

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 448

1 Samuel 2:12-36

October 22, 2022

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Episode Summary

This episode of the podcast continues in 1 Samuel 2 through the end of the chapter. In 1 Sam 2:12-36 we are introduced specifically to how Samuel contrasts with the wicked sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas. The chapter raises questions about the nature of Samuel's ministry, as well as the matter of the unidentified "man of God" that appears to prophesy against Eli.

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 448: 1 Samuel 2:12-36. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Well, Mike, it looks like we're competitors this week!

MH: Yes, we are. We are (in our Fantasy Football League for those who haven't followed the podcast and don't know what time of year it is). [laughs]

TS: Yeah, and if you don't, shame on you. But seriously Mike, how nervous and scared are you to face me? Because I am 4 and 1 (only behind your brother) and I got a pretty good team. So I know you're nervous.

MH: Not too much. I mean, I'm kind of used to it now. I'm used to all the injuries and what not.

TS: Used to losing? You're used to losing? I get that. [laughs]

MH: I'm used to struggling, yeah, in this league I am. So the Pugnacious Pugs are...I think I'm 2 and 3.

TS: Yeah.

MH: So I gotta climb back to 500. I got a few points in that dreadful Washington and Chicago game Thursday night.

TS: Yeah.

MH: But we'll see if that helps me.

TS: It's not, Mike, I'm sorry. There's not much you can do against my team, but thanks for playing. I mean, thanks for trying. I appreciate it.

MH: Right, right. No, all I'm caring about is getting into the playoffs 'cause anything can happen there.

TS: Yeah.

MH: Maybe I'll be at full strength then.

TS: Yeah, absolutely, absolutely. Well, Mike, I'm enjoying switching gears here to 1 Samuel! We're getting some good feedback, and everybody was pleasantly surprised and looking forward to it. We're going to finish out chapter 2 today.

MH: Yeah, yeah, yep, yep, we are.

So let's just jump in and read 1 Samuel 2:12-36 and then we'll jump into the content. So I'm reading again from ESV:

¹² Now the sons of Eli were worthless men. They did not know the LORD.

How's that for a beginning? [laughs]

¹³ The custom of the priests with the people was that when any man offered sacrifice, the priest's servant would come, while the meat was boiling, with a three-pronged fork in his hand, ¹⁴ and he would thrust it into the pan or kettle or cauldron or pot. All that the fork brought up the priest would take for himself. This is what they did at Shiloh to all the Israelites who came there. ¹⁵ Moreover, before the fat was burned, the priest's servant would come and say to the man who was sacrificing, "Give meat for the priest to roast, for he will not accept boiled meat from you but only raw." ¹⁶ And if the man said to him, "Let them burn the fat first, and then take as much as you wish," he would say, "No, you must give it now, and if not, I will take it by force." ¹⁷ Thus the sin of the young men was very great in the sight of the LORD, for the men treated the offering of the LORD with contempt.

¹⁸ Samuel was ministering before the LORD, a boy clothed with a linen ephod. ¹⁹ And his mother used to make for him a little robe and take it to him each year when she went up with her husband to offer the yearly sacrifice. ²⁰ Then Eli would bless Elkanah and his wife, and say, "May

the LORD give you children by this woman for the petition she asked of the LORD.” So then they would return to their home.

²¹ Indeed the LORD visited Hannah, and she conceived and bore three sons and two daughters. And the boy Samuel grew in the presence of the LORD.

²² Now Eli was very old, and he kept hearing all that his sons were doing to all Israel, and how they lay with the women who were serving at the entrance to the tent of meeting. ²³ And he said to them, “Why do you do such things? For I hear of your evil dealings from all these people. ²⁴ No, my sons; it is no good report that I hear the people of the LORD spreading abroad. ²⁵ If someone sins against a man, God will mediate for him, but if someone sins against the LORD, who can intercede for him?” But they would not listen to the voice of their father, for it was the will of the LORD to put them to death.

²⁶ Now the boy Samuel continued to grow both in stature and in favor with the LORD and also with man.

²⁷ And there came a man of God to Eli and said to him, “Thus says the LORD, ‘Did I indeed reveal myself to the house of your father when they were in Egypt subject to the house of Pharaoh? ²⁸ Did I choose him out of all the tribes of Israel to be my priest, to go up to my altar, to burn incense, to wear an ephod before me? I gave to the house of your father all my offerings by fire from the people of Israel. ²⁹ Why then do you scorn my sacrifices and my offerings that I commanded for my dwelling, and honor your sons above me by fattening yourselves on the choicest parts of every offering of my people Israel?’

³⁰ Therefore the LORD, the God of Israel, declares: ‘I promised that your house and the house of your father should go in and out before me forever,’ but now the LORD declares: ‘Far be it from me, for those who honor me I will honor, and those who despise me shall be lightly esteemed. ³¹ Behold, the days are coming when I will cut off your strength and the strength of your father's house, so that there will not be an old man in your house. ³² Then in distress you will look with envious eye on all the prosperity that shall be bestowed on Israel, and there shall not be an old man in your house forever. ³³ The only one of you whom I shall not cut off from my altar shall be spared to weep his eyes out to grieve his heart, and all the descendants of your house shall die by the sword of men. ³⁴ And this that shall come upon your two sons, Hophni and Phinehas,

5:00

shall be the sign to you: both of them shall die on the same day. ³⁵ And I will raise up for myself a faithful priest, who shall do according to what is in my heart and in my mind. And I will build him a sure house, and he shall go in and out before my anointed forever. ³⁶ And everyone who is left in your house shall come to implore him for a piece of silver or a loaf of bread and shall say, "Please put me in one of the priests' places, that I may eat a morsel of bread."'"

That's the entirety of the rest of 1 Samuel chapter 2. So we want to start with just generally, what is the passage about? Again, we're modifying what we do here a little bit to get through these passages and so we'll start it this way. What is the passage about?

Well, first the passage is about the corruption of Eli's sons and his negligence in dealing with the problem. That's kind of obvious from what we read. But it also marks the passing of the Elides; that is, Eli and his family—his priestly lineage. It marks the passing of the Elides and begins the transition toward Samuel functioning as God's priest or at least sort of like a priest. We'll comment in a little bit that Samuel does priestly things, but he's not actually from the line of Aaron, that he really needed to be to be a full priest. But anyway, recall from last time (our last episode) that Samuel's line could be traced back to Jacob through Levi. So Samuel was a Levite, but he wasn't a descendant of Aaron. And he's going to be this transitional figure to take over from Eli in some respect, but also until this other priestly figure will come (and we'll get to that in a moment).

As far as the wider context, let's just observe a few things here. First of all, the passage begins to highlight the contrast between Samuel and the Elides (again, Eli's priestly lineage). What the writer does here is he uses the literary technique of coupling; that is, putting together and comparing characters. So if you read through the passage, there are negative comments about Eli's household in 1 Samuel 2:12-17 and 22-25 and 27-36 that alternate with positive observations about Samuel's growing relationship with the Lord (like in 1 Samuel 2:18-21, 26). Samuel is described as being clothed in a linen ephod, marking him as the contrasting priestly figure to Eli and his sons, even as a young boy, and here we return to this point about Samuel not being from Aaron. We have to note this—that Samuel was not a descendant of Aaron so he could not serve in the office of priest. Rather, he was a Levite and so he could occupy parts of sacred space there at the Tabernacle and perform certain Tabernacle duties. He was permitted to offer sacrifices (at least certain sacrifices), but he was not a *kohen*, an Aaronic priest. And again, we'll also return to that a little bit later as we hit some other things in the chapter.

1 Samuel 2 also sets up the next chapter. If you really think about it, here in chapter 2, Samuel is functioning as a Levite and doing certain priestly things,

whereas chapter 3 will introduce him in the role of a prophet. This is when God starts to come to him and speak to him face-to-face.

Chisholm in his commentary remarks on this contrast as follows. He writes:

10:00

Samuel's arrival at Shiloh (1:28; 2:11) provides a contrastive backdrop for the author's negative portrait of Eli and his sons. The narrator alternates between negative accounts of Eli's house and brief positive observations about Samuel's growing relationship with the Lord. This culminates in the account of how Samuel becomes the Lord's prophet and reiterates the earlier judgment announcement upon Eli's house (3:1-4:1a). The narrator's positive assessment of Samuel helps to establish the latter's credentials, which is an important part of his strategy in promoting David as God's chosen king.

After all, 1 Samuel is going to be about the rise of David ultimately. Back to Chisholm. He writes:

This account, along with the one that follows (3:1-4:1a), also contributes in another way to the narrator's goal of presenting David, not Saul, as God's chosen king. The rejection of Eli's house and the announcement of a new priestly dynasty establish a pattern that will be repeated with Saul and David. Just as God withdraws his promise of dynastic succession from Eli and gives it to another (2:30-36), so he will do with Saul (later in 13:13-14). The house of Saul will not be able to appeal to God's election as unconditional, for Eli's experience demonstrates that disobedience can result in forfeiture of the divine promise. The Lord has the sovereign right to reject rebels and to accomplish his purposes through other and more-worthy instruments.

That's the end of the Chisholm quote. Now I'm going to come back to this theme as well of election because I think... Well, we might as well do it now. This latter paragraph (this comment that Chisholm had about the house of Saul not being able to depend on God's election of his household as unconditional) is important. Because that last paragraph is in reference to 1 Samuel 2:30-36, which we just read. I'll just read a little bit of it here again. Let's see, verse 30:

³⁰ Therefore the LORD, the God of Israel, declares: 'I promised that your house and the house of your father should go in and out before me forever,' but now the LORD declares: 'Far be it from me, for those who honor me I will honor, and those who despise me shall be lightly esteemed. ³¹ Behold, the days are coming when I will cut off your strength and the strength of your father's house, so that there will not be an old man in your house.

You keep reading... This is around the heels of, let's see, the way verse 30 begins.

'I promised that your house and the house of your father should go in and out before me forever,'

"In and out" being a reference to going in and out in the sacred space—the Tabernacle and later the Temple. And here God goes back on that. He rejects it. So God can revoke his choice, his elective choice, when apostasy becomes a problem. I think this shows, again, how we misunderstand election. This is another example of God changing election. So any talk of election which begins with God's choice of Israel needs to account for episodes and passages like this one, and too often they are ignored or missed or not factored into the discussion. Election is assumed to be something that is guaranteed, and it's not. I mean, here again, God did this with all Israel. Israel was elect. Every Israelite was elected as a member of the nation. But yet God sends the nation into exile because of apostasy. Here God rejects Eli's priesthood where he promised... Again, in verse 30, the Lord declares:

'I promised that your house and the house of your father should go in and out before me forever,'

But now the Lord declares, "Forget it! [laughs] Forget it, it's not going to happen because you and your sons are apostates." So any talk of election that we do, whether it's in the Old or the New Testament (and it always begins with the Old Testament; in typical Reformed theology, they will take this back to Israel's election which they have to do to be consistent, but then they're inconsistent in their election theology by not factoring in verses like this and passages like this—you need to do that)... Again, election is not about guaranteed salvation or guaranteed anything. It's about access. It's about access to the truth—to the true oracles of God. It's about an elective status that can be withdrawn if you apostasize, and that has ramifications for how we view election in the New Testament as well. But anyway, I think that was important to point out.

15:00

Secondly (the second observation), note how the judgements of chapter 2 address the apostasy of Israel in the period of the judges and the resulting Philistine oppression. God doesn't raise up the military leader to fix the problem first. He *first* cleans house at the Tabernacle. This is God's methodology—to clean up the spiritual side first. Harry Hoffner writes in this regard:

Considering the prominent role that warfare with the Philistines plays in 1 Samuel, one might have expected the opening chapters to focus on that threat to Israel. Instead, our text reveals a more sinister and deadly enemy to God's people – a cancer at the very spiritual heart of the people – in her priests, who were

responsible for teaching the people and mediating their prayers and sacrifices to God. The book of Judges, which forms the essential introduction to 1 Samuel, demonstrates that a succession of military victories over outside oppressors was insufficient to bring blessing to the nation when its spiritual condition was cold and careless, as it is repeatedly shown to be in that book (especially Judges 17 and 19). At this point, the nation of Israel needed more than a king – even a godly one like David. It needed a complete cleansing in its priestly leadership and a revival of the prophetic voice. If Eli and his sons vividly illustrate the degradation of the priesthood, the fact that Samuel’s voice broke a long silence in the prophetic ministry (1 Samuel 3:1) [MH: and really the whole chapter of 1 Samuel 3] shows that Israel was starving for the guidance of the living God – the God who had liberated it from Egyptian slavery and planted it in the land promised to Abraham. That new, faithful leadership would emerge in Hannah’s son Samuel.

So those are two sort of macro observations. What about some nuggets in the passage? I’ll park it on a few specific things in the passage. The first one I would get into is the sins of Eli’s sons. There were two main sins here. The first one was taking from the sacrifices, especially the proper priestly share of the sacrifices. The phrase “custom of the priests” refers to Deuteronomy 18:3. I’ll just read that for you.

³ And this shall be the priests' due from the people, from those offering a sacrifice, whether an ox or a sheep: they shall give to the priest the shoulder and the two cheeks and the stomach.

That’s what the priests were supposed to get. That was the custom of the “custom of the priests.” Again, we see how the characters are judged by Deuteronomy content. Remember the Deuteronomist History idea.

But, recalling Hoffner’s pushback on the DeutHist idea, we should also note that the priestly share is also described in more detail in Lev 7:28-34. The sons of Eli were not satisfied with the Lord’s provision and basically took what they wanted (v. 14). Further, the fat of the animal was to be burned first – it was part of the Lord’s portion, his own food offering (Lev 21:17-22). Eli’s sons were serving themselves before God, even at times by force. Resistance to Eli’s sons from lay Israelites shows that average Israelite worshippers knew the Law of Moses on the matter, so we ought to recognize that the law of Moses – either via Leviticus or Deuteronomy – pre-existed this episode and people had been taught the rules.

Now their second main sin was sleeping with the women who served in the Tabernacle. This is mentioned in chapter 2:22. There is a hard-to-miss contrast here between the Phinehas who was Eli’s son (and one of the perpetrators) and

his namesake, the other Phinehas from the era of Moses. Leithart comments on this in his commentary:

The earlier Phinehas pierced through a man and a woman who were fornicating in the camp (Numbers 25:1-9), but at Shiloh an anti-Phinehas fornicated in the tabernacle precincts. This fornication also had symbolic significance. In Leviticus 18, sexual sins are described as an illicit “uncovering nakedness,” and the language parallels the language used of approaches to the sanctuary. There is thus a conceptual parallel between the inviolability of the tabernacle and the inviolability of a woman, and the inviolability of the tabernacle is symbolized by the virgin women who served there. Hophni and Phinehas, however, (the sons of Samuel) violated these women, a sign that the tabernacle itself was being violated. Uncovering the nakedness of the women was as much as ripping down the curtains of the tabernacle. Instead of guarding the dedicated virgins, the sons of Eli treated them as sacred prostitutes.

20:00

The second nugget to look at here is Samuel’s status as a Levite and not an Aaronic priest. So here we come back to this point once again. We noted this earlier. Samuel was limited in what he could do on sacred space, but his presence was still used to contrast godly spiritual leadership with Eli and his worthless sons. Hoffner explains. He writes:

When Yahweh announced his judgment on Eli’s house (1 Samuel 2:27-36 and later in 3:11-18), he promised to raise up a “faithful priest” (*kohen n’eman*) to take its place (1 Samuel 2:35-36). This “priest” was not Samuel but Zadok, who would arrive on the scene after David was king and had captured Jerusalem. In the meantime, God continued to use priests of the family of Eli. Ahimelech, who presided at Nob, aided David in both a cultic (1 Samuel 22:10) and a practical way (1 Samuel 21:1-9) – at the cost of his life (1 Samuel 22:6-23). And his son Abiathar accompanied David during his fugitive years, providing him with guidance through oracular inquiries. The priestly oracular ability overlapped with the ministry of prophets such as Samuel, Nathan, and Gad in providing divine guidance to Israel’s first two kings. It was only when Solomon chose Zadok alone to be high priest, rejecting Abiathar (who was from Eli’s line), that the line of Eli was finally eliminated from serving Yahweh as priests to Israel and her kings. As for Samuel, he was a “seer” (the Hebrew word is *chozeh* or *ro’eh*) and “prophet” (*navi’*) par excellence, greater than any who preceded him since the time of Moses (Deuteronomy 18:15, 18; Deuteronomy 34:10).

Deuteronomy 18:15, remember, says (this is Moses speaking):

¹⁵ **“The LORD your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brothers—it is to him you shall listen—**

So Hoffner considers Samuel in that vein of prophetic fulfillment. He writes:

A good case can be made that prior to this prophecy's ultimate fulfillment in Jesus, it was Samuel who best fit the portrait of the prophet like Moses referred to in Deuteronomy 18. His prophetic utterances never erred.

And he gets that from 1 Samuel 3:19-21 which reads:

¹⁹ And Samuel grew, and the LORD was with him and let none of his words fall to the ground. ²⁰ And all Israel from Dan to Beersheba knew that Samuel was established as a prophet of the LORD.

So when it comes to Jesus' later ultimate status as the prophet like unto Moses, we have something here that really gets its start with Samuel. That's Hoffner's point.

One last point (and this more or less me intervening, even though Hoffner brings it up), I think there is something to be noted here between the parallel wording of 1 Samuel 2:26 and later of Jesus in Luke 2:52. 1 Samuel 2:26 says:

²⁶ Now the boy Samuel continued to grow both in stature and in favor with the LORD and also with man.

It sounds a lot like Luke 2:52:

⁵² And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature and in favor with God and man.

Again, there's a link there established between Jesus and Samuel that we don't want to miss.

So as far as distinguishing what the Aaronic *kohen* ("priest") and Samuel were authorized to do, David Tsumura summarizes this in his own commentary. Recall that the context for this is the Tabernacle itself which was at Shiloh. Tsumura writes, summarizing the chief duties of the priesthood as follows:

1. To go up to my altar: the sum of actions performed on the altar, including burning offerings as "an aroma pleasing to the Lord" (Leviticus 1:9 and other passages).
2. To burn incense (Exodus 30:7; Numbers 17:5): in the holy place, "before the Lord" (Leviticus 16:13). Note that the incense (*qetoret*) was "burned" on a special altar (the altar of incense), not on that of "the food offering". It's

25:00

purpose is to make “the cloud” to “conceal the atonement cover above the Testimony, (again, to conceal the lid of the Ark of the Covenant), so that the priest [the high priest] will not die” (Leviticus 16:13).

3. To wear the ephod (Leviticus 8:7): this ephod is to be distinguished from Samuel’s linen ephod (2:18). This ephod refers to the high priest’s ephod of Exodus 28:5-30, which included the jeweled breastplate and the Urim and Thummim. It appears in 1 Samuel 23:6 and 1 Samuel 30:7 in connection with oracular decisions.

So Samuel could do certain things, but he couldn’t do others. He is still this transitional figure, but he is not the “prophet like unto Moses” or this main sort of priestly replacement either. He is a go-between. He is an in-between. He is a transitional figure.

Third nugget: the unidentified man of God in chapter 2:27 and following. Now let’s just read that again real briefly.

27 And there came a man of God to Eli and said to him, “Thus says the LORD, ‘Did I indeed reveal myself to the house of your father when they were in Egypt subject to the house of Pharaoh?’

So on and so forth. So there’s this unidentified man of God. We’re never given a name, and the fact that God sends a man of God (think about it) to Eli who is the priest is indicative, again, of the spiritual distance between Eli and Yahweh. Yahweh has to send him a man of God—a prophetic figure. He is not speaking to him just by himself. I mean, there’s no relationship there between Eli and Yahweh.

Now on the Hebrew phrase *‘ish’ Elohim* (“man of God”), Hoffner writes as follows:

Although the narrator informs us in 1 Samuel 9:9 that in Samuel’s time the word for “prophet” was *ro’eh* (“seer”) not *navi* (“prophet”). The word that the servant uses is neither of these, but a third one: *ish Elohim* (“a man of God”). This phrase had none of the moral connotations associated with it in today’s language...

In other words, we use it today to refer to a Godly or devout person.

...although the spokesman of Yahweh certainly sought to obey his Torah. Instead, the focus of the phrase was a man who channeled messages from God (or in non Israelite parlance, from the gods).

Remember Hoffner was a Hittite scholar so he is going to dip into Hittite from time to time.

In Hittite, such a person was referred to as either a *šuniyanza*, which describes one controlled (perhaps temporarily possessed) by a god (*šuni-*) or a *šunaš antuḫša* – (“a man or person of the gods”). And although we never see Samuel behaving like an ecstatic, there certainly were examples of ecstatic behavior by true prophets of Yahweh (1 Samuel 10:9-13; see “Saul among the Prophets”). Here the expression is indefinite (here in chapter 2), “a man of God.” When the phrase describes a specific named individual, it is always definite. (Instead of *ish elohim* you would get *ish ha’elohim*, “the man of God”). Examples of such specific individuals include Moses (Deuteronomy 33:1).

I’ll just read that to you.

This is the blessing with which Moses the man of God blessed the people of Israel before his death.

Another example is Shemaiah in 1 Kings 12:22:

²² But the word of God came to Shemaiah the man of God:

The hallmark of a genuine “man of God” or “seer” was this title. Also, it is that whatever he says always comes true. Hoffner writes:

Compare the description in 1 Samuel 3:19 of Samuel’s reliable prophecies: Yahweh was with him and let none of his words fall to the ground” (in other words, Yahweh let none of his predictions fail or prayers go unanswered).

Fourthly, the vocabulary of “fattening” and the subsequent description of Eli as very heavy or fat is ironic. In the prophecy of doom from the man of God, Eli and his sons are accused of making themselves fat on the sacrifices of the people (chapter 2:29). There is a little irony here, as we learn later that Eli was indeed fat (1 Samuel 4:18). Let me read it to you. This is when the Ark of God is taken and Hophni and Phinehas die and so does Eli and we read this:

30:00

¹⁸ As soon as he mentioned the ark of God, Eli fell over backward from his seat by the side of the gate, and his neck was broken and he died, for the man was old and heavy. He had judged Israel forty years.

So “heavy” or “fat” is from the same Hebrew word as “glory” or “honor,” so Leithart comments to this effect as follows:

(“Heavy” is *kebed*, and “glory” is *kabod*). Eli is glorifying himself by fattening himself with the Lord’s food, instead of glorifying God by offering food to him.” In this regard, it should not be missed (also some irony here) that the cursings Eli and his family will experience in judgment are described as not having enough to eat (1 Samuel 2:36).

Let me just read you that, verse 36:

³⁶ And everyone who is left in your house shall come to implore him for a piece of silver or a loaf of bread and shall say, “Please put me in one of the priests’ places, that I may eat a morsel of bread.”

So the contrast here is that Eli and his sons are stealing from the offerings and making themselves fat literally, but one of the curses on their lineages as it begins to wane and be stamped out is they’re not going to have enough to eat. They’re going to be starving. They’re not going to have this livelihood anymore. “Please put me in one of the priests’ places, that I may eat a morsel of bread.” So this is the nature of God’s cursing. Again, it’s a direct commentary on this “fattening” language, which creates irony here in the text.

Lastly (our last nugget) is Eli’s failure. So this is our last point before we wrap up. Leithart does a nice job of summarizing this defect or this problem. He writes:

When the Lord later spoke to Samuel, he said that Eli’s great sin was his failure to rebuke his sons (1 Samuel 3:13). Eli did rebuke his sons, but did a poor job of it.

We read that in verses 23-25. Let me just read that again here. Eli said to his sons:

²³ “Why do you do such things? For I hear of your evil dealings from all these people. ²⁴ No, my sons; it is no good report that I hear the people of the LORD spreading abroad. ²⁵ If someone sins against a man, God will mediate for him, but if someone sins against the LORD, who can intercede for him?” But they would not listen to the voice of their father, for it was the will of the LORD to put them to death.

I mean, God was aiming at judging them anyway, so they’re not going to listen. But Eli does a poor job, Leithart points out. Leithart continues this way with this commentary:

Eli heard that his sons were committing fornication, but did not address that point in his rebuke. Eli’s rebuke was too general to cut to the heart. Failure to restrain

high-handed sin is judged as high-handed sin, which cannot be atoned by sacrifice or offering. Father's failure to restrain sons will be a persistent theme throughout the books of Samuel. Eli rebuked his sons, but lamely and ineffectually; Saul rebuked both David and Jonathan, but for their righteous works rather than for their wickedness; and David failed to restrain his sons.

That's the end of the Leithart quote. So again, the problem here is Eli is not specific and he doesn't just outright remove them. He does not do a good job of protecting sacred space and protecting the integrity of the sacrifices and of the Tabernacle itself. He just doesn't do it. He just says, "Well this is what I hear. I hear stuff going on. It doesn't sound good to me what you two are doing." As though they're going to just change after hearing that. And they didn't, and he didn't remove them. Again, that was his great defect and his great sin against the Lord according to 1 Samuel 3:13.

That's our treatment of 1 Samuel chapter 2 here—the rest of it. So again, there was a lot in here to be talked about and to be observed. The next time we're going to get into chapter 3. If you've read *Unseen Realm* or if you've heard me lecture about the Two Powers (the two Yahweh figures that are behind the two powers in Judaism), you know when we get into 1 Samuel 3 in that respect with the word of the Lord... We'll do a little of that the next time, but I'm not going to rehearse the content of *Unseen Realm*. There are other things to see in there. But we'll get into that and add a few other observations in chapter 3. So look forward to that.

TS: You know, Mike, you were talking about Shiloh and stuff and you know we were there when we went to Israel and I'm bringing up images of that.

MH: Yeah, we were.

35:00 **TS:** It's amazing how going there how, I don't know, it just does something when you read the Bible and talk about it.

MH: Yeah, you can see the dimensions of where the Tabernacle had been laid out.

TS: Yeah, they've got an amazing...If you ever go to Israel, you have to go to Shiloh because they have one of the secular presentation room where you sit down and they basically project what it looks like as you're looking at the ruins. Do you remember that?

MH: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

TS: And they have a little presentation.

MH: Yeah.

TS: Yeah, it's amazing.

MH: Yeah, they did a good job with it.

TS: Yeah.

MH: It is a memorable thing and Shiloh is in... We have to tell people that Shiloh is in disputed territory between Israel and the Palestinians. So not every tour group gets to go there. You have to gain permission to go there. So our tour... Again, we were fortunate to have a guide that was able to visit that place. So it's not a guarantee if you go to Israel you'll get to see Shiloh. So it's something to look up in your tour itinerary or at least ask about.

TS: Yeah, if you can, go, I highly recommend it. It's pretty amazing. Just all the history. Every place over there. Every inch of that country, it's just history, history, and it's crazy.

MH: Yeah. There's something there, yeah.

TS: It brings back good memories. All right, Mike. Looking forward to chapter 3 next week and with that, I want to thank everybody for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God bless.