

The Heart of YHWH and His Chosen One in 1 Samuel 13:14

Jason S. DeRouchie
Bethlehem College & Seminary

This paper considers the meaning of the prepositional phrase כלבבו “like/according to his heart” in 1 Sam 13:14. By assessing syntactic and semantic parallels, comparative ANE data, and the Deuteronomic context of 1–2 Samuel, the study argues that the prepositional idiom is best rendered adverbially and understood to clarify the norm or standard by which YHWH sought a king to replace Saul—he did so according to his own will. This being established, the paper then considers whether God’s showing discretion and seeking one man in contrast to others necessitates that there was something about the king-elect that matched the royal image he had in mind. Specifically, while כלבבו should be read adverbially, the resulting meaning in 1 Sam 13:14 may in fact align with both the numerous texts that emphasize David’s special divine election in contrast to Saul and the many passages that stress David’s greater like-mindedness to YHWH when compared to Saul.

Key Words: King, election, Saul, David, heart, obedience, man after God’s heart

I. INTRODUCTION

A key and familiar clause in 1 Sam 13:14 reads בקש יהוה לו איש כלבבו. In a recent *JBL* article, Benjamin J. M. Johnson provided a strong literary-contextual defense for the traditional view that these words explicitly describe “something about the heart of YHWH’s chosen agent” who will replace Saul—“David is ‘a man after [YHWH’s] own heart.’”¹ Whether pointing to the

Author’s Note: This essay is dedicated to my mentor and friend Dr. Gary D. Pratico, who first taught me to consider the difference between Hebrew adjectival and adverbial prepositional phrases and who displayed for me during my four years as his teaching and research fellow at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary what it means to be a man who treasures God and his Word.

¹ B. J. M. Johnson, “The Heart of YHWH’s Chosen One in 1 Samuel,” *JBL* 131.3 (2012): 455–66, quotes from 456 and 455. Three recent studies that assume this view are M. K. George, “Yhwh’s Own Heart,” *CBQ* 64 (2002): 446; T. S. Laniak, *Shepherds After My Own Heart: Pastoral Traditions and Leadership in the Bible* (NSBT; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006); M. J. Boda, *After God’s Own Heart: The Gospel According to David* (GAOT; Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2007); P. Borgman, *David, Saul, & God: Rediscovering an Ancient Story* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 5.

king-elect's inward makeup, motives, or God-dependence on the one hand² or his covenant loyalty on the other,³ this view consistently treats (1) the idiomatic prepositional phrase כַּלְבָּבוֹ “like/according to his heart” adjectivally, modifying the object אִישׁ “a man,” and (2) the 3ms pronominal suffix in כַּלְבָּבוֹ as having its antecedent in יְהוָה “YHWH.” The whole, therefore, is seen to point to the royal substitute's like-mindedness to God, which stands in contrast to Saul's tendency toward disobedience: “YHWH has sought for himself a man [whose heart/will is] like/in accord with his [i.e., YHWH's] heart/will” (see NASB).⁴

² Johnson states, “David is a man whose character YHWH somehow found most exemplary” (“The Heart of YHWH's Chosen One in 1 Samuel,” 455). Similarly, J. P. Fokkelman states, “David's interior, his real quality, corresponds to God's interior” (*The Crossing Fates*, vol. 2, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel* [Dover, NH: Van Gorcum, 1986], 123), and M. K. George asserts that “the content or quality” that sets David's heart apart from Saul's is the fact that he seeks the counsel of God continually and trusts God to act on his behalf (“Yhwh's Own Heart,” 455, 458–59). See also S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and Topography of the Books of Samuel with an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions* [2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913], 101; W. Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel* (Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990), 102.

³ For English versions that explicitly follow this interpretation, see table 1 below. Similarly, H.-J. Fabry states, “The king is in accord with Yahweh's לֵב when he keeps Yahweh's commands (1 S. 13.14)” (“לֵב; לֵלֵב,” in *TDOT*, 7:435). Cf. F. Baumgärtel and J. Behm, “καρδια, καρδιογνώστης, σκληροκαρδια,” in *TDNT*, 3:607; T. Longman III and R. B. Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 164–65.

⁴ To properly grasp the meaning of the traditional adjectival rendering of כַּלְבָּבוֹ, two points of note are significant: (1) This reading almost certainly requires the inclusion of the relative clause “whose heart is” in order for the sentence to make sense (so too Johnson, “The Heart of YHWH's Chosen One in 1 Samuel,” 458). For more on this, see §2.1 below. B. K. Waltke and M.

In distinction, the view Johnson argues against has been present at least since the late 1800s and was made popular in recent days by P. Kyle McCarter Jr.⁵ Here, *כלבבו* is still commonly rendered adjectivally with its suffix referring to YHWH, but now the idiom clarifies not that the king-elect's character reflects God's character but that the royal replacement stands in alignment with God's elective purpose: "YHWH has sought for himself a man of his choosing" (see

O'Connor have observed how ellipsis of a relative clause can cause structural ambiguity, making the referent of a given prepositional phrase difficult to discern (*JBHS*, §11.4.3e). (2) When properly understood, the reading requires that the relationship of *כלבבו* to *איש* "man" express the king-elect's like-mindedness to YHWH and not the man's pursuit of YHWH's heart. The issue is raised because the English word "after" bears a broader range of uses than the Hebrew preposition *כ*. "After" can connote resemblance of manner as "in accordance with, in imitation of, like" and as such may be a fine translation for *כ* in 1 Sam 13:14 (*The Oxford English Dictionary* [2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1989], 1:233a – "'after' §§13, 14"; *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* [10th ed.; Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc., 1993], 21; cf. *DCH*, 4:348; e.g., Gen 4:17; Josh 19:47). However, "after" also regularly means "in pursuit of," as in "the police are *after* him" and "the miner went *after* gold" (*The Oxford English Dictionary*, 1:232a – "'after' §4"; *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 21), and this meaning is *never* connected with *כ* in the Hebrew Bible (for more on *כ*, see footnote 22 below). It seems best, therefore, to render *כ* in 1 Sam 13:14 as "according to" or the like, so as not to lead some readers to conclude falsely that the clause means: "YHWH sought for himself a man (who was) *in pursuit of* God's heart." Nearly all modern translations render the preposition *כ* in 1 Sam 13:14 with the English word "after" (see table 1 below).

⁵ P. K. McCarter Jr., *1 Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 8; New York: Doubleday, 1980), 229. H. P. A. Smith said of the entire clause that "the divine purpose is already a fixed fact" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* [ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1904], 97); this suggests a reading that focuses on divine election over like-mindedness.

McCarter). In McCarter's words, *אִישׁ כְּלָבְבוֹ* in 1 Sam 13:14 "has nothing to do with any great fondness of Yahweh's for David or any special quality of David . . . [but instead] emphasizes the free divine selection of the heir to the throne."⁶

V. Philips Long has postulated a middle position that Johnson himself fails to highlight. Long suggests that *כְּלָבְבוֹ*, while primarily focusing on divine choice, may also *connote* the covenant loyalty of the coming king.⁷ In support, he observes that "implicit in the selection of a vassal is an expectation that the new appointee will act in harmony with the suzerain's will and purpose, viz. 'in accord with his heart.'"⁸ To this I add that, even if McCarter and others are

⁶ McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 229. Other more recent studies that follow this approach include D. M. Gunn, *The Fate of King Saul: An Interpretation of a Biblical Story* (JSOTSup 14; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 115–16; R. P. Gordon, *I&II Samuel: A Commentary* (Library of Biblical Interpretation; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 134; R. Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: 1 Samuel* (Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History 2; New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 131; B. C. Birch, "The First and Second Books of Samuel," *NIB* 2:1071–72; T. W. Cartledge, *1 & 2 Samuel* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary; Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2001), 174–75; D. T. Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 346, 349; K. Bodner, *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary* (Hebrew Bible Monographs; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009), 123; D. G. Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel* (AOTC; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2009), 156. Cf. J. H. Walton, et al., *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000), 301–02.

⁷ V. P. Long, *The Reign and Rejection of King Saul: A Case for Literary and Theological Coherence* (SBL Dissertation Series 118; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 92–93; cf. B. T. Arnold, *1 & 2 Samuel* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003), 199. On ambiguity in biblical narrative, see M. Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Indiana Literary Biblical Studies; Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1985), 186–229.

⁸ Long, *The Reign and Rejection of King Saul*, 92.

correct that כלבבו in 1 Sam 13:14 explicitly tags the “man” as chosen by God, the mere contrast with Saul’s disobedience in the passage seems to imply that something about the king’s replacement was guiding YHWH’s action. Such a link is made explicit in both 1 Sam 15:28 and 16:7. In 15:28, Samuel reinforces to Saul the God is replacing him: “YHWH has torn the kingdom of Israel from you today and has given it to *your neighbor better than you*” (cf. 28:17). Then in 16:7, the narrator clearly identifies David’s heart as influencing YHWH’s royal selection process: “Do not look to his appearance or to the height of his stature, for I have rejected him . . . for the man looks to the eyes, but *YHWH looks to the heart*.” Table 1 presents the way many English versions treat 1 Sam 13:14.

Table 1. Translations of 1 Samuel 13:14

MT	בְּקַשׁ יְהוָה לוֹ אִישׁ כְּלִבּוֹ	
LXX	καὶ ζητήσῃ κύριος ἑαυτῷ ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ	
Bishop’s Bible (1572), Geneva Bible (1599), KJV (1611), Webster Bible (1833), RV (1885), Darby Translation (1890), ASV (1901), WEB (1997) NKJV (1982), ISV (1995), CJB (1998), MEB (2014) NASB (1995) RSV (1946), AMP (1954), NIV (1984), NRSV (1989), ESV (2001), NLT (2004), NIV (2011)	Jehovah/Yahweh/the LORD hath/has sought him a man after his own heart. The LORD/Adonai has sought for himself/Himself a man after his/His own heart. The LORD has sought out for himself a man after his own heart. The LORD/Lord has sought out a man after his/His own heart.	<i>After</i> his own heart
Douay-Reims (1610) Young’s Literal (1898)	The Lord hath sought him a man according to his own heart. Jehovah hath sought for Himself a man according to His own heart.	<i>According to</i> his own heart
Bible in Basic English (1965) The Living Bible (1971) NET Bible (1996) HCSB (2003)	The Lord, searching for a man who is pleasing to him in every way . . . The Lord wants a man who will obey him. And he has discovered the man he wants. The LORD has sought out for himself a man who is loyal to him. The LORD has found a man loyal to him.	Character/loyalty
The Message (2002) CEB (2011)	GOD is out looking for your replacement right now. This time he’ll do the choosing. The LORD will search for a man of his own choosing.	Election
GNT (1992) NCV (2005)	The LORD will find the kind of man he wants. The LORD has looked for the kind of man he wants.	Character/loyalty and election

While commentators are split regarding the interpretation of the prepositional phrase **כלבבו** “like/according to his heart” in 1 Sam 13:14, most appear to agree on two points (whether consciously or unconsciously, intentionally or unintentionally): (1) the prepositional phrase functions adjectivally, modifying the object **איש** “man,” and (2) the subject **יהוה** “YHWH” stands as the antecedent to the 3ms pronominal suffix on **כלבבו**. The former conviction almost certainly necessitates the latter, for in an adjectival reading, having the 3ms suffix refer to the “man” would only be stating the obvious. Moreover, doing so would fail to provide the necessary contrast to Saul’s disobedience. Context demands that something is being said of the king-elect in 13:14 that *cannot* be said of Saul, and certainly one could say of Saul that “he was like/according to his own heart.”⁹

Raising fresh lexical, syntactic, comparative, and contextual questions, the present study investigates anew the meaning of **כלבבו** in 1 Sam 13:14. The argument will include four overlapping elements: (1) I will affirm with McCarter and others that the prepositional idiom points most explicitly to YHWH’s choice of the king-elect rather than to the successor’s makeup or loyalty. However, (2) I will argue for the likelihood that the phrase **כלבבו** itself is best rendered adverbially, modifying not the object **איש** but the main verb **בקש** “he sought.” Read this

⁹ Cf. 1 Sam 25:3, where the *kethiv* states of Nabal: **הוא כלבו** “he was as his own heart”—i.e., he was evil, for his heart was bent on evil; but most follow the *qere* and read “he was a Calebite [כלבי].”

way, **כלבבו** is shown to express the manner or standard by which YHWH pursued a new king—namely, he did so according to his heart/choice.¹⁰

(3) I will also consider the specific antecedent to the 3ms pronominal suffix on **כלבבו**, for the adverbial rendering creates two potential readings. If the suffix refers back to YHWH, then an adverbial interpretation would suggest that God’s own discretion guided his selection of a king: “YHWH has sought for himself according to his own will/choosing a man.” However, if the suffix refers instead to its nearest nominal **איש**, then a quality in or of Saul’s successor becomes the explicit standard that guided YHWH’s quest: “YHWH has sought for himself according to [the man’s] heart a man” (cf. 1 Sam 15:28; 16:7). Figure 1 below shows the primary syntactical possibilities for reading **בקש יהוה לו איש כלבבו** in 1 Sam 13:14, based on whether the

¹⁰ While I am the only scholar of whom I am aware that has explicitly raised the syntactic question of whether **כלבבו** in 1 Sam 13:14 functions adjectivally (modifying **איש**) or adverbially (modifying **בקש**), others have assessed similar structurally ambiguous texts in a comparable way. A fascinating parallel interpretive challenge comes in Lev 19:18: **ואהבת לרעך כמוך** “And you shall show love to your neighbor *as/like yourself*.” Both J. E. Hartley (*Leviticus* [WBC 4; Dallas: Word, 1992], 305 n.18.e) and J. Milgrom (*Leviticus 17–22* [AYB; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000], 1655) identify the interpretive options for **כמוך** “as/like yourself” in a way comparable to my handling of 1 Sam 13:14, distinguishing the adjectival view, where **כמוך** modifies the noun **רעך** “your neighbor” (so NAB, “as a man like yourself”; T. Muraoka, “A Syntactic Problem in Lev. xix. 18b,” *JSS* 23 [1978]: 291–97; cf. Joüon, §132.a; A. Schule, “*Kāmōkā*—der Nächste, der ist wie Du. Zur Philologie des Liebesgebots von Lev 19,18.34,” *KUSATU* [2001]: 2.97–129), from the adverbial view, where **כמוך** modifies the verb **ואהבת** “and you shall love” (so most commentators). Muraoka compares Lev 19:18 with Deut 13:7: **רעך אשר כנפשך** “you neighbor who is like your soul.”

prepositional phrase **כלבבו** modifies the object **איש** or the verb **בקש** and whether the 3ms suffix finds its antecedent in “YHWH” or “man.”¹¹

Figure 1. The Modification of **כלבבו** in 1 Sam 13:14

Adjectival	Adverbial
<p>... איש ... יהוה בקש לו</p> <p>כלבבו ↑</p>	<p>... איש ... יהוה בקש לו</p> <p>כלבבו ↑</p>

(4) After arguing for the likelihood of the adverbial rendering and for YHWH being the antecedent of the 3ms suffix, I will wrestle in the conclusion with whether YHWH’s showing discretion and seeking one man in contrast to others necessitates that there is something about the king-elect that matches the royal image God had in mind. That is, even with an adverbial reading of **כלבבו** that takes **יהוה** as the antecedent to the 3ms suffix, 1 Sam 13:14 may in fact both align with the numerous texts that emphasize David’s special divine election in contrast to Saul’s and anticipate those that stress David’s greater like-mindedness to YHWH when compared to Saul.

¹¹ Biblical Hebrew has been commonly classified as a VSO language in light of the fact that the “statistically dominant and unmarked word order” of the verbal clause is Verb-Subject-Object-Modifier (Joüon, §155k with *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax*, §572a; *BHRG*, 342 [§46.1.3(iii)a]; cf. GKC §142f; *IBHS*, §8.3b; *BHRG*, 336 [§46.1.1]). While some have recently argued for SVO (e.g., R. D. Holmstedt, “The Relative Clause in Biblical Hebrew: A Linguistic Analysis” [PhD diss., University of Wisconsin—Madison, 2002], 126–59, esp. 145–50), the fact does not change that adverbial modifiers most commonly *follow* the object. The placement of **כלבבו** “according to his heart” after the object **איש** “man,” therefore, in no way clarifies whether the prepositional phrase is to be read adjectivally or adverbially. The placement of **לו** “to him” after the subject **יהוה** “YHWH” was most likely necessitated by the need to track pronominal referent and to not stack two prepositional phrases on top of each other.

II. REASSESSING כִּלְבָּבוּ IN 1 SAMUEL 13:14

This paper argues that the idiomatic phrase כִּלְבָּבוּ in 1 Sam 13:14 focuses principally on YHWH's elective purposes (so P. Kyle McCarter Jr.) and yet does so adverbially (contra McCarter), describing that YHWH's own will or desire provided the standard that guided his pursuit of Saul's replacement (so with the 3ms suffix referring to the subject "YHWH," not the object "man"). My case is structured under the following headings: (1) syntactic and semantic considerations within the greater literary and biblical contexts; (2) ancient Near Eastern comparisons; and (3) David's election in context. In the conclusion, I will assess the extent to which YHWH's choice of one person over another in 1 Sam 13:14 requires viewing the text as stressing both the king-elect's election by God and his like-mindedness to God.

1. Syntactic and semantic considerations

Four points are noteworthy with reference to syntactic and semantic matters. *First*, Ronald J. Williams lists כִּלְבָּבוּ in 1 Sam 13:14 as one of his examples of "כ of the norm (according to)," and both of his other examples include adverbial uses (2 Kgs 11:14; Ps 51:3).¹² Some other parallel texts buttress this approach to 1 Sam 13:14.

Perhaps unwittingly, in support of his own conviction that 1 Sam 13:14 "asserts the freedom of the divine will in choosing a new king," P. Kyle McCarter Jr. compares the semantic meaning of כִּלְבָּבוּ with that of the prepositional phrase in Ps 20:5[4]: יתן־לךְ כִּלְבָּבְךָ "May he grant

¹² Williams' *Hebrew Syntax*, §259.

to you according to your heart/desire.” Significantly, the prepositional idiom in this structurally parallel text functions adverbially, clarifying the norm that was to guide God’s provision.

With a more direct contextual parallel to our passage, a number of commentators who agree with McCarter on 1 Sam 13:14 (e.g., Ralph W. Klein, Robert P. Gordon) liken the text to 2 Sam 7:21 (// 1 Chr 17:19): *וּכְלַבֶּךָ עָשִׂיתָ אֵת כָּל־הַגְּדוּלָה הַזֹּאת* “and according to your heart you have done all this greatness.” For our purposes, the wording in 2 Sam 7:21 is significant for a number of reasons: (a) The prepositional phrase is unambiguously adverbial, so that God acts specifically in accord with his heart. (b) The 2ms pronominal suffix on the prepositional phrase unquestionably refers to YHWH; his “heart,” not David’s, is in the fore. (c) This reference to YHWH’s “heart” is one of only four or five mentioned in the DtrH and one of only two or three in Samuel (see 1 Sam 2:35; 13:14; 1 Kgs 9:3; 2 Kgs 10:30).¹³ (d) Like 1 Sam 13:14, the verse is focused on David’s kingship. David declares to YHWH, “For the sake of your word *and according to your heart* (*וּכְלַבֶּךָ*) you have done all this greatness to let your servant know.” By “all this greatness,” David refers to YHWH’s gracious dynastic blessing (see 2 Sam 7:8–17), which was granted in accordance with God’s will, purpose, or pleasure (*כְּלִבְבְּךָ*). Now, if this unambiguous adverbial use of *כּ + לֵב* is seen to clarify the ambiguous use of *כּ + לִבָּב* in 1 Sam 13:14, a parallel is created: just as YHWH sought “according to his will” a replacement for Saul,

¹³ In addition to these 5, Fabry observes only 21 instances outside the DtrH that speak of YHWH’s “heart” (“*לֵב*,” “*לִבָּב*,” 7:434–35): Gen 6:6; 8:21; Jer 3:15; 7:31; 19:5; 23:20; 30:24; 32:35, 41; 44:21; Isa 41:22; 63:4; Hos 11:8; Ps 33:11; Job 7:17; 10:13; 34:14; 36:5; Lam 3:3; 1 Chr 17:19 (// 2 Sam 7:21); 2 Chr 7:16 (// 1 Kgs 9:3). Significant among the total 26 are the 7 references that present his heart as the seat of his will and as the norm for human conduct: 1 Sam 2:35; 13:14; 2 Kgs 10:30; Jer 3:15; 7:31; 19:5; 32:35 (ibid., 435).

so he promised “according to his will” a perpetual dynasty to David.¹⁴ This parallel supports reading *כלבבו* in 1 Sam 13:14 adverbially and reading *יהוה* as the antecedent to the 3ms suffix.

Along with 2 Sam 7:21, McCarter and others point to 1 Sam 14:7 and Jer 3:15 in support, but neither text in my view is fully clear either semantically or syntactically.¹⁵ The former is significant if only for its nearness to our passage. Here Jonathan’s armor-bearer declares, *הנני עמך כלבבך* “Behold, I am with you according to your heart.” McCarter believes the prepositional

¹⁴ Scholars agree that the semantic ranges of *לב* and *לבב* in biblical Hebrew are indistinguishable, so that in many texts the two words are interchangeable and appear synonymous (cf. Gen 31:20, 26; Judg 19:5, 8; 19:6, 9; 1 Sam 6:6ab; Ezek 28:2c, 6; 1 Chr 12:39ab[38ab]; 2 Chr 12:14; 19:3) (Fabry, “*לֵב, לֵלֵב*,” 7:407–8). Within Samuel, the 45 occurrences of *לב* and *לבב* connote eight different meanings, nearly all of which are non-physical. All three potential references to YHWH’s “heart” appear to refer to his “will, intention, or motivation” (1 Sam 2:35; 13:14; 2 Sam 7:21). In the following breakdown of “heart” texts in Samuel, a “Y” refers to YHWH and “D” to David/Saul’s replacement; I list in brackets alternative possible meanings in the various contexts: (1) *the physical organ* (1 Sam 25:37 [#4]; 2 Sam 18:14); (2) *mind* (1 Sam 1:13; 9:19); (3) *inclination, disposition, character?* (D: 2 Sam 14:1; Others: 1 Sam 6:6 [#8]; 10:9 [#8]; 10:26; 25:3, *qere*; 2 Sam 15:6, 13; 19:14); (4) *one’s inner self, seat of feeling or emotion* (D: 2 Sam 13:33 [#7]; 19:7; Other: 1 Sam 1:8; 2:1 [#8]; 4:13; 17:32 [#5]; 25:36; 28:5; 2 Sam 6:16; 13:20 [#7]; 13:28); (5) *conscience* (D: 1 Sam 24:6; 25:31; 2 Sam 24:10); (6) *determination, courage* (D: 2 Sam 7:27 [#8]; Others: 17:10); (7) *attention, consideration, reason* (D: 1 Sam 21:12; 25:25; 27:1; 2 Sam 19:19 [#4]; Others: 1 Sam 4:20; 9:20 [#3]; 2 Sam 18:3); (8) *will, intention, motivation* (Y: 1 Sam 2:35; 13:14 [D] [#3]; 2 Sam 7:21 [#3]; D: 1 Sam 16:7 [#3]; 17:28; 2 Sam 7:3 [#7]; Others: 7:3 [#3]; 12:20, 24; 14:7 [#7]). Outside Samuel one finds additional meanings for *לב* and *לבב*, such as “seat of vital force; the organized strength of; and inside, middle (metaphorically).”

¹⁵ Johnson calls both texts “ambiguous” (“The Heart of YHWH’s Chosen One in 1 Samuel,” 457–58).

phrase addresses “an individual’s will or purpose,” but V. Philips Long is correct to note the idiom could imply not only “chosenness” but also “‘unity of purpose’ and a willingness to act in concert.”¹⁶ What is clear is that the prepositional phrase is functioning adverbially.

In Jer 3:15, as a counter to the wicked Judean leaders of Jeremiah’s day (Jer 2:8; 10:21; 12:10; 23:1–2; 50:6), YHWH declares his new covenant promise: ונתתי לכם רעים כלבי “and I will give to you shepherds according to my heart” (cf. 23:4). C. F. Keil argued that this was a purposeful allusion to 1 Sam 13:14, which would make it significant that the 1cs pronominal suffix on כלבי “like/according to *my* heart” agrees only with the understood clause subject YHWH.¹⁷ What is not clear is whether the prepositional phrase itself functions adjectivally or adverbially and whether it points to the shepherds’ like-mindedness to God or their chosenness. Elsewhere in Jeremiah, YHWH does refer to his appointed shepherds as “chosen” (בחור) (Jer 49:19; 50:44), which heightens the possibility that the “heart” idiom in Jer 3:15 addresses divine

¹⁶ Long, *The Reign and Rejection of King Saul*, 92–93. This translation follows the MT, which reads הניני עמך כלבבך, but the LXX has ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μετὰ σοῦ, ὡς ἡ καρδία σοῦ καρδία μου “Behold, I with you; as your heart is my heart.” The inclusion of “is my heart” may be the translator’s interpretive addition in light of an apparent ellipsis in Hebrew, or it could witness the more original text, with כלבי “like/according to my heart” being lost through haplography (so McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 236).

¹⁷ C. F. Keil, “Jeremiah,” in *Commentary on the Old Testament* (ed. by C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, trans. by D. Patrick; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1866–91; repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 8:92. In his discussion, Keil contrasts YHWH’s selection of David in 1 Sam 13:14 with the kings that “Israel had itself appointed according to the desire of its heart”—a reading that renders the prepositional idiom adverbially. Later, however, he appears to support the traditional adjectival reading when he asserts, “If Israel will return to the Lord, He will give it rulers according to His heart, like David, who did wisely in all his ways.”

election. Nevertheless, the clause that follows in Jer 3:15 relates to the shepherds' faithful leadership, so there is also support for the traditional adjectival understanding.¹⁸ Clearly Jer 3:15 does not offer decisive help in our interpretation of 1 Sam 13:14.

Second, while Benjamin J. M. Johnson and others are correct that the content of 1 Sam 2:35 could be understood to support the traditional understanding of 13:14,¹⁹ this first of the three potential references in Samuel to YHWH's "heart" most likely supports the adverbial rendering of *כלבבו* and YHWH as the antecedent to the 3ms suffix. The similarities between the passages are clear: just as Samuel declared to Saul, "YHWH has sought *for himself* (לו) a man *according to his heart* (כלבבו)," so also YHWH declared to Eli through the man of God, "I will raise up *for myself* (לי) a faithful priest *who will do according to what is within my heart and within my soul* (יעשה

¹⁸ The clause that follows reads, *ורעו אתכם דעה והשכיל* "and they will shepherd you with knowledge and understanding" (cf. Jer 23:4). However, the wording is not decisive support for rendering a meaning of like-mindedness to *כלבבי*, for the *weqatal* *ורעו* simply signals logical progression (result?) from the previous clause, in light of the subject's switch from YHWH to the shepherds. All we learn, therefore, is that God's gift of pastor-leaders in the age of the new covenant will result in their shepherding in knowledge and prudence. For more on this construction, see *BHRG*, 168–71 (§21.3); D. A. Garrett and J. S. DeRouchie, *A Modern Grammar for Biblical Hebrew* (Nashville: B&H, 2009), 64–66 (§10.D).

¹⁹ Johnson, "The Heart of YHWH's Chosen One in 1 Samuel," 460–61; cf. T. Veijola, *Die Ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975), 56; M. Garsiel, *The First Book of Samuel: A Literary Study of Comparative Structures, Analogies and Parallels* (Ramat Gan: Revivim, 1985), 100–2. Garsiel further comments that the reader must wait until the battle of Gilboah (1 Samuel 28–2 Samuel 1) to see played out the narratorial hints that connect Eli and Saul (102–6).

יבנקשי (כאשר בלבבי ובנקשי).”²⁰ Johnson and others infer that the explicit stress on “doing” along with the occurrence of ב + לבב in 2:35 necessitates that כלבבו in 13:14 also focuses on the “doing” of Saul’s replacement—that is, he is like-minded to YHWH and lives accordingly (i.e., the traditional adjectival rendering). A number of observations, however, suggest a different conclusion:

- (1) The passages are distinct in their use of prepositions with לבב. Whereas 1 Sam 2:35 links the preposition כ + the relative אשר with the preposition ב + לבב, 13:14 has only כ + לבב. The preposition ב is clearly used spatially in 2:35, marking a location *within* the area of God’s will and clarifying the “what” of the relative אשר: that which is “done” is “according to *what is within God’s heart* and soul.”²¹ In contrast, the preposition כ is never used spatially, and in 13:14 it is either expressing a relationship of correspondence or identity between the “heart/choice” of God and the “man” (the adjectival view) or emphasizing agreement in kind, manner, or norm between (a) God’s “heart / will” and his action or (b) man’s “heart / will” and God’s action (the adverbial view).²²

²⁰ For more on 1 Sam 2:35, see most recently D. S. Diffey, “David and the Fulfillment of 1 Samuel 2:35: Faithful Priest, Sure House, and A Man After God’s Own Heart,” *EvQ* 85.2 (2013): 99–104.

²¹ On the spatial use of ב see *IBHS*, §11.2.5b.

²² כ describes comparison and correspondence “like, as, just as” (*ibid.*, §11.2.9a), and, similar to the English word “like,” the Hebrew preposition with its object noun (or noun equivalent) can function substantivally, adjectivally, or adverbially (see §11.1.3a; Joüon, §133g n.4). Waltke and O’Connor observe that, when viewed from a semantic perspective, the preposition כ is used in at least three ways: (1) to connote agreement in quantity or measure; (2) to express the logical outcome of a comparison as correspondence or identity; and (3) to

- (2) No ambiguity exists in the function of **כַּאֲשֶׁר** in 1 Sam 2:35: it is clearly modifying the *verb עשה* “to do.” That is to say, in 2:35 the prepositional phrase beginning with **כ** functions *adverbially*, just as was the case in 2 Sam 7:21 already noted. From the perspective of syntax, then, the use of **כ** and its object in 1 Sam 2:35 can only be seen to support the *adverbial* reading of **כַּלְבֻּבוֹ** in 13:14.
- (3) In 1 Sam 2:35 the faithful priest is the implied subject of the main verb *עשה*, but YHWH is the principal actor in 13:14. Whereas in 2:35 the anticipated priest operates according to what is in YHWH’s heart, God’s “doing” (pi. **בַּקֵּשׁ** “to seek”) rather than the man’s “doing” is at the fore in 13:14. Nevertheless, the way in which YHWH’s heart is portrayed as the standard in 2:35 supports the view that YHWH’s heart and not the man’s is addressed in 13:14.

All these observations suggest that YHWH is indeed the antecedent to the 3ms pronominal suffix on **כַּלְבֻּבוֹ** in 1 Sam 13:14 and that the phrase itself is functioning adverbially, describing the standard by which YHWH acted; he sought Saul’s replacement in accordance with his own will/choice.

Third, if the narrator of 1 Sam 13:14 had intended **כַּלְבֻּבוֹ** to be descriptive of **אִישׁ** “man” in the way Johnson and other traditional-view advocates attest, would he not have said “a man

emphasize agreement in kind, manner, or norm (*IBHS*, §11.2.9b). The phrase **כַּלְבֻּבוֹ** in 1 Sam 13:14 follows one of the latter two categories, so that (1) YHWH’s heart/will corresponds in some way with the (heart/will of the) man (i.e., the traditional adjectival reading), (2) YHWH’s elective purpose corresponds with or finds fulfillment in the man (i.e., McCarter’s adjectival reading), or (3) YHWH or the man’s heart serves as the standard or norm by which God sought a new king (i.e., the adverbial rendering).

whose heart is like his heart” (אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹ לֵב כְּלִבּוֹ) rather than just “a man according to his heart” (אִישׁ כְּלִבּוֹ)? Notice how passages with similar constructions and lexemes are shaped:

2 Sam 17:10	והוא גם־חיל אשר לבו כלב האריה המס ימס	And he—even a valiant one <i>whose heart is like the heart of a lion</i> —will completely melt.
Ezek 28:2	ותתן לבך כלב אלהים	And you set <i>your heart like the heart of a god</i> .
Ezek 28:6	יען תתך את־לבבך כלב אלהים	Because you have set <i>your heart like the heart of a god</i>

Certainly prepositions like כ can occur in “pregnant” constructions containing ellipsis.²³

However, in view of the filled-out patterns elsewhere both inside and outside of Samuel, one may legitimately question why the full construction was not included in 1 Sam 13:14 if the traditional adjectival view was intended.

Fourth, we must consider the work of Ernst Jenni, who in his 1994 monograph *Die Präposition Kaph* analyzes all 3038 occurrences of the preposition כ in the OT.²⁴ A key purpose of his study was to determine the meaning of the relation between the noun that the preposition governs and the clause in which the prepositional phrase appears. In the Hebrew Bible he finds nine main categories of usage, each with its own subcategories.²⁵ He places כְּלִבּוֹ in 1 Sam 13:14

²³ See *IBHS*, §11.4.3e; Joüon, §133h.

²⁴ E. Jenni, *Die Präposition Kaph*, Band 2, *Die hebräischen Präpositionen* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994). All translations of Jenni’s German original are my own; the German texts for most citations are included in the footnotes.

²⁵ Jenni’s nine primary categories are as follows: (1) *Comparability* (predicate approximation: without commonality); (2) *Similarity* (no transitive comparison); (3) *Imitation* (activity comparison: subject distinction); (4) *Reiteration* (situational comparison: subject equality); (5) *Realization* (mental anticipation); (6) *Truth Proving* (verbal anticipation:

under the general category of “realization (mental anticipation),” in which a comparison is made between reality and a mental image of that reality. Jenni states, “With the collective concept ‘mental image’ we think of various mental and intellectual activities that in a certain way picture external reality, particularly the activities of perception, subjective judgment, and willing.”²⁶ The formula Jenni uses to describe this category is: “X is/acts as X/Y imagined or conceived.”²⁷ Placing the various constituents of our clause into this formula results in the following statement: “YHWH acts as he conceived” or, more particularly, “YHWH sought (a man) in accordance with his act of willing.” Clearly, Jenni renders כלבבו adverbially and treats YHWH as the antecedent to the 3ms pronominal suffix.

Jenni places our passage in the sub-category of “action according to discretion.”²⁸ Here the preposition כ manifests in clauses that show how one’s willing or intention is fulfilled. So, for example, Gen 19:8 reads ועשו להן כטוב בעיניכם “Do to them as is good in your eyes”—that is, act

announcement); (7) *Compliance* (verbal anticipation: notification to attend); (8) *Temporal Use* (direct succession); (9) *Quantitative Use*.

²⁶ Jenni, *Die Präposition Kaph*, 117: “Unter dem Sammelbegriff ‘Vorstellung’ verstehen wir verschiedene Sinnes- und Geistestätigkeiten, welche die äussere Wirklichkeit auf eine gewisse Weise abbilden, vor allem Wahrnehmen, subjektives Beurteilen und Wollen.”

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 37: “x ist/handelt wie x/y sich vorstellt.”

²⁸ Jenni’s nine sub-categories under “Realization (mental anticipation)” are as follows (using his enumeration): (51) Fact as heard (e.g., 1 Sam 23:11); (52) Self-evident as seen (e.g., 2 Kgs 2:19); (53) Dream (interpretation) corresponding to meaning (e.g., Gen 40:5); (54) Evaluation according to appearance (e.g., Gen 19:14); (55) Fulfillment as anticipated (e.g., Gen 27:4); (56) Performance as projected (e.g., Num 33:46); (57) Fulfillment according to desire (e.g., 2 Chr 2:15); (58) Action according to discretion (e.g., Gen 19:8); (59) Intention as present status (e.g., Gen 50:20).

towards them as you think best. There are 26 instances of this use in the OT, five of which have God as the subject. The primary fulfillment verb is עשה (used 20x), but other verbs also occur. The various prepositional idioms of willing along with their accompanying fulfillment verbs are noted in table 2.²⁹

Table 2. The Preposition כ as Realization according to Discretion

Prepositional Idioms of Willing	Fulfillment Verbs (<i>Italics</i> =God as subject)					
	עשה	אכל	בקש	נתן	כתב	משל
1. כטוב / כישר בעיני "as is good / right in the eyes of . . ."	Gen 19:8a; Josh 9:25ab; <i>Judg 10:15a</i> (with כל); 1 Sam 11:10a (with כל); Jer 26:14ab; Esth 3:11a				Esth 8:8a	
2. כנפשך "according to your soul"		Deut 23:25[24]				
3. כלב- / כלבב- "according to the heart of . . ."	1 Sam 14:7; <i>2 Sam 7:21</i> // <i>1 Chr 17:19</i>		<i>1 Sam 13:14</i>	<i>Jer 3:15</i>		
4. כאפי וכחמתי "according to my anger and my wrath"	Ezek 25:14ab					
5. כתבונתם "according to their understanding"	Hos 13:2					
6. כרצון "according to what is pleasing to . . ."	Esth 1:8; 9:5; Dan 8:4; 11:3, 16, 36; Neh 9:24					Neh 9:37

In each of the above instances the prepositional idioms of willing are syntactically linked to the verbs of fulfillment. Specifically, Jenni correlates the prepositional phrase כלבבו in 1 Sam 13:14 with the fulfillment verb בקש "to seek." YHWH had an image of a new king, and on the

²⁹ In 1 Sam 14:7, the verb עשה is understood in the assertion of readiness by the weapon carrier (cf. 2 Sam 15:15).

basis of this act of discretion (i.e., “according to his will,” כלבבו) he sought out Saul’s replacement.

If Jenni’s categorization is correct, there is no question that כלבבו is functioning adverbially in 1 Sam 13:14. The intimate connection between the prepositional idioms of willing (here כלבבו) and the various fulfillment verbs (here בקש) necessitates this conclusion. It also requires that the phrase itself designate *God’s* heart and not that of Saul’s replacement.

In summary, the closest parallel texts both semantically and syntactically suggest that 1 Sam 13:14 should be read adverbially with כלבבו clarifying the standard by which YHWH sought Saul’s successor and with the 3ms suffix highlighting that YHWH’s own heart guided his selection process. These conclusions are further supported by Jenni’s study of the preposition כ, which treats the choice of the new king as the outward realization of God previous act of mental discretion.

2. ANE comparisons

V. Philips Long has compared our passage to one located in the Babylonian Chronicles (R §11–13): “The seventh year: In the month of Kislev the king of Akkad [i.e., Nebuchadnezzar II] mustered his army and marched to Hattu. He encamped against the city of Judah and on the second day of the month Adar he captured the city (and) seized (its) king. *A king of his own choice he appointed* (šarra ša ŠÀ-šú ina libbi ipteqid) in the city [i.e., Jerusalem] (and) taking the vast tribute he brought it into Babylon.”³⁰ Along with this reference, I add the following

³⁰ Translation taken from A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (repr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000; orig. Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1975), 102. Cf. D.

statement from a Hittite New Kingdom treaty between Tudhaliya IV of Hatti and Kurunta of Tarhuntassa (ca. 1250–1225 BC) (No. 18C; §19.ii.92–94): “Whatever son Kurunta prefers, whether the son of his wife or the son of some other woman, whatever son is the *choice* of Kurunta, whatever son Kurunta prefers, (let him place him in kingship in the land of Tarhuntassa).”³¹ Both of the above texts use cognates of the Hebrew לב / לבב in the context of a

J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of the Chaldean Kings* (London: British Museum, 1961), 72 r.13; this volume contains the hand copies and photos of the text.

³¹ Translated by Hoffner, “The Treaty of Tudhaliya IV with Kurunta of Tarhuntassa on the Bronze Tablet Found in Hattusa,” in *COS*, 2:103; cf. G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (SBLWAW; Atlanta: Scholars, 1996), 111. The original from *Bronze Tablet* (2:90–92) reads: *ku-in-za im-ma DUMA-an m.d.LAMMA ma-la-iz-zi ma-a-na-aš a-pé-el ŠA MUNUS-TI DUMA-aš ma-a-na-aš ta-me-e-el ku-e-el-ga MUNUS-aš DUMA-aš / nu ku-iš DUMA-aš A-NA m.d.LAMMA ZI-an-za ku-in-za DUMA-an m.d.LAMMA-aš ma-la-iz-zi*. In personal correspondence from February 29, 2006, Harry A. Hoffner Jr. wrote regarding this Hittite text: “The Hittite word translated ‘choice’ above is *ištanza*, written here with the Hittite-complemented Sumerogram *ZI-an-za*. It can mean both ‘mind, soul’ and specifically ‘wish, desire’. In Akkadian the Sumerogram *ZI* stands for the Akkadian word *napištu*, which does not have the secondary meaning cited above, but rather ‘life; living being; throat, neck’. This latter word is, of course, cognate with Hebrew *nefesh*. Interestingly enough, in his *editio princeps* of the Bronze Tablet, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 1*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988, page 21, Heinrich Otten rendered the phrase containing *ZI-an-za* as ‘welcher Sohn (also) dem Kurunta nach dem Herzen ist’ (emphasis mine), a rather neat correspondence to the biblical ‘after his heart’ (with *lev*).” Hoffner further noted: “Hittite *ištanza* (*ZI-an-za* [*sic*]) is not the anatomical ‘heart’, which is the word *ker* (Sumerogram ŠÀ), but it functions in Hittite as *lev* does in biblical Hebrew.” I thank Professor Hoffner for his help on this text.

human suzerain's appointing or electing a vassal. While the clauses that follow in the Hittite treaty do emphasize the need for the vassal's covenant loyalty, the "heart" language is abandoned.³²

I will now cite numerous texts that link a god's "heart" to the selection of a king.³³ Significantly, the "heart" idiom occurs in contexts dealing with divine royal election as early as the second half of the Early Dynastic III Period (ca. 2500–2335 BC), and it continues to be used at least into the reign of Cyrus II (the Great) (ca. 559–530) at the beginning of the Persian Period. The first text comes from Eannatum, a ruler in the Dynasty of Lagash and one of the last kings of the Early Dynastic Period (Brick A.i.9–ii.1). He declares that he is one "whose name was called to mind by Enlil; endowed with strength by Ningirsu; *envisaged by Nansh in (her) heart* (ša[g]-pa[d]-da^dnina-ge); truly and rightly suckled by Ninhursaga; named by Inanna."³⁴ King Gudea of the Dynasty of Akkad (ca. 2335–2112 BC) makes a similar announcement concerning himself on one of his statues (Statue B.ii.8–iii.5): "*Shepherd envisaged by Ningirsu in (his) heart* (sib ša[g]-gi-pa[d]-da^dnin-gir-su-ka-ge), steadfastly regarded by Nanshe; endowed with strength by Nindar; the

³² Cf. *Treaty between Tudhaliya IV of Hatti and Kurunta of Tarhuntassa*, No. 18C; §20.ii 99–102.

³³ For helpful discussions regarding the election of kings by gods in the ancient world, see H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society & Nature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), 238–40; S. Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies* (State Archives of Assyria, vol. 9; Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1997), xxxvi–xliv. I am grateful to John H. Walton for directing me to a number of the texts and translations that follow.

³⁴ *ISA*, 47, as translated by T. Jacobsen and cited by Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, 238; cf. *ISA*, 49 (Brick B) for a similar statement.

man described(?) by Baba; child borne by Gatumdug; endowed with dignity and the sublime scepter by Ig-alima; well provided with the breath of life by Dunshagar; he whom Ningiszida his god has made to appear in the assembly with (proudly) raised head.”³⁵ While we must not force the authors of these comparisons to mean more than they intended through the use of idiomatic speech, these texts at least conceptually align with Ernst Jenni’s categorization of כ (כלבבו) in 1 Sam 13:14 as “realization (mental anticipation).” The gods conceived in their “minds/hearts” both Eannatum and Gudea as kings.

The following further texts provide other pertinent parallels. On Cylinder A.xvvi.10–16 of Gudea’s inscriptions, the king proclaims of himself: “Being the one at whom Nanshe looked with favor, being *the man of the heart of Enlil* (^d*en-lil-lá galu ša[g]-ga-na-kam*), being the ruler . . . (?) of Ningirsu, Gudea, being born in a lofty sanctuary of Gatumdug; Nisaba opened the house of wisdom for him, Enki prepared the plan of the house for him.”³⁶ Similarly, the following example is representative of numerous statements in the royal inscriptions of Shu-Sin of the Ur III Period (ca. 2112–2004) that declare he was chosen by god (E3/2.1.4.3.i 4–16): “Šū-sîn, called by name by the god An, beloved of the god Enlil, *king whom the god Enlil chose in his (own) heart* (*lugal*^d*en-lil-le šà-ga-na in-pà*) as shepherd of the land and of the four quarters, mighty king, king of Ur, king of the four quarters.”³⁷ A series of Neo-Assyrian liver omens uncovered in

³⁵ *ISA*, 106–07, as translated by Jacobsen and cited by Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, 238.

³⁶ *ISA*, 156; translation by R. A. Averbeck in *COS*, 2:426.

³⁷ D. R. Frayne, *Ur III Period (2112–2004 BC)* (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia: Early Periods; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 302. For similar statements, see E3/2.1. 4.3.ii.8–13 (p. 303), vii.19–29 (Caption 1) (306); 4.4.ii.11–15 (308); 4.5 Caption 2.1–8

Ashurbanipal’s library (ca. 668–627 BC) contain the following comment (*Manzāzu* Commentary 1:19.103): “If the Presence is turned upside down: *Enlil will install a king of his own choice* (𒀭𒍪𒍪𒍪 *šarra ša libbīšu išakkan*).”³⁸ Finally, the Cyrus Cylinder records the king declaring: “He [i.e., Marduk] surveyed and looked throughout all the lands, *searching for a righteous king according to the desire of his heart, so as to grasp his hand* (*ištêma malki išaru bibil libbi ša ittamah qātuššu*). He called his name Cyrus, king of Anshan; he pronounced his name to be king over all (the world).”³⁹

(311); 4.7.1–5 (314), 15–20 (315); 4.9.x.6–10 (317); 4.11.1–9 (321); 4.12.1–12 (322); 4.13.1–5 (323); 4.14.1–5 (325); 4.15.1–5 (326); 4.17.12–19 (328); 4.18.1–8 (329); 4.19.1–8 (330); 4.20.3–10 (331); 4.21.5–14 (332); 4.24.1–5 (334); 4.27.1–6 (336).

³⁸ U. Koch-Westenholz, *Babylonian Liver Omens* (Copenhagen: Musem Tusculanum, 2000), 146 §19.103. The “Presence” (symbolic meaning) or “Station” (literal meaning) (*manzāzu*) is a vertical groove on the liver’s *lobus sinister* (45, 51–53).

³⁹ F. H. Weissbach, ed., *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden* (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1911), 2; translation adapted from Weissbach (3) and Mordechai Cogan in *COS*, 2:315. Cogan’s full translation paraphrases a more literal rendering: “searching for a righteous king . . . whom he [i.e., Marduk] would support.” A. L. Oppenheim’s offers a contrasting view of this final clause in *ANET*, 315: “searching for a righteous ruler willing to lead him (i.e., Marduk) (in the annual procession).” Here *ša ittamah* “his hand” is seen as a reference to Marduk rather than to the elected king—a more likely interpretation in view of the fact that the king’s chief duty during the annual procession was to “grasp Marduk’s hand,” the very thing the priests accused Nabonidus of not doing, thus securing Cyrus’ victory (see “Nabonidus Chronicle 7” in Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, 104–11). I thank Charles Halton for pointing this information out to me.

This unit has surveyed numerous extra-biblical texts dealing with a superior's selection of a king. In each of these contexts, the "heart" idiom refers to the human suzerain or god's mental conception or choice of a new king rather than to the like-mindedness of the vassal to his superior or to the loyalty of the new king as the standard for his selection.⁴⁰ This comparative ancient Near Eastern material, therefore, counters the traditional adjectival rendering of כלבבו in 1 Sam 13:14 and potentially supports all views that see the idiom focusing more on YHWH's choice of Saul's replacement and the 3ms suffix referring to יהוה "YHWH" rather than איש "man."⁴¹

⁴⁰ For a number of other interesting extra-biblical references to the divine election of a king, though without the same use of the heart idiom, see Parpola, *Assyrian Prophecies*, C n.186. H.-J. Fabry states that in Akkadian literature "the will of the gods (*libbi ilāni*) played an especially important role at the accession of a king, above all if he reigned *kī la [sic] libbi ilāni* 'contrary to the will of the gods'" (Fabry, "לֵב; לְלֵב," 7:405). He does not cite any examples, however, where the "heart" idiom is applied to the loyalty of the vassal.

⁴¹ While none of *The Assyrian Dictionary*'s seven translated examples of *libbu* "heart" following *kīma*, *kī*, or *akī* (cognate prepositions of כ) offer contextual parallels with 1 Sam 13:14, each has the prepositional phrase functioning adverbially, modifying a *verb* rather than a noun (see *CAD* L 171; cf. *AHW*, 1:549–51). For example, in the Amarna Letters (EA, 109.11; cf. 38.18, 21; 125.43) a certain Rib-Hadda tells the Great King that the sons of Abdi-Aširta overtook the cities of the mayor "just as they pleased" (*kīma libbišunu*) (see W. L. Moran, ed. and trans., *The Amarna Letters* [Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, 1992; orig. *Les Lettres d'El-Amarna*, 1987], 183). Similarly, the Middle Assyrian Laws (A §14; cf. §16) grant that the husband of a wife who commits adultery may "treat her as he wishes" (*ki libbišu epassu*) (*COS*, 2:355; *ANET*, 181; cf. *ANET*, 181 n.6, "in accordance with his heart").

3. David's "election" in context

Benjamin J. M. Johnson is certainly correct that within the context of 1 Samuel 13 an allusion to the new king's loyalty would provide the greatest contrast to Saul's foolish act.⁴² However, I question his claim that the literary context forces the reader to "expect the statement about YHWH's future chosen one in 13:14 to say something about the chosen one's heart, not something about YHWH's choice."⁴³ As V. Philips Long has noted, "The allusion to David in 1 Sam. 13:14, though obvious in the light of later episodes, is only anticipatory in the present context, so that *the emphasis falls not so much upon the sufficiency of David as upon the deficiency of Saul.*"⁴⁴

Furthermore, there are numerous literary signals in 1 Samuel that point to the necessity for 1 Sam 13:14, as the first mention of Saul's replacement, to provide a direct allusion to the new king's divine election. With the statement in 8:5 that Israel desired a king "to judge us *like all the nations*" (cf. 8:19–20), the reader is encouraged to interpret the history of Israel's monarchy through the lens of the royal ideal pictured in Deuteronomy 17, which stressed that Israel's king be divinely "chosen": "When you enter the land that YHWH your God gives you and you possess it and live in it and you say, 'I will set a king over me *like all the nations* who are around me,' then you shall surely set over you *a king whom YHWH your God chooses* (מֶלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר יבַחֵר יְהוָה)

⁴² Johnson, "The Heart of YHWH's Chosen One in 1 Samuel," 459.

⁴³ Ibid., 463.

⁴⁴ Long, *The Reign and Rejection of King Saul*, 93 (italics added).

” (Deut 17:14–15).⁴⁵ In all likelihood, this emphasis on “chosenness” provides the background to the historiographer’s stress that the *people* “chose” Saul (1 Sam 8:18; 12:13) *for themselves* (see לנו “for us,” 8:5; לכם “for yourselves,” 8:18), whereas *YHWH* acted *for himself* (לִי/לוֹ “for him/for me,” 1 Sam 13:14; 16:1, 3) in setting apart the one later identified as David.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ God is the subject of בחר “to choose, elect” in 88 of the verb’s 164 occurrences in the OT (54%). 32.95 percent of the 88 instances occur in Deuteronomy, a book that contains every key OT election motif. In Deuteronomy, God elects his people Israel (Deut 4:37; 7:6, 7; 10:15; 14:2), their king and his dynasty (17:14), his sanctuary location (12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26; 14:23, 24, 25; 15:20; 16:2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16; 17:8, 10; 18:6; 23:17[16]; 26:2; 31:11), and his priesthood (18:5; 21:5). When viewing the OT as a whole, God is the subject of בחר 29x in Deuteronomy, 7x Samuel, 12x in Kings, 11x in Isaiah, 9x in Psalms, and 18x in Chronicles. It applies to the choice of Israel’s place of worship (44x), of priests and Levites (9x), of David and the dynasty bearing his name (18x), and of Israel as the people and servant of God (17x). Along with many of the figures above, E. Nicole has rightfully noted that the theme of election is far broader than the occurrences of this single verb and its cognates (“בחר,” *NIDOTTE*, 1:639). Significantly, there is no hint in Deuteronomy 17 that Israel would be wrong to have an earthly king once in the Promised Land. Indeed, Israel could have a king so long as he was an Israelite, chosen by YHWH, and so long as he would be surrendered to God’s law. The problem in 1 Samuel 8, then, is not Israel’s desire for a king per se but the type of king they desired. They wanted someone who would replace rather than represent YHWH as judge and warrior, and in doing so they rejected God as king—something that was totally foreign to the picture put forth in Deuteronomy 17 (cf. 1 Sam 8:7, 20; 12:12–13).

⁴⁶ The text explicitly says that YHWH set Saul apart (1 Sam 9:17) and indeed *chose* him through lot to lead Israel (1 Sam 10:21–22, 24; cf. 2 Sam 21:6). However, following the statements that the people chose to have a king *for themselves* (1 Sam 8:5, 18), the text also stresses that God gave the king *for the people* (להם “for them,” 1 Sam 8:22). As YHWH’s later commentary makes clear, his setting apart of Saul was done “in my anger” (Hos 13:11). Indeed,

What is striking is that the immediate context nowhere explicitly declares David as God's "chosen."

For example, 1 Sam 16:1 highlights God's rejection of Saul and his selection of another (cf. 15:26, 28). But rather than using the more natural verb בחר "to choose, elect" as the counterpart to מאס "to reject," YHWH uses ראה "to see, identify": "I have *identified* for myself among his [Jesse's] sons a king."⁴⁷ Furthermore, following the statement in 16:7 that Eliab is rejected (מאס)

he could declare, "They have made kings, *but not by me*; they have set up princes, but I did not know/approve" (8:4). That Saul stands as a manifestation of divine judgment is highlighted within the context of 1 Samuel 10 both by the stress on his origin from Gibeah of Benjamin (1 Sam 10:21, 26; cf. Judg 19–21, esp. 20:4–6) and by the note of his height (גבה), which places him among those (with David's brother Eliab and Goliath, 1 Sam 16:6–7; 17:4) that Hannah already declared YHWH would bring down (2:3–10, esp. v. 3; cf. 2:30). As such, the reference in 1 Sam 10:24 that God *chose* Saul must be read in light of its highly polemical context and in relation to the two references of the people's choice of Saul that frame it (8:18; 12:13). As Long has noted, a comparison of the texts "suggests that David was Yahweh's choice in a way that Saul, given in response to the people's request, was not" (*The Reign and Rejection of King Saul*, 93). A similar rhetorical use of בחר is found in 2 Sam 16:18 where Hushai, a pro-David figure, prefaces his bad advice to Absalom with this statement: "The one chosen by YHWH, by these people, and by all the men of Israel—his I will be, and I will remain with him."

⁴⁷ For a number of extra-biblical texts that speak of a god's glance singling out a king, see Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, 238–39. The two verbs used for sight in this passage (hiph. נבט and qal ראה, 16:1, 7) both generally denote physical sense perception with the eyes (i.e., "to see, look"), and the two frequently appear together in the OT. Specifically, 26 of the 67 occurrences of hiph. נבט parallel or correspond with qal ראה (e.g., Num 23:21; 1 Sam 17:42; 2 Kgs 3:14; Isa 42:18; Hab 1:5; Ps 33:13; Job 28:24; Lam 1:11, 12). For example, YHWH declares in Isa 66:2: "But to this one I will look (hi. נבט), to the one who is humble and contrite of spirit and who trembles at my word." Note also 1 Kgs 14:8, which explicitly connects David's

and that God looks (ראה) at the heart (ללבב), the clause לא־בחר יהוה “YHWH has not chosen” is used three times with reference to David’s other brothers (16:8, 9, 10). Then, as soon as David shows up on the scene, YHWH tells Samuel in 16:12: “Arise; anoint him, for this is he.” Whereas Saul and Jesse’s seven oldest sons were “rejected” and thus “not chosen,” David is he who was “seen” by God and, by implication, “chosen” by him. J. P. Fokkelman is certainly correct that “an ‘election’ in favour of David . . . is conspicuous by its absence.”⁴⁸

That David is indeed the chosen one of God is further supported by the texts outside of 1 Samuel that explicitly use בחר in reference to David (2 Sam 6:21; 1 Kgs 8:16 // 2 Chr 6:6; 1 Kgs 11:34; Ps 78:70; 1 Chr 28:4). Significantly, all but two of these passages appear to echo 1 Sam 13:14; 15:28; or 16:7, thus affirming the royal election theme in these contexts, even though בחר is not used of David at these points. Specifically, 2 Sam 6:21 implies Saul’s rejection when speaking of David’s election and is one of only three other passages, the first being 1 Sam 13:14, that speak of David’s being “appointed (by YHWH) as ruler over Israel” (see also 1 Sam 25:30 and 1 Kgs 1:35). Furthermore, 1 Kgs 11:34 parallels the mention of David’s covenant loyalty with the statement of his election, and both Ps 78:70 and 1 Chr 28:4 echo the story of David’s

wholehearted obedience (i.e., covenant loyalty) to the sight of YHWH: “Yet you have not been like my servant David, who kept my commandments and who followed me with all his heart (בכל־לבו) to do only that which was right in my sight (בעיני).”

⁴⁸ Fokkelman, *The Crossing Fates*, 114. Even if David’s election is certain in the context, the narrator’s reticence to use בחר with reference to him is still striking and probably quite intentional. In all likelihood, the use of בחר with Saul and yet not with David in 1 Samuel is part of the narrator’s rhetorical strategy to discourage all human willing that is not submitted to YHWH’s authority and purposes.

anointing in 1 Samuel 16 by making reference to his being chosen “from all the house of my father” and “from the sheepfolds,” respectively.

While the narratives describing David’s rise to kingship clearly portray him as God’s “chosen” in contrast to Saul, the reader of the DtrH expects a more explicit expression of David’s divine election, especially in the first explicit reference to God’s replacement of Saul—namely, 1 Sam 13:14. Ernst Jenni’s proposal indicates that in this text YHWH’s previous act of discretion (i.e., his “heart/will,” לבב) anticipated and thus directed his seeking (בקש) of Saul’s replacement. I suggest, therefore, that either the verb “to seek” (בקש) with its modifier “for himself” (לו = “Yahweh sought for himself”) and/or the verb plus the prepositional phrase “according to his heart/will” (כלבבו) provide the expected reference to the divine choice of the king.⁴⁹ Both of these possibilities easily align within the adverbial reading of the text.⁵⁰

III. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

⁴⁹ That בקש can carry the sense of “to elect” is noted by its paralleling the verb צוה “to appoint” in our passage and by its similar use in Isa 40:20, where בקש “to seek” and בחר “to choose” stand in neighboring clauses. (For other examples of words or expressions that convey the idea of election, see Nicole, “בחר,” 638, 640.) 44 of the 250 occurrences of בקש in the Hebrew Bible occur in the book of Samuel. C. Chhetri has observed that God is the subject of בקש 14x and that the object of the verb can be persons, animals, or inanimate objects (“בקש,” *NIDOTTE*, 1:722–23).

⁵⁰ Recognizably, with the traditional adjectival reading, the verb “to seek” (בקש) with its modifier “for himself” (לו) could itself be seen as the expected allusion to Deuteronomy 17. In McCarter’s adjectival view, כלבבו itself supplies the allusion—“a man of/according to his choosing.”

1. Synthesis

The interpretation of 1 Sam 13:14 depends on properly grasping the meaning of the prepositional phrase **כלבבו** “like/according to his heart.” This paper has identified three overlapping issues that establish one’s conclusions: (1) Does the prepositional phrase function adjectivally, modifying the noun **איש** “man,” or adverbially, modifying the verb **בקש** “seek”? (2) Is the antecedent of the 3ms pronominal suffix on **כלבבו** the object **איש** or the subject **יהוה** “YHWH”? (3) Does the context of royal selection suggest that the “heart” language (**לבב**) refers more to character or election?

The traditional interpretation of the verse reads **כלבבו** adjectivally, sees YHWH as the antecedent to the 3ms suffix, and views the unit **איש כלבבו** to express the man’s like-mindedness to God. There is little question that this reading makes solid sense within the narrative framework of the book. As Benjamin J. M. Johnson concludes from explicit texts like 1 Sam 16:7 that highlight David’s inner quality in contrast to his brothers (and ultimately Saul), “It is a key thematic interest in the narrative of 1 Samuel that YHWH’s chosen agents have a right heart, and it appears that there is something about David’s heart that makes him an ideal candidate to function as YHWH’s chosen one.”⁵¹

The present study added justification to the view that YHWH’s heart and not the man’s is explicitly referred to in **כלבבו**. Numerous biblical parallels support this contention, as well as many comparative texts outside the Bible wherein a king’s selection is linked to the “heart/will” of a superior.

⁵¹ Johnson, “The Heart of YHWH’s Chosen One in 1 Samuel,” 466.

These same support texts, however, strongly affirm McCarter's assertion that **כלבבו** refers most directly to the divine choice of Saul's successor ("according to God's choosing") and not to the king's like-mindedness to God. In contrast to McCarter, however, the corresponding texts also suggest that **כלבבו** be read adverbially, clarifying the standard or norm by which YHWH sought a royal replacement—he did so in accordance with his own will/choice. The adverbial view easily allows **כלבבו** to provide the expected allusion to Deut 17:14–20, fits conceptually with the other ancient Near Eastern data, and aligns perfectly with Ernst Jenni's observations that prepositional idioms of willing (here **כלבבו**) have a close syntactic link to their respective fulfillment verbs (here **בקש**). As such, 1 Sam 13:14 is best understood to explicitly declare that YHWH's hunt for a new king was directly guided by his desire or inclination. The verse tells us nothing *explicit* about the inward makeup or loyalty of Saul's successor. We know only that God's mental act of discretion (**לבב**) regarding Israel's soon-to-be king found outward expression when YHWH sought Saul's replacement.

2. "Realization (Mental Anticipation)" in 1 Samuel 13:14

I now recall V. Philips Long's suggestion that while 1 Sam 13:14 denotes the king-elect as one divinely chosen it also connotes that the royal successor was in some way superior to Saul.⁵² Ernst Jenni classified our passage under the main category "realization (mental anticipation)" and the sub-category "action according to discretion," and he used the following formula to characterize the classification: "X is/acts as X/Y imagined or conceived." When the various constituents of 1 Sam 13:14 are plugged into the formula, the result is: "YHWH has sought in

⁵² Long, *The Reign and Rejection of King Saul*, 92–93.

accordance with his previous act of willing (a man).” YHWH’s choice (the mental image) anticipated his following action (the realization) with direct reference to Saul’s replacement. But now two possible interpretations follow.

On the one hand, if YHWH’s subjective judgment or willing expressed by לֵבַב in 1 Sam 13:14 points in particular to a choice of *David* in contrast to all others, then the action of seeking a man that follows is a direct fulfillment of the previous choice. On the other hand, if the mental image expressed by לֵבַב is more general and simply an expression of a royal ideal rather than of David in particular, then the seeking of a royal replacement may be a further act of discretion by which YHWH declared that David in contrast to others matched the ideal picture of a king that God had in mind. The meaning associated with this latter adverbial rendering would therefore allow 1 Sam 13:14 to remain parallel to 15:28, which identifies Saul’s replacement as “better than you” (cf. 28:17),⁵³ and 16:7, which elevates David over his brothers by stressing how “man

⁵³ Saul had wrongfully saved the “best” (מֵיטֵב) of the Amalekite spoil (1 Sam 15:15) to provide an offering to YHWH. In response, Samuel announced that Saul’s deeds were “evil” (הָרַע) (15:19), that obedience was “better than” (טוֹב) sacrifice (15:22), and that Saul’s replacement was “better than” (הַטוֹב) him (15:28). Like 1 Sam 13:7–14, chapter 15 stresses the covenant disloyalty of Saul. He had rejected God’s word, and therefore YHWH rejected him from being king (15:26). The comparative phrase “to your neighbor better than you” (לְרֵעֶךָ הַטוֹב מִמֶּךָ) in 15:28 thus most likely connotes the greater devotion to YHWH that Saul’s replacement would have (cf. Esth. 1:19). Where Saul failed, David would succeed. While David is not explicitly mentioned here as Saul’s “better” replacement, the story of David’s anointing that directly follows in 1 Samuel 16 and the echo of 15:28 in 28:17 (“YHWH has torn the kingdom out of your hand and given it to your neighbor, to David”) make clear that Jesse’s eighth son is the one to whom YHWH refers. Perhaps in order to leave no chance for doubt, the LXX translator created an allusion to 15:28 in 16:12 by adding ἀγαθός “good” to YHWH’s designation of David. Whereas

looks to the (outward) appearance but YHWH looks to the heart.”⁵⁴ The first option reads 1 Sam 13:14 only as a reference to the new king’s election with no implicit allusion to David’s superior qualifications to those of Saul. In contrast, while affirming the adverbial rendering of כלבבו and seeing an allusion to Deut 17:14–20, the second view also retains many of the strengths of the traditional adjectival interpretation wherein David is presented as a better candidate for kingship than Saul.

As noted, P. Kyle McCarter Jr. asserts that איש כלבבו “a man according to his heart” in 1 Sam 13:14 “has nothing to do with any great fondness of Yahweh’s for David or any special quality of David . . . [but] emphasizes the free divine selection of the heir to the throne”—a conclusion that aligns with the first adverbial reading.⁵⁵ I agree that the verse speaks principally about the replacement’s special election, and I recognize that it is only in 1 Sam 15:28 and 16:7 that divine discretionary statements are made *explicit*. As such, 1 Sam 13:14 may simply be an (intentionally) ambiguous text that leaves the reader wondering, “Who is this ‘man,’ and what does a man that *God* selects look like?”⁵⁶

On the other hand, the mental anticipation expressed in Jenni’s category of “realization” along with the clear readings of 1 Sam 15:28 and 16:7 insinuate that 1 Sam 13:14 indeed stresses the similarity between the *image* of the divine royal ideal and the *reality* seen in the “man,” the

the Hebrew (and the Greek Lucianic mss) reads, “And YHWH said to Samuel, ‘Arise, anoint him, because this is he (כי־זה הוא),” the LXX (spec. Codex Vaticanus) reads, “And the Lord said to Samuel, ‘Arise and anoint David, because this one is good (ὅτι οὗτος ἀγαθός ἐστιν).”

⁵⁴ On these texts, see Johnson’s helpful discussion (“The Heart of YHWH’s Chosen One in 1 Samuel,” 459–60, 463–64).

⁵⁵ McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 229.

⁵⁶ For more on this, see George, “Yhwh’s Own Heart,” 442–59.

person of David.⁵⁷ That is to say, even if כַּלְבֻּבוֹ in 1 Sam 13:14 describes the standard by which Yahweh sought a king (i.e., in alignment with his desire), the meaning conveyed by the adverbial reading likely includes the conceptual realities that the traditional adjectival reading intends to convey. YHWH sought a particular “man” who aligned with the divine picture of human kingship.

What was the nature of such a picture? As already noted, through the narrator’s inclusion of the people’s request for a king to judge them “like all the nations” (1 Sam 8:5, cf. 8:19–20), he encouraged readers to interpret the monarchic history through a Deuteronomic lens—specifically the description of the royal ideal in Deut 17:14–20, which itself emphasized the necessity for a king’s divine election (v. 15, בָּחַר) and covenant faithfulness (vv. 16–20). Both of these elements stand in opposition to the portrait of Saul (see esp. 1 Sam 8:10–18; 15:22–23) and are painstakingly realized in the way the narrator(s) of Samuel–Kings portrayed David.⁵⁸

While it is true that David’s sins are not hidden from the reader, he is nevertheless portrayed throughout the DtrH as the king that all others were to emulate (see e.g., 1 Kgs 3:6;

⁵⁷ Accordingly, Jenni states, “Comparison [with the external reality] thereby confirms the (real or unreal) equivalence of the content of the mental image and the situation that it pictures, but it leaves aside [the question of] inequivalence in relation to reality (a mere ‘mental image’) and in relation to point in time (anticipatory mental activity or that which begins only subsequently [to the pictured situation] and continues)” (*Die Präposition Kaph*, 117): “Der Vergleich konstatiert dabei die (reale oder irreal) Gleichheit des Vorstellungsinhalts und der abgebildeten Situation, belässt aber die Ungleichheit im Wirklichkeitsbezug (nur Vorstellung) und im Zeitpunkt (vorwegnehmende oder anschliessend einsetzende, weiterdauernde mentale Tätigkeit).”

⁵⁸ For 1–2 Samuel, see especially the comparisons of David and Saul in Garsiel, *The First Book of Samuel*, 115–37; M. Z. Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London: Routledge, 1995), 102–5; and George, “Yhwh’s Own Heart,” 442–59.

9:4; 11:4; 14:8; 15:3). One may legitimately wonder, therefore, why a sin like the “case of Uriah the Hittite” (1 Samuel 11–12; cf. 1 Kgs 15:4–5) was even retained in the narrative; certainly the Chronicler felt free to leave it out (see 1 Chr 20:1–3). Marc Zvi Brettler rightly asserts that 2 Samuel 9–20 was included to warn all Israel to act properly, reminding them that God takes sin seriously and that sin has consequences, even when it involves the ideal king.⁵⁹ Furthermore, the inclusion of David’s sins was likely also intended to show his humanness, to represent him as a model of repentance after sin, and to proclaim the grace of God in restoring him every time he cried out. Indeed, one of the key reasons that David was a better choice than Saul was because after failure he always sought to reestablish Yahweh’s supremacy in his own life (e.g., 2 Sam 12:13–20; 24:10–25; Psalm 51; cf. Deut 17:19–20).⁶⁰ Finally, along with stressing David’s humility before God, the negative elements of David’s life were probably retained to emphasize the need for one greater than David—a divine royal son (2 Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7, 12; cf. Luke 1:32), “chosen” of God (Isa 42:1; cf. Luke 9:35; 23:35; 1 Pet 2:4), whose faithfulness would be complete (Isa 55:3; cf. 1 Pet 2:22–24) and whose kingship would never end (2 Sam 7:16; cf. Luke 1:33).⁶¹ When 1 Sam 13:14 is read typologically, in the pattern of the Bible’s own redemptive-historical and canonical interpretation, Messiah Jesus becomes the culminating

⁵⁹ Brettler, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*, 99.

⁶⁰ So too Long, *The Reign and Rejection of King Saul*, 156.

⁶¹ See P. J. Gentry and S. J. Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012), 392–427.

object of YHWH's royal quest, the ultimate realization of God's ideal for kingship, the truest counterpart to Saul's disobedience, and the definitive hope to which 1–2 Samuel points.⁶²

⁶² See James M. Hamilton Jr., "The Typology of David's Rise to Power: Messianic Patterns in the Book of Samuel," *SBJT* 16.2 (2012): 4–25; cf. Diffey, "David and the Fulfillment of 1 Samuel 2:35," 99–104. For more on typological biblical exegesis, see Gentry and Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant*, 94–95, 101–8, 606–8; cf. R. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical TUPOS Structures* (Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 2; Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1981); D. Moo, "The Problem of *Sensis Plenior*," in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon* (ed. D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986) 175–212; G. K. Beale, "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text?" *Themelios* 14 (1989) 89–96; reprinted in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. G. K. Beale; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994) 387–404; idem, "Did Jesus and the Apostles Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Revisiting the Debate Seventeen Years Later in Light of Peter Enns' Book, *Inspiration and Incarnation*," *Themelios* 32/1 (2005): 18–43; R. Lintz, *The Fabric of Theology: A Prolegomenon to Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 304–10; G. P. Hugenerberger, "Introductory Notes on Typology," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Text?* 331–41; D. A. Carson, "Mystery and Fulfillment: Toward a More Comprehensive Paradigm of Paul's Understanding of the Old and the New," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Volume 2—The Paradoxes of Paul* (ed. D. A. Carson et al.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004) 393–436, esp. 404; Douglas J. Moo and Andrew David Naselli, "The Problem of the New Testament's Use of the Old Testament," in vol. 1 of *"But My Words Will Never Pass Away": The Enduring Authority of the Christian Scriptures* (2 vols.; ed. D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, forthcoming).

IV. APPENDIX:

THE TARGUM AND THE NEW TESTAMENT ON 1 SAMUEL 13:14

Two points are noteworthy regarding the history of interpretation of 1 Sam 13:14. First, *Tg. Sam.*, which adhered to a literal translation as far as possible,⁶³ unambiguously paraphrased the entire Hebrew idiom in 1 Sam 13:14 as a reference to covenant loyalty rather than divine selection: “YHWH has established before himself a man *doing his good pleasure*” (גבר עביד (רעותיה). The complete absence of Aramaic לָבַב, the cognate to Hebrew לֵבָב, is probably due to the tendency in *Tg. Neb.* to clarify ambiguous texts in the MT and to modify any texts that frame God in anthropomorphic terms.⁶⁴ Significantly, in the second way to interpret the adverbial reading of כַּלְבָּבוֹ, 1 Sam 13:14 highlights the resemblance of the *image* of the royal ideal in God’s mind with the *reality* seen in Saul’s replacement David. As such, the interpretive step found in the targum may in fact be anticipated in the original context of 1 Sam 13:14 and legitimated by David’s own life as portrayed in Samuel and as idealized by the narrator of Kings.

Second, the NT book of Acts records that the Apostle Paul alluded to 1 Sam 13:14 in a sermon to the Jews in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch during his first missionary journey (Acts 13:22). In order to show the continuity between Jesus and Israel’s past, the apostle shaped an abridged sketch of Israel’s history that begins with the patriarchs and Moses and proceeds

⁶³ D. J. Harrington and A. J. Saldarini, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible 10; Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987), 4.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 4, 7, 8–10. An external reviewer of this essay has noted the fact that *Tg. Neb.* regularly refers to the divine will and frequently treats the status of doing “his / my will” (e.g., Zech 11:11; Mal 1:1; 3:12). There may, therefore, be a predisposition on the targum’s part to think of doing God’s will, with the use of לָבַב setting up this interpretation in 1 Sam 13:14.

through the sojourn in Egypt, the exodus, the period of the judges and Samuel to Saul. He then states, “And after he [YHWH] had removed him [Saul], he raised up David to be their king, concerning whom he also testified and said, ‘I have found David the son of Jesse, a man according to my heart, who will do all my will [εὗρον Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματα μου].’” Paul’s rendering seems to combine the MT / LXX and *Tg. Sam.* in that it includes both the idiom and the interpretation.⁶⁵ With respect to the idiom, the fact that Paul’s speech comes after David’s rise easily explains both the inclusion of David’s identity and the shift in verbs from “sought” to “found.” As such, the prepositional phrase “according to my heart” could be either adjectival or adverbial, with the Apostle merely citing the text as it stands. This stated, the descriptive relative clause that follows (ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματα μου “who will do all my will”) clearly points to David’s loyalty rather than his divine selection and may be a direct translation of the targum. This latter possibility is suggested (1) by the plural form of θέλημα, only used elsewhere in the NT in Eph 2:3, and (2) by the fact that the Aramaic form for “will, pleasure” (רעוּתָא / רעוּ) in *Targum Samuel* could be pointed either as a singular or plural (sg = רַעוּתָא “his pleasure”; pl = רַעוּתָא “his pleasures”).⁶⁶ While in no way conclusive, Paul is at least aware of the way David’s own life of loyalty and repentance contrasted with Saul’s (cf. *1 Clem* 18:1). In contrast to Benjamin J. M. Johnson’s

⁶⁵ So C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 1:636. The LXX of 1 Sam 13:14 is word for word the Hebrew: καὶ ζητήσῃ κύριος ἐατῶ ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ. Paul replaces ἄνθρωπον with ἄνδρα, perhaps reflecting that he [or Luke] cited the passage from memory.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

assumption, however, there is not enough evidence to assert that Paul followed the traditional adjectival interpretation of כלבבו in 1 Sam 13:14.⁶⁷

⁶⁷ See Johnson, “The Heart of YHWH’s Chosen One in 1 Samuel,” 455 n.1.