



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

Contents

The Books of Samuel

Introduction	I - XIV	
Chapter I Book of Samuel		
Position in Canon	}	1
Name and Division.		3
Chapter II Contents of the Book		
Character of the Book	}	11
Historical Poetry		19
Chapter III Sources of the Narrative		
History of Tradition	}	29
Time and Author		49
Chapter IV Biography		61
History of Israel	}	73
Saul and David		84

Uvic. 3/81



Introduction

The nature ^{and} place, pursued by the writer of the following essay, are unique. The writer had one leading purpose in view, which was to say something positive of the Book of Samuel. The leading critics have all had their say, ^{and} it seems that their object was to render as little assistance as possible to the earnest inquirer of the facts of those historical books of the bible. Opinions are as numerous as the writers of the book, ^{and} contradictions just as many; so that there has accumulated about these books a mass of intricate commentary, whose windings ^{and} meanderings are as interminable as those of the famous labyrinth of Hædalus. But fortunately we have been able to follow up the thread ^{of thought} underlying them all, and thus a safe exit was possible for us.

The books of Samuel are before us in their original tongue, together with all the ancient versions ^{and} commentaries thereof. The data

for historical investigation, concerning the time when and the author by whom they were written, were taken from the original source ^{and} besides from Josephus, Philo ^{and} the ancient rabbins, ^{who} were nearer the sources of this period of literature ^{and} better acquainted with the manners, customs ^{and} pragmatism of the age. Yet we have also been guided by the biblical criticism of modern schools, both rational ^{and} orthodox, by whom the literature ^{and} traditions of the Israelitish nation, as well as the rabbinical literature have been thoroughly investigated.

The history of the period contained in the historical books of Samuel extends from the end of the republic in the time of Samuël (1080 B.C.) to the early administration of Solomon (1000 B.C.). The transition from the republic to the kingdom under Samuël, a fact which is characterized as one of the most dangerous innovations in the government of nations,

the judgeship of Eli & Samuel. The administrations of Saul & David; the establishment of the theocracy & the divine laws regulating the commonwealth of Israel, are most pragmatically set forth in the books of Samuel. In addition to this political history, Samuel has also given us a history of the literature describing the various phases of learning & civilization representing the intellectual diversity of the mind & the elements constituting to humanity of that remarkable period of Jewish history. Inspired bards touching the secret chords of the heart, prophetic orators charming the mind, philosophers & law-givers who give to Israel their first royal constitution all are counted among the national literati of this age, long before Orpheus tunes the Grecian lyre or Demosthenes & Cicero addressed "ye men of Athens & Rome."

The ecclesiastical history of Israel is most skillfully interwoven with the political, by historian of Samuel. Hence the passages

are always recurring, which point to the the-
ocracy as the foundation of the unity of the Hebrew
nation under the ה' יְהוָה the special
providence of God. The laws of the Kingdom were
therefore divine, the king was the regent and
highpriest of the Lord, the prophets and judges dispense
justice in the name of the Lord, while the voice
of God spoke through the prophets, highpriests,
kings and judges in the national council of
Israel, whose decrees were the echo of the voice of
God. A special importance must be at-
tached to these historical books of Samuel
because they are the first to set forth in
ecclesiastical history, the pure and sublime
ideas of the Hebrews entertained by Israel
as a nation united under a sovereign king,
who carries out the doctrines and principles of
the theocracy the laws of the monarchy. And
consequently we may assume that Israel, passing
through the same periods of life and development
as every other nation, had already entered upon

calm reasoning & quiet reflection, the mental operations of matured man, when its first king ascended the throne. Thus following out the contents of the books we succeeded in discovering that the political history of Israel, with its twelve tribes, for the first time united, the history of its literature then extant, and the ecclesiastical history were most naturally detailed by the pragmatic historian of that age.

In comparing Samuel with the other historical books of the bible, viz with Joshua & Judges, it at once dawned upon the writer, that the facts belonging to the province of history were more easily discerned, not being surrounded by doctrine & miracles, as is the case with the earlier books of the bible; it seems in Samuel we approach really historical times. The legendary figures of the books of Judges, are succeeded by persons, whose historical activity we have no reason to doubt. An age of historical legends, in which but shadows of real life can be discerned, is followed in Samuel by a

dawn of history, in which events take a more natural course and the accounts thereof begin to be closely and chronologically connected being based on trustworthy documents and traditions. The difference in style of Samuel from Judges and Joshua is also very striking; while Joshua and Judges are characterized by the simplicity and precision of the heroic style, which marks the Hebrew Literature down to the age of David, Samuel betrays everywhere the graceful beauty and elegance of another period of Hebrew Literature, the sublimity and power of the prophetic style to which the earlier literature of the prophets belongs. Thus Samuel, as distinguished from earlier historical books, is free from the record of the mystic and miraculous, while its style marks the beginning of a new period of Hebrew Literature.

The variety of opinion existing as to the original documents from which the two books of Samuel were compiled, disclose the independence of the unerring critics, who follow the new methods of Criticism guided by the authors of the

Jahvistic and Elohistie hypothesis. Since Richard
 Simon's "Critique du Vieux Testament" 1678,
 eight years after B. Spinoza's "Tract. Theol. Polit."
 1670, and extending up to our times, a new science
 of biblical criticism has sprung up, built on histor-
 ical and philological foundations which antagonized
 documentary and traditional evidence. The advocates
 of this new school, by a priori judgments overturned
 the whole history of Israel, and especially the
 history of the biblical literature. The more they
 examine into biblical literature, the less they seem
 to know, for they give us authors without number,
 and their liberality in manufacturing Jahvistic
 and Elohistie writers knows no limit. Thus
 He Wette has furnished me with the examination
 of at least thirty original documents for the books
 of Samuel, while the eight different authors given
 us by the modern German critics is only a slight
 evidence of their critical acumen. We have, in
 the chapter "Sources of the Samuel Narrative" given
 the documents from which we might reasonably

suppose the books of Samuel to have been compiled, while under the chapter "Time & Author of Samuel" the basis for our belief that Samuel, Gad & Nathan were the authors is made clear; to David also we have ascribed the authorship of the historical poetry of the second book of Samuel.

In our chapter entitled "History of Israel," our plan has been to extract those events transpiring which in the issue affected the conditions & surroundings of Israel as a nation; the biographical history forming a great portion of the books of Samuel, was passed over in toto, in order to lay greater stress upon the assimilating process going on among the various tribes; the abolition of the Baal-worship & the substitution of our national religion, or the worship of Jehovah was in my humble opinion the immediate cause of the people's demand for a King. For being now united in religion, they wanted to unify the state, hence the cry, "Give us a King."

And, in this connection we cannot fully understand Samuel's almost stubborn resistance to the wishes of the people. That provision for a king had already been made we see clearly from the fifth book of Moses, where certain enactments are made, especially the one requiring the king to be taken from the midst of the people of Israel; why then this individual opposition to the demands for a king. The only explanation seems to be Samuel's apprehension lest the theocracy, ^{and} the hierarchy be wrecked by the political ship of State ^{and} strange to say that the king, ^{as} David, was the very regent from whom the Messiah expectation originated ^{and} who established firmly the theocracy of Israel, based upon which were all the inspiration ^{and} recognition of all the prophets in Israel.

That the five books of Moses existed at the time of the compilation of David's Samuel, there can be no doubt. The numerous traces of customs laid down in the Pentateuch, not alone

the traces of them; but the fact that these customs, such as the yearly pilgrimage to the national sanctuary, the forbidding of the eating of the blood, show that they were observed ^{and} even enforced in the latter days of the Republic ^{and} the beginning of the kingdom. But not only do we find traces of the Pentateuch, but even whole verses are bodily quoted, ^{and} historical events completed under the reign of the kings. Thus the mentioning of Amalek who waylaid Israel in their conquest ^{and} the command to utterly destroy them, would have been most cruel ^{and} barbarous in execution, ~~unless~~ if his previous relation with Israel had not been clearly stated in the parasha of 758. Then again David in admonishing his son Solomon, impresses upon him the imperative duty of observing the words of The Law, which points at once to the fact that The Torah existed in his time. Nay so many ^{and} numerous are the traces of the Pentateuch in Daniel, that He Weller, Ewald, Hilzig, Weil ^{and} many other critics main-

tain that Deuteronomy must certainly have been compiled after these historical books were written, but we maintain that this is one of those "putting-the-cart-before-the-horse-acts" of which the Vater school of historians are capable of performing. How would the laws of Deuteronomy have obtained authority & sanction in Israel, if a Moses is not given the authorship of them? & how is it possible to compile from scattered historical traditions & documents, such a positive summary of the other four books of Moses, as Deuteronomy contains, surely it would then have been possible to discover about twenty different sources of documents in this book which is not the case at present. Of course our critics to overcome this objection go one step farther and make the whole Pentateuch a post-exilic redaction & revision. The assertion of such an idea is bald enough, but the attempted proof thereof is one of the most marvellous feats of jugglery ever performed by the human mind.

some day, we trust, this equilibrium will give way under the more sober light of investigation, and the tottering superstructure involve all these now juggling critics in its precipitous descent. Thus it will be seen that the authority and authenticity of the historical books of the bible, especially of the books of Samuel are of the greatest testimony and evidence for establishing the authenticity of the records of the Pentateuch, the proof of the one involves the certainty of the other as has been demonstrated above.

The biography of Samuel the great prophet judge and priest was taken purely from the original source. Of course here again we look to his acts in connection with their historical bearing on united Israel, and the completeness of his actions revealed by the historian leads us to infer it to have been the primary object of the writer to detail his deeds even to their ultimate bearing at the same time giving us an insight into the private life of the great prophet.

Yet however careful the historian was to set before us the last judge of the republic in the Theocracy, he seems to make all but introductory to the advent of David. From the moment that David enters upon the scene, from then on the historical narrative fairly sparkles in the praise & exaltation of the shepherd King of Israel. The private, domestic & political acts of David are given with such minuteness & detail that we are at once led to infer that some scribe of his or one, who was his son, friend, or must have written those portions of the books of Samuel which relate his biography, and this only strengthens my conviction that Samuel, Elkanah & Nathan were the authors of these books.

We have not entered into any textual criticism of the books of Samuel considering it unnecessary after ^{that} such men as Hülshausen, Philippius, Sternheimer, Steil and Men of the Old English tract society have exhausted their powers of mind on the text, and especially because we feel that textual criticism is beyond our full powers of mind.

But we have compared the texts of those documents in Samuel, which as traditions, have been incorporated as such, & which contain double narrations of events, sometimes supplementing one another, and again seemingly contradicting one another. It is on such an insecure basis that some would rest their opinion of an extensive revision and redaction of Samuel, Some portions of which are recognised as older, others as later compilations. But it seems to me that the unity of the book, the uninterrupted narrative thereof, its simplicity and harmony of connection argue against any such hypothesis, especially if we consider the book to have been compiled and completed in the time of Solomon when the chroniclers and scribes from the prophetic school gave to Hebrew literature its new elegance and independence of style, so well preserved in Samuel. All other matter as to contents, canonicity, historical tradition & division of the book, have been set forth in their respective chapters, and I hope to have succeeded in showing the positive aspects of these important books.

The Books of Samuel

Position in the Canon.

The bible, as before, is composed of forty three books. These forty three books have been compiled into twenty four volumes according to the Massoretic text. These in turn have been divided into three canons, viz. Thorah, the Pentateuch; Nebiim, the Prophets; Ketubim, the Hagiographa. The books of Samuel belong to the second canon, the prophets. The order and succession of the books of the prophetic canon according to the Talmud is as follows: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah and the Twelve Minor Prophets. The Massoretic establishment of the prophetic canon agrees with that of the Talmud with one exception and that is in placing Isaiah before Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The prophets also are divided into two classes: I The greater prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel; II the minor prophets: known as the Twelve Minor prophets.

There is a further classification of prophets by which they are known, as "The Earlier and The Latter Prophets. To the former belong Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings which are known as the books of the earlier prophets; furthermore they constitute the so called historical books of the prophets." Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and The Twelve Minor Prophets are thus distinguished as the books of the later prophets. Thus reverting to the books of Samuel we find that they belonged to the original forty three books of which the bible, as before us, consists; that they carried their authority as a distinct volume into the twenty-four book compilation; and in the redaction and establishment of the canons they were assigned to the second, known as the prophetic canon. Furthermore Samuel constitutes the third section of this canon the first and second being Joshua, and Judges; the book belongs to the historical books of the prophets; the prophets to the earlier ones.

Name and Division of the Books of Samuel.

As far back into antiquity as post-biblical Hebrew literature reaches, we are warranted in the statement, that, to the bible no book was added, from it none was taken, not yet was the name of any book changed with the exception of Nehemiah, which as it appears from Sanhedrin 93 b. was still a part of Ezra when the Talmud was written. Samuel and Kings may have been considered one book by the early Greek translators, but there is no trace of this in Hebrew sources. On the contrary, according to Massorah and Talmud, the number of the biblical books being twenty four, Samuel and Kings must each have been counted as a separate book. Josephus, Philo and Eusebius regard twenty two books comprising the compilation of the biblical texts while Epiphanius gives his version, maintaining twenty seven as the number of the divine books of the bible. The cause of this difference in the enumeration of the biblical books,

may be found, from ~~that~~ the fact that certain books such as Ruth and Lamentations were at one time considered separate books, at another, as belonging to three sections of the biblical books. Thus Josephus, Philo and many of the fathers of the church held that Judges and Ruth formed one book, also that Lamentations was but a part of Jeremiah, hence the division into 22 books. Epiphanius however divides Samuel, Kings and Chronicles each into two books, separate and distinct and maintaining Ruth and Lamentations as single books make the number of biblical books twenty seven. Thus we see that the ancient Greek translators also the Greek Jewish authors went from one calculation to the other in their attempts to lay down the number of biblical books which the Massora as well as the Talmud gives as twenty four. Samuel was especially a source of difference, some considering it as one book of two volumes, others as two distinct

volumes; while a third would have them
as a part of the book of Kings, consisting
of I & II Samuel and I & II Kings.
In the Massorah, the two volumes of Sam-
uel are counted as one book. We can
not state the exact time of the division of the
text of Samuel into two parts. This, much
is certain, that originally there was no such
division, both books being written as one, as
may be inferred from the fact that in the
Hebrew bible the initial letter ^{word} of the second
book begins with a small instead of a ca-
pital letter. Hieronymus divided each of
the books of Samuel as well as Kings and
Chronicles into two portions. In the first
bibles printed in Socino 1488 A.D. also
in Brestia 1494 the ancient Jewish divisions
are retained. It was Ernst Bomberg,
the celebrated editor of Venice, who at the
beginning of the sixteenth century first adopted
the Greek division of Hieronymus, then
to be copied in subsequent editions. We do not

mean to say that Bomberg made the division, but that he was the first to publish the Hebrew Bible with such division, for the Vulgate and Septuagint had already adopted the two-book division in their editions.

We may thus sum up the historical steps in the division of the Books of Samuel.

I In the ancient Hebrew manuscripts there was no division of the book. The Hebrew title of the book, שמעון דוד plainly indicates this.
II The division into two books is first made in the Septuagint and Vulgate.

III This division followed by Bomberg in his edition of the first Hebrew Bibles and subsequently introduced in all the rabbinical Bibles.

As regards the title of the books bearing the name of "Samuel" we must note that they are differently named in the Vulgate and Septuagint. Viewed in relation to those books which precede and those which follow Samuel, the latter name of these books becomes significant.

The double name "The First and Second Books of
Samuel" as these books are called in the printed he-
brew letter of Bemburg; as the "First and Second
Books of Kings" is entitled by the Septuagint
and Vulgate, well marks the two principal features
which characterize these books. They contain
a detailed record of the life and ministry of Samuel,
the great prophet and judge in Israel, which is
the first feature. They also contain the re-
cord of the rise of "Kingdom of Israel" the second, and
as I think the most important feature of these
books. Viewed in this light we can readily
understand how the difference in name arose.
Marland justly remarks, that these books do not
bear the name "Samuel" because he is the author of
them, but because his greatness as a judge,
minister and prophet are so apparent as to make
him the central figure in a period of transition
from theocracy to democracy. For he it was
that linked together the subsequent narrative
of events in that Saul and David were anointed
by him as the appointed kings of Israel.

As Samuel was the mediator between the
period of "Judges & Kings" so it was deemed
proper to honor that book narrating the
process of arbitration, as it were, & forming the
direct connection between the Books of Judges
& Kings with the name of Samuel. Yet it
seems that the title "I + II Books of Kings"
is more the less appropriate, because it has
this much in common with the books of Kings,
that together with the books of Kings the book
of Samuel has for its main object the rise,
development & progress of the monarchy
of Israel. But another consideration may
render the name I + II Samuel more de-
sirable. The close of almost every epoch
in the history of the Israelitish nation &
even the beginning thereof, is indicated in the
literature of that period. Thus after the time
of Moses & Aaron there was known the Torah
with the following books mentioned there in the
"book of antiquity" ספר הזמירות; the book of Joshua
the "Book of the Holy Wars" "the Book of the Fathers".

The episode of the judges as the period of heroes
is indicated in the following literature: The song
of Deborah, the fall of Jetham. Similarly
at the beginning of the Kingdom of Israel it
was Samuel, who as an author committed the
Kingly covenant to writing & preserved it in the
sanctuary. As the author of such an important
compact between God & Israel the name of
Samuel is most naturally appended to the
book recording his life & ministry. Reverting
again to the two principal features of the
book it is apparent that either "I & II Book
of Samuel" or "I & II Book of Kings" properly char-
acterize the books thus named. In relation
to the book of Judges the name "Book of Kings"
is appropriate; in relation to Joshua the
name "Book of Samuel" is the more so. Again
it is obvious that the present line of division
between II Sam. & I Kings is an arbitrary one.
If therefore the books of Sam. be taken as form-
ing one history with Kings then the division
of the Vulgate & Sept. into 4 books of Kings is natural.

But if these books are looked upon as an iso-
late history, the name "Samuel" is properly
applied to them, not only because he stands out
prominently as the great figure of the age,
but because his administration of the affairs
of Israel, was the connecting link to the
transition from the rule of the Judges to the
reign of the Kings, distinct from each other,
yet binding them both together. The im-
portant place to be filled by Sam. is seen
at once in the opening chapters of the book
bearing his name & in the ensuing history.
His parentage, birth & the remarkable
circumstances connected therewith, are recorded
in detail. We see analogous instances of
these details, in the birth of Isaac, of Moses
the redeemer of Israel, of Sampson the
deliverer. Looking upon these considerations as
in favor of the title "Samuel" or "Kings" as suggested
by Bleek, Ewald, Philipsson & H. & Wette also
Wellhausen. I see no reason why I & II Kings
should not have been the name of the books of Samuel.

Contents of the Book.

Although the historical narrative of Samuel forms one uninterrupted whole from the beginning of the first book to the end of the second extending even into the first three chapters of Kings still we may discern several natural divisions in the contents thereof.

The first book, chapters I-VIII, is a continuation of the reign of the judges, containing also the history of the last two, Eli and Samuel; chapters IX-XV the history of Saul to his rejection by the national council of elders; chapters XVI-XXXI history of the closing years of Saul's reign; history and biography of David until his accession to the throne of Israel. The second book sets forth the historical events under the reign of King David together with a detailed account of the domestic life of the King's household. Chronological order is not strictly adhered to. The divisions of the narrative is as follows: Chapters I-V the wars of David leading to his uniting the whole Kingdom of Israel:

Chapters vi-vii activities leading to the
establishment of the tabernacle in Shiloh and
the preparations for the building of a temple;
Chapters viii-xii foreign wars & subjugation of nations;
Chapters xiii-xx civil wars, internecine strife.
The book closes with an enumeration of David's
and his military officers, and David's grand hymn
of praise. From this division of the con-
tents of the books of Samuel it is readily seen
that we have but a partial history of
Eli, Samuel and Saul. The author of the
book has given but a short sketch of
these three distinguished personages,
considering their history subservient to
that of David. The elaboration of the
contents as above set forth will be given, in
a subsequent chapter. In the division
of the contents of the first book of Samuel
the writer of this paper had before him
first, the natural pause in the historical
connection and second the views of some of the German
writers who claim to find distinct authors for various sections
of these books. This topic will be discussed further on.

Character of the Book.

The character of the historical narrative of the book of Samuel though similar to that of Judges is unique. The author of the book is evidently aware of the historical facts as may be inferred from the detailed history in which the narrative of events is accompanied by a view of the causes and results. It is what may be termed pragmatic history, exhibiting clearly the causes and consequences of events. As set forth in the book the connection and progress of events becomes natural; of real contradictions there are but few; everything bears the stamp of authority and since for the incidents & occurrences of kings prophets and judges are regarded with that natural gravitas and candor which truth alone warrants. The point of view from which the author sets forth his estimate of the historical portions is that of the causal relations of events and his tendency is in this respect similar to that of the other historical books of the bible. To set forth in a comprehensive manner the general history

of Israel as a nation, to give the biography of the
judges, prophets & kings, mentioned in Samuel,
all under the sovereignty of God in order to recognize
and obey his authority, to represent the laws of nation-
al history as the providence of God, thus we consider
the object and tendency of the books of Samuel.
Though a transition, gradual in its revolution,
from a republican to a monarchical govern-
ment takes place, still the mediation of
the prophet at the head of the national council
of Elders, would indicate that the theocracy
was the basis of the monarchy. It is, uni-
versally a characteristic of this book of the early
prophets, to be showing that the will of God
is revealed to prophets and pilots a nation's history.
But since the prophet is, nevertheless, in more
direct communication with God, and ~~is not~~
notwithstanding, is only a mortal, the will of
God becomes identified with the will of man.
Thus the transition from the republic
to the kingdom of Israel, though not pleasing
to Samuel, was also under divine guidance, as the

principle of "Vox populi, vox dei." The theocratic element is especially uppermost in the mind of the author when narrating the incidents of the birth & subsequent biography of Samuel. The domestic life of Samuel is not touched upon, his administration as judge but casually alluded to; but, as here the author proves himself a theist, the birth of Samuel, as exhibiting the grace of God, his training & education for his sacred duties, his exertions to wipe out idolatry & substitute the worship of Jehovah, his recording the first royal constitution, & his making known the will of God by anointing Saul & David; all this in most accurate detail is further proof of the tendency of the book, & to show the divine intervention in Israel's national history.

Considering the tendency of the book from the theocratic point of view, there is a conspicuous ^{not an entire} absence of the mystic & miraculous in the historical narrative. In II Sam. XXV is the prophetic vision of Gad the seer, accompanied by a plague brought on and stayed by the hand of an angel.

The miraculous consists in the divine guidance and special intervention of Providence as revealed through the prophets. I Sam. XXVIII which relates the incident of Saul consulting the witch of Endor is but a deception as the exposé of modern spiritualism conclusively proves. The purpose of the warning and exhortations of the prophet is especially noticeable in I Sam. II, III, VIII, XII, XXV, XXVIII also in II Sam. III, XXIV. These chapters clearly indicate the divine prerogative of judgment and punishment exercised by God not only over the nation but also over kings in their domestic relations (2 Sam XII). In other respects the narrative, especially that of the second book, bears the true historical stamp. The history is now drawn mainly from oral traditions, which in turn is based upon ^{the} inscriptions of Monuments, proverbs and historical names 1 S. VI, 18 2 S. II, 8. II, 16. With exception of 2 S. VIII, XXII & the historian has given us a most vivid present-

tation of the historical features & events of this great epoch of the Israelitish nation, with so much detail, that at times the narrative becomes biography. As to chronological order, we are disposed to agree with Thiers, Thirlipson & others, that such order is not strictly maintained, but is often defective in consequence of the legendary history. 1 Sam. xvii, 2, xviii, 1.

2 Sam v, 4; xv, 7. Nevertheless there is a natural connection of incidents & though at times in seeming contradiction the historical circumstances are most strikingly set forth.

In style & diction Samuel is entirely different from any other historical book of the Bible. Clear, concise & vigorous the prose is interspersed with pieces of poetry, which the author ascribes to other writers.

Three poems found in I Sam. ii 1-10; II Sam i 17-27; ix, 33-34; xxii, xxiii 1-7 we shall characterize in a later chapter. The speeches recorded in Samuel are remarkable for their

energy and boldness; while the conversations are rich in thought and the beauty of language. From these speeches and conversations a most masterly blending of the theocratic and political government is set forth so that the books become not only a history of the time and Kingdom of David and Saul, but also a compendium of general history up to the authors time. The books itself also give us information about the then existing literature fragments of which we to-day possess causing us to regret the loss of the greater part of the literature of that age. The names of different books mentioned are: the book of Jashar (II Sam. i 18:1); the Meshal Hadmoni quoted by David, (I Sam. XXIV 14). and the poetical extracts mentioned above. Thus summing up the general characteristic of the books we may say, that incongruities are rare, the supernatural is merely incidental, while the accounts of events are based on trustworthy documents & traditions, while the truth of history pierces the veil of fiction.

The Historical Poetry of the Books.

Criticism, applied to the fertile field of Hebrew history, as opened up in the books of Samuel, is no longer purely conjectural, but must now act constructively. Its destructive work is quite easily ~~now~~ accomplished, and especially is this the case, where poetry, in songs or fragments, has been interwoven with historical prose. The book of Samuel is an apt illustration of prose-poetry history. Almost the very opening chapters (I Sam. II 1-10) confront us with such a poem, viz. Hannah's prayer, who speaking of Jehovah's King ^{the} anointed seems to have anticipated later historical times. This should not surprise the critic, but he must consider that the writers of sacred history as well as inspired singers often anticipate in their early writings the characteristic features of an epoch of national history. So it was also with the writer who credits Hannah with the expression "King" even before a King was anointed. Hence this poem is not a later invention.

Aside from this psalm, the book contains other poetical fragments which form an integral part of the prose narrative. In the account of the extermination of Amalek, where the last judge, Samuel, ^{and} the first king of Israel, Saul, figure, the one in the service of God, the other in the service of his people. Here lies the real, the decisive cause of the rejection of Saul's dynasty. Saul, as it appears from 1 Sam. xv. was commanded by Samuel to utterly destroy the Amalekites, their king, his possessions ^{and} all the possessions of that tribe. The king of Israel did not fully carry out this order, but spared Agag the king, ^{and} carried away the best of the sheep, ^{and} even to sacrifice to Jehovah. Whereupon Samuel reproaches him with disobedience ^{and} gives utterance to a most beautiful poetical effusion, prompted by the theme: "Has Jehovah as much delight in burnt-offerings ^{and} in sacrifices as in obedience to his will?" 1 Sam. xv. 22. "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, to hearken better than the fat of rams" also the 23. verse continues in the same strain.

Paul then acknowledged his guilt imploring forgiveness of Samuel. But the prophet refused, announcing again Paul's rejection. He exclaims with poetical fervor XI 29: "Israel's power lies not, and repents not, for he, is not a man, to repent." Saul again admits his having sinned and says "I have sinned yet honor me now, I pray thee, before the elders of my people and before Israel, and turn back with me, that I may worship Jehovah, thy God." Samuel yields and ordering Haggai to be brought before him said: "As thy sword has made women childless, so be thy mothers childless among women." And then he bade Haggai to go on his way to the sacrificial ground in Gilgal.

The next poetical expressions are those proclaimed by the women in Israel glorifying and praising David. He, a mere shepherd boy was secretly anointed by the prophet, as successor to Saul. In a war with the Philistines, David procured a victory for the assembled arrays of Israel, by slaying the giant champion Goliath. This was the first

of a series of victories which spread the fame of David throughout the land of Canaan, by virtue of which he was brought to the court of Saul, gained the confidence of the King's son Jonathan and in time rose to the height of commander of the army. Upon one occasion David returning from the "Slaughter of the Philistines" the women came out of the cities of Israel, singing and dancing, with instruments of music to meet King David and thus they sang. I Sam. XVIII

"Saul has struck down his thousands,
David has slain two of thousands."

The narrative then informs us that this displeased the King, who, ever after was the bitter enemy of David. From I Sam. XVIII to the end of the first book of Samuel the prose history is uninterrupted. But the second book contains an elegy and a psalm of praise both attributed to King David. It was the tragic fate of Saul, which inspired the elegy dedicated to him and his heroic son Jonathan.

In this dirge, we are told, David expressed his grief over the death of his most beloved friend Jonathan, the first King of Israel, Saul.

But all do not accept this statement as correct. Most critics among them, however, never do. They have no hesitation in ascribing the elegy to David. Others however, are of a different opinion. H. v. S. in his "Geschichte des Alterthums" vol II p. 90 says, "this assumption of David's uttering the words of the elegy, too much lowers the character of David. His moral complicity in Saul's fall, in the issue of the battle, is most evident to an impartial critic: he was prepared to take part in a war against Saul and Jonathan; his revolt, his desertion to the Philistines had weakened Saul's forces and deprived him of brave combatants." This would be rather disparaging to the great Psalmist's character. We believe that his friendship for Jonathan alone would have elicited the

elegy; further David the bold warrior was married to the daughter of King Saul; he had sworn to protect the followers of Jonathan; he was thoroughly imbued with the reverence due to God's anointed; he had experienced the penitence of Saul in the cave, as the narrator informs us. This together with the national calamity would have melted the heart of the most tyrannical of rulers and the elegy would prompt itself. We must not suppose that David was actually warring against Saul, but rather against the surrounding nations of the Philistines, and his willingness to enter into common warfare against Israel, was in my opinion but a shrewd plan of David to regain again his favor at Saul's court, by deserting in the midst of the battle to the Israelitish camp. This was also surmised by the leader of the Philistines and justly so. We therefore must side with those critics who ascribe this poem to David the Psalmist.

The twenty second chapter of II Sam. better known as Psalm XVIII is ascribed to David, by the historian of our book. The traditional character of David as set forth in the narrations of the books of Samuel & by the same in the books of Chronicles, is rightly portrayed in the ethical & literary attainments ascribed to that great monarch of Israel. David became the model king of history by whose standard the merits of his successors were measured. His exploits & excellences were epically expanded in psalms so that all the artistic inventions & literary productions of this refined age were attributed to King David himself or to the singers & poets of his court. Hence he became celebrated not only as a conqueror & ruler, but also as a poet & musician who organized choirs & invented musical instruments & composed hymns for religious worship. Psalms of adoration, & gratitude, of hope & repentance were inscribed with his name. Each suc-

Knappert, "The Religion of Israel."

cessive generation, dedicated a new prayer and psalm to David, so that, after the close of the literary collections of Israel, the number of psalms, as ascribed to David according to the superscriptions exceeded three score and ten. The Hebrew canon has seventy three, the Septuagint fifteen more. If, as has been established, these superscriptions were made some centuries after the extinction of the Davidian dynasty, they show their worthlessness is seen at once and we cannot be guided by them in tracing the history of the psalmic literature. Many of the psalms ascribed to David contain no distinct allusions to events in his life, nor yet do they agree with his character and disposition as manifested in the historical sketches of the books of Samuel. So that such critics of our times as E. Meyer, Curt & Schnapert would deny that that David was the author of any of the psalms of the first two books. On the other hand Ewald,

Dott 'The Bible for Young People'

E. Meyer, Gesch. d. jüd. National-Lit. d. Hebräer

Hitzig & Schrader accept his authorship of a-
 bout a dozen psalms. Among the very few
 accepted by the majority of all the critics is
 Psalm XVIII as incorporated in II Samuel.
 There is no historical evidence, that David wrote
 any other than the eighteenth psalm although
 the historian of Samuel tells us that he
 composed three poems, while the author of Chro-
 nicles, who was a most ardent admirer of David
 makes no mention of such poems. Even
 if the son of Jesse has written but the eightee-
 nth psalm his laurels as a psalmist were there-
 by established. For his was the golden age
 of literary achievements for the Jews just
 as Pericles' age was the golden one for the
 Greeks although Pericles himself was no
 author. The psalm-like song given in
 the twenty-third chapter of II Samuel
 contain 'The last words of David,' they are words
 such as only the immortal psalmist could
 have uttered, hence the redactor prefers The
 Hitt's History of Israel. He Hett's Einleitung.

beginning, by way of explanation, "This is
the utterance of David, the son of Jesse."

Psalm XXIII or II Sam XXII shows us the
faithfulness of our transcribers in copying ori-
ginal documents. Especially faithful were
these scribes in adhering to the name of
the deity, which are by no means changed
but precisely the same in the same
passage with one or two exceptions, which
however admit of most rational explanations.
Thus in the 3rd verse of the psalm, which is
a revision of II Sam. XXII the Psalmist adds

יְהוָה חַסְדֵּי וְחַסְדֵּי and substitutes
יְהוָה for יְהוָה also Jehovah for Elohe
because the tetragrammaton occurs twice in
the same verse & he omits one יְהוָה for the
same reason. From the above facts we
have sufficient reason to believe that there
was no such thing as Jehavistic & Elohist
writers as the terms Jehovah & Elohim were
most strictly adhered to by the transcribers of original documents.

His Lectures.

Source of the Samuel Narrative

That there existed written monuments, documents, contemporary inscriptions, oral traditions, written biographies which formed the basis of the book of Samuel is evident from the book itself. Although the thread of the historical events forms one continued uninterrupted narrative nevertheless it is easily detected by a close observer that the author has several authorities which were extant at the time of the composition of the book. The minute details into which the author of Samuel often enters, the double accounts of Havid's introduction to Saul I Sam XVI 14-23 ^{2d} XVII 55 - XVIII 5; of Saul's attempts on the life of Havid XVIII 10 ^{2d} XIX 10; of Havid's sparing the life of Saul XXIV ^{2d} XXVI; the seeming contradictions of such chapters as XIX ^{2d} XX 2; of XXI 10 where Havid seeks shelter with Achis ^{2d} feigns insanity; ^{2d} XXVII 2 ff. where he remains in the domain of Achis who gives him the city of Ziklag, all these and many similar passages point to the fact of the

various sources employed and interwoven in the Samuel narrative. As for the historical poetry of the book the historian gives us direct information that the elegy of Havid was written in the book of Jasher חֲנֵה כְּתוּבָה עַל-יָד 730 Samuel writes the royal constitution 730I in the well known book which was kept in the temple. We will here make a momentary digression to give the reader some idea of the nature of the book of Jasher. The word Jasher itself means a song hence the 'book Jasher' would imply a collection of songs written, as II Sam I 1-27 would indicate in poetic style and metre. Similar collections were found among all nations of antiquity and were entrusted to the custody of priests. Thus the kings of Sparta preserved the state prophecies; in Athens the sacred writings were kept at the Acropolis; the Romans also kept their sacred writings in the same way, while the books of Zoroaster were kept in Persepolis.

Samuel did the same with the royal constitution "recorded in the books laid up before God." And now reverting to the sources of Samuel again, it should be noted that the historical importance and reliability of the books are materially increased from the fact that the books in custody of the priests, who alone had access to them, were not exposed to interpolations and original documents thus remained intact. The author of chronicles gives us the original sources from which the book of Samuel was compiled. These are mainly the books of Samuel, Nathan and Gad (Chron XXIX 29) whether ^{or not} the books of Samuel, Nathan and Gad were directly incorporated in the present book we cannot tell, but this much is certain that the notes taken down by the prophets were afterwards revised and elaborated into our narrative. Besides these there are other sources indicated in the text. These sources were partly records and notations accessible to the author.

partly traditions such as are connected with inscriptions on monuments, stories & tablets (I Sam 18; II 12.); with proverbs & folk-saying (I Sam 17; XIX 24; II Sam 5;); & with important names (I Sam XVI 14, 23; XVII)^{*} such as occur in I Sam 20; II 21; XIII 28; II Sam 16; I 20; II 8. Here lies the source for the explanation of the fact that double accounts of events are given e.g. the first appearance of David (I Sam XVI 14-23 & XVII) where the only means of reconciling these statements is to accept them as different traditions incorporated bodily as such. Several accounts in the 2nd books of Samuel differ in their manner of narration, one being the mere notation of the event, the other the elaboration & result of the same event, e.g. (2 Sam V 6-25 & XIII 1-14; & XIV 15-22; Also I Sam. XXI - XXII is characteristic of how the sources were bodily incorporated while the poetry I Sam II 1-10; II Sam I 19-27 are taken from the national collection of songs as indicated in 2 Sam I 18 viz הַיְּשֵׁר. It is a mistake on the part of modern critics^{*} to assume

(Berthold, Ezechhorn, Heth, Ewald, Hitzig, Schrader, Heilprin)

that the slightest variations or contradictions which they inject into the narrative indicate later insertions and interpolations; they also forget that it is the object of the sacred historian to make the particular incidents and occurrences subservient to the general view and tendency of the book. As far as my humble observation extend these critics would make Samuel a mere book of adventure one incident leading on to the other. Those passages which to all appearances contradict, are when viewed with the proper care really harmonious. We have already stated that the sacred books of the bible give us information, one concerning the other. I Chron. xxi. 29. tells us directly of the ancient source of Sam. "The history of King David, behold, the first and last, it is written in the history of Samuel the seer, and in the history of Nathan the prophet and in the history of Gad the seer. The expressions לְיָמָיו וְלְיָמָיו may be understood either as referring to Samuel Nathan and Gad as authors, or that these books contained their biography. Further

more it may be inferred that Samuel left historical notices of his time which were later elaborated by the school of prophets instituted by him. Thus we may sum up the following authorities extant at the time of the composition of the book of Samuel.

I Book of Jashar. 2 Sam I 15 הַיְּשָׁרִים

II Book of David's Psalms. 2 Sam XXIII 1:

III Chronicles of David I Chr. XXVII 24

IV Book of Samuel the Seer. הַגִּיפִים } XXIX 29

V Book of Nathan the Prophet } I Chron.

VI Book of Gad the Seer הַגִּדִים } XXIX 29

VII National Collection of Genealogy. We may assume that the section of Samuel including

I - XII and such passages as XY, XVI, XXIX 18-24 with slight addition & alteration was taken from the book of Samuel the seer, hence the opinion of many that Samuel wrote the first XII chapters of the book, while I Samuel proves conclusively that the first seven chapters must have been written by Samuel.

Spinoza in his *Tract. theol. polit.* also Eichhorn
 in his *Einleitung* are not satisfied with the sources
 already enumerated but argue that wholesale
 interpolations have taken place in the book.
 Berth. and others insist that the portion included
 in 1 Sam XVII 12-31 & 55-XVIII 6, in con. V. of
 Septuagint was entirely omitted and must therefore
 be an interpolation. Thurnius on account of cer-
 tain anachronisms in the book of Samuel
 finds indications of the late redaction of the book.
 Weil finds nothing contradictory in Sam. in con-
 nection with Joshua XY 63 and Judges I 21 and
 says that David actually brought all his trophies
 to Jerusalem having foreseen the importance
 and greatness of that city. But it seems that
 taking the various sources and traditions into
 consideration and noting the conspicuous ab-
 sence of the miraculous and the myetic, it
 will not be necessary to manufacture hypotheses
 for reconciling apparent contradictions of
 the different traditions bodily inserted in Samuel.

Historical legends as such are authoritative and if we take the various chapters, in which we find double account of the same events in this light, we will find that the historical connection of the book is natural and without contradiction. Anticipating as in I S VIII 12 certain events by changing the chronological order which throws so many critics off their guard. Thus it is plain enough that the work of Samuel was collected from various authorities not always skillfully combined and eliminated; but the editor evidently believed in the authenticity of all the accounts which he used, making one supplement the other, even repeating the same story with slight variation or addition. And from I Chron. XXIX 29 is implied that Sam. Nathan and Gad kept certain records of their times which were used in subsequent compilations. How far these annals were introduced into our book or who was their compiler will be discussed with accuracy in another chapter.

History of the Samuel Tradition.

The tradition of Judges, Samuel & Kings, it is maintained, is not presented purely in its original condition. Ewald tries to show, that together with the older narrative, a new one has sprung up, which though independent & intelligible in itself adapts itself to the older tradition.

But we are not disposed to accept such an unqualified statement. Who has ever known of tradition, held in such sacred light, being substituted by a new tradition? What however we do admit is that in committing the old traditions to writing, they may have been elaborated & ~~and~~ diversified, may even additions made. This according to Ewald's view was the result of the "changing spirit of each successive period in the history of Hebrew literature".

As already noticed, the period marked in the books of Samuel is short yet extremely rich in incident forming one connected whole. The earliest traditions are those found in I Sam. It is worthy of noting how events ~~are~~ fitted into this

H & V. H. Ewald's.

Ewald's Geschichte & Prolegomena.

context according to a chronological system. Thus in I S IV 18, the judgeship of Eli is stated as lasting forty years; in I Sam XII 2-4 twenty years are given as the length of time that the ark abode in Berzath-yeirim; again in XII such historical persons as Jacob, Moses, Sisera, Jerubaal, Barak, Jephthah and even Samuel himself are alluded to show how in the theocracy Jehovah was the keynote while rebellion, affliction, conversion and peace follows in rapid succession; again in I Sam XVII the length of Saul's reign is given as is also that of Havid and Ishai in 2^d Samuel. Thus the religious as well as the historical in the earlier traditions of Samuel are formulated into fixed data. Details are regarded in their bearing on the whole; periods are alluded to in a comprehensive style and the points of tradition connected one with the other. In doing so the historians presupposes a knowledge of biblical history leading us through the historical significance of the then accepted traditions

The early chapters of I Samuel seem thus to be the essence of the traditions for the connection of historical periods. The principal epoch in the book is the transition to the monarchy which is associated with the name of Samuel alone. Even this transition had its foundation in earlier books of the bible. Thus Balaam viewing the happy future of Israel (Num. XXIII) speaks of the monarchy as one of Israel's greatest blessings as seen from verse 21 "Jehovah his God is with him, as the shout of a king is among them." With reference to Saul XXIV 7 and again to David XXIX 17 Ewald construes these verses. According to Gen. XXVIII 4, 5, the monarchy and the Torah are the two great gifts of God's grace to Israel. Thus we see that the historical traditions of the kingdom of Israel were by no means changed or altered in Samuel. The events leading up to the kingdom are set forth in first book of Samuel VII 2-4-17; Israel is summoned to repentance, the national council assembled at Mizpah in order to avert the affliction of the Philistines.

the Philistines attack them at prayer; Samuel entreats God with a sacrifice; the Philistines are routed. & thoroughly subdued never warring against Israel again during the life time of Samuel. Thus the first step the true & real origin of the monarchy was the struggle with Israel's enemies. Other steps leading to the same end appear in chapter VIII continued in X 17 through XII 25. i. e. Samuel freeing the land from foreign worship & oppression & establishing the worship of Jehovah reigns as judge over Israel until old age comes upon him. His sons however do not walk in his footsteps; & the elders of Israel demand a king such as the heathens about them have. After writing out a royal constitution & expostulating with Israel lots are drawn & Samuel anoints Saul king recording the laws of the kingdom to be stored away before Jehovah. But Saul is only king de jure, but and after proving his valor (XI) become king de facto. Thus chapter VII - XII 25 form integral parts of the version of historical tradition not to be altered.

In the relation which now exists between Saul and Samuel, the development of tradition is visible in many particulars. Compared with 1 Sam II, VIII, IX, XII the narrative containing the story about Samuel in chap. XIII is most similar to it in character. In this chapter is contained the rejection cause of Saul, his proceedings against the Philistines after an undue delay and unwarranted sacrifice. The various movements occur in v. 14, 7, 15, while v. 16 shows Saul at Gilgal where he proceeded to route the Philistines. Saul was anointed in Gilgal, in Joshua's old camp and his advance upon Gilgal shows that the tradition and the historical event coincided. But he Saul was rejected as king of which the triumphant continuation of chap. XIV seems to make no mention. Chap. I 8, refers to XIII 7-15 this in connection with II 7-15 and I 1-7 seems to be a combination of several traditions. It is clear that according to I 8, XIII 7-15 could Samuel was not in Gilgal as stated in II before going there, as

chap. XIII would indicate. If then we say XI 12-14
is a later tradition; the name of Samuel it seems
must have been added in XI 7; then again
as seen from XI 15 the people and the army clamored
for a king, hence it follows that X 8 XIII 7-15
are older traditions than VI VIII X 17 XII or
else the Tradition was modified. Comparing
the original copy in XIII 7-15 with XV and then
with XXVIII we may note the gradual devel-
opment. In these chapters the fate of Saul
is grievously criticised. In the case of XXVIII 3-25
there is a slight alteration of the original Tradition:
the Thread of XXVIII 1, 2, coming from chap. IX
is continued at XXIX 1 where again a slight in-
consistency arises. Tradition again is referred
to in the narrative of Saul's history where the
war of Amalekites appears to be undertaken
in consequence of Num. XXIV 7. compare with
1 Samuel IX 1- X 16, XI XIII XIV 48. At chap.
XVI David appears upon the scene, who now
becomes the historical character who is to supplant Saul.
Eichhorn, Thinius, He Wette.

It is a characteristic incident to note that the critics of the modern school such as Post, Kwald, Vatke, He Wette maintain that the corruption of the tradition is greatest in those narratives in which Samuel enters into the history of David. Wellhausen lays great stress upon this fact. He points out two insertions of the kind. According to XIX 18-24 David flees to Ramah where Samuel had established his school of prophets. Saul sends troops to overtake David but not succeeding, he goes in person but instead of capturing David, joins the ecstatic band of rhapsodists. Thus continuing the general history of tradition we note that Samuel has become the founder of a prophetic college & leader of their exercises. From David's flight to Samuel we infer a previous acquaintance as XIX 18th & XVI 1-13 seem to indicate. Anointed king in Saul's stead at the command of Jehovah, David leaves his office as shepherd to become the great warrior in Israel.

Apart in the story of Goliath, his older brothers know nothing of his previous anointing though present when it occurred (XIII 28). We may attribute this to jealousy, just as the brothers of Joseph, who however later acknowledges him as king. In the stories of David's persecutions also chap. XXIX XXXI Saul alone is mentioned as the ancestor of David. Yet we must say that there is here nothing strange, & no cause for finding interpolations; for it was generally believed and known that David was appointed & chosen by the prophet for the realization of great expectations in Israel. Thus the anointing of David ~~as Samuel~~ by Samuel carries out the tradition of Samuel's recognition as a prophet throughout the land of Israel. We have also already noted that the 'Books of Samuel' are so called because he was the great historical character in the progress of tradition, which may be measured by his great reformatory work.

Originally (IX. I-X. 16) Samuel is simply a seer and a patriotic Israelite feeling keenly the depravity of his fellow-men, he recognizes in Saul and David the deliverers and leaders of Israel. Samuel was not to be a warrior, his was the duty of interceding and pleading for Israel. "The relation between seer and warrior," says Hillebrand, "must be regarded as historical of Samuel is to mean anything at all." The same distinction obtains in the case of Heberah and Barak in earlier times and of Elisha and Hazael, Elisha and Jehu in later periods. Samuel's greatness lies in his arousing to activity the right man in the right place, being at the same time his guide and leader of the national council of elders. His greatness undoubtedly gave rise to the wonderful story of his youth, in which, while a boy, he predicts the downfall of Eli and his sons, also the revolution in the government of Israel (1 Sam. I-III). We next meet Samuel when an old man. It

seems that soon after his meeting with Saul a rupture took place between him & Samuel which caused the latter to retire to his secluded home at Ramah. The prophetic narratives recorded in chapters XVI showing the growth of tradition confirms us in this belief. Thus when the national council refuses to confirm in his reign King Saul, it became evident that his dynasty must be overthrown & Samuel, who anointed him, must now reject him. Samuel now appears as a prophet, in the style of Elijah & Elisha & commands Saul despotically (XVI) although according to 37 he felt the divine inspiration. Another stage is apparent in the traditional development when the unction of Saul is transferred to David who was now King de jure by the Grace of God. The respect with which Samuel is now regarded has increased; so that when he comes to Bethlehem, the elders tremble at his approach XVI 4 & in XIX 18 he seems to have a magical power over men.

Intellectually, Samuel towered head and shoulders above his time as did Saul physically. The seers thus became the authors of the monarchies, although early tradition has it that he resisted to the utmost the desire of the people for a king. Premonarchical Israel was at first a republic then advancing to a theocracy, with at its head phases most naturally into the monarchy with Saul as king, thus exhibiting the development of tradition among Israel. Samuel's cause of Saul, and his throwing of David has inclined modern judgement towards Saul and against David. Some critics, free from bias, regard Saul as ^{the} antagonist and David the tool of the hierarchy of which Samuel was the embodiment. Samuel it is known maintained a powerful position in the new empire by virtue of his leadership in the national council, which gave him an influence well and extensively organized. He found also support in the Nobites although the old tradition speaks of their alliance with the king as well as the seers.

That Samuel was the founder and president of this school is based on the anecdote in I Sam. xix 18: That he was in conspiracy with the priests against Saul is not inferred from I Sam. xxi - xxv where Abimelech of Gath provided David with food and shelter expiating this offense with his life as the extinction of the whole race of priests, the house of Eli. For these priests had no connection with Samuel nor yet with David being unacquainted with his abetted plans. These priests it seems were no distinct power against the king as seen from the fact xxi - xxv that on the faintest suspicion they were summoned and put to death without the least remonstrance. Samuel, if we rely on the historical and even legendary tradition, had the hierarchy as well as the national council to rest on in his opposition to the monarchy. In tracing the hierarchy to these early times the student strikes upon the very elements necessary to a true historical appreciation of Hebrew antiquity and national Jewish history as developed from and based upon the history of tradition.

during the time of the reign of Solomon. Hence the opinion that Samuel himself was the author of the book bearing his name is altogether untenable. The ancient Rabbins according to the Talmud Bala-batha wa, is a credited Samuel with the authorship of Judges Ruth & Samuel. If by Samuel they meant that part referring to the judgeship & priesthood of Eli we are disposed to agree, for none but the person who was educated by the high-priest himself could have written the domestic details & tragic fate of Eli the priest of the younger house of Aaron. Judging from I Sam III; V. 5; & IX 9 the author makes no pretensions of Samuel having written the book. Again, it must be remarked, that the historians nowhere leads us to suppose that the book was not written immediately after the death of Heli. From the references to time made in chapters XXX 25 & IV XXVIII 15 where the expression "unto this day" occurs, we may conclude with a conviction almost amounting to

certainly, that the book originated with one who flourished in the time of Solomon. Even if, as the palmist maintains, we would accept Samuel as the author of the book, the time of composition however could not be made to concure with facts historically established. Harbanel already saw this inconsistency and opposed his view of the ancient Psalmist. He referred for proof to 1 Sam. V 5; IX 9, where the expressions "unto this day" and "beforetimes" occurs; in addition he referred to the explanation of the origin of such proverbs and by words found in chap. XII; XIV 24; also to the custom set forth in XIX 25 all of which points conclusively to a much later redaction than the time of Samuel. Besides Samuel was but 52 years old when he died, hence he could not have lived during the whole period included under the reigns of Saul & David. Harbanel, while admitting that Samuel & Nathan had wrote part of the book, finds sufficient proof from 1 Sam. XVIII 6 for establishing Jeremiah as the final author and compiler of the book as before me.

But it seems to me that Abarbanel sought ^{an} easy way for accounting for the double accounts, ^{and} apparent contradictions in the book and by settling upon the prophet Jeremiah, who gathered up all bad letters, traditions ^{and} the documents ^{as} explanation of the difficulties of the book, ^{this} is most naturally offered. Hilsperson, while not agreeing with Abarbanel as regards the author infers from 1 Sam ^{xxviii} 6 firstly a natural allusion to the strength of Israel, ⁱⁿ the distinction of Juda from the other tribes, ^{and} that the terms "Israel" ^{and} "Judah" were at first merely conventional expressions which later on were introduced to designate the divided Kingdom. It would conclude that since the events narrated in Samuel do not extend into post-exilic times, that the book was completed ^{and} edited in pre-exilic age, probably when the Kingdom of Judah was at its height.

He Wette says that these passages of Samuel e.g. 1 Sam ⁱⁱ 35; ^{viii} 11-18; 2 Sam ^{vii} 6-16, which are the prophetic narrative ^{and} the royal constitution,

would point to the time of Solomon while 1 S XVIII 6 presupposes the the time of the division of Israel. It seems, says he that the designation of the nation as Israel ^{in Judges} 1 Sam XVIII 16; 2 Sam XVIII 1; seems to be just made by David as seen in 1 S II 8, 9; I 1-5; XIX 41; XX 2. Again he says that such passages as 1 S XI 15; XIII 8-14; XII 35; XVI 2; 2 S. XV 7; in which the ancient freedom of worship is not yet condemned points to a comparatively earlier time for the composition of writing of what critics call an older work of Samuel. In harmony with a deuteronomic revision, says He Kelle are such passages as 1 Sam VII 3; XII where the mourning against idolatry is the mourning of the leading astray of the king as well as the people 1 S III 25 is altogether unknown to the earliest narrators. Yet it seems to me that Judges II 6-III 8; Deuteronomy XII 31; XXVIII 36 which treat of the same subject as Samuel, contradict any such statement as just made by He Kelle, with one exception of the poetry as found in Samuel which possibly might point to an older redaction of the book.

But we have found in Huis "History of the
Israelitish Nation" an elaboration of his view of
the same ⁴¹, author of Samuel which entirely over-
throws the opinions held by a great many German cri-
tics. Prof. Oswald ⁴² Schrader to some extent agree
with this view, which supposes the book of Samuel
to have originated in the early reign of Solomon.
He reproduces the argument in substance as follows.
First it is noted that the history of David ⁴³ & part of
Solomon's have many peculiarities, as common as
may be seen from the first four chapters of 2 Kings.
These Judges & Kings may be synopses of larger works,
bestowing more care on the wars, public works & the
mercantile rule of the nation; Samuel & first four
chapters of 2 Kings bestow but little attention to them
giving a more thorough history of events, bearing
on the character of the principal men ⁴⁴ of the age.
Samuel is also entirely different in style from any
other of the historical books of the bible, being a clear
concise energetic prose mingled with poetry which
is ascribed by the author to earlier writers.

Bold in his record of his speeches, which bear the stamp of originality, the author gives to the conversation a charm of manner revealing a beauty of language, fertility of thought which renders the book of Samuel unique & singular in style. Such characteristics it is that points to the age of Solomon. It is, after arriving at this conclusion, somewhat rather peculiar, that the book of Kings should begin with the last days of David, while the book of Samuel was to have given a full & impartial history of David; that the second chap. of 1 King ends with, "and the kingdom was established in the hands of Solomon," and that the fourth chapter begins with "King Solomon was king over all Israel;" then in 11 chapter verse 12, in beginning of 12 chapter (Eng version 11, 21) where the limits of Solomon's empire are given; the account of his dream, the praise due Solomon as a judge in the case of the Harlots, & many other incidents in the early life of Solomon, ^{which} make his early reign complete in detail as set forth in the first five chapters of 1 Kings. Hence it is remarkable, that

The earlier history of Solomon, like that of David, is complete in all its particulars, while the later accounts, commencing with the fourth chapter of Kings, is deficient both in materials, arrangement and chronology, falling rather into the mythical than; so that it is almost certain, that while the book of Samuel and the first three chapters of Kings, belonging to the same author, were written near age, when the history of David and the first part of Solomon's reign were yet fresh in the memory of the people, the other part of Solomon's history was written some time after his death." From the above facts, it may be demonstrated that the first three chapters of 1 Kings properly belong to II Samuel. If so, there is no longer any doubt as to the precise time, when the book of Samuel was written! It must have been during the first years of Solomon's reign, for otherwise the author would have mentioned the building of the temple; then again, nothing is mentioned of the final degeneracy of Solomon II 3. How then

were those three chapters inserted, in the book
of Kings? The explanation is easily given. As
late as Philo and Josephus, the books of Samuel &
Kings, were considered as one, for all purposes.
Samuel is but a continuation of Samuel. When
the books were separated by the Greeks as thus
printed in the Bomberg Hebrew Bibles, about the
1624, the last part of the history of David, being
an introduction to that of Solomon, was
carried over into the book of Kings. Hence
we might reasonably suppose the book of S to
have originated immediately after the death
of David. But when in trying to ascertain the
author says, it is impossible to settle upon
any one individual, because so many literati
flourished in that age, among whom he mentions
Ethan ha. Ezrah, Heman, Chalchol, Samuel, Nathan
Iddo and others. Besides there are many traces of
the Pentateuch, in Samuel. Mosaic laws are
also mentioned; the prohibition not to eat blood IS XIV 34;
circumcision XXIII 25; new moon festival XX 5-18; meat & Eat.

impure sacrifice xx 26; the law of the Shabbat xxi 5-7; the
winger of blood, ii Sam. xix 2. The frequent imitation
of the verses of the Pentateuch indicates that the
author of Samuel was well versed in the Torah,
whose perfect style he imitated, which was the
precursor of the independent and original Hebrew
style in which ii Samuel is written. It shall
now be my endeavor to show why I consider
Samuel, Nathan and Gad the authors of the books
of Samuel. It seems to me that 2 Chron. xix
unnecessarily mentions these three authors just
going of course from the connection. It would
have been sufficient to have mentioned either
Samuel, or Gad, or Nathan. But the fact
that they were all three mentioned in the
same verse betrays to me a purpose of the
writer which was to inform us that these
three were the authors of Samuel. The
expressions והראשונים והאחרונים meaning the
first and last records would otherwise be superfluous.
showing that Samuel began the writing, and the other

two prophets finished them. The care taken by the author of Chronicles to let us know exactly who these men were "Samuel the Seer," "Nathan the Prophet," and "Ishai the Gershonite" would again be an unnecessary precaution, unless to inform the reader that these three, known as such and such wrote the acts of David, which extend over the two books of Samuel. Accordingly we will show the relative part of the books written by each, to which few of the German critics among who I refer to Himmelfarb especially, agree.

The books of Samuel may be conveniently divided into three parts. I, the history of Samuel and Eli (I-XXII); II, the history of David (I-XXI); III, history of David (XXII to III chapter of Kings). The first seven chapters are probably the work of Samuel himself. There is a unity in them and symmetrical arrangement, which argues him as the author, who, reticent in his own praises, feels deeply the degradation of the priestly order and dwells chiefly on those matters, which appertain to the interest and occupation of his life. Some facts, too are stated, which were

time, only, when recorded, e.g. XXI 13: "the philistines were subdued and came no more into the territory of Israel;" whereas a few years later, we read XIII 19, of a very different condition of affairs. Again Samuel is said to have judged Israel all the days of his life, which was true according to XII. We suppose that the later compiler inserted Samuel's own words here.

The second Part, containing the history of Saul, seems to have been written partly by Samuel and partly by Gad. Some of the facts, as the anointing of Saul, were known to no one but these two authors. There is a tenderness in recounting Saul's error and a desire to set forth the noble traits of his character, which show the reverence of the narrator for the rejected King. Gad was probably trained in one of the schools of the prophets and must have been intimately acquainted with the events here narrated; he accompanied David in his wanderings and is justly considered as the author of those portions relating to the flight of David. Gad worked together with Nathan and they finished the books of I up to I Kings II.

The Biography of Samuel.

Samuel may be considered the founder of the prophet guild and the first member thereof. The last of the Judges (1100 B. C.) gave new life to the theocracy, administered its affairs, in all particulars, and insured its preservation by instituting the college of prophets from which most of the earlier prophets graduated. True, in direct opposition to his theocratic principles, he was compelled by the public demand for a king, to revolutionize the government and proclaim Saul the first king of Israel (1095-1053). Nevertheless theocracy was made the basis of the monarchy and Saul is later rejected by the national council for acting against theocratic doctrines of the age. David is then anointed as ruler (1055-1015) either to overthrow Saul, or to take up the reign after Saul, but by all means to maintain the theocracy at least during the lifetime of Samuel. And truly with one or two exceptions when the prophets Gad and Nathan expostulated with David, his government was really a theocratic one. This is seen from the fact that these prophets,

stood in high favor with David and were esteemed at his court. It is even thought that Nathan was the private tutor who directed Solomon's education, and it is certain that he was the adviser and counselor of David. Even Solomon's Kingdom was at first ruled with theocratic rigor, and was favorably disposed to theocracy as the erection of the Temple would seem to indicate. But later on the king himself became a worshipper of Strange Gods, thereby bringing upon himself the enmity of the righteous ministers, especially of the prophet Ahia, who may have been instrumental in bringing about the division of the Kingdom after the death of Solomon. Thus we see the great influence of the theocratic principles championed by Samuel, extending to the division of the Empire. Before the advent of Samuel, the honest and pious high-priest Eli was judge in Shilo, then the place of the sanctuary. He was both judge and high-priest but at the same time weak and irresolute. Incapable both as a theocratic and political leader,

we must not be surprised to find the majority of the
 people (1 Sam. I 3, 21; II 14, 19.) worshipping the
 Canaanitic deities, Baal & Ashtar. Eli could
 not correct the gross idolatry, nor could he prevent his
 sons Hophni & Phineas from abusing their priest-
 ly office, committing deeds most disgusting &
 abominable, even in the eyes of the people. It was
 Samuel, who felt himself called up to prevent
 the downfall of the theocracy & the state, to restore
 again the worship of Jehovah by setting forth the
 practical results of pure Mosaicism & Monotheism.
 Thus he was the man who could & did accomplish
 this gigantic reform. His parents Elkanah &
 Hannah lived at Ramath-Tophim on Mt. Ephraim,
 where Samuel, the first born son of Hannah, was
 born. Samuel was thus an Ephraimite, according
 to I S I; but according to 1 Chron II, 23 he
 was a Levite. Possibly because Ramath was one
 of the Levitical cities, & because the prophet per-
 formed priestly functions, the author of Chronicles
 may be justified in his statement. Hannah,
 Krumpholtz. Characteristic der Bibel
 Baum, Geschichte der hebr. nation This History

after a long period of barrenness consecrates her son to Jehovah and Eli the high-priest is intrusted with his education and priestly culture. Samuel ever showed himself a God-fearing and pious man and was ever an humble and obedient servant of Eli, so that he was acceptable both to God and man.

II 21, 26: III 4-19. At the temple he observed the disgraceful actions of the sons of Eli and most likely determined to restore the pure Shemaism. Already as a youth, he dares to prophesy to Eli the displeasure and punishment of Jehovah (I S III 10). From now on the prophetic function of Samuel develops.

After Eli's death he took upon himself the public direction of the religious and political affairs of the nation, gaining and retaining to his old age the general esteem of Israel. Aided by the fact of being a pupil of the last Judge, as was Joshua of Moses, he established honesty and justice as the mainstays of his activity. In order to form a correct idea of the greatness of Samuel, let us view him in the light of Prophet, Priest and Judge.

As prophet he appears to be the medium, through which God makes revelations and instruction known to his people; he is the mediator of the theocratic harmony between Jehovah and Israel and as such he represents God to man; like all prophets he brings to consciousness a living Theocracy. His prophecy of the fate of Eli and his family; his writing of the royal constitution; his announcement to Saul of the Kingdom; and his rebuking Saul, who erred in the Theocracy, are not his own machinations, but the revelations, to his prophet, of God. (1 Sam III 18; II 27; III 18; IV 16;). The selection of Saul as king; his war against the Amalekites, the rejection of Saul, who has disobeyed the command of God, the anointing of David are set forth in the light of the hierarchy. (I, 1:24; II 13; III 13; IV 17; 22, 24, 26.

Samuel himself, wishes to be considered only as the messenger of God. By such strict and thoroughly established authority of the Theocratic principle, Samuel sought to reanimate the theocratic spirit and mind of the people, thereby to secure a theocratic tendency in all their external relations to other nations.

Thinius, Ewald, Stillhausen.

His efforts were directed with this purpose, viz that the theocracy, both in faith & action, be considered inviolable; therefore he sets forth what might be of advantage to it, & avoids the injurious; therefore he abolished idolatry & pledged the people to the worship of Jehovah, (VII 3, 15; IX 22). In accordance with such motive is his stubborn resistance to the demands of the people for an earthly King, fearing that their divine King & the Mosaic laws would be discarded; (VII 7; X 19; XII 12, 17) Therefore he & earnestly entreats Saul, at his coronation, to remain faithful to Jehovah; therefore he institutes the school of prophets, therefore his severe judgments against Saul who hearkens not to the theocratic warnings. Like all other prophets, he must maintain the theocracy, at all hazards, among the people; & in this respect, his struggles & aspirations are really prophetic. Otherwise he declares himself only a seer (IX 19) & has the reputation of a true visionary & fortune teller; hence in the course of the narrative he is known by the prophet's technical terms i.e. Navi, Seer, Man of God.

Also as priest, Samuel has his special functions. Although no Levite, he considered it his duty, as prophet of Jehovah, to perform the religious ceremonies of the theocracy. And furthermore it was possible, since the Levites and their subordinate Aaronites had not yet attained the exclusive right of administering in the temple, that even non-Levites might officiate. The time of service of a Levite was from the age of 20 to 50 years, but Samuel was lent unto the Lord, וְיִמְנָהוּ all the days of his life, according to the special consecration. Even the non-Levites Saul, David, Gideon, Meriah (Jud. VI 11; xiii 15; 1 Sam xiii 9, 12; 2 Sam VI 17) took part in the temple service; while David made his sons priests. (2 Sam viii 18). Hence Samuel had a double right to officiate. Recognized as an efficient servant, he often makes sacrifices, which were brought sometimes because of a successful undertaking, again as a thanks giving to Jehovah, and often as an expression of piety and religious duty. He orders feasts, fasts and libations (1 Sam vii 6; Chron xxxv 18). At these festivities he is the first, and they do not begin until he has pronounced the benediction (xiii 8). Samuel

often offers up public prayers for the people, in order to secure to them the grace of God. (XII 5, XII 19, 23) And makes special arrangements in the sanctuary as seen from Chron. IX 22, XXVI 28. After this he appears as the high priest of the nation, whose first prophet he was And thus maintains the theocracy in form And feature.

But it is especially as Judge, that Samuel becomes distinguished establishing And guiding the political activities of the people in strict accord with his theocratic principles. As such, Samuel already in the time of Eli (II 1) exercised his authority; but after his death Samuel takes the government of the people entirely upon himself And became the leader in the national council of elders. His very first act, was to assemble the nation at Mizpah, transact their business And prepare for war against the Philistines; in the meantime however he prays to God for he, like Moses was, no warrior who fought with the sword. The enemy was defeated, lost their station, And were again molested

Israel during the life time of Samuel. (II 5-14). Also with the Amorites, Samuel succeeded in making peace. (II 14). The success of these undertakings established the reputation of Samuel, theocratic leader, and it was comparatively an easy task for this powerful judge to rule in his theocratic spirit. As judge he resided at Ramah, his birthplace; made yearly travels about the country; assembled the people at Bethel, Gilgal and Mizpah in order to call up and arrange their affairs; and then returned to Ramah to preside in his capacity as Judge again. (II 15-17). Becoming old, he appointed his sons judges who took up their residence at Beersheba in the division of Judah, where they were to assist their father. But their injustice, and the desire of the people, already expressed on occasions of previous wars, to have one general and recognised leader, caused them, as security for the future, to demand a king from Samuel. In vain did Samuel oppose the wish of the nation, but yielded finally to the unnatural longing of the people, anointed Saul, the Benjamite, and at Mizpah installed him as king of Israel (I Sam VIII 1-10).

Leo Vorlesungen, Ewald's "Samuel's Commentary"

But, although Israel had a king, Samuel's authority was by no means diminished and the theocracy remained intact, and indeed Samuel wields this authority to the welfare of the people. For to him the people turn even after the inauguration of Saul, (XI 12, 19;) he orders the enterprises of the people (XV 1 &c) or accompanies them in person; XI 7: he fearless and bold takes Saul to task and judges him, with unsparring severity; (XIII 11; XV 10 &c) while Saul, in turn shows himself modest, respectful and obedient to the rigorous Seer.

At the same time Saul had been found deficient in the laws of theocracy and this was sufficient ground for Samuel to pronounce the rejection of the king and therefore he secretly anoints David the chosen one of God, whom he afterwards protects from the persecutions of Saul. (XI 2, 18;) Samuel chooses David because he was of the tribe of Juda, and because he thereby thought to firmly establish the theocracy after which Samuel withdraws from public affairs to his quiet abode at Ramah, where he was buried. XXV 1; XXVIII 3.
What Moses was to his generation, Samuel was to unite Israel.

Viewing Samuel in the light of his services, we may form some general idea as to the character of this self-sacrificing man. He was possessed of as great power, energy and rigor as he was determined, resolute and firm in action. This was his leading trait of character. That he recognized as right and just, that he brings into agitation with manly firmness and energetic severity endeavoring to maintain it within reasonable times. The gentle and tender feature, comfort and humanitarian traits are foreign to his personality. He often appears harsh, heartless, hard-hearted and stubborn, e.g. when he vehemently opposes the demands of a whole nation, refusing to institute the monarchy; when he commands the utter devotion of the Anabaptists and hews their long in furces. Yet we must not forget, that Samuel, knowing the degeneracy of his age alienated from Jehovah, had to proceed most rigidly, if he would succeed in restoring again the influence of the Theocratic principle. He was not an enthusiast like Colea, but a more of a political theorist who values and

estimated cause & effect, acting with circumspection
& strict justice. He is regarded as a true prophet
of Jehovah (I Sam. 20) who words come to pass (I K. 6); even
Saul honors him highly (II Sam. 10:1) never persecutes him as he did
David. At his death all Israel mourns for him (XXI 1; XXVIII 3:)
In such esteem he is also held by later writers (Jer. II 1: Ps. 99. 6.)
Here he is considered next to Moses, in Jeremiah, he is
accorded equal honors with Moses. And indeed he may be
regarded as a second Moses of the Hebrews, in that he also
laid the foundations to theocracy, and established the order
of priesthood as the representatives thereof; in this way
he re-instituted the theocratic principle, and originated
the school of prophets for its preservation. Samuel was
also one of the greatest reformers of antiquity. He held three
annual sessions of the council in Gilgal, Bethel, and Mizpah also
a perpetual court at Ramah thus removing the government, sit from
Ephraim as well as the national sanctuary. He founded the high school
at Ramah, the pupils of which were called benai nebiim and thus the
prophetic era was inaugurated. He also reformed and made ar-
rangements in the Levitical services and thus succeeded by his thorough re-
forms to effect a perfect union of the nation in religion & government

History of Israel under Saul & David.

The historical development, reached by the Israelites dates from the time of their wanderings in the wilderness. There the process of amalgamating the various tribes & elements began & the forward march to the conquest of Palestine & Civilization undertaken. Israel could not abide long in the desert, or their career would have been like that of Cadin, Moab & Edom. As a nation, they have a nature & instinct, accepted civilization in assimilating the heterogeneous elements about, or capable of admixture. They thus imposed upon themselves, material tasks which almost threatened the destruction of the religious basis of their national life. Their alliances among their own tribes gradually dissolved under the continuance of peace; for the subsequent occupation of the country, dispersed those whom the camp had united. The enthusiasm of conquest was followed by individual strokes of ambition. Peace enervated Israel; yet the lessons of simple truths, of the desineness of heroic self-sacrifice were brought home to them by Samual.

Israel, was ever and anon, accused from her quiet
slabers by the Philistines. From their abodes by the
sea on the lonely lying plains which skirt the
mountains of Judah on the West, they pressed Northward
into Sharon, thence to Jazzer. Here, after driving
out the Canaanites, they attacked the tribe of Joseph.
A great battle took place at Aphek and the victorious
Philistines carried off as a standard, the ark of Jehovah.
They also the southern countries, capturing the ca-
stle "Mount Ephraim." The national sanctuary
at Shiloh was destroyed, as its temple laid in
ruins. Thus their supremacy was undisputed even
as far as the tribe of Benjamin in Jabesh, Gilead,
and they confiscated all weapons, and removed all smiths.
This reproach brought upon Israel a widespread
exaltation of religious feeling, and under the leader-
ship of Samuel they soon retrieved their lost for-
tunes. He kindled anew the glowing ashes
and embers and made religion and patriotism iden-
tical. It was Samuel, who understood the
spirit of the times. The nation's calamity weighed

heavily upon him, as he viewed, with horror the down-
 fall of the theocracy. He discovered not only what
 Israel needed but himself was the man to supply
 that need. Having come to know Saul ben Tish,
 a Benjamite, a man of gigantic force, he declared
 to him his destiny to become King over Israel.
 Saul soon found an opportunity to display himself.
 The city of Jabesh-Gilead was besieged by the
 Ammonites, and the inhabitants were about to
 surrender. When the tidings reached Saul, who
 was returning with a yoke of oxen from the field, he
 heard the cattle in pieces, sent the portions in all
 directions, with the threat "thus shall be done with the
 oxen of everyone who refuses help in relieving Jabesh."
 The people obeyed, came to the rescue & delivered
 the city & its inhabitants. In Helgal, Joshua's old
 camp, Saul was anointed. Jonathan his son slew
 the messengers of the Philistines at Gibeath, who advanced
 their forces to Gibeath, being divided by the gorge of
 Muchinash. Only a few hundred Benjamites re-
 turned with Saul. Jonathan, with his armour bearer,

opened the battle by surprising the weak spot of the Philistines, who fled carrying the javelin to the camp. Saul then made a successful attack on the whole camp driving them back by the road of Beth-Horon. Saul was then established at Gibeah, the nucleus of his kingdom. He was the commander-in-chief, while the internal affairs of the country remained under the control of the national council, of which Samuel was the recognized leader, acting in concert with the Arbiter of the administration of the Theocracy. It should be noted that the warlike revival proceeded from Benjamin. Ephraim had lost its leadership as its symbol, viz. the sanctuary at Shechem, and the ark of the covenant, so that Benjamin thus became the connecting link between Ephraim and Judah. Through Saul also Judah enters definitely into history as his famous expedition against the Amalekites shows. Among the men of Judah, who came to Gibeah, was Havi the son of Jaser. His skill on the harp brought him into close relations with Saul. He became his armour-bearer, afterwards the most intimate

friend of Jonathan, finally the husband of his daughter and was declared the general favorite of the court and the people. His famous victory over the philistine giant together with his other successes excited the jealousy of Saul, for David thereby proved himself his superior as a warrior. The first outbreak of this jealousy was accounted for as a temporary mental depression of the king, but it soon became evident that this meant better and long cherished hatred against David. Jonathan warned his friend, aided him in his flight to the priests of Nob, who provided him with arms and food. He then fled to the wilderness of Judah, became the leader of the dissatisfied warriors, among whom were his kinsmen from Bethlehem. This was the nucleus of David's subsequent bodyguard. Saul suspecting that the priests of Nob were in league with David, ordered them all to be massacred so that Abiathar was the only surviving priest who followed David. Through him, David was able to consult the Urim & Thummim. Finally forced by the persecutions of Saul to leave Judah,

David resorted to the desperate measure of placing his services at the disposal of Achish the Philistine King of Gath; he was received with open arms and the town of Gath was assigned him for a residence. Here, with his followers he pursued his own manner of life, as an independent prince, obliged only to render military service to Achish. Meanwhile the Philistines once more mustered their forces against Israel. Saul awaited their attack in the plain of Jezreel. A most disastrous battle on Mt. Gelboah followed in which Saul, Jonathan and the flower of the army were slain. The work of Saul's life was thus undone. The Philistines regained their former power & possession even to the country west of the Jordan. Beyond the Jordan, Abner, the cousin & commander of Saul's army, ordained Ishbaal King in Mahanaim, who again established the supremacy of Israel over the Philistines. But the men of Judah elected David as their King. A protracted feud now ensued between the dominions of the house of Saul & David, while the fortunes of war de-

clared themselves in favor of David. In vain did Abner dispute his territory. Personal causes at last brought matters to a crisis. Abner, by taking to himself a concubine called Rizpah, had aroused Ishbaal's suspicion of aiming at his inheritance. This proved too much for Abner, & forthwith entered into negotiations with David at Hebron. His plans were realized and David became king of united Israel. Abner, who came in person to the king, when about to set out on his return, was murdered by Joab, a victim of jealousy. His death left Israel without a leader and after the death of Ishbaal who also was murdered, the elders of Israel, united in council and proclaimed David king, which he accepted. David made Jebus his residence, which became not only the political but also the religious centre; there the ark of the covenant was brought from Kirjath-jearim and was placed within a citadel, afterwards the temple mount. David was elevated to the throne by virtue of his ability to prosecute the war against the Philistines. This war was the forge of Israel's unity.

The struggle began with the transference of the seat of royalty to Jerusalem, and the anecdotes and deeds of valor of individual heroes, extal. spread far and wide in the land. The result was that David completed what Saul has begun and thoroughly subdued the Philistines, which was the greatest achievement of his reign. He subjugated Moab, Ammon and Edom. He vanquished the Moabites and treated them severely. Then, not long after the king of Ammon died David sent an embassy of condolence to Hanun, his successor, but he suspecting David, refused to receive the embassy and forthwith entered into an alliance with the Syrian kings. David sent his army under Joab against Rabbath-Ammon. The Syrians advanced to the relief of the city, but Joab dividing his forces and leaving his brother Abishai to hold the Ammonites in check, proceeded in person against the Syrians and defeated them. David again defeated them at Helam, and finally Rabbath-Ammon was captured.

The vision of Balaam was fulfilled when finally Edom was raised to the ground and Israel the youngest of the four Hebrew nationalities trod the three elders under his feet. Thus the political acts of David established his supremacy and his foes molested him no more. But turning now to the domestic side of David's rule, we see him confronted by new dangers, arising at home within his own family. Absalom, the handsome son of David, thinking to establish his claim to the Throne organised a revolt against his father. In order to foster this rebellion he availed himself of a misunderstanding between David and the men of Judah. The revolt was fomented in Hebron; Ahithophel, the once trusted counsellor of David, sided with Absalom and Amasa struck the first blow; all Israel with the exception of the territory east of Jordan were drawn into the rebellion. David fled to this territory with all haste being completely overtaken by the news of the rebellion. At Mahanaim he collected his

faithful followers together with his body-guard
the 600 Cherethites and Pelethites, for which Ab-
salom against the advice of Ahithophel allowed
him the time. The battle was fought in the
woods of Ephraim. Absalom was caught up
in a tree and suspended there was pierced by
the arrows of Joab, so that with his death
the rebellion was ended. The tribe of Joseph
sent a deputation to King David and the other
tribes with the exception of Judah returned
to allegiance at once. But later on David
succeeded in bringing back that tribe also though
he kindled such jealousy between Israel and Judah,
that another revolt broke out, which however
was at once repressed by Joab. Soon after
this event David after appointing Solomon
his successor, died. His historical importance
is very great. He established a united Judah
and Jerusalem. His personal character
has been greatly misjudged by the modern
critics. It seems strange that he caused,

the military prisoners to be treated with barbarity, and the sons of Saul to be hanged on the wall in Gilead. He combined in himself the most daring courage, with tender susceptibility. David's character belongs to the greatest of biblical personalities. In order to prove this, we must not only investigate his deeds, but also his glowing and hopeful psalms. There his fervent religious zeal stands forth showing the nobility of soul, and true manliness which prompted them. May we be to all, indulgent to a fault and an impetuous lover of his people for humanity and his God. Although at times he seems cruel (2 S VII 12; III 31) although all his actions could not bear close inspection, we must ascribe them more to the fault of his time than to his own personality. From his faithful administration, we learn that the kingdom was a blessing for the people; that he secured for them peace and recognition; that he established the unity of the tribes and maintained order and harmony among the various elements. Above all David carried out the reforms of

Daniel, by firmly grounding his theocratic principle
in spreading the worship of Jehovah, so that centuries
later the prophets Isaiah, Zachariah, Hoshea and
Ezekiel made of David the ideal prototype
of a theocratic regent, which became the
basis for the hope of Israel's salvation
by the advent of the Messiah, who is to
be descended from the house of David. We
need not linger on the delineation of Saul's character.
Among all his contemporaries he was the fittest to re-
ceive the royal dignity, possessing personal beauty, a
commanding stature, warlike skill, gifted with en-
ergy, perseverance and a high regard for the nation.
Though strictly not a religious man, he nevertheless
exhibited zeal for the worship of Jehovah. He re-
pressed, with a strong hand, infringement of the an-
cient code; he would sacrifice his gallant son of
a breach of religious vow. His noble sacrifice
in the midst of the battle, refusing to live when
the nation was defeated, showed that his was the en-
ergy of despair felt by one who is forsaken. A grandson in
itself.