1

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

AVIS

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

Biblical Parallelism in 2 Samuel

by

Michael Zaitzow, B.A.

**A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of**

Master of Arts

Department of Religion

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

June 13, 1994

copyright

1994, Michael Zaitzow

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Cat No Notre référence

**THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN
IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE
LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL
LIBRARY OF CANADA TO
REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR
SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY
ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR
FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS
AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED
PERSONS.**

**L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE
IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE
PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE
NATIONALE DU CANADA DE
REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER
OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA
THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET
SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT
POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE
CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES
PERSONNE INTERESSEES.**

**THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP
OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER
THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR
SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT
MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE
REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER
PERMISSION.**

**L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE
DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE
SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES
EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-
CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU
AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON
AUTORISATION.**

ISBN 0-315-98561-5

Canada

Name **Michael Zaitzow**

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Religion
SUBJECT TERM

0321 U-M-I
SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
 General 0289
 Ancient 0290
 Linguistics 0291
 Modern 0291
Literature 0401
 General 0294
 Classical 0295
 Comparative 0297
 Medieval 0298
 Modern 0316
 African 0591
 American 0305
 Asian 0352
 Canadian (English) 0355
 Canadian (French) 0593
 English 0311
 Germanic 0312
 Latin American 0315
 Middle Eastern 0313
 Romance 0314
 Slavic and East European

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion 0318
 General 0321
 Biblical Studies 0319
 Clergy 0320
 History of 0322
 Philosophy of 0469
Theology 0323

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology 0324
 Archaeology 0326
 Cultural 0327
 Physical 0310
Business Administration 0272
 General 0770
 Banking 0454
 Management 0338
 Marketing 0385
Canadian Studies 0501
Economics 0503
 General 0505
 Agricultural 0508
 Commerce-Business 0509
 Finance 0510
 History 0511
 Labor 0358
 Theory 0366
Folklore 0351
Geography 0578
Gerontology 0578
History 0578
 General

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science 0615
 General 0616
 International Law and Relations 0617
 Public Administration 0814
Recreation 0452
Social Work 0626
Sociology 0627
 General 0938
 Criminology and Penology 0631
 Demography 0628
 Ethnic and Racial Studies 0629
 Individual and Family Studies 0630
 Industrial and Labor Relations 0700
 Public and Social Welfare 0344
 Social Structure and Development 0709
 Theory and Methods 0999
Transportation 0453
Urban and Regional Planning 0453
Women's Studies

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
 General 0285
 Agronomy 0475
 Animal Culture and Nutrition 0476
 Animal Pathology 0359
 Food Science and Technology 0478
 Forestry and Wildlife 0479
 Plant Culture 0480
 Plant Pathology 0817
 Plant Physiology 0777
 Range Management 0746
 Wood Technology 0306
Biology 0287
 General 0308
 Anatomy 0309
 Biostatistics 0379
 Botany 0329
 Cell 0353
 Ecology 0369
 Entomology 0793
 Genetics 0410
 Limnology 0307
 Microbiology 0317
 Molecular 0416
 Neuroscience 0433
 Oceanography 0821
 Physiology 0778
 Radiation 0472
 Veterinary Science 0786
 Zoology 0760
Biophysics 0425
 General 0996
 Medical

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Polynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences 0566
 General 0300
 Audiology 0992
 Chemotherapy 0567
 Dentistry 0350
 Education 0769
 Hospital Management 0758
 Human Development 0982
 Immunology 0564
 Medicine and Surgery 0347
 Mental Health 0569
 Nursing 0570
 Nutrition 0380
 Obstetrics and Gynecology 0354
 Occupational Health and Therapy 0381
 Ophthalmology 0571
 Pathology 0419
 Pharmacology 0572
 Pharmacy 0382
 Physical Therapy 0573
 Public Health 0574
 Radiology 0575
 Recreation

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences 0485
Chemistry 0749
 General 0486
 Agricultural 0487
 Analytical 0488
 Biochemistry 0738
 Inorganic 0490
 Nuclear 0491
 Organic 0494
 Pharmaceutical 0495
 Physical 0754
 Polymer 0405
 Radiation 0605
Mathematics 0986
Physics 0606
 General 0608
 Acoustics 0748
 Astronomy and Astrophysics 0607
 Atmospheric Science 0798
 Atomic 0759
 Electronics and Electricity 0609
 Elementary Particles and High Energy 0610
 Fluid and Plasma 0752
 Molecular 0756
 Nuclear 0611
 Optics 0463
 Radiation 0346
 Solid State 0984
Statistics

Engineering 0537
 General 0538
 Aerospace 0539
 Agricultural 0540
 Automotive 0541
 Biomedical 0542
 Chemical 0543
 Civil 0544
 Electronics and Electrical 0348
 Heat and Thermodynamics 0545
 Hydraulic 0546
 Industrial 0547
 Marine 0794
 Materials Science 0548
 Mechanical 0743
 Metallurgy 0551
 Mining 0552
 Nuclear 0549
 Packaging 0765
 Petroleum 0554
 Sanitary and Municipal System Science 0790
 System Science 0428
Geotechnology 0796
Operations Research 0795
Plastics Technology 0994
Textile Technology

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

**Thesis Acceptance Form
M.A. Candidate**

**The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis**

Biblical Parallelism in 2 Samuel

**Submitted by Michael Zaitzow, B.A., M.D..
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts**

Robert Polzin, Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Religion

Carleton University

8 September 1994
date

Abstract

Parallelism is an important trope in biblical prose as well as poetry, and helps integrate biblical narrative style. The thesis begins with a review of biblical parallelism in poetry and prose. A range of representative examples of biblical parallelism in the narrative of 2 Samuel 1-12 are presented, with particular emphasis on its function to help develop and present complex thematic material in the story of King David. Overlap with the traditional concept of inclusio is explored in the context of parallelism helping to organize larger sections of text. As a trope, parallelism is grounded in the process of reading insofar as it signals to the reader to note links within the text. The parallelism of short utterances is expanded and applied to progressively larger texts. Parallelism begins in linguistics and ends in hermeneutics, pointing the reader towards interpretation.

Biblical Parallelism in 2 Samuel

Chapter 1. Introduction and Overview	p. 1
Chapter 2. Inclusio and Beyond	p. 36
Chapter 3. Parallelism and Thematic Presentation	p. 64
Conclusion.	p. 95
References	p. 100

Chapter 1. Introduction and Overview

The concept of parallelism in biblical literature has a long history, going back to Robert Lowth.¹ As a concept it has been used to understand the workings of biblical poetry but has been used very little to explicate biblical narrative. There are those who believe it to be the central, foremost and most comprehensive principle dominating biblical poetry.² Originally parallelism was

¹ In his seminal study published over two centuries ago, Robert Lowth described parallelism in the following way: "When a proposition is delivered, and a second is subjoined to it, or drawn under it, equivalent, or contrasted with it, in Sense; or similar to it in the form of Grammatical Construction; these I call Parallel Lines;" Isaiah, qtd in Berlin: Dynamics p.1.

² See Benjamin Hrushovski's discussion of parallelism in the Encyclopedia Judaica pp.1200-2. James Kugel in The Idea of Biblical Parallelism, p. 86, calls parallelism "the trope, the one shape of elevated speech."

understood to represent a poetic structure of balanced pairs of statements that were more or less equal. As Kugel mentions, two verses, half-verses or phrases, one following the other, of more or less equal length, with more or less the same semantic intent, were said to be parallel. Lowth's subtypes of parallelism ("synonymous, antithetic, synthetic") show him wrestling with a range of possibilities within this concept of symmetric repetition. Although schematic, Lowth's classification introduces the idea of parallelism as a set of complex relations between two similar, proximate phrases or lines. As Kugel notes, the study of biblical poetry has maintained an interest in Western units of analysis (hemistichs, stichs, versicles, colas, bicolos) with its essential focus on the single line or single phrase unit.³ Background work with this focus can be found in general works of biblical poetics and poetry such as those by Watson or O'Connor.⁴

Keeping with the spirit of its origin as a concept, an introduction to parallelism may begin with a poetic example. Let

³ James Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History p.2.

⁴ Although O'Connor's discussions of 'matching' may include some aspects of grammatical parallelism, he basically sees the concept of parallelism both as one concept among many as well as an amalgam of different phenomena. Much of this opinion derives from the traditional focus on the single poetic line as the main object of inquiry.

us take this example from the poetic ending to the first chapter of 2 Samuel. Saul has died and David laments:

- a) Do not tell it in Gath,
 - b) Do not spread it in the outskirts of Ashkelon,
 - c) Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice,
 - d) Lest the daughters of the uncircumcised make merry.
- (1:20)

Parallelism is a form of creative repetition. In this example, some element of clause a is repeated in clause b, and the same can be said of clauses c and d. The main factors underlying this or any example of parallelism are semantic, syntactic, phonologic and rhythmic.⁵ Indeed, there is usually some combination of all these factors.⁶

⁵ In his review of Kugel's book, Stephen Geller succinctly states that parallelism "consists of two discrete phenomena: correspondence of form ("grammatical parallelism") and of meaning ("semantic parallelism)". Geller (1982) p.66.

⁶ There is a certain preliminary wisdom to artificially dividing scholars into two rough camps: those that have emphasized the semantic aspects of parallelism and those that have emphasized the grammatical aspect. Modern linguistics seems to be shifting the understanding of parallelism deeper into its founding grammar. Greenstein, for example, would more or less equate parallelism with its grammatical aspects. There is a general consensus in the work of Berlin, Kugel, Greenstein, Geller and Collins that neither syntax nor semantics achieve priority one over the other. Perhaps it is safer to say that the semantic aspect has been appreciated for some time, grammatical aspects are becoming better understood with the tools of

Let us look at the example in more detail, keeping in mind that the unit of text that interests us is not the single clause, phrase or line but the two parallel clauses, phrases or lines taken together.⁷ The semantic, syntactic, phonologic and rhythmic factors sketch in how two parallel fragments work as a larger whole.⁸ Clause b repeats a syntactically and semantically. 'Do not spread it' represents a specific focussed repetition of 'do not tell it'. Robert Alter calls this a 'structure of intensification'.⁹ James

linguistics, and phonologic and rhythmic aspects have not been explored much to date.

⁷ Parallelism is essentially a relation between phrases. Textual segments may be equivalent or they may contrast. Some element of both equivalence and contrast through the linkage is the general rule. This process of comparison of phrases, which is enhanced by the paratactic nature of Hebrew, leads the reader to hold the two texts in a nonlinear relationship. The compared images in parallel texts are considered by the reader both sequentially and simultaneously. Berlin aptly states that, "Parallelism promotes the perception of a relationship between the elements of which parallelism is composed, and this relationship is one of correspondence. The nature of the correspondence varies, but in general it involves repetition or the substitution of things which are equivalent on one or more linguistic levels. The notion of equivalence and its counterpart opposition or contrast, will emerge again and again in the various areas of linguistics to which we will have recourse:" Dynamics p.2.

⁸ For an overview of these linguistic concepts in the context of biblical poetry, see Hrushovski's article in the E.J. For a more comprehensive taxonomy, please refer to Adele Berlin's The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism. She goes to great lengths to tease out the different linguistic determinants of parallelism, and then put them back together so they amount to an integrated poetics. One should also note that the term parallelism, as she uses it, is somewhat different from but related to its antecedent use in classical scholarship.

Kugel would say we have here an example of 'first a, and what is more, b'.¹⁰ 'Tell/spread' are identical syntactically and similar semantically. 'Spread' broadens the meaning of 'tell' and hints at a gossipy intent. The clipped three rhythmic stresses of clause a parallel the more relaxed four rhythmic stresses of clause b. This physical asymmetry reinforces again that b has gone beyond a. In line with the above discussion, clauses c and d are also broadly parallel to each other given their semantic, syntactic, phonologic¹¹ and rhythmic similarities. But keep in mind that although more equal a repetition, this second pair of clauses or lines upholds the

⁹ Alter organizes the concept of parallelism largely within his concept of a 'structure of intensification'. He is not interested primarily in parallelism but incorporates it conceptually into his process of analysis of poetry and prose. In a similar way, Moshe Garsiel and Meir Sternberg use concepts very similar to parallelism in their analyses of the biblical text without comprehensive reference to the concept. Some interesting methodological questions here arise given that 1) parallelism would seem to have a spectrum of meanings, depending on context, and 2) some important theorists use related theoretical formulations without direct reference to the concept or its background history.

¹⁰ James Kugel's discussions of parallelism, like Berlin's, strive for an integrated poetics. His apparently schematic labelling of fragments of parallelism as A and B is misleading, for the main thrust of his work in The Idea of Biblical Poetry, Parallelism and its History, is integrative.

According to Kugel, the parallel fragments A and B represent a single larger unit and should be taken together. They complement each other, integrating the statement, asserting its completeness or unity. This is the foundation beneath his schematic rendering of parallelism as: 'A, and what is more, B', a process aptly termed 'seconding' or 'sharpening'.

¹¹ Phonologic elements are largely founded on similarities in grammar, case endings, prefixes, etc. The phonology of these repetitive devices has not received much attention.

pattern of balance established in clauses a and b. Clause d represents an intensification of clause c. 'The daughters of the Philistines' have become, more pointedly, the 'daughters of the uncircumcised'. For b to go beyond a and for d to go beyond c it is necessary to have the terse, balanced proximity of the clauses. A discussion of parallelism must look at the two sets of texts in relation to each other.¹²

As already noted, parallelism is a concept among other concepts belonging traditionally to the domain of biblical poetry. More recently, parallelism has been seen as the process that underscores how biblical poetry works as poetry. If we proceed to apply these concepts to the analysis of biblical narrative, then we should be aware that we are importing a founding concept from

¹² For some academics, the nature of this complementarity brings up the dichotomy in structural linguistics that is drawn between deep and surface structure. Berlin: (Dynamics p.53) asserts that in parallelism, it is not the original sentence that is transformed but an unrealized sentence that sits deep to the structure of the narrative. This unrealized sentence generates both linguistic fragments that make up the parallelism, leaving them both on an equal footing, complementing each other without subordination. The ability to plot the syntactic transformations from one fragment to another supports the notion of a deeper, shared linguistic structure. Nevertheless, the concepts of deep and surface linguistic structure--to some extent--remain intuitive. This matches the reader's experience of reading parallel texts where an intuition links both parallel statements into a broader whole. Nevertheless, the hypothesis of a deeper structure encourages the reader/interpreter to plot transformations between related parallel verses in the spirit of the text which generally does not subordinate one fragment to another.

the domain of poetry (a concept that has been used to define poetry as poetry) into an area of analysis that has other founding principles. However, this distinction between poetry and prose is far from obvious or complete. Hrushovski alludes to this ambiguity in his Encyclopedia Judaica article when he summarizes:

"The basis of this type of rhythm (parallelism) may be described as semantic-syntactic-accentual. It is basically a free rhythm, i.e., a rhythm based on a cluster of changing principles. Its freedom, however, is clearly confined within the limits of its poetics."¹³

Some have broadly observed, however, that parallel structures exist and perform a similar organizing force within prose narrative.¹⁴ This brings up two important, related aspects of

¹³ Hrushovski: E.J. p.1201.

¹⁴ Berlin and others quote Jakobson's approach to support the point that the indicators of poetry do not differ substantively from the indicators of linguistic equivalences in prose texts. Indeed, "Certain linguistic usages, including a systematic exploitation of equivalences, are a mark of biblical style as a whole. They are not limited to one genre, although they may be more prominent in the one usually called poetry." Dynamics p.3. Geller: (1983) p.626 resists the facile distinction between poetry and prose when he states that the categories are "Hellenistic impositions. No system," he continues, "has yet been isolated that would make them meaningful for the study of that book [the bible]. Meter must be rejected. It has proved to be a mirage. At most one can discern a certain striving for "terseness" in some

biblical poetry: its laconic nature and the concept of balanced line length. When noting parallel structures within biblical narrative, it is possible to observe something of a tightening or focussing of the overall prose structure that preserves the Hebrew's laconic rhythmically-balanced structure. The factors that help focus meaning in Hebrew poetry may turn out to be broader processes that help focus meaning in the language of biblical Hebrew as a whole, including biblical narrative. Let us remain sensitive to these underlying issues as we attempt to access this "rhythm based on a cluster of changing principles."¹⁵ This 'cluster of changing principles' as organized within the concept of parallelism can be very helpful in explaining the process of reading and interpreting biblical narrative. The concept evolved within the

passages. Parallelism also cannot serve as a diagnostic criterion for "poetry", it is too common in "prose". It is better to view it as a universal rhetorical device of biblical style."

¹⁵ Berlin points out how even Kugel, when attempting to clarify the prose/poetry dilemma becomes enmeshed in his own terminology. He does away with the distinction between poetry and prose, then seems to return to it. In the end, this does not detract from his work, which, like Berlin's, precedes the distinction between poetry and prose. Similarly, like Berlin, his use of the term parallelism, in keeping with his contemporaries, is a comprehensive linguistic concept. Greenstein, Geller and others would basically agree, as would Collins (despite his use of the term 'line-forms' for parallelism.) Although distinctions in linguistic approach can be made between these scholars along the lines of whether parallelism is primarily a semantic or syntactic phenomenon, we are introducing the concept as an integrated whole with semantic and syntactic determinants, following Hrushovski's lead.

study of poetry, for it is here that the process is most apparent. To move from this domain into the domain of biblical narrative, it will be necessary to keep in mind the related elements of poetry: terseness, balanced phrase lengths, heightened language and closely structured repetition.¹⁶ We have seen in our above example that the concept of parallelism as a broad poetics contains these factors within its 'free rhythm'.¹⁷

¹⁶ It is interesting to note studies based on parallelism as a restricted concept used in the analysis of biblical poetry. For example, D. Pardee's analysis of Psalm 89 in ISOT Supplement 31 (pp.121-137) attempts to explore an entire work by noting the pervasive semantic parallelism. He expands the signing function of A//A' comprehensively, but then notes (p.122) that this type of analysis "probably cannot adequately be done at all" due to the nuances in shifting parallelism that pervades the psalm. As Pardee acknowledges, his study does not take into account the recent work of Kugel, Collins and others. His analysis of parallelism in a poetic text is a good example of analytic interest being driven by an appreciation of the text through parallelism, but the end result unfortunately reduces the text to lists and charted references. It is thus fair to observe that semantic parallelisms in this stylized form cannot stand alone without doing damage to a plain reading of the text.

¹⁷ It should be remembered that parallelism as well as the balanced sense of the line are based on the word pair. A taxonomy of examples would require a computer or a computer mind, and result in the necessity of lifting examples of word pairs and parallelism out of their narrative context. The most comprehensive background work on the word pair can be found in the studies by M. Dahood. Our study is contextual, and will attempt to build upon this framework. Strictly speaking, morphology refers to the grammar at the level of the word and syntax at the level of the line or stich. Berlin has clarified some of the morphological foundation of parallelism. She states that..."a term may be paralleled by one from a different morphological class, pronouns take the place of nouns, prepositional phrases and adverbs often serve the same syntactic function and are not always distinguishable; a relative clause may serve as a subject or object..." 1979 p.22.

To add to the prose-poetry dichotomy and the transformed use of the term parallelism, we must also admit the problem that the processes of parallelism may be central to the critical analysis of biblical texts but the term parallelism may not be seen anywhere within the specific scholarly analysis. Two examples will suffice to introduce different aspects of this dilemma: 1) the understanding of a specific concept and 2) the work of a specific scholar.

Inclusio refers to the envelope structure sandwiching a poem. An excellent example can be found in Psalm 8.¹⁸ In contrast to the examples of parallelism mentioned above, in the inclusio, the stated/restated phrase that introduces and concludes a section of text are separated by intervening material. However, the two phrases are related through this intervening material. The inclusio or envelope structure is a particular application of parallelism in nonconsecutive lines or clauses; these clauses are related directly as well as through the intervening material. There is some evidence that other linguistic and grammatical concepts such as chiasmus and merismus are also specific examples of

¹⁸ See Robert Alter's discussion of this highly stylized example of the envelope structure in his essay, The Art of Biblical Poetry, The Literary Guide to the Bible, p.255.

parallelism. Inclusio as a concept lends itself to the scope of this paper and will be discussed in the following chapter.

Looking at a concept that has been incorporated into a broader concept such as inclusio into parallelism, is perhaps easier to conceptualize than whether there is any place for a comprehensive concept such as parallelism resting implicitly within the described poetics of certain scholars. It is possible, for example, to detect a concept not unlike parallelism lurking under the surface of Meir Sternberg's "Basic Guide to the Structure of Retelling".¹⁹ Sternberg sets up a broad classification scheme to enlighten the process of retelling based on who tells and who repeats, the motivation for retelling and the accuracy of retelling. However, one cannot suppress the observation that these are composite manifestations of a more fundamental linguistic process. Indeed, at his conclusion he admits that "the 'protean functionality' of repetition relies on phonic and lexical equivalence, syntactic form, semantic shifts and ambiguity."²⁰ Perhaps Sternberg is taking our knowledge of the language and its poetics for granted, for his arguments often proceed along

¹⁹ See Meir Sternberg's, *Structure of Repetition: Strategies of Informational Redundancy*, in *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, pp.365-440.

²⁰ Sternberg, *Poetics*, p. 438.

intuitive closely-argued lines that have the above-mentioned linguistic factors at their root. His reference to a similar set of linguistic factors that underscore our understanding of parallelism within the context of a structure of repetition strongly suggests an overlap with the concept of parallelism. This is not the place to fully investigate this overlap theoretically, nor is it the place to compare particular examples of interpretation to see if they coincide with a methodology that begins with an understanding of parallelism. I mention Sternberg as one of many scholars including Garsiel, Fokkelman, Polzin, Gunn, Rosenberg and others only to introduce the idea that these scholars and others may use concepts that are related to or ultimately derive from the poetics of biblical parallelism in their analyses of biblical texts without direct reference to the concept of parallelism or its linguistic foundation.²¹

²¹ An interesting transitional example of how parallelism can be used as an organizing principle to understand a biblical narrative can be found in Shimon Bar-Efrat's *Narrative Art in the Bible* in JSOTS 70, Almond Press: 1989 pp.218-223. In discussing the narrative of Adonijah (1 Kings 1) Bar-Efrat organizes his analysis around the phrase: "And Solomon your son shall be king after me, and he shall sit on my throne." This central thematic phrase occurs and recurs in the passage (vvs. 13, 17, 24, 30 and 35). Bar-Efrat notes that this frequent repetition arouses the attention of the reader, although Bar-Efrat likely misjudges the signal function of the parallelism when he describes it as a deviation from customary usage. For Bar-Efrat, parallelism is accepted in poetry but not prose. Nevertheless, he continues to explain the process of parallelism with some accuracy; "This way of placing a sentence in slightly modified form adjacent to the previous, similar one, namely, repetition with alteration in juxtaposition,

At some point it will be necessary to shift to the analysis of specific examples of parallelism within the designated narrative without attempting a comprehensive taxonomy in advance. This necessity is not entirely unfortunate for it leaves open the scope of parallelism to be determined by the narrative, which will ground our understanding of parallelism within the process of reading.²² The selection of narrative material, 2 Sam 1-2, 5-7 and

serves to stress opposition." p.219. Bar-Efrat can thus proceed to interpret this 'opposition' as focussing the ironic distance or opposition between the oath which David swore to Bathsheba and the actual situation which has arisen. Bar-Efrat seems reluctantly aware of the stylistic implications of his observations. Indeed, his interpretation works because of the parallelism he takes such pains to analyze. Furthermore, his example is interesting and important because he elaborates an integrated interpretation of an extended prose narrative based on more than one, thematically linked example of parallel statements. In his analysis, parallelism is a signalling or focussing agent, a structuring process based on a set of binary relations between phrases, and a means of reaching an overall integrated interpretation. We can thus begin to challenge his conclusion, that parallelism is "one particular, prominent and deviant (italics mine) stylistic feature." On the contrary, the spontaneity of his analysis supports the idea that parallelism is based in an integrated style and works through the process of reading.

²² The process of reading is taken up in detail by Robert Alter in The Pleasures of Reading in an Ideological Age. His discussions are helpful: he strays very little from the process of the reader reading and what Rosenberg calls common sense (see also note 26). His discussion of the signal function of an allusion (pp.119-23) has particular application to our understanding of parallelism; there are similarities in the concept of allusion as he and others use it, and our understanding of parallelism. Alter's ideas come together with particular force in his concluding chapter, Multiple Readings and the Bog of Indeterminacy where he states that , "Most literary works... turn on an experiential dimension that is not.... reducible to the formal vehicles through which it is conveyed." (p.206). At this point in the discussion it is fitting that Alter proceeds to analyze a biblical narrative, the Book of Ruth.

11-12, is broad enough in scope to provide us with examples as well as to allow us to look at the integrative effect of parallelism over a significant range of material. We will look at the scope of these 12 chapters as chapters within an integrated longer work. The chapters have been selected to represent parts of the beginning, middle and end of this semi-autonomous narrative. Given this approach, the selection of chapters may contrast with selections chosen by scholars for their studied focus. For example, scholars such as Rost who are interested in the succession aspect of the narrative, organize their ideas around those chapters that deal with David's succession to kingship.²³ David Gunn, who breaks with scholarly tradition some, modifies the list of chapters he integrates into his analysis²⁴. Garsiel and others who focus on the story of David and Bathsheba, seem content to isolate narrative pieces within the broader narrative.²⁵ In contrast,

²³ See Rost's, The Succession to the Throne of David with his emphasis on the Davidic court history.

²⁴ See David Gunn's "The Story of King David. Genre and Interpretation." JSOT Supplement Series, Sheffield, 1978, as well as "David and the Gift of the Kingdom" (2 Sam 2-4, 9-29, 1 Kgs 1-2" in Semia 3 pp.14-45.

²⁵ Moshe Garsiel: 1972, 1973 and 1975.

Rosenberg begins to look at the narrative as an integrated whole.²⁶

A fairly clear, balanced example of a parallel structure within our narrative can be found in 2 Sam 7. David reports to Nathan the prophet:

2a) "Look: I dwell in a house of cedar,

2b) and/(but) the ark of God dwells within the curtain."²⁷

²⁶ At first glance, Joel Rosenberg's selection of material in King and Kin, Political Allegory in the Hebrew Bible, seems both eclectic and idiosyncratic. As the title to his series of essays implies, (David without Diagrams: Beyond Structure in the Davidic History), he brings a freshness to his analysis that specifically intends to get beyond the various theories of biblical scholarship that have focussed, at times relentlessly, on the identity of the court-history author. His review of approaches to this material is very helpful (pp.100-111) as well as his delineation of his own approach. In contrast to the microstructural analyses of Fokkelman (Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel vol 1-3) Rosenberg favours a method based on "memory, common sense, and wherever possible, plain speech - the same apparatus that the anonymous ancient author/tradent demanded of his readership, and that remain, whatever the technical advances of scientific scholarship, the most reliable tools of biblical study." King and Kin p.112.

²⁷ Wherever possible I will try to translate following the principles that are discussed and implemented by Everett Fox in In The Beginning, A New English Rendition of the Book of Genesis and Now These are the Names, A New English Rendition of the Book of Exodus. His translating skill, based on the method derived by the Buber-Rosenzweig collaboration, is sensitized to the oral nature of the language. As Fox states, (xii) "Using echoes, allusions, and powerful inner structures of sound, the text is often able to convey ideas in a manner that mere vocabulary cannot do." Fox translates the text in lines as opposed to paragraphs. These lines or cola preserve the "natural spoken phrasing, with each representing a unit of breathing. Each cola also represents a unit of meaning, thus illustrating the principle that form and content are inseparable in the Bible"(.xv).

Note the rhythmic balance in the line, an essential signalling aspect of its parallel structure.²⁸ Each phrase contains a parallel subject (I; the ark of God), the identical verb in participle form, and a similar prepositional phrase. The effect of the parallel structure is to relate the two phrases so that although they stand together as similar statements, they also challenge each other, welcoming a contrast between the circumstances of David and the circumstances of God.²⁹ The parallelism of this verse helps the reader read the 'and' of phrase 2b as an 'and' as well as a 'but'. This parallel structure draws an introductory focus to the theme of houses in the context of the complex overlapping relationship between David and God which is both similar ('and') and different ('but').

28 Balanced line length is a distinguishing factor of biblical poetry, but, remembering Hrushovski, parallelism is characterized by a free rhythmic balance that ranges from an exactly repeated number of stresses to an unequal balance that nevertheless preserves the impulse of repetition. When we use the term rhythmic balance, it is in the context of establishing the concept of a free rhythm as opposed to the less rhythmic quality traditionally associated with prose.

29 Remember Berlin's discussion of contrasting equivalences noted above. We will see that an exploration of the specifics of parallelism will bring us repeatedly into the area of interpretation, so that the parallelism can be seen as a signalling or focussing device.

The thematic introductory function of parallelism is quite common and other examples can be found in 2 Sam 1-12.³⁰ A pattern of balanced statement pairs introduces 2 Sam 2. David asks,

1a) "Should I go up in one of the cities of Judah?"

And God said to him, "Go up."

1b) And David said, "Where should I go up"

And he said, "To Hebron."

2) And David went up there.

In verse 1 we have two balanced statement pairs. David asks God if he should go up and God confirms that he should. Then in 1b David again asks and God confirms. Note the 4/3/4/3/ rhythm in these four clauses.

For the sake of clarity, let us analyze this text in some detail. The reader might make the initial observation that the two clauses of 1a are parallel to each other. David asks and God answers. The verb 'to go up' is echoed directly in God's response. As David asks,

³⁰ It may be helpful to differentiate the approach of this paper and that of scholars such as Charles Conroy. In his work, Absalom, Absalom! Narrative and Language in 2 Samuel, Conroy separates the question of content and language from each other. Parallelism begins to heal this split without alienating modern linguistics or criticism.

so God answers; the semantic repetition is identical. The syntactic transformation between the lines is characteristic of parallelism. In the concluding phrase of 1a the verb 'to go up' has been moved to the end of the phrase. The form has also been changed from the interrogative, future to the imperative, depending on context. The pattern of statement and response is also reinforced by the 4/3 rhythmic balance. In God's response, the place ('one of the cities of Judah') is gapped. David and God are seen in relation to each other; what God knows, David wants to know.

Now it is also apparent that the first clause of 1a is parallel to the first clause of 1b. In both texts, David is the speaker, asking something of God. In the second clause, we see the same semantic material; the same question is reformulated using the same verb ('to go up'). Again God answers in parallel to the second clause of 1a. It should now be apparent that the 4/3 pattern of rhythmic stresses of 1a is echoed by the similar 4/3 pattern of 1b. Again, the use of the verb 'to go up' and its grammatical form bring 1a into a parallel relation to 1b. This relation is further reinforced by the repetition of 'and he said'. In the concluding phrase of 1b, both the speaker (God) and the verb 'to go up' have been gapped, thus preserving the balanced feel. The effect of these opening statements serves to strike a balance between David wanting to go up and God's potential confirmation of the rightness of this policy

maneuver. From this example we can see that parallel statements may appear in clusters and that a single phrase or clause may be parallel to more than a single proximate phrase at one and the same time.

In order to develop the discussion, we can now return to our earlier example of a parallel structure introducing a theme in 2 Samuel 7. Let us quote 2 Samuel 7:1-2 more fully.

v.1a) And it came to pass when the king dwelt in
his house,

b) And God had relieved him of his enemies all
around,

v. 2 (that the king said to Nathan the prophet),

a)"Look, I dwell in a house of cedar,

b) and/but the ark of God dwells within the
curtain."

Like the example in 2 Samuel 2, this example is also more complex. Indeed, not only are the two clauses in 1 parallel to each other but 1a is also parallel to 2a. The two sets of introductory words ('And it came to pass when', and 'Look') help preserve the rhythm. Both phrases can be characterized as a variation on the following basic sequence: 1) an introductory segment 2) the same subject, the king

(shift from nominal subject to first person pronoun) 3) the same verb (shift from the perfect to participle verb form) and 4) a similar phrase (shift from the possessive 'his house' to the phrase 'house of cedar'). These two clauses are semantically identical, and the shifts are determined by a change in the speaking subject from the narrator to David himself.

The parallelism introduces different individuals (God, David) dwelling in types of houses ('house', 'house of cedar', 'within the curtain'). The different lexical and semantic houses are presented in relation to each other, and the reader can fairly expect an elaboration on these interlocking themes. The parallelism further presents the reader with a suggestive link between the concluding aspects of v.1 and v. 2: between God's dwelling within the curtain and David's relief from his enemies. The parallelism within v.2 brings David's house of cedar into correspondence with God dwelling within the curtain, thus suggesting that David's position challenges the apparent relief he has experienced from his enemies. We might now interpret more freely that as long as David lives in a usual fashion, God gives him relief from his enemies; as long as the Ark of God dwells within the curtain, God gives David relief from his enemies. However, David dwelling in a house of cedar appears to challenge the primacy of the Ark of God who only dwells within the curtain. David's desire to apparently rectify God's living

situation threatens to thus overturn the blessing that has been set up for him by God. It is precisely the two axes of parallel structures taken together that help present the thematic complexities that are developed further in the chapter.³¹

We see more clearly now that although the basic structure of parallelism depends on the relating of two adjacent phrases, this relationship does not necessarily occur alone. There is often more than a single example of parallelism in close proximity, a single phrase may be parallel to more than one phrase, and parallel structures may come in waves or groups. Given that some parallel structures are more obvious than others, their boundaries and even their existence may, to some extent, remain in dispute³².

³¹ The above discussion introduces us nicely to Rosenberg's discussion of 'the manifold sense of house' (pp.118-121). However, the parallelism gives this sense of house a particular twist: it is determined by David, God and their implied relationship. The parallelism would seem to suggest that David and God are both similar and different, and that this, in turn, is both good and bad. David reaches for the leadership associated with God, and this initiative is part of his regal character. Yet it is precisely this initiative, his appropriation of a space reserved for God that spells the doom of the kingdom. The above text, despite its brevity and introductory nature, hints at the impossibility of David's task. The kingdom is necessarily flawed from within. The flaw is rooted not just in the infighting between the north and the south, the house of David and the house of Saul. Israelite kingship, more fundamentally, is flawed. It is an impossible concept; the terms and qualities necessary to establish leadership within its structure challenges the space reserved for God. It is perhaps this theme that similarly informs Samuel's misbehavior in 1 Sam 8 when he reacts rather badly to the people's request for a king, a request that is sanctioned by God. See Robert Polzin's discussion in Samuel and the Deuteronomist. (pp.80-84).

³² Berlin: Dynamics p.19.

The threshold of perception of parallelism on the part of the reader has and will continue to generate active discussion.

Most readers will agree that our initial example drawn from 2 Samuel 7 represents a parallel structure. However, the impact of our argument will be lost if the scope or range of parallel structures is not appreciated, including the less obvious examples. Much biblical narrative has no parallel structure at all and seems to proceed in a more or less linear fashion. However, subtle parallel structures are not linear in that they focus the attention of the reader by suggesting complex comparisons between two parallel texts. Continuing with the theme of introductions, let us now turn to the controversial events surrounding David's seduction of Bathsheba in 2 Samuel 11. These events are introduced with a formulaic repetition.

1. 'And it came to pass' (wayhi) at that time of
year,

towards the time' (le'et) that kings go out. . .

2. 'And it came to pass' (wayhi)

towards the time of' (le'et) the evening. . . .

Although the text as presented above makes the parallelism more obvious, in the full text there are a further six phrase elements intervening between the parallel phrases presented above, and this surely dilutes the immediacy of their effect. Nevertheless, the parallelism helps create an impression of simultaneity that introduces the context of the chapter. This simultaneity supports the observation that while David should have been on the battle field, another activity was involving him somewhere else³³.

Although the example is subtle, it is confirmed by the overarching thematic intent of the chapter.

³³ This observation on the function of the introductory parallelism complements Meir Sternberg's discussion of this verse in *Poetics*: (pp.193-5). The parallelism leads, though, to a somewhat different division of texts for consideration. Sternberg divides the bulk of verse 1 from the concluding phrase (marked 1b) - 'and David stayed in Jerusalem' - to illustrate the irony in the story. Sternberg is locating his interpretation in the process of reading when he explains that "The short counterpart arrests our attention." David is at home in ironic contrast to the others who have gone out to battle. Our division of texts based on the experience of reading the parallelism tags the short concluding phrase of verse 1 (and David stayed in Jerusalem) to the parallel statement following. One might then interpret that instead of going out to battle with his troops as he should, he stayed in Jerusalem. It might also be argued that 'wayhi' ('and it came to pass') and 'le'et' ('towards the time that') commonly occur together and so it is not unusual to find them in close proximity, but it is unusual for them to occur together twice in close proximity as introductory phrases in adjacent opening statements. Despite the above discussion, it could be argued that the example at hand may not be noticeable to some sensitive, informed readers. However, regardless of the formal power of the parallel structure, (ranging from the obvious to the almost undetectable), the parallelism is 1. anchored in the process of reading and 2. leads to a comparison between two related sets of ideas which will bring the reader into the arena of interpretation.

Parallelism, it has been noted, is a process variously perceived by the attentive reader. In order to explore this problem of range of perception, let us present another somewhat obscure example from our text. Further on in 2 Samuel 7, at one of the high points of Nathan's report, Nathan relays God's words to David:

7). "In all that I have walked with all the children of Israel, did I speak a word with any of the tribes of Israel that I commanded to lead my people Israel... saying, 'Why did you not build me a house of cedar?' "

Despite the emotional build-up in Nathan's prophesy, verse 7 is somewhat obscure. There are no less than five introductory phrases preceding the central point, which seems to be that God did not ask for a house of cedar to be built for him. Translating this text in cola and remaining sensitive to parallel elements may help clarify the verse.

- a) "In all (bēkol) [the places] where I have walked about
with all (bēkol) the children of Israel,
- b) Did I [ever] speak a word
with any of the tribes of Israel.....saying
- c) 'Why did you not build me a house of cedar?'"

There are two strong indicators or signals of parallelism in these verses. First of all 'with any of the tribes of Israel' (b) is a direct semantic transformation of 'with all the children of Israel (a). This parallelism anchors the general relatedness of verse fragments a and b. Furthermore, within phrase a itself, there is a strong sense of parallelism created in part by 1. the rhythm and 2. phonologic similarities. This example of parallelism is somewhat unusual in that it does not contain strong semantic or syntactic elements. However, the argument for parallelism can be forwarded based on rhythm and sound. Rhythmically, both phrases of 7a contain 2 beats. Perhaps more convincing is the word 'in all' (bēkol) introducing each phrase element with the same word and sound. This draws the two phrase fragments into a strong relation despite obvious semantic and syntactic differences in the uses of this word in the two disparate contexts. The parallelism may help explain that 'the places' has been gapped in the verse in order to retain the rhythmic balance of its line length. In this example of parallelism embedded in the prose narrative, we see some of the features often associated with biblical poetry: terseness and heightened language. It is impossible to avoid the related concepts of terseness and rhythmic balance as they apply both to parallelism and biblical

narrative because we repeatedly find evidence of these features in the examples analyzed. At the same time, I do not wish to unnecessarily restrict our analysis to examples that uphold definitions of terseness and balanced rhythm as they have evolved within the study of biblical poetry. Given our exploration of parallelism in biblical narrative, we begin to expect rhythmic balance between specific signalled clauses or selected phrase elements that are found within larger utterances that do not necessarily demonstrate comprehensive balance themselves.

To return to our example of parallelism above, we again see a complex pattern of two sets of parallelism where there is more than a single axis of comparison. With respect to grammar, the reflexive form of 'walked about with' in the first phrase takes the hitpaël form of the verb. This suggests a repetitive or ongoing action.³⁴ At the analogous position in the second phrase, the text doubles the root 'to speak' (hadavar dibarti) and this doubling also suggests a kind of repetition of action. More simply stated, the two (parallel)

³⁴ The Hithpaël verb form represents a morphological diverse group (O'Connor: p. 424) and "Classification is often difficult, owing to the lack of data." (Lambden: p. 250). O'Connor states that the Hithpaël "serves primarily as the double-status (reflexive-reciprocal) counterpart of the Piel (O'Connor: p. 424). Our text can be compared to Gen. 3:8 where ... "{God} (is) walking in the garden toward the cool of the day," and may in fact refer to that text allusively. In the Hithpaël verb form, the second root consonant is doubled. In our example above, "walking" may represent either the iterative form of the verb (walking back and forth in a continuous motion) or a reflexive action (walking back and forth for His own benefit).

verb phrases evince different forms of grammatical doubling. The parallelism is also reinforced by the overall rhythm, which evolves in a 2/2/2/2 pattern. To conclude this example, parallelism as a concept helps clarify certain ambiguities in the text. It also serves a transition function. By focussing the readers attention through the use of sound, repetition and heightened language, it signals a shift in the paragraph toward the central motif of the chapter - building God a house of cedar.

Another example of parallelism as a regulator of time sense can be found in 2 Samuel 7. Above we introduced the theme of this chapter: David's wish to build a house for God, God living within the curtain, and David living in a house of cedar. Note v. 6 and its parallel relation to v. 2.

2. And the ark of God dwells within the curtain.

6. But I (God) was going about in the tent and
tabernacle.

On first glance, it is apparent that this aspect of v. 6 represents a rephrasing or restating of v. 2, which, it will be remembered, presented the introductory thematic statement for the chapter. V. 6, then, recasts the earlier statement. Note that the speaker has changed from David, to Nathan relating the words of God to David

in response. To clarify the parallelism explicitly it may be helpful to illustrate the texts in the following schematic way.

2. And the ark of God dwells within the curtain.

6. But I (God) was going about in the tent and
tabernacle.

2. nominal phrase participle prepositional phrase
 (construct)

6. subject implied waw consecutive prepositional phrase
 in verb perfect (was) + hendiadys
 + (hitpael) participle

The transformations of v. 6 diffuse the sense of time. Multiple elements combine to create this effect. The structure for this diffusion in time sense is the parallelism between the two verses. 'Was going about' in v. 6 contrasts with 'dwells' in v. 2. 'Was going about' takes an unusual grammatical form: a combination of the verb 'to be' (waw consecutive perfect meaning 'was') and the

participle form of the verb 'going about'. Both the use of the verb 'to be' as well as the use of the participle form of the verb suggest ongoing actions that reinforce and intensify the semantic function of the hitpa'el of halak: to indicate the imperfect or ongoing nature of the movement. On top of this, tent and tabernacle are parallel and almost synonymous. 'Tent and tabernacle' is an example of a hendiadys³⁵ and can be translated somewhat awkwardly as 'in the tent that is the tabernacle.'³⁶ These three points taken together combine to diffuse the time sense of v. 6 in comparison to v. 2. The parallelism of vvs. 2/6 reinforces the thematic importance of the timelessness of God's dwelling-place which matches thematically the spatial contrast of the mobility of His home with the apparent stability of a house.

Another example of parallelism impacting on the sense of time in the narrative can be found in this chapter, within the texts we are considering. Let us compare verse 6 and 11.

³⁵ O'Connor translates this example of hendiadys as 'with a tent as my dwelling (lit., a tent and dwelling) in Biblical Hebrew Syntax, p.74.

³⁶ The hendiadys itself, 'tent and tabernacle' is an example of parallelism between two associated lexical elements. Berlin considers this type of lexical association in her discussion of syntagmatic pairing; conventionalized coordinates (Dynamics; p.76). Conventional words pairs, on achieving the status of idioms, represent syntagmatic pairs. She asserts that this principle is firmly established in biblical Hebrew and includes examples of hendiadys and merismus. These word pairs are parallel, not synonymous, as she also points out. Our example, then, represents an example of parallelism within a phrase, at a lexical level.

6. Because I have not lived in a house from the day that I brought the children of Israel up out of Egypt until this day, but I have been going about in the tent and tabernacle.

11. From the day that I commanded judges over my people Israel, and gave you rest from all of your enemies, God has told you that God will make you a house.

Or more schematically:

6.	from the day....	11..	from the day....
	that I brought....		that I commanded...
	the children of Israel....		judges....
	up out of Israel.		over my people, Israel.

The parallelism of vs. 6 and 11 draws the phrases into relation with each other. The negative context of 'from that day' (6) ('I have not lived in a house') correlates with the affirmative context of 'from that day' (11) (God did give them rest). Both verses refer to

God and what God has been doing and saying since 'the day that'. This example of parallelism reinforces our interpretation of the opening parallel statements of the chapter. Taken together, we can interpret the text along these lines: God has established a tradition of going about in tent and tabernacle. This has been his way forever. We hear echoed in these phrases, the context established earlier in the chapter: David wishes to change the status quo and build God a house. God, on the other hand, states that (in contrast) He will build David a house. God has never told David to build Him a house. David threatens to disturb this balance, which will disturb the rest God has granted David from his surrounding enemies. Our example of parallelism is really an example of restatement. The differences in vvs. 6 and 11 do not appreciably alter the context. Taken together they can be collectively compared to David's wish to change the status quo. To clarify the time sense of this example, David's wish to build a house is a single act - to build a building, and this contrasts with the way things have always been. Keep in mind, however, that this is just one side of the interpretation. To some extent, God's tradition of living in tent and tabernacle, is analogous to Him living in the house David intends to build for him. This represents the traditional interpretation of the transition in God's legitimate dwelling place. Our interpretation brings another thread of meaning into dialogue with the first: yes, there is

continuity here between where God has lived before and where he will subsequently dwell, but there is a second thread of meaning, discontinuous and ironic. This second reading is the more powerful; it forcibly challenges the embedded traditional reading of the text. The examples of parallelism in 2 Samuel 7 are beginning to cohere. Different examples of parallelism suggest similar, ironic interpretations of the narrative. This observation suggests this thesis's general purpose and direction; to sketch how sets of parallel texts help organize progressively larger sections of narrative into meaningful structures and themes.

Although we have been careful up to this point to present only examples of parallelism that derive from the repetition of two phrases, two clauses or two lexical units (word pairs), a similar underlying structure can present as a triplet. Let us look further along Nathan's report of the words of God, at 2 Samuel 7:15.

- a) My mercy will not depart (sûr) from him
- b) as (ka-asher) I took it away (sûr) from Saul
- c) whom (asher) I removed (sûr) from before you.

It should be clear that phrase a is parallel to b and b is parallel to c. In the first set of two parallel phrases, we could translate and interpret; My mercy has not turned away from David/David's son in

contrast to my mercy turning away from Saul. The second set of parallel clauses could be broadly rephrased: Just as I turned my mercy away from Saul, I removed Saul from before you. However, the parallelism of verse 15, a, b and c contains some differences from the examples we have selected until now. The phrases are not strictly paratactic. The term 'which' (asher/ka-asher) creates a subordination in the clauses. The repetition of ka-asher/asher in b/c (with a different referent) and the repetition of 'from' - the prefix mem in the concluding word of each phrase of a, b and c, creates a series of parallel structures with a strong sound aspect. In this example, lexical and phonological aspects of parallelism override semantic and syntactic relatedness of the phrases. Phrases a and b are semantically similar but syntactically dissimilar. Most striking is the semantic and syntactic transformation of phrase c in relation to b. The two phrases are remarkably different but are nevertheless held in association with each other by the two sets of word-play (asher/sûr), their underlying phonology, and the 4/4/3 balanced rhythm of the triplet altogether. Indeed, the strength of the parallelism is powerfully reinforced by the word-play on the root sûr, meaning 'depart', 'take away', and 'remove' in clauses a, b and c respectively. The subject in a; object in b - my 'favour' or 'mercy' - does not change from phrase a to b, but shifts to Saul who was removed in phrase c. The overall shift in parallel structures

generates a continuity with the theme of fathers and sons recently introduced with its own, simple, rhythmically-balanced parallel doublet. Referring to David's son, God states,

- a) I will be to him a father
b) and he will be to me a son (14).

Thus, the run of parallel structures in 15 a, b and c, hints at its own extension: David may in turn be replaced by his son (i.e. David may not be allowed to build God a house) just as David replaced Saul as king of Israel.

Before leaving this example, it would be unfortunate not to extend it to the limits of its applicability. There is an interesting long-distance parallelism or allusive structure linking this section with a similar instance of word-play using the same root term 'to remove' (šûr) in 1 Samuel 18:12,13. Not only is the theme of succession central in both cases, the narrative in 2 Samuel refers directly to the specific literary context of 1 Samuel. In both texts the term for 'remove' (šûr) is also used in a similar range of grammatical verb forms, the kal and hiphil, so that the effect of the word-play is similar.

and [God] departed (šûr) from Saul (12).

then Saul removed him (sùr) [David] from him. (13).

Note the similar ironic pun as presented in 1 Samuel 18. Artificially meshing the two texts to illustrate their similarity gives us this picture:

2 Sam. 7:15a

...my mercy will not depart from him.

1 Sam. 18:12

...and [God] departed from Saul.

2 Sam. 7:15c

...whom I removed from before you.

1 Sam. 18:13

...then Saul removed him from him.
[David]

This example has broadened our perspective of parallelism in a number of ways. A parallel structure involving three phrases is made possible by the middle phrase functioning in parallel to both the initial and concluding phrases. Also, by potentially relating an example of word-play/parallelism in 1 Samuel with a similar example in 2 Samuel, it provides the beginning of an understanding of how parallelism may help explain the structure of allusion.

"For instance, the device known as inclusio, in which the first and last lines of a text contain the same words or phrases, is actually a form of parallelism and should be recognized as such."¹

Chapter 2. Inclusio and Beyond.

In chapter 1 of the thesis we introduced the concept of parallelism and explored a range of examples in the narrative of 2 Samuel. We are now ready to take the concept into larger texts. While making this jump, it is important to remember the linguistic foundation of parallelism and how it works. Jakobson described two axes; the axis of selection and the axis of combination; interpretative possibilities evolve from reading along these two axes simultaneously.²

¹ Berlin, Parallelism, p. 3.

² These two axes (selection/combination) are sometimes designated horizontal/vertical or the rhetorical axis of communication/the mimetic axis of representation. Jakobson applies his method to the analysis of Cant 4:8. His remarks organize around phonologic and rhythmic aspects of parallelism in this text. These patterns are subliminal; the assumption is that they are recognized at an unconscious level by the reader. Not all biblical scholars who trace parallelism back to Jakobson are impressed with the importance of this aspect of interpretive linguistics, even in the analysis of biblical poetry. Ziony Zevit, for example, in Roman Jakobson,

We have seen the structure of parallelism expanded to include sets of parallel statements that function together. We have seen examples that work despite material intervening between segments. As the concept of parallelism is stretched away from its traditional limitations in biblical poetry, it must retain both its linguistic foundation as well as its ability to lead the reader to interpretation. Even more fundamental to this thesis is the use of parallelism as a trope to explore narrative prose. Many have noted the presence of parallelisms in prose, but do not find their systematic use there. I disagree. Sometimes parallelism structures prose. It may be there systematically and represent the constructive, constitutive or formal device upon which the

Psycholinguistics and Biblical Poetry (*IBL* vol. 109, no. 3, 1990 pp. 385-401) concludes parallelism is of little value in the study of Biblical Hebrew poetry, providing "white noise" that is "heard but not registered", "there but not really present," (pp. 399-400). Zevit attributes the awareness of parallelism to the academic, literate world, an awareness that is necessarily lacking in the world of the ancient Israelites. The Israelites heard the text whereas we read and analyze the text. Zevit's argument should be turned back on itself. Parallelism, although it can be analyzed, is essentially heard or felt. What is more, it is precisely heard or felt along the two axes described by Jakobson. For an exhaustive study of parallelism in the analysis of a biblical text that challenges Zevit's contention, see Dennis Pardee's analysis of parallelism in Proverbs 2 (Dennis Pardee, Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism. A Trial Cut, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1988.) The analysis is exhaustive and exhausting in its detailed presentation, but Pardee successfully concludes that semantic parallelism is undoubtedly the main structural feature of the text in question. Yet Pardee's analysis exists so pervasively within the context of parallelism that the broad structure of parallelism is not presented to the reader in a way that it can be read or otherwise spontaneously appreciated. This is not essentially a problem of scholarship but one of presentation.

narrative is based.³ In contrast to parallelism in poetry, it may be less terse, less formally marked, and more variable in its presentation. These features are well suited to the workings of prose, such as regulating shifts in narrative tension and organizing larger prose structures.

*

In 2 Samuel 2, parallelism helps organize and present the narrative of vvs. 1-17. At the ritual at the pool of Gibeon, the troops of the two opposing sides are brought face to face. The confrontation is staged by a set of parallel statements that cluster mainly in verses 12-16. Taken together, these parallel statements help create the context for the spatial and thematic orientation of the battle.⁴

³ See Berlin, p. 10, Waugh p. 64-5, and Kugel, p. 85.

⁴ J.P. Fokkelman, in his third volume of Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel, devotes considerable space to this text. Parallelism provides the backbone of his ongoing interpretation (pp. 41-46.) Fokkelman is basically on the right track, although his structural-thematic focus would appear at times to lose its overall purpose in a way that is not unlike Pardee's analysis of Proverbs 2. Fokkelman's tendency has much to do with his method of drowning his organizing themes in his particular form of detail. When textual analysis is thus organized strongly around

In verse 12, the servants of Ish-boshet the son of Saul 'go out'. This 'going out' is matched by the 'going out' of Yoab and David's servants in v. 13. In the first phrase, the verb precedes the subject; in the second case it follows the subject.⁵ The verb form has also shifted from the imperfect with a waw conversive to the perfect. These two shifts taken together represent a common transformation in consecutive parallel lines.

12. And Avner son of Ner and the servants of Ish-boshet son of Saul went out from Mahanaim to Gibeon,

13. And Yoav son of Zeruiah and the servants of David went out, and they met them on the pool of Gibeon, together.

The parallel relation is reinforced thematically by the two terms 'they met them' and 'together'. I think it is fair to say that in the first case, the language is ambiguous to its advantage. Although it is most likely that 'they met them' means that Yoav went out and met the servants of Ish-boshet, it could also imply or include the opposite. This ambiguity is reinforced by the term 'together' which levels the distinction between sides and helps provide the spatial

primary source texts, the broader organizing concepts and secondary influences can be difficult to follow.

⁵ Note that the verb indeed precedes the subject in the Hebrew text, which is awkward to recreate in translation.

orientation for the scene to come. It is clear that the two sides in the confrontation are being related along the 'axis of combination' and it is the process of parallelism that is largely staging this relationship.⁶

The parallel presentation of the house of David and the house of Saul leads up to the pivotal v. 13.

- a) And they sat down
- b) these on the one side of the pool
- c) and these (those) on the one (other) side of the pool.

The balanced repetition of the phrase 'these on this side of the pool/those on that side of the pool' (b/c) creates a strong spatial equivalence of sides in the war. Content is not sufficient at this

⁶ There is broad support for our method in Fokkelman's explicit analysis of this text. First, he makes direct reference to the concept of parallelism. Then he uses it to analyze the section in question. This approach leads him to a similar consideration of material: the unit of vv. 12-16. He makes similar note of the balance of sides, how this balance is sustained, and how it is ultimately broken, using similar linguistic support. He notes that the symmetries culminate in vv. 15-16 (p. 45) and create a "kind of surrealism." His term 'surrealism' conveys both the emotional sense of the language as well as the opening for interpretation. Fokkelman, however, favours a certain structural simplicity. He finds the pattern of ABCDD'C'B'A' in these verses (p. 41) and arrives at a specific interpretation - that of "concentric duality." Referring to the two sides in the war, he states that "the background to all these mirrorings and symmetries is the nation's being torn apart, the rivalry of two small kingdoms. The different forms of unity and equality are expressions of duality. The text of vv. 12-16 is itself the linguistic arena in which unity and duality pursue one another."

point for the text to be successful in achieving this balance. Indeed, the narrative could have simply related that the sides squared off equally in battle, each represented by twelve warriors who faced each other and fell in a specific manner. The informational content could be thus conveyed without the powerful spatial orientation of the parallelism in these verses. The repetition within v. 13 is interesting - nothing at all changes between phrases b and c. The exactness of the repetition further diffuses the differences between the sides and functions to preserve an ongoing open-endedness in the narrative.⁷ One side squares off against the other; both sides are presented as equal. The process of parallelism helps bring these two sides, the servants of David and the servants of Ish-boshet son of Saul, into an equivalent relationship.

Parallelism continues to set the stage for the confrontation in the following verses.

- 14) And Avner said to Yoav,
 "Let the youths rise and play before us."
 And Yoav said, "Let them rise."
- 15) And they rose.

⁷ In this example, structural form directly implies thematic content. The two sides are being cast together in a complex relation that provides the backdrop of the ongoing story.

Yoav's response echoes Avner, so that when he repeats Avner's directive 'let them rise' it is as if the entire phrase, 'Let the youths rise and play before us' is contained in his terse reply. The gapping of single words in poetic parallelism can be expanded to include the gapping of larger utterances in prose. This asymmetry transforms what would otherwise be a simple repetition into a more pointed parallel structure. It breaks the symmetric relation in the direction of contrast. This example of parallelism constricts the open-endedness of the previous examples. Two sides are being brought together as equivalences, but this equivalence will not be sustained.⁸

The reciprocal relation of sides is again reinforced by another repetition similar to v. 13 above. In v. 15 the players in the confrontation line up in perfect symmetry,

twelve for Binyamin and Ish-boshet son of Saul
and twelve for the servants of David.

Given these examples of equivalent representation of the two subjects in conflict, the reader is well prepared for the high point of v. 16.

⁸ Another way to express this is that the axis of combination is being projected some onto the axis of selection.

- a) And each man grabbed hold of the head of his fellow,
 b) and (ran) his sword (into) the side of his fellow,
 c) and they fell together.

Note that phrases a and b are parallel in a linguistically comprehensive manner. The example is more in keeping with our introductory examples of parallelism in chapter 1. In clause b the term 'man' is gapped, thus creating a strong rhythmic balance between a line with four stresses and a line with three. Gapping 'man' in phrase b also enables the phrases a/b to beat nicely from 'his fellow' to 'his sword' back to 'his fellow', achieving a cadence and sense of rhythmic closure. Note also that the verb in clause b is implied or gapped. The a/b parallelism helps link the general violent intent of the two phrases, so that what is done with the sword in phrase b is an expected extension of 'grabbing hold' in phrase a. The verb is gapped in this unusual way in phrase b along with the more obviously gapped 'each man'.⁹ Overall, the powerful 4/3 rhythmic balance in consecutive parallel clauses is thus preserved. Parallelism and the terseness of the phrases combine to

⁹ 'Every one' and 'his fellow' can also be seen as a saying or word pair where a single element, as in phrase b, can evoke the complete pair, as in phrase a.

create an effect often attributed to biblical poetry.¹⁰ The two clipped stresses of the concluding phrase, 'they fell together' is definitive. It brings a physical sense of completion to the action. The young men fall and the scene of action is over. 'Together' or 'as one' links up with the 'together' initiating the set of parallel statements. Through our examples of parallelism above, 'together' might also be considered to include other semantic entities such as 'every man his fellow' (v.16) as well as 'these/those on this/that side of the pool' (v. 13). We begin to see a hint of the inclusio structure when we paraphrase; the two houses went out together (vvs.12-13) and they fell together (v. 16). The term 'together' has not been simply repeated; the meaningful structure of its repetition is the process of parallelism described.

In general, the ritual at the pool of Gibeon contains many examples of parallel statements and a general sense of symmetry that is brought to a heightened or focussed intent in v. 16. This

¹⁰ One could argue that this repetition includes an example of phonological or sound parallelism insofar as the repetition was not strictly necessary, given the content. However, it is difficult to distinguish aspects of phonetic parallelism from a repetition that is simply determined by the limits of language. In general, Pardee is likely on the right track when (on discussing parallelism in Proverbs 2) he states that "... (the) relative lack of strength in building larger structures is again related to the nature of phonetic parallelism: because of the relatively few variables and the brevity of each of them, sound parallelism cannot extend beyond a few syllables unless joined with lexical or grammatical parallelism (p. 154)." Indeed, phonologic parallelism is unlikely to occur alone; it is more likely to be one aspect of a larger example of parallelism with broader semantic and grammatical elements.

focussing is controlled by the process of parallelism and coincides with the thematic high point of the action, lending further support to our analysis. In this text, parallel structures both help maintain its open-endedness as well as bring it to a focussed close.¹¹ The inclusio structure is present, albeit in attenuated form.

In this story of kingship the claims of the houses of Saul and David to power are anything but equal, yet we see the two houses presented here as temporarily equivalent. Both sides 'go out together', then they 'fall together'. Building on this idea of equivalence, the reader is inclined to ask, Do the twelve warriors represent the entire people in miniature? Is the confrontation itself doomed to destroy both sides? Is David's side doomed as well as Saul's? Indeed, is there a more complex way to read the story of succession, one that undercuts the succession to power as the central theme? One could argue that it is kingship (both Israelite kingship and God's kingship over the people) and not a particular side in the battle that will somehow fall. This is not the place to answer these questions, only to illustrate two things: 1. how the process of parallelism functions to help organize larger sections of

¹¹ As Fokkelman notes here, (1990, p. 47) "The game of symmetry cannot go on forever." For Fokkelman, the 'game' is characteristically ambiguous. The 'game' seems to refer both to the action (combat) as well as to the linguistic technique of maintaining openness in the text (parallelism).

text and 2. how parallelism helps lead the reader into the arena of interpretation.

*

Inclusio, inclusion or the envelope figure is a literary structure common to the biblical style where the first and last lines of a text, classically a poem, contain the same words. Traditionally, the envelope figure is considered indicative of poetry where it functions to open and close a poem.¹² Within this paradigm, the envelope figure sits somewhat outside the poem or external to the body of the text.¹³ A good example, Psalm 8, is brought into the discussion by Robert Alter in his article on the Psalms in The Literary Guide to the Bible.¹⁴ Psalm 8 is an interesting example, and something of an exception in that the framing device is an exact repetition.¹⁵ In biblical poetry we often observe syntactic shifts, word order shifts and singular/plural changes on repeating

¹² Watson, p. 52

¹³ Watson, p. 274

¹⁴ See Alter's article Psalms in The Literary Guide to the Bible, pp. 244-262.

¹⁵ V. 10 of Psalm 8 concludes by picking up the refrain from the opening phrase (v.2) "Lord, our master,/how majestic is your name in all the earth."

the concluding frame. In contrast, Psalm 8 presents an extreme example of an envelope figure or *inclusio* which derives from the context of the particular poem, the closing of a perfect circle. Indeed, not all texts are symmetric and not all resolutions are perfect circles doubling back on themselves. Nevertheless, Alter's example helps erode the artificial distinction between the structure of *inclusio* external to the body of the text and the text itself. His interpretation of the parallelism as the closing of a perfect circle is specific to the meaning of Psalm 8, just as Fokkelman's interpretation of 'the game of symmetry'¹⁶ in our text above derives from his observed ABCDD'C'B'A' pattern, specific to 2 Sam. 2.

The envelope figure or *inclusio* is part of a broader series of devices, applying to a range of texts. The parallel lines of the *inclusio* may reveal an exact repetition or a repetition with significant changes. The parallel lines may neatly frame the text or may occur within the text and 'frame' it internally. The parallel device may close a text, as in 2 Samuel 2:16, or provide a bridge to adjacent material. It may function alone or with other semantic sets or examples of parallelism that, taken together are more powerful and integrative than the restricted, original concept of *inclusio*.

¹⁶ Fokkelman vol. 111, p. 47.

Analysis of 2 Samuel 11:8-13 expands the concept of inclusio in this way. The text corresponds to David's dialogue with Uriah. Here the parallelism is built primarily around the theme of 'going down to the house of Uriah.' The reader is primed to note the centrality of this theme through the parallelism of verses 8 and 9.

8. And David said to Uriah,
Go down to your house
and wash your feet.
And Uriah left the king's house.....
9. And Uriah slept at the door of the king's house
with all the servants of his lord,
and did not go down to his house.

In verse 8, 'Go down to your house,' is the opening clause spoken by David to Uriah. In verse 9, the last event recorded is that Uriah did not go down to his house. The shift in order from the opening to the concluding clause, as mentioned above, is a technique characteristic of parallelism in biblical texts analogous to the shift in subject/verb order. The clause noted represents the only aspects of these two verses that are in parallel, thus leading the reader to focus attention on their framing aspect.

The clause 'going down to the house of Uriah' or a close variation is present in vvs. 8, 9, twice in 10 and in the concluding verse of the dialogue, v. 13. 8/13 represents the framing inclusio.

8. And David said to Uriah,
Go down to your house...
13. And David called him
and he (Uriah) ate and drank before him (David)
and he (David) made him (Uriah) drunk
and he went out in the evening
to sleep on his bed with the servants of his lord,
but he did not go down to his house.

The inclusio does not sit outside the structure of the text; it is integral to the text. The limits of the text (vvs. 8-13) are reinforced by plot, the extent of the dialogue between David and Uriah as well as by the envelope structure. The parallelism introduces the text, structures it from within and concludes the text, all the while presenting the main theme.

There is also a strong parallel relation between verses 11 and 13. In v. 11, Uriah protests to David that he does not wish to eat, drink or sleep with his wife while the troops are on the battlefield. In v. 13, David calls Uriah before him, makes Uriah eat and drink, but Uriah resists and sleeps with the servants of David, not in his own house. Through the equivalences we have a strong interpretive thread that implies: Uriah did not go down but David did, Uriah did not sleep with Bathsheba but David did, Uriah spoke

honestly in contrast to David. The text concludes - 'to his own house he did not descend'. The repeated series of activities - eating, drinking, sleeping - creates a strong semantic parallelism between verses 11 and 13 that further points to the centrality of the envelope figure motif - 'going down to the house of Uriah'. Here the thematic focussing aspect of parallelism is contagious. Uriah's protest of v. 11, 'as my soul lives, I will not do the thing' should be thus linked to the central theme of 'going down to the house of Uriah'. The event referred to obliquely is the event brought into the minds' eye of the reader through the technique of parallelism. The circumstances of Uriah's protest are gapped; they are implied without direct reference. The gap is not precisely the area of ambiguity around whether Uriah knows or does not know what David intends to do to him.¹⁷ This gap has a broader

¹⁷ Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, pp. 201-213. Sternberg's discussion of this text centers around gaps opening at focal points in the narrative, and how the narrative "deliberately maintains the impossibility of their closure." He considers this an important key to biblical ambiguity. Much of Sternberg's analysis of this text centers around our pivotal phrase: 'go down to my house'. Basically he explores the text in the context of whether or not Uriah is aware of David's intent. He proceeds with two interpretations and observes that the narrator..."builds up a multiple and hence multifunctional character." (p. 208) (italics in original). He explains further that .. "two contrasting versions of reality are being projected at one and the same time by a single order of words." (p. 209). Sternberg's analysis has much to do with parallelism, although the linguistic links are not expressly stated. The 'see-saw movement of gap-filling' he describes semantically is rooted syntactically in parallelism. Furthermore, his interpretation leads him to a complex, double representation of character where two complex representations of Uriah are constructed in parallel to create a double, superimposed image.

narrative function - to help locate the reader's interest in the unspoken deeds contained within the motif of 'going down to Uriah's house.' 'Going down to Uriah's house' includes the range of David's deceit. The parallelism helps create a gap for the reader to consider the range of David's deeds and their implications.

Parallelism thus provides the internal structure of the inclusio, of which the envelope motif is but a small part. It signals the reader to pay attention and directs this attention from the beginning of the paragraph to its conclusion. It integrates the text and brings the reader to consider interpretative possibilities.

*

The concept of inclusio as we find it is now modified. The framing element may be attenuated. It may link up more powerfully with parallel structures within the text than with the frame itself. These parallel structures are essentially unmarked and embedded in the text. The included, internally framed text does not necessarily have a clear border.

Let us have another look at 2 Samuel 7.¹⁸ Remember that the theme of the making of houses frames the text. It is possible to see

¹⁸ See the discussion of parallelism in 2 Sam 7 in chapter 1 of the thesis.

the inclusio structure spanning vvs. 1-11. The first frame looks something like this;

- 1. And it came to pass,
when the king sat in his house,
- 11. And God told you,
that God will make you a house.

The parallelism is perhaps more obvious within the frame of vvs. 1/11 if examples of parallel lines within the text that help present this central theme are displayed in overview.

- 1. And it came to pass
when the king sat in his house,
 - 2a. Behold I sit in a house of cedar
 - 2b. and the ark of God sits within the curtain.
 - 5. Will you build me a house for my dwelling?
 - 6a. Because I did not dwell in a house....
 - 6b. but I went about in tent and tabernacle.
 - 7. Why did you not build me a house of cedar?
 - 11. God will make you a house.
-

We have already seen the parallelism at work in vvs. 1 and 2. Vvs. 6 and 7, which include other facets of parallelism discussed in chapter 1 of the thesis, can be seen as a rather tight cluster of parallel statements structured around the inclusio motif. V. 11 further draws the reader's attention as Nathan represents God's words in indirect speech. Note that the number of repetitions affords a broader drift away from the original statement while enabling the text to preserve the parallel linkage. Note also that the strongest examples of parallelism are not the framing or enveloping vvs. 1/11, despite the clear presence of the frame. On the contrary, the parallelism is most sharply focussed within vvs. 1/2 and 5-7. It could be argued that vvs. 1,2 and 5-7 thus represent sub-units of the vvs. 1-11 inclusio.

In contrast to the above inclusio structure, the envelope may be seen to coincide with the voice structure of Nathan's prophecy, ending in v. 16.

1. And it came to pass,
when the king sat in his house,
- 16a. And your house and your kingdom
shall be true forever before you.
- b. Your throne shall be established forever.

In vvs. 12-16 the parallelism is developed in a new direction. In chapter 1 of the thesis we discussed the parallelism of v. 14 (I will be, for him, a father/and he will be, for me, a son) as well as the word-play on the root to remove, that is embedded in a parallel triplet. Vvs. 12-16 has its own frame and its own content. Vvs. 1-16 may then be seen as a unit with two subunits, vvs. 1-11 and vvs. 12-16.

12.and I will establish his kingdom.

16a. And your house and your kingdom
shall be established forever before you.

The frame appears more complete if aspects of v. 13 are included in the equation. Note the continuity in the verb 'establish' as it shifts from the hiphil in v. 12 (hekin) to the doubled-root (knn) in v. 13 to the passive noun form (nagon) in v. 16. Note also the semantic overlap in the nouns 'kingdom', 'throne' and 'house', as well as the strategic interweaving of 'forever'.

12. ...and I will establish his kingdom

13.and I will establish the throne of his kingdom
forever.

16a And your house and your kingdom
shall be established forever before you

However, even this clear demarcation of subunits is not hermetic: we note the crossover or linkage between the two paragraphs when we consider the parallelism between v. 5 (or the theme of vv. 1-11) and v. 13.

5. Will you build me a house for my dwelling?
 13. He will build a house for my name.

Inclusio structures - larger amalgams of parallel structures - share some of parallelism's founding structure. They are contagious and they may overlap. They help establish paragraph length units and help overcome these relative boundaries. This particular text is remarkably rich in parallel structures. It could be argued that parallelism's omnipresence dilutes its importance and effect; hence the necessity of detailed analysis.¹⁹

¹⁹ J.P. Fokkelman presents a remarkable in depth analysis of this text (vol 3, pp. 207-236). The ongoing cohesion in his discussion is provided by the concept of parallelism that sits openly in the discussion, as well as behind concepts such as chiasmus. He also uses the concept of parallelism to begin the work of interpretation by bringing the parallel syntactic elements into thematic juxtaposition. Again, it is unfortunate that his exposition becomes somewhat enmeshed in detail, as if he assumes a complete experiential knowledge of the text on the part of the reader. It is perhaps difficult to balance a microstructural focus on the language of the text, a broader focus on the overall structure of the text, and an appreciation for how these levels lead to reasonable interpretation. Partly in an attempt to illustrate and overcome this difficulty, the discussions of this thesis have been divided arbitrarily into these levels and similar material is approached three times, in three separate chapters.

In 2 Samuel 7, the structure of parallelism helps keep the literary motifs around the theme of house open-ended and in relation. On the one hand, we have David's election and motivation, his service and kingship. In contrast we have the irreconcilable presence of God and his sovereignty. We are perhaps now in a position to understand the spirit of James Ackerman's comments when he states,

"Using the Davidic house as its focus, the text is a profound meditation on how life works, envisioning an intricate balance between human freedom and divine sovereignty. There is a wistful Camelot-like air to the work. Beneath the cool, dispassionate voice of the omniscient narrator is a lament that Israel's brief moment of greatness was lost by the perverse actions of passionate and headstrong individuals."²⁰

*

The final text considered in this chapter of the thesis is the prose element of 2 Samuel 1, vvs. 1-16. In this text, only a fragment of the strict inclusio structure remains, but there is continuity with

²⁰ James Ackerman, JBL 109/1, 1990, p 59.

our previous discussion of parallelism and the internal structuring of texts. A look at 2 Sam 1 directly brings up the issue of David and characterization. The technique of parallelism is well suited for the presentation of character. Character zones often represent boundary regions where two characters are presented together. Boundary zones imply both differences and similarities. I am proceeding from the traditional literary-critical standpoint that there is such a thing as character as well as a significant overlap between life and literature.²¹ In other words, we know about character in literature because of our knowledge of character in real life. The presentation of character in general, and in the Bible in particular is an enormous task, and I am only mentioning it in order to sidestep most of the discussion. However, parallelism as a trope is readily adapted to the development of relations; the

²¹ See Baruch Hochman's, Character in Literature, (Cornell, 1985), for an overview of the concept of character in literature, as well as Adele Berlin's 'Character and Characterization' in Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative, (Almond Press, Sheffield, 1983). Similar material is covered in Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan's chapter on characters and characterization in Narrative Fiction. Contemporary Poetics, (Routledge, New York, 1989). A relational approach to character pervades A.D. Nuttall's work, A New Mimesis. Shakespeare and the Representation of Reality, (Methuen, New York, 1983). Frank Kermode's essay 'Necessities of Upspringing' in The Genesis of Secrecy, (Harvard University Press, 1979), charts similar territory. This general thread in understanding character and the process of characterization in literature is to be broadly distinguished from the dissolution of character in deconstruction on the one hand (see Christopher Norris's Deconstruction: Theory and Practice, [Routledge, New York, 1982] for an overview) as well as from the concretized typologies presented in works such as Adin Steinsaltz's Biblical Images, Men and Women of the Book, (Basic Books, New York, 1984) on the other.

process of characterization can also be approached from a relational standpoint, and so the two processes (characterization, parallelism) may be more than coincidentally linked.

The text of 2 Sam 1 begins with a loose, sweeping set of three parallel phrasal subsets. Each subset of phrases begins with the formulaic 'wa-yehi'- 'And it came to pass':

1. 'And it came to pass' (wa-yehi)
 after the death of Saul
 when David returned from attacking the
 Amalekite
 and David stayed in Ziklag two days.
- 2a. 'And it came to pass that'
 (['and it so happened that'] - wa-yehi)
 behold a man came from Saul's camp
 and his clothes were rent and earth was on his
 head
- 2b. 'And it came to pass that'
 (['and it was such that'] - wa-yehi)
 when he came to David
 that he fell on the earth and bowed.

The parallelism of these three longish phrases is reinforced by the basic rhythm. The first utterance is composed of three clauses; the second is also composed of three clauses somewhat pared down; the third could be read as three clauses even further pared down or as two clauses. Basically, the parallelism helps reinforce the idea

that all of these clauses essentially occur at the same time (despite an actual diachronic lapse of three days) and represent parts of the same introductory event that leads up to verse four.

4. And David said to him,
 (a)"Where do you come from?"
 And he said to him,
 (b)"From the camp of Israel have I escaped."

Although there is little syntactic continuity between the phrases, a and b represent the same semantic content (Where do you come from/this is where I come from) and are both presented rhythmically in a clause with three words and three basic stresses that preserve a sense of balance.

After the Amalekite tells his story, David asks further about his identity.

8. And he (David) said,
 (a)"Who are you,"
 and he said to him,
 (b)"An Amalekite am I."

In verse 4, a three word/stress (question, 4a) is followed by a three word/stress (reply, 4b). In verse 8, a more terse two word question (a) is followed by a similarly balanced two word reply

(b). The parallelism of 8 is clearer in the Hebrew where the second word of the first phrase (you) balances the second word of phrase b (I).

Let us look further at the text. After David demonstrates his mourning for the dead Saul, he speaks again with the Amalekite.

13. And David said to the young man speaking to him,
 (a) "From whence are you?"
 and he said,
 (b) "The son of a stranger, an Amalekite, am I."

Again, it is possible to read both a and b as parallel statements with a strong semantic overlap, little syntactic continuity and a strong sense of rhythmic balance. All in all, we have three sets of parallel statements (vvs. 3,8,13) that also broadly replay each other comprehensively: they are parallel both internally and with each other: each of vvs. 3, 8 and 13 represents a retelling of the same dialogue. Each complication in the retelling throws the terms of this telling into doubt. The parallelism brings David and the Amalekite into an ongoing relation.

Before leading into interpretation, it may be best to present further examples of parallelism in this text. Within the Amalekite's story we have such an example. The Amalekite relates,

9. "And he (Saul) said to me,
 'Stand over me and kill me...'
 10. And I stood over him and killed him.

The Amalekite, despite his deed in killing God's anointed, seems to be a straight-forward reporter when he tells of this deed. He quotes Saul telling him to what to do and he does it. The Amalekite's straight-forward style is reinforced by his three sets of responses to David's questions mentioned above (3,8,13).

In contrast to all examples of parallelism presented so far in this chapter, the concluding example (between vvs. 14 and 16) is perhaps most complex, challenging and provocative. In v. 14 David speaks to the Amalekite, in v. 15 he has the Amalekite killed, and in v. 16 he continues his speech, ostensibly to the dead Amalekite.

14. And David said to him,
 "How did you not fear
 to send your hand
 to destroy the anointed of God?"
16. And David said to him,
 "Your blood shall be upon your head
 because your mouth has spoken against yourself,
 saying,
 'I have killed the anointed of God.' "

'Killed' (v.16) is a quote from the Amalekite's repeated words of vvs. 9/10, but the 'anointed of God' is David's interpretation. Indeed, David's reference to the 'anointed of God' calls to mind the network of cements in 1 Samuel 24 and 26 where David himself is in a position to kill Saul.

Based on the parallelism our analysis can now bring us into the arena of interpretation. David and the Amalekite are in dialogue. They not only speak to each other; their characters are being presented in relation to each other and it is the parallelism of their dialogue that brings them into this complex relation. They are to be compared and contrasted.

There is a strong coincidence between the two characters. David speaks and the Amalekite responds. There is no essential disagreement here. They both mourn Saul the king in a similar fashion: the Amalekite sets the trend in v. 2; David follows this lead in v. 11. The Amalekite removes the dead king's crown; it is no secret that David will soon wear it.

On the other hand, David's repetitions and interpretations throw his motives into question. The presentation of his style contrasts with the Amalekite's. We see the beginning of David's basic deceit, in contrast to the Amalekite's straight-forward reporting. David's killing of the Amalekite serves as a denial of his own complicity in the death of Saul. Given some overlap in the identities of David and the Amalekite, David's words can be

indirectly applied to himself. His repeated question to the Amalekite, "Who are you?" hints at his own questionable role in the succession of houses, supplanting the lineage of Saul. The concluding verse, v. 16 speaks most strongly and ominously against David; in this reading it is David's words that speak against himself, that call forth his own curse that will unfold in the chapters to come.

The death of Saul (v.1) and the killing of Saul (v.16) are both reported using the same Hebrew root (mût), thus preserving in attenuated form the envelope structure of the text. It is clear that we have strayed from the original, classical concept of inclusio. However, we have not strayed from our attempt to show how parallelism helps provide the backbone of the interpretive possibilities through internally structuring the text.

Chapter 3. Parallelism and Thematic Presentation.

This chapter will continue to explore the impact of parallel structures on thematic interpretation. It will include sketches of some aspects of characterization (David, Michal, Bathsheba) and plot. This third, broad swipe at the text is centred around how parallelism may help integrate the story. This exploration will span 2 Samuel 1-12 with the greatest attention directed at 2 Samuel 6.

Chapter 2 of the thesis concluded with an exploration of chapter 1 of 2 Samuel to introduce us again to the opening 'inclusio' of the story (2 Sam. 1-12). Parallelism helped present the overlapping identities

of David and the Amalekite.¹ David's speech, in part, represents him speaking to a representation of himself. His words take on a quality of self-reference, irony and deceit. Similar aspects of the narrative voice pervade the ensuing chapters, culminating in Nathan's denunciation of David in 2 Samuel 12. The prose element of 2 Samuel 1 is summed up by David's quote to the dead Amalekite (v. 16); " (a) Your blood is on your head/ (b) because your mouth has answered against yourself." This concluding, parallel text (a/b) has strong rhythmic and phonologic elements. Rhythmically it is a set of four balanced two-beat segments, one pair in each half of the semantically parallel clauses a and b. Each of the four phrases concludes with the sound cha on the ultimate stress. This phonologic similarity pushes beyond the necessary limits of grammar to create a

¹Identity, as a word, is a shortcut. Its use here is not intended to imply a definitive structure. Often, character zones emerge in relation to each other. They do not exist in themselves first and only then overlap. On the contrary, they emerge in relation to each other as dynamic entities. The Amalekite is not merely a device to tell us things indirectly about David. Nor will it help to call David a round character and the Amalekite flat. It is better to say that David is a more prominent character. But even this is temporarily misleading because where two characters are represented in dialogue, such as David and the Amalekite in 2 Sam. 1, they have a mutually represented balance and this represented balance, one of implied overlap and difference, is rooted in parallelism. David, in himself, has no identity, for identity is a construct that has to do with real self-representation and David is a represented character. Nevertheless, David has a represented identity. Just as real characters emerge in relational dialogue with each other, represented characters can appear to the reader to emerge or differentiate from each other through relational dialogue. What is necessary in reality (self-awareness) is not necessary here, for the potential state of insight and awareness has been shifted from the character in question to the narrator/reader duo.

strong cadence organized around this set of four ultimate stresses. The intense parallelism (semantic, syntactic, phonologic and rhythmic), the summary position of v. 16 and the background context of the parallelism in the chapter relating and overlapping David's identity with that of the Amalekite all rivet the reader's attention to the unifying power of this verse.² We thus interpret

² The signal function of parallelism can be compared with some cause to the signal function of anxiety. In anxiety, the individual is warned that something is happening. What is happening is a relational event. The signal suggests repetition and meaning - a set of internal relations mesh with a set of relational circumstances from the present. The linear nature of events is thus skewed or altered. Events are layered, a past set on a present set. In the text, parallelism serves a similar signal function. However, what is repeating (layered relational ambiguities) is not experienced by the characters but by the reader through the reader's representation of the characters. This representation is a thorny arena, for it is informed by both the reasonable reality of the represented text and the particular experiences of the reader. We must, therefore, assume a certain kind of reader for parallelism to work reasonably and at something of a conscious level. The reader must be able to engage the process of reading as an individual open to the process of represented repetition, but remain open enough to allow the text to set the basic terms. Anxiety is often experienced by the individual as confusion. In the process of reading, 'confusion' or the analogue of anxiety in the reader is generated through literary techniques. In our text, this 'confusion' may be generated by a shift from a linear, 'traditional' prose to a more focussed, terse parallel text. Terseness provides one aspect of the focussing device, analogous to physical tenseness in the realistic circumstance of anxiety. In its presence (terseness/anxiety), something important is happening or is going to happen. Parallelism may thus signal meaning, as opposed to tell specific meaning. The process of representation through parallelism overrides specific interpretation. It may help to say that tension in the text focusses attention; this directs the reader to look here for clues to the broader story. Hence the importance of rhythmic and phonologic elements of parallelism. In v. 16 something is going on and it is felt by the reader as an emotional pulse. The concept of *mis en abyme* shares some features with this discussion but there are some differences as well. *Mis en abyme* exploits the idea of double representation but is not necessarily linguistically grounded in a trope. Nevertheless, in *mis en abyme*, words can represent both an aspect of the narrative as well as the broader theme. "I have killed the anointed of God" may be such an example. Similarly; "Your blood will be on our head, for your

that David's blood 'will be on his (own) head'. Already, David's words 'speak against himself'.³

The theme of deceit is strongly felt in 2 Samuel 3. The chapter refocusses the conflict between the house of David and the house of Saul. There is a strong, comprehensive set of parallel structures in v. 1 reintroducing this conflict between houses.

"Now the war was long, between the house of Saul and the house of David/ and the house of David was becoming stronger,/and the house of Saul was becoming weaker."

The repetition of 'between' (bein) sets up a rudimentary parallel relation between the house of Saul and the house of David in the

lips have answered against you." However, without parallelism to focus attention to specific verses, the academic reader must rely on techniques such as word studies or computed memory to lead to reasonable interpretation and thus runs the risk of fragmenting the process of reading. If the critic is not happy with the concept of *mis en abyme*, it may be sufficient to limit the above discussion to the distinction between the diegetic level of the text and the metalinguistic aspects that form the subtext (see Michael Riffaterre's discussions of truth and fictionality in Fictional Truth, xvii, 3-7, 77.)

³ To look at characterization, such as that of David or Michal, requires working with assumptions about mimetic representation and the possibilities of verisimilitude. David's character, like many central characters in the modern novel, is itself based in part on the concept of deception. The image of David as a hero, initially strongly grounded in the text, unfolds into something else. David's deceit is created by the artful deceit of the author whose narrator has deceived its readership en route to revealing David the character and the broader perspective of the author. This is a common process observed in the modern novel, where the characters seemingly stable world unravels to reveal something else more comprehensively mimetic and believable. See A.D. Nuttall's discussion of realism in the chapter, *The Dissolution of Mimesis in A New Mimesis*, pp. 51-98.

introductory phrase. The chiastic order of houses (abba) reinforces the parallelism between the first clause and the second. Further, the use of the participle form of the verb 'to go' (becoming stronger/becoming weaker) and the shift from the singular to the plural (it was becoming stronger/they were becoming weaker) are common techniques that strengthen the parallelism. David's genealogy follows this opening statement, and the introduction concludes in v. 6 with a further recasting of the conflict of sides through a parallel maneuver. Abner is described as 'becoming strong' within the house of Saul, a parallel extension of the 'becoming strong' of the house of David in v. 1. The parallelism of v. 1 sets the balance (first axis); the parallelism of v. 6 picks up on this and threatens the balance (second axis). At first glance, Abner's 'strength' aligns him potentially with the house of David. It also suggests the possibility of the house of Saul gaining strength in parallel with the house of David. Remember that the relation of sides is not a new concept for us in 2 Samuel. This was an organizing focus of 2 Sam. 1: 1-17.⁴

Although we have not explored the second story in 2 Samuel 2, (the death of Asael on the battlefield), the complicated interplay of sides is again there represented, through parallel linguistic structures and the fascinating wordplay on the term 'after' (acher). Certain

⁴ See discussion in thesis, chapter 2.

themes are being replayed as the houses interact. Broadly speaking, the parallelism repeatedly frames the question, 'Who is on whose side?' In 2 Samuel 1, David appears to be on Saul's side. Through the parallelism he can appear to be so, but he also becomes aligned with the Amalekite. In 2 Samuel 2, the houses are presented in association, as if they both represent the legitimate people blundering equally. Then Asael, representing 'the doe Israel', is killed by Abner, the leading general of the house of Saul in a bizarre military ritual. But Asael is on the 'winning' side if you tally up the deaths and consider the central succession plot. The reader cannot help empathizing strongly with Abner, a feeling that is carried powerfully into chapter 3 and culminates in his murder by David's generals, the avenging brothers of Asael. We might interpret that there are no winning sides, only a repeating conflict interior to the people. Consider similarly the murder of Ish-boshet (2 Sam 4).

As the mourner of Saul and honorable statesman accepting counsel with Abner, David appears strong and respectable. But his absence is just as palpable. Where is he during the odd ritual battle at the pool of Gibeon? Where is he during the bizarre murder of Asael by Avner? And where is his strength and respectability when he glimpses Bathsheba from the rooftops and sends Uriah off into battle?

David's absence is presented more directly in 2 Samuel 3. First consider vv. 21-23. In v. 21, Avner visits David, they strike a covenantal deal, and Avner 'goes in peace'. In v. 22, David's general Yoab and the troops return to a situation where Avner is no longer because he has 'gone in peace' (identical in the Hebrew). In v. 23, Yoab is told that Avner has been there and that now he has 'gone in peace' (again identical in the Hebrew). All three sentences are multiclaused and report the same essential event from a different point of view. All three sentences conclude with the identical phrase ('and he went in peace'). V. 24 represents Yoab taking up the content of this event with the king, which brings v. 24 into a broad thematically parallel relationship with vv.21-23. The parallelism is cemented through the concluding phrase. Instead of 'he went in peace' we have 'he surely went'. The verb 'to go' has been doubled and the 'peace' eliminated.

A further set of parallel relations structures the word-play on the verb 'to know'. Immediately following the parallel verses of 21-24, Yoab tells David:

- v. 25 You know Abner the son of Ner,
 he has come to deceive you
 And to know your goings out and comings in
 And to know all of what you do.
- v. 26 (And Yoab left David
 and he sent messengers after Abner,

and they brought him back from the pit of Sirah)
and David did not know.

The text of vv. 25-6 is framed by David's knowing/not knowing. The wordplay overlaps David's knowing/not knowing with Abner's reputed deceit, which we the readers know to be unfounded. In contrast, Yoab's deceit is patently obvious and David, it would appear, is in an important grey area. This theme and the wordplay returns in v. 37 when 'All the nation and all of Israel know...' that David did not intend to kill Abner. And further (v.38), David exhorts the people to know that a great prince (Abner) has fallen this day. 'To know' helps internally frame the narrative that begins as Abner is being sent away 'in peace'. David's reasoned excuse is presented in parallel form: they, the sons of Zeruyah are strong but he, David, is weak. The workings of parallelism can account for some of the awkwardness of the text in v. 39.

And I, this day, am soft but anointed king
But these men, the sons of Zeruya are tougher than me

Here the parallelism is strictly semantic/thematic, although it is reinforced by the framing element of 'And I'/'than me' and the semantic opposites soft/tough. One welcomes the general awkwardness of v. 39. The parallelism of the prose is forced and David's words do not ring true but sound rather as if he is trying to

talk himself out of a sticky situation. He is king and is expected to have direct control over his 'servants', his army and generals. (This role is strongly reinforced in 2 Sam. 11:1) The concluding element of v. 39, "God will pay back the doer of evil according to his evil" could thus be interpreted similarly to 2 Samuel 1:16. Both statements encompass the biblical principle of *lex talionis*. Both statements conclude narrative sections that deal with David and some aspect of David's deceit. In the first case, the Amalekite pays with his life but David will pay as well, in relation to how his words can be applied to himself. In the second case, the reader imagines that the sons of Zeruya will pay for the murder of Avner. Most importantly, David's deceit occupies the gap in the chapter; his words again potentially apply to himself. Reading backwards from the incident with Bathsheba and Nathan's denunciation in 2 Samuel 11/12, the continuity in narrative voice becomes more apparent.⁵

⁵ There is no single central image that occupies the role of *mis en abyme* in this story in quite the same way as say, Matisse's painting of a room that includes a similar painting or novels about novelists writing a novel analogous to the novel they are in. However, the concept remains helpful and does not need to be discarded. A set of parallel statements that thematically cohere may present an 'analogy based on near-identity' (*mis en abyme*), although this analogy may be hidden in the narrative, may be less readily noticed, and may require a set of parallel linguistic markers to bring it to the reader's attention. *Mis en abyme*, as a concept, is often traced back to Gide's preoccupation with it as a literary concept (Dällenbach, Bal). Basically, it represents an analogy from an apparent superficial level of narrative to a deeper level where the analogy has a thematic function and the material of the superficial level comes to represent something bigger or more comprehensively representative of the whole narrative. In biblical narrative, where this function is not usually overtly explicative, the deeper level is contained or partly hidden in the superficial level. Parallelism can often

Another powerful link between this chapter and 2 Samuel 11-12 can be found in vv. 13-17. Interwoven with the story of Avner is a small interlude that relates how David takes Michal, Saul's daughter, back to become his wife once again. The character zones of Michal and Bathsheba overlap: the narrative representations of these women in relation to David overlap. Both women are taken from their husbands. Both have their fruitfulness cut short due to David: Michal remains childless; Bathsheba's child dies. Besides the thematic similarities between Bathsheba and Michal, there are powerful indicators of their linkage through the structure of the language. In both sources, the narrative constructs the deceit of its players in the context of the 'sending of messengers'. One could say that David's

serve as the tropic or linguistic basis for this analogy. Inevitably there will be discussion about whether highlighted texts sufficiently represent the overt story-theme in miniature, on this second level. Some candidates in our text include the discussed texts: 2 Sam. 1: 14-16 (on the first level, David accuses the Amalekite of killing Saul; on the second, metalinguistic level, David introduces the overarching theme of the broader narrative that implicates himself in a process of deceit); 2 Sam. 2: 16 (on the first level, we have an odd ritual introduction to the war; on the second level, the ritual battle as representative of the broader battle challenges the terms of David's succession and implies that in military success, all sides fail and something essential is lost.); 2 Sam. 3's presentation of David's presumed lack of awareness ('And David did not know' - or did he?); the 'breaches' of 2 Sam. 5/6 (David breaching into God's semantic space); the complex ironies of the 'building' of 'houses' in 2 Sam 7 and the 'going down' of 2 Sam 11. This is only a partial list of themes, all developed in part with the aid of parallel literary tactics that encapsulate aspects of the entire narrative and could thus represent examples of metalinguistic comment or *mis en abyme*. The list is certainly not exhaustive nor entirely specific. However, if these processes that help define the fictional subtext are rooted in parallelism, they will be driven and contained by the set of linguistic processes we are trying to describe and be plagued by the terms of its founding trope.

'sending of messengers' to Ish-boshet son of Saul regarding Michal (2 Sam. 3:14) is an allusive reference to David's 'sending of messengers' (2 Sam. 11:4) regarding Bathsheba. The two events have a similar purpose and result, summed up in the similar parallel word, vayikacheha (and he took her). Although this is only a single word, it contains four grammatical elements.⁶ This terseness of concentrated focus on top of the thematic and syntactic relatedness of the texts helps set up a powerful parallel relationship between the 'taking' of the two women.⁷

⁶ These four grammatical elements are: 1. the conjunction 'and', 2/3 the verb 'to take' in the imperfect, third person singular (he took), and -4, the suffix -her.

⁷ David's downfall is often described in a more limited manner in the context of his behaviours with Uriah and Bathsheba. According to this point of view, his lapse can thus be contained thankfully to the limits of a single chapter, 2 Sam. 11. In our reading, the complexity of character that accounts for these 'lapses' is apparent back to the beginning of 2 Sam. and perhaps beyond. It is important to consider where to place Michal in the process of interpretation. David's apparent errors of 2 Sam 11, murder and seduction, are the most obvious, but they are not necessarily the most central. Perhaps, for the modern traditional reader, they are just as likely to camouflage what has preceded than to reveal. In any event, Michal and Bathsheba share a certain space in relation to David. With respect to Bathsheba, the limits of David's unseemly behaviour are most obvious. However, Michal has far greater scope and presence in the narrative than Bathsheba: she has been around for many more chapters, is the daughter of Saul, has been in love with David and has talked to him and challenged him at intervals. The parallel relationship between the 'taking' of the two women encourages the reader to read backwards, from David's deeds in 2 Sam. 11 to this previous text. Although his errors are most obvious in relation to Bathsheba, they may be best explained in related circumstances with Michal.

Another similar link between the texts at the level of wordplay is created by the word Ish - man. Both our text here in 2 Samuel 3:14-16 as well as the parable leading up to Nathan's denunciation of David in 2 Samuel 12:7⁸ play with this term in a similar context.

v. 14 give me (et) my wife (Ishti)

(et) Michal...

v. 15 and Ish-boshet sent

and he took her

from (me-im) a man (Ish)

from (me-im) Paltiel son of Laish.

In v. 14 there is a strong poetic parallelism in the identity of 'my wife' and 'Michal' due to the comitative preposition et which is grammatically unnecessary. In v. 15 there is a similar strong poetic parallelism in the identity between 'a man' and the rhyming 'Paltiel son of Laish', in part based on the parallel use of the complex prepositional term me-im, 'from being with' - the opposite of the comitative et in the previous verse.⁹ Me, a shortened form of min, [from] and im [with] are thus combined in a parallel position in both phrases. Note the rhyming or phonological similarity in the conclusion of the clauses - Ish/Laish. Furthermore, notice the

⁸ 2 Sam 12:7: "You are the man (ha'ish).

⁹ Contrast et (with) and me-im (from being with or, 'without')

ongoing wordplay into the next verse where Paltiel son of Laish trails after Michal, crying. His hurt calls to mind the sensitivity of the wronged poor 'man' in Nathan's parable who has lost his lamb.¹⁰

v. 16 And her husband (Isha) went with her,
crying and crying.

The term 'her husband', grammatically unnecessary and unusual, continues the wordplay on 'Ish'. The hendiadys 'crying and crying' (literally, 'going and crying') suggests an ongoing action which enhances or subtly extends the impact of the associated feeling for the reader. Paltiel son of Laish will not be consoled. David asks Abner for Michal, then he forcibly takes her. David violates the spirit of reconciliation (brit-covenant) between the houses through the 'taking' of Michal, an action executed on his behalf by Ish-boshet son of Saul. However, later in the chapter it is Yoab's army and family that more flagrantly violate the peace between the houses, concealing David's role.

As the text says in the name of the people, David 'didn't know'. His 'not knowing' is an important element of thematic/narrative integration of the chapters in question. But David's 'not knowing' is necessarily balanced by the reader/narrator 'knowing', and what we

¹⁰ Note also the 'taking' of the poor man's lamb in 2 Sam 12:4, which deepens the textual connection to the 'taking' of Bathsheba (2 Sam 11:4) and the 'taking' of Michal (2 Sam 3:15).

know progressively has to do with this gap. Certainly reading the text 'backwards' from Nathan's parable to the 'taking' of Michal, it is apparant that David's deceit is a major integrating force in the narrative and not an isolated event of 2 Samuel 11. The reader is progressively drawn into an awareness of this deceit and the story begins to feel like an ongoing exposition on the downfall of David, kingship and power, an immensely sad story told against the background of David's apparent success and favour in the eyes of God.¹¹ As Laish trails after Michal, she herself perhaps the most

¹¹ In the process of characterizing David we are not looking at the more self evident processes such as direct definition or indirect presentation (see Rimmon-Kenan pp. 59-67) but attempting to retain our focus on parallelism, which is where we see the relational complexity of character unfold. Inherent in this focus is the perhaps not unfounded bias that the process of reading parallel texts represents the text to the reader precisely in a way that makes characterization seem real or believable. Traits are reductive bits, things in themselves, whereas characterization is a lively literary relational event. Remember that many theorists do away with the concept of character (deconstructionists and certain post-modernists as a group). This is both good and bad: bad because characterization is one of the largest literary arenas where there is an ongoing use of language grounded in our experience of what we know; good because a shift away from the stable concept of character in classical criticism is potentially a shift into something more relational, dynamic and comprehensive. An example of a radical shift in characterizaiton can be seen in R. Barthes concept of the Proper Name which cannot be spoken, or, one imagines, cannot be spoken directly (*S/Z*, 1974). However, the self need not be a very stable thing for characterization to remain possible (see Rimmon-Kenan, p. 30). In contrast to Barthes and deconstructionists, some later theorists with structuralist leanings try to upset the traditional concept of character and ground it in a system of traits (see in particular Baruch Hochman's *Character in Literature* and Seymour Chatman's *Story and Discourse*.) However, this line of investigation fails to put relational elements above traits and would appear to thus generally fail by the terms of its own original critique. A theory more suitable to our purposes would be object relations theory of development which derives from post-Freudian psychoanalysis (see Harry Guntrip's book *Psychoanalytic Theory, Therapy,*

powerful representation of the estrangement and potential reconciliation between David and the house of Saul, we might say that it is the narrator/reader who will 'not be consoled', for David and all he represents has run afoul.¹²

and the Self or Object Relations in Psychoanalytic Theory by Jay R. Greenberg and Stephen A. Mitchell.) or Bakhtin's theory of the self (This is presented largely in Bakhtin's essay 'Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity' that appears in the book Art and Answerability. Early Philosophical Essays by M. M. Bakhtin as well as in the psychological discussions in Morson and Emerson's book, Mikhail Bakhtin. Creation of a Prosaics). Both of these approaches provide relational-developmental theories of the self with applications to literature and can be integrated reasonably with our investigations of the thematic aspects of parallelism.

¹² The characterization of Michal leads us to a process of interpretation that contrasts the interpretations of both Adele Berlin and Robert Alter. In both of their expositions (Berlin, 1983, pp 24-5, Alter, 1981, 16-27), the personal tragedy is basically limited to Michal and does not include David or the kingdom as sharing in that tragedy. I agree with Berlin when she compares the characterization of Michal and Jonathan, but would cite parallel linguistic processes at the root of this comparison and say that Jonathan enjoys the narrator's favour in contrast to Saul in 1 Sam. 14 and that Michal enjoys the narrator's favour in contrast to David in 2 Sam. 6. David's demand for Michal's return may be, on one level, politically motivated, but it also, much more powerfully, displays his radical inability to reconcile himself both to himself and his family as well as to the warring houses of Israel. In this reading, Michal's sexuality is very much beside the point; the disappointment of her life coincides thematically with the disappointment of David's life and Michal, if anything, comes to represent David's embodied curse. Michal, we know, loved David. Their derisive argument of 2 Sam. 6 is deliciously sarcastic and intimate. Michal, as Alter shows (p. 120), is wonderfully compared to Rachel through the allusion of the household idols. Although never expressly stated, one imagines that Michal is beautiful and decisive, like Rachel, and that she is solid enough to strike that difficult balance of loyalties between a straying father (Laban/Saul) and the up-and-coming leader/lover (Jacob/David). Importantly, Michal thus embodies the narrator/reader's disappointment in David. In this role she is not spurned and limited unto death but tragically empowered to represent the authoritative version of the events.

*

A broad, parallel integrative device similar to that underlying the Bathsheba/Michal overlap can be seen between 2 Samuel 5:20 and 6:8.¹³ In chapter 5, David asks approval of God to go up and fight the Philistines. God tells him to go up and fight, for He will give the Philistines into David's hand. David goes up, fights, wins, and names

¹³ Following Robert Alter (*The Pleasures of Reading in an Ideological Age*, p. 112) we will resist the related term 'intertextuality' and try to stick to the basic sense of allusion as "the evocation - through a wide spectrum of formal means - in one text of an antecedent literary text." Alter discusses three basic variables involved in this process: the allusion's signal function, its literary function in the alluding text and its relation to the prior, evoked text. Significantly, Alter does not limit 'the relation of value and outlook between the alluding text and the text it evokes' (p. 132) and lists the possible dialogic relations along a continuum from consonances to dissonances. The succinct parallelism regarding Batsheba/Michal based on the term 'and he took her' discussed in the thesis is an example of a fiercely ironic consonant allusion. One might say that the trope is parallelism and the literary device is integrated so well into the fabric of the narrative that one is really talking about style. A discussion of style implies an attempt to describe the way in which literary material is fashioned and refashioned. As Alter states, (p. 99) "style never operates in a vacuum: it inevitably plays against a background of previous styles and even specific previous literary texts with their various associations of meaning, aim, attitude." At this point it is also helpful to refer to Bakhtin's essay 'The Problem of Speech Genres' where Bakhtin explains: "Each utterance is filled with echoes and reverberations of other utterances to which it is related by the communality of the sphere of speech communication. Every utterance must be regarded primarily as a response to preceding utterances of the given sphere... Each utterance refutes, affirms, supplements, and relies on the others, presupposes them to be known, and somehow takes them into account." (*Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, p. 91) It is a moot point whether the following discussion on the relation between the consecutive chapters, 2 Sam 5 and 6, represents a discussion of style, allusion or both. The discussion in the thesis here proceeds within a certain framework: that allusion is a part of style and is often based on the processes of parallelism.

the place Baal-perazim in honor of God who 'broke forth' upon the enemy. There is little irony here, only duty and faith on David's part. But in 2 Samuel 6 the circumstances have radically changed. Here David is trying to reclaim the Ark of the covenant and is running into a series of difficulties. Uzo, one of the sons of Abinadab entrusted with following along with the Ark, puts out his hand to steady it from a wobble caused by stumbling oxen. And God kills Uzo. David is angered by God's 'breach', which leads to a further place-naming.

Thematically, the two events (5:20 and 6:8) seem unrelated, but this is not the case. In both circumstances there is a confrontation. In both circumstances, the confrontation involves David. In both circumstances a place is named due to the events and in both circumstances David's words formulate the naming. In both circumstances, the term for breach is used and doubled.

5:20 And David said
 God broke (paratz) forth (on my enemies before
 me)
 like the breach of water (peretz-mayim)

6:8 And David was angered
 because God breached a breach (paratz-peretz) with
 Uzo.

The two texts are strongly parallel.¹⁴ The strongest link is lexical/grammatical, which is especially clear if one brackets the phrase 'on my enemies before me' in 5:20. In both cases the subject/verb (God breaking forth) is identical. Furthermore, immediately following each example of wordplay and doubling is the ritual naming of the place, which can also be compared and related.

5:20 Therefore, that place was called
Baal-peratzim ('the master of breaches')

6:8 And that place was called Peretz-Uzo ('breach of
Uzo')
until this day

These two formulaic naming utterances are parallel. 'Therefore' of 5:20 is parallel to the 'and' of 6:8. The same verb, to call or name, is used in both texts. In 5:20 the verb is in the perfect. In 6:8 it is in the imperfect (with a waw-conversive). Both naming ceremonies

¹⁴ Fokkelman (vol. 3, p. 189) also notes the use of 'paratz'. He comments that the word is used three times in 2 Sam. 6 as it is in 2 Sam. 5, that the context refers to a place-naming, and most importantly, that "One Perez passage is the obverse of the other." (p. 189-190). It is clear that Fokkelman knits the two texts together, as we have done through an analysis of parallelism, and goes on to formulate an interpretation based on the 'dialectic' between them. Despite a similarity in analytic approaches, Fokkelman arrives at a different interpretation. He contrasts divine and human freedom, themes he finds embedded in the events of the two place-namings, and proceeds with a fairly traditional interpretation of David's spiritual depth and his relationship with God. Thus Fokkelman's method of analysis, which shares much with our own, leads to a different, reasonable interpretation.

refer to 'that' place. The place names themselves show a similarity in grammatical construction. They are both nominal phrases, two nouns linked in construct form.

These two related texts help integrate adjacent chapters in a general way. They establish a certain trust in the narrator's overall competence. Although the authoritative and subversive voices are not formally distinct, the authoritative voice is more powerful in chapter 5, whereas the subversive, ironic voice is more powerful in chapter 6. In fact, the two texts, despite powerful parallelism, are remarkably different. In this 'contrast' is the beginning of interpretation.

It is necessary to sketch in aspects of chapter 6 more fully in order to see the pivotal background role 5:20 plays. Let us compare 6:7,8.

7. And God was angered with Uzo (be-Uzo)

8. And David was angered due to God breaking forth
against Uzo (be-Uzo)

On first glance, David picks up on God's anger and carries it forward. But on second glance this is surely not the case. The parallel context, mood and grammatical form of the term 'angered' bring these two texts into association. The concluding term of each text, being identical, also reinforces the parallelism. But the subject of the

verses has shifted from God to David, and this brings God and David into association. On the level of consonance or comparison, as we have mentioned, David carries forward God's anger. But on the level of dissonance or contrast, David is angry with God. Along the second axis of this parallel dynamic, David appropriates a semantic space that God occupies in the first text and might seem, on first glance, to occupy in the second. This interpretation correlates well with the general tone of the chapter. God and David are not getting along too well, judging from the ark's reluctance to follow David's urging as well as David's difficulty extracting God's blessing. If there is any doubt surrounding this tension between David and God, contrast David's position with the spontaneous favour shown to Oved Edem.

It is now fair to speculate on the semantic range of breach, beyond the breaking forth and destruction of legitimate enemies (5:20) and the breaking forth upon Uzo (6:8). The real breach is implied in the parallelism surrounding the wordplay: David's appropriation of the semantics of God's power. Similarly put, it is David's anger that represents the covert or hidden breach. Analogously, the reader senses the 'breaking forth' of the ironic, subversive voice within the authoritative voice that is reaching for this interpretation.¹⁵

¹⁵ It may be possible to tentatively reconcile our interpretation of 2 Sam. 6 with that of Fokkelman (vol. 3, pp. 176-205) by simply attributing Fokkelman's interpretation to the authoritative or traditional voice of the text. To this voice we are adding a second, subversive voice in dialogue with the first. One might

There is perhaps a further parallel relation between these two texts, in the use of the term 'to carry' in 5:21 and 6:4. In chapter 5, the verb occurs immediately following a focussed highpoint, the word-play on breach discussed above. After the battle with the Philistines, David and his men carry off the idols. This verb occurs in chapter 6 in the context of carrying the ark (6:4), the event that precedes and culminates in the breach of Uzo. In both circumstances, the object of cultic worship (idols, ark) are being carried. Perhaps the strongest argument, again, for the presence of a parallel structure is a similarity in grammatical form.

5:21 And they (David and his men) carried them (vayisa-em)

6:4 And they (the priests) carried it (vahisa-uhu)

As in our example of David 'taking' Michal/Bathsheba, here each Hebrew term (vayisa-em/vayisa-uhu - 'carried them'/'carried it') is a phrase comprised of a single word with four identical or parallel grammatical elements: the same verb is similarly prefixed, contains the subject implied in the verb form and concludes with a similar

argue that ultimately the traditional voice drowns out the subversive voice because the text does not achieve a fully integrated, open-ended novelistic discourse over its entire length. I disagree with this limited view; the text does achieve a novelistic balance in bits and pieces, stitched together here and there (2 Sam. 1-12 is one such example within the Deuteronomistic narratives), within a broader, integrated, continuous narrative.

object in a pronomial suffix form. This parallelism would perhaps be unremarkable in the absence of the similarity in context and the proximity to another set of strongly parallel verses linking the two texts (the 'breaches' of 5:20 and 6:8). If this parallelism is accepted as valid then the reader might relate the subjects of the two utterance, as well as the objects: David versus the priests; idols versus the ark. This leads to a comparison of circumstances: David was successful in battle and carried off the idols, but will he be successful here in the carrying of the ark? Or more pointedly, his power is presented as valid in 2 Samuel 5, but it is challenged in 2 Samuel 6. He does not, according to the relation suggested in this textual parallelism, belong in the role of the priest, a role he forcibly assumes: the priests carry the ark and David carries off the idols, the role of the victorious king in battle. There is more than a small hint here at David's insidious idolatry, which is further anchored in his appropriation of God's semantic space.¹⁶

¹⁶ When looking at the consecutive texts of 2 Sam. 5 and 6, it is insufficient to defer to the concept of allusion when explaining how the two texts might work together. In contrast to more typical examples of allusion, here the two texts are not distant and do not stand alone. The reference between them is oblique but powerful; the links linguistic and stylistic, not primarily thematic. Chapter 6 seems to be commenting on bits of chapter 5 or reworking its material. The narrative voice in chapter 5 is more authoritative; in chapter 6, more ironic. The language of ch. 6 engages some aspects of the language of ch. 5 and changes it. The language of ch. 5, unmarked, is quoted or embedded in the language of ch. 6. One might say, exploiting Bakhtin, that the two chapters are in some sort of dialogue. That is, they make sense when understood as speaking to the terms of reference of each other. Chapter 5's authoritative voice expects to be heard, loud and clear and go essentially unchallenged, drowning out the challenge. Chapter 6's voice is ironic and

*

Parallelism helps ground an interpretation of the controversial relations in 2 Samuel 6 between David and Oved Edom; between David and Michal. Parallelism helps provide a structure of repetition that leads to interpretation, a tapestry that knits together the wordplay on 'house', 'blessing' and 'dwelling', motifs and key words that echo throughout these texts.

10. And David was not able to move the ark of God to the city of David,

so David turned it aside at the house of Oved Edom the Gittite.

11a. And the ark of God dwelled in the house of Oved Edom for three months,

sneaky, indirectly confronting the voice of chapter 5. This second voice does not expect to be heard too directly. It unfolds gradually, in fits and starts. The two voices strike a fluctuating balance through 2 Samuel 1-12 and beyond. When sufficient examples of parallelism have been described that seem to help create this balance of two points of view, and when this process thus appears to be a representation of an ongoing purposeful style, then the reader has a chance at reasonable interpretation. One thus begins to understand the extreme diversity in interpretation of David's character, its broad range and controversy. Knitting consecutive chapters as we have done helps argue in favour of an integrated literary text, especially here where discrepant or discordant 'thematic' material, joined through parallelism, allusion and style, becomes more comprehensively thematic and dynamic once the fuller dialogue in the material is appreciated.

b. And God blessed Oved Edom and all of his house.

In 11a, the ark of God dwells in the house of Oved Edem. In 11b his house and belongings are blessed. The parallel relation between verses 11a and 11b links Oved Edem's blessing to the dwelling of the ark at his home (ark dwelled/God blessed). The parallelism reinforces the full semantic and thematic power of these texts, integrating and unifying them. This is one axis.

The parallelism between David and Oved Edom provides the second axis, primarily one of dissonance and contrast. David directs the ark to the house of Oved Edom, not the city of David; to a place where the ark provides blessing for somebody else. David is afraid (v.9); his control is at the surface. This situation serves as a linguistic mirror to the circumstances whereby the ark does not come freely to dwell with David and does not come to bless David.

Verse 12 continues to play with similar relations, using parallel tactics.

12a. And it was told to King David that the Lord had blessed the house of Oved Edom and all that was his, because of the ark of God,

b. and David went and raised the ark of God from Oved Edom's house to the city of David with gladness.

12a repeats the preceding themes, our axis 1. 12b represents David's challenge to this (axis 2). The 'and' conjoining 12a and b can thus be read as a powerful 'but'. 'With gladness' is part of the contrast, a challenge to 'dwelling' and 'blessing' (v. 11). 'Gladness' evolves from David's fear (v. 9) and lacks authenticity. One might say that 12a represents what God wants; 12b represents what David wants. This structure of comparison through parallelism sets the stage for the ironic context of David's subsequent rejoicing, his manic dancing and celebration that is infused with destructiveness. David's subsequent antics: his fearful inching forward, his propitious sacrificing, his manic dancing about, his masquerading in priestly garments, his celebratory raising of the ark to the blasts of the shofar, all thematically support each other as well as expand from the contrasting relationship to Oved Edom. Long before the text reintroduces the character of Michal (v. 16), parallel linguistic processes have helped shape a set of relations that will integrate her perspective with that of the ironic narrative voice. Michal, the narrator and the sympathetic reader come together to 'despise' David in their heart. His celebration is marred and superficial. His motivations are suspect and God's favour is absent.

To continue with the above theme, let us carry our interpretation of vvs. 10-12 into the narrative of vvs. 18-20 where David's resolution of the ark events is presented and we see the key

words 'dwelling', 'blessing' and 'house' reappearing in conjunction with each other. For example, v. 11b can be set up against 18.

11b And God blessed Oved Edom
and all of his house

18 And he (David) blessed the people
in the name of God Almighty

In v. 18 David is the subject. The absence of his name in the sentence helps emphasize the phonologic similarity with v. 11, reinforcing a parallel relation. David and God are set up in a double relation. David's power, on the first axis, stems from God's. On the second axis, David appropriates God's power and this fails. God does not bless David or the people. God is silent, and his silence carries His disapproval. The qualifying phrases are also telling when related to each other along this second axis. In v. 11 'all of his house' is inclusive and reaffirms the central thrust of the God's blessing. In v. 18 the qualifying phrase 'in the name of God Almighty' reinforces the exclusion. God, despite being Almighty, has neither blessed David nor the people. In v. 19, the people return to their houses without the blessing of God.

These two sets of texts (vvs. 10-12 and vvs. 18-20) can be further explored and compared.

11a And the ark of God dwelled (yeshev, from yasab-)...

b and God blessed.....

20 And David returned (yashav, from sub-)
to bless his house

In v. 20, instead of the 'ark dwelling', 'David returns'. His 'return' (v.20), a sound play linked to v.11's 'dwelled', calls to mind the absence of 'dwelling's' circumstances. Thus 'dwelling' reminds the reader of the absence of blessing. Indeed, in v. 20 David does not actually get where he intends to go, for he is interrupted by Michal. David's intent to return home and bless his house is cut short and the blessing does not come.¹⁷ The return of each man to his house [in the

¹⁷ David, in part, gets his power and authority from God. He is partly like God. He has taken in God's favour, and commands legitimate authority. But the boundary between him and God is not airtight. He encroaches on God's semantic space, tries to push God into a role God resists (eg. building of houses) and eventually this process leads to the blunders of 2 Sam. 11. Within this grandiosity also rests David's debasement, grandiosity's twin, most powerfully expressed in the dialogue with Michal in 2 Sam. 6, as well as the denunciation of 2 Sam: 12. Characterization of David, aided by the process of parallelism, presents this balance. Again, one might have recourse to relational theories of the self or Bakhtin's theory of dialogue to help explain the broader literary/clinical process of relating between characters/people in general, and how parallelism as a somewhat global trope helps ground the process. In object-relations theory of the self, individuals in the person's past remain alive in the individual's mind. During significant moments, the person interacts with reality (eg. another person) with a constellation of expectations that take the past into account. This internal expectation is often described as an internal object, another consciousness that has been taken into the individual. The individual goes forward into the world in a form of relational dialogue with others, engaging or meshing with the world using the structure of this internal set of objects as a guide. The individual is never an individual alone, but a relational mix of what is inside (internal objects) and what is seen outside (real others). Boundaries between individuals thus represent a crucially interesting area of exploration. Individuals do not exist in themselves alone, only in this form of complex dialogue that relates two sets of

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

absence of an expected blessing] (v. 19) is suggestive of the interaction between David and Uriah where a similar set of deceptive ironies circle about the meaning of Uriah's going home (2 Samuel 11:8-13).¹⁸

A further set of simple parallel structures helps prepare the reader for the change in narrative tone associated with Michal.

- 14a And David danced with all of his might before God
- b and David was girded with a linen ephod
- 15 And David and the whole house of Israel brought up the ark of God with shouting and the sound of the shofar.

The powerful parallelism of these three utterances links the content of the texts to each other and reinforces their central mood or tone,

consciousnesses. Much of this basic clinical theory finds a certain resonance in Bakhtin's writings. For Bakhtin, dialogue occurs at this boundary between real or represented individuals. Both theoretical areas could be explored in great depth, but for our purposes - the elucidation of the processes of parallelism in prose - we are primarily interested in the nature of these boundary regions and would lend them the greatest weight.

¹⁸ Any discussion of 'house' in this text must take Rosenberg's discussion (King and Kin, 113-123) into account. Rosenberg is right to note that when David sent "each man to his house" his own house was in a precarious state (p. 118). That precariousness had a lot to do with his relationship with Michal. Rosenberg masterfully presents the transition to 2 Sam: 7 (p. 118-9): "It is at this moment, and against such a background, that the famous episode of dynastic covenant is introduced, and with a thematically resonant transitional verse: 'It happened, when the king sat in his house, and YHWH had given him rest... from all his enemies, that the king spoke to Nathan the prophet.....' " (italics mine).

one of manic determination and denial, itself an extension of the mood we interpreted in 'with gladness' above (6:12). This integrated pulse of texts changes in v. 16 where the narrative tone shifts. This shift in tone is signalled by the opening phrase that breaks the above pattern, "Now it so happened that as the ark of God came into the city of David that Michal...."

Michal's role is central to the story of David, and nowhere is this more enigmatic and important than at the conclusion of 2 Samuel 6. Like Nathan in 2 Samuel 12, Michal denounces the king. She is a central player in the story and is infused with the full power of the ironic voice of the narrator. Her dialogue with David (vvs. 20-22) is neatly framed by the play on the word, 'to honor'. Michal opens with bitter sarcasm, "How honored was the king of Israel today who..." (v.20). And David rebuffs her, his last word framed to her opening sarcasm, "and with the maidservants of whom you have spoken, with them I will be honored." The chiasmic position of the verb, in the context of the one volley-one return dialogue, is a subtle example of *inclusio*. David has one point of view and Michal, a contrasting point of view.¹⁹ Both points of view are not isolated to

¹⁹ In a manner of speaking, David and Michal agree. It is as if Michal has stated that David is debased in his behaviour and David agrees with her. Consider the 'dynastic aspect' of their potential reconciliation (Fokkelman, vol. 3, p. 205). Fokkelman and others well recognize that Michal and David, together, could reconcile the split in the monarchy. Quoting Fokkelman, "If Michal had borne children to David a synthesis between the house of Saul and that of David might have arisen to benefit the nation and the monarchy. Such a birth would have aided David in a policy of conciliation towards the Saul

these three verses but stretch out, as suggested, into the rest of the chapter and beyond through examples of parallelism and wordplay. David's statement in v. 21, "And I played before the Lord" is a reference to the thread of manic celebratory terms that stretch back to his "playing before the Lord" in v. 5 ('playing' [5,21], 'with gladness' [13], 'dancing' [14], 'dancing and leaping' [16] , 'with shouting and the sound of the trumpet' [15]). Remember that that initial 'playing' failed and resulted in the breach of Uzo and David's loss of the ark for three months. David has achieved some kind of power through exuberance, but at what cost?

Michal is given the words to spell out some of the terms. Michal accuses David of revealing himself and David confirms and reaffirms his own debasement. There is an extensive language signifying

family and the tribe of Benjamin; a policy which, after his fair attitude to Saul's death and towards Abner and Ishbosheth, is in keeping with expectations. The splicing would have healed many wounds...." (italics mine). Now, our point is that one thread in the narrative deliberately proceeds relentlessly with the impossibility of this reconciliation in mind, so that Michal's pain and bitterness towards David who has rejected her is part of a broader pain and bitterness rooted in David's inexorable shift away from reconciliation. In this thesis we have traced this trend back to 2 Sam.1 and beyond, where David was seen to be in a position to kill Saul. "What has come over Michal to make her let fly at David so sharply?" (Fokkelman, vol. 3, p. 204). The bitterness here is not Michal's alone. Her bitterness is powerful and overdetermined. It begins with the sarcasm of a woman whose love has been rejected, who has been torn from her husband and trapped in a loveless bond, reviled and rejected until death. Coupled to this personal bitterness is an historical bitterness based on the failure of dynastic reconciliation. And finally, Michal's bitterness is ultimately the bitterness of the author/reader who have been let down by their hero. David, the anti-hero, succeeds by rewriting the rules of his election. And his apparent success not only throws his character and authority into question, but the nature of Israelite kingship itself.

debasement here that includes the examples of manic celebration above, Michal 'despising' David in her heart (v.16), the ironic undertones of 'honored' (vvs. 20/22), the three-fold use of 'revealed' with its sexual context (v.20) as well as two other terms for humiliation (shafal, nakel) in v.22. We have a serious clustering of ironic, derogatory verbs, all of which refer to David's behaviour. At the level of interpretation, what may or may not be 'revealed', is the extent to which the reader appreciates the debasement of David or the ironic voice of the narrator. This is the story of turning David inside out, from beginning to end. And it is fitting that there should be a significant dialogue with Michal, for she is his important wife, being the daughter of Saul. She has loved David in the past and risked her life for him. And as the daughter of Saul, she represents the potential reconciliation in the conflict. And here she seems to be aware of the parameters of David's deceit, which momentarily puts her on equal footing with him. But David has taken her back to be his property more than his wife as part of his payment for working in Saul's army against the Philistines. The childlessness of Michal is also David's, for David is condemned to repeat and extend his mistakes with Bathsheba. He has been 'revealed' temporarily, perhaps to Michal, perhaps to himself, certainly to the reader.

*

Conclusion

We have explored a range of parallelisms spanning short utterances to full accounts. Key signals are rooted in this linguistic trope that has a mixture of semantic, syntactic, phonologic and rhythmic elements. The method of its presence marks areas of interest, thus serving a signal function to the reader. This occurs precisely at the moment when the diegetic continuity is challenged by an embedded, poetic trope. The reader's attention is directed by this breach of narrative continuity. The reader specifically intuits connections between signalled texts, based on the two axes of convergence and divergence. Each parallelism retains linguistic markers even as it provides a broader linking function between signalled texts.

Parallelism is present in prose, not just poetry. In contrast to parallelism in poetry, the parallelism in biblical prose is more likely to be embedded in the narrative. Following Michael Riffaterre we can say that this aspect of discourse is necessarily "closer to poetry than to narrative" (xvii). It helps provide a "metalinguistic commentary that points to the truth of the context . . ." of the diegetic

narrative.¹ Parallelism brings its own formal set of functions to an otherwise linear narrative and thus extends the formal flexibility of the narrative.

In this study, the linguistic parallelism of short utterances has been expanded and applied to progressively larger texts. Parallelism begins in linguistics and ends in hermeneutics, pointing the reader towards interpretation. At no point does the subtext as aided by parallelism lose sight of its founding grammar. The linguistic parallelism of small texts can be expanded progressively to the parallelism of events and characterizations, such as that of Bathsheba and Michal. The characters of Bathsheba and Michal are linked to each other in the narrative. In the repetition of events, one experience reflects on the other just as one internalized relationship reflects on another in the life of a real individual. Bathsheba and Michal are extensions of each other with respect to the reader's perception and appraisal of David. This relational area, the arena where something central is being told in the subtext about David, goes around again and again. Michal's speech is endowed with the ironic voice of subversion, astride the author, but the legitimacy of her power, like that of the author and perhaps God, is not fully recognized by David. Bathsheba achieves a similar stance through her clear, brief, simple speech in 2 Sam 11. She too represents the

¹ Riffaterre, p. 53.

critical challenge to David, as it is spelled out in Nathan's denunciation of the following chapter. The women, in and of themselves, are different: Michal is innovative, daring and bitter; Bathsheba is passive and resigned. However, with respect to what these women mean in relation to David--his failures, the ironies of his power and sexuality--there is significant overlap and internal dialogue. It is here that the events repeat and character zones play one upon the other. In this repetition, the authoritarian cliché of David's power is hollowed and given new meaning.

In biblical narrative, parallelism helps explain some elements of self-reference. This self-reference goes beyond mimetic representation without fracturing mimesis, beyond simple diegesis without fracturing diegetic continuity. In this biblical narrative--the text of 2 Sam 1-12--self-reference is not obvious. Like the novel, the narrative and metalinguistic aspects of the narrative unfold together as events and their commentary. It is here that the reader finds the fun in the text, the expression of the author's playfulness. Authoritarian discourse is limited, monologic and cliché. In contrast, the parallel discourse of self-reference pushes beyond cliché insofar as it is an act of linking. One imagines that with time the playfulness of this biblical text has been, if anything, diluted as the informed reader falls away from the self-referential context of the ancient living language.

What is the subtext of this 'novel'? In 2 Sam. 1 the reader sees that identities may not cohere with their superficial presentation; they are changeable and confusing. What is seen on the surface may not turn out to be the whole truth, and David is sensed to be speaking indirectly against himself. The succession of Kings is proceeding with deliberate confusion and irony, and it is this gap that drives the metadiegetic aspects of the text. Ultimately, like in the novel, the subtext as determined by the narrative's forays into fictionality takes precedence over diegesis. This poetic aspect of the subtext is timeless and integrated so that once it is established, any aspect of the subtext can regenerate it in the mind of the reader.² The powerful syllepsis of after in 2 Sam. 2 again restates the subtext: who is after whom and what is all this business about sides in the succession of kings? As Avner is murdered, the subtext resonates, again around the split in David's identity and presentation. After a while, even single words can generate the presence of the entire subtext: death (2 Sam. 1); after (2 Sam 2), knowledge (2 Sam. 3); the various semantic possibilities for defilement (2 Sam. 6); breaking forth (2 Sam. 5/6); going down, duplicitous messages (2 Sam. 11); and man (2 Sam 12).

Parallelism--as a linguistic and hermeneutic concept--has helped integrate and explain some aspects of 2 Sam.1-12. It has

² Riffaterre, p. 110.

helped sketch in aspects of narrative voice, in particular the dialogue and balance between authoritative and subversive narrative threads. It has helped integrate style which suggests a sustained authorial purpose. This integrated style--where sections of text are thematically and linguistically linked in a broader purpose--is a reminder to the reader that the narrator is trustworthy and intelligent.

References

- Ackerman, J.
1990 Knowing Good and Evil. A Literary Analysis of the Court History. IBL pp. 41-60.
- Alter, R.
1981 The Art of Biblical Narrative. New York: Basic Books.
- 1983 "The Dynamics of Parallelism." Hebrew U. Studies in Literature and the Arts. vol. 11/1 pp. 71-101
- 1985 The Art of Biblical Poetry. New York: Basic Books.
- 1987 The Characteristics of Ancient Hebrew Poetry. The Literary Guide to the Bible. Cambridge: Harvard University Press pp. 611-624.
- 1989 The Pleasures of Reading in an Ideological Age. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bakhtin, M.M.
1981 The Dialogic Imagination. ed. M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- 1986 Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. ed. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- 1990 Art and Answerability. Early Philosophical Essays. ed. M. Holquist and V. Liapunov. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bal, M.
1978 Mis en abyme et iconicité. Littérature, 29, pp. 116-23.

- Bar-Efrat, S.
1989 Narrative Art in the Bible. JSOT Supplement Series 70. Sheffield: Almond Press.
- Barthes, R.
1974 S/Z. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Berlin, A.
1979 Grammatical Aspects of Biblical Parallelism. HUCA 50 pp. 17-43.
- 1982 Review of M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure. JAOS 102, 392-3.
- 1983 Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative. Sheffield: Almond Press.
- 1985 The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Chatman, S.
1978 Story and Discourse. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Collins, T.
1978 Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Conroy, C.
1978 Absalom, Absalom! Narrative and Language in 2 Samuel 13-20. Analecta Biblica, 81. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Cooper, A
1978 Biblical Poetics: A Linguistic Approach. Yale: Yale University Press.
- Culler, J.
1971 Jacobson and the Linguistic Analysis of Literary Texts. Language and Style 5. pp. 53-66.

- 1975 Structural Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Dahood, M.
1972 Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs. Ras Shamra Parallels I. Analecta Orientalia 49. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute. pp. 71-382.
- 1975 Ras Shamra Parallels II. Analecta Orientalia 50. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute. pp. 1-39.
- Dallenbach, L.
1977 Le récit spéculaire. Essai sur la mis en abyme. Paris: Seuil.
- Fokkelman, J.P.
1981 Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Vol. 1. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- 1990 Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Vol. 3. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Fox, E.
1983 In the Beginning. A New English Rendition of the Book of Genesis. New York: Schocken.
- 1986 Now These Are the Names. A New English Rendition of the Book of Exodus. New York: Schocken.
- Freedman, D.N.
1977 Pottery, Poetry and Prophecy: An Essay on Biblical Poetry. JBL 96. pp. 5-26.
- Garsiel, M.
1972 The Character and Aim of the Story of David and Bathsheba. Beth Mikra 17. pp. 162-82.

- 1973 A Review of Recent Interpretations of the Story of David and Bathsheba. Immanuel 2. pp. 18-20.
- 1975 The Davidic Kingdom: Studies in History and Reflections in Historiography. Tel Aviv: Society for Biblical Studies.
- Geller, S.A.
1979 Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- 1982 Theory and Method in the Study of Biblical Poetry. JQR 73. pp. 65-77.
- 1983 Review of J. Kugel, The Idea of Biblical Poetry. Parallelism and its History. IBL 102. pp. 625-6.
- Greenberg, J.R., Mitchell, S.A.
1983 Object Relations in Psychoanalytic Theory. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Greenstein, E.
1982 How Does Parallelism Mean? A Sense of Text. JQR Supplement. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Gunn, D.
1975 David and the Gift of the Kingdom (2 Samuel 2-4, 9-29, 1 Kings 1-2) Semeia 3. pp. 14-45.
- 1978 The Story of King David. Genre and Interpretation. JSOT Supplement Series. Sheffield: Almond Press.
- Guntrip, H.
1971 Psychoanalytic Theory, Therapy and the Self. New York: Basic Books.
- Hochman, B.
1985 Character in Literature. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Hrushovski, B.
1972 Prosody, Hebrew. Encyclopedia Judaica vol 13. pp. 1195-1203. Jerusalem: Keter.
- Jacobson, R.
1960 Linguistics and Poetics. Style in Language, ed. T. Sebeok
- 1966 Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet. Language 42. pp. 399-429.
- Kermode, F.
1979 The Genesis of Secrecy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kugel, J.L.
1981 The Idea of Biblical Poetry. Parallelism and its History. Yale: Yale University Press.
- Lambdin, T.O.
1971 Introduction to Biblical Hebrew. New York: Scribner's.
- Lowth, R.
1835 Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews. T. Tegg and Son, London (originally published in 1753.)
- 1848 Isaiah. A New Translation with Preliminary Dissertation and Notes. Wm. Tegg. London, (originally published in 1778).
- Morson, G.S., Emerson, C.
1990 Mikhail Bakhtin. Creation of a Prosaics. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Norris, C.
1982 Deconstructon: Theory and Practice. New York: Routledge.

- Nuttall, A.D.
1983 A New Mimesis. Shakespeare and the Representation of Reality. New York: Methuen.
- O'Connor, M.O.
1980 Hebrew Verse Structure. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- 1980 Review of T. Collins, Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry. CBQ 42. pp. 91-2.
- O'Connor, M.O., Waltke, B.K.
1990 An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Pardee, D.
1984 The Semantic Parallelism of Psalm 89 JSOT Supplement 31. Sheffield: Almond Press. pp. 121-137.
- 1988 Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism. A Trial Cut. Leiden: F.J. Brill.
- Perry, M., Sternberg, M.
1968 The King Through Ironic Eyes. Hasifrut 1. pp. 263-292.
- Polzin, R.
1989 Samuel and the Deuteronomist. New York: Harper and Row.
- Riffaterre, M.
1990 Fictional Truth. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Rimmon-Kennan, S.
1989 Narrative Fiction. Contemporary Poetics. New York: Routledge.

- Rosenberg, J.
1986 King and Kin. Political Allegory in the Hebrew Bible. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Rost, L.
1982 The Succession to the Throne of David. Sheffield: Almond Press.
- Steinsaltz, A.
1984 Biblical Images. Men and Women of the Book. New York: Basic Books.
- Sternberg, M.
1985 The Poetics of Biblical Narrative. Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Watson, W.G.E.
1984 Classical Hebrew Poetry. A Guide to its Techniques. ISOT Supplement 26. Sheffield.
- Waugh, L.
1980 The Poetic Function and the Nature of Language. Poetics Today 2/1a. pp. 57-82.
- Zevit, Ziony
1990 Psycholinguistics and Biblical Poetry. JBL vol. 109, #3. pp. 385-401.

END

3 1 - 0 5 - 9 5

FIN