did to us.&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>t, +propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:11</td>
<td>Rhetorical question, invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Then 3,000 men of Judah went down to the cleft of the rock of Etam and said to Samson, &quot;Do you not know that the Philistines are rulers over us?&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ct</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>t, +normality: status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:11</td>
<td>Rhetorical question, invoked evaluation</td>
<td>And he said to them, &quot;As they did to me, so I have done to them.&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ct</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>Philistine dominance</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>t, –inclination: reluctance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:11</td>
<td>Rhetorical question, invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Then 3,000 men of Judah went down to the cleft of the rock of Etam and said to Samson, &quot;Do you not know that the Philistines are rulers over us?&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ct</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>–capacity: mental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:11</td>
<td>Rhetorical question, invoked evaluation</td>
<td>And he said to them, &quot;As they did to me, so I have done to them.&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>t, +propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:11</td>
<td>Rhetorical question, invoked evaluation</td>
<td>And he said to them, &quot;As they did to me, so I have done to them.&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>+normality: status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>&quot;bind&quot;</td>
<td>They said to him, &quot;We have come down to bind you&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>–propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>&quot;give&quot;</td>
<td>so that we may give you into the hands of the Philistines.&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Yehova</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>&quot;swear&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Swear to me&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>–security: mistrust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>&quot;fall upon&quot; negated</td>
<td>lest you fall upon me yourselves.&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>–security: mistrust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:13</td>
<td>&quot;bind&quot;</td>
<td>So they said to him, &quot;No, but we will bind you securely&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>–security: mistrust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:13</td>
<td>&quot;secure&quot;</td>
<td>and give you into their hands;&quot;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>Force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>t, –normality: status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:13</td>
<td>&quot;kill&quot; negated</td>
<td>yet surely we will not kill you.&quot;</td>
<td>C:Ct</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>Force &gt; raise</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Judahites</td>
<td>–INCLINATION: RELUCTANCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then they bound him with two new ropes and brought him up from the rock. When he came to Lehi, the Philistines shouted as they met him. And the Spirit of YHWH came upon him mighty, so that the ropes that were on his arms were a flax that stood like reeds, and his bonds dropped from his hands. He found a fresh jawbone of a donkey, so he reached out and took it and killed a thousand men with it. When he had finished speaking, he threw the jawbone from his hand; and he named that place Ramath-lehi.

He became thirsty, and he called to YHWH and said, "You have given this great deliverance by the hand of your servant."
| Verse | Modifier | [great] | Subject | Object | Verb | |---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15:19 | Invoked evaluation | But God split the hollow place that is in Lehi so that water came out of it. | M | Narr | YHWH | Narrator | t, +propriety (compassion) |
| 15:20 | Invoked evaluation | So he judged Israel twenty years in the days of the Philistines. | M | Narr | Samson | Narrator | t, +normality status |
| 16.1 | Invoked evaluation | Now Samson went to Gaza and saw a woman, a harlot there, and went in to her. | M | Narr | Samson | Narrator | t, -propriety |
| 16.2 | Invoked evaluation | When it was told to the Gazites, saying, “Samson has come here,” they surrounded the place | M | ? | Samson | Gazites | -happiness: antipathy |
| | “surrounded” | and lay in ambush for him | M | Narr | Samson | Gazites | -happiness: antipathy |
| | “lay in ambush” | at the gate of the city | M | Narr | force > raise |
| | “kill” | And they kept silent all night, saying, “Let us wait until the morning light, then we will kill him.” | M | Gazites | Samson | Gazites | -happiness: antipathy |
| 16.3 | Invoked evaluation | Now Samson lay until midnight, and at midnight he arose and took hold of the doors of the city gate and the two posts and pulled them up along with the bars, then he put them on his shoulders and carried them up to the top of the mountain which is opposite Hebron. | M | Narr | Samson | Narrator | t, +capacity: physical |
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After this it came about that he loved a woman in the valley of Sorek, whose name was Delilah.

The lords of the Philistines came up to her and said to her, "Entice him, and see where his strength lies, and how we may bind him, and how we may afflict him."

Delilah said to Samson, "If you even die with the Philistines, I will not give you silver."
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Samson said to her, "If they bind me with seven fresh cords that have not been dried, then I will become weak and be like any other man."
| Delilah said to him, "Tell me how you are strong and whom you have evaluated, that I may become weak and be like any other man."
| And she said to him, "The cords with which you have bound me, those will I have at hand, and I will bind you with them."
| Then Delilah said to him, "Now the Philistines are upon you, and may God discern your strength as it was not discovered."
| Delilah said to him, "The Philistines are upon you, and may God discern your strength as it was not discovered."
| And Delilah said to him, "The Philistines are upon you, and may God discern your strength as it was not discovered."

So Delilah bound him with them, and said to him, "The Philistines are upon you, and may God discern your strength as it was not discovered."

But he said to her, "If they bind me with seven fresh cords that have not been dried, then I will become weak and be like any other man."

"And when the Philistines heard this, they brought up Samson from the house of his wife, and from the house in which he was bound."

And the Philistines said, "Bring Samson to us, that we may reason with him." But the Philistines did not reason with Samson, for they had put him in bonds."
For the ambush was lying in the inner room.

But he tore apart the ropes from his arms

Then Delilah said to Samson, “Up to now you have deceived me and told me lies; tell me how you may be bound.”

And he said to her, “If you weave the seven locks of my hair with the web and fasten it with a pin, then I will become weak and be like any other man.”

So while he slept, Delilah took the seven locks of his hair and wove them into the web. And she fastened it with the pin and said to him, “The Philistines are upon you, Samson!”

But he awoke from his sleep and pulled out the pin of the loom and the web.

Then she said to him, “How can you say, ‘I love you,’ when your heart is not with me? These three times you have deceived me.”

*Bracketed passages in vv. 13-14 are found in LXX only.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>It came about when she pressed him</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and urged him,</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>that his soul was annoyed/impatient</td>
<td>M Narr</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>so he told her all that was in his heart</td>
<td>M Nar</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I have been a Nazirite to God from my mother's womb</td>
<td>C Cc</td>
<td>t, +normality: chosenness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>If I am shaved, then my strength will leave me and I will become weak</td>
<td>C Cc</td>
<td>-capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and be like any other man</td>
<td>C Cc</td>
<td>-capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>When Delilah saw that he had told her all that was in his heart,</td>
<td>M Nar</td>
<td>+veracity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>she sent and called the lords of the Philistines, saying, &quot;Come up once more, for he has told me all that is in his heart.&quot;</td>
<td>M Delilah</td>
<td>+veracity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Then the lords of the Philistines came up to her and brought the money in their hands.</td>
<td>M Nar</td>
<td>-propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>She made him sleep on her knees, and called for a man</td>
<td>M Nar</td>
<td>+propriety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 Qere
and had him shave off the seven locks of his hair.

Then she began to oppress him, and his strength left him.

She said, "The Philistines are upon you, Samson!" And he awoke from his sleep and said, "I will go out as at other times and shake myself free." But he did not know that YHWH had departed from him.

Then the Philistines seized him and they brought him down with bronze chains, and he was a grinder in the prison.

However, the hair of his head began to grow again after it was shaved off.

16:21 In the house of the lords of the Philistines assembled to offer a great sacrifice to Dagon their god

and rejoiced, and to rejoice,

for they said, "Our god has given Samson our enemy into our hands."

---

41 The LXX suggests a Niphal pointing = "to become weak." HALOT, 853.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16:24</th>
<th>[_commands]</th>
<th>&quot;enemy&quot;</th>
<th>[events]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[.hebrew]</td>
<td>Wenn the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[command]</td>
<td>When the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[repetition]</td>
<td>When the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16:25</th>
<th>[commands]</th>
<th>&quot;enemy&quot;</th>
<th>[events]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[hebrew]</td>
<td>Even the destroyer of our country,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[command]</td>
<td>Even the destroyer of our country,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[repetition]</td>
<td>Even the destroyer of our country,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16:26</th>
<th>[commands]</th>
<th>&quot;enemy&quot;</th>
<th>[events]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[hebrew]</td>
<td>When the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[command]</td>
<td>When the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[repetition]</td>
<td>When the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16:27</th>
<th>[commands]</th>
<th>&quot;enemy&quot;</th>
<th>[events]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[hebrew]</td>
<td>When the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[command]</td>
<td>When the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[repetition]</td>
<td>When the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16:28</th>
<th>[commands]</th>
<th>&quot;enemy&quot;</th>
<th>[events]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[hebrew]</td>
<td>When the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[command]</td>
<td>When the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[repetition]</td>
<td>When the people saw him, they praised their god, for they said, &quot;Our god has given our enemies into our hands.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>2 Commands (I)</td>
<td>Then Samson called YHWH and said, “O Lord Yhwh, please remember me and please strengthen me just this time, O God,”</td>
<td>C:Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>4 Las verbs and pronouns, Cohortative verb</td>
<td>“avenged” that I may at once be avenged of the Philistines for my two eyes.”</td>
<td>C:Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>Samson grasped the two middle pillars on which the house rested, and braced himself against them, the one with his right hand and the other with his left.</td>
<td>C:Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>Invoked evaluation</td>
<td>And Samson said, “Let me die! I will die with the Philistines.”</td>
<td>C:Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And he bent with all his might so that the house fell on the lords and all the people who were in it.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So the dead whom he killed at his death were more than those whom he killed in his life.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Then his brothers and all his father’s household came down, took him, brought him up and buried him between Zorah and Eshtaol in the tomb of Manoah his father. Thus he had judged Israel twenty years.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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