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ABSTRACT

Chapters 8-12 of 1 Samuel have long been studied as a source of information about the development of a monarchy in ancient Israel. In modern scholarship the narrative in these chapters has usually been approached from the methodological perspective of historical criticism, in which an attempt is made to reconstruct both the historical events described in the narrative and the historical process of composition that resulted in the narrative. The result of 200 years of such study is that 1 Sam 8-12 is no longer read as a literary unit; individual units of the text are ascribed to various authors writing in various times and places, with various opinions about the concept of an Israelite monarchy.

The hypothesis explored in this dissertation is that it may yet be possible, perhaps even necessary, to read 1 Sam 8-12 as a literary whole in order to understand it properly. Moreover, initial surveying of the literary and rhetorical features of the narrative suggest that it is necessary to read 1 Sam 8-12 in the light of 1 Sam 1-7. Taken together, the various scenes in 1 Sam 1-12 constitute an episode in the continuing story of the theological-political experiment that was
ancient Israel's national existence. When these twelve chapters are read together, they are found to contain a coherent exploration of a single problem experienced by ancient Israel as it attempted to live in a covenantal relationship with its national God, Yahweh.

The methodological approach used in this dissertation may be characterized as a close reading of the text that attempts to discover the literary techniques of Hebrew narrative, to describe these techniques, and to use the resulting understanding of Hebrew narratology to understand and interpret the ideas presented by the narrative. The basic premise of this approach is that in order to understand an ancient text from a foreign culture, the modern reader must allow his reading to be guided and educated by the literary conventions of the text. The most basic requirement for this type of reading is that the reader describe the narrative, rather than evaluating it, either as literature or history.
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CHAPTER I

THE LITERARY ANALYSIS OF 1 SAMUEL 8-12

1. Review of Scholarship

The modern interpretation of 1 Sam 8-12, the conventional delimitation of the narrative describing the rise of the Israelite monarchy, has usually been undertaken using the methodology of historical criticism. The goal of historical criticism is to answer the questions "What actually happened?" and "Why?" about events reported in the Bible (E. Krentz 1975:37). In view of this ultimate goal it is necessary that the historical critic be circumspect about his narrative sources, the biblical books, which also have a history that must be investigated.

The writer's position as an observer, his internal consistency, his bias or prejudices, and his abilities as a writer all affect the accuracy of what he knows and the competence of the report. Where more than one report exists, they must be compared. If they disagree, this does not automatically mean that one is wrong. Differences may arise from the writers' position for
observation (Krentz 1975:44).

Before one can approach "what happened and why it happened," one must penetrate through the socio-historical context of the narrator who has filtered "what happened and why" in constructing his own narrative account.

The history of historical critical reckoning with 1 Sam 8-12 shows a continual focus on two features of the narrative that block the path to "what happened and why." First, there seem to be three conflicting accounts of Saul's inauguration as king: 1. Chapters 9:1-10:16, Saul is anointed to be nāgil, "designate"; 2. Chapter 10:17-27, Saul is chosen by lot to be king; 3. Chapter 11:1-15, Saul is made king in Gilgal after proving himself in battle (A. Weiser 1961:159-60). The perception of redundancy and inconsistency among these three accounts has led to the explanation that separate traditions or redactors have contributed to the narrative in the course of its transmission. This approach is evident in the Einleitung of J.G. Eichhorn, "So sind die Bücher durch die Beiträge verschiedener Zeitalter entstanden, auch durch die Hände verschiedener Überarbeiter gegangen und unter verschiedenen Gestalten und Ausgaben im Umlauf."
gewesen, bis sie ihre jetzige Form erhalten haben" (paraphrased by H.J. Stoebe 1973:35).

Secondly, these separate accounts or traditions in 1 Sam 8-12 seem to display markedly different attitudes towards the monarchy as an institution and towards King Saul himself. For example, in 8:7-8 the people's request for a king is characterized as rejection of God and equated with idolatry. This negative perception of the monarchy is also evident in 10:17-19 and 12:1-25. On the other hand, in 9:1-10:16 God himself sends a man to Samuel to be anointed nāgîd. The task of the nāgîd is strikingly reminiscent of Moses' task in Exod 3:7-10. He is to save Israel from the hand of the Philistines (9:16). Saul himself is praised in 9:2 and 10:23-24 but disparaged in 10:27.

Historical criticism has accounted for this multiplicity of opposing viewpoints on "what actually happened" with a hypothesis of multiple authorship from various periods of Israelite literary history. So J. Wellhausen, who discerns only two separate literary sources in 1 Sam 8-12, suggests, "In the great difference which separates these two narratives we recognize the mental interval between two different
The history of modern critical examination of 1 Sam 8-12 before Wellhausen exhibits several variations on the hypothesis of multiple successive authorship. Wellhausen wove the separate strands of his predecessors' hypotheses into one unified account of the narrative's development.

Wellhausen was able to correlate the two basic problems in 1 Sam 8-12—the three varying accounts of the inauguration of a monarchy and the two conflicting views of that institution—by dividing the narrative into what he saw as two separate versions (1899:240). One, anti-monarchic in viewpoint, appears in chs. 8, 10:17-27, and 12. The other, pro-monarchic, is seen in chs. 9:1-10:16 and 11.

It is obvious from the number of Wellhausen's literary strands—two—that he has subsumed the problem of three varying accounts to the criterion of pro- or anti-monarchism. He accomplishes this conjunction of two of the accounts, 9:1-10:16 and ch. 11, by noting that 9:16 is, literarily speaking, inconclusive, and requires the events of ch. 11 for a satisfactory resolution of events initiated in 9:1-10:16 (1973:251). What seemed, therefore, to be two
accounts of Saul's rise to power is in fact one; in 9:1-10:16 Saul is only king *de jure*, he becomes king *de facto* when he proves himself in ch. 11 (1973:250).

Having resolved the literary problems of the narrative, Wellhausen proceeds to explain the relationship between the two versions. He relates the two by setting each version within the context of Israelite history and the history of Israelite literature. The pro-monarchic version is earlier and expresses ancient Israel's gratitude to the men and institutions that ended the anarchy and oppression characteristic of the period of the judges (1973:254). The anti-monarchic version presented in chs. 8, 10:17-19, and 12 is the product of the exilic or post-exilic religious community. Those people knew nothing of government or statehood and so retrojected their theocratic concerns back to the early history of the monarchy (1973:255-56). The anti-monarchic version is much later than the pro-monarchic and is dependent on the latter; the anti-monarchic is unhistorical, the pro-monarchic is the genuine tradition (1973:255).

For Wellhausen, the establishment of an historical setting for each strand of the narrative takes the place of specific textual interpretation.
Any statement or view in either version is understood in the context of the historical milieu of its author rather than in its existing literary context. The two versions are compared and contrasted but the explanation of their differences is always traced to their separate historical contexts.²

Wellhausen's analysis of 1 Sam 8-12 is the classic formulation of scholarship in his day, but it is even more important for the paradigmatic role it has played in subsequent scholarship. Although there have been two broad shifts in hypotheses about the mechanisms of literary growth and accretion in the narrative—from Wellhausen's two separate versions, to three separate and possibly contemporary traditions (e.g., A. Weiser 1962; G. Wallis 1968; C. Hauer 1967) to complexes of one, two or even three redactions of earlier traditions (e.g., Noth 1967; Boecker 1969; Birch 1976; Veijola 1977; Langlamet 1978; McCarter 1980)—few examinations have stepped outside Wellhausen's paradigm.

**Wellhausen's Paradigm**

1. The separate components that together make up 1 Sam 8-12 must be isolated. This first step presupposes that the two problems of conflicts and
redundancy in the narrative are the result of composite authorship over an extended period of time. The theoretical framework of historical criticism is so heavily dependent on the literary dissection of narratives exhibiting conflicts or redundancies that it is almost impossible for any alternative explanation of these literary phenomena to occur. That these conflicts and redundancies might be functional exemplifications of narrative conventions is ruled out a priori. 3

2. Each component is analyzed to determine its author's intention and point of view.

3. A particular group or stratum of Israelite society is tentatively assigned authorship. In addition, a date and purpose for the composition is suggested.

The whole of the narrative can now be said to have been interpreted. All aspects of the text, especially the problems of conflicting viewpoint and redundancies, have been explained as the product of a particular school or view in a particular period of Israelite history. According to O. Eissfeldt it is only after determining the extent and nature, date, place, and purpose of the narrative components that
the structure and composition of a biblical book become intelligible (1965:130). The extrinsic nature of the historical approach is apparent. The narrative is explained and accounted for by tracing its origins.  

The historical critical approach has endured, albeit with modifications. Instead of literary sources, one speaks of "traditions" and "redactions." More importance is now given to the redactor's control over the content and shape of traditions that he uses. Nevertheless, interpretation is decidedly historical; the meaning of the sources (or traditions, or redactions) is uncovered by finding the particular time and place in Israelite history in which they were supposedly composed.

In the following review of works on 1 Sam 8-12, the dominance of the historical critical paradigm will be illustrated by schematization of each treatment according to the three steps described above. Rather than aiming at exhaustive treatment of all studies of the narrative, the review is thematically structured. Representative examples are reviewed under the headings of the three major varieties of historical criticism: source, tradition
and redaction criticism.\(^5\)

1. Source Criticism

a. K. Budde

i) Budde divides the narrative into two parallel independent sources (1902:xii, xviii, xix). His primary criterion for this division is the pro- or anti-monarchic viewpoint of the narrative components (1902:xii). Budde finds the pro-monarchic source in 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11, 15; 13; 14:1-46, and the anti-monarchic in 7:2ff; 8; 10:17-24a; 12; 15 (1902:xii). These two sources were combined by a deuteronomistic redactor, whose hand is apparent in 1 Sam 7:13-17; 14:47-51; 2 Sam 8 (1902:x). Although Budde agreed that his two sources were aggregates of pre-exilic traditions, he saw no visible evidence that would allow for a division of these sources into their respective components. "Weder Redaktionsspuren noch Unterschiede des Sprachgebrauchs noch sachliche Widersprüche innerhalb jeder der beiden Quellenschriften, noch gar selbständige anderweitige Überlieferungen stehn dafür zur Verfügung" (1902:xvii).

ii) Budde's analysis of the content of each source and their respective vocabularies brings him to recognize them as the Hexateuchal sources J and E
(1902:xviii-xix). The contents and tendencies of each source, J being the pro-monarchic and E the anti-monarchic, are explained with reference to the hypothetical characteristics of J and E in the Hexateuch (1902:xviii-xix).

iii) The identification of the two sources as J and E supplies a previously established place and date for them. Budde's identification of the anti-monarchic source with E caused him to date it much earlier than Wellhausen's post-exilic dating (Wellhausen 1975:254). The tone of the anti-monarchic E is prophetic in viewpoint with particular dependence on Hosea (1902:xix). The pro-monarchic source reveals its identity in its exact correspondence with preceding J narratives in Joshua and Judges, and in its extensive agreement with the viewpoint and vocabulary of J (1902:xix).

Budde's examination follows Wellhausen's division of the narrative into two sources. His main contribution is to demonstrate the feasibility of other datings and social settings, besides Wellhausen's post-exilic Judaism, that can explain the anti-monarchic stance of what he called E.

b. O. Eissfeldt
i) Eissfeldt is the most recent and probably the last proponent of a purely source-critical explanation of the narrative. Eissfeldt agrees with Budde that the narrative sources J and E make up most of 1 Sam 8-12, but makes further subdivision in J, the pro-monarchic source. To J, he ascribes 9:1-10:15; 11:6a; 13:3-15, and to his L, ch. 11 (excluding v. 6a); 13:1-2, 16-23; 14 (1965:275). The two parallel strands J and L stand against E, and relate to one another like J and L in the Pentateuch (1965:208-09). L presents older, cruder, more historically credible narratives (1965:275).

ii) Eissfeldt's comments on the contents of the narrative are almost exclusively devoted to showing how the narrative components assigned to each source exhibit the typical characteristics of their respective sources. For Eissfeldt, these observations confirm the validity of the divisions made in the narratives and the ascription of the resultant components to the pentateuchal sources. An order of dependence is established from available pre-formed materials to L, to J (with subsidiary reliance on "living popular tradition"), to E, who undertakes a religiously biased reshaping of L and J, again, with
access to "Popular tradition" (1965:279-80). Points of view and intentions of the narrative components are, of course, identical with those previously established for L, J, and E.

iii) For Eissfeldt, as for Budde, the task of determining a date and social setting for each source is solved by pointing to the prior determination of this information in the analysis of the Pentateuch. The division of 1 Sam 8-12 into the sources L, J, and E (in order of dependence) reveals the structural evolution of the narrative. For Eissfeldt the latter result is equally as important as the analysis of single narrative components, in which it is presumed that Samuel can be understood as a simple collocation of numerous individual narrative components (1965:270). There is no question, however, in Eissfeldt's view, of any narrative unity in 1 Sam 8-12.

2. Tradition History

According to Stoebbe, a change in approach to the books of Samuel took place after H. Gunkel inaugurated his methods of tradition history and form criticism (1975:47). Gunkel attempted to come to terms with the long and varied history of the traditional elements that had been combined to form a
narrative, or for that matter, any of the supposed sources. It was his goal to compile a historical catalogue of the literary types represented in the Old Testament. "We must take the writings of the Old Testament, and, as many of these are collections of writings, we must take their constituent parts out of the order in which they happen to appear in our Canon and in which 'Old Testament Introduction' usually studies them, and then rearrange them according to the type to which they belong" (1928:59). Such literary history, "will only merit the title it claims when it can show how the literature emerged from the national history and was the expression of its spiritual life" (1928:67). The text as it now exists is, therefore, comprehensible only when the long history of traditions—the separate narrative components—has been traced and comprehended as a product of changing historical and social contexts. Speaking of the Genesis sagas Gunkel says, "...the sagas have already had a history in oral tradition before literary fixation; and this prehistory, ultimately of sole importance, is not to be reached through literary criticism" (quote from D.A. Knight 1975:79).

a. H. Gressmann
Gressmann developed Gunkel's views on the importance of an examination of the prehistory of narrative components in order to understand both the features of the resulting conglomerate narratives and the historical information purportedly contained therein.

i) Gressmann suggests that the conflicts and redundancies in the books of Samuel are not the result of a combination of sources such as is the case in the Hexateuch. He sees the isolated conflicts (vereinzeltete Widersprüche) and mutually exclusive redundancies (ausschliesslich Wiederholungen) as the product of variant manuscript readings that have been combined in the present MT (1921:xviii). As the recension represented by LXX shows, these manuscript variants represent variant traditions which are more or less valuable.

 Dann sind die hebräischen Handschriften zu irgend einer Zeit miteinander verglichen und die Lesarten, nicht wie es gegenwärtig die Herausgeber zu tun pflegen, am Rande sondern in den fortlaufenden Text aufgenommen worden.... Sie sind einem allzu pedantischen Bedürfnis nach Deutlichkeit entsprungen.
The MT has been further complicated by a long history of glossing, the effects of which must be eliminated by excluding these later additions to the traditional material (1921:xviii).

1 Samuel 8-12 is divided into two groupings of traditions according to their attitudes to the monarchy and Samuel. 7:2-8:22, 10:17-27, and 12:1-25 are anti-monarchic and in them Samuel is a judge and central administrator (1921:46). 9:1-10:16 and 11:1-15 are pro-monarchic and Samuel plays only a minor role (11:1-15) or is simply a seer (9:1-10:16).

Although in the present text ch. 11 is required as a resolution and conclusion of 9:1-10:16, they were originally separate; 9:1-10:16 is a Sage, while ch. 11 is a Geschichtserzählung, which gives us the only reliable information on the rise of the Israelite monarchy (1921:43).

ii) Gressmann understands the intent and point of view of a narrative component according to its generic traits. Once each tradition is generically categorized, it may also be dated and placed within the general framework of the Israelite literary periods established by Gunkel. It is primarily the place of a tradition (narrative component) in
Israelite literary history that allows modern readers to understand its nature and intent.

Gressmann finds three genres in the narrative:
1. historical narrative represented by ch. 11;

1. Historical narrative presents contemporary material or material from the immediate past. It deals, by Gressmann's definition, with leading political figures and events (1921:xiv). Only ch. 11 fits this definition while also fulfilling the requirement of agreement with the facts of Israelite history as known from the general history of the A.N.E. ⁹

2. Saga primarily portrays events from the past. The focus is on individuals, personal relationships, and only incidentally on political events (1921:xiv). While historical narrative portrays what really happened, saga only simulates such relation to reality, "...weil ihr der Wirklichkeitssinn fehlt" (1921:xiv). Chapters 9:1-10:16 fit this category admirably, "...in der nicht die Gesetze der Wirklichkeit, sondern die des Wunders herrschen" (1921:34).

3. Legend is Gressmann's third generic
category. It is distinguished from saga by its
tendentious edifying purpose. "Die Religion, die in
der Sage also der naturliche hintergrund der Worte
und Handlungen erscheint und deren zarter Duft uns
uberall erfreut, drangt sich in der Legende sehr
stark und bisweilen unangenehm auf. Das Wunder, das
in der Sage nur eine Nebenrolle spielt, ist von der
Legende völlig unabtrennbar, da sie in seiner
Atmosphäre lebt" (1921:xvi). The legend cycle of
Samuel (7:2-8:22; 10:17-27; 12:1-25) fits easily here,
denn die Art, wie gerade hier von Samuel berichtet
wird, tragt durchaus den 'Stempel religiöser Erbauung'
(1921:26).

Having categorized each narrative component,
Gressmann continues his exegesis by noting how genre
and contents manifest the particular style and view-
point of a certain period in Israelite literary
history. The great detail and leisurely pace of
9:1-10:16 are, for example, the result of a poet's
immersion in his heroic subject, of a folk perception
of folk heroes. The numerous similarities of this
section to fairytales are characteristic of Sage,
which is governed by "die Gesetze des Wunders" (1921:
34).
iii) Chapter 11 is a sober, factually based account of the rise of the monarchy (1921:44). It stands close in time to the events described and little critical sifting is required to determine what actually happened. Since by definition ch. 11 represents the earliest of the three genres present in 1 Sam 8-12 and since it is pro-monarchic, the anti-monarchic viewpoint of the legends must be later and unhistorical (1921:46).

Second in reliability and age is the saga in 9:1-10:16. Many details in this narrative are embroidery of a basic historical kernel, the result of a process of oral transmission in which beliefs became imperceptibly mixed with fact (1921:xii-xiv). Nevertheless, it is the oldest of the sagas and legends in 1 Sam 8-12 and stands relatively close to the events.

Finally, the legends in 7:2-8:22; 10:17-27; and 12 are late deuteronomistic reflections on the narrative (1921:xvi-xvii). Hosea was the first prophet to voice similar anti-monarchic sentiments (1921:28). Gressmann's opinion of these legends is clearly reflected in his comment on 10:17-27.

Wie Saul König wurde in Israel,
berichtet zuverlässig K.11. Da unsere Erzählung dazu nicht stimmt, kann sie keinen Ausspruch auf Glaubwürdigkeit erheben, sondern muss als Legende betrachtet werden....Ein frommes Gemut verlangt, dass der König durchs Los bestimmt werde, was die Geschichte auf andere Weise entscheidet (1921:41).

All important in Gressmann's exegesis is the narrative component's historical content, the value of the component varying proportionally with its historicity. His analysis of the literary history of the narrative is in fact a by-product of his attempt to obtain what he considers to be true historical knowledge about the rise of the monarchy from the traditions found in the text. Given that even the literary history of 1 Sam 8-12 is secondary to the goal of historical knowledge, it is obvious that the meaning of the narrative in its existing shape is totally irrelevant to Gressmann.

In *Mose und seine Zeit*, Gressmann summarizes his approach to texts that are "unreadable and incomprehensible" in their final form because they are simply a chaotic conglomeration of recensions,
...lesbar und verständlich wird sie erst, wenn man sie in die zusammengehörigen Abschnitte zerlegt und diese dann stereoskopisch hintereinander schaut. Bisweilen wird freilich gefordert, man dürfe die Schichten nicht nur abtragen, sondern man müsse sie auch wieder an ihren Ort zurückbringen, oder ohne Bild gesprochen, man solle die Quellenschriften nicht nur in der Vereinzelung betrachten, sondern auch den jetzigen Zusammenhang würdigen, in dem sie uns überliefert sind. Diese Forderung ist prinzipiell abzulehnen, weil sie Unmögliches verlangt. Man kann sich das an dem eben gebrauchten Bilde der Ausgrabung klar machen. Wer einen Trümmerhügel ausgräbt, tut es, um die Trümmer zum Reden zu bringen und ihre Geschichte festzustellen. Zu diesem Zweck trägt er Schicht um Schicht ab; denn nur die genaue Kenntnis der einzelnen Schichten und ihre chronologischen Aufeinanderfolge hat wissenschaftliche Bedeutung. Wenn er diese Aufgabe geleistet,
die Ergebnisse daraus gezogen und alle
Einzelfunde sorgfältig eingeordnet hat,
dann ist sein Werk schlechterdings
vollendet. Jene Forderung aber besagt,
dass er seine Ausgrabungen wieder
zuschütten, ja sogar dass er den wieder-
hergestellten Trümmerhaufen würdigen
und den Wirrwarr sinnvoll erklären soll!
Die Wissenschaft hat mit einer solchen
Aufgabe nichts zu tun (1913:22-23).

b. M. Noth

Gressmann's work set the stage for alterna-
tives to the source-critical approach to the nar-
native, but it was not until the publication of
M. Noth's Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (1967)
that a traditio-historical approach to this narrative
found wider acceptance. According to Birch,
Gressmann's analysis was found unacceptable because
it lacked an adequate explanation of how the indepen-
dent narrative components came together (1976:2). In
Noth's case, it appears that at least part of his
success was due to his emphasis on the conglomerative
process and on the redactional meaning thereby
imposed on the traditions. One could view the
scholarly rejection of Gressmann in favour of Noth as an indication that interpretation of narrative is more satisfactory when it includes the final form in its purview.

i) Noth agrees with Wellhausen's literary-critical divisions in the narrative, and so his analysis conforms to the paradigmatic explanation of conflicts and redundancies as indications of multiple authorship. On the basis of characteristic vocabulary and perspective, 7:2-8:22, 10:17-27a and 12:1-25 are identified as deuteronomistic (1967:54-55). In these sections, the deuteronomistic redactor (dtr) has attempted to modify the older traditions in 9:1-10:16 and 11:1-15.

ii) Again Noth follows Wellhausen's reading of the viewpoints expressed in the narrative. Dtr is anti-monarchic. The request for a king in 8:5 is portrayed as an expression of the people's sinful desire not to be dependent on God and his missionary judge for protection against enemies (1967:57). On the other hand, the older traditions (9:1-10:16, 11:1-15) "...of the election of Saul to the throne obviously refer to the event with unfeigned satisfaction; they see in it a work of the God of Israel
and they show an obvious delight in the personality and the first actions of the new king" (1960:172).

iii) Noth accepts the relative dating of the pro- and anti-monarchic traditions established by Wellhausen. Nowhere does he explicitly say why the pro-monarchic traditions are to be regarded as older. Noth does say, of dtr's anti-monarchic viewpoint, that "...it is likely that in this an attitude to the monarchy as such was being expressed which was certainly later confirmed time and again by the experiences which the people had of the institution, but which had, however, existed from the very beginning and had made itself felt even before the rise of the monarchy" (1960:172-73). By implication, the only time in Israelite history when a pro-monarchic view would have been possible was its birth. As Noth observes, "For the time being, however, the emergency was so great that there was hardly time for detailed discussion, and the hope placed in the new king, who had proved his worth so brilliantly in the battle against the Ammonites, was so great that all doubts about him faded into the background" (1960:173). Noth's most basic interpretation of the pro-monarchic elements of 1 Sam 8-12 is, therefore,
historical. The views expressed in 1 Sam 9:1-10:16 and 11:1-15 are the product of specific situations in Israelite history. We understand them by understanding the events that they describe.

The anti-monarchical stance of dtr's redactional sections in the narrative is congruent with the remainder of the dtr history, the purpose of which, according to Noth, is to collect Israel's historical traditions and compile them in such a way as to illumine the course of Israelite history in light of its conclusion. To explain Israel's catastrophic end from his exilic vantage, the dtr portrays the nation's history as a continual sequence of Israelite defections from the covenant with God. The terms of the covenant and the justice of God both require the punishment of Israel for the continual apostasy, and so Israel was destroyed and its people sent into exile.

Einen gewissen Höhepunkt erreichte der Abfall nach Dtr in der Forderung des Volkes einenmenschlichen König zu bekommen (I Sam 8:4ff). An diesem Punkte hat jedoch Dtr nun der ihm vorliegenden Überlieferung dadurch Rechnung getragen,
dass er jetzt die Verantwortung vom Volke auf das Königstum überträgt und damit zugleich das Königstum, das seinerseits ja an der gottlosen Forderung des Volkes nicht beteiligt gewesen war, als noch unbelastete Größe in die Geschichte einführt und so die Möglichkeit gewinnt, sich der überkommene positiven Bewertung besonders des auf die kurze Saulepisode folgenden Königstums Davids anzuschliessen, um dann freilich von diesem Punkte aus wiederum die Linie des immer Wachsenden Verfalls zu verfolgen bis zu dem bitteren Ende, das ihn selbst als Ereignis der jüngsten Vergangenheit unmittelbar berührte und dessen deutlich abschliessender Charakter ihn zu dieser ernsten Gesamtauffassung von der Geschichte seines Volkes veranlasste (1967:91-92).

Once again, Noth's interpretation of the antimonarchic sections of the narrative is historical; the text is the product of an individual (dtr) trying to comprehend his own historical situation by composing an historical etiology. All of Noth's literary
observations and interpretations of the text are
directed toward one end: the history of Israel (cf.

Wer daher die einzelnen Elemente dieser
geschichtlichen Überlieferung untersuchen
und weiter von da aus zu einer sachgemässen
Kritik der historischen Quellen und
schliesslich zu einer quellenmassig
begrundeten Darstellung der Geschichte
des Volkes Israel verstossen will, der
muss sich zunächst ein exaktes Bild
machen von Umgang und Art dieser
Sammelwerke und von dem Masse, in dem
diese die ihnen bestimmten Zusammenhang
in ein besonderes Licht gerückt haben;
nur so kann die Entwicklung der geschicht-
lichen Überlieferung selbst geklärt
werden (1967:1).

c. A. Weiser

Weiser's views on 1 Sam 8-12 represent a
reaction to both Wellhausen's source criticism and
Noth's redaction-critical adaptation of Wellhausen.
Weiser labels these views of the apparent conflicts
of viewpoint a "Schulbeispiel der Literarkritik"
He proposes instead, a "traditions-geschichtlichen Untersuchung" in which, "...die Fragen nach der Entstehung, der Eigenart und Tendenz, dem Ort und den Trägern der jeweiligen Überlieferungen soweit möglich geklärt werden, ehe ihre geschichtlichen Bezüge erkennbar werden, und der Rahmen herausstritt, in den ein Gesamtbild eingeordnet werden kann" (1962:1).

It is evident that Weiser rejects only the hypothetical division of the narrative into pro- and anti-monarchic strands, whether the latter are conceived as literary sources (Wellhausen et al.) or as traditions and redaction (Noth). His exegetical goal is still to establish an historical context in which the text can be set and from which it is comprehensible.

i) Weiser begins from the same observations as his predecessors. The narratives of Samuel "are not all of a piece" (1961:159). The "books of Samuel must be regarded as a compilation of heterogeneous literary compilations" (1961:159). The narrative complex is not explicable, as in the Pentateuch, as a compilation of continuous parallel strands running throughout the complex. Rather,
narrative complexes such as 1 Sam 8-12 are composed of groups of narratives "...which are not so much intermingled with each other as strung after each other, partly on a very loose thread" (1961:162).

Weiser, like Gressmann, uses a generic criterion to divide 1 Sam 8-12 into its component traditions: 1. 9:1-10:16, a popular saga; 2. 11:1-15, a historical narrative; and 3. chs. 7, 8, 10:17ff., 12, cultic and prophetic formulations and reshapings of earlier traditions (1961:162-63, 169-70).

ii) Weiser finds one central concern in each narrative component: in ch. 7, to honour Samuel as an authoritative and powerful prophetic figure and to outline his role in the religious and political crisis posed by the Philistine threat (1962:23, 28); in ch. 8, to describe the proceedings leading to the establishment of a specifically Israelite monarchy (1962:43-44); in 9:1-10:16, to narrate the anointment of Saul (1962:49), in 11:1-15, to portray the connection between Saul's heroic deeds in the Ammonite war and his subsequent elevation to kingship (1962:72); in 10:17-26, to point out that Saul was elected by lot (1962:65); and in 12:1-25, to show how Samuel managed the transition from theocracy to monarchy (1962:81).
Throughout his investigation, Weiser attempts to demonstrate that neither the so-called anti-monarchic nor the pro-monarchic source exhibits the unitary characteristics and point of view that it should if it really were a separate literary source. For example, the starting point and primary criterion for specifying 7-8:22, 10:17-27a, and 12 as one literary source is the so-called anti-monarchic viewpoint common to these narrative components. Yet in Weiser's reading, ch. 7 reveals no anti-monarchic tendencies (1962:27). Chapter 8 rejects only the non-Israelite monarchical model proposed by the people (8:5, 20) and not kingship per se (1962:27). Chapter 10:17-27a portrays the choice of Saul as the will of God and differs from ch. 8 in the representation of the historical motivation for the people's request for a king (1962:62). Chapter 12 differs from both chs. 8 and 10:17-27 in its recollection of the setting and reason for the request (1962:80). In Weiser's view, the disagreements far outweigh any commonality of viewpoint these traditions are said to share.

Although he is able to discern the efforts of a redactor to impress a single chronological and
factual context on the disparate traditions, Weiser is more concerned with the specific and idiosyncratic details of each separate tradition (1962:25). The differing details of each tradition are the product of the different social and religious contexts from which the traditions arose. The narrative, therefore, as well as the individual traditions and the apparent conflicts between them is best understood from the combined historical, sociological, and anthropological perspective that Weiser calls *Traditionsgeschichte* (1962:48).

iii) Weiser's explanation for the development of such markedly different recollections of the same basic historical events is historical.

Die auffallende Tatsache des ursprünglichen Nebeneinanders der in Rama, Mizpa, und Gilgal beheimateten Traditionen, das vom Sammler mühsam genug in ein zeitliches Nacheinander umgewandelt wurde, und sich der Gewinnung eines Bildes des historischen Ablaufs hemmend entgegengestellt, hat ihren Grund wohl darin, dass in der Zeit seit dem Verlust der heiligen Lade bis zu deren Einholung nach Jerusalem durch David in

Chapter 7, with its emphasis on cultic interests, points to a setting in a Yahwistic cult at
Mizpah (7:5) (1962:13, 22). Chapter 8 stems from "den Kreisen gleichgesinnter Vertrauter des Samuel in Rama" (1962:44). Chapter 9 is the combined result of Benjaminit tribal conceptions of the rise of Saul, and sacral elements from the circle of Samuel's successors (1962:57). Chapter 10:1-16 contains several different traditions on the question of the "Königscharisma" (1962:59). Chapter 10:17-27 is the product of an Israelite assembly at Mizpah and is shaped in accordance with the sacred covenant traditions (1962:67). Chapter 11 is a cult tradition of Gilgal (1962:78). Chapter 12 is also a product of the Gilgal cult and like 10:17-27, is closely linked with Israel's covenant ideology (1962:88, 91). In each case, Weiser's understanding of each tradition's significance is contingent upon the correct determination of its time and place of origin.

3. Redaction Criticism

a. B.C. Birch

i) Birch rejects the customary divisions of 1 Sam 8-12 because, for the most part, they are based on content and not critical analysis (1976:132). Instead, he divides the narrative into fragmentary old traditions, a pre-deuteronomistic edition of the old
...traditions that unified them in a coherent theological perspective (1976:141), and finally the deuteronomistic redaction supplementing the prior redaction (1976:135).

ii) The old traditional narrative fragments are functionally categorized by Birch as aetiological (7:7-12; 10:10-12), folkloristic (9:1-14, 18-19, 22-24; 10:2-4, 91, 14-16a), archival (14:47-51), historical (13:19-22), and military encounters (11:1-11) (1976:132). Generally the old traditions are favourable to the monarchy although they also give evidence of some opposition (1976:134). Samuel plays a less prominent role in the old traditions, either as a judge (magistrate) (7:15-17; 8), or seer/man of God (chs. 9 and 10) (1976:134-35).

The first edition of the old traditions gives indications of prophetic interest lying behind the edition. Certain characteristic prophetic genres such as the call narrative and judgement speech are found in the narrative (1976:142). The prophetic editor used the old traditions to illustrate his theological viewpoint. The king as the anointed of God bears special responsibility to fulfill God's law (1976:148).

The deuteronomistic redaction allows that God
has granted Israel a king, but is not enthusiastic about this fact (1976:137). "His main concern, however, is to fit the kingship into the larger framework of covenant obedience....The kingship is not in itself a sin, but it contains a potential for sin" (1976:137).
The deuteronomist is, therefore, not an antimonarchist viewing kingship as inherently evil (1976:138).

iii) Birch is cautious when it comes to dating each contribution to the narrative. In general it may be said that the traditio-historical approach as a whole, of which Birch's study is one example, is more concerned to establish a sociological context for any given tradition or narrative component, than to establish an exact historical context. This caution is a product of both the great uncertainties in Israelite history and literary history, and an increasingly sophisticated awareness of the complexity and diversity of Israelite society. Even having established a date for a tradition, the latter cannot be correctly understood until it has been placed in particular social context.

Of the old traditions, Birch says that little more can be said than that there is no reason to date
them at any great distance from the time of Saul (1976:133). The prophetic edition exhibits forms dating to the second half of the 8th c. B.C. The picture of the king accords better with the northern kings and so would be composed not much later than 721 when the northern kingdom fell (1976:152). The prophetic edition's concern to demonstrate Saul's failure to live up to his charismatic designation is possibly an attempt at theological interpretation of the fall of Samaria (1976:153). Saul, a northern king, failed in obedience and was rejected. David, a southern king, received the boon of an eternal royal dynasty (1976:153).

Birch notes that the deuteronomist is dated anywhere from Josiah in the late seventh century to 550 B.C. He maintains that the "wait and see" attitude towards the monarchy excludes the view that the anti-monarchic views in 1 Sam 8 and 12 support an exilic date (1976:140). Beyond this suggestion, Birch does not attempt to interpret the deuteronomistic sections of the narrative by dating them.

b. T.N.D. Mettinger

i) Mettinger follows divisions of the text customary since Wellhausen: the framework, consisting
of 7:2-8:22 and ch. 12, is an important part of the
dtr composition, separable by vocabulary and ideology

ii) According to Mettinger the dtr framework
exhibits a negative attitude to Saul's kingship. The
placement of ch. 7 before the request for a king in
ch. 8 makes the request seem unwarranted; Israel has
Yahweh and Samuel to deliver it from its enemies
(1976:80). Chapter 8:11ff. criticizes certain
aspects of the monarchy and denigrates Saul and his
kingship (1976:81). Chapter 12 demonstrates Yahweh's
continued preservation of his people and consequently
the willfullness of their request for a king.

Chapters 9:1-10:16 are a composite narrative
consisting of an old tale about Saul's search for his
father's asses reworked to include an anointing by
Samuel. The original tale testifies to the concep-
tion of the divine election of the king. Its
exhortation to the new king to perform a deed of
valour (10:7) reveals a martial ideal of kingship
(1976:79). The reworking of the old tale adds
further emphasis to the concept of a divinely
elected king by adding the official designation of
Saul as nāgīd (1976:79).
Chapter 10:17-27 presents Samuel as the last of the pre-monarchic saviours and supplies a link between those figures and the monarchy of Saul. "The presentation of Samuel as having personally arranged the lot-casting at Mizpah serves to create something of an 'apostolic succession': Saul is brought into line with the great pre-monarchic leaders" (1976:90-91).

Chapter 11:1-15 presents a very ancient conception of the divine election of a king in which the divine choice is revealed in the course of events that occurred in the rescue of Jabesh (1976:87). Saul is seen to be the same type of man as the earlier saviours (1976:96). Chapter 11:1-5 is the oldest and historically most reliable tradition of the beginning of Saul's kingship.

iii) Mettinger is among those scholars who prefer to speak of multiple deuteronomistic redactions (1976:20). Although he remains non-committal on the exact dating of these redactions he does say that the dtr redactions are the last elements in the process of development of traditions that resulted in 1 Sam 8-12. (1976:96).

The original tale of 9:1-10:16 is dated from
the reign of Saul. "When Saul had proved to be a good warrior and had established his reputation as a hero of Israel his youth became an interesting topic for tradition" (1976:75). Mettinger explains the text as a product of historical events. The interpretive strand of 9:1-10:16 indicates a date near Solomon's death and a social setting in northern prophetic circles (1976:79).

Chapter 10:17-27 was shaped "not by the actual historical circumstances in connection with the beginning of Saul's kingship but by the needs of a later time characterized by a tension between different ideals of kingship" (1976:87). Mettinger suggests that many of the features of 10:17-27 are explicable if the tradition is dated in the reign of Solomon and interpreted as a northern polemic against Solomon's kingship (1976:92-95).

Chapter 11:1-15 is the oldest and most historically reliable tradition. It is to be read as an account of actual events (1976:86-88).

c. T. Veijola

Veijola's redactional analysis of the narrative signals a return to an interpretation of the individual narrative components along the lines established by
Wellhausen. Rather than explaining the pro- and anti-monarchic tensions and the redundancies in the narrative as the result of the confluence of various traditions from different times, places, and social situations, Veijola sees the tensions and redundancies in the narrative as the product of two dtr redactors, one pro-monarchic and the other anti-monarchic.

i) Veijola, basing his hypothesis upon the prior studies of Smend (1971) and Dietrich (1972), suggests that it is possible to discern two different layers in the dtr history by paying careful attention to the vocabulary of the redactor (1977:12-13). Veijola makes the following divisions in 1 Sam 8-12:

1. DtrG - Judg 17-21; 1 Sam 7:5-15, 17; 8:1-5, 22b; 9:1-10:16 (a pre-dtr composition used by DtrG); 10:17-18α; 19b-27a; 10:27b LXX-11:15 (pre-dtr),

ii) After dividing the narrative between the two dtr redactors and claiming that division to be based upon discernible differences in vocabulary (1977:13), Veijola proceeds to suggest that the tensions and redundancies in 1 Sam 8-12 are the result of two consecutive redactions of the narrative.
The first dtr redactor made use of old pre-monarchic traditions to compose a narrative with the intention of portraying the monarchy as the answer to the anarchy and official corruption prevailing in pre-monarchic Israel (1977:68). Veijola calls this redactor "der eigentliche Geschichtsschreiber, DtrG" (1977:115). King Saul is for DtrG:

...eine Gestalt der Heilsgeschichte:
Jahwe hatte ihn auf den Plan gerufen, weil er 'die Not seines Volkes sah' (1 Sam 9:16b), und DtrG wies ihm eine zentrale Rolle in der Rettungsgeschichte seines Volkes zu, als er ihm die Befreiung des Volkes nicht nur 'aus der Hand der Philister', wie die 'alte Überlieferung wusste (1 Sam 9:16a), sondern 'aus der Hand seiner Feinde ringsum' in Aussicht stellte (1 Sam 10:1b LXX) und in der Fortsetzung auch die volle Verwirklichung dieser Zusage mit historisch aussehendem Material ausdrücklich bestätigte (1 Sam 14:47-48) (1977:118).

The second dtr redaction is a supplementary modification of DtrG's work. Veijola calls the second
redactor DtrN (Nomistic) due to the characteristic way this redactor evaluates all characters and events from the perspective of deuteronomic law (1977:119-22). For DtrN, the "spätere Schüler" of DtrG, the monarchy had become highly suspect (1977:115). "Als Gegner des Königstums hat sich im Laufe dieser Untersuchung der spätere nomistische Redaktor DtrN erwiesen, der den königtumsfreundlichen Ton in der Erzählung des DtrG über die Anfänge des Königstums (1 Sam 8-11) durch eine tiefgreifende Revision fast unkenntlich gemacht hat" (1977:119).

Armed with this explanation of the chronological development of the narrative, the exegetical difficulties posed by the narrative are quickly overcome. Read separately the two redactions are coherent, if contradictory, presentations of the place of the monarchy in Israel. All that remains to be done in order for us to understand these two presentations is to determine, if possible, who made them and when.

iii) Veijola does not offer specific datings for DtrG and DtrN. He does place DtrN after DtrG based upon his analysis of dependency between the redactions. The lack of specific datings for DtrG and DtrN is not an indication that these are unimportant
to Veijola’s approach, but rather that he has taken them for granted as established by his previous work (1975:137-42). Veijola’s concern in Das Königstum in der deuteronomistischen Historiographie is to supply further confirmation of the validity of the multiple deuteronomist hypothesis developed to explain the Davidic traditions.

d. F. Crüsemann

Crüsemann’s primary interest in 1 Sam 8-12 lies in the anti-monarchic expressions. The purpose of his book is to interpret anti-monarchic texts throughout the O.T. as the product of a particular group or social class in a particular period of Israelite history. Speaking of the anti-monarchic texts, Crüsemann says, "Ihnen ihr Recht widerfahren zu lassen, bedeutet in erster Linie die Situation, der sie entstammen, den Widerstreit, in dem sie stehen, zu rekonstruieren." (1978:16). Crüsemann outlines four steps leading to an understanding of the anti-monarchic texts: 1. The literary analysis of individual texts; 2. The development of a hypothesis about the possibility and locality of an anti-monarchic movement in Israelite history; 3. An analysis of the pro-monarchic texts and comparison
with the anti-monarchic texts. (As polemical political writings they may only be objectively interpreted in comparison with each other.); 4. The construction of a sociological model in which the sociological, political, and theological aspects of the text may be correlated (1978:16-17).

i) Crüsemann divides 1 Sam 8-12 between two redactors, each of whom has made use of pre-existing materials. The first redaction is found in chs. 9-11. Three separate traditions, 9:1-10:16, 10:21bβ-27, and ch. 11, have been roughly incorporated, joined by redactional links (9:2b; 10:13b-16, 26b, 27a; 11:12-13) (1978:58). Subsequently a dtr redactor has inserted material in 10:17-21bα, 24aα, and 25, which alters the meaning of this first redaction and links it with the dtr redaction of chs. 8 and 12 (1978:55). The dtr redaction of chs. 8 and 12 presupposes the prior redaction of chs. 9-11 and includes within itself older traditions in 8:1-3, 7, 11-17; 12:3-5, 12 (1978:61-62, 75). The remainder of chs. 8 and 12 exhibit the vocabulary and ideology that characterizes the dtr history.

ii) The intention of the pre-dtr redaction in chs. 9-11 is, "...die Legitimität des saulidischen
Königtums zu begründen. Es soll über alle Zweifel deutlich werden, dass Jahwe Saul und keinen anderen zum König über Israel bestimmt hat" (1978:59). Of the dtr redaction in chs. 8 and 12, Crüsemann says, "Hier besonders entfaltet der Dtr seine kritische Sicht und dialektische Beurteilung des Königtums und seiner Entstehung" (1978:60). Even some of the traditional material used in the dtr redaction is anti-monarchic. Chapter 8:11-17 is "...wohl nur zu verstehen als eindringliche Polemik gegen das Königtum" (1978:65) as are 8:7 and 12:12 (1978:84).

iii) Crüsemann's interpretations of the traditions and redactions that comprise the narrative are particularly conditioned by the effort to define the historical and social settings of the individual units.

Wenn Israel ja und nein gesagt hat, muss man entweder—wie Wellhausen und Budde—zu einem klaren zeitlichen Nacheinander kommen, oder zu einer Unterscheidung innerhalb dieser Größe. Das aber bedeutet, dass soziologisch gefragt, werden muss, ja dass das theologische Problem vom soziologischen untrennbar ist. Wann haben warum welche Gruppen in Israel
zu dieser Institution nein gesagt, wann welche warum sie bejaht? Wie also hängen die verschiedenen Theologien für und wider das Königstum mit einem sociologisch fassbaren Gegeneinander in Israel selbst zusammen? (1978:15).

Crüsemann says that the question against whom the redactor of chs. 9-11 directed his polemical legitimation of Saul is at the same time the question of the date of this redaction (1978:59). He dates the redaction to the period of the Davidic-Solomonic regime and suggests that it was an appeal to antimonarchists to join forces with partisans of the Saulides, the legitimate and deserving claimants to the throne (1978:59-60). Crüsemann does not offer a specific dating for the dtr redaction but seems to concur with H.J. Boecker's post-monarchic dating (1978:12, cf. Boecker 1969:98).

The pre-dtr unit 8:11-17 is an early attempt to arouse opposition to the monarchy among the "relativ wohlhabende grundbesitzende israelitische Bauern" (1978:73). According to vv. 11-17, this group of well-established Israelites can only lose from a monarchy; the economic consequences of the
monarchy for the landed gentry are used as an exhortation to anti-monarchic agitation (1978:73). Crüsemann states, therefore, "Nur aus der Situation des frühen Königtns, aber von hier aus auch im allen Einzelheiten, wird das Stück verständlich" (1978:72). Chapters 8:7 and 12:12, which express the unique view that divine kingship and human kingship are mutually exclusive options for Israel, require explanation of "...wie es zu einer solchen Entgegensezung kommen konnte und was mit ihr eigentlich geschieht. Das ist zugleich der Versuch, zu einer jedenfalls annähernden Zeitbestimmung zu gelangen" (1978:76). Crüsemann, however, thinks it impossible to be more specific than the Solomonic period as a terminus a quo and the fall of the northern kingdom as a terminus ad quem (1978:83). "Es hat also während der Königszeit in bestimmten Kreisen eine Vorstellung vom Königtn Jahwes gegeben, die deutlich im Gegensatz zur Jerusalemer Konzeption steht und Jahwe allein Funktionen zuschreibt, die sonst in dieser Zeit über den irdischen König vermittelt sind" (1978:83).

2. **Summary and Critique**

The historical critical interpretations of 1 Sam 8-12 regard the narrative as composite and
incomprehensible in its present form. This judgement is based upon an initial sequential reading of the text. The historical critic approaches the text in search of the historical realities which are also supposed to be the object of biblical narrative. Historical truth becomes the criterion with which biblical narrative is evaluated. Whether one is a conservative historical critic, expecting revelation in scripture to be truthful and accurate, or simply a historian desirous of understanding the events described, the principle of historical analogy requires that biblical narrative give a correct, logical, sequential representation of what happened.\textsuperscript{13}

When a narrative does not seem to meet this criterion and, like 1 Sam 8-12, contains conflicting evaluative statements and repetitions such as could not conceivably have taken place, the historical critic temporarily turns his attention from the subject matter of the narrative to the level of the narrative itself. The narrative, as a source for historical knowledge, has shown itself to be in need of preliminary examination and evaluation.

This evaluation takes the form of a shift from historical analysis of the narrative to literary
analysis of the separate narrative components. The perceived lack of narrative logic is replaced with an historical logic by explaining the separate narrative components as products of separate socio-historical contexts. Once each component is reset in its new non-narrative context it may be evaluated for its suitability as a historical source (cf. Mettinger 1976:16-17).

In the course of historical critical studies of 1 Sam 8-12 the literary disunity of these chapters has become axiomatic. Differences of opinion arise, but only on where to divide the narrative, and on what hypothetical socio-historical context best explains any given narrative component. M. Buber's reading of 1 Sam 7-12 as essentially a unity (with some accretion) has not been seen as a serious enough threat to warrant extensive refutation.14

Despite the fact that dissenting voices have been almost non-existent there is a relatively unexplored alternative to the historical-critical reading. It is possible that the historical-critical impression of literary disunity is not the result of any inherent quality of the narrative, but of the literary standards by which the historical critics
have judged the narrative. It is even conceivable that the methodological predisposition to fragmentary reading of biblical narratives has barred the way to any reasonable attempts to read the narrative as a unit. A reading of scholarly works on 1 Sam 8-12 reveals that the theoretical and empirical basis for the literary fragmentation of the narrative has been based at best on suggested differences in vocabulary, and in ideological and geographical horizons in the material, and at worst on impressionistic evaluations of what constitutes a unitary narrative.15

Speaking of the tensions in 1 Sam 8-12, H.P. Smith stated, "So great a discrepancy, not in details of the narrative only, but also in the whole view of the same period, is not conceivable in one author. It can be accounted for only on the hypothesis that various works have been combined in one" (1899:xvi). Smith's view, characteristic of the majority of critical readings of the narrative, fails to examine the possibility that the differing viewpoints within 1 Sam 8-12 may be subordinate to a single encompassing authorial point of view that is expressed and can only be heard in the narrative as a whole.
Within the study of literature, literary critics have perceived ideological tensions differently. T.E. Hulme, for instance, suggests, "A powerful imaginative mind seizes and combines at the same instant all the important ideas of its poem or picture, and while it works with one of them, it is at the same instant working with and modifying all in their relation to it and never losing sight of their bearings on each other—as the motion of a snake's belly goes through all parts at once and its volition acts at the same instant in coils which go contrary ways!" (cited from A. Preminger et al. 1974:846).

Before passing judgement on the literary continuity of 1 Sam 8-12, the applicability of Hulme's comment should be tested.

J.R. Vannoy (1978) has, in fact, recently suggested that the apparently diverging pro- and anti-monarchic tendencies are reconciled in a final covenant renewal ceremony in ch. 12. In ch. 12, the relations and respective roles of theocracy, monarchy, and people are defined and any ideological conflicts between pro- and anti-monarchic factions are resolved. The aim of such a narrative would be to explore all sides of the theological-political
problems of government in the special case of Israel, people of Yahweh. Such a purpose is far from the tendentious purposes that have been suggested for the separated narrative components.

F. Crusemann notes the existence of many other biblical texts that are uniformly either pro- or anti-monarchic (1978:19-55, 85-193). The polemics of such texts are manifest and straightforward, as is expected from literature that is designed to persuade its audience to accept a particular perspective on the topic of discussion. When, on the other hand, we are faced with a text that holds the two contrary views in a state of narrative tension, and we read unencumbered by the theoretical predisposition to regard such tension as prima facie evidence of a composite text, the possibility that a neutral perspective—a study of a debated problem—is being voiced cannot be overlooked. In fact, the tables can be turned. The existence of a text containing contradictory views should be assumed to present an examination of a controversy. Only when such an assumption proves unfruitful should genetic explanations be considered as a last resort.

A small number of scholars have recently
suggested that the interweaving of pro- and anti-monarchic voices is intentional and meaningful. What is lacking in all existing assertions of the unity of 1 Sam 8-12 is a detailed descriptive reading of the narrative to support the assertions, which otherwise remain hypothetical and are consequently ignored by supporters of the traditional historical critical position. A detailed demonstration of coherent plot and a formal (rhetorical) overall narrative design in 1 Sam 8-12 should obviate the resort to hypothetical sources, traditions, or subsequent redactions on the principle of parsimony. A comprehensive attempt at reading the narrative as a unity, that is, at interpretation of the existing narrative, is therefore necessary and desirable.

The approach to any biblical text as a narrative unit does not deny the possibility that there are redactional additions or modifications in the text. But it must be stressed that the act of labelling any part of the narrative as secondary and contextually incoherent is a last resort and may be a failure of interpretation rather than the narrative itself (cf. J.P. Fokkelman 1975:2). David Gunn suggests that even if a narrative has a complex
redactional history, the perceivable unity of the text is a product of mutual interacting influence between existing narrative elements (plot, character, insights, and values) and those who have worked with the narrative. Subtlety in the story, says Gunn, is not necessarily the intentional contrivance of one author; "rather it may be a subtlety created unconsciously in the dialectical process by which the story is created, a subtlety which is the logical resolution of the variously nuanced contributions and not a property of the contributions themselves" (1980:15). Gunn's view is helpful in directing the focus of interpretation away from tangential diachronic hypothesis, which is inherently non-verifiable, back to the interpretation of the existing text.

Another weakness of historical critical literary analysis, as B.S. Childs has suggested, is that the practice of isolating individual components of the narrative may lead to an unbalancing and overemphasis of certain aspects contained in those sections:

the final form of the text performs a crucial hermeneutical function in establishing the peculiar profile of a passage. Its
shaping provides an order in highlighting certain elements and subordinating others, in drawing features to the foreground and pushing others into the background (1979:77). The practice of dividing a narrative such as 1 Sam 8-12 into separate redactional sections followed by an interpretation of the individual sections as separate expressions of different socio-historical situations may mistakenly attribute independent status and even socio-historical existence to themes, viewpoints, and concepts that owe their existence and particular nuances solely to their actual setting in the context of the whole narrative, the final form of the text. The only pro- and anti-monarchists that we become acquainted with in 1 Sam 8-12 are those voices that find complementary expression in their intertwined appearance in the narrative. It is the whole text that supplies the formal and semantic context that is necessary for interpretation.

3. A New Approach to 1 Samuel 8-12

The purpose of the present reexamination of 1 Sam 8-12 is to try to interpret the narrative by reading it as a unity, without ruling out the possibility that there may be some aspects that may
not, or cannot be comprehended. The method employed can be broadly described as close reading of the text, a reading strategy recently studied and used by "new criticism."

The label "new criticism" has been applied to a practical and theoretical approach to English literature that was concerned with close readings of the individual work rather than with its socio-historical milieu. New criticism explored the structure of a work rather than attempting to divine the mind and personality of the author or audience; it attempted to deal with the literary object rather than its origins and effects (Preminger 1974:568). Each text is treated as a structural whole made up of many contributing and participatory parts. A close reading of a text seeks to uncover and describe the intricate reticular connections that unite the narrative (or poem), making it into a singular entity, however complex or devious its plot may be.

Though "new criticism" is now seen as a phase in literary study that has rightly been superceded as an overreaction to a previous overconcentration on historical criticism (F. Lentricchia 1980), its methods and theoretical emphases are still of great
value to biblical studies, where scholarship is just beginning to explore avenues outside of historical criticism.

Descriptions of structure in narrative are often divided into two categories. Seymour Chatman, for example, first describes the "what" of narrative, which he calls its "story." "Story" is composed of events and existents, character and setting (1978:9). Chatman's second analytical category is the "way" or "discourse" of narrative. Narrative discourse is the means by which a story is transmitted. Similarly, Conroy divides narrative analysis into two categories, the text as narrative ("what") and as language system ("how") (1978:viii-ix). Under "text as narrative," Conroy describes macro- and micro-contextual narrative patterns, plot of action and character, meaning and theme, narrator and reader (primarily point of view). 20 Under "text as language system" he places sound stratum (phonology), vocabulary, uses of direct speech (grammar and syntax), and techniques of organization (rhetorical structure).

Although this twofold division is well-suited to Chatman's purpose, which is to generate a general theory of narrative, it is not as useful when the
goal is a comprehensive understanding of the meaning of a single work.\textsuperscript{21} As P.M. Wetherill notes with regard to his own typology of the textual features that contribute to a text's meaning, "these categories should not be interpreted narrowly, nor should they be seen as watertight compartments: [they] represent different angles from which a text may be approached. They are therefore independent" (1974:xvi). The meaning of a narrative arises from the union of content (Chatman's story or "what") and form (discourse or "way"). The line between form and content is indefinite; the events of a narrative are part of its content and, arranged in a plot, they constitute its form (Wellek and Warren 1975:140). Since it is the goal of this study to understand the meaning of 1 Sam 8-12, the form/content division, though taken into consideration in all analysis, cannot be studied sequentially as first "form" and then "content," or vice versa. To arrive at meaning of a scene, sermon, or sentence we must view form and content together. As Ellis says, "the attempted distinction between 'what is said' and 'how it is said' when analyzed turns out to be no more than a distinction between 'gross surface meaning' and
'more differentiated investigated meaning'" (1974:183).

An interpretation produced by close reading will follow the order of presentation given in the text, noting along the way the various contributions of linguistic\(^{22}\) and literary\(^{23}\) devices to the developing meaning of the text. At the same time, the close reading of any biblical text, and especially of 1 Sam 8-12 must be a retrospective reading carried out in the light of the previous historical critical readings of the text. We have been cued to the tensions, doublets and varying points of view and their location in the narrative by historical criticism. A close reading will have to describe the contextual role of such phenomenon if the hypothesis that the narrative can be read as a unity is to be maintained.\(^{24}\)
CHAPTER II
DEFINING THE LITERARY UNIT

A major difficulty facing the biblical interpreter is to determine the appropriate contextual boundaries within which to interpret the particular story or concept that has been chosen for study. A basic convention of communication is to build interpretation on a completed communication. The meaning of a sentence can only be apprehended by taking all the words together. The same holds true for a paragraph, a chapter or an entire book. Any interpretation that disregards this rule cannot be accepted by other members of the communicating community. The traditional division of the Bible into books, chapters, and even verses has posed problems with respect to this convention, by separating material that often seems should be read together,¹ or uniting material that should be separate.²

A response to the problem of determining context in biblical interpretation that has received some acceptance is what D. Robertson calls, "a literary approach" to context. The contextual decision is determined by the question the interpreter
puts to the text, which is in turn conditioned by the potential of the text to respond (Bar-Efrat 1980:185). Robertson gives the example of an interpretation of Job as a Greek tragedy. Such an interpretation may be judged valid if there are certain conventions in Job that function as the conventions of Greek tragedy do (1977:10).

The reversal in the role of the interpreter—from a passive recipient of a completed communication to an active questioner who sets contexts—is only apparent. No matter what the communicative situation, contextual determination is always the product of two inputs, objective determinants (completed communications and the possibilities of texts) and the audience's subjective input (a decision as to what context, generic or thematic, is appropriate to a given utterance).

Central to the reading of every literary work is the interaction between its structure and its recipient. This is why the phenomenological theory of art has emphatically drawn attention to the fact that the study of a literary work should concern not only the actual text but also, and in
equal measure, the actions involved in responding to that text. The text itself simply offers 'schematized aspects' through which the subject matter of the work can be produced, while the actual production takes place through an act of concretization [by the reader] (Iser 1978:20-21).

With regard to the interpretation of a text, the would-be interpreter must first pose a question such as, "What happened when Israel's government changed from theocracy to monarchy?", before the answer of "schematized aspects" in the text can be heard. The definition of the literary unit, then, is part of the question and part of the answer. The interpreter has a specific question in mind when he seeks to determine what part of the text answers his question and the text simultaneously begins its answer by presenting structural and semantic features that influence the interpreter's contextual determinations. The definition of the literary unit is the beginning of the interpretational dialectic and there is no set point of entrance into this hermeneutical circle.

As Bar-Efrat notes, biblical narrative is
particularly intractable when it comes to establishing the boundaries of a literary unit. Narratives, complete in themselves, are linked with others to compose large literary units such as the patriarchal cycles. The larger units comprise books which in turn make up the Bible (1980:156). Bar-Efrat responds by suggesting that structure may be legitimately discerned and analysed in both small sections and comprehensive units (1980:56). We may find an idea completely presented in a sentence, a verse, a chapter, or a book.

Similarly, R. Knierim suggests that the text contains different possible units depending on the way a question is put to it and on the structural characteristics of the text. The number of contextual delimitations of any text is only limited by the number of the various themes and concepts in the text (1968:25). Knierim's suggestion may also be put in different terms. A text may be viewed from the analytical perspective of story and scenes that comprise story. An interpreter of story must read all scenes in proper order if he wants to understand story. It is, nevertheless, a valid enterprise to analyse a single scene by itself as long as the
interpreter bears in mind that the scene and its interpretation should ultimately be reintegrated with the story. In fact, as a reader progresses through a story composed of several scenes, he takes the course just described, that is, he interprets each new scene as he comes to it, but then integrates it into his reading of subsequent scenes.

A practical limitation also imposes itself on all biblical interpreters in their attempts to determine the correct literary context for interpretation. The amount of time and the great amount of writing space necessary to the composition of a good close reading of a text do impose real limitations on the amount of biblical text that can be encompassed in any single examination. Faced by such limitations "it is enough to be aware of the incompleteness implied in this approach and to accept it with good grace" (Conroy 1978:7).

The accepted boundaries for the narrative treating the rise of Israel's monarchy are from chs. (7)8 to 12 of 1 Sam. The central theme of these chapters has been seen as a history of the inauguration of the Israelite monarchy. The primary criterion for this textual delimitation has been
perceived differences in content, along with the assumption that thematic unity is basic to any narrative. This thematic concern has also been used to distinguish chs. 8-12 from their immediate context. A. Schulz, for example, suggests the following thematic division of 1 Sam 1-15:

1. Samuel's youth, chs. 1-3;
2. The Ark, 4:1-7:1;
3. Samuel and the monarchy, 7:2-12:15; and
4. Saul, the victorious king, and his rejection, chs. 13-15 (1919:vii).

Whether or not chs. 7, 13-15 are included in the narrative on the rise of the monarchy or the rise of Saul's monarchy as the case may be, there is virtual unanimity that at least chs. 1-6 must be treated separately. Although stylistic observations and arguments are advanced to support this division, the principle evidence is the seeming lack of thematic continuity between accounts of Samuel's birth and youth, the "ark narrative" (1 Sam 4-6), and 1 Sam 8-12. So, for example, H.W. Hertzberg states that chs. 1-3 show how Samuel replaces the Elders, chs. 4-6 are a history of the ark, and chs. 7-15 are the history of the beginnings of Israelite

Hertzberg's separation of chs. 1-3 and chs. 4-6 within chs. 1-6 exemplifies a scholarly consensus that has only recently been criticized as too fragmentary. In a series of articles, J.T. Willis has suggested that chs. 1-7 must be viewed as a meaningful whole that is thematically and stylistically unified (Willis 1971, 1972, 1979). According to Willis, the theological concern expressed in chs. 1-7 is presented in a well-attested biblical literary pattern:
1. Yahweh prepares a man to lead Israel through some crisis (1:1-4:1a); 2. The crisis is described (4:16-7:1); 5. The successful guidance of Israel out of the crisis is accomplished by the chosen man (7:2-17) (1971:298). The character of Samuel is obviously an important unifying element in Willis's reading, and yet it is partly because of Samuel's absence in 4:1b-7:1 that scholars have separated all or part of chs. 1-3 from chs. 4-6. Willis suggests that Samuel's absence from chs. 4-6 emphasizes that, without him, Israel's situation was rapidly deteriorating under the Elides. The failure of the Elides in chs. 4-6 is contrasted with the deliverance accomplished by Samuel in ch. 7 (1971:299). Whether
Willis's analysis is judged right or wrong, the ability of his interpretation to include ch. 4-6, where the main character does not appear, is based on a more sophisticated understanding of narrative technique and character. The most important justification of Willis's reading of chs. 1-7 as a whole is that he can suggest a theme that unites the narrative. The numerous rhetorical connections between those parts of the narrative separated in the conventional historical critical reading are used by Willis to buttress his argument for unity upon thematic grounds (1979:208 n.29).

If Willis's reading of chs. 1-7 is more satisfactory as an interpretation than reading in which the chapters represent a series of disconnected events and conglomerate historical descriptions, it is because his interpretation reveals meaning and order in the sequential combination of chapters. Willis's reading of 1 Sam 1-7 does not differ in logic of the reading process from historical critical readings. Just as Hertzberg used an argument of thematic unity to justify his claim that chs. 1-5 were a unit, Willis uses the same argument to support the unity of chs. 1-7. Willis's
reading does differ, however, quantitatively. His reading unites seven chapters; Hertzberg's units only three.

M. Perry describes the reading process as the construction of a system of hypotheses or frames to create the greatest amount of correlation between the various data of a text. These frames or hypotheses explain the "co-presence" of data in the text in reference to models derived from "reality," or from literary or cultural conventions (1979:43). Willis's "frame" for chs. 1-7, for example, is a literary convention (1971:298-99). Perry describes the logic of frame construction in the reading process as a hierarchy of three considerations:

1. The reader prefers a frame that links the highest number of textual data; 2. The frame that connects the data most closely allowing them the least degree of "freedom" takes precedence; 3. The simpler, more conventional and more typical a frame is, the more acceptable it is. "The validity of a hypothesis will increase in a direct ratio to the variety of the items it organizes and to the heterogeneity of the textual dimensions where they originate" (1979:45). Perry's three considerations are in the nature of self-evident
descriptions of what we find acceptable in interpretation rather than being hypotheses about the reading process. It is unlikely that anyone would dispute the claim that the goal of interpretation in any field of human inquiry is an explanation (frame) that is comprehensive, provides a single explanatory structure for all or most of the data, and last, but not least, elegant. Yet these three qualities of a superior interpretation are simply adjectival paraphrases of Perry's three considerations. Willis's reading of 1 Sam 1-7 is more valid in Perry's terms because it has greater organizing powers, granted that the text does exhibit the features of Willis's "OT hero narrative."6

Valid as Willis's reading of chs. 1-7 may be, it is possible to construct a more valid interpretational frame that is preferable to Willis's reading in all three of Perry's considerations. The hypothesis to be tested in this study is that neither chs. 1-7 nor 8-12 can be properly understood in isolation from each other. The narrative extending through chs. 1-12 should be interpreted as a coherent theological-political exploration of human and divine leadership in Israel. This exploration is presented
in the form of a literary representation of the events leading to the establishment of a monarchy in Israel.

In the context of the deuteronomistic history, this important narrative is thematically distinguished from the preceding events, the period of the judges, and from the following events, the period of the monarchies. Chapters 1-12 belong wholly to neither of these periods, and focus, instead, on the moment of transition lying between the two periods. Although there are obvious connections between chs. 1-12 and the stories of subsequent monarchs, especially Saul, in the deuteronomistic history, it is legitimate to study this narrative as a self-contained unit focused on one particularly important moment within the history.

The description of Israel's transition from theocracy to a theocratically subordinate monarchy is an episode, which differs from preceding scenes in that it is a digression in the story of Israel's theological-political relationship with God. As an episode, the description of the movement away from theocracy towards monarchy is separable from the on-going story of covenant and theocracy, yet it also arises naturally from that story. And,
subsequently (1 Sam 13ff.) the book of Samuel returns to the theocratic story. Ultimately, of course, the interpretation of chs. 1-12 will have to be incorporated, and thereby certainly modified, into an interpretation of the whole of the deuteronomistic history. Such a task, however, is far beyond the scope of a single study, especially in view of the novelty of this approach. ⁹

Several stylistic features distinguish the episode from its context. The unit occupies the important position of the opening of a book. Perry cites a number of psychological experiments studying the "primacy effect"—the effect of information situated at the beginning of a message—that have shown that the beginning of a message receives more attention than its continuation (1979:50-58; cf. Sternberg 1978, index under "Primacy effect"). The literary text can exploit the "primacy effect" for rhetorical purposes by placing first information that will guide the reader's construction of hypotheses about the story so that subsequent material is always read in light of these interpretations.

As K. Budde observed, 1 Sam 1:1 differs from
the opening verses of the two preceding books of the deuteronomistic history, Judges and Joshua. "Das Buch knüpft nicht ausdrücklich an das Buch der Richter an, wie dieses an Josua und Josua an den Pentateuch (vgl. Richt. 1,1. Jos. 1,1)" (1890:167). The opening verse thereby sets the following episode, which it introduces, apart from the previous series of scenes in Israel's theocratic history. The small stylistic difference between 1 Sam 1:1 and the introductory verses of Joshua and Judges is a subtle hint about the special significance of the episode that follows.

An obvious guideline for the establishment of the proper opening contextual boundary is the simple fact that the book begins at 1:1. "Begin at the beginning" (L. Carroll 1963:158).

The episode ends in ch. 12 with Samuel's great oration in which he surveys Israel's history of defection and lays down the law for the future. As Noth suggests, ch. 12 is one in a series of speeches made by the Israelite leaders in the deuteronomistic history (1967:5). These speeches punctuate the narrative; they are placed at the close of important epochs in Israel's theocratic
history. In the view of Noth, and most scholars since, 1 Sam 12 constitutes a summary and conclusion to the period of the judges, which in the biblical narrative, stretches from Judg 1:1 to 1 Sam 12:25.

One function of the formula in 13:1 is that it is the dr's customary way of introducing the beginning of a king's reign by stating the king's age at accession and the length of his reign (cf. S.R. Driver 1913:96-97; P.K. McCarter 1980:222-23). The placement of this introductory formula immediately after Samuel's speech indicates that the period of the judges is, indeed, finished and that the age of the kings has begun.

Chapter 12 also functions more specifically as the conclusion of the narrative begun in 1:1. Samuel, the last of the judges (7:8, 12:11) is introduced in ch. 1, and in ch. 12 he makes his retirement speech as sole political representative. In the speech, he specifically mentions the length of his service, which reaches back to events narrated in 2:11. Another link to the narrative prior to ch. 8, the accepted introductory limit for the interpretation of chs. 8-12, is provided by 12:10-11, which refer, among other things, to the events of ch. 7.
The renewal of the covenant relationship in ch. 12 satisfactorily resolves the covenantal tensions that begin in 2:12ff. with the Elide abuses. At that time, Yahweh was provoked to annul his promise of a priestly dynasty to Eli's forefathers (2:30-31). The covenantal issue continues through chs. 2-7, in which Yahweh's apparent abandonment (4:3) and open rejection of Israel (6:20) lead Israel to a reluctant worship of other gods (7:2-3). A reconciliation is achieved in ch. 7. Israel is repentent (7:3-9), and Yahweh is acting again to save Israel from its enemy (7:9-12). Immediately thereafter, however, the covenant is again in jeopardy (8:7-8), although this time, in contrast to chs. 4-6 where Yahweh abandoned Israel (4:5; cf. Exod 23:22-23), it is Israel that expresses a wish to have a king like the nations and to be like the nations—(8:5, 20). Yahweh and Samuel correctly interpret the request as an attempt to break free from the theocratic covenant (8:7, 18; 10:19; 12:12). Yahweh takes the initiative in chs. 9-20 and makes an effort to avoid a covenantal breech by granting the people's request for a human king. It is important to note, however, that Yahweh gives them a king and a monarchy that remain within the covenantal
framework. Saul is not a king "like all the nations"; on the contrary, he is described in the same words as Moses, the paradigmatic theocratic representative (cf. Exod 3:7, 9), as a deliverer given to Israel by its all-seeing, protective God (1 Sam 9:16). Saul's victory in 11:11 is described as deliverance wrought by Yahweh in 11:13. Finally, the covenantal inconsistencies are disposed of in ch. 12 which redefines (vv. 13-15) and reestablishes the covenant (vv. 6-15) in terms that emphasize Yahweh's initiative in the original covenant (v. 22; cf. Deut 7:6; 14:2). It was Yahweh who decided to elect Israel and to covenant with them; it is also Yahweh, therefore, who will say whether the covenant ends or continues, and not Israel.

This brief survey of the causal linkage provided by the theme of covenant relationship reveals that the section comprised by chs. 1-12 is also distinguished as an integral unit by internal considerations. A problem is introduced in ch. 2 and a resolution is not reached until ch. 12. And ch. 1, as Willis has demonstrated (1979), cannot be separated from the rest. Taken together, the internal causal concatenations and the external
stylistic boundary markers permit the exploration of the hypothesis that chs. 1-12 may be fruitfully explored as an episode in Israel's theocratic history.
CHAPTER III

SUMMARY OF THE NARRATIVE AND ITS STRUCTURE

In studies of this nature, where methodological emphasis is placed on a persistent attempt to discover and trace the narrative logic of the existing text by conducting a minute examination of various literary features, there is a recognized need to provide the prospective reader with a "map" of the narrative so that he does not get lost in the course of a lengthy discussion of a single detail (cf. Conroy 1978:10). Armed with a summary description of the narrative and some of its more important literary devices, the reader should be able to maintain a proper perspective on the place and purpose of all the details and the descriptions thereof, within the framework of the narrative as a whole.

The following summary is the result of several complete readings of chs. 1-12, during which my own reading experience of the narrative developed from an unschooled manipulation by each voice heard in the narrative towards an appreciation for the various structures of such things as plot and voice that shape the narrative into a unified, logical
whole. The reader who has not had the opportunity to read 1 Sam 1-12 several times prior to reading my description can use the summary both as a quick introduction and as a guide with which to check his understanding at any point in the study.

In particular, I have tried to highlight the parallel plot structure of chs. 1-7 and chs. 8-12 so that the reader will have at least some idea beforehand of the intricate patterns of relationship that exist between chs. 1-7 and chs. 8-12. A cursory reading through chs. 1-7 would not likely give the reader the idea that chs. 1-7 are of any importance at all to the subject of Israel's monarchy, as numerous studies of ch. 1-7 as a separate (fragmentary) narrative section indicate. The provision of a brief introduction to the plot structure of chs. 1-12 is also of practical significance, since in the detailed description, which follows the narrative's own logic of expositional logic, the patterns of relationship and the relevance of chs. 1-7 for chs. 8-12 do not surface until ch. 8. It would be neither fair nor prudent to ask any reader of a study written in the scholarly genre to plow through hundreds of pages without the foreknowledge that there was some
connection between the discussion and the topic of the study.

As noted above, most studies of 1 Sam 1-12 see a definite break between ch. 7 and ch. 8, though some have suggested that ch. 7 reinforces the anti-monarchic polemic of ch. 8 (e.g. McCarter 1980:150-51). The extent of scholarly agreement on this division suggests that the text itself must promote this reading. In fact, as will be shown below, chs. 1-12 do contain a momentary resolution of the tensions created in chs. 1-6 in ch. 7, which describes a renewed participation in the covenant by both Israel and Yahweh.

Chapters 1-6 trace the development of a major crisis in the covenantal relationship between Israel and Yahweh. Israel's priestly leadership becomes corrupt (2:12, 23-25, 29; 3:13-14) and debilitated (2:22, 25; 3:2, 13). Yahweh decides to punish the Elide priests by annulling his promise to them of a perpetual priestly dynasty (2:28-30; 3:12-14). Yahweh inflicts the promised punishment (2:31-34; 4:11, 18) but his use of the indiscriminating Philistine army as a tool brings suffering to innocent Israelites as well (4:2-5, 10).
Yahweh's responsibility for the indiscriminate slaughter of innocent people along with the guilty priests is made manifest by chs. 5-6. The defeat at Aphek/Ebenezer was not a result of Yahweh's powerlessness—he is more than equal to Dagon (5:1-5, cf. Miller and Roberts 1977:46). To make matters worse, Yahweh caps his victorious return to his own people by smiting them for looking "in," or "at" the ark; Yahweh makes a "great slaughter" amongst the people (6:19). The Israelites seem to be worse off for the return of their victorious God than they were without him. This warring God smites Israelites (nākā, 5:6, 9, 12); he makes a great slaughter (makkā gêdôlā, 6:19) amongst them after his victory over the Philistines just as he allowed or, in view of chs. 5-6, caused a great slaughter (hammakā gêdôlā mᵉêdôn, 4:10) of Israelites in his effort to punish the Elides before his Philistine conquest. The question in 6:20, "And to whom shall he go up away from us?" parallels the Philistine view of the ark and its God (5:8, 10; 11; 6:2). Yahweh's unfriendly greeting forces the Israelites to respond like the Philistines did (6:19-20), and their covenant with Yahweh has become a farce.
Yahweh had joined forces with the Philistines in the battle at Aphek (ch. 4) in contradiction to his sworn promise to make Israel's enemies his enemies (e.g. Exod 23:22). He has treated them like Philistines and consequently they have come to view him as the Philistines do—as a foreign deity (6:19-20).

In fact, Yahweh treats the Israelites as if he were bringing the covenant curse on them for some transgression. According to the formulation of Deut 28:25, Israel would be defeated before its enemies (niggāp līpnē ʾoyēbeykā) and forced to flee before them (tănūś lēpānāyw) exactly as in 1 Sam 4:2 (wayyinnāgep yīsrāʾēl līpnē pēliṣṭīm) and 4:10 (wayyānusū).

The question of the Beth-shemeshites, "Who is able to stand before this holy God?" (6:20) may reflect an interpretation of Israel's misfortune as enactment of the covenantal curse. The expression "to stand before Yahweh" appears several times in contexts where it has covenantal connotations.¹ When the men of Beth-shemesh pose their question, then, at least one implication of this ambiguous utterance is that Israel finds it very difficult to maintain a covenantal relationship with a holy, incomprehensible
God, who punishes where no apparent wrong has been done (cf. 4:3) and who treats his own people as if he had annulled his covenant with them. Like the Philistines, who finally realized that the ark of Israel's God should not be kept around (5:7ff.), the men of Beth-shemesh ask on whom they may unload the burden of Yahweh and his ark.²

The covenant relationship is at a low point. The ark (and its God) is put into "cold storage" (7:1-2, Hertzberg 1964:61). Israel mourns Yahweh "...wie um einen Toten" (Buber 1956:118, cf. Ezek 32:18; Mic 2:4 and the noun form in Jer 9:9, 17-19; Amos 5:16). From Samuel's statement in 7:3, it seems that Israel believed the covenant was finished, and that Yahweh was no longer a viable option as a national god. Accordingly, they turned to the worship of other gods.

Samuel proposes a scheme for a renewal of relations between Israel and Yahweh. Israel is to return to the service of Yahweh only, and in return Yahweh will deliver Israel from the Philistines (7:3). Both Israel and Yahweh accept Samuel's mediating suggestion and the covenantal relationship is restored. Israel's enemies are once again Yahweh's enemies.
(7:13; cf. Exod 23:22), Israel serves Yahweh alone (7:4), and everything functions smoothly again under Samuel's guiding mediation (7:5, 9-10) and judgeship (7:15-17).

Chapter 7 concludes with a peaceful scene. Yahweh is once again on Israel's side, lost territories are regained (7:14), and there is even peace with the Amorites (7:14). The havoc wrought by Yahweh's decision to punish Israel's priestly leaders has been repaired. Order and regularity prevail. Samuel judges Israel as circuit-judge, making his rounds "year by year" (7:16). All is once again well with Israel.

Scholars are, therefore, correct to suggest that ch. 7 presents a resolution of conflicts, as they are correct to observe that, surprisingly, ch. 8 introduces a new problem and series of tensions almost immediately after the resolution achieved in ch. 7. They are not correct, however, in the view that we see in chs. 7 and 8 the end and the beginning of two separate and unrelated literary complexes. According to Stoebbe, ch. 7 contains a far reaching rejection of the monarchy, yet there is not even an allusion to ch. 7 in ch. 8. The lack of references
to ch. 7 in ch. 8, which is supposed to be outspokenly anti-monarchic, is said to be the strongest argument for the later and separate origin of this chapter (Stoebe 1973:175). As several scholars have noted, however, ch. 7 is an important introduction to chs. 8-12. McCarter, for example, suggests, "We have seen a major crisis met and surmounted under Samuel's leadership. Our narrator would have us believe that at this point in history the people of Israel could perpetrate no greater breach of trust, no more arbitrary exercise of self-will, no more senseless deed of vanity than to demand for themselves a human king" (1980:151; cf. Birch 1976:11). Though I disagree with McCarter's understanding of the narrator's intention, he has correctly apprehended the importance of ch. 7 as an introduction to ch. 8. It is not only ch. 7, however, that establishes the terms of reference according to which ch. 8, or more precisely chs. 8-12, must be understood. Rather, it is all of chs. 1-7 that establishes a paradigmatic plot structure which is mirrored in the events of chs. 8-12 with many parallels in narrative structure, events, characters, motifs, locations, and vocabulary.

McCarter's observations that ch. 7 ends with
all well in Israel is correct. Before taking this situation as an aspersions on the elders' request for a change in the Israelite political structure (8:5), however, one must reckon with 8:1-3. In vv. 1-3, the narrator describes an unacceptable state of affairs in the family of Israel's theocratic leadership. The most remarkable thing about this situation is that it is virtually identical to the previous state of affairs in the Elide household, which also happened to hold a position of mediation between Israel and God.

In 8:1-3, Samuel has grown old just as his predecessor Eli had grown old (2:22; cf. 3:2; 4:18). Samuel's sons, whom he has established as judges for Israel, are not walking in his ways (8:3) just as Eli's sons are described as bēnē bēliyāʿal who do not know Yahweh (2:11). Samuel's sons pursue violent gains (bāsaʿ) just as Eli's sons customarily require their servants to commit acts of violence against Israelite worshippers (2:16). Although the wrongdoing of Eli's sons is cultic and that of Samuel's sons is connected to their duties as judges, the parallel is, as McCarter notes, striking (1980:160). In both cases the leadership of Israel, whether
responsible for the maintenance of cultic or civil order—both stipulated requirements of the covenant—has failed in the transition to a new generation.\textsuperscript{4}

The elders' request (8:5) is not, therefore, presented as an "arbitrary act of self-will" or a "senseless deed of vanity" (McCarter 1980:151); or "as in line with the people's customary depravity" (Smith 1899:55). Rather, it seems a perceptive evaluation of an actual situation (supported by the narrator's description in 8:1-3), and an attempt to forestall any recurrence of a divine reaction such as that precipitated by the Elide family. The elders of Israel ask Samuel to accomplish the change peacefully before Yahweh intervenes with another of his own bloody solutions to the problem posed by sinful theocratic officials.

The second half of the elders' request is also conditioned by the events of the Elide affair and the possibility of the same threat to the Israelite people from a God provoked by a mediator's sinful sons. The theocratic form of government poses a problem for Israel when its covenant mediators are unfit. Under a theocracy, the danger of unfit leaders is not limited to Israel's relationship with Yahweh,
but also affects the nation's political and economic stability. The misdeeds of Eli's sons were in the area of the cult yet the punishment came in the area of external defense; Israel suffered politically for the cultic sins of its priests. As long as the theocracy continues it is impossible to isolate the effects of bad representation.  

The people's request for a king to govern Israel as the other nations were governed is an attempt to secularize Israel's political structure in order to remove it from the perils inherent in the theocratic structure. The covenant had made Israel "a people dwelling alone, not reckoning itself among the nations" (Num 28:9). Israel became Yahweh's own possession, unique and separate from all the other peoples and nations on the earth (Exod 19:4-6; 33:16; Deut 7:6; 14:2; 26:18-19; 32:8-9). The desire to have a king to govern Israel as the other nations is a desire to limit or perhaps even to annul the covenant by making Israel's political system profane. The advantages are obvious in view of the events of chs. 1-7. The abuses of Israel's covenantal officials would no longer affect political stability. Israel's national defense would not be subject to
the vagaries of the theocratic defense system (1 Sam 4). The request for political identity with the nations is particularly suitable in view of Yahweh's treatment of Israel at Beth-shemesh (6:13-19). There he treated Israelites like he had treated Philistines, that is, he treated Israel "like the nations." Before Yahweh has a chance to do so again, Israel wants to become "like the nations" only without the pain. Yahweh correctly perceives the intent of the elders' request; they have rejected his theocratic kingship (8:7).

Yahweh decides to accede to the elders' request and Samuel warns them of the costs of the mundane security provided by a king (8:11-18). In spite of Samuel's gloomy predictions, the people express their preference for drudgery under a human king (8:17, 19-20) just as their ancestors had expressed their preference for servitude under the Egyptians over the uncertainties of freedom in the wilderness (Exod 14:10-12; 16:2-3; 17:1-4; Num 14:1-4) with Yahweh as their deliverer and king (Exod 15:18; cf. Buber 1958:74-79).

The narrative continues with a detailed description of the selection and establishment of
a human king. As Buber points out the peoples' request is granted but only in a vitiated form (1956: 121). At Yahweh's command Saul is anointed as nāgīd and not as king (cf. Buber 1956:127-28). Saul's mission as nāgīd is described in the same words as Moses's mission to the enslaved Israelites in Egypt (9:15-16; cf. Exod 3:7-10). Yahweh refuses to allow the removal of Israelite politics from the covenantal sphere. The king who was supposed to govern a profaned Israel becomes, in fact, an instrument of Yahweh, a new Moses sent to save Yahweh's people.

Though he was, by way of the Philistines, the actual cause of Israel's outcry (4:13-14), and so also a contributory cause of Israel's request for a king like all the nations, Yahweh presents himself and his "designate" (nāgīd) as the answer to the "cry of his people" (9:16), which is, by implication, the request for a king. Yahweh's response to Israel's request for a profane government is to reaffirm more strongly his own commitment to the covenant. Saul is anointed as nāgīd over Yahweh's "heritage", (nahālātō) which Yahweh provided for himself by bringing Israel out of Egypt (10:1; cf. Deut 4:20; 9:26, 29; 32:9). The events of 9:1-10:16 make it clear that Yahweh
relinquishes none of his covenantal claims or responsibilities to Israel. The people will have their king, but he will be a king under Yahweh. As Buber says, "Für den Erzähler bedeutet dieser Vorgang die von Gott befohlene Ablösung der unmittelbaren primitiven Theokratie durch die mittelbare" (1956:128).

The description of the aged Samuel and his miscreant sons (8:1-3) parallels and develops the sketch of the Elders (esp. 2:11-25). The elders' request for a king (8:5) to replace Samuel and his sons parallels God's judgment on the Elders (2:27-36; 5:11-14), differing from the latter in being an anticipation of divine judgement with a view to precluding another national catastrophe. The request, especially when the people reaffirm it by adding that their king will go out before them and fight their battles, calls Yahweh's kingship into question (cf. 8:7), and so parallels and develops the same question posed by the defeat of Israel in ch. 4. Likewise, 9:1-10:16 parallels and develops the reaffirmation of Yahweh's kingship made in chs. 5-6. In chs. 5-6, Yahweh demonstrated that he had not been defeated by Dagon and, consequently, that the Israelite defeat was initiated by him (cf. Campbell 1975:210; Miller
and Roberts 1977:70-72).

In ch. 8, the threat to Yahweh's sovereignty is a direct result of the Elide punishment/Israelite defeat in ch. 4. The Israelites fear another reprisal and their request attempts to preclude a new disaster. Chapters 9:1-10:16 describe Yahweh's measures to reassure the Israelites of his intentions toward them by reasserting his covenantal commitment. While 9:1-10:16 parallels chs. 5-6 in reasserting Yahweh's sovereignty, it also corrects the implications of chs. 5-6, and especially of 6:19-21, that he had ever repudiated his covenant. Scholars since Gressmann have commented on the providential unfolding of events that guide Saul from ass-seeking to the position of "designate" (e.g. Gressmann 1921:34; McCarter 1980: 184-86). Four times in the course of directing Samuel to anoint Saul, Yahweh calls Israel my people, ʾammi (9:16-17; cf. Buber 1956:127). The word of God (9:27) in 10:1 describes Israel as Yahweh's inheritance (nah₆lātô). Yahweh has not forgotten the covenant, nor does he relinquish it.

The conditional accession to the request, conditional by giving a nāgîd instead of a king, contains an implicit affirmation of the validity of
the request. The leadership is again corrupt and that situation could lead to another untoward overflow of divine wrath on Israel such as that experienced in the Israelite defeat (ch. 4; cf. Campbell 1975:199-200).

Again a parallel exists between Yahweh's implicit admission and the events following the return of the Ark in ch. 6. There the Israelite people were the injured party. Yahweh had apparently rejected them, slaying them first along with their corrupt priests (ch. 4) and then again at Beth-shemesh (6:19-20). Yahweh was responsible for the disruption of covenantal relationship, although there was partial justification for his acts in the provocation by the corrupt Elides. Yet the Israelites, as the offended covenantal party, make the first move toward reconciliation in 7:4. Similarly in 8-10:16, Yahweh is the rejected party. Israel rejects Yahweh at the reappearance of corrupt leadership. Israel's act is justifiable, but it is just as overzealous as Yahweh's punishment of the Elides. In both cases, the attempt to remove corrupt intermediaries, once by God and once by man, mushrooms into a rejection of the covenantal partner. And, once again we see, in the case of Israel's rejection of
Yahweh, that it is the offended party, Yahweh, who makes the conciliatory gesture (chs. 9-11).

As Samuel had called all Israel to assemble at Mizpah when they desired to repair the damage to their relationship with Yahweh (7:5), so he reconvenes the assembly at Mizpah, this time with the object of presenting Yahweh's proposal for mending the relationship (10:17). Both the use of the lottery to select the person (10:20-21) as well as the second question put to Yahweh about the whereabouts of Saul (10:22) emphasize that the selected person is chosen by Yahweh (cf. Gressmann 1921:41; Stoebbe 1973:218).

In spite of this emphasis on the divine choice of Saul (cf. 10:24), the people are initially unaware that the new monarchy is not exactly what they asked for. All the people respond affirmatively to the choice (10:24). Their unanimous acclamation, yéhi hammelek, expresses recognition and affirmation of the new royal authority (De Boer 1955:231). But the people realize what manner of king and monarchy God has granted only after Samuel reveals the constitution of the monarchy (mišpat hammélukâ) (10:25).

The emphasis in v. 25 falls, not surprisingly,
on the sacral nature of this new monarchy. The monarchic constitution is written down and installed before Yahweh in an open declaration that the new monarchy is not the profane monarchy that was requested.

It is no accident that Samuel waited until all the people acclaimed the king before telling them what kind of monarchy it would be. The reaction to Samuel's announcement is mixed. Some accept the arrangements and go with Saul. The narrator tells us why these individuals accept a monarchy that remains squarely in the sphere of theocratic domination—God had "touched their hearts" (10:26).

The $\text{bêñê bêliya}$, on the other hand, remain firm in their resolve to have a secular monarchy (10:27). Their criticism of Saul, "How will this one deliver us?", is not a personal attack on Saul, who stood head and shoulders above any other candidate (9:2; 10:23-24). Rather, this group of Israelites, which apparently consists of all those whose hearts had not been touched, sees that Yahweh has not given them the secular monarchy that they regarded as necessary to national security (8:20). A monarchy in which the king is chosen by God and in which the
constitution is written by a theocratic official and installed before Yahweh could not be farther from the type requested.

The question put by the bêne bêliya'kal, "How can this one deliver us?" (mah-yôši'ênu, 10:27), recalls the similar words and concerns of the Israelites at the previous Mizpah convention (7:8). There they had requested that Samuel not cease to cry to Yahweh so that he might deliver them (wêyôši'ênu) from the Philistines. In both cases, the certainty of Israel's deliverance by the theocratic institution, whether the human agent be Samuel the judge qua priest or Saul the nāgîd, is questioned or doubted.

In ch. 7, Yahweh does answer Samuel and leads Israel to a stunning victory over the Philistines. The losses of the prior defeat (ch. 4) are completely reversed (cf. McCarter 1980:149). The parallel to the victory of ch. 7 is the defeat of the Ammonites in ch. 11. Both victories demonstrate the sufficiency of the theocratic government of Israel, thereby renewing Israel's faith in Yahweh and allegiance to his chosen intermediary.

Saul attributes the victory of ch. 11 to Yahweh (v. 13). Saul acts like a charismatic judge
(11:6) with Yahweh's support (11:7). The doubts of the bene beliya'al are answered by the victory and by Saul's statement that Yahweh has wrought victory (nevu'ca) for Israel. The people's desire to execute those who had questioned Saul's monarchy is a modest expression of their gratitude and acceptance of the type of monarchy offered by Yahweh.

Samuel's suggestion that they go to Gilgal to renew the monarchy (hamme1uka, 11:14) offers the opportunity for all Israelites to leave behind doubts about the efficacy of the theocratic monarchy and to express their allegiance to it. The division that split the people when Samuel explained the type of monarchy that they had unwittingly accepted is now healed. All the people go to Gilgal to renew the kingship (11:15) in contrast to 10:25, where only those whose hearts God had touched went with Saul.

At Gilgal the people make Saul king (wayyamliku) before Yahweh (11:15). The description of the location, "before Yahweh", uses the verbal cue lipne yhwh to recall 10:25, which described the installation of the monarchical constitution lipne yhwh. The renewal of the monarchy at Gilgal constitutes a conscious acceptance by all the people
of the theocratic monarchy proposed by Yahweh.

Once again a covenantal crisis has been overcome. The leadership of Israel has passed from priest to judge to king, but the overarching rule of Yahweh has remained intact. In ch. 12, Samuel rehearses the events that have led to the establishment of a monarchy in Israel. He outlines the conditions and covenantal stipulations that will govern monarchical Israel in the future. In vv. 1-5, Samuel responds specifically to the request for a king. He emphasizes that he had fulfilled his office as judge blamelessly and the people agree. He does not deal openly with the real cause for their request, namely the recurrence of a state of affairs in Israel's leadership that had provoked Yahweh's wrath. Instead, Samuel merely mentions his age and the presence of his sons in passing (12:2). Samuel's point is that there was no cause for the request as far as he or his sons were concerned.

In the repetition of the request (8:20) the people had implied that Yahweh was unreliable in warfare by asking for a secular king who would go out and fight for them. Samuel responds to this side of the request in 12:6-12. The recollection of Yahweh's
"saving deeds" (ṣiddqot) on Israel's behalf is designed to vindicate Yahweh on this charge. Again Samuel's recollection is somewhat biased; he forgets the Ark episode, the real cause for Israel's doubts about Yahweh's reliability in battle, and attributes the request directly to the Ammonite threat (12:12). While it is correct that the request for a king who would fight for Israel was made in view of future possibilities, it was not an exterior military threat per se that provoked it.

With these "proofs" for the needlessness of the newly established monarchy, Samuel goes on to make strong claims on the future behaviour of king and people. The fact of the matter is that Yahweh's accession to the people's request contains an implicit admission to the validity of their claim, and so the position and role of the new monarchy must be defined with respect to the covenant. Verse 13 emphasizes that the new king is Yahweh's gift and "vv. 14-15 place the people (and the king) under a renewed possibility of blessing or curse, which is the equivalent of the renewal of the covenant state" (McCarthy 1974:102). Although the monarchy is incorporated into the covenantal structure it does
not modify that structure; it is merely a unnecessary appurtenance. The new covenantal arrangements are no different than the pre-monarchic covenant. J. Muilenberg observes that ch. 12 exhibits the same literary form and the same requirements as the Sinaitic (Exod 19) and Shechemite (Josh 24) covenants (1959:561-65). Nothing has changed (12:14; cf. Exod 19:5).

As a demonstration of Samuel’s continuing vitality as a covenant mediator and of Yahweh’s agreement with Samuel’s characterization of the request for a king, Yahweh sends thunder and rain at Samuel’s signal (12:17-18). The people respond appropriately with fear for Yahweh and Samuel.10 The show of divine force turns the people to Samuel rather than their new king. Just as they relied on Samuel to pray on their behalf before they had a king (7:8), they must turn to him even when they have one. This time, however, they fear Yahweh’s wrath (12:19) rather than simply the Philistines.

In the same words he had used in 7:3, Samuel exhorts the people to be single-minded in their service and devotion to Yahweh.11 Just as they had to return to Yahweh for rescue (násal) from danger
in 7:3 and 8, so they must now. No king could conceivably save them from the wrath of Yahweh. Samuel characterized the request for a king as exceedingly evil (ра̍ткем раббах, v. 17) and now he describes it as turning after uselessness (hattōhû) (v. 21). It is Yahweh who can deliver (ناسال) Israel, and no one else (7:3; 10:18; 12:10, 11).

In 12:22, Samuel supplies the key to an understanding of the turn of events of chs. 8-12. Israel is not at liberty to become like the nations (8:5, 20). The covenant with Yahweh exists because Yahweh was pleased to make Israel a people for himself (cf. Exod 19:5; Deut 32:9; 1 Sam 10:1). Israel's raison d'etre is the covenant which came into being at Yahweh's initiative. Yahweh cannot be evaded. Therefore, the idea of an Israeliite monarchy was indeed a profitless, empty attempt to become like the nations. Israel as Israel, the political body made by Yahweh, cannot become like the nations; that would be a logical contradiction for a nation constitutionally defined as a priestly kingdom and holy nation (Exod 19:6; cf. Buber 1958:105-07). Samuel offers Israel only one assurance of Yahweh's continuing beneficence, that he will not ruin his
reputation by abandoning his people (12:22).

Samuel himself will continue in his mediatory role as intercessor to Yahweh on behalf of Israel and instructor of Israel on behalf of Yahweh, as he had done before the issue of monarchy had arisen (ch. 7). Once again he reiterates the covenantal demand that Israel serve God with all heart (12:24). Any further wickedness to the part of Israel or its king and they will be swept away (v. 25). No matter what has happened in the past, Israel is still required to live in accordance with the stipulations of the covenant and the nation's future as well as the future of the monarchy are totally dependent on that condition. The monarchy has changed none of that.

Structural Outline of Plot Structure in 1 Samuel 1-12

On the basis of the preceding summary of chs. 1-12 it is now possible to outline the structural contours of the narrative without a danger of the schematization seeming to be an imposition with no basis in the text. The structure can be described as a series of scenic parallels. The parallelism between chs. 1-7 and chs. 8-12 consists of two basic relationships between the events (actions,
occurrences) and existents (characters, settings) of chs. 1-7 and chs. 8-12. The relationship may be one of simple repetition of a situation in chs. 8-12 that occurred first in chs. 1-7, or it may be that the parallel in chs. 8-12 responds to or develops the prior events or existents. The result of such development in chs. 8-12 is that tensions introduced in chs. 1-7 are resolved in chs. 8-12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chs. 1-7</th>
<th>chs. 8-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction to Samuel, the primary human character (chs. 1-3).</td>
<td>Old Samuel (8:1, 5) and his corrupt sons (8:2-3, 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Old Eli the priest (1:9; 2:22) and his wicked sons (2:12-17, 22-25).</td>
<td>The elders of Israel act in anticipation of Yahweh's reaction (8:5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yahweh reacts to the Elide abuses (2:25, 30-36; 3:12-14).</td>
<td>The people request a secular human king who can fight Israel's battles (8:20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Yahweh punishes the Elides and seems himself to have been defeated (ch. 4).</td>
<td>Yahweh brings Saul to Samuel to be anointed nāgād and new Moses. Saul is enlisted in the service of Yahweh, who does not renounce his claims on Israel (9:1-10:16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Yahweh displays his powers in a manner similar to the Exodus display (chs. 5-6). Israel's divine warrior has not been defeated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Yahweh treats Israel in a manner similar to his treatment of the Philistines. Israel responds as the Philistines did (6:19-20; cf. chs. 5-6).

Yahweh seeks to reassure Israel of his commitment to them as his people, his inheritance (9:16, 27; 10:1). He commissions a new Moses to save them (9:1-10:16).

7. Israel, the rejected covenantal party, makes the first move to renew the relationship (7:3-8).

Yahweh, the rejected party, makes the first move towards reconciliation (9:1-10:16).

8. The rapprochement takes place at Mizpah, where Samuel gathers all the people (7:5).

Cf. 10:17.

9. Yahweh gives Israel the victory over the Philistines (7:9-14).

Yahweh gives Israel under Saul and Samuel the victory over the Ammonites (11:7, 11-15).

10. Samuel acts as covenant mediator for Israel in both political and religious spheres (7:17).

Samuel leads Israel in a covenant renewal that incorporates the monarchy. He pledges continued prayer and instruction to Israel on his part (ch. 12).
CHAPTER IV

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE NARRATIVE

Rather than discussing under separate categories the different aspects of narrative composition that create its meaning, as Conroy (1978) has done in his innovative study of 2 Sam 13-20, the following description of 1 Sam 1-12 will follow the order of the text and any feature of the narrative that seems important will be discussed as the occasion arises. Separate treatment of the various literary phenomena, though suitable for attempts to compose a biblical narratology, detract from the comprehensive understanding of a narrative when the goal is interpretation, as it is in this study. The focus of this study is not biblical narrative in general, but the specific narrative in 1 Sam 1-12 for which Buber's label, the "biblical Politeía" is an appropriate title (1964:734).

1. 1 Samuel 1

Verse 1

The narrative begins with an introductory phrase also found in the stories of the judges
(Judg 15:2; 17:1; 19:1). "There once was a man" (wayeḥi הֵיָ֣הָ הָֽאָדָ֗ם), is a common formula that cues the reader to understand the following narrative as a new story (cf. Stoebe 1973:92). McCarter's suggestion to follow the opening in LXXB (anthrōpos ἄν) instead of MT, which has supposedly been influenced by Judg 15:2, bypasses the significance of this parallel in MT. McCarter offers a genetic explanation for the form of the introductory formula in MT and uses this explanation as an argument in favour of the reading of LXX (1980:51). Such explanations are common enough in textual criticism, but their adequacy is questionable.¹

The fact that the opening of MT uses the sequence wayeḥi הֵיָ֣הָ הָֽאָדָ֗ם, which regularly introduces new stories in a series, arouses certain expectations in the reader about the nature of the material that follows, and about how he is to approach it. Buber's observations about repeated Leitwörter are pertinent; "wer diesen Wiederholungen folgt, dem erschliesst oder verdeutlicht sich ein Sinn des Textes oder wird auch nur eindringlicher offenbar" (1964:1131). The same is true of the influence of Samson's birth narrative on 1 and elsewhere in ch. 1.

Already with the first three words of Samuel's
birth story, construction of a framework is begun, and it is within this framework that the reader understands the narrative. If the narrative begins like the Samson birth narrative, do we gain more knowledge about it by speculating about the "superiority" of versional alternatives that do away with the parallel, or by noting the effects of the similarity on the reading process? Given the other similarities between Samuel's and Samson's birth stories (cf. McCarter 1980:64-66), and the fact that one of the four roles (priest, judge, prophet, and seer) that Samuel plays is that of a judge (ch. 7, esp. vv. 6, 15-17; 8:1-5 (by implication); 12:11), the connection between 1:1 and the stories of the judges seems to be in accord with the conventions of the scene as a whole. The story about to be told should, therefore, be read in the light of the prior stories of the judges (cf. Schulz 1919:2).

The place of Elkanah's origin has sparked many vexed topographical discussions. According to Driver, Ramathaimzophim is grammatically indefensible. He suggests that the final m of šophim is a ditto- graphic repetition of the initial m of the following words (1913:1). Driver's reading is coincidentally
supported by LXX and provides a balanced appositional sentence, roughly translated:

There once was a man from hārāmātayim,
a Zuphite from har ֶeprāyim.

Driver's suggestion receives further support from the name and tribal affiliation of Elkanah's great-great-grandfather. He is șūp, an ֶeprātî. Driver's reading suitably identifies Elkanah as a șūpî mēhār ֶeprāyim.

The dual ending on hārāmātayim creates a rhyme with the word ֶeprāyim, which supports the parallelism of the two lines.² Both geographical names serve to locate Elkanah and concretize the story from the very beginning.

Paradoxically, the names in Elkanah's genealogy are important because of their unimportance. They are all names of insignificant obscure people.³ This type of genealogy, labelled a "linear" genealogy by Wilson, traces a single line of descent from a given ancestor (1977:9). Linear genealogies are normally used to link a descendant with an earlier ancestor for social, political, or religious legitimation (Wilson 1977:40-45, 155, 164). The Elkanah genealogy is so employed in 1 Chr 6:11-13. There the genealogy places the family amongst the Levites, thereby making
Samuel a Levite.

As it appears in 1 Sam 1:1, however, the genealogy accomplishes anything but legitimation. Samuel's natural lineage grants him no claim to any important rank. If he has or attains any status at all it is not because of his family tree.

This reading of the genealogy is reinforced by the fact that Samuel, the son of a barren woman, only comes into being as a miraculous grant of God. He may be well-connected, but his connections are definitely not drawn from any Israelite social structures. Besides introducing the reader to Elkanah, v. 1 also establishes the "narrative situation" from which the narrator will relate the story. By framing his introduction to Elkanah in the preterite (wayehi דְּוָי), the narrator reveals, or rather states, that he views the events at some temporal remove from their occurrence. At this point the length of the intervening period of time between the events and the situation of the narrator, that is the narrative distance, is left undetermined.

A second, very important implication of the temporal distance between the events of the narrative and the event of narration is that the narrator
thereby indicates his position outside the world that he describes. Stanzel observes that this exterior position of the "authorial" narrative situation—a situation in which author and narrator are usually indistinguishable—"enables the authorial narrator to assume a position of superiority over his figures" (1971:38-39). The reader, who perceives and comes to understand the narrated events only as they are presented by the narrator is thereby also placed in a conscious position of superiority to the characters and exteriority to the story.

This definition of the relationship between the narrator and reader, on the one hand, and the narrative and its characters, on the other, is an important function of the preterite introduction. The importance of this definition for the proper understanding of the narrative cannot be overemphasized. All subsequent features of the narrative, such as the presence of conflicting evaluations and viewpoints within the narrative, are subject to this basic framework.

Verse 2

Verse 2 continues to sketch the background for the events of the birth story. A similar pattern
of gradually increasing specificity lies behind both vv. 1-2. The characters are gradually brought into focus by beginning with general specifications followed by ascending lists of particularizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verse 1</th>
<th>Verse 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. gender and number</td>
<td>way'êîî 'âv 'êhâd</td>
<td>wêlô 'êtê nâsîm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. place</td>
<td>min hârâmâtayîm</td>
<td>Women assume the situation of their husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. name</td>
<td>ūsîmô elqânâ</td>
<td>yêm bêt hanna'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. progenitors/genealogy</td>
<td>Peninnah has children, Hannah does not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specifications in v. 1 end with Elkanah's genealogy, which is not illustrious. In v. 2, the final concern is again with the family lines. In this case, however, it is with respect to their potentialities as preservers of Elkanah's line that Hannah and Peninnah are characterized. With respect to Samuel, v. 1 suggests his unimportance in Israel's social hierarchy, and now
v. 2 suggests that it is unlikely that he should
even become an insignificant character. At this point
he "is" the son of a barren woman.

In conjunction with the introduction of char-
acters, v. 2 also introduces the biblical motif of two
wives, one barren and one fruitful. This motif
serves as the impetus for the main events of the
chapter. Hannah is explicitly called the "first" wife
while Peninnah is the "second" (McCarter 1980:58).
Elkanah's love for Hannah is stated explicitly; the
contrasting lack of such a statement about his feelings
for Peninnah is conspicuous in absence. It seems that
she is "second" and unloved. As in the Jacob cycle,
the barrenness of the favorite wife is attributed to
Yahweh's direct intervention (v. 5; cf. Gen 29:31).
Hannah may be the first wife, but the chiastic
patternning of names in v. 2 places her last with her
barrenness. Peninnah comes first with her children.

\[
\text{\'śēm Ṿahat hanna} \quad \text{\'wēēm h̄assēnît pînînṇā}
\]
\[
\text{\'wāyi hî li} \text{pînînṇā ȳlādīn} \quad \text{\'ûēn hānnā \, } \text{ēn ȳlādīn}
\]

The combination of contrasting fortunes in one woman
is also a recurring element in this motif.
Any reader who is familiar with the motif will immediately become suspect that the reversal of fortunes elegantly represented by the chiastic syntax of v. 2 is a result of divine intervention (cf. Gen 29: 30-31; Matt 19:30). The reader who detects the conventional usage of the motif does not receive explicit confirmation of his suspicions until v. 5. The narrator withholds confirmation to perk reader interest with an element of suspense. Even the suspicion of divine intervention in the lives of these characters is enough to begin to stir the reader’s interest and speculation about the larger significance of the rather simple tale that has thus far been introduced.

Verse 3

Elkanah’s character receives further specification. The wāw consecutive perfect verb, wēḵālāh, has a frequentative force (Driver 1913:5; GKC #112dd), which along with the expression niyyāū̄m ūmīmā, "from days to days" (cf. below p. 135), depicts Elkanah first and foremost as a pious observer of sacrificial duties.

Two important new characters, Hopni and Pinhas, are unobtrusively introduced as the priests at Shiloh, where Elkanah regularly went to worship. Eli is also
introduced here as the father of the two priests (cf. Willis 1979:206). Bourke sees this introduction of the Elides in conjunction with the description of Elkanah's piety as the first instance in a series of contrasts drawn between Samuel (and Israel) and the Elides throughout chs. 1-3 (1954:82).

At least one may say that the reader is prepared for future contrasts by the paralleling of Elkanah "at Shiloh" (בֶּשִּׁלֹה) and the Elides "there" (הֵשָּמ). The topographical parallelism is made prominent by placing הֵשָּמ first in its own sentence, immediately following בֶּשִּׁלֹה, which is last in its sentence. Elkanah actively sacrifices and worships at Shiloh in contrast to the Elide priests, who are just there. The contrast is reinforced by using an active verb taking two infinitive constructs with ל as object to describe Elkanah's action. The Elide priests, on the other hand, do not even get a single verb to describe their functioning as priests; in their case the verb "to be" is simply assumed.

Elkanah's sacrificial activity is further highlighted by the numerous alliterations in the description of his activity: 1. הָּעִשם הָּהֵשם; 2. miyyāmīm yāmīmā; 3. לֶהָשם וּלֶılmış... lay...
(underlining only the alliterations). The Elides' inactivity receives similar treatment: 1. $w^e$Sam $s^e_n^e$ b$e^n^e$ - $c^g_l^i$; 2. $h^o$p$\acute{n}^i$ $\tilde{a}p^i$nh$\tilde{a}$.

The inclusion of the name of God, yhwh $s^e_b^a$or, in v. 3a introduces the reader to the warrior god who will play such an important role in connection with the ark in chs. 4-6 (cf. Budde 1902:4). Verse 3 concludes the reader's introduction to the major characters appearing in chs. 1-3.

Verses 4-5

The portrait of Elkanah's piety is even more definite in v. 4. Here, again, he is sacrificing. The introductory temporal clause specifies the action to follow as an example of one of the days when Elkanah would sacrifice (GKC #126s; Schulz 1919:10).

The narrator continues to develop the theme of tension between the wives. Elkanah gives portions of the sacrifice first to Peninnah and to all her sons and daughters. To Hannah he gives only one portion, "for though he loved Hannah, Yahweh had sealed her womb." Elkanah is fair in his dealings with his wives even though he loves Hannah more.

Verses 4-5 continue to stress the difference between Hannah and Peninnah. Peninnah is described as
Elkanah's wife; she and all her sons and daughters receive portions first. Only then does Hannah, who unable to fulfill her childbearing role as a wife, is not called his wife, get her single portion. Prominent here is the ignominy of Hannah's position. Although she is the number one wife, šāḥat (v. 2), she receives only a single portion, mānā šāḥat.

The final sentence of v. 5 provides the anticipated confirmation that Yahweh is indeed responsible for the recurrence of this typical familial situation in biblical narrative. Hannah's sterility is explicitly attributed to the fact that Yahweh sealed her womb. The statement is an unusual way to describe sterility. (The usual term for sterility is aqār, "barren," e.g. Gen 11:30; 25:21; 29:51; Exod 25:26; Deut 7:14; Judg 13:2-3; 1 Sam 2:5, etc.) The narrator, who now reveals his omniscience for the first time, tells us that Yahweh has intervened to close Hannah's womb. This expositional comment is addressed to the reader alone, and encourages him to continue to speculate about the larger significance of these events. The reader can now be certain, as he could not be on the basis of the convention alone, that Yahweh is working behind the scenes and probably directing events toward some goal,
as is his custom.

Why has Yahweh closed Hannah's womb? What is the goal towards which divine guidance is leading? The answers to these and similar questions are obviously available to the omniscient narrator, but he temporarily withhold them from the reader. The simple technique of withholding information, which is, by implication, available to his own omniscience, is the narrator's principal means of achieving "one of the primary aims of fiction—the creation and manipulation of narrative interest" (Sternberg 1978:45). At this point in the narrative interest is increasingly directed onto the question of the meaning of Hannah's sterility. Where mystery goes, the reader's curiosity will invariably follow.

Verse 6

Hannah's vexation is made complete in v. 6. The tension between the two women is brought to the surface. Peninnah is Hannah's rival who sorely vexes Hannah until the latter vociferates. It is the fact that Yahweh has sealed Hannah's womb that provides Peninnah with the ammunition to vex Hannah to the point of vocal thunderings: The קָּד of v. 6b is, therefore, causal (GKC #158ab; R.J. Williams 1976 #444).
The emphatic repetition of the final sentence in both vv. 5 and 6 links the two verses, both of which focus on Hannah's infertility. Elkanah, though he loves her, can only give her one portion because Yahweh has sealed her womb. Peninnah is able to vex Hannah both with her inabilitys as a wife and with her resultant single portion, because Yahweh has, so far, sealed her womb. Even the verb הָרָכֹּל, "vociferate," by its phonetic similarity to rahmān, Hannah's "womb," points to her sterility as the cause of her distress (cf. Dhorme 1910:19).

Bourke has also suggested that Hannah and Peninnah are stylized characters conforming to conventional themes in Hebrew literature. A barren woman is oppressed by a cruel rival blandishing her own fecundity. Hannah belongs to the nanâmûm, the humble, afflicted, poor, and righteous whom Yahweh loves. She is described in nanâmûm terms such as bitterness of soul (v. 10), afflicted (v. 11), pouring out her soul (v. 16), and having an abundance of complaint (v. 16). (Bourke 1954:84 supplies comparative examples.) By drawing these lines between the heroine of ch. 1 and her opponent, the narrative begins the process of associating Samuel with the side of
right and just causes, here through his oppressed mother. Although the oppression of Hannah by the vindictive Peninnah is not central to the narrative—Peninnah and the conflict leave the narrative after v. 7—it introduces an important thematic contrast between two characters. Such contrasts will come to occupy a central position in chs. 2-3.

The final sentence of v. 6 is introduced by a conjunctive kî; "Because (kî) Yahweh had sealed up her womb." The ostensible function of this sentence is to explain the behaviour of the two wives in v. 6. Peninnah is successful at taunting Hannah because Hannah is sterile.

The sentence also achieves less obvious ends; however, as a repetition of the last sentence in v. 5 it is foregrounded and the reader's attention is firmly directed towards its content. Events on the plane of the human characters in the story are being manipulated by God, who operates from the divine plane.

The repeated sentence is almost identical to the last sentence of v. 5 except for the addition of the preposition bê'êd, which functions idiomatically with the verb sgr (cf. BDB p. 126, col. 1 #1b). The
addition of the preposition seems to stress the totality of Hannah's barrenness; whereas v. 5b might be translated "Yahweh sealed her womb," v. 6b would be "Yahweh sealed up her womb." As in v. 5, the narrator does not reveal the reason for Yahweh's intervention in the regular course of biological events; his repeated address to the reader simply stresses that events on the human plane of the narrative are the product of an initiative from the divine plane.

The effect on the reader of this repeated exposition by the narrator is to divert a large amount of attention away from the plane of events on the human plane towards the divine and onto the as yet unrevealed goal that is the presumable object of the divine initiative. On the level of the story, then, the narrator's exposition creates distance between the reader's and the human characters' perceptions so that the reader begins to perceive the larger meaning in these events. As Booth says, "distance is never an end in itself; distance along one axis is sought for the sake of increasing the reader's involvement on some other axis" (1961:123).

Booth's observation is also applicable to the effect of the expositional comment on the reader's
relationship with the narrator. When the narrator addresses the reader with a piece of exposition such as this, he temporarily elevates the reader to his own level of omniscience. The information conveyed—that Yahweh had closed Hannah's womb—is privileged as both omniscient and after the fact. Possession of such information distances the reader from both human and divine characters, and even from involvement in the effort to decipher the divine manipulation of the human characters. In return, the reader's involvement and identification with the level and perspective of the omniscient narrator—the level of discourse—is greatly increased. Here, after all, the reader recognizes the answer to all puzzles and riddles not answerable from a reading that views from the plane of human characters or even from the level of the divine character. The expositional comment in v. 6b functions as one of the explicit invitations for the reader to perceive from the broadest perspective available in this narrative world, namely the perspective of the omniscient narrator who is the source and creator of narrative meaning.

Verse 7

The verse provides a summary of the events of
vv. 4-6, and notes that such was the regular sequence whenever the Elkanahs went to Yahweh's house. The parallel (with a difference) between the two phases of action is made prominent by the twofold repetition of *kēn*, and captured by Keil and Delitzsch. "So did he from year to year as often as she went up to the house of the Lord. So did she (Peninnah) provoke her (Hannah), so that she wept and did not eat" (1880: 22-23). Hannah's sorrow is such that she cannot even eat the single portion that she gets.

Verse 8

Elkanah is dissociated from Peninnah's mistreatment of Hannah. Hannah may not be able to fulfill her role as childbearer, but Elkanah is still her husband and cares for her.

The narrator emphasizes the special relationship between Hannah and Elkanah by attaching the seemingly redundant description "her husband" to the proper name Elkanah in v. 8. In contrast, Elkanah is never described as Peninnah's "husband." The alliterative complex of names at the beginning of the verse also emphasizes the bond between them: *(wayyōmer)*

\[\text{lan} \quad \text{elqānā} \quad \text{isāh} \quad \text{hannā} \]
Elkanah's threefold repetition of הָמֶה, "why," stresses that in terms of their marriage she has nothing to worry about. "Am I not better to you than ten sons" expresses his reassurance. No matter how many sons Peninnah may have, Elkanah's love for Hannah will continue. In human terms, Elkanah's love for Hannah should be worth more to her than ten sons without his love. Peninnah's vindictiveness supports Elkanah's claim.

Verse 9

Hannah appears to humour Elkanah by eating for we next see her getting up "after she had eaten" (גָּהֲרֵא אָכֶלָה, cf. GKC #91e, against Stoebe's repointing to אָכֶלָה, 1975:91). As v. 10 shows, however, her eating does not signify any change of heart over her childlessness.

Verse 9b is contemporaneous with v. 9a (Driver 1913:12; cf. GKC #116d; R.J. Williams 1976 #237). The verse structure recalls v. 5:

3. The man goes up from his city to worship and sacrifice to Yahweh at Shiloh.

9. Hannah gets up after eating and drinking at Shiloh.
3. There Eli's two sons are priests to Yahweh.

9. Eli the priest is sitting on his throne beside the doorpost of Yahweh's temple.

The statement that Hannah was at Shiloh when she got up after eating is not "oddly repetitious" (McCartter 1980:53), but meaningfully so. As in v. 3 the Elide priests are specifically associated with Shiloh. In both cases, we see the beginnings of the contrast schema that governs chs. 2-3 (cf. Bourke 1954:82ff.; Willis 1971:289). Elkanah actively goes up to worship and sacrifice at Shiloh; Eli's sons, the priests, are simply there. Hannah rises after eating and drinking at Shiloh; Eli is sitting at the doorpost. The contrast is not yet developed into an opposition of right and wrong, or good and evil, but is simply one of active and passive roles at the temple.

The narrator introduces these vestigial contrasts between the Elide priests and the family of Elkanah as foreshadowings of the coming contrasts between the Elides and Samuel, Hannah's son. The narrator leaves the full significance of this foreshadowing implicit, thus increasing narrative interest
in the attentive reader.

Verses 10-11

In desperation, Hannah turns as a last resort to Yahweh. As the reader reads about her bitterness of soul and about her cries and prayers to Yahweh, he is being allowed to share the narrator's knowledge that, ironically, Hannah is seeking help from exactly the right source. Though Hannah does not know it, Yahweh is the one who sealed her womb (vv. 5, 6) and he is, therefore, the logical choice to open it.

Hannah's dedicatory vow of any forthcoming offspring to Yahweh has attracted attention because of the Nazirite element in it. McCarter suggests that the additional note, "wine or strong drink he will not drink," of LXX\(^B\) is supported by space considerations in 4QSam\(^a\) (1980:53-54). Whether the variant is included or not, the allusion to the Nazirite status of any offspring is present.\(^{11}\) If Yahweh will give to his maid-servant the seed of men, she will give to Yahweh one upon whose head a razor has not gone.\(^{12}\) The act of dedication will turn an ordinary "seed of men" into a Nazirite, set apart from the rank and file, if Yahweh agrees.\(^{13}\)

The emphasis on the uniqueness and
distinction of the requested child is made even stronger by the way Hannah phrases her vow in terms drawn from Exod 3:7. Samuel will be the answer to Hannah's affliction as Moses was the answer to the Israelite's affliction in Egypt:

\[\text{v. 11}\quad \text{\( \text{m \ r\o \ h \ t\i \ b\c o \ n\i \ d\a \m\e \k\)}\]
\[\text{Exod 3:7}\quad \text{\( \text{r\o \ h \ r\e \ti \ e \c o \n\i \c\a \m\i\)}\]

This allusion to the exodus material and the Mosaic role of Hannah's future son begins a process of legitimating Samuel as a worthy replacement for the Elites. Not only is he to be born of a barren woman, but he will even be a new Moses. The verbal reminiscence brings the exodus event to the mind of the reader, who will be reminded of the paradigmatic significance of the exodus throughout the narrative.

Verses 12-13

The two verses are connected as one single event by a syntactic chiasmus of verb forms:

\begin{align*}
\text{Hannah, active verb} & \quad \text{\( \Rightarrow \) Eli, participle} \\
\text{Hannah, participle} & \quad \text{\( \Rightarrow \) Eli, active verb}
\end{align*}

Hannah fervently multiplies her prayers while Eli is watching her mouth. Hannah's prayer is
silent, only her lips move and Eli takes her for a drunk. Eli's mistaken identification provides Hannah with the opportunity to proclaim her abstinence from alcoholic beverages, a basic requirement for a woman who would bear a Nazirite (cf. Judg 13:4; Stoebe 1973: 97).

Willis suggests that Eli's misjudgement of Hannah's mental state is the beginning of the contrast between Hannah/Samuel/Israel and the Elides (1971:289). Perhaps it is better to regard this mistake as the first instance where the reader is led to favour Hannah over against Eli. The contrast between Elkanah and Hanna and the Elides has already appeared twice (vv. 3, 9) although with less explicit differentiation. The reader knows from vv. 11-12 that Hannah's outward appearance is the expression of deep inner distress and piety. When Eli takes Hannah for a drunk the reader takes him for an ignoramus. The narrator leads the reader to favour Hannah by allowing him a privileged insight into Hannah's thoughts but only an external view of Eli (cf. Booth 1961:245-49).

Verses 14-15

Hannah's polite response to Eli's mistaken rebuke strengthens the reader's favourable impression
of her. The forwardness of Eli's rebuke is foregrounded by the assonance in the second two words of v. 14 and is contrasted to Hannah's submissiveness, similarly highlighted by assonance:

v. 14 wayyō'mer ʾeleyhā ʾēlî
v. 15 wattaʾan ḥannā wattoʾmer

Eli is completely mistaken. As Hannah points out, her actions are not the manifestation of drinking (šātītî) spirits, but of pouring out (ʾespōk) her spirit; not of pouring into herself, but of outpouring of herself.

Thenius's widely accepted suggestion to read Hannah's self-description as qēṣāt yôm, "one in misfortune," instead of qēṣāt rūḥ, "hard-spirited," is unnecessary (1864:6). The entire episode between Hannah and Eli is a result of her fervent multiple prayers (v. 12), which are in turn the result of an embittered soul (mārat nāpesḥ, v. 10). Hannah explains her behaviour by the fact that she is a "determined" woman (ʾissā qēṣāt rūḥ) pouring out her soul (Ahlström 1979:254). Eli's question ʾad-mātay, "how long," also implies that it was the incessancy of her prayer that provoked him (v. 14).

Verse 16

The continuation of Hannah's answer confirms
this reading of 'ēṣat ṭūḥā. She continued speaking for so long (cad hēnnā) because of the greatness of her complaint (cf. v. 12) and vexation (cf. v. 10).

The introduction of the term bat bēliyāśāl here prepares for the subsequent occurrence of the expression in 2:12 (cf. Willis 1979:207). Hannah interprets Eli's rebuke as making her out to be a worthless woman (bat bēliyāśāl).

Verse 17

Eli accepts Hannah's explanation, though without apology for his error in judgement. He then sends Hannah off with his approval, "May the God of Israel grant you your request." Although neither he nor the reader know it, Eli has approved a request for his successor. Eli's endorsement of his own replacement is suitably a result of his lack of awareness of what is really going on in the worship at the temple. He demonstrates the need for a successor at the same time that he gives his blessing on the request for one.

Verse 18

Schulz suggests that Hannah's reply, "be-
deutet weiter nichts als die Bitte, Heli möge ihr die
freundliche Gesinnung, die er ihr jetzt gezeigt, weiter bewahren" (1919:17). Hannah's actions agree with Schulz's reading. She goes "her way," meaning that she takes up her regular activities again (cf. Koch 1978:276). Her renewed eating is a sign, as before (v. 9), that she has accepted consolation. Most commentators read the word pāneyḥā in the final sentence as "sad" or "troubled countenance." The parallel in Job 9:27 supports this reading (Thenius 1864:6; Nowack 1902:6; Driver 1915:15-16; Schulz 1919:18).

The adverb ̄ōd positioned last in v. 18 is another temporal hint that Hannah's troubles will be resolved sometime in the future. Hannah's firm resolve to have a child has been sufficiently described so far for the reader to surmise that if she is not sad anymore (̄ōd) it is because her wish eventually comes true.

Verse 19

Verse 19 concludes the events begun in v. 3, where the man (Elkanah) had left his city (w̄ēc-ālā mēc̄rō) to worship (l̄ēhiṣṭahˈōt) and sacrifice (w̄ēlizbōah) to Yahweh at Shiloh. In v. 19, they worship (wawyiṣṭahˈaw) before Yahweh and return home
to Ramah (wayyăsūbû wayyābōû ĕl-bētām hārāmātā).
The inclusio between vv. 3 and 19 shows that Elkanah has accomplished all that he set out to do. The events may be schematically outlined in correlation with Hannah's troubles as follows:

v. 2
Introduction to Hannah's problem.

v. 3 wēcālā ha ēl hahū me-cācō
lēhišṭaḥ wōt
wēlizbēah
That man alone, signifying division in the family.

v. 4 wayyizbah
Intensification of Hannah's difficulties.

v. 18b
Indication of a future resolution to Hannah's problem (ćōd).

v. 19a wayyīšṭaḥ ēl
wayyăsūbû wayyābōû ĕl
bētām hārāmātā
They worship together and return home. Division disappears.

v.19b
Hannah's problem is resolved.

As the outline shows, v. 19 describes both Elkanah's accomplishment of his purposes and the unification of the family, in worship and in their
return home. The statement that they return specifically to their home contrasts with Elkanah's departure in v. 3, which is simply from his city. The contrast emphasizes that previous alienation amongst family members has received some measure of resolution.

The narrator immediately goes on to relate the consummation of the resolution to Hannah's problem, a resolution he has so far only hinted at. No sooner has he traced the families' return journey home, than the narrator describes Elkanah in action, "And Elkanah knew Hannah, his wife." Elkanah's role, while essential, is not a sufficient cause to end Hannah's barrenness. Without further ado, the narrator adds the vital piece of information for the reader, and the efficient cause to end Hannah's sterility; Yahweh remembers (zkr) Hannah, just as she had asked (Cf. zkr in v. 11). The latter statement is the actual climax of the story, and the description in v. 20a simply works out the details of the birth process.

Verse 20

In due time Hannah becomes pregnant and bears a son. The key element, which makes the birth possible, is Yahweh's remembrance of Hannah. Elkanah
may know her, but Yahweh remembers her. Hannah recognizes this fact and commemorates it by naming her son Samuel. She explains the name in a recollection of her request for Samuel from Yahweh. The explanation of the name also expresses Hannah's understanding that her son is evidence that Yahweh has agreed to the terms of the vow in v. 11. Hannah has not forgotten that Samuel is the rightful property of Yahweh.

The name Samuel and Hannah's explanation have provoked many lengthy examinations of the connection between them (cf. Driver 1913:16-19; VanZyl 1969:125). Several studies have proposed the traditio-historical hypothesis that the birth story originally applied to Saul, whose name seems to fit the explanation better than Samuel (Hylander 1932:11-15; McCarter 1980:62, 65-66; cf. Zakovitch 1980:41 n.45). Given the focus of the present study on the existing narrative, however, discussion of the traditio-historical hypothesis about the text's prehistory is unnecessarily hypothetical. In addition, Zakovitch notes that all of the details concerning the family of Elkanah are applicable to the story of Samuel but not to that of Saul (1980:41). Even historical critics
sympathetic to the endeavour have either regarded the supposed underlying Saul story with suspicion or rejected it (Hertzberg 1964:26; Noth 1965:395 ["so unwahrscheinlich wie möglich"]; Stoebbe 1973:97-98).

As Driver notes, the relationship between the name and the explanation is alliterative; the name ṣemūò el "recalls" the word ṣā′al (1913:16). Kimche's reasoning supplies semantic explanation of the connection that Driver regards as assonantal: "For among the letters of Samuel (ṣm̂ŵl̂) there is Saul (ṣ̂wl̂), and among these letters there is also "of the Lord" (m̂l̂), as if she had said ḥ3l m̂l̂ ("lent of the Lord")" (cited from Zakovitch 1980:42). Hannah's explanation emphasizes that Samuel is from Yahweh by placing myhwh before ṣe′iltliw. Here, at last, is Samuel's real genealogy; he is from Yahweh.

In biblical etymologies Zakovitch suggests that we can discern a trend from an earlier derivatory explanation that did not aim at exact resemblance between a name and its derivation, to a later form in which attempt was made to embed all the sounds and elements of the name in the explanatory derivation (1980:31). Zakovitch suggests that Hannah's explanation of Samuel's name falls into the earlier, less
precise class. Hannah's explanation of the name, however accurate or inaccurate it may be from a linguistic perspective, gives an accurate assessment of the miraculous element in the birth of her son. She calls her son Samuel, which may be explained as "his name is God" (VanZyl 1969:125-26), or more simply "the name of God" (Weingreen 1976:64). Samuel's name forever identifies him as standing in close relation to God. Hannah's explanation of the name is very simple; Samuel gets a name that celebrates and identifies the divine because he is the answer to Hannah's request from Yahweh.

Samuel exists and his name celebrates his existence as a unique and special boon from Yahweh who is God. The traditional motif of the barren woman who is granted a son by God is used here, as elsewhere (Judg 13; and especially Luke 1), to characterize and legitimate the son who results. Elkanah's genealogy, nondescript in the first place, fades into the background in the presence of Samuel's true genealogy. The name Hannah gives to Samuel thus focuses the entire chapter on two things: the amazing divine capacities of Yahweh and the special character of her son Samuel.
Verse 21

A new stage in the history of Elkanah's sacrificial pilgrimages, v. 21 parallels v. 3 but also exhibits some differences:

1. Elkanah is mentioned by name; instead of הַיִשְׁתִּי הָֽהָֽעַר we read הַיִשְׁתִּי אֶלְקָֽןָֽהָ. In the preceding description of v. 3, I suggested that the narrator described Elkanah as simply "that man" and sent him off alone to sacrifice as a means of supporting the general impression of strife and division in the family. Between v. 3 and v. 21, however, Samuel is born and the source of conflict in the family thereby disappears. Domestic disputes being settled, the narrator evokes the opposite associations of familiarity and intimacy by using the proper name, Elkanah, in place of the pronominal description, that man.

2. Verse 21 explicitly states that Elkanah's whole family goes with him. Again the contrast with v. 3 creates the impression of a unified family. The entire household now acts in unison.

3. The family goes only to sacrifice and not to worship, as Elkanah did in v. 3. By leaving out one part of the hendiadys הִשְׁתִּיּוֹת וּלְיִשְׁבֹּא the
narrator separates this particular occasion from the previous practice, which occurred "from days to days." The sacrifice in v. 21 is more specific than that of v. 3.

4. Instead of having Elkanah go up to sacrifice "from days to days," the narrator says he went to sacrifice "the sacrifice of the days." The expression zebah hayyāmām is much more specific than miyyāmām yāmāmā of v. 3. The only previous mention of yāmāmā with the definite article comes in v. 20, where it refers to the completion of days associated with Hannah's pregnancy and delivery. As noted by Wellhausen (1871:40) and Driver (1913:16), these two occurrences of hayyāmām are related, as one would expect given their close proximity (cf. Stoebbe 1973:99). In view of the emphasis in v. 21 on the united household (kōl-bētō) going up with Elkanah to offer a special sacrifice, it seems likely and especially appropriate that the sacrifice be a celebration of the "completion of the days." Hannah's successfully completed pregnancy resolves the tensions between the two wives. Therefore, they can all go, kōl-bētō, to celebrate the sacrifice of "the days." The zebah hayyāmām celebrates both the birth of Samuel and the family
reunion.

5. Elkanah also "sacrifices" a vow in v. 21 in contrast to v. 3, which makes no mention of vows. There is no previous mention of any vow made by Elkanah. Noting that neder is not the object of zabah elsewhere, McCarter suggests that LXX gives a clue to the meaning of "his vow" (1980:55). He restores "and to redeem his vow and all the tithes of his land," supposedly lost by haplography. The LXX reading does not, however, solve the difficulty of what vow Elkanah is redeeming. The reference to land tithes has no obvious contextual contact and seems designed to ease the oddity of a vow that Elkanah did not make.

Hertzberg suggests that perhaps the narrator assumes that Elkanah has taken on Hannah's vow in accordance with the regulations for vows in Num 30: 1ff. (esp. v. 14). A husband could confirm or invalidate any vow made by his wife. "Elkanah even went beyond a confirmation of this nature by his personal participation in the vow" (1964:28). Aside from the difficulty of what "participation in the vow" might mean and how that would relate to the text's "to sacrifice...his vow," Hertzberg's
explanation does not take serious account of Hannah's vow. She vowed to give back Samuel. It is hard to see how Elkanah's "sacrifice of" (MT), or "participation in" (Hertzberg) his vow has anything to do with Hannah's vow. Yahweh "remembered" Hannah because she vowed to return Samuel, not to sacrifice for him or to elicit Elkanah's "participation" in the vow.

Verse 22

In the case of a nonsensical text, the way lies open for a judicious use of emendation. Supposing a diacritography of a וַ, a contextually suitable reading may be obtained: וּנְדֵרֹת(!)-נְדֵרֹ(ו) וֶחָנָּ֫ה ְ֫לֹ֫כִּלֶה; "But with a vow, Hannah did not go up."

The narrator reverses the usual word order to emphasize the important fact that Hannah is not quick to fulfill her vow (cf. R.J. Williams 1976:96 #573). "And the man Elkanah and all his household went up to offer the sacrifice of the days [in celebration of Samuel's birth], but with a vow Hannah did not go up." The chiastic juxtaposition of the actions of the household and the non-action of Hannah captures the reader's attention:
Hannah's procrastination contradicts the reader's expectations of her. All along she has been the protagonist and Peninnah the antagonist. In v. 21, however, Peninnah is included among the "entire household" going up to celebrate Samuel's birth while Hannah stays back with the vow. Will Hannah shirk the responsibility and so defeat the mysterious purpose of Yahweh? He was after all the real cause of her sterility in the first place. The resolution of Hannah's personal difficulty has unexpectedly jeopardized Yahweh's purpose. Ironically it is the very maternal instinct that drove Hannah to make her vow that now appears as a potential source of frustration for the divine purpose.

By reading "But with a vow" as the first part of v. 22 instead of v. 21 the syntax and meaning of v. 22 become less problematic than they have appeared in previous studies (e.g. Cross 1953:18; McCarter 1980:55-56). The verse may be translated, "But with a vow Hannah did not go up for she told her husband (wait) until the boy is weaned. (Then) I will bring
him and he will appear before Yahweh and remain there forever" (cf. GKC #112a, d).

Hannah seems to be stalling for time. Although her action is completely understandable and captures the reader's sympathies (Hertzberg 1964:28), she is obligated, as she recognizes, to present Samuel as she vowed.

Verse 23

Hannah is allowed a period of grace but, as the threefold repetition of the words כָּדָגָמָל in vv. 22-23 emphasizes, only until Samuel is weaned. Elkanah respects his wife's wishes, trusting her judgement to do what is right (הָדָּוִב בָּכָהָנָּיִק).

Elkanah's reminder to Hannah about her vow and petition, to which the birth of Samuel corresponds as the divine answer, also serves to remind the reader that the entire series of events evolves as the manifestation of a divine plan, initiated by God himself as we know already in v. 5. When Elkanah says, "Only may Yahweh establish his word," he expresses his understanding that the birth of Samuel after the vow indicates that the vow is in accord with Yahweh's purpose. The vow irrevocably establishes the future actions of Hannah and especially of Samuel. Yahweh's
assent to Hannah's request signals that the vow is his plan for the future, and it becomes "his word." Hannah would not have given up her son had she not been made sterile by Yahweh. We have proof of this in her actions after the birth, when she hesitates to fulfill the vow. Hence from the beginning to end, the narrative reveals that Samuel is "from Yahweh" (v. 20), "for Yahweh" (v. 11).

The deuteronomistic concept of Yahweh's word in historical manifestation has been suggested to lie behind Elkanah's words in v. 23 (von Rad 1965:vol. 2, 94 n.23). Samuel's future life of sanctified devotion to Yahweh has become Yahweh's word. Thereby the birth and future life of Samuel are incorporated into a historical perspective in which the word of Yahweh is "the real motive force and creator of Israel's history" (von Rad 1965:vol.2, 95).

Elkanah's words reinforce the narrator's presentation of preceding events—Hannah's sterility, her vow, and Samuel's birth—which affords the reader a few glimpses of the divine hand working behind the scenes. The sketchiness of these few insights into the larger significance of the birth story serves to increase narrative interest. The reader wants to
know why God has arranged to have this boy dedicated
to his service.

So far the narrator has given the reader no
real clues as to the historical cause or situation
that has prompted Yahweh to this course of action.
Instead of explaining these historical antecedents
with a piece of preliminary exposition, the narrator
plunges his reader directly into the outworkings of
the divine plan in progress. The reader can only
speculate on the wider context that brings about
this miraculous birth, and must patiently wait for
further developments and narratorial exposition in
order to completely understand the birth of Samuel.

The final sentence of v. 23 summarizes the
brief period of Hannah's time with the child. The
poignancy of the scene is sharpened by the choice of
words. Hannah nurses the child, now specifically
"her son" (bə'nāh), until he is weaned. The physical
bond, about to be broken, between mother and child
is in the forefront.

Verse 24

Hannah makes good her promise; the first
sentence of v. 24 stands in clear contrast to vv. 21/
22:
vv. 21/22  wē'ēt-nedēr(!) hāamma lō'ō'ēlātā... Cad yiggāmel

v. 24  watta'ēbenü'ē immēnh  kā'äsār ēmālattū
Hannah's forthright action lays to rest any doubts created by her hesitation in vv. 21/22.

Both Cross (1953:18) and McCarter (1980:56) see kā'äsār ēmālattū as redundant and syntactically awkward here and insert it in v. 22 following LXX and a reconstructed 4QSama. Given the doubts in vv. 22-23 about Hannah's intention to fulfill the vow, however, the kā'äsār ēmālattū is an appropriate and emphatic depiction of Hannah's faithfulness.

Hannah takes a "three year old bull," an ephah of flour, and a skin of wine. The final two sentences of v. 24 with v. 25 are radically different in MT and LXX (cf. McCarter 1980:57). Before attempting to determine the "original" or "correct" reading, we must first determine if MT has meaning as it stands. Recalling that the first sentence in v. 24 corresponds to vv. 21/22, a similar response can be seen in the last sentence of v. 24:

v. 22  waḥā'sābēt-apēētārēne yēwhā yēsāb sam căd-cō'ēm
v. 24  watta'ēbenü'ēhet-yēwhā sō'ō'ēlō'ē hāamma căr nā'ēcar
The narrative reemphasizes Hannah's faithfulness by describing the enactment of her promise, which she carries out quite literally.

The parallel may also afford an understanding of the obscure concluding sentence, \( \text{whanna} \text{car n\text{"a}} \text{car} \). Tsevat has proposed that "Der Knabe trat seinen Dienst als Diener an" (quote from Stoebe 1973:99 n.24d). Samuel takes up his role as \( \text{n\text{"a}} \text{car} \) to the priests once he gets to Shiloh, just as his mother had said he would in v. 22.

Verse 25

The subjects of the verbs are unspecified. Perhaps it was this unspecificity that provoked the longer LXX reading in v. 25, though this cannot be proven. The ambiguity of the text allows the reader to entertain several possibilities:²⁰ 1. The subjects could be Elkanah, his household, and Hannah, since Elkanah has not returned home from his journey in v. 21; 2. The subjects could be Hophni and Phinehas, who are the priests at Shiloh; 3. The subjects could be Hophni, Phinehas and Hannah.

The ambiguity invites speculation from the reader but also forces him to hold all the possibilities in abeyance until he receives further information.
Whoever the subjects are, the most important point is that the proper sacrifice is performed and that Samuel is brought to Eli, fulfilling the vow.

Verse 26

Hannah, at least, must be included amongst the subjects of v. 25. Here in v. 26 her address to Eli is introduced by the narrator using the waw consecutive (wattōmer), which implies temporal sequence (cf. R.J. Williams 1976:53 #178).

Hannah identifies herself to Eli as the woman who stood near him and prayed to Yahweh for Samuel. Again Hannah is supremely humble before Eli, recalling her previous bearing in vv. 15-16, 18. This time Samuel is physically associated with his mother when she exhibits such behaviour in Eli's presence. The association is an important prelude to the stark contrast to be made between Samuel and the Elders in chs. 2-3.

Verse 27

The first three words in v. 27 pick up and develop the last three words of v. 26. In v. 26, Hannah describes her prayer to Yahweh. Immediately following the words "to pray to Yahweh" (v. 26) she
says, "for this child" (v. 27). Taken together, the six words exhibit a chiastic symmetry that reinforces the semantic emphases of the words:

\[
\text{hitpälēl} \quad \text{el-yhwh}
\]

\[
\text{el-hanna} \quad \text{hazzeh} \quad \text{hitpallāti}
\]

The repetition of the verb hitpälēl, "to pray," unifies the two lines and accents the fact that the only resort of a barren woman is prayer directly to Yahweh.\(^{21}\) The paralleling of the indirect object "Yahweh," with the direct object, "this lad," both modified by the preposition el, suggests a connection between Yahweh and the lad. The demonstrative adjective zeh modifying hanna calls attention to the fact that the prayer was answered—"this (hazzeh) lad" is the result. The small chiastic structure sets up an important parallel that emphasizes one thing. Hannah prayed to Yahweh and Samuel is the result. The importance laid upon this state of affairs may be gauged by its threefold repetition, once in v. 20 and twice in v. 27.

Using different language, Hannah repeats again
her explanation of Samuel's miraculous birth to Eli. Almost word for word, she repeats what Eli said to her when she left the temple after her prayer in v. 17. Yahweh has granted her her request in the form of Samuel. Yahweh, we are told, is the answer to Hannah's problems.

Verse 28.

Hannah attempts to show how her own response to Yahweh's gift parallels the granting of her request:

v. 27 wayyitten yhwh l^et-s^elat^i
v. 28 we^gam anoki^ his^iltihu lyhwh

The correlative we^gam (R.J. Williams 1976: 64 #381), and the long form of the first person pronoun in the emphatic syntactic position before the verb highlight Hanna's response. "And I, for my part, grant him to Yahweh." The doubts raised in v. 22 about Hannah's ability to overcome her maternal instincts and to fulfill the vow by handing over her child are laid to rest. She willingly repays the vow.

As she promised, "All the days for which he shall be, he is granted to Yahweh" (Driver's translation, 1913:22). The special grant of Yahweh to
Hannah is specially dedicated to Yahweh. He will be Yahweh's man.

Hannah's remarks about the background to Samuel's birth and about his life-long career of dedication to Yahweh supply the reader with a conclusive definition of Samuel's role. Hannah recalls the almost miraculous birth and ties Samuel's career to his special birth; his pre-natal dedication, his birth, his name, and his public dedication all show that he is inseparably linked to Yahweh. The only thing that is not yet revealed about Samuel is the part he will play in Yahweh's plans. That Yahweh does have some purpose for this Samuel has been evident ever since the narrator told us that Yahweh sealed Hannah's womb (v. 5). Though we do not know what Samuel is going to do, we do know that Samuel, whose name means "the name of God," will act in the interest of his namesake, "God."

Few scholars since Hylander have failed to note the connection between the repeated emphasis on the verb ūnîl in connection with Samuel, and the name of Israel's first king, Saul. Most recently, McCarter has also adopted Hylander's position. McCarter suggests that an account of Saul's birth
and Nazirite dedication lie behind the narrative in ch. 1, which has been adapted for Samuel (1980:65-66).

McCarter provides two reasons for his suggestion: first, the word-play on šā'āl, and secondly, the points of contact between ch. 1 and Judg 15. The wordplay fits Saul's name better than Samuel's, and the birth story in ch. 1 involves Nazirite elements that parallel the Samson birth story in Judg 13. Yet Samson and Samuel are not alike. Samson was a great military figure more comparable to Saul than Samuel.

To suggest that the Nazirite elements of ch. 1 must originally have described a military man assumes, on the basis of the Samson story, that all Nazirites were military men. Yet the case of Samson is more the exception than the rule for Nazirite status and function. W.R. Smith, citing Wellhausen, observes that the Arabic nadhara and the Hebrew nz' both mean primarily "to consecrate" (1969:482). The law of Nazirite dedication in Num 6 also focuses on sanctification rather than any explicit tasks or actions such as military duties. In fact, military function is not even mentioned in Num 6. Nor as Exum notes, is the Nazirite vow mentioned in Judg 14-15, which describe Samson's military endeavours.
"Samson's fidelity to the Nazirite vow is not central to the theological message of the saga as it now stands" (1981:25 n.1).

Without further proof the assumption that Samson was a typical Nazirite is unwarranted. The Nazirite elements of 1 Sam 1 are perfectly suited to the character of Samuel as outlined so far. The primary focus in the Nazirite life is that it is to be a life dedicated to Yahweh (Rylaarsdam 1962:526). Samuel, requested from Yahweh (v. 20), given by Yahweh (v. 27), and given to Yahweh (v. 28), is an eminent Nazirite candidate.

Without the support of the suggested Nazirite connection between Samson and Saul, who incidentally does not appear anywhere in the course of 1 Sam 9-11 as a Nazirite, the connection between the verb שָׁאָל and Saul's name lends but weak support to speculation about the pre-history of ch. 1. The "whole narrative concerning the birth of Samuel cannot be declared a Saul birth story merely on account of this pun. Except for the verb שָׁאָל, there is nothing in the present Samuel narratives that exhibits any connection with a possible Saul birth narrative (Van Zyl 1969:124).
The genetic explanations of the word-play on šā-al with reference to Samuel have been found unacceptable even to historical critics (e.g. Noth 1965:395; Stoebé 1973:97-98). The observation that the word-play, especially in v. 28, applies more naturally to Saul than Samuel is, however, valid and requires explanation. Hertzberg suggests that the application to Samuel may contain a criticism of Saul. "The real deliverer is not the first king, but the last judge" (1964:26; cf. Stoebé 1973:98). Alternatively the connection may not be so much a criticism of Saul as a conditioning of the reader. When one reads the events of ch. 9 and realizes that this Saul character is going to be Israel's king, one recalls a previous person—Samuel—described as šā-ul. Samuel was šā-ul, "granted" to Yahweh to serve him all the days of his life. Saul's very name in ch. 9 thereby cues the reader to the possibility that Saul, too, may be or become one dedicated to Yahweh.

Whether or not this is, in fact, the correct explanation of the narrative function of the connection between šā-al in ch. 1 and Saul in chs. 9-11, it is, I believe, a correct approach to an.
explanation. The reader of 1 Sam 1-12 encounters ch. 1 before ch. 9 and so the reader reads and interprets Saul's name in terms of the previous associations he has encountered in ch. 1. \( \text{šārāl} \) in 1:28 foreshadows the name Saul in 9:2, which, in turn, may contain a subtle hint about the type of monarchy to be given to Israel.

If the connection between the verb \( \text{šārāl} \) in ch. 1 and the name Saul in ch. 9 is exploited by the narrative, it is the prior occurrence that will determine the frame within which subsequent occurrences will be read (cf. Perry 1979:40; Sternberg 1978:35-55).

The traditio-historical explanation reverses the conventional sequential order of reading, and interprets the prior occurrence in terms of the sequent. The basis for this reversal is the hypothetical historical priority of the latter. The dynamic structure built into the narrative for the apprehension of meaning by the reader is thereby disregarded. Instead, the meaning of the text is sought in its compositional history.

The root \( \text{š-l} \) is, nevertheless, of great importance for ch. 1 and the reader's view of Samuel.
If one attempts to say what ch. 1 is about, what single thing or person frames the episode, one must say that it is Samuel. Yahweh closes Hannah's womb with the result that she promises to give her child to Yahweh if he will only let her have one. Yahweh opens her womb and she, for her part, gives him Samuel, one requested from Yahweh and returned back to him to serve him. Samuel is the miraculous gift of Yahweh to a barren woman. He is a part of a mysterious divine plan of which the reader is allowed only glimpses at this point. The repetition of the root סָל in vv. 27-28 recapitulates these various emphases of the chapter.

Chapter 1 ends, therefore, with a reminder of exactly who and what Samuel is; the various nuances given to the root סָל are various nuances given to the character of Samuel. Repeatedly the final verses of ch. 1 emphasize Samuel's uniqueness and divine origination. He is the answer to prayer, the granted request. He has come into the world in response to Hannah's human need. Subsequently, he is granted to Yahweh, devoted to him all his days. In short, Samuel is a God-given man of God.

The subject of the final sentence in v. 28 is
not defined. Most commentators have followed Wellhausen, who himself followed LXX (1871:42). Instead of "He worshipped there to Yahweh," LXX reads, "And she left him there before Yahweh and returned to Ramathah." The LXX reading is unambiguous and logical, and so an attractive alternative to the obstacle posed by MT's ambiguity. And, as Wellhausen notes with respect to Elkanah's absence in LXX 2:11, "Wenn als statt dessen LXX in der That um den Abschied der Hanna berichtet, so wird dies um so mehr das Ursprüngliche sein, als sie kein Interesse hatte, dem Elkanah hier den Antheil an der Handlung zu verkummern, den sie ihm v. 24 so weitläufig erworben hatte" (1871:42).

It is possible, on the other hand, that the ambiguity of this sentence is intentional rather than an inadvertent textual corruption. Previously in v. 25 the subjects of the verbs were also left undetermined and there too LXX made them specific. In MT, Elkanah does not explicitly return from his journey of v. 21 until 2:11. The text allows the reader to include him in v. 25 and perhaps also as the subject of the last sentence in v. 28. The reader recalls that Elkanah went up to sacrifice and to worship in
v. 3. In v. 21, he goes up to sacrifice. Perhaps he completes his religious observances in v. 28, and then goes home as in 2:11. 24

Another possible subject for wayyištahû in v. 28 is Samuel (cf. Smith 1899:13). He is the subject in Hannah's preceding participial clause and could be the subject of the final sentence, which is a description from the narrator.

When Hannah finishes speaking about Samuel, it is possible that the narrator might not identify the subject of his descriptive conclusion. Since the topic of Hannah's utterance is Samuel, the narrator adds a subject-less sentence and assumes that the reader will understand that the topic of discussion—Samuel—has not changed. Viewed from the alternative perspective, it would be strange and difficult to follow if the narrator intended to change the topic of discussion from Samuel in Hannah's utterance to someone else in his own, but did not tell his audience who he was talking about.

If Samuel is to be understood as the subject of the last sentence—though it is far from certain that he or anyone else can be conclusively chosen—the sentence would show Samuel demonstrating his
willingness to take up the role prescribed for him by worshipping his new employer.

A third possibility suggested by de Boer is that the verb be read as "hitpal. 3rd pers. plur." with Hannah and Samuel as subject (1938:82; cf. Thenius 1864:9). Eli, while possible, is an unlikely candidate. Neither in the preceding context nor in the following is he or either of his sons cast in a clearly positive light. Contrast Elkanah, Hannah and Samuel. Worshipping Yahweh is not amongst the characteristics of the Elders. Eli even mistakes prayer for drunkenness (v. 14).

The positive function of the ambiguity of this sentence in v. 28 might be to cause the careful reader to do exactly what has been done above, namely to run through the possibilities noting who could and could not be subject. The process of recollection groups Elkanah, Hannah and Samuel as characters that could be expected to worship Yahweh and contrasts them with Eli. Such ambiguity, "plurisignation," is a valuable addition of richness and complexity to the structure of meaning in the narrative (Wimsatt and Brooks 1957:vol. 2, 639-40; Perry 1979:46-49). The unambiguous LXX reading does not contain the
opportunity for reader participation created by MT. The attempt to understand the ambiguity forces the reader to struggle with the text, thereby testing and modifying or confirming his understanding of it. Premature decisions to read MT here and LXX there dodge the obstacles in the text instead of confronting them and seeking to determine their significance.

Though summaries are doomed to misrepresent literary texts (cf. Brooks 1947:192-214), it may be useful to present such a "misrepresentation" at this point in order to reorient my readers to the description at hand. Chapter 1 centres on Samuel, aiming at a definition of his pre-determined role. Subsidiary accomplishments include the veiled revelations of divine purpose, and the introduction of a series of contrasts drawn between the Elide priests and ordinary Israelites such as Elkanah and Hannah.

These three aspects of ch. 1 are all on the level of story, the subject matter of the narrative.

On the level of discourse, the level of literary technique and narrative structure, the narrator introduces himself to the reader in ch. 1. The narrator shows that he reports to us from an undetermined time subsequent to the events of the
narrative. He is an omniscient narrator with access to God's hidden actions (e.g. v. 5), though he does not commit himself to telling all to his reader. On the contrary, he is interested in narration, and the creation of narrative interest, as his many ambiguities and denials of necessary expository material show. From ch. 1, we are given to understand that the voice describing everything belongs to a narrator telling a story, and not to a historian providing information.

Chapter 1, therefore, is best seen as an introduction to two persons, Samuel and the narrator.
2. 1 Samuel 2

Excursus: The "Song of Hannah"

The majority of critical studies on the song of Hannah have concluded that it is secondary in its present context (Thenius 1864:9; Wellhausen 1871:42; Smith 1899:14; Budde 1902:13-14; Nowack 1902:9; Dhorme 1910:29; Hertzberg 1964:29; Brockington 1962:319; Mauchline 1971:50; Stoebe 1975:106-07; McCarter 1980:75-76). Two positions have been taken on the question of the redactional logic for the insertion of the song.

Exemplifying the first position, Thenius suggests that a redactor who inserted the song saw a connection between vv. 1 and 5 of the song and the preceding situation of Hannah's infertility (1864:9; cf. Smith 1899:14). Because the connection is slim, almost spurious, the redaction critic is able to label the song redactional. He can then go on to suggest an original setting in which the song may be correctly understood (e.g., Budde 1902:13-14).

The presumption that an author of a work would not introduce a poem only minimally linked with its context has received neither demonstration nor analysis. Gutbrod, for example, simply asserts, "Es
bedarf keines sonderlichen Scharfblicks, um zu merken, dass dieser Lobgesang wenig, ja, genau besehen, gar keinem Zusammenhang mit der persönlichen Geschichte von Hanna und ihrem Sohne hat" (1956:19). We are to assume, therefore, that the psalm pre-existed its present context and has been inserted. "We should take this in the same way as the addition of a suitable hymn to a Bible reading" (Hertzberg 1964:29). But if it is "suitable," why call it redactional? Lacking are objective criteria for determining whether or not the song is redactional or integral to its context.

Scholars of the second position build on the redactional label attached to the song in the first position. They differ, however, in their perception of a broader thematic connection between the song and its context. McCarter is able to say "the song is not wholly unsuited to its secondary context....the little hymn is fitting enough on Hannah's lips" (1980:76; cf. Hertzberg 1964:31). As for the subsequent context, "the song of Hannah sounds a clear keynote" (McCarter 1980:76). Similarly, Gutbrod says that although we cannot answer the question of whether or not the song was sung by Hannah, it does introduce
the central concerns of the subsequent narratives.


The historical critic's recognition of such important thematic continuity undermines his reason for calling the song redactional. The redactional label is left supported only by the fact that 2:1-10 is written as poetry while its context is written as prose. By itself this difference allows no conclusions about the text's compositional history, unless
one were to go as far as to suggest that poetry and prose cannot coexist in the same literary unit.

The redactional label, originally applied because 2:1-10 was regarded as contextually isolated, becomes a vestigial appendage inherited from a historical critical mode of reading when vv. 1-10 are recognized as thematically appropriate. As Stoebe suggests, if there is a lack of specific reference in 2:1-10 to the details of Hannah's situation in ch. 1 it is because even ch. 1 is not so much concerned with the details as with the larger implications of those developments. "Die Gestalt der Hanna findet ebensowenig wie die Samuels Interesse um ihrer selbst, sondern um der Bedeutung willen, die Samuel für die Entstehung des Königtums behabt hat" (1973:106).

Both chs. 1 and 2:1-10 relate to Israelite politics, the basic subject matter of the books of Samuel. The song of Hannah according to Stoebe is a thematic introduction, by which "die ganze darauf abfolgende Geschichte als Ausfluss und Manifestierung der Weisheit Gottes (V.2 u.3) herausgestellt [ist], und das ist ein theologisch absolut richtige Beurteilung des Handelns des geschächtigten Gottes" (1973:106). Despite his correct observations,
Stoebe still feels compelled to doff his historical critical hat to his predecessors. "Sollte diese Folgerung zu weit zu gehen scheinen, so wäre jedenfalls daran festzuhalten, dass dieses Lied unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Gesamtgeschichte interpoliert wurde" (1973:107).

Scholars of the "second position" have rejected the view that the song of Hannah is contextually isolated, yet at the same time they have been unable or unwilling to give up the now questionable redactional label. Stoebe's statement that the song was at least interpolated in view of the entire narrative says nothing about the narrative and everything about the historical critical predisposition to interpret the text in terms of literary history.

McCarter suggests that since the lyrics presuppose the monarchy (v. 10), the song cannot have been contemporary with the events with which it is related. He suggests, therefore, that it is a redactional insertion made; perhaps, quite late in the literary history of the book (1980:75). It seems that McCarter assumes that the prose context of 2:1-10 was composed at the same time as the
events it describes happened. Yet such historical information is neither explicit in the text nor does McCarter supply a method for dating Hebrew prose. It is just as difficult to date the narrative context of Hannah's song as it is to date the song itself. ¹ Certainly the context offers no certain evidence about itself or its relative dating with respect to the song.

The only existing context for an interpretation of the song is to be found in its present narrative context. If the song does offer "an interpretive key" to the narrative (Childs 1979:273), then one can only discover how it unlocks subsequent events by a careful scrutiny of its contours as they now appear.

The hermeneutic options for reading the song of Hannah are at least two. We can read the song in a hypothetical historical context, interpreting it as the literary record of a specific socio-historical setting. Or, we can read it in its given narrative context. The problem facing the historical critical reading is the hypothetical nature of the undertaking. "Si la critique n'a qu'une voix pour reconnaître dans la cantique d'Anne un morceau introduit après coup,
l'accord est loin d'être fait sur l'interprétation de ce cantique et la date à laquelle on doit en rapporter la composition" (Dhorne 1910:32).

Even granting his correct determination of the socio-historical context, the historical critic is still faced with a problem analogous to that single problem facing a literary interpretation. Both approaches must show how the features of the poem engage the context, whether it be socio-historical or narrative. The most satisfying interpretation will be the one that is able to show the greatest degree of engagement between the poem and its context.

Polzin has even suggested that literary contextual analysis should have operational priority over socio-historical analysis. Citing K. Pomorska, he says, "if we move in the opposite direction, basing synchronic analysis on historical studies, 'we always run a risk of applying ready-made theories to something not suited to them'" (1980:6; cf. Ellis 1974:118-21, 133-54). Further socio-historical discussion of Hannah's song should at least consider the contextual engagement of the poem within the narrative before removing it to a separate
place and distant time (e.g. McCarter 1980:75-76).

Verse 1

Hannah expresses a prayer of thanksgiving and praise, apparently in celebration of her fulfillment of her vow (cf. 1:11). The repetition of the verb wawittipallel, forms an inclusio with the prior occurrences in 1:26-27:

1:26-27 Hannah prayed to Yahweh, praying for Samuel (this lad).
1:27 Yahweh gives Samuel to Hannah.
1:28 Hannah dedicates Samuel to Yahweh.
2:1 Hannah prays (to Yahweh, thanking and praising him).

The inclusio, with the intervening chiastic summary of the main events of ch. 1, specifically indicates that the following prayer of thanksgiving is Hannah's response to the result of the previous petitionary prayer. She is able to pray this prayer, which celebrates divine strength because Yahweh answered the first. Since this prayer in 2:1-10 is structurally linked to the prayer for Samuel in 1:26-27, we are also led to expect some correlation between Samuel and the message of the poem. In fact, Samuel becomes
more and more the sole representative of the theological and political point of view expressed in Hannah's prayer.

Verse I exhibits a chiastic structure of the AB:BA'A' type. A and A' are semantically parallel. Both describe Hannah's exultation in Yahweh and his deliverance. The two verbs čālas and šāmah also appear elsewhere in parallel construction (Pss 5:12; 9:3; 68:4). In all cases, the verbs describe the joyful response of humble worshippers of Yahweh, who exult in the strength of their God. Also associated with all occurrences are statements about the futility and wickedness of man's pride and efforts at self-help, whether done in defiance or ignorance of the deity.

B and B' are also connected semantically. "My horn becomes high in/by Yahweh, my mouth stretches wide over my enemies." They also share a connotation of power possessed by Hannah; in B she exults in the strength that Yahweh gives her and in B', in the consequent power over her enemies (I owe this observation to a letter from J. Fokkelman). The connection is reinforced by the alliterative parallelism between the verbs. Both begin with r and
describe metaphorical physical enlargements resulting from Yahweh's sponsorship. In addition to the chiastic structure of the verse, which sets off the exultation (A, A') against the cause of exultation (B, B'), there is a logical progression in the verse indicated by the grammatical construction of each line:

My heart exults in Yahweh
My horn is exalted in Yahweh
My mouth extends over my enemies
So I rejoice in your deliverance.

The 'Ki' introducing A' should not be omitted to agree with LXX (against McCarter 1980:68). It highlights the uniqueness of A', which is the only line of the verse in which Hannah is subject. The switch from third person description in A, B, and B' to first person in A', an exclamation addressing Yahweh directly in the second person, structurally conveys the mounting pressure of Hannah's exuberance. She finally bursts out in direct address to Yahweh because her descriptive praise is not expressive enough. The single 'Ki', the change in person of the verb, and the change from description to address to Yahweh in the 2nd person all combine to give
prominence to $A'$. As Muilenberg says, $kî$ "is characteristically associated with emphatic words or clauses, ... [it] frequently appears in a strategic position in the poem or narrative, ... [and] often confirms or underlines what has been said, or, at times, undergirds the whole of the utterance and gives point to it" (1961:150). A third pattern, pointed out by Fokkelman (in a letter) in v. 1 is related to the pattern of logical progression. The first two lines are paralleled in $A^1A^2$ pattern, as are the second two lines, $B^1B^2$. The first two lines are linked semantically and by the perfect rhyme of $yîhwî$. The $B^1B^2$ pair end in contrasting terms "my enemies," and "your deliverance."

There are, therefore, at least three structural patterns exhibited by v. 1. Rather than attempting to decide which pattern is predominant it seems better to regard all three as equally important. The reader of such beautifully constructed and integrated plural structure is forced to meditate on each verse with exceeding care if he is to discover all of the riches contained therein. The time necessarily spent on such a reading ensures that the reader cannot leave the poem without having a
thorough understanding and appreciation of the message presented by the poem.

In the particular case of Hannah's poem the utility of such poetic technique is readily apparent, since the message of the poem is one pole in the subsequent examination, through the narrative, of the question of human need in relation to divine aid. The reader who has read Hannah's poem as it should be read cannot fail to carry its message with him as he reads on. The three structures in v. 1 are, therefore, rhetorically complementary.

McCarter notes that the idiom, "raise, exalt the horn" denotes visible success and can refer specifically to progeny acquired (e.g. 1 Chr 25:5; 1980:71). Hannah's praise refers directly back to the birth of Samuel who is figuratively representative of her raised horn. As a result of his birth her mouth stretches (חָבָא) over her enemy.

Just as Moses and the people of Israel sang a song of praise to Yahweh for his deliverance (Exod 15:2) from their enemies (vv. 6, 7, 9) so Hannah rejoices. Both poems celebrate Yahweh's deliverance (יִשְׁתַּחַם) of his people, who praise him for it. Again in both cases the immediate context provides a
contrast in the representation of the fate of those whose strength is in their own hand (1 Sam 2:4-10a; Exod 15:4-10; cf. Isa 10:12-15). Hannah regards Yahweh's deliverance in the same terms as the Israelites looked upon their deliverance from Egypt. Hence the rhetorical emphasis on the final ki clause is seen to agree with the semantic emphasis of the poem, which celebrates Yahweh's deliverance of the weak and helpless. As the ki clause is distinguished as the climactic conclusion of v. 1, so it also introduces the leitmotif of the poem—salvation is from Yahweh. The only action to be taken by the one delivered is to rejoice. This notion is especially important in the light of Israel's subsequent decision to take matters into its own hands by ousting Yahweh as their king and replacing him with a human king (1 Sam 8). Though the reader does not read Hannah's song in light of 1 Sam 8, he will relate the two passages in the course of his reflections on ch. 8.

It is important to note at this point that the narrator does not himself espouse the notion of total reliance on Yahweh. Instead, he allows Hannah to do the talking. In her mouth, such an idea is
obviously motivated and supported by her personal experience. Given the location of the motivation for the expression of this notion within the story itself, the reader is not at liberty to believe that the narrator shares Hannah's point of view. The narrator presents the notion through Hannah so that the reader will consider it together with preceding and subsequent narrative situations and events. The reader must, however, wait for further evidence of the narrator's own point of view before making any firm decisions on his relation to the ideas expressed in Hannah's song. Given that the narrator has already supplied the reader with the story of Samuel's miraculous birth, a story that supports Hannah's position in 2:1-10, it seems that he is at least not against such views.

Verse 2

Practically all commentators regard this verse as conflate. Usually the second line is taken to be the intruder, although McCarter suggests that MT contains three separate variants (1980:68-69; cf. Talmon 1975:23ff.). It is, nevertheless, possible to include all three variants in a reading of the verse even though the first and third lines are
syntactically parallel, while the second deviates from the structure. It may be that the obtrusive appearance of the second line is designed to draw attention to it. If so, we would expect the foregrounded element to have a semantic role commensurate with its unusual form.

All three variants say more or less the same thing: Yahweh is unique and incomparable. The second line sums up the first and third, and includes all other comparisons that might be made. The unified voice of all three lines is that Yahweh is a certain source of refuge without rival. Parallel occurrences all stress the same idea (Deut 32:4, 15, 18, 37; Pss 18:3, 32, 47; 28:1; 31:3, etc.).

Hannah's assertion of this widespread notion is important in light of the people's request for a human king to replace Yahweh in ch. 8. She presents the standard theological view, which is supported by the events of ch. 1.

By allowing Hannah to speak directly, the narrator begins to equip his reader for the exploration of the theological-political problem that is presented in his narrative. Hannah gives voice to the standard view of the proper relation between
Israelite need and divine response to need. It is important to note, however, that the standard view is supported here by the deliverance of a pious individual. The events of ch. 1 prove the truthfulness of the standard view but the application is limited to the individual's case.

Because the reader reads the exaltation of Yahweh as deliverer of those in need in light of a supportive example (ch. 1), he is compelled to admit to the validity of the idea, at least within the framework of this narrative. The order of presentation, example followed by theological statement, is designed to convince. Since it is the author/omniscient narrator who has arranged this order of presentation, it would seem that he wants his reader to appreciate and accept the ideas presented by Hahnah. Through an awareness of the rhetorical function of the narrative's order of presentation, we can watch how the narrator carefully guides the reader's reflections and perceptions of the events and their significance.

Again one must be careful to maintain a distinction between views the narrator wants his reader to accept and what he himself accepts. The narrator
may get his reader to accept something only to intensify the effect of a subsequent questioning of it. The reader, therefore, is prudent to avoid attributing perspectives contained in the narrative to the narrator until the whole narrative has been studied. It is primarily in the structural whole, which includes all aspects of his narrative, that a narrator presents his peculiar perspective.

Verse 3

Verses 1-2 constitute a positive celebration of both Yahweh's deliverance of Hannah from her enemies and his preeminence as a haven for his people. That is, the positive implications of Yahweh's power and incomparability for humanity are presented. Verse 3 presents the reverse side of the coin. It advises against arrogant boasts because Yahweh is a knowledgeable God who weighs such practises.

The two key words גֶּבֹהַ and כָּתָא converge on the self-sufficient attitude of the person who makes such utterances. According to Gowan, the basic meaning of these words is haughtiness. They are the biblical Hebrew equivalent to the Greek word ὑβρίς (1975:20-21). Self-sufficiency is contrary to the proper attitude of dependence on Yahweh. He is the
sole determinant of human fortunes. Arrogance and boastful speech are characterized as *calilōt*, "evil practises." The evil deeds are, however, balanced by Yahweh. As in Zeph 3:11ff, the evil deeds of the proud are punished, while the humble are given divine protection.

A series of seven contrasts follow v. 3 and illustrate the "balancing" or weighing of deeds by Yahweh (Brownlee 1977:43). The reversals of fortune exhibit the standard Israelite belief that Yahweh downgrades human self-sufficiency and rewards the helpless, who have no basis for pride or self-sufficiency.

Verses 4-10

The warrior's broken bow is, as in Jer 51:56, symbolic of the insignificance of human strength. The reversal makes the strong weak and the weak strong. One cannot rely on appearances, which mean nothing when it comes to Yahweh (cf. 1 Sam 16:7). The obvious conclusion is that one should rely solely on Yahweh. He is the only "rock," the God who girds the weak with strength (Ps 18:32-35; cf. 2 Sam 22).

The reversals of fortune receive further illustration, thereby driving the point home by
repetition. Human fate is totally in Yahweh's hands (v. 6; cf. Deut 32:39). Ehrlich describes the intent of the references to the physical creation in v. 8: "Weil JHVH der Schöpfer und Erhalter der Welt ist, darum kann er in ihr schalten und walten nach Belieben" (1910:170). Verse 9 openly states the basis of all the unexpected reversals. A man does not become mighty by his own strength, but must resort to Yahweh for preservation (cf. Ps 33:16-17).

Verse 10

Yahweh shatters (yēḥattū) his opponents just as he shattered the bows of the mighty (v. 4). By implication one could say that his opponent is human self-sufficiency as symbolized by the warrior's bow. The situation of Yahweh in heaven, thundering and judging the inhabitants of earth, stresses man's helplessness before this God (cf. Ps 33:15-15). Obviously any posture other than humble submission is absurd.

Hannah's song also bears some implications for the character of Samuel. He is born to the woman who believes in the necessity of pious submission and utter dependence on Yahweh. Samuel, the fruit of such faith, will continue to bear that torch throughout
the following events. He is the living proof and will become the adamant exponent of the viewpoint expounded in Hannah's song.

The last two lines of v. 10 openly anticipate the coming conflict of political ideologies. In keeping with the entire poem we are told that it is Yahweh who gives strength to his king and raises the horn of his anointed. That is to say, if a king has any power at all, it is delegated to him by Yahweh. By attaching the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix to each noun describing the monarch the verse stresses the fact that the king is Yahweh's king (cf. 2:35, on which see below). He derives his power from him and owes obedience and allegiance to him.

The references to a king in v. 10 are usually taken as a clue that the song is from the later monarchic period. They are thought to be the clearest evidence that the poem is a redactional insertion. Willis (1973:148 n.43) gives a list of early modern proponents to which add all recent commentators. This genetic explanation fails to perceive the unity of the poem, and its thematic linkage to its prose context.
As Willis has observed, the poem begins with Hannah's description of her horn, raised by Yahweh, and concludes with a note that Yahweh raises the horn of his anointed (1973:148). An equivalence between Hannah and the anointed is thereby established. Hannah's horn-raising was accomplished through her prayerful, but submissive request for divine activity on her behalf. The structural inclusio suggests that the anointed's horn, raised by Yahweh, requires a similar stance of the king. If the reader has followed the logic of the poem, he will agree with its implication, "For it is not by strength that a man becomes might" (v. 9).

To reiterate, the song of Hannah begins to equip the reader for the future controversy over who shall rule in Israel—God or man. The poem directs us to the simple fact that Yahweh is the great leveller, the controller of human destiny. From this perspective the notion that a human king could rule and successfully guide Israel independent of Yahweh is nonsense. The point is not, however, made polemically, which is to say that redaction critics should not jump to label the poem anti-monarchic. Rather the poem sets forth this view upon the basis of
empirical observations, the case of Hannah, the examples of vv. 4-10, Yahweh's obvious superiority (vv. 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10), and upon the common tradition about the fate of the proud.

The poem is a theological reflection on the principles underlying the events of ch. 1. At the same time, Hannah's song sounds a key note for the subsequent story of Israel's political evolution. The poem suggests that an Israelite monarchy can only exist in a subordinate role determined by Yahweh. Verse 10 anticipates the turn of events in chs. 9-12 but does not thereby make those chapters anti-climactic. On the contrary, the intervening chapters (2:11-ch. 8) support Israel's request for a secular king, just as ch. 1 supports Hannah's exultation in the standard view about the necessity of total dependence on Yahweh. Yahweh's apparent acceptance of Israel's request (8:7, 9, 22) lends it further plausibility.

The narrative in chs. 1-12 exhibits a dialectical structure. In ch. 1 and especially in 2:1-10 Yahweh's supreme sovereignty over humanity is affirmed.

In the concatenation of narrative events
following Hannah's poem the desirability of Yahweh's sovereignty over Israel is called into doubt and even rejected by Israel (8:5, 20). 12

Finally, chs. 9-12 reaffirm both Yahweh's status as Israel's real king and the covenant between Israel and Yahweh. The reaffirmation is especially visible in the terms laid down by Samuel in ch. 12.

Hannah's song also serves as an appropriate introduction to the events of chs. 2-3, which set up a contrast between the Elides and Samuel. Samuel is of the same humble sort as his mother, with whom he is directly associated (2:18-21). Samuel is portrayed as a servant of God and his priests (2:11, 18; 3:1, 4-10). He calls himself "your servant" (כָּבְדֵּכָּא, 3:9) when addressing Yahweh just as his mother called herself "your maidservant" (רָמָּהֶכָּא, 2:11) in her prayer to Yahweh. Samuel is as humbly submissive to Eli's brusque cross-examination after Yahweh's visit (3:17-19) as Hannah was when Eli accused her of drunkenness when she was praying to Yahweh (1:15-16).

The Elides, on the other hand, are far from submissive types. Eli's sons put themselves before Yahweh in the sacrifices (2:15-17), thereby despising
(2:30) and blaspheming Yahweh (3:13). They sin against Yahweh (2:25). They are anti-types of Samuel and Hannah and can be grouped with those whose fate takes a turn for the worse in Hannah's song. It is Yahweh's will to slay them (2:25) just as he cuts off the wicked in Hannah's song (2:6, 9; cf. below on vv. 25-26).

Verse 11

The narrative thread is picked up from 1:28. Once again the text leaves the reader wondering about the place and action of a character, this time Hannah. Elkanah goes home and Samuel ministers to Yahweh, but where is Hannah and what is she doing?

R. Ingarden has called such narrative lacunae "places of indeterminacy." "Each object, person, event, etc., portrayed in the literary work of art contains a number of places of indeterminacy, especially the descriptions of what happens to people and things" (1973a:50; cf. Iser 1974:280; Chatman 1978:28-30). The reader's response to indeterminacies is to supply elements that agree with the context to concretize the indeterminacy. Ingarden focuses on the aesthetic effects of different concretizations. One way of filling-out may flatten
the work while another gives it greater depth, introducing new aesthetically valuable qualities (1973a:54).

The text-critical concretization of Hannah's indeterminacy is to follow LXX in v. 11: "after Hannah had returned to Ramah." This decision removes the gap between 1:28 and 2:11, but in doing so it also neglects the aesthetic possibilities of MT. Furthermore, there is no reason, other than the indeterminacy itself, for rejecting MT. McCarter's explanation for MT's supposed corruption rests on two weak supports: supposed scribal incompetence and redactional hypothesis. He suggests that the redactional intrusion of 2:1-10 obscured the connection between 1:28 and 2:11 (1980:78). But why would an obscured connection be made even more obscure by filling in Elkanah instead of leaving Hannah as subject in v. 11? Would not the scribe who was confused by the insertion of Hannah's prayer try to eliminate his confusion by reading the same subject in 1:28 and 2:11? As Ingarden suggested—and the examples of LXX and numerous text critics who have followed it support him on this—the usual response to an indeterminacy or obscurity is to clarify and not to obscure. There is in fact no basis for
suggesting that either MT or LXX is superior or inferior.

An alternative is to take MT seriously and to seek a concretization that is both aesthetically and contextually acceptable. We can recall that when Elkanah went up to offer the sacrifice of the days in 1:21 Hannah stayed behind so as to extend her time with Samuel (1:22). The poignancy of her situation was emphasized by the repetition of the phrase "until he is weaned" in 1:22-24, and the final sentence of v. 23, which pointedly emphasized the mother and child union.

Perhaps in 2:11 Elkanah finally goes home for the first time since 1:21, leaving Samuel at the temple. Hannah's absence at this point can be explained by the conflict she experiences between her vow to leave Samuel at the temple and her obviously strong maternal attachment. She does not go home with Elkanah because of her attachment to Samuel, and she does not stay with Samuel because of her promise to leave him "before Yahweh" when he is weaned. Hannah, as the text's indeterminacy suggests, is left nowhere, caught between her vow and her maternal instincts.
Of course there are virtually limitless alternative concretizations of Hannah's indeterminacy. Each reader fills in gaps in his own way (Iser 1974: 280). All that is claimed is that this concretization is contextually and aesthetically defensible.

Verse 11 immediately introduces Samuel in what will be his almost singular role in chs. 2-5. "And the lad was ministering to Yahweh before Eli the priest." Samuel is obviously a "flat" character according to E.M. Forster's division of characters into "flat" and "round." Forster's statement that the "really flat character can be expressed in one sentence" might have been written about Samuel in ch. 2 rather than Mrs. Micawber (1976:73).

Forster suggests that flat characters have two advantages; they are easily recognized and easily remembered. "They remain in his [the reader] mind as unalterable for the reason that they were not changed by circumstances" (1976:74). Samuel is the faithful servant in ch. 2, whose only development is to grow "in stature and favor with Yahweh and men" (v. 26). As a flat character, we easily recognize him as the unpretentious protagonist, continuing in his mother's footsteps. He represents the same
religious type as Hannah and will continue to express and exemplify the views she expresses in 2:1-10. His flatness makes him the unbending standard of right action by which other characters will be measured.

According to Driver, Samuel's action in v. 11 is simultaneous with the deeds about to be dealt with in v. 12 (1915:28). The synchronicity of Samuel's action with Eli's sons' misdeeds introduces the explicit contrast between them. While Samuel is ministering 'et-yhwh the sons of Eli do not know 'et-yhwh (v. 12). As in other occurrences of the expression, "to know Yahweh" describes a conscious interaction of the knower with Yahweh in a covenantal relationship. To know Yahweh is to acknowledge his divinity (Exod 5:2 by implication) and claim on Israel (Judg 2:10), to enter into covenant with him (Isa 19:21), to obey the ethical requirements of relationship with Yahweh (Jer 9:2, 5, 15, 23), and to participate in a covenant with him (Jer 51:5; Hos 2:22; 5:4; 6:3; 8:2). While it is not stated here that Samuel knows Yahweh, the contrast between the lad who serves Yahweh and the priests who are supposed to maintain the covenant but do not even participate in "covenantal knowledge," is clear and
strongly in favour of Samuel.

Samuel has not yet been introduced to the knowledge of Yahweh, and will not attain such knowledge until Yahweh comes and personally introduces himself to Samuel (3:7-21). By implication, the existing priests, supposed mediators of the knowledge of Yahweh, are incapable of introducing Samuel to it. Even though he lacks this important knowledge, however, Samuel remains a faithful servant of God, in contrast to the priests, who should have the knowledge, but do not. 14

Verse 12

The focus shifts completely from Elkanah and Samuel to the sons of Eli. By means of paronomastic assonance and consonance the bēnê ēlî are characteristically redefined as bēnê bēliyaˈcal. According to Otten, who reviews the various attempts at etymological explanation, there is no convincing solution to the derivation of bēliyaˈcal (1977:135). Within the context of 1 Sam 1-12, however, the three occurrences of the term all describe characters offensive to Yahweh: the drunken woman in the temple (1:16), those who do not know Yahweh (2:12), and those who reject Yahweh's compromise kingship (10:27).
In each instance, the children of בֶּלַיָּ֔אָל trespass against the covenant, or a covenantal institution: the supposedly drunken woman violates the sanctity of the temple (1:16), the sinful priest neglects the covenantal knowledge of Yahweh (2:12), and the rebellious dissenters refuse to honour the king that Yahweh has granted (10:27).

The prior association of the term with the drunken woman in the temple corroborates the aspersion that the narrator casts on the Elides here. The narrator's interruption of the narrative sequence to give us his judgement of Eli's sons is a measure of the importance that he attaches to the reader's acceptance of the criticism of the Elides. He relies on his proven authority to ensure that the reader accepts the negative evaluation without question. Functionally like the omniscient narrator's assertion of the innocence of Job (Job 1:1), this characterization of the sons of Eli must be accepted as true if the reader is going to follow the logic of the following narrative. Since it is the sins of Eli's sons that catalyze the subsequent Israelite defeat (2:26, 31-34; ch. 4, esp. v. 11) the narrator takes pains, in the form of explicit exposition, to
assure that the reader follows the course of events.  

Verses 13-14

These verses describe the customary practice of the priests when any person made a sacrifice (Buber 1964:737). The introduction to v. 13 indicates that the verse should be read as a separate syntactic unit from v. 12, which tells us about the Elides' actions with respect to Yahweh. Verse 13, on the other hand, describes their actions with respect to the people:

v. 12 Ṽēd`ēc`a  `et-yhwh
v. 13 ʾāmīṣpaḥ hakkōhānīm ʾet-hāʾām

Verses 13-14 are laid out in a symmetrical chiasmus:

A  The priests' custom with respect to (ʾet) the people when anyone sacrificed.
B  The priest's servant comes with his trident (ḥammazlēg ʾelōś-haʾāmāyim) when the flesh boiled.
B' (The priest's servant) thrusts his fork (ḥammazlēg) into the pots and the priest gets
whatever is on it.
A' So they (the priests) do to any Israelite coming to Shiloh.

The chiastic structure, with its parallel between ־et-hācām in A and ־ekol-yišrā'ēl in A', also shows that A in MT should be read separate from v. 12 with the verbal idea "virtually contained" in ʿumīṣpat.

The two verses themselves contain neither explicit nor implicit condemnation of the priests or the priests' servant's actions. Smith's view that this method of obtaining the priestly portion "could scarcely be more offensive" (1899:18) has little basis in the text. Instead the two verses seem designed to establish the regular practise in order to highlight the irregularities of v. 15.

Verse 15

The sin of the sons of Eli is foregrounded by placing the words gam bēterem first in the verse. Emphasis thereby falls on the fact that the priests demand their portion even before the god gets his in the form of smoke from burnt fat. It is exactly this prematurity that provokes Yahweh to anger;
2:29 he accuses Eli and his sons of fattening themselves on the first parts (מְרוּשִּׁת) of every Israelite offering (cf. McCarter 1980:90). Even the common Israelite saw the priestly indiscretion in the prematurity of their request for raw flesh. "Let the fat be burnt first (Kayyōm)" (v. 16; cf. Driver 1913:31). The words gam bēterem might, therefore be translated as "But even before...."

The reason for the priest's impatience is that he wants roasted meat rather than boiled. The gastronomical motivation for putting himself before Yahweh makes the priest out to be nothing more than a piggish lout (cf. Schulz 1919:37). As Yahweh points out the motivation for Eli's sons' priestly crassness is to get fat on the first parts of all Israel's sacrifices (v. 29). The Elides are far from being the promethians of Israel's sacrificial system.

Verse 16

As most commentators have recognized, v. 16 portrays an upside-down situation in Israel's cult. The layman tells the official how the sacrifice should be done (Hertzberg 1964:35). The offer to take whatever he desired after the fat had been burned is refused by the priest's servant. What is
at stake is not the question of raw or boiled meat; that is a foregone conclusion ("take whatever you want"). The point is that the priests will not wait for Yahweh.

The reply of the priest's servant puts the issue succinctly. "Give it now!" (ki ḫattāʾ tittēn). According to Driver the apodosis containing the "bare perfect" is uncommon and emphatic. "And if not I take it by force" (Driver 1913:32). Not only do the priests disregard the regular sacrificial custom (vv. 13-14), but they threaten violence to any who would obstruct them. Sacrifice in their eyes is only a means to their own ends, which are pursued with total disregard for sacrificer or Yahweh.

Verse 17

The verse assumes that the servants' actions are sinful, and declares only that the magnitude of their sin was very great in Yahweh's view (šēt-pēne šyhw). The gravity of the sin is explained by the fact that "the men" contemned the offering of Yahweh. "The men" who are subject of the verb do not appear in LXX and are omitted by some commentators (e.g. McCarter 1980:80). If retained, however, the shift in the verse from hannēcārīm to ḫaANNānāśīm lays
emphasis on the hybris of the act. It is an act of contempt by man (or men) against God. We expect, on the basis of Hannah's song, that such sinful hybris will not go unrequitted by Yahweh.

Again in v. 17 the narrator employs his omniscience to inform his reader about the relationship between the divine and human planes in the narrative. In ch. 1, he described a situation where a divine initiative changed the course of events on the human plane (1:5). Now, however, he shows a reverse causality, in which human actions have an effect on the divine character. Just as the reader was led to expect some future result of the divine intervention in ch. 1, he is now led to expect some future result, or reaction on the divine plane. A difference between the two situations is that while the human characters can only respond blindly, and so, from the reader's perspective, often ironically, to divine action, God responds directly and consciously to human actions that impinge on him. The expositional note in v. 17 assumes this difference and uses it to create narrative interest by leading the reader to anticipate a divine reaction.
Verse 18

As Willis observes (1979:208), v. 18 contrasts Samuel, ministering before Yahweh (מֵאֵל פֶּנֶה יָהוֹ הָאָד), with Hophni and Phinehas (or more correctly, the servants of the latter) whose sin is exceedingly great מֵאֵל פֶּנֶה יָהוֹ ה (v. 17; cf. Hertzberg 1964:35; Péter-Contesse 1976:313).

Samuel is introduced by name for the first time in an active role. It is possible that he is mentioned by name to avoid any misunderstanding that would identify him—the priest's servant (נָכַר מ, v. 11)—with the priest's servant of vv. 13-17.

The description of Samuel's garb also seems geared to contrast him with the Elides. De Vaux suggests that the linen ephod, worn here by Samuel, was a loin-cloth worn by priests performing their offices (1965:350). While the Elides are misbehaving as priests, Samuel behaves as one both in appearance and conduct.

Verses 19-21

These verses recall the series of events leading to Samuel's birth, reminding the reader of his special character.

The reminder, coming as it does just after an
explicit contrast between the Eliines and Samuel, and just after the expository comment in v. 17, is an example of the narrator's subtle use of structural associations to make veiled suggestions to the reader. Here he is reminded that Samuel was brought into the world for some divine purpose, just after the narrator has told the reader about the impingement of the Elide's actions on God. The association of these two transactions across the divine/human border seems to be aimed at arousing reader speculation about a possible relation between the two.

Hannah brings a little robe for Samuel every year when her husband brings her up to commemorate the birth of Samuel by sacrificing "the sacrifice of the days."\(^{22}\) Eli joins in the commemorative celebrations, blessing Elkanah and Hannah. She is again pointedly called Elkanah's wife (v. 20; cf. above on 1:19).

The scene parallels that in 1:17-18. The results are also similar. Eli blesses and Hannah/Elkanah or Hannah leave. Subsequently, God "remembers" or visits Hannah and she conceives and bears a child/children. The parallel indicates that Yahweh repays Hannah's faithfulness to her vow (v. 20) by giving
her five children for the one child, which came out of the previous visit and which she gave back to Yahweh.

The final sentence in v. 21 describes Samuel's physical maturation and his deepening relationship with Yahweh. Coming just after the notice of Hannah's continuing fecundity and her expanding family, this final sentence makes Yahweh the sole family for Samuel. Samuel's period of growth takes place with Yahweh, while Hannah is kept busy with his replacements.

We will hear no more from Hannah or Elkanah. They have fulfilled their task of introducing Samuel and now, both literally and literally, they retire. Samuel and his relationship with Yahweh take up where Hannah leaves off. Verse 21 accomplishes this shift in focus by a fade-out scene of Hannah with her five new offspring followed by a fade-in on the lad Samuel, who is growing with Yahweh (v. 21). Hannah is bountifully repaid for her part in Yahweh's plan, and Yahweh has the person dedicated to his service.

It was in order to get Samuel that the whole process of events involving Hannah was initiated. The reader has been informed about Samuel's special identity by the special circumstances of his birth
and his subsequent temple career. The reader has also been made aware of a problem amongst the priests serving at the temple.

The associations of vv. 17-21 have intimated that there may be some causal relationship between the two instances of actions from one side of the divine/human border with an influence or effect on the other side. The principal characters have been introduced and the stage is set. The plot will soon begin to thicken.

Verse 22

While Samuel is growing with Yahweh, Eli has become very old. The intended contrast is clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject</th>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>modifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 21 the lad Samuel</td>
<td>grew</td>
<td>with Yahweh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 22 Eli</td>
<td>(was) old</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mention of Eli's old age here is important for subsequent events (Miller and Roberts 1977:62). Eli's age will play an important part in his death in 4:15-18. It is the "old man" (zāqān) of the Elide household who is promised death in 2:31-32.

More important, however, is the paradigm
established by the conjunctive description of old Eli and his wicked sons in v. 22. When the paradigm is repeated later in the narrative, all of the meanings, associations, and consequences that are connected to the Elide instance are brought to bear on the recurrence. The paradigmatic Elide affair provides commentary on all subsequent reappearances of a similar state of affairs.

By providing the reader with this specific description of the Elides, the only leaders visible in the story, the narrator directs attention to a problem in the political structure of Israel, namely the problem of bad representation.

The theocratic system is utterly dependent on the proper functioning of the role of the mediator. In the specific instance of the priesthood it is clear that bad priests and abuses of the sacrificial system destroy the utility of the institution as a mechanism for maintaining normal covenantal relations between Yahweh and his people.

Eli hears of his sons sacrificial misdeeds and how they lay with (yiskěḇūn) the women serving at the entrance to the tent of meeting. Willis is inclined to see a case of sacral prostitution here
(1972:56). Given that the narrator is listing the abuses of Eli's sons and the fact that the women are described neutrally as tent servants, it seems more likely that it is simply another example of the Elides' "heart's desire" taking precedence over cultic propriety. Just as they contemned the sacrifices of Yahweh so Eli's sons now abuse Yahweh's servants.

This reading is supported by an observation made by Fokkelman (in a letter to me). The women abused by Eli's sons are those "serving" ($hagqob^e\dot{o}t$) at the door of the tent of meeting. This description alludes to one of the divine titles, $ywh^e\dot{b}^\sim\dot{a}^\wedge\dot{ot}$, introduced to us by another woman, Hannah, when she prayed for a son (1:11) in the same locale, the cultic sanctuary. Eli's sons are violating the "hostesses" of "Yahweh, God of hosts"! The allusion repeats the suggestion that the sinful acts of Eli's sons transmit an effect across the divine/human border.

Verses 23-25

Eli's attempt to warn his sons away from their dangerously sinful ways distinguishes him from his sons. He is neither a party to their misdeeds nor
does he condone them. The fact that he rebukes his sons because of the bad reports he has heard from the people (v. 23) has been taken by Willis to suggest an irresponsibility on Eli's part (1971:292). Presumably Willis thinks that Eli should have been aware of the problem on his own. Why present Eli rebuking his sons at all, though, if the goal is to criticize Eli at this point in the narrative?

The fact that Eli hears the bad report from the people is not so much a criticism of Eli as a reflection of Eli's agedness. He is old and out of touch with the affairs of the priesthood.

His knowledge of his sons' misdeeds is not second-hand because he is willfully ignorant and out of touch with reality. Rather, it is his agedness, over which he has no control, that renders him out of touch and unable to control his sons. Since the narrator supplies this mitigating explanation of Eli's ignorance about his sons' activities, it is a mistake to suggest that the narrator is accusing Eli of willful wrong-doing in vv. 22-23.

Willis' understanding of v. 23 is, in fact, the result of reading it in light of Yahweh's subsequent rebuke and condemnation of Eli (2:29; 3:13;
1971:292). In doing so he makes two mistakes. First, by reading any element in a narrative in the light of a subsequent element, the reader subverts the order of presentation created by the narrator. Since the order of presentation, or structure of a narrative is an extremely important device for the narrator's creation of meaning, we actually destroy the existing meaning structure and create a new one by rearranging the order of presentation (cf. Perry 1979; Sternberg 1978). Secondly, Willis' reading of the narrator's comments in vv. 22-23 together with Yahweh's condemnation of Eli in 2:29 and 3:13 disregards the voice structure of the narrative. An elementary convention in narratives with omniscient narrators who write from a time somewhere after the narrative events is that the voices of all characters, even God, are authoritatively subordinate to the voice of their creator, the omniscient narrator. One cannot simply combine the voice of the narrator with the voice of a character, even if it is God, and expect to have gotten it right. If a reader suspects that the narrator and a character share a common perspective, the suspicion must be supported by proof from the narrative before it is incorporated into an
interpretation.

Whatever the relationship between the narrator's voice and Yahweh's voice may turn out to be, Yahweh's comments should not be removed from their subsequent position to modify the narrator's existing evaluation of Eli in 2:22-23. Eli really does warn his sons of the danger of their acts. The reader is given no indication in these or any preceding verses that Eli is culpably lax in his warning. The narrator presents Eli as trying, within the limits imposed by age, to turn his sons from their sin. If a negative evaluation of Eli's efforts is later voiced by Yahweh, the reader will have to understand it in connection with the narrator's voice, and in subordination to it.

Eli mentions twice that the people are spreading the report of his sons' evil deeds. This repetition is an indication of the importance attached to absolving the people from any complicity in their priestly officials' sin (vv. 23-24). The emphasis lies on the peoples' universal judgement of their priests; Eli hears the reports "from all this people" (v. 23); the rumor is circulating amongst the people of Yahweh (v. 24).
This emphasis on 'all the Israelites denouncing their priests (לֹֽא-רֹבָּה הָאָשֶׁר מָעָה, v. 24) is another vital part of the theological-political problem that is being developed in these events. The people are innocent and are expressly called "Yahweh's people" (v. 24).

Though Eli's absolution does not itself have the authority of the narrator's explicit evaluations (e.g. the negative evaluation of Eli's Sons in v. 12, which is complementary to Eli's absolution of the people here), it receives the necessary support from the narrator's descriptions of the people's propriety in vv. 13-16. In addition, there is no mention of any sin on the part of the people anywhere in the preceding (or subsequent) context.

Eli points out the extreme danger of his sons' actions. Their abuses of cultic procedures and personnel are sins against Yahweh to whom all cultic activities are directed. Eli's professional opinion about the effects of his sons' action supports the narrator's observation about its effect on the divine plane (v. 17). There is no one to offer intercessory prayer for one who sins against Yahweh. Intercession by God, available in the case of a man sinning against
another, is impossible when Yahweh is the injured party (v. 25). Eli's words are ominous portents.

If he is correct, and the reader is given no reason to doubt him, then we must expect disaster to be approaching. Here, then, Eli himself is allowed to create narrative interest by making suggestions about impending doom.

Driver observes that the position of lyhwh in the apodosis of v. 25 is emphatic (1915:35). This emphasis supplements that of the nouns in the protasis. God (גֵּדֶוֹלְהוֹ) can mediate when a man (ךָּנֵח) sins against a man (ךָּנֵח). But when it is against Yahweh, Israel's sovereign, that a man sins mediation is out of the question. Even the possibility of an efficacious prayer is doubtful; "Who will pray for him?" (v. 25).

Eli's rhetorical question places grave doubts on the future of his sons. They have sinned against Yahweh (v. 17) and even Eli, their own father, castigates them rather than praying for them.

The final sentence in v. 25 explicitly prepares for the ensuing, but as yet unspecified, death of Eli's sons. Yahweh is the one character in the story whose ability to enact any wish or plan is
unquestionable. The death of Eli's sons is a foregone conclusion; it is only when and how that are unspecified, again creating narrative interest. When they do die the reader will be absolutely certain that their death and the conditions surrounding the event are the fruit of Yahweh's desire.

Few would debate the assertion that the repentance of the sinner is a predominant theme in the O.T., or that it is favored by man and especially God.²⁴ In Ezek 33:11 (cf. 18:32) Yahweh says, "I have no pleasure (ḥpš) in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn back from his way and live." Here in 1 Sam 2:25, however, the failure of Eli's sons to listen to him, that is, to repent, is directly attributed to Yahweh's pleasure (ḥpš) in killing them.²⁵ Eli's efforts to turn his sons from their path to destruction is a predetermined failure. Try as he might his words fall on ears closed by Yahweh himself.

As in ch. 1, the narrator affords his audience a clear view of the divine marionetteer working behind the scene. As he sealed Hannah's womb to get Samuel so now Yahweh prevents Eli's sons from listening to their father.
The fact that this revelation is preceded by only one other such insight into the direct divine intervention into human affairs provides an important and obvious linkage of the two distinct actions. The birth of Samuel and the ensuing deaths of Eli's sons are henceforth inseparable. The rudimentary pattern of birth (1:5) followed by death (2:25) suggests that the birth was engineered in anticipation of the death. The pattern at least makes room for such a hypothesis, which can be confirmed or rejected as it conforms or departs from the pattern of subsequent events.

Just as the divine initiative served as the efficient cause of events on the human plane leading up to Samuel's birth and dedication, Yahweh's desire to kill Eli's sons takes over in v. 25 as the efficient cause of subsequent events. Had he not intervened, Eli's sons might have repented and so changed the shape of subsequent events. Whatever happens, therefore can and must be understood as the result of Yahweh's intention. The sins of Eli's sons are hereafter causally subsidiary to Yahweh's desire.

It is worthwhile noting that v. 25 contains another point to which the narrator has lent his own
omniscient authority. As with the characterization of Eli's sons in 2:12, it is thereby mandatory for the reader to accept the point. There can be no doubt about Yahweh's responsibility for the deaths of Eli's sons, as well as for any circumstances directly attendant on their deaths. Yahweh's "desire" is the fourth such key to be given to the reader for a proper understanding of the subsequent course of events. 26

Verse 26

Samuel is contrasted with the wicked Elides, as many have noted (Smith 1899:20; Bourke 1954:82, 89; Hertzberg 1964:37; Willis 1971:289, 291; Péter-Contesse 1976:313-14; McCarter 1980:85). The implication of Eli's warning in v. 25 was that his sons had sinned, perhaps against man, perhaps against Yahweh. Samuel, on the other hand, "continued growing greater and better" (Driver 1913:36), with Yahweh and with men. The contrast is foregrounded by a chiasmus of objects, and the syntactic foregrounding is supplemented by the similar sounding prepositions that modify the objects:
The effect of the contrast is a striking confirmation of the hypothesis that Yahweh has brought Samuel into the world as a replacement for Eli's sons, who are well on their way out. Eli's sons are sinning against man and God, who plans to kill them because of their sin. Samuel, on the other hand, is prospering with respect to the very persons—God and man—with whom the Elides are failing.

Hannah offers this prophetic comment on the fates of Eli's sons and her own son Samuel, "The Lord killeth, and maketh alive: he bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up" (1 Sam 2:6)!

Verse 26 also serves to confirm the predominant traits of each of the three main characters. Explicitly it portrays Samuel, the good. By way of contrast it confirms Eli's sons as the bad. Finally, and also by way of the juxtaposition of Samuel and the Elides, vv. 25-26 presents Yahweh, manipulator. He has arranged for a Samuel to replace
the sons of Eli, whom he desires to kill.

**Excursus on Verses 27-36**

The man of God and his word of Yahweh have often been regarded as late-coming intruders imported by a deuteronomist (e.g. Smith 1899:21; Nowack 1902: xxx-xxxii [citing Kittel, Wellhausen, Budde, Smith, and Löhre in agreement]; Bourke 1954:73; Hertzberg 1964:37; deWard 1976:117; McCarter 1980:92-93).

Others have suggested that vv. 27-34 have only been elaborated by deuteronomic additions, especially in vv. 35-36 (Press 1958:187-89; Buber 1964:819-20; Tsevat 1961:195; J. Mauchline 1971:54; Stoebe 1973: 118; Miller and Roberts 1977:21, 30-31).

As several scholars have pointed out, however, there are several explicit literary connections between this episode and its preceding and subsequent contexts (Willis 1971:292-95; 1972:38; 1979:208; Stoebe 1973:86, 117; Miller and Roberts 1977:30). More important is the fact that this section of the narrative can be read, "deuteronomistic additions" and all, as an important integral development in the narrative. As in the case of textual criticism, when the text itself presents us with a cohesive intelligible sequence there is no call, other than the siren
song of genetic explanation, for suggesting multiple composers and compositional periods. Even if the passage is "replete with the devices and cliches of the Josianic historian" (McCarter 1980:92) and the latter could be convincingly dated, there are no comparable linguistic criteria by which the hypotheses of earlier literary versions could be substantiated. What we are faced with, instead, is an integral narrative punctuated with dueteronomistic ideology.

Verse 27

That a man of God comes to Eli to make known to him the word of God is an ironic comment on the state of the Elide priesthood. The very first thing mentioned in the message is that God revealed himself to Eli's forebears while they were yet in Egypt and belonged to Pharaoh.27 Now, in Israel, to the priests of his temple, Yahweh speaks only through a man of God.

The interrogative particle prefixed to nēgōh expresses the belief that the subsequent information is well known and unconditionally admitted by the hearer (GKC #150e; cf. Gen 3:11; 27:36; 29:15; Deut 11:30; Judg 4:6, etc.). Yahweh states the grounds for his displeasure at the Elide priesthood. Their
"house" became priests because Yahweh graciously revealed himself to them and so they owe their privileged position to him.

According to Zobel the niphal of glāh is a specific technical term for revelation (1977:484). The revelation of Yahweh establishes a communicative channel between God and man (cf. Gen 35:7). The subsequent statement (v. 28) that Yahweh chose Eli's forebear shows that the revelation of Yahweh is the first step in the call to be a priestly intermediary (Zobel 1977:484).

Verse 28

Yahweh privileged Eli's predecessors with a divine revelation, and established a permanent (v. 30, ād-ōlām) office wherein they could act as intermediaries between the God revealed to them, and the men amongst whom they lived. The verse stresses the unique status of the priesthood bestowed upon the Elide predecessors. They are chosen mikkol-šibṭē yisrā'ēl. Seebass' observations on bhr neatly describe the situation of Eli's predecessors. "Everywhere that bhr occurs in relationship to persons, it denotes choice out of a group (generally out of the totality of the people), so that the chosen one
discharges a function in relationship to the group" (1977:82-85).

The freedom bestowed by the revelation, releasing Eli's father from "being to the house of Pharoah" (bih יָוְתָם ִבְּבֵית פְּרֹה, v. 27) is now unlimited. His new allegiance is to Yahweh; he is now "to Yahweh" (עָבָהֳּר ָאֹתוֹיִּ, v. 28). In return for his liberating revelation Eli's father was given the duties of a priest. Remuneration for his services is given in the form of all the דְּוַיִּו of the Israelites. 28

An obvious parallel to the choice of the priests is alluded to in the mention of Egypt and Pharoah in v. 27. Israel too was freed from Egypt (Exod 19:4; Deut 7:8). It was chosen (בּר, Deut 7:6) and given stipulated covenantal duties (Exod 19:5; Deut 7:11-12). On the basis of these parallels it seems that what Yahweh rehearses in vv. 27-28 is the covenant he established with Eli's predecessors. Although the "six common elements of the treaty form" are not given, Yahweh does rehearse those points vital to his case against the Elides. 29 They are indebted to Yahweh because he revealed himself to them in Egypt. They were commissioned to be his
priests and were given specific benefits in payment for their services.

Verse 29

The Elide abuse of their covenantal election to the priesthood is described as בְּךָ, "to kick." The only parallel is found in a similar context in Deut 32:15. Jeshurun waxes fat (wayyišman) and kicks (wayyibcāt). He forsakes and scoffs at the God who saved him. The context reveals that Jeshurun has broken his covenant obligations to Yahweh. Similarly the Elides kick at Yahweh's sacrifices and offerings which he had commanded on account of sin.30 As in Deut 32:15, this "kicking" is associated with the fact that the kickers have grown fat.

The "kicking" is particularly heinous in the Elides' case. Not only do they desecrate Yahweh's provision for expiation of sin, but they get fat by taking the first part (merešāl, cf. McCarter 1980: 86) of the sacrifice (cf. 2:15-16). Obviously Yahweh sees this as an example of adding insult to injury if there ever was one.

Yahweh's accusation that Eli has honoured his sons before Yahweh must be weighed against the narrator's description of Eli's rebuke of his sons
in vv. 23-25 and against the narrator's comment that Yahweh desired the death of Eli's sons.

Neither option emerges as a decisive favourite.

Verse 30

The obligatory covenantal requirements are laid out in vv. 27-28, the infraction in v. 29, and now comes the punishment. The formal idiom of an oracle of doom is used as an ominous introduction (Hertzberg 1964:38; McCarter 1980:90). The use of the infinitive absolute āmōr before the verb āmartī recalls the previous use of this emphatic construction in v. 27. Yahweh reemphasizes his graciousness to the Elide line and the prosperous future that had awaited them.

The promise of a perpetual priesthood is revoked.32 Yahweh only honours (kbd) those who honour him (kbd), not those who honour (kbd) their sons more than God (v. 29). Those who contempt him (ūbōzay), as Eli's sons have (2:17), are cursed.

The requītal Yahweh offers to the Elides reflects the language of covenantal retribution used in passages such as Exod 34:7; Num 14:18; and Deut 7:9-10. According to J.A. Thompson these expressions have the appearance of liturgical formulae or
confessional phrases (1974:131). Yahweh recites the confessional view of covenantal retribution in v. 30, and follows this recitation with the particulars to be meted out to the Elides. He obviously sees himself as within his rights, as such are defined by the covenant.

Verse 31

In punishment Eli is to have his "arm" and the "arm" of his father's house cut off. The Elide dynasty is to be broken by cutting off its strength (zerōca, Driver 1913:38). The statement that there will not be an old man (zāqēn) in his house is pointed directly at Eli, who we know is zāqēn me‘ōd (v. 22).

The reference to a future implementation of the punishment (yāmîm bā‘îm) sets the reader in expectation of a specific fulfillment of Yahweh’s words in the future. Any subsequent events that can be taken as fulfillment of the oracle will be so taken.

Verse 32

As in v. 29, Seebass repoints mācōn, which is incomprehensible, to mēcāwōn (1966:80). The verse
would then read (ignoring Seebass' further emendations), "And you will see affliction, on account of [your] sin, in everything that should/will be good for Israel. There will not be an old man in your house anymore."

The occurrence of the two words mešāwōn in v. 29 describes the reason for the sacrificial system. The priests and the system were chosen and commanded by Yahweh to provide a means of atoning for sin. Ironically in v. 32 it is because of sin, by implication of the priests', that affliction will be seen in what should have been good for Israel. The repetition of the words mešāwōn draws attention to this reversal of the priestly effect on the people.

Instead of averting the consequences of the people's sin by obtaining sacrificial atonement for it, the priests bring the evil consequences of their own sin down on everything that should have been good for Israel.

The ambiguity of the verb form yētīb does, however, allow for two readings. Either Yahweh is hinting at the fact that the priests' sin will bring affliction to all Israel instead of the "goqd" that they expect to gain from the priestly offices, or he is saying that future benefits to Israel will
appear as afflictions to Eli.

Two factors militate against the second alternative. First, Yahweh says that Eli, "the old man," will see this affliction. Since he dies in 4:18, the event referred to must occur prior to that verse. Secondly, the second sentence states that there will not be an old man in Eli's house in the future. That is, there will be no Eli (cf. v. 22) in the future to see all the good that is supposed to be done for Israel. In view of these two considerations the first possibility, that v. 32a refers to the affliction that Eli will see overtaking Israel because of the sin of its priests, is attractive. 36 In v. 32b, Eli is told that having seen the affliction, he, himself an old man, will cease to exist.

In this reading of what Smith appropriately called "so desperate a passage," v. 32 contributes to an anticipation of an impending disaster already developed in v. 31. A specific chronological pattern has been given, and it coincides with the events of ch. 4. First, Eli sees the expected Israelite victory (kōl 𐤊𐤃𐤉 𐤁𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤃𐤋 𐤂𐤀𐤃 𐤀𐤃 𐤇𐤄𐤁 𐤁𐤃𐤃) turned into a terrible defeat (4:1-11). 37 Then he himself is
killed (4:18). The exact nature of the affliction and the potential good to Israel is left for the reader to discover in ch. 4.

Verse 32 introduces a central issue in chs. 1-12. In the theocratic system the people are very much affected by their leaders. Yahweh had established the priests as covenant mediators in charge of the cult. The latter, as Yahweh notes in vv. 28-29, is an essential feature of the covenant, allowing as it does for the expiation of sin. When the officials of this vital institution are themselves sinful and contemptuous of Yahweh their sin cannot be expiated or palliated by prayer (2:25-26; 3:14). The priests must die. The theocratic political system, that is the covenant in which Yahweh is sovereign and Israel subject, requires upright human leaders for its smooth operation.

But this problem carries with it an even worse consequence which is mentioned here in v. 32. The sin of the priests, and they are the only ones who have sinned so far, brings affliction to Israel. That Yahweh is able to tell Eli, before the fact, that Israel will be adversely affected by the sin of its priests, indicates that the defeat and
slaughter of innocent Israelites is not spontaneous. Hence what seems to be suggested is that Israel's fate is closely tied to that of its priestly leaders in the covenantally constituted theocracy.

On this point, Campbell has suggested that the punishment of the Elides is incommensurable with the national catastrophe of ch. 4 (1975:175). "The loss of the ark, two defeats and the death of 34,000 men is a steep price to pay for the punishment of two or three errant priests. Can this be justified by the central role of these priests in the nation?" (1979:35). Campbell concludes that the concerns of ch. 4 are largely unrelated to those of ch. 2.

Campbell, however, has unknowingly put his finger on the very issue that chs. 1-4, and indeed chs. 1-12, focus on. The defeat at Aphek is the fulfillment of the prophesied punishment and the question posed by Campbell is the question posed by the narrative. Is the theocracy with its covenant, its intermediaries, and its stipulations and especially its unpredictable God a desirable system? Are there imbalances in the system that create political havoc for all on the basis of the sacral misdeeds of a few who happen to be leaders?
Verses 35-36

Verses 35, 35-36 have occasionally been interpreted as the *vaticinia ex eventu* insertions of the deuteronomist.\(^{38}\) Press, for example, suggests "so kundet v. 33 die Nobkatastrophe an" (1938:191). The debate over the historical identification of the events and characters referred to in vv. 35, 35-36 has a long history. (Keil and Delitzsch, 1880:44-48, give early examples.)

Keil and Delitzsch offer the suggestion that we should allow the possibility of multiple fulfillments of the prophecy within a typological framework (1880:46-47). Certainly that option is able to accommodate all possible identifications, thereby conforming interpretation to the ambiguity inherent in the prophecy itself. Depending on the context in which a reader has chosen to read the prophecy, different possibilities arise.\(^{39}\)

The typological approach to the identity of the referents in the text comes close to certain modern theories of reader-oriented and structuralist critics. The following statement of Jonathan Culler exhibits important similarities to the typological approach. "To read a text as literature is not to
make one's mind a tabula rasa and approach it without preconceptions;...the semiological approach suggests, rather, that the poem be thought of as an utterance that has meaning only with respect to a system of conventions which the reader has assimilated. If other conventions were operative its range of potential meanings would be different (quote from Tompkins 1980:xvii-xviii).40 "The Rabbins" could never agree with Keil and Delitzsch or Gutbrod about the identity of the faithful priest in v. 35 because they operate from different conventional bases of interpretation.

Since the present reading is made from the context of 1 Sam 1-12, the present concern is to determine what, if any, subsequent characters and events are referred to by vv. 35, 35-36. The decision to read within this context is no more or, less arbitrary than the decision to read in terms of the deuteronomistic history (McCarter), the Hebrew Bible ("the Rabbins"), or the Old and New Testaments (Gutbrod).

An indication of the validity of a reading of the prophecy made upon the basis of its immediate context is found in the favourable comments on this option by those who have chosen different contexts.
McCarter, for example, says, "Indeed we are bound to say that on the basis of our reading of the childhood narrative of Samuel up to this point and of the sequel to this passage in 3:1-4:1a, Samuel emerges incontestably as the successor to the prerogatives of the house of Eli" (1980:92). He then rejects this incontestable reading in favour of one made in the context of the deuteronomistic history. Tsevat too sees the possibility of a connection between 2:27-36 and chs. 3-4, but rejects it (1961:207).

**Verse 33**

The man left to Eli at Yahweh's altar after the death of Eli (v. 32) and his sons (vv. 31, 33, 34) could be either Ichabod (4:20, 21) or Samuel, who can be said to be "to Eli" (אֶקָא) as a servant and apprentice. Samuel and Eli are close enough, in fact, for Eli to call him "my son" (3:6, 16). Against Ichabod is the conclusion of v. 33, which says that all the increase of Eli's house will die as men. Ichabod is presumably included here and so will be at Yahweh's altar (יהוה מִזְבַּח) neither as a cultic functionary nor even as a man. Furthermore it is difficult to see how the continued existence of Ichabod can be construed as a punishment that
would waste Eli's eyes and make his soul pine away.\textsuperscript{41}

Samuel, on the other hand, would be a suitable candidate for this role. The fact that a temple servant will outlast Eli and his house would be sufficient cause for grief to Eli. The identification of Samuel as the $^\text{15}$ of v. 33 also fits the immediate context of complete doom for the Elides. Finally, it should be noted that Samuel builds an altar to Yahweh in 7:17 and survives through the remainder of the narrative as the only active priest (7:9-10; 9:12-14; 10:8; 12:23). He does, in fact, replace Eli at Yahweh's altar.

**Verse 34**

The sign given to Eli is that his sons will both die on the same day. Yahweh gives Eli a sign because the latter will not be around to see the installation of his successor. The sign is to be taken by Eli as an indication that the various events prophesied are about to take place (cf. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:45; Smith 1899:23). The fulfillment of this prophecy in 4:11 is an incontestable link between chs. 1-5 and ch. 4.

Campbell, however, reasons that if ch. 4 was intended as the accomplishment of the prophecies in
chs. 1-3 one would justifiably expect an indication, such as that in 1 Kgs. 2:26-37, that the prophetic word had come to pass (1975:175). The answer to Campbell's difficulty may be found in 2:34. Yahweh says that the death of Eli's sons is an ُُٔت, a sign. As Gunkel notes a sign "is an object, an occurrence, an event through which a person is to recognize, learn, remember, or perceive the credibility of something" (quote from Helfmeyer 1977:170). "The significant thing about a sign is not the sign itself, but its function... it calls attention to, confirms, or corroborates something beyond itself..."(p. 185).

The fact of the simultaneous death of Eli's sons in 4:11 is all that is needed, at that point, for both Eli and the reader to know that they are witnessing prophecy fulfilled in ch. 4. The functional nature of the sign along with the several other links between 2:27-36 and ch. 4 justify reading them as prophecy and fulfillment.

Verse 35

The substitute for the Elide priests is characterized. According to Buber, "der kohen neeman von 2:35 realisiert sich in dem neeman ١٠-nabi von 3:20, d.h. der neue Kohen ist kein Kohen im alten
geschlechtsgebundenen und heiligtumsgebundenen Sinn mehr, das Geschlecht soll seiner Häupter beraubt, das Heiligtum soll zerstört werden, das Erbe soll der Nabi antreten. Nicht ein Priester, der ein neues Priestergeschlecht gründet und einem anderen Heiligtum vorsteht, sondern der Nabi" (1964:820). Buber supplements this observation with the links between 2:27, 3:7; and 3:21. The repetition of the verb gîh in the Niphal signifies, according to Buber, that the old priestly revelation, which has become unworthy, is replaced by a new prophetic revelation.

Buber is correct in his observation that Samuel is not simply a cultic priest. Instead he combines several occupations into one career.42 Included among his activities is his priestly role, prepared for in chs. 1-3 and implemented in chs. 7-12. The case for Samuel grows stronger when Samuel's origin and priestly apprenticeship are considered. One recalls that his birth to a barren woman bears the mark of divine intervention and purpose. He is Yahweh's all the days of his life (1:11, 28) and grows up as an apprentice to Eli (2:11, 18, 26; 3:1, 3). He wears the priestly clothing (2:18). Finally, the juxtaposition of the "outgoing" priests and the
growing favour of Samuel in 2:25-26 foreshadows the succession.

Consequently, when Yahweh says he will raise a faithful priest for himself the reader is encouraged by preceding events to conclude that Yahweh is simply making explicit the developments he had planned ever since he closed and then opened Hannah's womb. This conclusion will be subsequently confirmed both in the literary links noted by Buber and in the simple facts of Samuel's subsequent actions as Israel's new covenant mediator.

Hertzberg sees a problem arising for this reading in the statement that Yahweh will build a faithful house for Samuel. As we know from 8:3-5, Samuel's sons also go astray. Samuel's house does not, therefore, seem to continue from generation to generation as the prophecy implies (1964:38). It should be noted, however, that unlike Eli's sons, who are killed for their sins, Samuel's sons are still around in 12:2. From the context it appears that they still operate in an official capacity. Subsequently we hear no more of Samuel's sons due to the shifting focus of the narrative. We cannot conclude, however, that Samuel's house was not "faithful."
The final statement in v. 35 can be read as an anticipation of the monarchy established in chs. 9-12. The reader is prepared for subsequent events, albeit more with perplexity than anticipation or foreknowledge. Throughout the prophecy, Yahweh demonstrates his own awareness of future events and reveals his plans for those events. In fact, one of Yahweh's most constant traits throughout the whole of chs. 1-12 is foreknowledge of future situations in his covenantal relationship with Israel.

Yahweh's prediction also contains a subtle indication of the type of monarchy to be introduced. The fact that the king is referred to as Ṿevaḇaḇ suggests that some future monarch will be established by and be responsible to Yahweh. Anointment makes the king a theocratic vassal of Yahweh (Szikszai 1962:159). Without a prior awareness of the issues raised in ch. 8 the reader is unlikely, however, to comprehend Yahweh's surreptitious anticipation of chs. 9-12. It is a private irony between Yahweh and the narrator.

Verse 36
As Mauchline observes, it is especially in v. 35 that the identification of the faithful priest
encounters difficulty (1971:55-56). Nowhere can this prediction be seen in Samuel's career. Scholars have, therefore, turned to Zadok as the priest and suggest that v. 36 refers to the Levites, who in consequence of the Josianic reform (2 Kgs 23:9) were forced to come begging at the Temple (Mauchline 1971:56; Tsevat 1961:192-93; McCarter 1980:93).

Noth agreed, at first, with this judgement and labelled the prophecy a *vaticinium ex eventu* product of the deuteronomist (1967:61). He later repudiated this view of the prophecy, correctly observing "Der Vers 2:36 ist ganz undeuteronomistisch formuliert und lässt sich auch sachlich kaum mit den Angaben in 2 Reg 23:8f. in Einklang bringen" (1963:394). Noth's solution to the referential problem posed by v. 36 is to suggest that we have no certain grounds for dating it and even less certain grounds to specify a situation in which it was fulfilled. "Ein inspiriertes Wort eines 'Gottesmannes' gegen die frühere silonische Priesterschaft und ihre durch- aus mögliche Degeneration und für die königliche Priesterschaft von Jerusalem ist an sich durchaus denkbar" (1963:394).

In view of their radically different
presuppositions it is remarkable that Keil and 
Delitzsch arrive at a similar result. Just as they 
see the prophecy of the faithful priest fulfilled in 
both Samuel and Zadok so "the threat announces deep 
degradation and even destruction to all the priests 
of the house of Aaron who should walk in the foot-
steps of the sons of Eli..." (1880:46).

The readings suggested by Noth and especially 
by Keil and Delitzsch are most compatible with the 
intentional vagueness of the prophecy. The only 
specific information given is the sign. The death 
of Hophni and Phinehas is supposed to show both Eli 
and the reader that the fulfillment of the prophecy 
is beginning. The reader is thereby provoked to 
identify the other events prophesied, and is given 
opportunity to do so for all except v. 36 in the 
course of reading chs. 3-12.

For v. 36, the reader is required to continue 
through the books of Samuel and Kings in search of 
a suitable referential candidate. The apparent 
lack of correspondence between the prophesied 
situation of v. 36 and that of the "Levites" in 2 
Kgs 23:9 suggests that the majority of readers will 
come to identifications somewhere between Keil and
Delitzsch's multiple typology and the identification of Levites as in 2 Kgs 23:9.

The prophecy of the man of God in vv. 27-36 exhibits the characteristics of the literary phenomenon that Iser calls "blanks":

the blank, however, designates a vacancy in the overall system of the text, the filling of which brings about an interaction of textual patterns.... It is only when the schemata of the text are related to one another that the imaginary object can begin to be formed, and it is the blanks that get this connecting operation under way. They indicate that the different segments of the text are to be connected, even though the text itself does not say so. They are the unseen joints of the text, and as they mark off schemata and textual perspectives from one another they simultaneously trigger acts of ideation on the reader's part. Consequently, when the schemata and perspectives have been linked together, the blanks 'disappear' (1978:182-83).
The prophetic sign says "begin here," but it is up to each reader to decide what fulfills what (Iser's "acts of ideation on the reader's part"). It is important to note, however, that 4:11 presents an explicit textual directive to the reader forcing him to scrutinize the immediately subsequent context. This explicit connection stacks the odds in favor of reading the subsequent events and characters, insofar as possible, as those referred to by the prophecy.

Perry's notion of a reader's frame construction is also relevant here. The reader who has read the prophecy will not fail to construct a "frame" that incorporates the events of chs. 3-7 as the fulfillment of the prophecy in 2:27-36. "The reader does not wait until the end before beginning to understand it, before embarking upon its semantic integration" (Perry 1979:46). If subsequent information is given that contradicts the constructed frame he will then modify or reject it.

Within chs. 1-12, however, such contradiction does not occur. If the final verse of the prophecy cannot be recognized as fulfilled before ch. 12 the reader will wait and watch for its subsequent fulfillment, whatever that may be.
3. 1 Samuel 3

Excursus on the Contextual Situation of Chapter 3

In ch. 3, the narrator describes the concluding events in the transfer of human authority from the priestly Elides to Samuel, who begins the chapter as a priestly servant (v. 1) and ends as a prophet (vv. 20-21). It is to this end that the miraculous birth story (ch. 1), the contrasts between the families of Samuel and Eli (chs. 1-2), and the prophetic rejection of the Elide priests (2:27-36) have been moving. Events in chs. 1-2:26 proceed in mysterious concatenation towards the climactic message from Yahweh in 2:27-36. Though the narrator gives several hints at the connections between the fates of the Elides and Samuel, he never provides an explicit and detailed prediction of the end towards which their intertwining paths are surely proceeding. The veiled structural hints about that end, as well as the revelations that there is a divine purpose behind the events of chs. 1-2, are only specific enough to allow the reader to create hypotheses about the significance of the events. The result is the creation of a great deal of narrative interest, which prods the reader on in hopes of discovering the connection or of having
it openly revealed to him.

In the prophetic message of 2:27-36, God reveals his reading of preceding events and lays out a rather ambiguous prophetic plan for the future. Though some of the possible contextual readings of the prophecy were explored in anticipatory fashion in the preceding discussion of 2:27-36, these were not intended to suggest that the reader would entertain all or any such hypotheses. Though the reader will try, of course, to interpret the prophecy as he reads it and may even arrive at hypotheses such as those suggested above, he remains absolutely dependent on the narrator to confirm or reject his suspicions. Chapter 3, following hard on the heels of the divine revelation, does exactly that, as the narrator describes the events in which the Elide priestly presence is obviated.

In accord with the general narrational principles described by Ruhl's algorithm,¹ the narrator has placed Samuel's call immediately after the prophecy, leading the reader to see events in ch. 3 as the fulfillment of ch. 2. The narrator takes obvious care to insure that his reader follows the logic of his plot. The reader must be aware that the prophecy
is being enacted and that Yahweh is guiding these events.

Chapter 3 describes the state of Israelite leadership in terms of the revelation of Yahweh, both aural and visual; it contains six references to visual revelation or sight, and sixteen to aural revelation. Good leadership allows for open communications from Yahweh (vv. 19-21), bad leadership restricts it (vv. 1-2).

A link with the prophecy in 2:27-36 is also forged with the vocabulary of revelation. The Elide line had been elected to the priesthood when Yahweh revealed himself (חֵן לִהָנָה נִלְגֵּלִת) to them in Egypt (2:27). The Elide corruption is cause for annulment of their election (2:50) and contact with Yahweh via vision or word thereafter becomes very rare (v. 1; cf. Willis 1971:292-93).

As compensation for the loss of divine revelation through the medium of the priestly Elides, Yahweh grants Samuel a vision (v. 15), and speaks directly to him (vv. 4-14). As a result of the fulfillment of the message he then transmits, Samuel becomes established as the reliable prophet of Yahweh (3:20). Yahweh reappears at Shiloh because of
(kâ) his self-revelation (nîgîlâ yhwh) to Samuel (3:21). Samuel replaces the Elides as the human receptor and agent of the divine revelation. His installation in this important mediating office allows for renewed communication from Yahweh (cf. Newman 1962:89-90; Buber 1964:819).

Verse 1

The introductory description of the lad Samuel resumes the characterization of him begun in ch. 1 (Noth 1963:392). He is Yahweh's servant. The portrait of Samuel has an ever closer link with 2:11, with which it is almost identical. There are several significant variants, however, which can be viewed as the product of intervening events:

3:1  
\[ \text{whannā } \text{cār } \text{sāmū } \text{el } \text{mē}sāRET \text{ bēt-yhwh } \text{lipmē } \text{Cēlî} \]

2:11  
\[ \text{whannā } \text{cār } \text{hāyā } \text{mē}sāRET \text{ bēt-yhwh } \text{bēt-pēnē } \text{Cēlî } \text{hakkōhen} \]

(Differences are underlined twice.)

As always when the name "Samuel" is used, the narrator reminds the reader of the special meaning of Samuel's existence and of the purpose which brought
him into being. Immediately after the prophecy of the Elide rejection the reader is led to recall that Samuel is Yahweh's missionary. The contrast between Elides and Samuel is, again, obvious. We know from the prophecy that Yahweh plans to replace Eli and his sons. Samuel's appearance, serving Yahweh, immediately after the promise of a new priest is conspicuous and invites the reader to entertain the thought that Samuel is that priest.

In 2:11, the lad serves Yahweh and "the face" of Eli, both of which are modified by the accusative particle ְַּלִקְנֵה. In 3:11, however, Samuel serves only Yahweh, doing so "before" or "in the presence of" (לִפְנֵיהָ) Eli. The reason for this change is revealed by the final variant: Eli is no longer called "the priest" in 3:11; he is simply Eli. Samuel no longer serves Eli "with" Yahweh because Eli has lost the rank and title of priest. Already Eli takes a back seat to Samuel in the priestly service (against Mauchline 1971:57).

The second two sentences in v. 1 describe the state of divine communications in the period after the Elide rejection. It is the only description of the conditions of that time, and serves as an
important indicator of the effects of the upheaval in covenanted relations between Yahweh and his priests. The preciousness of Yahweh's word and the spareness of vision could indicate either that Yahweh has nothing to say to Israel, or that the official receptors of the vision, the Elides (cf. 2:27), were unfit to mediate any revelations. Given that Eli is no longer called "priest," it is most likely that there is no suitable recipient for the revelations of Yahweh. In fact, this is exactly the point, for when Samuel has come to know Yahweh through the revelation of his word, Yahweh reappears at Shiloh (v. 21).

The narrator momentarily shifts the reader's attention away from the characters to the state of affairs of covenantal communication with this brief note about the lack of such communication. He thereby exhibits his concern that the reader bear in mind the effect that the sin of the priests and the counter-measures of Yahweh are having in the larger arena of the theocracy as a whole. Obviously it is a dangerous situation for the union when the political leader refuses to communicate with the citizens.

Verse 2

Commentators have expressed doubts about how
to read the initial temporal clause in v. 2 and about its bearing on the events at hand (e.g. Wellhausen 1871:51; Smith 1899:25). According to GKC (#126s), the phrase simply means "one day." McCarter translates, "at that time" and states that the phrase introduces a syntactical sequence of ordinary past narration (1980:97). What follows the phrase would, according to McCarter's translation, take place at the same time as what immediately preceded.

More significant is the link that the phrase provides with v. 1. In v. 1, we read that "In those days (bayyāmîm hāhēm) the word of Yahweh was precious, and the vision sparse." In v. 2, we read that "At that time (bayyōm hāhu) Eli was lying in his place, his eyes were failing and he could not see." The repeated temporal phrase reinforces the semantic parallel between the two verses. The scarcity of word or vision from Yahweh is a parallel, and perhaps even the logical result, on the physical plane of the blindness of Israel's priestly leader.

The attention drawn to this parallel by the temporal phrases reinforces the point made in v. 1. Together, vv. 1-2 suggest that a capable, functioning priest is necessary for the regular communication of
messages from God, which are necessary for the main-
tenance of the theocracy. As in the Mosaic model, the institutional mediator receives the message from God and transmits it to the people (Exod 20:18-26). When the mediator is non-functioning, the quantity of divine communication is reduced.

The few communications that are sent when the institutional mediator is out of commission, such as that delivered by the man of God in 2:27-36, are exceptional and few in number. The purpose of such special revelations is not simply to continue the regular communications through a different channel. Rather, as the example of 2:27-36 shows, they often are directed against the institutional means of communication, and aim only at "tearing down" the existing figures. The task of "building up" is left to God's own subsequent action.

The description of Eli, lying in his place, contrasts unfavourably with that of Samuel in both vv. 1 and 3. While Samuel actively serves Yahweh in v. 1, Eli lies dormant in v. 2. Whereas Eli lies in his place, Samuel lies in Yahweh's temple (v. 3). Samuel attends to Yahweh's needs while Eli attends to his own.
These contrasts support the succession of Samuel to Eli's position in the mediating office. Though the narrator has not agreed with Yahweh's criticisms of Eli (cf. above on 2:22-25 and 29), he has suggested that Eli's great age is having a detrimental effect on his ability to carry out his important duties as the head priest. In the contrast between Eli and Samuel in 3:1-5 it is also Eli's feebleness in old age that serves as the basis for the narrator's contrast. The young Samuel remains in the temple, ready, able and willing to carry out any duty immediately. Eli, on the other hand, lies in his own place; the reader recognizes the familiar image of a tired, old man who relies on the comfort and security of his own place. In the narrator's contrast Eli is not sinful, he is only old. The contrast does show, however, that a transition from Eli to Samuel is desirable.

Verse 3

In contrast to the atmosphere of darkness and unknowing in vv. 1-2, symbolized by Eli's blindness and the scarcity of vision, v. 3 presents the hope of the future. The technique of foreshadowing a resolution to a present problem used in v. 3 has
already been seen in 1:18. Here in v. 3, the insertion of the word terem in the sentence "The lamp of God had not yet (terem) gone out," indicates that, though the situation described in vv. 1-2 is gloomy, there is still hope. The flame is not yet completely extinguished.

The lamp of God, still burning, is a symbol that God has not totally cut off relations with Israel on account of the Elides. In Exod 27:2 (cf. Lev 24:2), Yahweh commands that a lamp be kept ever lit in the tabernacle. As with the other furnishings and the tabernacle itself, the lamp represents the presence of Yahweh, in accord with his covenanted pledge to be with Israel (Lev 26:12-13; cf. Childs 1974:540). Ringgren suggests that the lamp provided a vivid image of the divine presence (1966:91).³

Associated with the lamp of God, symbol of God's presence and communication with Israel, is Samuel who lies in the temple. Through this associative parallelism the narrative identifies Samuel as a glimmer of light in the general darkness of that time (cf. Bourke 1954:85). The narrative has drawn the comparison between Samuel and Eli in terms of clear-cut opposites:
Samuel
lies in the temple
the light still burns

Eli
lies in his place
blindness, lack of
vision or word from
God

Commentators have generally missed the symbolic contrast between Samuel and Eli. The significance of God's burning lamp is seen to lie in its temporal definition (it was not yet dawn) (Thenius 1864:16; Keil and Delitzsch 1880:49; Smith 1899:26; McCarter 1980:98). Although the temporal dimension of the lamp does function as part of the general setting for the events of ch. 3 it has much greater significance as a symbol. As Stoebe noted with respect to ch. 1 the importance of details in this narrative lies in their significance for the theological-political issues raised by the narrative. Hence the reading that sees the mention of the still burning lamp as a temporal detail should be expanded to include the symbolism. As the still-burning lamp shows that dawn was near, so Samuel lying in the temple is a sign that a new dawn in Israelite leadership is also near.

Similarly, Buber observes that the mention of the ark, at first glance a mere scenic elaboration,
is in fact of special significance in view of subsequent events. The introduction of the ark here links it with Yahweh's message of doom. Samuel receives the message in the presence of the cultic object that will play a major role in the subsequent destruction of the Elides.

Die Offenbarung an Samuel, die nun folgt, hat...die Katastrophe der Lade zum Gegenstand... der Herr der Lade sagt ihre Verschleppung und Entweihung an. Dass diese Ansage an Samuel geschieht, deutet darauf hin, worauf der Erzähler von Anbeginn nachdrücklich hindeuten will: Samuel ist von Jhwh, der sich zum Strafgericht rüstet, dazu ausehren, in der ladenlosen, heiligtumsberaubten Zeit an Stelle der verurteilten Priesterschaft, ohne Ephod, als freier Nabi die göttliche Stimme zu tragen (Buber 1964:825; cf. Stoebe 1973: 124).

In addition, it should be noted that like the still-burning lamp, the ark appears in immediate association with Samuel in the temple. The reader finds Samuel sandwiched between these two symbols of God's presence and covenantal relationship with
Israel. The narrator seems to be trying to rub some of this symbolism onto the figure of Samuel by literally (literarily) surrounding him with it.

Verses 4-10

That Yahweh has to try three times before he can talk to Samuel is an indication of both Samuel's ignorance about Yahweh and Eli's lack of perceptiveness. Samuel's ignorance is innocent, for Yahweh has not yet revealed his word to him (v. 7). Eli's unperceptiveness, on the other hand, is probably again a result of his failing powers in old age. In addition, Yahweh's persistence indicates that he has something important to say and that it is intended specifically for Samuel's ears.

The reader, who is by now well aware of the general direction that events are taking, remembers Yahweh's last revelation through the man of God, which contained a reference to a replacement for Eli. Samuel's continual failure to receive his divine visitor is a source of increasing tension to the reader, who begins to doubt Samuel's intelligence. Will Yahweh abandon the attempt to communicate with the dutious but obtuse Samuel?

Samuel's speedy response to Yahweh's call is
to run to Eli, in the belief that Eli had called. Three times Yahweh calls and three times Samuel presents himself to Eli. Samuel appears as the young man with great things in store for him, who still runs to Eli in boyish respect when he thinks he is being called (Stoebe 1973:125). The insight into Samuel's character afforded by this incident, nevertheless, evokes a positive response from the reader. Though naive, Samuel is willing and responsive. Even his ignorance makes Samuel shine in the reader's eyes.

Press, discussing the rhetorical function of the threefold call, suggests that the tension produced by Samuel and Eli's continuing misunderstanding causes "der Steigerung des Interesses und der Hervorhebung des zu erwartenden Orakels..." (1938:184).

Yet, as in the descriptions of Hannah's sterility in 1:5-6 and the lamp in 3:2, a future resolution to a problem, in this case Samuel's ignorance of Yahweh, is hinted at by a temporal modifier attached to the description of the problem. Samuel does not yet (temem) know Yahweh, the word of Yahweh is not yet (temem) revealed to him (3:7). The reader is given to understand, even before Yahweh successfully
communicates to Samuel, that Yahweh will eventually get a message through. Samuel will know Yahweh, and the latter's word will be revealed to him (cf. terem, as it functions in 3:3).

Verse 11

When Samuel finally responds correctly to Yahweh's call, with the knowledge of who is calling, Yahweh is able to speak.

It is important to note that it is Eli who is finally responsible for the success of Yahweh's third attempt to communicate with Samuel. Eli finally discerns (wayyāben, v. 8) that Yahweh is calling the boy, and so tells Samuel how to respond. Again the narrator could have arranged his narrative so that Eli had no part in the success, but he did not. It is ironic that Eli should contribute to his successor's rise, but it is not a condemnation. If anything, Eli comes out of ch. 3 as a tragic figure.

Yahweh's mention of the location, "in Israel," of the thing he is going to do, and the statement that it will make all its auditors' ears buzz, seem to indicate an event of national significance. Gutbrod understands the national import of the punishment in terms of the loss of the covenantal mediation of the
priesthood (1956:34). While he is correct, it is also possible that Yahweh is hinting at the even more horrifying repercussions of the priests' punishment seen in the Israelite defeat in ch. 4. Whether or not this allusion is contained in v. 11, the effects of Yahweh's action are such as to affect all Israel. The reader familiar with the conventional implication of an "ear-buzzing" event is at least certain that the impending disaster will not be limited to an effect on the Elide priesthood alone.

Verses 12-14

As commentators have noted, v. 12 refers directly back to 2:27-36 (e.g. McCarter 1980:98). Samuel is alerted to the fact that all is not right between Yahweh and Eli. Yahweh claims that Eli knew of his sons' sin yet did not "rebuke" them (v. 13).6

Again (cf. above on 2:29) the reader must evaluate Yahweh's claim in the light of the authoritative information provided by the narrator that Eli did warn his sons and that they did not listen because Yahweh desired to kill them (2:25). Yahweh is not telling the whole story to Samuel. As the reader watches the innocent young man being indoctrinated with an explanation of the ensuing disaster that is
only partially true, he is once again filled with foreboding about the future of the people whose fate lies in the hands of this God.

Yahweh's half-truth also compromises Samuel's innocence by indoctrinating him with an understanding of what has happened and will happen that will make him an unquestioning ally and representative of Yahweh's position. Samuel was born to serve Yahweh, but the reader did not know until now just what such membership in the theocratic service might mean.

Yahweh's revelations to Samuel confirm the reader in the view that was forced upon him by the narrator's differences with Yahweh in ch. 2. Yahweh has engineered the unnecessary destruction of the Elides and now he is grooming his own pawn to take their place. If he had not desired to kill Eli's sons, perhaps they would have listened to their father, and if he told Samuel the truth about Eli's efforts to reform his sons perhaps Samuel would not be quite so dogmatically loyal to Yahweh.

As the reader stands looking over the narrator's shoulder while Yahweh interprets past and future for Samuel, he has no doubts about who is shaping the course of events. Whatever happens,
Yahweh is responsible.

Yahweh's presentation of his punishment for the Elides aims at an appearance of just retribution. As Stoebe observes, v. 14 seems an appropriate denial of expiation to the Elides (1973:125). They "kicked" at Yahweh's zebah and minhâ (2:29), which were instituted for sin (me̱cawôn). As their punishment, therefore, they are denied the use of zebah or minhâ to expiate their sin (cawôn bet-ṣâli). What could be more just than such measure for measure punishment?

Verses 15-16

Samuel lies down until morning and then opens the doors of Yahweh's house. Bourke, alone, seems to have noticed the symbolic significance of this gesture. Citing 2 Paraleipomenon 28-29, where good King Ezechias opens the temple doors closed by his wicked father, he suggests that Samuel's act symbolizes the restoration of God's word to Israel (1954: 86). Samuel, associated with the still-burning lamp in v. 2, floods the temple with the light of morning; "good has prevailed over evil, and light over darkness" (1954:86).

As his ignorance did before in vv. 4-9,
Samuel's fear introduces a tension into the narrative. Will Samuel tell Eli what he knows? The narrative highlights the similarity of the two situations by using the same call and reply scheme used before: Eli calls Samuel, "Samuel my son," and Samuel says, "here I am." Samuel's simple reply shows his submission to Eli and perhaps his reluctance to say anything at all.

Verses 17-18

Eli wants all the details and seems to assume that it is bad news. The oath formula that he uses to encourage Samuel to "tell all"—"May God do so to you and more also, if you hide anything from me of all that he told you"—is only coercive if the content of the message is actually bad. Eli seems to have drawn the conclusion that the divine message to Samuel is about his termination as priest. Eli could reasonably suspect this both because of the message he himself had received in 2:27-36, and because Yahweh had chosen to avoid him and had spoken instead to the young temple servant.

Eli's response to the message to Samuel has usually been understood as an expression of resignation and even pious submission to the will of God.
(e.g. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:51; Hertzberg 1964:42; Willis 1971:291; Stoebe 1975:126). McCarter's translation (1980:95) exemplifies the pious reading, "He is Yahweh. Let him do what seems best to him!"

On the other hand, it seems odd that Eli, who of all people should know that Yahweh's claim that he did not try to stop his sons was not true, should capitulate so easily to a spurious condemnation. Admittedly he is dealing with Yahweh, and so has no higher authority to turn to, but he could at least try to save his reputation. I would suggest that Eli does not simply lie down, but his only sympathizers are those who share his knowledge and so appreciate the ironic ambiguity of his answer to the message delivered to Samuel. Since Eli does not know that we readers are out here listening to his remark, our impression of the tragic side to his character is strengthened by his remark. "He is Yahweh. He does as he pleases." Eli's reply is an expression of despair. How can man resist God? Since Eli does not know that we readers are out here listening, our impression of the tragic isolation of his situation is strengthened. Certainly the innocent, but now indoctrinated Samuel could not
appreciate the despair contained in Eli's ambiguous reply. For Samuel, like the majority of commentators, Eli's remark would only seem to be a humble acceptance of just punishment.

Eli's remark is in agreement with 2:25, in which the omniscient narrator reveals the hidden divine intention. Yahweh wants to slay Eli's sons and he is going to do it. Eli's remark also casts an ominous shadow over the unknown future. If Yahweh is so concerned with the proper punishment of the sons of Eli that he allows his anger to outstrip his sense of justice—his ability to discriminate between guilty persons and innocent bystanders—then anyone who is associated with or even in the vicinity of the Elders is in danger. Yahweh's treatment of Eli is a harbinger of things to come.

The alternative reading of Eli's reply to Samuel as pious submission can be seen as a reflection of Eli's realization that Yahweh is answerable to no one. Fearing a fate worse than death, Eli hides his cynicism about Yahweh beneath the guise of piety and submission to the Almighty. It is, therefore, not a question of favouring either one or the other reading, but of realizing the ambiguity and
including both as mutually interacting opposites. 10

Verse 19

The placement of a note that Yahweh is with Samuel at this particular point highlights the fact that Yahweh has confirmed Samuel as the replacement for Eli. As always, Yahweh's presence with Israel, or an Israelite, is to be considered as a sign of divine favour and blessing (cf. Exod 3:12; Josh 1:5; Zimmerli 1978:70-81). The description of Samuel's growth is paralleled by 2:21, but there is a difference that underlines the fact that Yahweh has now chosen Samuel as Eli's replacement:

2:21 wayyigdal hanna'car y'se'el cim-yhwh
3:19 wayyigdal y'se'el wyhwh h'ayh cimmô

Samuel was growing with/under the influence of Yahweh. Now, he has grown and Yahweh is with him. Yahweh's choice of Samuel is highlighted both by the contextual contrast provided by 2:21, and by the fact that Yahweh is the subject of 'hayh in 3:19, which implies volition on his part.

Most commentators have observed that the expression, "he did not allow his words to fall to
the ground," indicates that the information conveyed by Yahweh to Samuel and by Samuel to Eli accurately describes subsequent events (e.g. McCarter 1980:99).  

This observation from the narrator takes the reader once again behind the human scenes to the place of hidden divine activity. Yahweh has indoctrinated his apprentice with an interpretation of what will happen to the Elides, and now he ensures that events are made to correspond to that interpretation. When the narrator tells us that Yahweh "did not allow his words to fall to the ground" we can only believe that Yahweh shaped the course of events to agree with the words. The narrator's "back-stage" observation assures the reader that disaster will overtake the Elides at the same time that it reveals the divine hand moulding Samuel into a believer shaping events.

Verse 20

The description of Israel's recognition of Samuel's status as a "reliable" prophet of Yahweh presupposes a message that Samuel gives, and which proves to be true. Both here and in v. 19, the narrator makes a point of anticipating the fulfillment of the judgement on the Elides. The people of
Israel, recognizing its fulfillment, come to a knowledge of Samuel's prophetic capabilities.

That the people's recognition is narrated prior to the event and even prior to Samuel's publication of his message (4:1), is neither a sign of a dislocated text nor of a misreading of v. 20. Only when the reader requires that the text proceed step by step, with narrative event, comment, or description proceeding in exact chronological order, do such problems arise.

W.J. Martin has recognized and described several instances of what he calls "dischronologized" narrative, in which events, as related in narrative sequence, are not in chronological sequence (1968). He suggests that such "dischronology" can be understood by analyzing its literary effect (1968:186). As Chatman says:

'Its [Plot's] order of presentation need not be the same as that of the natural logic of the story. Its function is to emphasize or de-emphasize certain story-events, to interpret some and to leave others to inference, to show or to tell, to comment or to remain silent, to focus on this or
that aspect of an event or character

In the case of v. 20, the focus of attention
is not on Israel's perception of the fulfillment or
even on their reception of Samuel's word. Rather,
what all Israel—from Dan to Beersheba—comes to
understand is that Samuel is "reliable" or "confirmed"
(ne'emān) as a prophet for Yahweh. Like v. 19, v.
20 is a description from the narrator. In v. 19, he
revealed that Yahweh shaped events to confirm Samuel's
words, thereby confirming Samuel as his apprentice.
Now, in v. 20, the narrator directs the reader's
attention to the public reaction to Samuel's prophecy.
He focuses on Israel's perception of Samuel, and not
the events since their course is a foregone conclusion.
All Israel understands the prophecy and fulfillment as
a visible manifestation of the close relationship
between Samuel and Yahweh. Samuel is ne'emān to pro-
phesy for Yahweh; whatever Samuel prophesies will come
ture by virtue of Yahweh's backing. Samuel has proven
himself as the mouthpiece of God. As such he is to
be repeated and perhaps even feared. As Jepsen
suggests, the people's recognition that Samuel is
ne'emān to Yahweh emphasizes their perception of a
rare closeness between Samuel and God (1977:296).

As in vv. 19 and 21, the narrator's concern is not with chronology in v. 20; rather, he traces Yahweh's steps to legitimate Samuel as a prominent theocratic mediator. Samuel proves himself to be and is recognized as a reliable replacement for the priests in the office of mediator. Verses 19-20 trace the enactment of the two aspects of legitimation necessary to any official mediator in Israel. First, the individual, Samuel, is chosen and supported by God, and then he is recognized by the people as capable of functioning in the mediatory office, in this case to prophesy for Yahweh (cf. Soggin 1967:6). It is this concept of sacral and secular legitimation that explains the order of the text here. Yahweh has chosen Samuel, equipped him, and obtained public recognition for him. Samuel, mediator par excellence, has arrived.

Verse 21

With Samuel's "arrival," the break in communication between Yahweh and Israel caused by the Elide defection is repaired. Buber, pointing to the three connected occurrences of the verb glh in 2:27; 3:7, 21, suggests "die alten unwürdig gewordenen
priesterlichen Offenbarungsträger werden durch den neuen würdigen prophetischen ersetzt" (1964:820). Buber's suggestion is supported by the structure of ch. 3. In vv. 1-2, the scarcity of the word of Yahweh and the vision is associated with Eli's failing sight. Now, in v. 21, contact is restored, and Yahweh reappears in Shiloh. The self-revelation of Yahweh to Samuel restores the word of Yahweh to Israel (Péter-Contesse 1976:314). This reappearance of Yahweh is a result (indicated by קִז) of his self-revelation to Samuel by his word (Noth 1965:399). 14

The structure of v. 21 consists of two parallel sentences with a final preposition tag added to the second. The repetition of "in Shiloh" emphasizes that the renewal through Samuel reaches to the very heart of the damages done by the Elides, for it was in the cult at Shiloh that they carried on their priestly malpractise. The final prepositional clause, bidbar יָהֵו, when not emended (e.g. Buber 1956:125 n.5), or deleted (e.g. Ehrlich 1910:181) stands outside the parallelism of the previous sentence and is thereby foregrounded. As in v. 7, it is through the word of Yahweh that Yahweh himself is revealed to Samuel.
The inauguration of Samuel as Israel's new mediator is begun; therefore, with the message of doom to the Elides. The reappearance of Yahweh occurs once Samuel has received this message. The new era is based on the revelation of the old era's passage. Verse 21, far from being "etwas Posthumes" (Wellhuasen 1871:54) or "tautological" (Smith 1899:50), offers a compact summary of the major development of chs. 1-3 (cf. Robertson 1944:189-90). It is through the announcement of the passage of the Elide era that the new mediator receives his authorization, and with that authorization Yahweh reopens the lines of communication. The goal towards which the divine initiative (cf. 1:5) was moving has been reached. The Elides are doomed and Samuel has been equipped and accepted as a replacement. The imbalance caused by priestly excess has apparently been righted—the lack of divine communication is ended. All seems well in Israel once more.

One small item of business remains to be concluded before the transition in mediators is completed. The destruction of the Elides remains undone. The narrator moves on to describe Yahweh's operations towards that end in ch. 4. The reader has been
prepared for ch. 4 in numerous statements and suggestions throughout chs. 1-3.

What the reader is not totally prepared for are the disastrous side-effects that the punishment will bring with it. It is those side-effects and their implications that will occupy the centre of attention in chs. 4-6. The principle result of this first section of the narrative (chs. 1-3), namely Samuel's installation as prophetic mediator, will remain unaffected by the events of chs. 4-6; in fact, it is Samuel as mediator who will serve as the principal agent for repairing the damages caused by the side-effects of the Elide punishment.
4. 1 Samuel 4

Verse 1

The first sentence in v. 1 picks up the temporal development of the narrative, which was briefly set aside in 3:19-21. Those verses gave a short summary of a large time-span, even including events from the narrative's future (the fulfilled prophecy). The summary described what happened when Samuel prophesied in order to show how Yahweh went about legitimating Samuel; it was not concerned with the temporal sequence of the events. With 4:1, the narrator returns to a consecutive rehearsal of events.

The content of the word of Samuel, spoken to "all Israel," is not specified by the narrator. The reader has already been told, though, that "all Israel" recognized that Samuel was a reliable prophet on account of Yahweh fulfilling his words (3:19-20). Since the only word that Yahweh has revealed to Samuel is the message of doom against the Elides, it is probable that this message is the implied content of the word in 4:1. Chapter 3:19-20 summarized the subsequent course of events as it concerned Samuel's prophetic capacity. Those events are now presented in detail in ch. 4.
Willis has made a study of similar summaries in 1 Sam, calling them "comprehensive anticipatory redactional joints." He suggests that a redactor uses such summaries to introduce major themes that are revealed in the following traditional complex or unit (1973:295). One might also add that, as in 3:19-21, the anticipatory summary incidentally provides the reader with a rudimentary map by which to follow the events subsequently narrated. Such literary maps are especially useful in cases where subsequent events are complex and do not appear to follow logically from their antecedents. Since this is the actual reading experience of some readers of ch. 4 (e.g. Campbell 1975:200), the placement of 3:19-21 can be taken as evidence of the good literary sense of the narrator. Hence in chs. 4ff. the reader expects a narrative description of what is summarized in 3:19-21. Chapter 4:1 rewards this expectation by describing how Israel came to know of the prophecy against the Elides—Samuel told them (against Ehrlich 1910:181).

Once he has shown Samuel actually transmitting the unspecified message to Israel (did Samuel, in fact, tell them everything?), the narrator
moves directly to a description of events that led to the destruction of the Elides. Many commentators have regarded 4:1b as abrupt and lacking connection to 4:1a (e.g. Schicklberger 1973:25).¹ Following LXX, they suggest MT has undergone haplography through homoio-teleuton (e.g. McCarter 1980:103).² As Campbell notes, what is at stake in the differences between LXX and MT is not only the question of literary style, but also the question of who began the hostilities—the Israelites or the Philistines (1975:58)?

While text-critical debate continues over this verse, there is no basis, from a literary point of view, for preferring one version to the other. Chapter 4:1b of MT is neither too abrupt nor does it require the additional material of LXX for logical consistency. Chapter 4 presents a new scene in the narrative. The shift in characters and backgrounds does not imply literary disjunction anymore than a cut and shift to a new scene is a result of something having "dropped out" in film production. As in any narrative medium, perspectival presentation sometimes shifts abruptly, focusing on certain aspects of separate scenes so as to accent specific connections without the intervention of long, and unnecessarily
tedious, logical or causal connections.\textsuperscript{3}

The LXX reading is neither better connected to the preceding context nor a better introduction to the following battle with the Philistines by making them the aggressors in this scene. Schicklerger suggests that MT's statement that Israel went out to meet the Philistines presupposes mention of a Philistine deployment (1973:26). From the perspective of literary response, however, the narrative could assume the Philistine advance and leave it as an "indeterminacy" to be filled by the reader (cf. Iser 1978).

On the other hand, MT does not even require us to assume an indeterminacy. The statement, "Israel went out to meet the Philistines for battle," only requires that the reader understand that there is going to be a fight. Neither Israel nor the Philistines are specifically labelled as the aggressor because it is irrelevant. The balanced initiative is indicated by the parallel statements of vv. 1 and 2:

1) Israel goes out to meet (ligra\textsuperscript{3}t) the Philistines for battle.

2) The Philistines get ready to meet (ligra\textsuperscript{3}t) Israel. Each group is equally active.
Verse 1 focuses, therefore, not on who started it, but just on it—the fact of warfare.

The description of the Israelite campground's location is of significance later in the narrative, when Israel defeats the Philistines in the very location where it is defeated here in ch. 4 (cf. 7:12).

Verses 2-3

The battle is "joined with a clash" and Israel is smitten before the Philistines. The use of the passive הַיִּנְדָּגֵפ, wayyinnagep, to describe Israel's losses is important. Already the narrator is hinting that the Philistines are merely agents of destruction, which originates from a higher authority. Israel is smitten "before" (לפַּנֵי) the Philistines. When the narrator follows this description with the active הָיַקֵּק, wayyakkî, he does not modify his previous interpretation of the defeat. The Philistines are still agents; the narrative merely continues with a description of the details of the event. About four thousand men from Israel's ranks are killed.

In v. 3, the interpretation of the battle suggested by the narrator in v. 2 is supported by the participating Israelites' interpretation of their defeat. The narrator's verbal description,
"they were smitten," \( \text{wayyinna\text{je}p} \) now becomes active with \( \text{Yahweh} \) as subject: "Why has \( \text{Yahweh} \) smitten us (\( \text{neg\text{app\text{yn}}} \)) today before the Philistines." There is no question of Philistine responsibility; the elders immediately assume that \( \text{Yahweh} \) has smitten them "before the Philistines."

The basis of this assumption lies, of course, in the Israelite view of war.\textsuperscript{7} \( \text{Yahweh} \) had established his covenantal kingship over Israel by defeating Egypt in the great battle that occurred when Moses led Israel out of Egypt (Exod 15; cf. P.D. Miller 1973:85, 113-17, 174-75). \( \text{Yahweh} \) and Israel agreed that the basis of the covenantal relationship between them was divine protection in war on the part of \( \text{Yahweh} \) and obedience to \( \text{Yahweh} \) on Israel's part (Exod 19:3-8). Israel's obedience to \( \text{Yahweh} \)'s commandments guaranteed his protection in war, and hence, victory in war (Exod 23:22-24). Only one thing could ever defeat Israel in battle, namely its own\'sin (e.g. Josh 7-8). Warfare for Israel was not a contest between opposing forces but strictly an indicator of the state of covenantal relations between Israel and \( \text{Yahweh} \) (cf. Campbell 1975:65). Judg 2:14-15 supplies the classic expression of the Israelite view of
defeat. Israel's enemies are only victorious on account of Yahweh's will to defeat Israel.

Only two interpretations of the defeat at the hands of the Philistines are possible for Israel: either Israel or an Israelite has sinned, or Yahweh has reneged. Miller and Roberts agree that only two interpretations are possible, but see an ambiguity in the question: was it Yahweh who put the Israelites to rout or were they (and consequently Yahweh) simply defeated by a mightier nation (and god) (1977:64, 70-75)? According to Miller and Roberts, ch. 4 suggests that the Philistines and their god have defeated Israel and its god (1977:71). This reading of the chapter is, however, in direct contradiction of vv. 2 and 3. There is no question in Israel's mind over Yahweh's responsibility for the defeat (v. 3), and the narrator implies in v. 2 that the Philistines are not ultimately responsible for Israel's defeat. The question, rather, is what to make of Yahweh's action—"Why has Yahweh smitten us before the Philistines?" (cf. Smith 1899:32).

The response of the elders suggests that they place the blame for the defeat on Yahweh (cf. Schulz 1919:72; against Mauchline 1971:70). The
elders say, "Let us get from Shiloh, the ark of the covenant of Yahweh." Their proposal presupposes two things: 1. Yahweh has a covenantal duty to fight Israel's enemies. The ark of the covenant is called for as a reminder to Yahweh of those duties; 2. The elders do not say "What have we done?", or "Who sinned?" (cf. Budde 1902:34). They can only think that Yahweh has momentarily forgotten his covenantal responsibility, because they are aware of no sin on their part.

The elders' neglect of the possibility that human sin has brought on the defeat is a reflection of the narrator's concern, which is not with the question of the relationship between the sins of the people and defeat. He does not, after all, contradict the elder's omission of such a possibility, and in fact, he does everything he can in preceding scenes to present the people as without sin. Since the narrator appears to accept and agree with the elders' attribution of the cause of the defeat, an attribution that is strikingly unique in narratives about Israelite defeats in battle (contrast e.g., Josh 7; Judg 2:16; 2 Kgs 21:12-14; 2 Chron 86:11-21), the reader must also accept it. Refusal to do so is simply a refusal
to accept the conventions of the narrative, whereupon the reader becomes a writer of another story.

The purpose for bringing the ark into Israel's midst, on the battlefield, is not simply to bring Yahweh into action as a result of the presence and imperilment of his palladium; nowhere does v. 3 imply that the summons of the ark will automatically bring Yahweh to deliver Israel (so, for example, Rössler 1966:119; Willis 1971:301-02; Campbell 1979: 36). Yahweh is already active in the battle before the elders decide to summon the ark. The point of bringing the ark of the covenant of Yahweh (the name of Israel's covenantal God) is to remind Yahweh that his actions do not agree with his covenant. He is supposed to smite Philistines, not Israelites.

Another aspect of the elders' suggestion is seen in the explicit mention that it is to be brought from Shiloh. This association of the non-performing Yahweh with Shiloh, where the non- or mal-performing Elides are, may suggest that the elders perceive some connection between the military defeat and the misdeeds of the Silonite priests. (One recalls that Samuel's word in 4:1 may have been the word about the punishment on the Elides.) In any case, the
mention of Shiloh does, as Willis notes, presuppose the prior description of the ark at Shiloh (1971:302). The literary link invites the reader to form his own conclusions about the relationship between Yahweh's anomalous military performance and the previously described situation at Shiloh. The reader may recall from 3:2ff. that Yahweh revealed his plan for punishing the Elides in the temple, where the ark was. At least, the link makes room for the reader's speculative anticipations of what the presence of the ark will do for Israel.

The final sentence of v. 3—"He/it will come into our midst and deliver us from the hand of our enemies"—can be read with either the ark or Yahweh as subject. Since the elders know that it is Yahweh who has smitten them, it is probable that Yahweh should be understood as the subject of this sentence. Reminded of his covenant by the ark, Yahweh will come into the Israelites' midst and from there, deliver them from the Philistines. 9

verse 4

Acting on the elders' decision, the people send for the ark, which receives an even longer title in this verse. Despite the many different attempts
to break this ark title down into separate components, Jackson is right when he observes that MT needs no correction (1962:116). This is the most ceremonious title given to the ark and Yahweh, "God of hosts," is characterized in his martial aspect (Hertzberg 1964: 48). The divine symbol is brought on stage dressed in all its glory. The elders decided to remind Yahweh of his duties with the "ark of the covenant of Yahweh"; what they get instead—courtesy of the narrator—is the "ark of the covenant of Yahweh of hosts who sits on the cherubim."

Only the reader is privy to the narrator's characterization of the ark that is brought from Shiloh. So far as Israel is concerned, they are bringing "the ark of the covenant of Yahweh" as planned. The narrator's perspective on the ark sheds a different light on its arrival in the Israelite camp. Emphasizing as it does the tremendous power and divinity of Yahweh, the narrator's description of the ark reminds the reader of who it is that is being reminded of his duties. This God is not to be trifled with. If Eli could say of Yahweh, "He is Yahweh and does as he pleases" (5:18), then so much the more so for the God whose ark gets this regal
Accompanying the ark of this awesome God, the narrator tells us, are Eli's two sons, whose presence with the ark is indicated by the words, "And there" (ウェサム) (cf. 1:3; Wellhausen, 1871:55; McCarter 1980: 102-05). As Stoebe suggests, the association plays on the foreboding doom announced first in chs. 2-3 (1973: 132). In 1:3, the identical introduction (ウェサム) to Eli's sons tells us that they are priests to Yahweh. Chapter 2 describes their priestly abuses and the consequent punishment assured to them by Yahweh's desire (2:25). By reintroducing them in the same way as 1:3, the narrator points out that these corrupt priests are now not simply "there" at Shiloh but "there" with Yahweh of hosts, who desires to kill them.

The structure of v. 4 stresses the ominous conjunction of the sons of Eli and Yahweh by repeating it twice. The order of repetition is significant. It traps the two sons of Eli "there," between two references to Yahweh's/God's ark:

...the ark of the covenant of Yahweh of hosts... and there are the two sons of Eli with the ark of the covenant of God, Hophni and Phinehas.
The two outside references name the adversaries—Yahweh of hosts versus Hophni and Phinehas; the two inside descriptions contrast them as man and God—the sons of Eli versus God (hašēlohîm). The reader, aware as he is of Yahweh's desire and intention to slay the sons of Eli (2:25), is alerted by this ominous companionship to the likelihood of the Elides' forthcoming demise; syntactically trapped between Yahweh of hosts and God, there is no escape for them.

Verse 5

Neither Israel nor Eli's sons seem to be aware of the threat hinted at by the narrator and thus seen by the reader. The ark is again described simply as "the ark of the covenant of Yahweh," to which the people respond with a great shout.

The resumptive use of this title for the ark can be viewed as the narrator's return to a non-revelatory mode of description with which he indicates that he is returning to a simple description of the chain of events after the revealing insights of v. 4. The reader, favoured with the privileged information of v. 4, however, knows that it is not simply the ark of the covenant of Yahweh that goes with Eli's sons. The Israelite welcome for "the ark of the covenant of
Yahweh" is a product of their misunderstanding of the reason for the first defeat. Although they attempt no specific explanation for Yahweh's behaviour, the Israelites' summons for the ark and their great shout upon its arrival indicate that they see no reason for continuing failure. They give vent to the great shout ($t_r^u^a^c^a$ $g^e^d^o^l^a$), suggesting that they expect Yahweh to turn the battle in their favour.

P. Humbert has suggested that the $t_r^u^a^c^a$ was "l'acclamation sauvage mais rituelle de Yahvé le roi et le guide... le chef de guerre, celui qui rvéla sa puissance à l'exode..." (1946:34). Whether the Israelites shout simply because they believe their troubles are over, or as a further attempt to goad Yahweh into action on their behalf, is not made explicit by the narrative. Given that the ark is called as a reminder to Yahweh, it is possible that the $t_r^u^a^c^a$, while expressing a sense of relief and hope, was also employed as a further reminder to spur Yahweh on to combat and victory at the head of Israel's troops.

Verses 6-9

The Philistine reaction to the ark's arrival affords the narrator a further opportunity to point
out to the reader the important implications of the impending Israelite defeat (cf. Stolz 1972:49; Campbell 1975:67). The Philistines deduce that the Israelite gods have come into the enemy camp. They fear this new turn of events not because of the presence of the ark, but because they have heard of the power of the Israelite gods.

The Philistines wrongly assume that their previous battle with Israel was waged in the absence of Israel's gods. "Woe to us; it wasn't like this before" (v. 7). The Philistines' despair reveals to the reader that they are the unwitting instruments employed by Yahweh in his dealings with Israel, and more particularly Israel's priests. The narrator, the reader, and even the Israelite elders know that it was like this before (v. 3), only "Israel's gods" acted in a way perplexing to Israel and totally misleading to the Philistines.

The Philistines' recollection of the Israelite gods' victory over Egypt in the wilderness is an obvious example of the narrator's use of a character's voice to draw the reader's attention to important theological-political considerations unobtrusively (Cf. Smith 1899:34; Hertzberg 1964:48, who sense
something odd about the Philistines' comment, but are not quite clear on what it is.) It was Yahweh's victory over Egypt that began the covenant relationship formed between himself and Israel in the wilderness. As a result of Yahweh's military victories over their enemies, the Israelites came to see him as their king (Exod 15:1-18; Deut 33:5; P.D. Miller 1973:174-75).

The Philistine question, "Who will deliver us from the hand of these terrifying gods?" (v. 8), the gods of the exodus, is, from the Israelite perspective if not the Philistine, rhetorical. Only if the exodus gods themselves allow it can the Philistines be delivered. Hence, both from the Israelites' understanding of the previous battle (v. 3) and the Philistines' fear of Israel's gods; the reader is given to understand that any subsequent Philistine victory is willed by Yahweh, god of the exodus. As Buber observes, the question that is raised by the inclusion of these exodus recollections is, what has become of the covenant formed on the basis of the exodus (1964:823)?

The Philistines' exhortation to be strong and to act manly (v. 9) is understood by Stoebe as an
attempt to preclude any misunderstanding that the subsequent loss of the ark was due to Yahweh's inferiority to the Philistine gods (1973:132). The Philistines rely on their human capacities and not their gods in their battle against Israel's god. As the reader knows from 1 Sam 2:4, 9-10, however, human strength cannot defeat Yahweh. As a prelude to the battle report in vv. 10-11 then, the Philistine exhortation in v. 9 again directs the reader to regard any subsequent Israelite defeat as the intention of Yahweh. Verses 8-9 set up a battle between the mighty gods of the exodus and the Philistine men. This contrast is highlighted by the descriptions of the opponents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v. 8</th>
<th>v. 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. hā'ōlmäh ḫā ḫaddirim</td>
<td>ḫānāsim pēlistim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. hā'ōlmım ḫammākkım ṣēt-</td>
<td>ṭā'abāh là'ibrım ṣā'āśram</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Philistines are mere men, potential slaves, fighting the awesome gods who destroyed might Egypt. 15 Clearly the Philistines do not have a chance if they really have to fight Yahweh (cf. Schickelberger 1973: 31).
Verse 10

The unexpected, which the reader expects by now, occurs: the Philistines fight; they are subject of the verb (wayyillāhānā) indicating, perhaps, their dominance over the Israelites (cf. v. 2). Israel, on the other hand, is subject only of wayyinnāgēn, "they were smitten," an indication of their poor showing in the battle. Obviously Yahweh has not been constrained by the reminders of his covenant. The people of the gods that devastated Egypt (hammakkîm ʾet-miṣrayim bʿkol-makkāʾ, v. 8) are themselves devastated (wattēhī hammakkāʾ gēdōlā) by the Philistines, mere men. The entry of the ark into the Israelite camp saw Israel united in giving expression to the teʿuʾcāʾ (wayyāriʾcū kol-yiśrāʾēl) (v. 5). The second Philistine victory destroys this regrouping, which was centered on the ark's presence, and the Israelites flee separately, each to his own tent (v. 10; cf. McCarter 1980:107).

Israel's expectations, or at least any hopes for a reversal in military fortunes, are clearly disappointed by the second defeat. This reversal of Israel's hopes, which were justifiable on the basis of Yahweh's covenanted commitment, fulfills the prophecy of 2:32. Yahweh had promised Eli that he
would see affliction because of sin in what should be good for Israel.\textsuperscript{16} Now, in the course of events leading up to Eli's sons' punishment, Israel experiences a terrible defeat instead of the expected, and covenantally assured victory. The subsequent fulfillment of the predicted sign (2:34) confirms that it is indeed the sin of the priests that has brought defeat upon Israel.

Verse 11

The ark of God (\textit{\textsuperscript{\text{3}}elohim}) is, like the Israelites in v. 10, subject of the passive; it is taken (\textit{nilqāh}) by the Philistine army.

The loss of the ark in battle (\textit{nilqāh}) is the ironic counterpart to the elder's decision to bring (\textit{nighbā}, v. 3) the ark into the camp as a reminder to Yahweh of his military duty (noted by J.P. Fokkelman in a letter to me). God (\textit{\textsuperscript{3}}elohim) appears to have been overpowered by man (\textit{nasīm}, v. 9).\textsuperscript{17} The reader is well aware of the fact, however, that the Philistine victory is engineered by Yahweh, who has his own purposes, the accomplishment of which is now described.

Yahweh allows his ark to be captured and so allows Eli's sons to be killed. He has finally
executed his heart's desire to kill them (lah\textsuperscript{3}mîtām, 2:25). The conjunctive description of the capture of the ark and the death of Eli's sons, without any mention of the Philistine agency, focuses attention on the connection, known to be causal from the previous context, of these two incidents.

An interesting structural parallel between v. 11 and v. 4 supports the latter observation. Ranged side by side, the correspondences highlight one important difference. Both sentences are prefaced with a mention of the ark; in v. 4 it is brought by the Israelites into their camp on the advice of the elders (nîqîhâ) and in v. 11 it is taken (nîlqâh) by the Philistines. Then follows each of these sentences:

v. 4
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{wēsām sēnē bēnē-əlî}
\item \textit{cîm-\textsuperscript{3}rōn bērît hā-\textsuperscript{3}lōhîm}
\item \textit{hōnî ūpinhās}
\end{itemize}

v. 11
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{\textsuperscript{\dot{A}}sēnē bēnē-əlî}
\item \textit{mēṭî}
\item \textit{hōnî ūpinhās}
\end{itemize}

Verse 11, in place of a note about the presence of Eli's sons with the ark, inserts a verbal description of their death; their presence with the ark is
transformed into their death.

The description of the ark as the יאָרֹם יְהוֹלֶה is important not only for the contrast it provides with the Philistine victors, who are mere "mem" and unlikely conquerors of gods; it also helps the reader to avoid misinterpreting the second defeat as the Israelites and Philistines do. Israel had summoned the ark of the covenant of Yahweh. When the ark is captured, they can only believe that the covenant is broken and that Yahweh has abandoned them (4:21-22). Yet the reader knows that it is not the ark of the covenant of Yahweh that is taken. Rather it is the ark of God, the tool of him who allows men to "defeat" him and so to further the divine aims.

As Campbell notes, the simultaneous death of Hophni and Phinehas is the sign, comprehensible to Eli and the reader, that the prophecy of 2:27-36 has been set into action (1979:35). In as much as the description of the battle culminates with the sign, the narrative presents the death of Eli's sons and not the capture of the ark, which is only an important contributing factor, as the final, and most important consequence of the battle (cf. Miller and Roberts 1977:65). That the entire conflict between Israel
and the Philistines culminates in the fulfillment of the prophetic sign is a further indication, available to Eli and the reader, that Yahweh has had the guiding hand in these events.

The death of Hophni and Phinehas resolves the problem of wicked priests, at least from Yahweh's point of view (Miller and Roberts 1977:66). Yet the elimination of Eli's sons has brought with it dire consequences. Innocent Israelites have also been injured, even killed, and Israel's theological-political covenant has, from Israel's vantage, apparently been revoked. Against Miller and Roberts it should be noted that the second defeat does not call into question the power or claims of Yahweh (1977:70-72). Israel is well aware that their defeat is willed by Yahweh (v. 3) and the capture of the ark does not change this one bit. Just as Yahweh operates without the ark in the first battle, so he uses it in the second battle as the instrument of Hophni's and Phinehas' perdition. The reader, knowing that Yahweh was responsible for the first defeat which resulted in the call for the ark of the covenant (and Eli's sons), and that Yahweh desired to kill Eli's sons and promised to do so, can only regard their deaths
in the second defeat as Yahweh's doing. The issue raised by the second defeat is the same as that raised by the first; it is not Yahweh's power that is questioned, but his covenantal faithfulness.

The reader, privileged with information unavailable to Israel, knows that Yahweh has not reneged on his covenantal duties, but only appears to have done so. At the same time, the reader is able to appreciate the problems posed to Israel by the defeats. The narrative, therefore, poses separate questions with regard to the covenantal relationship—one to the reader and another, within the story, to Israel.

For the reader the problem is not Yahweh's abandonment of the covenant but the justice of Yahweh, "who does as he pleases," and the weakness of the theocratic political system as a practical government for the Israelite nation. Yahweh may have cause and even precedent (e.g. Josh 7) for his drastic means of punishing Eli's sons, yet the injustice of his actions and the political uncertainties inherent in the theocracy are underlined in this narrative. Campbell, who wants to say that the defeats are not aimed at punishing the Elides, is a good example of
a reader impressed by the political dangers posed by
the theocracy.

Yet the disproportion between the deserved
disgrace of the Elides and concomitant
disaster for Israel is glaring. The loss
of the ark, two defeats and the death of
34,000 men is a steep price to pay for the
punishment of two or three errant priests.
Can this be justified by the central role
of these priests in the nation?, (1979:35).

Is Yahweh's covenantal justice just? Is the covenant
along with its mediators of real value to Israel,
given that Israel in fact suffers because of it?

The question raised for Israel, on the other
hand, is the question of Yahweh's allegiance to his
covenant with his people. The call for the ark of
the covenant of Yahweh was a call for responsibility
on his part. The second defeat suggests, not that
Yahweh is weak, but that he has abandoned Israel.
As subsequent interpretations of the second defeat
suggest, Israel takes the defeat as a signal of the
end to the special relationship between Yahweh and
his people.
Verses 12-18

The fulfillment of prophecy continues. The literary links between vv. 12-18 and 3:2-18 confirm that the defeats are Yahweh's doing as he goes about punishing the Elides:

3:2
Eli lies in his place.

3:2
Eli cannot see.

3:4
God calls Samuel to tell him what he is about to do (the ear-tingling event) (cf. above on 3:11).

3:5
As a result, Samuel runs (wayyorāš) to Eli.

3:11-14
Yahweh reveals his plans to Samuel. (Eli does not know what God says because he is "blind" and does not receive visions.)

3:16-17
Eli, wanting to know (4:16) what God said,
calls Samuel (שֵׁם-עֵזְר bֵּן) and asks what God said (מָה הַדָּבָר).

3:18 Samuel tells all (wayyaged-לו שֵׁם-עֵזְר)
et-kol-hadd世界各国).

3:18 Contents of Samuel's message: everything
(including what Yahweh had previously said in
2:27-36 according to
3:12).

4:14 The messenger tells Eli what happened (wayyaged-
1כֵּלִי).

4:17 Content of message:
Israel fled, great losses,
Eli's sons dead, and the
ark taken.

The appearance of the messenger alone is enough
for anyone seeing him to know that Israel was defeated
(v. 12; Campbell 1975:78). Eli is unable to see the
facts, however, and must ask. The description of Eli
in v. 13 is paralleled in 1:9, with the difference that
Eli is no longer called "the priest" and he no longer
sits at the doorpost of the temple. Instead, he sits
atop the gate, watching because he was fearful on
account of the ark.18

Eli's fear has been the subject of some debate.
Campbell, who sees the loss of the ark and the
interpretation of that loss as the primary concern of
ch. 4, suggests that the text's explicit statement requires that we understand Eli to be fearing for the ark, and presumably, its safety (1979:37). P.R. Davies, on the other hand, notes that ḫrd does not mean to be concerned or worried, but rather to be fearful and trembling (1977:12; cf. BDB "terrify," p. 355). According to Davies, Eli is afraid of the ark and for his sons, because of their sins and, one might add, because of the prophecy. The disagreement extends to the understanding of the focus of ch. 4: for Campbell it is the loss of the ark, for Davies it is Eli and his family.

In fact, both Campbell and Davies are correct insofar as it is possible to have a "correct" interpretation. The chapter is concerned with the punishment of the Elides, but as Miller and Roberts note, that introduces a new problem, the loss of the ark (1977:66). It is likely that Eli fears both the loss of the ark and the potentially dangerous situation of his sons, who are accompanying it. We may assume that Eli shares the elders' assumption that Yahweh was responsible for the first defeat, especially in view of Yahweh's last message to Samuel. Knowing that Yahweh
had promised the death of his two sons and that Yahweh was acting very weirdly towards Israel, Eli could be expected to entertain fears for his sons' safety and misgivings about the possibility that his sons had brought this evil on Israel (cf. 2:32; 3:12, and the interpretation above).

It is important to note that when the ark, accompanied by his sons, goes out to the battlefield, Eli does not worry about the danger of the situation for the ark or his sons; his fear is explicitly focused on the ark alone. Eli's attention, attuned by the prophetic messages of chs. 2 and 3, is drawn to a single aspect of the situation, the presence of the ark and what that might portend. Further detailing of his concern is left to subsequent verses.

The scene at the entrance of the ark to the Israelite camp is tragically mirrored by the messenger's entrance to the city. In v. 5, all Israel (kol-\textit{yišrā'el}) had voiced an earth-shaking \textit{ṭêru'ā} on the ark's arrival in the camp. In v. 13, the whole city (kol-hā\textit{c̱ār}) cries out at the messenger's report. The Philistines, hearing the sound of the \textit{ṭêru'ā} ask "What is the meaning of this great \textit{ṭêru'ā}" (v. 6). The narrator tells us that they realized that the ark
had arrived. Eli, on the other hand, when he hears the sound of the outcry and asks, "What is the meaning of this outcry (hehāmōn)," (cf. v. 5, wattēhōm) has to be told. Instead of a narratorial comment telling us that he realizes what has happened (as in v. 6), the narrator tells us that he was an old man (lit. 98 years old) who could not see. As previously (3:2), Eli's blindness is more than physical and the narrator uses it to compare him unfavourably, first with Samuel and now with the Philistines. As Dorn notes, v. 15 does provide general background to the narrative (Dorn 1978:318-19), but more importantly, it renders a subtle judgement on Eli, who is even less perceptive than the Philistines. As in ch. 3 where he has to ask what Yahweh said (v. 17), now Eli has to ask what Yahweh has done (v. 16).

The messenger's perception of the climax of the second defeat differs from the narrator's (cf. vv. 10-11). Instead of placing the death of Eli's sons last, the messenger regards the capture of the ark as the final blow. The difference is significant and indicative of the gradual change of focus that occurs in ch. 4. The narrator's order in v. 11 places the military defeat first, which leads to the capture
of the ark, which leads to the deaths of Hophni and Phinehas. The list follows the causal sequence that Yahweh uses to kill the Elders. The messenger's list, on the other hand, is an expression of an interest in the consequences of the defeat for Israel. The list gives these consequences in ascending order of importance: first the people are destroyed, then the priests are killed, and finally, the ark of God is taken. What will become of Israel?

When Eli hears the last item in the messenger's list, he falls off his chair and breaks his neck (v. 18). The narrator's explanation of the cause of Eli's death, "for the man was old (zāqēn) and heavy (kāḇēd)," places Eli's death alongside his lack of control over his sons as a consequence of old age. Though Eli's death fulfills Yahweh's prediction that there would be no old man (zāqēn, 2:32) in his house, the narrator ensures that the reader will remember that Eli's punishment is for the "crime" of becoming old and feeble. By tying Eli's death explicitly to his age and decrepit condition (kāḇēd), the narrator emphasizes the correspondence of his death with his "crime" and plays down the actual cause of death, the broken neck. The expository intrusion suggests that the narrator
is more concerned that the reader recall why Eli is
dying than he is with the actual circumstances of the
death. The death of the old man reminds the reader
of the injustice of the whole scene, which is directed
by the a-rational divinity, "Who does as he pleases"
(3:18).

Commentators have often taken Eli's reaction
in v. 18 as confirmation that Eli was fearful for the
ark's safety in v. 13 (e.g. Campbell 1979:37). Hertz-
berg, for example, says that "it is the news that the
ark has been captured and not that his sons have been
killed, that is the direct cause of the old man's
death" (1964:49; cf. Smith 1899:50; Campbell 1975:80,
1979:37; Miller and Roberts 1977:66; McCarter 1980:
116).

Careful attention to what the narrator tells
us in v. 18 suggest an interesting alternative. What
Eli hears, according to the narrator, is everything
up to and including "the ark of God." The narrator
explicitly states that when the messenger mentioned
"...the ark of God" Eli fell and died. Whether or
not Eli actually heard the word nilqāḫā, "was taken,"
is debatable; the point made by the narrator is that
immediately upon hearing the words, "the ark of God,"
mentioned after the message about the defeat and the
death of his sons, Eli fell to his death. It may be
that Eli had already guessed what had happened to the
ark on the basis of his knowledge about the defeat and
his sons' death. After all, his sons were accompanying
the ark as a priestly guard. But the narrator's
obvious omission of the word nilqāhā from his descrip-
tion of what Eli heard before his death places primary
emphasis on the fact of the collocative mention of
Eli's sons' death with "the ark of God." Having heard
that his sons were dead, Eli recognized the fulfill-
ment of the sign (2:34). Upon hearing the words "the
ark of God" Eli surely recognizes God's hand in all
of this and is so overcome that he falls to his death.
Hence although Campbell is correct to observe that the
messenger's list presents the capture of the ark as
the most important consequence of defeat; he is wrong
to see Eli's death as confirmation of this (1975:80).
Eli and his sons are solely catalysts of the problem
they create for-Israel and are not concerned with
the consequences of the lost ark. The ambiguity of
v. 13 will, at this point, be reinterpreted by the
reader in light of v. 18 which is clear (cf. Perry
1979:46-48). Eli fears on account of the ark of God
in v. 13, since he knows that the ark's God is going to kill his sons. In v. 18, he is not interested in the ark per se, but only with the mention of it in connection with his sons' deaths.

The note that Eli judged Israel for forty years is often passed over with the comment that it is of deuteronomistic provenance, designed to incorporate Eli's career into the framework of the book of Judges (e.g. Smith 1899:36; McCarter 1980:114). While this redactional hypothesis may be true, it does not apprehend the effect of the notice on the narrative. Hertzberg faces this question and decides that the notice shows the damage done to Israel's social and political institutions by the loss of the ark (1964:50). This interpretation can be expanded.

First, it is not because the ark is lost that Israel experiences this blow to its leadership. Rather it is the corruption of the priestly leadership of Eli's sons that provokes Yahweh to arrange this defeat and to allow the loss of the ark. Viewed in the light of the role played by previous judges in Israelite history, the conclusion to "judge" Eli's career and its effect on Israel is ironic. The reader's attention is directed to this ironic contrast by the
formulaic obituary notice, which follows the examples of obituary notices about other judges in the book of Judges. Such obituary notices were usually prefaced with a description of how the judge delivered Israel "from the hand of their enemies" (e.g. Judg 2:18; 3:31; 8:28). Eli's obituary notice, on the other hand, comes immediately after a detailed description of total chaos brought on Israel as a result of the sin of its priestly leaders. The system of theocratic mediators seems to have backfired.

Verses 19-22

The news of the ark's capture and the death of her father-in-law and her husband causes Phinehas' wife to go into premature labour, and the delivery brings about her death (k'cet mütâh, v. 20). She takes neither interest nor satisfaction in her accomplishment in bearing a son. Her only action with respect to her son is to name him and even this act reveals that her thoughts are elsewhere (cf. McCarter 1980:115). The name she gives to her child, Ichabod, means "Where is the glory?" or, "Alas, the glory!" (McCarter 1980:115-16).

Like Eli, Phinehas' wife is mortified by the news of the battle. She too hears a list of three
items, which are summarized by the narrator in the following order: the capture of the ark of God, the death of her father-in-law (Eli), and the death of her husband (observed by Fokkelman in a letter to me). In her case, the news brings on her labour pains (v. 19). She gives birth to a son, but dies soon after.

Phinehas' wife presents an interpretation of the crisis that reveals that she either has not, or refuses to come to grips with the implications of the connection between the defeats and the word of Samuel given in 4:1a. To her the second defeat is disastrous because "glory" has departed from Israel. Her two separate but parallel statements on the departed glory (vv. 21-22) seem contradictory and have given rise to emendations and excisions to remove the conflict (cf. Schicklberger 1973:38-42, Stoebe 1973: 135). The seeming contradiction can be resolved, however, by paying close attention to the differences between the two verses.

The first statement (v. 21) is a narratorial description of how she knows that glory has departed from Israel. "She said glory has departed from Israel with respect to (מֹלֶא) the captured ark, her father-in-law, and her husband." Campbell (1979:37)
has suggested that "glory" refers to the loss of the ark, but this interpretation neglects v. 21, which emphasizes equally the ark and the priests. Davies makes the opposite mistake, suggesting that "glory" refers primarily to Eli and Phinehas (1977:12). de Robert comes closer to the mark when he suggests that "glory" refers both to the ark, Israel's esteemed divine symbol, and Eli and Phinehas, Israel's honoured, prestigious priests (1979:352-53). These prestigious symbols and honoured figures are supposed to be Israel's glory. The difficulty with de Robert's suggestion is that only the ark has left Israel; Eli and Phinehas are dead and in Israel.

Schulz takes an entirely different approach. Citing Jer 5:16ff; 14:21; and 17:12, he suggests that šāḇōḏ without the definite article may be a circumlocution for Yahweh (1919:83-84). Elaborating on Schulz's suggestion, one might note that the ark was the physical symbol of Yahweh's presence with Israel (cf. vv. 3-7; Num 14:39-45). The priests were installed by God as operators of the sacrificial cult (1 Sam 2:28), the purpose of which was to remove the impurities caused by sin (2:29). These impurities were believed to attack both man and God, the latter
in his sanctuary (J. Milgrom 1976:766). The pollution of the sanctuary by human sin drives God out from the midst of his people (cf. Num 5:1-4; Deut 23:9-14). The priests are, therefore, agents of the presence of God in Israel. The narrator suggests, in v. 21, that Phinehas' wife says that the divine presence has left Israel, and points to the capture of the ark and the deaths of the priests as indications of the divine absence (cf. Gutbrod 1956:41). Without these instruments and tokens of the divine presence, Phinehas' wife assumes that God cannot be present with Israel anymore.

The second statement (v. 22) is a "tagged quotation" of Phinehas' wife's view on when or why the divine presence left Israel. If we translate מָּאָה as "in that," then the verse seems to suggest that the capture of the ark was the first visible manifestation that the presence had left. The deaths of the priests are comprehensible because Yahweh is no longer around to defend them. His absence is inferred from the capture of his ark. Were he present, he would not allow such a thing. If, on the other hand, we read מָּאָה causally, the verse becomes a strong expression of the view that Yahweh's presence is tied
to the ark. The presence left Israel because the ark was captured.

The picture of the distraught wife of Phinehas offers a contrastive parallel to that of Hannah. In ch. 1, we see a barren woman who, thanks to the intervention of God, gives birth to a son and celebrates the divine action by naming her son in honour of God. For Hannah, the birth of Samuel is a jubilant affair, a time for praise of God and celebration of his aid to the faithful (2:1-10). For the reader, the birth of Samuel was the first step in a series of events that were being shaped in accordance with some obscure divine plan. The birth of Phinehas' wife's child stands as the concluding event to that plan. In contrast to Hannah, Phinehas' wife's comment on divine intervention is full of despair. Ichabod, "Alas, the glory," is a living reminder of the undesirable effect that Yahweh's intervention (or lack of appropriate intervention) can have, even on his own people. Hannah was typically overjoyed at the birth of her son, yet Phinehas' wife, who should also be happy, pays no heed to the news of her accomplishment, overpowered as she is by the news of the disaster (v. 20).
The contrast between these two child-bearers is clear and it reveals that events in Israel have taken a turn for the worse. Since in both cases it is divine intervention that provokes the mothers' reactions, the reader looks forward to a third intervention that will again restore the favourable reaction.

By allowing the wife to voice her own interpretation of the disaster, the narrator creates an opportunity for the reader to reflect on the course of events from yet another vantage, namely that of a human character with limited horizons. The reader has been privileged to know the true cause of defeat and shares few if any of the wife's thoughts about Yahweh's supposed absence from Israel. Neither she nor the elders (v. 3) seem to have linked the defeats with the word of Samuel. Instead, they think in terms of God's abandonment of (v. 3) or departure from (v. 22) Israel. What is a simple punishment of sin from Yahweh's perspective is experienced by Israel as a religious and existential crisis.

The reader is forced to consider the two perspectives on the defeat and to integrate them. He knows the real cause, yet he also sympathizes, as
a human being and, perhaps, as an Israelite, with the wife's and elders' interpretations of defeat. His omniscient perspective on the entire episode allows him to see the injustices of the slaughter and brings him to agree with the elders, who view the defeat as a failure of Yahweh to do what he promised (vv. 3-4). This sympathy for Israel is strengthened by the impression, gained from the narratorial intimation in 2:25, that the entire episode could have been avoided had not Yahweh desired the death of Eli's sons.

What emerges for both the reader and Israel is the unpredictability of Yahweh, and for the reader alone, the apparent irrationality and even the injustice of Yahweh's means of punishing the priests. The narrative displays the potential danger of having a god living amongst men and serving as their minister of national defense. The controls and insurance against disaster in this situation are the priests and the cult. When these means of insulating the community against the awful powers of the divinity fail there is no back-up system (cf. 2:25). The narrative exposes a weakness inherent in the theocratic polity, namely the fallible human mediator(s) between God and man, and the consequent danger to
the community of the unleashed wrath of the punishing
God, "who does what he pleases."

As Levine points out, Yahweh's wrath knows no
distinctions and is uncontrollable when unleashed
(1974:71). Yahweh is portrayed as a demonic power,
dwelling in the innermost sanctuary and requiring
that his worshippers defend themselves from his wrath.
Israel was willing to risk the dangers of divine
immanence in order to gain the blessings thereby
made possible (1974:71). The episode in 1 Sam 2-4
questions the viability of the political system
established to accommodate the divine presence.
Problems between the priests and Yahweh interfere
with the nation's defense, due to the constitutionally
based lack of distinction between the sacred and pro-
fane aspects of national existence. Similarly,
Israel experiences an existential and religious crisis
when it is defeated in war due to this same lack of
distinction.

The reader is left waiting for a resolution
of the difficulties created in the course of punish-
ing the Elides. Yahweh has estranged himself from
Israel. How will he repair the damage done to his
relationship with them? The process of reconciliation
is described in chs. 5-7.
5. 1 Samuel 5

Excursus: Perspective and Knowledge in 1 Sam 5:1-6:11

The events of 5:1-6:11 are reserved for the eyes of the narrator and his reader. The defeated Israelites in the story are not allowed any insight into the reasons for the return of the ark in 6:12, nor do they know what Yahweh or the ark have been doing during the time of the ark's stay amongst the Philistines. By intentionally limiting access to these events the narrator illuminates the meaning of Israel's defeat for his reader, while leaving Israel in the dark. The revelation of Yahweh's superiority to Dagon and the Philistines is a clear testimony to Yahweh's intentions in the Israelite defeats (Gutbrod 1956:44; Miller and Roberts 1977:71). The reader is granted absolute certainty regarding the real causes and results of the Israelite defeat in ch. 4.

At the same time, however, the reader is aware that the Israelites share neither his omnipresent perspective nor his certainty about the meaning of their defeat. Even though the narrative states that "the word of Samuel was (broadcast) to all Israel" (4:1), the problem of correlating that prophecy with
specific events remained. While the reader is privileged with corroborating details such as 5:1-6:11 by the narrator, Israel sees only the bare facts and only some of those. The reactions of the city-dwellers (4:13) and of Phinehas' wife (4:20-22) illustrate the initial confusion over the significance of Israel's defeat.

The reader sees all and knows all, but is forced to recognize the singularity of his vantage by the presence, in the story, of an Israel that cannot share his view. Since the reader is also aware of the fact that he would normally share Israel's limited perspective, his privileged access to narrative events also become a privileged opportunity for reflection on the encounter in history between God and man, and on the implications of the normally limited human access to an intelligible perspective on the divine action. Though the narrator does not himself explicitly engage in such reflection, he does encourage his reader to do so by allowing him the use of the omniscient point of view.

It is also important to be aware of the reverse side of the omniscient perspective. Just as the narrator can use his omniscience to create an
opportunity for reader reflection on the problems of human limitations in knowledge, he can also give his reader an experiential grasp of those problems by denying him a share in the omniscience that is always available to the narrator. So in 6:19, for example, the narrator resigns the reader to a view of divine action "from below," thereby allowing the reader a fuller appreciation of Israel's perspective on that particular action.

As the majority of commentators have observed, 5:1-5 demonstrate Yahweh's complete superiority to Dagon, the Philistine god. Only on the basis of this demonstration is it usually inferred that Yahweh was responsible for the Israelite defeat (e.g. Campbell 1975:92; Miller and Roberts 1977:71; McCarter 1980:124-25). Miller and Roberts suggest that vv. 1-5 are a vindication of Yahweh's power in response to the doubt cast thereon by the Israelite defeat (1977:70-71). As Campbell intimates, however, Israel was never in doubt about Yahweh's role in the battle—the question they asked was why Yahweh had smitten them, not whether he had (1975:92). In addition, one might add that the reader has no doubts about Yahweh's responsibility, given his prior knowledge of Yahweh's
intent gained from chs. 1-4. For whom, then is this demonstration? The only answer is that it is for the Philistines. Israel is unaware of the events in the temple at Ashdod and the reader is in no doubt about Yahweh's abilities, but the Philistines appear to have been in a position to misunderstand their success. From 4:9 it should be recalled that the Philistines plunged into battle as "men" against the powerful and mighty gods of the exodus. Their apparent victory might be taken by them as an indication that they had conquered those mighty gods.

As in the case of King Nebuchadnezzar, who was reduced to an animal existence for thinking that he was responsible for his success rather than God (Dan 4:20-37), the Philistines are made to remember their proper station whether they have forgotten it or not. The god is smashed and they themselves are stricken with a plague of tumors. Perhaps the best comment on ch. 5 is contained in a line from Hannah's song, "man cannot prevail by strength" (2:9). The episode is, however, not so much a vindication of Yahweh's powers as it is a glorification of them. The keynote of Yahweh's Philistine venture is glorification amongst the nations (6:5-6).
Verse 1

Verse 1 introduces a new scene in the chain of events consequent to the Israelite defeat (cf. Schicklberger 1975:100; against Campbell 1975:83-84). The positioning of *pēlistim* first in the sentence emphasizes the Philistine initiative as subject (cf. Campbell 1975:83). At the same time the syntax of v. 1 also serves to distinguish this new scene from the preceding scene in ch. 4 (Miller and Roberts 1977:41; cf. Budde 1902:39; Schulz 1919:84). The emphasis on the Philistine initiative is also seen when v. 1 is compared with 4:22. In 4:22, the ark is subject of the passive "was taken" (*nilqah*), but in 5:1 the Philistines take over as subject of the same verb (*lāqēbahu*). Ehrlich notes that *lāqah*, in this incidence "heisst hier nicht nehmen, sondern, wie oben 4:11, 17, 21, 22, erbeuten" (1910:183). The point of such emphasis is, as in the following verses, to show that the Philistines deserve the punishment they get. They act presumptuously, as though they had won the victory and are bringing home their trophy (Miller and Roberts 1977:42-43).

Verse 2

The repetition of a large part of v. 1 in
v. 2 is reminiscent of certain aspects of poetic parallelism and need not be taken as a redundancy to be explained by the text's compositional history (Wellhausen 1871:58; Miller and Roberts 1977:41; against Dhorme 1910:55; Stoebbe 1975:138; Campbell 1975:84-85; cf. Kugel 1981:59-95). Verse 2 specifies exactly where in Ashdod they brought the ark. The emphasis on the Philistine initiative continues in v. 2; they are subject of all three active verbs, while the ark is mentioned three times only as object of the verbs. The Philistine manipulation of the ark, so strongly highlighted in vv. 1-2, is soon to end.3

Verses 3-4

The significance of Dagon's fall continues to be debated by scholars. Does the verse depict a battle of gods? Is it Yahweh or the ark that brings down Dagon? Is Dagon worshipping Yahweh or is he lying at his feet in defeat? In the two verses themselves these sorts of consideration are not given special prominence. No conflict is described. The contest is really no contest. Yahweh does not act and the ark is impassive. Only Dagon does anything, and he simply falls to his face before the ark.4
The reader is allowed to see only the results of the nightly activity. The activity itself is intentionally disregarded. The scene of the morning after is set forth in a simple, matter-of-fact description that evokes neither surprise nor excitement in the reader. There is no hint that either Yahweh or the ark has lifted a finger in this "contest." Dagon, the inferior, naturally falls with his face to the ground before his superior (cf. Miller and Roberts 1977:44).5

The first fall of Dagon turns the tables on the Philistines. In vv. 1-2 they took (wayyiqhû) the ark and brought it to the house of Dagon, setting it next to Dagon. When Dagon falls from his former estate, it is him whom the Philistines have to take (wayyiqhû) and return to his place. The reversal of fortunes, indicated by the parallel and contrastive verbs describing actions with the ark and Dagon as objects, indicates that it is simply the presence of the ark that brings about Dagon's downfall. When in the presence of a superior, an inferior god quite naturally shows deference.

As v. 2 is a development of v. 1, so v. 4 develops the implications of v. 3. The first half
of v. 4 virtually repeats the first half of v. 3, while the second half contains a new development. This time Dagon seems to be broken up by his fall. His head and the palms of his hands are severed on the threshold of the temple leaving "only Dagon on him." Against Miller and Roberts, one must maintain that Dagon is not "slaughtered by Yahweh" (1977:45). The mythological parallels that they adduce as a possible context for understanding Dagon's dismemberment, while interesting, make Yahweh's involvement explicit when the text leaves it implicit. (Cf. Gutbrod 1956:43, "Bis zu diesem Punkte der Erzählung ist das Wirken des Herrn Israels nur zwischen den Zeilen zu lesen.")

Granted that the narrator leaves the determination of the agent of Dagon's demise to the reader, and Yahweh is the only logical choice, the narrator's formulation focuses on the simple fact that Dagon lies dismembered before the ark. Yahweh's absolute supremacy over Dagon is thereby demonstrated without any explicit struggle or effort on Yahweh's part, thus making the feat more remarkable.

Verse 5

In this etiological note, the narrator supplies the reader with empirical confirmation of
the truth of what is told in vv. 3-4, citing "factual evidence" from outside the narrative (cf. Miller and Roberts 1977:46). The reader is reminded that the events did occur and did bear consequences still felt "until this day." Viewed from a literary perspective, this etiology appears as a rhetorical technique supportive of the narrative. Since the Philistines are supposed to have been the only viewers of Dagon's calamity, the narrator adds an etiology both as proof of his story and as a reminder to the reader of his privileged perspective.

Verse 6

Although Yahweh's activity and responsibility for Dagon's downfall is purposefully left implicit, the narrator does reveal the divine hand (yad-yhwh) when it moves against the Philistines themselves. When it is a god with whom Yahweh contends, the narrative carefully avoids any appearance of activity on Yahweh's or Dagon's part.

The only things that reveals Dagon's inferiority is that each morning the statue of Dagon is found lying face down before the ark, cultic symbol of Yahweh. Yet even in that change of position, we are prevented from seeing any activity. Dagon's submission
to Yahweh is a state, without beginning, and not a process.

When it is merely the Philistines that are the objects of Yahweh's offensive actions, however, there can be no question of Yahweh's vast superiority. His total mastery of the situation is denoted in the playful, almost comic way that he defeats the Philistines (A. Bentzen 1948:46; Hertzberg 1964:53; Stoebe 1973:144).

The specific ascription of the Philistines' sufferings to "the hand of Yahweh" is also significant in view of the fact that Dagon's hands (palms) are cut off (v. 4, Miller and Roberts 1977:48). The intended contrast is exhibited in the verb conjugations: Yahweh's hand is subject of the active verb wattikbad, while Dagon's palms are governed by the passive, k'erutot; Yahweh acts, Dagon is acted upon.

Miller and Roberts suggest that the use of plague as a machine of war is part of Israel's divine warrior ideology. They see the divine warrior as a primary image that binds all parts of the narrative together—the defeats of Israel, Dagon, and the Philistines—demonstrating that the power of Yahweh, the divine warrior, is the key to what the narrative
is really about (1977:49). One can agree with this suggestion insofar as the narrative does illustrate Yahweh's complete control of the situation from beginning to end. The instance of the plagues and their association with the divine warrior ideology is a further example of the narrator's efforts to impress upon the reader the fact of Yahweh's supremacy.

The insuperability of Yahweh is, however, only a key to the meaning of the narrative. The point of illustrating at such great length (chs. 5-6) that Yahweh was in control is not simply to affirm Yahweh's superiority over the enemies of Israel and their gods (e.g. Miller and Roberts 1977:68). Rather Yahweh's obvious superiority is given centre stage to evoke a question in the mind of the reader.

If Yahweh is so obviously superior to the Philistines that one must assume his total control over the Israelite defeat, why did the defeat have to take place on such a grand scale? Could not the sinful priests have been exterminated more economically (cf. Campbell 1979:35)?

Verse 7

The Ashdodites' recognition that Yahweh is behind their misfortunates parallels that of the
Israelites in 4:3. The difference between the Philistines and the Israelites is that the former see the elimination of the ark's presence among them as the way to relieve their suffering while Israel, Yahweh's people, regards the presence of the ark as the guarantee of their deliverance (4:3). In future, however, Israel will come to share the Philistine antipathy to the ark's presence (cf. 6:20).

Campbell has drawn attention to a recurring pattern of interaction that begins here in vv. 6-7 (1975:96-99; cf. Schicklberge 1973:155-59). Yahweh is shown plaguing the Philistines in the vicinity of the ark, and they respond by passing the ark along to someone else. The pattern is partially unified through a chiastic structure that shapes vv. 6-7. The structure, in outline, is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The hand of Yahweh is heavy on the Ashdodites</th>
<th>he smites them(_g) (Ashdod and precincts) with tumours.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The men of Ashdod cognize their situation</td>
<td>they say that his (Yahweh's) hand is hard on them and their god.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pattern is important. Its repetition firmly impresses upon the reader the way that Yahweh treats his enemies and the recourse that they have to his attacks. When the ark is finally received by Israel (6:19-7:1), Yahweh's similar treatment of Israelites and their similar response are clear indications to the reader that the disturbing effects of the Elide affair have not been remedied.

Verse 8

Like the Israelites in ch. 4, the Philistines are now faced with their first "defeat," and the apparent inability of their god to do anything for them. The Philistine princes convene to decide what to do with the ark of Israel's god in view of their situation, just as the Israelite elders met and together decided to summon the ark in view of their defeat (4:3). The operation of this technique of scenic parallelism has often been observed operating in other narratives (e.g. the wife-sister motif in Gen 12, 20, and 26). Alter suggests that "narrative analogy" (his term) is an important feature in much biblical narrative, through which "one part of the text provides oblique commentary on another" (1981: 21). The parallel between Israel in 4:3 and the
Philistines in 5:8 highlights the difference in the response to known defeat by Yahweh. Israel calls for the ark to remind Yahweh of his covenantal commitment, while the Philistines, who have no contract with Yahweh, pass it on. The narrator will use this Israelite/Philistine parallel again in 6:19-21 with a definite difference in Israel's response, which is in obvious contrast to the parallel here in v. 8.

The Philistine decision to send the ark around to Gath indicates their unrepentant will to retain Israel's God's ark and affords further opportunities for exploiting the effect of Yahweh's show of power on the reader's understanding of the narrative. (Cf. Schicklberger 1973:155-58, who discusses the repeated incident in terms of "Steigerung" and "Dramatisierung" and their effect on the reader.)

Verse 9

The pattern established in Ashdod (vv. 6-8) is repeated in vv. 9-10; of the Philistines' suffering is intensified as a result of the ark's continuing presence amongst them (Schicklberger 1973:155). The hand of Yahweh results in a "great confusion" in the city. Yahweh makes use of his divine implements of war to do what he would not do when called upon by
Israel in ch. 4.

The second sentence of v. 9 reinforces this reading of the הָוָּמָה. The objects of the divine warrior's attack are specifically the men of the city, "from small to big." The detailed description of the human object of the divine attack emphasizes the insignificance of Yahweh's "opponents." Again Yahweh is shown to have been in full control of Israel's defeat; at the same time, however, the inappropriate gradiosity of his methods is highlighted. As he engineered a defeat of the entire Israelite nation to kill the sons of Eli in ch. 4, Yahweh now brings his divine armament to bear on the men of Gath in order to show them who is really responsible for victory and defeat. Both his sense of proportion and his timing seem skewed.\(^{11}\)

Verses 10-11

The men of Gath respond to Yahweh's attentions with greater speed than the Ashdodites. Without a convention of the Philistine leaders, the ark is immediately dispatched to Ekron (Campbell 1975:98). The Ekronites, however, have already heard of the misfortunes of those to whom the ark is sent. They object to the ark's presence in their town.\(^{12}\) Fearing
for their lives in view of Yahweh's prior exhibitions, the Ekronites reconvene the Philistine princes. Unlike the Ashdodites (v. 8), they finally know exactly what to do with the ark and demand that it be sent back to Israel. As in the final plague in Egypt (Exod 12:29-35), it is the mēhūmat māwet, which brought death to the Ekronites, that convinces the Philistines to send the ark back:

Exod 12 1 Sam 5
wattiḵbad yad-yhwh (v. 6) wayyizcaqū hāeqrōnîm (v. 10)
quîmî sēš mittōk ca:mmî (v. 31) šalēlpî ḫet-ārōn... (v. 11)
dâmērû kullānu mētîm (v. 33) lâh mitēnî wēēet ca:mmî (v. 10; cf. v. 11)\[15\]

Yahweh's affliction of the Philistines can get no worse, since he has intensified his efforts from plaguing them to killing them. The intensification is highlighted by repeated vocabulary taken from vv. 6-9:

wattikbad yad-yhwh (v. 6) kābdâ mēēōd yad hāēlōḥîm (v. 11)
mēhūmâ gēdōlâ mēēōd (v. 9) mēhūmat-māwet (v. 11)
Verse 12

D. Daube (1963:75) notes that the idea that those who escape one peril are smitten by another is also found in the exodus narrative (Exod 10:5, 12, 15). Driver also makes the exodus connection when he observes that וָשָׁמַע is paralleled in prose only by Exod 2:23 (1913:53). It would seem, then, that the vocabulary of vv. 12 has been employed to remind the reader of the exodus event. Daube especially has drawn attention to numerous parallels between the events in 1 Sam 5-6 and the exodus (1963:73-88; cf. Bentzen 1948:45-47; Bourke 1954:96-99; Fretheim 1967: 120-21).

These scholars' observations suggest that chs. 5-6 should be read in the light of the exodus story and the latter's significance for Israelite thought.14 In v. 12, however, the narrative has only begun to draw attention to the exodus motifs, so that the reader's consideration of such allusions is just developing.

In view of 4:9 the description of the cry of the city "mounting up to heaven" is especially interesting. In 4:9, the Philistines are exhorted to fight bravely so as not to become slaves to the
Hebrews as the Hebrews are slaves to the Philistines. Now, in 5:12, however, the Philistine city utters the same cry for help (šawcat ha'ait) that the Israelites cried to God when they were slaves in Egypt (Exod 2:23). Though they may have won the battle, the Philistines' existence under the heavy hand of Yahweh seems to have become as oppressive as that of the Hebrew slaves.

The captivity of the ark, which is also to say the Israelite defeat, has resulted in the Philistine degradation in "slavery." Hence it is not only Israel that experiences loss from the battle. The Philistines too are subject to the experience of defeat. Are there any winners? Yes, one; "By withholding his hand from the Philistines at Ebenezer, Yahweh had created an opportunity not only to remove his ark from Shiloh and its wicked priests but also to demonstrate his power in the land of his enemies" (McCarter 1980:126).

The whole series of events from the defeat of Israel, to the deaths of the Elides, to the Philistine devastation portrays men as pawns in the hand of Israel's God. With them Yahweh plays a deadly game in which he eliminates those who have sinned against him, simultaneously affording himself the
opportunity to display his power to the Philistines. The narrative follows the movement of the ark from town to town to show Yahweh in action, revealing his gradual intensification of the Philistines' devastation. Yahweh's personal motivation is the same as his purpose in devastating the Egyptians in Exodus. He sends minor plagues at first, not wanting to crush "the opposition" straightaway so that he can give an extended demonstration of his power. God's ultimate aim, of course, is to spread his reputation (cf. Exod 9:15-16; Lev 26:45; Num 14:13, 15; Josh 2:9-11; Kaufmann 1972:297). While the narrator has not put such an explicit avowal as that of Exod 9:14-16 in the mouth of Yahweh here, he has made the divine intention clear in the structural parallels between this scene and the exodus narrative.

Yahweh's hand in the Israelite defeat was not explicitly mentioned. The reader knows of it from chs. 1-3, and Israel assumes it in 4:3, but Yahweh accomplished his first purpose in secrecy. When it comes to his self-vindication amongst the Philistines, however, he plays his hand in full view (ch. 5).

The divine character obviously wishes to be associated only with the victory over Israel's
enemies. Since he later exhibits no qualms about pro-
claiming his own active role in Israel's greatest defeat,
the exile, it may be that he realizes that his role in
the defeat of ch. 4 is indefensible. The divine justi-
fication for the exile was the extent of Israelite sin,
and so he could publish his role as a just act of
retribution. Without such justification, however, he
remains silent, working only behind the scene in ch. 4.

The reflective reader is hard-pressed to find
reassurance in the tale of Yahweh's vengeful rampage in
captivity (as according to McCarter 1980:126). If
Yahweh was always in control of the situation why could
he not have simply stricken the Edomites with the deadly
plague that killed the Philistines. When David wanted
Uriah dead, he simply arranged for him to be deserted
in the frontlines of a battle (2 Sam 11:14-17).

Miller and Roberts are right that the might of Yahweh
is the red thread of ch. 5 (1977:49), but they are
wrong when they suggest that the narrative is an
"early theodicy" that vindicates Yahweh's actions by
giving the reader an insight into the larger purposes

Far closer to the mark is Campbell who sees
the narrative as an expression of "an overwhelming
conviction of the absolute freedom of Yahweh" (1975:206). As Eli said, "He is Yahweh and does as he pleases" (3:18). Rather than providing reassurance, the narrative exposes the frailty of the theocracy in the weak link of its human priests, and the a-rationality of Israel's God, whose purposes are not always compatible with the well-being of his people.

Granting all these negative considerations created in and by the narrative, there is an as yet unexplored, positive possibility in ch. 5 (and 6). The exodus associations in ch. 5 have been observed by several readers, most of whom have suggested that chs. 4-6 describe a new or second exodus by which Yahweh demonstrates his desire for renewed affiliation with Israel (Bentzen 1948:46; Timm 1966:525-26; Fretheim 1967:120-22; Campbell 1975:200-07).

Campbell offers an example of a reader who is guided by the exodus associations in chs. 5-6. He perceives the end of ch. 4 as the end of an epoch in Israel's history (1975:199-200). The covenantal relationship established at Sinai on the basis of Yahweh's saving deeds in the exodus, seems to have been dissolved (Timm 1966:522, cited with approval by Campbell 1975:199). When, in the course of chs. 5-6,
Yahweh is seen engaged in a second exodus, the reader is led to entertain the possibility that Yahweh is establishing a new basis for renewed relationship with Israel. Campbell is careful to point out that this second exodus does not lead automatically to Israel (1975:205). His caution at this time is, however, a product of his inclusion of the conclusion of the next scene (6:19-21) in the reading of ch. 5. That is to say, his reading of ch. 5 is made after the fact of having read the entire narrative.

For a reader following the step by step unfolding of the narrative, the exodus associations are more seductive. The prospect of renewed relationship between Yahweh and Israel on the basis of this second exodus is brought to the reader's attention by literary parallels that recall the exodus and its theological-political significance (Fretheim lists 15 parallels, 1967:120.). The similarities between the Philistine and Egyptian devastations lead the reader to expect similar conclusions. The rhetoric of the exodus parallels is, therefore, to lead the reader to believe that though Yahweh may have mishandled the Elide affair he is, in the new exodus, showing a desire and intention for reconciliation with Israel.
The new relationship will be based on the second exodus which indicates Yahweh's will to act for Israel against its enemies (cf. Fretheim 1967:121).

As will be seen in the conclusion of the voyage of the ark, however, the new exodus does not result in a renewal of Yahweh's relationship to Israel. The opposite occurs. The narrator seems to use the exodus parallel to set up his reader for a great disappointment at the end of ch. 6. The reader's disappointment is focused squarely on Yahweh, who seemed to be engineering a new exodus leading to a renewed covenantal relationship. This elicitation of reader disappointment encourages the reader to sympathize even more with the suffering Israelites, who are ignorant of all the processes and events the reader has seen. The narrator seeks to establish the bond between the reader and suffering Israel just as his portrayal of Yahweh tends to alienate the reader from Yahweh. The narrative establishes these polarities in preparation for ch. 8, in which the story of Israel's rejection of Yahweh will be told. In order to preclude any automatic pious judgements on Israel's request in ch. 8, the narrator has set up the reader to understand the reasons for Israel's action; he is able to seriously consider
the validity of Israel's claim. The presentation of chs. 4-6 neutralizes the theological-political prejudices of the reader (that God rightly and justly rules Israel) so that the reader can approach the request in ch. 8 with an appreciation of its legitimacy. Without the background provided by chs. 1-7, the reader is almost inevitably dominated by theological prejudice and the overpowering rhetoric of Samuel and Yahweh in ch. 8. The reactions of commentators who read chs. 8-12 separate from chs. 1-7 testify to this predisposition.
6. 1 Samuel 6

Verse 1

Verse 1 follows naturally on the description of the final plague that breaks the Philistine determination to keep the ark. It is not "late" (Stoebe 1973:151) nor does it displace an expected conclusion of the account concerning Ekron (Smith 1899:42, followed by Budde 1902:42). The Ekronites' resolve in 5:11 is firm—the ark must be sent back. Chapter 6:1 is a summarizing chronological note, a flashforward, or prolepsis, indicating the total duration of the ark's stay in Philistine territory.¹

The insertion of a chronological summary at this point indicates, beforehand, that the ark will definitely be sent out of Philistine territory and so serves as a fitting conclusion to the description of the plagues. What follows v. 1 is, therefore, presented as a detailed retrospect of the final moments that led up to the ark's departure (against Campbell 1975:108).

The proleptic vision afforded by v. 1 guides the reader's attention away from the simple chronological sequence of the ark's departure, diverting it onto the significance of the departure. This deictic
function of v. 1 supplements the emphasis placed on words and meaning throughout vv. 1-16. Schickelberger notes, "im Vordergrund stehen nicht mehr—wie in Kapitel 5—irgenwelche Ereignisse oder Handlungen, sondern das gesprochene Wort, eine Aussage. Das lässt sich schon daran erkennen, dass, rein quantitativ betrachtet, ein Gespräch das in eine predigtartige Ansprache mündet, den grösseren Teil des Abschnittes ausmacht" (1973:168). Especially in ch. 6, the narrator directs the reader to the meaning of this event rather than to the bare event itself, which is summarized in the first verse.

Verse 2

The double question of the Philistines has provoked much scholarly discussion about literary-critical implications (see Campbell 1975:108-12). Any difficulties can be obviated, however, by the simple observation that the multiple questions of the Philistines exhibit both their anxious desire to get ride of the ark and their self-confessed ignorance of how to go about that needful task. The point is not how many questions are asked, but a realistic depiction of the distraught Philistines, who are anxious to be relieved of the ark.
The same impression is conveyed by the summons to the priests and diviners, specialists called in to deal with the technical problem at hand (Ehrlich 1902: 186; Hertzberg 1964:57). The narrative explicitly notes that the Philistines call priests and diviners to get answers to their questions. The situation is obviously beyond the means of ordinary people (cf. Gutbrod 1956:46).

Bourke notes the parallel to v. 2 in Exod 8:19 (1954:97; cf. Freitheim 1967:120). Once again the reader is reminded by the parallel that this narrative is proceeding along the lines laid down in the exodus narrative. Will Yahweh and Israel be reunited?

Verse 3

The advice of the priests and diviners makes it clear that the Philistine difficulties require a cultic resolution. A solution is proposed in terms of an ֹּּ֟ asam offering, indicating that the Philistines have committed an inadvertent trespass against Yahweh by their capture and retention of the ark.2

The significance of the cultic solution lies in the nature of the action, which is an appeal for divine forgiveness and a halt to punishment. The
Philistines are forced to recognize their actual position with respect to Yahweh, and to assume a proper posture of submission. There is no other option. God will be glorified.

Daube notes that the priestly instruction in v. 3 resembles the casuistic "if/then" legislation of Deuteronomy (1965:80). The Philistines, according to Daube, appear to have come under the rule of religious legislation that obliges them to propitiate Yahweh in recognition of the authority of Israel's God. Yahweh's grip on the Philistines is tightening as it did in Egypt. In the course of the plagues, Pharaoh was also forced to submit to Yahweh, and requested that Moses make supplication to Yahweh on his behalf (Exod 8:4, 24; 9:27-28; 10:16-17; 12:32).

Similarly, the Philistine priests' advice that the ark must not be sent away empty (rēqām) is paralleled by Israel's despoliation of Egypt, commanded by God himself (Exod 3:21-22 (lō ṭēlēkū rēqām); 11:2-3).

The narrative uses this exodus parallel both to demonstrate the complete success of Yahweh's operations amongst the Philistines and, even more so, to increase the reader's expectation of a future reconciliation of Yahweh and his people. After all,
was it not the case in Egypt that when Pharaoh and the Egyptians recognized Yahweh's authority (e.g. Exod 9:27-28), Israel was soon allowed to leave Egypt and join Yahweh on non-Egyptian territory? The only difference is that in the present situation, it is Yahweh who will soon be allowed to leave Philistine territory to make the expected reunion with his people Israel.

Verse 4

All Philistines are represented by the דָּאָשָם to Yahweh, which takes the form of five golden tumors and five golden mice. The introduction of the mice at this point has proved troublesome to scholars, who have offered various literary-critical explanations. Hertzberg suggests that the mice are a natural cause for the plague and hence their appearance is contrary to the purpose of divine glorification in the narrative (1964:58; cf. Stoebe 1973:151).

It should be recalled, however, that the Philistines are uncertain about how to interpret the entire incident. They do not know what they did to deserve their plague, and they do not know how to stop it (v. 2). The priests' religious explanation of the plague depends on the success of the דָּאָשָם;
only if they are healed will they know why Yahweh afflicted them (lesai tērāpēnu wehōda lākem, v. 3). Even the act of returning the ark, the material "admission" that Yahweh was responsible, is a test to determine whether it was Yahweh or chance that brought the plague to the Philistines (v. 9).

Miller and Roberts point out that there are no known, exact ancient parallels to the Philistine procedure of making golden tumors and mice, but suggest, on the basis of a Hittite ritual, that a plague could be attributed to an enemy god and that an end was sought by placating the god with gifts (1977:55; cf. Gaster 1969:453). Stoebbe says the inclusion of five golden mice, even though no mice have been previously referred to, is based on the prior knowledge of instances of plagues of mice (1975:151). Though all scholars are agreed that we cannot be certain about the exact significance of the golden mice, it seems possible that these golden offerings were included as a kind of insurance policy, in case the plague had some connection with mice. Whether the Philistines thought Yahweh had sent the mice, or whether they thought of them as a separate, natural cause, is not specified. The fact that the mice are included in the offering
sent along with the ark, however, suggests that the mice were connected to the action of Israel's God.

It is not necessarily contrary to the narrator's attribution of the plagues to Yahweh, then, for the Philistines to be uncertain about the cause of the plague. Instead, it is a further reflection of the Philistine priests' human uncertainty about the causes and meanings of the plague. They are simply playing it safe and covering all possibilities, including the chance that the plague is somehow connected with mice. The mice need no explicit introduction in the previous narrative; their introduction here, as the product of Philistine uncertainty, is another instance in a continuing series of situations where man is not certain how to respond to Israel's God's interventions in human affairs.

Verse 5

The exhibition of the Philistine uncertainty continues in v. 5. The fabrication of the golden tumors and mice is a separate act virtually unconnected with Israel's God, to whom the priests only say "honour" (kāḇōd) must be given. As commentators have observed, the images seem capable of two functions (Mauchline 1971:78). They are both an ʾāšām presented
to Yahweh, and homeopathic objects designed to draw off the ill-effects of the objects they represent (cf. Hertzberg 1964:58; Num 21). The Philistine vacillation is further illustrated in the participial adjective, "the destroyers of the land" (ḥammashı̂tim et-hā'āres̄), that modifies the images of tumors and mice. Here the priests seem to view the destruction in terms of its limited physical causes rather than as a result of the divine hand. Of course they suspect the hand of Yahweh (v. 3), but at the same time, as might be expected of Philistines, they lean towards other possibilities.

McCarter notes that the final sentence in v. 5 makes the priests and diviners seem even less confident than in v. 3 (1980:134; cf. Campbell 1975:113). According to BDB (p. 19), the preposition ʿalay expresses hope, fear, or doubt. In all cases an element of uncertainty prevails. To the Philistine religious experts Yahweh's divine acts in history are an uncertain quantity, not easily reckoned with. They are anxious and willing to respond, but they are uncertain about how to respond because they are uncertain about how to interpret what has happened to them. One gives honour to Yahweh in hope (ʿalay) that he
will lighten his hand on people, god, and land, while at the same time, making apotropaic images as an insurance policy. Although there is some relation between the two acts, even the syntax of v. 5 separates them into distinct sentences, each with its own verb.

Within the compass of the entire Israel-Philistine episode, the Philistine uncertainty over Yahweh's part in their misfortune is yet another expression of the sub-theme of human uncertainty about divine action that runs throughout. Just as Israel did not know why their own God would allow them to be defeated (4:3), the Philistines are not certain what they have done to displease Israel's God, nor are they even certain that he is displeased. The narrator emphasizes this gap between human understanding and divine action, only temporarily bridged for the reader by the narrator's omniscient point of view, because it is of central importance to the developments in Israel's political thought in ch. 8. In that chapter, Yahweh's undependability in conjunction with Israel's uncertainty over the divine mind provide Israel with justification for a new political structure.

Verse 6

Keil and Delitzsch observe that this warning
against hardening of the heart is not at variance with the fact that the Philistine priests were in some doubt about the exact cause of the plagues. Their doubts were not denials, and the possibility that Yahweh was responsible warranted an unhedged response (1880:64).

Both Thenius (1864:25) and Campbell (1975:114) have noted that the Philistines have not actually voiced any reluctance to which v. 6 may be seen as a priestly response (cf. Rost 1926:13). The explicit recollection of the exodus events seems, rather, to be somewhat akin to an aside, delivered in the presence of the Philistines (who have no need of it), yet audible only to the reading audience. Bourke comments that "one cannot avoid the impression that at this point the writer is putting a central idea of his own into the mouths of his characters" (1954:96).

This reference to the exodus reminds the reader of "den heilsgeschichtlichen Urzustand Israels" (Timm 1966:525). What we see, we are told, is a new exodus, a new basis for relationship between Israel and Yahweh. In view of the fact that the relationship was disrupted in ch. 4 (cf. 5:30-32) the narrator indicates the significance of Yahweh's actions during his stay among the Philistines. Like the Philistines' question in 4:8, a reminder about the covenantal significance of the
upcoming battle for Israel, v. 6 directs attention away from simple events to the theological and political significance of those events. Chapter 4:8 served as the theological-political key for understanding the crisis engendered by Israel's defeat (cf. Timm 1966: 521). Now 6:6 serves a similar purpose; in contrast to 4:8, though, it points to a hope for covenantal renewal by directing attention to the similarity of the ark's departure from Philistine land to Israel's departure from Egyptian territory.

Finally, it should be said that although v. 6 is not a response to any preceding obstinacy amongst the Philistines, it is not altogether inappropriate in the context of events. In v. 5, the priests recommend that Israel give "honour" (kāḇōd) to Yahweh. It is exactly this, giving honour, that the priests themselves do in v. 6. As Hertzberg observes, there is a paronomastic link between vv. 5-6 based on the words kāḇōd (v. 5) and tēḵabbēḏû, kibbēḏû (v. 6) (1964:59). Verse 6 gives glory to Yahweh by correctly evaluating his power and advising the proper response of submission. It was in order to elicit such recognition, both in Egypt and world-wide, that Yahweh performed his mighty deeds in Egypt (Exod 7:4-5; 9:14-16). By acquiescing
to Yahweh and pointing out the folly of the Egyptian resistance, the Philistine priests give honour to Yahweh in hopes of not becoming the object of Yahweh's "sporting activities" (hit'callēl).

**Verses 7-9**

The instructions for the return of the ark and its booty are a continuing expression of the Philistine uncertainty. The plans exhibit an effort to show reverence and respect to Yahweh, but at the same time they exhibit some disrespect by designing a test to determine whether Yahweh is really responsible. The two motives are especially visible as concatenated in v. 7. The new cart and the unworked milch cows are signs of respect for the ark's sanctity and a desire to avoid further profanity towards it (Keil and Delitzsch 1880:65). Yet the fact that the cows are unbroken to yoking and their calves are separated from them also makes them tests to see if Yahweh can take this unlikely carriage home (Hertzberg 1964:59). Like the story of a doubting Thomas (John 20:24-29), this trial of Yahweh's cart driving abilities offers the narrator an opportunity to display the divine wonders (cf. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:66).

In v. 8, the Philistines are given instructions
for the ark's removal from Philistine territory. Several parallels between v. 8 and v. 2 reveal a remarkable change in the Philistine attitude toward the ark:

v. 2
The Philistines took (wayyiqhû) the ark of God. (wayyabiû) it to the house of Dagon. They installed (wayyasigû) it next to Dagon.

v. 8
Take (âleqahtem) the ark of Yahweh. Put (ânetattem) it onto the cart. Set (tâsimû) the golden objects, rendered as an âsâm, in the box beside it (the ark).

In the first parallel a change is seen in the motivation for the same verb; lqâ in 5:2 describes the Philistines taking the ark home as booty, while in 6:8 it is an order from the Philistine priests telling how to get rid of the ark. The same contrast is seen in the verbs of the second parallel, albeit using different verbs. Also in 5:2 they bring the ark to
the sanctuary of their own god, Dagon, but in 6:8 they put the ark into the cart, a new "sanctuary" constructed to house the ark alone. Finally in the third parallel we see a clear contrast between the ark, set beside Dagon as a trophy in 5:2, and the golden ֶאֶשֶׁמ set beside the ark as a propitiatory going-away present in 6:8. The distinct change of heart evidenced by the comparison of these two verses supplements statements such as v. 6, which demonstrates the effect of Yahweh's mighty deeds on his and Israel's enemies.

As Fretheim notes, v. 8 also offers a parallel to the exodus story in the mention of the golden objects (קֵלֶּה הָזַחַהַב) that are given to the departing captives by their repentant captors (1967:120; cf. Exod 12:35). The common despoliation motif is yet another encouragement to the reader to identify Yahweh's exit as a new exodus, and so to expect a renewal of the covenantal relationship inseparably associated with the exodus.

Miller and Roberts correctly surmise that v. 9 reveals some uncertainty on the Philistines' part, but wrongly conclude that their concern in the test "is obviously due to the consideration that if
Yahweh was not responsible, then some other power was, and they would have to keep searching for the correct deity to appease before the plague would abate" (1977: 56). The priests explicitly state that if it was not Yahweh that had perpetrated the calamity, it was simply "chance" (mīqreḥ). The narrator's concern is not to explore the various theological explanations for war or plague in the ancient Near East. His aim is, rather, to demonstrate Yahweh's control over the Philistine situation and to follow that demonstration with an examination of its implications for Israel (6:13ff.).

Verses 10-12

The plan is put into effect with the result, predictable from the reader's perspective, that the cows and cart head straight for Beth-Shemesh without deviating. As Driver notes, the emphasis in v. 12 falls on the straightness of the cows' route (1913:56). The narrator has the Philistine princes follow the ark on its homeward journey so that there is no doubt, even amongst the Philistines, about the significance of the journey.
Verses 13-14

The reader's attention is now directed to the Israelite reaction to the ark's return. The Philistines and their doubt have served their purpose and so are retired, temporarily, with the note in v. 16.

This view of Israel is the first offered since ch. 4, where the reader was left with the picture of an Israel lamenting the departure of Yahweh. Any uncertainty over what Israel's response to Yahweh's return would be is quickly removed by the narrator. After presenting the reader with a view of Israel going about its regularly yearly agricultural activities (v. 13), and hence in no dire strait requiring Yahweh's aid, the narrator describes Israel's reaction to the return of their God. Recalling that Israel had questioned Yahweh's behaviour in 4:3 and that it was possible for an Israelite to think that Yahweh had abandoned Israel (4:22), Israel's response is amazing. One would expect at least a hint of reproach, yet there is none. In three short, uncluttered, verbal descriptions their undivided joy over the return is depicted—"they looked up, saw the ark, and rejoiced at the sight." The description focuses exclusively on Israel's visual reception.
of the ark, indicating thereby, that "just the sight (of it)" made them happy. They have gained nothing from the ark's return. They do not know of the conditions of its return. The fact that they are harvesting the wheat crop indicates that they are getting along very well without the ark. Yet their reaction to the mere sight of it is spontaneous and positive. Again, Israel comes out spotless in the narrator's presentation. The people seem to have forgiven and forgotten.

The actual dinner reception (Côlâ) for Yahweh is described in v. 14. The cart goes into the field of a certain Joshua and stands there. The cart itself is the subject of the verbs in v. 14. Since the reader will be well aware that carts are without volition, he will no doubt see the hand of Yahweh at the reigns of the cart. The description leaves Yahweh behind the scenes once more and lends an aura of weirdness to the cart's movements, as was the case in v. 12. The divine cart-driver has stopped at a specific spot (šâm) where (šâm), it so happens, there is a large stone. 5

The name of Joshua, the man in whose field the cart stops, recalls another more famous character who was chosen to lead Israel into the promised land
when Moses was barred entry (cf. Num 20:12; Josh 1). Once again an allusion to the exodus story is used to indicate the significance of these events. In this particular example, the ark's passage onto Israelite soil in the field of one Joshua recalls Israel's own entry into the land under the leadership of a Joshua. From the perspective of Israel's history, the return of the ark into Joshua's field after the destruction of Israel's polity in ch. 4 would seem a perfect portent for the renewal of that selfsame polity.

The second Israelite response, after seeing the ark and rejoicing, is to offer a holocaust to Yahweh, using as material the spoils of his Philistine travels (Hertzberg 1964:59-60). The response is immediate, following right after the description of the cart's stop by the big rock. The offering of an ʼolām by Israel with materials provided by the Philistines is appropriate. The ʼolām was, among other capacities, both an expression of thanksgiving (Lev 22:17-19; Num 15:1-16) and an expiatory sacrifice (Lev 1:4; Milgrom 1976:769). Here the Israelites express their thanks, and at the same time unwittingly perform an expiatory sacrifice on behalf of the Philistines, who had supplied the sacrificial materials.
Verse 15

Most commentators have viewed v. 15 as a late insertion designed to correct any misimpressions about the manner in which the sacrifice of v. 14 was carried out (Stoebe 1973:148; McCarter 1980:156). The Levites are described taking the ark and the box of gold articles down (ḥōridû) and setting them on the great stone. As Stoebe observes, however, the cart has already been burnt so that the description is out of chronological sequence (1973:148). The difficulty can be resolved by attention to the rhetorical emphasis and structure of vv. 14-15.

In v. 14, the description of Israel's reaction is presented as immediate and spontaneous. An ĕlā is offered the moment the cart stops. The description of the Levites' activities in v. 15 can be understood as a narratorial aside, not intended as a chronologically subsequent event to v. 14. The concern of v. 15a is to show that the ark was not mishandled. Rather, it was dismounted and set on the great stone by the Levites, the only Israelites consecrated to handle the ark (Num 4:4-15; Deut 10:8). The people of Bethshemesh do not make Uzzah's mistake (cf. 2 Sam 6: 6-7).
That v. 15a is not intended as a continuation of the chronological sequence is indicated by two factors: 1. The breaking up of the cart on which the ark sat is narrated already in v. 14. Verse 15 cannot logically follow v. 14 in chronological order. 2. In the second half of v. 15 the narrator makes use of "resumptive repetition," a rhetorical technique used to resume the chronological sequence of a narrative by an aside.

By cutting the thread of a story at a convenient, or even not quite so convenient, juncture, then interweaving other matter of a different narrative character, and again resuming the first account by means of repeating the verse, phrase, or even the word, at which the cut-off occurred, the author safeguards the linear continuity of the narration, and at the same time permits the listener or the reader to become aware of the synchronicity of the events related (Talmon 1978: 17).

Verse 15b resumes v. 14 by repeating the words ḫešelō ạlot...ływh, "they offered holocausts to Yahweh." The rhetorical need for the device of resumptive repetition is created in v. 14, in which
the narrator underlines the swift and immediate sacrificial response of Israelites, the unspecified subjects of the verbs, to Yahweh. Immediately thereafter (v. 15a), in narrative, syntactic—not chronological—sequence the narrator takes pains to show that no trespass was committed by the unsanctified against the ark. Finally, in v. 15b, the narrator returns to describe the unreserved sacrificial response.

In the resumptive repetition in v. 15b the subjects of the sacrificial verbs are specified—the Bethshemeshites—an important development in view of the subsequent incident. In addition, the narrator adds that they also made sacrifices (עֵבָהִים) to Yahweh as a further indication of their unstinting welcome for Yahweh. The temporal determinant—"on that day"—serves to link the action of v. 15b with that of v. 14, a further support for the device of resumptive repetition.

Verse 16

At the same time that Israel is celebrating Yahweh's apparent return, the Philistine chiefs are observing the proceedings. The temporal simultaneity of their observation is indicated by the repeated temporal determinant, "on that day," in both vv. 14
and 15. In contrast to the Bethshemeshites, who rejoiced after they saw (wayyir\textsuperscript{2}\textsubscript{4}, v. 13) the ark, the Philistines leave when they see (\textit{ra\textsuperscript{3}3\textsuperscript{4}}) the proceedings. The repeated verb \textit{ra\textsuperscript{3}3\textsuperscript{4}} functions as a Leitwort, directing the reader to connect the two occurrences and compare them (cf. Geber 1964:1131; Alter 1981:92-96). In this instance both Philistines and Israelites are "seeing" the return of Yahweh to Israel. The return sparks a joyful celebration in Israel; the Philistines, on the other hand, simply return home to the now devastated city of Ekron. The parallel is important because it shows that Israel responds to Yahweh's return far differently than the Philistines. Israel greets him as their God. The Philistines just walk away. Obviously Israel holds no grudge against Yahweh for his part in their defeat in ch. 4. Yahweh's response to their welcome will soon change this attitude, however, and Israel will come to view Yahweh and the presence of his ark just like the Philistines.

Verses 17-18

The verses, as Campbell observes, add an element of verisimilitude to the narrative "by associating it with concrete and verifiable objects" (1975:120; cf. McCarter 1980:137; above on 5:5). The
narrator opens his address, which is directed to his reader, with the words "and these" (welekhe) as though he had the very things he lists sitting in front of him. He uses this rhetorical device to create the impression in his readers that he does have the items and, in turn, that the events described did happen. Supplementary to his reference to the golden tumors and mice, he points to the great stone which sits "to this very day in the field of Joshua, the Bethshemeshite" (v. 18) as a "witness" (Ed) to the truth of what he has depicted. 8

Perhaps the emphasis on the reality of the events under description is made with a view to the subsequent events. All through chs. 5-6 the narrator has encouraged the reader to see the ark's sojourn and return in terms of the paradigmatic exodus story. With the return and joyous celebrations of ch. 6 the reader is led to believe that the problem of the captured ark and the foreboding covenantal implications of that occurrence have been not only ended, but even have a certain value. Once more Yahweh has had an opportunity to display his awesome abilities to the nations and to reaffirm his choice of Israel as he had in the first exodus. Now, with Yahweh back with Israel, surely
the bad times are over. Could any further misfortune really come to Israel?

Verse 19

Nothing could be more unexpected, either by the Israel in the narrative, or the reader reading the narrative, than the response of Yahweh to the attentions of the Bethshemeshites. The majority of scholars confronted with the startling presentation of MT in v. 19, of which Stoebe says that it stands "in einer so deutlichen Spannung zum Vorhergehenden, dass sie keine organische Fortsetzung dazu bilden können, sondern eine eigene, unabhängige Überlieferung sein müssen" (1973:153), following LXX or some reconstruction based thereon. Unfortunately the LXX reading also has contextual difficulties. 9

N.H. Tur-Sinai lists the main difficulties of MT as follows: 1. The predicate verb wayyak appears twice, the first time without an explicit subject.

2. The description of the numbers of the smitten also occurs twice - 70 men and 50,000 men - in asyndetic combination. 3. The larger number - 50,000 - is difficult to accept for a small town like Bethshemesh.

4. The smaller number - 70 - is unexpectedly small in a legend about "a great slaughter" (1951:277).
Tur-Sinaï fails to mention the further difficulty seen by most readers in the "justification" supplied for Yahweh's action, "because they looked in/on (b) Yahweh's ark."

The general approach of a literary study of the Bible is to seek a solution to such problems, insofar as possible, in the literary dynamic of the narrative rather than in the text's prehistory or compositional mechanics. If the text under study, MT, is not nonsense then an effort must be made to determine what implications these difficulties may bear for the whole story being told.

The opening sentence of v. 19 describes Yahweh's response to the inhabitants of Bethshemesh, who were last seen in v. 15 offering both čölâ and zebah sacrifices to Yahweh. "And he struck down (way-yak) some of the men of Bethshemesh because they looked at the ark." What kind of way is this to treat the people who rejoice at the mere sight of his ark? Yahweh's treatment of the Bethshemeshites is similar to his treatment of the Philistines (5:6, 9, 12)—both are stricken by God (Willis 1971:296). The connection between the two incidents of divine assault on human objects if foregrounded by the repetition of
the verb nkh in the same form, wayyak (v. 19; cf. 5:6, 9). The omission of "Yahweh" as the explicit subject of the first occurrence of wayyak in v. 19 contributes to this linkage with the previous incidents, where the verb also appears without the addition of an explicit subject.

When the reader recalls that Yahweh's previous assaults on the Philistines were cast in the mould of the exodus pattern, designed to exalt Yahweh in the course of his saving deeds performed on Israel's behalf, the repetition of the same divine behaviour amongst his own chosen people changes the meaning of the ark's "new exodus" entirely. Instead of a dual purpose event, with both divine and human dividends, it becomes solely an opportunity for an overbearing display of divine power. If, instead of leading up to Israel's renewal of relationship with Yahweh, the "new exodus" leads up to a situation in which Israel is also subjected to the divine assault and self-glorification, the entire spectacle becomes an occasion for realignment. Instead of Israel and Yahweh against the nations, we have Israel and Philistia (representing "the nations") against Yahweh.

This realignment of Israel is particularly
evident when we recall that 6:19-21 is the third incidence of a "narrative analogy" (cf. Alter 1981: 21), in which Israel or the Philistines respond to a divine action in connection with the presence or absence of the ark. In the first instance Israel, seeing itself submitted to defeat by Yahweh (4:3), calls for the ark's presence to remind Yahweh of his covenantal commitment to Israel (4:3-4). In the second case, the Philistines convene after their evident "defeat" at Yahweh's hands, and decide that the ark must be sent on to someone else (5:8).

Now in the third incidence Israel's attitude is seen to have undergone a remarkable shift. Their response to Yahweh's action and the presence of the ark is like that of the Philistines who have no covenant with Yahweh, and unlike that of the Israelites in 4:3-4. The latter still operated within the covenantal guidelines and attempted to call Yahweh to order. Israel in 6:20-21, seeing no rationale for Yahweh's behaviour, makes no claims based on the covenant and simply tries to relieve itself of the burden of the ark's presence. Without mutual understanding, there are no grounds for relationship. The parallel to the Philistine response in 5:8 offers
convincing evidence that Israel has become "like the nations" (cf. 8:20) as a result of Yahweh's disregard for his people.

The narrator seems, nevertheless, to supply some mitigation for Yahweh's attack on the Bethshemeshites in the explanation that he did it because they looked "at the ark of Yahweh" (ba'aron yhwh). But what kind of mitigation is this? The narrative has already given the reader a direct description of the Bethshemeshites looking at the ark (wayyir'et-hā'aron, v. 13) including an unambiguous description of their mental state at that time—they were overjoyed at the sight—(wayyism'hu lir'ot, v. 13).

The simplest solution to the seeming contradiction between the joyful seeing in v. 13 and the seeing in v. 19, for which Yahweh assaults the Bethshemeshites, is to regard the mitigation as ironic. Yahweh's response is made to appear totally incomprehensible by the narrator. It is as though he assaults the Bethshemeshites for simply looking at the ark. The mitigation is, in ironic fact, a concealed criticism of Yahweh's conduct towards his people. Both before (ch. 4) and after the new exodus of the ark they suffer at his hands for no just cause. The rationale
for Yahweh's actions is now hidden not only from the people in the narrative, as seemed to be the case for some in ch. 4 (e.g. 4:3). The irony of the mitigation is shared by the omniscient narrator with his reader, who is now numbered among those who do not see the purpose of Yahweh.

Abrams suggests that "recourse to irony by an author carries an implicit compliment to the intelligence of the reader, who is invited to associate himself with the author and the knowing minority who are not taken in by the ostensible meaning" (1981:90). In this case, the narrator invites the reader to share an ironic jab at Yahweh that underlines the Bethshemeshites' perplexity over Yahweh's ungrateful response to the joyous visual reception. The ironic explanation also promotes the reader's sympathetic identification with the Israelites in the story. At this juncture, he actually does share in their ignorance of the divine motivation. His knowledge of the ironic mitigation causes the reader to reflect on the distance between the purposes of God and the cognitive possibilities of man.

The question still remains why the narrator chooses to say that the Bethshemeshites looked
ba^a rôn in v. 19 instead of "et-hâ hâ rôn as in v. 13 if he was intending only ironic justification of Yahweh's assault. A rhetorical justification may be seen in the fact that the preposition b occurs four times in v. 19. The use of the preposition b after the verb "to see" (râ bâ) parallels the latter with the smiting (nâkâ) performed by Yahweh. The parallel usage of b to introduce the objects of both verbs draws attention to the contrast in the type of action done by each subject:

\[
\text{wayyak } b^c \text{ anse } b^t \text{ šemes} \\
\text{ki} \\
\text{râ } b^c \text{ a rôn yhwh}
\]

The chiastic structure highlights the incongruity of Yahweh's response by drawing attention to the parallel and reciprocal action of the Bethshemeshites; their looking was joyful; his response seems wrathful.

The second problem that Tur-Sinai saw in MT was that the repetition of the words "and he smote the people" (wayyak ba^c âm) seemed to indicate a disturbed, unnatural text. In conjunction with the emphasis on
the reprehensibility of Yahweh's action, however, the repeated emphasis on the smiting is suitable. The narrator repeats the word nākā four times in the verse, forcibly recalling the parallel with the Philistine devastation (cf. 5:6, 9, 12) and focusing attention on Yahweh's unfriendliness.

The first occurrence of nākā has "the men of Bethshemesh" as object; the second has "the people." The change in object recalls the fact that the Bethshemeshites are a people, or more specifically, "the people" of Yahweh. He smites some of "the people" (cf. Exod 6:7) just as he smote the Philistines. The repetition, therefore, emphasizes the overwhelming nature of Yahweh's smiting and at the same time introduces the anti-covenantal aspect of the deed by the subtle change of objects in the second occurrence.12

In Tur-Sinai's list of four difficulties in v. 19, the asyndetic numbers, 70 and 50,000 men, comprise three of the four. The asyndetic syntax is thought to show that 50,000 is a gloss (cf. Schulz 1919:109). The first number, 70, is unexpectedly small, while 50,000 is too many for a small town such as Bethshemesh (Tur-Sinai 1951:277). The two numbers can be understood as examples of what Talmon has
called "double readings" (1975:231). Such double readings may result from the insertion of marginal glosses into the text together with the readings they were intended to supersede, or they may be the attempt of a scribe to preserve two variant readings of equal value and worth (p. 231). From this perspective, each reading may be examined to determine its effect on the narrative without the influence of the prejudicial label "gloss" being attached to either.

When such separate readings are made, the difference between the two variants is small in terms of the effect on the narrative. Seventy men would represent the elimination of a complete complement of men. As U. Cassuto observes, "This number—seventy—commonly indicates the perfection of a family blessed with offspring, both in the pre-Israelitic and in the Israelitic traditions" (1967:8; cf. Cassuto 1961:12-13). The number seventy in v. 19 points to the severity of the divine assault in that the "perfect number" of men are destroyed. The second number, 50,000, is not that different, rhetorically speaking; it too emphasizes the severity of the damages done to Israel in the divine attack. Since the two readings are almost rhetorically synonymous,
it is understandable why they were both preserved. In the present form of the text, the repetition of the numbers slain is in accord with the repeated verbs of Yahweh's smiting; the enormity of the devastation is foregrounded and impressed on the reader.

Yahweh's return to his people, signaled by the reappearance of the ark, made them happy (v. 13). His response to their reception has now changed their joy to sorrow and they mourn their dead (wayyit\textsuperscript{3}abb\textsuperscript{e}lu\textsuperscript{\textdegree}, cf. Baumann 1977:46). Once more the narrator focuses on the ill-effects of Yahweh's return to his people. When Yahweh deserted Israel in ch. 4 he left them to be defeated before the Philistines (4:3). The result of that desertion is given in 4:10—"there was a great slaughter" (watt\textsuperscript{e}h\textsuperscript{\textdegree} hammakk\textsuperscript{\textdegree} g\textsuperscript{d\textdegree}ol\textsuperscript{\textdegree}). Having achieved his purpose (the death of the Elides) in that escapade and having shown the Philistines who really controlled that battle, one would expect Yahweh to return home and make amends for the incidental injustices to his people. Instead, Yahweh personally makes yet another great slaughter amongst "the people" (hikk\textsuperscript{\textdegree} yhwh b\textsuperscript{c\textdegree}am mak\textsuperscript{\textdegree} g\textsuperscript{d\textdegree}ol\textsuperscript{\textdegree}).

The narrator seems to be doing his best to point out certain imbalances in the relationship
between Yahweh and Israel. Thus far the pattern of interaction has been: 1. Israel offers sacrifices to Yahweh (2:13-17; 6:14-15); 2. Yahweh "responds" with great slaughters (4:10; 6:19).

Though Yahweh may have been justified (cf. 2:25) in what he did to the Elides, he was not justified to include so many of the people in the punishment; though Yahweh is justified to punish sanctum trespass, there is no clear, unambiguous trespass in 6:19. The question mark that the narrator's portrait of Yahweh's behaviour places over the viability of the covenant relationship is openly stated in v. 20.

Verse 20

The questions posed by the Bethshemeshites are paralleled by two questions put by the Philistines during the course of their dealings with Yahweh. The first question, "Who can stand before Yahweh, this holy God?", is similar to the Philistines', "Who can deliver us from the power of these mighty gods?" (4:8, Willis 1971:296). The second, "To whom might he go up from upon us?", is preceded by the Philistines', "What should we do with the ark of Yahweh? What shall we send back with him?" (6:2). The simple fact of the parallel itself reveals a remarkable affinity between
Israelites and Philistines in their attitudes to Yahweh. Both attitudes are brought about by the warring actions of Yahweh, the divine warrior, against his enemies and against his people.

"Wenn die Leute von Beth-Schemesch vor diesem heiligen Gott nicht bestehen können, so weist auch das in das Gebiet ursprünglicher Kriegsfrömmigkeit, wonach ein Feind vor Jahwe nicht standhalten kann" (Stoebe 1973:153; cf. Judg 2:14). Stoebe has correctly noted one implication of the Bethshemeshites' question: it is an expression of the conviction that no one, not even his own people, is safe from the warlike attacks of Yahweh. Israel, in coming close to the Philistines in the expression of this attitude, has become distant from Yahweh.

A second implication of the question, "Who can stand before Yahweh, this holy God?", is noted by Ehrlich, who suggests that the Bethshemeshites are expressing their inability as unsanctified people, to render properly sanctified treatment to the ark (1910: 191; cf. Schulz 1919:111). More recently McCarter has adopted this view in conjunction with his emendation of the mitigation in v. 19 ("no members of the priesthood joined in") and the belief that the mention
of levitical activity in v. 15 is a late insertion (1980:156-37). Citing examples, McCarter notes that the expression "to stand before" connotes "attend upon" and is often used of priests attendant on Yahweh or his cult. The Bethshemeshites, according to McCarter, are simply admitting their guilt in profaning the ark and suggesting that they find a suitable attendant.

While he has touched upon an important sense of the phrase "to stand before," McCarter's suggestion must be rejected for two reasons: 1. It depends upon an unconfirmed emendation of LXX in v. 19, and upon a hypothesis about the literary history of v. 15 that, in turn, depends on debatable literary-critical observations. 2. If the Bethshemeshites had admitted culpability for their misfortune and were simply seeking a proper priest to attend to the ark, why would they want to get rid of it? Why would the ark be left in "cold storage," in the care of a person who was not a member of a priestly family (cf. 6:21; 7:1)? Why would all Israel mourn Yahweh as though he were dead (7:1; cf. Buber 1956:118)? Surely there was at least one proper priest in Israel.

The value of McCarter's observation about the
phrase "to stand before" is that it reveals yet another side to the Bethshemeshites' exasperation. Reading the chapter as it stands, v. 15 indicates that the ark was handled by licensed personnel, the Levites. The question of v. 20 may, therefore, be rhetorical. If those sanctified to handle the ark are not able to stand before Yahweh, who can? Only from this perspective on the cultic side of the Bethshemeshites' question do the subsequent question and events make sense (against Schicklberger 1973:128). If the Levites can not deal with Yahweh and his ark, no one can. The ark goes into "cold storage" and Israel mourns Yahweh.

Finally, there is a third side to the first question of v. 20. Not only is the phrase "to stand before" used with reference to priestly service of Yahweh, itself a prominent aspect of covenantal intercourse between Yahweh and Israel; the phrase is also used both of covenantal intermediaries and of Israel standing before God in covenantal ceremonies. In view of its context, then, the question of v. 20 is also rhetorical in a covenantal sense. No one can covenantally stand before this holy God who makes great slaughters (4:10; 6:19) amongst his people
for no apparent reason.

The addition of the phrase "this holy God" is a sarcastic comment on Yahweh's unapproachability and incomprehensibility. Hertzberg, who does not see any sarcasm in the phrase, still gets the same impression and cites Eccl 5:2, "God is in heaven and you upon earth," as a parallel (1964:61). A covenant with such a totally "other," whose behaviour admits of no rationale from an Israelite perspective, is impossible. The question, then, is an expression of Israel's alienation from a God who will not be approached.

That the answer to the question, "Who can stand before Yahweh, this 'holy' God?" is "no one," is confirmed by the second question, which contains an implicit answer to the first. The only way to deal with this God, as the Philistines well knew (cf. chs. 5-6), is to unload him on someone else. The use of the prepositional phrase "from upon us" (mēʿālēnû) characterizes the renewed presence of Yahweh with Israelites as a burden, wearisome to its bearer.

Verse 21
Like the Philistines, the first step the Israelites take when they decide to get rid of the ark is to send (wayyisheḥû, cf. 6:8, 11) for outside help.
The narrator continues to point out that Israel has been forced into the ignominious role of behaving as if they were Philistines on account of Yahweh; he has, in fact, modelled the entire Israelite encounter with Yahweh on the previous Philistine encounter. In outline form, the parallels are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philistines</th>
<th>Israelites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Take possession of the ark (5:1).</td>
<td>&quot;Repossess&quot; the ark (6:14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Install the ark in the cultic sanctuary (5:2).</td>
<td>Perform cultic acts celebrating the repossession (6:14-15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yahweh strikes the Philistines and creates a &quot;great confusion&quot; (mêhûmâ gêdôlâ) in the city (5:9).</td>
<td>Yahweh strikes the people with a &quot;great smiting&quot; (makkâ gêdôlê) (6:19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The people cry out (5:10, 12).</td>
<td>The people mourn (6:19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The people demand that the ark be sent away (5:11).</td>
<td>The people ask to whom they may send the ark (6:20).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The ark is sent to Israel in a specially dedicated vehicle along with propitiatory offerings (6:7-12). The ark is taken up to Qiryath-yeʿarim, and a guard is sanctified to keep it (7:1).

Hertzberg asks the important question why the ark was not sent to one of the more important, well-known sanctuaries, instead of putting it into "cold storage" in a back-water like Qiryath-yeʿarim (1964:61-62). He suggests a plausible historical reason, but misses the reason implied in the narrative. The ark is now seen as a dangerous burden, one not to be kept where many people would be exposed to it. The choice of an out-of-the-way hamlet is, therefore, completely natural.

The Bethshemeshites, aware that no one would take the ark if they knew the true story of its return, conceal the facts and make the description of the ark's return as matter of fact as possible. They say "the Philistines have returned Yahweh's ark," failing to mention the peculiar manner of the ark's return. They are also somewhat deceptive in their instructions to the inhabitants of Qiryath-yeʿarim. "Come down and take up the ark to you." As Driver
observes, Bethshemesh was at a lower altitude, hence "come down" and "take up" are geographically appropriate (1913:59-60). But the instructions also contain a hidden significance that appears only when they are compared with the second question of v. 20:

v. 20 \( \text{w}^\text{e} \text{el-mî ya}^\text{c} \text{âle} \text{h} \text{m}^\text{ê} \text{âl} \text{ênû} \)

v. 21 \( \text{h}^\text{a} \text{c} \text{âlû ò} \text{tô ñ} \text{a} \text{lêkem} \)

The Bethshemeshites conceal their real concern, that Qiryath-ye\(^\text{c}\)arim take on the burden, in a geographical subterfuge.
The men of Qiryath-ye'arim seem either to have seen through the Bethshemeshites' deception or to have been given some clues as to the dangers posed by the ark and its God. They do come and take the ark, but do not install it in a sanctuary as would be expected (cf. Hertzberg 1964:61). Instead the ark is brought to the home of a private citizen, Abinadab, whose son Eleazar is consecrated to guard it. The means by which the men of Qiryath-ye'arim came to know the truth about the ark is left as a "gap" or "indeterminacy" to be filled in by each reader in his own way (cf. Ingarden 1973a under "concretization"; 1973b under "indeterminacy; Iser 1978:172-82). That they do know that Yahweh has apparently rejected the services of the Levites is apparent from their consecration of a secular person to a sacral task.

Chapter 7:1 describes how the ark was put into cold storage, out of harm's way. The people, as Ehrlich notes (1910:192), cannot make priests or levitical attendants for the ark (cf. Schulz 1919:111). The latter are chosen and sanctified directly by Yahweh (Num 4:4-15; Deut 10:8; 1 Sam 2:27-28). Keil
and Delitzsch, faced with this difficulty, suggest that it is very probable that Abinadab was a Levite "because otherwise they would hardly have consecrated his son to be the keeper of the ark, but would have chosen a Levite for the office" (1880:70). This suggestion, wrong as it is, clearly reveals the emphasis of 7:1. Eleazar is a commoner elected to watch over the ark, which along with its absentee levitical attendants, no longer plays a role in the active religious life of Israel. As Smith observes, nothing at all is said of Eleazar's belonging to a priestly family or tribe (1899:50).

Verse 2

Verse 1 cannot, therefore, be regarded as any kind of resolution of Israel's difficulties with Yahweh. It is only a temporary measure designed to bring symptomatic relief of the troubles associated with the ark's presence. That the care of Eleazar is not a cure for the ills in Israel's relationship with Yahweh is shown, in part, by the chiastic structure that governs 6:19-7:2:
6:19 The people mourned because Yahweh had made a great slaughter.
7:1 The men of Qiryath-ye'arim bring the ark home.
7:2 The ark stays twenty years at Qiryath-ye'arim.
7:2 Israel mourns Yahweh.

The removal to Qiryath-ye'arim has brought no perceptible change in Israel's behaviour or relationship with Yahweh. The only difference that twenty years of cold storage has made is that Israel mourns Yahweh rather than its own dead, killed by him.

Gutbrod has noted the presence of much summary in ch. 7, in contrast with the preceding six chapters (1956:51). Verse 2 offers a good example in which a period of twenty years is passed over with a simple temporal description. The only descriptive content that the narrator attaches to that whole period is that of Israel mourning Yahweh as though he were dead (cf. Ezek 32:18; Mic 2:4; Jer 9:9, 17-19; Amos 5:16; Buber 1956:118; Against Seebass 1967:166 n.3). The reader is thereby directed to think in terms of a long period of mourning and hence of a state of serious disrepair in covenantal relations between Yahweh and Israel (cf. Willis 1971:304; 1979:209; against Miller
and Roberts 1977: 20, 59, 66, 69). The ark, and by implication Yahweh, is interred in Qiryath-ye'arim, and Israel obviously sees no hope for renewal.

That v. 2 provides the last view of the ark, sitting in storage (sebet), has troubled some scholars who seem to require that all characters and important objects such as the ark continue to occupy a place in every scene if a narrative is to be judged and interpreted as a unity. Press, for example, says "7:2 versucht zwar eine Überleitung von der Ladegeschichte her zu geben, lässt aber dunkel, warum in den folgenden Kapiteln die Existenz der Lade überhaupt nicht mehr erwähnt wird und ist durch Inhalt und Stil als Überleitung denkbar ungeeignet" (1938:192). Apparently the possibility that the role of the ark is taken over by someone else (cf. Stoebe 1973:172), such as Samuel, and that the narrative has been purposefully moving toward that transition, is overruled by the considerations of "Inhalt und Stil," which remain unspecified by Press.

The note that a period of twenty years passed during the ark's stay in Qiryath-ye'arim is usually taken to be a late deuteronomistic insertion (e.g. Blenkinsopp 1969:143 n.1; Veijola 1977:31; McCarter
1980:142). Even if the attribution were acceptable—
it is debatable on the grounds that someone other than
the deuteronomist may have had use for temporal descript-
tions—the contribution of such redaction labels to an
understanding of the narrative is questionable. Do we
learn what the deuteronomist was trying to say in his
literary montage by examining what we think are his
fingerprints on the tape that holds the separate pieces
together, or by making a careful study of the literary
effect of the montage (cf. Alter 1981:140)? Even when
there are clear indications of a vocabulary and theology
that permeate all the books of the deuteronomistic
history, it is only through detailed examination of the
contextual literary impact of each "deuteronomisticism"
that the reader will ever come close to an understanding
of deuteronomistic literature.

This is not to say that it may not be helpful to
correlate the usages of specific "deuteronomisticisms"
so as to form a general understanding of deuteronomis-
tic usage which may then be applied to the individual
occurrence. Although there is a good amount of
circularity in such an approach, it is the circularity
attendant upon the study of the relationship between
any single phenomenon and its wider context, and cannot
be avoided. What can and should be avoided is the act of simply labelling any phrase or unit as deuteronomistic and thinking that such is explanation enough for a "late redactional element."

Verse 3

The sudden reappearance of Samuel along with the implication that Israel's subjection to the Philistines is a result of its idolatry and defection has prompted scholars to think in terms of source or redactional conflicts in the text (e.g. Budde 1902: 48-49; Blenkinsopp 1969: 148 n.19). In chs. 4-6, the Israelite defeats are caused by Yahweh's desire to kill the Elides, and the ark plays a central role. Samuel does not appear in those chapters. Now Samuel reappears, the ark disappears, and a causal connection seems to be implied between the Philistine domination and Israelite idolatry. Is there any other explanation for such contradiction and shifting focus than a source-critical or redaction-critical analysis?

Taking the matter of Samuel's sudden reappearance first, it should be noted that Samuel makes his second debut with a plan for renewal and victory exactly at a point when all hope seems to have vanished. Israel's attempts to converse with Yahweh,
whether by using the ark as a reminder to him (4:3-5), or simply in sacrificial response to the ark's reappearance, have failed miserably. Thereafter the ark is interred in a hamlet with a common person ordained as its keeper. Samuel's sudden reappearance could not be more perfectly timed.5

Furthermore, as Schulz has observed, the words used to reintroduce Samuel provide a link back to 4:1, the place at which Samuel was last seen (1919:114). In 4:1, Samuel gave out the prophetic word to Israel, presumably a word related in some way to the visit he received from Yahweh. Now in 7:3 he returns after the disaster with a plan for repairing the resultant damages. Both his exit and his entrance show Samuel speaking to Israel, attempting to guide it through and out of the crisis precipitated by the Elides. Samuel takes over exactly where the "failed" ark leaves off, and he has a plan that should bring about what Israel thought the ark could be used to effect, namely responsible divine action. Could Samuel have timed his reappearance for this important point so that if all goes according to plan, he will be established as the new centre of mediation between Yahweh and Israel? If his mediation is successful in ch. 7,
he will have accomplished what could not be accomplished through priest and ark in chs. 4-6. Buber, especially, has seen this side of Samuel's succession to the place held by the ark in 4:3-4:

Gottesführung ohne Lade, das ist in der Stunde der von ihm angekündigten Katastrophe Samuels 'Idee'. Es ist die nêbiische. Die Priester-
schaft, die das Unheil verschuldet hat, muss ausgeschaltet werden. Die Lade hatte ihren Sitz in einem von Priestern verwalteten Heilig-

Samuel does not appear in chs. 4-6 because the narrator does not want to associate him with the failure of preceding mediatory institutions. Samuel appears only after those institutions have failed. He steps in after a lengthy period of depression about
the disastrous meeting at Bethshemesh and offers a
plan for rehabilitating the relationship. No polit-
tician could have timed his campaign better than
Samuel. Israel is obviously ripe for anything that can
give them hope for renewed ties with Yahweh whom they
have been mourning for twenty years. In such a state
of mind they could be expected to do almost anything
that Samuel would suggest.

The second problem in v. 3 is the apparent
connection between Israelite apostasy and the Philis-
tine victory. "Dass das Volk anderen Göttern gedient
hat, dass es darum von der Philisternot betroffen ist,
wird stillschweigend vorausgesetzt, und doch haben
wir bisher nichts davon erfahren; auch cap. 1-3
machen nur das Haus Elis dafür verantwortlich" (Budde
1902:49).

The problem resolves itself when close atten-
tion is paid to what the text says. It does not say
that the Philistine victories were caused by Israelite
apostasy, but only that a future victory over the
Philistines may be had if the people will repent and
return to the sole worship of Yahweh (Willis 1971:303).
The narrative, as Budde observes, is very definite
that the Elides, and no one else, were responsible for
Israel's defeats.

If one asks when, following the defeat, Israel might have turned to other gods in the face of Yahweh's apparent defection, only one answer is possible. Prior to Yahweh's action in 6:19 the Israelites appear still faithful to Yahweh (e.g. 6:13-15). Following 6:19, however, they voice a Philistine-like objection to the presence of Yahweh and the ark (6:20); they put it (and him) in cold storage (6:21-7:1), and they mourn Yahweh's passing. With Yahweh dead and gone, Israel might have turned to the reluctant worship of other deities.

Though the narrator does not himself tell us when Israel turned to these substitute deities, he does confirm (v. 4) the fact that Israel did turn to other gods. Given their unstinting devotion to Yahweh, even after the disaster in ch. 4, it is most likely that they turned to these other gods only out of désperation.

Samuel attaches no blame to his exhortation in v. 3. He simply states that if Israel will return to Yahweh, the latter may give them victory over the Philistines. Scholars who suggest that v. 3 is based partly on a pattern found in Judg 10:6-16 have usually
not seen the essential difference between the two passages (e.g. McCarter 1980:143, 150). In Judges, the people's apostasy provokes Yahweh to abandon them. In 6:19-7:3, on the other hand, Yahweh's apparent abandonment of the people provokes them to apostasy. The deuteronomistic idea of "return" may be present, but this does not automatically incorporate the incident into the deuteronomistic theology of history with its pattern of apostasy, punishment, repentance, and deliverance (against McCarter, 1980:143). Rather, the sequence in which v. 3 is incorporated is: unwarranted punishment, apostasy, guided repentance, and deliverance.

A question may arise in the reader's mind at this point about why Israel should be desirous of a victory over the Philistines. The answer is to be found in Israel's continued mourning for Yahweh (v. 2), which is a result of catastrophic disturbances in the relationship with Yahweh. It will be recalled, and Israel needed no reminder of this fact, that the disorder of the relationship first appeared in the battle against the Philistines. Seeing that Yahweh was against them Israel had called out the ark of the covenant, a reminder to Yahweh to deliver Israel.
from the hand of its enemies (יֹשֵׁבֶהֱנֻֽו mikkap לֹ֣יְבֶֽהֶנֻֽו, 4:3). Yahweh ignored the reminder and since then things had gone from bad to worse. Now Samuel proposes a plan to reverse the bad turn taken in ch. 4. If Israel will take the first step by eliminating their newly adopted religious practises, Yahweh will deliver them from the hand of the Philistines (וַיָּסֶל וְתַקְם miyyad p'листìm, 7:3). Obviously, to an Israel that mourns Yahweh for twenty years, nothing could be more desirable than an opportunity to get back to a normal relationship with Yahweh.

Samuel has promised a reversal of the effects and the covenantal implications of the defeat in ch. 4. The question that arises, for both Israel and the reader, is whether Yahweh, whose behaviour has been anything but normal or comprehensible, will do as Samuel suggests. The narrator makes use of this question in the mind of his reader to increase tension and narrative interest as he traces events up to the crucial moment when the promised action is required of Yahweh.

Samuel has asked Israel to give Yahweh one more chance. They are required to take a gamble since
they must first return to Yahweh before he will act again on their behalf. The significance of Israel's initiation of the rapprochement will appear in ch. 9, where Yahweh launches a second reconciliation. In both cases it is the injured party that must make the first move towards covenant renewal. If the injured party is not desirous of reconciliation, nothing can be done to repair the relationship.

Verse 4

Israel's response is immediate and unequivocal. They turn out their adopted religions and worship Yahweh alone. There is no question about Israel's continued desire for normal relations with Yahweh. Obviously they turned to other gods only because Yahweh was acting so strangely towards them. As soon as an opportunity arises, Israel turns back to its covenantal God without hesitation. Israel's forced apostasy is, therefore, mitigated from the reader's perspective.

Verses 5-6

Samuel enjoins all Israel to congregate at Mizpah where, he says, he will intercede on their behalf in prayer. Israel, as ever in this narrative,
responds immediately to Samuel's direction (v. 6). It has been suggested that the actions of v. 6 indicate a ceremony for community purification necessitated by Israel's defection to other gods (McCarter 1980:144). The confession of sin also points to a parallel in 12:19 (cf. 12:10, Buber 1956:158), where a similar confession is part of a process of covenant renewal (Seebass 1965:294-95; McCarthy 1978:217).

Given the immediate context of v. 6 it is also possible that these rites should also be viewed as rites of covenant renewal (cf. Weiser 1962: 15 n.1). First Israel engages in acts of symbolic contrition and confession, and then Samuel, the new intermediary, judges Israel.

Weiser also suggests a covenantal function for Samuel's judging. "Im Sinne des Verfassers ist der die Szene abrundende Satz 'und Samuel richtete die Israeliten in Mizpa' 7, 6 in die vorausgehende Darstellung mit einzubeziehen, nach der Samuel die in Frage gestellte Beziehung Israels zu Jahwe wieder in Ordnung zu bringen suchte" (1962:15; cf. Budde 1902:49). Although Samuel's judgeship is not specifically described, the context makes Weiser's suggestion plausible.
Verse 7

The Philistines, last seen heading back to Ekron (6:16), hear of the Israelite assembly in Mizpah and come back up to Israel. The Philistines' speedy response to the news is the narrator's gift to Samuel, affording him and Yahweh the opportunity to set things right at the opportune moment when Israel has just confessed its sin.

The attitudes of the Philistines and Israelites are linked and contrasted by the repetition of the verb, "they heard," for both. When the Philistines hear ($\text{wayyism\text{\textsuperscript{\textcircled{-}}\text{c\text{\textperiodcentered}{\text{\textsuperscript{\textcircled{-}}\text{d}}}}}$) they aggressively advance against Israel. Apparently they have not connected their devastation by Yahweh with their prior defeat of Israel. On the other hand, when the Israelites hear ($\text{wayyism\text{\textsuperscript{\textcircled{-}}\text{c\text{\textperiodcentered}{\text{\textsuperscript{\textcircled{-}}\text{d}}}}}$) of the Philistine advance, they fear the Philistines. Samuel's promise of divine aid is, by itself, not enough to allay their fear. Israel has no more confidence in Yahweh's intentions towards it.

This description of aural response is also contrasted with an earlier scene paralleling the present one (cf. Willis 1979:211). In schematic form the parallels appear as follows:
4:6-7

1. wayyismū pēlistīm

2. a great noise in Israel's camp

3. They knew that the ark of Yahweh had arrived in Israel's camp.

4. Israel hears (wayyismū bēnē-yišrā'ēl) that the Philistines are coming.

5. The Philistines fear (wayyirṣōn) Israel's gods.

7:7

wayyismū pēlistīm

that Israel had reassembled

The Philistine heads go up to Israel.

Israel fears (wayyirṣōn) on account of the Philistines.

Verse 8

Israel's acceptance of Samuel's role as the new mediator is evidenced by the parallel between 7:8 and 4:3. In the latter instance, Israel calls for the ark, symbol of the covenant, when faced with the continued threat of the Philistines following the first defeat. With the ark in their midst, they believe that "he will deliver us from the hand of our enemy" (wēyōśišōnū mikkap ṣēyebēnū). In 7:8, on the other hand, Israel expresses its faith in Samuel's unceasing intercession
to stir Yahweh into action, יָשָׁנַע מִיָּד פֶּלֶשְׁתִּים. As Hertzberg points out, the expression "to cry" מִיעַק indicates the urgency, and one might add the helplessness, of Israel's situation (1964:68). It is the same word used to describe Israel's oppressed cries to Yahweh in Egypt (cf. Exod 2:23; 3:7), and is also followed in Exod 3:7 with the expression "to deliver them from the hand of the Egyptians." It would appear that once again the narrator encourages the reader to view the ensuing battle in terms of the exodus and so to interpret a victory on Israel's part as a new divine saving deed upon which a renewed covenant may be based. Thus far, though, the narrative has given no indication as to what Yahweh's response, if any, will be. The Philistines are approaching; Israel is getting nervous. The narrator prolongs the increasing tension by describing, in detail, Samuel's sacrificial ministrations at this crucial hour.

Verse 9

The animal offered is not simply a lamb, but a "single milk lamb." Samuel not only offers a "whole burnt offering"; it is a "complete whole burnt offering to Yahweh."8

The narrator's descriptions of sacrificial
procedures slows the narrative's progress towards resolution of the increasing tension. Momentarily diverting the reader's attention away from the pressing circumstances of the Israelites, the narrator's attention to the details of the sacrifice recalls the initiation of this entire series of events through the performance of sacrifice. Eli's sons' abuse of the sacrificial system provoked Yahweh and he arranged for them to be killed in battle. Now, some twenty years later, Samuel takes care to offer a proper burnt offering to Yahweh. Again the outcome of a battle is linked to a sacrifice. Will a proper sacrifice have a better effect on Yahweh? The inclusion of the retardatory details on Samuel's sacrifice is doubly designed to increase tension and suspense about Yahweh's role in the upcoming battle. It slows the reader's progress towards the crucial details while at the same time increasing the suspense about how Yahweh will respond to sacrifice.

Finally, the narrator turns to the matter of immediate interest to both Israel and the reader. Samuel's intermediary role is foregrounded in the description of his cry; it is to Yahweh on behalf of Israel. Having arrived at the peak of expectation,
the narrator wastes no more superfluous words (cf. Buber 1956:119, "zurückhaltende Stil"), but simply states "And Yahweh answered him." This is Yahweh's first positive action towards Israel or an Israelite since he answered Hannah's petition in 1:19. In both cases, Samuel is inextricably involved—once as the positive answer and once as the intercessor requesting and receiving the positive answer. In between, Yahweh's treatment of Israel is totally conditioned by the presence of the wicked Elides as Israel's priestly intercessors, and his desire to eliminate them.

Verse 10

Characterization by way of contrasts revealed in dialogue is a technique of biblical narrative noted by Alter (1981:84-85, 123). Verse 10 offers an example of contrastive characterization created by indicating the simultaneity of the different characters' acts. The reader sees the pious Samuel offering up a sacrifice. At that very moment the sneaking Philistines are moving in for the kill. The simultaneity of the two actions is expressed syntactically by a qatal-qatal structure; wayeši yemū'ō el ma'aleh... upelīšīm niggēvō (cf. Talmon 1978:11-12; Driver 1913:65).
The whole of v. 10a is recognized by McCarter as a parenthetic discussion supplying the reader with incidental information (1980:145; cf. Nowack 1902:35). He wrongly suggests, however, that it obscures the connection between Yahweh's "answer" in v. 9 and "thunder" in 10b (p. 145). The reader of biblical narrative familiar with the convention of parenthetic discussions would recognize its function and appreciate its apt placement. Just before Yahweh lets loose with his thunder the reader is treated to a picture of the stealthy Philistines whose sacrilegious designs on the pious Israelites are so richly deserving of punishment. Far from obscuring the connection between v. 9 and v. 10b, v. 10a makes it so much more appropriate.

What failed to materialize when Israel gave vent to its great earth-shaking shout is now accomplished with ease by Yahweh's loud thunder against the Philistines:

4:5 wayyari\textsuperscript{c}u kol-yi\textsuperscript{s}r\textsuperscript{a}\textsubscript{el} c\textsuperscript{e}ru\textsuperscript{c}a g\textsuperscript{e}d\textsuperscript{d}la watt\textsuperscript{e}h\textsuperscript{h}om h\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{2}ares

7:10 wayyar\textsuperscript{c}em y\textsuperscript{h}wh b\textsuperscript{e}q\textsuperscript{d}l-g\textsuperscript{d}dol...way\textsuperscript{e}hum\textsuperscript{m}em
Israel's shout gets an echo; Yahweh's thunder gets action. As before (5:9) Yahweh's attack on the Philistines throws them into a confusion (wayehummēm). Most commentators have noted that Israel steps into the battle only after it is already decided by Yahweh (e.g. Smith 1899:53; Stoebe 1973:174). Yahweh's overthrow of the Philistines thereby becomes a solid basis for renewed relationship between himself and Israel. It is an unambiguous indication of the divine will to be with and for Israel against its enemies (cf. Hertzberg 1964:68). It is also a reversal of Yahweh's previous contraventions of his promise to make Israel's enemies his enemies (cf. Exod 23:22; 1 Sam 4:2-3).

The final sentence of v. 10 describes an obvious reversal in Israel's fortune at war. In 4:2, Israel is smitten (wayyinnāgep) before the Philistines (cf. 4:10; Veijola 1977:37-38; Willis 1979:211). Now, however, Yahweh honours his agreements and it is the Philistines who are properly smitten (wayyinnāgep) before Israel. In both cases, it should be noted that the action is described with the defeated as subject of a passive verb, "x was smitten before y," indicating Yahweh's responsibility for the outcome of both battles.
Whether it is Israelites or Philistines that win, Yahweh alone determines who will be smitten before whom. The reversal is another assurance of Yahweh’s renewed good will towards Israel. Samuel’s promise (v. 3) is thus made good by Yahweh. A new effective and beneficial team of God and mediator has been tried and proven true.

Verse 11
Continuing his description of the symmetrical reversal of Israel’s previous defeat, the narrator now shows the Israelites going out from Mizpah in pursuit of the Philistines. The contrast with 4:10 is striking:

4:10 wayyānūsū ʾēw lē-ōhālāyw
7:11 wayyēśēm ṣāmē yīśrāʾēl min-hammispa wayyirdēpū...

The first noticeable difference is in the verbs. In defeat each man flees whereas in victory they pursue their enemy. In defeat, it was every man for himself and each was not even described as an Israelite, perhaps an indication of the devastating political consequences of military defeat for Israel. In
victory, however, it is the men of Israel, now united by their God-given victory, who pursue their enemy (against Ehrlich 1910:193). Finally, one might note that in defeat each man returns to his own tent, a measure of the disunification caused by defeat. In contrast, the men of Israel go out from Mizpah, their base, indicating the security brought by victory, which allows them to venture out of their own territory.

Verse 12

The stone set up by Samuel is a tribute to the renewed aid given by Yahweh to his people. Given the memorial name הֵ冊 הָעֵבֶן, "stone of help," the stone also serves as another indication that Israel's victory constitutes a complete reversal of its previous defeat, for it was exactly at Ebenezer (4:1) that Israel had been defeated (cf. Willis 1979:210-11; McCarter 1980:146).

Contrary to Buber, Samuel's expression "as far as here" (כָּנֶפֶן הָעֵבֶן) does not imply "und vorläufig nicht weiter will die Hilfe des Himmels reichen" (1964:731). Verse 13, which Buber disallows as integral to the original narrative, states quite clearly that Yahweh's hand was on the Philistines
throughout Samuel's life. Instead, one must seek a meaning for Cad-hênnâ that agrees with its present context.

Both Samuel's actions and words in the preceding sentences of v. 12 are centered on the commemoration of the particular place to which Israel pursued its victory (cf. Gutbrod 1956:55). The name that Samuel gives to that place just happens to be identical to the name of the place where Israel was first defeated, that is, Ebenezer. In view of the strong emphasis on symmetrical reversal of Israel's previous misfortune in vv. 10-12, it is likely that the final sentence of v. 12 also contributes something to that aim. When Samuel says, therefore, that Yahweh has helped them "as far as here" or "up to here," and "here" (hênnâ) refers to Ebenezer, it would seem that he is making two points, one geographical and one theological. Yahweh has helped them back to Ebenezer and has there reversed the ill-effects of the previous disaster; he has helped the Israelites back Cad-hênnâ, to the place where they were undone and their relationship with Yahweh seemed at an end.

Samuel's Cad-hênnâ is a fitting summary and conclusion to the entire battle report. The battle
brings Israel back to Ebenezer in victory and, thereby, Yahweh back to Israel. The point by point reversal of Israel's defeat is the means that Yahweh chooses to right his wrongs and to show Israel that he desires reconciliation with them. It should be noted that it is only after the Elides are dead and Samuel has taken over as leader and covenant mediator that Yahweh moves to renew relations. Before Samuel's appearance and intervention there were no indications of any such desire. Hence the victory not only expresses Yahweh's renewed concern for Israel; it also legitimates Samuel, firmly establishing him as the new mediator chosen (cf. chs. 1-3) and designated by Yahweh.

Verses 13-14

The legitimation of Samuel as mediator continues in vv. 13-14 (cf. Good 1965:60-61). In contrast to chs. 5-6, where the heavy hand of Yahweh on the Philistines was of no benefit to Israel, the hand of the Lord on the Philistines during the period of Samuel's judgeship brings peace to Israel. Again the difference is due to Samuel's assumption of the role of renewer (v. 6) and maintainer (v. 15) of the relationship between Israel and Yahweh. The connection between the lack of a Philistine presence in Israelite
territory and the influential presence of Samuel is explicit in v. 13. The state of affairs therein described exists "all the days of Samuel."

All territories lost to the Philistines are regained by Israel and there is even peace with the Amorites on the eastern front (v. 14). Once again the narrator shows how the accession of Samuel to the mediating office results in a return to normal patterns in Israel with divine protection from external forces. The description of recaptured cities on the western front (Philistine) and peace on the eastern front (Amorite) expresses the completeness of the peace on all fronts achieved under Samuel (cf. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:75; McCarter 1980:147; against Hertzberg 1964:69).

Verses 13-14 summarizes Samuel's "military" career in a formulaic pattern known from the book of Judges (McCarthy 1973:402; McCarter 1980:147). The summary is designed to convey the impression of a lengthy period of peaceful existence in Israel under the judgeship of Samuel. "Die Folge des Sieges war eben ^\text{\textsuperscript{\textcopyright}}\text{\textregistered} \text{s\textaelom \text{\textcopyright}}\text{\textregistered} in ganzem Umfang" (Stoebe 1973:175). During this period, the narrator tells the reader nothing about the people or their reactions to the
renewed protection of Yahweh under the auspices of Samuel's judgeship. It is as though having been brought back to a normal state of covenantal existence, they have no further interest in the matters being described, that is, matters of state. So long as there is peace in Israel, with no threat of recurring political disaster such as the Elide affair, this is how the people continue to behave.

Verse 15

As Weiser observes, vv. 15-17 lay great emphasis (three occurrences of \textit{ypt}) on Samuel's role as judge over all Israel (1962:10). Against Noth's assertion that Samuel the judge is a deuteronomistic fiction, Weiser suggests that the emphasis on Samuel's judgeship is more elegantly explained as a true historical reminiscence born by the old tradition upon which vv. 15-17 are based (p. 10; cf. Wildberger 1957: 464; Seebass 1965:292; V. Fritz 1976:351; and Noth 1967:55).

The emphasis on Samuel's judgeship, whatever its historical basis, fulfills certain important literary functions in its immediate literary context. Verse 15 says that Samuel judged Israel "all the days of his life." The description of the duration of his
period in office parallels the description in v. 13, a description of the period when Yahweh's hand was against the Philistines, "all the days of Samuel." By means of this repeated temporal definition, the narrator draws attention to the contemporaneity of Samuel's judgeship and the absence of a Philistine threat to Israel.  

The obvious implication of this link between vv. 13 and 15 is that when Samuel is judge in Israel, Yahweh effectively wards off external dangers. Samuel and Yahweh make a successful administrative team. Samuel judges Israel, maintaining internal affairs, while Yahweh keeps his part of the bargain in his defensive activities against the Philistines. M.A. Cohen agrees that Samuel's judgeship should be understood in terms of political leadership:

Samuel's importance derived not from his role as a shofet or military leader or from his role as a prophet, but from his actual position as the Shilonite seer-priest. As such he was the legitimate spokesman for Yahweh and the embodiment of the ideology that united the tribes in what might be called today a religious federation (1965:66-67; cf. Press 1938:193).
Willis has observed that v. 15 makes Samuel the immediate successor to Eli's office as judge (1971:304; 1979:211; cf. 4:18). With a good judge in this office Israel experiences the positive side of covenantal existence under Yahweh. The contrast between Israel's experiences under bad judges and good is highlighted by the link between these descriptions of Eli and Samuel, both of which are written as formulaic summaries. Eli's summary is placed at 4:18, immediately following the catastrophic defeat brought on by his sons' misdeeds. Samuel's summary, on the other hand, follows immediately after the reversal of Israel's defeat, a reversal produced and engineered by Samuel in his role as judge.

By means of these structural parallels linked by the formulaic summaries, the narrator draws attention to the effect that good and bad judges have on the theological-political fortunes of Israel. A bad judge brings about political destitution and an apparent end to the relationship with Yahweh (4:22). A good judge, on the other hand, is capable of quickly reversing the ill-effects of any predecessor's mismanagement. The lesson taught by these parallels is that Israel's fortunes are determined, to a great
extent, by the degree of its judges' rectitude. Without a good mediator in place Yahweh is too unpredictable (cf. 3:18), too holy (cf. 6:20) for a regular, normal relationship with Israel.

Verses 16-17

The portrait of Samuel on his regular yearly rounds as Israel circuit-judge serves to give an impression of restored regularity to Israel's existence. Samuel's conscientious application to his duties is emphasized by the threefold repetition of the words "he judged Israel" in v. 17. Thereby the impression of regularity and a lengthy period of peace in Israel is directly tied to Samuel's performance in office.

The summary format of vv. 15-17 also contributes to the impression created by vv. 15-17. By compressing a large span of story time into a short narrative description, the narrator is able to characterize the whole period uniformly (cf. 7:2). In this particular case the result is an unblemished and lengthy period of peace under the all-encompassing judgeship of Samuel.

The final portrait of Samuel's leadership in Israel seeks to combine all aspects of his career and
to use this combination as a culminating characterization of his function in Israel and of the results thereby accruing to Israel's profit. Samuel returns home following his rounds, suggesting a time of peace when Israel's judge can retire to his own home. The peaceful scene is explained, as previously, by the covenantal maintenance performed by the judge. Samuel judges Israel in Ramah, thereby preserving the social and political order required by covenantal law. He also builds an altar to Yahweh so as to maintain proper relationship with Yahweh by means of expiatory sacrifice, "given for sin" (see above on 2:29). Samuel, as apparently Eli before him (cf. 1:9; 2:28; 4:18), unites the sacral and secular aspects of mediation in one person.

In all this time the reader does not hear of Israel, save as the object of Samuel's judging. No complaint is voiced during the entire period of Samuel's office. Trivial as this observation may seem, it is very important in view of suggestions that have been made as to the purpose of ch. 7. McCarter, for example, suggests the following reading of ch. 7:

All is well in Israel. Yahweh rules by his
prophet. The land is secure. We have seen a major crisis met and surmounted under Samuel's leadership. Our narrator would have us believe that at this point in history the people of Israel could perpetrate no greater breach of trust, no more arbitrary exercise of self-will, no more senseless deed of vanity than to demand for themselves a human king (1980:151).

These are strong words, but do they accurately describe the effect of ch. 7 when seen in conjunction with ch. 8? The reasons that the elders supply for their request in 8:5 are, in fact, based on developments that arise subsequent to the situation in ch. 7. Hence ch. 7 can no more be used to defame Israel's request than the Elides' predecessors' good behaviour could be used to criticize Yahweh's decision to eliminate the Elides. Things change and from ch. 7 to the time of the elders' request in 8:5 great and portentous changes have occurred.

Chapter 7 cannot, then, be viewed as an attempt to predispose the reader to a negative valuation of the request for a king in 8:5 (against Schulz 1919:121;
Boecker 1969:97; Stoebe 1973:175). It may in fact do the opposite in that the people voice no complaint at all until situation demands it. McCarter is right to see all well in Israel in ch. 7. Apparently the people of Israel agree. It should be recalled that even though they were wrongfully spleened by Yahweh in 6:19, not to mention ch. 4, they are the first to make a move towards reconciliation. Having achieved the state they so anxiously desired, it is not surprising that they do not complain. All is indeed right in Israel at the end of ch. 7. From 7:17 the reader knows that Samuel is at home judging Israel; Israel is doing no other thing than being properly judged by Samuel; and Yahweh is presumably in heaven, ready and willing to accept the sacrifices offered by his chosen servant, Samuel.
8. 1 Samuel 8

Verse 1

The narrator begins a new scene with a circumstantial clause (cf. Andersen 1974:79 #5.1.1). At the same time, the new scene contains recurring elements from preceding scenes. The narrator describes a state of affairs that will trigger a sequence of events ending only in ch. 12. It is important to note that the descriptions of the state of affairs in vv. 1-3 does stem from the omniscient narrator himself and is, therefore, not controvertible by anything a character might say or a reader might think.

Attention is drawn to Samuel's age by placing the predicate adjective, zāqēn, before the noun, "Samuel." The prominence that the narrator gives to Samuel's age supports the importance it will subsequently be given by the elders in their request (v. 5).

More importantly, however, the foregrounding of Samuel's age focuses the reader's awareness on the picture of an aged judge with two sons. The reader struck by the emphatic position of zāqēn cannot fail to recall the importance attached to Eli's age in preceding scenes (cf. 2:22, 32; 3:1-2; 4:15, 18). Moreover, this associative recollection of the Elide
affair is supported by the second sentence, which describes Samuel installing his sons as judges for Israel. The reader recalls, of course, that the aged Eli also had his sons working under him as priests (1:3; 2:11-13, 22-25; cf. Robertson 1944:193).

The reader of v. 1 will recognize, therefore, that the narrative has moved on to a new scene on account of the introductory circumstantial clause. The reader's initial reaction to the new scene is one of foreboding because of the associations with the Elide affair. Perhaps under Samuel's firm leadership, however, events will not take the bad turn that they did under the aged Eli.

Verse 2

Scholars reading v. 2 have suggested that it, along with v. 1, stems from an old, genuine tradition (Wildberger 1957:457; Weiser 1962:30; Noth 1967 56 n.7; Birch 1976:26). The straight-forward presentation of the names of Samuel's sons, along with their place of occupation seems to impress these readers, at least, with the verisimilitude of the narrative in these two verses. Perhaps the narrator has supplied these details to lend realism to his introductory background information to the new scene; but there is an even
more important function for the names. As Dhorme notes the manner of presentation of Samuel's sons is reminiscent of that of Eli's sons (1910:70; cf. 1:3). Even the simplest introduction is used to reinforce the association of the sons of Eli and Samuel. ¹

The statement that the sons occupy themselves in Beersheba, while possibly an authentic, southern Samuel tradition (Neiser 1962:30), or an effort to extend the narrative's geographical focus to all of Israel (cf. McCarter 1980:156), serves to establish an important difference between the situation of the corrupt sons of Eli and that of the equally corrupt sons of Samuel. Eli's sons engage in their wrongdoing in the very same temple that Eli presided over so that Eli was implicated, and even charged by God as complicit in his sons' sin (2:29). By placing Samuel's sons in Beersheba, approximately 80 km. south of Ramah, Samuel's home (7:17), the narrative physically removes Samuel from any reproach that might fall on his sons. ²

Verse 3

The narrator reinforces the geographical separation of Samuel and his sons by inserting his own comment to distinguish them. The first sentence
of v. 5 characterizes the misdeeds of the sons as the opposite of their father's behavior. Samuel serves as the standard of upright behavior against which his sons are measured and found wanting. Samuel is placed above the wrong-doing of his sons; the narrator puts him beyond reproach.

The misdeeds committed by Samuel's sons are similar to those of Eli's sons, excepting specific differences attendant on variations between the offices of priest and judge. Samuel's sons turn aside after personal gain and they take bribes. Such actions are abuses of the mediatory office (cf. McCarter 1980:156). The wrong actions evidence an attitude that places self before others in an office where self-denial is part of the occupation. Eli's sons are no different (cf. Kellermann 1977:208). They pursue their own ends in sacrifice, callously neglecting the needs of man and transgressing the rights of God (2:12-17).

By repeating the verb nātā twice in v. 3, an equation is made between "turning aside (wayyittū) after gain," and "perverting (wayyattū) justice." The equation indicates that the pursuit of selfish gain is an abuse of the office that creates the
opportunity. The maintainers of justice (šōpēṭīm) have become perversers of justice (mispār) (cf. Weinfeld 1977:87).

This description of the sons' misbehaviour is the first sign of any problem since the great reconciliation of ch. 7. Significantly the fault lies on the side of the theocratic administrators as opposed to the common people. The situation duplicates the previous priestly sin which was contrasted with the innocence of the common people (as in 2:12-17). And as the people complained of their priestly mediators' misbehaviour there (2:22-24), they will now complain to Samuel about his sinful sons.

Verse 4

The last assembly was described in 7:6, where all Israel assembled (wayyiqqāḇāšū) to make confession for sin as the first step towards reparation of the rift in their relationship with Yahweh. Though they were the injured party, the Israelites made the first move towards reconciliation. Now in v. 4 we see a reassembly (wayyiqqāḇāšū).

A difference between the assemblies of v. 4 and 7:6 is immediately apparent in the assembling group; in v. 4 it is "all the elders of Israel" and
in 7:6, "all Israel" (7:5). The last time the elders conferred they voiced a concern over the outcome of a battle and decided to call out the ark as a reminder to Yahweh of the covenant (4:3). Now in v. 4 the elders are reassembling for a related, but different purpose. As Gutfrood suggests, the elders "treten in Tätigkeit, wo es um den Bestand und das Geschick Israels als des Volkes im Bunde Gottes geht" (1956:58). The description of their assembly before they go to Samuel at Ramah already indicates that they are united as a group with a singular purpose even before they go to see him. Israel, as a body, is going to confer with Samuel, Yahweh's mediator.

Verse 5

The reasons given for their request for a king by the elders are supported by the narrator's description of vv. 1-3. Samuel's age and the sins of his sons constitute the sole basis for their request. Some scholars have seen this narrow support as an attempt by the narrator to cast aspersions on the request (e.g. Buber 1964:728; Good 1965:60, "The fact of incompetent incumbents is no reason to throw over the whole institution of judgeship."). Others have seen it as an indication that Israel was beginning
to awaken to political realities and the insufficiency of the judge system (e.g. Ishida 1977:35). Yet another view is expressed by Weiser, who regards the reasons as plausible and an indication that the narrative, at this point, is not anti-monarchic (1962:30; cf. Veijola 1977:68-69).

On account of the narrator's support for the elders' observations the reader knows that their evaluation is accurate. He also knows that it was the identical state of affairs that brought Israel to grief before, on account of the Elides and Yahweh's desire to punish them. The elders are aware of this recurrence of a potentially disastrous state of affairs in the offices of their mediators. Knowing what this state of affairs led to previously, the elders have determined to avoid a repetition at all costs. 3

The fact that the elders come to Samuel, the designated mediator, and ask him to establish a king to take over the office of judge indicates that they regard their complaint and request as legitimate and justifiable in terms of the existing covenantal constitution (cf. Willis 1972:52). The request is a product of a defect in the theocratic system, a
defect lying wholly on the side of Yahweh and his chosen mediators. What the request amounts to is a formal petition, calling for an end to the theocratic system with its fallible mediators and its holy God.

The request for "a king to judge us" has posed a problem in determining the meaning of the word "to judge." For Press the meaning is determined by v. 20: "Recht schaffen soll der König seinem Volke als der siegreiche Führer seiner Kriege" (1938:197; cf. Boecker 1969: 24 n.2). Speiser, on the other hand, states that the obvious meaning is not "to judge" but "to govern" as the preceding context would lead one to expect (1971:282).

It is probable that both these aspects are contained in the verb "to judge." As Hertzberg intimates the verb "to judge" is used of the requested king to show that the office of judge is replaced by that of king (1964:72; cf. Stoebe 1973:183-84 citing W.H. Schmidt 1966:39-40 in support). Buber notes that such a reading of "to judge" in v. 5 is exactly what the repeated use of spt in chs. 7-8 would lead one to expect.

Der in Zusammenhang des Buches vorangehende Text 7, 15-18 [sic], 3 tut, indem er das
Wurzelwort sechsmal im Sinn von richten, Richter, Recht (in gesetzhafter Bedeutung) wiederholt, das Mögliche—und in alttestamentlicher Komposition übliche—, um uns diesen Sinn so einzuhamern, dass, wo uns das Wort nun ein siebentes und achtes Mal begegnet, wir sogleich bereit sind, es ebenso zu verstehen (1964:728).

But Buber disallows that the king takes over the functions of the judge on the grounds of 7:15-17, which states three times that Samuel judged Israel. Since in ch. 8 the mediatory office of judge continues, it cannot be that activity which the people desire of the requested king.

Buber's rejection of the reading demanded by the repetitions of ūṣēr is, however, more a product of his own reconstructed narrative, than of the narrative found in MT. The elders' request for a king "to judge" is a pointed rejection of the existing judgeship. The unusual role requested of the future king is intended to show that a king will obviate all the functions that the judge has performed in chs. 7-8. As Buber says, the word ūṣēr and its significance as a description for Samuel's mediatory activities has been
so pounded into the reader that its recurrence in a request for a king cannot be understood as anything else than a replacement of the office of judge by that of king. When it is recalled that the primary function of all of Samuel's judging activities in ch. 7 was to act out the role of covenant mediator, renewing and maintaining the relationship, the seriousness of the elders' request for a replacement begins to be appreciated. But what is the point of the switch? Why is it necessary and what does it accomplish?

It is only with the inclusion of the last three words of the request that its full implication becomes clear. The elders request a new government that will make Israel a state like any other pagan nation. The key to the meaning of the request lies not in Deut 17: 14, to which it is certainly related, but in the implications of an expressed desire to be "like the nations." Hertzberg notes that the word for nations, ḫaggōyīm, stresses the "non-Israelite, heathen element," and correctly concludes that the elders express a desire to depart from the special political status of a nation chosen and ruled by God in order to become simply one among many ordinary nations (1964:72).

Israel had been created as a people with a
theocratic political system as a result of Yahweh's special action. Israel was Yahweh's people (חַוּל יְהוָה) chosen from out of all the peoples of the earth to be Yahweh's special possession (Exod 19:5-6; Lev 20:26; Deut 7:6; 14:2; 26:18-19; 32:8-9; 1 Sam 12:22).

"Israel's social existence was founded on the premise of being distinct from all peoples by virtue of divine election" (Talom 1979:6). The covenant between Israel and Yahweh distinguished Israel, elevating it above all the nations of the earth (Deut 4:6-8). The request of Yahweh's people (חַוּל יְהוָה) to become like the nations (קוֹל-הַגָּוִים) in political structure is, therefore, not only a rejection of the theocracy and its judges, but even more it is a rejection of the covenant.⁵ "The fundamental thing threatened by Israel's action was the covenant relationship" (McCarthy 1973:412).

Scholars have regarded the request, which is subsequently correctly interpreted by Yahweh as apostasy (v. 8) and rejection of his rule (v. 7), as either an overreaction (Good 1965:60), or as out of sorts with its subsequent context (Press 1938:196-97). When it is recalled that the elders' request is a response, not simply to one instance of corrupt
leadership but to a recurrence of corrupt leadership, a state of affairs that had previously led Israel to disaster and an apparent end to the covenant (cf. 4:22; 7:12), their drastic request seems entirely appropriate. Rather than requesting new judges and leaving themselves open to further recurrences, the elders attack the roots of the problem—the theocratic system. Before Yahweh can respond to the corruption of Samuel's sons as he did to that of Eli's sons, the elders request that the whole problematic system, with its judges, its covenant, and its "holy God" (6:20) be done away with. Hence the elders' request is actually a timely nipping of another theocratic disaster yet in bud. The lack of continuity that Press sees between a request for a king on account of sinful judges, and Yahweh's interpretation of the request in vv. 7-8 as a rejection of divine kingship and covenantal rebellion, is only apparent and disappears when the sins of Samuel's sons are viewed in the context of chs. 2-7. Rather than allowing Yahweh to create another national disaster that would again seem to be an end to the covenant (cf. 4:22; 6:20), Israel will end the relationship less painfully by simply installing a king in a secular government. Yahweh will then have
neither cause nor justification to foist another national disaster on Israel on account of his officials' misdeeds.

On a structural note, one observes that v. 5 constitutes the beginning of a balanced dialogue between Yahweh and Israel, with Samuel, true to his profession, acting as go-between. The structure constitutes a remarkable network of correspondences and reversals in the roles of speaker and addressee; the complexity of the pattern cannot be explained as a redactional pastiche of sources, traditions, and redactional insertion.

v. 5 People to Samuel; "give king."

v. 6 Samuel to Yahweh; "prayer."

vv. 7-9 Yahweh to Samuel; "listen; declare the manner of the king."

vv. 10-11 Samuel to people; "description of the manner of the king."

v. 19 People to Samuel; "No—give king."

v. 21 Samuel to Yahweh; "reports people's refusal."

v. 22 Yahweh to Samuel; "listen; make a king."

v. 22 Samuel to people; "Go home."

At the centre of this balanced inversion we
see that the opposition between two groups is really between Samuel and the people—not between the people and Yahweh as would be expected. The structural opposition supports and confirms a fact that appears during the course of the unfolding dialogue; Yahweh, though he does not like the request, does not deny it; instead, he simply subverts it (cf. Buber 1964:234-35).

Verse 6

Scholars have often spoken of a perspectival division between vv. 1-5 and vv. 6ff. (e.g. Wildberger 1957:467). Verses 1-5 are regarded as positive, or at least neutral with respect to the suggested monarchy. Veijola calls the request "ein durchaus verstandlicher Plan nach den eingerissenen Misstanden" (1977:55; cf. Weiser 1962:30; Stoebel 1973:182). Nevertheless, according to Veijola, vv. 6-22a, the product of one (DtrN) of two deuteronomistic redactors (DtrN and DtrG), voice an absolutely negative judgement on the proposition (1977:55). While in vv. 1-5 the reason for the request is stated to be the abuses of Samuel's sons, vv. 6ff. attribute the request to Israel's stubbornness (Wildberger 1957:457). Furthermore, from v. 7 on, the confrontation over the issue of the monarchy takes place between all the people
and Samuel, whereas in vv. 4-5 the elders alone bring forward the request (Veijola 1977:55).

Impressive as this argument for redactional divisions in the text may be, there is a case to be made for a unified reading, which, at the same time, calls into question the validity of the anti-monarchic label attached to 8:6-22 if not all of ch. 8. Both redactional analysis of the chapter and the more generally accepted opinion that ch. 8, and hence the compiler/narrator of ch. 8, is expressing an anti-monarchic point of view depend on a total disregard of the "voice structure" of ch. 8.

In the analysis of a speech or literary composition, nothing is more important than to determine precisely the voice or voices presented as speaking and the precise nature of the address (i.e., specific direction to a hearer, an addressee); for in every speech reference to a voice or voices and implication of address (i.e., reference to a process of speech, actual or imagined) is a part of the meaning and a frame for the rest of the meaning, for the interpretation of which it supplies an indispensable control (La Drière
The simple act of attention to the question of "who says what," soon reveals who the real anti-monarchist is in ch. 8, and he is definitely not the narrator.

The description of Samuel's reaction to the request is the first indication that the narrator holds a different view than Samuel. The proposed monarchy (haddābār) displeases Samuel, not the narrator and not Yahweh. That Samuel, groomed from before birth to be Yahweh's agent, should be displeased with the request is neither surprising nor expressive of narratorial anti-monarchism.

Samuel's personal dislike for the request receives additional emphasis in the narrator's description of what specifically bothered Samuel about it. "The matter displeased Samuel because (kaṣer) they said, 'Give us a king to judge us'." The narrator pointedly leaves out the crucial information about the covenantal implication of the request (kākol-haggōyim) in order to show that Samuel's interest is, at this point, focused on the personal import of the request (against Talmon 1979:10). Samuel is concerned, at this point, only with the administrative switch from judge to king. As Schulz says, Samuel's resentment

Samuel's personal involvement has initially prevented him from seeing the large implications of the request (cf. Stoebe 1973:184). Even though he was intimately involved in the Elide affair, knowing both its causes and consequences, he is unable to see the justice and necessity of the elders' request as an attempt to prevent a repetition of the previous disaster. Neither does he yet appear to have fully perceived the covenantal implications of the request, which aims at terminating not simply the judgeship, but the whole theocratic enterprise. Poor old Samuel, he is human after all.

Returning to the supposed split between vv. 5 and 6, it is difficult to see how Samuel's resentment of the request can be read as "ein absolut negatives Urteil über das Vorhaben des Volkes" (Veijola 1977:55; cf. Hylander 1932:118; Soggin 1967:32). Smith provides an example of how scholars can misunderstand a narrator's purpose by taking a protagonist such as Samuel as the unquestionable mouthpiece of the narrator. Commenting on vv. 6-9 he says:
The view of the author is evidently that the theocracy is the divinely appointed constitution for Israel, and that the substitution of another form is treason to God. He does not seem to recognize that Samuel was chargeable with fault in not correcting the abuses of his sons' government, nor does he tell us how Yahweh would give them relief (1899:56).

What Smith fails to recognize is that it is the narrator himself who presents the misdeeds of Samuel's sons as legitimate cause for the Israelites' request. It is the narrator who has constructed chs. 1-7, in which the basis for the request is established. It is Samuel and not the narrator who fails to recognize his sons' shortcomings.

Naturally if the reader assumes that the narrator is publishing his own views through each character's thoughts and speech, then he must also assume a multiplicity of narrators to account for the varying viewpoints expressed by the different characters. Once it is allowed that a narrator can and will allow his characters to voice contradictory opinions over which the narrator and reader stand as observers, shifts in opinion such as that between the elders in
v. 5 and Samuel in v. 6 can be seen in their proper literary perspective. They are the integral parts of the narrative's dialectic. Verse 6 explicitly limits dissatisfaction to Samuel and only with respect to the king as a replacement for a judge.

Verse 7

Samuel takes his problem to the Lord in prayer, and Yahweh replies with an astute observation about Samuel's personal involvement: "Listen to the peoples' voice, to everything that they said (lêkôl ᵐᵃˢᵉʳ-yō₃ᵉʳû ᵃᵉˡᵉʸḵā); (kî) they haven't rejected you but me from reigning as king over them." Yahweh has a much more accurate understanding of both the nature of the people's request and the nature of Samuel's displeasure, in contrast to Samuel's clouded vision. The narrator has nicely used the deity's omniscience, which is also unquestionable, to reveal the true import of the request in an unerring, omniscient evaluation.

Yahweh tells Samuel that he is getting sidetracked by a relatively minor implication of the request, because he has not really listened to all of it (cf. Weiser 1962:35). At issue is not simply the fate of particular judges, but the entire theocratic enterprise. As Driver observes, Yahweh emphasizes the
difference between Samuel's misinterpretation and the realities of the request with the emphatic syntactic positioning of the contrasting phrases introduced by \( kā\); \( kā\) lō\( ^3\) tēkā...\( kā-\) tē (1913:67).

Yahweh's statement that the people reject his kingship, in conjunction with the case of the rejection in the recurrence of sinful mediators, indicates that Yahweh's actions in chs. 1-7 are to be understood as actions of the divine king. The people now reject him as king because they do not want a repetition of such actions on the part of the divine monarch. They reject him and his government because of the inherent dangers and weaknesses of the theocratic constitution.

According to Crüsemann, the function of the opposition between the kingship of Yahweh and man in v. 7 is to label the request as reprehensible (1978:74). Speaking of v. 7, which he regards as a pre-deuteronomistic element, Crüsemann says, "Das ist als äusserste, im Jahweglauben denkbare Kritik am Königtum in der vor-dtr Vorlage von 1 Sam 8 und 12 geschehen; ihr Vorwurf lautet im Kern: Die Errichtung eines Königtums und damit die Gründung eines Staates bedeutet praktizierten Atheismus" (1978:84).

Similarly Boecker, who places emphasis on the
interpretation of v. 7b, the "Alternativformel," in the context of its prehistory rather than its existing literary context, suggests that the pre-monarchic history of Israel was decidedly anti-monarchic (1969: 26). The deuteronomist uses an "Alternativformel" from the pre-monarchic period and so purposefully incorporates the early anti-monarchic political thought into his history (1969:25-26).

Is v. 7 any more an anti-monarchic expression of the narrator than the request in v. 5? Already in v. 5 the reader was made aware of the covenantal implications of the request, which signals and end to the relationship by requesting a profane, non-covenantal status for Israel as one among many nations. The reader is also well aware that the request is justified by the recurrence of sinful mediators. When Yahweh corrects Samuel's misimpressions in v. 7, therefore, he is doing nothing more than making an accurate explication of the implications of v. 5 with respect to his own sovereignty over Israel. His correct apprehension of the aim of the request should not be taken as the narrator's attempt to cast aspersions on it. The fact that Yahweh uses the verb mā'ās to describe the rejection does not characterize the
narrator's evaluation of the request, but Yahweh's (against Veijola 1977:55-56). That Yahweh is disturbed by the request is well within the bounds of expectation. The narrator, it should be observed, refrains from commenting on Yahweh's assessment, a strange silence if he agreed with Yahweh and was trying to show that the requested monarchy was a bad thing for Israel.

Verse 8

Verse 8 presents great interpretational difficulty because it contradicts v. 7; in v. 7, Yahweh tells Samuel it is not Samuel but Yahweh that the people reject, but in v. 8, Yahweh tells Samuel that they are forsaking (מָזָב) Samuel and serving other gods as they have been doing to Yahweh since the exodus. As Buber especially has noted, the conflict is irreducible. "Hier redet JHWH so, als gelte der Verrat des Volkes wirklich Samuel, und vergleicht ihn nur mit dem von Israel oft an ihm selber, seinem Gott, durch den Dienst andrer Götter geübt" (1964:733). Buber's remark touches on the other major difficulty, namely the incongruity of equating the rejection of Samuel, only a man after all, with Israel's previous religious defections.
from the worship of Yahweh.

Taking the second difficulty first, one should note that the described sin of Israel is not simply religious, but covenantal, as the parallels in Deut 29:25-26 clearly indicate (cf. 1 Kgs 9:9):

1 Sam 8:8

1. Mentions the exodus, the divine act of deliverance that serves as the basis of the covenant.

2. Recalls the period between the exodus and the present.

3. Israel forsook Yahweh (wayyê azbûnî) and served other gods (wayyê abdû lôhîm ăherîm).

Deut 29:24-25

Cf. 29:1-2, 15.

Cf. 29:3-5, 15-17.

Israel is punished because they forsook (çaz bû) the covenant of Yahweh...and went and served other gods (wayya abdû lôhîm ăherîm).

In v. 8, the deeds that Yahweh compares as the same as those which Israel is now doing "even to Samuel" are of a covenantal nature and constitute a rebellion of Israel against its sovereign Yahweh. Samuel is,
however, a most unlikely candidate for sovereignty. Are we really expected to believe that Yahweh, having just told Samuel that Israel is not merely rejecting a judge, but its divine sovereign, now tells Samuel that he is experiencing the rejection that Israel customarily gives to its sovereign?

A solution by way of a small, justifiable emendation has been proposed by S.L. Harris. Not only does Harris' solution clear up v. 8, but it also reveals clear parallels (and gains support therefrom) between v. 8 and 10:18-19 and 12:6-12, both of which also give a past history of Israel's covenantal transgressions, and both of which, like v. 8, conclude with a divine "affirmation" of the monarchy. Harris suggests that the last clause in v. 8 has undergone the haplography of a mem after gam, so that it should read "so they are also making a king" (kēn hēmmā ġōšîm gam-melek[!]) (1981:79). The emended text is then eminently agreeable to its context, and simply constitutes an expansion of the theme stated in v. 7. The final clause is now compatible with the previously mentioned deeds of v. 8; the act of making a king is, like all previous defections (kēkōl-hammaṣāsim), a rejection of Yahweh.
Harris' emendation neatly removes the contradiction between vv. 7 and 8. Yahweh does not change his mind over who is rejected in v. 8. Both vv. 7 and 8 interpret the request as a rejection of the divine king.

The parallels cited by Harris support his emendation. In 10:18-19, a history of Yahweh's saving deeds is given, followed by a description of the request for a king as the rejection of God. The verses conclude with the adverb \textit{w\textasciitilde eCatt\textbar a}, and a description of making a king follows (10:19-24). Chapter 12:6-12 follows the same pattern; the past history (vv. 6-11), the rejection of Yahweh as king (v. 12), and the conclusion, introduced by \textit{w\textasciitilde eCatt\textbar a}, describing the new human king. In 8:8-9, we see the past history, the making of a king characterized as a rejection of Yahweh, and the acquiescence to the wish, again introduced by \textit{w\textasciitilde eCatt\textbar a}, (Harris 1981:80).

In all these examples, the prefacing of a recollection of Yahweh's mighty acts of deliverance before the description of the rejected divine king (and his human replacement) indicates that it is the saving deeds that constitute the basis of Yahweh's
kingship (cf. Exod 15:18). The covenant at Sinai was established on the basis of those deeds and hence, as Buber notes, they should be seen as basis for relationship with Yahweh as king and Israel as his people (1967: 39; cf. P.D. Miller 1975:174). Like v. 5, then, v. 8 draws attention to the covenantal significance of Israel's request, which repudiates any claim based on the exodus events.

The links between vv. 7-8 are strengthened by alliterative connections between the verb for rejecting Yahweh in v. 7 and those for rebellious deeds and king-making in v. 8:

v. 7  \( \text{mā āšū...mā āšū} \)

v. 8  \( \text{hamma cašām...cašū...cašūm} 10 \)

It has been observed that v. 8, widely agreed to contain deuteronomistic vocabulary, incorporates the present incident into the deuteronomist's historiographic pattern of cyclic apostasy (e.g. Weiser 1962: 33-34; Veijola 1977:56-58; McCarter 1980:157). The recapitulation of Israel's past failings does little, however, to support the anti-monarchic label attached to ch. 8. It should be noted that it is Yahweh, the
divine king whose abdication is demanded, who compares the request to past apostasy. It is Yahweh's view, not the narrator's that the request is an apostasy. The narrator refrains from inserting his own views.

Yahweh's interpretation of the request, while an accurate assessment of the covenantal implications, may also contain an ironic revelation about Israel's past defections, which Yahweh refers to here. The reader knows that Israel's request for a king, its present apostasy, is justified. If such is true for present defection, might there also have been mitigations for past instances, which Yahweh finds comparable to the present?

This question about Yahweh's reading of Israel's past defections is a result of the direct conflict between the narrator's voice and Yahweh's voice over the justification of Israel's request for a king. The narrator supports the justice of the request by his narrative in chs. 1-7 and by his description in 8:1-3. Yahweh, in contrast, impugns the justice of the request by associating it with previous defections from the theocracy. Since the omniscient narrator's voice is the ultimate authority
in the narrative world that he creates, and since the narrator's voice contradicts and overrules Yahweh's in the evaluation of the request for a king, doubts are also cast on Yahweh's interpretation of past defections, which he himself has chosen to compare to the request.11 Within the context of the voice structure of the whole narrative, therefore, Yahweh may voice anti-monarchic sentiments in v. 8, but his views, because they are subordinate to the narrator's, are to be viewed as expressions of personal opinion, not statements of fact. Viewed from the narrator's perspective, Yahweh's comparison of the request with past defections suggests that maybe past defections were somewhat more complex too. Could Israel actually have had valid reasons for rebelling in the wilderness? Such an implication is not beyond the possible for the narrator who created an incident such as that of 6:19-20.

Verse 9

In all three parallel occurrences of the adverb $\text{wecattâ}$ (cf. 10:19; 12:13), the word introduces a new possibility, "now," as opposed to the immediately preceding past, the exodus events. The adverb signals the dawning of a new political age in Israel.
In contrast to v. 7, where Yahweh placed emphasis on Samuel's audition of all that the people said, he now tells Samuel simply to listen to their request:

v. 7 \( \text{Ye} \text{ma}^c \text{ b} \text{eqol} \text{ h} \text{ac} \text{am} \text{ l} \text{kol} \text{ sa} \text{r-y} \text{om} \text{r} \text{u} \ldots \)

v. 8 \( \text{Ye} \text{ma}^c \text{ b} \text{eqol} \text{am} \ldots \)

Yahweh's capitulation to the request, immediately after he has voiced his opinion that it is a breach of covenant, seems odd (so Birch 1976:23). One would expect him to put up some resistance to the request. In fact, that is exactly what he does—the immediate compliance is only apparent, limited as it is by the expression \( \text{dak ki}^\wedge \), "howbeit." As Buber observes, the \( \text{dak ki}^\wedge \) presupposes that the request will be honoured, that is, a king will be made (1964:736). The \( \text{dak ki}^\wedge \), however, places a restriction on the act of making a king by laying down guidelines for Samuel to follow as he proceeds to fulfill the request. "Das akh ki besagt somit: nur dass es eben doch kein Königstum wie aller Völker sein soll, das sich etwa als Vikariat eines Gottes bezeichnen mag, aber nicht in Wahrheit dem Himmel Rechenschaft schuldet und erstattet, sondern wirkliches nach oben verantwort-
verantwortliches, also von oben absetzbare, von oben 'verwerfbares' (15, 23) Statthaltum" (Buber 1964:738; cf. Weiser 1962:38). Yahweh's first condition is that Samuel must "stipulate the stipulation against them" (Israel). Although the reader is not given to know whether this stipulation is drawn from the old theocratic covenant or a new one created explicitly for the monarchy, it is obvious that Yahweh has not renounced his role as creator and legislator of Israel's political system. He commands Samuel to lay down the legal framework for the establishment of a monarchy. This action alone should indicate to the reader that the king to be installed will not be a king like those of other nations, but a king that stands under "the stipulation" (ḥā-ṣed) of Yahweh.

Buber calls attention to the fact that Samuel is to stipulate the stipulation against Israel (ḥāḥem). "'Gegen sie': denn wenn je und je sie oder ihr König oder sie und ihr König mitsammen auf ihre Autonomie pochen und sich darauf berufen, dass sie einen Staat haben 'wie alle Völker', dann wird dieses Urkunde der göttlichen Verfassung gegen sie zeugen" (1964:737-38). Yahweh understands that the stipulation is contrary to the wishes of the people.
Hence it must be stipulated "against them."

Samuel's second task is to declare the "manner" (mišpaṭ) of the king that will be established. Both the "stipulation" and the "manner of the king" in v. 9 are to be proclaimed by on behalf of Yahweh. The active force of both verbs is emphasized by the fact that both are given in the Hiphil form. As Buber points out, the "manner of the king" is "nicht eine Verfassung 'von unten', sondern 'von oben', eine von Jhwh erlassene, für deren Einhaltung der bewilligte König also ihm, seinem unabsetzbaren 'Vorgänger', verantwortlich sein wird, ja die gar keine Einzelpflichten, nur eben die fundamentale Festlegung dieser Verantwortlichkeit zu enthalten brauchte" (1964:737).

At this point Yahweh does not specify the content of the stipulation or the manner of the king. His vagueness leaves room for misinterpretation on both Samuel's and the reader's parts. Yahweh has stated his intention to remain in control, but he has not explained how the stipulation or the "manner" will do so.

Yahweh's conditional acquiescence to the request is in accord with his perception of the request as characteristic of Israel's covenantal behaviour. As
many times as Israel had expressed its dissatisfaction and thrown off the yoke of the covenant, Yahweh had responded with a solution to repair the damage and pacify Israel (e.g. Exod 15-19; Num 11:14). So now when Israel tries to escape the covenantal relationship, Yahweh tries to appease them by giving them a king, but not such as they desired.

Verse 10

The narrator informs the reader that Samuel repeats "everything" (kol-dibré yhwh) that Yahweh said to the people. The people are thus potentially made aware of Yahweh's grasp of the implications of their request and of his intention to maintain a hold on Israel and its king. Due to the vagueness of Yahweh's response, and Samuel's own misinterpretation of Yahweh's directives (a fact revealed in v. 11), however, it seems that the people do not perceive Yahweh's intention until it is unveiled in 10:24-25. When they finally understand the implication of Yahweh's response, there are mixed reactions, with some vocal opposition (10:26-27). It seems that Samuel's simple retelling (wayyōmer) of what Yahweh said is not powerful enough to carry the imperative directive force of Yahweh's "stipulate" (tā'id) and "declare"
The people to whom Samuel tells all are explicitly described as "those asking a king from him (Samuel)." With this description the narrator highlights the fact that the request is not a simple rebellion or apostasy, contrary to what Yahweh might say. The people pursue their case legitimately through the institutions open to them in the theocratic political structure. Unfortunately for them, the theocratic structure places all power and authority in the hands of Yahweh and his mediator; the people must make their case to the very individuals whom they wish to oust. We see the same political principle at work today, when the Canadian people must take their request for constitutional reform to the Queen of England for her approval, even though she is the very person whose authority over Canadian political affairs is finished with her assent to the new constitution.

The narrator's emphasis on the people as "those asking a king from him" placed immediately after Yahweh's conditional affirmation of the kingship, also brings the unlikelihood of success for their request to the surface.
Verse 11

Conspicuous in their absence from Samuel's conversation with the people in v. 10 are the stipulation that he was to stipulate and the manner of the king that he was to declare. Instead of stipulating (tācōd) and declaring (wēhiggadtā), Samuel simply told (wayyōmer) the people what Yahweh said. Although one might infer that such activities are subsumed by the verb ָmr in v. 10, it would seem that the peculiar usage of ָmr with a definite objection is specifically intended to highlight the difference between what Yahweh commanded and what Samuel did.15 Neither does Samuel make the appropriate declarations in v. 11. Instead of "declaring (wēhiggadtā, v. 9) the manner of the king that will rule over them," Samuel again simply says (wayyōmer) "this will be the manner of the king that will rule over you." Yahweh tells Samuel to prescribe "the manner," and instead Samuel describes it.16 As a result of his misunderstanding of Yahweh's directive, Samuel proceeds with a lengthy description of what he perceives as the prospective disadvantages of the monarchy.17

The request for a king that would unseat him as judge seems to have unsettled Samuel. First he
missed the more important and larger implications of the request (vv. 6-7), and now he misses the regulative intention of Yahweh's reply in v. 9. Thinking that Yahweh has simply acceded to the demand, Samuel seems to interpret Yahweh's instructions as warnings to Israel. He regards the "manner of the king" not as a divine directive, but an analysis of possible monarchic abuses. Buber, who regards vv. 11-18 as a redactional insertion comes, nevertheless, to a similar reading of the difference between "the manner of the king" in vv. 9 and 11. For Buber, though, it is the redactor who inserted the tendentious exegetical pamphlet now seen in vv. 11-18 that misunderstands Yahweh, and not Samuel (1964:738).

The misunderstanding is, nevertheless, appropriate to Samuel and serves to illustrate further his personal anxieties over the request. He has heard nothing Yahweh has said and seeks only to dissuade the people from their purpose. His arguments, as we shall see, seek to persuade the people of the favourability of the theocratic regime, under Samuel and Yahweh, over the monarchy. Samuel assumes the role of rhetorician, speaking his own thoughts, rather than the role of Yahweh's authoritative mediator.
commanded to make specific declarations on the "manner of of the king." Ironically it is the very fear of losing his role as mediator that prevents Samuel from fulfilling that role.

Samuel begins his skillful speech with a hard-hitting description of how a monarchy will encroach on the individual Israelite families. As Weiser notes, the fourfold repetition of the verb "he will take" (yiqqāh) stresses the burdensome aspect of the monarchy (1962: 40; cf. Veijola 1977:60). Samuel attempts to emphasize the negative in everything that the monarchy will do. The list of things that the king will take begins with the most important of possessions, the sons (v. 11), and proceeds in descending order through daughters (v. 13), real estate (v. 14), and income tax (vv. 15-17a). Each description is introduced by placing the affected object first in its sentence. The emphatic position of each object (Driver 1913:67) is intended to impress the audience with all of the areas that will be affected by the monarchy—family, land, and wealth. Nothing will be left untouched. The cost of kingship is very great, says Samuel. Will Israel be willing to pay, asks the reader?

At the same time that he lists the evils of
the monarchy, Samuel unwittingly reveals positive aspects. It is these positive aspects of the monarchy, hidden behind Samuel's rhetoric, that have provoked some scholars to suggest a pro-monarchic tradition lying behind vv. 11-12 (e.g. Press 1938:197; Stoebe 1973:186-87). As Talmon notes, the two positive aspects of fundamental importance to any stable ancient near eastern monarchy are the creation and organization of an army and the internal administration of the kingdom (1979:13). The inclusion of these aspects in Samuel's criticisms is not so much the result of a combination of sources as it is a necessity of the speech. If Samuel wants to criticize the monarchy for pressing Israelites into military service, he is forced to mention the good of a monarchic army, a necessity for national defence. Similarly to criticize the monarchy for taxation necessitates mentioning the good of a centralized administration.

In order to appreciate the rhetoric of Samuel's speech, we must follow it through in its given sequence. The royal expropriation begins with "your sons." The first blast strikes uncomfortably close to the persons of the audience, and emphasizes the high personal cost of establishing a royal army. The descriptions
of the sons' duties are intended to emphasize the service that the people will render to the king. The king appoints them to his chariot, to his cavalry, and they will run before his chariot. "Das ganze Stück basiert auf einer bewusst angestrebenen Distanzierung: Ihr, das Volk—er, der König" (Crüsemann 1978:69). From Samuel's description one would hardly think that a national army could benefit anyone other than the king. Yet the most important aspect of any army is defence and enforcement of external policy.

Verse 12

Even high-ranking officials are made to do the menial tasks of farming the king's estate by Samuel (cf. Smith 1899:57; de Vaux 1965:124). Not even those in positions of authority have anything to gain from Samuel's king.

Verse 13

The second assault on the audience's purposes exhibits a slight weakening in that it is only daughters who are taken. Samuel begins to prepare his audience for a devastating grand finale by gradually lessening the importance of the affected item; he leads his audience to believe that the worst is over with the
sons. The same tactic can be discerned in the descriptions of the tasks to which the daughters are put—they are now simply perfumers, cooks, and bakers rather than his perfumers, his cooks, and his bakers.

Verse 14

The lulling effect continues with the transition from the effect on families to that on possessions. Samuel makes his criticism elegantly, using contrasting verbs and pronominal suffices: "He will take your best fields, your best vineyards, your best olive groves and give (them) to his servants."²⁰

Verse 15

The neat structure that Samuel uses in each of the three preceding cases breaks down in vv. 15-17. Crüsemann notes the inconsistency, especially in v. 15, and suggests that v. 15 and the asses in v. 16 be omitted as obvious additions that disturb the clear structure of vv. 11-17 (1978:67-68). It is possible, however, that the narrator has abandoned the neat structure repeated in vv. 11-14 in order to convey a portrait of the growing emotion and forcefulness of Samuel's presentation, which comes, as often in speeches, at the expense of order and precision. The same
impression is conveyed by the principle of linking words (Leitwörter) that does organize vv. 15-17. Samuel's growing animation brings him to present his arguments in an associative concatenation rather than a logical, structured order.

Verse 15 is connected to the preceding verse by the repetition of the words "your vineyards." "Both your grain crops and your vineyards he will tithe and give them to his officers and his servants." The use of contrasting verbs and pronominal suffixes continues to emphasize the negative side of the monarchy. Also continued is the diminishing severity of each item. In contrast to the expropriation of the best vineyards (v. 14), only the tenth part of the produce is taken in v. 15.

Verse 16

Verses 15 and 16 are linked by the word "servants." In this case, the connection itself serves to make a point about the cost of kingship. "He will give (the tithes) to his servants (v. 16), but your servants...he will take and put to his (own) work." The king pays his own servants with the taxes and on top of that, conscripts Israel's servants to do his own work. The conscription of servants is a further

The list of expropriations in v. 16 reflects the rhetorical pattern of the entire speech; it proceeds from the most important to the least of the losses to the king: slaves, maidservants, cattle, ending with asses. The mention of the asses following the adjective hattobim does seem incongruous (Dhorme 1910:72); its position can, however, be understood as an indication of Samuel's growing excitement as he nears his punch-line.

The mention of the tithe on the flocks is linked to v. 15 by the verb yaštor and to v. 16 by the parallel categories of possessions (cattle, asses, flocks). The associative logic and appearance as an afterthought contributes to the impression of Samuel's growing fervor.

Verse 17

As commentators have noted, the mention of the tithe on the flocks appears as an anti-climatic afterthought; "sie legt den Gedanken an eine spätere Auffüllung nahe" (Stoebe 1973:186). It is, however, precisely on account of its anti-climactic aftertaste that it should not be seen as a late redactional expansion. As with the whole of vv. 11-16, Samuel uses
this final afterthought to accommodate his audience to the costs of kingship. Certainly Samuel's audience would also have been impressed with the incongruity of his concluding remark, which is remarkably similar to Yahweh's final words to Jonah, "and also much cattle?" (Jonah 4:11).

Samuel's assumption of the appearance of a scatter-brain is only a ruse designed to lower the defences of his audience. Having given them a growing sense of ease with the descriptions of what would happen to their families and possessions, Samuel fires a parting shot aimed squarely at the persons of his audience. Such is the emphasis supplied by the opening w'atem, "And you," of v. 17b, following, as it does, after all the "your" openings: your sons, your daughters, your fields, your vineyards, your olive groves, your seed crops, your vine crops, your slaves, your maidservants, your cattle, your asses, your flocks, you (cf. Driver 1913:68). Having gradually accustomed his audience to the adjustments in lifestyle under a monarchy by the rhetorical pattern that governs his speech, Samuel blasts his unsuspecting audience with the most devastating description of all.22

"And you will be slaves to him." The line has
a familiar ring to it that Israel would easily recognize from its past, and which the reader also recalls from the latter part of 2:27, "when they (your fathers) were in Egypt 'to the house of Pharaoh'." Samuel is using the same methods as the book of Deuteronomy to dissuade his audience from what he sees as their wrong purpose; "Remember that you were a slave in Egypt" (Deut 5:15; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18, 22). The election of a king will return Israel to the slave status from which Yahweh originally freed them. Samuel's purpose is clear, especially when v. 17 is set beside Deut 6:21, an explanation of the significance of Israel's covenental laws:

v. 17 \( \text{we'attem tihyû-1ô la'cábádìm} \)
Deut 6:21 \( \text{cábádìm+hâyinû e'parcôh b'emîsîrâyim wayyôsî'ênû yhwh mîmîsîrâyim b'yâd hâzâqâ} \)

Israel's anti-theocratic request will lead them back to the state from which Yahweh rescued them.

"Thus 'the manner of the king' as it is stigmatized in 1 Sam 8:11-18, could just as aptly have been labelled in that context 'the Egyptian manner'" (Speiser 1971:...
285). Since they cannot cope with the freedom (and uncertainty) of political life under the theocracy, they will have to live as slaves under the overbearing, monocratic rule of a human king. The change cannot be from the freedom under theocracy to a freedom under a monarchy, but only from freedom to bondage.

Samuel's characterization of the wish for a king as, in fact, a desire for renewed slavery parallels certain facets of the murmuring traditions in the Pentateuch. In both the request, as interpreted by Samuel, and the murmurings in the wilderness, Israel rejects the freedom of life under Yahweh and his mediator in favour of the life of slavery in Egypt, under a king (cf. Exod 16:2-5; 17:3; Num 11:4-6; 20:3-5; 21:5; Ps 78:18-22). The rationale for the choice is that life "in Egypt" is free from the uncertainties and insecurity of the free life under Yahweh; "a live dog is better than a dead-lion" (Eccl 9:4).

*Verse 18*

Samuel, having been corrected by Yahweh in vv. 7-8, gives a correct interpretation of the anti-covenantal intent of the people. Yet his interpretation is not neutral, but polemical; he tries to emphasize the ills of the people's request for an
"Egyptian" lifestyle. Verse 18 combines the memories of Egyptian slavery with the more immediate memory of deliverance under Samuel in order to call the wisdom of the request into doubt.

Samuel notes that the life of slavery under a king will undoubtedly lead to cries (عز אָּתָם) for help, just as in Egypt (cf. Exod 3:7). Yahweh, however, will not answer because it was Israel's choice to reject the divine king and their covenant with him. They chose, instead, to elect a human king (בְּהַרְטֶם הָּלָּכָם).

Verse 18 also contains specific recollections of the crucial moment in 7:8-9, when Samuel cried (wayyizכָּאַג) to Yahweh on Israel's behalf, and Yahweh answered him (וַּיַּאֲכָהָּנֻ). The rejection of the existing covenant will mean that Israel will no longer have a mediator to convey its cries to Yahweh; without a mediator, there can be no answer such as there was in 7:9. The options are clear: slavery under a human king, or deliverance under Yahweh and Samuel.

Verse 19

The people unhesitating reject Samuel's argument. The narrator's description of their refusal "to listen to Samuel" (לִשְׁמֹאֵלָּה בְּשֵׁמַּלְּנֵהוּ) reminds
the reader of Yahweh's previous instructions to Samuel to listen to the people (šēmāc b'qōlām, v. 9). Samuel has not listened to Yahweh, so the people do not listen to him. His words from v. 11 on lack the authority of the words given to him by Yahweh in v. 9. Instead of declaring the manner of the king and stipulating the stipulation, Samuel presented the people with his own estimation of their alternatives. Accurate as it may be, Samuel's evaluation of the monarchy is an ineffectual restatement of facts already contained in the request and in Yahweh's own evaluation (vv. 7-8). Contrary to Samuel, however, Yahweh did more than evaluate; he moved swiftly with a declaration, as reigning king, to cut off his people's insurrection.

The people brush off Samuel's alternatives as the irrelevant redundancies they are. They remain firm in their decision to opt out of the theocracy; "their insistence even in the face of Samuel's objections indicate[s] that the negotiations were conducted on the basis of clear knowledge of the obligations and privileges that went with the monarchy" (Talmon 1979:15).

The fact that the people prefer even the despotic monarchy described by Samuel is also a clear
indication of the degree of their fear of another disaster such as that brought on Israel by the Elides. Samuel's description of the change their choice involves is greeted and welcomed; from Israel's point of view it is a welcome change from the uncertainties of theocracy to the certainties of monarchy. The price that Samuel names is apparently counted as small for the benefits received.

Verse 20

The people reaffirm their wish to be like the nations with a non-covenantal political structure. The people's emphatic declaration, "(Yes) even we shall become like all the nations" is an unambiguous repudiation of their special status as Yahweh's own possession, a priestly kingdom and a holy nation (cf. Exod 19:5-6). As in Ezek 20:32, Israel's desire to become "like the nations" is a proclamation of independence, a vocal manifesto ending allegiance to the divine king. "The author of I Sam. 8 tries to capture in a single phrase how Israel repudiates the special position ordained for her by God, and wishes to assimilate her own special constitution to the profane constitution of the states in the heathen world around her" (Eichrodt 1970:277). Yahweh said, "You shall be to me a priestly kingdom,
a holy nation" (Exod 19:6), but Israel says "But we, yes we (gam) will be like the nations." As their subsequent reasons show, the people view monarchy and theocracy from a much different perspective than Samuel; they also have memories, recalled in v. 20, which extend back to the exodus, and more recently, to the events of ch. 4.

The king will take the place of both Yahweh, the present king, and Samuel, the present judge—"our king (malkênu) will be our judge (šê pâṭânû)" (cf. North 1952:9; Whybray 1962:138). The king will go out before Israel (we yâṣâ  lê pâḥênu) in battle as Yahweh had once gone out before Israel (cf. Judg 4:14; Boecker 1969:32-33). The king is supposed to fight Israel's battles, which are specifically described as "our battles" rather than "Yahweh's battles," the usual, and covenantally grounded description of Israelite warfare (cf. Hertzberg 1964:74; Boecker 1969:34; Stoebel 1973:189). The king is expected to take on the role that Yahweh promised to play—but did not (cf. ch. 4).

As Buber notes, v. 20 is a development of v. 5, a response to the recurrence of an "Elide" situation amongst the judges. Of v. 20, Buber says:
was daraus spricht, ist die unverwindbare Erinnerung an die Katastrophe der Lade und des von ihr geführten israelitischen Heers und das Bewusstsein der Vergeblichkeit der seitherigen Befreiungsversuch; dahinter steht die Erfahrung die man in kriegerischen Unternehmungen gegen die Philister mit Heiligtümern und Gottesmännern gemacht hat (1964:739).

In the people's view, Yahweh had unquestionably reneged on his covenantal obligations in the battles of ch. 4. Now, with the recurrence of an "Elide" situation amongst the judges, Israel chooses to have a human king whose military activities will not be affected by these, or any other theocratic concerns. The people prefer the stability and reliability of a human king and their own devices to fight their wars, rather than helpless dependence on Yahweh to fight a "Yahweh war." As a profane political unit there will be no sacral complications to interfere in either the internal or external affairs of state.

Over and against Samuel's alternatives, the people set their own alternatives: stay within the theocracy and risk a repetition of ch. 4, or get out
and make one's own way, fighting one's own battles. At least the latter option insures that military defeats will be produced only by one's own military deficiencies. Israel's request for a king, then, is a decision on a national level to take its fate into its own hands with one of its own people at its head where Yahweh used to be.

Verse 21

The narrator informs the reader that finally Samuel does hear "all the words" (ט kol-dibré hā'ām, cf. v. 7), the implication being that he finally realizes the full implications of Israel's request for covenantal reform. Israel's polemical rebuttal of his remarks about the monarchy is what finally brings Samuel to a sense of everything they are saying, and not just the personal implications of their request. As before (v. 6) he brings what he considers as news to Yahweh.

There is a difference between Samuel's two conversations with Yahweh (cf. Press 1938:198). The first time Samuel speaks of the request it is in a prayer concerning his own replacement as judge (v. 6). In v. 20, however, Samuel has finally realized the full import of the request and so relates this "new"
development to "Yahweh's ears," an expression chosen, perhaps, to indicate that Samuel relates a discovered secret to Yahweh.

Verse 22

Yahweh's response to Samuel's news is simply to reiterate his previous command to Samuel to listen to the people (šēma bēqōlām, cf. v. 9; Stoebe 1973: 189). Samuel's discovery has changed nothing and Yahweh tells him to get on with his job. As in v. 9, Yahweh's instructions indicate that he is not abdicating. Samuel was to "stipulate the stipulation" (ḥāʾēd tāʾēd), "declare the manner of the king" (wēhiggadātā lahem mišpat hemmelek), and to "make the king" (wēhīmlaktā lāhem melek), all Hiph'īl verbs indicating that Yahweh still controls Israel's politics even in the matter of kings (cf. Cohen 1965:69; Payne 1972:323).

Once again, however, Samuel balks at the command and does not proceed with the necessary action straight away. Instead of making a king he sends every man to his city. Samuel was unable to follow Yahweh's instruction, even when he was only aware of the instability of his own position. Now, aware of the covenantal implications of the request, Samuel
cannot bring himself to do as he is bidden. His act marks a failure to obey out of a sense of loyalty to Yahweh and the covenant concept. It will take some further explaining on Yahweh's part before Samuel understands the divine plan and takes an active part in its enactment. Samuel's failure to obey Yahweh reveals the human side of Samuel; he is faithful to his own perception of what should be done (the maintenance of the covenant) and will not obey even Yahweh when the command seems to contradict his allegiances. Samuel's loyalty to the theocratic covenant is immaculate.

Verse 22 does, as most commentators have noted, prepare for the description of Saul's anointment (e.g. Smith 1899:59); but it is not the simply redactional link that it is often said to be. McCarter for example, comments "Exulent omnes. The prophetic narrator dismisses the people" (1980:159). It is not the narrator who dismisses the people, but Samuel, who thereby reveals something of his character and understanding of the situation to the reader. Samuel does not immediately make the king because he does not know what kind of king Yahweh has in mind, and he refuses to make the kind of king that the people have in mind. The dismissal of the people does, then, "make room"
for Yahweh's leading of Saul to Samuel in ch. 9, but not simply as an artificial redactional link. Since Samuel has not caught on, Yahweh himself has to choose a man, Saul, bring him to Samuel, and tell Samuel exactly what he has in mind. The room made for ch. 9 is not redactional and artificial, but vital and integral to the narrative. Samuel's inability to follow orders and make a king creates an opportunity for Yahweh himself to move to centre stage. As will be seen in ch. 9, his orchestration of Saul's journey to the throne leaves no doubt about Yahweh's conception of an Israelite monarchy.
Excursus on the Contextuality of 9:1-10:16

Past literary analysis of ch. 9 is emblematic of the analysis of chs. 8-12 as a whole—no single dissection of the text has proven to be generally acceptable. The predominant approach to these scenes (9:1-10:16), in which Saul is selected to be nāgād by Yahweh, is evident in a comment by W. Richter. He observes that the most reliable criterion by which a narrative may be divided—doublets—is lacking in 9:1-10:16. "Das garantiert noch nicht die Einheitlichkeit, vielmehr ist nach weiteren Kriterien Ausschau zu halten" (1970:13). Contained in Richter's advice is one of the most widespread and fundamental of historical-critical assumptions: biblical narrative is composite and can be shown to be so, appearances to the contrary. It is held to be methodologically unsound to draw exegetical conclusions, either historical or literary, prior to the isolation of "die Kleine Einheit" (Richter 1970:13 n.3).

It is exactly this order in historical-critical analysis that has prevented scholars from reaching any kind of agreement concerning the historical content of 9:1-10:16. "Die verschiedenen Auffassungen über
den historischen Gehalt des Abschnittes spiegeln nur
die Tatsache, dass bis heute keine Übereinstimmung über
seinen literarischen Aufbau erreicht worden ist" (L.
Schmidt 1970:59). In view of the fact that it is the
principal aim of historical criticism to achieve a
historically accurate understanding of this and other
narratives, the methodological sequence described by
Richter can only be regarded as self-stultifying.
L. Schmidt's own attempt to resolve the inconclusive
debate is to provide yet another reanalysis, and that
has subsequently been added to Kegler's list (1977:67-
68) of previous analyses. Kegler continues the tradi-
tion with his own unique analysis and resulting
historical conclusions (1977:70-77).

A relatively untravelled path around the morass
created by historical-critical division and redivision
of 9:1-10:16 is the narrative itself, when read in its
existing consecution. One would be very short-sighted
not to anticipate the objection that his holistic
reading is just another analysis to be added to the
existing pile of disagreements. While it is true that
there are no compelling arguments in favour of final-
form readings, other than the possibility of achieving
more interesting readings of the narrative itself
(rather than the 'history behind it), the approach does have one important advantage: at least when readings are all based upon the same text, rather than various segmentations of the text, a major variable and hence, source of disagreement is eliminated. Seen from a contextual perspective, most of the literary phenomena that historical criticism has used to divide the narrative appear as integral components in an episode which is itself an integral component in a larger pattern. One recalls that certain aspects of ch. 8, notably the recurrence of a particular state of affairs in the offices of Yahweh's mediators (8:1-5) and the consequent request for a king to fight Israel's battles (8:20), appeared to parallel or react to the precedent-setting events of chs. 1-7. It comes as no surprise, given the narrator's prior use of the literary technique of parallel episodes, that 9:1-10:16 also corresponds to certain aspects of the events of chs. 1-7 and react to others. Chapters 9:1-10:16 present the divine response to Israel's request for a king (ch. 8) but it is also a reaction and response to chs. 5-7. In summary form the points of contact are:
1. Yahweh displays his powers in a manner reminiscent of the exodus display (chs. 5-6). The divine warrior vindicates himself before his enemies, but leaves his own people in the dark.³

2. Yahweh treats Israel in a manner similar to his previous conduct towards the Philistines. Israel responds like the Philistines (6:19-20; cf. chs. 5-6).

As he did prior to the exodus, Yahweh hears the cry of his people (cf. Exod 3:7, 9) and brings them a deliverer. Saul (a new Moses) is to be appointed nāgid over Yahweh's people (šammāh 9:16), his inheritance (10:1). Yahweh reasserts his sovereign responsibility to Israel and his covenantal claim on their allegiance.

The narrative in 9:1-10:16 portrays a divine response; it is a response to the request for a king but also constitutes an attempt to make amends for any divine failures in the events that brought defeat to Israel at the hands of the Philistines. If Israel was excluded from any participation in the exodus-like reenactments of chs. 5-6, Yahweh now makes certain that they will be included in the new monarchy, a monarchy not "like the nations" but under the nāgid of Yahweh.

The divine actions in terms of the exodus paradigm reveal wild oscillations in Yahweh's covenantal
behaviour. In the first instance his exodus-like actions seem to omit Israel (chs. 5-6), and go so far as even to appear anti-Israelite (6:19-20). When Israel calls a justifiable halt to relations upon being faced with a renewed threat of recurring misbehaviour (8:5, 20), however, Yahweh counters with a national theological-political slogan (9:15-16) taken from Exodus 5:7, 9, as he plays the role of Israel's divine protector. Yahweh's creation of a new deliverer, a new Moses (9:16), for Israel is a response intended to make amends for his prior refusal to allow Israel to participate in his exodus from Philistine territory.

Verse 1

As scholars have observed, Samuel's refusal to listen either to the voice of the people or the command of God opens the door to the events described in chs. 9-10 (e.g. Veijola 1977:73). When Samuel refuses to carry out Yahweh's commands, the counter-measures to Israel's request, the reader expects Yahweh to respond, perhaps by taking matters into his own hands. Hence any subsequent events that exhibit the slightest hint of divine intervention on the human plane will be scrutinized by the reader, who is on the lookout for Yahweh's response to Samuel's
refusal.

The reader is immediately provided with some hint of what is to follow by the introduction to Saul, which, as most commentators have noted, is similar to that of Samuel (Budde 1902:58; Nowack 1902:39; Schulz 1919:128; Hertzberg 1964:80; Stoebe 1973:195; McCarter 1980:172). As in 1:1, the opening in 9:1 (wayēḥā נַעְזָר) marks a new scene following the pattern of previous introductions (e.g. Judg 13:2; 17:1; 19:1; cf. Richter 1970:30). The parallel encourages a recollection of Samuel's birth story and alerts the reader to watch for any further similarities.

The genealogical information about Saul consists of a list of unimportant ancestors known otherwise only from the books of Chronicles (1 Chr 8:33; 9:39). Saul's genealogical connections, like Samuel's, are incapable of providing any legitimate claim to superior office or status in Israel (cf. above on 1:1). Considering that it is the normal function of a linear genealogy such as v. 1 to provide social, religious, or political legitimation (Wilson 1977:40-45, 155, 164), the lack of any such potential in Saul's genealogy should be regarded as an intentional manipulation of genealogical conventions. The genealogy without
legitimation, used as a prelude to the story of Saul's anointment, indicates that any successful elevation of Saul is not a product of familial connections.

Like Samuel, Saul begins as a nobody who becomes a somebody as a result of Yahweh's decision to make use of him. The unusual function of both Samuel's and Saul's genealogies creates a conspicuous parallel between the two. On the basis of his previous experience with a character introduced by such a genealogy, the reader may begin to formulate some hypothetical frames about the connection between the new character, Saul, and Yahweh's plans for the Israelite monarchy.

The description of Kish as a gibbor hayil, a "man of means" (Eising 1980:351; McCarter 1980:173), might seem to contradict the suggested function of the genealogy. The reader is, however, not certain about Kish's role in the story and so cannot make any firm conclusions. All he knows is that a new scene has begun and that a relatively unimportant man of means has been introduced.

Verse 2

The explicit introduction of Saul into the story bypasses his birth, a circumstance that has fueled speculation that the birth story of Samuel may
originally have been a birth story about Saul (e.g. Hylander 1932:11-39). The connection between the two stories is, in fact, literally reinforced by v. 2 as well as by the links already seen in v. 1. Placed side by side, the correspondences and differences are evident:

1:1-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Introductory formula</th>
<th>9:1-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(way^hi is ehad)</td>
<td>Introductory formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(way^hi is)</td>
<td>Geographical note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Geographical note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Name: Elqanah

4. Genealogy

5. Introduction of wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Introduction of wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(we^lo s^e^s^e n^a^s^i^m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(we^lo hay^a^a ben)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. (Miraculous birth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Introduction of Samuel

The introduction of Saul contrasts with that of Samuel in passing over the birth story. Saul's career as an instrument of Yahweh, if he is indeed to have one, is not one pre-ordained before birth, but one to which
he is adapted. Samuel and Saul are miraculously enlisted in the divine service, but Saul's career begins only later in life, entailed as it is by the unforeseen demands of the people for a king. The lack of a birth story in the episode describing Saul's rise to kingship is congruent with the immediacy of the demand and the fact that Saul's career as a servant of Yahweh is not one that Yahweh had intended from before his birth. As will become apparent in Saul's subsequent career, the unplanned choice of Saul develops into complications that reveal the danger of forcing Yahweh to make spur of the moment choices (1 Sam 15:11).

An even stronger association between Samuel and Saul comes in the form of Saul's name, which appeared several times in verbal form (šâl) in ch. 1. Though I have argued against the position that Samuel's birth story originally belonged to Saul, the use of the verb šâl in ch. 1 does link Saul with Samuel by association. After reading the miraculous birth story of Samuel and being told several times that Samuel is "asked" (šâl) from God (1:17, 20, 27) or granted to God (1:28), the reader cannot fail to associate "Saul" with the story of Samuel's birth. The question that
remains unanswered at this point is the meaning of the association. Is "Saul" perhaps an answer to Israel's request? Is he another of Yahweh's dedicated servants (cf. 1:28)? The narrator is not telling yet, so the reader can only hypothesize and wait for subsequent expositional clarification from the narrator.

Saul's description as a handsome, tall young man, taller and better looking than any other in Israel, is a further suggestion that Yahweh may have decided to go even further to please the people with his choice for a king. Far from being an inconspicuous, unlikely choice, Saul stands head and shoulders above any other Israelite. Though the reader is far from certain that Saul is indeed the man that Yahweh has chosen to make king, the parallel with the Samuel birth story encourage that hypothesis.

Again the reader is led, by the narrator's description, to wonder whether Yahweh is choosing more according to how Israel would choose—by appearance—rather than according to how the divine should choose, by character (cf. 1 Sam 16:7; Stoebe 1973:193, 201). Whatever the answer to this complication, the questions posed to the reader remain to influence the reading of the narrative. Why might Yahweh choose the
greatest instead of the least? Would such a choice prove felicitous? The reader must wait until he has read 9:16 and then 10:23-24 before he will understand the divine logic in the choice of Saul (cf. Buber 1956: 115). And due to the complete lack of narrative exposition at the beginning of ch. 9, telling him that Saul is Yahweh's future king, the reader must certainly wait until vv. 15-16 before he can confirm or reject any hypotheses (frames) about the connection between chs. 8 and 9.

The introduction to Kish/Saul, and the subsequent tale of the asses is, at first glance, a simple case of retardation for increased suspense. The narrator leaves off the matter of monarchy at a crucial moment and switches to this pastoral scene. "One of the prime means of creating, intensifying, or prolonging suspense consists in the author's temporarily impending ('suspending') the natural progression of the action, especially its onward rush towards some expected climax, by the interposition of more or less extraneous matter" (Sternberg 1978:159). Sternberg's description might have been written to describe the transition from ch. 8 to ch. 9.

On account of the parallel between the
introductions to Samuel and Saul, however, the reader is led to think that there may be some connection, however slim, between past and present descriptions and hence between the matter of the monarchy and the story about Saul. Similar hints as to a connection, which remains implicit, between past and present are dropped to the reader throughout vv. 1-14 of ch. 9. It is these subtle hints that keep the reader's interest alive in the first 14 verses and which also make these verses more than a simple retardation; they indicate that the tale of the lost asses may be an integral part of the ongoing events, as, in fact, turns out to be the case.

Verses 3-4

The accidental loss of some asses that go astray becomes the occasion for a journey by Saul to find them. Familial relations are foregrounded by the redundant descriptions of Kish as "the father of Saul" and Saul as "his son"; these relations were previously established in v. 2. Explanation of this foregrounding is to be found in the contrast between Kish and Saul and previous fathers and sons, Eli, Hophni, and Phinehas; Samuel, Joel, and Abijah. In previous cases, the sons either disregard their father's instructions or fail to follow his exemplary actions in office.
Relations between Saul and his father are different. Kish issues a simple command, "take a servant, and go search for the asses." The command is even softened, according to Smith, by the placement of the word naḥ after the imperative (1899:60). Saul's response is lightning quick; Kish has only just finished speaking when we see Saul crossing over to the Ephraimite hill country (v. 4). Recalling that Israel's previous misfortunes in ch. 4, and the standing request for a king in ch. 8 were predicate to the situation of disobedient or wayward sons, Saul's unquestioning, immediate obedience becomes an important characterization. Disobedient sons have been rejected by God and man; might Saul be an obedient replacement?

The search is described first generally—"he crossed the Ephraimite hill country"—and then in detail in three specific locales (McCarter 1980:174). Although scholars have generally preferred to follow LXX and Vulg. in reading all verbs in the plural, MT does exhibit an ordered pattern of singulars and plurals:

1. General overview: singular, wayyaḵabōr

2. Specific descriptions:
Though it is difficult to derive semantic import from the patterning, it does indicate that MT is not entirely random, and hence, that it need not be regularized.

Regarding the topography and significance of the places visited, Mauchline's conclusion is safe, and apprehends the rhetorical effect of the description. "We can conclude without hesitation that a wide search was made of the hill country between the range of Shechem in the north and well nigh Jerusalem in the south" (1971:94). Despite a thorough search, the asses remain unfound. Could someone have hidden them? The text does not say, but the extent of the search leads the reader to entertain such thoughts.

Verse 5

Saul receives further characterization as a devoted son who is concerned for his father's well-being (cf. Gunn 1980:61). As most commentators have noted, the search has brought Saul to the land of Zuph,
which the reader associates with Samuel on the basis of 1:1. McCarter, for example, says "Providentially (v 16) Saul's wanderings have brought him to Samuel" (1980:175; cf. Buber 1957:124). Saul's presence in the territory associated with Samuel leads the reader to wonder whether there will be a chance meeting between the two, or whether the loss of the ass and the search for them have perhaps been engineered to bring Saul to this locale. Though the narrator refrains from any explicit exposition about these possibilities, he has provided the associations that allow the reader to speculate.

Saul's choice of a location to express his doubts about continuing the search is the second in a concatenation of "chance" occurrences that guide his steps towards anointment. "The way in which the hitherto negative results are transformed into something positive will seem to every reader to be a conclusive proof of the mysterious workings of fate" (Hertzberg 1964:81). As such coincidences continue to mount, the reader's initial inkling that the story of Saul might be another story of divine choice and election, such as Samuel's, is nurtured.

Having read chs. 1-7, in which Yahweh is often at work behind the scenes, the reader has already been
acquainted with the divine modus operandi. The narrator's notable restraint in withholding the explicit identification of Yahweh's hand in all of this earns the dividend of increased reader interest and active participation in the unfolding events at the negligible price of some possible initial uncertainty over the connection between chs. 8 and 9.14

Verse 6

The servant's speech is another invitation to reader speculation. "He said to him, But there is a man of God in this city. He is an honoured man, and everything he says comes true..." This servant certainly seems to know a lot about the man of God, whose identity he, nevertheless, does not reveal. The narrator employs the servant temporarily to divulge this important information at a point when Saul was about to turn back, thus ending the journey and frustrating the reader's own search for the significance of the journey. Though the servant drops some important clues about the identity of the man of God, he is careful to preserve the veil of mystery that the narrator has thrown over the journey so far. The servant's advice to Saul is itself an example of the
narrator's secretiveness; he uses the servant to provide Saul with information that allows for the continuation of the journey, and at the same time, provides the reader with hints about the identity of the unknown man of God.

The servant speaks of an honoured man of God whose predictions always come to pass. The reader will recall that Samuel is the only prior example of someone whose words always come true (3:19-20; cf. Schulz 1919: 131). Although Samuel is called a prophet in ch. 3, unlike v. 6, the reader's suspicions are aroused by the claim of accurate prediction for both individuals.

The problem that historical criticism has found in the contradiction between vv. 6-10, which speak of a "man of God," vv. 11, 18-19, which speak of a "seer," and vv. 14-17, 19, which identify both "man of God" and "seer" as Samuel can be resolved, as Buber noted, by paying close attention to the rhetorical impact of the variations (1956:124-26). Weis describes the rhetorical effect of the initial anonymity of the unknown man of God/seer as follows:

Dass sich die Exposition erst im Laufe der Erzählung entfaltet, erhöht den Reiz ihrer dramatischen Spannung. Demselben Zweck dient auch der Zug, dass der "Gottesmann," an
dessen Identität mit Samuel nicht zu zweifeln ist, in den Augen Sauls und seines Begleiters als Wahrsager erschien, dem man für seine Auskunft eine Vergütung schuldet; dies entspricht einer volkstümlichen Auffassung, die nur das zum Ausdruck bringt, worauf es in diesem Stadium der Erzählung gerade ankommt, die aber die sonst bekannte weit umfassendere Bedeutung Samuels keineswegs ausschliesst (1962:50).

The narrator is able to disguise his deliberate suppression of the identity of the "man of God" by introducing the latter through the mouth of Saul's servant, who need not know Samuel's name. To Saul's servant, the adviser is important for their predicament only as a man of God who can make their way known to them. His lack of concern for the name of the man of God is thus realistically motivated by his focus on the problem at hand. Whether or not the servant knew of Samuel, or should have known of him on account of the latter's prominence is debatable (against e.g. L. Schmidt 1970:71). The servant's only concern is that they seek advice from a human representative of God. The generic appellation of the adviser may,
therefore, be regarded as a usage consistent with the situation in the story. ¹⁶

The generic "man of God" also serves the narrator's purpose by maintaining the suspense and mystery surrounding the journey and its relationship to the matter of the monarchy, which in spite of its absence so far in ch. 9, is prominent in the reader's mind on account of the abrupt end of ch. 8.

The narrator plays on the indefiniteness of the "man of God" to contribute to the sense of marvellous coincidence in the journey; his characters go in search of a man of God and find, instead, a Samuel (Hylander 1932:243, citing G. Holscher). That the servant should expect simply a man of God in the city, yet encounter a Samuel there, can be explained as a further attempt to illustrate the divine engineering agreed by all to play a dominant role in 9:1-10:16 (e.g. Gressmann 1921:34; McCarter 1980:184-85).

As first noted by Buber, the young man's speech also introduces an element of irony to the quest (1956: 126, 142; cf. McCarter 1980:176). The young man says "Let us go! Perhaps he will advise (yaggid) us about the journey we have undertaken" (McCarter's translation).
The suggestion that the man of God will "declare" (yaggid) introduces a number of repetitions of words based on the same root as nāgid (vv. 6, 8, 16, 18, 19; 10:1), an office to which Saul is being divinely directed. To the reflective reader of ch. 9, the young man's innocent description of the forthcoming "advice" is a remarkable verbal irony based upon a repeated Leitwort (cf. Buber 1956:126). The young man says that the man of God will "declare" (yaggid) their way and the result is that Samuel anoints Saul as nāgid.\(^17\)

The narrator supplements the irony based on the Leitwort with the young man's description of what it is that the man of God will do for them. In view of the fact that they are out searching for the lost asses, it is rather surprising that the man of God is expected to tell them of "the path that we have taken" instead of the whereabouts of the asses.\(^18\) Surely they knew the path they had taken as well as anyone else. Viewed in the context of what the man of God actually does, however, the significance of the strange suggestion is clear, and another instance of irony in the naive young man's utterance. Samuel does, in fact, tell Saul about the immediate cause of their journey (v. 20), and also, by way of his subsequent actions, about the
ultimate reason for their taking a path that led them
to him and Saul to the office of nāgād (9:19-10:1).
The reflective reader will see the narrator's irony
behind the young man's words; the latter expects some
sort of solution to his immediate difficulties, while
the narrator hints at a somewhat different significance
for the path that the servant and Saul have taken. 19

Verses 7-8

Saul points out a complication for the servant's
proposal—they do not have the means to pay the man of
God for his advice. The mysterious appearance of the
quarter shekel in the young man's hand seems to be
another of the narrator's subtle hints that events
are being guided from behind the scenes. The unusual
expression nimṣā bēyādā, "there is found in my hand," rather than the more common yēš 11, "I have," is con-
spicuous, and emphasizes that the money comes from a
source other than Saul or the servant (McCarter 1980:
176). The sudden materialization of the shekel in the
young man's hand creates a gap in the narrative by
leaving the natural question, "Where did it come from?"
unanswered. The reader will, of course, formulate
some of his own answers, but he will also hope to
find some authoritative answer later in the narrative.

Verse 7 offers the reader a further hint about the identity of the man of God by juxtaposing the words נָבִּי and יִשָּׂ and then underlining the juxtaposition by repeating it in a modified form, לֶהָבִּי לֶיִשׂ הַלֹּפִים (Buber 1956:126). The verb נָבִּי, "we bring," is a homonym of the noun נָבִּי, "prophet." Though the syntax prevents any ambiguity about the meaning of נָבִּי, the similarity of the roles of "man of God" and prophet is enough to bring the juxtaposition to the attention of a careful reader such as Buber. Though no explicit equation is made in Saul's unconscious juxtaposition, the man of God is related to prophecy, as he was in v. 6.

These subtle intimations about the identity of the anonymous man of God function as goads, prodding the reader on in hope of an authoritative identification of the man of God that will fill in the gap (indeterminacy) created by his anonymity (cf. Sternberg 1978:311 n.31). It should be recalled that this gap is created first to show that neither Saul nor the servant knows who the man is, and second to add to the aura of mysterious purpose that envelopes the entire search for the asses.
The curiosity excited by this gap, which, along with the glimmerings of a mysterious purpose shaping the search, capture the reader's attention. Were it not for such literary techniques, the seeming lack of connection between the issue of monarchy, unresolved in ch. 8, and the matter of lost livestock might serve as a distraction to the reader, and perhaps lead him to believe that he was reading two separate and unrelated stories.  

The disjunctive effect of the "in medias res" beginning of ch. 9 is ameliorated by the mystery of the search and the smaller gaps of the identity of the man of God and the question of where the coin came from in v. 8. 

In fact, however, the reader's attention is not drawn immediately to this single large gap as a whole but rather to a series or system of smaller, successively opened gaps subsumed by it....For as soon as the initially propelled situation and the characters figuring in it have caught his attention, the reader becomes aware—and this awareness can easily be heightened by a suitable manipulation of gaps—that he will not understand them fully or at all as long
as he lacks certain information about the
period preceding the beginning of the sujet.
...the very sketchiness of the information
thus unfolded renders these gaps even more
prominent and proportionately stimulates his
curiosity even further (Sternberg 1978:53-54).

Verse 9

As scholars have noted, v. 9 is a gloss, a
narratorial intrusion into the ongoing tale. It is
addressed directly to the reader, and though often
transposed to a position between vv. 10 and 11 (e.g.
McCarter 1980:165), or between vv. 11 and 12 (e.g.
Smith 1899:61), it is also appropriate in its present
location (cf. Hylander 1932:139-40; Seebass 1967:158
n.16).

Before he explains the history of the words
"seer," and "prophet," the narrator characterizes the
proposed visit to the man of God as an "enquiry of
God" (דֵּרָשָׁה) (Stoebe 1973:195, 203). The narrator thus
indicates that the conversation about going to the
man of God for information has shiften the focus of
the journey; it began with Saul seeking (בָּאָשֵׁנָה) the
asses, but now it has come to seeking (לִידְּרָשָׁה) God.
The synonymous verbs, ḥqṣ and ḍrṣ, are narratorial confirmations to the reader that he is on the right track when he perceives more than a simple search for livestock in the trek.

Yet the narrator does not offer this authoritative description to his reader without camouflaging it with another meaning, and so preserving the ambiguity of the search. He does this with the explanation in v. 9b. As Stoebe notes, v. 9b shifts the reader's attention away from the nature of Saul's quest (1973: 203). He suggests that it is a further (and presumably later) expansion of the gloss in v. 9a. Recalling, however, that there have been prior allusions to the relationship between prophets and men of God (vv. 6-7), a further similar allusion, albeit between seers and prophets, might not be totally out of context.

One should note that 9b opens with the words ลำkâ wēnēlēkâ, which hark back to the servant's words, yāḇō̕ ...nēlēkâ (v. 6), and Saul's nēlēk (v. 7), and look forward to Saul's ลำkâ nēlēkâ (v. 10). Each occurrence have as its end an audience with the man of God. The narrator thus equates the actual visit to the man of God with a hypothetical visit to the seer, as do Saul and the servant in v. 11. Seer and man of
God are synonymous in this narrative.

The narrator goes on to tell his reader that the seer is the same as a prophet, that is, the two words describe the same office. Again the narrator is offering the reader hints about this man of God. The difference expected in an explicit authorial comment such as v. 9, is that the equation is clear and specific; man of God = seer = prophet (cf. Buber 1956:125-26). As in v. 9a, the narrator partially conceals his explicit clues in the guise of an antiquarian linguistic comment. The hidden message of v. 9, which is meant to be discovered, is that Saul is really seeking God and really going to a prophet.

The insertion of a comment of this nature offers some positive reinforcement to the assiduous reader who has struggled through the abrupt beginning in medias res of ch. 9, and the gaps along the way. The comment encourages the reader to continue to wonder about the ultimate meaning and goal of the journey by confirming that there is a hidden significance to the journey. Having momentarily drawn back the veil, however, the narrator quickly replaces it and covers the partial revelation with the antiquarian tone of v. 9. The brief respite over, the reader is plunged
back into the ongoing flow of events.

Verse 10

Saul voices his agreement to the servant's plan. The narrator then tells his reader that Saul and the young man went off to the city where the man of God was. The narrator's use of the descriptive term "man of God" (previously used only by Saul and the young man) immediately following his equation of Saul's visit with a visit to a seer/prophet reveals that he uses the terms as synonyms, interchanging them as he sees fit.

Verse 11

The situation of a young man meeting a young woman, or a group of women at a well is a "type-scene" frequent in the Genesis narratives (cf. Exod 2:15ff.; John 4; Culley 1976:41-43; Alter 1981:51-62). Alter characterizes a "type-scene" as "The recurrence of the same event—the sameness being definable as a fixed sequence of narrative motifs which, however, may be presented in a variety of ways and sometime with ingenious variations—" (1981:181). Verse 11 alludes to that type-scene and the complex of associations and expectations included with it in order to add further information about the nature of
Saul's approaching encounter with the seer. Press reaches a similar conclusion from a historical perspective: "Fragen wir nach dem historischen Tatbestande, den 9 lff. voraussetzt, so wird es nicht zufällig sein, dass die beiden Märchen motive der Eselinnensuche und der Mädchen am Brunnen vor dem Tore im Gesamtaufbau der Erzählung nur dazu dienen, die Begegnung Samuels und Sauls in Rama hervorzubeheben" (1938:201).

The betrothal type-scene, as summarized by Alter (1981:52) is as follows:

1. The future bridegroom (or surrogate) journeys to a foreign land.

2. He encounters a girl, usually described as a naṣara, at a well.

3. Someone, either the man or the girl, draws water from the well.

4. The girl or girls rush home to bring the news of the stranger's arrival (the verbs "hurry" and "run" are emphasized here).

5. A betrothal is concluded between the stranger and the girl, usually after he has been invited to a meal.
When Saul's encounter with the ladies is compared, noticeable differences appear:

1. Saul journeys to a foreign land in search of the lost asses.
2. He encounters the הָרֹת coming out to draw water.
3. No one draws water.
4. The girls tell Saul to hurry (מָהֶר) to the city if he wants to find the seer.
5. Saul meets Samuel, he is invited to dine at the head of the table, and he is anointed נָגִיד over Israel.

The reader who is familiar with the convention forms certain expectations about what will happen as soon as he is cued to it by the first two items of the list contained in vv. 1-11. The modification of the typical consummation by replacing the union of male and female with the events leading to Saul's anointment, his entrance into theocratic service, is another means the narrator uses to show that Saul's journey is no ordinary journey. Though the reader does not yet know that Saul will be anointed in v. 12, the deviations from the conventional type-scene are
sufficient notice that something unusual is happening. The importance of Saul's appointment with the seer does not allow him to dally with the maidens, who speedily send him off to meet his destiny.

The question put by Saul and his servant to these woman, while plausible in itself, affords the narrator the opportunity to place some well-chosen words in the mouths of the young ladies. As Richter notes, "Als Antwort [auf die Frage von v. 11b] genügte eine Erläuterung, wo und wie er zu finden ist" (1970: 23). The rather lengthy response is more in the way of a narratorial comment to the reader than a pertinent response of the maidens to Saul and servant. The narrator preserves his unintrusive mode of narrating the journey by getting characters to supply the reader with important information.

Verse 12

Saul's arrival could not have been better timed by the narrator; as the maidens tell Saul, the seer has arrived "just ahead" (םפניאקא) of him, another in the chain of fortunate coincidences. The repeated temporal explanation of the seer's presence (כי 하יוּם...כי זבהּת 하יוּם) emphasizes the uniqueness of the occasion. The article with יָם is
demonstrative—"Today" (cf. R.J. Williams 1976:19 #87; GKC #126ab). Like Saul and his servant, the seer has only come to the city for a special reason: they, to receive his explanation of their journey, and he, because there is a sacrifice for the people on the high place.

The sacrifice is specifically described as "to" or "for the people" (lā'ām). The last time the people were seen they had been sent home after requesting a king. Now they reappear as the beneficiaries of a sacrifice. Is there any connection? Have the people forgotten their demand? Has the demand been filled in the meantime? Do these people even know about the request? These and other questions are created by the reappearance of "the people," who so far are the only characters explicitly common to both chs. 8 and 9. The fact that the sacrifice is "for the people" also introduces a commonality between the two chapters in which the people are benefited or potentially benefited by the actions of a prophet or seer.

Verse 13

The seeming superfluity of the continued response is not simple revelry in detail (so Stoebe
1973:203). Rather it supplies the reader with additional important information about this sacrifice for the people. The seer plays a central role in the sacrifice and the people will not eat of it until this seer comes and blesses it. As Wildberger notes, however, sacrificial duties are not the usual province of a seer, or even a prophet (1957:462). This seer seems to have a wider range of duties and authority than that of any ordinary seer. Again the reader is given additional information about the seer, yet the information, as before, serves only to increase the awareness of the anonymity of the seer and of the gap created by his anonymity.

After the seer blesses the sacrifice, it is "the invited" (haqq ērušām) and not simply the people that eat.27 This description of the eaters seems to imply that they have been summoned especially for this occasion (Buber 1964:740). Like all of the other hints dropped by the narrator, however, the ērušām contribute more to the reader's sense of mystery and the mounting tension of the narrative than to any new illumination.28 The reader sees the mysterious confluence of Saul and servant, the seer, and the invited eaters all converging on the city and then
the sacrifice; yet he has no certainty about the occasion or meaning of the meeting.

We recall Sternberg's observation that such expository information is usually intentionally sketchy, serving to spark the reader's curiosity and force him onward (1978:53-54, quoted above on vv. 7-8). The fact that there is a noticeable increase in such hints (exposition) towards the latter part of the tale is an indication that the narrator is aware of the danger of losing his reader's interest, and so includes proportionately more of these goads to curiosity.

The final sentence of v. 13 places emphasis on two things: first, on the necessity for Saul and the young man to get going right away, and second on the fact that they will find him, (the seer). The emphasis on timely departure and meeting is conveyed by the words מָכָּעַטְתָּ and קֶחֶיָּיָּוֶם, and on the anonymous person they are to meet by the repeated דּוֹתָּ. The impression is one of a unique opportunity that can be lost if Saul and the young man are late.

Verse 14

The most important contribution of v. 14 is, of course, the narrator's identification of Samuel as the mysterious man of God/seer. To the historical
critic, Samuel's presence in v. 14 represents an indis-putable key to the separation and analysis of the com-
ponents and prehistory of 9:1-10:16. For the close reading of the story it is an important break in the shroud that covers almost every aspect of the search for the lost asses. The reader who had correct suspi-
cions as to the identity of the anonymous holy man is rewar ded and encouraged to continue thinking and hypo-
thesizing about the narrative. Attention is now shifted completely to the significance of the journey and the encounter between Saul and Samuel, both of which remain as gaps in the reader's understanding. The meeting with Samuel momentarily becomes another of those expository elements that gives a little information while demand-
ing larger and larger amounts of attention and curiosity as payment from the reader (cf. Sternberg 1978:86-
89).

Samuel last appeared in 8:22, where he sent the people home instead of installing a king over them as Yahweh had commanded. The problem of the monarchy was left in suspension at that point, in order to tell the story of Saul's search for the lost asses. The revela-
tion that it is Samuel to whom Saul has come for enlightenment about his journey is certainly intriguing
to the reader, especially in view of the previous secrecy about the seer's identity. Without further information, however, the reader is reduced to speculation about the meaning of journey and meeting, and must wait upon the narrator for any real understanding.

Verses 15-16

Finally the narrator reveals the information that will make sense of the journey and of the meeting. Allowing his reader to listen in on Yahweh's private revelation to Samuel, the omniscient narrator finally confirms any suspicion the reader might have entertained that events on the human plane were somehow being moulded by divine intervention and guidance. All the coincidences, and intimations of the narrative about the journey are confirmed by Yahweh's explication to Samuel.

The sense of mystery and the many uncertainties that prodded the reader on to this moment of revelation were not, however, purely means of stimulating the reader's interest and attention. Such responses were aroused by narrating the journey from the viewpoint of a detached human observer who has no knowledge of any larger purpose of meaning in these events (cf. N. Friedman 1955:1174-75 on "witnessing" and point of
view). The aura of mystery functions both outside the story as a literary technique to spark attention and interest, and inside the story as a pervasive description of the atmosphere surrounding the journey. None of the characters is allowed to see any hidden purpose or significance in the journey and meeting. There is no intentional human complicity in the engineering of this concatenation of events. God, alone, has brought these events about. 50

The great revelation to the reader opens significantly with the words "Yahweh revealed." The keynote for both reader and Samuel, the story's recipient, is revelation. Yahweh returns to the stage giving his first communication to Samuel since he told the latter to make a king. Samuel had refused that task and the reader was led to expect a divine response. Yahweh proceeds to explain what he has been doing, how he has begun his response, and what that response actually entails.

The strayed asses were simply the means that Yahweh had chosen to send (שָׁלַח, v. 16) Saul to Samuel. The predictive aspect of the revelation in v. 15 is an important characterization of the entire journey as divinely engineered. Yahweh is able to
predict the future course of Saul's journey because he has directed it all along.

Yahweh's revelation is indeed a response to Samuel's failure to make a king in 8:22. As noted above on 8:9, 22, Samuel misunderstood Yahweh's command to make a king. Though Yahweh had implied that he would maintain theocratic control of Israel and its monarchy (8:9, 22), Samuel had not apprehended that implication of Yahweh's command, and so had not made a king. Instead of choosing a man and installing him as king, Samuel had sent all the people home. In immediate response, as we now see, Yahweh took Saul from his home and brought him directly to Samuel. Saul's journey from home to Samuel is the divine summons that reverses the effect of Samuel's dismissal of the people. Having directed Saul's steps to Samuel's doorstep, as it were, Yahweh now gives a detailed explanation of the role that this future monarch will play.

Yahweh tells Samuel that he is to anoint Saul as nāgid. The act of anointment itself indicates that Samuel is in a position of authority. The fact that Samuel is commissioned by Yahweh to invest Saul with the commission of nāgid reveals the lines of
authority. The theocratic structure remains, as ever, God over mediator over Israel, or in this case, over Saul the nāgīd. Yahweh's command for Samuel to anoint Saul is a specification of the manner in which Samuel was to "make a king" (cf. 8:21). Yahweh's explanation reveals, or should reveal, to Samuel that the theocratic structure will remain in place. If Samuel proceeds to carry out Yahweh's commands it will indicate that he refused to do so previously on account of his misunderstanding Yahweh's original intention.

The subjugation of the "king" to the theocracy is also indicated by the name of the office for which Saul is anointed. The etymological derivation of nāgīd is uncertain (Fritz 1976:351-52; Mettinger 1976:158-59; Ishida "nāgīd...," 1977:35 n.8). Ishida suggests in his article that the term was originally the title of a person designated, either by Yahweh or a reigning monarch, to be ruler (1977:45). Mettinger narrows the meaning of nāgīd as it occurs in 1 Sam 9 even more. He sees the latter occurrence as the product of prophetic circles in Israel (the northern kingdom) (cf. Mayes 1978:14).

[They] introduced the idea that YHWH, the Supreme King, could take one of His own
people and designate him nāgād. It is tempting to see in the choice of this terminology for divine designation a tacit criticism of the secular institution of a human king designating his successor: God Himself and no one else was to decide who was to sit on the throne (1976:168; cf. Richter 1965:77-78; Fritz 1976:352).

Both Mettinger and Ishida agree that the term describes a person who is designated to perform a task, usually of leadership (Mettinger 1976:182; Ishida "nāgād...", 1977:48; cf. McCarter 1980:178-79).

When Yahweh prescribes an anointing as nāgād for Saul, the combined meaning of the words ṣāḥātā lēnāgād is clearly and uncompromisingly theocratic. The man is chosen as the official "designate" of Yahweh, to be invested in office by Samuel, the theocratic mediator (cf. Kegler 1977:74). Yahweh has now clearly delineated what he left implicit in his previous instructions for inaugurating the monarchy. Samuel's refusal to make a king provides the occasion for Yahweh's entrance and an unambiguous statement on what kind of king (mispāt hammelek, 8:9) he will stipulate (whiggadā, 8:9). Samuel's misinterpretation of
Yahweh's words in 8:9, detailed in 8:11-18, is now corrected by Yahweh. Yahweh had said "Designate (wēhiggadā) the kind of king" (8:9), and now he has brought the man to be anointed as designate (nāgīd). Saul's rise to the office of "king" is, therefore, Yahweh's doing from beginning to end.

The people had demanded that a king be established over them (Cālēnu, 8:19) so that they, the people of Yahweh, could be "like all the nations." The phrase "like all the nations" was Israel's declaration of independence. In response, Yahweh now issues his theocratic declaration: "Anoint a designate over (Cāl) my people Israel (Cāl-ammā yisra'ēl)." A clear denial of the people's declaration resounds in Yahweh's command. The one who will be over (Cāl) Israel is Yahweh's designate; the reason—Israel is Yahweh's people. Buber's description of Yahweh's counter-declaration is accurate:

In dem Befehl an Samuel spricht sich also JHWHs eigentliche Antwort auf das Volksbegehren, die Verwandlung des Gewährten entscheidend aus. Für den Erzähler bedeutet dieser Vorgang die von Gott befohlene Ablösung der unmittelbaren
primitiven Theokratie durch die mittelbare
(1956:128, Buber's emphasis).

Yahweh's description of the task for which Saul
is anointed places the new designate well within pre-
viously established theocratic bounds. "He will deliver
my people from the hand of the Philistines." Albright,
among others, sees the description as a statement that
Saul was anointed only as a military leader of the tri-
bal confederation (1969:163; cf. Robertson 1944:183;
Langlamet 1970:191-92). Yahweh's statement is in
pointed opposition to the people's idea that their new
monarch would make them "like the nations." The "king"
as designate, will instead widen and maintain the gap
between Yahweh's people and the nations such as the
Philistines.

The reader familiar with the exodus narrative
in the book of Exodus easily recognizes that Yahweh is
quoting himself in v. 16. The fact that he spoke
almost identical words to Moses when he was preparing
to bring Israel out of Egypt (cf. Exod 3:7-9) indicates
that Yahweh views the present situation as similar to
that of the exodus. 34 Not only does Yahweh see the
situations as parallel, but he makes their outcomes
parallel. Saul is to be a new Moses, delivering Israel
from the Philistines as Moses delivered them from the Egyptians (cf. Exod 3:10). 35

Smith correctly observes that Yahweh's suggestion that there is a Philistine threat stands in direct contradiction to 7:11-14 (1899:62). Buber uses the contradiction as a basis for labelling the end of 7:9 as a gloss along with the description of victory in 7:11-14 (1956:114-20). He suggests that only with the revelation of 9:15-16 does Yahweh answer Samuel's cries of 7:9 (Buber 1956:128).

An alternative, which obviates recourse to textual excision or division into separate sources, arises when one notes that it is Yahweh who seems to contradict the events of 7:10-14. Either he has forgotten—unlikely—or his statement is more complex than it first seems. Pursuing the latter possibility, one recalls that v. 16 is a response to the request for a king by way of defining what that king will be. The request in turn was provoked by the reappearance of a situation (cf. 8:1-4) that threatened to provoke another catastrophe such as ch. 4. The people feared bad judges (theocratic mediators) because Yahweh had previously allowed the Philistines to defeat Israel in order to punish errant priests (also theocratic
mediators). Thus their request for a king could be "interpreted" by Yahweh, whose judgement is obviously prejudiced by personal involvement, as an expression of their fear of a recurring Philistine disaster. Yahweh leaves out any mention of his own part in the disaster both because he has no one to answer to and because he is concerned to place the request in a new light. He ignores the request's implication that he has misgoverned as he "forgets" his own role in the disaster. Yahweh reshapes the request into a plea for divine aid within the theocratic structure. All anticovenantal emphasis simply disappears beneath Yahweh's forceful reassertion of national covenantal ideology.

Yahweh's response to the request characterizes him as a powerful and somewhat unsympathetic God. The nearest he comes to an admission of guilt is his installation of Saul as nāgîḏ. The fact that he gives in even half-way to the request indicates that its justice requires Yahweh to recognize it. Far from expressing the noble sentiment that it did in Exodus, however, Yahweh's self-quotation becomes the sarcastic response of an unmoving, all-powerful God who will not admit his mistakes.36 As Eli said, "he is Yahweh and does as he pleases" (3:18).
Israel requested a melek and political independence; Yahweh responds with a nāgīd and an emphatic "my people" (3 times in v. 16). Yahweh's reliance on the exodus and its significance to respond to Israel's request for a king reminds the reader of his prior reenactment of the exodus in chs. 5-6. In both instances, Yahweh resorts to the exodus typology because his status as a mighty divine warrior and Israel's king has been called in question. Israel's defeat in ch. 4 seemed to suggest to the Philistines that they and perhaps their god Dagon had defeated Yahweh, the fearsome god of the exodus (cf. 4:8; 5:1-2). Similarly, Israel's request for a king was justified with the statement that a king would go out before Israel to fight Israel's battles (8:20). Since the request was made in view of Israel's past defeat in ch. 4, the clear implication of 8:20 was that Yahweh, who was covenantally committed to Israel's defence, had failed to live up to his commitment and so forfeited his kingship over Israel.

Both times Yahweh responds by "replaying" some aspect of his actions in the exodus. Apparently Yahweh regards the exodus events as fundamentally establishing his sovereignty over Israel and as clear
signals to the nations that he is the mightiest divine warrior. In response to the Philistines' apparent victory, he reenacts the exodus using the ark as his new Israel. The result is that his reputation is cleared. Similarly, when Israel itself questions his right to rule them, Yahweh calls out a new Moses to lead them to safety. He uses the exodus events to overrule any objection that Israel might have to his rule, and simply reasserts the covenantal dogma: they are his people and he is their divine king.

The parallels that the narrator has drawn between these exodus allusions are part of the broad parallelism that he has constructed between chs. 1-7 and chs. 8-12. If the reader remembers what Yahweh's prior exodus recollection did for Israel—nothing—the implications for Israel's requested monarchy are not good. The only one likely to benefit from Yahweh's new Moses is Yahweh himself.

Samuel, alone amongst the human characters, is given to know the specifics of Yahweh's response. No one else is allowed to know the true nature of the monarchy and the divine response until after the new arrangement is ratified and made law (10:25). By giving the reader access to the details of Yahweh's
plans for the monarchy the narrative offers another explanation for the sense of mystery surrounding Saul's journey, and for the secrecy attendant on his subsequent anointing. If anyone else were to know the true nature of the new monarchy, it would be immediately rejected. The entire affair is, therefore, concealed from start to finish. Even Saul and his servant have no idea about the true nature of their quest. The air of conspiracy that Wildberger detected in ch. 9 is there, but it is a conspiracy perpetrated by Yahweh and Samuel, rather than Samuel and the elders (Wildberger 1957:454). The reader's access to the revelation functions, therefore, as an important interpretive guideline for the remainder of the narrative. With it the reader will be able to penetrate the appearances staged by Yahweh and Samuel, and so understand the realities of their inauguration of the Israelite monarchy. Having attuned the reader to the realities of the divine plan, the narrator will proceed to present an ironic picture of Israel as it welcomes Saul, the people's "king" who is really Yahweh's designate.

Verse 17
The narrator now resumes his description of
the flow of events that is carrying Saul towards kingship. He left off his narration with a view of Samuel from Saul's perspective. The revelation to Samuel is bracketed with the temporal description that it came the day before (v. 15). The return to the time frame of Saul's arrival is indicated in v. 17 by a description of Samuel seeing Saul.

The sequence of perfect verbs suggests the simultaneity of the actions in v. 17. As soon as Samuel saw Saul, Yahweh answered, "Behold the man..." (McCarten 1980:179; GKC #164b.)

The verb yaכ sor in the last sentence of v. 17 has not yet been successfully shown to mean "will rule," despite many citations of cognates in other languages and post-biblical Hebrew (cf. Smith 1899:64, and examples in Stoebe 1973:196).

McCarten, noting that כָּשַׁר usually means "restrain, hinder, retain, shut in" suggests that Yahweh is referring to Saul's activities in mustering Israel's forces, hence "to retain" (1980:179). "This one shall muster my people!" (McCarten 1980:165). There is, however, quite a difference in meaning between "restrain" and "muster".

An alternative reading for which the normal
sense of Căsar is eminently suited, appears when Yahweh's sarcasm is appreciated. Yahweh does not himself see any need for a king to defend Israel. Instead, he is installing a năgid precisely because he wants to restrain Israel from its admitted goal of becoming "like all the nations." In v. 16, Yahweh tells Samuel that he intends to maintain the theocracy and the covenant by installing a năgid, which in this context might be translated "puppet king." In v. 17, then, one should translate Căsar as usual: "Behold the man of whom I spoke to you. This one ought to stop my people." Yahweh's explicit statement about the purpose of the new năgid continues his sarcastic comments about his "capitulation" to the people's request for a king, but only when Căsar is kept to its normal meaning. Certainly Samuel, who was not willing to give in to the people, would appreciate Yahweh's vitriolic comments about the designate's function.

Verse 18

When Saul comes asking Samuel where the nameless seer is, he reveals his innocence of any complicity in the plan revealed by Yahweh. He does not even know who Samuel is.
As Buber observes, Saul's question "Can you tell me...?" (haggıda) is another instance of the narrator's subtle structural ironies by way of word-play (1956:126, 141-42). Saul still seeks the seer whom he hopes will explain (yaggid, cf. vv. 6, 8) their course. It is his quest for explanation that brings him to ask (haggıda) Samuel the seer's whereabouts. The irony is that his quest is really a summons to become nāgid (cf. McCarter 1980:179).

Verse 19

If there was any doubt left in the reader's mind that Samuel was the seer, it is now dispelled by Samuel's answer, "I am the seer." Saul seems neither to recognize Samuel nor to know of his role in Israelite politics. As a result, Saul appears as the simple, naive country boy from Benjamin, out of touch with the national concerns. In view of Yahweh's subterfuge, he could not have chosen a better subject for his designate. Under Yahweh's and Samuel's guidance, Saul will be transformed from a tabula rasa to Yahweh's anointed designate.

Samuel can also engage in the verbal irony of which the narrator is so fond; "I'll send you off in the morning and explain (aggid) everything on your
mind." One can almost visualize Yahweh and Samuel winking at one another.39

Verse 20

Samuel proves himself as seer by telling Saul that the lost asses have been found even before Saul makes any mention of them. That Samuel should tell Saul about the asses and then still have him up to eat and to stay overnight, indicates that more important issues than lost asses are at hand (cf. Hertzberg 1964:83).

Samuel's veiled explanation of why Saul should not worry about the asses "is obscure to Saul as it is clear to the audience" (McCarter 1980:179). The word hemdat, usually translated as "desirable" (objects) or "riches," also contains an ambiguity that reveals Samuel's continuing disgust at Israel's request for a king. According to Wallis hmd can be negative, neutral, or positive (1980:455-56). On the face of it Samuel appears to say that Saul need no longer worry about such silly things as asses when all the riches of Israel are at his disposal. But this windfall is only available because Israel requested a king, a request that Samuel regarded with open disfavour (ch. 8). Wallis notes that hmd can be negative when the
desire is viewed in conjunction with a disreputable act (1980:455). Samuel's comment may play on the ambiguity of hmd to voice another criticism of Israel's "base desire" for a king. Good also observes this ambiguity in Samuel's rhetorical question and suggests that, on the basis of ch. 8, "Israel's desire (chemdāh) amounts to a rejection of Yahweh" (1965:62). Samuel leaves no doubt in the reader's mind about his stance on the monarchy. Even though he knows that Saul will only be another theocratic official, Samuel still resents the request.

Verse 21

The narrator continues to develop his characterization of Saul as a simple, modest, country boy. Saul protests that his background does not warrant such lofty promises as Samuel has given. The reader knows why Samuel has spoken as he has and, by Saul's reaction, he is assured that Saul has not the slightest inkling about contemporary political issues. Anyone who knew about the request and the transactions of ch. 8, in which Samuel played an important part, would easily understand Samuel's meaning. He should also, as scholars have frequently noted, recognize
Samuel, an important figure in the political transactions. Since Saul gives no evidence of any such knowledge, the reader sees him entering into his anointed office with complete and unsuspecting innocence.

The point is stressed because Saul's simplicity plays an important role in the scheme that Yahweh and Samuel use to gain legal acceptance of their puppet king. Saul is Yahweh and Samuel's dupe; the success of their operation depends on their total control of him. As soon as Saul shows signs of going his own way (ch. 15) he is rejected as unfit for office:

For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king (1 Sam 15:23 KJV).

Verse 22

Observing Saul's puzzlement and consequent hesitation, Samuel personally leads Saul and his servant to the banquet hall. Saul is a good catch that must not be allowed to escape. Samuel continues to honour Saul in a way that is mysterious to the characters but transparent to the reader.
The narrator's bestowal of this privileged perspective on the reader gives him a clear view of the theocratic conspiracy. Samuel and Yahweh are revealed in all their manipulative nakedness. The reader's appreciation of his privileged access is heightened by the fact that the narrator denied it to him in the first suspenseful half of ch. 9. Nor does the sudden lifting of the previously annoying veil leave the reader with an unbiased appreciation of Yahweh and Samuel's machinations. Having himself been subject to the mystifications thrown round Saul's journey to kingship, the reader's sympathies have been educated so as to lie with the unsuspecting Israelites (cf. above on 6:19-20).

As will be seen, however, the narrator's goals are far more complex than the simple alliance of the reader with Israel. Only in ch. 12, where Yahweh and Samuel face Israel openly with their subterfuge, does the narrator present his reader with a conclusive position in which the whole issue of theocracy and monarchy is resolved. Whether it is a satisfactory resolution remains to be seen.

The fact that Samuel honours Saul at a public banquet indicates that Yahweh's scheme is now put into
action. The people at the banquet are themselves being prepared for a reception of what they think is their new king. Nothing is mentioned about any nāgîd or king, however, indicating that the banquet is used as a preparatory step: Saul is made to feel that Samuel and the invited guests are united in purpose, and the guests are given the impression that Samuel has honoured Saul in accordance with a preconceived plan. What the plan and purpose are is, however, left in ambiguity for the guests and Saul. Samuel, like a good narrator, leaves his audience to fill in the indeterminacy with their own speculations. His purpose at this time is best achieved by allowing all participants to close the ambiguous gaps with their own expectations.

Verses 23-24

Samuel's instructions to the "butcher" (lattabāh) make it seem as though he had prepared for Saul's presence. Richter observes that any preparation for this moment is in direct contradiction to v. 12 (1970:24). The contradiction may be resolved by v. 15, however, which takes place before v. 12 in narrative time (the day before). Samuel was prepared for Saul's coming and apparently pre-arranged with the butcher to have a special portion set aside.
for the man that Yahweh was sending.

The text of v. 24 is corrupt and, as the most recent textual treatment has suggested, has not yet been explained (McCarter 1980:170-71; cf. Driver 1913: 75-77). It is comprehensible, excluding the obscure word הֶ֫כֶּלֶם, up until the word לֶ֫כֶסְּמָה, however, and describes the butcher bringing out the thigh which had been set aside for Saul's consumption. 44

In the butcher's address to Saul the latter is again given to understand that his arrival and presence have been anticipated. Saul is made to feel that his destiny has been guided and prearranged, leading him to this meeting. Obviously such psychological manipulation is of great utility to Samuel who uses the meal especially to convince Saul of his destiny (against Hertzberg 1964:84). The butcher, whose own understanding of the situation is left undetermined, is a tool in Samuel's hands. With the butcher, Samuel shapes Saul's perception of his path to this meeting.

The shock of experiencing such prearrangement of one's life takes obvious effect on Saul. No longer questioning the incredible behaviour of others towards him, Saul's response to the butcher's speech is simple and passive—he eats what is set before him. The
narrator's description of Saul's response reveals that Samuel's staged sacrifice has achieved its goal. "And Saul ate with Samuel on that day." Saul has become Samuel's accomplice; he simply complies with the situation and its requirements. The conspiratorial sacrifice has transformed Saul into Samuel's compliant eater, who, for a time, swallows everything that Samuel feeds him.

Verses 25-26

Most scholars since Thenius have preferred the reading of LXX in vv. 25-26. Driver notes that the sequence of verbs in MT is so badly incongruous compared to LXX's natural and suitable sequence that there can be little doubt that LXX is the "true reading" (1913:77; cf. Thenius 1864:38, who comments on LXX, "So Alles in schönster Ordnung"). Stoebe (1973), nevertheless, follows MT, which is comprehensible even if incongruous. Since both the readings of LXX and MT accomplish more or less the same function—to get Samuel and Saul to bed and back up again in the morning—I shall "harden my heart" with Keil (so Smith 1899:66) and follow MT in accordance with my interpretational principle of reading with the primary text whenever possible.

The topic of Samuel's discourse on the
roof-top is not disclosed by the narrator. Instead, he focuses on the simple fact that Samuel and Saul converse, indicating thereby that they become more closely acquainted. Since it is Samuel's goal to make an obedient theocratic servant out of Saul, the detail is not without significance.

According to Keil and Delitzsch, the temporal description "it was sunrise" following the verb "they rose" (wayyaškimū) is simply a more precise definition of the verb (1880:94 n.1). The night's activity—sleeping—and the preparations for it, all described by LXX, are passed over and left indeterminate by MT. In defence of MT, Keil and Delitzsch offer the pertinent comment that both bed making and sleeping were "matters of course, and there was consequently no necessity to mention them; whereas Samuel's talking with Saul upon the roof was a matter of importance in relation to the whole affair, and one which would not be passed over in silence" (1880:94 n.1).

The final three sentences of v. 26 are important for the light they cast on the relationship between Samuel and Saul. First the reader sees Samuel issuing a command: "Get up and I'll send you off." The immediacy of Saul's response is visually conveyed
by making the very next word a description of Saul's response—"Get up (q̱umâ) and I'll send you off," and he (Saul) got up" (wayyâcom). One recalls that Saul demonstrated such obedience previously in response to his father's command to go and find the asses (vv. 3-4). Yahweh's choice of an obedient young man is already paying dividends. The order of dominance has been unquestionably established. Samuel commands and Saul obeys.

The relationship is not entirely stratified, however, as we see from the final sentence of v. 26. "And the two, he and Samuel, went out." The impression conveyed by this description is one of solidarity between the two, an impression based on the grammatically redundant double subject (šênehem hu' ûsmu'el) which serves to emphasize the unity of the pair. 46. This description is the final member in a chain showing the convergence of Samuel and Saul: first we saw Saul eating with (ûm) Samuel (v. 24), then the latter speaking with (ûm) Saul, and finally the two of them going out together. They may have arrived by separate paths and for individual reasons, but, following the revelation to Samuel and the banquet for Saul, Samuel and Saul leave town as a pair. They are united by the
single purpose of which the reader and Samuel are aware, and by which Saul is obediently governed. Saul has shown himself fit to become nāgāḏ by his obedience; the morning on which Samuel told Saul he would tell (נָגָד, v. 19) everything has arrived (v. 26; cf. L. Schmidt 1970:71). The reader awaits the description of the anointment that he knows must come.

Verse 27 The moment for Saul's enlightenment arrives, but the word of God is for his ears only and so the servant is directed by Saul to travel on ahead. Once again the chain of command is presented; Samuel commands Saul to tell the servant to go ahead, and the servant goes ahead, the implication being that Saul followed Samuel's directive. No one but Saul himself is allowed to see or hear what Samuel is now going to make known to Saul, nor is Saul allowed to tell anyone (see below on 10:16). Contrary to Weiser, the reason for the secrecy is not the simple result of "der Eigenart der Sagenbild, ihren Entstehungsverhältnissen und ihrem Anliegen" (1962:51). Rather the secrecy has a function within the story. The true nature of Israel's new monarch and his subordination to Samuel are hidden from all; only after the people have accepted Saul does
Samuel reveal the secret of the anointing.
10. 1 Samuel 10

Verse 1

Verse 1 continues the description of Saul's anointment. In 9:27, Samuel tells Saul to send the servant ahead and that he will proclaim the word of God (וְאֵ֑אמֶר אֶל־דֶּבֶּר בֵּ֑אָשַׁם כָּלֶ֖חָלָה) to Saul. Samuel thus prepares the innocent young Saul to hear and accept the political ideology that Samuel will reveal. The official sounding announcement (cf. Birch 1976:37-38) is designed to make the deepest impression on the young country-boy. Whatever Samuel is going to say or do, Saul is supposed to take it as official and irrevocable.

Samuel breaks the vial of oil on Saul's head, kisses him, and then explains why (הִנֵּֽה־קָ֖הָל) he has performed the ritual. Like the announcement about the word of God (9:27), the ceremonial anointing and kiss (Blank 1962:39) are calculated to impress the importance of the occasion on the naive young man. After such treatment, Saul should be all ears to anything Samuel should say. The anointing should have much the same effect on Saul as the prior banquet did (cf. above on 9:24).
As it stands in MT, Samuel's explanation of the anointment is a terse reformulation of the revelation that he received in 9:16. As always when a piece of information is repeated by any character, additions and deletions are important (cf. Alter 1981:97).

Samuel repeats only the command portion of Yahweh's revelation to Saul:

9:16 ʌm ʌsahtɔ ʌnägåtɔ ɔcal-ɔammɔ yiʃræ̅l
10:1 ki-ʌmeʃahkã yhw ɔcal-nahalãtɔ ʌnägåtɔ

One notes, first of all differences in syntax. Yahweh's order of emphasis was first Samuel's role as anointer, then Saul's position as designate, and finally Yahweh's own intention to keep a hold on Israel, "his people." Samuel, on the other hand, directs Saul's attention first to the fact that the anointer is Yahweh, then to the condition of anointment—it is over his (Yahweh's) "property"—, and lastly to Saul's status as designate. Yahweh sought to show Samuel that he still had a theocratic role to play and to explain the constraints that would be placed on the monarchy. Samuel seeks to awe and overpower Saul with the information that Yahweh anoints him, while at the same time down-playing
Saul's subordinate status as designate. Both Yahweh and Samuel take advantage of the primacy effect (better known as first impressions) in their speeches.4

Samuel also changes Yahweh's description of the group over which Saul will be designate. Yahweh called it "my people, Israel," but Samuel calls it "his possession."5 Yahweh affirmed the covenantal aspect of his relationship, as does Samuel, but Samuel's choice of the word "possession" emphasizes the fact that Saul is being set over a group that belongs to Yahweh (cf. Buber 1956:132). Through syntactic construction and vocabulary Samuel seeks to combine an overpowering sense of subordination with the fact of political elevation.

Omitted altogether are Yahweh's ironic comments about the intended function of the designate. As suggested above, Saul is to be a puppet king and so is not taken completely into Samuel's confidence. Anything that might cue Saul to the real purpose of his new position is discreetly left unmentioned (against Sebäss's 1967:159 n.21). Their goal is to make of Saul a loyal theocratic designate; all efforts are directed exclusively to that end.6
Verse 2

If the sacrificial meal was orchestrated to convince Saul that his destiny lay in the guiding hand of God, Samuel's prediction of the course of Saul's return journey is doubly so. Each of the three predicted incidents corresponds to a specific event on the journey that led Saul to Samuel (Buber 1956:133-34). The most important persuasive element in Samuel's description is the fact that he knows what will happen before it happens. The predictive aspect of Samuel's description, in combination with the uncanny correspondence of each incident to a prior occurrence, constitutes an overpowering mechanism by which Saul is to be thoroughly convinced of his destiny. The miraculous correspondences show Saul the power and authority of Yahweh who guides his every step, and Samuel's predictions of these events bear witness to his own intimate relationship with Yahweh.

The first incident involves a meeting with two men who repeat Samuel's disclosure that the asses are found (cf. 9:20), and confirm Saul's own fear that his father would forget about the asses and begin to worry about him (cf. 9:5; Smith 1899:67). As Saul heard Samuel describing the future, he would no doubt recall
the past and his own worries about his father. This first description would not, however, lead him much beyond the recollection of the past and a marveling at Samuel's predictive abilities. He might recall that it was his worrying that had sparked the decision to seek the seer's advice and hence had helped to bring him to become designate and stand there listening to Samuel's prediction. For the moment, however, the narrator leaves Saul's reactions as an undetermined gap.

Verses 3-4

The second incident involves an encounter with three men who just happen to be going up to God at Bethel. Their gift of bread to Saul as they go up to God recalls Saul's own lack of bread when he wanted to go to a city to inquire of a man of God (Hertzberg 1964:85). But now a pattern begins to appear. As in the first prediction, Saul has changed places in these parallels to his previous journey. Before, he was the one who suggested that his father might worry about him; now, it is Saul who listens while someone else tells him the same. Before, Saul was the one who had no bread to give to the man of God; now, having visited Samuel, bread is given to him. The correspondences
appear to point to a significant change; could it have something to do with the fact that Saul has been anointed by Yahweh as designate?  

Verses 5-6

The final incident and recapitulation of Saul's journey to Samuel and the office of nāgîd takes the form of a meeting between Saul and a band of prophets coming down from the high place. As Buber notes, the encounter with this group of prophets matches Saul's previous encounter with Samuel, who was just going up to the high place when Saul met him. "Samuel verwaltet das Sakrament, den es realisierenden Geistempfang vermittelt seine Gilde, die Begegnung mit ihr (10:10a) wird mit den gleichen Worten wie die mit ihm (9:14b) verrichtet, und was auf einer bama begonnen hat, vollendet sich auf einer" (Buber 1956:135; cf. 9:14).

The parallel to which Buber draws attention also serves to highlight a major difference. In the second encounter with prophets at a high place, Saul is overcome by the spirit of Yahweh and actually joins in the prophetic activity. Samuel's prediction that Saul will "become another man" is a perfect description of the desired effect of all these
incidents—Saul will become a convert—presented in the
guise of a portrayal of Saul's prophetic condition.
Unlike his first encounter when he went to the prophet
Samuel seeking information, Saul now joins the company
of prophets and prophesies with them. Between the two
incidents lies the event that explains the change,
namely Saul's induction into the theocratic service as
nāgīd.

Verse 7
The purpose of Samuel's predictions and the
astonishing correspondences with Saul's first journey
is suggested by Samuel's description of the future
incidents as "signs" (נֲוָטָט).

ט, 'sign,' is an object, an occurrence,
an event through which a person is to recognize,
learn, remember, or perceive the credibility
of something.' In my opinion, this definition
suggested by Gunkel correctly emphasizes the
functional character of a sign, for that
which is crucial in a sign is not the sign
itself or its execution, but its function
and its meaning...

The function of a sign [is]...to mediate
an understanding or to motivate a kind of behaviour (Helfmeyer 1977: 170-71).

It should first be noted that Samuel suggests that Saul is to respond to the signs with action "do whatever your hand finds" on account of the knowledge conveyed by the signs that, "God is with you." Samuel thus supplies Saul with the correct interpretation of the signs. The purpose of the signs is to convince Saul that God is with him by showing him his new position within the theocratic regime in contrast to his former position outside of it. The means of convincing Saul of his new position are the contrasting parallels. When Saul sees the actual change that the anointing has brought about, he will be certain that God is now with him, the new designate, and that his steps and actions are all directed by God.

As Irwin suggests, Samuel's advice that Saul do whatever comes to hand is closely bound to the fulfillment of the signs (1941: 124; cf. Buber 1956: 137). When it is recalled that the final event in these three incidents is Saul's conversion to another man, it is clear that Samuel's instructions to do what comes to hand are directed to the changed Saul and not to Saul as an ordinary person. Hence it would appear
that the freedom granted to Saul in v. 7 is not completely unconditioned. Furthermore, L. Schmidt concludes that a study of the expression to do "what comes to hand" reveals that the expression does not mean unlimited personal freedom:

An allen Stellen, die untersucht wurden, bezieht sich "die Hand findet" nicht auf das Unbestimmte einer Situation, auf irgendwelche Möglichkeiten, die die Lage bietet, sondern auf die handelnde Person. Die Wendung drückt die Fähigkeit einer Person aus, etwas zu tun, oder sie bezeichnet die Macht, die eine Person über andere Menschen auszuüben vermag (1970:77).

As the divine guidance had led Saul in the past, without his ever intending to aid the divine direction, so it will continue to lead him. The signs do not give Saul himself the knowledge of the entire future course of his divinely led destiny. On the contrary, they give him only the assurance that his steps are guided by God and that whatever actions are required of him by circumstance are in fact ordained by God. Samuel alone knows how God will direct Saul's path as designate; Samuel demonstrates this knowledge in his
predictions of vv. 2-7. The sign themselves are also examples of how Saul's divinely led career will go; in all three examples, Saul is a passive respondent to the circumstances into which he is led.

Verse 8

Samuel's instructions to Saul in v. 8 are primarily preparatory to the events of ch. 13, but need not therefore be regarded as contradictory to v. 7 (against e.g. Buber 1956:137-39; Richter 1970:19). Samuel has just finished predicting a series of events in which Saul would participate upon leaving Samuel. The passing of these incidents as predicted was to be a sign to Saul that his steps were guided and that he was to continue to participate in further events because God, as the signs clearly showed, was with him. The content and sequence of incidents subsequent to the prophesying is left undetermined by Samuel, who describes them only as "whatever comes to hand." Following this predicted blank, however, Samuel continues his predictive description of future events.

The resumption of the prediction is indicated by the waw-consecutive perfect verb, "You will go down" (w'yaradā), which continues the series of such
verbs in vv. 2-6. What Samuel says in v. 8 is no less predictive or prescriptive than what he said in vv. 2-6. The difference between v. 8 and v. 7 is that the latter leaves the future course of events undetermined.

To say that the latter event or events are not determined is not the same thing as saying that they are left to be determined by Saul. Instead what is implied is that Samuel does not know what exactly will happen in that space of events. He leaves it open and tells Saul to improvise. Why Samuel should do such a thing at the very time when he and Yahweh are seeking to establish strict control over Saul's loyalty and action is left undetermined by the narrative. The reader, at this point, can only speculate about Samuel's reasons. Perhaps there are some conditions that cannot be predicted for that particular period. Could it be that Samuel and Yahweh are not yet certain of how the people will respond to their choice for a king? The answer to this question lies in subsequent scenes.

This reading of the banquet (9:22-24), the anointing (9:27-10:1), the signs of vv. 2-6, and the subsequent prediction of v. 8 as the scheming efforts of Yahweh and Samuel to form Saul into an obedient and loyal designate is supported by the events of ch.
13 which are dependent on v. 8.\textsuperscript{11} At the first sign of independence from Saul, when he deviates from the passive role assigned to him by Samuel (v. 8; cf. 13:8-9), Samuel predicts a premature end to Saul's monarchy (13:14).

Verse 8 need not, therefore, be regarded as "diametrically opposed" to its context (so Crüsemann 1978:58-59).\textsuperscript{12} Samuel first predicts a series of situations and prescribes Saul's responses (vv. 2-6). The fulfillment of those events will constitute a sign to Saul that God is indeed with him, and that knowledge will allow him to continue to do "whatever his hand finds to do" in the assurance that his steps are still divinely guided (v. 7).\textsuperscript{13} Finally, sometime in the future, Saul is to go to Gilgal and wait seven days for Samuel whereupon the latter will come and make known Saul's future undertakings.\textsuperscript{14}

Verse 9

Samuel has done as much as he can to indoctrinate Saul, and now God takes over. No sooner does Saul turn to leave Samuel than God gives Saul another heart. The narrator's description emphasizes the immediacy of this divine intervention (cf. Nowack 1902:...
47). Listening to Samuel in v. 6, the reader has been led to expect that Saul will not be a changed man until he joins in the prophesying with the band of prophets.\footnote{15} Why does the narrator now contradict Samuel?

Various solutions have been sought to explain the apparent prematureness of the change. Keil and Delitzsch rationalize, suggesting that the change did not come early but on the same day as the signs were fulfilled. "As he left Samuel early in the morning, Saul could easily reach Gibeah in one day..." (1880: 104). Smith demythologizes, suggesting, "it is psychologically quite comprehensible that the impulse should anticipate the predicted order of events" (1899:70; cf. Dhorme 1910:86).

More recently Helfmeyer has suggested that the changed heart was given to Saul so that he might gain a clear and proper understanding of the subsequent signs (1977:185). Citing parallels, Helfmeyer suggests that only when Yahweh gives an "understanding heart" is it guaranteed that a sign will be properly understood (p. 185). Helfmeyer fails to observe, however, that unlike Deut 29:3, which speaks of the need for Yahweh to give an "understanding heart" (lēb lādaʿat), v. 9 speaks only of a "changed heart" (lēb ʿahēr).
A solution to the difficulty presents itself when attention is directed to the question of who says what to whom. In v. 6, it is Samuel who tells Saul that he will be a changed man when the spirit takes him and he prophesies. In v. 9, on the other hand, the omniscient narrator reveals to his reader that God intervenes and changes Saul's heart at the very moment that Saul turns to leave Samuel. Certainly Samuel did tell Saul that he would be changed after or during the prophesying. But God, as the narrator so kindly shows us, has no qualms about speeding up the change in Saul as an insurance against any slip-up; he makes the change immediately.

"When he turned to leave Samuel, God transformed his heart." No entrance is left for accidental influences to distract or deflect Saul from the course on which Samuel and God have set him. From what Samuel told Saul, it would be the signs given by the three incidents that would objectively show him that God was with him. The reader now knows, however, that God has exercised his divine prerogative, intervening to ensure that Saul is properly affected. Welcome Saul, automaton.

The third sentence in v. 9 is the narrator's
matter-of-fact summary description that all of the signs came to pass on that same day. When he now recounts in one sentence what it took Samuel roughly sixteen detailed sentences to describe, the narrator brings the reader back to the reality of the situation. Given that God has just intervened directly to change Saul's heart, the narrator indicates that it is a matter of course, requiring little attention, that the signs are fulfilled. The narrator diverts his reader's attention away from the astonishing correspondences and meanings of the signs, and directs him to observe God and Samuel in action. Save the rhetoric and fulfilled signs for Saul—both the narrator and the reader already know that God is "with Saul."16

**Excursus - Structure in 9:1-10:16**

Buber has noted a significant pattern exhibited by the events of 9:1-10:16 (1956:142). First Saul is the centre of action as he makes his unknowing way towards Samuel (9:1-14). Then Samuel takes over in the actions leading to Saul's anointment and induction into the theocratic service (9:15-10:9). Finally, Saul returns to centre stage on his return journey (10:10-16). From the reader's perspective, three parts
to the story of Saul's designation may also be labelled according to the narrative's point of view.

First we travel with Saul, experiencing and understanding the journey solely from the limited perspective of the human character. Although the narrator sprinkles hints about some larger significance throughout vv. 1-14, they are not enough to afford the reader the opportunity to climb out of his limited access.

In the second stage, where Samuel takes over as the principal actor (though Yahweh's part should not be ignored), the narrator reveals the hidden significance of Saul's journey and the true nature of the office that Yahweh bestows on Saul. The narrator accomplishes this revelation by means of his omniscience, which allows him and his reader to listen in on the revelation to Samuel, and to peek behind the scenes as God gives Saul a new heart.

Finally, Saul sets out on his return journey. The return segment of the journey differs from the outbound segment in two ways: Saul is now nāgid, and the reader now knows what that designation really means. The narrator focuses on two events in Saul's homeward journey, both of which illustrate the reception that the new designate receives from his fellow countrymen
and from his immediate family. The reader watches with interest, as we may assume Yahweh does, to see if Saul will be detected or give away his secret. Once again, the narrative presents events primarily as they are seen on the human plane, that is, from a limited point of view. Saul is presented as he appears to other characters and their reactions to him are recorded. The reader, noting that he was formerly in the same state of ignorance as Saul's onlookers and interlocuters are in vv. 10-16, is able to appreciate both the ignorance of the human characters and the advantages that Yahweh holds over the people who demand a king.

Verse 10

Most scholarly readers of v. 10 have been troubled by the omission of the first two signs from description, or conversely, with the description of the third sign when v. 9 has already told of the fulfillment of all the signs. Smith suggests that two signs may have "dropped out" (1899:70-71; cf. Budde 1902:69; Driver 1913:82). McCarter, accepting the integrity of the narrative, regards v. 9b as a summary that replaces the first two signs (1980:183). But why does it not replace all the signs? Stoebe answers
that question with the suggestion that the third sign receives special mention because of its greater importance (1973:208; cf. Hertzberg 1964:86 who regards the emphasis as an accident of transmission rather than a reflection of intention).

An examination of v. 10 soon reveals, however, that the narrator is not simply relating the fulfillment of the third sign. "Die Schilderung des Prophetenzuges ist hier nicht so vollständig wie in V.5" (Schulz 1919:151). The fulfillment of the third sign is repeated only in summary, with only those elements mentioned that are essential to the reader's understanding of the people's reaction. Were it the narrator's intention to describe the fulfillment of the third sign, the failure to mention Saul's change to another man—the climax of the third sign according to v. 6—would be especially peculiar.

When we accept the narrator's statement that the matter of the signs and their fulfillment was finished in v. 9, however, v. 10 poses no problems of redundancy or omission of signs. Instead, v. 10 is presented as an example of Saul's reception by the people who are allowed to glimpse the first manifestations of Saul's new position within the theocracy.
Keil and Delitzsch are on the right track with their explanation of the reason for repeating the third sign: "The third sign is the only one which is minutely described, because this caused a great sensation at Gibbeah, Saul's home" (1880:104). If vv. 10-13a may be taken as a complete scene, without change in place or break in temporal continuity (Abrams' definition of scene, 1981:2), it is obvious that the topic is the people's reaction to Saul's new position amongst the prophets.

This reading of the function of v. 10 as a prelude to vv. 11-12 rather than a fulfillment of vv. 5-6 is also congruent with the subsequent encounter between Saul and his uncle. In both meetings Saul, the new theocratic designate, is exposed to contact with ordinary people who question his behaviour—known by the reader to be an exhibition of Saul's new status—ask him about his journey—of which the reader knows the real significance—and ask about his conversation with Samuel—in which the reader knows more than asses were discussed. Both meetings are tests: the first tests the people's ability to discover Saul's secret; the second, Saul's desire to keep it, and hence, his loyalty.
Verse 11

The reader knows that Saul's prophesying is a manifestation of the presence of God with Saul, of his new position within the theocracy as nāgīd. The narrator now presents the view from outside, that is from a human, non-omniscient perspective. He draws attention to the people's perception that Saul's behaviour differs from what it had formerly been (cf. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:104). The people who comment on Saul's radically new mannerisms are "everyone who knew him previously." Emphasis is also placed on the fact that the people now see him in a new group; two times Saul is described as "among the prophets" (Cûm-nèbi-im, bannèbi-im). The people's double question, "What has happened to the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?", reflects their awareness of a change in Saul's behaviour and raises the possibility that something has happened to change his manner; "the implication is that his former life had been of a very different kind from theirs [the prophets]" (Smith 1899:70).

Nowhere in v. 11 is there any indication that the people regard Saul's prophetic activity either negatively or positively. Neither does the immediate context afford any entrance to the reader who wishes
to know whether the people approve or disapprove of Saul's new talent, or his new-found companions.

One recent study suggests that the proverb that is central to the incident antedates the aetiological narrative context in which it has been placed (Sturdy 1970:208-09). According to Sturdy, the narrative context or aetiology has probably not understood the proverb, however, and so the meaning of the proverb "must then be other than that in the stories" (p. 209). He then ventures to read the proverb in isolation, and it turns out to be critical of Saul. An equally conjectural "setting in life" is created as a new context for the proverb and the ultimate result is that it is seen as Davidic propaganda against Saul (p. 213). Sturdy's study provides a modern parallel to midrashic exegesis in which a word or a phrase is taken out of context and made to serve as the basis from which new, interesting stories and anecdotes are created. With respect to the interpretation of 1 Sam 10:11, however, it is almost totally irrelevant.

The meaning of v. 11 is quite simple in context. Saul has been inducted into the theocratic service, and his prophetic activity is a visible manifestation—a sign—of his new role. His former acquaintances
witness his prophetic display and ask themselves if Saul is also now a prophet. They have come rather close to the true meaning of Saul's activity, but only accidentally, because the prophets were also considered to be servants and mouthpieces of God. Saul's participation in this group's activities is only an ambiguous evidence of his new status.

In fact, however, the people's guess is no more than an expression of surprise, an exclamation, in which they simply restate what they see in the form of a rhetorical question. They have no answer to their own question. Though they are presented with a visible, indubitable manifestation of Saul's new association, they do not understand its significance. The point is not that they should understand, but rather, that it is impossible for them to know what Yahweh has done to Saul, their future king, even when he publicly displays his theocratic association. The verbal reaction to Saul's behaviour is, therefore, neither a negative (e.g. Wildberger 1957:454) nor a positive (e.g. Ishida 1977:44) evaluation, but a simple rhetorical question.

The question asked by Saul's acquaintances, unanswerable by them yet easily answered by the reader, can be viewed as another example of the narrator's
frequent irony, this time dramatic. The people express the proposition that Saul is among or with the prophets, but their use of the question format indicates their uncertainty and incredulity over this state of affairs. The reader shares the narrator's knowledge that they have correctly stated Saul's new association, however, making their question dramatically ironic. Saul, as they shall soon find out—to the dismay of some—stands with the prophet Samuel; he is a living rebuttal to the demand for a king.

Verse 12

Supplementary (wayva\textsuperscript{can}) to the general expression of surprise at the incongruous sight of Saul prophesying amongst the prophets, a local man (\textit{\textit{mivy\textsuperscript{am}}} \textit{\textit{mivy\textsuperscript{am}}}) adds another question of similar import. The second question, also conspicuously unanswered, asks who the "father" of the group is. The word "father," in contexts where it describes a person who heads or is honoured by a group, is usually regarded as a title given to the leader or master (Ringgren 1977:8; cf. Lindblom 1962:69 n.39; Wilson 1980:141).

The second question like the first comes close to comprehending the significance of Saul's act. If
they knew who the leader of the band of prophets was, the people might have a better idea of what Saul was doing in the band. That the man phrases this insight as a question, however, is also an admission that he does not know who the leader is.

The reader, on the other hand, at least knows that Samuel was able to predict the movement of these prophets and that it is likely that Yahweh has, as previously, orchestrated the entire meeting. Subsequent events and the recurrence of the proverb about Saul will confirm the reader's suspicion that Samuel is indeed the head of the band of prophets (1 Sam 19:20-24). Thus the second question, like the first, strikes very near to the heart of Saul's appearance among the prophets. The second question may also be regarded as an example of dramatic irony, with the reader knowing both the answer to the question and the significance of both question and answer.

The last sentence of v. 12 is a narratorial comment addressed directly to the reader. It suggests that "for this reason (al-kēn) it became a proverb, 'Is Saul also among the prophets?'" The bare facts of what has just been narrated do not, however, explain why the question became a proverb, and so
scholars have attempted to supply historical contexts that might explain the proverbial status of the question (e.g. Sturdy 1970; L. Schmidt 1970:118).

An alternative is available, however, arising from the observation that both questions are examples of dramatic irony. Both the narrator and his reader know the significance of Saul's action, and the answer to the questions. As they watch Saul's fellow Israelites struggling to come to grips with Saul's unusual behaviour, the narrator knows and the reader suspects that Israel will soon know what Saul's activity signified when Saul is publicly installed in the office of designate. At that point, those Israelites who asked these ironic questions will share in the irony. For this reason—the irony of the situation—(Cal-wên) it became a proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?".

It is perhaps unnecessary to point out that the suggestion about the ironic origin of the proverb is purely literary and only intended as a description of the contextual significance of the proverb and of the narrator's statement about the proverb. Whether, in fact, there ever was such a proverb, and if there was, the questions of how it came to be and what it
meant are beyond the concerns of this reading. One might add that such questions are also beyond the known concerns of the narrator, whose only known interest in the proverb comes to expression in his narrative. As a proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" is not a matter of fact, but a matter of biblical literature.

Verse 13

The secret of Saul's anointing has passed the first test; no one was able to penetrate through to the truth even when the sign of God's presence with Saul was manifest. Without pause the narrator stops Saul in his prophetic tracks and moves him quickly on to the next scene, the encounter with the uncle. Obviously the narrator does not regard causal continuity as a necessary feature of narrative representation.

Saul comes to the high place, the definite article suggesting that it is the high place that Samuel mentioned in v. 5 (cf. Buber 1956:140). Saul moves into that period in which Samuel told him to do what came to hand, Samuel's predictions and directions having ended with the prophesying (against Ap-Thomas 1961:242). The point is important to the following scene in which Saul's loyalty to his new affiliation is tested. Since
he is now more or less on his own his actions should reflect his own position on what has happened to him (cf. L. Schmidt 1970:115-16).

Verses 14-16

How did Saul's uncle happen to be at the high place? How did he meet Saul? Why is it Saul's uncle that questions Saul, and not his father? These and similar questions have provoked some scholars to regard vv. 14-16 as a disconnected traditional fragment (e.g. Birch 1976:41). Ap-Thomas attempts to integrate the scene by giving a new meaning to the word דוד, usually translated as "uncle." He suggests that דוד means (Philistine) governor (cf. 10:5), and that Saul conceals his anointing from the enemy (1961). Were this the intention of v. 14, one might wonder why the text would call this governor "Saul's governor" (v. 14) instead of "the Philistine governor." Moreover, why would the same words not be used as in 10:5 (נֵּשִׁבֶּה-פֶּלִיסְתִּים) to describe this governor?

A simpler solution to the problem of why the uncle poses the questions to Saul may be had by observing what literary gains are made by this move. First, if Saul's father had asked the questions, he could not
have asked Saul "where were you?" and receive the eva-
sion, "looking for the asses." Saul's father knew.
where Saul had gone (9:3). Since it is the narrator's
apparent wish to show how Saul evades any questions
that would disclose his secret anointing, the uncle is
a good choice to ask the first general question.

An even more simple explanation (which I owe to
Alan Cooper) of why Saul's father does not question
Saul is that he simply was not around (in the narrator's
story) when Saul came back.

Saul's answer to his uncle's first question is
truthful, even if it does omit the most important events
of Saul's journey. When he says "when we saw that they
were nowhere to be found, we went to Samuel," the reader
is led to entertain the thought that Saul might dis-
close the contents of his conversations with Samuel.
Tension mounts. Will Saul give it away?

The uncle's second question especially opens
the door for Saul to disclose his secret anointing and
so to ruin the entire operation planned by Yahweh. The
question that the narrator places on the uncle's lips
seems especially chosen to heighten the tension of the
moment for the reader. Saul, we know, was secretly
anointed as nāgīd. When the uncle says, "Tell me
(haggidâ) what Samuel said to you' (v. 14), it seems to the reader (and so, the reader must think, to Saul) as if he somehow knew about this great secret, and is only asking Saul to confess it. The apt choice of words increases the reader's sense of tension and tests Saul's loyalties to the limit. This is the moment of truth for Yahweh's entire scheme; one word from Saul about being the new nāgîd over Yahweh's property, and Yahweh's "messianic secret" will be ruined.

The narrator increases the suspense even more in v. 16 by having Saul use the verb ngd two more times in his recapitulation of what Samuel said. "Saul said to his uncle, 'He told (haggêd higgid) us that the asses were found.'" With all of this paronomastic playing around the word nāgîd it seems almost certain that Saul is going to say something about it. Yet, he does not; "but he did not say (higgid) a word to him about the kingdom."

Why Saul would not say anything about the kingdom is answered for us by the narrator himself in a narratorial comment on Saul's answer. The final three words of v. 16 are usually read as a relative clause modifying "kingdom," that is, "the kingdom of which (Jayser) Samuel had spoken." Were this the case,
one would expect the relative clause to follow immediately after the noun that it modifies.\textsuperscript{20} BDB (p. 83 8e), however, suggests that \textsuperscript{2}šer can be equivalent to \textsuperscript{2}šer, "as," citing Jer 33:22; Isa.54:9; and perhaps Jer 48:8; Ps 106:34 as examples. In its present position, separated from the noun ham\textsuperscript{e}l\textsuperscript{k} by the verb, \textsuperscript{2}šer is easily associated with the verb, but only with difficulty with the noun.

Saul does not mention a word about the kingdom because Samuel told him to keep quiet about it. "But he did not tell him anything about the kingdom, as Samuel had said." As past readers have observed, Saul's reasons for silence are not found in the text when \textsuperscript{2}šer is connected to "the kingdom" [McCarter 1980:184]. When \textsuperscript{2}šer is connected to the verb, however, Saul's reasons are clear, and Samuel's instructions are in accord with his previous efforts to keep the subject under wraps (9:27).

The introduction of the word "kingdom" (ham\textsuperscript{e}l\textsuperscript{k} here by the narrator is conspicuous. He uses the word to describe the secret arrangements surrounding Saul's anointment as n\textsuperscript{g}d. The narrator thus introduces the reader to "the kingdom" as a description of the theocratically subordinate
institution that Yahweh has planned in response to the people's request for a king "like all the nations."
Since it is the narrator himself who so characterizes "the kingdom (hammēlūkā) the reader is obliged to under-
stand that that is what the word means in this narrative.
The narrator's comment that Saul did not let
out the secret of "the kingdom," while an important
summary description of Saul's silence on this topic,
is even more important as a preparation for the descrip-
tion of Samuel's subsequent public unveiling of "the
kingdom" (10:25). When the reader hears what Samuel
proclaims in that verse, his prior acquaintance with
the word mēlūkā and its significance help him to under-
stand Samuel's audience's reaction.
Saul's return to public view bearing the
visible signs of his new status (10:10) and even speak-
ing about his journey and visit with Samuel (10:14-16)
is successful. No one suspects what has happened to
him and Saul has demonstrated his own fidelity to the
theocratic cause. The stage is now set for Saul's
public acclamation as king. Too late Israel will dis-
cover that they acclaim Yahweh's nāgid as their king.

Verse 17

The beginning of a new scene in v. 17 is
indicated by the temporal and geographical disjunction between v. 16 and v. 17. According to Weiser, the disjunction "rührt wohl daher, das ihm [Sammler] für die Zwischenzeit keine weitere Tradition zu Gebote stand" (1962:62). While it is possible for the reader to suggest many events or "traditions" that might fill this temporal gap in the narrative, he should not thereby conclude that something has been left out and that the narrative is defective. All literary creations are based upon a selection of events from the sum total of available real or conceivable events. "We can say that, with regard to the determination [exhaustive representation] of the objectivities represented within it, every literary work is in principle incomplete and always in need of further supplementation; in terms of the text, however, this supplementation can never be complete" (Ingarden 1975b:251, my emphasis). With respect to the disjunction of v. 17, then, the reader should respect the narrator's decision as to what he wishes to represent and accept the disjunction as an indication of a new scene.

A nāgid has been made (9:1-10:10) and his loyalty proven (10:11-16). Samuel will now set in motion processes to obtain public support and
acclamation for Saul. The secrecy that has enveloped Saul's designation continues to play a fundamental role in this new scene, which stretches from v. 17 to v. 27. Buber describes this continuing role of the secret with particular respect to the interchange between Saul and his uncle:

Die Frage des Oheims und diese Antwort sollen vollends deutlich machen, dass alles Bisherige nur eine Sache zwischen Gott und Saul war. Dies ist die Voraussetzung für das Folgende, aber nicht seine Vorwegnahme. Symbolisch haben die Ältesten die vollzogene Wahl erfahren, das aber heisst: als vorerst schweigen Sollende, das Volk darf noch nichts von der Kürgung wissen (1956:141, Buber's emphasis).

The secret of Saul's theocratic affiliation will not be revealed until after Israel has irrevocably accepted him as king.

Chapter 10:17-27 is also linked to chs. 8-10:16 in another respect, namely Samuel's change of heart regarding the installation of a king over Israel. Samuel, who had refused to make a king in ch. 8 and had, instead, sent the people home (8:22), finally
recalls them. He is able to carry forward his task of making a king only because of the intervening developments of 9:1-10:16, and because he now knows exactly what Yahweh means when he says "Make a king for them," (8:22; cf. 8:9; 9:15-16). Hence the scenes of 9:1-10:16, far from being unrelated or even contradictory to 10:17-27, are absolutely essential to the reader's understanding of Samuel's change of heart, not to mention the reality behind Saul's public installation (against e.g. Press 1938:198-99; Weiser 1962:62; Hertzberg 1964:87; McCarter 1980:191, 194).

Verse 17 draws attention to parallels between the new scene and the assembly in ch. 7, both located at Mizpah,²¹ by repeating words used in the narration of the previous meeting:

10:17
wayyas'eq yemuel
(^et-ha'am)
el-yhwh
hammispaha

ch. 7
wayyis'caq yemuel (v. 9)
(baca yisra'el, v. 9)
el-yhwh
(hammispata, v. 5)²²

The Mizpah meetings are also parallel in purpose: both convocations are called to deal with covenantal
matters, the first to renew the relationship, and the second for its apparent annulment. Mizpah is, therefore, an appropriate place at which to hold the second convocation, for it was there that the people and Yahweh had been reunited after Yahweh's apparent abandonment of Israel in the events caused by the Elide affair. Israel and Yahweh will now meet again at Mizpah for the apparent purpose of undoing the work done in the prior Mizpah meeting.

The second meeting, like the first, looks back to the Elide affair and the disaster it caused for Israel; in order to avoid another such disaster, the second meeting at Mizpah is convened for the apparent replacement of the old theocracy and its fallible mediators with a new, profane kingship.

Included in the parallels between the two Mizpah meetings is a shift in the way words from the first meeting are used in the second. The fact of the people's intervening request for a king, which constitutes a rejection of Yahweh's kingship, explains the shift. In ch. 7, Samuel had cried to Yahweh on the people's behalf, because Yahweh had apparently left them. Now, Samuel cries to the people and calls them to Yahweh, the implication being that they have
departed from him. In ch. 7, Samuel called out to Yahweh on behalf of the people, who had made amends and wished to renew relations. In 10:17, on the other hand, Samuel cries to the people on behalf of Yahweh, who has made a nāgīd and wishes to maintain his grip on Israel.23

Both Mizpah meetings are initiated by Samuel on behalf of the covenantal partner who has been spurned or openly rejected. The major difference in the second meeting is that the meeting appears, at first, not as a covenant renewal but as an annulment.24 The people are led to believe that their rejection of Yahweh has been acknowledged (v. 19) and that their request has been granted (vv. 19-24). Only when the pact is concluded does Samuel reveal the true meaning of the meeting (v. 25).

Verse 18

Samuel initiates the proceedings with a formal recitation of Yahweh's past saving deeds, deeds that had inaugurated and served as the constitutional foundation for Israel's theocratic policy (cf. Boecker 1969:38-39). Samuel prefaces his remarks to the assembled people with the official-sounding statement,
"thus says Yahweh, God of Israel." Samuel thereby indicates to his audience that what he is about to say comes from Yahweh, and not himself. The possible aim of the official introduction is to convince the people of the formality and seriousness of the procedures that will follow.

Samuel's introductory words may be contrasted with his previous address to Israel on the matter of the requested king. In 8:10-11, where Samuel disobeyed Yahweh's instructions because he misunderstood them, Samuel did not say "thus says Yahweh." Instead, he simply related what Yahweh said and went on to give his personal reflections on the disadvantages of monarchic government. In 10:18, on the other hand, Samuel has finally come to understand Yahweh's intention and so he is able to understand Yahweh's position.

As the sympathetic mouthpiece of Yahweh, Samuel returns to what Yahweh really told him (8:7-8), and delivers that word to the people. Samuel emphasizes the covenantal role of Yahweh as Israel's God in the first sentence of the historical recitation. Speaking now for Yahweh in the first person, Samuel says "I brought Israel up from Egypt." Only in the next sentence does Samuel address his audience in the second
person plural. The reason for his initial impersonality is, of course, to emphasize the covenantal significance of the exodus. The nation Israel was formed on the basis of this act; connection of the names "Israel from Egypt" is an important recollection of the national political significance of the exodus.

Samuel's second sentence recalls the continuing covenantal fidelity of Yahweh from the exodus on. Israel's God delivered it from Egypt and all other oppressive kings.25 Boecker, commenting on the significance of the verb הָכָּלֵּת הָלָּלָה, also notes the emphasis on Yahweh's continuing acts of protection on Israel's behalf (1969:42). The emphasis in v. 18 is placed on the magnanimity of Yahweh towards Israel. He did all these things for Israel without compulsion.

Verse 19

The new sentence, begun with the pronoun "But you" (וּכְאָתָם) in the emphatic position, contrasts Israel's response to Yahweh with what Yahweh has done for Israel (Driver 1913:83). In gratitude for Yahweh's benevolence, Israel reject its God. Samuel, speaking for Yahweh, correctly characterizes the request for a king as a rejection of God.
Boecker describes the rhetoric of v. 19:

In place of the expected response of fealty and obedience to Yahweh's acts of deliverance Samuel places the request for a king, a direct contradiction to the expected expression of gratitude. Rather than honouring and respecting the divine king Israel rejects him by requesting his replacement. Israel's request is made to appear as a repudiation of its national God and its foundational myth, the exodus.

Samuel obviously recognizes that the basis of Israel's request lies in its previous defeat at the hands of the Philistines, but refuses, along with Yahweh, to admit the validity of the request. Like
Yahweh (8:7-8), Samuel totally ignores the disaster at Aphek, refusing even to mention it. Samuel presents the final theocratic position on the requested monarchy; Yahweh has been completely faithful to his obligation, and the request is legally (covenantally) groundless (cf. Weiser 1962:64).

Were the reader only aware of the request as presented by Samuel and Yahweh, he might believe that it was totally arbitrary. Thanks to the narrator, though, the reader sees Samuel's speech in a wider perspective. From that larger perspective the usual description of 10:17-19 as an anti-monarchic tradition is highly questionable. There are, in fact, good reasons for the people's request and the narrative has clearly presented these in previous scenes. The only anti-monarchists in vv. 18-19 are Samuel and Yahweh. The narrator, on the other hand, stands against Samuel's biased review of the request insofar as he has already presented the reader with the real background and reasons for it. Samuel's anti-monarchic tendencies reflect only the personal tendencies of a character in a story, not of the narrator outside the story. In fact, in view of the obviousness of the bias in the anti-monarchism of vv. 18-19 it may be that the
narrator is even anti-theocratic. By allowing both Yahweh (8:7-8) and Samuel (10:18-19) to present bigoted descriptions of the request, the narrator lets them convict themselves, for the reader knows that the people have not rejected Yahweh on account of any saving actions such as Samuel has just rehearsed.

Rather than reading vv. 18-19 as the anti-monarchic vilifications of an isolated tradition (Weiser 1962:63) or redaction (Veijola 1977:41, citing support in n.18) that is inconsistent with the subsequent election of Saul, these verses must be read and understood from the perspective of Samuel's rhetorical purpose. Samuel seeks to convince his audience that they are getting what they asked for—a king that replaces Yahweh and the theocracy—while at the same time denying the validity of the request. He must deny the validity of Israel's request because Yahweh does not intend to dissolve the theocracy and so cannot admit any failing on his own part. To admit to past covenantal failing would be political suicide for Yahweh and, therefore, for Samuel too.

Though he wants to deny the validity of the request, Samuel must convince the people that their request has been granted so that they will formally
accept Saul as their new king. He therefore correctly summarizes the request as a rejection of the theocratic covenant and acts, subsequently, as though Saul were the king that fits the bill of a new, non-theocratic state.

Samuel's brief restatement of the anti-covenantal implications of the request for a king seems to be agreeable to Israel. Nobody protests that Samuel has misunderstood the implications of the request, as one expect. Since this is the first occasion for the theocrats to convey their understanding of the request back to Israel, it is also the appropriate point for Israel to correct any misimpressions that Samuel or Yahweh might hold about the request. Israel's silence indicates that Yahweh and Samuel do correctly understand and represent the request as anti-covenantal.

Several scholars have suggested that vv. 17-19 take the form of a judgement oracle, with the ceremonial lottery to find a king taking the place of a specific judgement or punishment (Birch 1976:48-54, citing also Richter; Kegler 1977:77-78; McCarter 1980: 191-92, 195). Even granting this categorization, the resulting negative presentation of the transition to
a monarchy expresses Samuel's attitude and not the author's. It is part and parcel of Samuel's rhetorical endeavour to convince his audience that they have no right to ask for a king and that from the theocratic perspective, the installation of a monarchy is a judgement on Israel.

As readers we sit in the privileged position granted us by the narrator and look over Samuel's shoulder as he puts his audience through its paces. His apparent anger and indignation (expressed in the form of a prophetic judgement) at the request and at the task of making a king are designed to lead his audience to believe that they are getting what Samuel seems not to want (cf. 8:6, 11-18), namely a profane king.

The employment of the prophetic judgement oracle has two sides: 1. To Samuel's audience it is a sign that their request is grudgingly being fulfilled; 2. To the reader it is an ironic intimation of the true nature of the monarchy to be installed. The installation of a theocratic designate in response to the request for a secular monarch is, indeed, a judgement and punishment of the people who only want freedom from the uncertainties of the theocratic
polity.

The discord between Israel and Yahweh has been ceremoniously recapitulated by Samuel; the resolution of the problem is now dramatically introduced by the particle לְכָּאָתָא, "And now..." (Birch 1976:50). This introduction is more than dramatic, and serves as in other covenantal contexts, to introduce the stage in the proceedings where Israel is called upon to participate in something that will affect the covenantal relationship thereafter (cf. Exod 19:5; Deut 4:1; 10:12; Josh 24:14, 23; 1 Sam 12:7; Muilenburg 1959:355, 363; Weiser 1962:65; Stoebe 1973:216). In conjunction with the solemn call to assemble before Yahweh in their tribal groupings, Samuel uses the transitional particle לְכָּאָתָא to impress his audience with the seriousness of what they have done and are about to do. Playing upon Israel's manifest belief that the demand for a king was just and lawful, and hence to be pursued through the existing judicial system of the theocracy (8:4-6), Samuel accents the formality of what will take place. The people will be bound by what they say and do.
Verses 20-21

The sham continues with Yahweh now joining in directly in the operations of the lottery. To the participating Israelites all appears normal, which is to say the lottery is completely unpredictable. To the reader, however, it is no surprise to watch the successive lotteries closing around Saul until he is finally taken. Yahweh is obviously working behind the scene.

Stoebe misses the point when he suggests that this scene presupposes neither Saul's meeting with Samuel, nor his anointment "nach der eine Loswahl nicht nur überflüssig, sondern geradezu Sakrileg wäre" (1973:214). The lottery is staged by Samuel and Yahweh solely for the benefit of the unsuspecting Israelites, who are led to believe that the divine will is being formulated and made manifest before their very eyes, and in response to their request for a replacement for Yahweh.28 Weiser observes that the use of a lottery to find the new king was also intended to show "dass alle Stämme unter gleichen Bedingungen ordnungsmässig zur Wahl gestanden haben" (1962:65). Though the Israelites in attendance may have been expected to believe in the equity of the lottery, we readers of
9:1-10:16 are certainly not.

Hertzberg comes closer to the contextual significance of the lottery when he says it is a "miraculous confirmation" of the events of 9:1-10:16 (1964:88). In view of Yahweh's ultimate purpose (stated in 9:15-16), however, the choice of Saul by lot is neither surprising, nor miraculous to either the reader or, apparently, Saul.

Saul seems to anticipate the results of the final throw; when he is taken, he is nowhere to be found. Scholars have found Saul's absence troublesome. Lindblom points out that in lot-casting, the only answers that could be given were yes, no, or silence (cited by Birch 1976:44). Saul must have been present when taken and so it is nonsensical to say that he could not be found. In addition, Eissfeldt has suggested that beginning with the words "They sought him" (v. 21), we are faced with a new tradition contained in another literary strand (1931:7). In this second tradition, the means of election is determined by the physical superiority of the candidate rather than by lottery (Eissfeldt 1931:7; a list of subscribers to this view is given in Mettinger 1976:180 n.73).

It is possible, however, that our narrator
did not know exactly how the lottery worked in practice, and even that he was not so concerned with a historical representation of Israelite lottery practices as he was with constructing an interesting story (cf. Weiser 1962:65-66). Pursuing this possibility, one must ask what is gained by Saul's absence when he is chosen by the lottery. The answer to this question lies in v. 22, in which the significance of Saul's absence is probed.

Verse 22

From the point of view of the Israelites, the fact that the lot has fallen to someone that is absent and cannot be found suggests that there may yet be another, as yet unidentified person to come forward. Since the mechanism of the lottery seems to have malfunctioned, the Israelites inquire directly of Yahweh, "Is there still (i.e. besides ourselves) any one come hither?" (Driver's translation, 1913:84). 29 In the absence of the one designated by the lottery, the people look for "anyone" (אָיזֶהָ without article) to fill the gap; they are completely at a loss and depend entirely on Yahweh for the choice of their king.

The reader, at this point in the narrative, is
no more certain about Saul's whereabouts or the reason for his absence than the people in the story. The text leaves these things completely undetermined. The reader knows that Saul was predestined by Yahweh to be Israel's leader, so Saul's absence and the people's apparent confusion pose no immediate jeopardy to the theocratic scheme. What emerges most clearly from the people's question is their total passivity in the choice of a monarch. When the lottery "before Yahweh" seems to fail, they do not even think to make their own choice, but go straight to Yahweh for a resolution. The people, as always in the entire narrative, remain under the authority of their existing king—Yahweh—and make no insurrectional moves, even when opportunities, such as the apparent failure of the lottery, arise.

Aside from reinforcing the passive, law-abiding characterization of the people, their question and Saul's absence afford Yahweh another opportunity to demonstrate his control over the whole situation, and to the reader, his determination to install his designate Saul as Israel's new king (cf. Weiser 1962:66; Stoebbe 1973:218). To the Israelites in attendance, Yahweh's directions for finding the hidden Saul in response to their indefinite question show that Saul
is "mehrfach beglaubigt und ohne allen Zweifel der erkorene Liebling Jahves" (Gressmann 1921:42). They had asked simply for an $^3_\text{is}$ any man, and Yahweh had responded in accordance with the choice of Saul by lot; "He (h$^3$) has hidden...."

The obvious question, asked by almost every published reading of v. 22, is why did Saul hide? His action presupposes, as Keil and Delitzsch point out, that he knew the lot would fall to him, and hence that he had made the connection between his anointing and the matter of the monarchy (1880:108). The text, however, supplies no indication as to his motives for hiding so that readers have had to fill that gap, usually with some suggestion about Saul's modesty and self-effacement (e.g. Smith 1899:73; Ishida 1977:46).

However this gap is filled, McCarter is probably right when he says that to seek Saul's motive is to miss the point (1980:196). The gap in the text—Saul's motivation—cannot be filled conclusively on the basis of the prior context, nor will it be filled immediately in the subsequent context; it is what Sternberg calls a permanent gap:

No reader can afford to disregard them, but he will look in vain for pat explicit answers. Only
through a close analysis of the text can he evolve an hypothesis or a set of hypotheses by which these gaps can be filled in with some degree of probability (Sternberg 1980: 51).

An entrance to such a hypothesis is provided by the fact that Saul's action was manifestly made in the knowledge that he would be chosen; why else would he hide? His action reveals, in a small way, a certain amount of will for self-determination, and hence the potentiality for this meek and mild designate to frustrate Yahweh's designs. To hide when Yahweh has chosen him may be a futile act on Saul's part, but it does reveal a side to his character that becomes increasingly important later in his career (e.g. ch. 13).

In summary, v. 22 is primarily a verse of characterization: of Israel in the question, Yahweh in the answer, and Saul in the baggage.

Verses 23-24

Upon hearing the whereabouts of Yahweh's chosen one, the people run and get him. Once more, Israel's forthrightness—they ran and got him—shows
that they willingly accept the condition that Yahweh alone decides who his replacement will be.

The description of Saul standing head and shoulders above all the people around him harks back to the prior occurrence of this description in 9:2, where it prefaced the description of Saul's secret designation. In v. 23, on the other hand, it plays an important part in his public acclamation. While it has often been suggested that 9:2 is a redactional connector based on 10:23, and aimed at linking a disjointed narrative, closer examination demands a reconsideration. 31

As noted above in the discussion of 9:2, the reader is given to wonder about the significance of Saul's size, especially as it might relate to his possible involvement in the proposed monarchy. The description in 9:2, as it stands in context, opens a gap in the reader's understanding of the information about Saul's stature as it relates to previous events and the ongoing story. What, if any, is the connection between this Saul and the request for a king? What about his great size? The expositional gap is only temporary, however, and is now closed by the description of the use to which Samuel puts Saul's size.
The narrator directs the reader's attention to this closure of the gap, the answer to those previously unanswerable questions, by means of repeating words from the verse that created the gap. Buber is an example of a reader sensitive to this use of Leitwörter: "Jetzt erst spricht Samuel das entscheidende Wort aus, dem das bachur ix2 präzidierte, das aber seither, von dem disponierenden Stil des Erzählers aufgespart, auf sich hat warten lassen: bachar, erwählt hat JHWH den" (Buber 1956:145). The repetition is not limited to bbr, however; also repeated are miṣṣikmo wāma ce-la' gabōahh mikkol-hācām, and with some variation, ṭen ēn šī mibbēne yiśrā'ēl ṭōb mimennū. The reader is thus invited to renew his attempt to understand the significance of these descriptions using their second occurrence as a context.

Samuel commends Yahweh's choice to the people by pointing to his size.32 Keil and Delitzsch unknowingly put their finger on the very important strategic reason for the choice of the giant Saul: "Such a figure as this was well adapted to commend him to the people as their king (cf. ch. x.24), since size and beauty were highly valued in rulers, as signs of manly strength" (1880:87; cf. Gressmann 1921:42).
Knowing Samuel's (and hence Yahweh's) deceptive intentions, one of the reasons for the choice of Saul is clearly that he would be an attractive choice from the people's perspective. The people had requested a king who could fight their battles, going out before them to war (8:20). Who would seem better suited to this task than the biggest man in the land? Samuel even implies that Yahweh's choice was made in view of Saul's incomparable size (ki דַּעֲנֵנֵן kāmōhû).

That Yahweh had Saul's attractive size in mind from the very start of his operation to subvert the proposed monarchy is evident from 9:2, which now can be seen to fit into the total maneuver. Reading Samuel's speech in v. 24, the reader understands why the narrator focused on Saul's size in 9:2; the size of the giant is the bait that, when taken by the people, will spring the trap of the nāgīd on the unsuspecting victims.

The literary dynamics of this particular example of a temporary gap may be summarized as follows: 1. A gap is created in the reader's understanding of the narrative by supplying him with a detail, Saul's size, that seems important, but has no immediate contextual significance; 2. Following
a lengthy plot development, the gap is closed by placing
the detail in a new context in which the importance of
its previous occurrence is explained by its second
contextual connection.

The author did not explain the significance of
Saul's size immediately on the first occurrence for
two important reasons: 1. The withholding of exposi-
tion creates reader interest and curiosity, thereby
making a more compelling tale; 2. On account of the
sense of mystery and unseen purposes which he seeks to
create in 9:1-14, the author could not afford to
explain that, in consideration of Saul's size, Yahweh
would choose him for a king. Such preliminary exposi-
tion would totally destroy the literary artistry of
both 9:1-4 and that now created by the delayed exposi-
tion in 10:24. As it is, when the reader watches as
Samuel presents the bait to Israel and recalls the
prior mention of Saul's size in the story of his path
to designation, he says "Of course, how clever!" By
allowing his reader to "discover" the explanation for
9:2, the author creates a more interesting, satisfying
reading experience.

I have suggested that the proceedings of vv.
17-27 are a trap set up to trick Israel into accepting
Saul, the nāgād. In order to be successful, however, the trap must have also teeth, that is, some means of compelling Israel to abide by their acceptance, if they should give it.

Throughout the narrative, the people have been the model of covenantal fidelity. Even when they have justifiable cause to reject Yahweh, they do so only through existing covenantal channels, which is to say, through Samuel and Yahweh. Playing on this characteristic uprightness, Samuel engineers the proceedings so that Israel commits itself to Saul before he reveals the constitutional basis of the monarchy (mispāt ḥammēlūkā, v. 25). As noted above, Samuel sets a serious, ceremonious tone for the proceedings from the beginning (cf. above on v. 19). Using the form of a prophetic judgement, he leads the people to believe that their request is being acceded to. Now, in v. 24, Samuel asks the people if they will "appoint" (ḥā·āṣitem) Yahweh's choice. What Samuel is hoping for is an official, binding agreement from the people that they accept Saul.

The response is immediate. All the people (kol-hā·ām) send up a great shout (wayyāri'ū). It is important to note that at this point, before Samuel
lays down the new monarchic constitution, the acclamation is unanimous and therefore binding on all Israel.

The acclamation of Saul has two separate vocal parts, the "great shout," and the exclamation "Long live the king!" (Mettinger's translation of הָלַעַמֶלֶק, 1976:132). According to Humbert, the "great shout"

était l'acclamation sauvage mais rituelle de Yahvé le roi et le guide (arche et taureau), le chef de guerre, celui qui révéla sa puissance à l'exode (1946:34).

The people's use of this means to voice their approval of Saul as Israel's new leader is particularly appropriate, and reveals their conception of what is taking place. Yahweh, their past king, their military leader, the one who led them in the exodus, is replaced by Saul as the one acclaimed by the great shout. Everything symbolized by the expression in the past is now transferred to the new, profane monarchy. Yahweh had failed them before, even though they had greeted the arrival of his ark with a "great shout" (4:5). The acclamation of his replacement with the same sound can, therefore, be taken as a communal recollection of the reason for their installation of this new king.
Significantly this is the first and last time that Israel acclaims a new king with this shout, normally reserved to recognize Yahweh as king.

The second part of the acclamation, " הָמְמֶלֶךְ hämmelek, occurs six times in connection with the investiture of a king (De Boer 1955:225; Mettinger 1976:132-33; Ringgren 1980:335-36). Though the exact translation of this acclamation is disputed, it is agreed that it is a recognition of the authority of the new king and that those expressing it consent to submit to the king's authority (De Boer 1955:231; Mettinger 1976:135-36; Ringgren 1980:336).

The alert reader will see in Israel's first response (the great shout) to Saul an example of dramatic irony based both on the verb יָרָיֵּ֥י wayyārīʿ, previously occurring in 4:5, and on the parallelism of scene, character, and character expectations between the two occurrences. In 4:5, the people send up a great shout when they see the ark, expecting its arrival to turn the battle in their favour. In fact, the exact opposite takes place. Now in 10:24 the people send up a similar shout expressing their approval of the new king, who they think will lead them as a profane nation into new conquests,
uncomplicated by the problems of theocratic political existence (8:19-20). As the reader knows, however, they are actually expressing their approval, not of a king to make them like all the nations, but of a nāgīd whose only real commission is over Yahweh's "inheritance" (10:1). 36

Verse 25

The bait taken, the trap sprung, Samuel lays down the law concerning the new monarchy. Ben-Barak (1979) has presented a detailed comparison of v. 25 with two well-known tribal covenants: the covenant at Sinai (Exod 19-24), and the covenant at Shechem (Josh 24). On the basis of that comparison which need not be recited here, Ben-Barak concludes that v. 25 is also a description of the ceremonial formalization of a covenant (1979:32-33; cf. Stoebe 1973: 218, who cites Baltzer's work on Josh 24 and Exod 19ff.; Mettinger 1976:136). In view of the emphasis on acclamation and commitment in v. 24, Ben-Barak's judgement also appears sound from a contextual perspective. Samuel's actions in v. 25, therefore, bind the people to the king in a "covenant document" that is legally inescapable. 37 If the people continue in their law abiding ways, they will do so with Saul as
their king.

Besides the legal aspect of v. 25, there is yet another revelatory side to Samuel's management of the covenantal installation. Samuel describes the "manner," "type," or "law" (constitution) of the monarchy (מִשְׁפָּט הַמַּמֵּשֶׁלֶת) to the people. Various suggestions have been made about the content of this constitution: it is identical or related to the מִשְׁפָּט הַמַּמֵּשֶׁלֶת described in 8:11-18 (e.g. Smith 1899: 74; Budde 1902:72; Dhorme 1910:90); it is unrelated to 8:11-18 which is not a constitution, but a critical evaluation of the weaknesses of monarchy (e.g. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:108; Birch 1976:51-52; Mettinger 1976:87-88; McCarter 1980:193-94); it is related to the description in 8:11-18, but may (Stoebe 1973:218-19) or does involve further considerations than the purely negative valuations of 8:11-18 (Hertzberg 1964: 88; Langlamet 1970:187); it presupposes, or relates to the law of the king in Deut 17:14-20 (Nowack 1902: 49; Talmon 1979:13).

There are four definite textual features that can help to resolve this problem of identification. Against the identification with 8:11-18 is the people's differing reactions to each מִשְׁפָּט. The
people find nothing objectionable in 8:11-18, insisting that they will have a king, no matter what he may do. In response to the mishpāt in v. 25, on the other hand, there are mixed feelings. Those "whose hearts God had touched" accept Saul, and so the conditions described in the mishpāt (v. 26). Other untouched persons—bēnē bēliyā'āl—, however, rejected Saul as a king that cannot benefit them (v. 27). In view of the fact that all the people (kol-hā'ēm, v. 24) accepted Saul before Samuel made known the mishpāt, one must conclude that it is the monarchic constitution and not Saul per se, that has upset these people. Thus the two mishpātim of 8:11-18 and 10:25 cannot be the same.

The second point to be taken into consideration is the treatment accorded to this new mishpāt, which is written in a covenant document and installed before Yahweh. As in the example of the great stone in Josh 24:26, the covenant document is placed in Yahweh's presence with the implication that he will watch over and guarantee the fulfillment of its stipulations and, if necessary, punishment for any infractions. "On déposerait ce document en présence de Yhwh, signe évident de la dépendance de la
monarchie nouvelle à l'égard du Dieu national" (Langlammert 1970:198; cf. Weiser 1962:67; Thornton 1967:420; Boecker 1969:56). In view of the people's intention to sever the ties between "church and state" it is altogether understandable that there should be a negative reaction to Samuel's news. The installation before Yahweh also stands, therefore, against the linkage of the *mispat*im of 10:25 and 8:11-18.

Regarding the third point, we can recall that there was an important difference in ch. 8 between what Yahweh said, "Declare the manner of the king to them" (v. 9), and what Samuel did (8:11-18). Instead of declaring the "manner of the king," Samuel had tried to dissuade the people by describing, in the worst light, "the custom of a king." Could Samuel now be fulfilling Yahweh's command by unilaterally laying down this new constitution on the basis of what he has learned in ch. 9? Certainly the two passages would seem to agree with regard to the question of whether or not Israel could have a monarchy not under the direct governance of the theocracy and its agents. In 8:9, Yahweh commands Samuel to take immediate regulative control over the implementation of the request, and in 10:25, Samuel places
the new monarchical constitution squarely before Yahweh, a clear indication of its theocratic subser-
vience.

One seeming difficulty posed by the suggested connection is the difference in terminology. Yahweh had said "Declare to them the manner of the king" (וְהִגַּדְתָּנִי לָהֶם מִשְׁפָּט הַמַּעֲלֶה, 8:9), but here Samuel simply "tells" the people what the constitution is (וָאֵדְבֶּרֶת לְהַאֵמָן בּוֹ הַמִּשְׁפָּט הַמַּעֲלֶה). As Boecker has noted from a somewhat different perspec-
tive, the solution to this problem is to pay close attention to the contextual frame of each occurrence (1969:52). In 8:9, Yahweh seeks both to still Samuel's fears about losing his position to the new king, and to tell him what action to take in response to the request. The words Yahweh uses are directly suited to that particular situation of immediate need. In 10:25, on the other hand, Samuel, no longer fearful for his position, is engaged in the public pro-
clamation and installation of a monarchical constitut-
ion to go with the already accepted king. Though what he does is in essential accord with Yahweh's command, Samuel's public proclamation has a different rhetorical emphasis (cf. Boecker 1969:56).
The fourth and conclusive indication of the identity of this "monarchic constitution" is the word מֶלֶךְ. The reader will recall that this word has occurred only once previously in 10:16. There the narrator himself introduced the reader to this word, which in context, could only be taken to refer to the secret arrangements that Yahweh and Samuel had made to install a theocratically subordinate designate over Israel as king. That introduction to the meaning and significance of the word provides the reader with a ready understanding of the מִשְׁפָּט הַמֶּלֶךְ in v. 25, and of the mixed reactions resulting from Samuel's announcement. The meaning of the word established by 10:16 is also in accord with the installation of the constitution before Yahweh; it is, after all, his creation.

The combined weight of these four considerations is, in my opinion, sufficient to establish the meaning of the מִשְׁפָּט הַמֶּלֶךְ. It is "the monarchic constitution" that subordinates the monarchy to the theocracy. It is installed before Yahweh as a sign of his continuing political supremacy and as a warning that he is the warden who will ensure that Israel, the committed "signatory," lives up to this
new monarchic constitution.

According to McCarthy the final sentence of v. 25 is comparable to Josh 24:28, a formal phrase of dismissal counterpart to the call to assembly in Josh 24:1 (cf. 1 Sam 10:19) (1978:224). Samuel leaves no room for protest at his deception. The people are dismissed and explicitly told to go their separate ways (םֵֽשֶׁת לֶבֶטּו), perhaps to prevent insurgent assemblies from forming.

Verse 26

The first thing the reader is told after Samuel dismisses the people is that "even" (gam) Saul went to his home. The emphasis of gam is placed on Saul's response because his action is the first action of the inaugurated monarch—an obedient response to the command of Samuel, the theocratic mediator. Saul leads the way for his subjects with his exemplary response to Samuel's command. His obedience is, of course, a result of his conditioning and heart-changing (10:9) experiences in ch. 10.

Not surprisingly, as our narrator points out, those who go along with Saul, thus expressing their acceptance of him as king under the new constitution, are also persons whose hearts are touched by God. As
God changed Saul's heart in 10:9 to ensure Saul's compliance so now he touches the heart of the army, making them Saul's supporters. 40 Again God appears as the divine enforcer of what Samuel has begun; Samuel sends the people home separately to avoid rebellious mobs, and God, who must have read Thomas Hobbes, 41 provides the physical means of force to keep the monarchy in place. The future of the new monarchy is now guaranteed by a constitution and the means to enforce it.

Verse 27

Not all of the people are touched by God, however, and those who are not openly question the utility of Saul's monarchy. The request for a king was motivated by the desire to avoid future military disasters like that of ch. 4. Freed of theocratic entanglements, the people could at least fight in the confidence that they could depend on their king (8:19-20). The new monarchy still situated within the theocratic structure is, therefore, useless from the perspective of the request. Truly King Saul cannot deliver them from the theocracy.

It may seem odd that the narrator who has been sympathetic to Israel's plight should now
characterize these dissenters as $b^\text{e}\text{n}^\text{ê} \ b^\text{e}\text{l}^\text{i}^\text{y}^\text{a}^\text{c}^\text{a}^\text{l}$. This descriptive term has been used twice before in the narrative; once in Hannah's protest to Eli, who thinks she is drunk in the temple, not to take her for a bat-$b^\text{e}\text{l}^\text{i}^\text{y}^\text{a}^\text{c}^\text{a}^\text{l}$ (1:16), and once in a description of Eli's sons as $b^\text{e}\text{n}^\text{ê} \ b^\text{e}\text{l}^\text{i}^\text{y}^\text{a}^\text{c}^\text{a}^\text{l}$ who do not know (yd$^\text{c}$) Yahweh (2:12). These two examples both relate to possible or actual cultic abuse (Otzen 1977:135-36). The usage in 10:27 seems, on the other hand, to be related to juridical abuses since these persons refuse to honour their expressed commitment to Saul as king (cf. Otzen 1977:134). In all three cases, the translation "renegade" captures the essential significance.

The narrator's critical evaluation of these renegades, however, should not be taken as an indication of a complete turnabout in his attitude towards the people and their case for a profane monarchy. Rather, the term $b^\text{e}\text{n}^\text{ê} \ b^\text{e}\text{l}^\text{i}^\text{y}^\text{a}^\text{c}^\text{a}^\text{l}$ should be understood:

1. as an accurate, and therefore not completely condemnatory, description of someone transgressing against an existing statute; & 42 2. as an indication that the narrator places a high value on the virtue of honouring one's commitments, a trait that he has already revealed in his negative presentation of
Yahweh and positive presentation of the people; 3. as an indication that the narrator believes that Yahweh's concession of Saul is a necessary compromise in view of the ultimate meaning and value of Israelite existence as the people of Yahweh. This last consideration, which will predominate in ch. 12, is obviously at the forefront of the narrator's evaluations of either covenantal partner's action. When Yahweh disregarded his commitment, the narrator sympathized with the people. And now that Yahweh has made the conciliatory gesture of a monarchy under the theocracy, which the people have legally accepted, he tenders a criticism of those individuals who cry foul play. Though they have been duped, everyone acclaimed Saul (v. 24) so that any subsequent rejection of him automatically brands the protestors as "renegades."

A similar emphasis is also seen in the second sentence of v. 27, "And they spurned him." Görg notes that the verb bəzḥ is sometime used when a "sacral legal relationship" is contravened (1977:62-63). Saul, it will be recalled, is Yahweh's anointed and so any slight against him is also a slight against Yahweh. The choice of the verb bəzḥ also harks back to those previous bənē bəliyācāl who, Yahweh implies, are
despisers of Yahweh (bozay, 2:30). In both cases, the offenders have broken a covenant with Yahweh; both their title and the verb describing their action point to this aspect of their behaviour.

The verse and the chapter are concluded with a description of Saul's personal reaction to these rebellious dissenters. The narrator introduces the change of focus by switching from the general covenantal implication of the dissent to the particular, individual event. The be’ne beliya’al express their disrespect by not bringing any "tribute" (minha) to the new king.43 Saul's response is described as silence, "as being deaf."44 This reaction, while not qualified by the narrator, can be judged by the reader as astonishment, or inexperienced inability to respond, or forbearance, or perhaps all of these. The reader must, however, wait for further events and narratorial comment before he can accurately gauge the performance and behaviour of the new king towards his subjects. From the perspective of narrative technique, then, Saul's silence opens a gap in characterization that may or may not be filled in the subsequent narrative.
11. 1 Samuel 11

Many readers of ch. 10 have noted that the final scene closes on a note of inconclusive uncertainty (e.g. Mettinger 1976:84-85; Veijola 1977:40). The doubts expressed by some of the people go unanswered by Saul himself with the result that the reader looks toward future scenes for a resolution of the question about Saul's monarchy (cf. Noth 1967:59; McCarthy 1973:411; Crüsemann 1978:55-56).

Saul's public inauguration has been performed. The new constitution has been publicized and installed before Yahweh. And yet, as Wellhausen says, "Dann geht man nach Hause und alles bleibt beim Alten" (1899:241). The conditional monarchy may have been installed, but there is, as yet, no indication of any accord between Yahweh and his people. The imbalance created in the relationship between Yahweh and Israel by the latter's request for a king to make them like the other nations has obviously not been corrected by the installation of a monarchy whose constitution is dictated by the theocratic representative.

The reader will recall that in the previous Mizpah meeting (ch. 7), which consisted of a ceremony in which Israel tried to bridge the gap between itself
and Yahweh, the reunification of the two partners was sealed in a battle against a common enemy, the Philistines. When Israel saw Yahweh once again fighting on its behalf, it became clear that Yahweh had accepted the contrite plea for renewed relationship. As the reader will soon discover, the new scene, about to unfold in ch. 11, runs parallel to the battle scene that followed the first Mizpah rapprochement. When the Israelites see just how well their new king is able to save them from an outside enemy, they will unite in their acceptance of him, and hence in their agreement to a renewed relationship with Yahweh. As Israel remained unsure of Yahweh's acceptance of their conciliatory offer (7:8) until Yahweh joined in the battle on their side (7:10-14), so Yahweh (and the reader) will not be sure of Israel's allegiance to the new monarchy (Yahweh's conciliatory offer) until Israel responds to the victory wrought by Yahweh (11:11; cf. v. 13). It is a significant comment on the relationship between Israel and Yahweh that it should depend so completely on the performance of Yahweh (or his designate Saul) on the battlefield. Without assured military victory, it seems, there could be no ties between Israel and Yahweh.
Verse 1

The reader is made aware that he faces a new scene by the introduction of a new character, Nahash, and a new setting, the location at Jabesh-gilead. The new scene, as scholars have noted, opens without explicit connection to prior events. Even following LXX one only gets a limited temporal connection that can even be read as a connector to 9:1-10:16 (e.g. Gressmann 1921:45; Hylander 1932:159). The narrator jumps from Saul's silence at Mizpah into the middle of ongoing actions at Jabesh-gilead. The sudden switch reinforces the reader's sense of unfinished business in ch. 10.

Buber has correctly described the literary dynamic of this abrupt opening:

so durch, dass er die verlängerte Zeitlinie des vorhergehenden Abschnitts im Moment einer entscheidenden Begegnung kreuzt.... Hier kommt es vom Anliegen der Sage aus darauf an, zu zeigen, wie der verhaltene und verkannte Held im Augenblick, da die situation ihn gewaltig anfordert, ausbricht und sein Heldentum bewährt; (1956:150).

With respect to Saul's kingship, the reader is struck by the complete disregard paid to Saul in the description of the initial exchange between Israelites and Ammonites at Jabesh-gilead. Since all the people had acclaimed Saul (wayyārīqū kol-hācām, 10:24), the reader must take the Jabesh-gileadites' suggestion that they would like to become Ammonite vassals under an Ammonite covenant (cf. McCarter 1980:203) to imply that they have no trust in the new king, and no longer feel any allegiance towards Yahweh and their covenant with him (cf. Gutbrod 1956:79-80). A king had been requested that would make Israel "like all the nations" (8:5, 20). When a king was set over Yahweh's "inheritance" (10:1) to maintain Israel's identity as Yahweh's "people" (9:16) and the Jabesh-gileadites were faced with the Ammonite threat, they decided that it
was better to subjugate themselves to "the nations" in a covenant, than to risk a reliance on the bruised reed of a theocratically subordinate monarchy.

It seems that the Jabesh-gileadites have forgotten neither the request for a profane king, nor the reason for it, namely the great defeat at the hands of the Philistines (ch. 4). That previous defeat is recalled here by the repetition of the verb הָנַּח in v. 1, last used in 4:1 to describe the Philistine encampment. Should this Leitwort connection seem rather slim, one might note that this is also the first time that Israel or a group of Israelites has faced an enemy encampment since ch. 4. The first sight of an enemy encampment and Israel would rather surrender than fight. The Jabesh-gileadites, at least, do not seem to regard Saul's monarchy as a suitable solution to the problem of enemy encampments.

Verse 2

Nahash's reply to the plea for a peaceful surrender is also used to indicate the weakness of Israel without an accepted leader. His terms—all the right eyes of the Jabesh-gileadites—are intended to show Nahash's contempt for the weak enemy who give up
without a fight. Nahash's suggestion that this disfigurement of the Jabesh-gileadites would be a reproach to all Israel is based upon the obvious lack of a national defence program in Israel. When a city within a nation is willing to gouge out its eyes in surrender rather than to fight in expectation of support from its country, the disfigurement would indeed be a reproach on the whole country.\(^1\) It would also seem to indicate a complete lack of political authority and allegiance in the country where such a thing would even be conceivable.

**Verse 3**

The portrait of Israel's complete disarray as a political entity is completed in v. 3. The elders beg (herep lānû) for a seven-day period of grace in which they will send messengers to every corner of Israel in search of a deliverer (mōṣî‘a).\(^2\) It seems that the Jabesh-gileadites would disagree with Samuel's statement that Yahweh is their deliverer (mōṣî‘a, 10:19) and by not turning directly to their new king would implicitly agree with those "renegades" (bēnê bēliyâ‘al) who questioned Saul's ability to deliver them (māh-yōṣî‘ēnû, 10:27; cf. Buber 1956:149). At least for these Israelites neither the theocracy nor its agents
is worth considering as a source of deliverance.

Instead, they look for help from their fellow Israelites, "in every corner of Israel." This attitude is underlined by the Jabesh-gileadites' complete willingness to surrender should they not find a deliverer within Israel. Divine help is neither expected, nor solicited. In view of Israel's covenant with Yahweh, in which divine protection (as Samuel has just recalled, 10:17-19) was the underlying presupposition of the relationship, the behaviour of these Israelites is remarkable to say the least. If anything, Yahweh's concession of a limited monarchy has worsened the state of affairs. Only once before had Israel looked for a human leader to deliver them from an enemy instead of looking to Yahweh (Judg 10:17-18) and that was because Yahweh himself had told them that he would not deliver them anymore (Judg 10:11-14). Even after the terrible defeat of ch. 4, Israel was still willing to rely on Yahweh's saving action to deliver them from a renewed Philistine threat (7:8), though it is only fair to point out that the exigency of that situation was a great stimulus to their renewed faith. In 1 Sam 11, on the other hand, Israel disregards Yahweh's help totally on its own initiative. The people act as if
their covenant with Yahweh no longer existed.

Verse 4

Immediately following the plea to the Ammonites the narrator describes the travels of the messengers, leading the reader to assume that Nahash did grant the seven-day reprieve (cf. Gressmann 1921:44). Nahash's agreement is a further indication of what dire straits Israelite defence was in. "Er will nur mit ihnen spielen wie die Katze mit der Maus" (Schulz 1919:160; cf. Budde 1902:74).

The description of the messengers' journey is limited to the one stopping place which is of any importance in the narrator's eyes, namely Gibeah of Saul. The town in this visit, Gibeah, is called gibɔt ša'ûl, not because the narrator wishes his reader to think that Saul now owns the town, but in order to jog the reader's memory that Saul had gone home to Gibeah after the inauguration (cf. 10:26). The messengers are thus shown to have pursued their search for a moši'â and to have arrived in Gibeah of Saul, a man whom Yahweh had said would deliver (w'hoši'â, 9:16) Israel, but a king whose ability to deliver was doubted by some Israelites.

As Budde notes, the single destination of the
search suggests that the messengers have come to Gibeah to get Saul, who is known to Israel and reader alike as king (1902:74). Perhaps, the reader is led to conjecture, the messengers, unable to find a deliverer, have finally decided to give Saul a try. Is Saul finally going to be giving a chance to prove himself to the people? The narrator excites these and other speculations in his reader with the description that the messengers went to Gibeah of Saul, but he does so only to build up the reader's expectations and then demolish them with the realities of the situation.

The messengers relate their mission to the people. Instead of running to tell the news to Saul, who has purposefully been left off stage so that the people can call for him if they want him, the townspeople begin helplessly weeping and wailing. Even the inhabitants of Saul's own home town do not seem to consider Saul, their elected king, as a possible deliverer. Neither do they make the obvious move and turn to Yahweh for help for their countrymen. Saul's neighbours thus share the Jabesh-gileadites' mistrust of Yahweh, and, along with the Jabesh-gileadites, they seem to agree with the doubts of the "renegades" (bêne bêliyâ'al) about the ability of Saul's monarchy.
to serve as Israel's delivering agency.

Verse 5

While his subjects are lamenting the fate of the Jabesh-gileadites Saul appears, coming up from the field behind the oxen. The reader may recall a previous incident where Saul was following some animals (9:3-14) and ended up being anointed as Yahweh's designate. Could the narrator be hinting at something that lies in Saul's future by putting him in a similar position here?

As Miller points out (1974:165-67), scholars have often used the description of Saul engaged in agricultural pursuits to separate this scene from 10:17-27, where Saul is the acclaimed king with the army at his side (e.g. Beyerlin 1961:188-89; Soggin 1967:41-42). Two explanations of Saul's agricultural activity are possible, both of them allowing the reader to understand ch. 11 as an important and logical sequel to 10:17-27. First, it is not entirely implausible that a king should also go out and plough his own fields in a small, disjointed kingdom like Israel. (Smith cites Poole who gives classical parallels, 1899: 78.) Secondly, and more important, the reader has already been presented with two examples of groups of
people who seem to have rejected any notion that either Yahweh or Saul can deliver Israel from the enemy. Perhaps Saul does not act like a king because he is not recognized as one, even when his help is desperately needed. In a situation where a new king—the first ever in the nation's history—is not recognized by his subjects, what else can he do but tend to his regular daily affairs? If the lack of recognition for the king is openly displayed even in his home town, how much more so would it be in the distant areas of the country. Without even the recognition of being used as a king when his help is needed, Saul is, for the moment, a king without a kingdom.

The description of Saul's agricultural activity after his inauguration completes the picture of the stalemate in Israel's struggle for constitutional reform. Yahweh may have foisted his own designate upon Israel as their king, but they seem to have countered by refusing to recognize Saul. No one even takes the time to tell Saul about the Ammonite threat so that he, like the worn out, old priest Eli (cf. 4:14), must ask to find out why the people are crying (Smith 1899: 78). The political negotiations are at an impasse. Yahweh has made his offer but Israel refuses to
recognize Saul, even though he was accepted by all. Their refusal is apparently regarded as at least partially justified by God and king, neither of whom tries to force the people to recognize the new monarchy. The reader may surmise that the refusal of recognition is justified by the devious methods used to install the theocratically subordinate monarchy.

Verse 6

Into the stalemate rushes the spirit of God, overpowering Saul, who immediately becomes enraged over what he has just heard (cf. Smith 1899:78, the spirit is "the efficient cause of wrath"). "It is clear that in 11:6 the possession of the spirit becomes the motivation for all that follows: hence, the impetus is God's (Birch 1976:57). Saul's own anger at the situation, which commentators have observed to be separate from the onrush of the spirit (e.g. Hertzberg, 1964:93; Stoebe 1973:227), is now stirred because the spirit has overpowering him; hence he is no longer subject to normal human limitations and is able to disregard and overcome the lack of recognition from his subjects. He is angered by the situation because he has just been given the means to surmount it.
Much scholarly effort has been spent on the questions of the historicity and nature of Saul's inspiration by the spirit of God (see Beyerlin 1961; Mettinger 1976:234-38 for discussion and review). In the context of our narrative, however, the implications are fairly straightforward. Saul had experienced the onslaught of the spirit once before (10:10), and had been supplied with the explanation that it, amongst other things, indicated God's presence with him (10:7), empowering him to do whatever circumstance demanded. The reader may, therefore, regard this second rush of the spirit of God onto Saul as a necessary booster shot to stir him into action. By himself, Saul seems incapable of overcoming the people's resistance to his leadership (cf. Fritz 1976:357).

Verse 7

The timing is perfect. The spirit of God comes upon Saul exactly when he hears about the Jabesh-gileadites' need for a deliverer. Thus reminded of Samuel's instruction to do what comes to hand, Saul throws off his role as farmer and takes on the task of deliverer. His first action, with which he signals the end of his farming activities, is to take the pair of oxen and cut them up. What a difference a bit
of spirit makes—instead of following the oxen around, Saul now destroys them.

Saul commandeers the messengers who were to have gone to every corner of Israel in search of a deliverer and sends them on the same course (בֵּקֵל-גֵּבֵּל יִשְׂרָאֵל) with pieces of the cut-up oxen. Saul's act is a direct challenge to the people's refusal to recognize him. The search for a deliverer is transformed by that deliverer into a call to all Israel to follow Saul and Samuel in the fight against the Ammonites. Saul's bold transformation of the messengers' task carries its own clear message with it. A deliverer, says Saul, has been found.

As a not so subtle reinforcement of his call to arms, Saul issues a threat, promising also to destroy the oxen of anyone that did not come out in support of himself and Samuel. The threat that he would destroy the oxen of anyone refusing to come out in support of Saul and Samuel indicates that Saul will no longer tolerate the passive resistance to his leadership. If Israel will not willingly support him, he is now willing to coerce their support for the sake of the threatened Jabesh-gileadites.

As is often observed, there are similarities
between Saul's use of the pieces of oxen and the Levite's use of pieces of his concubine in Judg 19:29 (e.g. Smith 1899:78; Wallis 1952:57-61; McCarter 1980:203). But the differences between the two incidents are even greater than the similarities (cf. Buber 1956:151; Stoebe 1973:227; Miller 1974:167-68). Saul sends his pieces of oxen out as a threat against anyone who would not come to fight under him; the Levite sends his pieces of concubine out without any accompanying explanation, request, or command. In response to Saul's action, the fear of Yahweh falls on the people and they come out "as one man," but in response to the Levite's action the people independently suggest a conference and independently assemble "as one man" at Mizpah (Judg 20:1). The essential difference is that Saul seems to have the authority to command an action on the part of the people, whereas the Levite only tries to stir up a public reaction, which is initially a reaction to his own abuse of the concubine's corpse (Judg 19:30).

Why do the people, who have so far ignored Saul's kingship, now choose to obey him? Before seeking a specific answer one should note that this is the first explicit command that the new king has issued; so, in fact, this is the first actual trial of Israel's
recognition of Saul's authority. Against those who assert that 11:1-11 does not presuppose either Saul's designation (9:1-10:16) or acclamation (10:17-27), Miller suggests that Saul's threat "is not the sort of threat that an unknown farm boy is likely to have made, or that the people would likely have taken seriously—unless they were aware that he had some authority or ability to back it up" (1974:167-68). Miller pinpoints the source of Saul's authority in the army, which, as the reader knows from 10:26, was God's inauguration present to Saul (1974:168).

The reader of v. 7, though he may share Miller's surmise, is given a more explicit reason for the people's obedience. Saul makes the threat, yet intervening between the threat and the positive response is the narrator's own explanation—"And the fear of Yahweh fell upon the people" (cf. Zimmerli 1978:87). Saul's prime source of authority, then, is Yahweh himself (cf. Birch 1976:57). As Yahweh's chosen king, Saul must be obeyed. Disobedience of Saul is disobedience of Yahweh and the people are well aware that he is able to enact punishments far more serious than Saul's threat of chopped-up oxen.7

With the events of v. 7, then, the stalemate
between the theocrats and the people is over, even if the recognition accorded to Saul's leadership is forced. For the moment that is all that is required since it will give Saul, Samuel and Yahweh the chance to prove the advantages of acceptance of and cooperation with the new monarchy.

Verse 8

The narrator apprises his reader of the response in numerical terms. However the reader understands the meaning of ᵃᵉˡᵉᵖ, "thousand," he is predisposed by v. 7 to understand the numbers as a favourable response to Saul's call. If the response to the call was as unified as v. 7 suggests—"they came out like one man"—then the numbers that are given should be taken to support that description (cf. Shulz 1919:162).

The separate assessment of participants from Israel and from Judah foreshadows the eventual split between the two regions (Keil and Delitzsch 1880:112). By describing the rally in these terms the narrator includes a veiled irony in his story of Israel's first king, for though the king is able to unit all Israelites "as one man," the reader is reminded by the names Israel and Judah that a subsequent king will also be a cause of division amongst the people.
Verse 9

The messengers that came (habbâ'îm) from Jabesh-gilead (cf. v. 4, wayyâḇū hammal'akîm) are told to tell the men of Jabesh-gilead that they will be rescued the next day. In MT the verb 3mr is plural, indicating that it is the assembled people (or a part thereof) that, with or without Saul, predicts a rescue for the Jabesh-gileadites. Though the majority of scholars follow LXX in which the first verb is singular and understood to have Saul as subject, there is no basis other than interpretational preference for rejecting MT. The reader of the Hebrew text must ask not whether the verb is singular or plural, but why the unidentified subjects of v. 9a predict a rescue.

At least three answers are possible. The persons who make this promise may be army personnel, the hearts of whom God had touched in 10:26. The reader might understand them to express their faith in their leader. Alternately, the anonymous authors of the promise may be people who have changed their minds about the efficacy of Saul since he now seems to have a new appearance of authority and is obviously taken seriously by all in attendance. In this case, the reader is given to understand that Saul's
authoritative command to come out, in combination with
the fear of God, is enough to gain the sympathy and
support of a previously balky populace. Finally, the
reader might also consider the possibility that the
assembled people feel confident of their success on
account of their perception of their own strength, Saul,
Samuel and Yahweh aside. The anonymous subjects thus
promise deliverance without any consideration or desire
for divine aid in combat. The simple inclusion of
Saul in each of the aforementioned possibilities alters
the reader's understanding of each, and multiplies the
number of readings to a total of six. The reader is,
therefore, forced to wait for subsequent events and
perhaps narratorial exposition to know who made this
statement and why they made it.

Though the narrator will not fill in the expository
gap created by the anonymity of the subjects
in v. 9a, the gap causes the reader to consider and
reflect upon the meaning of the assembly and the battle
with respect to the people's perception and acceptance
of Saul's designated monarchy. Whether the reader
ever arrives at any certainty about who made this
promise is relatively unimportant. As it turns out,
however, the narrative will allow Saul a chance to
declare unambiguously who really assures deliverance \( (\text{t\textsuperscript{evac\text{\textsuperscript{a}}}}) \) in Israel (11:13) and by that time the question of the people's allegiances will no longer be in doubt.

The ambiguity of v. 9 continues in the description of the Jabesh-gileadites' reaction to the promised deliverance. Do they rejoice because their fellow Israelites feel they have strength enough to save them or because King Saul now seems capable of acting as a deliverer in Israel? Only time will tell, and even then the reader will not be sure whether Saul was accepted before or only after the victory. By that time, however, the issue will have palled in the light of the reconciliation and resolutions of the victorious Israelites and their king. The ambiguity is important only as a technique to prod the reader into a consideration of the manifold possibilities and prospects of the narrated events with respect to the disputed kingship.

Verse 10

The Jabesh-gileadites inform the Ammonites that they will surrender the next day, implying that their messengers have not been successful in their quest for a deliverer. They "give the Ammonites tidings
intended to make them confident. The hidden double meaning of the phrase 'tomorrow we will come out to you' is thus an especially subtle touch, which the ancient audience would have applauded loudly" (Hertzberg 1964: 93; cf. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:112).

Verse 11

The attentive reader will recall that just as the preceding ceremonies at Mizpah (10:17-27) were parallel to the prior Mizpah meeting (7:5-10), so this battle account also has its counterpart in 7:10-12. In the prior instance Yahweh had thrown the Philistines into confusion so that they were defeated by Israel. That victory was a sign to a conciliatory Israel that Yahweh was once again with them.

When the reader compares this second battle with the first, however, he notes a significant difference. Here Yahweh does not himself exert any overt influence over the course of the battle. Nor does Samuel, whose intervention by sacrifice and supplication played a major role in the previous battle, take any part in the battle itself. Instead, Saul stands alone as commander of the Israelite forces. The campaign, like that of ch. 7 (vv. 10-11), turns into a rout with the Ammonites fleeing in total confusion, "disbanded
(וֶלֹּא נִשֵּׂאָה רַעְבּוֹ בָּם שֵׁנֵיָיִם יָהָד) and dispersed (וַיְהִי חַנִּים אָרִים וַיִּפְסֻעָה)." This similarity in result only serves to emphasize even more, however, that the second post-Mizpah victory is achieved under Saul without any apparent interference from Yahweh. Saul has proved that he is indeed capable of delivering Israel (cf. Knierim 1968:32). Only Saul, the narrator, and the reader know that it was the spirit of God that stirred Saul into action in the first place. From the people's point of view, victory is aided only by their support.

Verse 12

Verses 12-14 are one of those places in the Bible where scholarship has blazed so many different pathways through the material that no "tree" or, in this case, word is left standing as a solid point to guide the biblical reader through the textual wilderness. A short list of difficulties that have been encountered by historical-critical readers is as follows:

1. The people in v. 12 want to kill those who have questioned that Saul should be king. Yet nowhere in ch. 11 has Saul acted as king
and even in 10:27, presuming momentarily that 10:27 might be read before ch. 11, nobody questions Saul's kingship, but only his ability to "deliver" (e.g. Seebass 1967:165 n.24; Bardtke 1968:298; Stoebbe 1973:222, 228; Ishida 1977:46-47).


3. A question is put to Samuel in v. 12, yet in v. 13 it is Saul who responds. The logic of the text requires that we follow LXX and read Samuel in place of Saul as the subject of v. 13 (e.g. Weiser 1962:74 n.60; McCarter 1980:201). The shifting of subjects of vv. 12-14 may be the result of redactional disturbances in the narrative (Stoebe 1973:222, 228).

4. The request to kill some people who reject Saul's kingship in v. 12 makes sense only when 10:27 is presupposed (Weiser 1962:75-77; Kegler 1977:82; Crüsemann
1978:56-57). Yet 11:12 seems to reflect a personal rejection of Saul, while 10:27 questions the type of monarchy established (Bardtke 1968:298; Crüsemann 1978:59).

Though the list could be extended considerably, the relevance of these considerations for a synchronic reading is limited, since in all cases the literary-critical discussion of vv. 12-14 presupposes various dissections and rearrangements of the material in chs. 8-10. Because it has proven possible to find coherence in the preceding scenes, it seems plausible that vv. 12-14 may also be understood as integral elements of a unitary literary context (cf. Buber 1957:153; Miller 1974:166).

The first thing that the reader notices in v. 12 is a definite shift in the attitude of the people towards King Saul. In 10:27, some had expressed serious misgivings about the chances of such a monarch ever proving a capable deliverer. Subsequently in 11:1-5 the reader was presented a picture of widespread lack of recognition for Saul's kingship. Even in the face of danger, when a search was being made for a deliverer (a role that we know from 10:27 to be a king's
recognized task), Saul was not even considered as a possible choice, let alone as the obvious one. Following the victory, however, it seems that the majority of people (הָכָם) have changed their views and wish to publicly proclaim their allegiance to the crown. These people therefore jump in at the first opportunity —just after the last single Ammonite disappears over the horizon in v. 11—to profess their new-found allegiance; they do so by a clever rhetorical contrast drawn between themselves, loyal defenders of the crown, and those base individuals who had dared to question Saul's kingship over them. The new converts attempt to hide their past disregard for King Saul behind their accusing fingers, which are pointed at those who dared to voice (הָדִּמְר) their misgivings about the new monarchical constitution.

The rhetorical intent of the people's question and request also explains the much questioned change in the nature of the questions in 10:27 and 11:12. In 10:27, the "renegades" (בֵּנֵי בֶּלִיָּהוֹחֵל) had questioned the efficacy of Saul's kingship when they heard Samuel's constitutional declaration (10:25). Now, however, the people rephrase the expression of doubt so that it becomes more serious in its implied
rejection of King Saul. Rather than a question about efficacy, the question becomes a rejection of Saul's kingship, kingship already acclaimed and constitutionally supported (10:24-25).

In their desire to appear as loyal supporters the people have turned an expression of misgiving into an offense of treason, the outright rejection of the monarchy. The renegades (בֵּנֶּה בֵּלִי לאֶל) had not, in fact, questioned the legitimacy of Saul's kingship, even though they had been duped. They questioned only the ability of a theocratically designated monarch to "deliver" what they had in mind. The psychology behind the people's reformulation of the question is at least as old as this example and still prevalent in similar situations today. The paradigmatic biblical example of this blame-shifting technique is, of course, found in Gen 3:11-13.

To make matters worse, at least from the reader's perspective, the people express their intention to slay these villains for their calumny against King Saul. The hypocrites will have scapegoats to absorb the punishment due to all for failing to treat Saul as the king acclaimed by all. The reprehensibility of the people's call for scapegoats is not alleviated by Knierim's observation that they base their call for the
death of the vocal opposition on the dictates of sacral justice:

After Saul had been chosen by the Yahweh lot out of the tribes, Samuel said: "Do you see him whom Yahweh has chosen?" and Saul received the acclamation, except for a few who despised him. After Saul's victory, however, it was proved by divine judgement that the despisers had not merely slandered Saul but also Yahweh's messiah, and with that Yahweh himself. This meant that the judgement of death had been revealed over them according to the understanding of sacral justice. Then the people, in asking Samuel for the execution of the judgement, do not turn to the avenger but to the representative of Yahweh and to the judge of Israel. The desire of the people has, therefore, nothing to do with vengeance and it is not 'petty.' It is a legitimate and necessary demand to executive judgement against the convicted slanderers of Yahweh (1968:33; cf. Birch 1976:61-62).

While Knierim's suggestion is probably correct, especially since it is supported by the narrator's own
sacro-legal characterization of the dissenters as \( b^\text{e}_\text{n}^\text{e} \) \( b^\text{e}_\text{l}^\text{i}^\text{y}^\text{a} \text{c}^\text{a} \text{l} \) (10:27), the people's call for justice is thereby no less hypocritical. The \( b^\text{e}_\text{n}^\text{e} \) \( b^\text{e}_\text{l}^\text{i}^\text{y}^\text{a} \text{c}^\text{a} \text{l} \) may even legally deserve the death penalty for what they said against Saul's kingship, but the fact remains that the quotation of v. 12 is a fabrication that reveals more about the people who utter it than it does about the reaction of the dissenters to Samuel's constitutional proclamation.

Knierim’s observation that the people bring their sacral legal grievance to Samuel because he is Yahweh’s representative and Israel’s judge is argument enough against the frequent attempts to oust him from v. 12. The reader will recall that Samuel had officiated over Saul’s public installation. It is natural that the newly confirmed adherents should address their self-justifying incriminations to the human representative of the divine architect who designed Saul’s monarchy (cf. Weiser 1962:75).

Verse 13

It seems odd that in v. 13 Saul should answer the question posed to Samuel in v. 12. Some commentators have followed LXX in v. 13, which reads “Samuel” instead of Saul as subject of the first sentence, thus
resolving the incongruity (e.g. Weiser 1962:74 n.60; McCarter 1980:201). Others have regarded LXX as a harmonistic alteration to circumvent the incongruity (e.g. Dhorme 1910:94; Stoebe 1973:222), all to the greater glory of Samuel (Budde 1902:76).

If the people's utterance in v. 12 served to characterize them is it possible that Saul's interruption is also used to characterize him? Birch has observed one aspect of characterization in Saul's interruptive response to the question posed to Samuel. According to Birch, Saul's response is apodictic in form, a legal pronouncement based upon Yahweh's deliverance and not on Saul's personal magnanimity (1976:61). Saul thus encroaches upon Samuel's territory in sacral/legal judgements; "this small fragment of tradition serves to set up the later situation of Saul's rejection precisely because of his lack of concern for matters of sacral law" (Birch 1976:62). It would, however, be a mistake to regard this brief passage as a criticism of Saul. On the contrary, Saul's impetuosity in v. 13 offers, if anything, a mitigation for this and subsequent trespasses on Samuel's theocratic province. The mitigation is supplied within the answer that Saul gives to the request for summary
justice to be meted out to his own erstwhile detractors. Saul orders the stay of execution but immediately justifies his command with a profession of his own. Though Yahweh played no obvious part in the battle, Saul gives him all the credit for the victory. Saul implies that his own command over the Israelite forces is, in fact, the command of Yahweh. Saul witnesses to the fact that he is Yahweh's designate, that he had acted on the impulse of his inspiration, and so he testifies to his own belief that Yahweh was with him as he directed the Israelite army to a sound defeat of the Ammonites. Saul's impetuous interruption is, therefore, the result of his honesty and self-effacement. He wants everyone to know who really brought victory to Israel. Saul's intrusion into Samuel's sphere of activity is excused by his enthusiasm and his open show of allegiance to his theocratic lord exactly at a time when it would have been easy for him to take personal credit for the victory. Saul passes his first test of power with flying colours. He recognizes and affirms his subordination to Yahweh and at the same time deals justly and sympathetically with his subjects, especially those who had previously criticized his kingship.
Still we would like to know why the fact that Yahweh has given Israel a victory (קָנָה יְהוָה tָּֽשָׁעַא) should be cause for amnesty for those who had malignd Yahweh's chosen king. The answer lies in the sequence of actions in narrative time. Yahweh chooses a king who is accepted but then doubted by these vocal dissenters. Nevertheless, Yahweh delivers Israel, indicating that he has disregarded the slight against his chosen king. And if Yahweh shows by Israel's deliverance that he has not been offended by the criticisms of the dissidents, then so much the more should Israel and Saul let them pass. Saul emphasizes the fact that Yahweh's positive action supersedes the criticism by stressing the word "today" first in his justification. "No one will die on this day (בַּיֵּיָהוֹם הָאָזֶה) [for former offences] because today (בַּיֵּיָהוֹם) Yahweh has given deliverance in Israel." The fact of "deliverance" after the offence is enough to suspend any call for punishment.

Saul directs the attention of both his audience and the reader to an important implication of their victory. That Yahweh should disregard the detractors of his chosen king and still press on to his goal of getting his people to accept his designate is an
accurate measure of his priorities. While he could have anticipated the people's call for the death penalty, perhaps by arranging it so that the "renegades" would be killed in the battle, a maneuver at which Yahweh is accomplished (ch. 4), he does not. Instead Yahweh continued his efforts to have Saul accepted, installed and recognized as Israel's king. The matter of the detractors is obviously of small importance from Yahweh's perspective, in comparison to the great gain of reconciliation if Saul would be welcomed by the people. For this reason, says Saul, no one shall die, for that would be contrary to Yahweh's wishes as known from the deliverance that he has granted.14

Verse 14

Vannoy notes that there is near consensus that v. 14 is the creation of a redactor who tried to harmonize the crowning of Saul at Gilgal (11:15) with the account of his inauguration at Mizpah (10:17-27) (1978: 114).15 In all cases, the key to understanding the harmonistic redactional intent of v. 14 is seen in the verb "let us renew (n̂ehaddēš) the monarchy." (To Vannoy's survey of redactional analyses of v. 14 add McKenzie 1962:8; Langlamet 1970:197 n.195; Miller 1974:172; Fritz 1976:356; Mettinger 1976:84; Veijola
1977:40; Mayes 1978:16.) Speaking of the relationship between 10:17-27 and 11:14-15, Hertzberg suggests that originally the action of 11:15 was no renewal, but a separate description of the first establishment of Saul's monarchy. "We are also able to see in the sequel that here an editorial hand has tried to represent things as a succession rather than a juxtaposition of accounts" (Hertzberg 1964:94).

Before surrendering v. 14 to the redactional scrap-heap, however, we should examine it carefully to see if it really is so out-of-sorts with its context. Is it possible that the monarchy was in need of renewal? The reader will recall that though all the people did acclaim Yahweh's choice in 10:24, there was vocal dissension after the publication of the monarchical constitution (10:27). In fact, only the army, whose hearts were manipulated by God, "went with Saul."16 Subsequently it became apparent that the lack of recognition for Saul's kingship was widespread in Israel (11:1-5; cf. Buber 1956:155). Though Saul had been publicly acclaimed and a monarchical constitution had been proclaimed and installed before Yahweh, the monarchy had been dormant because it was not recognized by the people.
Following the victory over the Ammonites, however, the people act speedily to profess their uncompromising support of Saul as their king. "Das gespalte, unentschlossene Volk realisiert aber die melukha zunächst nicht,—nicht durch das, wodurch allein sie vom ihm realisiert werden kann, durch Einheit des botmässigen Handelns, der Gefolgschaft" (Buber 1956: 155). Saul matches their zealous defence of his kingship with a proclamation that Yahweh has granted deliverance to Israel and so all former detractors are pardoned. Both sides of the monarchic dispute thus show themselves reconciled, forgiving, and ready to act together under the auspices of the new monarchic constitution.

Could anything be more appropriate than for Samuel, theocratic mediary and official installer of the conditional monarchy, to suggest that everyone now go together (לְקֻנָּה וּנְאֶלֶקָה, ‑יָנָהָדָדֶץ) and renew the monarchy (cf. Levine 1974:28-29)? As Buber observes, Samuel's name has now appeared three times in connection with the word melukha (10:16, 25; 11:14). Samuel "erscheint zuerst als der Mittler des Sakraments, das die melukha begründet, sodann als der Überbringer der Verfassung, durch die sie normiert wird, nun
erscheint er als der Initiator des noch ausstehenden reiner und feierlichen Vollzugs" (Buber 1956:156). The "kingdom" (מֶלֶךְ) that Yahweh establishes for Israel was secretly planned (10:16), perpetuated (10:25), but unaccepted (10:27-11:5), and finally accepted and supported by all (11:14-15).

Not only is a renewal of the monarchy possible in the context of chs. 10-11, but it is absolutely necessary as an opportunity for the people to affirm their acceptance of and allegiance to the monarchy offered to them by Yahweh (cf. Vannoy 1978:66). The renewal will mark the beginning of a new period in Israelite political history in which the people are willingly governed by a king given to them by Yahweh on the express condition that the theocracy remains, with the king ruling only as Yahweh's designate. The renewal gives the people the chance to say yes to this condition with an unambiguous and unanimous affirmation, not previously given.

The choice of Gilgal as the place to renew the monarchy is apt, since the renewal of the monarchy is also a renewal of allegiance to Yahweh, the divine architect and master of this monarchy. Forever linked with Gilgal was the memory of Yahweh's foundational
acts of deliverance on Israel's behalf (Josh 4:19-24). Gilgal was the place of the twelve stones, set up as a permanent reminder of the exodus and the crossing of the Red Sea, "so that all the people of the earth may know that the hand of the Lord is mighty; that you may fear the Lord your God forever" (Josh 4:24, RSV). A renewed allegiance to the monarchy at Gilgal is a fitting conclusion to the introduction of a monarchy into the theocracy. The combination of a memorial location and renewed allegiance to the conditional monarchy signals the end to any aspirations of becoming "like all the nations" with a leader other than Yahweh. 17

Verse 15

In response to Samuel's suggestion all the people, together again (cf. 10:24, the last explicit description of their unity), go to Gilgal (cf. Buber 1956:154, "die elementar als Einheit ergriffene und als einheit handelnde Schar"). The victory, their perception of the possibilities in Saul's kingship, and Samuel's suggestion to renew the monarchy have together brought about a reunification of the people.

As many readers have observed, there is a pronounced emphasis on the fact that the people alone
make Saul king (wayyamliḵū šām et-šā’ūl) (Wildberger 1957:449; Alt 1967:254; Speiser 1971:284; Birch 1976:60; Fritz 1976:357). This emphasis is cited to support the argument that v. 15 and indeed all of ch. 11 represents a separate account in which Saul is made king solely on the initiative of the people (e.g. Birch 1976:60). As Birch is well aware, however, under the influence of 11:14, which suggests renewal, the people's action serves only to express their support of the king already designated and chosen by Yahweh. In v. 15, also, there is an emphasis on the act as confirmation. Five times Gilgal is mentioned (thrice as šām) to stress the importance of the site where the new monarch was finally accepted by the people. The act of making Saul king takes place "before Yahweh," indicating that it is under Yahweh's sanction and in agreement with the monarchical constitution previously installed "before Yahweh" (10:25). 18

The emphasis on renewal and reconciliation in response to the previous dissatisfaction with Saul's monarchy (10:27-11:5) is also seen in the description of sacrificial activity. In contrast to the "renegades" who refused to bring the new king a minhā, "tribute" (10:27), the people now sacrifice vešāmim, "offerings
of well being," before Yahweh. In the contrast with
the situation in 10:27, in the type of sacrifice, and
in the locations "there," (Gilgal) and "before Yahweh,"
there is strong emphasis on the complete resolution of
political conflict between Yahweh and Israel, recon-
ciled as they are by the new monarchy.

In view of the atmosphere of reconciliation
created by vv. 12-15, it seems probable that the empha-
sis on the people alone making Saul king or, with
Mettinger (1976:86), "calling him king" in v. 15 should
be understood not as an indication of an alternate con-
ception of the inauguration of Israel's monarchy, but
as the proper and necessary response to Yahweh's con-
ciliator gesture of giving Israel victory through Saul.
It is important for the future state of relations
between God, king and people that the people do act alone
in this renewal. They thereby give their uncompromised
seal of approval to the monarchy of Saul, and so they
eliminate the shadow of doubt which hung over the prior
inauguration on account of the deceptive procedure em-
ployed by Samuel.

The final sentence of v. 15 is the narrator's
depiction of the peaceful conclusion to this stormy
period in Israel's political history. We see Saul and
all the men of Israel together and exceedingly happy about the conclusion that has been reached. The men of Israel are happy to have such a king, Saul is happy to be such a king, and Yahweh has installed the type of king that maintains the relative positions of himself and Israel: he as their God and they as his people.

The sequence of events initiated by the misbehaviour of Samuel's sons has finally come to a conclusion. Not surprisingly, in view of the many instances of scenic parallelism already observed between chs. 2-7 and 8-11, the concluding resolution of conflicts in ch. 11 parallels the resolution of ch. 7. In both cases the series of events were initiated by the misdeeds of Israel's theocratic leaders, and in both cases the series concludes with a victory given to Israel by Yahweh through a theocratic agent. The only significant difference in the final analysis is that in the second resolution a division of labour has been instituted in the offices of mediator. Saul takes over the role of military leader and provides some insulation of national defence from the cultic sphere. Perhaps this division of labour explains why Israel is now satisfied with the arrangement, even though they obviously knew (10:27-11:5) that they have not gotten
what they asked for (8:5, 20). At least they will never again be confronted by a disaster like that brought upon them by the sins of the Elides.
12. 1 Samuel 12

Verse 1

There is general acceptance of Noth's suggestion (1967:5, 10, 47) that 1 Sam 12 is a programmatic outline of prospects for the new monarchy seen against the historical background of Israel's relationship with Yahweh (e.g. Boecker 1969:65-64; Miller 1974:161; Wolff 1975:88-89; Fritz 1976:360; Mettinger 1976:82; Veijola 1977:83; Mayes 1978:10 n.40). There is less unity concerning the question of the relationship of ch. 12 to 1 Sam 1-11 or to chs. 8-11, or even to ch. 11. Veijola, for example, argues, against Muilenburg (1959:364) and Weiser (1962:82), that Gilgal (11:15) is not the locale of ch. 12. The fact that a collector put the disparate traditions and redactions of chs. 11-12 in their present order with the understanding that oration of ch. 12 took place at Gilgal "beweist noch keineswegs Gilgal als Haftpunkt von 1 Sam 12" (Veijola 1977:84 n.5). For Veijola it is important that ch. 12 be viewed alone, separate from its collected context, because he regards the chapter as the redactional product of "DtrN," a redaction in which geographic locales are characteristic-ally absent (1977:84).

Considered from a literary perspective, 12:1 does
not seem to introduce a new scene; in fact, continuity predominates. Three of the four important scenic determinants link 12:1 with 11:15:

1. Topic - the inaugurated monarchy
   (Keil and Delitzsch 1880:115);
2. Characters - Samuel (11:14), all Israel, and Saul (the melek of 12:1);
3. Time - no indication of any lapse between 11:15 and 12:1;

A separate factor that argues for the inseparability of chs. 11 and 12 is the causal connection: Samuel's introductory words in 12:1 are a response to the proceedings described in 11:15.¹

The contextual connection of v. 1 extends much further than 11:15; Samuel explicitly recalls the words of Yahweh in 8:7 (Budde 1902:77): שֶׁמַא bֽכֹל hא־cָּם
לְכֹל עָשַׂר—yּוֹ לֶרִי לְאָלֵל (against Smith 1899:84).

For Samuel at least the actions of 11:15 are the fulfillment of the request made in ch. 8. He has made them a king (wא—אֱלַקִּה cָּלֶקָה melek) in accordance with Yahweh's final command (wּה-וּוּלְדּא לְאָהָנָה melek, 8:22) (Boecker 1969:65; Birch 1976:67; McCarter 1980:212).
Samuel's opening remarks imply that the conditional monarchy of Saul is "everything they asked for" (לְכֹל הַשֵּׁרֶשׁ). They also remind the reader of Samuel's initial worries that the people were rejecting him (8:6), fears that were only allayed when Yahweh told him to "listen to the people, to everything they say" (8:7). Samuel's quotation of Yahweh's words at this point can be understood partly as an effort at self-assurance in the face of the now firmly established monarchy, which Samuel had previously regarded as a threat to his own office (cf. above on 8:6-7). Samuel quotes Yahweh as a reminder to himself that the request for a king was a direct threat against Yahweh's position, and not his own. Further on the reader will see that Samuel's own position with respect to the monarchy is of major concern to him. He takes care to ensure that his position is understood and accepted by the people (vv. 16-25).

Samuel's efforts at self-assurance are supplemented by his obvious effort to assert his continuing authority over Israel after the acceptance of King Saul. The first thing Samuel does after the renewal is to claim credit for the creation of the monarchy—"I made a king over you." As Dhorme observes, Samuel seems to
quote Yahweh (8:22) here, but makes one small alteration (1910:100). Yahweh said, "Make a king for them (lāhem)," but Samuel says "I made a king over you (caškem)." Emphasis falls on Israel's subordination to the king and on the authority of Samuel who places the king over them. Through this statement Samuel is characterized both by what he says and by what he changes when he quotes Yahweh (cf. Alter 1981:70, 97). Both quotations reveal that Samuel is a bit apprehensive about his own position as theocratic mediator, probably because the people now have their king.

Verse 2

A switch to a new concern, separate from the details of installing a king, is marked by the introductory particle waCatta (cf. Veijola 1977:92-95; Van- noy 1978:11 n.5). Samuel points out that the path to monarchy has been followed to its conclusion, using the demonstrative particle hinneh (cf. Labuschagne 1973:74): "And now, take note. The king walks before you. As for me, I am old and grey. My sons are with you and I have walked before you from my youth up to this very day." Samuel states the result of the request for a king, touching noncommittally on the
immediate catalyst for the request in the state of affairs in his own family.

The presentational order of his recollections is a reversal of the actual order in which things happened. Reversing Samuel's order, we see that he retraces the steps by which the king seems to have preempted Samuel's place, walking before the people. Intervening between the king who now walks before the people and Samuel who has walked before them is Samuel's painful recollection of the request for a king. That Samuel appears to think that the king has replaced him, or at least encroached on his monopoly of walking before the people, is indicated by the emphatic juxtaposition of himself and the king as the past and present "walkers" (Langbame 1978:289 n.12; Vannoy 1978:11; McCarter 1980:212-13).

As scholars have observed, v. 2 is not a simple recapitulation of the transition, especially as it pertains to Samuel's sons. Weiser goes so far as to suggest that the author of 12:2 seems neither to presuppose nor even to be aware of the sins of the sons as they are described in 8:5, (1962:80; cf. Veijola 1977: 95; Crūsemann 1978:61-62). In view of Samuel's concern over his own post-monarchic status (cf. vv. 1, 5-5), it
is likely that the critically unaffiliated reader will see the neutral presentation of the sons in v. 2 as the biased opinion of a father trying to maintain family honour in the community.

Closer examination from this angle uncovers Samuel's defensive tactics. The reference to his sons is surrounded by two self-references, both begun with the words "as for me" (waš3āni) to contrast Samuel with the new king. Samuel tries to hide and protect his sons between the two predominant self-references; he points to his own behaviour as the explanation for the request.

What were Samuel's failings?—he is old and grey from a lifetime spent walking before the people. The way Samuel puts it the reasons for the request for a king are grudging and thankless. He sees everything in the light of his long career, which he knows is uncompromised (cf. vv. 3-5).

The sons, moreover, are "with the people," a phrase with which Samuel proposes a camaraderie between sons and people. The sons are even paired with the king by the parallel introductions of both by the particle hinnēh and the suggested associations of both with the people. Samuel includes his sons with the king
as joint heirs to his heritage. Obviously Samuel's sons are the chink in his armor, so he is careful to hide their failing behind his own merits. More than the neutral mention of them in v. 2 he dares not make.

Verse 3

Samuel redirects his audiences' attention to himself, again, with the third repetition of the demonstrative particle, hinî. He has recalled the inauguration of the monarchy and touched lightly upon the reasons advanced by the people for their request. Samuel continues to present a revised recollection of the causal conditions for a monarchy which has little in common with the people's perspective as revealed in ch. 8. In v. 3, he lays the groundwork for an understanding of the request for a king from his own perspective as Israel's incumbent theocratic mediator. The people have had their say about Samuel and his sons, and their request has been partially granted. Now Samuel sets about the task of reframing the entire sequence in what he regards as a proper perspective.

The people are called to testify before Yahweh and his anointed against Samuel if he has committed any of the crimes that he lists. Samuel's specification
that testimony be made also before Yahweh's anointed has sometimes been considered a secondary expansion, largely on the basis of grammatical considerations in v. 5 (e.g. Veijola 1977:94; Crüsemann 1978:63). Samuel's inclusion of the anointed accomplishes two things, however, both important for his immediate purposes.

First, by suggesting that any legal testimony be made before Yahweh and "his anointed" Samuel implies that the law and legal practises of Israel still remain a theocratic province, even when it is the theocratic mediator that is being tried. Though they now have a king requested, we are reminded by v. 2, on account of corrupt judges (cf. 8:3-5), he is by definition "Yahweh's anointed" and not an alternative or separate authority in Israel's law and legal practise (cf. Gutbrod 1956:87). The new king has not altered the judicial hierarchy in Israel, even though it had been expected that a king would do so by judging Israel "like all the nations" (8:5). The "anointed" stands with Yahweh.

Secondly, Samuel confidently puts himself on trial by the people before Yahweh and his anointed with the expectation of being cleared of any charges he makes against himself. Samuel recruits the new king
as a witness to his own innocence. The king, requested to replace Samuel, becomes a witness to the fact that Samuel's replacement was uncalled for, and thus to his own redundancy in Israel's legal system.

The injustices that Samuel denies having committed have sometimes been regarded as intentional contrasts to both the manner of the king in 8:11-18 (Budde 1902:78; Schulz 1919:168; Boecker 1969:70; Veijola 1977:95; Crüsemann 1978:64-65; Vannoy 1978:16) and the provocative misdeeds of Samuel's sons (Boecker 1969:70; Crüsemann 1978:64-65; Vannoy 1978:12 n.12a). Unlike his hypothetical king in 8:11-18, Samuel claims that he has taken (lqah) no livestock and has not wronged or abused anyone. Unlike his sons, Samuel has not taken any bribes. Samuel sets up the questions, all relating to the abuse of power by a mediator, so that his audience, if they grant that he has not done any of these things, will be trapped in the implication that nothing was wrong in the pre-monarchic offices of theocratic mediation. The reader will note that Samuel is very careful to avoid mentioning any of the specific misdeeds of his sons, and that he does not ask their opinion of his son's performance in office.
Verse 4
The people answer with a complete acquittal for Samuel on all charges.

Verse 5
Samuel capitalizes on his exoneration by reversing the roles of Yahweh and his anointed; instead of witnessing claims of injustice against Samuel, they now stand as witnesses against the people (bākem) that Samuel's hands are clean (lō3 mesātem bēyādî mēnūmā). The ultimate aim of this public exoneration is not immediately apparent, though the very fact that Samuel enlists the support of Yahweh and his anointed as witnesses is reason enough for the reader to believe that Samuel plans to develop some further action or claim (cf. Weiser 1962:84). Since it is Samuel's activities as theocratic mediator that are cleared of suspicion, it is a good bet that any further claims will have direct bearing on the question of his partial or complete replacement by the new king (cf. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:116).

The final sentence in v. 5 is problematic on account of the unidentified subject of the verb wayyōmer. Who says "Witness"? A common solution to the problem is to follow versitional readings in which the
verb is plural (e.g. Smith 1899:84-85; Stoebe 1973:232). The subject is then understood as the people, who express their assent to Samuel's legal claim with the single word "Witness."

Whether one follows the plural of the versions, or simply understands Israel as a unit to be subject of the singular (so Keil and Delitzsch 1880:116; cf. Vannoy 1978:18 n.23), the context seems to demand that the subject be understood as the people, who agree to Samuel's claim. In v. 3, Samuel calls for testimony against himself; in v. 4, the people reply (third person plural of 3mr without specified subject), clearing Samuel; in v. 5a, Samuel replies (third person singular of 3mr without specified subject) with a citation of witnesses; in v. 5b, the people reply (third person singular of 3mr without specified subject) in agreement; in v. 6, Samuel replies (third person singular of 3mr with specified subject, necessary for clarity on account of the singular in v. 5b) with a comment on the people's agreement. Both the alternating dialogue and the explicit subject of v. 6 suggest that the unidentified subject of v. 5b is the people. The fact that Samuel is specified as the new subject of 3mr in v. 6 also suggests that the verb in v. 5b should be
left in the singular; if it were plural, there would be no need to reidentify Samuel as the respondent, since he is the subject of all third person singular utterances in ch. 12 up to v. 5b.

Verse 6

Inextricably linked to the difficulties in v. 5 is Samuel's description of Yahweh in v. 6 (cf. Buber 1956:157-58, who eliminates both vv. 5 and 6 as, respectively, insertion and gloss on insertion). Attempts to regularize the syntax of the verb have either followed LXX and inserted כֶּד before yhwh (e.g. Thenius 1864:47), or inserted the pronoun הָעָלֶה between the words yhwh and יָשֵׂר (e.g. Ehrlich 1910:207). The syntactic difficulty of v. 6 can also be alleviated, as Keil and Delitzsch suggest (1880:116), without alteration on the basis of versions by careful attention to context.

Samuel's reidentification as the speaker in v. 6 avoids confusion on account of the last sentence in v. 5. Samuel answers the people's response (wayyōqēmēr כֶּד, v. 5) immediately, perhaps even intrusively so that his first word, yhwh, follows immediately after the word כֶּד, voiced by the people in v. 5. The unidentified person or persons who say כֶּד in response
to Samuel's call for witnesses are given an impromptu definition of who it is that is called and accepted as witness to Samuel's integrity. As Ehrlich noted against a correction on the basis of LXX, nothing has dropped out of MT before the word \( \text{YHWH} \) (1910:207). "He (they) said, 'Witness,'" and Samuel said to the people, '(is) Yahweh...'."

Verse 6, then, does function, in part, as a concluding answer to vv. 1-5. Samuel reminds the people that the witness to his integrity as mediator is Yahweh. More specifically, he points out that his divine witness is Yahweh, who "made" Moses and Aaron and brought the fathers from the land of Egypt.

Samuel regards this biographical information about Yahweh as important to Yahweh's status as witness to his own integrity. (Scholars, on the other hand, have regarded this information, especially the peculiar note that Yahweh "established" \( \text{Ca'sa} \) Moses and Aaron as justifiable grounds for excising at least v. 6b as a secondary intrusion; e.g. Buber 1956:157-58; Noth 1967:59 n.3; Boecker 1969:71; Stoebe 1973:237; Veijola 1977:94; McCarthy 1978:207, "a gloss as in v. 8?".)

Keil and Delitzsch suggest that the expression "he made Moses and Aaron," means "to make a person what
he is to be" (1880:116; cf. Driver 1913:92). What were Mose's and Aaron? The answer, provided by the allusion in the second biographical detail, is that they were Israel's theocratic mediators throughout the fundamental event of the exodus. The syntax of v. 6 parallels the making of Mosés and Aaron with the bringing of the fathers up from the land of Egypt:

\[\text{ywhw \textbf{\textbar} ser \ kas\textbar et-m\textbar n \ w^e \ et \ ah\textbar n r\textbar non} \]
\[\text{wa\textbar ser he\textbar c\textbar ia \ et \ b\textbar d\textbar t\textbar ek\textbar m...}\]

The witness to Samuel's integrity is Yahweh, creator of the offices of theocratic representatives in the exodus and "maker" of Moses and Aaron, the archetypal mediators. Samuel's credentials as an upright mediator must, therefore, be immaculate, testified to by the people, and witnessed by Yahweh.

Vannoy notes that the verb \textbf{\textbar s\textbar h in the phrase, "who made (\textbar s\textbar h)...."} must have been employed to bring out a particular emphasis (1978:23 nn.39-40). He observes that the same verb is used in v. 7 with reference to the \textbf{\textbar s\textbar d\textbar q\textbar t ywhw}, "Yahweh's acts of justification."\(^9\) \textbf{\textbar s\textbar h also occurs in 11:13 with Yahweh as subject: "Yahweh has made deliverance" (kas\textbar-ywhw}
placing all three occurrences together, it seems that Samuel, following Saul's use of צ"ה in 11:13, places Moses and Aaron in the same category as "deliverance" and "acts of justification." All are things "made" (צ"ה) by Yahweh for Israel's benefit in a situation of need. The witness to Samuel's integrity as mediator is the person who created that position for Israel's benefit.

The political evolution traced by Samuel reveals a surprising aspect of the succession of a king to a position previously occupied by the theocratic mediator alone. The people have moved to replace an officer, whose office is ranked alongside Yahweh's deliverance and saving deeds, with a king. Moreover, they have done so while openly admitting the rectitude of Samuel. As regards the specific situation in the mediatory office, this grave development, which in Samuel's presentation amounts to a rejection of Yahweh's unwarranted graciousness, is made to appear unnecessary and inexplicable. If the reader or Samuel's audience accepts Samuel's claim, and his audience seems bound to do so by their own testimony to his integrity, the request for the monarchy begins to appear less justifiable. The obvious question of why Samuel should trouble himself to
persuade Israel that the request was not legitimate
after the monarchy is already in place is answered
later in ch. 12.

Just because v. 6 has been shown to function
conclusively with respect to vv. 1-5 does not mean
that it does not also serve as an introduction to
vv. 7ff. Verse 6 introduces the topics of the arche-
typal mediators Moses and Aaron and the exodus event
with which these figures are associated. Boecker
argues that the references to Moses and Aaron in v.
6 (and v. 8) are conspicuous and without contextual
against this view are Samuel's concern with the office
of mediator in vv. 1-5 and the important bearing of
v. 6 on that subject. In addition Samuel will continue
to trace both the benefits and the lineage of mediators
from the paradigmatic Moses and Aaron down to himself
(vv. 6-11). To deny the connection of Moses and Aaron
to Samuel's remarks on Yahweh and his beneficial medi-
tors one must ignore the syntactic parallels between
the descriptions of Moses and Aaron (v. 8) and the
other judges (vv. 10-12). Both form and content speak
against the elimination of Moses and Aaron from Samuel's
speech.
Samuel's brief recollection of the origins of his office in v. 6 is a turning point where he shifts from the vindication of his own performance in office to a historical retrospect covering the entire line of theocratic mediators. Having obtained a public acknowledgement of his person integrity in office, he moves on to defend the office itself.

He begins already in v. 6 with his recollection of the exodus, Israel's birth story as a nation, and the provision of mediators whose important role was known by all Israelites (cf. Vannoy 1978:21). These memories remind Samuel's audience of a time and place when the mediator was of irreplaceable benefit to Israel, as Yahweh worked through Moses and Aaron to bring Israel up out of Egypt.

Verse 7

Samuel marks a complete shift to a new topic in Israel's political affairs by repeating the introductory expression וַּאֲחָזָה, so employed at three places in Samuel's presentation (vv. 2, 7, 16; cf. Muilenburg 1959: 361-63; 1968:171 n.2; Veijola 1977:92-93; Vannoy 1977: 11 n.5, 24-25). He proposes to review Yahweh's past performance. Like the previous section introduced by
\textit{wale\textsuperscript{catt\textsuperscript{a}}} (vv. 2-5 (6)), vv. 7-12 stand in relationship to v. 1, which gives the basic datum to which all of Samuel’s reviews are related. In summary form the relationship is:

v. 1 Samuel said, "I have listened to everything you said and set a king over you:

vv. 2-5 (6) "And now," as for Samuel’s conduct.

vv. (6) 7-12 "And now," as for Yahweh’s conduct.

In contrast to his own case, where Samuel called on the people to testify against him before Yahweh and his anointed (v. 3), Samuel expresses his desire to dispute with Israel before Yahweh, all the acts of justification that Yahweh has done for them and their fathers.\textsuperscript{11} Samuel is open about his bias concerning Yahweh’s irreproachability; he will not even entertain the notion that Yahweh’s past behaviour was ever detrimental to Israel’s well-being.

Once again the reader sees Samuel circumventing the real reasons for Israel’s request for a king. It was not for his performance of any such acts of
deliverance that Israel requested a king to replace Yahweh; rather, it was on account of Yahweh's failure to perform these covenantally ensured acts (cf. ch. 4). Like his noncommittal reference to his sons in v. 2, Samuel's rehearsal of Yahweh's saving deeds touches on the matter of concern, but skirts the crucial issues. Samuel's concern is formal vindication for himself and for Yahweh, and not an impartial review of faults.

Verse 7 begins a section in ch. 12 generally regarded to exhibit the influence of literary covenant forms (e.g. Muilenburg 1959:360-65; Baltzer 1964:73-76; Stoebbe 1973:237; Birch 1976:68-70; McCarthy 1978:215-21; Vannoy 1978; McCarter 1980:220-21). Scholars are careful to point out, however, that the covenant form is subordinate to Samuel's particular rhetorical purposes. "...we do not have a covenant or a treaty document but a speech by Samuel that shows the influence of the covenant form" (Birch 1976:68). It will pay, therefore, to devote attention to resemblances to covenant formulas found in Samuel's presentation without expecting to find a covenant or covenant renewal as a result. The reader informed by a knowledge of a fixed literary form for covenant renewal in the Bible should be prepared to let Samuel's direction of the
proceedings override his own understanding of how such a ceremony should go.\textsuperscript{12}

The covenantal nature of the business at hand is introduced by Samuel's call to assembly ($w^e\text{catta} hityass^e\text{bu}$), an expression regarded by Muilenburg as a common feature of covenantal formulations (1959:361, 563, cf. Baltzer 1964:74 n.1; McCarthy 1978:207; Vannoy 1978:24-25). Samuel had last called such a formal assembly in 10:19 ($w^e\text{catta} hityass^e\text{bu}$) when he installed Saul, initially under the guise of a replacement for Yahweh. The reassembly in 12:7 recalls the assembly of 10:19; at both gatherings Yahweh's history of beneficent acts on Israel's behalf is invoked as a demonstration of the senselessness of the request for a human king (cf. Boecker 1969:74).

Verse 8

Samuel commences his recitation of Yahweh's acts of justification with the exodus. In Samuel's presentation it is Israel, represented here by Jacob, that gets itself into trouble in Egypt. Yahweh is excluded from any involvement in the migration to Egypt. Samuel's interest lies in the series of interactions between Yahweh and Israel; he therefore
skips over any mention of the Egyptian oppression and moves directly from Israel's entrance into Egypt to Israel's cry to Yahweh for help. Samuel presents his audience with a singular focus on Israel's sole responsibility for its troubles in Egypt. The lack of reference to Egyptian oppression is more elegantly explained as a rhetorical feature than as a textual error (against Driver 1913:93), or an alternate tradition about the exodus.

Yahweh's immediate response to the fathers' cries for help is to send Moses and Aaron, his mediators, to their aid. It is Moses and Aaron—not Yahweh—who bring (wayyōšiḇū) the fathers out of Egypt and settle them (wayyōšiḇūm) in the land of Israel (literally "this place"). In this paradigmatic instance Yahweh accomplishes his justifying acts through the agency of his mediators; the only verb of which Yahweh is subject is wayyīšlah, "he sent Moses and Aaron."13

In the first instance Yahweh's justifying act is complex because it depends on the actions of the mediators Moses and Aaron for its success. The mediator is indispensable in the exodus; he is the specific means Yahweh chooses to accomplish the paradigmatic act of justification.
Samuel brings the implications of Moses' and Aaron's actions up-to-date with his description of the place where the fathers of his audience were settled: it is "this place" (bammāqom hazzeḥ), the very place where Samuel and the people stand and ponder the apparent replacement of the last mediator by a king. Recalling that Samuel had claimed Yahweh, maker of Moses and Aaron, as witness to his integrity as mediator, and that it was Yahweh who sent Moses and Aaron as mediators of the primary act of justification, Samuel seems to suggest that the people are disrupting the mechanism of Yahweh's justifying acts by replacing Samuel. If the divinely appointed mediators, Moses and Aaron, brought "your fathers" to "this place," why replace their successor to whose untarnished record you have just testified before Yahweh?

Verse 9

Samuel goes on to describe Israel's response to Yahweh's first act of justification. Yahweh arranges for his people to be brought out of Egypt and they express their gratitude by forgetting him. In Samuel's historical concatenation Israel is allowed only an unequivocal thanklessness in response to Yahweh's
beneficence. According to McCarthy, "forgetting" Yahweh is destructive of the relationship between Israel and Yahweh (1978:219-20). Indeed, this side of Israel's forgetfulness is highlighted by Samuel himself, who says, "They forgot Yahweh, their God..." Samuel draws the contrast between Yahweh and Israel with bold strokes that pay for unambiguous expression with a lack of accuracy in representation. Yahweh seeks to build a relationship between himself and Israel and is, therefore, good; Israel's forgetfulness is destructive of Yahweh's efforts and Israel is, therefore, bad.

Yahweh's response to Israel's forgetfulness is to "sell out" (wayyimkör...b'ya'd) Israel to its enemies in warfare. Yahweh's action is a direct reflection of their forgetfulness. They forget him so he abandons them on the battlefield. Like Israel's first misfortunes in Egypt, these difficulties are presented as brought on by the people themselves. Though Yahweh is now inextricably linked to all of Israel's experiences, Samuel shows that adversity within the period of covenantal relationship was the just and necessary result of Israel's own failings. The point is important to Samuel's presentation because it establishes a
historical precedent for an alternate interpretation of Israel's disastrous defeat at the hands of the Philistines. If Israel's military failings were previously caused by Israel's own misbehaviour, why should the recent case be understood any differently?

The brief list of enemies to whom Israel is sold out does not correspond to the fuller enumeration given in the book of Judges. Though McCarthy sees the sequence of names as an example of the conservation of a tradition by the deuteronomist(s) that did not agree with his (their) own portrayal in Judges (1978:208-09; cf. Stoebe 1973:237-38), it is possible to forego the conjecture, following Smith; "The list of oppressors here, 'Sisera, the Philistines, the king of Moab,' does not pretend to follow the order of the Book of Judges" (1899:86; cf. Vannoy 1978:36-37; McCarter 1980:215).

As in v. 8, Samuel takes obvious liberties with the traditional stories both to make new points and to direct his audience's attention to those new points. Here he only alludes to the tales from the period of judges because his concern is not to recite history or tradition. Rather than diverting his audience's attention onto irrelevant reveries or sad memories, Samuel mentions only three representative examples. The
three examples serve as paradigmatic characterizations of the whole period of the judges as a continual cycle of Israelite forgetfulness met by Yahweh's remedial response. Samuel's inclusion of the Philistines might imply that even the defeat of ch. 4 should be interpreted as an example of this paradigmatic cycle.

Verse 10

Not surprisingly, given that we know that Yahweh has delivered Israel to its enemies, Israel is seen immediately after the battle description in a position of complete helplessness (wayyillah^{a} מָתְנַחְּ שָׁם בָּם wayyiz^ן כַּֽעַּ פְּלִיסְתִּיִּים el-yhwh, vv. 9-10). The people are in the same straits that their fathers found themselves in in Egypt, and like their fathers, their only recourse is to "cry to Yahweh" (vv. 8, 10). Suffering alone turns Israel towards Yahweh. With admissions of sin and apostasy the people promise renewed service to Yahweh if he will deliver them from their enemies.

Samuel borrows both the language and the cycle of forgetfulness and promise of renewed devotion from the books of Deuteronomy and Judges (Birch 1976:70-71; McCarthy 1978:208-09; Vannoy 1978:33-37; McCarter 1980:214). The cycle in v. 10 is predicate to the allusion to previous cycles in v. 9 and is, therefore, presented
as a summary of the pre-monarchic history of covenantal relations between Israel and Yahweh. That this cycle depicts the customary shape of relations is confirmed by v. 11, which describes a succession of emissaries sent by Yahweh to rescue Israel again and again from the destitution paradigmatically described in v. 10. Samuel emphasizes the respective roles of Yahweh and Israel in the pre-monarchic period: Israel was ever the backslider, and Yahweh ever the forgiving and faithful benefactor (cf. Vannoy 1978:36-37).

Verse 11

As in the exodus (v. 8), Yahweh sent various individuals throughout Israel's premonarchic period to rescue Israel. The names of these emissaries, like the names of the adversaries in v. 9, are allusive. The names Jerubbaal and Samuel establish the chronological limits for the period in which these emissaries functioned. The middle names, Bedan and Jepthah, represent those mediators sent during this period to deliver Israel from its enemies; "...jedenfalls wollte Dtr hier auf alle 'Retter' - Gestalten der 'Richter' - Zeit hinweisen" (Noth 1967:59). 15

Samuel's inclusion of his own name amongst
these agents of Yahweh's acts of justification, though not in accord with the book of Judges, is in keeping with the tendencies of his speech. He exculpates Yahweh of any failings that could justify the request for a king and extols the human emissaries who are Yahweh's agents. Samuel includes himself amongst those emissaries to indicate that "Yahweh had continued to provide for the nation's defense and leadership even during his own lifetime—, in order to make his case relevant to the current situation, and the request for a king" (Vannoy 1978:37; cf. Hertzberg 1964:99). The second thing Samuel's self-inclusion achieves is to number his own actions on Israel's behalf among Yahweh's acts of justification. As Keil and Delitzsch observe, Samuel is justified to do so by his role in the events of ch. 7 (1880:118). And, as Smith perceives, by tracing the continuing acts of justification through emissaries up to the contemporary moment, Samuel places any defection from this divinely implemented system in the same class with all other such defections (1899:86).

Verse 11 is the capstone of Samuel's historical argument against the validity of the request for a king. He has established a set of causal principles underlying Israel's history and has traced their
operation into the contemporary scene. Since the people have already exonerated his performance as mediator, they are now set up for the great fall that Samuel has prepared for them. By seeking to replace Yahweh or Samuel, the people have in fact rejected the justifying acts of Yahweh, a sin even worse than their predecessors' continual forgetfulness.

The last two sentences of v. 11 stand together in a relationship of cause and effect. Together they offer a picture of Israel's security under Yahweh's protection. Samuel signifies this security with the word **beṭah**, which evokes a sense of the complete peace of mind Israel gained by Yahweh's victories over their enemies. Because **bṭḥ** is only positively toned as a description of human behaviour when Yahweh is its object of inspiration, Samuel must say that Yahweh (the implicit subject), rather than the emissaries, "delivered" the people (**wayyassēl ṭetakem**). Since he has already established his claim for the importance of the emissaries in the larger framework of the continuing acts of justification, Samuel's shifting of responsibility for the saving acts from the mediators to Yahweh himself should be seen as a shift in focus, from the beneficial acts and actors to the resulting
peace of mind given to Israel. Samuel ensures that no one will misunderstand the ambivalent word בָּה by making it clear that the secure feeling is a response to an act of God.

As Smith notes, the picture of peaceful external relations in v. 11 is similar to the situation with which ch. 7 concludes (1899:86; cf. Schulz 1919:170). Samuel paints this pastoral backdrop in anticipation of his next point, the senseless, unwarranted nature of the request for a king. That much of the final description of Israel's security is dependent on the thought and language of such passages as Deut 12:10; 25:19; and Josh 23:1 supports this reading of its rhetorical purpose as a contrastive backdrop. The attainment of such a state of peaceful security, courtesy of Yahweh, is the goal of Israelite existence; there is nothing more to be achieved. Subsequently, Israel is expected to act in accordance with the wishes of Yahweh, who has fulfilled his covenantal commitment by giving them this secure refuge. Whether there is any truth in Samuel's recollections or not, if he has succeeded in convincing his audience, the last thing that could be expected is a response of insurrection or rebellion from Israel (cf. Gutbrod 1956:
If Samuel's audience or the reader simply accepts his presentation of the course of Israel's history up to the time of the request—and it is difficult to do otherwise since the unintrusive narrator allows Samuel to hold the floor—Samuel's evaluation of the request for a king (v. 12) will seem indisputable. Both Samuel's audience and the reader know, however, that his memory is defective because he avoids any mention of the disastrous events of chs. 2-6.

The narrator does not allow anyone in Samuel's audience to object to Samuel's obvious bias. This enforced silence within the narrative is a goad that prods the reader to express his own objections to Samuel's biased recollections. The reader has been supplied with authoritative information that contradicts Samuel's presentation (chs. 2-6). The silence of the narrator and Samuel's audience only adds to the reader's sense of a need for protest and his frustration at the absence of it. Though he cannot actually come to Israel's defence, the critical balance given to the reader allows him to evaluate all of Samuel's subsequent rules and regulations for the new political structure from a more sheltered vantage than those in
Samuel's audience.

Verse 12

Nowhere is the discrepancy between Samuel's presentation and what actually happened (according to the narrator) more apparent than in v. 12. Though various suggestions about the compositional history of chs. 8-12 have been tendered to explain the differing reasons that are suggested for the request for a king, the most elegant is supplied within the narrative itself. 18

The reader knows that the request for a king was made in view of the particular state of affairs in Samuel's family seen from the perspective of an Israel educated by the Elide affair. He has this information on the authority of the narrator (8:1-3) who has proven to be reliable throughout the narrative. 19

When Samuel contradicts the authoritative version of what brought on the request, the reader can only understand the discrepancy as a product of the character's personal opinions and involvement—as an attempt by the character to reinterpret the past, attributing the desire for a monarchy solely to Israel's inexplicable willfulness. Vannoy is a reader who comes to this very conclusion: "Samuel's statement in
1 Samuel 12:12 is thus compatible with chapters 8, 10, and 11, [see note 18 above] but more important is that it reveals his own analysis of the motivation behind the initial request of the elders for a king" (1978:39).

As Samuel presents the request, and in this he shares Yahweh's perspective (8:7-8), it seems to arise as one in the succession of Israelite defections from loyalty to Yahweh. According to Samuel, when the people saw Nahash advancing against them they said, "No, but a king shall be king over us," yet Yahweh was their king. Having just rehearsed the usual course of action when faced with an external threat—to cry to Yahweh—Samuel obviously regards Israel's "No" as a rejection of the theocratic framework for national defense, a framework that he has just shown to be historically proven.

In place of the cry to Yahweh for help, we find "No—but a king shall be king over us" (Böecker 1969:76; Veijola 1977:96-97). As Samuel stages it, the request is a senseless act. Israel already had a king in Yahweh their God, who, as Samuel has just demonstrated, was not only capable of delivering Israel from any external army, but even of giving Israel a secure existence available from no other source (betah; cf.
above on v. 11). Samuel sees the request for a king, which he quotes from 8:19, as a rejection of Yahweh that is comprehensible only as the fruit of ingrained stubbornness and stupidity, the heritage of their fathers' sins (vv. 9-10).

From the reader's perspective Samuel's recollection of the request reveals a loyal Yahwist who refuses to admit the validity of Israel's reasons for that request. Whether or not a reader entertains the possibility that the Ammonite threat also lies behind the request in ch. 8 (Vannoy 1978:38-39), Samuel has omitted its real justification, which lay in Yahweh's past behaviour (chs. 4-6) and the immediate danger threatened by the behaviour of Samuel's wayward sons. By avoiding the real reasons and occasion for the request, Samuel exposes his own sensitivity to it (cf. 8:6-7). The discrepancy between the request as described in ch. 8 and ch. 12 is a relatively simple matter of a disparity between the way it was, and the way a deeply involved character would like everyone to believe it was.

In spite of the reader's awareness that Samuel is hopelessly biased here (and elsewhere, e.g. 10:17-24), the failing is partially mitigated. Samuel's
evasive defense is the utterance of an old man who has spent all his life as a servant of God and people. Both his pride in a lifetime of flawless service and even his continued existence in the office of mediator were jeopardized by the request. Yet he himself had not done anything to deserve dismissal.

Samuel turns to the present result of the request, Israel's new king. Samuel introduces him first as "the king whom you have chosen," an expression he last used in 8:18 in his attempt to dissuade the people. There is no indication here that Samuel is suggesting that the king they have gotten is a despot. Rather, his emphasis lies solely on the fulfillment of the people's desire; they have gotten what they wanted. At least, that is what Samuel would like them to believe. Next he refers to the king as the one "whom you requested," implying, with this play on the name שָׁעִיל and the verb שָׁלַט, that King Saul is in fact a king such as they had asked for.

Samuel, a master at diplomatic rhetoric, opens his remarks on the behavioural requirements of monarchic Israel with two notes that emphasize that the people have gotten what they wanted.21

Finally, however, Samuel must turn to the task
of characterizing the new monarchy from the prescriptive theocratic perspective. He signals the important shift in perspective by introducing it with the particle hinneh (cf. Boecker 1969:77). "So now, Yahweh has installed a king over you."

The combination of the verb ntn with the preposition c1 stresses the hierarchy of the new arrangement: Yahweh is over the king, by virtue of being the one to install him, and the king is over "you," by virtue of the manner of installation (c1) (cf. McCarthy 1978:214). "...der zweite Satz dieser Kriegsproklamation hat programmatisches Gewicht; er leitet sich ab aus der unmittelbar vorausgehenden grundsätzlichlichen Feststellung, dass Jahwe der König des Volkes ist (V. 12b), und umschliesst sowohl die von Gott verliehene Autorität des Königs dem Volk gegenüber als auch seine Verantwortung Gott gegenüber" (Weiser 1962:86).

With this description, the emphasis shifts from the people's will regarding the king, to Yahweh's. Placing both aspects together, in balance, Samuel presents a summary description of the forces that have gone into the creation of an Israelite monarchy; it is a manifestation of the people's will, which is then actualized, with some reinterpretation, by Yahweh (cf.
Vannoy 1978:41 n.95).

Samuel's presentation begins to take on a positive, exhortatory tone with the statement that Yahweh installed the king. Yahweh's action appears to have converted the people's idea of monarchy into something that can be incorporated in the theocratic structure. "...v. 13 marks the climax of the formulation and it reverses the history of sin. The king is no longer the sign of a great infidelity; he is Yahweh's gift" (McCarthy 1974:102; cf. Muilenburg 1959:363; Boecker 1969:77; Wolff 1975:88-89; Birch 1976:69).

As the request for a king was linked to the long history of Israelite defections, so Yahweh's response is to be understood as the most recent in a series of gracious responses. Israel's defection is forgiven and arrangements are made for the continuation of relations between Yahweh and Israel.

Verse 14

Samuel proceeds to lay down the conditions under which the new political organization will function. McCarthy notes that the conditional protases of both vv. 14 and 15 are typically deuteronomistic in concern and formulation, excepting the use of "rebel" for a
future possibility (1978:209-10). All of the conditions show that Israel remains firmly bound by the same covenantal stipulations as before. The monarchy has changed little if anything. In spite of the fact that they now have a king, Yahweh continues to be the only one to whom Israel owes its loyalty:

With the institution of kingship the potential for divided loyalties of the people and conflict of interest between Yahweh and the human king is created. In this new situation Samuel challenges the people to renew their determination to obey Yahweh, and not to rebel against his commandments, and thereby to demonstrate that they continue to recognize Yahweh as their sovereign (Vannoy 1978:44).

Though v. 14 in MT has often been regarded as needing a conclusion in the form of some reward for accepting the conditions (e.g. Smith 1899:87-88; Ehrlich 1910:208; Driver 1915:94; Stoebe 1973:238; McCarter 1980:211-12), the necessary apodosis is, indeed, found in MT. Beginning with the words ויהיITEM, a grammatically correct introduction to an apodosis (Smith 1899:88), Samuel's audience is promised that they and their king will follow Yahweh. Boecker has
shown that the expression ḥāyā... ṣāḥar is a suitable apodosis in v. 14 (1969:77-82). By fulfilling all the conditions mentioned by Samuel, the people and their king will be true followers of Yahweh. As the phrase reveals in other contexts (2 Sam 2:10; 15:15; 1 Kgs 12:20;16:21), to be a true follower of Yahweh means to recognize him as king. "ḥāyā ṣāḥar, to be after or behind a person, is good Hebrew, and is frequently met with, particularly in the sense of attaching one's self to the king, or holding to him" (Keil and Delitzsch 1880:119; cf. Boecker 1969:80; McCarthy 1978:215-16; Vannoy 1978:42-43).

Still, one might ask how Israel's and its king's recognition of Yahweh as their supreme political head would be a blessing to them. By recognizing Yahweh as ultimate authority, Israel should be able to count on Yahweh's help as promised in the covenant (Weiser 1962:86; Boecker 1969:81). "The implication...in terms of the covenant conditional is that Israel and her king can then continue to expect Yahweh's help in war and enjoy the benefits of Yahweh's rule as described in the blessings of the covenant (Deut 28:1ff.) which are received as the concomitant of covenant loyalty to Yahweh" (Vannoy 1978:44-45).
Verse 15

Samuel's description of the alternative to accepting his terms is obviously aimed at strengthening the theocratic hold on the people and their king. Samuel characterizes the alternative as disobedience to Yahweh, and rebellion against his commands. The consequence of such lawlessness is that, "The hand of Yahweh will be against you and against your 'fathers' to destroy you." If Israel and its king are not willing to be subject to Yahweh, thereby reaping the benefits of being his followers, then they will be treated as an enemy. The same "hand of Yahweh" that the reader has seen in devastating action against the Philistine enemy will turn against monarchical Israel.

Many scholars have argued that vv. 14-15 constitute a representation of the covenant blessing and curse, indicating that Israel is being offered a fresh beginning in its relationship with Yahweh (Muilenburg 1959:363; Weiser 1962:86-87; Boecker 1969:81-82; Veijola 1977:87-88; Vannoy 1978:46-47). The choice Samuel offers is clear-cut: Israel and their king can either be for Yahweh or against him. The results of each option are two sides of the same coin: obedience allows unification with Yahweh and disobedience turns
him into their enemy (Boecker 1969:82; McCarthy 1978: 210).

Considered from the larger perspective of Israel's past relationship with Yahweh, the new conditions, paralleling as they do the blessing and curse portions of the covenant, indicate that the monarchy has changed nothing essential in Israel's political structure. Everything still depends on Yahweh's expressed desires for Israelite behavior and on Israel's conformity with those stipulations. The king, originally requested as an instrument of political change, is publicly subsumed within the old order. 24

Verse 16
A new stage in the proceedings is marked by Samuel's opening words in v. 16, gam-attâ, which link up with the previous usage of attâ in v. 7. The emphatic particle gam also expresses Samuel's recognition that the formal call to assembly (hituyass̱ bû) is made again here, even though it has already been made in v. 7 (cf. Ehrlich 1910:208; against Buber 1956:158, "das gam Catha von v. 16 ist vollends nichtssagend"). Both Muilenburg (1959:35$, 363) and Harrelson (cited by Vannoy 1978:47 n.106) suggests that the verb hitysb
is used in such contexts as a formal expression. The emphasis lies not so much on the physical detail as on the psychological attitudes and religious meaning of the act of assembly.

The people are called to assemble and witness "this tremendous deed" which Yahweh is about to do before their very eyes. Vannoy has observed that there is a close phraseological resemblance between Samuel's introduction of this phenomenon and Moses' introduction to Yahweh's deliverance at the Reed Sea (1978:47-48). Samuel sets himself up as a Moses figure, leading Israel to a new or renewed experience of relationship with Yahweh. The formation of the relationship in Exodus and the reformation in vv. 16-25 are catalyzed by the experience of Yahweh's miraculous deeds. In Exodus the miracle of the Reed Sea is enough to make the Israelites fear Yahweh and believe in Yahweh and in Moses (wayyirā'ahānām et-yhwh wayya²a²minu byhwh ³ubemōšeh cabdō) (Exod 14:31). Likewise, the thunderstorm convinces Samuel's audience, whose quest for a king has already been compared to Israel's apostasy during and since the exodus (1 Sam 8:8; 12:8-12; cf. 10:18-19),²⁵ that their request for a king was sinful, and they fear Yahweh and Samuel (wayyirā' kol-hānām
The opening phrases show Samuel operating in the role of mediator; once more in a position of dominance, he exhibits an attitude of assurance. Though he had begun his remarks with intimations that he would step down from his post in deference to the new king and perhaps to the younger generation (v. 12), Samuel's demonstration of power, both Yahweh's and his, if anything puts him back in the position of authority he last occupied by himself in ch. 7.

Structural Excursus

Both Buber (1956:158) and Seebass (1965:294-95) have perceived a connection between 12:16-25 and ch. 7 (cf. Press 1958:211-12; Hertzberg 1964:100). Seebass even argues that this section in ch. 12 is modeled on ch. 7 (1965:294-95; cf. Birch 1976:70, criticizing Seebass' proposal). Though the reader, and perhaps Samuel's audience, will not realize the full extent of the patterns of contact between the two scenes until Samuel completes his presentation, I shall anticipate that realization by summarizing the parallels beforehand in deference to conciseness of presentation.
ch. 7

Israel is exhorted to put away foreign gods and Ashtaroth, to direct its heart to Yahweh, and to serve him only; then he will deliver it from the Philistines (v. 3).

Samuel directs Israel to assemble (qbs) at Mizpah, where he will pray to Yahweh for them (v. 5).

Israel gathers at Mizpah. They draw and pour out water before Yahweh, they fast on that day (bayyôm hahu^3) and confess their sin against Yahweh (v. 6).

ch. 12

Israel is promised that if they will fear Yahweh and serve him, heed his voice and not rebel against his command, then Israel and its king will be behind Yahweh, and by implication, Yahweh will be before them (v. 14).

Samuel says to assemble (htysb) to see the tremendous deed that Yahweh is about to perform for them. Though it is now harvest time, Samuel will call to Yahweh and he will send thunder and rain so that Israel will recognize and see the great evil that they have done in Yahweh's eyes, by asking for a king (vv. 16-17).

Samuel calls to Yahweh and he sends thunder and rain on that day (bayyôm hahu^3) (v. 18).
Hearing that the Israelites have assembled at Mizpah, the Philistine leaders go up to Israel. Israel hears about it and fears (wayyirā) the Philistines (v. 7).

The Israelites tell Samuel (wayyōve'reü ʾēl-šēmuʾēl), "Do not refuse to cry for us to Yahweh, our God (ʾēlōhēnū), that he may deliver us from the Philistines" (v. 8).

Samuel takes a suckling lamb and offers it as an offering to Yahweh. Samuel cries to Yahweh on Israel's behalf, and Yahweh answers him. When the Philistines close for the attack, Yahweh thunders against them with a great voice. The Philistines are duly confused and then

As a result of Samuel's call and Yahweh's response, the people greatly fear (wayyirā) Yahweh and Samuel (v. 18).

The people tell Samuel (wayyōve’reü ʾēl-šēmuʾēl), "Pray on your servants behalf to Yahweh, your God (ʾēlōheykā), that we might not be killed because we have added to all our sins the evil of asking for a king" (v. 19).

Samuel tells the people not to be afraid. Though they have done this evil, they should not turn away from Yahweh; they should serve him with all their heart. They should not turn aside after vain things, which are profitless and unable to rescue because they are vain. Yahweh will not abandon his people on account of his reputation
routed before Israel (vv. 9-10).

Yahweh has shown his willingness to be reunited with Israel, and continues to demonstrate it by giving Israel victory over some neighbours and peace with others. Samuel is established as judge over Israel for the rest of his days (vv. 12-17).

("great name") for it was Yahweh's pleasure to make them into a people for himself (vv. 20-22).

Yahweh will not abandon his people (v. 22) and Samuel promises that he shall not sin against Yahweh by ceasing to offer intercessory prayer on Israel's behalf (cf. 7:8); he will teach Israel to walk the straight and narrow (v. 23) and in vv. 24-25 he sets to that task.

In both cases the upshot of the proceedings is that Yahweh sits in firm possession and leadership over a penitent Israel guided by his watchful servant (Israel's intercessor) Samuel. The parallel proceedings support the view that the theocratic superstructure ultimately remains intact and is recognized as legitimate by Israel; the monarchy has not changed the basic political order at all.

The reader must, however, be careful to distinguish between Samuel's meanings and the narrator's
meanings. The narrator, who presents us with a third person narration of Samuel's (and Yahweh's) grand finale may shed a different light on Samuel's demonstration through the differences between his third person perspective, and the infra-narrative perspectives expressed by Samuel and the people.

As this narrator's readers we see Samuel's demonstration of Yahweh's power (at his beck and call) neither from the position of the Israelites, who are frightened into confessions of sin, nor from Samuel's (and probably Yahweh's) point of view, from which the demonstration serves to evoke a proper and needful response from Israel. Instead the reader is the aloof onlooker, viewing things from the distance created by the narrator's third person perspective. The reader's viewpoint is undisturbed by the immediate turbulence created by the thunderstorm. He easily recalls all sides of the kingship issue, including the historical causes as presented in the narrative. These powers of recollection are afforded by the narrator's gift of distance. The meaning of Samuel's demonstration is different for the reader than it was for Samuel and Israel.
Verse 17

Samuel sets up a demonstration that will prove two things. The demonstration will take the form of a miraculous phenomenon, a thunderstorm in the dry season when such a thing never occurred. According to G.A. Smith, in a chapter appropriately titled "The climate and fertility of the land, with their effects on its religion," "In May showers are very rare, and from then till October, not only is there no rain, but a cloud seldom passes over the sky, and a thunderstorm is a miracle" (1900:65). Samuel tells his audience that this weird event, to be enacted at his signal, is intended to convince them that Yahweh viewed their request as very evil.

The second purpose of the demonstration, unmentioned by Samuel but obvious to both his audience and the reader is that it proves the strength of Samuel's ties with Yahweh and the agreement between them concerning the monarchy (cf. McCarter 1980:216). If Samuel's relationship with Yahweh were weak, or if Yahweh did not regard the request as evil, he would not answer Samuel. Samuel shows a great deal of confidence in v. 17. He is so sure of himself and of Yahweh's opinions that he willingly stakes his
reputation on the success of the demonstration.

With respect to the parallel between v. 17 and 7:5, several consideration arise. Back in 7:5, Samuel had gathered a scattered Israel, which had experienced a loss of faith in Yahweh on account of his strangeness towards them. Samuel promised to pray for them with the unstated goal of bringing them back together with Yahweh. Now in v. 17, Samuel has called another assembly in which he will effect a communication between Yahweh and Israel, only this time it is a message from Yahweh to the people who had cast a vote of non-confidence against him and Samuel with their request for a king. Besides the difference in the direction of the communication, there is also a difference in tone: when Israel feels rejected by Yahweh it seeks reunification through intercessory prayer (at Samuel's suggestion), but when Yahweh feels (is) rejected by Israel he uses the heavy-handed, direct route of miraculous thunder and rain, which communicates displeasure and smells of coercion, especially against the backdrop of Israel's passive submission through Samuel's intercession.

This contrast is partly explained by the fact that reconciliation over the matter of kingship has already taken place (ch. 11). Yahweh has already given
in to a certain extent by allowing a conditional monar-
chy. What is intended by the demonstration of v. 17
is not so much reconciliation as it is a restoration of
a respectful distance in the existing relationship.
Israel has questioned Yahweh and experienced some suc-
cess in its petition. The demonstration will put
Israel back in its proper place through a show of
divine force.

Verse 17 and 7:5 are alike, then, in describing
assemblies for the purpose of a divine-human inter-
change through the agency of Samuel. Verse 17 differs
in that it describes an effort at restoring proper
relationship, while 7:5 describes only a request for
renewed relationship. The difference is caused by
the intervention of the request for a king which,
though granted, is regarded as impudent, improper and
in need of redress.

Verse 18

Having presented Samuel's description of what
he was about, the narrator describes the actual under-
taking. Samuel's actions correspond word for word
with what he said he would do, and in support of
Samuel, so do Yahweh's actions. Scholars have often
debated the significance of Yahweh's response.
According to one view, the dispensation of thunder (and rain) is to be understood as an echo of theophany, especially the Sinai theophany (Weiser 1962:87). Against this position others have argued that the out-of-season thunder and rain are a visible manifestation of Yahweh's power, a sign given in response to Samuel's call and so an authentification of Samuel as mediator (Boecker 1969:85; Stoebe 1973:238-39; Veijola 1977:98).

As the results of the demonstration show, however, it is likely that aspects of both theophany and sign are contained in the demonstration (cf. Vannoy 1978:50-51; McCarter 1980:216). The people fear Yahweh and Samuel, a twofold result that corresponds to the two sides of the demonstration. On the theophanic side, Birch observes that thunder (qôl) is common to such manifestations (1976:70). Both the people's fear of Yahweh (v. 18) and their fear that they might die if Samuel did not pray for them seem more in tune with the concept of theophany than that of pure sign (cf. Birch 1976:70). The terrifying thunder and rain do indeed convince Israel that Yahweh was displeased with the request: "Gott, der von Israel mit dessen Drängen nach dem König als wesenlose Unwirklichkeit beiseite geschoben ist, bezeugt sich handgreiflich als der
Lebendige, der mächtig ist, seine Kreatur völlig zu vernichten (Gutbrod 1956:90-91). The people certainly see this side of the miraculous thunderstorm; the manifestation of divine power as a displeased reaction to their request seems to them to threaten their very existence (v. 19; cf. McCarthy 1978:217; Vannoy 1978:50-51). While there is, strictly speaking, no theophany, Weiser is justified in saying that there is an echo of it here (1962:87).

On the other hand, the demonstration does serve to legitimate Samuel by showing the people that they need his services as mediator to pray on their behalf. Yahweh's real power and real domination over Israel continues, as the storm demonstrates (cf. Boecker 1969:85). On account of Samuel's intimacy with this powerful God, with whom the people know he shares bad feelings about the request for a king, Samuel is a man to be feared alongside God. Think what he could call down upon them if they angered him by not heeding Yahweh's "voice" (qôl v. 14 = qôlot v. 18 "thunder") or rebelling against Yahweh's "mouth" (v. 14, Samuel?). In Israel's position there is every reason to fear Samuel along with Yahweh.

Turning now to the parallel with ch. 7, it will
be recalled that following the ceremonial downpour of water in v. 6 the Philistines advance against Israel. Israel fears the advance on account of their previous experiences with the Philistines, in which Yahweh has proven unreliable. Despite a victory in that instance, Israel soon finds itself threatened with a repeat of the Elide disaster (8:1-3) and decides to avoid further fiascos by opting out of the theocracy. As a direct result of that request, Israel is now in greater danger, for they face a greater threat than the Philistines. Instead of fearing the Philistines because they were not sure that Yahweh would come to their aid, they fear Yahweh and Samuel with the knowledge that no human power could ever deliver them from this potential enemy.

Verse 19
There is only one way to soothe Yahweh's bad feelings over the request: Israel hastens to adopt an attitude of humble, repentant submission. In the first words allowed to them since Samuel began his presentation all the people tell Samuel, "Pray on behalf of your servants to Yahweh your God." The request acknowledges a need for Samuel's legitimate service as intercessor. The people characterize themselves as
Samuel's servants, thereby acknowledging their subordination to the theocratic mediator whose prayers are requested. They speak of Yahweh as Samuel's God (אֶלֶה יְהֹוָה), in recognition of the fact that their request has alienated God from themselves (cf. Vannoy 1978:52). They express the hope that Samuel's prayers will prevent their death, a punishment that they seem to see lurking in the thunderstorm. Finally they confess that over and above all their sins, they have gone and added to the evil of asking for a king for themselves.

The demonstration is a complete success, having achieved both of its goals (Veijola 1977:98-99). The people have been frightened into a recognition of their need of Samuel and a confession of their sin in asking for a king (cf. Vannoy 1978:52). The relative positions of Israel, Samuel, and Yahweh are restored to the same order that obtained before the request for a king. In a time of fear and need, Israel confesses to its own sin, suggesting that it has brought this trouble upon itself (cf. 7:6). Fearful for their lives, (cf. 7:7) Israel calls on Samuel to cry or pray to Yahweh for them (cf. 7:8; Hertzberg 1964:100; McCarter 1980: 216). The omission of any reference to their king as
a possible source of relief indicates their complete return to the theocratic form of dependence.

The parallel with ch. 7 in this instance also reveals a change in Israel's perception of its relationship with Yahweh. In 7:8, the people ask Samuel to cry to Yahweh "our God" whereas in v. 19 they ask Samuel to pray to Yahweh "your God." The change is a result of Israel's perception of the threat contained in the thunderstorm. Having spurned Yahweh by asking for a king, the people no longer think they have the unquestioned right to call Yahweh "our God" (Vannoy 1978:52). Israel has come full circle back to the position of dependence in which it stood as recently as ch. 7 and from which it had tried to escape by the request. Con­trite and repentant, the people plead for a renewal of regular theocratic operations.

The reader's perception of the thunderstorm is influenced by what he knows of the narrative past, and by his understanding of the psychological side of the demonstration, which he has been fortunate enough to view from a distance. Israel's humble confession is not seen as the utterance of deep reflection and consequent repentance. Rather it is a forced confession, extorted under duress, in fear for life itself. Only a short
time (10:27-11:5) before (10:27-11:5) all Israel had refused to treat Saul as king because he was not a king such as they had wanted. The people were bold then in their demand for a king who would make them a nation like any other nation. When the reader now sees the people humiliated into a condemnation of their seemingly just demand, he is forced to explain their about-face. The obvious answer, supplied by the narrator in v. 19, is that the confession is extracted by the strong-arm tactics used by Samuel and Yahweh. The people beg for Samuel's intercession and confess in order to avoid sudden death (וּלְאִלְנָהוּת).

Yahweh and Samuel may be pleased with their results and Israel may be forced to accept them, but for the reader—a question mark hangs over the whole enterprise. If the subsequent history of the relationship between Israel and Yahweh is based on such a foundation, and it is presented as a foundation for what follows, what will come of it? Can there be a satisfactory sequel to this scene? The reader will have to continue his passage through the books of Samuel and Kings to get an answer.
Verse 20

Having extorted the confession with a little help from his God, Samuel proceeds to remold the penitents' perception of their request and the meaning of their new political existence as a monarchy under theocracy. As Weiser observes, Samuel again holds a position of recognized authority as mediator between Israel and Yahweh (1962:87). "Samuel springt in die Bresche vor das verlorene Volk samt seinem Künig" (Gutbrod 1956:91).

Vannoy notices that Samuel does not immediately pray on the people's behalf, as they request, but suggests that it may be assumed that he did pray for them on the basis of v. 23 (1978:32). Plausible as this assumption may be, the adoption at this point in the narrative (v. 20) of an assumption based on later material (v. 23) is a defection from the narrated order of description. As Sternberg emphasizes, the reader of narrative must constantly be aware of the effect of sequence on the reading process:

Why has this complex of events been presented first and that delayed? Why has this facet of a character been portrayed before that? Why has this piece of (Verbal, actional,
structural, or even generic) information been conveyed—or on the contrary, suppressed and ambiguated—at precisely this point? And it is especially imperative to investigate these questions whenever the distribution and ordering of information involve a deviation from a conventional or previously postulated pattern of organization, such as chronological sequence (1978:97).

The people have asked for Samuel's prayers and, if he is favourably disposed towards them, we expect him to pray for them. The people in vv. 19 believe that they are in a life or death situation and beg Samuel to intercede that they might live. Instead, Samuel takes advantage of their situation of absolute dependency on him in order to give another repetitious (cf. vv. 14-15) lecture on the behaviour required of them.

The fact that Samuel pursues this didactic course reveals that he knows of another side to the demonstration; he views the thunderstorm as an audio-visual teaching aid rather than a threat to life. Samuel does not hasten to pray for Israel because he actually set up the demonstration for educative rather
than punitive purposes (v. 17). His post-thunderstorm lecture is, therefore, the natural consequence of his intention to convict Israel of the great evil it has done in asking for a king.

Samuel's first words to the fearful Israelites are a clear exhibition of his own interests and concerns; "Fear not! You have done all this evil, but do not turn aside from after Yahweh and serve Yahweh with all your hearts." They ask him to pray to God because they are scared to death and instead he gives them a lecture on Yahweh's behalf. Passing off their terror with a simple "Fear not," he reiterates a portion of their confession—"you have done all this evil"—and offers advice for better future performance, again partially repeating himself (cf. vv. 14-15). Samuel's response reveals that what is of paramount importance to him, and hence to Yahweh who supports him here, is that Israel return to a course of strict obedience and total devotion to Yahweh.

By paralleling the mention of the evil done, that is, the request for a king, with the demand for future obedience, Samuel hints at an evaluation of the request as an act of disobedience. He plays on his audience's moment of terror to redefine the legitimate
request from the covenantal perspective as though it were a simple act of unprovoked disobedience and faithlessness.

Verse 21

Though v. 21 is frequently discarded as a late gloss ("einem Einschub im Einschub," Buber 1956:159) on account of the supposedly anachronistic word ṭ̄ōhu (e.g. Budde 1902:81; Buber 1956:159; Stoebe 1973:239; cf., however, Deut 32:10) and the ease with which the verse may be omitted without disturbing the sense of the context (Budde 1902:81; Boecker 1969:86), it is not entirely without contextual value. As Boecker observes, v. 21 is connected to v. 20 by the repetition of the verb tāsūrû, which is given an expanded interpretation in v. 21 (1969:68; cf. Seebass 1965:295 n.21). It is the expansionistic rhetoric of Samuel's restatement that also explains the particle ki̇, which follows after the verb tāsūrû and has generally been omitted as "senseless" with the support of LXX (e.g. Wellhausen 1871:79; McCarter 1980:212; cf. Vannoy 1978:54 n.128 for a review of other suggestions). The repeated exhortation taken from v. 20 is "Do not turn aside." Following the exhortation is a ki̇ clause explaining why one should not turn (cf. Muilenburg 1961:157). "Do
not turn aside, for (פָּלַע) [it is] after vanities which can neither benefit nor deliver because they are vain."

The word תֹּהוּ, though usually understood as a reference to false gods on the basis of Deutero-Isaiah (e.g. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:121; Hertzberg 1964:100), has a more specific reference in this context. In v. 20, Samuel balances the evil that has been done—the request for a king—against the exhortation not to turn aside anymore from after Yahweh. By a series of associations, then, Samuel equates the anti-covenantal request for a king like the nations with defection (שָׁנֵר) from Yahweh: 1. the request for a king is evil (v. 17); 2. the evil (the request) done is not a cause for fear so long as Israel no longer turns aside from after Yahweh (v. 20); 3. one should not turn aside because the things that are so pursued are worthless (v. 21).

In v. 21, Samuel provides a more detailed definition of the defection. He tells Israel why it should not engage in such defections: the reason, because all such things are worthless. They are profitless (לֶאִי$ vֶהָּ$גָּלָע) and unable to deliver (לֶאִי$ וָגָּלָע). Samuel's negative evaluations of the worthless things, such as the kingship they requested, may be contrasted with
Yahweh's actions. He brought Israel up (hêceleti, 10:18) from Egypt, and he delivered (wâassîl, 10:18; cf. 12:11) Israel from all its enemies. No one but Yahweh, according to Samuel, is of any use to Israel as a source of security; in comparison, everything else is hattōhû, "worthlessness."

Verse 22

The introduction of this verse by kâ indicates that the subsequent information is attached to the preceding as an explanation or motivation for what has been said (Keil and Delitzsch 1880:121; cf. Vannoy 1978:55-56). Israel is not to turn aside because Yahweh will not forsake his people. He has a reputation to maintain. Yahweh's reputation is staked on Israel's fortunes because he made them into a people, and so they need never fear for their political existence. So long as Yahweh's "great name" means anything to him, Israel's continued survival as his people is guaranteed. It is this certainty of Yahweh's benefaction that makes Israel's request for a king a vain thing. Israel sought security from a king when it was already guaranteed by Yahweh's great name (v. 11).

From the reader's perspective Samuel's assurances are less than reassuring. Only a few chapters
previously (chs. 5-6), Yahweh took action to protect his reputation, but that action was of no benefit to Israel. Both before and after the Philistines were forced to confess to the greatness of the mighty exodus God, Israel was subjected to unwarranted abuse at the hands of Yahweh. So the reader, at least, perceives a hollow ring to Samuel's assurances in v. 22. The response of Samuel's audience is left undetermined by the narrative. Perhaps since they were not privy to Yahweh's name-saving actions in chs. 5-6 the assurance provided by the divine reputation might seem more credible to them.

At any rate, the narrative is focused on Samuel and on the conditions, promises, and requirements that are laid down as the basis for Israel's conditional monarchy. But Samuel's tendentious interpretation of the past and his dubious reassurances about the future do not seem a firm foundation for the political organization that is being reaffirmed. The inadequate half-measure of a 'theocratically designated king only smooths over the problem raised by the request; Samuel's reassessment of the request only buries the seeds of legitimate discontent under the facade of covenant renewal, and Israel is obliged to do all of the
It is frequently observed that the language and ideas of v. 22 draw upon Israel's covenant ideology (Weiser 1962:87; McCarthy 1974:102; Veijola 1977:90). In view of the context some scholars have suggested that v. 22 renews the covenant between Israel and Yahweh (Boecker 1969:87; McCarthy 1973:412; 1978:217). Certainly it must be admitted that Samuel holds out the possibility for a fresh beginning to monarchic Israel in ch. 12. But is it accurate to say that v. 22 re-establishes the covenant?

What v. 22 does, in fact, is to point back to the conditions that have always supported Israel's covenantal existence, namely the priority of election and Yahweh, who has a great name to maintain (cf. Muilenburg 1959:364; Payne 1972:324). These presuppositions of Israel's covenant do not signal a renewal of covenant, because the covenant has not been broken since ch. 7, when it was last renewed. As ch. 11 concludes Israel has come to terms with Saul's theocratic subordination and signaled its acceptance of Yahweh's terms by renewing the kingdom (11:14-15). At that point any rift in the relationship has been mended. Verse 22 explains that Israel should not turn aside
from after Yahweh because it is unnecessary; it emphasizes continuity between past, present and future rather than a re-establishment of past conditions. Yahweh will not forsake (so Israel should not turn) because he has gladly made Israel his people.

Verse 23

Samuel contrasts his own steadfast behaviour as mediator with that of his audience through the use of the emphatic introductory pronouns in vv. 20 and 23: "You have done all this evil... but as for myself..." (Ehrlich 1910:209; McCarter 1980:216).

Having criticized Israel’s request to the fullest, Samuel finally responds to the people’s appeal for his prayers: his response, "Far be it from me to sin against Yahweh by ceasing to pray on your behalf," implies that he has never stopped praying on Israel’s behalf because it is part of his God-given task as Yahweh’s mediator. Though the people have only just recognized their continuing need of Samuel’s services, Samuel, like Yahweh, has continued and will continue to fulfill his task within the covenantal framework.

Samuel’s reassurance about his continuing prayers for Israel is paralleled in ch. 7 by Israel’s request that Samuel not cease crying to Yahweh for
deliverance (7:8). His statement here may be taken as a conscious allusion to that request and as such constitutes a celebration of his personal victory. Threatened with retirement, Samuel has emerged from the crisis with a public vindication of his integrity (v. 4) as well as the public recognition of his indispensability as mediator. Samuel remains in authority (cf. Robertson 1944:194; Willis 1972:52-53).

Samuel crowns his successful demonstration of the necessity of his office by electing himself to the task of directing Israel in the good and upright path. On the one hand, his audience might well understand this as an act of kindness on Samuel's part:

Samuel's pledge in v. 25, therefore, is undeserved by its beneficiaries, the Israelites. It amounts to a special provision for the succor and preservation of the people, which comes on the very brink of disaster...


With Samuel as teacher, the people need not worry that they will foolishly turn away from Yahweh in pursuit of some chimerical end. "Samuel selflessly undertakes to keep Israel on the straight and narrow, which, in view of the ominous threat of divine punishment, must be
accepted as a valuable and necessary service to Israel.

The reader cannot help but notice that the installation of the theocratic mediator as the official censor, dictator of the "good and upright path," is the final blow to Israel's idea of a political system unfettered by the minutiae of theocracy. The result of Israel's quest for independence is a strengthening of the theocratic hand on this people whom it has pleased Yahweh to make. Whether the people will always accept this imposition, and whether the king will be satisfied with his subordination remain as questions that the reader must carry into the subsequent scenes of the monarchic history.

One thing is certain about v. 23: it marks the end of the movement for a king like all the nations. Just as the request for a king was sparked by a recurrence of a previous circumstance, the dangerous state of affairs in the mediator's family, so the conclusion to the chain of events resulting from the request is marked by the recurrence of the scene at the end of ch. 7. In both instances Samuel has brought Israel through a crisis and stands thereafter ensconced as mediator, shepherding the people of Yahweh. Both the request for a king and the conclusion of the issue
illustrate the narrator's technique of scenic parallel
and allusion to add commentary to scenes that otherwise
With Samuel's remarks in v. 23 and the parallel situ-
ation in ch. 7, it is almost as though the request had
never been made. Under Samuel's direction, with
special effects by Yahweh, the pursuit of a king like
the nations has now come to seem the pursuit of an
illusion (hattōhu?)

Verses 24-25

Samuel concludes his presentation with a recap-
pitulation of what is required of Israel, balancing his
descriptions of Yahweh's and his own future activity
(vv. 22-23) with another prescription for Israel's
behaviour. Of the exhortations only the addition of
the adverb be’emmet "sincerely" is not a repetition of
things he has already said in vv. 14-15, 20. As Buber
has noted, the explanatory clause is linked with the
first part of the exhortation by a wordplay. "Only
fear (yēr’ā’āh) Yahweh...for consider (rē'ūn) how gravely
he has dealt with you" (1956:161). The fear of Yahweh
and sincere service are motivated by the tremendous
deed (haddābār, haggādōl, v. 16) that Yahweh showed
to demonstrate his evaluation of the request for a king (Smith 1899:89; Budde 1902:81; Ehrlich 1912:209; cf., however, Keil and Delitzsch 1880:121; Gressmann 1921:46; Stoebe 1973:234). Correct behaviour is motivated by the threat implicit in the thunderstorm.

The alternative to a proper fear of Yahweh and faithful service to him is described by Samuel with the comprehensive words "If you do evil." Anything other than obedient subservience to Yahweh is included in this description. The penalty for continued disobedience on the people's part is that both they and their king will be swept away. The people had said about their proposed king "Even we (gam-æreš-nahnu) will be like all the nations" (8:20), to which Samuel responds here "Even you and even your king (gam-attem gam-malkë-kem) will be swept away."

Thornton understands v. 25 to be a threat of destruction aimed particularly at Saul himself, if he should behave wickedly (1967:421). Yet, as Boecker observes, Saul is not even mentioned in ch. 12 (1969:87 n.3). Moreover, the kingship of Saul is neither questioned nor criticized in ch. 12; only the request for a king like all the nations is reproved. If anything, v. 25 ties the fate of the Israelite monarchy
to the behaviour of the Israelite people. If Samuel's audience continues to do evil, the king will be subjected to the same fate as themselves, without any consideration of his complicity or the lack of it. The installation of a king has changed nothing with regard to Israel's theocratic obligations. They are still governed by the same theocratic duties in their binding covenant with Yahweh. Regarding the Israelite monarchy, Samuel is right: it is hattōhû.
V. CONCLUSION

Needless to say, it has, in my view, proven possible to read 1 Sam 1-12 as a unitary narrative with a clear, logically progressive plot. The major hypothesis of this study has, therefore, been confirmed. Individual points of interpretation may be debated, modified, or rejected, but the fact that these chapters can be read as a unity is indisputable.

During the course of reading this episode in Israel's theological-political adventures, it became apparent that the greatest failing of historical-critical readings of the narrative was a neglect of the narrative's voice structure. The majority of supposedly irresolvable ideological conflicts in the opinions that find expression in these chapters disappear when careful attention is paid to the simple questions, "Who says what to whom?" and "Where and when was it said?".

Along the way, several implications arose out of the reading, by virtue of the fact that 1 Sam 1-12 is relied upon as a source of data in so many important areas of contemporary biblical scholarship. Obviously a unitary reading of all of the twelve chapters calls into question any readings that suggest a chapter or
group of chapters must be read in isolation. Until the suggested unity of the narrative and the supporting evidence thereto is refuted, any further suggestions about the socio-historical settings of the "pro- and anti-monarchic factions" in chs. 8-12, or about the "Ark narrative" in chs. 4-6 must be regarded as unnecessarily complex, both as hypotheses and as explanations of the data. Literary explanations of the narrative are inherently stronger because they are descriptive and verifiable; a holistic literary approach eliminates the undesirable multiplication of historical assumptions, and its conclusions can be accepted or rejected as they agree or disagree with the text (cf. Polzin 1980:5-7). The literary approach that I have used provides a way out of the proliferation of studies whose conclusions cannot be compared because each study depends on varying, non-verifiable hypotheses and assumptions. A descriptive reading of 1 Sam 1-12 can be compared with other such readings and the comparative strengths and weaknesses of each reading should appear. Individual readings may suffer refutation, but scholarly dialogue about the text will increase.

Read as a unit, 1 Sam 1-12 also posed problems
for existing readings of the deuteronomistic history. If the narrator of these chapters does not condemn kingship, and if the narrator is the deuteronomist, then it would seem that the generally accepted opinions about the deuteronomist's negative attitude towards the institution of monarchy need reconsideration. Again such reconsideration is made necessary by a reading that pays careful attention to the narrative's hierarchical voice structure, such as was not done by previous studies of the "deuteronomist" in 1 Sam 1-12.

The theological implications of my reading of these chapters, especially as regards the characterization of God, suggest that 1 Sam 1-12 is more comparable to a book like Job than has previously been accepted. It would, of course, be question-begging to suggest that these theological implications reveal the perversity of my reading when viewed in the wider context of the known theology of the deuteronomistic history. A close reading of the remainder of the deuteronomistic history is necessary to evaluate a close reading of 1 Sam 1-12.

Finally, a subsidiary result of my reading is to add some observations and descriptions to the
existing catalogue of Hebrew narrative technique. Eventually, after all biblical narrative has been studied from a methodological perspective similar to the one that I have found fruitful, it should be possible to write a narratology of biblical narrative.
Notes to Chapter I

1Stoebe (1973:32-44) reviews this period in scholarship.

2Wellhausen was himself aware of this neglect of the existing narrative but saw no deficiency in his approach. It is the history of Israel and its literature that enables one to understand the Bible and the relationship between its parts. (See Wellhausen’s description of his own experiences, 1973:3.)

What is important is not the narrative description itself, but the more remote social and historical contexts that have given expression to the biblical text (1973:366, 368).

3K. Koch explains the reasons for this apparent apriorism:

Literary [source] criticism begins with the recognition that the period of origin of a biblical writing presents enormous difficulties, and that the situations of the writers have also become greatly obscured through a many levelled process of redaction. Formerly independent sources were linked together, even merged, or torn apart and made up into different and separate units.
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The literary [source] critic therefore attempts to discover the original writings, to determine exactly their date of origin, and to grasp the personality of the writer as much as is possible. This means that he approaches the text with, so to say, a dissecting knife in his hand, looks out particularly for breaks in continuity, or missing links in the train of thought, and also for disturbing duplications and factual inconsistencies, and for variations in the use of language which will have originated in another set of circumstances or at a period of different religious concepts. The literary critical [sic, source] method leads to a determination of sources....Literary criticism is the analysis of biblical books from the standpoint of lack of continuity, duplications, inconsistencies and different linguistic usage, with the object of discovering what the individual writers and redactors contributed to a text, and also its time and place of origin (Koch's underlining)
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4 For criticism of the extrinsic approach see R. Wellek, A. Warren 1975:73-74, 139-41; J.M. Ellis 1974:104-54.


8 See Gunkel 1906:51-102; and Gressmann 1921:xii-xvi for the latter's own summary of the
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generic history of Israelite literature.

9 Gressmann gives a summary of the histories of Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Palestine, showing how events led to the possibility and actual formation of Israel's monarchy. Since only ch. 11 comes close to agreement with Gressmann's analysis of the historical situation it is probably the only historical tradition (1921:27).

10 The historical period in which a pro-monarchic view is possible is further defined for Noth by the historical fact of the long delay before the institution of a monarchy in Israel. Noth explains the delay, remarkable in view of the external threat from neighbouring kingdoms, as a product of a pre-monarchic theocratic ideology in Israel (1960: 164-65). Pro-monarchic views, therefore, were not likely to have been common before the crushing defeat of the amphictyonic armies at Aphek (1 Sam 4). The losses in this battle forced the weakened Israelites to resort to a monarchy if they were to continue as a politically independent society.

11 Weiser includes Noth (1967) among those whom he calls literary critics because Noth follows
Wellhausen's source divisions of the narrative.

For example, Birch divides ch. 9 into 1-14, 18-19, 22-24, and ch. 10 into 2-4, 9, 14-16a. These verses represent a separate folk tale of Saul's search for his asses (1976:132).


See Buber 1956, 1964. Buber's arguments for the unity of 1 Sam 7-12 are vitiated by his excisions of material that does not conform to what he sees as the unitary narrative.
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17 The principle is best known as formulated by William of Ockham who said, appropriately enough, "Plurality is not to be assumed without necessity," and "What can be done with fewer [assumptions] is done in vain with more" (cited from P. Edwards 1967: Vol. 7/8, 307).

18 R. Polzin comes to similar conclusions, "If, on the other hand, we assume that many gaps, dislocations, and reversals in the biblical text may profitably be viewed as the result of the use (authorial or editorial) of several different viewpoints within the narrative, then, whether the present text is the product either of a single mind or of a long and complicated editorial process, we are still responsible for making sense of the present
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text by assuming that the present text, in more cases than previously realized, does make sense" (1980:17).

19 Cleenath Brooks suggests that "it is easy to see why the relation of each item to the whole con-
text is crucial, and why the effective and essential structure of the poem has to do with the complex of attitudes achieved. A scientific preposition [sic] can stand alone. If it is true, it is true. But the expression of an attitude, apart from the occasion which generates it and the situation which encom-

20 The macro-contextual pattern is the narrative structure that governs the narrative as a whole (Conroy 1978:89-90).

21 The objective of narrative theory "...is a grid of possibilities, through the establishment of the minimal narrative constitutive features....What can we say about the way structures like narrative organize themselves?...What are the necessary compo-
nents—and only those—of a narrative?" (Chatman 1978:19).

22 E.g. phonology, vocabulary, grammar,
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syntax, and rhetorical structures.

E.g. plot, theme, sequence, suspense and tensions, time relations, character, and narration and point of view.

For the methodological principles guiding the literary approach to 1 Sam 8-12 see P.M. Wetherill (1974). His book provides summaries and examinations of the major theories and methods in recent literary studies. Rather than supplying a summary of Wetherill's methodological summary it seems better, at this point, to avoid further theoretical discussion. As Wetherill suggests, the individual text must determine the methodology that will be useful in the comprehension of its meaning and in the description of how it achieves that meaning (1974: 248). Since the object of this study is the interpretation of a specific narrative rather than a general theory of narrative, a detailed discussion of methodology would be aprioristic with respect to 1 Sam 8-12, and redundant and superficial in view of Wetherill's and others' metacritical studies.
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For example, although modern scholars agree that the "Court History of David" (2 Sam 9-20, 1 Kgs 1-2) is a unit (e.g. G. Fohrer 1968:222), it is divided in the Bible between the books of Samuel and Kings.

E.g., the collocation of three literary units—the three Isaiahs—in the single book of Isaiah.

This delimitation was classically formulated by Wellhausen (1899:240-41, 1973:24). Although there have been differences amongst scholars on the boundaries of the narrative, some beginning with ch. 7 (e.g., citing only periodical literature, Z. Ben-Barak 1979, R.E. Clements 1974, F. Langlamet 1970, A.D.H. Mayes 1978, E. Robertson 1944, H. Seebass 1965) and others with ch. 8 (V. Fritz 1976, D.J. McCarthy 1973, R. Press 1938, T.C.G. Thornton 1967, M. Tsevat 1980, H. Wildberger 1957), there is agreement, however, that 1 Sam 1-6 (7) are not to be included in the narrative.

When chs. 13-15 are included, the theme becomes more specifically the inauguration of Saul's kingship and his subsequent rejection.
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5 L. Rost’s study (1926) offers detailed exemplification of stylistic analysis used to support this thematic division. For 1 Sam 4:1b-7:1, see especially p. 11ff.

6 P.D. Miller and J.J.M. Roberts rejected Willis’s literary pattern (1977:20). Willis replied in a lively polemical rebuttal albeit with reduced claims of pervasiveness for the convention in biblical narrative (1979:212). In my opinion, Willis’s reading remains the more valid even with the smaller comparative basis for the pattern. The reading of Miller and Roberts suffers from excessive trimming of textual data to get a "text" (1 Sam 2:12-17; 22-25, 27-36; 4:1b-7:1 (Miller and Roberts 1977:60-61)) that fits their explanatory frame. (See Willis 1979 for extensive criticism of Miller and Roberts on this issue, esp. 204-07.) Even if Willis’s literary pattern were evident only in 1 Sam 1-7, it would still be valid as a logical frame for the interpretation of the narrative because he meets the first two of Perry’s considerations on frame construction.

7 The question of the historicity of the events is not at issue here. My concern is only to analyse
and describe the text and what it says about those events.

8 Samuel himself describes the move towards monarchy as a "turning aside" out of the path of ordained theocratic politics (1 Sam 12:21. See the exegetical comments on ch. 12 for my reading of this verse.).

9 R. Polzin (1980) proposes to do a literary study of the deuteronomistic history in two volumes. Obviously he neither intends, nor is it possible for anyone, to deal with all the individual exegetical problems posed by the history. Such detailed analysis, however, is my aim for this study of 1 Sam 1-12.

10 McCarter notes that the use of the word *טְסָעָא* in 11:13 links the victory over the Ammonites with the pre-monarchical acts of deliverance via the judges (1980:203-04). This link stresses that regardless of the human agent, deliverance always comes from Yahweh.
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1 The phrase הָאָמֵד לֶפֶנָּה is also used in covenants of grant to describe the loyal service of a servant which is rewarded by a grant (M. Weinfeld 1970:185-86).

In the Bible the phrase occurs several times in the context of covenantal obedience or priestly service to Yahweh. In Ezra 9, the Israelite returnees have broken the commandment "by the prophets" (cf. Lev 18:24-30; Deut 7:3) not to intermarry with non-Israelites. Ezra says, "Behold we are before thee in our guilt, for none can stand before thee because of this" (9:15). In Deut 4:10, the people stand before Yahweh to hear his words and to learn to fear him. The words that Yahweh speaks are his covenant—the ten words (v. 13). The priestly service, described as standing before Yahweh, is another aspect of Israel's total covenantal obligation to Yahweh as 2 Chr 29:10-11 shows. Hezekiah, wishing to renew the covenant with Yahweh, asks the Levites who have been chosen to stand before Yahweh as servants (cf. Deut 10:8; 18:5, 7) to be diligent.

2 The question, "To whom will he it go from upon us," (i.e. "get off our back") (6:20) is
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pointedly ambiguous and includes both Yahweh and his infernal ark.

3 The problematic individuals in both families are the sons and not the aged fathers, who, it is implied, are too old to keep a tight rein on their sons' activities. Eli is never accused of active wrong-doing but is implicated in his sons' sinfulness because he has not put a stop to their activities (2:29; 3:13).

4 It was essential for both priest and judge, the mediators of the covenant relationship, to be absolutely sinless. The priest represents Yahweh to man (oracle, ordeal, instruction, blessing and cursing) and man to Yahweh (sacrifice), (G. Fohrer 1972:212; cf. H. Ringgren 1966:204-10; R. de Vaux 1965:357). The judge was the official agent to whom the Israelites brought their cases (Exod 18:13-22, cf. de Vaux 1965:151-53). Judges were supposed to be God-fearing, trustworthy, and haters of bribes (Exod 13:21). They not only arbitrated legal disputes, but also represented the people before God, taught them the statutes and decisions, and how they were to behave (Exod 18:19-20; cf. Samuel's role as judge
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described in 1 Sam 7:5, 6, 15-17; 8:10; 10:25; 12:3 (possible abuses of the judgeship), 7, 20-25).

The fourfold repetition of שְׁאָשָׁן in 9:16-17 emphasizes that Yahweh still regards Israel as his covenantal people; cf. Buber 1956:128.


The apostasy described by Samuel in 7:3 can only be seen as the Israelite's reaction to their apparent rejection by Yahweh. They mourn Yahweh's removal from themselves (7:2) and turn to other gods for consolation in the face of Yahweh's silence. The narrative makes no previous mention of Israelite apostasy. The only prior descriptions of the Israelites display them adhering to the ordained sacrificial regulations, objecting to the Elide abuses (2:13-16), and going out to war on the Philistines (4:1-10).

Saul's silence on the matter of the monarchy
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(ḥammēlūka) at the request of Samuel (משה שמעון, 10:16) also appears to aim at avoiding premature disclosure of the manner of monarchy Yahweh has granted.

9 The point of this description is not, as Buber notes against Budde, to describe the establishment of a royal court or bodyguard (1956:148). The expression "they went with him" (wayyēlēku ʾimmō) connotes more than mere physical accompaniment. In several occurrences, the idiom is used for Yahweh's covenantal presence with His elect (Exod 33:16; Lev 26:21ff; Deut 20:4; 31:6; 2 Sam 7:9; Mic 6:8; 1 Chr 17:8; cf. Helfmeyer 1978:395). Several other occurrences describe a league between individuals (Num 10:32; Judg 4:8; 11:8; 1 Sam 30:23; Job 31:5; 34:8). Amos, though he does not use the expression, states the principle: "Do two walk together, unless they have made an appointment?", (3:3).

10 On the appropriateness of fearing Samuel too, see Stoebe 1973:239 and Buber 1956:159.

11 The key words are sūr "turn aside," bēḵol-šēbabkem "with all your heart," ʾābad "serve," nāsal "rescue."
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Of ten occurrences of the word "raʾ/raʾā", variously translated as evil, harmful, distress, or wickedness (1:8; 2:23; 6:9; 8:6; 10:19; 12:17, 19, 20, 25), five occurrences appear in ch. 12 and all of these describe the request for a secular monarchy. (This is also true of the usage in 8:6.) Given the emphasis on whole-hearted service of Yahweh alone (cf. Weinfield 1972:77; McCarthy 1978:45 on the covenantal significance of this emphasis), it is likely that the continued wickedness of 12:25 refers to further efforts at political secularism.
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1McCarter notes that the LXX reading is dis-junctive, marking the beginning of an entirely new narrative. He cites Job 1:1 as a parallel example. One might just as easily say that the LXX reading is an accommodation to the beginning of other biblical books. Neither genetic explanation would understand either MT or LXX. Interestingly enough, McCarter observes that the LXX reading supports his traditio-historical hypotheses about the pre-history of the text. He makes this observation in a section of his commentary supposedly devoted solely to textual criticism. Whether it is MT or LXX that is the "correct reading," a thing that will never be certain, it is certain that the decisions of text criticism are better made without the influence of traditio-historical hypotheses.

2Driver's long excursus on the secondary status of the dual ending and the topographical features of Samuel's village (1913:2), though of interest from the theoretical perspective of historical geography, is unnecessarily complex from a literary perspective. An awareness of the poetic parallelism in the genealogy provides a pleasantly
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parsimonious literary explanation of the dual ending. Needless to say, the literary explanation neither rules out alternatives from other perspectives, nor does it need their agreement. It is a self-sufficient way of looking at biblical narrative.

In addition, both Robertson (1944:180-81) and Aharoni (1979:210) supply geographical arguments that support the dual ending.

The names appear elsewhere primarily in Chronicles in various genealogical lists from different periods. Even in these lists they are names of unimportant persons. The occurrences are: 1. יִרְוָם - Neh 11:12; 1 Chr 6:12, 19; 8:27; 9:8, 12; 12:27; 27:22; 2 Chr 23:1. 2. אֵלֶּה - 1 Chr 12:20; 26:7; 27:18; and the book of Job. 3. שִׁפָּה - 1 Chr 6:20.

The genealogy of Jesus in the gospel of Luke (3:23-38) provides another example of this reversal of the usual function of linear genealogies (Wilson 1979:21).

The motif of two wives, one barren and one fertile, usually with the barren wife being favoured over the fertile, is prominent in the patriarchal narratives; see Hauge 1975; J.G. Williams 1980.
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6. The textual difficulty produced by the word אֵפֹי in v. 5 can be relieved by a philologically and contextually defensible reading suggested by Wellhausen (1871:36) and developed by Driver (1915:7-8). Based on LXX ב, the problematic אֵפֹי is read ב and, with the following כ, translated "howbeit." The sense of the verse with the emendation is that although Elkanah loved Hannah, he could only give her one portion because Yahweh had sealed her womb (cf., however, D. Aberbach 1974:350-53; F. Deist 1977:205-09).

7. McCarter's suggestion that MT is expansive by including her daughters is arbitrary (1980:51). The point of saying "and all her sons and daughters" is to emphasize the vexation to Hannah. The sons and daughters are multiple and they are specifically Peninnah's (3rd fem. sing. suffixes).

8. Dhorme labels the repetition in v. 6 as a gloss, simply because it repeats the end of v. 5 (1910:19). Repetition has since been recognized as an important stylistic device in biblical literature e.g. Muilenberg 1953:97-111.

9. McCarter's objection to the Wellhausen/Driver
solution to ْلااپاَم in v. 5 is that it is contextually unsuitable. It assumes that Elknah gives Hannah only one portion thereby leaving Peninnah's rancor in v. 6 unexplained (1980:52). He suggests that Peninnah's rancor can be explained by reading ْلااپاَم as كَٰذِنَم, "proportionate to them, equal to them," and understanding that Peninnah is retaliating on account of Hannah's preferential treatment. The Wellhausen/Driver reading is, however, perfectly suited to the context and provides a better understanding of Hannah's vociferation in v. 6. She not only gets a smaller share of the sacrifice because of her sterility, but is also subject to Peninnah's scorn. Peninnah, characterized as both the second wife and Hannah's rival, needs no excuse to vex Hannah; rather Hannah's barrenness and consequent single portion of the sacrifice provide a prime opportunity for Peninnah to rub it in.

10 The additional note about Hannah's drinking, "and after drinking" (مَاٰحَرَ وَسَأَتُنَ) is grammatically anomalous (GKC #113e.n.3) and usually seen as a gloss (Stoebe 1973:91; McCarter 1980:53). Even if it is retained in one's reading it changes nothing. It is
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difficult to understand why a glossator would add such an anomalous and irrelevant detail, though. Perhaps it was intended as a small piece of scenic background by whoever included it.

11 The possibility that the gaps in 4QSam\(^a\) may support LXX\(^b\) is insufficient reason to follow the variant, even if the combined versional voice does represent an independent witness and not simply an amplification of MT (cf. Driver 1913:13; B. Johnson 1976/77:134). MT makes sense as it stands and so from a literary point of view, there is no reason to add or subtract anything. Neither is there any compulsion to compare variants in order to see what difference the variant would make to the meaning of the text in such a case. M. Greenberg suggests that although there is no logical basis for choosing one version over another when they both make sense, a comparison of the divergencies, each read in its own context, provides a powerful heuristic resource that can alert us to the particular focus of each version (1977:140).

Greenberg does unquestionably demonstrate the heuristic value of the comparative exercise. But
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there is a danger here that each version may be understood and explained according to its distinction from the other. This method of elucidating a text concentrates on a distinctive feature, which is only especially distinctive in view of the other version. Thereby that specific textual feature is given more prominence than it would have had viewed only within its own context (cf. J.M. Ellis 1974:116-18). To avoid this danger, and Greenberg is aware of it, it seems better to leave such comparisons aside until a complete interpretation of the narrative has been made. Or if comparison must be made no special importance should be attributed to LXX or any other version, if our purpose is simply to highlight the text under study. As Wellek and Warren suggest, "the same end may well be achieved by devising for ourselves alternatives, whether or not they have actually passed through the author's mind" (cit. in D.G. Mowatt 1958/59:217-18).

\[12\] Although, as S.B. Parker states, it is clear from the context that Hannah desires a boy (unetatt\textsuperscript{nw}, Cal-ro\textsuperscript{so}) (1979:694; cf. Hertzberg 1964:25), McCarter is correct to reject the translation of zer\textsuperscript{c} \textit{našim
as male child/offspring (1980:61). The expression occurs only here, where it stands in explicit opposition to the Nazirite whom Hannah gives back to God.

13 Nowack denies that the uncut hair alludes to an association of the future child with the Nazirite life. Instead, he says it was the custom of the priests to leave their hair uncut, citing Ezek 44:20 as an example (1902:5). As Cooke notes, however, the context implies that the reference in Ezek 44 is to the custom of cutting the hair as a sign of mourning. This practice was associated with non-Israelite religious practices and so was prohibited (1936:485; cf. Lev 21:5-6; Deut 14:1). The fact that Hannah is making a vow also supports the connection with the Nazirites, who according to Num 6:2 become Nazirites by making a vow, lindör neder.

14 Note Hertzberg's response to Hannah. "Hannah's modest reply so obviously bears the stamp of truth that Eli believes her completely..." (1964:25).

15 The fact the narrative notes Hannah's pregnancy only after the passage of due time may indicate that pregnancy is judged by external
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appearances rather than the cessation of menstruation.  
16 Ellis argues that to go back to prior contexts or usages of a literary document is a contradictory reversal of the process that resulted in the literary work. "...to put back all that the poet thought was irrelevant and therefore left out is to destroy the structure of the finished work by virtue of which it has its artistic impact and meaning; that meaning was created precisely by the selective operation that so many critics seem to be at pains to reverse and remove" (1974:114). Applying these remarks to the case of Samuel's name and its explanation one could agree with the hypothesis that the explanation is well-suited to the name Saul and yet maintain that the interpretation of the actual connection between the explanation and the name Samuel must take precedence as the first concern of readers. Similar observations are made by Childs 1979:75-77.

17 According to Haran, there is no difference between the two times and sacrifices of vv. 3 and 21; both mean "the yearly sacrifice" (1978:304-07; cf. Newman 1962:88). Haran cites Exod 13:10; Judg 11:40;
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21:19 as support for translating miyyāmîn yāmînā "from year to year." As employed in 1 Sam 1:3 he says it is an event that occurs once a year. But both Exod 13:10 and Judg 11:40 include additional temporal determinants, without which it is not clear that miyyāmîn yāmînā designates any specific or limited occurrence. Neither is it clear that the ḫag in Judg 21:19 is a once-a-year affair. The evidence, however, is ambiguous, as Boling's interpretation shows. He reverses Haran's hypothesis, and uses 1 Sam 1:3 to identify the ḫag in Judg 21:19 as the "important yearly celebration at Shiloh" (1975:293).

Haran deduces the existence of a yearly sacrifice from 1 Sam 1 (esp. v. 21), held once annually. For yāmînā meaning "year" he cites Lev 25:29-30; Judg 17:10; 19:2.

The occurrence in Lev 25 should not be translated "year"; the word yāmînā is set in an appositional explanatory clause that emphasizes the multiplicity of opportunities for redemption of a residence in a walled city. yāmînā is balanced against ṭōm ve'nat. The use of yāmînā (pl.) has rhetorical value that is
lost when understood simply as synonymic with \( \text{\textsc{sinat}} \), "year."

Judges 17:10 is ambiguous and in 19:2 Haran arbitrarily inserts a \( \text{\textsc{waw}} \) copulative before \( \text{\textsc{yamîm}} \), without which there is no reason to translate "year". (Haran 1978:306 n.28) (BDB, p. 599, suggests no occurrence of \( \text{\textsc{yamîm}} \) that should be translated a "year." Most occurrences actually capitalize on the plurality of the word.)

\( \text{\textsc{kâsîr}} \) is used similarly to note the fulfillment of promises many times throughout Deuteronomy, e.g. 1:3, 11, 19, 41; 2:1, 14; 4:5; 5:12, 16, 32; 6:3, 19, 25, etc.

The reading "a three year old bull" instead of "three bulls" is accepted by most commentators, e.g. Driver 1913:20-21; Stoebe 1973:99; McCarter 1980:56-57. It is required by the context in v. 25 where a single bull is slaughtered (\( \text{\textsc{et-happâr}} \); cf. Thenius 1864:8). "MT \( \text{\textsc{bprym šlîsh}} \) shows a simple corruption, the m grouped with the wrong word" (McCarter 1980:56-57).

Ehrlich offers the entertaining suggestion that "die Verba sind im Pl. und ihr Subjekt
unbestimmt wegen des Stieres, den Hanna nicht führen konnte" (1910:168).


22 Hylander provides a summary of the discussion of the topic prior to his study, 1952:13 n.1.

23 LXX omits this sentence in 1:28, placing it in 2:11 where MT has Elkanah, rather than Hannah, going home to Ramathah.

24 Keil and Delitzsch hold this view, but for different reasons (1880:28).
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1 Archaic features in the song of Hannah allow only the conclusion that the poem contains certain features of early poetry. Archaizing cannot be ruled out (cf. Robertson 1972:147-48). Even if an acceptable date could be suggested for the song on the basis of the proposals of Albright and his followers (cf. Robertson 1972:6; Willis 1973:140 n.10; Cross and Freedman 1975; McCarter 1980:75-76), it would say nothing about the putative redactional status of the song. Whether it be early or late, dating cannot answer the questions of who put the song in ch. 2, and when he did it. If a certain dating of the narrative context could be determined, then it might be possible to say that the song is redactional—but only if its date were later than that of the prose context.

2 The syntactic patterning should also indicate to the redaction critic that the song has not simply been inserted. At the very least, it is skilfully grafted.

3 The connection between B and B' could be further strengthened assonantly, if the reading of LXX and OL was adopted, as most scholars do (e.g.
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rāmâ qarnî be'îlōhāy (!)
rāḥab pî cālîyyēbay

As Willis notes, however, MT is representative of the repetitive style often seen in early Hebrew and Ugaritic poetry (1973:143-44), and so can be read as is.

Ps 18:3 is a particularly interesting parallel since it also shares both the vocabulary and the conceptual framework of 1 Sam 2:1-2.

Cf. Zeph 3:11 where cāliîîōt are the rebellious acts of the proud against Yahweh.

Reading weîîō with the qere.

An alternative explanation in terms of class conflicts and revolution is offered by Gottwald 1979: 534-40.

Again, the parallel in vocabulary between 1 Sam 2:4 and Ps 18:33 illustrates that Hannah's song expresses a common belief:

1 Sam 2:4 weînikšâlîm dâzîî hāyîl
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Ps 18:33  הָאֵל הַמַּזֶּרְנִי הָיִל

Both passages show the beneficial side of Yahweh's power and incomparability.

9 On the meaning of v. 5b see McCarter 1980:72.

10 Gottwald errs in restricting the poem's critique of human self-sufficiency to the social elite of Canaan (1979:537-38). Nor is it correct to say, as Gottwald does, that the poem "hails the elevation of the poor and destitute to the status of communal leaders and to the full exercise of sovereign self-rule" (1979:535). The poem is directed against all expressions of self-sufficiency pointing instead to Yahweh's graciousness to the helpless and submissive. It is difficult to read a poem that downgrades human ability "the warrior's bows are shattered" (v. 4), and "a man does not become mighty by strength" (v. 9) as revolutionary ideology. The poem exalts only Yahweh's ability and willingness to rescue the defenseless. The contrasts are not between people of different nations, or social classes, but between the humble dependant of Yahweh and the proud self-sufficient human.
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11 Other occurrences of this metonymic usage of ḫapsē-.between are Isa 45:22 and Ps 22:28. See Hamp's discussion, 1977:362. On reading ṭālāw as a divine name in v. 10b see Barr 1968:285.

12 The demand for a human king in 8:5, 20 is not a response resulting from a perception of God's feebleness or incompetence. Rather it is made in the knowledge of Yahweh's apparently unpredictable and, therefore, unreliable behaviour when the covenant mediators are sinful (cf. 2:22-25, the resulting disaster in ch. 4, and the note preceding the request (8:1-3), which shows a relapse to the dangerous situation of sinful mediators).

13 This contrast has been discussed by several scholars, e.g. Bourke 1954:82ff.; Hertzberg 1964:13; Willis 1971:289-94; 1972:38; 1979:208 n.29; Péter-Contesse 1976:313.

14 Samuel acts as though he were a Levite, ministering to Yahweh before Eli the priest (cf. Num 3:5-13; 8:19, 26; 11:28; Deut 18:7). The Elders, on the other hand, do not act as the priests they are supposed to be.
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15 The rhetorical effect of narrative exposition is discussed by Booth 1961; Chatman 1978:228-48; and Sternberg 1978.

16 Two other possible alternatives have been suggested for interpreting vv. 13-14. Smith reads the mispaṭ hakkōnānim as object of the verb in v. 12 (as in LXX), suggesting that vv. 13-14 describe cultic abuse (1899:18). Driver, following Wellhausen, also sees vv. 13-14 as examples of cultic abuse, but reads v. 13 disjunctively from v. 12, as in MT (1913:29).

The interpretation proposed here is not claimed to be superior to Driver's, but simply accounts for the verse from a different perspective. Smith's proposal, as well as any other that follows LXX instead of MT, deals with a different narrative.

17 The accusative particle here "depends on a verbal idea, virtually contained in what has gone before, and consequently present to the speaker's mind as governing the accusative" (GKC #117). It also serves to call attention to the parallel between vv. 12 and 13.

18 In conjunction with the decision to read v. 13 with v. 12 (e.g. Hertzberg 1964:32, 34) it has
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been suggested, following LXX, that the final מ of hakkohanim should be read with the following אֶת as מֶּאֶת. "They knew not Yahweh, or the right (i.e. the rightful due) of the priest from the people" (cit. in Driver 1913:29). Cf. Stoebe (1973:108) who suggests simply a haplography of מ. The chiasmus in MT argues against these emendations.

According to Wellhausen the gam at the beginning of v. 15 requires that vv. 13-14 be seen as cultic abuses. "Denn da-dieses Gleichartiges steigert, so kann v. 13f. nicht dem v. 15f. wie Recht dem Unrecht entgegengesetzt sein, sondern beides gilt als Ueberschreitung der Befugnis, nur das eine in höherem Masse als der andere..." (1871:44). It is quite possible, however, to read the gam of v. 15 asseveratively in connection with the priestly lack of patience to wait for Yahweh to get his share (cf. R.J. Williams 1976:63 #379; GKC #153). When v. 15 is not seen as a further abuse, then, as Wellhausen says, vv. 13-14 appear as the customary practice of the priests at that time.

Willis (1972:55) suggests that the priests desecrated the sacrifice in three ways: taking from
the cooking pots what was not voluntarily given (vv. 13-14), claiming choice portions of raw flesh (v. 15), and intervening before Yahweh got his share (v. 15). The fact that the priest refuses boiled meat seems to suggest that that is what was offered to the priest. At best, the receipt of uncooked as opposed to boiled meat is only a subsidiary issue. In fact, the priest's desire for raw meat seems more a means of revealing his character and the reason for his impatience to get his due. Nowhere is the prohibition against eating on the blood (cf. Gen 9:4; Lev 19:26; Deut 12:16) brought to bear, as one would expect if that were at issue.

In Ps 10:3-4, it is also the hybris-filled man who rejects (ni'ēš) Yahweh. He glories in the desires of his soul (ta'awat napšō). Similarly the priest's servants take whatever they desire (1 Sam 2:16, ka'asēr tē'awweh napšēkā), and the narrator tells us that they contemned (ni'ēšū) Yahweh's offering. In both cases, the attitude of self-help is exactly that criticized in Hannah's song.

See above on 1:21 for my reading of zebah hayyānim in this narrative.
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23 The exact meaning of the verb רל is as yet undetermined. For surveys of opinions see de Ward 1976, 1977; Houtman 1977. For present purposes, however, the context suggests an act of judging and mediation that lessens the severity of punishment inflicted on the sinner.

24 Tsevat can list only four instances, including 1 Sam 2:25, in which failure to repent of sin is traced to divine agency (1964:357 nn.5-9). He suggests that the explanation of human folly by divine coercion is one extreme in the spectrum of biblical responses to the problem of unrepentant sinners (pp. 355-58).

25 According to Willis, v. 25 suggests that Eli's sons "refused to listen to him because he had not behaved so as to command their respect" (1971:292). Again, he bases this reading, which contradicts the plain sense of the text, on 3:13, which states that Eli failed to rebuke/restrain them (וֹלֲכִּים) and on 2:29, which states that Elihonours his sons more than Yahweh. Clearly these last two verses contradict 2:25, according to which Eli had no chance of persuading his sons because Yahweh had already
Notes to Chapter IV - 1 Samuel 2


The historical-critical solution to such contradictions is commendable in that it admits them, instead of harmonizing them by favouring one at the expense of the other. Press sees 2:22ff., 2:29, and 3:13 as all contradictory and concludes that, "das führt zu der Annahme, dass an I Sam 1-3 drei verschiedene Hände gearbeitet haben" (1938:179).

It is, nevertheless, possible and even necessary to relate the two supposedly contradictory views, or better voices, by paying careful attention to two important facets of all narrative, namely the temporal ordering or structure, and the voice structure, as suggested above on v. 23. Attention to these parameters of the narrative put the conflict into proper perspective as a difference of opinion between the narrator and God.

26 The three aforementioned keys are: 1. the divine initiative in Samuel's birth; 2. the unquestionable sin of Eli's sons; and 3. the undisputed innocence of the Israelite people.

27 Most commentators follow LXX and now 4 QSam³,
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and insert cabādîm after bēmisrayim. Haplography caused by homoioteleuton is suggested as the cause for corruption (e.g. Wellhausen 1871:48; McCarter 1980:87). As it stands, though, MT stresses the fact of belonging; the house of Eli's father belonged to Pharoah in Egypt. The revelation came to them in that state and by implication freed them to become priests to Yahweh.

28 The exact meaning of pīśē is disputed. From LXX on, the term has been translated as "offering made by fire," but modern exegetes have suggested that it could mean "oblation" (Hamp 1977:424; McCarter 1980:90, citing Hoëtijzer 1967:114-34). Whatever the exact meaning of the word, the point is that the priests are granted one-specific type of sacrifice or offering as payment for their services.

29 The standard treaty form is discussed by K. Baltzer 1964; McCarthy 1978.

30 As Driver, among others, notes mācōn is "untranslateable" (1915:37). Seebass suggests that we repoint to mācēwōn reading "um der Schuld willen" (1966:77). On the causative use of min see GKC #119z. On ēwōn as the object of expiation by sacrifice and
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offering see 3:14.

31 Eli's participation is implied by the 2nd pers. pl. suffix in lēhabriāj kem, "to fatten your-selves."

32 On the meaning of vithallē'ku see Keil and Delitzsch 1880:42; McCarter 1980:90.

33 Cf. McCarter, "the author is quoting or paraphrasing a traditional maxim" (1980:90).

34 C. Ruhl has constructed the following algorithm to describe the reading procedures commonly used (by all except historical-critics) to make sense of discourse, including narrative.

If a structure A-and-B can be analyzed as a temporal sequence, it will be. If it can be further analyzed that A is a precondition for B, it will be. And if A can be analyzed as a decisive condition—that is, a cause—for B, it will be. Only if the first stage—the temporal sequence—is not reached, will the co-ordinate structure be analyzed as symmetric (cit. in M.L. Pratt 1977:156).

The almost total annihilation of the Elide house in ch. 4 should, according to Ruhl's algorithm, be
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identified by most readers as the temporal and causal result of the word of God presented in v. 31.

35 Cf. Deut 8:16; 28:63; and 30:5 for further examples of יָֽרָ֑ב construe with the accusative of person (Keil and Delitzsch 1880:43).

36 Tsevat comes close to suggesting a similar reading of 2:27-36:

It would not be unreasonable to assume that it is the intention of the story of the house of Eli as part of the book of Samuel to lead up to the destruction of Shiloh and the capture of the ark, to indicate that, far beyond bringing kareth upon their family and damaging the institution of the priesthood, the sons of Eli brought about national disaster. This assumption, however, is not substantiated in the text. Nowhere are the catastrophe of Aphek and Shiloh and the long years of Philistine rule over Israel traced in any way, however, devious, to the conduct of the Elders (1961:207).

His rejection of the type of reading suggested here for v. 32 cannot be regarded as well founded in view
of the foreshadowing and explicit prophecies of the
deaths of Eli's sons (2:25, 34; 4:11). The Israelite
defeat is Yahweh's means of killing Eli's sons. We
know from 2:25 that Yahweh was going to kill Eli's
sons, and from chs. 5-6 we know that he, in fact, was
responsible for the Israelite defeat in which they
were killed. Tsevat's original intuition is, in fact,
quite reasonable and need not be called an assumption
in view of evidence such as v. 32.

37 The verb יָשָׁב in the Hiphil is also
associated with Israelite military success in Deut
6:18-19.

38 Modern commentators in favour of reading
vv. 33, 35-36 in this way include Budde 1902:21-22;
Nowack 1902:17; Dhorme 1910:41; Driver 1913:39-40;
Schulz 1919:52-53; Stoebe 1973:117-20; McCarter 1980:
87-93. Others see the supposed references to
Abiathar in v. 33 and to Zadok in v. 35 only as
uncertain possibilities (Smith 1899:23; Hertzberg
1964:38; Mauchline 1971:55; Miller and Roberts 1977:
30).

39 From a typological perspective the identi-
fications of the faithful priest of v. 35 as Samuel
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(Thenius 1864:15), Zadok (McCarter 1980:92, "Theodoret and the Rabbins," [Keil and Delitzsch 1880:45]), or Christ (Keil and Delitzsch 1880:47; Gutbrod 1956:30-31) are all valid possibilities.

40 Cf. Michaels who makes the same point using examples from both legal and literary interpretations. "...plain meanings are functions not of texts but of the situations in which we read them" (1979:33).

41 For la\textsuperscript{3}adib we must read 1\textsuperscript{e}ha\textsuperscript{2}adib for a grammatically correct text (Driver 1913:39). There is no need to change the suffixes on the two infinitive constructs to the 3rd masc. sing. The idea of a man who will continue in the Elides' place at the altar is supposed to cause Eli severe mental anguish.

42 On the subject of Samuel's multiple roles see McKenzie 1962:3-18. McKenzie attempts to find the "real," historical Samuel lying behind the traditions. He tentatively suggests that the real Samuel is the leader of the sons of the prophets, as seen in 1 Sam 10 (p. 16).

As in the case of Moses, however, it seems possible that Samuel's multiple roles should not be regarded as contradictory. Whether the
contradiction is seen in historical terms, or in terms of tradition history is irrelevant. Buber's comments on Moses are equally applicable to Samuel:

It is true that the way in which he receives the revelation is largely prophetic,...; but his activity in history, as leader of the people, as legislator, is what separates him in character from all the bearers of prophecy known to us. For this reason Moses likewise cannot be comprehended merely as a combination of priest and prophet; moreover, he is not to be comprehended at all within any exclusively "religious" categories. What constitutes his idea and his task: the realization of the unity of religious and social life in the community of Israel, the substantiation of a ruling by God that shall not be culturally restricted but shall comprehend the entire existence of the nation, the theo-political principle; all this has penetrated to the depths of his personality, it has raised his person above the
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compartmental system of typology, it has mingled the elements of his soul into a most rare unity (1958:186).
Notes to Chapter IV - 1 Samuel 3

1Cf. above on 1 Sam 2, n. 54, and Pratt 1977: 156 on Ruhl's algorithm.

2Stoebe argues that bimaqomā is a general expression and does not intend to indicate a deviation from correct priestly practise on Eli's part (1973: 123). He suggests that if Eli's resting place was supposed to be emphasized, it would have been put more clearly. The contrast is clear, though, between Eli in his place and Samuel in Yahweh's temple, and it is supported by its agreement with the other contrasts noted in vv. 1-2. Eli may not be breaking any rules, but neither does he shine when compared with Samuel, as he is in these verses.

3On the symbolism of the lamp see Funk and Ben-Dor 1962:64; Keel 1978:188-90.

4The first time reader would not be able to appreciate the significance of this mention of the ark. Its appreciation is reserved as a private irony between the narrator and the retrospective reader, who, like Buber and Stoebe, see it as a harbinger of the disaster about to be revealed to and through Samuel. The inability of a first reading to see this meaning is not a point against it, but rather, should
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be taken to show that scripture is amenable to retrospective reading.

Cf. 2 Kgs 21:12; Jer 19:3, where ear-buzzing events are also catastrophes of a national proportion. "Ein grosses Unglück wird aber über das Volk Israel hereinbrechen..." (Schulz 1919:62).

The verb kīhâ, translated here as "rebuke," poses a problem. McCarter says this translation cannot be right in view of 2:22-25. He suggests, with D.N. Freedman, a relationship to kāhâ "be weak" (v. 2)—thus kīhâ, "weaken, repress, restrain" (1980:98). This reading, however, does little to alleviate the dilemma. Eli's rebuke in 2:22-25 can also be seen as an attempt to restrain his sons. The reader knows from 2:25 that nothing short of death can restrain Eli's sons. Is Yahweh judging Eli because he did not kill his sons himself? The uncertainty about the meaning of kīhâ prevents a certain answer.

One might posit a textual corruption in kīhâ, as a result of metathesis (cf. Ehrlich 1910:180). Originally, the verb might have been hîkkâ, resulting in a known idiom, "He did not slay them." (For other occurrences of nkh with a direct object modified by
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b see 1 Sam 18:7; 21:12; 29:5; 1 Kgs 20:35; cf. Jer 5:6.) This reading would solve the dilemma. Yahweh would be justified, as Eli did not try to kill his sons. Since MT is conceivable, however, this emendation is only an entertaining speculation.

7 Cf. above on 2:29 and Seebass 1966:77 for discussion of this pointing of מֵּוֹנְו.

8 Most recent scholars agree with Wellhausen (1871:53) that wayyåskêm babbôqer, "he rose in the morning," should be added, with LXX, after "he lay down until morning." This concretization of an indeterminacy (cf. Iser 1978:170-80) is possible but unnecessary, since MT already has כָּזְד-הָבַבּוֹקֵר. The preposition implies that the action of the verb ends at morning. The reader does not require the explicitness of LXX to understand that Samuel got up.


10 The rhetoric of ambiguity is discussed by Rimmon-Kenan 1980/81:185-88 and J.H. Miller 1980/81: 189-91. Rimmon-Kenan describes ambiguity as the co-existence of mutually exclusive readings that
frustrate the reader's expectation of a univocal, definitive meaning (p. 186).

11 Both Budde (1902:29), and Stoebe (1973:126) suggest that "his words" (de\textit{bār}ay\textit{w}) are God's, not Samuel's. In view of the fact that Samuel does pass them on both to Eli and later to Israel (4:1), it is more likely that the words are Samuel's and Yahweh's, since they originate from Yahweh. Also v. 20, containing Israel's recognition of Samuel's prophetic accuracy, requires a reason for this recognition. What could be more suitable than the immediately preceding reference to the veracity of Samuel's words? Cf. Hertzberg 1964:42.

12 Jepsen discusses the problem of translating ne\textit{mēn} in his article in TDOT (1977:296).

13 Seebass regards the portrait of Samuel as a prophet as an "aufgesetztes Licht" that contradicts the preceding tradition (1967:164 n. 40). In that tradition (3:1-18), Samuel's familiarity with Yahweh's word is associated with his cultic duties under Eli (cf. Schunck 1963:103). The two conceptions of Samuel, as priest and prophet, are products of different socio-historical circumstances according
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to Seebass.

In fact, Samuel has difficulty receiving the word of God in his priestly capacity. His master, Eli, only comes to realize that God is trying to speak to Samuel after three attempts. The notice in v. 7 that Samuel did not yet know Yahweh is as much a negative reflection on Eli's tutelage as vv. 1-2 are on his effect on relations with Yahweh. Hence, Samuel's intimacy with the divine word is not so much connected with his situation amongst the priests in Shiloh as it is in spite of that association. Neither is Samuel's prophetic role necessarily in conflict with his priestly role.

As suggested previously, Samuel performs several roles in chs. 1-12. Like Moses, Samuel is one of the great figures of mediation in Israelite literature. It would be surprising if he were not portrayed as a great priest, prophet, judge and seer. Verse 20 says only that Samuel was recognized as a reliable prophet, not that he was no longer a priest (cf. Péter-Contesse 1976:314).

14 Textual emendations and reconstructions abound for v. 21 (see Stoebe 1973:123 for a selection).
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Noth correctly observes, however, that "Ein zureichender Grund zu einer Text-'Verbesserung' besteht jedoch nicht; und daher ist es methodisch geboten, am gegebenen Wortlaut festzuhalten" (1963:399).
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Mauchline suggests that 4:1b introduces a sudden change of subject. Chs. 1-3 are concerned with the Elides, Shiloh, and Samuel; chs. 4-6 are concerned with politics, the Philistine war, and the national emergency (1971:69). Mauchline has missed the connection between the two episodes, which are only superficially separate. (Cf. Gutbrod, who seems to be unable to decide how to view the connection between chs. 1-3 and 4-6 (1956:38).) They are linked not only by the theme of priestly sin and its consequent punishment, but also, and to a much greater extent, by the probing of Israel's theological-political order. In chs. 2-3, Israel is troubled by the priests, who irresponsibly abuse the sacrificial system, thereby interfering in the regular process of atonement necessary for normal covenantal relations in the theocracy. In chs. 4-6, Israel is made to experience the retributitional fruits of its priests' misdeeds in the form of a national military disaster that is interpreted as an end to the theocratic system (4: 20-21).

LXX adds "Eli grew very old, and his sons continued to act more and more wickedly in the
presence of Yahweh. In those days the Philistines gathered to make war against Israel" (McCarter 1980: 102). Though the LXX reading has captured the crucial features of the Elide family situation, and though it does make a nice associative implication about the connection between the impending war with the Philistines and Yahweh's wrath at the Elide sin, it cannot be said that it is a necessary correction to any obvious deficiency in MT. LXX offers a slightly different narrative, but not a "better" one.

3Cf. Booth 1961:154, and Dostoevsky cited by Booth (p. 168), who explained lapses in his story "most of all because, as I have said before, I have literally no time or space to mention everything that was said and done."

4Cf. GKC #125e.

5The associations of the verb wattippos are discussed by Driver (quoted in J.J. Jackson 1962:115) and Campbell 1975:59.

6The placement of the interpretation before the description makes use of what psychologists call the "primacy effect" (cf. Perry 1979:53). Once a semantic organization of a set of facts is established
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it will not be altered if subsequent input can be sub-
sumed within it. Hence the first description of the
Israelite defeat has a greater input into the reader's
understanding of the event, and the second can be sub-
sumed.

7 For detailed examination see von Rad 1951;

8 Maier's simple assertion that "MT [הֶרְמָן
בֵּרֵי יִהוָה] ist allerdings z.T. sekundär entstellt,"
and consequent acceptance of LXX's הֶרְמָן יְלֹהֵהְנוּ
is an example of unsupported textual "criticism" at
reason for deleting the word "covenant" is that it
"in den Mund der Ältesten nicht recht passt"!).
Rather than impressionistic selection of one variant
or another, the exegete should endeavour to determine
the sense of each variant. In the case of "the ark
of the covenant of Yahweh," the description mentions
covenant precisely because it is the covenental issue
of Yahweh's military duties that is at issue.

9 Taking the ark as subject of the final
sentence, the elders' reasoning seems less reasonable.
Yahweh has already smitten them. How can the presence
of the ark save them when Yahweh has indicated his will to defeat them? It is Yahweh who must be with the Israelites; the ark of the covenant is only a token of his covenanted presence.

Discussion of the various names for the ark and bibliographical information may be found in Schicklberger 1973:27-28.

Although F. Stolz disagrees with Humbert's analysis of te'emac' in other respects, he agrees that it played a part in the enthronement festival and that is was a sign of Israel's positive expectations in 1 Sam 4:5 (1972:48-49).

The statement in v. 6 that the Philistines knew that the ark of Yahweh had arrived in the Israelite camp is a narratorial description, not of the content of the Philistines' knowledge, but rather of the Philistines' awareness that ki: the ark of Yahweh had come into camp. This knowledge is deduced solely from the sound of the te'emac'. Hence the point of v. 6 is not that the Philistines know that the ark has come amongst the Israelites, but that they are aware of the significance of the te'emac'. As the narrator has them say in v. 7, the Philistines
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... know only that "gods have entered the Israelite camp."

13 The description of the ark in v. 6 (simply 2aron yhwh) cannot serve as an independent witness to multiple redactions in ch. 4 (as, for example, according to Budde 1902:34). The narrator who supplies the title as part of his own narrative commentary is concerned only to describe the Philistines' reaction to the entrance of the ark. He uses a title which appropriately describes the ark with respect to the Philistines—it is the ark of Yahweh, Israel's national god.

McCarter's view that the Philistines are somehow aware of the claim that Yahweh rides upon the ark is unsubstantiated by the text (1980:106). The Philistines speak of these gods only generally, and, never as Yahweh. Besides, it is the narrator who calls the ark "the ark of Yahweh" in v. 6.

14 The Philistine view that God smote Egypt in the wilderness is neither to be emended as incomprehensible (e.g. Wellhausen 1871:55) nor viewed solely as a Philistine peculiarity (e.g. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:55). The mention of the wilderness, as more explicitly that of the exodus, alludes to the saving
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deeds of Yahweh and the initial covenantal experiences. The period in the wilderness (bamidbar, cf. the Hebrew title of the book of Numbers) is recalled by the Philistines' geographical "error" and the associations thereby recalled to the reader are used to indicate the seriousness of Israel's predicament (cf. Jackson 1962:119). "Das Volk setzt den Gott des Auszuges aus Ägypten und mit ihm das Fundament seiner geschichtlichen Existenz aufs Spiel" (H. Timm 1966: 521). While it might be more accurate to say that Yahweh is the one who jeopardizes the fundamentals of Israelite existence, Timm has correctly apprehended the impact of the Philistines' reflections.

15 Ahlstrom observes that addīr usually appears in contexts of Yahweh's cosmological or other superhuman acts (1977:74).

16 On this reading of 2:32 see the discussion above.

17 For a discussion of other passages that utilize such a man-God contrast see Ringgren 1977: 273-75.

18 Rost observes that watching (mesappeh) is to be taken in a general sense as "waiting" or

Contrary to those who would excise v. 15 as a suspicious doublet of v. 2 that contradicts v. 13 (e.g. McCarter 1980:111), or those who, like Budde, would regard it as indicating another source or redaction than that of v. 13 (1902:36), the verse is an integral, functional, and characteristic example of this narrative's literary technique. We have already seen several important examples of this mirroring technique whereby the narrative offers comment upon an item or event by providing a structural parallel to it elsewhere in the narrative. The narrator refrains, mostly, from explicit commentary and allows these parallels and literary links to stand as sole comment. The largest and most important of these parallels is, of course, that which comprises the overarching structure of chs. 1-12. Alter discusses other examples of this important literary technique, 1981.

The messenger's name for the ark is difficult to incorporate into the framework of
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previous observations on the significance of names for the ark in ch. 4. One would expect him to voice concern for the ark of the covenant of God/Yahweh, given his interest in the implications of defeat for Israel. It is possible, however, that as in v. 11 "the ark of God" is used to express surprise that the symbol of God is taken by man.

21 Rozenberg, in a study of the title יָשֶׁר, suggests that it often refers generally to "leadership" without intending further specificity (1975:78). Hence to call Eli a judge after the narrative has made him a priest is not a contradiction between the roles of the priest and "vindicator" or "deliverer." Instead it suggests that both religious and political authority were exercised by Eli as mediator/judge.

22 Cf. Brockington 1962:320 who suggests that "glory" in vv. 21-22 may anticipate its use in later writers (e.g., Ezekiel) for the concept of God's presence on earth. Cf. Ps 24:7-10.

23 Levine, citing H.L. Ginsberg's study of the usage of כָּבּוֹד as "body, person," suggests that although כָּבּוֹד can mean "glory, honour," "in more cases than not, we should eliminate the elements of
Notes to Chapter IV - 1 Samuel 4

greater abstraction, so understandably evoked by
divine associations, and emphasize rather the element
of real presence" (1968:72 n.1). Cf. Rendtorff
1968:36-37.
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1Cf. Alter, "The biblical tale might usefully be regarded as a narrative experiment in the possibilities of moral, spiritual, and historical knowledge, undertaken through a process of studied contrasts between the variously limited knowledge of the human characters and the divine omniscience quietly but firmly represented by the narrator (1981:157).

2Further discussion of the instrumentality of foreign nations in Yahweh's dealings with Israel may be found in Zimmerli 1978:63-64, 218-19.

3Detailed treatment of ancient near eastern comparative parallels to the capture of the ark may be found in Miller and Roberts 1977, whose special concern is the theological problem raised for a nation by the capture of its gods. Rather than reciting their study, I will presuppose their work and make reference to it when necessary.

4Discussion of the preposition רפנָּהָיִו may be found in Delcor 1964:148; Stoebbe 1973:138-39; Miller and Roberts 1977:44.

5Other biblical examples of prostration as a sign of deference are found in Gen 44:14; 50:18; Josh 5:14; 7:6; 2 Sam 9:6; 14:13, 22; 17:49; 19:19, etc.
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6 Several emendations and text-critical explanations for the difficult statement that "only Dagon was left upon him [Dagon]" have been suggested (e.g. Smith 1899:39; Stoebe 1973:139). It is possible, however, that MT is not "meaningless" (McCarter 1980:119), and that the significance of the statement will only be understood when a better knowledge of the god Dagon is possessed. The verse states that Dagon's head and the palms of his hands were cut off, and then goes on to say that only Dagon was left on him (ℵålåw). Perhaps Dagon, a grain god associated with the concept of fertility (Ringgren 1978:142), possessed some distinctive appendage, or anatomical feature that characterized him as the grain god. The point of telling that his hands and head were cut off, but his dāgōn was left would be to show that he was powerless (i.e. "palmless") even when still in possession of his distinctive feature, his dāgōn. Tenuous as this suggestion may be, it does offer a verifiable alternative to the unprovable suggestions of emendation.

7 The literary reading of this etiology is the opposite of what Long calls the "inferential model" prevalent in historical criticism. The inferential
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model regards the story as an answer contrived to answer a previous question (Long 1968:88-89). In 1 Sam 5:5, for example, the question would be, "Why do the Philistines skip over the threshold?" The literary reading of etiology, on the other hand, seeks to understand the literary function of etiology in its existing narrative context.

Campbell discerns a three part pattern that is repeated three times. In order to get a three part pattern, however, he shifts 5:1 to a position immediately preceding vv. 6-8. Since 5:1 is satisfactory where it is, however, its removal and reinsertion seems dubious.

The participation of the so-called gloss, ḫet-ʾasḏād wē³ et-gēbūleyha, in the chiastic structure lends some support to the rejection of this text-critical label on the grounds of the inherent unverifiability of such pronouncements (against e.g. Smith 1899: 40; Driver 1913:52).

The great "confusion" (mē humā) was the divine weapon used to defeat Israel's enemies (Deut 7:23; 1 Sam 14:15, 20, 22; McCarter 1980:106).

Cf. Campbell (1975:101), "Any triumphalism
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in the plague stories must needs be tempered by the presence of an unspoken but menacing implication for Israel."

12 The description of the ark as "the ark of God" in v. 10a rather than as "the ark of Israel's God" (vv. 7-9, 10b, 11) has been taken to indicate a separate source or tradition (e.g. Maier 1965:48). It should be noted that the "ark of God" in v. 10a occurs in a narrative description immediately subsequent to v. 9 in which there is an emphasis on the divine/human contrast. It may be significant, therefore, that the narrator should say that they sent the "ark of God" away, rather than the "ark of Israel's God."

Within ch. 5 one notes that, with the exception of a narrational element in v. 8, the "ark of Israel's God" is used by the Philistines, for whom it is natural to speak of the ark in political terms.

13 D. Daube (1963:75) discusses this parallel in greater detail on account of the puzzling first person singular expression attributed to the Ekronites in v. 10.

14 Cf. Bourke (1954:99), "He [the narrator] presupposes the sort of audience that would be steeped
in Hebrew tradition, and that would know the story of the exodus off by heart. For such an audience the significance of this story would emerge spontaneously (and therefore quite compellingly) from the facts themselves."

It should be recalled that Yahweh's non-appearance and passivity in vv. 1-5 meet the specific rhetorical requirements of that particular "conflict." He effortlessly dominates Dagon without lifting so much as a finger. See above on vv. 1-5.
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2 Cf. Milgrom’s discussion of the 3-asam case in Lev 5:17-19:

He who suffers in body or conscience without knowing the cause suspects that he is being punished by God for trespassing on his sanctums. In this respect, ancient Israel is no different from its environment, where unconscious sanctum trespass was identified as a prime cause for divine retribution (e.g., ANET pp. 34-36, 391-92) (1976:768).

Levine, in a discussion of 1 Sam 6:3 notes the appropriateness of the 3-asam in the Philistine case. The Philistines had inadvertently trespassed on the sanctity of Yahweh’s ark in the course of handling it. Although they did intend to capture and keep it, they were ignorant of its sanctity, of the proper procedure for handling it, and of the penalties for trespass. "The 3-asam thus emerges as a response to misfortune; when the causes of misfortune
are not fully identified, and an element of uncertainty exists" (Levine 1974:94).

The numerous emendations, literary-critical operations, and unusual readings for the second half of v. 3 are obviated by Levine's observations. (See Stoebbe 1973:146; Miller and Roberts 1977:52-54; McCarter 1980:129, 133 for examples.) The priests prescribe an ḫāšām because the people know that something has to be done, but do not know what. The healing of the people after they have sent the ḫāšām will explain the plague to them because the ḫāšām is successful. The final sentence of v. 3 thus predicates the knowledge of why Yahweh's hand is against the Philistines to the successful result of the ḫāšām. The people will know how they have been healed, that is, by an ḫāšām, a sacrifice for inadvertent trespass.

3 See McCarter 1980:135 for a discussion of the correct translation of ḫargaz. Ehrlich (1902:189) offers the plausible suggestion that ḫargaz is simply a textual corruption of ḫaron.

4 Most scholars have chosen to follow the LXX here, reading "they rejoiced to meet it" (e.g. McCarter 1980:150, who also adds an unattested verb "they ran
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rejoicing to meet it""). Given the flexibility of text-criticism, however, one may choose to view the LXX reading as either "pregnant...[and] so much more forcible and idiomatic" (Driver 1913:57), or as "a free translation" (De Boer 1938:63). MT is acceptable as is, and makes good sense when כְּלֵךְ is translated as a verbal noun, object of the verb שָׁמָה (cf. R.J. Williams 1976:35 #193, GKC #114m).

Contrary to Schulz, the double שָׁמָה is not to be reduced to one and explained as dittography (1919:105). The narrator attracted the reader's attention to the divine-cart driver's straight path in v. 12 by multiple descriptions. Now he does the same for the choice of a final stopping place, noting by the double שָׁמָה that the cart stops exactly where a large stone is located. As Wellhausen notes, the stopping place is important (1871:65). It indicates the cart-driver's intentions, which are correctly perceived by those Israelites in attendance in v. 14, who use the cart and cattle to offer a holocaust to Yahweh (Budde 1902:45). It is important to note at this point, however, that the text does not say that the כָּלָה was offered on the stone. Though that action
is implied by the text, and inferred by most readers, it is never made an explicit part of the narrative (against Schicklberger 1973:120).

6 Contrary to Mauchline's belief, the notice about the Levites does not "make it plain that the sacrifice was made by properly authorized persons" (1971:80; cf. Hertzberg 1964:60). The Levites are only subjects of two verbs, both of which describe actions done to the ark and box. As a matter of fact, the only persons who sacrifice at all in v. 15 are the Bethshemeshites.

7 Discussion of the textual problems in v. 18 may be found in Driver 1913:57-58; Stoebbe 1973:148-49; and McCarter 1980:130-31.

8 On the pointing of ζδ see Stoebbe 1973:148.

9 Resort to LXX is initially made because Yahweh's devastation of the Bethshemeshites on account of their looking "on" or "in the ark" is said to be out of tune with the preceding context (e.g. Mauchline 1971: 81). LXX justifies Yahweh's slaughter on account of the sons of Jeconiah, who did not participate in the joyful reception of the ark (καὶ οὐκ ἐσμενίσαν ὡς ἡμῖν οἱ ἰεροὶ ἰεροντίου ἐν τοῖς ἁγιοι ἱερασίν βαθησάμενοι).
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As Stoebe has observed, however, if Yahweh has just cause for punishing because of some wrong actions amongst those present, there is no call for the people as a whole to take exception to the punishment (1973: 153; cf. Campbell 1979:38). LXX has, therefore, as much or more difficulty with the subsequent context (v. 20), as is suggested for MT and the preceding context. McCarter's ingenious adaptation of LXX is weakened in its dependence on literary-critical hypotheses about the text's pre-history in v. 15, hypotheses that are not supported by versional evidence (1980:131). In any case, the reading with LXX or an adaptation thereof is not warranted when MT is comprehensible as it is here. What is incomprehensible, as the people of Bethshemesh observe in v. 20, is Yahweh, not the text. See Driver 1913:58-59, Schicklberger 1973:123-26; Stoebe 1973:149; and McCarter 1980:131 for elaboration on the possibilities of LXX.

Both from the preceding context (v. 13) and the usual meaning of the verb רָאָה with the preposition ב, it is possible that nothing more is intended by the expression in v. 19 than that the Bethshemeshites looked at the ark. We know from v. 13 that they did look at
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the ark from a distance, since it had not yet stopped in the field (v. 14). We also know from v. 15 that the ark was handled only by Levites, in accordance with the prohibition against profaning the ark. Since both of these verses are pieces of narration supplied by the same narrator who gives us v. 19, it is a fairly safe contextually based assumption that v. 19 intends to say "because they looked at the ark." From the numerous other occurrences of רָאָא with ב it is also safe to say that the preposition functions deictically, indicating the object of perception (BDB 907 #8a-908; cf. 90 IVd; GKC #119k).

The inference made by some commentators that the expression is used in a bad sense in v. 19, signifying "to gaze at, viz. with an unbecoming interest" (Driver 1913:58; cf. Wellhausen 1871:65-66) is unsupported by any consistent occurrence of such usage elsewhere. Neither does the immediate context support such an inference.

There is, however, no other indication that this author thought it sinful to look upon the Ark. Had he thought so, he would have shown what precautions were taken by the
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Israelites before the battle to prevent this profanation, and would for this cause have aggravated the plague sent upon the Philistines (Smith 1899:48).

11 In contrast to commentators' attempts to supply the seeing in v. 19 with an adverb that would demonstrate the Bethshemeshites culpability, the narrator supplies us with an adverb in v. 13 (in verbal form) that demonstrates their good intentions.

12 Cf. Alter, "Broadly when repetitions with significant variations occur in biblical narrative, the changes introduced can point to an intensification, climactic development, acceleration..." (1981:97).


14 Examples of the phrase used to describe priestly service are Deut 10:8; 18:5, 7; Num 16:9. The connection between the priestly service "standing before Yahweh," and the proper maintenance of covenant is explicit in 2 Chr 29:10-11. The covenant mediator is also found standing before God in Jer 18:20. In Deuteronomy the covenant is established with Israel standing before Yahweh (4:9-14; 29:14). And in
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Ezra 9:15, Ezra confesses the inability of Israel to stand before God because it has forsaken the covenantal laws. Cf. Weinfeld 1970:185-86; 1972:77.
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The examples offered by Miller and Roberts (1977:25) to support their claim that Eleazar is designated as a proper priest in 7:1 do not support it. In all cases (Exod 28:5, 41; 29:1, 44; 30:30; 40:13; Lev 8:30; 21:8) qds...l is used of the sanctification of priests only at the direct command of Yahweh himself. Similarly, šmr as a description of priestly duties is, in the examples provided by Miller and Roberts, a description of a service commanded directly by Yahweh (Num 1:53; 3:10, 31; 18:3; 31:30, 47). Ehrlich's observation that there is a great difference between the people sanctifying someone and Yahweh doing so, stands against the argument of Miller and Roberts.

McCarter also wishes to see Eleazar made a priest in 7:1. He offers only the weak defense that the names Abinadab and Eleazar are common in the levitical pedigree (1980:137). Both Miller and Roberts and McCarter see Eleazar's putative priesthood as a satisfactory conclusion to the "ark narrative." McCarter understands that the problem in Bethshemesh was caused by a lack of proper priestly attendance on the ark. "But this final difficulty is resolved when Eleazar, a proper custodian for the ark at last, steps on stage"
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(1980:139). This may be true for McCarter, but not for Israel, which continues to mourn even after Eleazar takes over as custodian (7:2). For a different perspective on the difficulties involved in regarding 7:1 as a satisfactory conclusion to the "ark narrative" see Willis 1979:209-10; Campbell 1979:38-39.

2. There is no vocabulary in the temporal note that has, so far, been judged the exclusive province of deuteronomistic literary expression.

3. Cf. 1 Sam 13:10 where Samuel's timing also plays an important part in the narrator's story.

4. Only ardent devotees could react like the Bethshemeshites do when they seek the ark: "They looked up, saw the ark, and were overjoyed at the sight" (6:13). To appreciate this reception, one must recall that the ark was last seen being taken in a battle that Israel knew was directed by Yahweh against Israel.

5. I read the participle ʕāḇām, "returning," as expressive of imminent action as in e.g. Gen 6:17; 20:3; 1 Kgs 20:13; cf. R.J. Williams 1976:39 #214; GKC #116p. Samuel is not describing what Israel is doing. (One does not normally "return" to someone
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that one has mourned as dead.) He is making a suggestion about what Israel might do.

On the problem of determining what "judging" means for Samuel and throughout the Bible see Rosenberg 1975:77-86. Keil and Delitzsch arrive at a result remarkably similar to that of Weiser and Budde.

Judging the people neither consisted in a censure pronounced by Samuel afterwards, nor in absolution granted to the penitent after they had made a confession of their sin, but in the fact that Samuel summoned the nation to Mizpah to humble itself before Jehovah, and there secured for it, through his intercession, the forgiveness of its sin, and a renewal of the favour of its God, and thus restored the proper relation between Israel and its God, so that the Lord could proceed to vindicate His people's rights against their foes (1880:73; cf. Gutbrod 1956:54).

Against Veijola it must be maintained that the Israelites do not have a mechanical trust in the ark in 4:3, nor is the ark to be taken as subject of the
verb \( \text{w'yōśîn} \) in 4:3 (1977:37). They know full well that Yahweh is responsible for their plight and hence are well-aware that only he himself can deliver them, if he will.

Ehrlich offers an entertaining reason for Samuel's choice of sacrificial animal. He suggests that Samuel chose a tender lamb in view of the imminent threat posed by the Philistines. The small and tender lamb would burn more quickly (than an old goat), thereby allowing Israel and Yahweh to get to the business of fighting more quickly (1910:193).

Buber attempts to use Yahweh's singular action as a solid basis for source analysis in ch. 7. He regards Yahweh's miraculous defeat of the Philistines in response to Samuel's prayer as a late, unhistorical conception (1956:117). Buber suggests that the original narrative ended on the note that Yahweh answered Samuel without supplying a specific content to the answer (p. 118). The answer does not come until 9:16 where Yahweh supplies the true answer to the Philistines threat in the form of Saul's monarchy (pp. 127-28).

Buber's excision of vv. 10-12 from the
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"original" narrative falters in the face of the literary connections between this battle report and those in ch. 4 (cf. Willis 1979:211), and on the implications thereby created for the meaning of Yahweh's renewed action on Israel's behalf. When such literary links are evident, the case for compositional layering is weakened and certainly requires more proof than a simple assertion that the theology or ideology of a verse does not agree with one's perception of its context.

10. For discussions of geographical questions entailed by v. 12 see Driver 1913:65; Seebass 1965: 293 n.18; McCarter 1980:146-47.

11. On the deuteronomisms in v. 14 see Birch 1976:20; McCarter 1980:147. Although the name "Amorite" is used as a general description of people in Palestine prior to Israel's entry (e.g. Gen 15:16; Deut 1:7; Josh 10:5), it is a name more specifically associated with residents of Trans-jordan (e.g. Deut 3:8; Josh 2:10) (H.B. Huffmon 1976:21).

12. Uncharacteristically, Buber misses this repetition and suggests that the expression in v. 15, "all the days of his life," be deleted as a probable
replacement for an original numerical description (1964:837). He supplies, however, no grounds for his suggestion.

13 The well-worn paths around the questions of the actual function of the judges and the meaning or meanings of the word "judge" need not detain us at this time. Within the immediate context of chs. 7-8, it is clear enough that Samuel's judgeship consists more importantly in his role as mediator, allowing for renewed covenantal relations between Israel and Yahweh (vv. 6-15). As the temporal paralleling of vv. 13 and 15 shows, Samuel's judging Israel is matched by Yahweh's defensive actions against the Philistines. With regard to covenantal implications, Samuel's judging should be regarded as a maintenance of Israel's commitment by ensuring that stipulations are adhered to. Yahweh's defense of Israel may be seen as the protection promised for Israel's obedience.

For a recent survey of research on "judging" and judges, with an attempt at a new historically oriented solution see de Vaux 1978:751-73. Additional bibliography may be found in Wallis 1968:76 n.37.

14 Cf. Driver, "Observe the series of perfects
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with w conv., descriptive of Samuel's custom" (1913: 65).
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1 Soggin also notes this connection between the Sons but draws an unusual and unsupported conclusion: Diese für die jüngste gehaltene Tradition ist an sich auch nicht mehr einheitlich, da sie mit der Beschreibung der Söhne Samuels einsetzt und sie also Anknüpfungspunkt für die Forderung nach einem König nimmt. Beide Geschichten sind allerdings zu trennen: in der Episode der Söhne Samuels haben wir eine Parallele zu der der Söhne Elis 2:1ff., und beide haben natürlich mit dem Königstum ursprünglich nichts zu tun (1967:31).

Whether or not the sons of Samuel or Eli actually had anything to do with the monarchy is a matter beyond the grasp of anyone. According to the narrative, however, both the sons of Eli and Samuel are intimately and inextricably involved in the initiation of Israel’s monarchy, as a first reading of even 8:1-5 alone makes plain.

2 The modern reader must remember that a distance of 80 km. was a much greater isolating factor than it is today. Samuel’s control over his sons and even his knowledge of their actions would always be two days after the fact.
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3 Israel's knowledge of the cause of their misfortunes in war comes by way of Samuel's prophecy (4:1) in connection with reflections on the disaster after the fact. That Israel does know of the potential danger of an old mediator with wayward sons is clear enough from 8:5 alone, however.


5 Clements observes that the term "nation" (gōy) has strong political colouring. It is never used in construct with the name of a deity. Israel is called the ʾam yhwh but never the gōy yhwh (1977:427). The case of Exod 19:6, where God says Israel will be a gōy to himself is no exception; Israel is "a priestly kingdom, a holy nation" (ʾekōy qādōs) indicating that Israel, as a nation, is to be separate from all other nations, sanctified and holy to Yahweh.

Cazelles' reading of Exod 19:6 supports the reading of 1 Sam 8:5 being made here. "Israel is a holy nation that is supposed to draw near to God in the sanctuary, 'because her national life is dependent upon priests..., while the other nations have kings'"
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(cit. by Botterweck 1977:430). The request in 1 Sam 8:5 is for a king so as to become a profane nation.

6 The literary technique of omitting or adding details to differentiate between actual narrative circumstances and the characters' perceptions of the same has already been seen in the case of Eli's death, where the latter dies before he hears that the ark was taken (4:17-18). Cf. Alter:

But there is a different kind of biblical repetition, which is phrasal rather than verbal or a matter of motif, theme, and action. Here entire statements are repeated, either by different characters, by the narrator, or by the narrator and one or more of the characters in concert, with small but important changes introduced in what usually looks at first glance like verbatim repetition. Many of the psychological, moral, and dramatic complications of biblical narrative are produced through this technique (1981:97).

7 Buber misses the point when he objects; "Aber so privatpsychologisch als hätten die Alten nicht eine unerhörte Neuerung, sondern die Demission eines
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Ministers gefordert, ist nicht zu erfassen, was das Erzähler als den Widerwillen in Samuels Seele uns darstellt" (1964:731). The narrator does not say that the elders requested only new judges—far from it—but that "in the eyes of Samuel"—a significant way of putting it—the request initially boiled down to the simple fact of a king "to judge" Israel instead of a judge.

Boecker seeks to buttress Buber's objection against seeing a technique of characterization in v. 6 by suggesting that one must take v. 7b, which seemingly "auf die persönlichen Gefühle Samuels gemünzt ist," out of its literary context and read it in the context of its prehistory (1969:25). While Boecker may or may not be right in his conjectures about the prehistory of the "Alternativformel" in v. 7, it must be maintained that the existing narrative context must serve as the principal standard of any reading. There can be little surprise that scholars discover numerous sources and redactions, contradictions and inconsistencies, and ideological multiplicities in ch. 8 when they read with strategies such as Boecker's. ("Bei der Interpretation des V. 7b sollte man den unmittelbaren Kontext nicht Überbewerten" 1969:25.)
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8Veijola takes the mention of "the people (hācām) as the voicers of the request in v. 7 as strong support for separating vv. 6ff. from vv. 1-5 in which it is the elders alone (vv. 4-5) who make the request (1977:55). Against this one might counter that the issue is covenantal, the rejection of Yahweh's rule by his people. Hence it is perfectly appropriate for Yahweh to note that the request for a new sovereign comes from the people, since the covenant is between the god and his people. In addition, it should be noted that Yahweh does not simply say "listen to the people," but "listen to the voice of the people." One may understand "the voice of the people" as a reference to the elders, or simply as implying, with divine insight, that the elders speak for the people.

9Against Buber, who suggests that the past misdeeds of v. 8 are inappropriate to their context because they describe religious failures and cannot be compared with the theological-political treason of the request for a king (1964:733-34).

10This use of connective alliteration to link the rebellion of v. 7, the previous rejection of Yahweh (v. 8), and the making of a king (v. 6) may explain
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why the verb Ĥš is used only here in the Bible to describe the establishment of a monarchy. Cf. Harris 1981:79.

This reading of v. 8 goes against the usual reading of similar "deuteronomistic interpolations" in the deuteronomistic history, all of which are supposed to trace the cause of Israel's downfall to its continual sin and apostasy (see Cross 1973:274-86), and hence might seem contrary to the supposed known intention of its larger literary context. Closer examination of other "deuteronomisticisms" in their immediate narrative context might reveal a more variegated deuteronomistic ideology, however. Hence before a close reading of a "deuteronomistic interpolation" such as v. 8 may be rejected as contradicting the known purposes of the deuteronomist(s), a close rereading of interpolations should be made, in which they are read in relation to their immediate literary context.

It is probable that the single-minded deuteronomist, a hypostasization built from the isolation of all his words from their immediate context (or even worse, from forcing contexts to agree with isolated
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deuteronomistic interpolations), will appear as a much more complex fellow once he is read in context. The more recent redactional analyses of deuteronomistic literature reveal an increasing awareness of its complexity (e.g. Smend 1971, who saw two differing deuteronomists (DtrG, DtrN), but now (1978:123) sees three (DtrH, DtrP, DtrN). Cf. Dietrich 1972; Veijola 1975; 1977; Bickert 1979; Friedman 1981). As was once the case in Pentateuchal studies, the initial isolation of a unitary literary strand, or in this case, redaction, gives way to a more nuanced reading in which one speaks of J1, J2, J3..., or Dtrs H, P, and N. The literary alternative to this process of redactional reductio ad absurdum, which ultimately results in a new deuteronomist with each change in context, is to avoid premature attributions of authorship or redaction, waiting until a detailed contextual reading of all the literature has been made.

12Veijola has shown that the phrase ḫā'ēd ta CA
bāhem must be understood as covenantal in character. Citing 2 Kgs 17:15, he suggests the expression ḫā'ēd ta CA
ayyēser ḫē CA
bām should be translated "seine Bundesbestimmungen (bzw. Vertragsverpflichtungen), die
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er ihnen auferlegt hatte" (1977:64).

15 Many different translations have been suggested for mishpāṭ in v. 9 (cf. Langlamet 1970:186 n.46). No matter which translation is preferred, the point I wish to make is that the determination of the king's behaviour is made by Yahweh through Samuel.

14 On the shift from elders in v. 5 to people in v. 10, noted by Wildberger (1957:459), see above on v. 7, and Dhorme (1910:71).

15 Cf. Budde (1902:55); Dhorme, "Le verbe ṣmr ne s'emploie pas généralement avec un complément direct" (1910:71).

16 See Langlamet (1970:186 n.146) for a list of scholars who read vv. 11-18 as a description "de la maniere d'agir habituelle des rois." Cf. Speiser, "As regards mishpāṭ—which has not turned up at Mari—we should now expect it, theoretically, to mean something like 'standard, regulation,' and hence conduct, custom, manner, or characteristic behaviour in general" (1971:282).

17 Again a great deal of discussion on the "manner of the king" in vv. 11-18 has focused on the question-of the anti-monarchic tendency that the
narrator is thought to be expressing here, while neglecting the simple fact that it is Samuel—not the narrator—who expresses these reservations about monarchical administration. Whether these verses are completely critical of the monarchy (e.g. Boecker 1969:17; Crüsemann 1978:72-73), or contain positive elements (e.g. Press 1938:197; Wildberger 1957:458, 467; Seebass 1965:295 n.22; Stoebe 1973:186-87; Ishida 1977:41; Talmon 1979:15); whether the monarchical model for the practises is early Canaanite (e.g. Mendelsohn 1956; cf. Rainey 1975; Weiser 1962:39; Thornton 1967:418; Soggin 1972:16) or the later kings of Israel (e.g. North 1931:8 [Solomon]; Wildberger 1957:458; Cohen 1965:68 [Solomon]; Clements 1974:409 [Solomon]; Fritz 1976:354-55; Mayes 1978:9 [Solomon]), the reader can only misconstrue the narrator's position if he does not distinguish between statements made by the narrator and the characters in the narrator's narrative.

One cannot deny that a narrator may occasionally, or even consistently agree with a specific character, but such agreement must be studied and then demonstrated, rather than assumed. E.M. Forster's
advice stands even biblical readers in good stead:

So next time you read a novel do look out for the 'point of view'—that is to say, the relation of the narrator to the story. Is he telling the story and describing the characters from the outside, or does he identify himself with one of the characters? Does he pretend that he knows and forsees everything? Or does he go in for being surprised? Does he shift his point of view...

(1976:187)?

Budde also notes that what Samuel says about the manner of the king is not given to him by Yahweh (1902:55).

On the syntax of v. 12 see McCarter 1980:158, who follows Driver's explanation, cf. Driver 1913:67; GKC #114p. Ehrlich regards the entire verse as "ganz und gar ein geschmackloser späterer Einschub" (1910:194-95). His reasoning is that the commissions of officers are honours, the mention of which goes against the negative evaluation of the monarchy's impact.

On the nature of the king's "servants" see Mendelsohn 1956:20-21; Rainey 1975:95-97; and McCarter
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1980:158.

21 The emendation, supported by LXX, of bahûrêkem to beqarkem, first suggested by Capellus (Stoebe 1973:186), is almost universally accepted (cf. however Stoebe 1973:186, 188). Not only have the "young men" been implicitly dealt with in v. 11 (Driver 1913:68), but they are incongruous in a list of possessions such as v. 16. Furthermore, their mention here, which Stoebe notes "stellt nun freilich den starksten Eingriff in die Freiheit der Familie dar" (1973:188), is at odds with the ranking of vv. 11-17 from most important to least important items, a rhetorical technique with which Samuel tranquillizes his audience. The same holds true for the order of v. 16 itself, where one would expect the bahûrêkem to come before the male and female slaves (cf. McCarter 1980:155 and Deut 5:21).

22 For a parallel rhetorical pattern see Amos 1:3-2:16, and Wolff's comments (1977:149). A similar pattern appears in the prologue to the book of Job (ch. 1), although there the devastations progress from mild to severe with a culmination in Job's personal affliction (2:1-7).

23 Seebass also notes the disjunction between the
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people's reply and Samuel's warning, but uses it to draw conclusions about the literary history of ch. 8 (1965:287).

Against Talmon's view that Samuel "took absolutely no exception to the people's wish to be like the other nations in the matter of the monarchy" (1979:10), it must be asserted that Samuel's disobedience of a direct command from Yahweh constitutes the strongest possible expression of Samuel's revulsion at the thought.
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2 A brief summary of this approach as advanced by Gressmann, Budde, Buber, and Weiser, may be found in L. Schmidt 1970:59-60.

3 See above on chs. 5-6.

4 Cf. Weinfeld who regards Exod 3:7, 9 as "ancient formulae" (1972:33 n.5).

5 Weiser comes to much the same conclusion from a historical perspective.


6 Wellhausen suggests that the information about Kish's place of residence, mibbin-ya'min in MT, is
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superfluous in view of the subsequent note that Kish's
great-great-great grandfather was an מִשְׁפָּט הָאָדָם. Consequently he inserts, without versional support, מִסְחֵט בְּקַנִית-יָמִין, a suggestion that has been almost universally adopted (1871:70). MT's description is, however, acceptable as is. Benjamin, by itself, is perfectly acceptable as a geographical name (cf. Aharoni 1979:210; G.A. Smith 1900:290). Neither is this geographical information superfluous in view of the subsequent note that Kish had an ancestor who is described as an מִשְׁפָּט הָאָדָם. The first occurrence of יָמִין gives Kish's geographical background, the second, his genealogy (cf. Richter 1970:14).

7 The lack of the adjective אָחָד after מִשְׁפָּט in 9:1 marks a deviation from the pattern seen in Judges and in 1 Sam 1:1, the significance of which is uncertain. One might conjecture that it differentiates Saul and Samuel, hinting at the differences in the courses of their divinely initiated careers.

8 Richter's syntactical objection to 9:2b as an original element of ch. 9 is not compelling (1970: 25-26). 9:2b can be read as a separate sentence, unrelated, syntactically, to the prior comparative.
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9Buber suggests additional reasons for seeing Saul, at this point, as the chosen one (1956:123, 145).

10Yahweh's remark in 1 Sam 16:7 reflects his own experience with choices made on the basis of appearance and stature. Saul's failings have taught Yahweh the folly of choosing a king that will meet with immediate human approval on account of superficial appearance.

11See McCarter 1980:173 for a convincing explanation of the definite article attached to the first occurrence of "the asses."

12Cf. R.J. Williams 1976:67 #409, 100 #593.

13Symbolic interpretations of the journey have been suggested by Bič 1957:92-97, and Stoebe 1957:362-70; cf. 1973:201-02. The most recent attempt to rationalize the itinerary is that of McCarter 1980:174-75. Since there is no obvious significance in the itinerary, the problem can be left for topographical and geographical studies; in a specifically literary study such as this, it would digress too far.

14The historical-critical division of chs. 8 and 9 is made possible by the narrator's use of uncertainty in the opening of ch. 9. Since historical
criticism is predisposed to dissect at the first sign of disjunction, it is unable and unwilling to struggle through the uncertainty and so to achieve the participatory understanding that the narrative affords to a sequential reader. The historical critic is excluded a priori from an appreciation and understanding of any narrative that includes the common literary techniques of suspension and retardation. In anticipation of the objection that the sequential unity is a total creation of the sequential reader, one need point only to the lack of resolution in 8:22. Yahweh had said "Make a king," and Samuel said only "Go home." The expected resolution of their differences comes, not surprising immediately thereafter, in ch. 9.


16 Stoebe points to parallel instances in the Elijah narratives where Elijah is called both by name and by the descriptive appellation, "man of God" (1973:
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202).  

17 Of course the reader will only appreciate the full effect of this irony after he has been told that Saul will be anointed nāḡ̄ūd, but this is also true of his appreciation of the entire journey in search of the asses. Once he is told the real meaning of the journey, the reader can make a quick review of the preceding events confirming his suspicions and gaining a full appreciation of the ironies incorporated by the narrator (cf. Sternberg 1978:31).

18 As Dhorme observes (1910:76), the perfect tense of the verbal adjective ṃas̄er-hālaknū militates against Driver's suggestion that derek includes the goal here (1915:71).

19 An example of a reflective reader is Calmet who, following the Vulgate, makes the irony explicit in his translation of v. 6. "Peut-être qu'il nous donnera quelque lumière sur le sujet qui nous a fait venir ici" (cited by Dhorme 1910:76). Cf., however, GKC #106g.

20 Smith, for example, says that 9:1-10:16 "begins like a separate book, introducing persons hitherto unknown" (1899:xviii).

21 In media res is a simple description of the
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literary technique of beginning a story "in the middle." If we make a distinction between the real, "historical" order of events (the Russian formalists' fabula) and the order in which these events are actually told (sjužet, plot), an in medias res beginning is the opening of a plot that does not begin where the real, historical events began (cf. Chatman 1978:19-21, 63-67; Sternberg 1978:8-14, 35-41). In proper "historical" order, the events of ch. 9 would follow a sequence of: 1. divine intervention, leading the asses astray; 2. human response, Saul's search; 3. divine revelation to Samuel; 4. divine guidance and sustenance, Yahweh leads Saul to Samuel and gives him a quarter shekel, etc.

22 See Richter 1970:19 n.20 for a list of adherents to this view.

23 Richter's response to the wordiness of the reply, in contrast, is to suggest possible expansions (1970:23-24).

24 I follow Stoebe's defence of the 2nd person singular suffix in MT (1973:195).
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26 Most translations have not successfully conveyed this idea, e.g. RSV, "the people have a sacrifice"; Stoebé (1973:190), "die Bevölkerung ein Opferfest feiert"; McCarter (1980:165), "the people have a sacrifice."

27 As Richter notes, the supposed discrepancies between vv. 12b, 13a, 13b, and 22 on who participated in the sacrifice—people, invited guests, or 30 guests—are insufficient for purposes of literary-critical division (1970:20).

28 Wildberger provides an interesting example of a reader who constructs a provisional frame within which to incorporate and understand all of the exposition hints dropped by the narrator.


Wildberger is well aware that this explanation is his own construction (zwischen den Zeilen) and even offers
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Unfortunately, as Weiser notes, Wildberger fails to renounce this provisional frame even when it is contradicted by subsequent information in the narrative (Weiser 1962:51 n.8). Wildberger does, nevertheless offer an example of a reader responding to the literary dynamics of ch. 9, and so his hypothesis provides tangential confirmation of the analysis presented here.

29 On the arguments for and against emendation of this last sentence in v. 15 see Wellhausen 1871:72; Driver 1913:72-73 (both against); and McCarner 1980:169 (for).

30 Cf. Weiser 1962:50:

Nicht zu übersehen ist der eigenartig geheimnisvolle Ton, der die gesamte Erzählung durchzieht. Er ist nicht zu verwechseln mit dem erzählerischen Stilmittel, das die Spannung dadurch erholt, dass es das
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anfängliche Dunkel, das über den Personen und dem eigentlichen Ziel des Geschehens schwebt, erst allmählich Zug um Zug erheilt; er erklärt sich auch nicht nur von dem verborgenen Hintergrund des göttlichen Plans und Auftrags her,...

Weiser wrongly suggests that the "geheimnisvolle Ton" cannot have more than one function. He does, however agree that an important function is "Dadurch ist Saul als König in einer Weise legitimiert, die jede menschliche Einmischung von vorneherein ausschliesst" (1962:53).

31 Mettinger gives a judicious survey of the various positions on the significance of anointment in his history of scholarship (1976:185-88, see p. 185 n.1 for bibliography). Mettinger divides biblical anointing into two groups:

1. Instances of anointing performed by the people or their representatives.

2. Instances performed by a human
For Saul's anointing, we are concerned only with the latter group. Although Mettinger denies the historical accuracy of Saul's anointment—"we can feel entitled to infer that Saul was never anointed" (1976:197)—the fact remains that in the narrative his anointment is performed by Samuel.

Mettinger concentrates on the political legitimation accomplished by divine anointment. The king is consecrated to Yahweh and the anointing becomes a visible sign of divine election (1976:207). The anointing of a king by Yahweh signals a covenantal relationship between Yahweh and the king, who becomes a vassal to Yahweh. In return, Yahweh is obligated to the king as protector (1976:230, cf. 222). In Mettinger's view, the leitmotif of the historical cases of anointing was to express the idea that God had chosen and was obligated to the anointed (1976:230). For present purposes and in the context of 1 Sam 1-12, where the issue is the relationship between theocracy and monarchy, equal weight must also be given to the other side of the coin,
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namely that the act of anointing makes the anointed the vassal of Yahweh. De Vaux's study exhibits the necessary balance:

So far then we have shown: that the king of Israel was designated by Yahweh; that he was the nāgīd, the administrator appointed by Yahweh over his people Israel; that he was the servant of Yahweh; that these facts of choice and dependence were expressed in a "covenant" which guaranteed divine protection for the king in return for his fidelity; that the terms of this covenant were contained in a pact which the king had no choice but to accept and which had similarities, both in form and in content, with ancient Oriental treaties of vassalage. All of these characteristics make the king of Israel Yahweh's vassal (1972:162).

Knutsch (1963), who regards all instances of divine anointing as unhistorical, theological attempts at monarchic legitimation (p. 58), also recognizes that divine anointing submits the anointed to divine
authority. "In der israelitischen Vorstellung von
dieser Salbung steht an der Stelle des Pharao Jahwe als
Oberherr. Der Gesalbte ist hier wie dort an die
Weisung des Overherrn, der ihn 'ermächtigt' hat,
gebunden, geniesst andererseits aber auch dessen beson-
dern Schutz" (p. 57). Weisman has subsequently attempted
to harmonize the two kinds of anointing as complementary
steps in king-making (1976:378-98).

32Langlamet (1970:188-92) gives an extensive
summary of scholarship on the term nāg़îd, including
biographical notes.

33Cf. L. Schmidt, who reaches a similar conclu-
sion from a redactional perspective:

Er verknüpft einen Akt, der in der Einsetzung
eines Königs wurzelt, mit der Bezeichnung nāgîd.
Freilich spricht der Bearbeiter an keiner
Stelle von Saul als mālāk, obwohl er eindeutig
Saul als König ansieht. Er will offenbar nicht
nur die Gründerzählung so deuten, dass sie von
der Einsetzung Sauls zum König handelt, sondert
er will zugleich dieses Königtum interpre-
tieren. Deshalb verzichtet er auf das Wort
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"mālāḵ" und verwendet stattdessen "nagid"


35 The slight difference in emphasis—Yahweh says that he will deliver Israel in Exod 3:8, whereas Saul delivers them in 1 Sam 9:16—may be accounted for by the purpose of v. 16, which is to define the role of the new "king." The difference is also not as great as it might seem, since emphasis has already been placed on Saul's role as Yahweh's anointed designate.

36 From this perspective one may also understand the omission of the word Cănî from the quotation. Most scholars insert it in the phrase "I have seen (the affliction of) my people" on the basis of LXX and Exod 3:7 (e.g. Thenius 1864:36-37). Without "affliction," Yahweh appears to say that he has "seen" (had an insight into) his people on account of their request, which he regards as fear of the Philistines. For this
usage of the verb רָאָה one may compare Gen 37:14; Exod 2:25; Num 24:20-21. Alternatively, reading with LXX, Yahweh would be saying that he now understands the suffering that his people underwent in chs. 4-6 on account of their recent cry to him for a new king. Either reading is possible, but since MT is coherent, there is no pressing reason to follow the text of LXX, which may or may not be an accommodation to the Exodus passage.

37 The verb כָּנָּה (Yahweh "answered him") implies that Samuel was watching out for the man and that when he spied Saul Yahweh "answered" his vigilance (cf. Driver 1913:73-74).

38 כָּשָׁר is also used with ב governing the direct object in Job 4:2; 12:15; and 29:9.

39 L. Schmidt attempts to use Samuel's suggestion that Saul stay overnight as a means for textual dissection. He suggests that Samuel originally did not know what he would say to Saul, and required an evening in which to receive the word from God (1970:68). The revelation of vv. 15-16 is, therefore, a separate tradition. Schmidt's suggestion fails, however, to account
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for the wordplay on nāgid throughout vv. 1-19, and more specifically for Samuel's verbal irony in v. 19. Is it reasonable to regard such a developed and widespread verbal irony as the happy accident of amalgamated traditions?

McCarter's suggestion that Saul's protest of unworthiness is the customary response of individuals called to divine service fails to recognize that Saul does not know at this point that he is being inducted (1980:179). Similarly Birch, who observes that Saul has not yet been told what he is supposed to do, suggests that Saul's self-effacement is an integral element in a call narrative (1976:37). Birch suggests that Saul's objection should be taken to mean that he feels unworthy of being chosen for divine service (1976:37). But neither Samuel nor Saul make any mention of induction into divine service (cf. Seebass 1967:163 n.36). Saul, in fact, objects to nothing; he simply remarks on the incongruity of Samuel's rhetorical question and then asks what the meaning of it is (wēlāmā dibbartā ḍēlay kaddābār hazze) (cf. Walters 1978:69). How can Saul be said to protest or
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object to a remark, the significance of which he does not even understand (cf. Schulz 1919:137; Gutbrod 1956: 71)?

L. Schmidt's reading of v. 21, also influenced by the hypothesis of a Berufungsschema in ch. 9, is more congruent with the details of the text.


41 Cohen also notes that the choice of Saul was a planned and careful move, but completely ignores the characterization of Saul supplied by the text. In his historical reconstruction, Saul is a military hero before he is chosen. (Cohen places ch. 11 before ch. 9.) "Saul descended from a family of wealth, to judge from his servants and possessions, and of prestige, to judge from the length and impressiveness of his genealogy" (1965:70; cf. Ishida 1977:44). According to the text, however, Saul's father possessed an
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unspecified number of servants and asses. Whether many
or few is left to the imagination of readers. His
genealogy is not very long and it makes him a man with
no impressive familial ties (see above on 9:1). If as
Cohen suggests, the "old guard" chose a king that they
could easily manipulate (1965:70), it would make more
sense for them to choose the Saul of ch. 9 rather than
the military hero and landed gentryman that Cohen
reconstructs.

42 Seebass fails to take into account Saul's
obvious confusion in v. 21 when he suggests a contra-
diction between separate narratives seen in vv. 19 and
22 (1967:158). According to v. 19, Saul is to go up
to the high place ahead of the seer, while in v. 22
Samuel personally escorts him. The change is most
economically explained, however, by Saul's hesitation
in the intervening v. 21, rather than by the supposi-
tion of two narratives.

43 Buber plausibly suggests that the guests, in
view of the events of ch. 8, would see Saul as the
requested king (1956:129-30). Similarly, L. Schmidt,
citing biblical parallels, suggests that the
combination of an assembly and an offering with a meal was customary in the election of a new king (1970:84-85). The narrator, aware of this custom, incorporated such a scene into ch. 9 by including these aspects in the existing meal of the "Grunderzählung" (vv. 22a, 24b).

Schmidt seems to suggest that the anachronistic incorporation of this custom, which became familiar only after the succession of monarchies, indicates that the meal was intended to honour the new king. But would the guests, who had never had a king before, know this? My point is not historical but literary, and as such it is not an objection to Schmidt's suggestion but merely a question of mimetic plausibility. In any case, the narrative itself leaves the guests' impressions unstated.

44 The corrupt portion of v. 24 cannot be interpreted as is, nor do I have any alternative to add to the existing list of unsatisfactory emendations.

45 For an example of gap-filling (concretization) see the suggestion of O.V. Gerlach regarding the topic of the roof-top discourse (cited by Keil and Delitzsch 1880:93-94).
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46 The servant's accompaniment is omitted from description, not because he was not along—he was (v. 27)—, but because the narrator wishes to foreground the bond between Samuel and Saul and the mention of the servant would obscure the otherwise clear description.
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The majority of scholars follow LXX in 10:1, which contains a substantial addition (e.g. Wellhausen 1871:72-73; McCarter 1980:171; see also Langlamet's review of text criticism on 10:1, 1978:291-94). MT gives, however, no appearance of corruption. Consequently there are some scholars who defend MT and explain LXX as a deviation (e.g. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:96 n.1; Stoebe 1973:197, 205).

Given the lack of accepted principles for reaching agreement on what our text should be in cases such as 1 Sam 10:1, the reader of the biblical text is left with a practical course. Whether one reads the LXX version of the narrative or MT, one should stick with that version unless corruption dictates otherwise. Even faced with an obvious corruption, versional support for emendation, however convincing, can never be more than incidental since one can never be sure whether the intelligible reading was formed before (variant) or after (correction) the corrupt reading. When scholars think that they must make a decision between two intelligible variants, the resulting decision will always be beyond proof or refutation and is best described as impressionism.
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Examples of text-critical judgements on 10:1 support this judgement:

The text of the Septuagint is nothing more than a gloss formed from ch. ix 16, 17, which the translator thought necessary, partly because he could not clearly see the force of הָיוֹן יִקְּרָא, but more especially because he could not explain the fact that Samuel speaks to Saul of signs, without having announced them to him as such. But the author of the gloss has overlooked the fact that Samuel does not give Saul a σήμειον but three σήμεια... (Keil and Delitzsch 1880:96 n.1):

Da Samuel sich hier seinem Gaste zum ersten Male offen und rund erklärt, so ist es in der Ordnung, dass er es ausführlich thut; die Bedeutung ferner jener Ereignisse v.2ff. als Zeichen für das Eintreffen des größereren stand nicht nur nachträglich (v.7,9) als bekannt vorauszusetzen, und endlich verräth noch das ky nach הָיוֹן im Mt. die Lücke zwischen diesen beiden Worten, die entstanden ist durch
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Abirren eines Schreibers von ersten mšhқ
aufs zweite (Wellhausen 1871:73).

Both Keil and Delitzsch and Wellhausen use inferential arguments based on their understanding of context and literary necessities to support their decisions. The impressionistic element in text-criticism seems unavoidable.

Before we can see what it is that has occurred when a text has been changed from one version to another, we must look at the effects of the parts of the text concerned on the whole text; that is, we must interpret their function within both complete texts. And only after that can we form any judgement about the nature of the changes, which must be viewed not merely as the change of a few words that can be compared directly to each other, but as a change from a whole text meaning one thing to a whole text meaning another (Ellis 1974:118; cf. Greenberg 1977).

Both the examples of Keil and Delitzsch and Wellhausen exhibit the rudiments of the approach suggested by
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Ellis.

The point I wish to make, however, is that text-criticism is partially dependent on literary interpretation. As such, a preference for one version over another is partially a product of the preference of one interpretation over another. The science of text-criticism is still handmaid to another queen, the art of interpretation. Hence those readers who select a little LXX here, or a mite of MT there, actually compose new texts (variations) on the basis of interpretation and become interpretive composers in their search for the Urtext (theme). As Mowatt points out, such textual criticism is self-defeating when it is seen as an interpretational necessity:

The author's version of his own work is a desirable starting point for the literary historian and critic. Where this is not available, however, it is doubtful whether we are justified in trying to reconstruct it. If we do try, we are obscuring our own function, which is the interpretation of the facts as found (1971:26).

Mayes also notes that the anointing episode
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"was as much to emphasize the role of the prophet in the call and anointing of Saul as it was to indicate that Saul was in fact called and anointed..." (1978:14).

Knierim also perceives the emphasis on Yahweh's role in the anointing—"the king is not the anointed of the people, but of Yahweh" (1968:30; cf. Buber 1956:132)—but fails to observe that Saul is the only Israelite given to know this. At this point in the narrative, the characterization of the anointing as a Yahweh anointing is not so much a polemic as it is a definition with which the naive Saul is indoctrinated.

Perry discusses the literary uses of the primacy effect in his article on literary dynamics (1979:52-58), as does Sternberg (1978: index under "Primacy effect"). It is also an accepted view that Hebrew syntax can lend special emphasis to a word by placing it first in a sentence and so contrasting it with the usual word order, a technique that seems to depend on the primacy effect (cf. R.J. Williams 1976: 96-98).

Richter explains the difference chronologically; "'über meine Erbe' dürfte die ältere Form sein,
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9, 16 enthält die Erweiterung auf Israel" (1970:47). Aside from this assertion, however, he supplies no proof of the relative dating, and his explanation merely serves to show the tendencies of historical criticism. Such commentary, instead of enhancing the reader's understanding of the story, diverts it onto the hypothetical history of the story.

6 It is for this reason that, as Fritz observes (1976:551), the term melek is never mentioned in any communications to Saul, who only comes to know that he will be melek as well as nāgid in 10:21.

7 Tsevat suggests a symbolic meaning for the second sign. "Whereas the third sign symbolizes Saul's appointment by God, the second points to his recognition by the people...Saul is given consecrated food" (1962:117). Although MT does not say that the bread was consecrated, Tsevat's suggestion, based on LXX (and supported by 4QSam², McCarter 1980:172), is in accord with the general sense of the text. Saul has crossed over from a secular to a sacred position; instead of giving bread, he gets it (cf. Wildberger 1957:455).

8 The incidental note that there was a
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Philistine prefect at Gibeath-ellohim prepares for ch. 13, but cannot be labelled secondary on that account alone if one admits that a narrator can include anticipations in his narrative (against e.g. McCarter 1980: 182).

9Cf. Gressmann (1921:33), who unfortunately suggests that Samuel presents the predictions in order to allay Saul's astonishment and doubts. Weiser criticizes Gressmann's reading as over-interpretation without textual basis (1962:58). He suggests that for the narrator and reader, the anointing done by a man with the authority of a Samuel, accompanied by a word of God was sufficient proof and required no additional signs. The signs are, therefore, secondary accretions (1962:57-58).

Weiser, however, goes too far in his reaction to Gressmann. The signs are in the text, and though Saul is never explicitly shown to doubt Samuel, the purpose of the signs, like the prearranged sacrificial banquet, is to convince Saul beyond the slightest doubt, that he is predestined to be the designate of Yahweh. The signs, therefore, are part of the plan and not an impromptu response to some doubt that Saul
may or may not have had.

10 The series is ʿmāṣāʾtā, wēcāmērū (v. 2); wēhaalaptā, wāhālėm, ʿübāʾtā, ʿūmešāʾükā (v. 3); wēṣāʾalā, wēnāte nú, wēlāqaḥta (v. 4); (tābō), āpāgācātā (v. 5); wēšālėmā, wēhitnabbītā, wēnēhpaktā (v. 6).

11 Veijola, who follows Press' line of reasoning (1938:199), suggests that the connection between 10:8 and ch. 13 was logical only before ch. 11 was inserted between chs. 10 and 13. According to 11:14, Samuel, Saul and the people all go to Gilgal to renew the kingdom. "Ein sieben Tage langes Warten auf Samuel in Gilgal wäre danach sinnlos" (Veijola 1977:49)! In view of the fact that 10:8 is a prediction that Saul will go down to Gilgal ahead of Samuel and wait there seven days, however, there is no contact or conflict between 11:14 and ch. 13. The only thing they share, in fact, is a situation in which Samuel and Saul are both in Gilgal together, but the circumstances are unrelated.

12 Alternate defences of 10:8 are presented by Eissfeldt 1931:8; Irwin 1941:122-24; and J.M. Miller 1974:160-61. The reading presented here was partially
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anticipated by Schulz 1919:150.

13 Had Samuel wanted to give Saul the freedom
to do as he saw fit, he could have said, as Jonathan's
armorbearer did, "do all that your mind inclines you
to" (כָּשֵׁה קֹל-ָּשָׁר בִּילַּבַּכְּרַ נְּּהָ לָּק, 1 Sam 14:7),
which better conveys a sense of individual freedom.
The expression "do what your hand finds," on the other
hand, carries a sense of action in accord with exter-
nal circumstance.

14 Richter raises a further objection against
10:8, saying that it is in contradiction to 9:13b; in
9:13b Samuel simply blesses a prepared offering but
in 10:8 he promises to perform the very specific
sacrifices of כּוֹלָת and שֵׁילָם (Richter 1970:19).
Were one to admit a connection between Samuel's
appearances throughout chs. 1-12, as Richter, I think,
would not, one might note that Samuel has already
been trained as a priest (chs. 1-3), has already
offered an כּוֹלָת (7:10), and has built a sacrificial
altar (7:17). Wildberger's objection to using these
passages as proof of Samuel's priesthood depends on
rather arbitrary assessments of historicity (Samuel
as prophet is historical, but as priest is fictitious)
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and, in any case, holds only against those who would argue the historicity of Samuel's priestly activity (1957:462-63). The lesser claim of the literary approach is simple and incontestable—in the narrative, Samuel sometimes acts as a priest. Furthermore, 9:13 does not say that the seer cannot sacrifice, but only that he blesses the sacrifice before the people eat.

On the topic of Samuel's priestly activity see McKenzie 1962:4-6 (Samuel's priestly character is late and unhistorical), and Willis 1972:44-45 ("it was natural for traditionist circles to think of Samuel in priestly terminology").

15Budde believes so strongly that the expectation created by v. 6 should not be anticipated that he rejects the early divine intervention as a "falsch eingerückte Randglosse" (1902:69). Hertzberg shows a similar preference for order and transposes the description of the changing of the heart to the end of v. 10 (1964:77-78).

Cf. Weiser, "Denn die abschliessende Bemerkung (10:9) 'Da trafen alle diese Zeichen ein an jene Tage' macht eine derartige Erzählung eigentlich überflüssig, zumal der Erzähler verständlicherweise es
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17 Abrams defines dramatic irony as "a situation in a play or a narrative in which the audience shares with the author knowledge of which a character is ignorant: the character...says something that anticipates the actual outcome, but not at all in the way that he means it" (1981:91).

18 Seebass' suggestion that Saul returned to the high place where he attended the banquet (9:19) strains the meaning of the verb wayyābō in v. 13 and conflicts with v. 14 (1967:161 n.28). According to Seebass, Saul's uncle was one of the invited guests at that banquet. In v. 14, however, the uncle asks Saul where he has been and Saul replies that he has been out looking for the lost asses. The implication is that Saul and the uncle have not met since Saul first left home in 9:4.

19 It should also be noted that only a member of Saul's immediate family or a close acquaintance would miss Saul and ask him about his absence. An uncle is neither better nor worse a choice than any
other within that circle to perform this task for the narrator.

20 Driver notes the "awkward and unnatural position of the words," but suggests only that v. 16b is a misplaced gloss (1913:83).

21 Various socio-historical reasons have been advanced to explain why Mizpah was chosen as the site of the two important meetings in chs. 7 and 10 (e.g. Press 1958:199; Noth 1967:58 n.3; Boecker 1969:36-37; Stoebbe 1973:215; McCarter 1980:143 n.6, 191). Whatever the historical importance of Mizpah may have been, the reader should first seek to determine the contextual significance of Samuel's choice to convene Israel at Mizpah.

Although there is no narrative context that helps us to understand why Samuel held the first convention (ch. 7) at Mizpah, we do gain insight into the second (10:17-27) by comparing it with the first. "Samuel selected Mizpeh for this purpose, because it was there that he had once before obtained for the people, by prayer, a great victory over the Philistines" (Keil and Delitzsch 1880:105). As Keil suggests, Samuel convenes the second meeting at the
same place—Mizpah—because the item on the agenda is directly related to the agenda of the prior meeting.

Samuel's prior administration of Israel's victory had led to a restoration of theocratic covenant relations. The installation of a king is held at Mizpah to show that the accomplishment of the prior meeting is now being reversed, or at least apparently so, for one must always bear in mind that the ceremony of 10:17-27 is a show staged to trick Israel into public acceptance of a "king like all the nations" who is really Yahweh's designate. Israel is led to believe that it is rejecting Yahweh in favour of a king (10:19), and hence annulling the reconciliation previously made at Mizpah (ch. 7).

The choice of Mizpah may, therefore, be viewed as a brilliant ploy on Samuel's part. As director of this sham covenant dissolution, Samuel carefully ensures that the stage setting is eminently suited to the ensuing action.

22 Smith (1899:72) also observes the connection on the basis of Mizpah, but does not draw any significant conclusions therefrom.

23 That Samuel is said to call the people "to
Notes to Chapter IV - 1 Samuel 10

Yahweh" (אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה) may be a subtle intimation about the true purpose of the meeting—to call the people back from their insurrection to Yahweh.

24 No generic, which is to say form-critical, assertions are intended by the terms covenant renewal or annulment, which are simply aimed at describing what happens in each meeting.

25 Samuel misses no opportunity to criticize the people's desire for a king. He describes Yahweh's saving acts toward Israel as rescues from the hands of kings, who oppress Israel. Yahweh saves, kings oppress.

26 Boecker follows "praktisch alle Kommentare," LXX, Vulg., Syr., and Targ. reading "No!" (16) rather than MT's "to him" (16) (1969:43 n.2). Since Samuel has just finished saying that Israel spurned (מֵאָסטֶם) its God, however, MT's reading seems most suited to that description. A pattern in vv. 18-19 also supports MT:

v. 18 Yahweh (subject) - brings Israel (direct object) up from Egypt and delivers Israel from the
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hand of all the kings
oppressing it.

v. 19 Israel (subject) - spurns its God (direct
object).

Yahweh (subject) - is Israel's deliverer
(mōṣî'ā lākem) from all
its ills and hardships.

Israel (subject) - says to him (lō), "Give
us a king."

Reading lō rather than lō² in v. 19, there is a degree
of correspondence (underlined above) between Yahweh's
saving acts on Israel's behalf and Israel's spurnful
replies. See also below, n.27.

27Veijola denies that wēcattā is an element of
a covenant form, suggesting that it is simply a redac-
tional connector (1977:41 n.19). In support he sug-
gests "dass die Aufforderung zum Hintreten vor Jahwe in
einer direkten Jahwe-Rede—deren Form allerdings schon
in V.19a verlassen wird—höchst unsachgemäss klingt"
(1977:41 n.20). There is, however, nothing in the
narrative to suggest that v. 19b should be regarded as
part and parcel of the "word of Yahweh," and in fact
the particle (wēcattā) itself seems to suggest a new
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beginning, which in context is clearly attributable to Samuel alone. As to any "Verlassenheit" of the Jahwe-Rede" in v. 19a, by which one must assume that Veijola refers to the third person references to "your God" and "he," these references are part of a rhetorical pattern in the oracle:

v. 18 I brought up Israel
     I delivered you
v. 19 But you spurned your God
     and you said to him

28 Noth approximates this perspective on the lottery, though he fails to observe the dramatic, which is to say the staged, aspects of the lottery. "...es sei denn, dass Dtr diese Entscheidung auch noch vor der Öffentlichkeit des Volkes ausdrücklich bekannt gemacht wissen wollte, um der in 11, 14.15 berichteten Szene den Anschein einer eigenmächtigen Handlung von seiten des Volkes zu nehmen" (1967:58).

29 It has been suggested that the question of v. 22 should be regarded as evidence of two traditions in vv. 21-22. In v. 21, Yahweh's will is manifest by
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lottery, in which answers to questions could only be yes, no, or silence. In v. 22, on the other hand, the explicit location of Saul could only be given by some type of oracular designation (Birch 1976:44). It is therefore inferred, in conjunction with other considerations, that the two incompatible types of inquiry belong to separate traditions.

In view of the fact that the lottery process was stalemated by Saul's absence, however, there is no reason why the people would not have reverted to the other, more explicit means of divine inquiry. If we can understand that the words יָאַל byhw describe oracular consultation ("by means of the Urim and Thummim," Keil and Delitzsch 1880:107; cf. Albrektson 1977/78:4), we should also be able to understand that Israel could know which one to use in order to obtain an answer to a question such as that posed in v. 22.

30 Regarding the significance of Saul's choice of a hiding place, של hakkêlîm, McCarter also offers the most balanced view. hakkêlîm "can refer to almost any kind of equipment or paraphernalia, so that exactly where Saul was hiding is something we cannot know with certainty" (1980:193).
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31 See Richter 1970:25 for the redactional argument. He also lists other proponents of the redactional view on p. 25 n.48. Richter is willing to admit, however, that 9:2 may function as one of Buber's Leitwörter, but only on the level of the final revision.

32 Scholars have been puzzled by the fact that Samuel, who was vehemently anti-monarchic as recently as vv. 17-19, should now so heartily endorse the monarchy of Saul (e.g. Schulz 1919:156). Once it is recognized that the endorsement is a trap, however, Samuel's mixed attitudes are clearly seen as a part of his rhetoric. There is no need to posit separate Samuels in separate sources or traditions.

33 Birch objects to this reading of v. 24. "Vs. 24 emphasizes that it is Yahweh who has chosen Saul, and his stature in vs. 23 acts as a prior sign attesting to this divine choice. In no way is it suggested that it is because of Saul's stature that he becomes king" (1976:46). But nowhere in v. 23 is there any mention of a sign. In fact, Saul's physical preeminence is made manifest to the people only because Yahweh has already chosen him (as far back as ch. 9), revealed his choice in the lottery, and thwarted Saul's efforts
to evade public notice, as the chosen one.

Birch suggests that "Yahweh has chosen a king completely apart from the normal means of cultic designation which have apparently failed" (1976:46). The failure of the lottery was, however, only apparent and due to Saul's uncooperative behaviour. Yahweh revealed his hiding place and hence reinforced the results of the lottery. Samuel's speech in v. 24 only suggests a plausible reason why Yahweh chose Samuel, a choice first made manifest in the lottery.

I follow Mettinger's recent development of a suggestion by Clark (1971:275 n.3) that the verb הָנָּח (nāh) is used here (and elsewhere) as a term for election or choice (1976:112-13). Numerous parallels are presented and discussed by both Clark and Mettinger. According to Clark, "חָנָּה and הָנָּה also came to function as technical terms of royal election" (1971:275).

As Mettinger points out, it is the contextual suitability of this translation of הָנָּה in v. 24 that is most compelling. The divine choice has been established in the lottery, and the people are asked if they agree.

This solemn question was not merely rhetorical
that is whether the people were able to see (discern) whom the Lord had chosen. What Samuel's question implied was, whether or not the people were prepared to recognize the divine designation of Saul and appoint him king. The formal consent of the people was expressed by means of the acclamation [יְהִי הַמֶּלֶךְ] (1976:113).

35 Dramatic irony involves a situation in a play or a narrative in which the audience shares with the author knowledge of which a character is ignorant: the character acts in a way grossly inappropriate to the actual circumstances, or expects the opposite of what fate holds in store, or says something that anticipates the actual outcome, but not at all in the way that he means it (Abrams 1981:91).

36 Budde provides an example of a reader who is aware of what Samuel has done—given Israel as king, a man who is only authorized with the anointing of נָגִּיד —, but instead of accepting this, he proposes a conjectural emendation to bring the installation into
accord with 12:1-3. In 12:1-3, says Budde, Samuel recalls that he installed Saul as Israel's king, and then refers to the latter as Yahweh's anointed (1902:72). Accordingly there might once have been a simple note at the end of v. 24 that said, "And Samuel anointed him king" (1902:72).

Budde's conjectural emendation is the result of a careful reading of the text, but he errs in attempting to read 10:24 in the light of the subsequent 12:1-3. Read in the natural order, the reader encounters 12:1-3 after Samuel has revealed that King Saul is actually Yahweh's designate. From this perspective for Samuel to identify the king as Yahweh's anointed in 12:1-3 is not surprising at all.

37 Commenting on Josh 24:26, McCarthy suggests that the word sēper should be translated "covenant document" on the basis of parallels in a Sefire treaty (1978:223). Given the covenantal context of 1 Sam 10:25, and the parallels between it and the Joshua example, it seems safe to assume that such is also the meaning of sēper in v. 25.

38 Seebass also perceives the rhetorical differences between the mīspāṭîm of chs. 8 and 10, and on
that basis suggests they are "Parallellüberlieferungen" (1965:286-87). Unless one presumes compositional multiplicity, however, a contextual explanation of such rhetorical differences should preclude genetic explanations.

39 The expression "to go with" (hlik כמנ) someone is regularly used to show unity and even compact between individuals and groups (Exod 33:16; Lev 26:23-24, 28, 40-41; Num 10:32; Deut 20:4; 31:6; Judg 4:8; 11:8; 1 Sam 30:22; 2 Sam 7:9; Mic 6:8; Job 51:5; 54:8; 1 Chr 17:8).

40 Stoebé (1973:214) and DeBoer (1938:56) defend MT's "army" (hahayil) against the addition of bene before hahayil. On translating hayil as "army" see Crüsemann 1978:55 n.9 and Eising 1980:351-52.

41 The opinion that any Monarch receiveth his Power by Covenant, that is to say on Condition, proceedeth from want of understanding of this easie truth, that Covenants being but words, and breath, have no force to oblige, contain, constrain, or protect any man, but what it has from the publique Sword; (1968:231).

42 Caspari's attempt to convey the covenantal
implications of the description of transgressors as $\text{bêne} \text{ bêliyâ'îl}$ with the translation "Verfehmte" has not been well received (cit. by Buber 1956:147 n.3). Even so, Stoebbe, though he rejects Caspari's translation, agrees with his general conception. "Ein $\text{bêliyâ'îl}$ ist ein Verletzter des Gottesrechtes" (1973:214).

43 See Levine 1974:16-17 on this translation of minhâ'.

The majority of scholars have chosen to follow LXX in v. 27b, correcting the Hebrew from $\text{wyhý kmâhry's}$ to $\text{wyhý kmhd's}$ (cf. McCarter 1980:191, 199-200). Recently the evidence of 4QSam$^a$ has also been cited as reason to read $\text{wyhý kmw hd's}$, a reading close to that of LXX (McCarter 1980:199-200). From a strictly grammatical, syntactical perspective, both MT and LXX are possible and neither preeminent (cf. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:109; Driver 1915:85).

The reader gains two things from the cross-fertilization of MT by LXX and 4QSam$^a$. First, with the temporal information of the new reading, "About a month later" (McCarter's translation), he gets a transitional note telling him how much time has elapsed between the last narrated event and the forthcoming one.
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(The effect is the same whether the transition bridges 10:27 and 11:1 as in MT and LXX, or the additional information of 4QSam a and 11:1.) Secondly, the reader is thereby relieved of the task set by the expository gap if he follows MT. And while I would not suggest that scholars have followed LXX or 4QSam a in conscious evasion of the expository gap in MT's v. 27, it is quite possible that this interpretational complexity could influence a text-critical decision. As to the first gain to be had, one notes that temporal transitions in Hebrew narrative may be explicitly noted (e.g. 1 Sam 3:2; 6:1; 8:1) and they may not (e.g. 1 Sam 2:27; 4:1b; 9:1; 10:17). Without a supporting argument from narrative technique, it is difficult to see any advantage in the versional reading, though there is certainly a difference. Greenberg's comments on LXX and MT divergence in Ezek 2 also apply here:

The two versions thus convey different messages in this paragraph, for which their distinctive formulations are the necessary vehicles. Can one message be made a criterion for the other? Which one is more original? On what ground will the
Notes to Chapter IV - 1 Samuel 10

decision be made? (1977:136).
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2 The seven day period has troubled some scholars as being too short a time for messengers to cover all of Israel (Wallis 1968:55-56; cf. Gressman 1921:44; Soggin 1967:42-43). Be that as it may, one might also consider the influence of the symbolic significance of the number seven on this suggested time period. Cassuto claims that Akkadian, Hebrew, and Ugaritic examples all prove "that a series of seven consecutive days was considered a perfect period [unit of time] in which to develop an important work..." (1961:13). Perhaps the seven day time period is intended to suggest a "perfect period." If they could not find a deliverer in this period, they would never find one. The text is, therefore, readable so long as one does not presuppose that it is intended to be historically accurate.

3 The characteristic Israelite response to threatening adversaries, on the other hand, is straight away to "cry to Yahweh" (e.g. Judg 3:8-9, 13-15; 4:2-3;
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4 Alternatively, Budde suggests that in the redactional process a description of the wide-ranging travels of the messengers was dropped out to make it look like the messengers went straight to Saul (1902:74). Budde, therefore, also arrives at a conclusion about the redactor's interest, but includes two assumptions in his comment—that there was a separate redaction, and that something has been omitted from the original narrative. Occam's razor may be put to good use when the reader faces such alternatives.

5 Beyerlin suggests that Saul's two experiences of the onrush of the spirit must be separated, one being a temporary prophetic charisma and the other an empowerment similar to that given to the judges in their battles against Israel's enemies (1961:187-89; cf. Langlamet 1970:193-95). When looking at the differences between the two one should also note that the prophetic instance was uncontrolled by Saul, and so functioned for him as a sign that God was with him. The instance in 11:6, on the other hand, leaves Saul in complete control. In fact, just after the spirit comes on him, Saul gets very angry at what he has heard. The spirit,
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Turning to the similarities between the two instances, one observes that they are both examples of God's direct intervention in Saul's life for the ultimate purpose of making him Yahweh's designate and, as such, Israel's king. The first instance aims at convincing Saul that God is with him, the second, at stirring Saul into effective action and so, convincing a reluctant people that their new king is an effective leader in times of military trouble. The different manifestations of Saul's charismatic experiences may, therefore, be seen as the product of the different contexts within which they appear. They are linked by the overriding unity of purpose of installing a theocratically designated king in Israel over a people that accept him and thereby give up their intention to sever their political ties to Yahweh. (Mettinger has also questioned the absolute separation of 10:10 and 11:6, and presents other arguments in favour of their compatibility, 1976:236-37.)

The common assumption that the words "and after Samuel" are secondary redactional insertions is
not favoured by a careful consideration of their context (cf. Willis 1972:53 n.75; Ishida 1977:47-48, against e.g. Smith 1899:78; Fritz 1976:356-57; McCarter 1980: 205). Saul's inclusion of Samuel with himself is a statement by Saul to the people that he intends to uphold his ties with the theocracy. The people are clearly reminded by Saul that they will be fighting under Saul, Yahweh's willing designate, and Samuel, the theocratic mediator. Samuel's inclusion in the call to arms is thus an important preliminary characterization of the meaning of the battle. Though Saul may have been slow to fulfill the role assigned to him by Samuel, he leaves no doubt in anyone's mind that he is mindful of it and of the man who stands over him.

The fact that Saul's threat should evoke the fear of Yahweh in the people is a good argument against the suggestion that 11:1-11 does not presuppose even 10:17-27. If the people were not aware that Saul was Yahweh's chosen king whom they had acclaimed, why should they fear Yahweh when Saul, the supposedly unknown farmer, had made the threat? Only the reader is aware that Saul's behaviour is conditioned by an onslaught of God's spirit (v. 7), since that fact is only manifest
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in a narratorial description. That the onslaught of the divine spirit was not readily ascertainable by the people is evidenced already in 10:10-11, a manifestation even more obvious than 11:7.

Some commentators have regarded the large numbers of v. 8 as fantastic and hence, spurious (Smith 1899:78-79; Budde 1902:75; Nowack 1902:51; Hertzberg 1964:93). Others have explained that the turnout was so large because Saul had issued a call for a general levy of all Israelites (Keil and Delitzsch 1880:112; Stoebe 1973:22). A third possibility is that the word הָֽקֶּלֶף, usually translated as "thousand," refers to a military unit comprised of a variable number of men (E. Meyer 1906:498; Mendenhall 1968:52-66; Gottwald 1979:270-76; McCarter 1980:204). This last possibility would reduce the response to a more credible level. Finally, it is possible that the large numbers are intended to emphasize the great extent of the response to Saul's call, an emphasis already seen in the expression "as one man" in v. 7.

Ishida also recognizes that the plural wayyōšēmrū in v. 9a focuses the reader's attention on the question of the people's response to the call.
Notes to Chapter IV - 1 Samuel 11 (1977:47). With reference to the question posed in 10: 27, "How will this (Saul's kingship) save us (yôṣi'ênu)?" the possibilities with respect to 11:9 and the tsûâ promised therein remain the same. Either the anonymous subjects have decided that Saul is capable, or they have concluded that their own assembled strength is sufficient to the task.

10 Defense of the question as it appears in MT is made by Driver 1913:87; cf. GKC #150a. The insertion of a negative particle, following LXX (saoul ou basileusei) is unnecessary.

11 Knierim also notes the legal implications of the term bê'ê bêlîya'âl. "In all Old Testament references bêlîya'âl is a slanderer of God or a breaker of the sacral laws, a destroyer of justice, a rebel against the king, or one who destroys life" (1968:53; cf. above on 10:27).

12 The fact that Saul thinks it necessary to justify his prohibition against executing the vocal dissenters argues against Birch's assertion that the right to make judgements in the sacral/legal realm has been transferred to Saul (1976:61). If he did have that right, he would not have to justify his
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pronouncements.

Saul's insecurity in this area is manifest when contrasted with David's issue of a similar amnesty. In 2 Sam 19:22, Abishai suggests that Shimei should die for cursing David, Yahweh's anointed. David, whose situation parallels Saul's in that he has just regained his hold on the throne, asks "Shall any one be put to death in Israel this day? For do I not know that I am this day king over Israel?", (2 Sam 19:23). David bases his amnesty proclamation on the fact that he has, once again, a firm hold on the crown. Though the death penalty was suggested because Shimei cursed "Yahweh's anointed," David issues the amnesty on his own authority, a far cry from Saul's humble justification.


This [Yahweh's deliverance] demonstrated Yahweh's sanction of the choice of Saul to be king, but at the same time it also demonstrated Saul's realization that he was merely an instrument in the accomplishment of Israel's deliverance, which, rightly understood, was to be regarded as a work of Yahweh.

14 Those commentators who have suggested that
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Saul's amnesty is intended to publicize his magnanimity as king (e.g. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:113; Smith 1899: 80; Hertzberg 1964:94) are not as far off the mark as Knierim suggests (1968:33): They have simply shifted the magnanimity that is Yahweh's onto the shoulders of Saul. Goodenough's statement that the object of the amnesty was "to make Saul's claim to kingship include judicial justice and mercy, as well as prowess in war" (1928:187) needs only minor modification. What the amnesty pays tribute to is Yahweh's merciful granting of deliverance through his designated king, even after the people have voiced their opposition (10:27) and withheld the recognition due to a king (11:1-5).

Vannoy also gives a representative survey of the variations that individual scholars have composed on the redactional theme of v. 14 (1978:114-127).

See above on 10:26 for the significance of the expression h1k čm. Against the argument that only a minority questioned the monarchy after its constitution was described and installed, Buber replies:

Einer solchen Auffassung der Sächlage hat der Erzähler durch sein einprägsames 'die Tapfern, denen Gott das Hertz angerührt hatte',
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vorneugen wollen. So wird eine Majorität
nicht bezeichnet, so wird eine Elite
bezeichnet, die gegen den Strom schwimmt" (1956:155).

In addition, one might note that the impression created
by 11:1-5 is one of general disregard for the monarchy,
which would seem to confirm Buber's reading of "those
whose hearts were touched" as a minority.

17 Vannoy also notes the significance of choosing
Gilgal as the location for the renewal, but suggests
that the monarchy (מלועות) that is renewed is Yahweh's
over Israel (1978:82-84).

Precisely because the kingdom of Saul was
being formally established, the kingdom of
Yahweh must not be forgotten. The intro-
duction of the monarchy in Israel required
that it be understood within the framework
of the provisions of the Sinaitic covenant
so that the continued rule of Yahweh in the
new political order would be recognized
(1978:81).

Vannoy's suggestion, while plausible within the textual
limits he sets to his study (1 Sam 11:14-12:25),
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illustrates the hazard of interpretation on the basis of a limited context. The reader knows from 9:1-10:16 that Saul's monarchy presupposes the continuing higher authority of the theocracy, a condition that initially caused the people to question and ignore Saul's kingship (10:27-11:5). When the people are finally persuaded to accept the preferred monarchy, their renewal of Saul's kingdom constitutes and is recognized to constitute a simultaneous renewal of allegiance to the theocracy to which Saul publicly professes his own allegiance (11:13).

It is, therefore, unnecessary to isolate the usage of שְׁלֹעָה in 11:14 either to have Israel renew its commitment to Yahweh, or, against historical criticism, to show that the Gilgal renewal is not simply a repetition of the Mizpah inauguration (10:19-25) (cf. Vannoy 1978:61-84). שְׁלֹעָה, in all three of its appearances (10:16, 25; 11:14), refers to Saul's monarchy; when the people finally reaffirm their acceptance of Saul as king, they also accept the fact that Saul stands under the theocratic authority.

Mettinger's suggestion that the verb הָיָּלֵּדָה is a "delocutive" verb, "to call someone king," also
supports an understanding of the people's act as a confirmation rather than an initiatory act (1976:86).

Vannoy, following R. Schmid (1964), suggests that the ūlāmām are covenant offerings sacrificed to ratify the renewed relationship between Israel and Yahweh (1978:88-91). Objections to the exclusive association of ūlāmām with covenantal contexts have, however, been raised by McCarthy (cit. Vannoy 1978:89 n.84) and especially Levine (1974:35-41). Though the context of v. 15 seems to invite an understanding of the sacrifice in covenantal terms, it is equally open to Levine's suggestion that the ūlāmām are "gifts" given to the king and by him to God in celebration of his new kingship (1974:28-32).

Milgrom summarizes the suggested etymologies for ūlāmām, all of which, he notes, are conjectural, as peace, covenant, gift, whole or sound, and repay. He offers the tentative suggestion, which more or less encapsulates the general similarity of all the suggestions, "offering of well-being" (1976:769). In 1 Sam 11:15, where the emphasis lies on the fact of reconciliation, it seems unwise to be too specific in one's understanding of the ūlāmām, given the disputed state
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of the question. Understanding the $\textit{ve} \text{\textlaam} \text{\textmim}$ as offerings expressing the people's sentiments of acceptance of Saul and so reconciliation with Yahweh also agrees with the generally applicable translation $\textit{peace offerings}$ (cf. Keil and Delitzsch 1880:114; Smith 1899:81; Rowley 1967:122-23).
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1 Both Thenius (1864:46) and Keil and Delitzsch (1880:115) also point to the waw consecutive imperfect (wayyō\textsuperscript{5}mer) in 12:1 as a syntactic support for the connection.

2 Die Wendung \textsuperscript{w}attā "und nun" begegnet in über 220 Fällen regelmässig nach einer Art Exposition, der Darstellung eines Sachverhaltes, die zunächst von der Sprech-Situation wegführt, worauf dann mit "und nun" zur aktuellen Situation des Redenden (und des Angeredeten) zurückgerufen wird, um eine auf die vorangehende Exposition folgende Reaktion einzuleiten (Jenni 1972:8).

3 In spite of McCarter's objections (1980:90, 212-213), Driver's explanation of the phrase "to walk before" is adequate. "To walk before any one is to live and move openly before him" (1913:38; cf. Helfmeyer 1978: 393).

4 Birch (1967:67) and McCarter (1980:213) also regard the positive sounding reference to the king as. Yahweh's anointed as incongruent with the remainder of the chapter, which does not use the title "anointed"
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(Birch; McCarter) and is uniformly critical of the monarchy (McCarter; cf. Veijola 1977:94). The usage of the title "anointed" can, however, be understood when viewed from the perspective of Samuel's rhetorical intent. As for the supposed anti-monarchic stance of ch. 12, I will suggest that Samuel is not so much critical of the new monarchy, which is recognized as God-given (v. 13), as he is of the reasons and attitudes displayed by Israel in its bid for political change (cf. McCarthy 1974:102).

The contrasts between Samuel and his sons do not consist of the verbal linkages so often used when contrasts and comparisons are made in biblical narrative (cf. Crüsemann 1978:64-65). This vagueness, however, is exactly what one would expect. Samuel is trying to prove that the request for a king was not warranted by pointing to his own innocence of the crime of abusing the office of judge while avoiding any mention of the wrongdoing of his sons. In support of this reading of the vague contrasts one might also note that Samuel is more specific in his comparison with 8:11-18; he does not take (lqḥ) livestock, but the king does (8:16-17; cf. Boecker 1969:70; Vannoy 1978:16).
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McCarter offers the interesting suggestion that the last sentence in v. 5 and the first in v. 6 are conflate variants, "And he said 'Witness,'" "And Samuel said to the people, 'Witness...:'" (restoring a second ḫd after ḫm with LXX) (1980:210). He opts for a conglomerate reading using elements from both variants—"Yahweh is witness," he said,... (1980:208, 210), a solution which removes the difficulty by creating a new version. The new version also creates a new problem for the reader, who must now supply a connection between Samuel's discourse on Yahweh's past history and the preceding dialogue. If the reader follows MT, the connection is supplied by the logic of the alternating dialogue between Samuel and the people.

In contrast to Keil and Delitzsch, who suggest only that "the context itself is sufficient to show that the expression 'is witness' is understood" (1880:116), I maintain that Samuel's interruption incorporates the last word of v. 5, ḫd, into his own sentence, and hence that nothing needs to be presumed. In other words, Samuel finishes the last sentence of v. 5 with his own conclusion, thus shaping the admission of "Witness" to suit his own purposes.
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9 Eichrodt says that the sidqôt yhwh are Yahweh's military victories on Israel's behalf, which, as proofs of Yahweh's righteousness, suggests why they are labelled ṣdq (1961 vol. 1:242). As Zimmerli notes, however, "righteousness" is not always an accurate translation of ṣdq (1978:142). Zimmerli touches on a more appropriate understanding of Yahweh's ṣdq with respect to Yahweh's relationship with Israel. "When the Old Testament speaks of 'Yahweh's righteousness' it means rather the social bond existing between him and his people and Yahweh's actions based on this bond" (1978:142). With respect to Yahweh's sidqôt in Judg 5:11 and 1 Sam 12:7, both contexts of recitation of Yahweh's military acts on Israel's behalf, it would appear that these acts are called sidqôt because they justify Yahweh's covenantal claim on Israel. That is to say, Yahweh's sidqôt are those actions that justify (or make right, and hence "righteous") Yahweh's status as Israel's political leader, the divine king. "Yahweh
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is acclaimed as king in the light of the victories
[ṣidqāt yhwh] which he and his armies have wrought..."
(P.D. Miller 1973:84).

10 Again the reader must be careful not to con-
fuse Samuel's presentation and views with those of the
narrator. The people are only compelled to admit
Samuel's argument if they allow Samuel's suggestion
that the request for a king was partly or wholly
entailed by his own performance as mediator. That the
narrator does not share Samuel's perspective is evident
from his authoritative presentation of the problem in
8:1-3. If Samuel's audience accept Samuel's suggestion,
the reader can only attribute their acquiescence to the
combination of Samuel's persuasive rhetoric and their
characteristic docility, for their admission of his
innocence can in no way be extended to cover the sins
of his sons.

11 Presentations of the two sides to the insol-
uble grammatical dispute over v. 7 may be found in
Driver 1913:92-93 (favouring LXX) and Vannoy 1978:24-26

12 Caution in the matter of perceiving formal
literary patterns need not be taken to the extreme of
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denying such affiliations unless exact replication of all elements is present. Veijola, for example, denies the validity of reading ch. 12 in the light of covenantal forms, "denn es handelt sich hier weder um einen 'Bund' noch um eine Ordnung des Königtums" (1977:95 n.79). McCarthy rightly maintains the covenantal aspects of Samuel's presentation, even though there is no strict adherence to any idealized covenant form (1978:218).

One might add that the story as developed up to this point requires neither a new covenant nor a covenant renewal. The fact that the people have accepted Saul and renewed the kingdom by making Saul king before Yahweh (11:14-15) is a sufficient expression of their willingness to remain under and within the theocracy. Covenantal relationship at the end of ch. 11—Yahweh having given a conditional monarchy and the people having accepted it—is restored and in no need of repair. If Samuel presents his argument in ch. 12 in covenantal terms, it may be that he is seeking to define the relationship that already exists and, more importantly, to give the people the theocratic perspective on the recent calamities in the relationship.
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Several scholars have objected to the plural verbs in v. 8 and have accordingly followed LXX in which the verbs "brought out" (LXX^A, Targum, Vulgate) and "settled" (LXX^BL, Syriac, Vulgate) are singular, with Yahweh understood as subject (e.g. Stoebe 1973: 233 and scholars cited by him; McCarter 1980:210). As Driver puts it, the plural verb "they settled" "expresses just what Moses and Aaron did not do" (1913:93).

Underlying the text-critical judgement is an exegetical presupposition that Samuel's presentation of the exodus and settlement stories should agree, or be made to agree with the presentations in the Pentateuch and Joshua. It is equally possible, however, that the plurals of LXX are the product of the same harmonistic presuppositions that lead modern scholars to prefer the versional readings. The alternative path, taken here, is to consider the singular verbs as meaningful, important and integral to the context of Samuel's rehearsal of Yahweh's "acts of justification."

Ehrlich recognizes the validity of the plurals in MT, but short-circuits the interpretation of the verb numbers by shifting to tradition history. "Die Recepta wird hier wohl richtig sein, nur setzt sie eine
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"Altere Tradition voraus, die Josua als Nachfolger Moses nicht kennt" (1910:207).

Veijola's use of the words bammāqōm hazzeh to draw redactional conclusions about ch. 12 suffers from inattention to the contextual utility of the words. Before labelling the expression as "einer der unauffälligen dtr Termini, die durch ihren wenig konkreten Inhalt der dtr Sprache ihren Gegenwartsbezug und ihre breite Interpretationsfähigkeit verleihen" (Veijola 1977:86), it is desirable, methodologically speaking, to eliminate the possibility that the expression might be contextually requisite rather than stylistically characteristic.

The widely accepted emendation that reads Barak (following LXX) rather than the obscure Bedan (e.g. Driver 1913:93) receives support from the widespread use of allusion in the immediate context. If Samuel is trying to convey a general understanding of the whole period, it is difficult to regard the introduction of an almost unknown character amongst the allusions as compatible with this purpose.

The suggestion of Zakoyitch would alleviate this difficulty. He suggests Bedan, identified as a
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Gilbeeldite in 1 Chron 7:17 is actually another name for Jepthah, also a Gileadite (Judg 11:1, 1972:124-25). The existence of two names for the same man is paralleled by the case of Gideon-Jerubbaal. Originally the list in 1 Sam 12:11 contained only the names Jerubbaal, Bedan and Samuel. A copyist or redactor who knew that Jepthah = Bedan inserted the name Jepthah after Bedan to explain the relatively obscure Bedan. Finally a later copyist, not knowing that Jepthah was intended as a gloss on Bedan, added the words \( \text{et} \) before Jepthah (1972:125).

Whether the reader follows LXX (Barak) or Zakovitch, the result is much the same: Samuel alludes to the period of the judges. If, on the other hand, one follows MT, one must assume that Bedan was a judge of whom Samuel could assume his audience's knowledge, whose memory has been lost. In any case, Bedan is insignificant enough that no single alternative changes the reading of v. 11.

In passages where derivates of the root \( \text{bth} \) are used to describe relationships between human beings, frequently they describe security that is taken for granted, but which also turns
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out to be disappointed, i.e. a credulous, frivolous, or even arrogant unconcern and security. ...frequently bth is used to describe a person who thinks he is secure, but is deceived because the object on which his feeling of security is based is unreliable. When we take all the passages in which bth is used in this sense, we get a picture of everything to which the heart of man clings and on which he believes he can build his life, but which will end in failure (Jepsen 1977:90).

In contrast to this clear linguistic usage of bth there is another that is even clearer. The community of Yahweh can know for sure that it can rely on him (Jepsen 1977:92).

Thus the feeling of being secure in God is the only certain support for human life. When Israel lives securely, it is a result of divine guidance: 1 S. 12:11; 1 K. 5:5 (4:25); Ps. 78:53 (Jepsen 1977:93).

17 In Deut 12:9 it is implied that this security
is part of the "rest and inheritance" given by Yahweh to Israel. Only when these are actualized is Israel to establish the place of sacrificial worship that Yahweh shall choose (vv. 8-11). In Josh 23, the achievement of this security signals a moment for recollection and recommitment to maintain the achievement.

Among the proposals one sees three variations:

1. Verse 12 is a late insertion (Budde 1902:80), serving to unite chs. 11 and 12 (Schulz 1919:171). Apparently late redactors do not see contradictions or are not bothered by them.

2. Verse 12 is the creation of the deuteronomist, being an interpretive collage of traditions in chs. 8 and 11 (Hertzberg 1964:99; Noth 1967:60; Boecker 1969:75-76; Birch 1976:71-72; McCarter 1980:215). Boecker explains the discrepancies between v. 12 and chs. 8 and 11 on the reasons for and time of the request with the suggestion that the deuteronomistic redactors were obviously not so concerned with such disparities as the modern reader (1969:76). Veijola, who also suggests that v. 12 is the composition of a deuteronomist (DtrN), recognizes the problem of the contradiction, which Boecker explains away, and suggests that 8:1-5 is the view of DtrG while 12:12 is that of

A fourth position, presented by Vannoy, is that though the request in ch. 8 is not explicitly made with an eye on the Ammonite threat, there is also nothing in the text that would contradict this hypothesis (1978:38-39). This suggestion is a good example of the construction of a retroactive frame with which a reader provides a logical explanation for apparent discrepancies in a text. Such hypotheses may stand or fall depending on whether there is any explicit confirmation or disaffirmation in the text itself. If the text leaves the issue unresolved, the reader is forced to hold such possibilities as the presence of the Ammonite threat behind the request for a king (ch. 8) forever in mind but never incorporated in an unequivocal reading.
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20 Against the counter-proposals of Stoebel (1973:238) and McCarthy (1978:214), who suggest that the request is not viewed negatively in v. 12, one must affirm with Veijola (1977:97 n.85) that the context speaks against such a view. The request replaces the cry to Yahweh in a situation of need, and the people are subsequently forced to admit that their request was sinful (v. 19). The thunderstorm is staged by Samuel so that Yahweh has a chance to show his displeasure at the request (דָּכָּתְקֵם רַבָּא ... בֶּכֶּנֶּה יְהוָ֖ה לִ֝שֶּׁאֹל לָקֵם מֶלֶֽךְ, v. 17). The monarchy in the form created by Yahweh, where Saul is Yahweh's anointed designate, is not regarded as sinful by Yahweh and Samuel, but the request for a king in place of Yahweh certainly is.

21 Though text critics have argued for the omission of either of the verbs (יָפָל, e.g. Wellhausen 1871: 78-79; בּרָק, e.g. Stoebel 1973:233-34), the redundancy of Samuel's usage is rhetorically comprehensible and
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therefore suitable (cf. Vannoy 1978:40 n.94).

22 In support of the semantic arguments for the apodosis in v. 14, Vannoy has marshalled a convincing structural argument based on the parallel structures of vv. 14 and 15 (1978:42; cf. Baltzer 1964:74 n.6). The parallel, in translation, can be briefly illustrated here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v. 14</th>
<th>v. 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>protasis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you fear Yahweh and serve him,</td>
<td>But if you do not heed Yahweh's voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and heed his voice</td>
<td>and you rebel against his commands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and do not rebel against his commands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apodosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then (wih'item) you and your king will be after Yahweh, your God.</td>
<td>then (w'hay'etá) the hand of Yahweh will be against you and your fathers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 The final word of v. 15 is an example of a situation in which we are forced either to stretch the
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usual meaning of a word in the text, to follow another textual tradition, or to resort to judicious emendation. Examples of all three solutions to MT, which Smith in his forthright manner calls "absurd" (1899:87), are:

1. The conjunction \( \hat{u} \) attached to the last word (\( \hat{u}ba\hat{\text{b}0\text{tekem}} \)) is used in a comparative sense, "as it was upon your fathers" (Keil and Delitzsch 1880:119; Stoebe 1973:234; McCarthy 1978:210; Vannoy 1978:46 n.104). Against this option one notes that \( \hat{u} \) - comparative is confined to poetry (R.J. Williams 1976:71 #457), and that when it is used in poetry the verb from the first item of comparison applies identically (including tense) to the second item. The tense of the verb that governs the first object ("against you") is "will be," but for the comparison to make any sense one must substitute
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"it was" for the second clause: "The hand of the Lord will be against you as it was against your fathers"; "the substitution of 'it was' in the second clause destroys entirely the 'parallelism of idea' upon which the idiom itself essentially depends" (Driver 1913:94 n.1; cf. Thenius 1864:48).

2. Another example of interpretation that depends on expansion of the usual semantic range of a word is David Kimhi's suggestion that the word "fathers" refers to Israel's kings: "like wbmlkkkm, for a ruler is to the people like a father to a son" (the translation is Alan Cooper's, who brought Kimhi's suggestion and several parallels to my attention). Kimhi cites Gen 45:8 as a parallel (cf. Isa 22:21, and the Phoenician parallels in KAI 22; 24). Ringgren discusses parallels in Egyptian,
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Akkadian and Ugaritic (1977:2-6). He also notes the use of b as a royal epithet in Isa 9:5 (p. 19). Kimhi's suggestion is attractive because it requires no adjustments in the text and because of its contextual suitability. Understanding "your fathers" as a reference to Israel's kings, the parallelism of vv. 14-15 is clear and forceful.

3. The majority of scholars have followed the readings of LXX, "and against your king" (Wellhausen 1871:79; Nowack 1902:54; Driver 1915:94-95) or LXX, "and against your king to destroy you" (Klostermann 1887:39; Smith 1899:88; Budde 1902:80; Dhorme 1910:104; McCarter 1980:212). The reading "and against your king" completes the parallelism of the apodoses in vv. 14 and 15, in which the fate of king and people are linked, but does not explain how MT's "and against your
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fathers" might have come about. The reading of LXX, which in McCarter's retrojection is \(wbmlkkm \| bydkm\), is proposed as the possible basis of MT's reading. Whether we accept this explanation of MT or not, the reading "and against your king (to destroy you)" is superior to MT in contextual suitability, if Kimhi's suggestion about the meaning of \(\mathfrak{s}{\text{b}}\) is not accepted.

4. At least three different emendations of the problematic conclusion to v. 15 have been suggested. Schulz, who rejects the reading of LXX because he regards the idea of annihilating the people as an anachronism from the time of the prophets, expressed his wish to solve the problem by simply ending the sentence with the words "against you" (1919:172). Goslinga (cited by Vannoy 1978:46)
n.104) suggests that the conjunction ְַֽמ attached to "against your fathers" is a scribal error for ָֽמ, so that the conclusion is "against you even as against your fathers." The major problem with Goslinga's suggestion is the same as that facing MT (without Kimhi's suggestion), namely that it disturbs the parallelism of vv. 14 and 15. R. Weiss turns the tables on those who follow either LXX reading, suggesting that LXX ָֽל ("against your king") is a harmonistic exegetical attempt to correct MT, and that LXX ָֽל ("against your king to destroy you") is obviously an attempt to bridge the gap between LXX ָֽל and MT (1976:53). He hypothesizes, instead a minor corruption in which an aleph was mistakenly inserted into the final word wbbtykm, "and against your houses"
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(1976:54). The copyist was influenced to err by the common expression ²tm w³btykm and by the three prior occurrences of the word ³btykm (once in conjunction with ²tkm (v. 7)) in ch. 12. Incisive as Weiss arguments against the LXX readings are in revealing the ambiguity of the relationships between the textual traditions, his suggestion does not, in my view, succeed against the strong contextual linkage of vv. 14-15, which supports LXX.

Additional support for the LXX in v. 15 is also found in vv. 24-25, which reiterate the structural and semantic patterns of vv. 14-15. Paraphrased, the pattern is:

A. Fear Yahweh and serve him because he has benefited or will benefit you.

B. If you will not acquiesce, you and your king (!) will become Yahweh's enemies and be destroyed.
This parallel, along with the structural argument from the parallelism of vv. 14 and 15, makes the reading of the LXX an attractive alternative.

Only Kimhi's reading of MT allows a retention of the Hebrew text in view of the structural necessities of the parallelism between vv. 14-15 and the parallel in vv. 24-25. And since Kimhi's reading of ἄνθρωπος allows for the same sense as the reading of LXX, which may be a correct explication of an obscured sense of the word ἄνθρωπος, I prefer to follow Kimhi, in keeping with the principle of retaining MT when it is comprehensible.

It is important to note that at this crucial juncture, when the conditions for Israel's survival under the monarchy are being laid down, no special emphasis is placed on the behaviour of the king as opposed to the people. Rather they stand together under the demand for obedience. When one holds this fact together with the observation that what Samuel criticizes in ch. 12 is not the monarchy, but the request for a king in place of Yahweh, it becomes questionable whether ch. 12 supports the claim that the deuteronomist, supposedly responsible for the construction of ch. 12 (Noth 1967:54-55), saw
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the monarchy as Israel's downfall. According to Noth, the deuteronomist used Josiah as his model for kingship:
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ungeschichtlichen, sondern auch durch die
Behauptung, dass das Königstum während der
Zeit seines Bestehens für die Beachtung des
'Gesetzes' und damit für die Aufrechterhaltung
des Verhältnisses zwischen Gott und Volk
verantwortlich gewesen sei, unter einen
unsachgemässen Gesichtspunkt gestellt
(1967:94).

The deuteronomist, says Noth, remodels the traditions
about the rise of the monarchy, incorporating within
them his own interpretation of Israel's downfall as
caused by the failure of monarchy:

'Var [sic] schon in der 'Richter' - Zeit das
israelitische Volk durch seinen fort gesetzten
Abfall fast bis an den Rand des Abgrundes
gelangt (vgl. Ri. 10, 6-16), so übernahm
nunmehr nach seiner Auffassung der Dinge das
Königtum die Verantwortung, und zwar mit dem
Enderfolg, dass - allerdings erst nach längerer
Zeit - dass israelitische Volk durch seine
Könige schliesslich in den Abgrund gestürzt
wurde (1967:54).
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In view of the obvious contradiction between Noth's understanding of the deuteronomist's views about monarchy and obedience to the law, and the deuteronomist's own statements on the subject in ch. 12 (assuming that ch. 12 is deuteronomistic), it seems that there is reason to reexamine the whole question. If the deuteronomist does not seem to place responsibility for obedience to Yahweh at the king's doorstep in ch. 12, which is generally regarded as a covenant renewal that governs the whole of the monarchical period up to Josiah, then we must either say that vv. 14-15 (McCarthy 1978:210) and 24-25 are not deuteronomistic or we must reevaluate our understanding of the deuteronomistic history.

25 Speiser has also observed that Yahweh and Samuel see the request for a king as comparable to Israel's previous expressions of a desire to return to a lifestyle such as they had when they were slaves in Egypt. "Thus 'the manner of the king' as it is stigmatized in I Sam. 8:11-18, could just as aptly have been labeled in that context 'the Egyptian manner'" (1971: 283).

26 Though Buber finds that "die Zusammenstellung
von JHWH und Samuel in v. 18b wirkt neben Ex. xiv 31
fast wie eine Travestie" (1956:159), the fact of the
matter is that the parallel is there as an integral
part of the scene in which Samuel secures the position
of mediator, first held by Moses, for all subsequent
Israelite history. The parallel with Moses in Exodus
is, therefore, an important recollection of the
fundamental role that Samuel is playing. The only
travesty here lies in Buber's arbitrary division of
ch. 12 into, among other things, original narrative
and inserted miracle story "die mit der Handlung nichts
zu schaffen hat, also einen Erweis nicht im guten Sinn
der Sage, sondern im Willkūrsinn der spät en Legende
darstellt" (1956:158). Such occasional exhibitions of
homage to historical criticism in Buber's studies are
travesties of his otherwise thorough readings of
biblical texts.

Although this reordering of the reading
experience of vv. 16-25 is destructive of the gradual
realization created by the temporal sequence of the
narrative, it avoids the tedious repetition involved
in first describing the gradual realization, then the
full structural parallel, and finally, the significance
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of each point of contact. In addition, the gradual realization of the parallel does not seem to play the important role in 12:16-25 that it did, for example, in Saul's journey in search of his asses (ch. 9).

28 Ehrlich suggests a third possible implication of the out-of-season shower, namely that Yahweh thereby shows "dass er den Wunsch seines Volkes nach einem König nicht an der Zeit findet" (1910:209).

29 In view of the widespread acceptance of the opinion that ch. 12 is critical of the monarchy, it is worth emphasizing that Samuel only says that the show of force is supposed to convince the people of the evil of their request (lišeḇol lákem melek). The thunderstorm expresses no negative views of the monarchy of Saul, which is an institution created and implemented by Yahweh himself.

30 Boecker suggests that the demonstration of the divine power at Samuel's disposal was intended simply to show the error of the request. The request was an expression of doubt about the power of Yahweh:

Israel hat sich nicht mehr darauf verlassen wollen, dass sein Schreien von Jahwe erhört wird, so wie es früher immer gewesen war.
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This suggestion must be rejected on the grounds of two considerations in the narrative and one consideration in Boecker's own argument. First, it is explicitly stated that the thunder and rain are to convince Israel of Yahweh's displeasure with the request (v. 17), and that is exactly how Israel takes it (vv. 18-19). When creator is displeased with creature's behaviour, there is good reason for creature to experience some insecurity about his position in the world. Secondly, if Yahweh and Samuel were only trying to demonstrate the continuing viability of the old arrangement for defence, and were not using strong-arm tactics, why would not the show of power be more convincingly vented on one or another of Israel's potential opponents?
Notes to Chapter IV - 1 Samuel 12

As the later examples of Martin Luther and other converts shows, the thunderstorm is a particularly effective means of convincing human beings that they are in need of some protection against the fearful power that is revealed in such storms. The psychologically coercive power of the thunderstorm could only be multiplied many times by the weird occurrence in the dry season, at Samuel's call, and after the explanation that it shows the creator's displeasure!

McCarters confuses the issue:
The point of the narrator is clear: a prophet is the proper and divinely sanctioned channel between man and God, and in this respect the request for a king is a great evil (1980:216). Nobody has suggested that the king might replace the prophet as channel. The king was intended to replace both prophet and God as Israel's political leader. He obviates this sort of communication with God in times of need. What the demonstration does show with reference to McCarter's perspective, is that even though Israel now has a king it is still in need of Samuel's intercession precisely because it has made the request and so has displeased Yahweh. King or no king, the people
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cannot escape Yahweh. They need a Samuel to pray for them.

32 A widely accepted reading of the deuteronomistic history is that of Noth. He suggests that the deuteronomistic recognized "dass Gott in dieser Geschichte erkennbar gehandelt hat, indem er auf den ständig wachsenden Abfall mit Warnungen und Strafen und schliesslich, als diese sich als fruchtlos erwiesen hatten, mit der völligen Vernichtung geantwortet hat" (1967:100). Given the importance of 1 Sam 12 for the history of monarchic Israel, and the suggestion in the narrative that the arrangement is not fair and not freely accepted by Israel, it seems fair to say that a reconsideration of the meaning and purpose of the history is in order. It would be a simple case of question-begging to suggest that our understanding of the wider context of the deuteronomistic history allows us to reject this reading of 1 Sam 12:16-25. The reading may be discarded, but not until a detailed reading of the entire history, unconditioned by presuppositions borrowed from previous readings, is made.

33 "You" (םָתֶם) is positioned emphatically
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(Driver 1913:95) as a further means of drawing the audience's attention to its own culpability.
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