

# NAHASH, KING OF THE AMMONITES, IN THE DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY

Reinhard G. KRATZ

## INTRODUCTION

In the preface to his study on the text of the Books of Samuel from 1871 Julius Wellhausen observed that it was very difficult “to find the boundary where literary criticism stops and textual criticism begins.”<sup>1</sup> He believed the reason for the fluid boundaries between textual and literary criticism lay in the “evolution of the historical books” (*Entstehungsweise der geschichtlichen Bücher*) of the Hebrew Bible. These were not the product of mechanical composition but have emerged from a core on which additional pieces and literary layers have been deposited. The “edition” of biblical books thus begins very early. It should be regarded as a process of permanent updating and interpretation in which the history of the composition as well as the history of the text and its revisions intertwine from the very beginning, even if, in principle, both should be kept separate.<sup>2</sup> For this reason “modifications of the original core and adaptations of small passages, changes of individual words, minor insets (Gen 3:20) are inseparably connected with the evolution of these historical books.”<sup>3</sup>

The Dead Sea Scrolls have brought a wealth of new material to light, which provides welcome *external evidence* for the relationship between

Author’s note: English translation Ruth Ludewig-Welch (Göttingen). I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Andrew Teeter (Harvard) for his careful reading of this paper and his comments which helped immensely to clarify and strengthen the argument.

<sup>1</sup> Julius Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871), xi: “die Grenze zu finden, wo die Literarkritik aufhört und die Textkritik beginnt.”

<sup>2</sup> See Reinhard G. Kratz, “Innerbiblische Exegese und Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz,” in idem, *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* (FAT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004; 2d ed. 2013), 126–56; idem, “Das Alte Testament und die Texte vom Toten Meer,” *ZAW* 125 (2013): 198–213; and Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3d rev. and exp. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).

<sup>3</sup> Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, xi: “sind Modificierungen des ursprünglichen Kernes und Umarbeitung kleiner Stellen, Aenderungen einzelner Wörter, geringfügige Einsätze (Gen. 3, 20) mit der Entstehungsweise der geschichtlichen Bücher unzertrennlich verbunden.”

literary and textual history in addition to the Septuagint which Wellhausen takes as the main tool (*Hauptmittel*). One famous but still controversial example where this relationship can be studied is found in 1 Samuel 11 in the story of Nahash, the king of the Ammonites. Beginning by briefly recapping the evidence I will then discuss the textual, tendency and redaction-critical issues involved. I would like to suggest a new solution which takes two things into consideration: the position of the chapter in the literary context of the Deuteronomistic History and the internal analysis of the narrative.

### THE TEXTUAL EVIDENCE

The textual tradition in 1 Sam 11 is complex (the textual witnesses can be seen in the appendix at the end of this paper). After Saul in 1 Sam 9–10 “had gone out to seek his father’s asses and found the kingdom” (Hugo Gressmann), chapter 10 ends with the return of Saul and his companions to Gibeah (v. 26). However, some troublemakers rebel against Saul and do not pay him tribute, but Saul remains silent: וַיְהִי כִּמְחֹרֵשׁ (“And he was like someone being mute,” v. 27).<sup>4</sup> This is followed in chapter 11 by Nahash the Ammonite’s sudden attack on the city of Jabesh-Gilead: וַיַּעַל נָחָשׁ הָאֲמֹנִי וַיִּחַן עַל-יָבֵשׁ גִּלְעָד (“Nahash the Ammonite marched up and besieged Jabesh-Gilead,” v. 1). The residents of the city want to make a covenant with Nahash, but he threatens to gouge out everyone’s right eye. Thereupon the elders of Jabesh-Gilead send out messengers to all the districts of Israel to get help. One of these districts is Gibeah, where Saul is living. As soon as Saul learns of the situation he organises an army in Israel and promises the messengers from Jabesh-Gilead help the next morning. The next day, as prearranged, it comes to the battle in which Saul slaughters the Ammonites. Those who had rebelled against Saul are proven to be liars, but are spared and Saul is crowned king by all the people at Gilgal.

<sup>4</sup> On the various possibilities for the semantics of ש-ר-ה and the syntactical linking of the phrase, see Renate Klein and Johannes Klein, “יהי כמחוריש (1Sam 10,27): Plädoyer für eine neue Diskussion eines alten Problems der alttestamentlichen Auslegung,” in *Sieben Augen auf einem Stein* (Sach 3,9): *Studien zur Literatur des Zweiten Tempels, Festschrift für Ina Willi-Plein zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Friedhelm Hartenstein and Michael Pietsch; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2007), 185–92; also Walter Dietrich, *1 Samuel: Kapitel 1–12* (BKAT VIII/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010), 474–6.

The peculiar note in 1 Sam 10:27 **וַיְהִי כְּמִהְרֵי־שָׁנָה** has always caused offence and so one usually turns here to the Septuagint, which reads **καὶ ἐγένηθη ὥς μετὰ μῆνα**, in other words **וַיְהִי כְּמִהְרֵי־שָׁנָה** or **וַיְהִי כְּמִהְרֵי־שָׁנָה** (“And about a month later”) and moves the time indication to the beginning of chapter 11.<sup>5</sup> Given less attention, but being no less important, are the other variations in the Greek version.<sup>6</sup> They fall into three categories: 1) different readings of the text or variants of another *Vorlage* with no interpretative significance;<sup>7</sup> 2) stylistic alignments and smoothing of the text;<sup>8</sup> 3) significant interpretative variants of content which emphasise the roles of Saul and Samuel (v. 4, 6, 9, 12, and 15).<sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 76; Samuel R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel: With an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography* (2d ed; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 85; the second Hebrew phrase is attested in 4Q51 (see below).

<sup>6</sup> Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 76–7; Siegfried Kreuzer and Martin Meiser, “Basileion I / Regnorum I / Das erste Buch der Königtümer / Das erste Buch Samuel,” in *Genesis bis Makkabäer* (vol. 1 of *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*; ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 745–807, here pp. 765–7. For the inner Greek variants see Terry L. Eves, “One Ammonite Invasion or Two? 1 Sam 10:27–11:2 in the Light of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *WTJ* 44 (1982): 308–26, here pp. 311–12. Only the doublet in the ‘Lucianic’ text (boc<sub>2</sub>e<sub>2</sub>) at the transition of 1 Sam 10:27 to 11:1 is of some interest. It witnesses the reading of MT (**καὶ ἐγένηθη ὡς κωφευ[γ]ῶν**) as well as of LXX (**καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ μῆνα ἡμερῶν**) and is most likely due to a secondary alignment to MT; see Eugene Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978), 69–70, 169–70; Eves, “Ammonite Invasion,” 317, 322–3.

<sup>7</sup> V. 2 “over Israel” instead of “over all Israel”; v. 5 “early” (**הַבֶּקֶר**) instead of “of the cattle” (**הַבְּקָר**), cf. v. 11; v. 7 “to scream” (**וַיִּצְעַק**) instead of “to go out” (**וַיֵּצֵא**), maybe with reference to Judges (Judg 4:3 etc.); v. 8 “in Bezek” misunderstood or interpreted as a personal name, in some manuscripts the Bama of Gibeah (1 Sam 10:5) is added as location; v. 9 sing. “he spoke,” MT pl. “they spoke”; v. 11 “Ammonites” instead of “Ammon,” cf. 4Q51 10:6.

<sup>8</sup> 1 Sam 10:26 + “sons” (**טוֹיֹי דְּנֻבָּאֵי**) in alignment with “the sons of Belial” in v. 27 (cf. also Judg 21:10); 1 Sam 11:1 + “the Ammonites”; v. 2 + object “covenant” according to v. 1; v. 3 “men of Jabesh” instead of “elders” according to v. 1; v. 6 “of the Lord” (**יְהוָה**) instead of “God,” cf. v. 7, 13 (also 10:26); v. 7 the definite article before “messengers” is omitted so as not to confuse them with the messengers from Jabesh-Gilead; v. 7 + (people of) “Israel” to exclude confusion with “people” in 4–5 and to create a connection to v. 8; v. 8 “every man of Israel” instead of “sons of Israel”; v. 9 “Jabesh” instead of Jabesh-Gilead as in v. 3; + “to the city”; v. 10 + “to Naas the Ammonite”; “to do good” instead of “according to all the good”; v. 12 “not rule,” rhetorical question in the MT.

<sup>9</sup> In v. 4 the messengers from Jabesh-Gilead travel directly to Saul; v. 6 anger + “over them”; v. 9 “the help” instead of “help”; v. 12 “hand over” sing., MT pl. (together with Samuel and soldiers); v. 15 (in alignment with V. 14) Samuel is the one who makes Saul king (sing. instead of pl.), and he is celebrating the feast together with Israel (the changes cannot be explained only as a scribal error from **שָׂם אֶת שְׂאוֹל** and **שָׂם שְׂאוֹל** in

The transition from chapter 10 to chapter 11 is also preserved in the manuscript 4Q51 (4QSam<sup>a</sup>) col. 10. The final and official edition of the Qumran fragments of Samuel has been available in DJD XVII since 2005. Better readings of our text, however, can be found in Frank Moore Cross's "preliminary" edition, which is to be preferred in all cases where the editions deviate from one another.<sup>10</sup> Line 9 in this manuscript reads *וַיְהִי כַּמִּחְרִישׁ כִּמוֹ הַדָּשׁ* directly before 1 Sam 11:1 and not *וַיְהִי כַּמִּחְרִישׁ*. In addition, the manuscript gives evidence of a plus inserted between the last sentence in 10:27 – *וְלֹא־הֵבִיאוּ לוֹ מִנְחָה* ("And they brought him no gift") – and the note in question *וַיְהִי כַּמִּחְרִישׁ* or *וַיְהִי כִּמוֹ הַדָּשׁ*. The plus provides an additional episode according to which Nahash, the king of the Ammonites, first suppresses the Gadites and Reubenites and then, with the exception of 7000 men who are able to escape to Jabesh-Gilead, gouges out their right eyes. "About a month later" (*וַיְהִי כִּמוֹ הַדָּשׁ*) he turns his attention to Jabesh-Gilead itself. The story in 1 Sam 11:1 begins at this point, whereby v. 1a (*וַיַּעַל נַחֲשׁ הַחֹשׁ הַעֲמוֹנִי וַיַּחֲזֵק עַל יְבִישׁ [גַּלְעָד]*) is added above the line.

The manuscript occasionally deviates from the Masoretic text also in the following. Consistent with the Septuagint, the text in col. 10b–c:5 (1 Sam 11:9) reads the article before the word "help" (MT *הַשׁוּפָּעָה*, Q *הַתְּשׁוּעָה*, LXX *ἡ σωτηρία*), but in contrast to MT and LXX, it also has a plus at the same place: help comes *מִיְהוָה* "from the Lord."<sup>11</sup> The text in col. 10b–c:7 (1 Sam 11:10) is consistent with MT, which is shown by the spaces in the gap, and does not have the addition which is found in LXX (*πρὸς Ναααὶ τὸν Ἀμμωνίτην*). Finally, it seems that the manuscript

v. 15b). On the same lines are the alignments in v. 6 "of the Lord" (YHWH) instead of "God"; and v. 7 + (people of) "Israel."

<sup>10</sup> Frank Moore Cross, "The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Missing Verses from 1 Samuel 11 Found in 4Q Samuel<sup>a</sup>," in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel: Proceedings of the IOSCS, Wien 1980* (ed. Emanuel Tov; Jerusalem: Academ, 1980), 105–19; repr. in *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures* (ed. Hayim Tadmor and Moshe Weinfeld; Jerusalem: Magnes Press–Hebrew University, 1983); Frank Moore Cross et al., eds., *Qumran Cave IV: 12: 1–2. Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005). Readings of DJD in col. 10a which are to be corrected: 1 *בְּכָל הַעַם*; 2 *הֵן מְלוּכָה*; 7 *אֵימָה וּפְחָד* [עַל 7]; 8 *בְּעֵבֶר*, [וְיִשְׂרָאֵל] (or *וְיִשְׂרָאֵל עַל* [וְיִשְׂרָאֵל עַל]), as is read by Ronnie Goldstein, "More on the Story about Nahash in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>: Its Purpose and Diffusion," *Shnaton* 22 (2013): 17–26 [in Hebrew], 8 *בְּעֵבֶר*, [וְיִשְׂרָאֵל עַל]; 9 *וַיַּחֲזֵק עַל יְבִישׁ [גַּלְעָד]*; 10 *וַיַּעַל נַחֲשׁ הַחֹשׁ הַעֲמוֹנִי כִּרְתָּהּ* [לְנֹו]. In col. 10b–c DJD fills in the gaps according to the LXX, which of course does not count in view of the complex evidence and can in no way be justified; see for instance col. 10b–c:7 (1 Sam 11:10) where it obviously doesn't work.

<sup>11</sup> Also in 1 Sam 10:25–27, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> 10a:3–4 (*לְמַקְוֵמוֹן*) agrees with LXX (*εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ; οἱ τοὺς δυνάμεων ὧν ἦγατο κύριος*) and disagrees with MT (*לְבֵיתוֹ*).

also had a somewhat longer text here and there, which is to be found neither in MT nor in LXX (col. 10b-c:5).<sup>12</sup>

Last but not least, a fourth version of the text is provided by Josephus in the sixth book of his *Antiquitates Judaicae*.<sup>13</sup> This version is rather a paraphrase than a rendering of 1 Sam 11 containing all sorts of embellishments and explanations. However, this version is significant because it also contains the additional episode at the transition from chapter 10 to chapter 11, which the manuscript 4QSam<sup>a</sup> provides in Hebrew. In Josephus the episode is not inserted between the last two sentences of 1 Sam 10:27 but follows after them. However, Josephus does not assume the Masoretic reading  $\text{וַיְהִי כְּמִחְרָשׁ}$  but offers the same time indication, “after about a month” ( $\text{Μηνὶ δ' ὕστερον}$ ), as the Septuagint and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. The additional episode here is the start of the war with Saul, and Josephus is anticipating Saul’s brilliant victory already at this point. As in the Qumran manuscript Nahash is also called “king of the Ammonites” which doesn’t occur in the Masoretic text. Instead of the offence against the Gadites and Reubenites, Josephus speaks of a military expedition against all Jews “beyond the Jordan” and describes how Nahash has conquered and enslaved their towns. Anyone surrendering to him or in his power as prisoner of war will have their right eye gouged out. The measure is justified on the grounds that this will make them unfit for war. In the course of his campaign Nahash finally turns on the Gileadites and their capital city Jabesh. This is where the paraphrase of 1 Sam 11 begins, which places the attack on Jabesh-Gilead in the larger context of the military action against Israelite cities on both sides of the Jordan. The paraphrase of Josephus concludes with a summary on the changeover from the epoch of Judges to the period of kingship.

#### TEXTUAL CRITICISM

That is as far as the textual evidence goes. Now we come to the question of how to explain this evidence, especially the additional episode attested by 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus. There are two opposing positions in

<sup>12</sup> Remains are still preserved in col. 10b-c:6 – between 1 Sam 11:9 (l. 5) and 11:10 (l. 7) ( $\text{לְכֶם פָּתַחוּ הַשְּׁנַעַר}$ ), the following line is broken off. The reading of col. 10a:9–10 in DJD ( $\text{מִלֶּךְ בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן}$ ) is to be excluded on palaeographical grounds; probably the  $\text{עַמּוֹנִי}$  filled the gap at the beginning of line 10 (= 1 Sam 11:1) with the plus of LXX and in alignment with v. 2 in MT (Eves 1982, 316 erroneously localises the plus in v. 2). Again, in 1 Sam 10:27, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> ( $\text{וּבְנֵי הַבְּלִיעֵל}$ ) with the definite article) disagrees with the MT ( $\text{וּבְנֵי בְלִיעֵל}$ ) and LXX ( $\text{οἱ τοῦμοι}$ ).

<sup>13</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 6:67–85.

scholarship.<sup>14</sup> One assumes that the long version in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus represents the original version,<sup>15</sup> the other, that it is secondary.<sup>16</sup> The debate cannot and does not have to be given here in detail. I will restrict myself to the key issues and begin with the text critical approach.

In terms of textual criticism, the discussion is very much focussed on the transition from chapter 10 to chapter 11, especially on the variants at the end of 1 Sam 10:27: וַיְהִי כְּמֹחַר־יָשׁ (according to MT) or וַיְהִי כְּמוֹ חֹדֶשׁ (according to LXX, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus). Cross and others believe that the reading וַיְהִי כְּמוֹ חֹדֶשׁ is original, and explain the differences between long and short versions in terms of mechanical scribal errors. To prove this, one would have to explain how one version materialised out of the other. This is, however, not easy, since the time indication in the different versions occurs in three different places: in LXX between 1 Sam 10:27 and 11:1, in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> following the additional

<sup>14</sup> See Dietrich, *Samuel*, 502–3.

<sup>15</sup> Cross, “Ammonite Oppression”; idem, “Original Biblical Text Reconstructed from Newly Found Fragments,” *BRev* 1/3 (1985): 26–35; Cross et al., *Qumran Cave IV: 12: 1–2. Samuel*; Ulrich, *Qumran Text*; Peter K. McCarter, *1 Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes & Commentary* (AB 8; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1980), 199 (erroneously added to the other position by Armin Lange, *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (vol. 1 of *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer*; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 219–20 n. 33); Eves, “Ammonite Invasion”; Tracy M. Lemos, “Shame and Mutilation of Enemies in the Hebrew Bible,” *JBL* 125 (2006): 225–41, here p. 229 n. 11; Lange, *Handschriften biblischer Bücher*, 219–20 (following Tov); Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 311–13.

<sup>16</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament: I. Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther* (OBO 50/1; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982); Alexander Rofé, “The Acts of Nahash According to 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *IEJ* 32 (1982): 129–33; idem, “4QMidrash Samuel? – Observations Concerning the Character of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *Textus* 19 (1998): 63–74; idem, “Midrashic Traits in 4Q51 (so-called 4QSam<sup>a</sup>),” in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (ed. Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker; VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 75–88; see also Edward D. Herbert, “4QSam<sup>a</sup> and its Relationship to the LXX: An Exploration in Stemmatological Analysis,” in *IX Congress of the IOSCS, Cambridge 1995* (ed. Bernard A. Taylor; SBLSCS 45; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1997), 37–55; Zecharia Kallai, “Samuel in Qumran: Expansion of a Historiographical Pattern (4QSam<sup>a</sup>),” *RB* 103 (1996): 581–91; Alessandro Catastini, “Su alcune varianti qumraniche nel testo di Samuele,” *Henoah* 2 (1980): 267–84; idem, “4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: II. Nahash il ‘serpente,’” *Henoah* 10 (1988): 17–49; Simone Venturini, “1 Sam 10,27–11,1: Testo masoretico e 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. Le posizioni di alcuni autori e un tentativo di soluzione,” *RivB* 44 (1996): 397–425; for a summary of the discussion, see Stephen Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Masoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO 57; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 91–8; James A. Sanders, “Hermeneutics of Text Criticism,” *Textus* 18 (1995): 1–26, here pp. 20–6; Dietrich, *Samuel*, 503–4.

episode before 1 Sam 11:1, and in Josephus before the addition, i.e. between 1 Sam 10:27 and the addition.

Since Cross believes 4QSam<sup>a</sup> to be original, he assumes that the Josephus *Vorlage* is corrupted. Due to a “so-called vertical dittography,” the statement ויהי כמו חדש (or ויהי כמחדש) was repeated in the beginning of the additional paragraph so that both sections, the addition and 1 Sam 11:1 are introduced by the same time indication. The versions in MT and LXX developed out of this corrupted text as an occurrence of “haplography owing to homoioteleuton” (actually it was rather a case of homoiarkton) and corrupted once more in MT to ויהי כמחר(י)ש.<sup>17</sup> The version in Josephus, which deviates from MT and LXX as well as 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, is not explained further by Cross.<sup>18</sup> It is obvious that this highly speculative, purely hypothetical explanation is very uncertain and, moreover, presupposes what needs to be proved from the outset: the originality of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

The same applies to the hypothesis considered by Terry Eves, which is based on the Lucianic textual witness; a hypothesis which Eves himself immediately rejects on the basis of the historical textual assumptions made by Cross.<sup>19</sup> According to this hypothesis the original text would have contained both variants, MT and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, and the scribe jumped from the Masoretic ויהי כמחר(י)ש in 1 Sam 10:27 to the time indication ויהי כמו חדש (or ויהי כמחדש) at the beginning of 1 Sam 11:1 and thus caused the omission of the 4QSam<sup>a</sup> surplus. This explanation also operates with a hypothetical version of the text from which the present versions are derived, and, apart from that, incurs the problem of having to explain the omission of ויהי כמחר(י)ש in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

Since a haplography on the basis of the surviving textual evidence cannot be verified,<sup>20</sup> Cross also gave an alternative explanation for the omission of the additional episode. He suggested an *aberratio oculi*, in which the eye of the scribe jumped from the beginning of the surplus (וַיְהִי כַּמֶּלֶךְ בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן) “[And Na]hash, the king of the Ammonites”) to the beginning of 1 Sam 11:1 וַיַּעַל נַחֲשׁ הָעַמּוֹנִי “And Nahash the Ammonite marched up”).<sup>21</sup> But since the two beginnings are not identical, this explanation is also speculative. This eventually led David Freedman and

<sup>17</sup> Cross, “Ammonite Oppression,” 153.

<sup>18</sup> Pisano, *Additions or Omissions*, 97–8.

<sup>19</sup> Eves, “Ammonite Invasion,” 321–3, on the doublet see above footnote 6.

<sup>20</sup> McCarter, *I Samuel*, 199: “The omission apparently was not haplographic – there seems to be nothing in the text to have triggered it. A scribe simply skipped an entire paragraph of his text.”

<sup>21</sup> Cross, “Ammonite Oppression,” 153; Eves, “Ammonite Invasion,” 323–4.

Shawna Overton to make the desperate assumption that the letter *waw*, with which both sections begin, constituted a homoioarkton and caused the omission of the episode in question in MT and LXX.<sup>22</sup> The fact that there is no evidence of a mechanical scribal error cannot be demonstrated more clearly. If, however, one stays with the surviving evidence and applies standard text-critical rules, one has to say that MT is the *lectio brevior et difficilior*. While this does not automatically mean that this reading is also original, it should, nevertheless, prevent one from too much bias against MT.<sup>23</sup> The decision depends on which of the readings lets itself to be derived easiest from the other.

For this purpose we return to the placement of the relevant variants שׁוֹמְרוֹתֵינוּ (MT) or וַיְהִי כַּמּוֹ חֲדָשׁ (LXX, 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, Josephus). In the placement MT agrees with LXX and Josephus but not with 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. Since Josephus also contains the plus found in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, one can rule out that the placement of the note in question has been caused by the absence of the surplus in MT and LXX. It is much easier to explain the placement of the note in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> by a secondary insertion of the additional episode, which in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> was inserted just *before* the relevant note and which, in contrary, in the (Hebrew or Greek) *Vorlage* of Josephus or even by himself was inserted and reformulated *after* the note.<sup>24</sup> Thus, the difference between Josephus and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in the placement of the time indication (before or after the additional episode) speaks for a secondary intervention.<sup>25</sup> The converse process of a secondary transposition of the time indication from the end of the additional episode to the front – which, for various reasons, would have fortuitously led to the same result in Josephus (with the plus) on the one hand, MT and LXX (without the plus) on the other – is more unlikely and would be much more difficult to explain. In my opinion, this possibility is only worth considering for Josephus, who condenses both of Nahash's attacks into one large-scale expedition against

<sup>22</sup> David N. Freedman and Shawna D. Overton, "Omitting the Omissions: The Case for Haplography in the Transmission of the Biblical Texts," in *"Imagining" Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan* (ed. David M. Gunn and Paula M. McNutt; JSOTSup 359; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 99–116, here p. 103.

<sup>23</sup> Thus Eves, "Ammonite Invasion," 321: "Theoretically, three possibilities exist: (1) that the MT reading is original; (2) that both were in the *Urtext*; and (3) that the Qumran reading is original. The first possibility is the weakest of the three."

<sup>24</sup> The latter suggestion is supported by the differences between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus in the additional episode, which are essentially caused by Josephus. See section "The Textual Evidence" above.

<sup>25</sup> Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 171.

all Jews in the Transjordan, which results in the omission of the tribes and the 7000 refugees from Gad and Reuben as well as some other deviations.

All things considered, the text-critical analysis leads to the relative chronology: MT – LXX – 4QSam<sup>a</sup> – Josephus. Even the beginning of 1 Sam 11:1, which is added over the line in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, seems to me to be more an indication of a secondary insertion of the surplus. The scribe might have first transposed the plus (perhaps from the edge of the manuscript or from a second *Vorlage*) into his manuscript, and then – because of the homoioteleuton ויבאו אל/על [י]בש גלעד – jumped over 1 Sam 11:1a and consequently had to add the text over the line.<sup>26</sup> In any case, this explanation is much more likely than the converse assumption that the addition over the line in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is an indication of an omission of the surplus in MT and LXX.<sup>27</sup> Finally, one should recall that the first Nahash episode in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus is not the only plus, but that both versions show further additions at different places – all of which speaks for a secondary addition.

The discussion concerning the placement of the variant is otherwise regarded as being independent of the question on which reading is original. Here Dominique Barthélemy and Alexander Rofé have raised strong objections to the usual conjecture of MT. They are of the opinion that the *lectio difficilior* יָהִי כְמִתְּרִישׁ in MT is original, compared with the readings of LXX, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus.<sup>28</sup> This assumption is supported by the nearer context, in particular the comment in 1 Sam 10:16, according to which Saul is silent on the matter of the kingship. 1 Sam 10:27 concerns the public debate on whether or not Saul is a suitable “saviour” of Israel, which, in view of the ending of the subsequent narrative, has already Saul’s kingship in mind (1 Sam 11:12). And again, Saul (still) says nothing, but remains “mute.”<sup>29</sup>

<sup>26</sup> The error, a classic case of haplography due to homoioteleuton, is obvious when in the 4QSam<sup>a</sup> *Vorlage*, like the MT, the name Jabesh in 1 Sam 11:1a (as before at the conclusion of the addition in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> 10:9a) was written first defective and then plene in the following. With the supralinear addition the scribe certainly oriented himself on the plene orthography in 1 Sam 11:1b.

<sup>27</sup> Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 168–9.

<sup>28</sup> Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 166–72; Rofé, “Acts of Nahash,” 132–3; see also Kallai, “Samuel in Qumran,” 588.

<sup>29</sup> Somewhat differently Rofé, “Acts of Nahash,” 133, who points out Saul’s shyness in 1 Sam 10:22 and his trust in God in the manner of Ps 38:14–16; this may also have played a part in Saul’s “silence.” For more possibilities of understanding the text see the literature above, footnote 4.

It is therefore quite possible that in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint, which shows a tendency of smoothing throughout 1 Sam 11, the time indication at the transition of 1 Sam 10 to 11:1 represents such smoothing. From here, it could have reached the text in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> as well as the Josephus *Vorlage* before or at the same time as the additional episode. It is also possible that the alteration of וַיְהִי כִּמְהָרִישׁ (MT) to וַיְהִי כִּמוֹ חֲדָשׁ or וַיְהִי כִּמְהָדָשׁ (LXX, 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, Josephus) originated only in the process of the formulation of the additional episode in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, where the time indication “makes perfect sense” (Cross). From here it penetrated the other versions.<sup>30</sup> Although the absence of the surplus in the Septuagint speaks against this theory, its text can be explained (according to Eugene Ulrich) as a subsequent, if only partial, alignment with MT – in other words, not a scribal error.<sup>31</sup> But I will not completely rule out the other possibility, that the text in MT was produced from the reading in LXX, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus by a scribal error (a mix-up of ד and ר) and a corresponding reading or interpretation of ש-ה-ר-שׁ as Hif’il participle.

Further differences between the surviving text versions show that a number of intermediate steps are to be expected in all this.<sup>32</sup> Variants are encountered in almost all possible configurations, whereby Josephus, due to its free paraphrasing, plays a special role: MT with LXX, and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>; MT against LXX and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>; MT with LXX against 4QSam<sup>a</sup>; MT with 4QSam<sup>a</sup> against LXX; MT against LXX and both against 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. The possible smoothing of the difficult reading וַיְהִי כִּמְהָרִישׁ in 1 Sam 10:27 (MT) in the (*Vorlage* of the) Septuagint as well as the insertion of the additional episode in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus and their revision in Josephus fit into the picture of the remaining deviations in the textual witnesses.<sup>33</sup> This also results in the relative chronology: MT – LXX – 4QSam<sup>a</sup> – Josephus. Ultimately the textual evidence found in 1 Sam 11 is not without significance for the historical text assessment of the 4QSam<sup>a</sup> version as a whole. It speaks – as do other passages in the same manuscript – against a stemmatics of the textual witnesses which is all too one-sided and the hypothesis that 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, LXX (Old Greek), and

<sup>30</sup> Rofé, “Acts of Nahash,” 133.

<sup>31</sup> Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 169–70, who suspects that the OG (Old Greek) contained the episode (with time indication) and therefore G (LXX) was changed on the basis of MT.

<sup>32</sup> See section “The Textual Evidence” above.

<sup>33</sup> Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 168: “J has simply drawn this datum from its original situation and used it as part of his topic sentence, keeping the reader’s mind on the main thread of his story (Saul’s rise to kingship). He has done this often ...”

Josephus (and Chronicles) represents the same type of text in every case and are more original than MT.<sup>34</sup>

#### TENDENCY CRITICISM

In scholarship, aspects of style, content and tendency which are supposed to support one position or the other are also discussed. Strictly speaking, these aspects do not belong to textual criticism; they touch instead on issues of tendency and redaction criticism. And therefore one calls on the Deuteronomistic vocabulary and style of the surplus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> which is in part unique in 1 Sam 11, also on the function of the additional episode as an introduction which is necessary for understanding the abrupt inception of the narrative in 1 Sam 11, and on historical facts. Everything is supposed to prove the originality and historical plausibility, and even the historicity of the additional episode. According to Cross: “All in all, the text as preserved in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> makes excellent narrative and historical sense, as part of the Deuteronomistic work.”<sup>35</sup>

Barthélemy and Rofé have rightly raised objections to the above conclusion by pointing out that exactly the same arguments can also be applied in favour of the opposite position.<sup>36</sup> The characteristics of the additional episode can be understood as secondary alignments of the awkward story in 1 Sam 11 and for the purpose of incorporating the narrative in the context of the Deuteronomistic work. In addition, linguistic arguments such as the interpretation of the *we-qatal* forms as absolute infinitives or the explanation of the phrase ויהי כמו הדש (or ויהי כמחדש respectively) as “an archaic expression” by pointing out that the parallel of Gen 38:24 does not stand up to close examination;<sup>37</sup> the language of the whole passage in question is rather late.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>34</sup> See Eves, “Ammonite Invasion,” 316–17, 324–5, who, however, adheres to the priority of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> over all other witnesses. Contrary Alexander Rofé, “The Nomistic Correction in Biblical Manuscripts in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *RevQ* 54 (1989): 247–54; idem, “4QMidrash Samuel?”; idem, “Midrashic Traits”; for the discussion see Jong-Hoon Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königebücher: Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1–19,9* (BZAW 394; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009).

<sup>35</sup> Cross, “Ammonite Oppression,” 153–8, quotation p. 157. See also Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, 167–8; Eves, “Ammonite Invasion,” 318–21; Pisano, *Additions or Omissions*, 93–4.

<sup>36</sup> See footnote 16 above.

<sup>37</sup> Cross, “Ammonite Oppression,” 150–1, 155, is aware of the linguistic and orthographic problems but nevertheless decides for the originality and an old age of the text.

<sup>38</sup> Rofé, “Acts of Nahash,” 133 n. 17; Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 167–8.





satisfactorily link up to the situation in Judg 21. The problem is that, according to Judg 21:8–15, all people in Jabesh-Gilead were killed, including the women and children (v. 10–11) with the exception of four hundred virgins (v. 12), who were handed over to the tribe of Benjamin to enable this tribe to survive and return to the community of the people of Israel. When the attentive reader reaches 1 Sam 11 he or she must have wondered whom in Jabesh-Gilead did Nahash the Ammonite actually attack and whose eyes did he want to gouge out since, according to Judg 21, no one survived and lived there anymore.

And so it seems that the attentive reader became a glossator and invented the episode with the Gadites and Reubenites living in the land of Gilead, of whom 7000 fled to Jabesh-Gilead, which repopulated the city, and so the narrative of 1 Sam 11 was able to take its course. The choice of Gadites and Reubenites, who, according to Num 32 (and Josh 22:32–34), lived in the land of Gilead, is explained by the fact that in Judg 20–21 a distinction is made between the Israelites in the land of Gilead, who took part in the gathering of the tribes of Israel in Mizpah “as one man” (Judg 20:1), and the men of Jabesh-Gilead, none of whom appeared (Judg 21:8–9) which lead to the brutal reaction. This also clarifies what is expressed somewhat indistinctly in Judg 21:8. Judges 21 enquires after “one of the tribes of Israel” and in its answer names the absent, then murdered, men of Jabesh Gilead. So the question could arise whether or not Jabesh-Gilead belongs to the tribes of Israel. The additional episode attested by 4QSam<sup>a</sup> makes clear that at least in 1 Sam 11 the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead are members of the tribe of Gad and Reuben, i.e. Israelites, on whose behalf Saul and the people of Israel go to war “as one man.”

In short: I would like to suggest that the surplus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> at the transition of 1 Sam 10–11 was added due to the exegetical effort to solve a problem that could arise from reading the sacred history in context. The city of Jabesh-Gilead, which was devoid of inhabitants according to Judg 21, needed to be filled with people again in order to be attacked by Nahash. At the same time, the city had to be explicitly and irrefutably populated by Israelites (Gadites and Reubenites) in order to justify the intervention of Saul and the people of Israel “as one man.”

If this explanation is correct or at least plausible, then it is even more conspicuous that, in his version of the surplus, Josephus does not mention either the Gadites and Reubenites or the 7000 refugees, who saved themselves by fleeing to Jabesh-Gilead. Again, this does not speak for the originality of the additional episode. Rather, this deviation can be

explained by the composition of Josephus' work. It is worthwhile to take this composition into account in some detail because it demonstrates that Josephus is not just a textual witness for the additional episode but is reworking or rewriting the whole story.

In his *Antiquitates Judaicae* Josephus also relates the story in Judg 19–21 but in a different context. He places the story at the beginning of the period of the Judges in order to use the worse deed of atrocity to introduce the epoch of lawlessness, which came before the establishment of the monarchy. He also reports the complete obliteration of the city of Jabesh-Gilead with the exception of the four hundred virgins for the six hundred survivors of the tribe of Benjamin.<sup>48</sup> The transposition, however, means that the narrative in 1 Sam 11 is not preceded any more by Judg 19–21 but by Judge Jair from Gilead and the confrontation of the Gileadites with the Ammonites and by the “king of the Ammonites” under Jephthah in Judg 10–11.<sup>49</sup> Here Josephus speaks mainly of the Gilead region, but the cities of Gilead are also mentioned under Judge Jair and they seem to be intact (again). This means that, when reproducing 1 Sam 11, Josephus can readily speak of Jabesh-Gilead as the capital city of Gilead<sup>50</sup> without having to consider the problem of the re-population, even if he had been aware of it.

The deviation goes hand in hand with the other accents that Josephus sets in the reproduction of 1 Sam 11 as well as in the additional episode. For his contemporary readers, he, as usual, comments and clarifies in a rational manner the seemingly odd features of the story – the gouging out of eyes, the Gileadites request to be allowed to send for military help before Nahash's attack, or the cutting up of the yoke of oxen and the sending of the pieces throughout Israel. But this is not the only thing he does; more importantly, he conflates the attacks against the Gadites and Reubenites and the war of Jabesh-Gilead into a single campaign. In 1 Sam 11:1 the men of Jabesh-Gilead offer to make a covenant with Nahash “to serve” him (כָּרַת-לָנוּ בְרִית וְנַעֲבֹדָהּ). This is interpreted by Josephus as Nahash leading the Transjordanian cities into slavery: “He also reduced their cities into slavery (καὶ τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν εἰς δουλείαν ὑπάγεται), and that not only by subduing them for the present, which he did by force and violence, but by weakening them by subtlety and cunning that they might not be able afterward to get clear of the slavery they

<sup>48</sup> Josephus, Ant. 5.164, 168.

<sup>49</sup> Josephus, Ant. 5. 254ff.

<sup>50</sup> Josephus, Ant. 6.71; 5.74, 76; 5.79–80.

were under to him (πρὸς τὸ μηδ' αὔθις ἀποστάντας δυνηθῆναι τὴν ὑπ' αὐτῶ δουλείαν διαφυγεῖν): for he put out the right eyes of those that either delivered themselves to him upon terms, or were taken by him in war." (Ant. 6.69) In doing so, Josephus tries to make the story more understandable, which to some extent is already the function of the variants in the Septuagint and the surplus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

However, Josephus also pursues his own goals. With the victory over Nahash and the renewed public elevation of Saul as king in 1 Sam 11 he completes the epochal transition from the era of the Judges to that of Kings: "And so the government of the Hebrews was changed into a regal government. For in the days of Moses and his disciple Joshua, who was their general, they continued under an aristocracy; but after the death of Joshua, for eighteen years in all, the multitude had no settled form of government, but were in an anarchy; after which they returned to their former government, they then permitted themselves to be judged by him who appeared to be the best warrior and most courageous, whence it was that they called this interval of their government the Judges" (Ant. 6.83–85). The era of Judges is explicitly described as a period of anarchy. Serving this purpose is the transposition of the infamous action of the Benjamites in Judg 19–21 to the beginning of the era of Judges, where the lawlessness and anarchy begins only to end with the liberation of Jabesh-Gilead from the equally bloodthirsty Nahash under Saul, and allows it to flow into the period of kingship.

#### LITERARY AND REDACTIONAL CRITICISM

Josephus' explicit reflection of the transition from the period of Judges to the period of Kings undoubtedly arose out of a redactional creative design. Like the rewriting of the biblical *Vorlage* of 1 Sam 11 and the transition from Judg 17–21, which forges a bridge between the taking of Jabesh-Gilead at the beginning of the period of Judges to liberation under Saul, this can also be seen as a kind of editing of the biblical text. After considering textual and tendency criticism, we thus come to redactional criticism, which, in my opinion, provides confirmation of the assumption that, with the surplus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus, we are not dealing with the original text, but with a secondary addition.

The relationship of the periods of Judges and Kings, which Josephus reflects in his way at the end of his paraphrase of 1 Sam 11, also plays an important role in the other versions (MT, LXX, 4QSam<sup>a</sup>). Pointing

back – usually indirectly – to the period of Judges, they, however, do not so much force the changeover of epochs as establish a link between Saul’s kingdom and the Judges of Israel and the pre-history of the kingdom under Samuel.

That we are dealing with a redactional matter here can be seen from a few significant variants of the Septuagint, which place Saul and Samuel at the centre of events.<sup>51</sup> In 1 Sam 11:4 the variants let the messengers from Jabesh-Gilead travel directly to Saul, whereas in MT they arrive by chance in the city where Saul, who lives there, is just coming back from the fields. In v. 6 it is not the spirit of “God,” but of the “Lord,” in other words of YHWH, that comes over Saul, as it did over the Judges of Israel.<sup>52</sup> The anger that then flares up is aimed specifically “against them,” i.e. against the Ammonites.<sup>53</sup> In v. 9 there is not the prospect of unspecific help but “the help” which is already familiar from the period of Judges.<sup>54</sup> In v. 12 it is not Saul and Samuel (MT plural) but Samuel alone who should hand over (LXX singular) the rebels against Saul’s kingship. This emphasises Samuel’s responsibility for the events. Correspondingly in v. 15 – following 1 Sam 9–10 – Samuel and not the people anoints Saul as king before the Lord and in the celebrations that follow he is mentioned specifically with the people. At the same time this takes the edge off the announcement in 10:8, according to which Saul has to wait with the sacrifice until Samuel comes to Gilgal, which does not happen till 13:7–14.

The allusions to the period of Judges, however, are much more obvious in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. We have already discussed the narrative gap in Judg 19–21 regarding the population of Jabesh-Gilead which is filled by the additional episode. In addition there are two significant verbal parallels. The most important is the expression “oppressed by force” (קהקח ... חץ), which is only to be found in one other place in the Hebrew Bible, namely

<sup>51</sup> See footnote 9 above.

<sup>52</sup> Judg 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 14:6, 19.

<sup>53</sup> According to the most obvious subject this deals with Saul’s anger and not YHWH’s. See 1 Sam 19:22 (+ και ἐθυμώθη ὀργῇ Σαουλ); 20:30 (και ἐθυμώθη ὀργῇ Σαουλ ἐπὶ [= כ] ... + σφόδρα); also 18:8; the scene in 1 Sam 11:6 recalls Gen 39:19. The “anger” also builds a bridge to the period of Judges, but in the plus of the LXX no particular link can be detected: see Judg 9:30; 14:19; the anger of YHWH, which burns against the Israelites: Judg 2:14, 20; 3:8 (rendered as και ὀργίσθη θυμῷ κύριος ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ, with the dative case in 2:14 ms A for בישראל); 10:7 (και ἐθυμώθη ὀργῇ κύριος ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ; with ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς [= עליהם] 2 Chron 32:26).

<sup>54</sup> Judg 15:18; see also 2 Sam 19:3; without the definite article 1 Sam 19:5; 2 Sam 23:10, 12.

in Judg 4:3, and therefore cannot be dismissed as a Deuteronomistic topos, but clearly refers to the period of Judges.<sup>55</sup> Also, although the title “king of the Ammonites” (מֶלֶךְ בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן) corresponds to the usual introduction of a king in the Deuteronomistic work, it has its closest parallels in the story of Jephthah in Judg 11:12–14, 28 and in 1 Sam 12:12 (as well as 1 Chron 19:1 // 2 Sam 10:1).

In redactional historical terms, chapter 1 Sam 12 is of particular significance. It is known to belong to a very late literary stratum of Deuteronomistic redaction.<sup>56</sup> It shows how, even at this late stage of the “edition” of the biblical book, the periods of Judges and Kings are explicitly brought into a relationship, onto which Josephus could connect up seamlessly. In the process the editing in 1 Sam 12 makes recourse to the story of Jephthah in Judg 10–11. In v. 11 Jephthah and Samuel are named as being the last two judges before v. 12 recalls the story of 1 Sam 11. Nahash is called a “king of the Ammonites” at this point, which is, however, no argument for the originality of the additional episode in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. In contrary: Taking Judg 11 as model, the occurrence of the title “king of the Ammonites” is not surprising and the outcome of redactional activity. The *Vorlage* obviously is Judg 11 and not the additional text in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. In 4QSam<sup>a</sup> it is more a case of a continuing redactional process in which the manuscript itself, formulating the additional episode, inserts the title from 1 Sam 12:12 into 1 Sam 11. The same exegetical interests as in the relationship to Judg 21 can be detected here.

Literary critical analysis of 1 Sam 11 strongly suggests that the editing process proceeded in this direction and not in reverse. In the course of his textual analysis already Wellhausen discarded v. 12–14 in 1 Sam 11 on literary and redaction-critical grounds.<sup>57</sup> The passage includes the first

<sup>55</sup> The verb is typical for the Judges period: Judg 1:34; 2:18; 10:12 (Judg 6:9 with the Egyptians as in Ex 3:9; Deut 26:7); 1 Sam 10:18; afterwards only 2 Kings 13:22.

<sup>56</sup> Reinhard Kratz, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments: Grundwissen der Bibelkritik* (UTB.W Theologie 2157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000; trans. as *The Composition of The Narrative Books of The Old Testament* by J. Bowden; London: T&T Clark International, 2005), 177–8 (English version 172–3); Reinhard Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik* (FAT II/3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 177–96. Also Cross, “Ammonite Oppression,” was aware of the redactional historical status of 1 Sam 12 referring to the analysis of Timo Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der Deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia B/198; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977).

<sup>57</sup> Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 77; see also Peter Mommer, *Samuel: Geschichte und Überlieferung* (WMANT 65; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 113; and Dietrich, *Samuel*, 494–5.

acclamation of Saul as king at Mizpah (10:24) and the resistance to this in 1 Sam 10:17–27, and balances this episode with 1 Sam 11: the outcome of Saul’s elevation at Gilgal (11:15) was the “renewal” of the kingdom of Mizpah (11:14). The possibly original closing remark in 10:27 וַיְהִי כְּמַחֲרֵי יָשׁ (see section “The Textual Evidence” above) as response to the resistance to the first public proclamation of Saul as king, records Saul’s silence in 10:15–16 once more and prepares for a reiteration of the theme of the resistance in 11:12–14.

It is immediately obvious that this relationship is secondary. Without the addition of 10:17–27 and 11:12–14, the story in 1 Sam 11 – with or without the time indication – connects up seamlessly with Saul’s secret anointing by Samuel in 1 Sam 9:1–10:16. Saul does “whatever his hand finds to do” (עָשָׂה לְךָ אֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָא יָדְךָ) as it is expressed so beautifully in 10:7. Wellhausen comments: “There is a very clear and psychologically subtle relationship between 10:1–16 and chapter 11.”<sup>58</sup> Some commentators see an early “Samuel-Saul” storyteller at work in the secondary insertion of the episode 1 Sam 10:17–27 and its inclusion by means of 11:12–14.<sup>59</sup> But Wellhausen probably had the more correct feeling when he ascribed the addition to the same later level of redaction as 1 Sam 8 and 12. With the election by lot (10:21–22), the consultation of the Lord (10:22) and Samuel’s active involvement (10:24–25) Saul’s election by YHWH is underscored, thus distinguishing the Israelite kingdom – despite its reprehensibility – from all other nations surrounding it.<sup>60</sup>

There is a further passage in 1 Sam 11 which is on the same lines as the addition in 1 Sam 11:12–14. Here I am thinking of v. 6–8, a passage

<sup>58</sup> Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 77: “Es ist ein sehr klarer, dazu psychologisch feiner Zusammenhang zwischen 10,1–16 und c. 11”; Dietrich, *Samuel*, 433–4, relates the phrase אֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָא יָדְךָ to Saul’s battles against the Philistines (9:16; 14:47) because of 10:5. Perhaps both are correct, but on different literary levels.

<sup>59</sup> Dietrich, *Samuel*, 495.

<sup>60</sup> Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 77: “Das Interesse, welches v. 12–14 mit 10,17–27. c. 8. 10,8. c. 12. 13,7b–15a theilt, ist das, die Beteiligung Gottes u. Samuel’s an Saul’s Erhebung als möglichst unmittelbar erscheinen zu lassen. ... Doch scheint allerdings v. 15 nichts von Samuel’s Anwesenheit zu wissen: und auf c. 12 darf man sich nicht berufen, denn der Interpolator von 11,12–14 ist höchst wahrscheinlich der Vf. von c. 12.” Following this path one will, however, have to distinguish 10:8 and 13:4b, 7b–15a from the other pieces in 1 Sam 7–8; 10 and 12 as well as the additions in chapter 11. The nub of these verses (10:8; 13:4b, 7b–15a) lies in the fact that Samuel is not involved in the events in 1 Sam 11 and is not yet present at the proclamation of Saul as King in Gilgal (v. 15). Hence these verses are older and represent a first step of – Deuteronomistic – criticism of kingship in 1 Sam 7–13. See Kratz, *Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 175–9 (English version 171–4); Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft*, 119–96, esp. pp. 148–76.

which – in accordance with or inspired by the title “saviour” מושיע in v. 3 – makes Saul a figure of Judges. As with the Judges and Jephthah in particular, who fights the Ammonites (Judg 11:29), in 1 Sam 11:6 the “Spirit of God” also comes over Saul. In the LXX *Vorlage* and in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> this has consequently become the “Spirit of YHWH.”<sup>61</sup> In the same way the Levite of Ephraim in Judg 19–20 dismembered his murdered wife, so in Sam 11:7 Saul cuts up his cattle into pieces and sends these to “every district of Israel,” in order to spur Israel into action – a literary link to the period of the Judges, which might have led the glossator of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> to Judg 21 and the problem of the population of Jabesh-Gilead.<sup>62</sup> Also the mustering of the army (פקד) and the fantastic figures in 1 Sam 11:8 recall Judg 20–21 (20:15, 17; 21:9). Only the “terror of YHWH” (פחד־יהוה) is unusual, at other times it mainly falls on the enemies of Israel to defeat them. Here it does the exact opposite and causes all of Israel to rise up “as one man” and achieve the final victory.<sup>63</sup> This exception is perhaps to be explained from the (late) use of religious language, in which the “terror of God” becomes to mean “terror” before God, in other words, “fear of God” which also comes over Israel and causes it to do pious deeds.<sup>64</sup>

What the two passages – the addition in 11:12–14, which includes 10:17–27, and 11:6–8 – have in common is that Samuel and God are involved in elevating Saul to king. For this reason, it has been the case since Wellhausen that Samuel’s involvement in v. 7 (“and follow Samuel”) is often deleted along with 11:12–14.<sup>65</sup> But this still doesn’t solve the problem. With the typology associated with Judges and applied to Saul, the passage in 11:6–8 introduces a new tone in the story and interrupts the narrative thread of v. 4–5 and v. 9. Even before Saul responds to the messenger’s news in v. 4–5, the spirit of combat has already been organised

<sup>61</sup> See footnote 52 above, in particular Judg 14:6, 19 (with אף “anger”); 15:14. Cf. the identical announcement in 1 Sam 10:6, which, however, is aimed neither at 11:6 nor at any wars (be them against the Philistines or against the Ammonites), but at the prophesying in 10:10; in comparison 11:6 is completely different, and it is highly unlikely that they originate from the same hand. See also Mommer, *Samuel: Geschichte und Überlieferung*, 114.

<sup>62</sup> A further link between the additions in 1 Sam 11 and Judg 19–21, which the glossator of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> cannot have failed to notice, lies in the meeting place Mizpah in Judg 21 and 1 Sam 10:17–27.

<sup>63</sup> See Dietrich, *Samuel*, 509, who refers to 2 Chron 14:13 as a possible (!) parallel.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Ps 36:2; 119:20; and, in particular, 2 Chron 19:7 (וַעֲתָה יְהוָה פֶּחַד־יְהוָה עֲלֵיכֶם); in a verbal form Hos 3:4; Mic 7:17; Prov 28:14.

<sup>65</sup> Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 77, with reference to the relevant additions in v. 15 LXX; also Dietrich, *Samuel*, 493 n. 27, 494 n. 34, 508–9 n. 91, 94, who removes the “unhistorical” numbers in v. 8b as well (*ibid.*, 509–10).

and the army set up and mustered. Only afterwards does Saul answer the messenger. V. 9 links up consequently to v. 5 where MT (plural) lets the people from v. 4–5, Saul and Samuel from v. 7 or the Israelites and Judeans from v. 8 answer the messengers; in the Septuagint (singular) only Saul responds. It is difficult to say which reading is the original. In v. 9 MT could originally connect to v. 4 or be a later change with regard to v. 6–8; the reading of the LXX could originally connect to v. 5 or be a later focusing on Saul. But even a connection of the plural in v. 9 MT to v. 5 would be possible in view of the people mentioned here. In any case, I have the impression that v. 6–8 together with 12–14 have to be excluded as a secondary addition.<sup>66</sup>

The objection to the removal of v. 6–8 on the grounds that this robs the narrative of all religious elements,<sup>67</sup> cannot be upheld for various reasons. One reason is that then an elaborate story such as the Siloam inscription or large parts of the Joseph story should not exist. Another reason is that the story is in no way “profane” just because it did not originally mention God or YHWH. God’s involvement is assumed (cf. v. 15) but not explicated, while Saul’s explicit endowment with the spirit of God as well as Samuel’s involvement, especially in the context of 1 Sam 8–12, is characterised by the already prevailing antithesis between divine and human rule (cf. 1 Sam 10:17–27). For this reason, 1 Sam 11:6–8 resorts to the endowment of the spirit on the Judges as an antithesis to inherited kingship.

We do not have to bother ourselves with the question of whether or not the story of Saul’s victory over the Ammonites (1 Sam 11:1–5, 9–11) and his elevation to king (11:15) could be based on an older war narrative in 11:1–11 (excluding v. 6–8) of which v. 15 is still unaware.<sup>68</sup> Neither do we have to interest ourselves at this moment with whether or not the additions in v. 6–8 and 12–14 (with 10:17–27) were inscribed by one or more hands. It is much more important that we can grasp a level of redaction and editing in these additions (as in 1 Sam 7–8) which establishes a link to the period of Judges.

<sup>66</sup> Kratz, *Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 176 n. 80 (English version 172, 212 n. 27); Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft*, 151–2. See also Pfeiffer, “Sodomie in Gibeon,” 283 n. 89, who, however, removes only v. 6a, 7b, 8, אֲחֵרֵי שְׂמוֹנָה in v. 7a and, in addition, v. 2b.

<sup>67</sup> Dietrich, *Samuel*, 494, who makes the curious distinction between the literary criticism he performs (removal of v. 7, 8b, 12–14) and a “hypercriticism” of others (removal of v. 6–8). On this methodological differentiation see already Julius Wellhausen, *Revision of Friedrich Bleek, Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Vol. 1; Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift; 5th ed; Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1886), 3.

<sup>68</sup> Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft*, 148–58.

The redactional editing identifies Saul as the last judge and places particular emphasis on the involvement of God and Samuel in the events. This redaction is the second of a total of at least three redactional steps in 1 Sam 7–13. It is preceded by a first redaction in 1 Sam 10:8 and 13:4b, 7b–15a which prepares the downfall of Saul's kingdom and justifies this by his misconduct contrary to Samuel's instructions. In its own way each of the first two redactional steps – 1) 1 Sam 10:8; 13:4b, 7b–15a and 2) 1 Sam 7–8; 10:17–27; 11:6–8, 12–14 – differentiates between divine election and human kingship and wants to stress that it was the fault neither of God nor of Samuel that Saul and the kingship failed. The third redactional layer is found in 1 Sam 12, the prophet Samuel's philippic. It takes up the antithesis of divine and human kingship and, modelled on 1 Sam 10:17–27 but in even more detail, it goes into the biblical prehistory in order to document God's many acts of mercy from Exodus to the period of Judges. God's mercy is not compatible with the people's desire for a human king even if God now relents and, on the condition of obedience to the law, instates a king.

The various versions of the text in the Septuagint, in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus are tied up with this growth of the biblical text almost seamlessly and thus manifest themselves as a continuation of the redactional editing of 1 Sam 11. The variants of the Septuagint support the tendency to emphasise the direct involvement of Saul and Samuel in the events. The surplus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> ties in with the typology of Judges in 1 Sam 11:6–8 (and also 10:17–27; 11:12–14), which 1 Sam 12:11–12 also takes up, and extends the existing references to Judg 19–21. Finally, Josephus orientates himself mainly on the historical outline in 1 Sam 12 and puts the changeover from the period of Judges to that of Kings in a nutshell. However, unlike the redactions in 1 Sam 7–13 and the version in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, Josephus does not object to the introduction of kingship but, on the contrary, sees it as an act of divine care.

In short: The literary history of 1 Sam 11 and the redactional history of 1 Sam 7–13 confirm the hypothesis that the version of 1 Sam 11 in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, in particular the surplus, which is only witnessed by 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus, is not original but secondary.

#### SUMMARY AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM

The text-critical analysis has not produced any positive arguments that prove the originality of the surplus in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. On the contrary, all of the text-critical variants that differ from the Masoretic version can be

accounted for as secondary deviations and suggest the following relative chronology: MT – LXX – 4QSam<sup>a</sup> – Josephus.

The analysis of the tendency of the four text versions lead to the same result. We observe an increasing exegetical explanation and rationalisation of the events told in the source text, the Masoretic version. Here, the events begin all of a sudden and present a number of narrative gaps, which are filled in the other versions in different ways. The tendency also suggests the relative chronology of MT – LXX – 4QSam<sup>a</sup> – Josephus.

The result of the internal literary criticism of 1 Sam 11 and the redactional criticism of 1 Sam 7–13 as a whole fit ultimately into the same picture. As the literary and historical analyses show, the process of the interpretation of the narrative already began in the literary history of 1 Sam 11. The connections to the tradition in the book of Judges and the distinction between the epochs of Judges and Kings already go back to the inner-biblical exegesis. And thus the literary and redactional history of 1 Sam 11 and of the 1 Sam 7–13 complex as a whole represents the point of departure for further exegesis and implementation in the other versions of the text and confirms the hypothesis that we are dealing with younger, secondary versions.

Finally, let me mention briefly another methodological approach that has played a major role in the discussion, but which has been consciously blanked out up to now. In order to support the textual, tendency and literary criticism scholarly argumentation often uses the dating and the historical credibility of the story in 1 Sam 11 and the additional piece in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> as proof for the analysis.<sup>69</sup> I do not want to enter into the debate on historical details here as it does not contribute much to this discussion. The question of whether or not a text is primary or secondary should not be decided by absolute dating or historical speculations. These can only be postulated but not proven and therefore remain hypothetical. For this reason I advocate a strict differentiation between the relative chronology of the text genesis and the absolute dating and historical classification of a text. Where both levels of arguments are mixed together, one enters into a circle which cannot be reconstructed in the text and only consists of statements of belief.

This paper has dealt only with relative chronology. A next step would be to examine what historical information might possibly be contained

<sup>69</sup> Cross, “Ammonite Oppression”; Mommer, *Samuel: Geschichte und Überlieferung*, 110–20; and Dietrich, *Samuel*, 496–501 and passim. For the discussion see also Carl S. Ehrlich and Marsha C. White, eds., *Saul in Story and Tradition* (FAT 47; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

in the separate layers of text and – which again would have to be differentiated – into which time period the writing of the individual layers might fall. Without being able to go into this more closely, I can only hint at how this matter seems to me.

In the basic version of 1 Sam 11:1–15 (without v. 6–8, 12–14 and a few other additions) I see a reflection on the kingdom of Saul which, apart from the vague recollection of Saul as warlord, does not possess any historical value and which together with the story of Samuel's birth in 1 Sam 1:1–20, the asses-episode in 1 Sam 9:1–10; 16 and the war story in 1 Sam 13–14, is part of a legendary tradition in honour of the House of Saul, the legend of the foundation of Israelite kingship. The tradition could have originated at the time of the Northern Kingdom of Israel. In my opinion everything else in 1 Samuel and the other versions of the text is due to a subsequent inner-biblical exegesis, which links the legend of Saul after the fall of the Northern Kingdom (722 B.C.E.) with the tradition of David and is further exaggerated after the destruction of Judah (597/587 B.C.E.), at first within the Deuteronomistic History in the books of Samuel and Kings, then within the biblical sacred history in (Genesis) Exodus–Kings including the book of Judges. However, this is another story and material for a further paper.

APPENDIX

1Sam 10:27–11:2 MT

וַיְהוּדוּ לְאֵי-הִבְיֵאוּ לוֹ מִנְחָה ... וַיְהוּדוּ לְאֵי-הִבְיֵאוּ לוֹ מִנְחָה

4Q51 (4QSama) Col. 10a:5–10

5 [הוּ] וַיְהוּדוּ לְאֵי הִבְיֵאוּ לוֹ מִנְחָה. [ ] [ ]  
 6 [וּבְנֵי] מֶלֶךְ בְּנֵי עֲמוֹן הָיוּ לְחַן אֶת בְּנֵי מִדְּיָאָה בְּנֵי הַבְּאוּרִי בְּחֻזְקָה וְנִקְרָא לָהֶם כְּנָיִן  
 7 [עַוְלָן יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִתְּנָה וְפִחָה וְפִחָה] וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא מִשְׂאֵי אִישׁ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר כְּנָיִן  
 8 [הִדְרָן] אֲשֶׁר לֹא נִקְרָא לוֹ נִתְּנָה מֶלֶךְ בְּנֵי עֲמוֹן כֹּל עֵץ יִצְחָק רַק שִׁבְעַת אֲלִפְסֵי אִישׁ  
 9 [נִצְלָן מִדְּ] בְּנֵי עֲמוֹן וַיְבֹאוּ אֵלָי [יְבִישׁ] גִּלְעָד  
 וַיְהִי כִמוֹת הַדָּל  
 11:1 וַיְהִי נַחֵשׁ הַעֲמוֹנִי יִחְזַק עַל יְבִישׁ [גִּלְעָד]  
 9 וַיֹּאמְרוּ כָל אַנְשֵׁי יִבְישׁ אֵל נַחֵשׁ [ ]  
 10 [הַעֲמוֹנִי בָרְחַו] לָנוּ בְרִית וְעֵבֶדְךָ. וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו [יְהוָה] הַעֲמוֹנִי בֹאֵה אֶבְרָתָה לְבָסָךְ  
 ...

1Sam 10:27–11:2 LXX

27 ... και ἠτήμισαν αὐτὸν και οὐκ ἦνεγκαν αὐτῷ δῶρα.

11.1 Καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς μετὰ μῆνας

Josephus Ant 6:67–71 (6.4.6–6.5.1)

οἱ καταφρονούντες αὐτοῦ και τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐχλεύεζον και οὕτε δῶρα προσέφερον οὐτ' ἐν σπουδῇ και λόγῳ τὸ ἀρέσκεισθαι τὸν Σαούλον εἶτιθετο.  
 6.68 Μηγὶ δ' ὕστερον ἄρχει τῆς παρὰ πάντων αὐτῶ τιμῆς ὁ πρὸς Ναάστην πόλεμος τὸν τὸν Ἀμμωνιτῶν βασιλέα οὗτος γάρ πολλά κακὰ τοὺς πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ποταμοῦ κατέφκημένους τὸν Ἰουδαίων διατίθησι μετὰ πολλοῦ και μαχίμου στρατεύματος διαβάς ἐπ' αὐτοὺς 6.69 και τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν εἰς δουλείαν ὑπάγει· ἰσχύει μὲν και βίβη πρὸς τὸ παρὸν αὐτοὺς χειρωσάμενος σοφίᾳ δὲ και ἐπινοίᾳ πρὸς τὸ μηδ' αἰθῆς ἀπυστάτης δυναθῆναι τὴν ὑπ' αὐτῷ δουλείαν διαφυγεῖν ἀσθενεῖς ποσσὶν τὸν γὰρ ἡ κατά πίστιν ὡς αὐτὸν ἀφικνουμένων ἡ λαμβανόμενων πολέμου νόμῳ τοὺς δεξιὸς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐξέκοπτεν. 6.70 ἐποίησε δὲ τοῦθ' ὄπως τῆς ἁριστερᾶς αὐτοῦς ὄψεως ὑπὸ τὸν θυρεὸν καλυπτομένης ἀχρηστοί παντελῶς εἶεν

και ἀνέβη Ναας ὁ Ἀμμωνίτης και παρεμβάλλει ἐπὶ Ἰαβίβ Γαλαὰδ. και εἶπον πάντες οἱ ἄνδρες Ἰαβίβ πρὸς Ναας τὸν Ἀμμωνίτην Διάβου ἡμῖν διαθήκη, και δουλοῦσομεν σοι. 2 και εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Ναας ὁ Ἀμμωνίτης Ἐν αὐτῇ διαθήσομαι ἡμῖν διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἐξορύξει ψῆδὸν πάντα ὀφθαλμὸν δεξιὸν, και θήσομαι ὄνατος ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ.

6.71 και ὁ μὲν τὸν Ἀμμωνιτῶν βασιλεὺς ταῦτ' ἐρησάμενος τοὺς πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ἐπὶ τοὺς Γαλαδιῶνους λεγομένους ἐπεστράτευσεν και στρατοπεδεύσάμενος πρὸς τῇ μητροπόλει τῶν πολέμιον Ἰαβίβ δ' ἐστὶν αὐτῇ πέμπτει πρὸς αὐτοὺς πρέσβεις κελεύων ἡδὴ παραδοῦναι σφῆς αὐτοῦς ἐπὶ τῷ τοὺς δεξιὸς αὐτῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐξορύξει ἡ πολιορκήσῃεν ἡλεῖλει και τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν ἀναστήσειν τὴν δ' ἄρσειν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς εἶναι πότερον ποτε βραχὺ τι τοῦ σώματος ὑποτεμεῖν θέλουσιν ἡ παντάσῃ ἀπολωλέναι

1Sam 10:27–11:2 MT

10:27 ... So they scorned him and brought him no gift.

But he pretended not to mind.

11:1 Nahash the Ammonite marched up and besieged Jabesh-Gilead. All the men of Jabesh-Gilead said to Nahash, "Make a pact with us, and we will serve you." 2 But Nahash the Ammonite answered them, "I will make a pact with you on this condition, that everyone's right eye be gouged out; I will make this a humiliation for all Israel."

1Sam 10:27–11:2 LXX

10:27 ... And they despised him and brought him no presents.

11:1 And it happened about a month later,

4Q51 (4QSama) Col. 10a: 5–10

5 [And] they despise[d] him and brought him no gift. vacat  
6 [And Nah]hash, the king of the Ammonites sorely oppressed the Gadites and the Reubenites, and gouged out a[ll] their

7 right [e]yes and struck terror and dread] in [I]srael. There was no one left among the Israelites in Tr[ans-]

8 [Jordan who]m Naha[sh, the king] of the [A]mmonites [did not g]ouge out the right eye; only seven thousand men

9 [rescued themselves out of the hand of] fled from] the Ammonites and came to [J]abesh- Gilead.

11: Then after about a month, Nahash the Ammonite went up and besieged Jabesh-[Gilead].

And all the people of Jabesh said to Nahash

10 [the Ammonite: "Make a covenant] with [us, and we will serve you." 2] But

Nahash [the Ammonite said t]o [th]em, "I will make it with you on this condition: that I gouge out the right eye of every one of you and so disgrace all Israel."

Josephus Ant 6:67–71 (6.4.6–6.5.1)

6:67... who despised him and derided the others, who neither did bring him presents, nor did they in affection, or even in words, regard to please him.

6:68 After one month, the war which Saul had with Nahash, the king of the Ammonites, obtained him respect from all the people; for this Nahash had done a great deal of mischief to the Jews that lived beyond Jordan by the expedition he had made against them with a great and warlike army. 6:69 He also reduced their cities into slavery, and that not only by subduing them for the present, which he did by force and violence, but by weakening them by subtily and cunning that they might not be able afterward to get clear of the slavery they were under to him: for he put out the right eyes of those that either delivered themselves to him upon terms, or were taken by him in war; 6:70 and this he did, that when their left eyes were covered by their shields, they might be wholly useless in war.

6:71 Now when the king of the Ammonites had served those beyond Jordan in this manner, he led his army against those that were called Gileadites; and having pitched his camp at the metropolis of his enemies, which was the city of Jabesh, he sent ambassadors to them, commanding them either to deliver themselves up, on condition to have their right eyes plucked out, or to undergo a siege, and to have their cities overthrown. He gave them their choice, Whether they would cut off a small member of their body, or universally perish.

that Naas the Ammanite went up and encamped against Iabis-galaad, and all the men of Iabis said to Naas the Ammanite, "Make a covenant with us, and we will be subject to you." 2 And Naas the Ammanite said to them, "By this I will make a covenant with you, by gouging out of you every right eye, and I will put disgrace upon Israel."