

## 1-2 Samuel: Jonathan and other men and women who loved David

1-2 Samuel pertains to the → Deuteronomist History (DH, along with → Joshua, Judges and Kings), first published during the reform of Josiah (640-09), with a second edition during the period of exile (560). However, although 1-2 Samuel is the third volume of the DH, the theology of → Deuteronomy and the influence of the Deuteronomist compiler are less evident in Samuel than in the other books<sup>i</sup>. A series of perspectives and questions arise, and they are the prevailing factor in many chapters—particularly the question raised by the prophet Nathan shortly before the death of David:

”Who should sit on the throne of the king (David) after him?” (1 Kings 1:27).

Since the the publication of German scholar Leonhard Rost’s study *The Succession to the Throne of David*<sup>ii</sup>, it has been admitted that this is the dominant question in **2 Sam 9-20 and 1 Kings 1-2**, since various candidates for the succession emerge in the course of these chapters, and, one by one, they are eliminated<sup>iii</sup> (see the outline below):

- **Mephib’osheth** (crippled in the feet), son of Jonathan, 2 Sam 9:1-13 (see 1 Chron 8:34-40; 9:40-44).
- Death of the first son of Bathsheba and David, and birth of **Solomon**, 2 Sam 12:15b-25
- **Story of Absalom, 2 Sam 13-20:**
- **Amnon** rapes his sister Tamar, sister of Solomon, 2 Sam 13:1-22
- **Absalom** arranges for the murder of **Amnon** and flees, 2 Sam 13:23-39
- Defeat and death of **Absalom**, 2 Sam 18:1-18

As Rost pointed out, the question made explicit in 1 Kings 1:27 is given a final, immediate answer—”Solomon!” (1 Kings 1:28-30).

### **SOLOMON is successor to David, 1 Kings 1-2:**

**Intrigues of Adonijah: he competes for the throne with Solomon, 1**  
Solomon consolidates the kingdom; deaths of David, **Adonijah** and Shimei, 2]

Randall Bailey<sup>iv</sup> and Serge Frolov<sup>v</sup> point out some challenges to Rost’s hypothesis concerning a source that develops the subject of the succession to David’s throne, but the hypothesis is still supported by the majority of Biblical scholars.

Following Martin Noth’s conclusion on the Deuteronomist History (Joshua-Judges-Samuel-Kings), David Jobling<sup>vi</sup> points out that the theological summaries in the DH suggest other divisions, since there is one in Judges 2:11-23, another one in 1 Sam 12 and yet another one in 2 Sam 7. Apart from these summaries location in the text, the last of the ”judges” is not Samson (Judges 13-16) but Samuel (1 Sam 1-12, esp. 7:15-17). Thus, we should make out an Extended Book of Judges (Judges 2:11- 1 Sam 12), followed by ”The Book of the Eternal Covenant” [with David]” (1 Sam 13-2 Sam 7). The theological implications are radical, since the book of Judges traditionally ends with very negative chapters (Judges 17-21, see esp. 21:25), whereas the acknowledgment of Samuel as the last Judge and the ending of the Extended Book of Judges in 1 Sam 12 implies a basically positive evaluation of the Judges, but a negative one of the

subsequent monarchy. Furthermore, this permits us to see that Hannah is, first and foremost, the mother of the last judge (Samuel), a just leader (cf. the coming King, 1 Sam 2:10).

### **Outline: 1 Samuel**

#### **Samuel: birth, infancy, vocation, 1- 3**

Elkanah, Penninah and Hannah: the birth and christening of Samuel (a Nazarene?), 1:1-28

Song of Hannah (→ Luke 1:45-55, Mary), 2:1-11

Samuel at Shiloh; the impious sons of Eli and their punishment, 2:12-36

Samuel's vocation as a prophet, 3:1-21

#### **The ark of Yahweh among the Philistines, 4- 7**

Defeat of the Israelites and capture of the ark, 4:1-11

Death of the priest Eli and of his daughter-in-law (the wife of Phinehas), 4:12-22

The troubles suffered by the Philistines with the ark, 5:1-12

The Philistines return the ark: the ark in Bethshemesh; in Kiriath-jearim, 6:1-21

Samuel, judge and liberator, 7:1-17

#### **Samuel and Saul: The establishment of monarchy, 8- 15**

The people ask for a king: Samuel denounces the proposal of a monarchy, 8:1-22

Saul looks for his father's asses and meets Samuel, 9:1-24

Samuel anoints Saul as king, 9:25-10:8

Saul prophesizes with the prophets, returns home, chosen as king by lot, 10:9-27

Saul triumphs over the Ammonites, he is proclaimed king, 11:1-15

Samuel, prophet and judge, steps down, warning against monarchy, 12:1-25

Preparation of war against the Philistines: the break between Samuel and Saul, 13:1-23

Jonathan attacks the Philistines, disobeying a prohibition of Saul; he is rescued by the people, 14:1-52

War against the Amalekites; Yahweh rejects Saul; Samuel hews Agag in pieces, 15:1-35

#### **Saul, David and Jonathan, 16- 31 (→ + 2 Samuel 1)**

Samuel anoints David (**handsome, 16:12**); David (**beloved, 16:21**) enters the service of Saul, 16:1-23

David (**very handsome, 17:42**) kills the giant Goliath with a sling, 17:1-58

**Jonathan falls in love with David, they make a pact (18:1-4)**; Saul jealous, 18:1-16

Saul offers a daughter, David brings 200 Philistine foreskins, he marries Michal, 18:17-30

**David loved by Jonathan (19:1)**, saved by Michal; Saul, jealous, strips off his clothes, 19:1-24

**Jonathan** helps Daniel to escape (**Saul, 20:30; pact, vv. 40-42**), 20:1-42

David with Ahimelech, priest of Nob (they eat holy breads); he flees to Gath, 21:1-15

David forms a guerilla unit; Saul murders the priests of Nob, 22:1-23

David in Keilah, escapes from Saul (**pact with Jonathan, 23:17-18**), 23:1-28

David forgives Saul (I); 24:1-22

Death of Samuel; David marries Abigail, widow of Nabal, 25:1-44

David forgives Saul (II), 26:1-25

David takes refuge in Gath, he becomes a vassal of Achish the Philistine, 27:1-12

War against the Philistines: Saul consults the medium of Endor, 28:1-25  
The chiefs of the Philistines dismiss David from their service, 29:1-11  
David and his men fight a campaign against the Amalekites, 30:1-31  
Defeat in the battle of Gilboa; death of Saul and of his three sons, 31:1-13  
→ **2 Samuel 1**: David learns of Saul's and Jonathan's death, 1:1-16  
Elegy of David for Saul and for *Jonathan* (his "best love", **1:26**), 1:17-27

### Outline: 2 Samuel

David learns of Saul's and Jonathan's death, 1:1-16  
Elegy of David for Saul and for *Jonathan* (his "best love", **1:26**), 1:17-27

**David, King of Judah**; Abner proclaims Isbaal (Ishbo'sheth) King of Israel, 2:1-11  
War between Judah (David) and Israel (ruled by the House of Saul), 2:12-32  
David's sons born in Hebron, 3:1-5  
Abner breaks with Isbaal, negotiates with David, 3:6-21  
Assassinations of Abner and Isbaal, 3:22-4:12  
**David, King of Judah and of Israel**, conquest of Jerusalem and of the Philistines, 5:1-25  
The ark brought from Baalejudah to Jerusalem; David dances in the procession, 6:1-23  
Nathan's prophecy; David's prayer, 7:1-29  
The wars of David; the administration of his kingdom, 8:1-18

### The intrigues surrounding the Succession, 9-20; → 1 Kings 1-2

David's kind-heartedness toward *Mephib'osheth* (crippled in the feet), son of Jonathan, 9:1-13  
The Ammonite war; victory over the Arameans, 10:1-19  
David commits adultery with Bathsheba; he plans her husband Uriah's death, 11:1-27  
Nathan denounces David's injustice and violence: David's repentance, 12:1-15a  
Death of Bathsheba's son and birth of *Solomon*, 12:15b-25  
Conquest of Rabbah, 12:15-31

### Story of Absalom, 13-20

*Amnon* rapes his sister Tamar, Solomon's sister, 13:1-22  
Absalom arranges for the murder of *Amnon* and flees, 13:23-39  
Joab negotiates the return and pardon of Absalom, 14:1-33  
Absalom's intrigues and revolt; David's flight, 15:1-29  
David ensures Hushai's allegiance, Hushai goes to join Absalom, 15:30-16:23  
Hushai transforms Ahithopel's plans, 16:20-17:16  
David and Absalom cross the Jordan, 17:17-29  
Defeat and death of Absalom, 18:1-18  
David receives the news and goes into mourning, 18:19-19:9a  
David's return to Jerusalem: Shimei, Mephib'osheth, Barzillai, 19:9b-40  
Israel and Judah dispute over the king; revolt of Sheba, 19:41-20:26

### Appendices

The great hunter; execution of Saul's descendants, 21:1-14  
Deeds against the Philistines, 21:15-22  
Psalm of David, 22:1-51 // Psalm 18

David's last words, 23:1-7

David's brave men, 23:8-39

Census of the people, the pestilence, and divine forgiveness, 24:1-17

Purchase of Araunah's threshing floor, edification of an altar, 24:18-25 (site of the future Temple)

[→ *SOLOMON* is successor to David, 1 Kings 1-2; → 2 Samuel 9-20

Intrigues of *Adonijah*: he competes for the throne with *Solomon*, 1:1-53

Solomon consolidates the kingdom; deaths of David, *Adonijah* and Shimei, 2:1-46]

**1 The poor and the prophets.** David Jobling points out that, just as the cycle pertaining to Samson in → Judges 13-16 is representative of a literature of resistance generated by an oppressed class in its struggle against a culturally superior oppressor, 1 Samuel is also a good candidate for such an interpretation (and this explains the dialectic between two different profiles of the Philistines → below). Whereas the Israelites spoke of the Philistines as "the uncircumcised", the Philistines called the Israelites "Hebrews" (probably derived from the Akkadian *apiru*, a designation for a social class of the weak and oppressed poor<sup>vii</sup>; see David's guerilla group in 1 Sam 22:1-2; 30<sup>viii</sup>)

Under the reign of the Judges, Israel had repeatedly suffered impoverishment due to oppression. But would it be any different under a monarchy? Reflecting the diversity of experiences (both negative and positive) in very different historical contexts (from Samuel up to the Exile), 1 Samuel shows a strong dialectic between

- pro-monarchic texts (9:1-10:16; 11:1-11; 13:1-14:46) and
- anti-monarchic texts<sup>ix</sup> (8; 10:17-27; 12; 15).

Reflecting the situation of Philistine oppression under the Judges, the Canticle of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1-10) emphasizes the sufferings of the weak and poor, and the hope of comfort and liberation that the awaited king would bring:

- 1 My heart exults in Yahweh [the God of the Exodus];  
my strength is grounded in him.  
I can celebrate his liberation  
and mock my enemies-oppressors....
- 4 The bow of the mighty is broken,  
but the *weak* recover their strength.
- 5 Those who formerly had *food to spare*  
are sold for a slice of bread;  
those who formerly *suffered from hunger*  
now live *full and satisfied*....
- 6 From Yahweh come both death and life:  
he makes us descend to the grave,  
but he also raises us up (→ the medium and Samuel's ghost, 1 Sam 28)
- 7 Yahweh brings both *poverty (morish)* and *richness*;  
he humiliates, but he also exalts.
- 8 From the dust he raises the *poor person (dal)*  
and from the waste heap he lifts up the *beggar ('ebyon)*

in order to have them sit in the midst of princes  
and to give them a magnificent throne.

The song of Mary (Luke 1:46-55) reflects that same confidence in the God of the Exodus who opposes the oppressors and liberates the oppressed poor:

52 He has put down the mighty from their thrones,  
while he has exalted the *humble poor*.  
53 He has filled the *hungry* with possessions,  
and he has sent away the rich empty-handed.

Nevertheless, when Saul is presented as king in an anti-monarchic text, Samuel reminds his audience about the long history of oppressions and liberations (1 Sam 10:17-19):

Thus says Yahweh, God of Israel:  
"I brought up Israel out of Egypt. I freed you from the Egyptians' power and from all the kingdoms by whom you were *oppressed (lachsats)*". Now, however, you have rejected your God, who saves you from all your calamities and *afflictions (tsarah I)*. You have said: "¡No! Give as a king that he may govern us!"

In another anti-monarchic text that seems to reflect the oppressive measures taken by Solomon, Samuel makes clear that the kings will oppress the people just as enemy nations did during the time of the Judges (1 Sam 8:11-18):

11 These will be the ways of the king who will exert power over you: he will take your sons and appoint them to his chariots and to be his horsemen, and to run before his chariots. 12 He will make them commanders and captains, and he will make them labor and harvest, and make weapons and chariot equipment. 13 He will also take your daughters in order to use them as perfumers and cooks and bakers. 14 He will gain dominion over your best fields, vineyards and olive orchards and give them to his ministers, 15 and from you he will demand a tenth part of your harvests and vineyard produce in order to give them over to his officers and to his ministers. 16 Furthermore, he will take your manservants and your maidservants, and the best of your oxen and asses, so that they work for him. 17 He will demand the tenth part of your flocks, and you yourselves will serve under him as slaves. 18 And when that day has arrived, you will cry out because of your king, whom you have chosen for yourselves, but Yahweh will not answer you" (see also 1 Sam 12).

In contrast, in his farewell speech (1 Sam 12), Samuel addresses the whole nation of Israel, and he emphasizes his own just conduct:

3 From whom have I stolen an ox or an ass?  
Whom have I defrauded ( *'ashaq*)?  
Whom have I oppressed ( *ratsats*)?  
From whom have I taken a bribe ( *kofet*)?  
Accuse me, and I will pay whatever is due.

4 They responded: "You have not defrauded us (*'ashaq*"), nor have you oppressed us (*ratsats*) nor have you stolen anything from anyone." (see the reference to Yahweh's acts of liberating justice, 12:7).

Another text, however, makes clear that one of Israel's motives for wanting to have a king, apart from the necessity of defending itself from the Philistines, was the corrupt conduct of Samuel's two sons:

Neither of the two followed their father's example, but both let themselves be guided by greed, accepting bribes (*shakhad*) and perverting justice (*mishpat*; 8:3)

Before he became king, fleeing from Saul's persecution, David lived in poverty as the leader of a guerilla band:

David left Gath and fled to the cave of Adullam....many who were oppressed (*tsuq*), loaded with debt or embittered, came to join him. Thus, David finally had some four hundred men under his leadership" (1 Sam 22:1-2; cf. Che Guevara).

Furthermore, in his oracle promising David an eternal dynasty, the prophet Nathan speaks of a time when "the impious will not oppress (*'anah*) the people any longer (2 Sam 7:10). However, once he has become King, David starts imitating the sins of oppression and violence that are typical for monarchs, the same ones that Samuel had denounced. Thus, when Nathan denounces the David's double sin, his parable unmasks the oppression and violence against the meek and poor that came to be a salient characteristic of monarchy (2 Sam 12:1-10):

1 "Two men lived in a town. One of them was rich, the other one poor (*ra'sh*). 2 The rich man had very many sheep and cows, 3 whereas the poor (*ro'sh*) man did not have more than one little ewe lamb, which he had bought and raised himself. The lamb grew up in his household with his children: it ate from the man's plate, drank from his glass and slept in his lap. For that man the little lamb was like his own daughter. 4 But it so happened that a traveller came as a visitor to the rich man's house, and since the rich man did not want to kill any of his own sheep or cows to prepare for his guest, from the poor (*ra'sh*) man he took away the only lamb that he had."

5 So great was David's anger against that man, that he said to Nathan: "Just as surely as Yahweh lives, the man who has done this deserves to die!....7 Then Nathan said to David: "You are that man!....9 You have murdered Uriah the Hittite in order to obtain his wife! You have killed him with the sword of the Ammonites!"

The psalm preserved at the end of the story of David's life (2 Sam 22:1-51 // Psalm 18) emphasizes the violent oppression (*khamas*) on the part of his enemies (22:3, 49, insertion) and the fidelity of Yahweh, the liberating God of the Exodus, in having saved him from all those oppressors (2-4, 17-20, 47-51):

22:2 Yahweh is my rock, my fortress, my liberator;  
3 he is my God, the rock in which I take refuge.  
He is my shield and the horn (power) of my salvation,

my highest hiding place!  
 He is my protector and my savior.  
 You saved me from *violent oppression* (*khamas*)!  
 4 I invoke Yahweh, who is worthy to be praised,  
 and I am kept safe from my enemies....  
 49 You liberate me from my enemies,  
 you exalt me above my adversaries,  
 you save me from *violent oppressors* (*khamas*).

And, just as the Song of Hannah (2:1-10), this Psalm also reiterates that Yahweh liberates the poor-humiliated-oppressed from oppression (an example of structural inclusion):

You bring salvation-liberation to the *poor-humiliated-oppressed* (*'ani*),  
 But your gaze humiliates those who are arrogant (22:28).

**2 Women: bigamy, polygamy, rape, adultery.** 1 Samuel frequently presents women in pairs, and this same tendency is also evident in → Luke (where Mary's canticle is based on Hannah's psalm<sup>x</sup>, 1 Sam 1).

**2.1** Two wives of Elkanah, **Peninnah and Hannah**, mother of Samuel, 1 Sam 1-2. Hannah's song (1 Sam 2:1-10) is something unique in the Hebrew Bible, since the Scriptures rarely offer examples of women's prayers, and never in such detail anywhere else<sup>xi</sup>. In the song, the divine option in favor of the weak, hungry, sterile and poor (1 Sam 2:4-8) is reflected one thousand years afterwards in the Canticle of Mary (→ Lucas 1:46-55; see above under 1. The poor). In both cases, feminine virtue does not consist in being sterile (Hannah) or in being a virgin (Mary), but, rather, in the prophetic voice that denounces the oppressors and defends the oppressed. In ancient times, the struggle for survival led to a particular emphasis on the woman's role in procreation and the man's role in war, both considered to be essential (see Ps 127-128). Hannah's experience, and her song, both reflect the extreme anguish suffered by sterile women, an anguish quite common in that historical context (see Sarah, Gen 11:30; Rebecca, Gen 25:21; Rachel, Gen 29:31; Manoah's wife, Judg 13:2). Apart from details in the content of her prayer, Hannah is set apart by her initiative in making a vow, and even more in making a sacrifice when the vow was kept (1:24-25; TM; both the LXX as well as 4QSamA reflect their patriarchal prejudice in that they eliminate Hannah's role in making the sacrifice<sup>xii</sup>).

Hannah's experience and her song both prove to what extent historical context has an influence on the concept of women's liberation, since women in modern Western societies tend to orient their struggle towards freeing themselves from the necessity of bearing and bringing up children, whereas women in ancient times, such as Hannah, attempted to free themselves from the opprobrium of sterility. Modern feminist studies characterize Hannah as a "victim and redeemer"<sup>xiii</sup>, and they describe her sacrifice as an example for women's religion<sup>xiv</sup>. Once Hannah fulfilled her vow to dedicate Samuel to the service of the Sanctuary (in Shiloh), Yahweh rewards her for her sacrifice and blesses her with the birth of three sons and two daughters (1 Sam 2:8, 21; see Ps 113:7-9). However, in her song, Hannah also breaks away from the rigid molds of assigned roles, since even more than the language of maternity (2:5b), her psalm makes use of military terms (1-4, 9-10; see other songs of war uttered by women<sup>xv</sup>: Miriam, Ex 15:20-

21; Deborah, Judg 5; Jephthah's daughter, Judg 11:34; the Israelite women who greet David, 1 Sam 18:6-7, 21:11 and 29:5; cf. the daughters of the Philistines, 2 Sam 1:20).

Considerable controversy has been sparked by the conclusion of Hannah's song, referring to a king // an anointed one (2:10; see 2 Sam 22:51), since it was only decades later that Saul and David were anointed as kings (by Samuel) and monarchy was established. Traditionally the text has been interpreted as a prophecy foretelling the establishment of monarchy and the coming of the Messiah, the "anointed"<sup>xvi</sup>. David Jobling concludes that the reference to the monarchy in 1 Sam 2:10 is a later addition, and he insists that Hannah's song exalts the liberations and the justice that Israel enjoyed under the reign of the Judges (1 Sam 2:1-9), and is not a prophecy of monarchy<sup>xvii</sup>. At any rate, in Hannah's song the emphasis on God's historical project in favor of the weak, poor and oppressed is expressed in a focus on God's exclusive sovereignty, without the usual intermediaries posited in later texts (angels, demons, a Devil): it is only Yahweh who gives life and death, wealth and poverty (1 Sam 2:6-7 → Is 45:7); it is also Yahweh who makes a woman sterile (1:6) or fertile (2:5). The same *sanctity* of Yahweh as incomparable God consists in his liberating acts in history, in favor of the oppressed (2:2 → Is 6).

**2.2 Saul's wife: Ahinoam**, mother of Merab, Michal, *Jonathan* and three further sons (1 Sam 14:49-50; see 31:2; 1 Chron 8:33; 9:39). As David Jobling<sup>xviii</sup> points out, Ahinoam is only mentioned as the target of Saul's denunciation, but she never appears as a figure in the story. When Saul denounces Jonathan for his love relationship with David, also blaming Jonathan's mother, Ahinoam (1 Sam 20:30), the language is so fierce that we must supposed that Saul and Ahinoam needed some PFlag counseling. Saul also had two sons through his **concubine Rizpah** (2 Sam 21:8).

**2.3 Eight wives and ten concubines of David.** Randall Bailey concludes that all David's marriages were political, even that with Bathsheba<sup>xix</sup>:

- (1) **Michal** (daughter of Saul, 1 Sam 18:20-28; 25:4; 2 Sam 3:1-16); see her sister, **Merab**;
- (2) **Ahinoam** of Jezreel, 1 Sam 25:43;
- (3) **Abigail**, 1 Sam 25 y (4-7)
- (4-7) Four other political weddings, 2 Sam 3:2-5; 5:13;
- (8) **Bathsheba** (2 Sam 11-12; 1 Kings 1-2; 1 Chron 3:5; title of Ps 51). There is a remarkable contrast between the two narratives in which Bathsheba appears. In 2 Sam 11-12, she is totally passive, the object of David's adultery; in 1 Kings 1-2, however, she is active in her attempt to assure the throne for her son Solomon. In the first narrative, David is guilty of adultery and murder, playing the role of the fool ("Nabal"); what is more, he is a "bed-man", since he prefers to seek relationships with women in the comfort of his palace instead of assuming the manly role of the leader in war (the concept of someone's being "effeminate" in Antiquity; → 1 Cor 6:9). As it turns out, the love of Yahweh for David seems somewhat mysterious; Saul was rejected for minor sins (he offered a sacrifice slightly earlier than the time set by Samuel; he did not kill King Agag and all the Amalekites, including women and children, with the animals<sup>xx</sup>, 1 Sam 15).

**10 David's concubines** (1 Sam 15:16; 16:21-22; 19:5; 20:3). According to 1 Chron 3:9, David had sons through his concubines. They were raped by Absalom during the war of

succession, after which David forced them to live enclosed (*tsarar* I) in a house as widows<sup>xxi</sup> (2 Sam 20:3; see 2 Sam 3:6-11; 1 Reyes 2:13-25).

**2.4 Tamar**, David's daughter, raped (‘*anah*) by her half-brother Amnon (2 Sam 13:12,14,22).

**2.5 The "good witch" of Endor**, Saul—and Samuel! (1 Sam 28:3 –25). Just as the narration of the mysterious hand writing on the wall in → Daniel 5, the story of the medium who summons up the dead prophet Samuel is a ghost story. What is more, like Alice in Wonderland, Saul finds a "good witch" who even shows love towards her enemies. Traditional commentaries misinterpreted the story, not recognizing its literary genre, and also because they supposed that the laws of the Pentateuch against mediums had already existed and were known in Saul's time (→ Ex 22:17/18; Deut 18:9-14; Lev 20:27). However, when the text tells that Saul "had put the soothsayers and mediums out of the land" (1 Sam 28:3), we should not suppose that he did this in obedience with the laws of the Torah, since they were codified and canonized centuries afterwards. The narrator of 1 Samuel 28 has nothing negative to say about the "witch"; rather, she is presented as a capable professional with a merciful heart. What is more, how should we suppose that Samuel, a just man, could have been summoned by the spells of a bad witch? Seized by fear and terror of the Philistines, Saul first "consulted Yahweh, but God did not answer him, not even in dreams, or by Urim, or by prophets" (1 Sam 28:6). Only once the resources and magical techniques of the "orthodox" Israelite tradition had failed him did the desperate king disguise himself and attempt to find the medium of Endor (28:8), a town bordering on Philistea.

David Jobling suggests that, from the start, the medium recognizes who Saul is<sup>xxii</sup> and that she is speaking ironically when she says 'You know what Saul had done' (28:9). During the session, she proceeds with professional competence, summoning Samuel's ghost from the dead, and describing him as a "god" (*elohim*, 28:13). Later on, when Saul refuses to eat, the medium keeps on showing love towards the enemy that had tried to banish her from her country, and along with Saul's officials, she manages to convince him to eat, preparing him a true banquet<sup>xxiii</sup>. Luis Mott and others have shown that many of the "witches" burned by the Inquisition in Brazil were lesbians (→ Ex 22:17/18). Maybe the witch of Endor was a "good witch" because she was lesbian. At any rate, the text gives us another example of the diversity of perspectives evident in the Biblical texts (see the dialectic concerning the Philistines, below; also cf. the love relationship between Jonathan and David, and the prohibitions of anal sex between males in Lev 18:22 and 20:13).

For David Jobling<sup>xxiv</sup>, Samuel, the last of the "Judges", represents the original pre-monarchic political system of egalitarian justice. In the famous opening words of his *Communist Manifesto*, Karl Marx described Communism as "a spectre" that terrifies Europe. Now, just as Samuel, Communism has also died, but it continues to terrify the postmodern Capitalist world—where the rich always make themselves richer and the poor become poorer—the spectre of a new order of egalitarian justice. Even in the most eloquent texts of pre-monarchic propaganda (see Ps 72), the spectre of Samuel, that of egalitarian justice, keeps on re-appearing.

David Jobling (1998: 185-191, 273-278, 301-308)

Overholt, Thomas W. (2000). "Médium of Endor", WS, 258-259.

Cryer, Frederick H. (1994). *Divination in Ancient Israel and Its Near Eastern Environment: A Socio-Historical Investigation*. Sheffield: JSOT.

**2.6 Prostitutes.** David assures Priest Ahimelech that his men had abstained from sexual relations with women during the military campaign (1 Sam 21:4-5; cf. Deut 23:9-11). The Hebrew word for "men" (*na'ar*) usually stands for young men from infancy until they are married. Thus, the women in question here do not seem to be the warriors' wives, but prostitutes<sup>xxv</sup>. According to the general perspective of the Hebrew Bible, David does not seem to be opposed to relations with such prostitutes on other occasions.

**2.7 Two wise women: the wise woman of Tekoa (2 Sam 14:1-20); and the wise woman of Abel of Bethma'acah (2 Sam 20:14-22).** In the first story, the wise woman of Tekoa, a village 10 km south of Bethlehem, seems to be more of a good actress than a wise person. She presents herself before King David with a kind of parable (see the parable that the prophet Nathan used to condemn David for his adultery with Bathsheba). David immediately perceives that General Joab is behind the woman's story. What is more, the parable's intent—to convince the king to permit his son Absalom to return to Jerusalem—does not seem wise either, since Absalom, four years later, was to conspire against David and provoke a civil war before he died<sup>xxvi</sup>.

### **3. Sexual minorities and sexual sins (rape, adultery—is rape preferable?).**

For using 1-2 Samuel as a source of wise, just norms for modern life, one text in particular is of special importance. Jesus quoted it in order to refute and wrest authority from legalist usage of the Law on the part of the fundamentalists of his time:

<sup>23</sup>One sabbath he was going through the grainfields; and as they made their way his disciples began to pluck heads of grain. <sup>24</sup>And the Pharisees said to him, "Look, why are they doing what is not lawful on the sabbath?" <sup>25</sup>Jesus said to them, "Have you never read what David did, when he was in need and was hungry, he and those who were with him: <sup>26</sup>how he entered the house of God, when Abiathar was high priest, and ate the bread of the Presence, which it is not lawful for any but the priests to eat, and also gave it to those who were with him?" [→ **1 Sam. 21:1-6**]. <sup>27</sup>And he said to them, "The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath; <sup>28</sup>"so the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath" (**Mark 2:23-28** // Matthew 12:3-4 // Luke 6:3-4).

According to the text Jesus quotes from 1 Sam. 21:1-6, the High Priest was Ahimelech, not Abiathar (his better-known son); there are also differences between Mark and the parallel texts in Matthew and Luke<sup>xxvii</sup> (see the laws about the sacred bread in Ex 25:30; Lev 24:5-9<sup>xxviii</sup>). Still, Jesus makes clear the necessity of interpreting divine commandments in the light of human beings' needs (cf. the principle of Paul in Romans 13:8-10, referring to the Ten Commandments: love your neighbor and do not harm him/her). Traditionally, the Church has created a distinction between commandments of religious observance and ethical/moral commandments, but such a distinction is not akin to Biblical theology. Thus, the commandment to bear offspring (Gen. 1:28) and the texts concerning divorce (→ Mark; Ezra; Nehemiah), as well as the prohibition of anal sex between males (→ Lev 18:22; 20:13) all need to be interpreted and applied *with discernment*, following the norms of loving the neighbor and avoiding harm to others.

**3.1 Elkanah and his two wives: Peninnah and Hannah,** mother of Samuel, 1 Sam 1-2. Women are also poor and sexual minorities<sup>xxix</sup>.

**3.2 Two Prophets: Samuel a widower?** 1 Sam 8:1-3 two unjust sons; 12:2 the sons go without punishment cf. 2:23-25; There is no reference to a wife/mother. Cf. → Isaiah and the prophetess with his children. The prophets' school (single shamans?) does not seem to uphold "family values" (see below on Saul). **Nathan, a single man?** 2 Sam 7 // 1 Chron 17; 2 Chron 29:25; 2 Sam 12; 1 Kings 1:11-45.

**3.3. Saul, his wife Ahinoam** (1 Sam 14:49-50; see 31:2; 1 Chron 8:33; 9:39) **and his concubine Rizpah** (2 Sam 21:8). After having been rejected by God, Saul went out in search of Samuel,"but the Spirit of God came upon him also, and Saul was in a prophetic trance during the whole journey, until he came to Naioth in Ramah. Then he stripped off his clothes, and he was in trance in the presence of Samuel, naked, on the ground, all that day and all that night. Hence it is said, 'Is Saul also among the prophets?' "(1 Sam 19:23-24; cf. 10:9-11). On the other hand, when David brought the ark of Yahweh to Jerusalem, he was also in an ecstatic trance; he danced in a scandalous way, almost naked (2 Sam 6:14-16, 20; → Isaiah 20). As to Saul's jealous feelings concerning the relationship between David and Jonathan, see 1 Samuel 16:21-22<sup>xxx</sup>.

### **3.4 David and Jonathan and... (1 Samuel 16- 31 + 2 Samuel 1). The ten key texts:**

**1 Sam. 16:12.** [David] was blond, he had beautiful eyes and he was handsome (*tob*) of appearance. Yahweh said: "Arise, anoint him [as designated king]; for this is he!"

**16:21.** And David came to Saul and stayed in his presence, since Saul loved (*'ahab*) him greatly, and he made David his armour-bearer. [Later on, Saul jealous of Jonathan? See 20:3.]

**17:42.** [Goliath] looked around, and saw David, and he disdained him, because he was [only] a youth, blond and beautiful. [Was Goliath distracted?]

**18:1-4.** <sup>1</sup>When David had finished speaking to Saul, the soul/life (*nefesh*) of Jonathan was knit (*qashar*) to the soul/life (*nefesh*) of David, and Jonathan loved (*'ahab*) him as he loved himself [see Lev 19:18,34; → Rom. 13:8-10]. <sup>2</sup>From that day on, Saul would not let [David] return to his father's house. <sup>3</sup>Then Jonathan made a **covenant** with David, because he loved him as he loved himself. <sup>4</sup>And Jonathan stripped himself of the robe that he was wearing, and gave it to David, and he also gave him his tunic and even his sword, and, what is more, his bow and even his girdle [→ covenant, 20:40-41; 23:17-18].

[*qashar* (active form, *qal*): to tie, unite, knit, fasten, attach;

in the passive form (*nifal*) it means "to grow fond of, to develop tender feelings towards"<sup>xxxix</sup>].

**18:25-27.** Saul insisted: "Tell David: 'The only thing that the king wants...as a marriage present for his daughter...is 100 *foreskins* of Philistines.....' ". David arose and went, along with his soldiers, and killed 200 of the Philistines, whose *foreskins* he then gave over to the king [Saul]. [Michal loves (*'ahab*) David, 18:20; → Samson, Judges 14:3.]

**19:1.** Saul made known to Jonathan his son and to all his officials his decision to kill David. But Jonathan, Saul's son, loved (*khafats*) David very much, and he warned him....

**20:30.** Saul became furious with Jonathan: "You son of a *perverse* (*na'awah*) and rebellious woman! Do you think I do not know that you chose (*bakhar*) the son of Jesse, to your own shame, and to the shame of your mother's nakedness? [See Saint Jerome and Saint Chrysostomus.]

**20:41-42.** David came out from his hiding place, and after having bowed three times, put his face on the ground. Immediately *they kissed one another*, and wept with one another, until David *was able to calm down* (*higdil < gadal*, to grow larger). "You can go in peace", said Jonathan to David, "since we have made an eternal **covenant** together in the name of Yahweh, asking him to judge between me and you, and between your descendants and mine" [= a **covenant/alliance**].

**23:16-18.** <sup>16</sup>Jonathan, Saul's son, rose, and went to see David at Horesh, and encouraged him to keep on trusting in God. <sup>17</sup>"Fear not", he said, "for my father will not be able to catch you. You shall be king over Israel, and I shall be next to you. This, even my father knows." <sup>18</sup>And the two of them made a **covenant** in the presence of Yahweh, after which Jonathan went back home and David remained in Horesh.

**2 Sam. 1:26.** Your love (*ahab*) for me was more delicious than the love (*'ahab*) of women. [having eight wives and ten concubines, David had plenty to compare with.]

### **The interpretation of the key texts: David and Jonathan and.... (1 Samuel 16- 31 + 2 Samuel 1).**

On 2 Sam. 1:26, David Jobling writes: "The story of David and Jonathan, and these words in particular, assume great importance for gay rights activists, who find in them virtually the only positive presentation of male homosexuality in the Jewish Bible. Here is a man telling of his love for another man, comparing it with heterosexual love, and saying it is better."<sup>xxxii</sup> In the same vein, Silvia Schroer and Thomas Staubli conclude: "David and Jonathan shared a homoerotic and, more than likely, a homosexual relationship."<sup>xxxiii</sup>

Please note: we are talking about some *eight chapters* in the Hebrew Bible, not just a lone verse, whereas only *two verses* in Leviticus (18:22 y 20:13) prohibit anal sex (without condoms) between males, in a context where other practices that were common in idolatrous cults are also prohibited. Jobling continues:

"**The validity and power of the gay reading.** Nothing in the text rules out, and much encourages the view that David and Jonathan had a consummated gay relationship. The text does not force this conclusion on us; there are obvious cultural reasons why it would not. But it is at least as valid as any other. There are issues in the text that the homosexual reading seems better able to explain than other readings, for example Saul's outburst in 20:30-34."<sup>xxxiv</sup>

**20:30.** Saul became furious with Jonathan: "You son of *perversity* (*na'awah*) and of rebelliousness! Do you think I do not know that you chose (*bakhar*) the son of Jesse, to your own shame, and to the shame of your mother's nakedness?"

Saul explains his fury against Jonathan by saying that his son has "chosen" David (20:30), that David is a menace to Jonathan's succession to the throne, and that, thus, David must die. However, as Jobling points out, such an "explanation" cannot explain Saul's desire to kill Jonathan with the sword, since such a violent act would never help his son ascend to the throne. Jobling comments: "Es razonable buscar otro motivo no expresado por la furia irracional de Saúl, y la experiencia moderna de la homofobia irracional se presenta como el motivo adecuado"<sup>xxxv</sup>.

According to Jobling, such an interpretation is strongly confirmed when we observe how Saul vinculates Jonathan's behavior with sexual connotations: "to your own shame, and to the shame of your mother's nakedness" (1 Sam. 20:30b). Jobling concludes: "La idea que un varón gay es un 'muchacho pegado a las faldas de su mamá' es una expresión muy común de la homofobia. El padre procura eliminar la posibilidad que hay algo [afeminado] *en sí mismo* que hubiera producido tal resultado"<sup>xxxvi</sup>. According to another possible reading of the Hebrew text in 20:30, it could be that Saul is not only blaming Jonathan, but also Saul's wife Ahinoam: "Son of a *perverse (na'awah)* and rebellious woman!"<sup>xxxvii</sup>. The father's irrational fury expresses itself, just as in the case of some homophobic fathers of today, by blaming the mother (see even Sigmund Freud in some of his writings), and not just the son, for his homosexuality. In a patriarchal, *machista* society, the father cannot accept the son's queerness as a simple occurrence within human variety (such as left-handedness), and any departure from cultural norms for males is attacked as if such a "perversion" was intentional, coming either from the son, or from the mother, or from both. Jobling points out: "Es una reacción demasiado conocida de un padre que descubre que su hijo es gay....Quiero enfatizar como una mujer puede ser acusada aún sin aparecer personalmente en el relato"<sup>xxxviii</sup>.

**18:1-4.** . <sup>1</sup>When David had finished speaking to Saul, the soul/life (*nefesh*) of Jonathan was knit (*qashar*) to the soul/life (*nefesh*) of David, and Jonathan loved (*ahab*) him as he loved himself [see Lev 19:18,34; → Rom. 13:8-10]. <sup>2</sup>From that day on, Saul would not let [David] return to his father's house. <sup>3</sup>Then Jonathan made a **covenant** with David, because he loved him as he loved himself. <sup>4</sup>And Jonathan stripped himself of the robe that he was wearing, and gave it to David, and he also gave him his tunic and even his sword, and, what is more, his bow and even his girdle [→ covenant, 20:40-41; 23:17-18].

Jobling comments that the relation between David and Jonathan "mayormente se elabora como un 'pacto' entre los dos varones, *que podemos leer como análogo al matrimonio*"<sup>xxxix</sup>. In this relation, he points out, "Jonatán juega el mismo rol como las mujeres de David....Jonatán, en términos de la manera en la cual el texto explota el poder femenino, es *una mejor mujer que las mujeres de David*"<sup>xli</sup>, since the texts talk of Jonathan's love for David and of the women's love for David, and not of David's love for them; it is Jonathan who takes all the risks and uses all means in order to rescue David from Saul, and it is Jonathan and the women who prophesy that David will succeed Saul as king. This interpretation reflects the conclusion reached by Danna Fewell and David Gunn: "Jonatán es una mujer, más mujer que las mujeres [de David]"<sup>xli</sup>.

In contrast, Gordon Hugenberger<sup>xlii</sup> has attempted to establish that *heterosexual* marriage in the Hebrew Bible consisted in a covenant between a man and a woman, established by the taking of vows—even though the three texts he quotes are all of controversial interpretation (→ Mal 2:10-16; → Prov 2:17; → Ezek 16; cf. the metaphors in Hos 2:18-22 and 1 Sam. 18–20). On the other

hand, it is quite striking that the texts concerning the relation between David and Jonathan and their mutual pact of love *explicitly* refer three times to the covenant they made together. The Biblical evidence thus comes closer to the conclusion drawn by John Boswell<sup>xliii</sup>, who showed that the Christian rites of wedding between friends of the same sex existed centuries *before* ecclesiastical rites for a wedding between a man and a woman (since heterosexual marriage continued existing as a secular phenomenon until the end of the Middle Ages). J. A. Thompson<sup>xliv</sup> showed that, in Hebrew, the verb *to love* (*’ahab*) commonly occurs in contexts that refer to pacts, such as in the texts that tell about David and Jonathan. But Thompson did not acknowledge that the political dimension in the pacts between David and Jonathan is subordinate to their shared friendship and their committed, homoerotic love.

**A tradition of censure and denial.** In order to interpret these texts correctly, it is important that we acquire a good knowledge of their historical context within the literature of the Ancient Near East. For Cyrus H. Gordon, a conservative Jewish scholar and one of the leading 20th-century experts in Ancient Near Eastern literature, the conclusion is obvious:

Aquiles compara a su camarada Patroclo con una muchacha (Il. 16:7ss.) que nos hace recordar del amor de Gilgamés por Enkidu como para una mujer (Gilg. Epic 2:31ss; 1:v:47; vi:1ss). Que esta actitud (para nosotros no varonil) fue firmemente arraigado en la literatura épica del Cercano Oriente es evidente por su presencia en el libro de Jaser (“Justo”; abstraída en 2 Sam. 1:17ss.) donde David proclama que el amor de Jonatán para él fue más dulce que el amor de mujeres (1:26).<sup>xlv</sup>

If, for experts in Ancient Near Eastern literature, the homoerotic nature of the relation between David and Jonathan is so obvious, how can we explain that this conclusion has been denied and censured during so many centuries of Jewish and Christian tradition? And how can we explain that it is now that so many Biblical scholars such as David Jobling are coming to accept the homoerotic interpretation instead of the traditional homophobic one? In order to be able to understand this radical change in interpretation in the last century, it is fundamental to remember that, traditionally, almost all scholars accepted the conclusion that Moses had written all of the Pentateuch (in ca. 1300 BC), some 300 years *before* David and Jonathan, and thus the scholars supposed that the two verses in Leviticus forbidding anal sex between males (18:22 y 20:13) must have existed in David and Jonathan’s time, and accepted by them and by their contemporaries as divinely inspired.

However, now that almost all Biblical scholars acknowledge that the texts in Leviticus have their origin in the priestly source (P) of the Pentateuch, dated during the period of exile some 500 years *after* David and Jonathan, the tendency is now to interpret the texts concerning David and Jonathan in the context of the Ancient Near East, and not letting that the two verses from Leviticus determine their correct interpretation. Furthermore, only a century ago, everybody thought that the texts referring to Sodom (→ Genesis 19 y a total of ca. 48 others) were condemning “sodomy” (or “homosexuality”, starting in the late 1800’s). But now, almost all scholars acknowledge that Genesis condemns the attempt to *sexually rape* angels, and not consenting homoerotic relationships. Thus, the process of unmasking traditional homophobic interpretations has prepared the road for acknowledging and accepting texts with a positive portrayal of homoerotic relationships.

Even → 1-2 Kings starts mentioning "the mercies of God", using David as a model for forgiving the sins of subsequent kings. Thus, even in 1-2 Kings, i.e. the books that come after 1-2 Samuel in the → Deuteronomist History (550), David is mainly remembered for his compassion. Censure already sets in with → 1 Chron. 10–29 (400), where some 20 chapters retell the story of David, yet eliminating all references to Jonathan as well as to the adultery with Bathsheba. In his history of the Jews written in the first century after Christ (*Jewish Antiquities*), Josephus eliminates the homoerotic scenes and affirms that Jonathan honored and loved David due to the latter's virtue.

Randall Bailey concludes that all of David's eight marriages were "political" (i.e. they were an attempt to gain more power), including that with Bathsheba<sup>xlvi</sup>:

- (1) **Michal** (Saul's daughter, 1 Sam 18:20-28; 25:4; 2 Sam 3:1-16); see her sister, **Merab**;
- (2) **Abigail**, 1 Sam 25:2-42;
- (3) **Ahinoam** of Jezreel, 1 Sam 25:43;
- (4-7) Four further political weddings, 2 Sam 3:2-5; 5:13; and
- (8) **Bathsheba** (adultery, assassination), 2 Sam 11–12.

Like many great spiritual leaders, David seems to be somewhat narcissistic. The texts repeatedly refer to the love that others have for David, but not of his love for them. Ilse Mülner summarizes the evidence as follows: "Saúl amó a David (1 Sam 16:21; cp. 18:22); Jonatán amó a David (1 Sam 18:1,3; 20:17; 2 Sam 1:26; cp. 1 Sam 19:1); todos los siervos de Saúl aman a David (1 Sam 18:22)); todo Israel y Judá amó a David (1 Sam 18:16); Mical, la hija de Saúl amó a David (1 Sam 18:20, 28). *Solamente David no amó*"<sup>xlvii</sup>; see how David expresses his sorrow over the death of Jonathan: *Your love for me was more delicious than the love of women*" (2 Sam. 1:26; cf. 1:23, with a less explicit subject; also 2 Sam 19:7 where the object of love is not identified). None of the texts indicate that Jonathan (divorced? a widower?) had a wife; see his son (2 Sam 4:4; 9).

### **Homophobia and xenophobia: the Philistines (*pelishtim*; → Palestine).**

David Jobling<sup>xlviii</sup> points out that, although 1 Samuel contains more treatment of the Philistines (descendants of Ham, Gen 10:6,14) than any other book in the Bible (see also Genesis and Judges), the texts reflect two perspectives that result in *two profiles*:

- A *realist*, more positive profile: the two times David stayed with King Achish (→ 1 Samuel 21:10-15 + 27:1–29:11) reflect a continuity with favorable perspectives concerning Abraham and the Philistine king Abimelech (→ Genesis, Elohist source, Gen 20:1-18 and 21:22-34); see also Isaac with Abimelech (Yahwist source, 26:1-33; cf. 12:10-20, Yahwist<sup>xlix</sup>).
- A profile which is the product of *fantasy*, reflecting the fears and hates towards that which is totally "other" (as if the Philistines belonged to another race, the "uncircumcised", a neighboring people, more advanced in terms of technology and military power, commonly an oppressor; a negative perspective, in accordance with the narrations in Judges (especially Samson, 13–16).

The Philistines were not "Canaanites", the original inhabitants of the land promised to Israel (according to Deut 7 and Joshua 1–12, the latter were destined to be utterly destroyed), but rather a neighboring people who arrived in Palestine (from Kaftor/Crete) around the same time as the Israelites<sup>1</sup> (12th century BC). The prophet Amos still refers to Philistine emigration as to another "exodus" directed by Yahweh (Amos 9:7). In Genesis, Abraham and Isaac had good dealings with Abimelech, the Philistine king, who is described as being more pious than the patriarchs (Abraham and Isaac lie to him, saying that their wives are their sisters). In the same way, in two similar texts in 1 Samuel (1 Samuel 21:10-15 + 27:1–29:11), David flees from Saul and stays two times with Achish, a respectable, kind Philistine king.

In the Samson narratives, however (Judges 13–16), Israel suffers under the cruel oppression of the Philistines, and responds by making fun of them and by individual heroic deeds that supposedly demonstrate the Israelites' superiority. Jobling suggests that a sensitive, wise reader will know to correct the distortions of fantasy (the negative texts) by confronting them with the tolerant perspective in the positive texts, thus contributing to heal his/her own xenophobia. From 1700 on, it was common in the West to use the term "Philistine" to insult any group of people despised as barbaric, uneducated or lacking in aesthetic and artistic sensitivity<sup>li</sup>. The term became popular amongst German university students, for designating the common people—since, for those privileged students, Samson (with his tricks and sexual adventures) was a hero<sup>lii</sup>. In modern discourse, fantasies that loathe contemporary "philistines" function as a mechanism for ignoring class struggle<sup>liii</sup>.

In the history of homophobia, we can see that it is commonly accompanied by xenophobia: any expression of homoeroticism is condemned as having been "imported" by emigrants that threaten to contaminate the purity of God's people<sup>liv</sup>. When we study the texts concerning the Philistines which reflect Israelite xenophobia, we can learn how to heal our own xenophobia. At the same time, we can also heal our homophobia, by comparing those verses which are negative on certain expressions of homoeroticism and realizing that they also occur in contexts where xenophobia is also present (Lev 18:22; 20:13; cf. Lev 18:1-5,24-30; 20:22-26).

## David and homoeroticism in literature and art<sup>lv</sup>:

Although for centuries the churches and synagogues were opposed to a homoerotic interpretation of David and Jonathan, the Epic of Gilgamesh (discovered in the 19th century) showed that such relationships were common and accepted in the Ancient Near East. Ever since the Renaissance, knowledge of Greek and Roman classical literature became so widespread that many artists started reflecting the Greeks' and Romans' more tolerant attitudes.

Sculpture:

Donatello, "David" (1430-1440), bronze

Michelangelo, "David" (1501-04), white marble (Florence, Italy)

Literature<sup>lvi</sup>:

Peter Abaelard, poem (1079-1142)

Ralph Waldo Emerson, *The Friends* (1839), drama

André Gide (1896), *Saul*

Herman Melville, *Clarel* (1876) and *Billy Budd* (1891)

Oscar Wilde (1854-1900), speech during his trial ( )

E. M. Forster, *Where Angels Fear to Tread* (1905)

Rainer Maria Rilke, *Klage um Jonathan* (1875-1926)

D. H. Lawrence, *David: a Play* (1926)

William Faulkner, *Absalom, Absalom* (1936)

James Baldwin, *Giovanni's Room* (1956; "Giovanni" is Italian for "Jonathan")

See also the article "David et Jonathan" in *Dictionnaire Gay*, Leonel Povert, ed., (Paris: Jacques Grancher, 1994). "David et Jonathan" is a French association of "homophile" (gay/homosexual) Christians, founded in 1972; it has very few lesbian members. See also the book by the founder of "David et Jonathan", the priest Jacques Perotti, *Les exclus de l'Eglise, apprendre à s'aimer* (Paris: Filipacchi, 1988).

Frontain, Raymond-Jean (1995/2002). "The Bible". *The Gay and Lesbian Literary Heritage*. Claude J. Summers, ed. New York: Henry Holt, 92-100

----- (2000). "David and Jonathan". *Gay Histories and Cultures*. George E. Haggerty, ed. New York: Garland, 243-245.

----- (2006). "The Fortune in David's Eyes". *The Gay and Lesbian Review*. July-Aug 12-15.

**Bibliography: David and homoeroticism (Jonathan, Saul, Goliath).** See A. Brenner below.

Thompson, J.A. (1974). "The Significance of the Verb *Love* in the David-Jonathan Narratives in 1 Samuel". VT 24:334-38

Balka, C. & A. Rose, eds. (1989). *Twice Blessed: On Being Lesbian or Gay and Jewish*. Boston.

Cantarella, Eva (1988/92). *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*. New Haven/ London: Yale University.

Gordon Cyrus H. (1955). "Homer and the Bible: The Origin and Character of East Mediterranean Literature". *Hebrew Union College Annual* 26:89.

Horner, Tom (1978). *Jonathan Loved David: Homosexuality in Biblical Times*. Philadelphia: Westminster. See the quote of Cyrus Gordon, p. 19, + 118, note 18.

Houser, Ward y Warren Johansson (1990). "David and Jonathan". *The Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*. Wayne Dynes, et al, ed. London/New York: Garland

Hamilton, Wallace (1979). *David at Olivet* Homoerotic interp. Saul jealous of Jon.

Edelman, Diana V (1992). "Jonathan son of Saul". ABD III:944-946

Comstock, Gary (1993). *Gay Theology without Apology*. Cleveland: Pilgrim.

Boswell, John (1994). *Same-Sex Unions in Premodern Europe*. New York: Villard.

Stuart, Elizabeth (1995). *Just Good Friends: Towards a Lesbian and Gay Theology of Relationships*. London/New York: Mowbray.

Frontain, Raymond-Jean (1995/2002). "The Bible". *The Gay and Lesbian Literary Heritage*. Claude J. Summers, ed. New York: Henry Holt, 92-100

Goss, Robert E. (2000). "Jonathan and David". L&G Studies, 319-20.

Fone, Byrne (2000). *Homophobia: A History*. New York: Metropolitan/Henry Holt.

Schroer, Silvia & Thomas Staubli (2000). "Saul, David and Jonathan—The Story of a Triangle? A Contribution to the Issue of Homosexuality in the First Testament". *Samuel and Kings*. FCB (Second Series). Athalya Brenner, ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 22-36.

Wilson, Nancy 1995. *Our Tribe: Queer Folks, God, Jesús, and the Bible*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 149-153 [chapter omitted in the 2000 edition].

## Bibliography, 1-2 Samuel

- Alter, Robert (1999). *The David Story: A Translation with Commentary on 1 and 2 Samuel*. New York: Norton.
- Anderson, A. A. (1989). *2 Samuel* WBC 11. Waco: Word.
- Auzou, Georges (1971). *La Danza ante el arca: Estudio de los libros de Samuel*. Madrid: Fax.
- Bailey, Randall C. (1990). *David in Love and War: The Pursuit of Power in 2 Samuel 10-12*. JSOTSup 75. Sheffield: Sheffield.
- (2000). "Samuel, Books of" EDB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1161-65-.
- The Bible and Culture Collective (1995). *The Postmodern Bible*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Birch, Bruce C. (1998). The First and Second Books of Samuel. NIB. Nashville: Abingdon, II:947-1383.
- Bosch, Juan (1963). *David: Biografía de un rey*. Santo Domingo.
- Brenner, Athalya, ed. (1994). *A Feminist Companion to Samuel and Kings*. FCB 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- (2000). *Samuel and Kings*. FCB (Second Series), 7. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic. See esp. Silvia Schroer & Thomas Staubli, "Saul, David and Jonathan—The Story of a Triangle? A Contribution to the Issue of Homosexuality in the First Testament", 22-36.
- Brueggemann, Walter (1985/2002). *David's Truth in Israel's Imagination and Memory*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- (1990). *First and Second Samuel*. Louisville: John Knox.
- Campbell, Anthony & Mark O'Brien (1999). *1-2 Samuel*. CBI, 524-556.
- Clines, David J. A. (1995). "David the Man: The Construction of Masculinity in the Hebrew Bible". In *Interested Parties: The Ideology of Writers and Readers of the Hebrew Bible*, 212-43. JSOTSup 205. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Ellul, Jacques (1972). *The Politics of God and the Politics of Man*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- (1988/ET 91). *Anarchie et Christianisme*. Lyon: Atelier de Creation Libertaire.
- Fewell, Danna Nolan & David M. Gunn (1993). *Gender, Power, and Promise: The Subject of the Bible's First Story*. Nashville: Abingdon.

- Frolov, Serge (2002). "Succession Narrative: A 'Document' or a Phantom?". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121/1 (Spring), 81-104.
- Gilbert, Pierre. (1997). *Los Libros de Samuel y de los Reyes*. Cuadernos Bíblicos 44. Estela: Verbo Divino.
- Gordon, Robert P. (1984/86). *1 and 2 Samuel: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- , ed. (1995). "*The Place is Too Small for Us*": *The Israelite Prophets in Recent Scholarship*. SBTS 5.
- Gunn, David M. (1980). *The Fate of King Saul: An Interpretation of a Biblical Story*. JSOT.S 14. Sheffield: JSOT.
- (1978). *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation*. Sheffield: Sheffield University.
- Halpern, Baruch (2001). *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hertzberg, H. W. (1964). *I & II Samuel*. London: SCM / Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Hackett, Jo Ann (1992/98). "1 and 2 Samuel". WBC, 91-101.
- Jobling, David (1998). *I Samuel*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical.
- (1990). "Writing the Wrongs of the World: The Deconstruction of the Biblical Text in the Context of Liberation Theologies". *Semeia* 51, 81-118.
- Jobling, David & Catherine Rose. "Reading as a Philistine: The Ancient and Modern History of a Cultural Slur". Mark G. Brett, ed. *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 381-417.
- Klein, Ralph W. (1983). *I Samuel*. WBC 10. Waco: Word.
- (1999). "Samuel, Books of". BDI. Nashville: Abingdon, 431-435.
- McCarter, P.K. (1980 y 84). *I Samuel 2 Samuel* AB 8 and 9. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- McKenzie, Steven L. (2000). *King David: A Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Peterson, Eugene H. (1999). *First and Second Samuel*. WBC. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Rost, Leonhard. (1926/82). *The Succession to the Throne of David*. Sheffield: Sheffield.

- Said, Edward W. (1988). "Michael Walzer's Exodus and Revolution: A Canaanite Reading". Edward W. Said & Christopher Hitchens, eds. *Blaming the Victims: Spurious Scholarship and the Palestinian Question*. New York: Verso, 161-178.
- Schwartz, Regina M. (1991). "Adultery in the House of David: The Metanarrative of Biblical Scholarship and the Narratives of the Bible". *Semeia* 54, 35-55.
- Schechter, Stephen (1996). *David and Jonathan: An epic poem of love and power in Ancient Israel*. Montreal/Toronto/ Paris: Robert Davies. (poetry).
- Sicre, José L. (1997). *El primer libro de Samuel*. Barcelona: Herder.
- Steussy, Marti J. (1999). *David: Biblical Portraits of Power*. Columbia: University of South Carolina.
- Warrior, Robert (1989). "Canaanites, Cowboys and Indians: Deliverance, Conquest, and Liberation Theology Today". *Christianity and Crisis* 29, 262-265.
- Wénin, A. (1007). *Samuel, Juez y Profeta*. Cuadernos Bíblicos 89. Estella\_ Verbo Divino.

### Married homosexual people: only three alternatives

Leonard Bernstein (1918-1990), the famous composer and conductor of the New York Philharmonic, "se mostró en su vida privada como homosexual. Aun así su matrimonio con Felicia Montealegre Cohn duró hasta su muerte en 1978, procreando tres hijos". (*TIME*, 10/29/1990, *Obituary*, p. 43).

As opposed to popular myths and caricatures, one of the most frequent *gay lifestyles* is the phenomenon of gay males who are married. Numerous investigations make clear that a considerable percentage of gay males, 25% of them, get married, and that 2/3 of those marriages end in separation or divorce after three to five years. One Roman Catholic source estimated that 30% of all divorces are within couples where one of the two is homosexual. However, Catholic priests, as well as Protestant pastors, keep on promoting *marriage* as the possible *cure* for any man with *homosexual tendencies*, although, as far as I know, no one would be willing to consider their own daughter as a candidate for such a marriage.

In order to clarify our concepts and avoid getting bogged down within this swamp of heterosexist ideology, it would be pertinent to write the word "married" in quotation marks. Such a homosexual would be legally "married" according to the law and canonically "married" according to the church. However, theologically, we would question the assumption that such a relationship fulfills the Biblical norm of forming a couple that becomes *one flesh*. If a single heterosexual was unjustly condemned and sent to prison for twenty years, and this prisoner would give in sexually to a homosexual jailkeeper in order to avoid greater damage (on the part of other jailkeepers or prisoners), no one would think that the prisoner was "married" with the jailkeeper (even both of them became very good friends). Once freed from prison and from his duties of homosexual sexual services, the heterosexual inmate would be incensed if anyone deplored the *tragedy* of his *divorce* (from the jailkeeper), exhorting him with insistence to *return to the wife of his youth*—particularly if it was thanks to that particular jailkeeper that the prisoner was able to achieve his final freedom.

For people who are bombarded from infancy with the majority (heterosexist) propaganda it becomes almost impossible to be able to think clearly on this complex subject matter. But writing "married" within quotation marks would at least help us bear in mind we are dealing with differences that are more significant than legal and canonical similarities with heterosexual marriage. I will keep on insisting that, in reality, homosexual people never really "marry" someone of the opposite sex. Just like their oppressors (u.e. the heterosexist society they live in), they have been bombarded from tender infancy with heterosexist propaganda. During adolescence they suffer the diffamation of being considered as sick, sinners or criminals. Finally, they remain entrapped within the idea that they can be healed and gain the forgiveness of Heaven by becoming "married". To conclude: they are entrapped within a relationship that could be even worse for the heterosexual "spouse" (acting as a shield or as a jailkeeper).

After fifteen years of reading and counseling, preceded by thirty years of having received incompetent counseling, I have reached at least a few clear conclusions in this area. First of all: no homosexual person should be encouraged to "marry", even less so with the false notion that he/she would be able to attain a change in his/her sexual orientation. Sexual habits do change, just as in the case of heterosexual inmates, but sexual orientation does not. Very few

psychological professionals would make the mistake of counseling someone to do so at present. (Fifty years ago, some professionals counseled me incorrectly during a period of three years.) However, it is tragic that both Catholic and Protestant clergy keep on encouraging their followers to contract such "marriages", and then they lament and complain about the resulting increment in the divorce rate, fueled by their own incompetence. Since the scientific data have been known for decades and are just as available as the columns of any newspaper, I would demand that clergy who have been guilty of such professional incompetence be sued for malpractice. With the spread of AIDS, even within the heterosexual population, deplorable ignorance and intolerance towards homosexuality are luxuries we can no longer permit ourselves.

Secondly, although personal situations can be painful and complex, the true alternatives are rather few and simple.

1. Ideological fundamentalism's simplistic response is to treat such relationships as if they were real marriages, threatening the couple with excommunication and the fire of Hell if they ever divorce. People who have sought my counsel, coming from such backgrounds—whether they be Catholic, Pentecostal or Evangelical—suffer from severe anguish because of this.

In one case, the heterosexual wife, ignoring that her husband was homosexual, constantly threatened to commit suicide and violently attacked him, causing bitter fights in front of the children. Whoever thinks that such "marriages" should always be saved "for the good of the children" should carefully examine all that those children have to go through and be a witness of. After having separated, the mother and father can start healing themselves psychologically and spiritually, and become better parents for the children involved. Yet if they remain together ("suffering all") for the sake of the children and attempting to satisfy church demands, the whole story can end up in cases of suicide or homicide.

In another case, the heterosexual wife felt emotionally abandoned—whilst ignoring that she could have possibly become HIV-positive and that, while she continued to bear children, 30% of those children could also become HIV-positive. In a third case, a Baptist pastor sent one of the members of his congregation, a married homosexual man, to a Christian counselor who claimed to be able to cure people from homosexuality. This counselor intended to seduce his patient, yet he continued to advertise for his services in denominational magazines. Once more, the unsuspecting wife had become a good candidate for becoming infected with HIV. What is more, the Baptist pastor in question prohibited the distribution of literature that might call his sexual ideology into question, without having read it.

These are not horror stories from the "mean secular world out there", but they are typical of conservative churches whose members are considered to be rigorously pious in their practice of religion. It is common that pastors who promote such "marriages" tend to lose contact with the couple before they can witness the disasters they have provoked, which might call their own dominant ideology into question. Of those concerning whom we have follow-up news, investigations show that the majority of those men who tend to have anonymous, promiscuous sex, so firmly denounced by fundamentalists as incarnating the "bad essence" of the gay lifestyle, are, in reality, no other than those neurotic, depressed and repressed married homosexuals whom that same fundamentalist ideology specializes in producing<sup>lvii</sup>.

Ethical theory is one thing; another thing, however, is to offer adequate pastoral counseling for desperate people who can disappear if they are advised to follow solutions they find unacceptable. No matter how long it takes, a gay or lesbian person must attempt to educate the couple who ignore what homosexuality is, working to achieve the goal of making clear to them the truth about their relationship and their situation. Gay and lesbian people will rapidly come to acknowledge that a satisfactory, lasting intimate relationship cannot be built on the foundations of subterfuge and cheating. The heterosexual spouse has the right to know what the situation really is, yet the truth needs to be "said in love". Generally, this implies not unloading the whole baggage concerning homosexuality on them all at once, not on someone who is still a prisoner of ignorance, prejudice and fanaticism concerning homosexuality (Ephesians 4:15; John 16:12-13).

Gay males who are sexually active outside their marriage are in dire need not only of a serious warning, but also of detailed, explicit information about safe sex. If they were able to respond to the requirement of sexual exclusivity with their spouse, they would be presumably satisfied to listen to fundamentalist diatribes with contrition. In many cases, however, fundamentalism's simplistic response threatens to become a recipe for the worst kind of disaster.

2. The usual alternative for those who cannot bear to go on within such a "marriage" arrangement is to separate. When the heterosexual spouse is informed about the situation, crisis becomes almost inevitable. It is recommendable that this spouse seek out professional psychological help, which can remain necessary for an indeterminate amount of time. The crisis commonly results in separation or divorce. However, counselors with expertise in this area are tending more and more *not* to recommend separation or divorce if the relationship has been hitherto long-lasting and if it contains a series of positive elements<sup>lviii</sup>. Nevertheless, without any further stimulus from outside, separation or divorce will take place at any rate, generally because the heterosexual spouse has insisted on it. Although homosexual people should never be encouraged to "marry" heterosexually in the first place, once they are "married" one must bear in mind other negative factors (apart from suffering from homophobia) before one starts recommending separation or divorce. However, even once all subterfuge has been lifted, very few gay males will desire or be able to achieve emotional maturity in an exclusive heterosexual relationship. From a biblical point of view, it is important to distinguish between that which Jesus attacks, namely the hypocrisy of the *oppressors* (Matthew 23), and the necessary deceptions and concealments to which the *oppressed* are forced when they have to hide the truth to protect their own lives, just as the Israelite midwives did in Egypt (Exodus 1:17-19), and just as the Jews did under the terror of the Nazis.

3. If, generally speaking, an exclusive sexual relationship is no longer possible or healthily feasible, and divorce is not recommended in that particular situation either, then the only alternative for homosexual people who have fallen in the trap of "marriage" is to opt for an open relationship, negotiated by both parties, both being fully conscious of the conditions they are in and the reality they are confronting. Heterosexual couples practicing "open marriage" have been repeatedly vilified—maybe rightly so, as far as I know. However, I would insist that an open relation that includes one homosexual member is different from an "open marriage" between two heterosexual people. In the case of "married" homosexual people, several recent studies give support to the alternative of opting for an open relationship<sup>lix</sup>. Unfortunately, very few psychologists and pastors who are counseling married homosexuals have read these works,

which are difficult to come by outside certain university libraries and quality gay/lesbian bookstores.

If the heterosexual spouse agrees to an open relationship, it would be useful to clarify usage and to avoid the word "marriage", attempting, instead, to use a less confused term, such as "relationship". Obviously, we are not talking about an ideal arrangement. Nevertheless, just as in cases of polygamy, imposed monogamy or divorce might turn out to be worse than a certain dose of informed flexibility—that is, wisdom, as Biblical literature calls it. Faced with the limitation imposed by being sterile, Sarah took the initiative for creating something similar to an "open marriage", when she insisted that Abraham take her own slave Hagar as his concubine (Genesis 16). Even in conservative Evangelical circles it is well known that some women caught in "marriage" with gay males have opted to take that step<sup>lx</sup>.

Although condoning open relationships as the less destructive option, Isay makes clear that remaining "married" makes it difficult for a gay male to "integrar plenamente a su sexualidad en una identidad gay positiva"<sup>lxi</sup>. In this area, Jacques Ellul's comments on the full Christian life as a dialectic between freedom and love are not only pertinent, but moving. The old Book of the Covenant of Israel describes the analogous situation of a slave who had the right to become a free man after seven years of servitude, but was not allowed to take his family with him:

But if the slave does not accept his freedom because he loves his wife, his children and his master, then his master shall bring him to God, and he shall bring him to the door or the doorpost; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, thus making him a slave for life (Exodus 21:1-6).

The philosopher Nietzsche and maybe some of those who support gay liberation, would consider such a decision to be typical of the slave moral. It is certainly true that, under current circumstances, if such a case arose we could insist that the master make the necessary sacrifice and not only free the slave, but all of his family as well. Nevertheless, whoever has had to affront decisions such as that slave had to make can appreciate the depth of the Biblical perspective on the often wearisome dialectic between freedom and love. Can a married gay or lesbian's love for his/her heterosexual spouse be as authentic and profound when the homosexual spouse's identity and orientation are constantly being tread upon? Is it sensible for a heterosexual spouse to encourage the continuity of such a relationship, remaining fully conscious of the obstacles and limitations involved, and recognizing that the expressed love will never be that of an ideal marriage?

Anglican bishop C. G. Moule (1841-1920) wrote a hymn describing his own relation to Christ as an allegory of the Hebrew slave's decision:

*My glorious Victor, Prince Divine, Clasp these surrender'd hands in Thine;  
At length my will is all Thine own, Glad vassal of a Savior's throne.  
My Master lead me to the door; Pierce this now willing ear once more....  
Self's weary liberties I cast Beneath Thy feet; there keep hem fast.  
Tread them still down; and then I know, These hands shall with Thy gifts o'erflow;  
And pierced ears shall hear the tone Which tells me Thou and I are one.*

¿Are we dealing with the slave moral here? Or, rather, is this the expression of authentic Christian freedom, which acknowledges that human freedom is never total, and that genuine love is sometimes willing to make sacrifices? Where there is so little self-esteem and love of self, can such a sacrifice be a true expression of emotional health and lead to full, psychologically mature inner healing? Or will the relationship have to have a certain sado-masochist touch in order for it to work at all? Future investigations in the area of the social sciences, carried out in the light of the Scriptures, would help to bring more clarity into this complex and painful area of human experience.

**Bibliography: married homosexuals (see Jonathan)**

Buxton, Amity P. (1991). *The Other Side of the Closet: The Coming-Out Crisis Straight Spouses*. Santa Monica, California: IBS.

Gochros, Jean S. (1989). *When Husbands Come Out Of The Closet*. New York: Harrington Press.

Hill, Ivan, ed. (1987). *The Bisexual Spouse*. McLean, Virginia: Barlina.

Whitney, Catherine (1990). *Uncommon Lives: Gay Men and Straight Women*. Brattleboro, Vermont: NAL.

## **Bisexuales, ¿ninguna o todas las personas? Cuatro guías de trabajo (ver David)**

Leonard Berstein (1918-1990) se mostró en su vida privada como homosexual. Aun así su matrimonio con Felicia Montealegre Cohn duró hasta su muerte en 1978 procreando tres hijos.

**Time**, 29 de octubre de 1990, Obituario, p. 43

*En 1987, Leonard Berstein fue el tema de una detallada psicobiografía que incluía discusiones sobre su bisexualidad.* **Newsweek**, 29 de octubre de 1990, Obituario

La confusión de los medios de comunicación es comprensible puesto que los estudios científicos sobre la bisexualidad son parciales y contradictorios. Incluso las iglesias que tienen mucho que decir sobre la homosexualidad, desde la plena aceptación al absoluto anatema, a menudo permanecen silenciosas acerca de las personas bisexuales. Esto es sorprendente puesto que las personas bisexuales representan del 15 al 45 por ciento de la población siendo de dos a diez veces tan numerosas como las personas homosexuales. Indudablemente, el porcentaje de personas bisexuales que se casa es mucho mayor que el 20% de personas homosexuales que lo intentan.

Incluso sexólogos sumamente competentes, y científicos de otras disciplinas, estarían en desacuerdo si, en principio, toda persona o ninguna es bisexual. En parte, el problema consiste en la definición pues la capacidad de funcionar sexualmente con uno u otro sexo no es igual a ser mitad y mitad en términos de orientación o preferencia sexual. Parecería que el desacuerdo científico es consecuencia de la perspectiva tradicionalmente negativa de la sociedad sobre la homosexualidad, en el presente asociada al estallido de la epidemia del SIDA a causa de una perspectiva, aún más negativa, sobre la bisexualidad. Desde la infancia los niños perciben que ser una mariquita es lo peor. Para muchos adolescentes, una persona homosexual es una basura moral. Hasta hace poco, toda persona con tendencias homosexuales procuraba poner a resguardo su autoestima y conformidad personal convenciéndose que era una poquito bisexual. Empero el estallido de la epidemia del SIDA desvaneció la era de elegante aceptación de la bisexualidad y las personas bisexuales se encontraron aún más odiadas y oprimidas que las homosexuales.

Frecuentemente, las y los profesionales de la psicología llevan el tratamiento de una persona homosexual durante meses y años antes que pueda aceptar su orientación. No es pues sorprendente que las encuestas sobre la preferencia sexual sean tendenciosas. A pesar de las imponentes estadísticas de Kinsey en las que solamente el 4 por ciento de la población es exclusivamente homosexual en tanto que el 46 por ciento ha tenido experiencia bisexual, los expertos en sexualidad estarían convencidos que el verdadero número de personas cerca de mitad y mitad respecto de la preferencia sexual es muy pequeño. Algunas de las personas que piensan que son bisexuales estarían, verdaderamente, en camino a admitir una identidad homosexual pero, debido a la presión social, demoran la experiencia homosexual que confirmaría su orientación. Esto es así a pesar del mito, afirmado por un gran número de lesbianas y gays, que es falso.

En cuanto a la religión, las personas bisexuales tienen una gran ventaja pues jamás debieron escuchar sermones basados en *Levítico 20* que declarasen públicamente la pena de muerte para los bisexuales. Tampoco nadie ha traducido 1 Corintios 6:9 afirmando que Pablo excluyó a los bisexuales del reino de Dios. No deseo dañar a mi prójimo bisexual y, por cierto, no deseo

inculcar maliciosas ideas en las mentes de los traductores contemporáneos. Sin embargo, es sumamente probable que los autores bíblicos comparten el antiguo punto de vista que toda persona es potencialmente bisexual en el sentido de ser plenamente capaz de apreciar la belleza, sentir atracción y desempeñarse sexualmente con uno y otro sexo (Horner 1978). En consecuencia, respecto de Romanos 1, ni el punto de vista fundamentalista que Pablo condena a las personas homosexuales ni la respuesta popular de las personas gays que Pablo habla de personas heterosexuales que hacen actos homosexuales, ver Boswell, tienen visos de verdad. Probablemente, Pablo supone, como sus contemporáneos, que las personas tienen cierto potencial bisexual pero solamente habla de deseos y actos, no de orientación.

Una reciente encuesta telefónica en USA concluyó que las personas homosexuales eran, prácticamente, inexistentes. Del mismo modo, una encuesta en la Alemania nazi que pretendiese descubrir el porcentaje de judíos habría, probablemente, alcanzado similares conclusiones aún antes que seis millones muriesen en los campos de concentración. ¿Quién desearía admitir por teléfono a una persona desconocida lo que pudiese llevarlo a la cárcel en veintitrés estados, y la pérdida del trabajo, la familia, la herencia, el seguro social, en cualquier otro lugar? ¡Nada es más fácil de obtener en las encuestas populares sobre el sexo que respuestas heterosexuales! Las y los científicos han de ser extremadamente cuidadosos para lograr resultados confiables en esta área del conocimiento.

El Informe Kinsey ha sido un factor adicional de confusión. De manera superficial, las personas se consideran de 0 a 6 según la famosa escala de Kinsey olvidando que el autor habló de conducta sexual, no de orientación o preferencia. En consecuencia, de acuerdo a Kinsey, la persona cabalmente heterosexual según la orientación que está encarcelada y mantiene relación sexual con un guardia para evitar sevicias, sería considerado plenamente homosexual. Pero la persona cabalmente homosexual, según la orientación, que se ha casado y mantiene exclusivamente esa relación sexual, sería clasificado plenamente heterosexual. Actualmente, las y los investigadores usan encuestas con grillas de preferencia que son más confiables que los simples informes sobre conducta sexual (Klein y Wolf 1985:35-49, Geller 1990:64-81) pero las encuestas usualmente publicadas en los medios periodísticos parecieran adheridas al modelo mal interpretado de Kinsey.

Al olvidar la existencia de las personas bisexuales los ministerios y curanderos de exgays continúan teniendo a su disposición la posibilidad de recoger testimonios de homosexuales practicantes que lograron exorcisar sus demonios en una iglesia fundamentalista, se casaron con la mujer justa y vivieron para siempre felices (Blair 1982). Esta ideología es invencible cuando el testimonio es publicado inmediatamente después de la ceremonia de casamiento y nadie nunca más nadie averigua donde están esas personas cinco o diez años después.

Dada su misteriosa e imponente capacidad para ser todos y nadie, aún para científicos más capacitados, no sorprende que las personas tiendan a ser olvidadas e ignoradas por los teólogos y pastores. Los líderes religiosos puntualizan a menudo que la única alternativa a las personas heterosexuales felizmente casadas es el repugnante y miserable estilo de vida gay, siempre en singular. Sin embargo, las guías de trabajo adecuadas para la interpretación bíblica, el ministerio y asesoramiento de las minorías sexuales pueden sólo ser aplicadas a la compleja y confusa área de la bisexualidad. En tanto que los genuinos bisexuales se den a conocer del maderamen donde han tratado de fundirse al modo de su equivalente del armario gay, desarrollen una imagen

positiva, escriban abiertamente para las publicaciones gays y, si son cristianos, hagan su propia contribución a la teología e interpretación bíblica, esta vasta área de la experiencia humana será ampliamente iluminada.

Podríamos confirmar científicamente que las personas bisexuales son, por cierto, de a diez veces tan numerosas como las homosexuales, o que muchas más que el diez por ciento del núcleo de personas gays y lesbianas. Podríamos decidir que aun cuando *Jonatán amó a David* (Horner 1978), David no lo amó lo bastante como para abandonar a sus ocho esposas, pues era bisexual y, por cierto, polígamo. Del mismo modo, Rut y Noemí, proclamadas como lesbianas, obviamente encajan en el molde bisexual mejor que en el exclusivo homosexual pues ambas se habían casado y tenido hijos. En el Nuevo Testamento, en tanto Pablo no ofrece prueba de atracción sexual por las mujeres, Jesús estuvo íntimamente vinculado con María Magdalena y otras mujeres, así como con el discípulo al que particularmente amaba, probablemente Juan, aunque otros dirían Lázaro.

Entretanto, si las relaciones abiertas debiesen aceptarse como una posibilidad para las personas homosexuales que cayeron en la trampa del matrimonio, parecería razonable que una relación abierta fuese aceptable como posibilidad para las personas bisexuales. Algunas personas bisexuales preferirían una relación exclusiva pero no necesariamente permanente. Cuando una relación concluye, muchos emprenden una relación con alguien de diferente género. Tanto para las mujeres como para los varones homosexuales, las investigaciones muestran una tendencia a preferir mujeres para las relaciones básicas y a varones para el placer sexual. Semejante recomendación podría parecer como una bomba terrorista puesta debajo de nuestra ideología heterosexista y, ciertamente, es herética para la tradicional interpretación bíblica. Sin embargo, la astronomía de Galileo y la geografía de América también eran heréticas para los autores de la Biblia como lo fueron para siglos de los intérpretes. Frente a las complejidades de la bisexualidad, hemos de contentarnos con la mejor prueba científica disponible y extraer directivas de las continuidades históricas bíblicas fundamentales: libertad, justicia, amor y sabiduría. (Mateo 23:23, Proverbios).

### **Bibliografía: La Bisexualidad (ver David)**

- Balderston, Daniel (1997). "Excluded Middle: Bisexuality in Doña Herlinda y su hijo." *Sex and Sexuality in Latin America*. New York: New York University.
- Cantarella, Eva (1992/1988) *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*. New Haven: Yale. (traducción del italiano)
- Garber, Margarie (1995). *Viceversa: Bisexuality and the Eroticism of Everyday Life*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Geller, Thomas, ed. (1990). *Bisexuality: A Reader and Sourcebook*. Novato, CA: Times Change.
- Hutchins, Loraine and Kaahumanu, Lani, eds. (1991). *BI any other Name; Bisexual People speak out*: Boston, Alyson.
- Herdt, Gilbert (1997). *Same Sex, Different Cultures: Gays and Lesbians Across Cultures*. Boulder, CO: Westview/HarperCollins.
- Hill, Ivan, ed. (1987). *The Bisexual Spouse*. McLean, Virginia: Barlina.
- Klein, Fred, MD (1978/1993). *The Bisexual Option*, New York: Harrington Park.
- Klein, Fritz and Wolf, Timothy J., ed. (1985) *Two Lives to Lead: Bisexuality in Men and Women*. New York: Harrington Park
- Mendès-Leité, Rommel (1996). *Bisexualité: le dernier Tabou*. France: Calmann-Lévy. Off Pink Publishing
- Off Pink Publishing (1988). *Bisexual Lives*. London: Off Pink.
- Weinberg, Martin S., Williams, Colin J. And Pryor, Douglas W. (1994). *Dual Attraction: Understanding Bisexuality*. New York: Oxford.
- Romano, Claudio (1994). *Las dos vidas de Claudio La bisexualidad en los varones*. Bogotá, Colombia
- "Bisexuality" Cover Story, *Newsweek* July 17, 1995:44-50 (Buena introducción popular).
- "Bisexualiity: Both/And Rather Than Either/Or." *Open Hands* 14/1 (Summer 1998). Issue devoted to theme of bisexuality.

6:9 chance? (*miqreh*) "suceso, accidente, casualidad, suerte" (Schökel 1994:455)  
1 Sam 6:9; 20:26 (= emisión of semen?); Rut 2:3 (+ *qarah*); Ecl 2:14-15; 3:19;  
9:2-3);  
*qarah*: suceder, pasar, acontecer, ocurrir, acaecer, resultar (S 673)  
ver Ecl. Vs. Romanos

3.5 1 Samuel (como Jueces) comúnmente designa a los filisteos como los "incircuncisos", que les reduce a una característica física (como el color de la piel en el racismo), con enfoque en la función sexual de los varones (una amenaza desde la perspectiva israelita). El relato sobre el precio que Saúl demandó de David al ofrecer a su hija Mical en matrimonio—100 prepucios filisteos—refleja los mismos prejuicios (xenofobia + homofobia; notemos que David aceptó el reto con gusto y le trajo a Saul 200 prepucios filisteos; 1 Sam 18:17-29; Jobling 1998:227-232)

Schökel 588:

*'arlah*, prepucio: Gen 17:11-14; Lev 12:32; Deut 10:16; Jos 5:3; **1 Sam 18:25**  
*'aral*, nifal: dejar ver el prepucio, Hab 2:16  
*'arel*, incircunciso: Gén 17:14; Lev 26:41; Ex 6:12,30; Jer 9:25  
*mwl* ("mul"), circuncidar: Gen 17:11,14; Lev 12:3; Dt 10:16; Jos 5:8 (Schökel 409)  
*mulah*, circuncisión, Ex 4:26

Edelman, Diana V (1992). "Jonathan son of Saul". ABD III:944-946  
Jonatán tenía 30 años cuando murió (946)  
Niega la historicidad del amor y los pactos entre D&J (946)

(Saul celoso?); homosexuales casados; Goliat?

Pobres.oprimidos:

1S 2:7-8

5:9 Dios afligió los filisteos con tumores (arca)  
12:6 filisteos opr en batalla militar  
24:11-13, David inocente de injusticias, viol (contra Saul)

25:29 *tsarar* bound securely in the bundle of the living  
26:24 *tsarah*, trouble, David libre de 30:6 David  
28:15 Saul en gran distress *tsarar*, busca bruja de Endor

2S 1:26 David grieved *tsarar* I for Jonatan

16:5-14 Shimei maldice a David : 7-8 hombre de sangre (viol), distress, 12  
24:13-14 (*tsarar* II), enemies, distress... ángel afflicting (*shakhat*) el pueblo

(McCarter + Birch?) ver Klein re intro?<sup>lxii</sup>

- 
- <sup>i</sup> Klein 1999:434
- <sup>ii</sup> Leonhard Rost, *The Succession to the Throne of David*. Sheffield: Sheffield (1926/82)
- <sup>iii</sup> BJ note 2 Sam 9
- <sup>iv</sup> Bailey 2000:1163-64
- <sup>v</sup> Frolov 2002
- <sup>vi</sup> Jobling 1998:29
- <sup>vii</sup> Jobling 1998:214
- <sup>viii</sup> Norman Gottwald, *Tribes*, 1979:419-425
- <sup>ix</sup> See Norman Gottwald, *Introduction* (1985:312)
- <sup>x</sup> Jobling 1998:181-194
- <sup>xi</sup> Linda Schearing 2000:549
- <sup>xii</sup> see Lillian R. Klein 2000:91
- <sup>xiii</sup> Lillian Klein 1994
- <sup>xiv</sup> Carol Meyers 1996
- <sup>xv</sup> Jo Ann Hackett 1998:96
- <sup>xvi</sup> Ronald Youngblood 1992:51
- <sup>xvii</sup> Jobling 1998:
- <sup>xviii</sup> Jobling 1998:178-179
- <sup>xix</sup> Bailey 1990; 2000:1164
- <sup>xx</sup> see David Jobling 1998:77-104
- <sup>xxi</sup> Ken Stone WS 2001:264
- <sup>xxii</sup> Jobling 1998:188
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Jobling 1998:188-189
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Jobling 1998:273-278
- <sup>xxv</sup> Carol Myers 2000:257, WS
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Claudia Camp, WS 2001:263 and 266-67; WHB 1999:195-207
- <sup>xxvii</sup> BJ notes Mark 2:23,26,27
- <sup>xxviii</sup> BJ note to 1 Sam. 21:5
- <sup>xxix</sup> Marcela Althau-Reid, *Indecent Theology*
- <sup>xxx</sup> Silvia Schroer & Thomas Staubli 2000:22-36
- <sup>xxxi</sup> Schökel 677
- <sup>xxxii</sup> Jobling 1998:161
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> Schroer & Staubli 2000:22; see Randall Bailey 2000:1165; Gary Comstock; Nancy Wilson 1995:149-153 (in a chapter which was omitted in the later edition published in 2000); Tom Horner 1978:26-39
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> David Jobling 1998:161
- <sup>xxxv</sup> Jobling 1998:161
- <sup>xxxvi</sup> Jobling 1998:161, following Fewell & Gunn 1993:149-150
- <sup>xxxvii</sup> see NVI, JB, DHH; cf. Jobling 1998:178
- <sup>xxxviii</sup> Jobling 1998:178-179, referring to Ahinoam
- <sup>xxxix</sup> Jobling 1998:163
- <sup>xl</sup> Jobling 1998:162
- <sup>xli</sup> Fewell & Gunn 1993:151
- <sup>xlii</sup> Hugenberger 1944/98
- <sup>xliiii</sup> Boswell 1994/96
- <sup>xliv</sup> Thompson 1974:334-338
- <sup>xlv</sup> Cyrus H. Gordon, 1955, "Homer and the Bible: The Origin and Character of East Mediterranean Literature" (*Hebrew Union College Annual* 26:89), quoted in Tom Horner 1978:19
- <sup>xlvi</sup> Bailey 1990; 2000:1164
- <sup>xlvii</sup> Müllner 1999:118
- <sup>xlviii</sup> Jobling 1998:197-243
- <sup>xlx</sup> see BJ notes Gen. 12:10; 20; 26
- <sup>1</sup> BJ note Joshua 13:2
- <sup>li</sup> Jobling 1998:197-198
- <sup>lii</sup> Jobling 1998:200-202
- <sup>liii</sup> Jobling 1998:213

---

<sup>liv</sup> Byrne Fone 2000

<sup>lv</sup> Raymond-Jean Frontain 1995/2002

<sup>lvi</sup> See also the article "David et Jonathan" in *Dictionnaire Gay*, Leonel Povert, ed., (Paris: Jacques Grancher, 1994

<sup>lvii</sup> Isay 1989:83

<sup>lviii</sup> Geest 1990:129; Whitney: 1990

<sup>lix</sup> Klein and Wolf 1985; Hill 1987; Gochros 1989; Isay 1989; Whitney 1990; Buxton 1991; cf. Masters and Johnson 1988; Pearson 1986

<sup>lx</sup> Gardner 1984:84

<sup>lxi</sup> Isay 1986:66

<sup>lxii</sup>