people. The persistent emphasis upon such features as the rejection of Saul, his enmity towards David, the latter’s chivalry, and his friendship for Jonathan, will partly account for the present literary intricacies; and, on general grounds, traditions of quite distinct origin (Calebite or Jerahmeelite; indigenous Judaean; North Israelite or Benjamite) are to be expected in a work now in post-exilic form.@@1 David’s history is handled independently of Saul in 1 Sam. xxv.; and the narrative, now editorially connected with the context *(υ.* 1, see xxviii. 3, and *v.* 44, see 2 Sam. iii. 15), gives a valuable picture of his life in the south of Palestine.@@2 With this notice his relations with south Judaean cities in xxx. 26-31. His flight northwards to the Philistine king of Gath (xxvii.) is hardly connected with the preceding situations in xxiv. 17-22, xxv. or xxvi. 21-25, and his previous slaughter of the Philistines at Keilah (xxiii. 1-15) raises historical difficulties. This is not to mention his earlier successes over the same people, which are very explicitly ignored in xxix. 5, although the famous couplet there quoted now finds its only explanation in xviii. 7 after the death of Goliath and the defeat of the Philistines. The traditions of varying relations between Judah and the Philistines attached to David (cf. xxvii. 5 seq.) are quite distinct from the popular stories of giants of Gath, and now form part of the joint history of David and Saul. The independent narratives of the latter’s fate seem to represent one of those disastrous attacks upon the north which are familiar in the later history of the northern kingdom (xxviii. 4, xxix; see Jews: *History,* § 12). The geographical data are confused by the stories of David (see 1 Sam. xxviii. 4, xxix. 1, and the commentaries), and, while the “ Philistines ” for once march north to Jezreel to deliver their attack, David’s presence is not discovered until Aphek is reached (xxix.). His journey is the opportunity for an Amalekite raid (xxx. cf. xxvii. 8 seq.), and this new defeat of Amalek, ascribed to David, proves a more successful undertaking than that which led to the rejection of Saul (xv. 20 seq. 26-28). Similarly, Saul’s disaster leaves Israel again in the hands of the “ Philis- tines ” (xxxi. 7, cf. xiii. 6 seq.), and it is for David to save the people of Israel out of their hands (2 Sam. iii. 18, cf. 1 Sam. ix. 16).@@3 The sequel to the joint history has another version of Saul’s death (2 Sam. i. 6-10, 13-16), and an Amalekite is the offender; contrast his death in i. 15 seq. with iv. 10 seq. The chapter explains the transference of the royal insignia from Israel to Judah. Here is quoted (from the “ Book of Jashar ”) the old poetical lament over the death of the valiant friends Saul and Jonathan, describing their successful warlike career, the wealth they brought the people, and the vivid sense of national misfortune (i. 19-27). It is utilized for the history of David, to whom its authorship is attributed. In general, it appears that those narratives wherein the histories of Saul and\* David are combined—very much in the favour of the latter— were originally distinct from those where (*a*) Saul’s figure is more in accord with the old poem from the Book of Jashar, and (*b*) where David’s victories over prehistoric giants and his war­like movements to Jerusalem pave the way for the foundation—from a particular Judaean standpoint—of his remarkably long dynasty.

The literary problems of the books oí Samuel are those of the writing of the history of the monarchies from different points of view; and the intimate connexion of the books with those that precede and follow shows that a careful consideration of the internal literary and historical features of these also is necessary. The first step is the recognition of a specific Deuteronomíc redaction in Joshua—Kings, an intricate process which extended into the post-exilic age.@@4 Certain phenomena suggest that the first compilation was made outside Judah—in Israel, whereas others represent a Judaean and anti-Israelite feeling. The close interconnexion of Judg. x.- 1 Sam. xii. is as crucial as that of 2 Sam. v.-1 Kings ii. The (probably

Deuteronomic) framework of Israelite history in Kings can be traced in Samuel, and it is a natural assumption that it should have gone back beyond the time of Jeroboam 1. While the detailed history of Israelite kings and prophets in 1 Kings xvii.-2 Kings x. (Ahab to Jehu) finds more developed parallels in the narratives of Saul and Samuel, the peculiar treatment of the lives of David and Solomon (Judaean kings over a united Israel) and of the division of the monarchy has complicated the present sources. Although the contents of 2 Sam. v.-viii., xxi.-xxiv., 1 Kings ii. 10-12, iii. 2, appear to have been consecutive (in some form) at an earlier stage, the connexion has been broken by ix,-xx., 1 Kings i. ii. 1-9, 13 sqq., and the further vicissitudes can scarcely be recovered ; and while there are clear signs of more than one Deuteronomíc hand in the former group, the latter shows in 1 Kings ii. 2-4 a Deuteronomíc revision, either of independent origin or in the combination of the sources in their present form. Moreover, Samuel’s farewell address (1 Sam. xii.) belongs to the Deuteronomíc and later account of Saul’s rise, and closes the period of (*a*) the lsraelite “ judges ” (see Judg. ii. 6-iii. 6, an extremely composite passage), and (*b*) the Ammonite and Philistine oppression *fib.* x. 6 sqq.).@@5 The former follows upon Joshua’s two concluding speeches, one given by a Deuteronomíc writer in xxiii., and the other incorporated by another though similar hand in xxiv. Although the pre-monarchical age is viewed as one of kinglike “ judges,” the chiefs are rather local heroes (so Ehud, Gideon, Jephthah), and the boisterous giant Samson (Judg. xiii.- xvi.), and the religious leaders Eli and Samuel are “ judges ” from other standpoints. Perplexity is caused, also, in the oldest account of Saul’s rise (1 Sam. ix.) by the sudden introduction of a Philistine oppression which cannot be connected with vii. 2-viii., or even with 1 Sam. iv.-vii. 1.@@6 On the other hand, Judg. x. 6 sqq. refers to a Philistine oppression which has no sequel. It may be conjectured that there was an original literary connexion between the **two** which has been broken by the insertion of traditions relating to Samuel and Saul.@@7 This finds support (*a*) in the internal evidence for the later addition of Judg. xvii.-xxi., and of certain portions of the opening chapters of 1 Samuel; (*b*) in the absence of any continuity in the intervening history; and (*c*) in the material relation­ship between portions of the highly composite Judg. x. 6 sqq. and the rise of Saul. The literary processes thus involved find an analogy in the original connexion between 2 Sam. v.-viii. and xxi.-xxiv., or between Exod. xxxiii. seq. and Num. x. 29-36, xi. (see Saul).

The section 1 Sam. iv.-vii. 1 forms the prelude to Samuel’s great victory and belongs to the history of Shiloh and the priesthood of Eli. But the fall of this sanctuary scarcely belongs to this remote age (11th century); it was sufficiently recent to serve as a warning to Jerusalem in the time of Jeremiah (close of 7th century). This event of supreme importance to north Israel (cf. Judg. xvifi. 30 seq.) is already connected with Samuel’s prophecy in iii., but the latter is strengthened by the Deuteronomíc passage, ii. 27-36, which links the disaster, not with the history of Samuel, but with the rise of the Zadokite Levites of Jerusalem, and thus represents a specifically Judaean standpoint. This is analogous to the Judaean adaptation of the prophetical treatment of Saul’s life, and it also reflects certain priestly rivalries (see Levites). With the loss of Shiloh is explained the appearance of the priests at Nob outside Jerusalem (xxi. **I,** xxii. 9), which is followed by their massacre, the flight of Abiathar (xxii.), and the transference of the sacred ephod to David (xxiii. 6).@@8 Here, however, the emphasis laid upon the ephod brought by Abiathar, the survivor of the house of Eli (cf. ii. 28, xxi. 9), points away from what was once a common object of cult to the late and post- exilic restriction of its use to the Aaronite high priests (see Ephod).

Moreover, according to 1 Kings ii. 26, Abîathar bore the *ark,* and while some traditions traced its history to Shiloh, or even found it at Bethel (Judg. xx. 27 seq.), others apparently ran quite another course, associated it with southern clans ultimately settled in Judah, and supposed that Jerusalem was its first resting-place. The author of 2 Sam. vii. 6 (cf. also 1 Chron. xxiii. 25 sq.) can scarcely have known 1 Sam. i.-fii. with its temple at Shiloh, and although 2 Sam. vi. finds its present prelude in 1 Sam. vi. 17-vii. 1, that passage actually brings the story of its fortunes to a close by relating the return of the ark from Philistine territory to the care of Abinadab and Eleazar at Kirjath-jearim (note the “ Levîtical ” type of the names; Budde,*Sam.* p. 47). From Josh. ix. 17 (post-exilic source) it might indeed be argued that the district was not under Israelite jurisdiction (see Kennedy, *Sam.* p. 325 seq.), although to judge from the older

@@@1 The late genealogy of Saul in 1 Chron. vfii. 29 sqq., ix. 35 sqq., is evidence for a keen interest in the Saulidae in post-exilic times.

@@@2The chapter with the prophecy of Abigail may be of Calebite origin.

@@@3 So also, David’s wars (2 Sam. viii.) bear a certain resemblance to those of Saul (1 Sam. xiv. 47).

@@@4 Sec G. F. Moore, *Ency. Bib. "*Historical Literature.” § 6 seq. “ Joshua,’’ §§ 5, 11; “Judges,” § 14.

@@@5 With the length of office in 1 Sam. iv. 18 (cf. vii. 15) compare the similar notices in Judg. x. 2 seq., xii. 7 sqq., xv. 20, xvi. 31, and with the length of oppression in vii. 2, cf. Judg. iii. 8, 14, iv. 3, vi. 1, x. 8, xfii. **I.**

@@@6 Nowack, p. 39; Riedel, *Theolog. Lit. Blatt* (1904), No. 3, col. 28.

@@@7 S. A. Cook, *Critical Notes,* p. 127 seq. (cf. Dhorme, *Rev. Bibl.,* 1908, p. 436; Godbey, *Amer. Jοurn. Theol.,* 1909, p. 610).

@@@8 Although writers sought to explain Saul’s disastrous end (cf. 1 Chron. x. 13), it is only Josephus *(Ant.* vi. *14*, 9) who refers to the atrocity at Nob. The significance of the tradition is unknown ; some connexion with Saul’s religious zeal at Gibeon has been conjectured (2 Sam. xxi. 2). That the actual murderer was an Edomite may perhaps be associated with other traditions of Edomite hostility.