by David's family, and by H. J. Stroebè (VT 6, p. 403; cf KAT VIII 1, p. 324) who would prefer to write off the whole passage as secondary, partly because it is not included in the LXX, partly because it makes no sense in view of the fact that David belonged to the free landowners. This last argument is irrelevant, however, since naturally Saul could not know beforehand who was going to accept his offer. Nor would it offer any solution to look upon Saul's pledge to grant tax exemption as insignificant, because David's family as Judaeans could not be tributaries of the Israelite king. In this connection I think it most probable that no political union existed between Israel and Judah before David became king of both countries, (Mowinckel, BZAW 77, pp. 137 ff., and de Vaux, Histoire ancienne, pp. 50 ff.).

Another way of understanding v. 25 is a closer definition of the word שֹבֵן. I shall elsewhere (in another article) try to prove that in Ex. xxii 2 שֹבֵן should be interpreted in the light of the source material on the hupsu from the Near Orient. Only the conclusions will be listed here:

הֻּפְסָע/שֹבֵן were a class of clients in the city state and were supported by this either by an allocation of plots for cultivation or by supplies of provisions from the royal stores. To me it seems absolutely relevant to take this understanding of the הֻּפְסָע/שֹבֵן in consideration when trying to penetrate into what Saul actually did mean by promising some persons a status as שֹבֵן. Probably there is no question of a tax exemption or the like (a typically modern thought), but rather of an offer to grant supplies from the royal household. It is wellknown from 1 Sam. xxii 7 that Saul had the means to support a private guard of mercenaries, and it may be deducted from this that he also had the means to attract influential families as his clients. In this particular case the intention may have been to procure adherents in Judaean circles just as later-on David bought himself support from leading Judaeans.
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AN OBSERVATION ON SOURCE-CRITICISM OF THE PLAGUEPERICOPE (Ex. vii-xi).

The composite character of the pericope of the ten plagues in Exodus is generally recognized. More involved is the question, if we are in a position to solve this problem by the relatively simple expedient of source criticism, which divides the text into two or three sour-
ces, welded together by a redactor, or whether the complicated prehistory of the pericope precludes attempts of this kind. It is the latter thesis which the present writer defended in a detailed analysis 1).

The aim of this paper is restricted to the scrutiny of one central aspect of source-criticism, i.e. the widely held view that we may single out one source which narrated seven plagues, viz. the plagues of blood, frogs, swarms of insects, pestilence of livestock, hail, locusts and the smiting of the firstborn. This theory, elaborated in the framework of general source-criticism of the Tetrateuch, ascribes the above component of the plague-history to J or JE. Some defenders of this analysis find a confirmation of their view in Ps. lxxviii 44-51 and assert the close affinity of this passage to the source J 2). In a recent paper M. Greenberg 3) took up the source-problem again, but refrained from any reference to Ps. lxxviii and even abandoned the general categories of source-criticism. It is apparently for this reason that he speaks of the source A, where his predecessors spoke of J or JE. This difference in terminology, however, does not involve any principal difference in approach, at least not as far as the analysis of the plague-pericope is concerned. For the sake of simplicity we shall speak in the following of source J.

In J the smiting of the firstborn is immediately preceded by the plague of the locusts. As pointed out by Greenberg, this analysis is borne out by Pharaoh's address to Moses during the plague of the locusts (Ex. x 16-17) which leaves us with the impression that we are confronted with the last but one plague. That is to say that Pharaoh's speech is not appropriate in the present text, where the plague of locusts occupies the place of the eighth among ten plagues. The emphasis laid by Pharaoh on the plague of locusts makes however perfect sense on the supposition, that the description of this plague derives from a version in which that plague figured as the sixth plague of seven, i.e. immediately came before the smiting of the firstborn.