CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

1 Samuel 11:1-11 informs that the leadership of Saul was completely authoritive in the defeat of the Ammonites (cf Tsumura 2007:303; Rendtorff 2005:105). The manner of the summons of Saul to Israel defines the absolute leadership (1 Sm 11:7). [1] In the verse the phrase, "Come out after Saul and after Samuel," signifies a decisive moment in the leadership of Saul (cf Barton & Bowden 2004:122; Fokkelman 1993:469-470; Matthews & Moyers 1997:97; Edelman 1991:59-65; Eslinger 1985:368). The phrase highlights the heroic role of Saul to unite the people of Israel (1 Sm 11:7) by defeating the enemy (1 Sm 11:11). Overall, the biblical narrative explains that the leadership of Saul legitimized the kingship of Saul (Tsumura 2007:308; 1 Sm 11:15). None of the figures can be compared with Saul in the event (cf Ishida 1977:47).

Against the course of the narrative, the narrator entered a modified nuance in the direct speech of Saul. He stated that the leadership of Saul was not the only ground for the emergence of the monarchy in Israel, but Samuel also. The phrase, "Come out after Saul and after Samuel," revealed that Samuel's leadership was also a critical factor in the event (Jobling 1998:120). The mention of Samuel emphasized that the role of Saul was reinforced by the role of Samuel (Fokkelman 1993:469). But the leadership of Samuel in the phrase is ambiguous, since there is no specific role of Samuel narrated in the event (cf Klein 2002:174). The historical claim of the phrase is rather dubious in that there is no evident role of Samuel in the event (Vriezen & Van der Woude 2005:294; Birch 1976:55). The narrative focused on the heroic

---

[1] The connotation of the mustering was rooted from the ancient Near Eastern world. Levinson (2001:517) saw the act of mustering as one of six characteristics of the "shared royal ideology" of Israel and the ancient Near East. Levinson (2001:517) regarded the mustering role of Saul as "military commander-in-chief." The manner of the summons to Israel has been also seen in the Mari letter (Wallis 1952:57-61). For further discussions see this dissertation 4.4.3.3.4.

leadership of Saul in mustering Israel and the defeat of the Ammonites. It is therefore legitimate to ask whether the inclusion of Samuel could be a redactional addition (1 Sm 11:7) (Veijola 1977:49; Mettinger 1976:85; Flanagan 1976:21).[2] This conjecture suggests that the redactional phrase intended to shadow the leadership of Saul with Samuel, although the intention is far from obvious.

In the macro-context of 1 Samuel 8-12, Samuel appeared as a multiple role player as to a political concern (cf Eslinger 2004:43; Jobling 1998:69). In 1 Samuel 8, 10:17-27, and 12, Samuel was reluctant to introduce kingship to the people of Israel. On the other hand, in 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16, Samuel devoted to facilitate the introduction of the kingship into Israel.

It is shown that there is an obvious distinction between the two different attitudes of Samuel: a religiously oriented Samuel and a politically oriented Samuel.[3] The latter tradition (1 Sm 9:1-10:16) is concerned with anointing

---

[2] Campbell (2003:128-129) viewed that 1 Sm 11:1-11, 15 was combined with 1 Sm 9:1-10:16 by prophetic redactors who supported the kingship of Josiah, promulgating prophetic roles in the emergence of the kingship in Israel. He strongly pointed out that a prophetic claim was motivated in the redaction of 1 Sm 11. It is highly probable that prophetic roles were essential to form the kingship in ancient Israel. However, it is uncertain that a prophetic redaction was intended to support the Joshianic reform. Rather the contention of Campbell shows that he disregards with a different theological contention between a prophetic redaction (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11, 15) and the reform of Josiah (2 Ki 23). The prophetic redactor focused on introducing the kingship into Israel by Samuel and Saul. On the other hand, the reform of Josiah focused on propagating the kingship of Josiah, the Davidic kingship.

[3] Scholars have focused on understanding of the two perspectives, religious and political orientations, in the emergence of the kingship in terms of a prophet and a king (Isbell 2002:99-100). Their perspective was rooted from a two source theory to 1 Sm 8-12. A king, according to Isbell (2002:99), represented a group who wanted to build a better political organization in terms of defence from the enemies. On the other hand, Isbell (2002:99) explained that a prophet stood for another group who always showed "mistrusts of a king, any king." Isbell (2002:100) contended "a complicated political and social struggle, we may say that the solution chosen in Israel was a compromise between these two opposing religious and political points of view . . . the kings could be the kings, but the prophet would be the person to speak to the people what is the true will of YHWH. And what an 'odd couple' some of these king-prophet pairs made." However, unlike the contention of Isbell, there is another possibility of viewing the religious and political conflicts within the attitudes of Samuel himself, if we see 1 Sm 8-12 as a whole in unit. In other words, if we accept the text of 1 Sm 8-12 as the result of the final redaction, we certainly recognize two distinct perspectives in Samuel. Further, if we perceive a historical claim of the biblical materials of 1 Sm 8-12 (cf Halpern 1981:64), the two perspectives in Samuel are much striking in 1 Sm 8-12 in terms of prophetic redactions (cf Campbell 1986:17-21; 2003:85-90). If so, we are

Saul as *nagid* in the need of a military leader. One characteristic is that the tradition is highlighted in an oracle of Yahweh (1 Sm 9:16-17) and the prophecy of Samuel (1 Sm 10:1-7)[4] with its fulfillment in 1 Samuel 10:9-10. On the other hand, the former tradition (1 Sm 8; 10:17-27; 12) on the religious oriented Samuel is concerned with the kingship of Yahweh (1 Sm 8:7) (cf Rendtorff 2005:105; Barton & Bowden 2004:122). In this tradition Samuel implies that asking the kingship of the nations means rejecting the kingship of Yahweh (1 Sm 8:8).

This observation makes it more difficult to perceive an implied role of the redactional phrase in 1 Samuel 11:7, since the multifaceted roles of Samuel imply textual complexities (Nigosian 2004:89). By the same token, another critical question surfaces in the phrase. The macro-context indicates that the role of Samuel was essential in legitimizing the kingship of Saul in Israel. His role provided a prophetic foundation in building the monarchy. The appearance of Saul in 1 Samuel 11:1-11 is well fitted to the prophecy of 1 Samuel 10:7 (cf Heller 2006:109).[5]

---

obliged to scrutinize how Samuel changed his attitudes. There is probably a redactional intention of showing two perspectives in Samuel. The observation is critical in order to conceive a prophetic relationship between Samuel and Saul in the emergence of the kingship.

[4] 1 Sm 9:15-10:1 shows a certain religious intention. Matthews and Moyers (1997:96) say: "To creat the perception that the kings were chosen directly by God, Samuel was instructed to receive the candidate whom God would direct to him and anoint his head with oil." In a similar manner, Herrmann (1981:136) also clarified the act of anointing as divine assent.

[5] 1 Sm 10:7 is not related with 1 Sm 10:8. 1 Sm 10:8 is rather a redactional insertion by the Dtr in attempting to legitimize the fall of Saul. Many critical scholars contended that 1 Sm 10:8 is connected with the occasion of 1 Sm 13 in Gilgal (Long 1989: 51-66; Eslinger 1985:324-325; contra to Thompson 1963:106; Blenkinsopp 1975:84). The command in 1 Sm 10:8 is eccentric in the context of 1 Sm 10:1-16 (cf Richter 1970:19). If the command in 1 Sm 10:8 signifies the occasion in 1 Sm 13, the connection brings a highly complicated textual issue. Saul has never been presented in public as a king according to 1 Sm 10:1-16 that departs critically from the connotation of 1 Sm 13 that Saul has already established his kingship among the people. Saul is king of Israel in 1 Sm 13. If the point is illegitimate, then another question can be asked here. If 1 Sm 10:8 relates with 1 Sm 13, why did not the people of Israel acclaim Saul as the king right after the event in 1 Sm 13? Rather they did it according to 1 Sm 11:15 after Saul defeated the Ammonites. A further critical issue is about the chronological order. In the chapter 10 Saul is a young man who is looking for his father's lost ass, but in the chapter 13 he is king who has a prince, Jonathan. Thus, it is unacceptable that 1 Sm 10:8 could refer to 1 Sm 13. Certainly the point seriously impacts on one of the major issues in the tradition of Saul, that is, what is the primary reason for the rejection of Saul by Samuel in 1 Sm 13. For instance, if as majority critical scholars believe that the command of Samuel in 1 Sm 10:8 refers to the event in Gilgal in 1 Sm 13, the

Another critical question is: why did the original author of the narrative not explicitly clarify the prophetic role of Samuel in the event? Did he just neglect to specify any role for Samuel in the event or to connect the leadership of Samuel with Saul? It is clear that a main thrust of the narrative is identical with the tradition favoring Saul in terms of kingship (Mettinger 1976:85). The narrative and its macro-context demonstrate that there is a tension involved in the emerging kingship of Saul (cf McCarter 1980:207), between the acknowledgment of the political demand of the people (cf 1 Sm 8:5, 19-20) and the reluctance of Samuel in religion (1 Sm 8:6, 21-22).

Although the historical claim of the phrase, "after Samuel," is obscure, the historical context indicates that the religious leadership of Samuel was indispensable in establishing the kingship.[6] Multiple factors existed in the time of the emerging kingship: religious, political, military, and social (Hackett 1998:199-201; Meyers 1998:225). The narrative and its broader context imply critical historical and literary issues (cf Birch 2005:119-124; Collins 2004b:217-218).

Certain critical issues in 1 Samuel 11:1-11 are highlighted in perceiving various independent traditions in the macro-context (Coogan 2006:232; Campbell 2003:130-131; Birch 1976:131-154). The context of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 within 1 Samuel 8-12, narrates conflicts in the emergence of the kingship with regard to the role of Samuel in the choice and anointing of Saul as king of Israel (1 Sm 10:1, 24; 11:15).

---

specific reason why Saul is rejected is confronted with serious problems. Gunn (1980:40) saw the two phrases connected to each other. However he proposed that the only possible answer for the rejection of Saul is the predestination of Yahweh and the role of Samuel. The concept of predestination implies a religious factor involving in the critical situation. See Gunn (1980:33-40) for a more detail discussion of the issue.

[6] Obviously, the name of Samuel assured the divine favor in the kingship of Israel (Rendtorff 2005:106). Initially his role was highlighted by the anointing of a king of Israel in the emergence of the kingship (1 Sm 10:1). Later his role was intensified in rebuking and rejecting the king in the monarchy (1 Sm 13:13-15; 15:23). Samuel rejected the kingship of Saul but not the kingship as endored by Yahweh (Rendtorff 2005:106; cf 1 Sm 8:22).

The understanding of the conflict features has decisively focused on the diachronic, historical-critical approach of reading the text. The focus of the diachronic approach attempts to find different sources (Wellhausen 1957:245-256) or traditions (Campbell 2003:130-131; Birch 1976:131-154) or redactional layers (Soggin 1989:210-214; Veijola 1977:115-122) in the text. It differs from the synchronic approach, which perceives the relation between the literary cause and its result in the context as a whole (cf Knoppers 1993:29-30; Bar-Efrat 1989:9-11; Polzin 1989:17; Garsiel 1985:16). It views various perspectives in terms of the literary techniques in the narrative. Both these approaches contribute to the understanding of the narrative as a text.

1.2 Research problem

The research focuses on the proper textual understanding of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 and its place in the broader literary context (1 Sm 8-12). Since the biblical narrative is involved in various historical and literary issues, its understanding comes from multiple perspectives. Particularly the focus of the issues is concerned with the understanding of the role of Saul in the biblical text as well as in its macro-context with its various perspectives on him.

Ackerman (1991:12-13) suggested that 1 Samuel 11:1-11 described Saul as a judge (See also Jobling 1998:66). The description of Saul, according to him, evinced how Yahweh chose him as the leader, "YHWH's *nagid*", not a king as in 1 Samuel 10:17-27. Ackerman did not explain the meaning of "*YHWH's nagid*," but simply followed the definition of Albright (1961:163-164) of *nagid* as a military leader. Neither did he give a proper explanation of the coming of the "spirit of God" (1 Sm 11:6) as the typical sign of the judges. A proper understanding of the relation between *nagid* and the "spirit of God" is critical for understanding the role of Saul, as well as for the historical background of the narrative.

Miller and Hayes (2006:135; Miller 1974:157-174) reconstructed the sequence of Saul's tradition based on the understanding of Saul's

charismatic role according to 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16, 13:2-14:46, 10:26-11:15, and 16:1-5. Miller (1974:165-171) suggested that the account of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 was a late tradition, since it attested to a strong military leadership of Saul that was established in the early stage because Saul could not otherwise summon the people of Israel as effectively. He (Miller 1974:170) saw Saul the king, as a military leader who had established his kingship in the event of 1 Samuel 11 (cf Ahlström 1993:447). Miller's reconstruction of the historical narrative did not perceive the final text as a whole, though he clarified the leadership of Saul as king in 1 Samuel 11:1-11.

Edelman (1991:30-34) proposed a tripartite pattern of the kingship installation ceremony in 1 Samuel 8-12 from a comparative analysis of ancient Near Eastern (hereafter ANE) literature: namely, designation, testing and coronation. Edelman (1984:194) proposed that Saul was the "elect-king" until he proved his ability in 1 Samuel 11. She explained the events of Saul's coronation in the historical narrative. However, Edelman (1991:51-63) did not succeed explaining the contextual relation of 1 Samuel 10:17-27 with 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 1 Samuel 11:1-11. 1 Samuel 10:17-27 might be a redactional interpolation to break the tradition of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 1 Samuel 11:1-11 (cf Soggin 1989:210-24; contra Halpern 1981:64). The Deuteronomist (hereafter Dtr)[7] devaluated the prophetic endorsement of Saul's leadership which was turned into kingship (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11). Thus the public designation of 1 Samuel 10:17-27 was a redactional addition (Campbell 2003:114; cf Gordon 1982:46-47).

---

[7] The Dtr was the final redactor of the text in the context. In conjecture, he had been influenced by the circle of the priestly prophets whose origin probably stemmed from Samuel. Two Dtr can be distinguished: One in the time of Josiah (cf Campbell 2003:89) and one in the exilic period. On the other hand, Van Seters (2006:398) contended that the idea of the 'redactor' is unacceptable, since he believed that "redactors" and "redactions" serve "no useful critical purpose." He proposed the idea of an editor to understand the biblical books (Van Seters 2006:400). In this dissertation the idea of van Seters is not adopted, since his argument is not helpful to discover multiple theological viewpoints in the Deuteronomistic History (hereafter DH). For a further discussion for the two Dtr see 3.2.2.3.3 in this dissertation.

It is unclear exactly how 1 Samuel 11:1-11 depicted Saul's role. Was he a judge or a military leader? Did the coming of the "spirit of God" upon Saul characterize his role of leadership as merely identical with that of Samson (Jdg 13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14)? It is essential to identify this problem in the broader context of the narrative.

The strikingly different context of 1 Samuel 11 to the context in Judges is noticeable with regard to prophecy. In 1 Samuel 10:10, Saul prophesies among the band of prophets with the "spirit of God." In 1 Samuel 11 the coming of the "spirit of God" seemingly results from the prophecy of Samuel in 1 Samuel 10:7. [8] Arguably the sign of the coming of the "spirit of God" itself was not a guarantee for the characteristic of the judges. The prophetic characteristic in 1 Samuel 11:1-11 brought a critical indication of a different literary and historical situation of the event.

Polzin (1989:100-108, 114-117) identified a certain prophetic aura in 1 Samuel 10 and 11. He saw all the activities of Samuel in the interest of Saul and Saul's actions and words. Especially he noticed that 1 Samuel 10 features a prophetic circle. Polzin (1989:101) pointed out that Samuel foretold events of Saul. Their close relationship was specified in terms of prophecy and fulfillment in 1 Samuel 10 and 11. However, foretelling emphasized only one side of the prophetic feature of the time, since these figures were involved in some cultic activities as well. His analysis did not fully explain the probable historical roles of Saul in the context.

A probable explanation is a cultic relationship between Samuel and Saul. In 1 Samuel 9:11-12 and 22-24 Samuel was depicted as a prophetic figure who presented offerings on behalf of the people to Yahweh. His cultic activity of

---

[8] Long (1989:51-55) strongly rejected any fulfillment of prophecy between 1 Sm 11 and 1 Sm 10:7. Rather he proposed that 1 Sm 13:3-4 is the fulfillment of 1 Sm 10:7. However, he did not explain why there was no indication of the 'spirit of God' in 1 Sm 13:3-4. In the prophetic context, the spirit of God stood as a basis in terms of prophecy and fulfillment. The prophecy of Samuel (1 Sm 10:7) and the charismatic action of Saul (1 Sm 11:7) shares the common agent of the actions, the spirit of God.

offering sacrifices was highlighted in a critical moment of a military crisis (1 Sm 7:10). Furthermore, cultic activities were also implied in the connection of Saul with a prophetic group from the high place (cf 1 Sm 10:9-13; 13:8-12). Although there was no specific mention of a cultic activity of the prophetic group, it is conceivable that Saul and Samuel were involved in the cultic activity at the high place. The cultic characteristic served as the religious background for Saul's role in 1 Samuel 11:1-11.

Another prophetic characteristic can be seen in the implied cultic backdrop. Apparently, in the context of 1 Samuel 8-12, Samuel was a priestly prophet. Saul was depicted as a member of the ecstatic prophetic group from the high place.

The multiple religious explanations of the relation between Samuel and Saul can also be seen in the different attitudes of Samuel to the kingship. In 1 Samuel 10:5-6 Samuel gave a prophecy to Saul as a sign of the divine sanction of his leadership. In this prophecy Samuel was positive towards the earthly kingship. The prophecy implied the possibility of Saul's cultic activity in the connection with the high place. In other texts Samuel was negative towards the kingship (1 Sm 8:6, 10-18; 12:1-25). He critically challenged the cultic activity of Saul and consequently refused his kingship (1 Sm 13:13-14), and rejected him (1 Sm 15:10-23).

For the failure of Saul as king of Israel, Knierim (1968:20-51) suggested a possible solution. He (Knierim 1968:28-32) stressed the prophetic influence in 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 16:1-13. He (Knierim 1968:36-38) contended that Saul failed since he did not hear the voice of Yahweh given through the prophet, Samuel (cf 1 Sm 13:13; 15:22-23). But Knierim did not appreciate that the appearance of Saul and his military achievement were the benefit of the people (1 Sm 10:24; 11:15; 14:47-48; 15:9 cf 1 Sm 8:5). Saul's military leadership protected them from their enemies (1 Sm 14:47-48). Saul's succession in 1 Samuel 11:1-11 was assured by the prophecy of Samuel (1

Sm 10:7). Therefore, it is difficult to see Saul's kingly failure as the result of a deficient prophetic standard in his military leadership. His failure should be seen from a different perspective, in terms of the multiple prophetic backgrounds of Saul and Samuel (cf 1 Sm 19:18-24).

Various historical and literary issues are involved in perceiving 1 Samuel 11:1-11. The request of the elders in Samuel 8:5 was involved in its ANE context. Knowledge of the kingship in the ANE provides a tangible context for the type of kingship that the elders specified. Since Saul and Samuel eventually appeared, a proper understanding of the ANE society is necessary (cf 1 Sm 22:6-10; 19:8-24).

1.3 Aims and objectives

The primary aim of the research is to understand the origin of the kingship of Saul. For this understanding the research aims to point out divine sanction in the origin as one of the most essential factors for royal ideology in the ANE. The proper understanding of the origin may give a plausible historical and theological background of 1 Samuel 11:1-11. The concept of divine sanction designates to support the role of Saul in 1 Samuel 11:1-11 as king of Israel who removed an impending national shame (1 Sm 11:2).

Second, the research will present the social and religious background of Saul as an essential factor in formulating his kingship. A social and historical consciousness of the period of Saul will be suggested as a premature stage for the royal ideology of Saul (cf Hackett 1998:200-201; Meyers 1998:236-243). On the other hand, the kingship of Saul will be challenged as a political model to meet the expectation of the people in terms of the kingship in the ANE. The model is to be contended as a cultic kingship with regard to royal ideology in the ANE. The prophetic relationship between Saul and the ecstatic prophetic groups in the high place, particularly in Gibeah will be reasoned as one of social religious factors in the origin of Saul's kingship.

Third, the research will propose a comprehensive textual analysis with diachronic and synchronic approaches for 1 Samuel 11:1-11 (cf Eslinger 2004:31-50; Frolov 2004:27-36; Klement 1999:439-459). The analysis will present 1 Samuel 11:1-11 as a historical narrative pertaining to the military success of Saul (Klein 2002:173; Cross 1986:148-158). The literary form of the narrative and its place will be contended as a redactional intention. 1 Samuel 8-12, as a macro-context for 1 Samuel 11:1-11, is involved in multiple biblical sources and traditions that were redacted in unit (cf Birch 2005:121-124). Judges 17 through 2 Samuel 1 will be viewed as a broader redactional context for 1 Samuel 11:1-11; it reveals the legitimacy of the kingship in Israel in terms of the Davidic kingship. The analysis will be supplemented by a social political perspective to this narrative and its macro-context, particularly 1 Samuel 8-12 (Brueggemann 2003:133).

Fourthly the research will propose the characterization of Saul in terms of a prophetic tradition and a deuteronomistic (hereafter dtr) redaction. The characterization will be expected to distinguish different perspectives about king Saul. Distinctive characteristics of Saul will explicate how the tradition about Saul had been redacted and judged by the Dtr.

1.4 Methodology

The historical information of the Old Testament (hereafter OT) has been critically challenged because of the theological nature of the OT. In general, the books of Samuel are theological, interpretive narratives (Davison & Steussy 2003:97). Further, Garbini (1988:18-19) confronted theologized historical figures and events as idealized information. Garbini (1988:18-19) said that "The Old Testament has set out a sacred history of universal value, but it is not very reliable as evidence of a secular history of the kind that the Hebrew people atually experienced." Later he claimed that "Only the Bible remains as evidence of what they would have liked, but did not happen." Apparently Garbini refuted any historical authenticity of the OT. He saw that the OT is of a 'sacred history.' Garbini further actualized his contention in

what he means "ideology." He (1988:xvi) explicated the "historical conception of the Old Testament" as follows:

> That political thought which identifies itself with religious thought (the prophets) and that religious thought which makes itself historical thought (the history of writers) and creates a fictious but sacral history come together in a circularity which in our all too knowing language is no longer politics or religion or history-but ideology.

His understading is obviously negative for giving any historical credentials to the OT. The OT, according to him, is nothing else than ideology. Unfortunately, his contention is excessively cynical of any possibility of historical information.

Millard (2002:103-110) challenged the negative position about the historical legitimacy of the OT, specifically Samuel and Kings. He gave a highly affirmative value of historical information in the biblical books. His idea came from the comparative analysis from a context of the ANE. First of all, he clarified the historical value of the reproduced inscription of Mesopotamian kings, Sargon and Naram-Sin. Millard (2002:109) challenged: "If the Babylonians could preserve, in various ways, narratives and records about long-dead kings, why could not the Israelites?" The analogy provides for Millard (2002:110) a safeguard to conclude that "The compilers of Samuel and Kings, whenever and wherever they worked, could have had access to earlier reports and chronicles, found in those books, the works they cite as sources in their histories." His position was highly affirmative in historical legitimacy of the biblical books (cf Laato 1999:24-33; 1997:244-269). Indeed, the biblical historians used various historical sources. However he seemingly disregarded a probability of the historians's religious viewpoint. Although it is hard to deny any positivity of the OT in terms of historical information, it is also difficult to admit the historical affirmative of the OT because of its theological nature.

Dever (2003:226) reinforced Millard's position. Dever (2003:226) said:

> That is, the basic traditions about ancient Israel now enshrined in the books of Exdous-Numbers and Joshua through Kings cannot be read uncritically as a satisfactory history, but neither can they be discarded as lacking any credible historical information.

Dever was convinced that a critical reading is necessary to understand historical information given in the biblical books.

In a similar manner, Herrmann (1981:132) explained:

> The tensions and problems surrounding the Israelite monarchy have found credible expression in the Old Testament tradition, but they often dominate the account to such a degree that it is difficult to distinguish between reliable historical information and reflection and criticism.

Herrmann saw three characteristics of the OT tradition with regard to the Israel monarchy such as historical information, reflection, and criticism. The observation of these characteristics of the OT demands to be cautious to interpret any biblical historical accounts.

It is unnecessary to refute any historical value of historical information in the biblical books. All the discussions given above presupposed a historical characteristic of the OT tradition in ancient Israel. Collins (2004b:218) pointed out that there is no way of checking of historical accuracy of the stories in Samuel. Collins (2004b:218) said that "they [the stories] have the character of a historical novel, which clearly has some relationship to history but is concerned with theme and character rather than with accuracy in reporting." However, the question is how to understand historical information in terms of historical characteristics given in the biblical books.

Garbini (1988) was perhaps right in terms of his depiction of ideology. However, he was erroneous in that any literary texts, including the biblical

books, are not free from the intention of the authors. All the literary works are involved in the selectivity and subjectivity of the authors.

Historical information is selective and subjective in a text. It is unquestionable that there is time span between the actual time of the event and narrating it in a written form. It is hardly to refute that the selectivity and subjectivity are critical factors in forming any historical traditions in written forms. In other words, selectivity and subjectivity of the authors are behind any historical claims of a text.

The idea of selectivity and subjectivity are clarified in terms of historical claims of a text. This idea is not only applied to the biblical authors but also to the people of Israel who were intended as the original readers. What actually happened in the original historical setting is perceived in theologization. The term theologization explains that a community accepted the historical value of an event in the tradition. Once oral tradition was begun by a legitimate figure or a group, such as a prophet or a prophetic group, the tradition began to gain a legitimacy of reporting certain figures or events among the people. In other words, previously theologized past events or figures among a prophetic group became historicized in a written form.

Steck (2000:49) provided an obliging insight for its theological understanding on selectivity.

> It is thematic "history" led by tradition that is seen, experienced, viewed, and desired *sub specie dei* (from the perspective of God) . . . This perspective specifically includes the experience of a lengthy time span by selection, concentration, depth of meaning, and order of meaning, as these elements correspond to the perspective, plan, and activity of God-the higher point of view mentioned at the beginning.

Steck (2000:49) indicated that the perspective of God refers to selectivity in the biblical history. According to him, history of ancient Israel is sharing the

perspective of God in the life of Israel. Understanding the history is how to discern the perspective of God throughout the lengthy periods of interpretation and reinterpretation.

It is explicitly epitomized for the point of selectivity and subjectivity of theologized past events and figures in redaction. The point is how the Dtr presented historically embedded events and figures from various biblical materials in the formation of the final text (cf Birch 2005:121-122). Therefore the principle of analogy could suggest what historical embeddedness existed in the final text.

A supportive idea comes from Cook (1986:27-48). Cook (1986:27-48) proposed two principles to understand Samuel and Kings: a "flat linearity" to present the historical narrative (cf Schökel 1999:277) and a "sub-typological analogy." His principles were designed to understand a small literary unit in a broad context, historically as well as literary. The *flat linearity* provides an apparent theological and literary context in which God acts as the omniscient narrator who interrupted the sequence. The *sub-typological analogy* promotes a better understanding of the historical embeddedness of the historical narrative. Cook's understanding of the narrative helps to interpret the text in terms of its literary and theological perspectives. But it is too general as far as the characters of the biblical narrative are concerned, since he did not pay attention to the difference in the historical circumstances. As seen from Cook's treatment of his example, it is highly complicated to perceive the historical nature of the text in its literary context.

The aim of the exercise is to synthesize the theologized history, that is, theologically formulated history in the narrative. The proper textual understanding on the historical information is rooted from distinguishing historical information from theologized historical account (cf Miller 1999:20-21). The final biblical text is the result of a combination of the historical and literary context in the perspective of God (cf Campbell 2002:427-441).

The designation of 'theologized history in the narrative' is to synthesize historical embeddedness and literary viewpoints in terms of the omniscient narrator.[9] The contention of the term is to propose a comprehensive understanding of historical-critical analysis as well as literary analysis. The design of 'theologized history in the narrative' is based on the hypothesis that 1 Samuel 11:1-11 was transmitted in four stages: first, the event itself, what actually happened; second, the understanding of the actualized event in an oral tradition; third, the solidified tradition in a written form; and last, the redacted narrative.

A primary concern of the methodology focuses on how to perceive the biblical text as it stands in its broader context as well as its biblical sources and traditions (cf Birch 2005:121-124; Frolov 2004:27-36; Campbell 2002:427-441; Klement 1999:439-459). The broader context of the text presupposes that there was a specific reason to present the text in its final context (cf Knoppers 1993-4; Noth 1991:4). Literarily speaking, the biblical text is narrative, that is, it is designed to deliver what the omniscient narrator implied and intended in the text in the literary context (Fokkelman 1993:320; Polzin 1989:125). It is seemingly unproblematic to recognize the biblical text as narrative in its context. However a historical nature of the text also demands a close attention to identify multiple factors contributing to the formation of the text in its context (Campbell 2003:13-17; Lemche 1988:120-122). There was, on the other hand, a final decision to order the text in the literary context as it stands, although there were various historical and theological factors involved in forming the text and the context. Coogan (2006:233) pointed out that the redactional activities of the Dtr are enormous in shaping biblical materials in "their final presentation," whereas "many appear to preserve authentic historical memory."

---

[9] See Jobling (1998:141-142) for the definition of the omniscient narrator and a possible contention for the "omnipotent narrator" in place of it.

In short not one single approach can claim legitimate status for understanding the narrative about the origin of the kingship of Saul. The approaches should be incorporated in each other, based on their own value. For example, *source approaches* (Wellhausen 1957:245-256) and *tradition critical approaches* (Campbell 1986:17-21; Birch 1976:132) detect a prophetic trace in the connection of 1 Samuel 9-10:16 and 1 Samuel 11. *Redactional approaches* (Dietrich 1987:54) also admit that prophetic activity is prevalent in the layer of redaction. The *new literary approaches* (Gunn 1989:100-108, 114-117) could observe a prophetic aura in the text.

The synchronic text level approaches, however, could not explain the prophetic activity behind the origin of the kingship on the historical level of the present text. *Redactional approaches* indicate that prophetic redactors promulgate their own theological agenda in combining 1 Samuel 11:1-11 and 1 Samuel 9-10:16. The approaches also point to different layers of redaction, so that each biblical text can be seen as an independent account by different prophetic redactors. *Tradition critical approaches* indicate various pre-monarchic and other prophetic materials in the text but can not explain the nature of the kingship of Saul, specifically about the more complicated socio-political circumstances involved in forming the kingship. The *socio-scientific approaches* are necessary to elucidate the issue of the kingship as complementary to the text-oriented analysis (cf Liverani 2005:88-89; Hackett 1998:200-201; Meyers 1998:236-243; Flanagan 1981:47-73). It focuses on the social circumstances in forming the kingship.

In conclusion, the methodology demands one to distinguish embedded historical information in the text from a final redactional intention, that is, theological purpose of the redactor. The final form of the biblical text referred to theologized information of real figures and events (cf Schökel 1999:258) whereas many biblical sources and traditions preserved their own embedded historical characters. Each approach would be justified based on its own value for the research.

1.5 Hypothesis

The hypothesis of the study is that

there are two prophetic groups directly involved in the emergence of the monarchy of Saul. Samuel represented the one group of priestly prophets (cf Isbell 1976:66-67) who affected the kingship of Israel, particularly the kingship of David. Saul represented the group whose activity had a close connection with the cultic practices of ecstatic prophets (cf Mowinckel 1987:74-98) that impacted on the formation of the kingship of Saul.

Both of the prophetic groups were deeply involved in the cultic activities, whereas their prophetic manner and base differed (1 Sm 19:20-24). The most striking distinction between two groups is their different cultic bases, the high place in Gibeah and Nabioth in Ramah, respectively.

The religious and social background of Saul had been seriously challenged by the Dtr, since the Dtr was influenced by the priestly prophets whose origin stemmed from Samuel. The choice of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 in 1 Samuel 8-12 shows that the Dtr demonstrated not only Saul's unfit quality for the kingship but also the evil origin of his kingship. The Dtr highlighted the relation between Saul and cultic practices in the high place, since the Dtr aimed to attribute the evil origin of the kingship of Israel to Saul.

1 Samuel 11:1-11 idealized Saul's divinely sanctioned kingship in relation to the context of 1 Samuel 9-10:16 as the royal ideology for Saul. On the other hand, the Dtr intentionally overshadowed the royal ideology in his redaction to legitimize the Davidic kingship in terms of divine sanction.

1.6 Outline of chapters

Chapter 1 aims to define what the research problems are. Second, the purposes intended to resolve the research problem are formulated. Third, the methodology of this research is spelled out. The methodology correlates with the historical review in chapter 2 in that the review will reinforce the

methodology. Fourth, the designed hypothesis proposes the impact on a serious scholarly discussion of 1 Samuel 11:1-11. The chapter concludes in outlining chapters for providing a tangible context of the research as well as applicable terminology used by the author of this dissertation.

Chapter 2 reviews historical and literary issues on the emergence of the kingship in Israel. Attention is focused on explaining any possible historical and social background for the emergence from biblical and the ANE perspective. Last, a synthesis of the review will present background of the following discussions in the subsequent chapters.

Chapter 3 discusses the social and religious setting of socio-religious context of the kingship of Saul. The discussion focuses on analysis of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 as 'theologized history in the narrative.' For the discussion certain social and religious factors are determined for the time of Saul. Multiple factors in the kingship provide a critical clue to perceive historical embeddedness and religious dynamics in the text as well as in its broader literary context. A macro-context of events in 1 Samuel 11:1-11 is discussed to provide a biblical background for the emergence of Saul's kingship.

In chapter 4 the discussion proposes a comprehensive textual analysis of 1 Samuel 11:1-11. A brief discussion of the textual issues follows 'narrative as the macro structure.' The demarcation of the context, Judges 17 to 2 Samuel 1 demonstrates that the kingship of Saul was historically established to restore religious order among the people, protecting them from the enemies. The relationship between *nagid* and *melek* is briefly suggested as an excursus. A detailed textual exposition follows. The textual exposition incorporates a large scope of the scholarly discussions to be dealt with in the research. Consequently, the textual exposition shows that 1 Samuel 11:1-11 is the royal ideology of Saul with 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16.

Chapter 5 is a summary in terms of the characterization of Saul. The distinction of the divinely sanctioned king Saul and the divinely rejected king Saul will be highlighted, since it will clarify how the royal ideology of Saul had been outshined from the redactions of the Dtr. The final synthesis shows that the phrase, "after Samuel," is a redactional phrase to indicate the fate of the historical Saul as illegitimate king of Israel by the Dtr in the exilic period.

1.7 Terminology and orthography

A main thrust of the research is to clarify the historical characteristics of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 in its broader redactional context. The biblical text and its context show that there are multiple historical and literary conflicts and inconsistencies in reporting certain events and figures. The discussion employs some conventional terms to suggest awareness of the scholarly discussions on the historical and literary issues of the text and its context. This includes the following:

- Deuteronomic History (hereafter DH): DH means from Joshua to Kings. The DH is identical with the Former Prophets circulated mainly in the Jewish tradition, *Nevi'im*, according to Martin Noth's understanding. The DH is a recognized scholarly reconstruction. In this dissertation the term does not indicate that it exists but means a recognized scholarly reconstruction.

- Deuteronomistic (dtr): The designation of dtr is to signify any biblical passage pertaining to any theological implication and context of the law of Deuteronomy.

- Deuteronomist (Dtr): Dtr stands for one who had been inherited a prophetic tradition from a priestly prophet, Samuel. In the research Dtr is identified as Dtr1 and Dtr2. Each Dtr participated in the redaction of biblical sources and traditions to form a biblical text in a different period. Dtr1 probably operated as the redactor in the time of Josiah by

idealizing his Davidic kingship that brought the centralized cultic practice in the Temple of Jerusalem. On the other hand, Dtr2 represents the final redactor during the exilic period. He proposed a hope of the Davidic kingship and a revival of the Temple in Jerusalem.

- Narrative: Narrative signifies the final form of the biblical text as it stands as a whole. The implication of narrative is to deliver the intention of the omniscient narrator in the final form of the text.

- Tradition: Tradition suggests a religious perspective of a specific group or society about a certain historical event or figure in ancient Israel. A different group or society gave a different religious viewpoint of a happening or a person. The term implies any religious perspective involved in a specific social setting. By saying a religious perspective this researcher refutes to attempt any explicit distinction between religious and political perspective in ancient Israel, specifically in the time of Saul.

- Theologized history in the narrative: The designation of theologized history in the narrative means to attempt to synthesize a historical character and a theological perspective in the written form. I mean that the final form of the narrative is engaged with what historical sources and traditions implicated and how they were incorporated in the present form as it stands.

- Prophetic characteristic: It means an embedded historical concern by a prophetic writer of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 1 Samuel 11:1-11.

- Ideology/ Royal ideology: Ideology refers to a religious endorsement for a political institution. In the ANE a political entity was only legitimized by the divine sanction. Royal ideology means the religious promulgation of the kingship.

- Historical claims: Historical claims indicate what have been claimed in a specific moment as historical realities.

- Historical embeddedness: It signifies what happened to the traditions in the process of reevaluation. It refers to understand how and why historical occasions happened.

- I use the adjusted Harvard method of reference (author-date-reference system) (See also Kilian 1989).

- Abbreviations of books of the Bible used in this dissertation:

Gn: Genesis	Ex: Exodus	Lv: Leviticus
Nm: Numbers	Dt: Deuteronomy	Jos: Joshua
Jdg: Judges	1 Sm: 1 Samuel	1 Sm: 2 Samuel
1 Ki: 1 Kings	2 Ki: 2 Kings	1 Chr: 1 Chronicles
2 Chr: 2 Chronicles	Neh: Nehemiah	Job
Ps: Psalms	Pr: Proverbs	Is: Isaiah
Lm: Lamentations	Ezk: Ezekiel	Dn: Daniel
Am: Amos	Mi: Micah	Zph: Zephaniah
Zch: Zechariah		