reason correctly from all the evidence, on the basis of axioms that seem (and one hopes will also seem to one's fellow-critics) to be satisfactory.

One other omission in my book has been called to my attention by Daniel Bryant. Page 60 should continue as follows: "The second variation below does not lock D, only C and E; the third variation locks D with respect to E; the fourth variation locks it with respect to C:

A B C D E F G
A B C D E F G
A B C D E F G
A B C D E F G"

On p. 61, the first complete paragraph should continue as follows: "If a group will not line up, but does not contain at least two members that have different partners in one of the variations making the locked sequence, the group is to be ignored. In the following example the failure of the group FG to line up is to be ignored; but the failure of the group AC to line up is significant:

A B C D E F G H
A B C D E F G H
C A B D E H F G"

The information is conveyed in different words on pp. 63 and 93-5, but the reader should not have to backtrack.

Los Angeles

Vinton A. Dearing

A REPLY TO G. GERLEMAN ON MALKÊ HESED IN 1 KINGS XX 31

In his article, "Das übervolle Mass. Ein Versuch mit ḫaesaed", VT 28 (1978), pp.151-64, G. Gerleman argues for a drastically new translation for the familiar word-pair sedeq-hesed. While the first expresses fullness, rightness, and sufficiency ("volle Mass"), the second expresses superabundant zeal, excess, and enthusiasm (übervolle Mass"). One of the evident consequences of this interpretation is that the derivative ḫāṣid must express extreme piety or even fanaticism, rather than fidelity to an ancient covenantal norm, as commonly understood.

Vetus Testamentum, Vol. XXIX, Fasc. 3
One shudders to think of the shock-waves that will reverberate in the scholarly world if Gerleman proves to be right. What will now have to be done, for instance, with the classic formulation in Mic. vi 8, where “man” is informed that he already knows what God requires of him? If ʿahəbat hesed means fanatical zeal or the like, how is this commensurate with whatever is meant by baṣnēa’ leket ʿim ʾelōḥēkā? As a matter of fact, has not extreme religiosity been expressly rejected in what God says he does not require (vv. 6-7)?

No doubt Gerleman’s challenge will provoke extended discussion. He will be criticized for imposing his new meaning on many passages, rather than demonstrating it from them. The present note endeavors only to make a correction respecting the crucial passage, 1 Kings xx 31, where Gerleman translates malkē hesed as “extravagant kings” in place of the usual “merciful kings” (pp. 157f.). Two considerations make this occurrence especially important: (1) the phrase in question is placed in the mouths of foreigners with reference to Israelites, one of whom comes in for stern censure because he apparently lives up to this description; and (2) this passage is relatively early and is isolated from the normative (Judahite) stream of biblical tradition.

In my book, Prophet Against Prophet (Grand Rapids, 1978), I have analysed the genre and setting of the prophet narrative, 1 Kings xx 30b-43a, dating it to the time of Joram/Jehu. It has a tightly drawn structure in which nothing is coincidental or without design. It has two scenes. That of vv. 30-34 narrates how an Israelite king’s opportunity for ending the Aramean menace is transformed by his own saying into a perilous compromise, opening the way to eventual calamity. Following the introductory expositions (30b), there are three functional sub-elements: (1) consultation on a strategy that will save Ben-hadad’s life, v. 31; (2) the interview with the Israelite king, vv. 32-33a; and (3) negotiation of a treaty, vv. 33b-34. Each action is interpreted in discourse; and since sub-elements 2 and 3 are thematically co-ordinate, we should expect sub-element 1 to be functionally anticipatory and to have the purpose of establishing this same theme. That is to say, the Israelite king’s identification of Ben-hadad, ‘āḥi hū’, replacing the properly deferential ʿabḏekā ben-ḥodād, expresses his desire to negotiate with the Syrian on equal terms. It also suggests a bond of mutual obligation that already exists or may be created between them. Hence the berit and the release that conclude the scene. Ben-hadad’s servants