Who Guides Whom? Embeddedness and Perspective in Biblical Hebrew and in 1 Kings 3:16–28
Author(s): Ellen Van Wolde
Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 114, No. 4 (Winter, 1995), pp. 623-642
Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3266478
Accessed: 10/05/2013 09:12

WHO GUIDES WHOM?
EMBEDDEDNESS AND PERSPECTIVE
IN BIBLICAL HEBREW AND
IN 1 KINGS 3:16–28

ELLEN VAN WOLDE

Faculty of Theology Tilburg, 5000 HC Tilburg, The Netherlands

What makes a text an absorbing story that grips the reader? How does a narrator involve a reader in the views of the characters in a text? The definition of a text as a transformation of the initial situation toward the final situation does not explain reader involvement with the personae in the text. This can be achieved only if the significance of another crucial characteristic of narrative texts is recognized, namely, that the narrator does not tell merely *about* actions by characters or *about* situations but also looks *through* the eyes of the characters and speaks *through* their mouths. The narrator then surrenders the observation or narrative point of view to those characters in the narrative, so that characters' texts (*discourses*) that are embedded in the narrator's text (*narrative*) emerge. Through this embedding of texts in texts, the reader is being guided in a certain direction, since the information that the reader obtains is always determined by the textual perspectives or subject-oriented views of the narrator and the character. In this article a study of textual perspectives in narrative texts will be presented that is based on the linguistic markings in texts rather than on literary characteristics.[1] The use and value of these insights are shown in the story of the judgment of Solomon.

I. Embeddedness and Perspective

A text consists of sentence units or clauses, each consisting of a grammatical subject and predicate not exceeding one finite verb form.[2] A distinction can be made between the clauses in which the narrator tells about events or actions

---

[1] This linguistic approach has, therefore, to be distinguished from literary-narratological Bible research, as presented by, among others, R. Alter, M. Bal, and M. Sternberg.

[2] The text-linguistic model presented here was developed in close cooperation with José Sanders. For a more detailed description of this model, see J. Sanders, "Perspective in Narrative Discourse" (Diss., Tilburg University, 1994).

(narrative) and the clauses representing speech by a character (embedded discourses). Consider, for example, 1 Kgs 3:25:

3:25   The king said:
                Cut the living child in two
                and give half to the one
                and half to the other.

Here the clause "The king said" belongs to the narrative and the clauses "Cut . . . other" form an embedded discourse. Within the spoken text, a character may let himself/herself or another person speak. Consider 1 Kgs 3:23:

3:23   The king said:
                This says:
                        This is my son, the living one
                        and the dead one is yours.
                And this says:
                        No, the dead is your son
                        my son is the living one.

The sentences of a story may thus be arranged in a hierarchical structure of one or more embedded discourses in a narrative.

The textual perspectives, which are related to this embeddedness of textual units, can be analyzed on the basis of verbal forms.[3] The verbal forms and temporal and locative adjuncts used in a story identify the person (narrator or character) who determines the perspective by which the reader is guided. Verbal forms valuable in this case are tenses (present, past, future) and persons (first, second, or third). If the narrator is speaking, the character will be referred to in the third person and the tense of the verb will, as a rule, be placed in the past. If the embedded speaker (character) is speaking, he/she uses the first person and addresses the other characters in the second person; the standard tense is the present tense. For example, the sentence "Of his wife Sarai Abram said that she was his sister" is told by the narrator, while in Gen 12:13, "Tell them: 'You are my sister,'" the character Abram is speaking. Not only are

---

[3] Some well-known linguistic studies dealing with these aspects are the following: A. Banfield, *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction* (Boston: Routledge, 1982); D. Cohn, *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); J. Dinsmore, *Partitioned Representations* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1991); S. Ehrlich, *Point of View: A Linguistic Analysis of Literary Style* (London: Routledge, 1990); idem, "Referential Linking and the Interpretation of Tense," *Journal of Pragmatics* 14 (1990) 57–75; M. Fludernik, *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: The Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness* (London: Routledge, 1993); M. Jahn, "Contextualizing Represented Speech and Thought," *Journal of Pragmatics* 17 (1992) 347–67.

verbal tenses and personae speaker-dependent, so also are temporal and loca-
tive adjuncts. One can become aware of this by asking oneself from whose ori-
entation "here" or "there," "this" or "that," and "now" and "when" are spoken.
For instance, compare "Abraham's servant stood near the well, and he saw a
woman coming toward him" and Gen 24:15, "Abraham's servant stood near the
well, and he saw that Rebekah came out to draw water." In the first case the
story is told from the perspective of the servant ("him" and "come *toward*"); in
the second case from the narrator's, as appears from the verb "come *out*" and
the name Rebekah, known to the narrator but not to the servant. In short, the
verbal forms and temporal and spatial indications identify the textual perspec-
tive by which the reader is guided.

Not only verbal forms but also propositional contents define the textual
perspective, because the contents are represented in a way that is connected
with or holds for the person who speaks, observes, or thinks it. Take for example
Ruth 1:6:

1:6   Naomi returned from the fields of Moab,
        because she had *heard* in the country of Moab
        that YHWH had visited his people by giving them bread.

The three clauses are narrator's texts, but the third clause represents
Naomi's observation: *she* is therefore responsible for the propositional content
of this observation. The narrator does not say that YHWH is responsible for
ending the famine; nor does he say in 1:1 that YHWH was responsible for
bringing about the famine. However, Naomi apparently supposes it.[4] Con-
sequently, because different speaking instances (narrator or character) are
responsible for the forms and/or contents of the information presented, a study
of these aspects may lead to a growing awareness of the guiding strategies of
the text.

The Representation of Perspective in Narrative and Embedded Discourse

The representation of perspective in a narrator's text can take two forms.
The starting point of a narrative is that the narrator tells about the actions of
characters. The verbal forms and presentation of the contents start from the
narrator. This is a *direct narrator's text.* For example, 1 Kgs 3:16:

3:16   Then two harlots came to the king
       and stood before him.

---

[4] Thus, in my view, R. Hubbard makes a mistake in his commentary on Ruth when he states:
"This is the first report of God's direct action in the book. . . . Here his [God's] gift marks a hopeful
turning point in Naomi's tragic story" (*The Book of Ruth* [NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988]
100).

In addition to the direct narrator's text there is also an *indirect narrator's text.* Here the narrator does not directly speak from a narrator's point of view but indirectly, through the character's point of view: the character is represented as a thinking, observing, or speaking subject, but the representing is done by the narrator. For example, 1 Kgs 3:26:

3:26   [The woman,]
      Truly her heart burned with compassion for her son.

The representation of perspective in an embedded discourse differs from that of a narrator's text. In an embedded discourse, the narrator may let the reader look at actions or events through the character's awareness. This again may be presented in a direct or indirect way. In the *direct representation* of a discourse the embedded speaker is responsible for the contents, the pronoun "I" and the verbal tenses refer no longer to the narrator but to the speaking character, who is responsible for the content as well as the form of the clause. This means that the finite verbs, the possessive pronouns, and the locative and temporal adjuncts are conceived from the point of view of the speaking, observing, or thinking character. When an embedded discourse is a speaker's text, which is marked by verbs such as to speak, to tell, to say, and the like, we speak of *direct speech;* it is in fact a direct representation of a character's speech. An example of direct speech is found in 1 Kgs 3:21.

3:21   The woman said   I arose in the morning to nurse my son,
                        and look,
                        he was dead.

If an embedded discourse is of a mental or sensory nature, which is marked by verbs such as to observe or to think, we speak of *direct observation or thought;* it is in fact a direct representation of the observation of a character. Represented in direct thought, 1 Kgs 3:21 might have read:

*   The woman thought   I arise
                       and I will look for my son.

In *indirect representation,* the narrator may freely exert his/her influence on the content and form of the information that comes from the character. This can take the form of *indirect speech,* for example, "She said that she was ill," or of *indirect observation or thought,* such as "She thought that she was ill." In this indirect way of representation, the narrator lays the responsibility for the content of the speech or thought with the character, while he (or she) himself/her-

self is the speaker or observer. The verbal forms and tenses are therefore determined from the perspective of the narrator.[5]

In short, the way in which a narrator represents actions, statements, observations, or the mental awareness of himself/herself and of the characters, determines the reader's view of a text. The reader is guided to look through the eyes of the narrator or of a character, as the responsibility for the verbal forms lies now with the character, now with the narrator, and, depending on the representation, the propositional content is colored by the narrator to a greater or lesser degree. The smaller the influence of the narrator on the representation of the discourse, the more directly the reader obtains information through the eyes of the character. In sum:

Narrator's text
1. Direct narrator's text   "She was tired."
2. Indirect narrator's text   "She felt tired."

Discourse (embedded in a narrator's text)
3. Indirect representation of a discourse
    –indirect speech   "She said that she was tired."
    –indirect observation/thought "She thought that she was tired."
4. Direct representation of a discourse
    –direct speech   "She said: 'I am tired.'"
    –direct observation/thought   "She thought: 'I am tired.'"

Analysis of the Perspectives in 1 Kgs 3:16–22
(Episode I)[6]

3:16   The two harlots came for the king
       and stood before him.
3:17   The one woman said:
           Please, my lord!
           I and this woman dwell in the same house
           and I gave birth to a child while she was in the house.
3:18   On the third day after I was delivered,
           this woman also gave birth to a child.
           We were alone,

[5] In addition to direct and indirect representation, free indirect representation also occurs in modern texts.

[6] In the translation of 1 Kgs 3:16–28 the structure of the text is demonstrated to a certain extent. Thus, every sentence unit begins on a new line, the indented text units indicating embedded discourses.

there was no one else with us in the house,
just the two of us in the house.

3:19   This woman's child died in the night,
because she lay on it.

3:20   She arose in the night
and took my son from my side,
while your maidservant was asleep,
and laid him in her bosom
and laid her dead son in my bosom.

3:21   I arose in the morning to nurse my son,
and look,
he was dead.
I looked at him closely in the morning,
and look,
it was not the son I had borne.

3:22   The other woman said:
No! my son is the living one,
and your son is the dead one.
And this one said:
No! your son is the dead one
and my son is the living one.
Thus they spoke before the king.

The story in 1 Kgs 3:16–22, known as the "judgment of Solomon," begins with a direct narrator's text. The narrator introduces two women very tersely, namely, as זנות ("whores"), and lets them remain nameless during the whole story. He gives the floor to one of the women but refers to her vaguely as האשה האחת ("the one woman"). The reader does not exactly know who the one or the other woman is. The view of the "one" woman of the events is directly represented by the narrator in a spoken discourse, so that the form as well as the content of the spoken text can be attributed to her.

In this direct speech, the woman begins with a polite phrase, בי אדני ("Please, my lord!"), and immediately continues with אני: "I and this woman dwell in the same house"; "I gave birth to a child while she was in the house"; "On the third day after I was delivered, this woman also gave birth to a child." The textual perspective lies with the woman who calls herself "I" and refers to the other one three times as האשה הזאת. The word זאת is entirely dependent on the point of view of this woman and simultaneously shows us to what extent the reader is forced to look through *her* eyes. The structure of her argument is as follows:

3:17   I versus THAT WOMAN
3:18   WE alone
   3:19–20 SHE: son of that woman dies
            she lay on him
            she got up
            she took
                YOUR MAIDSERVANT was asleep
            she laid
            she laid
3:21   I arose
   see, he is dead
  I looked
   look, it was not the son
   I had borne

The events take place at night; nobody else is there. Twice the first woman uses the word "the night": that woman lay on her son in the night and in the middle of the night she exchanged the sons. This behavior of "that woman" or "she" is contrary to the conduct of the "I" in the morning: in the morning "I get up" and in the morning "I look closely." In contrast to the woman who is not careful and causes the death of her own child is the ("one") woman who gets up in the morning and does have an eye for her child.[7] The king and the readers learn about this event only through the eyes and the mouth of this woman, and they may ask themselves how it is possible that the one woman is so sure that the other woman lay on her son in the night, while she herself was firmly

---

[7] In historical-critical exegesis, the repetition of בבקר ("in the morning") gave rise to corrections; see A. Sanda, *Das Erste Buch der Könige* (Exegetische Handbuch zum AT; Münster: Aschendorff, 1911) 61–62: "Das doppelte בבקר müßte zwei zeitlich verschiedene Momente bezeichnen. Das ist innerhalb eines Satzes stilistisch hart. Darum streicht man das zweite besser"; W. Rudolph, "Zum Text der Königsbücher," *ZAW* 63 (1951) 201: "בבקר in 21b ist überflüssige Wiederholung, es ist aber nicht zu streichen, sondern בקר zu lesen"; M. Noth, *Könige 1* (BKAT; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968) 43–44: "Das doppelte בבקר in diesem Vers wirkt nicht gerade sehr elegant. . . . Eines der beiden בבקר kann freilich auch leicht als sekundärer Zusatz verstanden werden, und zwar am ehesten das erste als naheliegende Ergänzung zu ואקם"; J. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1976) 109–10: "The story is told in an effective way, with a genuine feminine strain to it; there is a certain amount of repetitiousness, which the Grr. avoided. . . . Stade would delete one or the other of the two cases of *in the morning,* but the language is that of feminine repetitiousness"; J. Gray, *I & II Kings* (3d ed.; London: SCM, 1977) 128n: "Omitting בבקר with G^b as tautological"; E. Würthwein, *Das Erste Buch der Könige: Kapitel 1–16* (ATD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977) 36n: "Streiche 'am Morgen' als Dittographie von V.21b." An analysis of the embeddedness and perspectives may therefore in this context rectify the corrections of historical-critical exegesis by showing that the contrast between the two perspectives of the two women is essentially continued where both "night" and "morning" are repeated twice.

asleep.[8] So firmly asleep that she did not even perceive that her own son was taken from her side! As a result, it is difficult for the king and for the readers to determine how reliable her account is, for we only have her side of the story. It is remarkable that exactly at the moment the weak spot in her argument becomes detectable, she switches her point of view to the king: "She took my son from my side, while *your* maidservant was asleep" (3:20). Just as in her polite opening phrase "Please, my lord," she endeavors to make the king's point of observation coincide with hers by the use of the word "your maidservant."

Thus far, the king has only seen the information as represented by her. The woman reinforces her point of view by phrasing the climax of the story in v. 21 in a way that awards a preeminent place to her own eyes: namely, she twice uses the word הנה ("look"): "look, he was dead," and "look, it was not *my* son whom *I* had borne." As a result, the king (as well as the readers, because of the narrator's direct representation) is explicitly solicited to share her observation.

The narrator then introduces "the other woman" with the words האשה האחרת (3:22a). In this way, the narrator gives an identity to neither the first nor the second woman. The only identities they have are through the embedded discourses in which they themselves speak. At that moment, however, they speak for themselves, in a way that suits their own purpose best. The second woman is considerably briefer than the first; she does not give her view of the events in the form of a story but confines herself to stating that her son is the living one. Because she is so brief, or because the narrator represents her words so briefly, it is not so easy for the readers to sympathize with her. Therefore, most readers are inclined to follow the view of the first woman: readers have been able to share her arguments and her language, and particularly her observation and awareness. The narrator immediately continues with the reaction of the other woman (3:22b). The narrator characteristically refers to the women either as האחת (3:17) and האחרת (3:22), or as זאת (3:22) and וזאת (3:26) respectively. Since the demonstrative pronouns זאת and וזאת are markers that assume the narrator himself/herself as the point of departure, and since the reader is not present at the interview, these pointers remain indeterminate. Who exactly this זאת is and who that זאת is remain obscure.

As a result of the direct representation, the reader sees directly and alternately through the eyes of both women. Because the narrator does not connect the conflicting information of the two women or give further information of his own, the reader cannot identify the women or value their statements.[9] Thus a

---

[8] This forms the basis of the interpretation by E. and G. Leibowitz in "Solomon's Judgment," *Beth Mikra* 35 (1989-1990) 242–44. They argue that King Solomon perceived this inconsistency in the woman's account, which eventually enabled him to judge correctly. However, we cannot be sure that the king actually noticed this inconsistency; the text does not mention it.

[9] In this context, M. Sternberg speaks about "gaps" in the text (*The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985] passim). What Sternberg calls gaps may refer to the many kinds of missing information in a text. Thus, he wrongly does not distinguish between gaps in

problem arises for which no solution exists.[10] The narrator confronts the reader with this dilemma on the one hand by presenting disconnected and unverifiable, perspectivized information in direct speech, and on the other hand by supplying direct narrator's texts that do not contain any clue to identification. An analysis of the successive perspectives shows that merely partial perspectives, for which one person is responsible, are offered. And this is precisely the crux of this story. Hence, the king is confronted with two assertions that are at right angles to each other without any available witnesses to reach a proper decision. In that sense the king's position is no different from that of the reader. Both the king and the reader are faced with an insoluble problem and do not have the means to come to a well-founded opinion.

II. Linguistic Markings of Embeddedness and Perspective in Biblical Hebrew

In different languages, perspectives and embedded texts can be presented in different ways. Biblical Hebrew often, but not always, parallels modern Indo-European languages.[11] One of the greatest differences, however, is that in Biblical Hebrew, the narrator's text is distinguished from an embedded discourse by certain linguistic markers. These markers consist of Hebrew verb forms as well as certain words for direct speech and direct observation.

First of all, embedded clauses and perspectives are indicated by Hebrew verb forms. Recent text-syntactic research shows that verb forms in Hebrew not only indicate tense or aspect within the clause but also fulfill certain functions within the narrative and the embedded discourses.[12] A *wayyiqtol* form

---

perspective that occur when perspective domains do not link up (as is the case here in 1 Kgs 3:17–22), syntactic gaps (or ellipses) that avoid unnecessary repetitions (for instance, in "he got up and went," instead of "he got up and he went") and semantic gaps, in which markers of meaning are missing.

[10] See S. Lasine, "The Riddle of Solomon's Judgment and the Riddle of Human Nature in the Hebrew Bible," *JSOT* 45 (1989) 61–89, esp. 61: "the story also becomes a riddle for the reader, who is challenged to identify the mothers solely on the basis of their quoted words."

[11] Up to the present time, there have been few linguistic studies on forms of perspective that are characteristic of Biblical Hebrew. M. Niehoff recently undertook a linguistic analysis of free indirect speech in early biblical texts ("Do Biblical Characters Talk to Themselves? Narrative Modes of Representing Inner Speech in Early Biblical Fiction," *JBL* 111 [1992] 577–95). In my opinion, the linguistic categories are not differentiated clearly enough in his article. Thus, he calls a discourse "free indirect discourse" but defines it as a narrator's text: "a narrative technique for rendering a character's thought in his own idiom while maintaining the third-person reference and the basic tense of the narration" and "In contrast to plain narration, free indirect discourse lacks the typical introductions by mental verbs and other indicators of authorial distance" (p. 581).

[12] In particular I refer to H. Weinrich, *Tempus: Besprochene und erzählte Welt* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1964; 4th ed. 1985); W. Schneider, *Grammatik des Biblischen Hebräisch* (Munich: Claudius Verlag, 1974; 6th ed. 1985); E. Talstra, "Text Grammar and Hebrew Bible: I, Elements of a Theory," *BO* 35 (1978) 169–74; idem, "Text Grammar and Hebrew Bible: II, Syntax and Semantics," *BO* 39 (1982) 26–38; idem, "Text Grammar and Biblical Hebrew: The Viewpoint of Wolfgang Schneider," *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 5.4 (1992) 269–97; A. Niccacci, *The Syntax*

indicates a narrative unity in which the narrating person, narrator or character, represents actions. Other types of clauses, mainly nominal clauses or verbal clauses with *qatal* forms, indicate that the narrating person (narrator or character) freezes the action and interrupts his/her narrative to give background information. (S)he then describes the circumstances that form the backdrop of the events by means of a non-*wayyiqtol* form, usually a nominal clause or a verbal clause with a *qatal* form. In an embedded discourse, the speaking of a character is represented; except when (s)he is relating an event, verbs are (mostly) in volitive forms (imperative, cohortative, or jussive) or *yiqtol* forms. On the other hand, when reporting an event, the character may freeze the action and interrupt this report to give background information. He/she then mostly uses non-*yiqtol* forms, a nominal clause or a verbal clause containing a *qatal* form. For example, 1 Kgs 3:24–26a:

וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ	3:24	The king said:
קְחוּ לִי־חָרֶב		Bring me a sword.
וַיָּבִאוּ הַחֶרֶב לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ:		They brought a sword before the king.
וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ	3:25	The king said:
גִּזְרוּ אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד הַחַי לִשְׁנָיִם		Cut the living child in two
וּתְנוּ אֶת־הַחֲצִי לְאַחַת		and give half to one
וְאֶת־הַחֲצִי לְאֶחָת:		and half to the other.

And Gen 11:2–3:

וַיְהִי בְּנָסְעָם מִקֶּדֶם	11:2	They migrated from the east
וַיִּמְצְאוּ בִקְעָה בְּאֶרֶץ שִׁנְעָר		they found a valley in the land of Shinar
וַיֵּשְׁבוּ שָׁם:		and settled there.
וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ	11:3	They said to one another
הָבָה		Come
נִלְבְּנָה לְבֵנִים		Let us make bricks
וְנִשְׂרְפָה לִשְׂרֵפָה		and let us burn them hard.
וַתְּהִי לָהֶם הַלְּבֵנָה לְאָבֶן		Brick served them as stone
וְהַחֵמָר הָיָה לָהֶם לַחֹמֶר:		and bitumen served them as mortar.

Second, in Biblical Hebrew, the embedding of direct speech in a narrative is very often marked by one word: אמר. Traditionally, direct speech in Biblical Hebrew is defined as an asyndetic, independent clause; and indirect speech as

of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose (JSOTSup 86; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1990); idem, *Lettura Sintattica della Prosa Ebraico-Biblica: Principi e Applicazioni* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1991).

a subordinate, syndetic clause containing the conjunction כִּי.[13] New linguistic research has shown that in Biblical Hebrew, the differentiation between direct and indirect speech lies not in the conjunction but in the *verbum dicendi* that is selected.[14] The verb אמר ("say"), with or without כִּי, will always introduce direct speech.[15] That the direct discourse generally requires אמר is evident from the fact that some form of אמר—especially the infinitive לֵאמֹר[16]—is required after another verb of saying, or the *wayyiqtol* of אמר is added to a previous *wayyiqtol* form of another verb of saying, e.g., 1 Kgs 3:17, 22 (וַתֹּאמֶר הָאִשָּׁה); 1 Kgs 3:27 (וַיַּעַן הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיֹּאמֶר); Gen 8:15; 17:3 (וַיְדַבֵּר . . . לֵאמֹר).[17] In the use of this marking of direct speech by means of the verb אמר, Biblical Hebrew differs from the modern Indo-European languages in which the syndetic or asyndetic connection determines the difference between direct and indirect speech ("that," "dat," "dass," "que," "che").[18] In direct speech only the character is responsible for the spoken text that follows אמר, as regards content as well as form, and the reader is directly involved in the perspective of the character. Sentences in the Hebrew Bible that start with *verba dicendi* other than אמר (נגד, ענה, and the like) or with *verba sentiendi* (ראה, שמע, זכר, and the like) indicate that it is a narrator's text and not a character's text; this is often also shown by the *wayyiqtol* forms.[19] The classical distinction between direct and indirect speech (as it exists

---

[13] GKC §157; P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Subsidia Biblica 14; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1991) §157; BDB, 471; *HALAT*, 448–49.

[14] G. Goldenberg, "On Direct Speech and the Hebrew Bible," in *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax: Festschrift J. Hoftijzer* (ed. K. Jongeling et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1991) 79–96, esp. 85–86. S. Meier's survey of all the verbs of speaking before a direct discourse (*Speaking of Speaking: Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible* [VTSup 46; Leiden: Brill, 1992] 324–37) can be read as a confirmation of Goldenberg's position. G. Fischer inventories the introductions of direct speech in the Pentateuch in *Jahwe unser Gott: Sprache, Aufbau und Erzähltechnik in der Berufung des Mose (Ex 3–4)* (OBO 91; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989) 40–42, and this inventory confirms Goldenberg's theory as well.

[15] But the reverse is not true. In some Hebrew texts direct discourses occur without the introductory אמר, e.g., 2 Kgs 1:3; Gen 32:31; 41:51, 52.

[16] See GKC §114o: n. 1 (p. 351): "לֵאמֹר is very often so used after וידבר in the Priestly document (Gn 8¹⁵, 17³, &c., and in numberless times in the legal parts of Exod., Lev., and Num.)—a pleonasm which is not surprising considering the admittedly prolix and formal style of the document."

[17] There are, however, elliptical texts in which the verb אמר is assumed. An example is Exod 16:28–29, in which the direct speech of YHWH is followed by a direct speech by Moses without any indication to that effect. Here a clause such as ויאמר משה is missing. In such a case the change from the first person ("my commandments") to the third person (he, YHWH) shows that the speaking person has changed.

[18] In modern Bible translations, Hebrew direct speech is often translated as indirect speech. See, e.g., Gen 12:13: אמרי־נא אחתי את and the JPS translation: "Please say that you are my sister."

[19] Goldenberg, who very convincingly described אמר as a marker for direct speech in Biblical Hebrew, wrongly failed to abandon the classical distinction between direct and indirect speech (as it exists in the Indo-European languages) for Biblical Hebrew. If he had done so, it would have become clear that clauses introduced by *verba dicendi* other than אמר or by *verba sentiendi*, do not in fact introduce indirect speeches, but belong to the (indirect) narrator's texts. This is demon-

in Indo-European languages) must therefore be abandoned in Biblical Hebrew. In the Hebrew Bible there are two possibilities that the narrator may employ to let the reader share the awareness of a character: the reader may either directly join in the reading through the words and the eyes of the character by means of an embedded direct speech (introduced by אמר) or may be indirectly involved in the words and the awareness of the character by means of a narrator's text.

In addition to embedded direct speech, Biblical Hebrew also has embedded direct observation. Just like direct speech, it is linguistically marked by one word, namely, (ו)הנה. Recent linguistic research shows that (ו)הנה is an independent clause with the imperative meaning: "(and) see"; the clause that follows (ו)הנה is the object of seeing as observed from the position of the character.[20] The word הנה therefore introduces a character's point of view and presents the observed action or event as an object clause, that is, as perspectivized information that is related to the speaking and observing person.[21]

For example, 1 Kgs 3:21:

[וַתֹּאמֶר]	[She said]
וָאָקֻם בַּבֹּקֶר לְהֵינִיק אֶת־בְּנִי	I arose in the morning to nurse my son,
וְהִנֵּה־מֵת	and look, he was dead.

Or Gen 24:13:

[וַיֹּאמַר]	[He said]
הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי נִצָּב עַל־עֵין הַמָּיִם	I stand by the spring
וּבְנוֹת אַנְשֵׁי הָעִיר יֹצְאֹת	and the daughters of the town come out
לִשְׁאֹב מָיִם׃	to draw water.

The word הנה enables Biblical Hebrew to represent a direct observation in a narrative text in a more perspectivized way than is possible in, for example, English narrative texts. In addition, it is possible in Biblical Hebrew to represent an indirect observation as an indirect narrator's text, rather than as an indi-

---

strated by the *wayyiqtol* forms in the examples of indirect discourses mentioned by Goldenberg (for instance in his n. 17).

[20] S. Kogut, "On the Meaning and Syntactical Status of הנה in Biblical Hebrew," in *Studies in Bible 1986* (ed. S. Japhet; ScrHier 31; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986) 133–54.

[21] A. Berlin has discussed (ו)הנה mainly in a literary-narratological sense (*Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* [Sheffield: Almond, 1983] 62–63, 91–95). She calls it a word "which is known to sometimes mark the perception of a character as distinct from that of the narrator" (p. 62). S. Kogut described (ו)הנה from a linguistic point of view and studied the syntactic function of (ו)הנה ("הנה"). These two approaches may easily be combined in the text-linguistic explanation of (ו)הנה presented here, as a linguistic marking of a direct representation of an observation by a character: as an observation it is connected to the observing subject (see Berlin), and the observed action or event is represented as an object clause (see Kogut).

rect character's text. Thus, the reader is less involved in the observation of the character.

Apart from these features (verb forms, הנה, אמר), which linguistically mark embedded discourses or character's texts, Biblical Hebrew also possesses specific markers for narrator's texts. In the first place there is the use of the word כי before a *verbum sentiendi* (to observe, to see, to hear, to think, and the like). The word כי, which has a demonstrative[22] and emphatic[23] function and therefore refers to or emphasizes something, is essentially a particle that points ahead to something that is about to happen and deserves attention.[24] This כי functions in many literary contexts and therefore possesses many shades of meaning.[25] Thus, כי has a strong emphatic meaning when it immediately precedes a predicate, an oath, or an assurance and suchlike.[26] This כי also functions in an indirect narrator's text, that is, in a text in which the narrator depicts the mental awareness of a character, as a marker of the emphasis the narrator places on the mental or sensory awareness of the character.[27] Because of כי's emphatic function, it must be translated as "truly," "assuredly," "verily," or another form of emphasis (and not causally as "so that," "because," "since"), e.g., 1 Kgs 3:28:

כִּי רָאוּ כִּי־חָכְמַת אֱלֹהִים	Truly they saw that the wisdom of God
בְּקִרְבּוֹ לַעֲשׂוֹת מִשְׁפָּט:	was in him to execute justice.

[22] W. Gesenius and F. Buhl, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1915) s.v.: "die Ursprüngl. demonstr. Bed."; T. Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 158–64, esp. 160: "I shall attempt to demonstrate that our particle has demonstrative force, not only as its original etymologically deducible function, but also as one of its basic uses in Old Testament Hebrew alongside its later varied specialisations" and p. 164: "this demonstrative function is the source of its occasional asseverative-emphatic use."

[23] KB, 431; J. Muilenburg, "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle כי in the Old Testament," *HUCA* 32 (1961) 135–60, esp. 136: "All the lexicons point to its demonstrative character. It is designed to give emphasis, to give force to a statement. . . . This is confirmed by the fact that it frequently falls outside the pattern of the Hebrew meter; it is thus given special stress by standing metrically isolated while still giving force to the colon which follows"; A. Schoors, "The Particle כי," in *Remembering All the Way* . . . (ed. A. S. van der Woude; OTS 21; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 240–76, esp. 242–43.

[24] Muilenburg, "Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages," 136: "it points or shows the way forward"; B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990) 657: "The particle כי is a clausal adverb, emphasizing the clause it introduces. Traditionally כי is considered a conjunction (cf. 'for'), but we consider it rather to be an emphatic adverb (cf. 'indeed')."

[25] W. T. Claassen, "Speaker Oriented Functions of kî in Biblical Hebrew," *JNSL* 11 (1983) 29–45; A. Aejmelaeus, "Function and Interpretation of כי in Biblical Hebrew," *JBL* 105 (1986) 193–209.

[26] Muraoka, *Emphatic Words,* 164.

[27] This does not concern the word כי preceded by a mental verb, but the כי that immediately precedes a verb of observation or mental awareness.

Similar to הנה, כי is followed by an object clause that is related to the obser-
vation or the awareness—and thus the perspective—of the character. By pre-
senting the character's awareness in this explicit form, the narrator reveals
greater involvement in this awareness than in the case of an indirect narrator's
text without כי. In this way he also increases the reader's involvement with the
observed or mental object. Thus, Biblical Hebrew appears to possess a unique,
intermediate form to bridge the gap between direct representation and narra-
tor's text. One could perhaps claim that Biblical Hebrew uses the word כי to try
to express what modern Indo-European languages indicate by means of indi-
rect speech or observation ("She thought/said that she was tired"). Precisely
because Biblical Hebrew cannot have indirect representation of a speech
or observation by a character, this language indicates this either through direct
representation ("She said: 'I am tired'") or through an indirect narrator's
text ("She felt tired").[28] At any rate, in Biblical Hebrew there is a difference
between an indirect narrator's text without כי before a predicate in which
the narrator introduces a character's awareness without any emphasis, and an
indirect narrator's text with כי before a predicate (a verb of observation or
awareness) in which the narrator creates an optimal reader involvement in a
character's awareness.

Analysis of 1 Kgs 3:23–28
(Episode 2)

3:23   The king said:
                This one says:
                        This is my son, the living one
                        and the dead one is yours.
                And this one says:
                        No, the dead one is your son
                        my son is the living one.
3:24   The king said:
                Bring me a sword.
        They brought a sword before the king.
3:25   The king said:
                Cut the living child in two
                and give half to one
                and half to the other.
3:26   The woman
        whose son was the living one,
        said to the king,

---

[28] Of the four categories (1) direct narrator's text, (2) indirect narrator's text, (3) indirect rep-
resentation of a discourse, and (4) direct representation of a discourse, group 3 is not found in Bib-
lical Hebrew.

truly her heart was moved with compassion for her son
she said:
> Please, my lord!
> Give her the living child,
> only do not put it to death!

And this one said:
> It shall be neither mine nor yours,
> cut!

3:27 The king answered
and said:
> Give her the living child
> and do not put it to death,
> she is his mother.

3:28 All Israelites heard of the judgment,
that the king had rendered,
they stood in awe of the king.
Truly they saw that the wisdom of God was in him to execute justice.

As we have seen, the first episode of the story of King Solomon and the two whores ends with an insoluble situation which the two whores place before the king, and which the narrator places before the reader. In the second episode the king takes over the initiative. First he summarizes the dilemma: "This one says: 'This is my son, the living one and your son is the dead one.' And this one says: 'No, he isn't! Your son is the dead one and my son is the living one'" (3:23). The king does not recapitulate the view of either of the women, except their last assertions, which contradict each other. The fact mentioned explicitly by the first woman in v. 18, that nobody was in the house except the two women, becomes all the more important. Also, the fact that the two women are whores is not to their advantage. The decision that the king takes is simple: "Bring me a sword!" And they bring the king a sword. Then three staccato commands quickly succeed each other: "Cut the living child in two," "Give one half to the one" and "[Give] one half to the other." The king does not in any way reveal that he is troubled by the problem. He does not ask for time for reflection but acts instantly. The narrator does not make it easy for the reader to sympathize with the king, for he does not mention any considerations or motives, not even a purpose. The readers must content themselves with the words of the king. In his first order, the king speaks about himself in the first person: "bring *me* a sword" and clearly centralizes himself as the point of reference. Furthermore, the rest of his speech, summarized in "sword," "cut," and "give one half to each" does not evoke an agreeable picture, which is reinforced by the fact that neither the narrator nor the king gives any motivation for these orders.[29]

___
[29] The reader of 1 Kings knows Solomon only through his first acts as king in 1 Kgs 2:1–46,

Moreover, the king speaks not about "the child" but about "the living child," making it clear that he orders the living child to be cut in two. Those who do not know the ending of the story must think this a very cruel decision, for half a child is no child.

Fortunately the story does not end with the king's decision. There is a turning point in the story at the moment that the narrator for the first time identifies one of the two women as "the mother of the living child" (v. 26a) in a direct narrator's text. The readers do not yet know whether the first or the second woman is this mother, and they never will.[30] The narrator describes her as "the woman, whose son was the living one." He goes one step further when he says in an indirect narrator's text (v. 26b):

כִּי־נִכְמְרוּ רַחֲמֶיהָ עַל־בְּנָהּ   truly her heart was moved with
                                                             compassion for her son

The effect of this indirect narrator's text is that the reader is maximally involved in the mother's experience. Moreover, the words used by the narrator reinforce the heavy emotional intensity of her feelings: the Hebrew word רחמיה, here translated as "heart," is a plural form of "womb";[31] and the word נכמרו, rendered as "was moved," also means "burned," "be ablaze." The reader is drawn into this intense feeling. Had v. 26b been in direct speech, the reader would merely have been informed of the observation or the awareness of the persona and the narrator would not have been responsible. Now that this verse is an indirect narrator's text for which the narrator is responsible, the character-oriented emotions are supported by the narrator. The emphatic כי ("truly," "verily") in fact confirms that the narrator presents the character's awareness in a way that rouses identification. In this emphatic indirect narrator's text, the narrator expresses his identification with the woman who proves to be the mother and calls up the reader to share his/her appreciation of this woman and to experience her feeling and awareness.

The breakthrough in the deadlock basically occurs in three steps. The first step is brought about by the narrator through a direct narrator's text in which he identifies one of the women as "the woman whose son was the living one." He

---

where he rules by the sword. In 1 Kings 3 Solomon has asked God for wisdom in words (not in acts) and was promised gratification of his wish. This is his first appearance after that event.

[30] Still, most readers will be inclined simply to identify the first speaking woman as the mother of the living child. The reason for this may be in the translation: RSV and NEB have translated 3:27 as "give the child to the first woman," instead of the Hebrew "give her the child."

[31] P. Trible describes the connection between רחם ("womb") and the plural רחמים as follows: "In its singular form the noun רחם means 'womb' or 'uterus.' In the plural, רחמים, this concrete meaning expands to the abstraction of compassion, mercy and love. Further, these abstractions occur in a verb, רחם, 'to show mercy,' and in an adjective, רחם, 'merciful.' Accordingly, our metaphor lies in the semantic movement from a physical organ of the female body to a psychic mode of being. It journeys from the concrete to the abstract. 'Womb' is the vehicle; 'compassion,' the tenor" (*God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* [OBT; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978] 33).

introduces the second step by an indirect narrator's text in which, through the use of the emphatic word כִּי, he highlights the description of the character's mental awareness and summons the reader to share the "inner" feelings of this woman. The third step is initiated by the narrator through a direct representation of the discourse, the woman-mother's direct speech: "she said: 'please, my lord, give her the living child, only do not kill it.'" Her choice is for the living child. In order to stress the life-giving aspect, she no longer calls the child יֶלֶד, the child, but יָלוּד, the borne one. She no longer stands up for herself and does not fight the other woman ("that woman") any more. In allowing her heart to speak, the woman who is the mother breaks through the deadlock in a situation that until then was insoluble.[32] The other woman (whom the narrator again calls "this one," who is not identified and with whom it is impossible for the reader to develop a tie) denies this and says: "the child shall be neither yours nor mine, cut." Still, this is an odd reaction, since the first woman (the real mother) has just yielded her child![33] Apparently she wants the child of another to suffer the same fate as her own dead child. Her order "cut," although she has just been given the child, proves that she cannot be the mother.[34]

The king reacts instantly. He literally repeats the two sentences that the mother has just spoken: "give her the living child" and "by no means kill it." His speech echoes the words of the true mother. Like the mother, he no longer calls the child יֶלֶד, but יָלוּד, the borne one, and thus acknowledges this child's right to live: in no way may it be killed. For the first time he alludes to the woman who chooses for her son not by means of the demonstrative pronoun "this one" or "the one," but refers to her with the personal pronoun "she," *and* he calls her "mother." He likewise acknowledges the child's own identity, when he describes the mother as "his" mother. The possessive pronoun indeed indicates that the king sees from the child's perspective. And a short time ago, just before the mother responded, he had ordered that the living child be cut in two! The king therefore appears to have changed his orders on the basis of the feelings and words of the mother. He abandons his first plan. The narrator guides the readers through v. 26 (the direct narrator's text, the indirect narrator's text with כִּי and the direct speech) as well as through v. 27 (in which the narrator lets the

---

[32] W. Beuken, "No Wise King without a Wise Woman (1 Kings III 16–28)," in *New Avenues in the Study of the Old Testament* (ed. A. S. van der Woude; OTS 25; Leiden: Brill, 1989) 1–10.

[33] On the basis of this element, H. C. Brichto comes to the conclusion that juridically this is a case of stealing a person or kidnapping (*Toward a Grammar of Biblical Poetics: Tales of Prophets* [Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1992] 47–54, esp. 50–51).

[34] G. E. Mendenhall, however, is of the opinion that the exclamation of the second mother in v. 26b could likewise characterize the true mother: "she would rather see her child killed than give him up to an unscrupulous bitch" ("The Shady Side of Wisdom: The Date and Purpose of Genesis 3," in *A Light unto my Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers* [ed. H.N. Bream et al.; Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974] 324). The problem with this view is that in v. 26a, the narrator himself/herself has already identified the mother of the living child.

king echo the woman's words) toward a positive appreciation of the king's changed judgment. They cannot but draw the conclusion that in his second assessment of the situation, the king judges truly.[35]

In v. 28, the Israelites react positively to the king's decision.

וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ כָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַמִּשְׁפָּט	3:28a	All Israelites heard of the judgment
אֲשֶׁר שָׁפַט הַמֶּלֶךְ	3:28b	that the king had rendered,
וַיִּרְאוּ מִפְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ	3:28c	they stood in awe of the king.
כִּי רָאוּ	3:28d	Truly they saw
כִּי־חָכְמַת אֱלֹהִים בְּקִרְבּוֹ	8:28e	that the wisdom of God was in him
לַעֲשׂוֹת מִשְׁפָּט:		to execute justice.

This verse consists of three indirect narrator's texts, a-b, c, and d-e (which appears from the two *wayyiqtol* forms), that must be attributed to the narrator in terms of form; the Israelites are responsible for the content. In v. 28d, the indirect narrator's text with the emphatic כִּי, the narrator distinctly chooses the side of the Israelites. Thus, the narrator summons the readers to share the Israelites' view. As with the indirect narrator's text with כִּי in v. 26, where the readers were invited to join the inner feelings of the mother and to appreciate them, so by the indirect narrator's text with כִּי in v. 28 they are invited to join the mental awareness of Israel and to value that positively. Since both verses are in close proximity to one another and display great similarity as regards phrasing and perspective, it seems likely that the narrator wishes to show that there is a correspondence between both appraisals.

The story of Solomon's judgment has of old been read as an instance of smartness or strategy on Solomon's part. Recent exegeses of 1 Kgs 3:16–28 also stress Solomon's wisdom as the critical factor in this story, with the happy exception of one single exegete, W. Beuken.[36] Other interpretations speak highly of Solomon's wisdom because he was able to spot the inconsistency in the argument of the first woman;[37] focus entirely on the contribution of divine inspiration that engenders Solomon's discernment;[38] discern the explanation of the story in the juridical conditions;[39] or suggest that with the aid of divine wisdom, Solomon can surmount human cognitive limitations (and therefore also

---

[35] Sternberg gives an interesting analysis of the points of view in 1 Kgs 3:16–28, even though at an early stage he seems to have taken sides against the two whores and with the king, and above all with the king's divine inspiration (*Poetics,* chapter 5, "The Play of Perspectives," esp. 167–70): "[The story] challenges us to match wits with Solomon and, indirectly, with his heavenly source of inspiration" (p. 167). From this point, everything that Solomon does becomes strategic action inspired by God's wisdom.

[36] Beuken, "No Wise King," 1–6.

[37] E. and G. Leibowitz, "Solomon's Judgment," 242–44.

[38] Sternberg, *Poetics,* 168–69.

[39] Brichto, *Grammar,* 50–51.

false evidence).[40] Hardly any exegete perceives the narrator's guiding in this text through which the reader is irresistibly involved in the feelings of the mother. The reader is able to value the king's final judgment positively, since the narrator has prompted him or her to accept it as true and beneficial. Hence, this analysis of perspective leads to the conclusion that evaluation of the story has unfairly focused on Solomon's double decision. Rather, the linguistic markers show that the turning point in the story is brought about by the woman. The narrator shows that both the woman, through her love and her readiness to renounce her perspective, and the king, through his ability to listen and his readiness to renounce his perspective, have proved themselves wise. However, only the king is rewarded for his wisdom, and he is praised for his wisdom by the people and by history.

III. Conclusion: Who Guides Whom?

Writers write texts and are naturally not always aware of all these forms of direct and indirect representation, just as someone who is speaking is unaware that he/she uses a particular grammar or builds certain structures of meaning. In that sense there is a great discrepancy between the activity and the awareness of an author and those of a linguist, exegete, or text analyst. Through the study of the textual perspectives in a text, an exegete and reader may give meaning to a text in a more conscious and responsible way, by allowing himself/herself to be guided by the linguistic markers of that text in the attribution of meaning. Embeddedness and perspective belong to these linguistic markers: they are the subject-oriented points of view by means of which the narrator provides the information. Without perspective, there is no view that a reader may share or reject; without embeddedness a narrator cannot let the characters speak.

In order to explore these perspectives more systematically, a method has been presented to study the extent to which a narrator or a character determines his or her view of the information. To that end each clause of the text is analyzed as direct or indirect narrator's text or as directly represented discourse. The embedded clauses as well as the extent to which the character is involved in the embedded discourses and observations may be studied on the basis of the verb forms that occur in the narrative or in the discourse and in the foreground or background clauses. In Biblical Hebrew this is supported by the use of particular words. The word אמר marks an embedded discourse in a narrative; in that embedded discourse, the reader may be directly involved in the observation of the persona by the use of הנה(ו). Within the narrator's text the narrator uses the word כי to support the observation or thoughts of the character, which function as a tool to create a maximum involvement of the reader.

---

[40] Lasine, "Riddle," 61ff.

The question in the title of this article, Who guides whom?, can therefore best be answered at different linguistic and textual levels. At the level of the characters in 1 Kgs 3:16–28, the king is guided in his final decision by the attitude of the woman who turns out to be the mother, and is himself the guide who inspires the Israelites. Perhaps he is valued precisely because he is a leader who allows himself to be led by the considerations of others. At the story level, the narrator, through indirect narrator's texts with כִּי, persuades the reader to identify the real mother and to judge the king's final decision positively. At the language level, the narrator is steered by the Hebrew language system, which offers particular possibilities (direct and indirect narrator's text, and direct representation of speech and observation by characters) and denies others (indirect speech, free indirect speech). Thus, every participant in the process of textual communication appears to be a guide as well as to be guided. This also holds for the reader, who is guided by the Hebrew language system, by the narrator, and by the language markers to build up a particular textual interpretation and to feel drawn to certain points of view in the text. On the other hand, however, the reader also retains his/her own freedom, generated among other things by the Hebrew language system, which identifies certain things and conceals others, and by the text itself, which, through its intrinsic syntagmatic relations, leaves the reader a fundamental freedom of interpretation. Therefore, a reader who belongs to Israel may on the basis of the last verse in 1 Kgs 3:16–28 agree with the speakers and praise only the king. Or readers may be so stirred by the word God in v. 28 that they spontaneously range themselves on the side of the wisdom of God. Language and text, narrator and characters guide, but the reader has the freedom to set out with or without a guide.