

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

Statement by
Referee

AUTHOR Solomon T. Greenberg

(Not Necessary
for Ph.D.
Thesis)

TITLE "Biblical Dialogues: Indexed and Interpreted"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. ☐ D.H.L. ☐ Rabbinic ☒
Master's ☐ Prize Essay ☐

1) May (with revisions) be considered for Publication

☒ yes ☐ no

2) May circulate ☒

3) Is restricted ☐

3-14-66
Date

Robert L. Katz
Signature of Referee

Statement by
Author

(Please consult with Librarian if copyright protection
is desired.)

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of
my thesis for security purposes.

The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ☒ yes ☐ no

March 3, 1966
Date

Robert L. Greenberg
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed 5/6/66
Date

Luciano Stinner
Signature of Library Staff Member

To this study, Mr. Greenberg has appended a brief essay indicating the relationship of the dialogue to everyday life.

Mr. Greenberg has performed his chosen task with diligence. Readers might welcome some generalizations from a phenomenological as well as psychological point of view. Some transitions are abrupt and the style is occasionally uneven. The hortatory intrudes when the expository would have sufficed.

We are in debt to Mr. Greenberg for a research task conscientiously and thoroughly done. It is with pleasure that I recommend the acceptance of this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for ordination.

Robert L. Katz
Referee

BIBLICAL DIALOGUES: INDEXED AND INTERPRETED

SOLOMON T. GREENBERG

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Hebrew Letters and
Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

1966

Referee, Prof. ROBERT KATZ

Thesis Epitome

Thesis title: Biblical Dialogues: Indexed and Interpreted

Author: Solomon T. Greenberg

Referee: Dr. Robert L. Katz

This thesis contains three parts and a suppliment.

Part I deals with some general observations of the Biblical dialogue. Within this section there is an explanation of the approach used by the author in the following parts of the thesis. Also, there is a definition of the material within scripture that is classified as dialogical. This part also contains a discussion of the varieties of Biblical dialogues with special mention of varying lengths and numbers within the various books of the Bible. Also mentioned are the different emotions expressed in the form of dialogue. The emotions cited are: hatred, anxiety, disgust, fear, grief, joy, love and pity. Each emotion is defined and a Biblical proof text given. Part I concludes with a discussion of the relationship classification index which is found in Part II.

Part II contains two indices in which every Biblical dialogue is classified : A) by Biblical book, chapter and verse, and B) by the relationships of the participants . The categories of relationship are: husband-wife, man-man, woman-woman, man-woman, father-son, father-daughter, mother-son, mother-daughter, daughter-daughter (sister-sister), son-son (brother-brother), son-daughter (brother-sister). Every dialogue in this index is briefly summarized.

Biblical Dialogues: Indexed and Interpreted

Part III contains four Biblical dialogues between:

1) Jacob and Esau (Genesis 25:29ff.); 2) Joseph and Potiphar's wife (Genesis 39:7ff.); 3) Samuel and Saul (I Samuel 15:13ff.); and 4) Amnon and Tamar (II Samuel 13:10ff.).

Each of these four dialogues is treated in a similar fashion. First, the dialogue is quoted in full. Secondly, the setting in which the dialogue takes place is discussed. Thirdly, the dialogue is interpreted with special emphasis on the psychological forces which are at play within the participants.

The ~~Supplement~~ to this thesis concerns itself with the application of the principle of dialogue to everyday life. The importance of dialogue for human relationships, dialogue in marriage, dialogue between parents and children, dialogue in the search for truth, dialogue in politics, dialogue in business, dialogue in education and dialogue in the temple are all discussed.

BIBLICAL DIALOGUES: INDEXED AND INTERPRETED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Introduction	1
A. General observations of the Biblical Dialogue	1
1. Approach used in indexing	1
2. Approach used in interpreting	2
3. Definition of material classified as Biblical dialogue	3
B. Varieties of Biblical dialogues	4
1. Length and number (see also Part II, Index A)	4
2. Different emotions expressed	5
a. Hatred	6
1. Definition	6
2. Dialogue: I Samuel 22:11-17a	6
b. Anxiety	7
1. Definition	7
2. Dialogue: I Chronicles 21:2-6	7
c. Disgust	7
1. Definition	7
2. Dialogue: Genesis 21:10-11	7
d. Fear	8
1. Definition	8
2. Dialogue: Genesis 44:18-34	8
e. Grief	9
1. Definition	9
2. Dialogue: I Samuel 4:14-18	9
f. Joy	10
1. Definition	10
2. Dialogue: Esther 6:5-9	10

g. Love	11
1. Definition	11
2. Dialogue: Ruth 1:15-18	11
h. Pity	11
1. Definition	11
2. Dialogue: I Samuel 1:14-18	11
C. Discussion of the categorization by relation	13
1. General comments on the relationship index (see also Part II, Index B)	13
a. Types of relationships	13
b. Observations of the number of dialogues in each category	14
c. Subject matter	15
2. Summary comments on categorization	16
II. Biblical Dialogues: Indexed	18
A. Index A: Classification of dialogues by Biblical books	18
B. Index B: Classification of dialogues by relationships	24
1. Husband-wife	24
2. Man-man	25
3. Woman-woman	33
4. Man-woman	34
5. Father-son	36
6. Father-daughter	36
7. Mother-son	37
8. Mother-daughter	37
9. Son-son (brother-brother)	38
10. Daughter-daughter (sister-sister)	38
11. Son-daughter (brother-sister)	38

III. Biblical Dialogues: Interpreted	39
A. Jacob and Esau	39
1. Dialogue: Genesis 25:29-34	39
2. Dialogue setting	40
3. Dialogue interpreted	42
B. Joseph and Potiphar's wife	49
1. Dialogue: Genesis 39:7-15	49
2. Dialogue setting	50
3. Dialogue interpreted	53
C. Samuel and Saul	64
1. Dialogue: I Samuel 15:13-26	64
2. Dialogue setting	66
3. Dialogue interpreted	68
D. Amnon and Tamar	75
1. Dialogue: II Samuel 13:10-15	75
2. Dialogue setting	76
3. Dialogue interpreted	78
IV. Supplement: Application of the principles of dialogue in every day life	87
A. Importance of dialogue for human relationships	87
B. Dialogue in marriage	90
C. Dialogue in the relationship between parents and children	92
D. Dialogue in the search for truth	93
E. Dialogue in politics	94
F. Dialogue in business	95
G. Dialogue in education	97
H. Dialogue in the Temple	99
I. Concluding remarks	101

Footnotes

102

Bibliography

1105

INTRODUCTION

A. General Observations of the Biblical dialogue

The title of this thesis, *Biblical Dialogues: Indexed and Interpreted*, tells only in part what is contained herein. The Biblical dialogue is but one aspect of the vast material handed down to us as Holy Writ. However, it is by no means relegated to a lesser status because of its infrequent appearance. It is through the literary form of dialogue that the various authors of the Bible present insights into different personalities, show the working out of human problems, express a variety of emotions and enliven the scriptural text. And it is through the Biblical dialogue that one may achieve a feeling of closeness for and a being a part of the numerous dramas depicted. Further, it is through the Biblical dialogue that the human relations element in scripture becomes vivid and alive. 2

1. Approach used in Indexing

It was felt by the writer of this thesis that in order to make this material readily accesible and usable as a source of inspiration, insight and study of human relationships that different approaches were necessary. All Biblical dialogues were indexed regarding their specific location and position within the Bible and each particular book of the Bible. This was done in the following two

ways: a) By presenting chapter and verse of each dialogue found in every book of the Bible and, b) By classifying every dialogue found in scripture by the relationship of the participants of that dialogue. These two classifications comprise Part II of this thesis and are entitled: Biblical Dialogues: Indexed. This indexing method serves the purpose of making the dialogical material easily accesible.

2. Approach used in interpreting

In order to show that dialogical material can be used as a source of inspiration, insight and study of human relations, the writer of this thesis chose selected Biblical dialogues, each representing a different relationship, to interpret. The dialogues chosen for interpretation were done so because of the problems with which they deal, their length, that is, that there is enough material within each with which one can work effectively, and finally, because of their popularity and the reader's familiarity with the characters involved.

Each interpreted dialogue was treated in a similar fashion: a) The Biblical material is quoted in full in order to give the reader the full impact and flavor of the situation, b) The historical setting is presented to allow the reader to gain a deeper understanding of why this dialogue itself came into being as it did and c) The dialogue is interpreted and commented upon, verse by verse.

The interpretation and commentary are of a psychological and psychiatric nature because of the writer's interest in the motivations and character development of the Biblical personalities depicted. Also, it is through this type of commentary that one may glean a deeper insight into the workings of the human being in relationship. This section of the thesis is under the heading: Part III, Biblical Dialogues: Interpreted.

3. Definition of material classified as Biblical Dialogue.

At this juncture of our introductory remarks, it is necessary to stipulate the conditions Biblical material must meet to be classified as dialogical. The conditions are as follows: the material must present a dramatic encounter between two individuals and both of these individuals must participate, that is, there must take place some interaction in the form of verbal communication.

The writer has limited dialogical material by excluding encounters between an individual human being and God, between an individual and a messenger of God (angels), between an individual and an animal and between more than two individuals.

We shall now proceed with the remainder of the introductory section and turn our attention to: the varieties within Biblical dialogues and a discussion of the categorization by relationship of the Biblical dialogue material.

B. Varieties of Biblical Dialogues

We are now aware that dialogue is wide in scope and may contain great depths of meaning. This is true not only in the general sense of the word but also when studied in Biblical literature. Biblical dialogues vary in length, literary style, intensity of expressed emotion and even the emotions expressed. We shall now proceed with a brief description of these varieties as presented in the Biblical dialogue.

1. Length and Number

Probably the most obvious difference one confronts when reviewing the Biblical dialogue is the varying lengths of the passages considered. They range from the shortest dialogue, that of Manoah and his wife (Judges 13:22-23) - And Manoah said to his wife, "We shall surely die, for we have seen God." But his wife said to him, "If the Lord meant to kill us, he would not have accepted a burnt offering and a cereal offering at our hands, or shown us all these things, or now announced to us such things as these." - to an entire book of dialogue, Job.

It is also interesting to note the number of dialogues found in the various books of the Bible. In the book of Genesis there are found thirty-two different dialogues. In Exodus, three. In Numbers, five. However, in Leviticus and Deuteronomy none are found. Therefore, in the entire

Torah there are but forty dialogues. In Joshua there are but three, and in Judges, ten. But in the four books of First and Second Samuel and Kings there are ninety-one. When we consider the five Megillot we count but fourteen. Finally, when we look to the Wisdom Literature of Psalms and Proverbs and the Prophets we find virtually no dialogues. For a complete breakdown of the Biblical dialogues indexed by book, chapter and verse, see Part II, Biblical Dialogues: Indexed, section A.

2. Different emotions expressed

Whenever two human beings enter into dialogue emotion is not only expressed but also felt. In human relationships people react. If they did not they would not be alive. In every encounter, especially when there is an attempt to communicate, there is some degree of energy investment. The amount of energy invested will depend upon the situation, the individuals involved and the seriousness of the topic under discussion.

It is our purpose in this section of the thesis to list the various emotions expressed in the Biblical dialogues. These emotions include the entire gamut of the emotions found in everyday life. The writer will list the emotion and cite a Biblical reference as an example. He will give no justification or further clarification for his choice as he assumes that the examples given are clear enough to be accepted on face value.

A. Hatred

1. Definition: "An emotional reaction aroused by being interfered with, injured or threatened - that is characterized by certain distinctive facial grimaces, by marked reactions of the autonomic nervous system, and by overt or concealed symbolic activities of attack or offense."¹

2. Dialogue: I Samuel 22:11-17a

"Then the king sent to summon Ahimelech the Priest, the son of Ahitub, and all his father's house, the priests who were at Nob; and all of them came to the king. And Saul said, "Hear now, son of Ahitub." and he answered, "Here am I, my lord," And Saul said to him, "Why have you conspired against me, you and the son of Jesse, in that you have given him bread and a sword, and have inquired of God for him, so that he has risen against me, to lie in wait, as at this day?" Then Ahimelech answered the king, 'And who among all your servants is so faithful as David, who is the king's son-in-law, and captain over your body-guard, and honored in your house? Is today the first time that I have inquired of God for him? No! Let not the king impute anything to his servant or to all the house of my father; for your servant has known nothing of all this, much or little.' And the king said, "You shall surely die, Ahimelech, you and all your father's house." And the king said to the guard who stood about him, 'Turn and kill the

priests of the Lord; because their hand is also with David, and they knew that he fled, and did not disclose it to me."

B. Anxiety

1. Definition: "An unpleasant emotional state in which a present and continuing strong desire or drive seems likely to miss its goal."²

2. Dialogue: I Chronicles 21:2-6

"So David said to Joab and the commanders of the army, 'Go, number Israel, from Beer-sheba to Dan, and bring me a report, that I may know their number.' But Joab said, 'May the Lord add to his people a hundred times as many as they are! Are they not, my lord the king, all of them my lord's servants? Why then should my lord require this? Why should he bring guilt upon Israel?' But the king's word prevailed against Joab. So Joab departed and went throughout all Israel, and came back to Jerusalem. And Joab gave the sum of the numbering of the people to David. . . But he did not include Levi and Benjamin in the numbering, for the king's command was abhorrent to Joab."

C. Disgust

1. Definition: "A feeling or attitude of disdain, displeasure, rejection, and/or incipient nausea."³

2. Dialogue: Genesis 21¹⁰⁻¹¹

"Sarah said to Abraham, 'Cast out this slave woman with her son; for the son of this slave woman shall not be

heir with my son Isaac.' And the thing was very displeasing to Abraham on account of his son."

D. Fear

1. Definition: "An emotion of violent agitation or fright in the presence (actual or anticipated) of danger or pain. It is marked by extensive organic changes and behaviors of flight or concealment."⁴

2. Dialogue: Genesis 44:18-34

"Then Judah went up to him and said, 'O my lord, let your servant, I pray you, speak a word in my lord's ears, and let not your anger burn against your servant; for you are like Pharaoh himself. My lord asked his servants, saying, "Have you a father, or a brother?" And we said to my lord, "We have a father, an old man, and a young brother, the child of his old age; and his brother is dead, and he alone is left of his mother's children; and his father loves him." Then you said to your servants, "Bring him down to me, that I may set my eyes upon him." We said to my lord, "The lad cannot leave his father, for if he should leave his father, his father would die." Then you said to your servants, "Unless your youngest brother comes down with you, you shall see my face no more." When we went back to your servant my father we told him the words of my lord. And when our father said, "Go again, buy us a little food," we said, "We cannot go down. If our youngest brother goes with us, then we will go down; for we cannot see the man's

face unless our youngest brother is with us!" Then your servant my father said to us, "You know that my wife bore me two sons; one left me, and I said, surely he has been torn to peices; and I have never seen him since. If you take this one also from me, and harm befalls him, you will bring down my gray hairs in sorrow to Sheol." Now therefore, when I come ~~to~~ your servant my father, and the lad is not with us, then, as his life is bound up in the lad's life, when he sees that the lad is not with us, he will die; and your servants will bring down the gray hairs of your servant our father with sorrow to Sheol. For your servant becamer surety for the lad to my father, saying, "If I do not bring him back to you, then I shall bear the blame in the sight of my father all my life." Now, therefore, let your servant, I pray you, remain instead of the lad as a slave to my lord and let the lad go back with his brothers. For how can I go back to my father if the lad is not with me? I fear to see the evil that would come upon my father."

E. Grief

1. Definition: "An emotional state normally resulting from loss of something greatly cherished, manifested by sobbing, relaxed postural tone, etc."⁵

2. Dialogue: ISamuel 4:;4-18

"When Eli heard the sound of the outcry, he said, 'What is this uproar?' Then the man hastened and came and told Eli. Now Eli was ninety-eight years old and his eyes were

set, so that he could not see. And the man said to Eli, 'I am he who has come from the battle; I fled from the battle today.' And he said, 'How did it go my son?' He who brought the tidings answered and said, 'Israel has fled before the Philistines, and there has also been a great slaughter among the people; your two sons also, Hophni and Phinehas, are dead, and the ark of God has been captured.' When he mentioned the ark of God, Eli fell over backward from his seat by the side of the gate; and his neck was broken and he died, for he was an old man, and heavy. He had judged Israel forty years."

F. Joy

1. Definition: "An emotion, usually related to present experiences, highly pleasant and characterized by many outward signs of gratification."⁶

2. Dialogue: Esther 6:5-9

"So the king's servants told him, 'Haman is there, standing in the court.' And the king said, 'Let him come in.' So Haman came in, and the king said to him, 'What shall be done to the man whom the king delights to honor?' And Haman said to himself, 'Whom would the king delight to honor more than me?' And Haman said to the king, 'For the man whom the king delights to honor, let royal robes be brought which the king has worn, and the horse which the king has ridden and on whose head a royal crown is set; and let the robes and the horse be handed over to one of the

the king's most noble princes; let him array the man whom the king delights to honor, and let him conduct the man on horseback through the open squares of the city, proclaiming before him: "Thus shall it be done to the man whom the king delights to honor."'

G. Love

1. Definition: "A feeling, varied in its behavioral aspects and in mental content, but believed to have a specific and unique quality; affection; a feeling of attachment for a person (sometimes a thing); strong liking."⁷

2. Dialogue: Ruth 1:15-18

"And (Naomi) said, 'See, your sister-in-law has gone back to her people and to her gods; return after your sister-in-law.' But Ruth said, 'Entreat me not to leave you or to return from following you; for where you go I will go, and where you lodge I will lodge, your people shall be my people, and your God my God; where you die I will die, and there will I be buried. May the Lord do so to me and more also if even death parts me from you.' And when Naomi saw that she was determined to go with her, she said no more."

H. Pity

1. Definition: "An emotion of sadness or solicitude aroused by the distress or misfortune of another."⁸

2. Dialogue: I Samuel 1:14-18

"And Eli said to her, 'How long will you be drunken? Put away your wine from you.' But Hannah answered, 'No, my

lord, I am a woman sorely troubled; I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink, but I have been pouring out my soul before the Lord. Do not regard your maidservant as a base woman, for all along I have been speaking out of my great anxiety and vexation.' Then Eli answered, 'Go in peace, and the God of Israel grant your petition which you have made to him.' And she said, 'Let your maidservant find favor in your eyes.' Then the woman went her way and ate, and her countenance was no longer sad."

There is no doubt that there are many other examples which could have been used to illustrate each of the above mentioned emotions. It was not the intention of the writer to compile another index of Biblical dialogues regarding emotional expressions, but, rather, merely to show that every conceivable emotion is portrayed in the form of dialogue.

C. Discussion of the categorization by relationship.

This section of our introduction will concern itself primarily with a description of Index B of Part II of this thesis. Index B presents to us a complete listing of every Biblical dialogue, including a short summary of each, and utilizes the categorization of relationship.

1. General Comments on the Relationship Index.

The writer has chosen to categorize the Biblical dialogues by relationship for two reasons. First, to facilitate quick reference when this material is needed and, second, because of the author's interest in human relations.

This index has two further aids for the reader: under each relationship heading the dialogues are listed by Biblical book in order of appearance within each book, and for each dialogue there is a brief statement which summarizes its contents.

a. Types of relationships

The dialogues are classified within eleven categories: husband to wife; man to man; woman to woman; man to woman; father to son; father to daughter; mother to son; mother to daughter; son to son; daughter to daughter; and son to daughter.

It was our intention to concentrate on the primary family unit therefore, uncle, aunt, grandparent, in-law and

cousin relationships were not classified as such but placed within the appropriate man to man; woman to woman or man to woman category.

b. Observations on number of dialogues in each category.

We have already stated that our primary concern was with the immediate family unit and that relationships outside this structure were placed in the three more generalized categories, nevertheless, we were quite surprised about the results obtained regarding the number of dialogues under each relationship heading.

Under the general heading: man to man there are one hundred and forty-four dialogues representing twenty different Biblical books. This category, contains, by far, the most dialogical material of any of the categories listed. If we should look to the relationship heading of man to woman, we would find twenty-three dialogues representing but ten scriptural books. And when we consider the third general category: woman to woman there is observed only three dialogues which are all found in the book of Ruth, and are between the heroine of that book and her mother-in-law, Naomi.

We shall now turn our attention to the family unit. The writer confesses that the results are somewhat amazing for in the entire Bible there are but thirty-seven dialogues between close family members. In a text which is considered by so many throughout the world as the apex of a way of life and a director of human relationships it is astonishing that

one can find so few instances of actual dialogue between family members.

Under the heading of husband to wife, there are thirteen dialogues found in five different books; father to son, eight in three books; son to son, seven dialogues in two different books; mother to son, three dialogues in three books; father to daughter, three dialogues in two books; son to daughter (brother to sister), two dialogues in two books; and in the category of daughter to daughter (sister to sister), one dialogue between Rachel and Leah found in Genesis. The most interesting observation is that there is not one between mother and daughter in the entire Bible.

c. Subject matter

The subject matter of the various dialogues found in the Bible is as varied as scripture itself. Every aspect of life is considered and discussed: from the birth of a child (II Kings 4:8-17) to the buying of a burial plot for Sarah (Genesis 23:3-17); from a wife telling her husband to curse God (Job 2:9-10) to a wife offering her husband her handmaid (Genesis 16:4-22) to the heights of affection between a man and a woman (Ruth 2:8-14); from devotion and love of a relative (Ruth 1:8-18) to the rape of a sister (II Samuel 13:1-33); and from a son wishing to marry out of the faith (Judges 14:1-20) to a father obtaining a proper mate for his offspring (Genesis 24:2-10). All this, and much more.

Every conceivable situation arises and is discussed, every conceivable emotion is called forth and expressed (see Part I, section B).

The writer can but call to the attention of the reader Index B and hope that he pursues his own interest.

2. Summary comments on categorization

Before drawing this discussion to a close it is incumbent upon us to make a few additional comments concerning Index B. Under the general headings: man to man, man to woman, and woman to woman we notice a marked decrease in the number of dialogues when women are involved. The fact that between men there are one hundred and forty-four dialogues and between women only three is significant. It is significant because it points out the status of women in the minds of the Biblical authors. Because of their less frequent appearance we assume their lesser importance.

A similar type of reasoning is utilized when we consider the primary family unit. The number of dialogues between husband and wife and between one parent and a child far outweighs the number between any category of dialogues between siblings. This forces us to conclude that in the Biblical authors' minds the parents (more precisely the father) are to be thought the central and most important figures in the family structure.

Let us now turn our attention to this great scriptural heritage focusing specifically on that material

within it that utilizes and deals with a principle which not only pervades but also is a necessary component of all human relation, the Biblical Dialogue; as indexed and interpreted.

II Biblical dialogues: Indexed

Index A

Index A: Classification of dialogues by Biblical Book

GENESIS

13:8-10

14:21-24

16:2-6

20:9-18

21:10-11

21:22-30

22:7ff

23:3-17

24:2-10

24:17-26

24:35-52

25:19-34

26:7-12

27:1-46

29:11-30

30:1ff

30:14-16

30:25-36

31:14-16

31:26-54

33:1-17

37:6-11

GENESIS (con't)

38:13-27

39:7-20

40:7-23

41:15-45

42:7-38

43:1-44:17

44:18-45:15

47:1-12

48:1-22

50:14-21

EXODUS

2:11-15

8:21-25

18:5-27

LEVITICUS

None

NUMBERS

10:19-32

11:28-29

NUMBERS (con't)

12:1-16

16:1-35

22:2-25

DEUTERONOMY

None

JOSHUA

2:3-5

7:19-26

15:18-19

JUDGES

1:13-15

3:18-23

4:4-9

11:34-40

13:21-22

14:1-20

15:2-3

16:4-22

17:7-30

19:16-30

RUTH

1:8-18

2:4-7

2:8-14

2:19-3:5

3:8-13

3:16-18

4:1-6

I SAMUEL

1:9-18

3:4-18

4:14-18

9:5-10

9:18-10:8

10:14-16

13:8-15

14:6-15

14:24-30

14:43-46

15:13-31

17:24-30

17:31-40

17:41-47

I SAMUEL (con't)

18:17-30

19:1-7

20:1-23

20:27-34

21:1-9

22:11-16

24:8-22

25:23-35

26:6-25

28:8-20

29:6-11

II SAMUEL

1:1-10,13-16

2:12-14

2:20-23

2:26-28

3:6-11

3:12-16

6:20-23

7:1-3

9:1-5

9:6-13

11:6-13

11:22-25

II SAMUEL (con't)

12:1-15

13:1-33

14:1-33

15:19-23

16:1-4

16:5-14

16:20-17:14

18:9-15

18:19-23

18:28-33

19:16-23

19:31-40

20:16-22

24:11-14,18

24:18-25

I KINGS

1:15-31

1:41-48

1:50-53

2:13-18

2:19-25

2:28-35

2:36-46

3:16-28

I KINGS (con't)

13:1-10
13:11-32
17:8-24
18:7-16
18:17-19
19:19-21
20:13-15,22,28
20:35-43

21:1-16

21:17-24

22:1-28

II KINGS

1:9-16

2:1-12

3:6-10

3:11-20

4:1-7

4:8-17

4:18-37

5:1-17

5:19-25

5:26-27

6:11-23

6:26-31

6:31-7:2

II KINGS (con't)

8:7-8,14

8:9-13,15

9:4-10

9:17-28

9:30-37

20:8-19

22:3-10

I CHRONICLES

17:1-15

21:1-6

21:9-13

21:20-27

II CHRONICLES

18:1-27

25:7-10,15,16

EZRA

None

NEHEMIAH

2:1-8

4:1-5

6:10-14

ESTHER

3:8-11

5:3-5

5:6-9

6:4-11

7:1-10

8:3-8

9:11-15

JOB

2:9-10

3:1-26

4:1-5:27

6:1-7:21

8:1-22

9:1-10:22

11:1-20

12:1-14:22

15:1-35

16:1-17:16

18:1-21

19:1-29

20:1-29

21:1-34

22:1-30

23:1-24:25

JOB (con't)

25:1-6

26:1-31:40

32:1-37:24

PSALMS

None

PROVERBS

None

ECCLESIASTES

None

SONG OF SOLOMON

None

ISAIAH

38:1-3

39:3-8

JEREMIAH

28:1-16

37:11-15

37:16-21

38:7-13

LAMENTATIONS

None

JONAH

None

EZEKIEL

None

MICAH

None

DANIEL

2:24-25

2:26-49

4:1-27

5:13-29

6:19-24

NAHUM

None

HABAKKUK

None

ZEPHANIAH

None

HOSEA

None

HAGGAI

None

JOEL

None

ZECHARIAH

None

AMOS

7:12-17

MALACHI

None

OBADIAH

None

Index B

Index B: Classification of dialogues by relationships

HUSBAND-WIFE

Genesis:

- 16:2-6 Sarah tells Abraham to lie with Hagar.
21:10-11 Sarah tells Abraham to throw out Hagar.
30:1ff Jacob-Rachel. Tells him to go in to handmaiden Bilhah.
31:14-16 Jacob-Rachel and Leah. Both go with husband, will have nothing if remain with Laban.

Judges:

- 13:22-23 Menoah-wife (parents of Samson) God will not kill them for He accepted their offerings.

I Kings:

- 1:15-31 David-Bathsheba. Solomon to be made king.
21:5-16 Ahab-Jezebel. Naboth's vineyard.

Esther:

- 5:3-5 Esther-Ahasuerus. Esther invites the King and Haman to her banquet.
5:6-9 Esther-Ahasuerus. King will allow whatever Esther wants, up to one half his kingdom.
7:1-10 Esther-Ahasuerus. King will allow whatever Esther wants, up to one half his kingdom. Haman is the denounced.
8:3-8 Esther-Ahasuerus. Esther asks king to recind Haman's order to kill the Jews.
9:11-15 Esther-Ahasuerus. Esther requests additional day to kill sons of Haman.

Job:

- 2:9-10 Job-wife. Job's wife tells him to curse God.

MAN-MAN

Genesis:

- 13:8-10 Abraham-Lot separate.
- 14:21-24 Abraham-King of Sodom.
- 20:9-18 Abraham-Abimelech (does not harm Sarah.)
- 21:22-30 Abraham-Abimelech. agreement concerning well.
- 23:3-17 Abraham-Ephron. Buying of burial plot for Sarah.
- 24:2-10 Abraham-servant. Obtaining wife for Isaac.
- 24:33-52 Laban-servant. Discuss mission of wife for Isaac.
- 26:7-12 Isaac-Abimelech. Isaac declares Rebekah his sister.
- 29:11-30 Jacob-Laban. Buying of Rachel (gets Leah).
- 30:25-36 Jacob-Laban. Jacob leaves.
- 31:26-54 Jacob-Laban. Laban catches up with fleeing Jacob and his wives.
- 40:7-23 Joseph-butler and baker. About their dreams.
- 41:15-45 Joseph-Pharoh. Tells his dream.
- 47:1-12 Joseph-Pharoh. Allows Joseph's family best in Egypt.

Exodus:

- 2:11-15 Moses-Hebrew. Moses flees because of killing an Egyptian.
- 8:21-25 Moses-Pharoh. Agreement to let Hebrews go and sacrifice.
- 18:5-27 Moses-Jethro. Jethro tells Moses burden of leadership too heavy for one man.

Numbers:

- 10:19-32 Moses-Hobab. Moses asks him to go with Israelites.
- 11:28-29 Moses-Joshua. Joshua tells Moses Eldad and Medad are prophesying.

Numbers (con't):

- 16:1-35 Moses-Korah. Rebellion.
22:2-25 Balak-Balaam. Balaam disobeys kings and blesses Israel.

Joshua:

- 7:19-26 Joshua-Achan. Man sins, confesses yet stoned.

Judges:

- 3:18-23 Ehud-Egdon (Moab King). Ehud kills Egdon to deliver Israel.
15:2-3 Samson-Father-in-law. Father-in-law wants Samson to take younger daughter.
17:7-30 Micah-Levite. Levite becomes a priest.
19:16-30 Old man-guest. Men of town want to commit homosexual act.

Ruth:

- 2:4-7 Boaz-Reaper. Concerning Ruth.
4:1-6 Boaz-Elimelech (next of kin). Settle matter of halizah.

I Samuel:

- 3:4-18 Samuel-Eli. Samuel tells Eli God spoke to him.
4:14-18 Eli-man. Eli learns sons are dead and holy ark destroyed.
9:5-10 Saul-servant. On mission looking for lost asses.
9:18-10:8 Saul-Samuel. Their meeting.
10:14-16 Saul-uncle. Saul discusses asses but not matters of kingdom.
13:8-15 Saul-Samuel. Saul offers uncalled for sacrifice.

I Samuel (con't):

- 14:6-15 Jonathan-Armor bearer. Victory at Michmash.
- 14:24-30 Jonathan-man. Jonathan unknowingly transgresses his father's command by eating honey.
- 15:13-31 Samuel-Saul. Saul wrongly builds altar to self.
- 17:31-40 David-Saul. David convinces Saul he can defeat Goliath.
- 17:41-47 David-Goliath.
- 18:17-30 David-Saul. David gives Saul 200 foreskins as present for his daughter.
- 20:1-23 David-Jonathan. Discussion of Saul's feeling toward David.
- 21:1-9 David-Ahimelech (priest at Nob). David takes Goliath's sword.
- 22:11-16 Saul-Ahimelech. Saul has priest killed for aiding David.
- 24:8-22 David-Saul. David, although could have, does not kill Saul. Discussion.
- 26:6-25 David to various officers. Again spares Saul at Ziph.
- 28:15-20 Saul-Samuel. Saul asks for help. Does not know what to do.
- 29:6-11 David-Akish (Philistine). David considered faithful yet not allowed to fight in Jezreel.

II Samuel:

- 1:1-16 David-man. David learns Saul and Jonathan are dead.
- 2:12-14 Abner-Joab. Agree to let young men play before them.
- 2:20-23 Abner-Assahel. Abner kills him.
- 2:26-28 Abner-Joab. Abner adjures Joab to cease fighting.
- 3:6-11 Abner-Ishbosheth. Abner tells him David should be king.
- 3:12-16 Abner-David. Abner tells David he is to be king.

II Samuel (con't):

- 7:1-3 David-Nathan. King tells prophet he wants to build a house for God.
- 9:1-5 David-Ziba (servant in house of Saul). David wants to show kindness for sake of Jonathan.
- 9:6-13 David-Mephibosheth (Jonathan's son). David shows him kindness.
- 11:6-13 David-Uriah (the Hittite).
- 11:22-25 David-messenger. Man makes known to king Uriah is dead.
- 12:1-15 David-Nathan. Prophet points the finger at king.
- 14:1-44 David-Joab. Joab secures Absalom's recall.
- 15:19-23 David-Ittai (the Gittite). Swears he will follow David.
- 16:1-4 David-Ziba. David gives him all that belonged to Mephibosheth.
- 16:5-14 David-Shimei (of family of the house of Saul). Shimei curses David as a man of blood.
- 16:20-17:14 Ahithophel-Absalom. Absalom rejects his counsel to rise against David.
- 18:9-15 Joab-man. Man tells Joab he saw Absalom caught in a tree.
- 18:19-23 Joab-Ahimaaz (son of Zadok). Ahimaaz wants to tell David that his enemies are dead. Joab no!
- 18:28-33 David-Ahimaaz. Ahimaaz tells David of Absalom's death.
- 19:16-23 David-Shimei. Shimei sorry he cursed David.
- 19:24-30 David-Mephibosheth. Mephibosheth tells David that Ziba deceived him.
- 19:31-40 David-Barzillai (David's aged friend). David wants him to go with him to Jerusalem.
- 24:11-14 David-Gad (prophet) David given choice - famine,
&18 flee or pestilence.
- 24:18-25 David-Araunah (the Jebusite). David, upon Gad's advice buys threshing floor to avert the plague.

I Kings:

- 1:22-40 David-Nathan. Solomon is to be made king.
- 1:41-47 Adonijah-Jonathan (son of Abiathar). Jonathan informs him Solomon is made king.
- 1:48-53 David-Adonijah. Adonijah grabs hold of horns of altar for protection.
- 2:28-35 Solomon-Benajah (son of Jehoiada). Joab killed because he supported Adonijah.
- 2:36-46 Solomon-Shimei. King commands him to remain in Jerusalem. He disobeys and is killed.
- 13:1-10 Jeroboam-Man of God. Jeroboam's hand is healed.
- 13:11-32 Old prophet of Bethel-son(s). Man of God is killed by lion for disobeying God.
- 18:7-16 Elijah-Obadiah (over the household of Ahab). Elijah tells him to let Ahab know that he has come.
- 18:17-19 Elijah-Ahab. Accuse one another of being "Troubler of Israel."
- 19:19-21 Elijah-Elisha. Passing of mantle.
- 20:13-15 Ahab-Prophet. Prophet predicts victory over Ben
22,28 hadad of Syria.
- 20:35-43 Ahab-Prophet. Prophet desires to be struck down.
- 21:1-4 Ahab-Nabuth. Vineyard.
- 21:17-24 Ahab-Elijah. The prophet confronts the king about Naboth.
- 22:1-28 Ahab-Jehoshaphat. The kings discuss impending war with Syria (Micah prophesies the truth.)

II Kings:

- 1:9-16 Elijah-Captain of fifty. Captain summons Elijah to appear before the king.
- 2:1-12 Elijah-Elisha. Elijah is taken up to heaven.
- 3:6-10 Jehoram-Jehosaphat. Discuss alliance against Moab.

II Kings (con't):

- 3:11-20 Elisha-Jehosaphat. Elisha predicts victory Moab.
- 4:8-17 Elisha-Gehazi (his servant). Concerning wealthy woman with no children of Shunem.
- 5:1-17 Elisha-Maaman. Elisha cures him of leprosy.
- 5:19-25 Naaman-Gehazi. Gehazi pursues Naaman to receive payment for cure.
- 5:26-27 Elisha-Gehazi. Gehazi receives curse of leprosy for his deceit.
- 6:11-23 King of Syria-one of his servants. Inquiry of Elisha's whereabouts.
- 6:31-7:2 Elisha-messenger. Elisha to be killed.
- 8:7-8,14 Ben ha dad (King of Syria)-Hazael. Hazael is to inquire of Elisha how king will fare.
- 9:4-10 Jehu-prophet. Prophet annoints Jehu king of Israe.
- 9:17-28 Jehu-Joram. Jehu kills Joram.
- 20:8-19 Isaiah-Hezekiah. Hezekiah's sickness.
- 22:3-10 Josiah-Shaphan (son of Azaliah, son of Meshullam). Josiah sends Shapan to Hilkiah the High Priest. (Hilkiah has found a book-? Deuteronomy?)

I Chronicles:

- 17:1-5 David-Nathan. Concerning the building of a House for the Lord.
- 21:1-6 David-Joab. David tells Joab to number the people.
- 21:9-13 David-Gad. David given choice; famine, devastation or pestilence.
- 21:20-27 David-Ornan. David desires to buy Ornan's threshing floor to build an altar to God.

II Chronicles:

- 18:1-27 Jehoshaphat-Ahab. Judah and Israel make an alliance. They inquire of Micaiah son of Imlah.
- 25:7-10, 15,16 Amaziah-Man of God. Man of God warns king not to trust in army but in God.

Nehemiah:

- 2:1-8 Nehemiah-King Artaxerxes. Nehemiah saddened over condition of Jerusalem.
- 4:1-5 Sanballat-Tobiah. Ridicule the Jews for rebuilding Temple.
- 6:10-14 Nehemiah-Shemaiah (son of Delaiah, son of Mehetabel). Shemaiah warns Nehemiah that he might be killed.

Esther:

- 3:8-11 Haman-King Ahasuerus. Haman convinces the king to allow him to destroy the Jews.
- 6:4-11 Haman-King Ahasuerus. King asks Haman what reward for one whom king delights to honor.

Job:

- 3:1-26 Job-Eliphaz. Job bewails his birth.
- 4:1-5:27 Job-Eliphaz. Eliphaz retorts that all men commit some transgression.
- 6:1-7:21 Job-Eliphaz. Job demands his innocence.
- 8:1-22 Job Bildad. Bildad states that God does not pervert justice.
- 9:1-10:22 Job-Bildad. Job answers God creates all, He destroys good and wicked, Job still innocent.
- 11:1-20 Job-Zophar. Zophar accuses Job of iniquity.
- 12:1-14:22 Job-Zophar. Job affirms God's power, defends his own integrity yet realizes man is frail.
- 15:1-35 Job-Eliphaz. Eliphaz rebukes Job.
- 16:1-17:16 Job-Eliphaz. Job calls his friends "miserable comforters."
- 18:1-21 Job-Bildad. Bildad depicts the lot of the wicked.
- 19:1-29 Job-Bildad. Job states that his close friends have failed him.

Job (con't):

- 20:1-29 Job-Zophar. Zophar depicts the wicked man's portion.
- 21:1-34 Job-Zophar. Job recants that the wicked do prosper and have old life.
- 22:1-30 Job-Eliphaz. Eliphaz accuses Job of great wickedness.
- 23:1-24:25 Job-Eliphaz. Job cries out to find God. God appears indifferent to wickedness.
- 25:1-6 Job-Bildad. Bildad reiterates that no man is righteous before God.
- 26:1-31:40 Job-Bildad (all). Job replies - No matter I am innocent. The fear of the Lord is wisdom. Job recalls his past happiness and bewails his present wretchedness.
- 32:1-37:24 Job-Elihu. Elihu states that no one confuted Job. Job is guilty. - No man knows all of God's ways. God is justified. God is perfect in knowledge. God is with man. God is great.

Isaiah:

- 38:1-3 Isaiah-Hezekiah. Isaiah tells Hezekiah to set his house in order.
- 39:3-8 Isaiah-Hezekiah. Hezekiah has shown all the treasury to the Babylonian ambassadors.

Jeremiah:

- 28:1-16 Jeremiah-Hannaniah (prophet). Hannaniah gives false prophecy - only zyrs will go into captivity.
- 37:11-15 Jeremiah-Irijah (son of Shelemiah, son of Hananiah). Irijah accuses Jeremiah of deserting to Chaldeans.
- 37:16-21 Jeremiah-Zedekiah. The king inquires of Jeremiah if there is any word from the Lord. Jeremiah is placed in the court of the guard.
- 38:7-13 Zedekiah-Eved Melech. The eunuch intercedes on behalf of Jeremiah.

Daniel:

- 2:24-25 Daniel-Arioeh (Captain of king's guard appointed to slay wise men). Daniel declares that he is able to interpret the king's dream.
- 2:26-49 Daniel-Nebuchadnezzar (king). Daniel interprets the king's dream.
- 4:1-27 Daniel Nebuchadnezzar. Daniel interprets the king's dream of a tree.
- 5:13-29 Daniel-Belshazzar (king). Daniel interprets the writing on the wall.
- 6:19-24 Daniel-Darius (king). Daniel survives den of lions.

Amos:

- 7:12-17 Amos-Amaziah (Priest of Bethel). Amos says he's no prophet yet the Lord has sent him to prophesy.

WOMAN-WOMAN

Ruth:

- 1:8-18 Naomi-Ruth and Orpah. Tells them to return home. Ruth - wither thou goest.
- 2:19-3:5 Naomi-Ruth. Discuss Boaz.
- 3:16-18 Naomi-Ruth. Ruth tells of gifts. Naomi - "Boaz will settle the matter today."

MAN-WOMAN

Genesis:

- 24:17-26 Rebekah-servant of Abraham at well.
- 38:13-27 Judah-Tamar. Judah thinks she is harlot. She has his children because refused right when husband slain.
- 39:7-20 Joseph-Potiphar's wife.

Joshua:

- 2:3-5 King of Jericho-Rahab. He inquires concerning spies.

Judges:

- 4:4-9 Deborah-Barak. He will go only if she does.
- 16:4-22 Samson-Delilah. Story of her deceiving him vs. his love.

Ruth:

- 2:8-14 Boaz-Ruth. He promises her care because of her goodness.
- 3:8-13 Boaz-Ruth. On threshing floor.

I Samuel:

- 1:9-18 Eli-Hannah. He thinks she is drunk.
- 25:23-35 David-Abigail. She informs David of her husband's foolishness.
- 28:8-14 Daul-Witch at Endor. King deceives the medium.

II Samuel:

- 6:20-23 Michal-David. She tells him that he is vulgar for dancing before the people.

II Samuel (con't):

- 14:1-33 David-woman of Tekoa. Tells him Joab has sent her.
20:16-22 Joab-wise woman. She has Sheba killed and his rebellion is crushed.

I Kings:

- 1:11-14 Nathan-Bathsheba. Solomon to be made king.
2:13-18 Adonijah-Bathsheba. He appeals to her for a wife.
3:16-28 Solomon-harlot-harlot. Story of dividing child to discover true mother of baby.
17:8-24 Elijah-woman. She feeds him, jar never empty; Elijah revives her son.

II Kings:

- 4:1-7 Elisha-wife of one of the sons of prophets. The widow's vessels are filled with oil.
4:8-17 Elisha-wealthy woman. Child is born.
4:18-37 Gehazi (Elisha's servant) -wealthy woman. Child dies, get Elisha.
6:26-31 King of Israel-woman. Eating of son.
9:30-37 Jehu-Jezebel. Jehu has Jezebel killed.

FATHER-SON

Genesis:

- 22:7ff Akadah: Abraham-Isaac.
- 27:1-46 Isaac-Jacob, Esau. Blessing of sons (Rebekah's plot).
- 37:6-11 Jacob-Joseph. Tells his dream.
- 48:1-22 Jacob-Joseph and Joseph's sons Ephriam and Manaseh. Receive blessing. (First time sone one lays on hands in blessing.)

Judges:

- 14:1-20 Samson-Menoah. Samson wants to marry out of faith.

I Samuel:

- 14:43-46 Saul wants Jonathan to die for eating honey. (People ransom him.)
- 19:1-7 Saul wants Jonathan to kill David but Jonathan talks him out of it.
- 20:27-34 Saul angry with Jonathan because David not at banquet.

FATHER-DAUGHTER

Joshua:

- 15:18-19 Achsah asks Caleb, her father, for gift; it is granted.

Judges:

- 1:13-15 Achsah asks Caleb, her father, for gift; it is granted.
- 11:34-40 Jephthah-daughter. Vow to kill first one he meets.

MOTHER-SON

Genesis:

27:1-46 Rebekah-Jacob. Plot to fool Isaac.

Judges:

14:1-20 Samson-mother. He wants to marry out of faith.

I Kings:

2:19-25 Bathsheba-Solomon. She appeals to king on behalf of Adonijah. Adonijah is killed.

MOTHER-DAUGHTER

There is no Biblical dialogue between a mother and a daughter.

SON-SON (BROTHER-BROTHER)

Genesis:

- 25:29-34 Jacob buys Esau's birthright.
33:1-17 Jacob-Esau. Meet to do battle.
42:7-38 Joseph-brothers. In ~~egypt~~.
43:1-44:17 Joseph-brothers to bring Benjamin.
44:18-45:15 Joseph-brothers. Reconciliation.
50:14-21 Joseph-brothers. After death of Jacob, Joseph
promise not to harm.

(Brothers treated as one unit, equal Joseph-brother.)

I Samuel:

- 17:24-30 David-Eliab. Eliab angry that David considers
fighting with Goliath.

DAUGHTER-DAUGHTER (SISTER-SISTER)

Genesis:

- 30:14-16 Rachel-Leah. Rachel wants mandrakes to make her
fertile.

SON-DAUGHTER (BROTHER-SISTER)

Numbers:

- 12:1-16 Miriam-Aaron speak against Moses.

II Samuel:

- 13:1-33 Amnon-Tamar. Amnon forces his sister to lie with
him.

III. Biblical dialogues: Interpreted

A. Jacob and Esau

1. Dialogue: Genesis 25:29-34

"Once when Jacob was boiling pottage, Esau came in from the field, and he was famished. And Esau said to Jacob, 'Let me eat some of that red pottage, for I am famished!' (Therefore his name was called Edom.) Jacob said, 'First sell me your birthright.' Esau said, 'I am about to die; of what use is a birthright to me?' Jacob said, 'Swear to me first.' So he swore to him, and sold his birthright to Jacob. Then Jacob gave Esau bread and pottage of lentils, and he ate and drank, and rose and went his way. Thus Esau despised his birthright."

2. Dialogue setting.

In the South country of Canaan by the Arabian desert, Isaac lived with Rebecca his wife. Rebecca was the daughter of Bethuel and sister of Laban. Isaac prayed to the Lord for his wife because she was barren; and the Lord granted his prayer, when her days to be delivered were fulfilled, there were twins in her womb. The first came forth red, all his body like a hairy mantle; so they called his name Esau. "The second to come forth was called Jacob because the name in Hebrew means supplanter, second fiddle. He was found holding his brother Esau's heel."¹

Before the twins were born they struggled within their mother. Rebecca feeling this pain, went to inquire of the Lord who told her,

"Two nations are in your womb,
and two peoples, born of you,
shall be divided;
the one shall be stronger than the other,
the elder shall serve the younger." (Gen. 25:23)

This unusual prophecy was probably known to the entire family. Indeed, Rebecca must have assuredly told her favorite, Jacob, the far reaching implications of such a unique utterance.

However, there was one obstacle which must have seemed insurmountable in the society in which the family of the second patriarch lived; Jacob was the second born and the blessing of inheritance went only to the firstborn.

Therefore, from his youth, Jacob probably coveted the birthright inheritance of his brother which carried with it certain priestly perogatives in the household. He may have frequently but unsuccessfully bartered for it. He probably studied his brother's weakness. One night Esau came home from the chase, hungry and faint, with a ravenous appetite which needed gratification at once. Jacob was boiling pottage. Esau begged for some and was willing to pay the price. Jacob seized the opportunity, and gave ~~him~~ a mess in exchange for his birthright, sealing the bargain with an oath.²

3. Dialogue Interpreted

25:29-30; Once when Jacob was boiling pottage, Esau came in from the field, and he was famished. And Esau said to Jacob, "Let me eat some of that red pottage, for I am famished!"

What a wretched scene is presented. The tired hunter, unsuccessful that day in his pursuit of game, comes to the tent of the shepherd to ask for food. Jacob sees the opportunity which he has so long awaited. He responds, "First sell me your birthright." (25:31). It is difficult to ascertain whether or not Jacob really believed his brother would be quite so foolish as to agree. His proposition was undoubtedly made in the form of a question. He was, in a sense, sounding out his brother's reaction. To Jacob's astonishment Esau replies, "I am about to die, of what use is a birthright to me?" (25:32) His expressions are the extravagant and reckless words of a man passionate and uncontrolled. "Feed me, I am about to die." This great strong man appears unmindful of everything but the demands of appetite. "He cries like a baby for the pottage, insisting that he would not live for ten minutes unless his cravings were met. He is careless of the larger and more remote interests, ready to sacrifice them all to the immediate satisfaction of physical desire, fierce and unruly in its demands."³

Esau, to whom the rights and privileges of primogeniture belonged, seemed to care nothing for them. Instead

of assuming his role of first born, and asserting his authority he acts very much like a young child who must have his wants fulfilled immediately. He presents a personality structure of an infant whose id demands are not yet disciplined by the ego. *Super-ego?*

However, this is not the whole man. For there were times when Esau did fulfill his position of the next in line. "Esau was rough in many ways but he was virile, and his old father Isaac, who was sixty years old when the twins were born, instinctively turned to him. Isaac knew that if there was anything he wanted done, Esau could do it; and as he grew old he leaned increasingly on Esau's strength."⁴

Isaac had a dependent personality throughout his life. And this, of course, had a great effect upon his two sons. All are familiar with Isaac's complete submission depicted in the Akedah story; there is no mention of any struggle whatsoever when the young Isaac is to be sacrificed to the Lord by his father. The lad must certainly have been aware of what fate was in store for him when Abraham bound him to the altar, yet there is not so much as a murmur of protest uttered or recorded.

Also, when Isaac was a young man he is once again shown as one dependent upon others even in the acquisition of his wife. In a stage of development when the individual usually exerts his independence, Isaac stands in the back-

ground. And when married, the family situation as pictured in our Bible, presents a portrait of a man completely dominated by his wife.

Finally, in his old age, when one would normally expect the patriarch to be the ruler of his brood, as was indeed the case with Noah, Moses, and his own father Abraham, Isaac was dependent upon his son for the very food he ate. Therefore his wife, Rebekkah, and younger son, Jacob, thought so little of him as husband and father that they dared to deceive him.

But not Esau. And for this reason our sympathy goes out to him. "Esau was a warm hearted man." Evidently he loved his father, as his father loved and depended upon him. When Isaac was old and blind, the rough Esau was gentle with him and quick to respond to everything his father wanted. Esau readily assumed the responsibility of caring for the physical needs of the family; he was, indeed, able to assume the role of first born and of provider.

Therefore, Jacob was unsure that he could believe his brother's words. Would Esau truly sell his birth-right for but a bowl of pottage?

Many forces were at work in the mind of Jacob. Many influences pushed him forward. Jacob was the favorite of his mother, which was probably due to Rebekkah's motherly inclination to protect the more feeble of her young. Also, those acts of mothering and protection afforded her the opportunity to expend certain libidinal

energies which had no other outlet because of her infirmed husband's condition. "Jacob was tutored by his scheming, doting mother who encouraged him from the start to bargain with his brother for the precious birthright."⁵ For by the completion of such an act Rebecca would once again have a "man" whom she could dominate as she had dominated Isaac in the past. Rebecca was not above any act which would achieve her aims. She taught her son deceit and trickery. She was instrumental in her son's developing a corrupt super-ego; she filled him with consuming ambition to gain his goal at no matter what cost and in any way good or bad.

Jacob weighed the two possibilities carefully in his mind: Esau was a man of the moment, yet he was also aware of his responsibilities. Still Jacob realized this might be the chance for which he had so longed hoped. He could no longer contain himself. Whereas in the first instance he haltingly questions if his brother will sell his birthright, here Jacob bubbles over with the expectant possibility of success. This time he demands "Swear to me first." (Gen. 25:33)

Would Esau really go through with this absurd bargain? If Esau was careless about the particular advantages of the birthrights, he was not careless about his father's blessing. Yet, Jacob knew that his older brother was generous and magnanimous. He knew in his inner most being that Esau was not the type of person who would bear a grudge (as was later proved when the two brothers confronted one another after Jacob deceived his father). "A man like Esau is likeable,

may even lovable. He may be easy going, careless and lacking in any strenuous principles or fixed aims, which under normal circumstances would characterize a man as a poor sort of citizen, yet such impulsive lovingkindness makes him somewhat attractive."⁶

Jacob had forced the issue, he was unsure how Esau would react, still, though, he had strong indication that Esau's impetuosity and generosity would win out. And so it did. For Esau swore to his brother, and sold his birthright to Jacob. (Gen. 25:33)

As fond of Esau as we might be, we are made well aware that he would not have been able to lead his people because of his great fault, his impetuosity. Esau was a man of the present, the immediate and the now. He was a man of the wilds who was free of all law. But a leader must submit and acknowledge the superiority of law for his nation to exist and thrive. The essence of law is restraint; the putting off of the immediate desire for some higher goal.

Esau is appealing to many because he offers a return to childhood, a return to a period in our lives when we were satisfied not only continually but immediately, a period when we were not restrained by any overbearing laws. But this appeal of regression can last but a moment for the adult. For the civilized adult does realize the importance of law; he sees the desirability of a more mature approach (blemished as it was) of a man like Jacob.

Character is the stamp, the die of a man: that is what the Greek word means. It is the net result of two things: nature and nurture. We inherit from our parents certain natural gifts of mind and heart and body. Our environment does some of the nurturing, but above all, our wills fashion our natures by forming habits of thought and choice that eventually distinguish us. Jacob and Esau were two men who were as much a part of these two influences, nature and nurture as any men. They acted as they did because they had to, because they were what they were.

Therefore, "Jacob gave Esau bread and pottage of lentils, and he ate and drank, and rose and went his way."
(Gen. 25:34a)

The bargain has now been completed, Jacob has won out. Jacob achieved what he so long desired; to become the leader of the family and to become a real man. Symbolically Jacob was attempting to become his brother Esau through the act of buying his birthright. Jacob was in great need of a strong father figure, the image of which Isaac did not fulfill because of his dependent character. Therefore, if Jacob could become a man, a truly strong figure as was his brother, who was a man physically as well as through the right of the first born, he would fulfill his desire. Therefore, Jacob followed through, and completed the act, he gave his brother the pottage in exchange for the right of the first born.

When Esau realized the true import of the deed . . .
"Esau despised his birthright". (Gen. 25:34b) He soon
became aware that he had given up his right of the first
born, that he would no longer be the man of the household
nor the leader of his people.

B. Joseph and Potiphar's Wife

1. Dialogue: Genesis 39:7-15

Now Joseph was handsome and good looking. And after a time his master's wife cast her eyes upon Joseph, and said, "Lie with me." But he refused and said to his master's wife, "Lo, having me my master has no concern about anything in the house, and he has put everything that he has in my hand; he is not greater in this house than I am; nor has he kept back anything from me except yourself, because you are his wife, how then can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?" And although she spoke to Joseph day after day, he would not listen to her, to lie with her or to be with her. But one day, when he went into the house to do his work and none of the men of the house was there in the house, she caught him by his garment, saying, "Lie with me." But he left his garment in her hand, and he fled and got out of the house. And when she saw that he had left his garment in her hand, and had fled out of the house, she called to the men of her household and said to them, "See, he has brought among us a Hebrew to insult us; he came in to me to lie with me and I cried out with a loud voice; and when he heard that I lifted up my voice and cried, he left his garment with me, and fled and got out of the house."

2. Dialogue setting

Joseph is described as the eleventh son of Jacob and the first born of Rachel, the favorite wife of Jacob.

Like his father, Jacob, and his grandfather, Isaac, Joseph was born to a woman who had been barren. This often repeated pattern tends to impress the reader with divine activity in connection with childbirth. It also tends to single out the child thus born as one especially favored by God. We can safely assume that the author of the Joseph story was intent on enhancing our appreciation of the divine favoritism evident throughout. The story does this by supplying a detail of Joseph's birth which is considered most significant - i.e., the fact that Joseph was the first born of the favorite, but originally barren, wife.

Immediately after the birth of Joseph the family left Haran and returned to the land of Canaan. After a series of adventures the small group arrived at Kiriath-Arba (Hebron). It is here that Jacob and Esau are said to have buried their father, Isaac, and it was from this area that Joseph was sent forth to seek his brothers.

In connecting the family of Jacob with the region of Hebron the biblical writer does not mean to imply that they are to be considered city dwellers. The Bible accurately portrays the life of the patriarchs as being semi-nomadic. The shepherd life of Joseph's time was not sedentary, because of the constant need for seeking areas in which to graze flocks. Although shepherds moved from place to place, the

life Joseph knew was not strictly nomadic. Jacob built himself a house in Succoth, in contrast to tents for his livestock, and he stayed behind in Hebron with Joseph when the rest of the family followed the flocks in Shechem. It is also significant that the dream of Joseph concerning "sheaves" further betrays close contact with sedentary (farming) life.

Genesis 37:3 explains that Joseph was favored by his father, "because he was the son of his old age." The psychological explanation can still be easily understood today. At that time in history it was more normal to favor the legitimate heir, who was usually the oldest son; but Jacob, who had purloined his older brother's birth-right, seemed determined to by-pass convention by favoring first Joseph, then Benjamin, and finally setting Ephraim before Manasseh. This pattern of favoring the younger son over the older seems to appear quite frequently in the Bible (cf. Abel; David; Solomon). The preference of Jacob for Joseph expressed itself in the making of the "long robe with sleeves," or the "coat of many colors."

One of the expressions used to describe Joseph is "The Lord (ba-al) of dreams." To be "lord" of something means simply to possess it, to be in charge of it, or to master it. We can be quite sure that the older brothers had no idea of flattering Joseph when they used this expression, but what could better describe the peculiar talent that was to bring Joseph both fame and power than to call him the "master of dreams?"

tena

Joseph was sent after his brothers at Shechem. Not finding his brothers there, he follows the directions of a stranger, and went to Dothan. It was at Dothan that his brother threw him into a pit and sold him to a passing caravan.

After his betrayal Joseph was brought to Egypt, where he was sold to an Egyptian named Potiphar. The Biblical account implies that Joseph was not long in Potiphar's household before he was promoted to the highest position in the house. Joseph is the very model of an administrator. He is pictured as modest - at least in his Egyptian career - hard working, honest, wise, and devoted to his superior. All these qualities contributed to the rapid rise of Joseph.¹

On the other hand, we know very little indeed about Potiphar's wife. All we know for sure is this episode we have chosen for our dialogue, i.e., that she attempted to seduce the "handsome and good looking" Joseph. However, there may be somewhat of a hint given which would explain the reason why she attempted to seduce the young slave when we consider the office which was held by her husband. It is described by the Hebrew word SARIS. The word saris normally means "eunuch". If Potiphar was, indeed, a eunuch, the dynamics of the temptation scene are quickly understood. However, there are other commentators that state that the term saris was extended to cover officials whose duties were similar to those of eunuchs, and finally to any courtier. This latter view is most likely the correct one.

3. Dialogue Interpreted

39:7: Now Joseph was handsome and good looking. And after a time his master's wife cast her eyes upon Joseph, and said, "Lie with me."

Karen Horney quotes the views of one psychoanalyst, Helene Deutsch, who believes

that what woman ultimately wants in intercourse is to be raped and violated; what she wants in mental life is to be humiliated; menstruation is significant to the woman because it feeds masochistic fantasies; childbirth represents the climax of masochistic satisfaction. Unless, Deutsch believes, women are or feel they are being raped, injured or humiliated in intercourse, they are likely to be frigid.²

transcription

The work of recent women psychoanalysts, including Horney, nevertheless is likely to increase skepticism of such views. Furthermore, theoretical preconceptions have, of course, important consequences for therapy. The theory of penis-envy in women offers a good example of this. People naturally seize upon comparatively harmless and simple solutions of their problems in order to avoid the pain of facing their inadequacies and the need to change. It is so much easier for a woman to think that she is nasty to her husband because, unfortunately, she was born without a penis and envies him for having one than to think that she has developed an attitude of righteousness and infallibility which makes it impossible to tolerate any questioning or disagreement. It is so much easier for a woman to think

that nature has given her an unfair deal than to realize that she actually makes excessive demands on the environment and is furious whenever they are not complied with.

The wish to have a penis (the handsome and good looking Joseph) may express a desire, often a yearning desire to have those qualities which are regarded as masculine: strength, courage, independence, success, sexual freedom, the right to choose a partner. Neurotic women also tend to base their inferiority feelings on the fact that they are women, a less privileged group, than on the more direct and specific interpersonal relations which engender feelings of inferiority. (Potiphar's wife was virtually a princess.) However, women have been, for centuries, deprived of great economic and political responsibilities and kept to a private emotional sphere, the family and home. Hence, they have had to rely on love, for example, as the only value that counts in life, a situation which makes them especially vulnerable to the vicissitudes of life. Consequently, the obsession with love and love relationships is a neurotic phenomenon with, admittedly, cultural overtones as well.

39:8: -But he refused and said to his master's wife, "Lo, having me my master has no concern about anything in the house, and he has put everything that he has in my hand;

:9 He is not greater in this house than I am; nor has he kept back anything from me except yourself,

because you are his wife; how then can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?"

Joseph was, at first, probably taken aback by this woman's flattery and show of affection and this could have had added power if he had let it touch another possible emotion in himself, viz., self-pity.

He had been cruelly battered about by hostility in his own family, and here was someone whose softness would compensate for that. Here was healing for his inner hurt. Furthermore, here was incitement for ambition, and a prospect for pride. This woman, powerfully placed, if he encouraged her devotion to him might carry his interests far. And all the while he could excuse his conscience by the plain fact that whatever might be questionable, he had not provoked it.³

What lay in this man's mind when he was confronted by this temptation? What was it that caused him to summon the moral integrity to refuse the affections of this seductive woman? Modern psychiatry would answer hidden facts, but real and decisive ones from somewhere in his earlier years forced his reply.

A child values his parents differently at different periods of his life. Early in life when he is abandoning the Oedipus situation, he regards his parents as splendid figures. In identifying himself with his parents, he naturally adopts this exalted image of them, thus setting up within himself an ideal by which the ego measures itself, towards which it strives, and forever struggles to fulfill the demands which it implies for an ever increasing perfection. Since Joseph was sold into slavery at an early age he most likely carried this exalted image of his parents along with

him into captivity and, more particularly, into Potiphar's house. However, because Joseph was forcibly removed from his parents - his love objects, he needed to transfer his love to another authority figure. In this case, his master, Potiphar. And Potiphar returned his love by showing the young man his complete trust in him and placed Joseph over all his household. By giving Joseph responsibility and authority, Potiphar also gave acceptance and love which Joseph so desperately needed after his terrifying experience with his own brothers. Therefore, Joseph psychologically, could not risk another rejection. He had no choice but to refuse the advances of his master's wife. For obedience to his master would bring approval and love, a much more important kind of "love" than this woman offered. Obedience to Potiphar's requests and the fulfillment of his demands would produce a good feeling, pride and satisfaction. A much deeper satisfaction than could ever be achieved in a fleeting moment of pleasure which she offered.

This leads to a further truth. A man's integrity in the world of men is not the result of human motives only. Joseph made that clear when he said "How can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?" Only in relation to God are other human beings seen in their full dignity. Unless men are regarded as of intrinsic worth, human obligations become reduced to passing whim or shifting calculation. Consider how in Nazi Germany all decent respect for human beings disappeared with repudiation of religion. Without accountability to God, human relationship can degenerate into

a crafty manipulation of advantage. What ultimate reason then is there for not treating human beings as pawns to be pushed off the board as part of a winning game? What reason unless there is the ultimate authority of truth and righteousness, and magnanimity and mercy, as established in the character of God? The dependably good man is the godly man. Reflect upon the convictions which must be inculcated in a child if there is to be any moral course followed.⁴

Failure to obey the demands of the authority figure whether it be God, parent or later love object, entails punishment, reproaches and disapproval, which are felt as pangs of conscience and feelings of guilt. The most feared punishment appears originally to be the dread of castration, (which would have been what Potiphar's wife desired and what Joseph would have unconsciously known would happen if he had been seduced), and this is the kernel around which the subsequent fear of conscience gathers. In this way the super-ego comes to dominate the ego in the form of conscience or perhaps of an unconscious sense of guilt. And, 39:10, "although she spoke to Joseph day after day, he would not listen to her, to lie with her or to be with her."

Potiphar's wife continued her sexual advances. Failing to convince Joseph in the beginning she kept on trying day by day. This persistent temptation was most likely harder to resist than the first suggestion. Joseph, no doubt, considered her offer carefully as he did take time and effort to give her a careful explanation as to

why he could not fulfill her lustful desires. He may have been shocked by her openness and boldness, but this shock soon wore off. His superego soon won out, for Joseph had sense enough to know that he must remove himself from where temptation constantly stalked. Therefore he would no longer listen to her, or lie with her, and he took care not to be with her.

39:11-12 But one day, when he went into the house to do his work and none of the men of the house was there in the house, she caught him by his garment, saying, "Lie with me." But he left his garment in her hand, and fled and got out of the house.

From this verse we see Potiphar's wife as a person exhibiting an exploitive character; one who tries to take everything she wants from other people by force or by cunning. This type of individual, no matter what sphere of life she may be concerned with, will want to grab or steal: another's spouse or friend, another's ideas, another's material goods. Everyone is an object of exploitation. Anything the exploitive person can take or steal is more attractive than what she can obtain by her own, and/or more acceptable efforts. Potiphar's wife's attitude is one of hostility and manipulation.

Joseph, aware of the inherent danger of the situation, and being subject to his own super-ego demands, saw but one means of escape: to flee the house. It is possible

that he knew himself well enough to realize that if he remained in her presence he would have been overcome by the temptation Potiphar's wife presented.

It is also possible that Joseph considered that "some sins can only be avoided by flight. Ecclesiasticus 21:2. 'Flee from sin, as from the face of a serpent; for if thou come too near it will bite thee: the teeth thereof are as the teeth of a lion, slaying the souls of men.' The rabbis say, 'At the moment of temptation, his father's image appeared to him and gave him strength to resist.'"5

clear
original
source

This latter view, that "his father's image appeared to him and gave him strength to resist" seems to verify our previous observation - viz. that Joseph's super-ego demands won out. His earlier training and his need for respect by his master prevented him from complying with his mistress' desires.

39:13 And when she saw that he had left his garment in her hand, and had fled out of the house,

39:14a she called to the men of her household and said to them, "See, he has brought among us a Hebrew to insult us;

Joseph finalized his rejection of his master's wife by fleeing her presence in such haste that he left his garment behind in her outstretched hand. Potiphar's wife had offered herself to the handsome slave and he ran away in distaste.

Being rejected by a slave was much too difficult for her to face. In order to preserve a feeling of unity in herself by which she could function, in order to protect herself from facing the terrible truth of being rejected, she created an image, which though deceptive, she beleived was really her. This image was largely, though not entirely, unreal. The kind of image a person has will depend on the structure of her personality. To the degree to which the image is unrealistic it makes one arrogant; one arrogates to oneself qualities that one does not have or has only potentially. The more unrealistic the image is, the more vulnerable a person is and in need of affirmation, recognition and acceptance. Essentially the neurotic is unaware that she is idealizing herself. For Potiphar's wife, her image had the value of reality.

It served as a substitute for the genuine self-confidence and pride, which she lacked, as an illusory kind of fulfillment of the need to feel superior, and as an obligating power or ideal which saved her from feeling lost in the world, as a guide or purpose in life, and as a facade to hide her inner conflicts.

Like most neurotic patterns, her idealized image had serious drawbacks. The worst drawback probably was that it alienated her from her real self. Furthermore, it made it all the more difficult for her to accept herself

as she factually was. Since she had put herself on a pedestal, the contrast became all the greater. Because she could not tolerate herself as she really was, her idealized image emerged. Then the image made the actuality all the more unbearable. Her first reaction was most likely to rage against herself and to despise herself. But this reaction, because of her idealized self image, could not be tolerated for long as it produced a new conflict, and even more anxiety.

Since anxiety is said to be a fear which involves a subjective factor, the problem arises as to what that factor is. It is hostility. According to Horney, "hostile impulses of various kinds form the main source from which neurotic anxiety springs."⁶ These hostile impulses are usually repressed. Repressed hostility usually becomes intensified if given no means of expression. One cannot fail to experience unconsciously hostility or rage when one's interests or one's integrity is violated, if it is not possible to feel hostility directly and consciously. Repressed hostility may itself arouse anxiety, if there is a possibility that the hostility would endanger other interests by its expression, such as social position or the love of a spouse. However, more often it is projected, sometimes on those against whom one feels hostile. Therefore, we can readily see the intent of Potiphar's wife's action, when after calling the men of her household she says to them - "see, he" - Potiphar, my husband, "has brought among us a Hebrew to insult us;" She could not

admit that it was, indeed, her own actions which caused her dilemma. Rather, she manipulated her repressed hostile feelings which were, in truth, against herself and projected them unto her husband.

However, she must have soon realized that this would not hold up. Her husband appears to have been not only highly respected by the royal court but also well liked by the servants of his household. Therefore, Potiphar's wife quickly changed the direction of her projected hostility unto Joseph, who was, after all, but a slave. Consequently she puts the blame on him by saying:

39:14b "he came into me to lie with me and I cried out with a loud voice;

39:15 and when he heard that I lifted up my voice and cried, he left his garment with me, and fled and got out of the house."

Potiphar's wife has turned the facts around sufficiently in her own mind that she has come up with the exact opposite of what really took place. The dynamics of her response are detailed by Otto Rank in his "relativity" *Source?* theory of knowledge. He holds to the view that the nature of will determines truth and falsity, not the nature of the world. Truth is subjective - what we will to be true is true. The reality which penetrates consciousness through our sense organs can influence us only by way of the emotional life and becomes either truth or falsehood accordingly; that is, is stamped as psychic reality or unreality. In

the interaction of will and consciousness as it manifests itself in the emotional life we find a continuous influencing of one sphere by the other. Even the purely sensory consciousness is not merely receptive, but is guided and restricted by will. We see or hear what we want to, not what is. ("I spoke to you. . .but you said I will not listen" - Jer. 22:21.) What is can only be learned by overcoming the tendency to deny all that we do not want to see or hear or perceive. Still more clearly is the intellect influenced by the will, for logical, casually directed thinking, going beyond the effort to shut out the painful is the positive, active expression of the will to control reality. Thus, Potiphar's wife was able to completely rework the circumstances of the situation in such a way to protect herself. In her own mind she had constructed a phantasy which permitted her to say, "I will not perceive what is" but "I will that it is otherwise, i.e., just as I want it. And this, and only this, is the truth."

C. Samuel and Saul

1. Dialogue I Sameul 15:13-26

And Samuel came to Saul; and Saul said unto him: "Blessed be thou of the Lord; I have performed the commandment of the Lord." And Samuel said: "What meaneth then this bleating of the sheep in mine ears, and the lowing of the oxen which I hear?" And Saul said: "They have brought them from the Amalekites; for the people spared the best of the sheep and of the oxen, to sacrifice unto the Lord thy God; and the rest we have utterly destroyed." Then Samuel said unto Saul: "Stay and I will tell thee what the Lord hath said to me this night." And he said unto him: "Say on."

And Samuel said: "Though thou be little in thine own sight, art thou not head of the tribes of Israel? And the Lord annointed thee king over Israel; and the Lord sent thee on a journey, and said: Go and utterly destroy the sinners the Amalekites, and fight against them until they be consumed. Wherefore then didst thou not hearken to the voice of the Lord, but didst fly upon the spoil, and didst that which was evil in the sight of the Lord?" And Saul said unto Samuel: "Yea, I have hearkened to the voice of the Lord, and have gone the way which the Lord sent me, and have brought Agag the king of Amalek, and have utterly destroyed the Amalekites. But the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the chief of the devoted things, to sacrifice unto the Lord thy God in Gilgal." And Samuel said:

"Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices.

As in hearkening to the voice of the Lord?

Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice,

And to hearken than the fat of rams.

For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft,

And stubbornness is as idolatry and teraphim.

Because thou has rejected the word of the Lord, He hath also rejected thee from being King." And Saul said unto Samuel: I have sinned; for I have transgressed the commandment of the Lord, and thy words; because I feared the people, and hearkened to their voice. Now, therefore, I pray thee, pardon my sin, and return with me, that I may worship the Lord." And Samuel said unto Saul: "I will not return with thee; for thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, and the Lord hath rejected thee from being king over Israel."

2. Dialogue Setting

One of the most striking events in the story of the beginning monarchy was the situation presented above. It points out the ever increasing hostility between the "man of God" and the first king of Israel. Samuel was forced to choose a king because of the people's displeasure with his own two sons. The Bible clearly shows that Samuel was uneasy about this innovation which he would be instrumental in bringing about. His first meeting with Saul was in connection with the "lost asses". Saul is given a special place at the banquet, later anointed privately and finally underwent a change of heart. For all these things, as well as his political stature, Saul was completely dependent upon Samuel. When he later calls his army to do battle against the Ammonites, he does so not only in his own name as king, but in the name of Samuel as well.

The dialogue presented here indicates a serious rupture between these two leaders. Before the battle at Michmash there was to be a sacrifice at Gilgal. After waiting a number of days, and with the people becoming uneasy, Saul decided not to wait for Samuel and to perform the act by himself. Immediately afterward, Samuel appears, and castigates him for his unthoughtful decision, and declares: "Now your kingdom shall not continue." Saul is definitely upset, Samuel departs; yet the situation was not yet as bad as it was to be.

The final break between these two came after an Amalekite attack in which the Israelites were thoroughly successful in routing them. Saul was ordered to utterly destroy the people, their king and their animals. However, he spared Agag and the cattle. Samuel regarded this act as rank insubordination to the will of the Lord. Moreover, though Saul admitted his sin and begged forgiveness, Samuel would not be cooled, and he indignantly states: That the Lord has rejected Saul in favor of a neighbor of his who is better than he. The best Saul could do was to persuade Samuel to stay for the sacrifice for the sake of saving face. But the rupture was complete; "Samuel did not see Saul again until the day of his death." (verse 35)¹

3. Dialogue Interpreted

15:13 And Samuel came to Saul, and Saul said to him "Blessed be you to the Lord; I have performed the commandment of the Lord."

Samuel has finally come unto Saul, but only after word has come to Samuel from the Lord. In chapter 15:10-11 God has made known to the prophet that He is displeased with the king's actions, so much so that He repents that He has made Saul king. The reason given is that Saul has disobeyed and not followed the Lord's commandments. This, needless to say, angers the elderly prophet for the king has acted in such a way as to eliminate Samuel's position as the intermediate between God and man. When Saul saw Samuel approaching he must have sensed his anger and, therefore, calls out to him: "I have performed the commandment of the Lord." Saul's unprompted claim is so sweeping and self-satisfied that he can hardly have been fully conscious of his offense. Note that his words are the exact opposite of those which God has used of him: he hath not performed My commandments. (verse 11) ²

15:14 And Samuel said, "what then is this bleating of the sheep in my ears, and the lowing of the oxen which I hear?"

To the prophet's ears, already burning with the angered words of the Lord, Saul's response only deepens his displeasure with the man whom he has now grown to

hate. Samuel confronts the king in a pure fabrication. Not only has the king disobeyed the word of God but has rejected the authority of Samuel by lying to him.

Saul declares that it was the people who brought up the animals from the Amalekites; "for the people spared the best of the sheep and of the oxen, to sacrifice to the Lord your God, and the rest we have utterly destroyed." (verse 15)

Saul's excuses aggravate his offense: he attempts to shift the blame from himself to the people; he offers as an excuse for the retention of the best of the cattle a motive which, it seems certain, had prompted neither him nor the people; and suggests that by using the animals for sacrifices he will have fulfilled his charge just as well as if he had destroyed them.

15:16 Then Samuel said to Saul, "Stop! I will tell you what the Lord said to me this night." And he said to him, "Say on."

15:17 And Samuel said, "Though you are little in your own eyes, are you not the head of the tribes of Israel? The Lord annointed you king over Israel.

15:18 And the Lord sent you on a mission and said, "Go, utterly destroy the sinners, the Amalekites, and fight against them until they are consumed."

15:19 Why then did you not obey the voice of the Lord? Why did you swoop on the spoil, and do what was evil in the sight of the Lord?"

Samuel can no longer listen to Saul's feeble excuses, he can no longer control his pent up anger. The command of the Lord was clear: "utterly destroy". Why did Saul persist in lying? Why did he not obey? Why did he do what was evil in the sight of the Lord? Why did Saul disobey Samuel? Samuel was overwhelmed by questions and doubts. By the king's blatant disregard of the command the entire structure of society of the day was at stake.

Also, if we look closer at Samuel we will see why he absolutely could not tolerate those actions of Saul. The great prophet was still a man. A man, like all men, who was influenced by his anxieties, emotions and unconscious mind.

Samuel had made Saul king over Israel. He had, in fact, made Saul what he was. In the earlier years one could say that warmth and friendliness characterized their relationship. But when Saul completely disobeyed God, and thereby Samuel as the man of God, this action of the king threw the prophet into conflict. One whom he must have dearly liked, nay loved, had turned away from him. Samuel experienced the same type of awareness of a parent who realizes that his child no longer needs him to survive. Yet this shock had deeper meaning for it was, most likely, taken as a rejection. It was probably experienced as the third great abandonment of Samuel's life. Firstly his parents had abandoned him to Eli the priest. Secondly,

the people had abandoned him in their request for a king. And, finally, Saul had abandoned him.

This was too much for him to bear. An authority figure, such as Samuel, derives his inner security from his relationship with a higher authority, God in this case, and from the acceptance of those over whom he has power. Saul's act of defiance was a definite blow to both. He not only disobeyed the commandment of God but also supplanted Samuel's position before the people which threatened Samuel's basic psychic structure. His world was falling; his inner security crumbling. He had no choice but to take the course of action which he did.

Nevertheless, Saul again pleads his own innocence and blames the people saying it was they who "took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the best of the things devoted to destruction, to sacrifice to the Lord your God in Gilgal." Saul still maintains that such conduct can be justified. His plea is that he had fulfilled the command of God in its essentials in destroying the Amalekites, and that the people did not seek self-gain from the spoil.

Samuel's reply is a classic statement of the prophetic teachings on the subject of sacrifices. "To obey is better than sacrifice," and sacrifices which are the outcome of disobedience, like Saul's, are worthless. Further, Samuel decrees; that because Saul has rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord has rejected him from being

king. This is too much for Saul to bear. He can no more excuse his actions, he can no longer shift the blame, he must turn the guilt inward, on himself. Saul breaks down and confesses "I have sinned; for I have transgressed the commandment of the Lord and your words, because I feared the people and obeyed their voice. Now, therefore, I pray, pardon my sin, and return with me that I may worship the Lord." (15:24-25)

Samuel has won. He has brought the king to his knees begging forgiveness and pardon. But the man of God is not so generous or magnanimous as to forgive Saul's indiscretion. Instead, Samuel rejects Saul, he repays the king in kind for his rejection of him, saying, "I will not return with you." Then to bring the king even lower he repeats the harsh decree stating, "the Lord has rejected you from being king over Israel."

Why was Saul really rejected? Was it because he disobeyed the word of God and the command of Samuel or were there other reasons?

One possible explanation was the plain fact that

the king did not measure up to the expectations of Samuel and the prophetic party. His early enthusiasm for religion seems to have waned somewhat as time went on. There is no record, for example, that he ever did anything for the ark. He also grew to resent Samuel's guidance. Worst of all, a nervous disease made him prone to rash and impatient acts. Unable to control himself, he became less and less fit to rule over others. Samuel,

therefore, loyal patriot and intense man of God that he was, disappointedly turned elsewhere to find Saul's successor. The reaction of this upon Saul was to increase his natural melancholia, and subject him to sudden fits of jealousy and insane anger.³

Our sympathy is apt to be with Saul; but we must not overlook the fact that he is represented as contending for a principle. In sparing Agag, for instance, his motive was not humane but selfish; and by saving out the best of the spoil he and his men were doing substantially what Achan had done at Jericho (Joshua 7:1). When confronted by Samuel he acknowledged his "sin" and made no claim to be acting from any higher impulse.

But granting that he did disobey, was one act of disobedience serious enough to justify the peremptory fashion in which he was set aside? No! For the real reason we must delve deeper. "Saul's error was that he failed in a test situation."⁴

While it was true that laymen could perform sacrifices themselves, it was customary, when a whole community was involved, that a priest should officiate, as Samuel did on his circuit tours. It must have been of special importance to Samuel that he himself should perform the sacrifice before the main body of the Hebrew people. Both factors, then, must have been involved: Saul's deferring to him in the matter of waiting and in the actual performance of the ritual.⁵

What is the significance of Saul's failure to meet this test?

The sin of which he was guilty was not only disobedience but a lack of faith in Samuel. For, if he really had a firm faith in Samuel as the man of God, whose prophetic and

clairvoyant powers made him omniscient, he would have obeyed Samuel unquestioningly, regardless of the reality situation. But he put his own judgment above that of the leading priest and prophet of Israel. Saul was, in fact, rebelling. He was rebelling against the father image which Samuel presented, and he was trying to overthrow him.⁶

Saul's reaction could quite readily be compared to the adolescent's struggle for freedom. At a certain stage of development the individual finds that he must free himself from his parents and discover a "foreign object" whom he can love. In this case Samuel became the foreign love object of Saul. However, Samuel in turn rejected Saul for his disobedience. Therefore, in order for Saul to have kept his own self image and self respect he severed his relation with Samuel and freed himself from the rejecting love object.

The son, Saul, must become reconciled with his father - or father image, Samuel. If by his infantile opposition he becomes subject to the father's domination, as is the situation herein depicted, the son must free himself from the domination. Hence the sacrifice was performed by Saul. However, the overthrow was not complete for Samuel declared that the kingdom would be taken away from the rebellious son. Saul is thereby trapped, he has failed; and failure in this sense means a crippling of the personality⁷ - and eventual complete breakdown.

grammar

D. Amnon and Tamar

1. Dialogue: II Samuel 13:10-15

Then Amnon said to Tamar, "Bring the food into the chamber, that I may eat from your hand." And Tamar took the cakes she had made, and brought them into the chamber to Amnon her brother. But when she brought them near him to eat, he took hold of her, and said to her, "Come, lie with me, my sister." She answered him, "No, my brother, do not force me; for such a thing is not done in Israel; do not do this wanton folly. As for me, where could I carry my shame? And as for you, you would be as one of the wanton fools in Israel. Now, therefore, I pray you, speak to the king; for he will not withhold me from you." But he would not listen to her; and being stronger than she, he forced her, and lay with her.

Then Amnon hated her with very great hatred; so that the hatred with which he hated her was greater than the love with which he had loved her. And Amnon said to her, "Arise, be gone."

2. Dialogue setting

Amnon was David's eldest son. He was born of Ahinoam the Jezreelitess at Hebron. (II Samuel 3:2)

Tamar was the daughter of David (II Samuel 13:1; I Chronicles 3:9) and the half sister of Amnon. She and her brother Absalom were the children of Maacah, the daughter of Talmai, King of Geshur. (II Samuel 3:3)

We have but this one incident in the life of Amnon upon which to base our opinion of him. We see presented a man who was so tormented by such lust for his sister that he made himself ill.

The symptom of Amnon, classified as hysteria, was known from time immemorial as the "lovers disease". A direct romantic allusion to this "heart affection" is found in the Song of Songs, and runs as follows:

2:5 Sustain me with raisins, refresh me with apples;
for I am sick with love.

And again, 5:8:

I adjure you, O daughters of Jerusalem,
if you find my beloved,
that you tell him
I am sick with love.

The remedies for the love-sickness: raisins, apples - are, however, not those recommended by pagan antiquity nor by some modern advisors to the lovelorn. The former advised travel and "verbal confession" while others went to the core of the matter and recommended marriage, while some moderns prescribe nerve sedatives. As the Talmudic authorities were strict moralists they countenanced no advice such as that given by the physicians of the

time which would relax sexual morality, and were impatient with the love-lorn swain whom the sages would rather see dead than permit sex indulgence out of wedlock, as a means of cure, Sanhedrin 75a.¹

Sanhedrin
75a

In the historical setting in which we find ourselves the remedy proposed, by Jonadab, the friend of Amnon, is:

"Lie down on your bed, and pretend to be ill; and when your father comes to see you, say to him, 'Let my sister Tamar come and give me bread to eat, and prepare the food in my sight, that I may see it, and eat from her hand!'"

II Sam. 13:5. This counsel was readily heeded.

It is interesting to note that although Jonadab did not expressly give his consent to the rape, he was most definitely, an accomplice because he gave the sick Amnon a crafty means whereby the prince would be able to satisfy his lustful craving.

There is every reason to believe that before Amnon is presented to us in this chapter he was already steeped in sensuality. It was his misfortune to have Jonadab, who at heart must have been as great a profligate as himself, for a friend. For if Jonadab had been anything but a profligate, Amnon would never have confided to him his odious desire, and Jonadab would never have given him the advice that he did.²

The plot was carried out, successfully, to be sure. And as told in our dialogue, Tamar, the shy young virgin, innocently entered the chamber of her brother, was raped and was sent away in shame.

Justice was, however, later done, for the full brother of Tamar, Absalom, revenged her honor by slaying Amnon for the heinous crime which he committed.

3. Dialogue Interpreted

13:10 Then Amnon said to Tamar, "Bring the food into the chamber, that I may eat from your hand." And Tamar took the cakes she had made, and brought them into the chamber to Amnon her brother.

Amnon's suggestion that Tamar prepare the food in his presence was but a simple guise to allow the young prince the opportunity to gaze at his sister. She complied and in doing so unknowingly raised his lust for the forbidden fruit which he so deeply desired for

the sexual life, although, mainly under the control of the erogenous zones, also comprises various partial impulses which afford sexual gratification and which are integrated into adult sexuality. These partial impulses include gazing, exhibiting and the cruelty impulses.

13:11 But when she brought them near him to eat, he took hold of her, and said to her, "Come, lie with me, my sister."

Amnon's lust takes over completely. He could no longer control himself.

We can easily understand that it was a great disaster to him to be a king's son. To have his position in life determined and all his wants supplied without an effort on his part; to be surrounded by such plenty that the necessity of denying himself was unknown, and whatever he fancied was at once obtained; to be so accustomed to indulge his legitimate feelings that when illegitimate desires

rose up it seemed but natural that they too should be gratified; thus to be led on in the ways of sensual pleasure till his appetite became at once bloated and irrespressible; to be surrounded by parasites and flatterers, that would make a point of never crossing him nor uttering a disagreeable word, but constantly encouraging his tastes, all this was extremely dangerous. And when his father had set the example, it was hardly possible he would avoid the snare.

According to Adler,⁴ the pampered and over indulged individual remains tied to the parent, who has pampered and over-indulged him in fact he becomes more or less of a parasite and looks to that parent for the satisfaction of all his wants, including his sexual wants. The "spoiled" individual is sexually precocious because he has learned to deny himself nothing. And in the family situation, when there are several children in the family, and with the passing of years affection wanes, the boy in the family may take his sister as his love object to replace his "faithless" formerly indulgent parent.

13:12 She answered him, "No, my brother, do not force me; for such a thing is not done in Israel; do not do this wanton folly.

Tamar makes a valiant attempt to dissuade her brother from his evil intentions. She is well aware that Amnon is physically stronger than she and that he could, if he so chose, force her. Tamar's appeal is that "such a thing is

not done." It is an appeal that is given when one realizes that none other will apply nor work. It is an appeal made from the depths of emotion; made from fear and anxiety because the individual making it knows that it will probably have no real affect. She has appealed to her brother's conscience not to do this wanton folly, but it did not work, grasping again for an argument to stop him Tamar begs:

13:13 As for me, where could I carry my shame?

Tamar is pleading with her brother to consider the consequences of his proposed act; a deed which would gain momentary satisfaction for him but would result in her life being ruined. The act would have more serious results for her being a woman, because she would carry the shame for life. Amnon, on the other hand, would be "as one of the wanton fools in Israel". Although, not desirous, still not as serious as her punishment. Tamar, desperately seeking an out makes one last cry for release: "I pray you, speak to the king; for he will not withhold me from you."

As a last resort

Tamar expresses her willingness to marry him; but in the Torah such a union is forbidden as incestuous (Lev. 18:9)! Some have supposed that Tamar's suggestion was a subterfuge, an attempt to gain time; but if the union were impossible, there would have been no plausibility in her proposal. It does seem as if Tamar is proposing something which she believes to be both legal and possible, and it would appear that the law forbidding the marriage of half-brothers and sisters was either unknown to her or not strictly observed at this time; in which case the "wanton deed" which she resists is fornication, not incest.⁵

If the latter is true, that this law was not strictly observed at this time and Tamar expressed the conviction that, in truth, David might permit their marriage, then

we may have a partial explanation of the incentive thus provided for Amnon's lust. The argument in Amnon's mind would then be, "If my father might indeed relax the code in order to give me my sister in marriage, then the fulfillment of my desire with her is not a crime of greater magnitude. I do not wish the responsibilities of a marriage which would break the law anyhow; why not do it my way?" The danger of a partial laxity is that it puts authority in an untenable position and fosters complete self will in him who desires to break the law after his own fashion.⁶

Therefore, Amnon "would not listen to her; and being stronger than she, he forced her, and lay with her." (13:14)

It is interesting to note that the Biblical text stresses the point that Amnon was stronger than his sister and that "he forced her". In most cases when the authors of the Bible describe or allude to the sexual act they utilize the euphemistic term "to know". Here, however, not only is it made explicitly clear that the sex act was completed - but, more significantly, that Amnon "forced her".

The impulses toward sexual activity, and the influence of the infantile wishes concerning sexual activity are subordinate to and in the service of the imaginary masculine goal in the life of a person such as Amnon. An individual such as he, one who had been pampered throughout his entire life, feels that he must "prove himself" as a man, that he can stand on his own two feet. The

unremitting struggle for this imaginary masculine goal, and not sex, is the key concept for understanding this type of neurosis. For a "neurotic" such as Amnon, the enjoyment of sexual pleasure or any form of sexual expression is secondary. In fact, the whole picture of the sexual neurosis is nothing more than a portrait depicting the distance which he was removed from the imaginary masculine goal and the manner in which he sought to budge it. The "neurotic" person uses sex, like everything else, as a means toward the one all-inclusive end.

The sexual components cannot be properly estimated except in relation to the person's orientation toward life, to his style of life. The erotic phases are functions of the life style and are to be understood in this way because all feelings adapt themselves to the life style. The expression and enjoyment of sexuality is determined according to the particular pattern of the original form of orientation. If the prototype is sociable and interested in others, the personality into whom it develops will solve all love-problems with loyalty to the partner and responsibility to society. If the prototype is struggling to attract notice and to suppress others, its manifestations will include the use of sexuality towards the same ends: that person will establish sexual relations in order to rule. Such is the case with Amnon.

13:15 Then Amnon hated her with very great hatred; so that the hatred with which he hated her was greater than

the love with which he had loved her. And Amnon said to her, "Arise, be gone."

If anything more was needed to show the true character of Amnon, it is his treatment of Tamar after he has violently achieved her ruin. It is the story so often repeated even at this day - the ruined victim flung aside in dishonor and left unpitied to her shame. There is no trace of any compunction on the part of Amnon at the moral murder he has committed, at the life he has ruined; no pity for the maiden whom he has doomed to humiliation. She has served his purpose now let her crave away it is nothing to him. The only thing about her that he cares for is, that she may never again trouble him with her presence, or disturb the flow of his life.⁷

A somewhat deeper insight into the dynamics of Amnon, as presented in the narrative description of this dialogue, is given by Dr. S. Goldman in his commentary to the book of Samuel. Commenting on the phrase, "Amnon hated her" he says, "This sudden revulsion of feeling betrays Amnon's love to have been nothing more than lustful passion. Perhaps also he projects unto Tamar the hatred which, now that the fever has left his blood, he feels for himself."⁸

Indeed, this is the case. Amnon despised himself and his illicit passion and therefore visited his self-loathing upon the victim of his unbridled lust. Modern psychiatry deals with countless men and women who go through

life driven by too rigid a conscience. The level to which the conscience has been developed and educated will determine the level upon which it operates; but whatever that level - whether high or low - the conscience of the wrong doer, the sinner, will drive him to desperation unless he can somewhere find the forgiveness which alone springs from reconciliation and restitution.⁹

Self hatred is the most grievous hatred. For it causes within the neurotic person feelings of anxiety. Anxiety may be concealed by various experiences, such as anger, or suspicion or feelings of inadequacy. The anxiety experienced in a character neurosis has to be understood with reference to the past history of the person.

The childhood experiences of a great number of persons with a character neurosis show that their environment has certain typical characteristics.

The basic problem is invariably a lack of genuine warmth and affection. One reason why a child may not receive enough warmth and affection lies in the parent's incapacity to give it. This may be due to either the parents being occupied with other things (as was probably the case here, for Amnon's parents were most likely involved with numerous court activities), or on account of their own neuroses.

Furthermore, we find various actions and attitudes on the part of the parents which cannot but arouse hostility (e.g. David's actions with BathSheba or preference for Absalom).

A child who experiences little or no love or respect in his early years will tend to develop a reaction of hatred toward his parents and other children and a distrustful or spiteful attitude toward everyone. However, since the child needs his parents and their care in order to survive he may be compelled to repress his hostility, and eventually, because of his precarious situation, he develops anxiety. As this person grows he will have an inordinate need for affection, and can never get enough of it. He fears dislike or disapproval and he will go to great lengths to avoid them, even though his basic hostility will manifest itself again and again to thwart him. As a rule he cannot bear to be alone, he needs continual contact with others and their friendly reassurance. Hence, he will tend to have little discrimination in his choice of friends (Jonadab). He will be eternally dependent emotionally on someone. Also, it is likely he would slide from one sexual relation into another, and that his sexual activity, like all of his human relationships, will be indiscriminate and compulsive (as with Tamar), and will often serve as a substitute for emotional intimacy. In spite of his overwhelming craving for affection, when it does present itself, it raises a conflict within him because he has a deep conviction of his own unlovability, and because he fears emotional dependency, which to him, an intimate relation implies.¹⁰

This type of person demands unconditional love. In other words, he wished to be loved regardless of any provocative

behavior on his part, to be loved without any return of love, and to be loved without any advantage for the other person. The demand of unconditional love ultimately springs from his need of reassurance because he has a deep conviction of his own inability to love. Therefore, he casts away the one loved so as not to put himself in a situation where he would have to face his problem.

IV. SUPPLEMENT: APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLE OF DIALOGUE IN EVERY DAY LIFE

A. Importance of dialogue for human relationships

Every man is a potential adversary, even those whom we love. Only through dialogue are we saved from this enmity toward one another. Dialogue is to love, what blood is to the body. When the flow of blood stops, the body dies. When dialogue stops, love dies and resentment and hate are born. But dialogue can restore a dead relationship. Indeed, this is the miracle of dialogue: it can bring relationship into being, and it can bring into being once again a relationship that has died.

There is only one qualification to these claims for dialogue: it must be mutual and proceed from both sides, and the parties to it must persist relentlessly. There is risk in speaking the dialogical word - that is, in entering into dialogue - but when two persons undertake it and accept their fear of doing so, the miracle working power of dialogue may be released.

If the claims we are making here for dialogue are a cause for surprise to the reader, the reason may be that dialogue has been equated too exclusively with the conversational parts of a play. We think of it somewhat differently - as the serious address and response between two persons, in which the being and truth of each is confronted by the being and truth of the other. Dialogue, therefore, is not easy

and comfortable to achieve, a fact which may explain why it occurs so rarely in many books of the Bible, as well as in our daily lives. Its rare occurrence accounts for the frequent absence of its benefits in our communication with one another.

Communication is important to human life for communication means life and death to persons. A study of the nature of communication is needed in this day of mass communication. On a colossal scale never known before and with technical aids that surpass the wildest imaginings of yesterday's science fiction, man can bombard his fellow man's mind, feelings and will with a subtleness and effectiveness that is frightening. Man has become the victim of communication rather than communication being a means by which he finds himself in his relation with other men in a community of mutual criticism and helpfulness.

Both the individual and society derive their basic meaning from the relations that exist between man and man. At the moment of birth the individual comes into personal being in response to his being met by his mother and father and all the others who care for him in all the concreteness of his need. And out of that same meeting the family community is born. Without dialogue individuals and society are abstractions. It is through dialogue that man accomplished the miracle of personhood and community.

The relation between a man and a woman also can reveal how indispensable is the life of dialogue. In

addition to their differences as man and woman, there are other multifaceted differences between them. Some event in which each has participated has brought them together, such as the meeting of eyes or the recognition in a discussion that they share the same opinion or attitude. In this kind of event the dialogue begins. Each then undertakes to seek and explore the other. It is important to know who the other truly is, and through dialogue that employs both the language of relationship and the language of words to seek to know life through the other. Love is born out of this dialogue in which there is both the intimacy of what these two people share in common and the distance of the unplumbed mystery of each. The emergence of this mutual awareness in the relationship reveals an important distinction between monological and dialogical love. Monological love enjoys only self-centeredly the feelings of a relationship. The lover exploits the beloved for the sake of the emotional dividend to be had. In contrast, dialogical love is outgoing. The lover turns to the beloved not to enjoy her selfishly but to serve her, to know her, and through her to be. Correspondingly, the beloved seeks the lover not to enjoy him for herself but to serve him, to know him, and in knowing him and being known by him to find her own being. In dialogical love there is enjoyment of love, and since it is not exploitive, the enjoyment increases rather than diminishes the power to love.

B. Dialogue in Marriage

Marriage is an ultimate commitment to this kind of human relationship, expressing the realization that to become a person one has to share in the being of another, and that one has to offer oneself as a person, in relation with whom the other may participate in the realization of his own being. The dialogue is in earnest. And every aspect of the relationship becomes a vehicle for it: verbal activity, living together, the assumption of responsibilities, sexual relations and recreation. And this relationship will continue to be a living one so long as each keeps in communication with the other. Each must try to speak honestly out of his own conviction, discipline and subjective feelings, seek patiently to keep aware of the partner as another person, and try to keep open the meaning of everything that happens in the relationship. Whenever either party begins to be more concerned for himself than for the other, when he uses the other as a thing for any purpose whatever, when he hides in defensive behavior, the marriage has become monological and broken. When this happens either or both of the partners may indignantly demand that the other repent and reform in the interest of a mended relationship. Healing of a marriage or any other relationship cannot occur when the partners see themselves as separate individuals with a right to demand services of each other. Healing can come only when one or the other is able to turn toward his partner, to accept the risk of giving himself in love, and to search himself

for whatever reform may be necessary. A wife, for example, may be able to make this kind of gift, and yet have it fail to heal because her husband cannot accept her gift and give himself in return. But if he can, then the miracle will occur and the dead relationship will be called again into life.

C. Dialogue in the relationship between parents and children

The relationship between parents and children also calls for a practice of the principle of dialogue. How hard it is for parents to respect and trust the uniqueness and powers of their children. While there are those aspects of life in which parents must decide and act for them until such time as they are able to decide and act for themselves, children should always have the experience of being met as free persons in a trusting and responsible relationship. The need for this trust increases as the children grow older, and it becomes acute at adolescence when the transition from childhood to adult-hood is taking place. Then it is imperative that young persons be allowed their freedoms, but equally imperative that they also have encounter with persons of conviction who, at the same time, respect their freedoms. Without this kind of relationship the individual simply flees from life, becomes passive and locked up within himself; or he may become a fighting person whose creativity is lost in the wastelands of his aggression. The importance of dialogue for this juncture of growth lies in the fact that it expresses mutual respect so that youth neither repress creativity nor throw it away, and parents neither ask to dominate nor turn away from youth in frustration. In those instances where the young person has withdrawn from life or is in hostile combat with it, as in delinquency, dialogue may accomplish the miracle of bringing the young person back into a creative relation to life.

D. Dialogue in the search for truth

Dialogue is indispensable also in the search for truth and here, too, it is a worker of miracles. Unfortunately many people hold and proclaim what they believe to be true in either an opinionated or defensive way. Religious people, for example, sometimes speak the truth they profess monologically, that is, they hold it exclusively and inwardly as if there was no possible relation between what they believe and what others believe, in spite of every indication that separately held truths are often complimentary. The monological thinker runs the danger of being prejudiced, intolerant, bigoted and a persecutor of those who differ with him. The dialogical thinker, on the other hand, is willing to speak out of his convictions to the holders of other convictions with genuine interest in them and with a sense of the possibilities between them.

E. Dialogue in Politics

Another area in desperate need of dialogical spirit and action is that of politics. National parties are often pitted against each other solely in the interest of their own success and sometimes to the cost of the country they are professing to serve; and nations look toward themselves and not toward each other, thus threatening the welfare of the planet. Indeed, the human race stands in danger of being destroyed because of the deliberate effort of parties and nations to advance their own cause by falsifying the aims and character of their opponents. With this frequently goes an ignoring of one's own misdeeds and responsibility, a representation of the self as being better than it is, and a sense of injury at the hands of the other, as if the fiction created about them was true. The abuse of dialogue has gone on so long that politicians find it difficult to break out of their monological fantasies and move toward a dialogical meeting. What is needed is the coming together of men of conviction from their respective camps who are willing to talk honestly with one another in the face of mutual criticism and loyalty to their own views. If these men would speak with one another not as pawns on a chessboard but as themselves in the sanctuary of truth, the sphere of public life would be transformed by the miracle of dialogue.

F. Dialogues in business

Still another area of life in which communication is indispensably important is industry and business. It is claimed by those within industry and by critics on the outside that mechanization and industrialization have a depersonalizing effect on people; that persons are reduced to things and made to serve the purposes of industry as if they were merely cogs in a machine. This is said to be true not only of the man who works in the shop or on the line but of the executive as well.

There are, however, other factors that can serve to combat dehumanizing influences. Men in business are persons with capacity for personal relations which can be exercised in spite of the impersonal forces lined up against the personal. But the quality of dialogue has to be in those relations, and this means that each of the participants must hold in mind his fellow workers in their present and particular being and turn to them with the intention of establishing a mutual relation between himself and them.

While the personal seems to be threatened by the intricacy and massiveness of modern industrial enterprise, it must be remembered that this enterprise was and is being built by creative persons and can only be maintained by them. No better illustration of this can be found than in the radical transformations that occur in business organizations when the leadership passes from one person to another. The question then, is: Will machines and organizations created by man destroy him, or will he control and use them for creative purposes?

This question will be answered in part by the relationships achieved in business - between labor and management, for example. Here is an area of life which needs to be touched by the transforming power of dialogue. In the midst of a labor dispute or the working out of a contract agreement, when the two parties are meeting across the table, the question needs to be asked: Is the discussion monologue or dialogue? If it is competitive only and motivated by concern of each side for itself alone, then it is monologue. If, on the other hand, the discussion is informed of each party's honest representation of itself and its aims and a genuine "seeing the other" or "experiencing the other side" of the dispute, true dialogue will occur out of which creative settlement may more likely appear. When a condition of stalemate is followed by a settlement it means that the parties finally abandoned an earlier determination to see the situation only from their own point of view and began to look at it also from the side of their opponents. The discussion changed from monologue to dialogue, thus making a settlement possible.

G. Dialogue in education

The sphere of education calls for the application of the principle of dialogue. Two views of education compete for acceptance: (1) transmission, which seeks to educate by funneling what needs to be known from the teacher to the pupil; and (2) induction, which seeks to draw forth from the student his creative powers in relation to his interest in and need for the world around him. The authoritarian kind of education places emphasis on the content of the curriculum, and the permissive theory emphasizes the student and his freedom to learn. Each theory is inadequate to the task of education. The authoritarian theory ignores the student and what he brings to the educational encounter; and the permissive theory ignores the disciplines necessary to learning; and both ignore the significance and power of the relationship between teacher and student upon which the whole educational enterprise finally depends. The student must be free to explore and to think, but he needs also to be met by a teacher who embodies in himself the data and meaning of the world and who trusts the student to respond creatively when he presents it. The educator faces two temptations: first, to interfere and force the student to learn and respond by imposing his own opinion and attitudes on him, so that the student becomes either obedient or rebellious or a confused mixture of both; and second, in the name of freedom, to leave the student without benefit of direction.

Some educators belittle and ignore the intellectual discipline; others neglect the significance of the relation between the student and the teacher. Actually, the two belong together. That which is to be taught comes from man's relation with himself and his fellows and the world in which they live. The learning of these things, therefore, should not be abstracted from the relationship from which they come, to which they belong, and to which they must be re-related if learning is to produce in the learner appreciation and creative power. There must be dialogue between teacher and student, and between the meaning as formulated in theory out of man's past experience and meaning as it emerges out of their contemporary experience. The miracle of dialogue in education is the calling forth of persons who have found their own unique relation to truth and who serve that truth with creative expectancy.

H. Dialogue in the Temple

The ofttime separation between the world and the Temple also calls for dialogue. The Temple sometimes withdraws from the world, refuses to communicate with it and treats it as an enemy rather than as the place of its life. When the Temple is preoccupied with its own concerns and oblivious to the world, its communication becomes monological and not equal to its real task. The true concern of religion is not religion but life.

The responsibility of the Temple is to speak dialogically with each generation and thus meet the needs of men. And the Temple's own need for renewal is met through such dialogue. The exchange between the Temple and the world, if it is genuine, must have mutual effect. A word spoken in isolation cannot have the same meaning as the same word spoken in relation. Likewise, the word of the Bible is best understood when it is spoken in relation to the word of man for whom it was written. Those who proclaim those words of the Bible, therefore, have as much responsibility to understand the word of man as they do the religious word in order that they may help men to recognize and accept their need of the religious word. The vitality of religious teaching is dependent in part upon its awareness and response to the meanings and questions of human life. The word "tradition" means "from hand to hand". Religious tradition becomes dead and sterile when it passes through generations without real encounter with them. When there is dialogue between truth and life, the tradition grows, accumulates

understanding and skill, and becomes equal to the challenges of each new age. The concepts of religion, therefore, have to be kept in dialogue with man and confirmed in his life. We have the same Bible that our fathers had 1500 years ago, but our understanding of it and its power to illumine human life is much greater than at that time as a result of the dialogue between biblical study and scientific, literary and psychological studies.

I. Concluding remarks

We conclude our remarks with the optimism and certainty with which we began. The Bible contains genuine dialogue; dialogue where each of the participants truly has in mind and feeling the other in his present and particular being, and turns to him with the hope, desire and intention of all his being to establish a living and dynamic mutual relationship between himself and the one with whom he wishes to relate. From this type of human relationship we can gain not only insight and understanding but inspiration as well, to direct our lives accordingly.

FOOTNOTES

I. INTRODUCTION

- 1 Horace B. English and A.V. English, A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms, New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1958, p.31.
- 2 ibid. p. 35.
- 3 ibid. p. 157.
- 4 ibid. p. 204.
- 5 ibid. p. 230.
- 6 ibid. p. 282.
- 7 ibid. p. 299.
- 8 ibid. p. 393.

II. BIBLICAL DIALOGUES INTERPRETED

Jacob and Esau

- 1 C.P. Teulings, A Gallery of Portraits of the Old Testament, New York, Vantage Press, 1963, p. 58.
- 2 George L. Robinson, Leaders of Israel, New York, Young Men's Christian Association Press, 1907, p. 24.
- 3 Charles R. Brown, The Story Books of the Early Hebrews, Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1919, pp. 42-43.
- 4 George A. Buttrick, ed., The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. I, New York, Abingdon Press, 1953, pp. 665-666.
- 5 Teulings, op. cit.
- 6 Interpreter's Bible, Vol I., p. 666.

Joseph and Potiphar's wife

- 1 See - The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. E-J, pp. 981-986.
- 2 Karen Horney, Our Inner Conflicts, New York, W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1945, pp. 110-111.

- 3 The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. I, p. 764.
- 4 Paraphrase - ibid. p. 765.
- 5 Dr. J.H. Hertz, The Pentateuch and Haftorahs, London, Soncino Press, 1952, p. 148.
- 6 Karen Horney, The Neurotic Personality of our Time, New York, W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1937, p. 63.

Samuel and Saul

- 1 Paraphrase - Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol 4, p. 231.
- 2 S. Goldman, Samuel, New York, Soncino Press, 1951, p. 89.
- 3 George Dahl, The Heroes of Israel's Golden Age, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1923, p. 31.
- 4 Goldman, op. cit. p. 88.
- 5 Dorothy F. Zeligs, "Saul, ¹The Tragic King" Reprinted from: The American Imago, Vol. 14, No. 1. Spring of 1957, p. 73.
- 6 ibid. p. 74.
- 7 See - Patrick Mullahy, Oedipus, Myth and Complex, A Review of Psychoanalytic Theory, New York, Grove Press, Inc., 1948, p. 29.

Amnon and Tamar

- 1 Morris Braude, M.D., Scriptural Psychiatry, pp. 100-102.
- 2 W. Robertson Nicoll, ed. The Expositor's Bible, Vol. II, p. 163.
- 3 Mullahy, op. cit. p. 19.
- 4 Alfred Adler, What Life Should Mean to You, New York Grosset and Dunlap, p. 51.
- 5 Goldman, op. cit. p. 259.
- 6 The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. II, p. 1113.

- 7 See - The Expositor's Bible, Vol. II, p. 164.
- 8 Goldman, op. cit.
- 9 See - The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. II, pp. 1113-1114.
- 10 See - Karen Horney, Self Analysis, New York, W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1942, pp. 54-60.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Alfred, What Life Should Mean to You, Grosset and Dunlap, New York.
- Alexander, George M., The Handbook of Biblical Personalities The Seabury Press, Greenwich, 1962.
- Bargellini, Piero, David, J.P. Kennedy and Sons, New York, 1946.
- Biberfeld, Henry, David, King of Israel, The Spero Foundation, Cleveland, 1943.
- Bonser, Edna M., How the Early Hebrews Lived and Learned, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1932.
- Braude, Morris, M.D. Scriptural Psychiatry, private publication.
- Bronstein, Menachem, The Scriptures by Psychological Category, (in Hebrew) Kiryat Sepher, Jerusalem, 1964.
- Brown, Charles R., The Story Books of the Early Hebrews, The Pilgrim Press, Boston, 1919.
- Buttrick, George A., editor, The Interpreter's Bible in 12 volumes. Abingdon Press, New York, 1953.
- _____, The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible in 4 volumes, Abingdon Press, New York, 1962.
- Clegg, Alfred, Narrative Dialogues from the Bible, Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., New York, 1928.
- Dahl, George, The Heroes of Israel's Golden Age, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1923.
- Douglas, George C.M., Samuel and His Age, Eyre and Spottiswood, London, 1901.
- English, Horace B., and English, A.V., A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms, Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1958.
- Flight, John W., The Drama of Ancient Israel, The Beacon Press, Boston, 1949.
- Fowler, Henry Thatcher, Great Leaders of Hebrew History, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1920.
- Friedman, Maurice S., Martin Buber, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1955.
- Hertz, Dr. J.H. The Pentateuch and Haftorah, Soncino Press, London, 1952.
- A

- Goldman, S., Samuel, Soncino Press, New York, 1951.
- Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version, Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York, 1952.
- Horney, Karen, Self Analysis, W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., New York, 1942.
- _____, Our Inner Conflicts, W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., New York, 1945.
- _____, The Neurotic Personality of Our Time, W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., New York, 1937.
- Howe, Revel L., The Miracle of Dialogue, Seabury Press, Greenwich, 1963.
- James, Fleming, Personalities of the Old Testament, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1939.
- Kaplan, Jacob H., Psychology of Prophecy, Julius H. Greenstone, Philadelphia, 1908.
- Katz, Robert L., "A Psychoanalytic Comment on Job 3:25", (offprint, Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. 29), Cincinnati, 1958.
- Mullahy, Patrick, Oedipus, Myth and Complex, A Review of Psychoanalytic Theory, Grove Press, Inc., New York, 1948.
- Nicoll, W. Robertson, editor, The Expositor's Bible, Vol. II.
- Robinson, George, Leaders of Israel, Young Men's Christian Association Press, New York, 1907.
- Schorer, M., Miles, J., and McKensie, G., Criticism: The Foundation of Modern Literary Judgment, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1958.
- Teulings, C.P., A Gallery of Portraits of the Old Testament, Vantage Press, New York, 1963.
- Westman, H., The Springs of Creativity, Antheneum, New York, 1961.
- Willman, Leon Kurtz, Men of the Old Testament, Young Men's Christian Association Press, New York, 1908.
- Wise, Carroll A., Psychiatry and the Bible, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1956.

- Zeligs, Dorothy F., "The Role of the Mother in the Development of Hebraic Monotheism" (reprinted from: Psychoanalytic Study of Society, Vol. I), International Universities Press, New York, 1960.
- , "Solomon, the Man and the Myth" (reprinted from: Psychoanalysis and the Psychoanalytic Review, Vol. 48), No. 1., Spring of 1961.
- , "The Personality of Joseph" (reprinted from: The American Imago, Vol. 12, No. 1.), Spring of 1955.
- , "Saul, The Tragic King", (reprinted from: The American Imago, Vol. 14, No. 1.) Spring of 1957.
- , "Abraham and Monotheism", (reprinted from: The American Imago, Vol. 11, No. 3.), Fall of 1954.
- , "A Character Study of Samuel", (reprinted from: The American Imago, Vol. 12, No. 4), Winter of 1955.
- , "Abraham and the Covenant of the Pieces", (reprinted from: The American Imago, Vol. 18, No. 2), Summer of 1961.
- , "Two Episodes in the Life of Jacob" (reprinted from: The American Imago, Vol. 10, No. 2), Summer of 1953.
- , "A Study of King David", (reprinted from: The American Imago, Vol. 17, No. 2), Summer of 1960.