CHAPTER 2
HISTORICAL REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

1 Samuel 8-12 serves as the macro context for 1 Samuel 11:1-11. It provides the probable historical background of the origin of the monarchy of Saul. There also appears to be a stalemate situation in identifying the historical nature of the occurrence, since it seemingly presents conflicts and inconsistent accounts. The main contentious account is the multiple perspectives on the kingship in Israel. Based on the biblical account, two viewpoints about the kingship emerge: pro- and anti- monarchical attitudes. Within the two perspectives the biblical narrative seemingly described three phases of Saul's royal ascession. The multiple angles of the reporting on the emergence of the kingship are the critical issue for investigation by the source approach, redaction approach, tradition-historical approach, social approach, and the new literary approach. Basically, all these approaches aim to clarify which historical claims stand behind the text and its macro-context and how they rest together. The focus of this chapter is to detail how scholarly discussions scrutinized and drew conclusions regarding the social-political situations that played an essential role in forming the kingship in Israel.

The ancient Near Eastern context in general will be surveyed to detect the royal ideology of the cross-cultural historical context of the kingship. The royal ideology is one of preeminent examples around the kingship in the ANE. The survey will provide a probable historical context for the monarchy in Israel. Israel is part of the ANE and shares common historical factors with it. The following brief survey of the royal ideology in the ANE covers Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Canaan.

This historical review focuses on biblical material that relates to the origin of the monarchy, and the process of leadership in ancient Israel. Layers of

materials in 1 Samuel 8-12, such as sources, redactions, and traditions will be reviewed. The review encompasses two aspects of the kingship of Israel in 1 Samuel 8-12: pro-monarchic and anti-monarchic viewpoints. Regarding leadership in ancient Israel, the focus will be on the social factors and circumstances that were involved in forming the monarchy in Israel. The discussion of the social scientific approach treats the period of the judges in general, since a major component of the social scientific approach is the belief in the development of periods, in particular from the period of the judges to the period of Saul.

This chapter points out that a comprehensive approach is necessary to understand the formation of the monarchy in Israel. Thus, it will value each approach. A probable social-historical context for 1 Samuel 11:1-11 will be provided. The social-historical context will support the thesis that ecstatic prophetic groups were a major social political factor in furthering the formation of the monarchy of Saul. Reviews will be selective of scholars and their perspective.

2.2 Royal ideology

A fundamental attribute of the royal ideology in the ANE was implicated in the relationship between the king[10] and the divine. In ancient Egypt, the king was deified as the son of gods or himself god. On the other hand, the kings of ancient Mesopotamia generally were the earthly agents of the gods. In a similar manner, the deification of the kings as sons of the gods appeared in

---

[10] A general term for king in the Old Testament is *melek*. The term suggests a correlation with the Akkadian *maliku* (counselor). On the other hand, *śarru*, king in Akkadian, denotes an official in Hebrew, *sar* (see Mettinger 1976:296). In the pre-monarchic period, the term appears once: Melchizedek, king of Salem, a Canaanite city. Melchizedek, king of Salem does mean he was the king of a city state. In Gn 14:8 this term *melek* strongly implies a priestly king. In Ps 110:4 the tradition of Melchizedek refers to the Davidic king. In Judges the term also appears in "Abimelek." Unlike the previous cases, the implication of *melek* in Judges is a military warrior who could deliver the people from their enemies. The most striking term to indicate a king is *nagid* for Saul in establishing the monarchy. It was a highly provocative moment, since the people specifically asked Samuel for a *melek*, not a *nagid*. Strangely enough, Samuel anointed him as *nagid*. The two different terms pose a critical question as to the use in its own context. Furthermore, the moment when the monarchy in Israel was established it was seemingly involved with a certain confrontational socio-political conflict which had a religious stimulus.

Canaan. The evidence for the deification of the kings in the ANE mainly comes from records of royal ascensions (cf Rice 2003b:96-100; Hornung 1997:284), royal inscriptions (cf Wilson 1958:262), and monumental architecture (Rice 2003b:72; Laato 1997:244-269; cf David 1986:23). Idealization of the king was highlighted during the ceremony of his ascension, particularly in Egypt. In other cases, the king stressed his divine origin in royal inscriptions of his glorious victories over enemies. He constructed temples for his gods to show his divine allegiance and qualification as a divinely sanctioned king. In all the cases the kings of the ANE strongly emphasized their divine origin in cultic settings, although they were sometimes heavily involved in political and economical situations. Important for the discussion are the titles or epithets of kings in the ANE. Those titles and epithets display well refined political and religious ideologies about kingship.

The royal ideology of the ANE is an essential part of the organization and the dynamics of the whole ANE social system (Whitelam 1992:40-48), since a kingdom is destined to have a king (see Kempt 1983:19). The primary focus of the royal ideology is to promulgate the kingship as the center of the whole society. Ostensibly the kingship would provide the apex point to combine all the social organization and dynamics.[11] Thus, particularly the royal ideology provides a religious, social, and political foundation for the kingship to justify and to legitimatize the king's rule over his potential political enemies, as well as, against social threats (cf Pollock 1999:173; Whitelam 1989:121).

In the ANE, religion served as fundamental for forming the royal ideology (cf Postgate 1992:260). A religion and the kingship were indispensable in the ANE. No kingship had been sustained without the support of its religion. However, the relationship between the kingship and the religion tends to be flexible or even contestable, since each institution was dissimilar (cf

---

[11] In Sumer temples were the fundamental social organizations as the "gods' households." However, once established as a strong political kingdom in Mesopotamia, the palace took over the socio-political hegemony from the temples (see Leick 2003:75-82).

Whitelam 1992:40-48; Chaney 1986). Titles and epithets of the kings evince the specific case of the religious aspects in the royal ideology. Generally in the ANE, all the kings had multiple titles or epithets that depicted an essential mode and the nature of the kingship in the ANE. Therefore, the titles and epithets will be the focus of the section.

A major issue of the royal ideology, specifically on the matter of the titles or epithets of the kings is, to what degree the context of the ANE impacted on the kingship in Israel.[12] Although there was a certain common royal ideology in the ANE, there was an corresponding nature in the kingship when compared with the kingship in the ANE, specifically pertaining to the kingship of Saul as evidenced in 1 Samuel 11:1-11. The following discussion focuses on the royal ideology of Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Canaan. The royal ideology of the kingship of Israel will be considered in the context of the royal ideology of the ANE.

2.2.1 Egypt

The divine nature of the gods would provide the most conspicuous concept of the king in the ancient Egypt (Rice 2003b; Smith 1997:83; Hornung 1990:283; Liverani 1990:125-38; Montet 1964:32-34; see also Baines 1998:23-24). Egyptians, above all, saw the king as a being to be worshipped. Concurrently, they also had the concept that the king represented them as priest before the gods in the cults (Morkot 2005:152; Hornung 1990:283). The idea of the deification of the king revealed that the king is either a god among gods or the priest of priests.

---

[12] Baines (1998:16-53) pointed out an ostensible difference in the social institutions of ancient Egypt and Israel, that avoids a close comparison between the two nations, whereas Roberts (1987:377-397) strongly contended that the ancient Egyptian kingship directly influenced many aspects of Israel. In a somewhat neutral position, Cross (1973:247) viewed a circuitous influence of ancient Egyptian kingship on Israel, pointing out the trace of the Egyptian influence through the Canaanites. On the other hand, Day (1998:72-90) strongly contended that in the time of the rise of the kingship in Israel, Egypt and Mesopotamia were not strong influences in Israel. Thus, he believed that the direct impact on the kingship of Israel originated from Canaan.

The dualistic idea of the king possibly denotes part of the typical worldview of the Egyptians. Rice (2003b:95) noted that the two natures could not be separated in the king, since "for the one there was always the other, in king, gods, nature and the ways of men." The dualistic concept is well represented in the Middle and the New kingdom in Egypt, that the king was the only one on the earth to enforce the divine cosmological order (Smith 1997:83; Liverani 1990:125-38).

The king was appointed by the sun god to sustain *ma'at*, ('order, harmony, rightness') against the threats of *isfet* ('disorder, chaos, evil') (Smith 1997:83; Assmann 1990:174-236). The Egyptians considered the traditional foreign enemies of Egypt to be the most dangerous force threatening *ma'at* (Smith 1997:83; Ritner 1993:115). The king was thought to be the only authority to defeat the enemies and to keep their divinely order. The king represented himself as the base of order, harmony, and rightness (Atwell 2004:16-17). He was seen as a mighty warrior. The Egyptian report about the victory of Ramses III (1194-1163 BCE; see also Matthews & Benjamin 2006:151) against the Sea peoples is an example of the Near Eastern royal ideology of the complete annihilation of enemies.

> I extended all the frontiers of Egypt and overthrew those who attacked them from their lands. I slew the Denyen in their island, while the Tjeker and the Philistines were made ashes. The Sherden and the Weshesh of the Sea were made nonexistent, captured all together and brought in captivity to Egypt like the sands of the shore. I settled them in strongholds, bound in my name. Their military classes were as numerous as hundred-thousands. I assigned portions for them all with clothing and provisions from the treasuries and granaries every year (Wilson 1958:262)

In the report, the expressions for total destruction are recognizable, such as *made ashes*, *made nonexistent*, and *like the sands of the shore*. The expressions are surely metaphorical rather than historical in recording events of the past. Ramses III was boosted and glorified in the report as the perfect victor against his enemies. The report functioned to solidify the military

leadership of Ramses III that ostensibly played an essential role in the kingship of ancient Egypt. His total victory of the enemies and the total destruction of the enemies secured his kingship; that is the main intention of the Egyptian royal ideology (Ahlström 1993:296-298). The royal victory idealized the king as the mighty warrior, who preserved the divine order by destroying the enemies.

The dualistic nature of the king already appeared in the idealizing of the king at his birth. Since the fourth Dynasty, or occasionally in the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties, the divine name Re or Amun were connected to the names of the kings (Hornung 1990:284). The kings were also regarded "*neter nefer*, the perfect god" and "*neter aa*, the great god" for some periods (Montet 1964:32). The epithets signify that the kings are an "exceptional being[s]," (Montet, 1964:32) deified from birth to death. The concept of the divine birth appeared specifically during the Old Kingdom (Montet 1964:34).

As a result of the deification of the king, his death was seen as entering eternity. His tomb was idealized as "a house for eternity," with furniture and commodities for eternal life (David 1986:22). The pyramids are the best examples of the belief in divinely death (Rice 2003b:172-188; David 1986:22-23). The pyramids symbolized the legitimacy of the kingship and the kingdom (Rice 2003b:72; cf David 1986:23). The divinized king through his death became a divine being, a god to his successor and the kingdom. Therefore the successor king and his subjects performed the funerary cult. The funerary cult turned into the most significant religious practice during the Old Kingdom (Shirai 2005:149). In turn, the royal funerary cults served to keep the social and economic stability in the kingdom (Shirai 2005:149-159; Malek 2000:105-108; Kemp 1983:85-96). They provided the cohesion among certain upper class groups (Shirai 2005:159). An example of the concept of the king's eternity comes from Sinuhe R, 6-12.:

> The god was lifted up into heaven and there united with the
> solar disc; the divine body was assimilated into that which

> had created it. The court was plunged in silence and hearts
> were sad; the great double remained closed; the courtiers
> bowed their heads and the Patu lamented (Montet 1964:38).

As seen in Sinuhe R, 6-12, the return of the king to heaven is innate, since he came from heaven. In the traditional and official myth only the king represents the gods and is god himself.

The public deification of the king was ritualized at his coronation ceremony. At the coronation ritual, five titles propagated the deification of the king (Hornung 1997:284). They symbolized the essential characteristics of the royal ideology. The royal titles were: Horus, Two Ladies, Golden Horus, Dual King, and Son of Re (Baines 1998:20). The meaning of the five royal titles is explained by the titles of Shoshenq I:

> Horus: Mighty Bull, Beloved of Re, whom he caused to appear in order to unite the Two Lands; Two Ladies: Who Appears with the Double Crown like Horus Son of Isis, who propitiated the gods with *ma'at* (order); Golden Horus: Powerful of Strength, who smites the Nine Bows, great of victories in all lands; Dual King, Lord of the Two Lands, possessor of strength of arm: Hedjkheperre-satepnare (= The White One of the coming into being of Re, whom Re chose); Son of Re, of his body: Shoshenq, beloved of Amun (Baines 1998:20).

The nature of the king was described in the titles. As the incarnated god, he appeared to unite the Two Lands, signifying the Egyptian beliefs, the dualistic order of Universe (Rice 2003b:95). The king was the only one who united "a whole only in combination" (Hornung 1997:285). The dualistic idea possibly came from prehistoric times as seen in the incarnated Horus, the traditional god, the "falcon-shaped sky god."

Baines (1998:19) explained the titles as follows:

> Horus: the king as a specific manifestation of the principal deity of early times;
> Two Ladies: manifestation of, and protected by, the tutelary goddesses of the two halves of the country;

Golden Horus: meaning uncertain, in late times related to Horus defeating his enemy Seth;

Dual King (*nyswt byty*): the 'throne name' and first cartouche name adopted at ascension, expressing the king's relation with the sun god Re;

Son of Re: second cartouche name, which is the incumbent's birth name, placed after a title that expresses the king's dependence on and tutelage by the sun god; in two periods followed by the 'dynastic' name Ramesses or Ptolemy.

The titles shed a light on understanding the identity of the king and his relationship with his deity.

According to Baines (1998:24), the titles are the result of a complicated and rhetorical process of accumulation. Baines (1998:23) pointed out that "In themselves, titularies do not say much about relations between the king and his subjects, a reticence that is characteristic of core Egyptian ideology, in which humanity plays rather little part." Baines (1998:24) concluded that titles themselves cannot guarantee the identity of the Egyptian kings as gods with a special existence, and who are different from other people. He conceives of a rhetorical connotation of the titles, rather than historical facts.

But the titles do have religious significance to signify the special relation between the king and his god. For instance, Amenophis IV (from 1378 to 1352 BCE) later changed his name to Akhenaten ('Agreeable to Aten') as the result of his religious reforms (cf Redford 1984). It kept his coronation name, Neferkheperura ('The transformations of Ra are perfect') with the epithet *wa-n-ra* ('unique one of Ra'), but changed his title, his Horus name from 'Mighty bull, tall of feathers' to 'Mighty bull beloved of the Aten,' and his Two Ladies name from 'He who uplifts his diadems in Southern Heliopois' to 'He who uplifts the name of the Aten' (Grimal 1992:228). At the accession of a king there were many officials and people involved in the ritual acted as a sacral drama (Rice 2003b:96-100). Those titles ostensibly uncover the religious significance of the king as well as his duties and responsibilities. The king is the universal conqueror, subduer of foreign lands, the creator of laws, the

bringer of peace and prosperity, the Temple builder, and the divine being (Morkot 2005:154-155).

The royal ideology included royal knowledge. The king is the exceptional being who knows the divines, since he is a god himself as well as the priest of the gods. Knowing the gods is the privilege of the king alone. Thus, king signifies that he is the only earthly figure who had knowledge of the divines.

In analogy, the elite group in the Egyptian society would idealize the king, since they could control knowledge in general (Rice 2003b:72). Morkot (2005:151, 165) suggested that the constraints of literacy and schooling are most critical factors for the elite group. The king is the head of the elite group. He had divine knowledge that causes him to know everthing. Morkot (2005:155) summarized it: "Egyptian elite society was about the control of knowledge. To know is to be able to control, and the pharaoh's divine power was based upon his knowledge of the gods, their secret names and their actions." An example comes from the *Treaties on the King as Sun-Priest*:

> He [the king] knows their [the gods] appearance and incarnations;
> He knows the place where they stand;
> He knows the words spoken by [*god* X];
> He knows how Ra is born and his metamorphoses in the flood, etc. (Morkot 2005:155).

The king has the prime access to the gods to acquire the divine knowledge about the gods and earthly matters with its divine origin. The king is distinguished as the priest who regularly goes to the divines.

The king in Egypt is the absolute being who could bring well-being to the people by conquering chaos, especially the enemies, by combining social circumstances for order, by bringing unity in the society, and by conveying divine knowledge to govern society perfectly.

2.2.2 Mesopotamia

Kingship in Mesopotamia generally differed from that of ancient Egypt. The Egyptian king was seen as a divine being throughout the history of ancient Egypt. In Sumer the kings were no more than leaders of city-states and protectors of the Temple properties. The primary duty of the Sumerian kings was to take care of the divine properties that belonged to the Temples. Under the reign of Sargon, when Mesopotamia established an empire with a central administration with a capitol city, the deification of the kings temporally appeared in the royal ideology. The deification of the kings emerged in Gilgamesh epic in 2700 BCE. Gilgamesh became a minor god. Later the concept was endorsed by Naram-Sin, the grandson of Sargon, the fourth king of the Akkadian dynasty (cf Lambert 1998:58). However, the concept did survive after the Ur III dynasty, whose kings became deified even in their life time (Lambert 1998:60). Eventually, the Mesopotamian kings were recognizably perceived as mortal beings (Nemet-Nejat 2002:217; Soden 1994:67).

The royal ideology in Mesopotamia saw the king rather as representative of the divine order on earth, especially in most of the later times. The focus of the royal ideology promulgated a divinely sanctioned kingship (Leick 2003:80; Pollock 1999:191; Van de Mieroop 1997:119-120).[13] The royal ideology shifted from its religious-economic purpose to a political-economic one. Political power in Mesopotamia was a complex nature (Postgate 1992:260). The aim of the royal ideology shifted from time to time. For instance, there were in Sumer diverse terms applied to rulers, such as *ensi(ak)*, *en* in Uruk, *sanga* in Umma, *Isin*, and *lugal*. Lambert (1998:56) suggested the meanings of the names of the city ruler's position as follows:

> *nam-šita*, literally, 'lord of the mace';
> *ensi*, meaning 'lord of the *si*';
> *en*, meaning either 'lord' or 'high priest';
> *lugal*, meaning literally, 'big man.'

---

[13] In idealizing the kingship the temples, at certain times, functioned as the major institutions (Van de Mieroop 1997:120).

The ruler had the authority in his city, with its patron god, temple, and its economic properties such as land, flocks, herds, and buildings. Sumer, as a city-state, had its own temple(s) for its god. At that time the basic responsibility of the city ruler was to keep its gods' properties (Lambert 1998:55). The ruler had three fundamental roles as the agent of the gods: He was the political leader, as high priest he was the cultic leader, and as warrior he was the military leader. Although there are debates on the meaning of *en*, it is generally agreed that it denotes a high priest (Lamber 1998:55). Other titles appeared to emphasize the king's expansionistic policies, such as 'the strong king' (meaning the legitimate king); 'the legitimate king' (in reality, a usurper), and 'the king of the four corners (of heaven and earth)' (Nemet-Nejat 2002:217).

Another concept of the kingship refers to wealth and protection. Sargon,[14] the first Semitic king, brought about revolutionary concept of the kingship with the building of his capitol Akkad. His construction of the capitol caused a social and economic upheaval in Mesopotamia, since the palace economy and standing army accompanied the building of the capitol. As a result, the change of the social system affected the relationship between the kingship and the temples, since, until then, the hegemony of religion and economy belonged to the temples. The appearance of a central governed kingship changed the basic social-economic system. The building of the capitol symbolized the beginning of the gradual take over of the hegemony from the temples, which was a complicated process (Crawford 2004:21; cf Van de Mieroop 1997:120). In particular, it is possible to perceive the idea of "might and power" from Sargon's titles *lugal* and *šarru* during the Akkadian interlude.

In Mesopotamia the term 'shepherd' demonstrates the basic role of the king (Lambert 1998:57; Van de Mieroop 1997:119). It is a metaphoric description

---

[14] The precise date of the reign of Sargon and Naram-Sin is still in debate. According to Millard (2002:104), two possible dates are generally proposed: Sargon's reign at 2340-2284 BCE and Naram-Sin at 2260-2223 BCE, but he suggested that later dates for Sargon at 2296-2240 and Naram-Sin at 2213-2176 BCE are preferable.

to denote the fundamental role of the king to bring wealth, based on agriculture, and protection from the enemies. The Mesopotamians believed that wealth and protection come from the gods through the divine sanction of the kingship (cf Lambert 1998:55). See for example the divinely sanctioned kingship in the following quotation:

> In former days, in far-off years when
> [The heavens] were grieved and the earth groaned at evening time, the gods . . .
> To mankind, they became appeased and granted them abundance . . .
> To guide the land and establish the peoples they appointed a king.
> [.] . . . To rule the black-headed, the many peoples.
> (The Tamarisk and the Palmtree, lines 1-5, Lambert 1960:155)

It was the conviction that the kingship proved that the gods of the specific king was the most powerful and successful god or goddess politically and economically (Pollock 1999:191).

Sometimes the kingship demonstrated the contrastive context of power. The different performances of power, according to Leick (2003:79-80), showed in the founders of new dynasties. For instance, Hammurabi, an Amorite king, was a chieftain who handled all political and social factors in the state, even trivia (see Van de Mieroop 1997:119; Gadd 1973:184-7). The authority of the king was adversely affected by unfortunate political and economical situations. On the other hand, the kingship of Nebuchadnezzar II denoted his absolute sovereignty over the kingdom. The kingship is the main factor in controlling prosperity in economics, and order in politics.

The royal family line played an important role in the royal ideology in Mesopotamia. The heredity of the noble family line can be seen in Summerian lineage of Nebuchadnezzar I (1123-1103 BCE):

> Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, who supervises all cult centres, and confirms the offerings, distant scion of kingship, seed preserved from before the flood, offspring of Enmeduranki, king of Sippar. . . (Lambert 1998:62; 1974:432, 435)

In the Sumerian list of kings, Nebuchadnezzar I stressed his noble ancestral line which went back to ancient times (Lambert 1998:62; 1974:432, 435; Foster 1995:197). Although the idea did not appear consistently throughout the whole era of Babylon, it was alive until the Late Babylonian dynasty (626-539 BCE).[15] The concept was well known in Assyria (Lambert 1998:66-69). The noble lineage was one of the essential constitutions to legitimize kingship in Mesopotamia (Nemet-Nejat 2002:218).

Although there are certain inconsistent trends in the kingship of Mesopotamia, its royal ideology played a major role to legitimize the kingship as representative of the divine order in economic and political matters. Only divinely sanctioned kingship could bring wealth and protection to the kingdom and its people.[16] Finally, the idea of an eternal hereditary dynasty comes into the divinely sanctioned kingship.

2.2.3 Canaan

An essential idea of the royal ideology in Canaan is given from Ugarit. It showed a close relationship between kingship and priesthood (Day 1998:74-75). The idea of priestly kingship is well attested in various sources (KAI 13. 1, 2; KTU 1.14). One of the best examples is the story of Keret (KTU 1.14). The focus of the story is to emphasize the special relationship between the ancestor of the ruling king and the patron god El of Ugarit during the Late Bronze Age (Wyatt 2002:177; Merrill 1968:5-17). Although the literary genre

---

[15] Laato (1997:244-269) pointed out five themes from Assyrian Babylonian inscriptions: Genealogy, legitimation of the king, the dedication of a building project, a prayer of the king or an expression of hope, and blessings and curses. He argued that the idea of an eternal hereditary dynasty is even presupposed in later Assyrian and Babylnonian inscriptions.

[16] The 'Legend of Naram-Sin' is a good example of the devastating of the land and the army of Naram-Sin who failed to listen to unfavorable omens. Initially Naram-Sin was a successful warrior king. In the end he turned out to be a hapless monarch (Foster 1995:171).

of the story is in debatable, whether it is myth, legend, epic, poem or story, the text relates to the earthly king, Keret of Khabur on the River of Khabur (Wyatt 2002:177; cf Hadley 2000:41). The translation of KTU 1.14 is as follows:

> The loss of Keret's family is described; the king goes to bed weeping. El appears to him in a vision, offering him wealth…
> Keret protests that it is sons that he wants, not wealth. He is told to offer sacrifice, then muster his army to march against…
> King Pabil of Udum, who will try to buy him off, but whose daughter Hurriy he must demand in marriage, Keret awakes from sleep, offers…
> sacrifices as instructed, musters a vast army, and sets off for Udum. On the way he comes to a sanctuary of Athirat, and vows that if his enterprise is successful, he will offer the goddess twice his bride's weight in silver, and three times in gold. The army travels on and arrives at Udum.
> The city is besieged. After a week Pabil sues for peace, offering Keret wealth.
> His embassy arrives. Keret rejects wealth, and demands Hurriy in marriage. The embassy returns… (Wyatt 2002:178)

Keret is in deep despair of losing his family. In a vision El appears as a comforter to promise wealth, and demands a sacrifice from him. Keret, however, wishes to restore his family with sons through marriage to Hurriy rather than acquire wealth. Keret fulfills the command of El and succeeded to marry Hurriy. The story suggests that El communicated directly with Keret but wanted a sacrifice from him, a task that belongs to a priest. In the text, the relationship between kingship and priesthood is highlighted as the privilege of the king in Ugarit.

In Ugarit the concept of the king as a son of god and god himself is part of the royal ideology. In the Ugaritic king list (KTU 1.104) the divine determinative 'il is seen before each deceased king's name. Thus, a critical question arises, why is the divine determinative used only for a deceased king? Does the determinative mean that it only indicates deceased kings? Or, is there any special meaning to the divination of ancestor kings in Ugarit?

Generally two opinions are proposed: either divine denomination or a technical term to connote a dead king.

Schmidt (1994:19, 67-71) contended that the marker is simply denoting the godly custodian of the king. Likewise Lewis (1989:47-52) said that the divine determinative did not guarantee the divination of the deceased kings. It is better to understand it as an expression to honor kings upon death, just as during their life time. He argued that there is no evidence of raising the deceased kings to the divine level in the cult of El or Baal. On the other hand, Day (1998:82) alleged that the king was both a god, and the son of the god El. He contended that *ʾil* connoted a god. Day (1998:82) argued that the king in Ugarit was deified, not only upon his death, but also in his life time (cf Healey 1984:245-54). His evidence comes from KTU[2] 1.16.I.10-23.

> Is then Keret the son of El, the progeny of Lat(dot under t)ipan and the Holy One? . . . We rejoice in your life, our father, we exulted (in) your immortality . . . Shall you then die, father, as men . . . How can it be said (that) Keret is the son of El, the progeny of Latipan and the Holy One? Subsequently, Keret's daughter, Thitmanat, laments her father in largely identical words (KTU[2] 1.16.II.36-49).

Yassib glorified his father, although the expression is rather rhetoric than historical. He aims to take over the kingship from his father. Yassib saw that his sick father was incapable of obliging the kingship (cf Hadley 2000:41). The idea of the deification of the living king in Ugarit should be treated with caution, although the deification of the deceased kings in Ugarit has a strong indication (Pardee 1988:168-169). Wyatt (2002:399) said that the literary context of the story of Keret is divine kingship, thus at least the determinative signifies divinized kings.

The royal ideology of Ugarit can be seen in the obligation of the kings as it appears in the story of Keret. As Yassib appealed to his father Keret, he reminded Keret of what he failed to accomplish as king, a welling-being and righteousness for the poor and the weak (Day 1998:86).

> While bandits raid you turn (your) back,
> And you entertain feuding rivals.
> You have been brought down by your failing power.
> You do not judge the cause of the importunate.
> You do not banish the extortioners of the poor,
> You do not feed the orphan before your face
> (nor) the widow behind your back.
> (KTU²1.16.VI.43-50; cf 1.16.VI.30-34.)

Inefficiency in providing righteousness and well-being for the people was the most compelling charge against the kingship because in the Canaanite context the king was the symbol of righteousness and well-being to the peoples.

In short, the story of Keret characterizes certain aspects of the kingship of Canaan, first of all, in the idealized relationship between the king and the god in terms of a priestly king. Second, he was a son of god as well as god himself. Last, the king stood as an accomplisher of well-being and righteousness for the people.

2.2.4 Royal ideology of ancient Israel in the context of the ANE

Several ideas about the kingship of the ANE shed light on the understanding of the kingship in Israel. The religious aspect of the royal ideology upholds the divine origin of the kingship. Specifically, the concept of the king as a deified god and the son of the god are attested in Egypt, Canaan and Mesopotamia. In Egypt and Canaan, the king was deified in his lifetime and after his death. In Mesopotamia, the king was the representative of the gods to fulfill the divine order. In Israel, according to Psalm 2:7, the king was regarded as the son of God "You are my son, today I have begotten you." [17] The context of the psalm implies that the king is the adopted son of God and not his naturally born son. The concept of the 'son of God' by adoption departs from the Egyptian and Canaanite concept.[18] Thus, the concept of the

---

[17] Unless specified, all the English translation comes from NRS.
[18] Day (1998:82) argued that the concept of the son of God by adoption originated from the Canaanites. But he disregarded the context of the idea in the monarchy of Israel. Zenger

'son of God' by adoption is seemingly invented by the Israelites and not from the context of the ANE (Moenikes 1999:619-21).[19] The idea of the 'son of God' in the ANE is syncretistic. Although Israel used a term from Egypt and Canaan, she employed it metaphorically that it denotes the divine choice of the king (Polish 1989:11). Specifically it highlights the Davidic kingship.

As far as the responsibilities of the king are concerned, in the ANE he must guarantee the well-being of his people, their wealth and protection. He could bring divine order as implied in the titles of the Egyptian king such as "Two Ladies," "Golden Horus," and "Dual King." The Mesopotamian king also represented the gods to provide wealth and protection to the people as their shepherd. The Canaanite Keret was charged as a failed king to bring righteousness and well-being. In Israel the Davidic kings are described with the metaphor of a shepherd to propagate the legitimacy of their kingship (2 Sm 5:2; cf Ps 23). The legitimacy of the Davidic kingship is pinpointed in Psalm 72 where the king appears as one who brings righteousness (1 Ki 10:9; Jr 22:3; see also Walton 2006:283) and peace.[20] It is also true that most of the concepts of kingship of Israel show similarities with regard to those of the ANE (Walton 2006:284).

In the ANE the king was the representative of the god as his priest. In Mesopotamia the king was *ensi*, the priest. In Canaan, various sources evince the idea as attested in KAI, 13.1,2. A similar idea is founded in Israel. The so-called Royal Psalms describe the earthly king and kingship. According to Gunkel (1998:99), they comprise Psalms 2; 18; 20; 21; 45; 72; 89; 101; 110; 132; 144:1-11 (see also Mettinger 1976:100). A general theme

---

(2005:204-205) understood that the idea of adoption in Ps 2 is one of examples of "Egyption (and Canaanite) models."

[19] It is generally and scholarly agreed that the setting of Ps 2 is the monarchic period (Craigie 2004:64). Some placed the date of the psalm in the reign of Manasseh (Terrien 2003:87). This designation shows that Yahwism may have been established as the national religion as the concept of the son of god was designated to indicate the adopted son of God in ancient Israel.

[20] Zenger (2005:205) contended that Ps 72 reveals "this 'mixture' of Egyptian and ancient Near Eastern royal ideology and its 'actualization' through the integration of Neo-Assyrian concepts of the king."

of these psalms is the king as a warrior and leader of the people. Psalm 110 implies a close relationship between kingship and priesthood (Grabbe 1995:26-27).[21] In the psalm, the Davidic king refers to Melchizedek, the priestly king of El-Elyon (Gen 14:18). The Davidic king is designated in the Temple. If the psalm is attributed to David, he is the symbol of the ideal kingship in Israel that unites the priesthood of Yahweh with the kingship. Indications can be seen in 1 Samuel 13:9-10 (Saul), 2 Samuel 6:13, 17-18, 24:25 (David), 1 Kings 3: 4, 15 (Solomon), and 1 Kings 12:33 (Jeroboam). Thus, as seen in Psalm 110, the kingship of Israel does not only function in the political sphere but also in the cultic sphere. However, there is a difference between the close relationship of the kingship and the priesthood in Israel, and that relationship in the ANE. The prime purpose of the royal ideology in the ANE was to promulgate the divine origin of the kingship as a deified king or god himself or as the only representative of the gods.

In Israel there is a different understanding of the royal ideology distinct from the ANE. McKenzie (1966:175) contended that David is idealized as "the type of king-messiah": the charismatic leader powered by the 'spirit of God.' The essential issue of the royal ideology about the origin of the kingship in Israel is whether a king is a charismatic leader divinely empowered to fulfill the will of God against the enemies. In the royal ideology, Israel did not understand their king as the only one who kept order by defeating their enemies. Unlike the Egyptian idea that their traditional enemies were dangerous powers that intimidated the order in Egypt, Israel saw Yahweh as the One who kept order and defeated their enemies (Ex 15; cf Maré 2006:712-722). The king was only the agent of Yahweh, empowered by his Spirit. Yahweh even used a

---

[21] See Emerton (1990:45-71) and Day (1998:72-90), as against Rowley (1967:485) and Gammie (1971:365-96). Serious challenges against the priestly kingship came from the issue of the identity of Salem that was challenged as a Canaanite city, called Salem rather than the Jebusite city, Jerusalem. Further, the challenges also contended that the recipient was the Zadokite priest, not the Davidic king. Day (1988: 73-74), however, strongly refuted the opinion, believing the contention can not be sustained in that the focus of the psalm is of a king rather than a priest. In Ps 76:2 the city, Salem, indicated Jerusalem. Day believed that the royal ideology in connection with the Canaanite Melchizedek appeared after David conquered Jerusalem.

foreign king as his tool to restore his order amongst the nations, as seen in Isaiah 45:1:

> Thus says the LORD to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have grasped to subdue nations before him and strip kings of their robes, to open doors before him--and the gates shall not be closed.

The focal point of the royal ideology in Israel is not on the king but on Yahweh. The king of Israel is a chosen son of God as he knows to keep the will of God. The king of Israel only executes the divine will as he is empowered by the 'spirit of Yahweh' (cf Edelman 1991:34). Therefore the king should know what the divine will is, and needs divine sanction for its execution on matters (Edelman 1991:34; see 1 Sm 28:6; 30:8; 2 Sm 5:23-24). As seen in the story of David, the critical factor that established his kingship is his knowledge of the will of God through the prophets (cf 1 Chr 29:29), Samuel (cf 1 Sm 16:13; 19:18-24), Gad (1 Sm 22:5; 2 Sm 24:11; cf 1 Chr 21:9), and Nathan (2 Sm 7:4; 12:1; cf 1 Chr 17:3). His knowledge of God's will is promulgated as the royal knowledge against the Saulide kingship, mainly in 1 Samuel 13-2 Samuel 1 (cf Lasine 2001:79-82).[22] This issue will be discussed in detail in the chapter 3.

---

[22] Many scholars discussed the ideology in 1 Sm 8-12 in the context of the Davidic ideology (McCarter 1980a: 489-504; cf Edelman 2000:67-84; Frick 1994:79-92; Liverani 1992:474-77; Ishida 1977:54). One of strong contentions comes from Ishida (1977:54). He argued that initially Samuel was positive and endorsed Saul's kingship, since he hoped to reestablish his authority through the kingship. Samuel's insistence faded on account of the request of the people and the elders for a strong monarchy. The request of the people meant that the political leadership usurped the religious authority of Samuel (Ishida 1977:39). Ishida argued that a strong political motivation played a critical role in the appearance of the monarchy. The political motivation also symbolizes the departure from the old religious system towards politics in Israel. Thus, the new monarchy brought a new religious system in Israel. To Samuel, according to Ishida, the request of the people and the elders signified idolatry (Ahlström 1993:371-390). A different perspective on the biblical text comes from Coote (2006:37). To him, the DH is royal literature that displays the royal sovereignty over states that intentionally propagated a certain social organization. The idea of the twelve tribes reveals the role of social organization under the state sovereignty. Coote (2006:40-47) proposed twelve characteristics of the tribes:
> First, *tribal structures and identities are fluid*.
> Second, *kinship levels . . . also tend to be elastic*.
> Third, *the ambiguity of kinship levels relates directly to the blurring of the boundaries of kinship functions*.
> Fourth, *though territoriality might well be a reflex of endogamy, it is not intrinsic to kinship as a political metaphor*.

2.3 Biblical perspectives on the origin of kingship

Generally, historical-critical scholarship has considered 1 Samuel 8-12 as one of the most significant sources for the origin of the kingship in Israel (Robinson 1993:49-51; Edelman 1991:27). The critical approach focused on finding the date and sources of the biblical text. The unity of the text is still hotly debated, not only by historical critical scholars, but also by new literary critics.

There are two distinctive perspectives on the sources for the kingship in 1 Samuel 8-12, which are demonstrated by source critics like Wellhausen (1957:245-256), Driver (1913:175-178), and Halpern (1981:59-96). Certainly, for some of them there are uncompromising issues, specifically the limitation of the perspective in the biblical text. The dates of the sources were mostly controversial. The issue of the sources was taken up by redactional approaches, since a redactional approach proposed the context of sources. Layer(s) of redaction is a priority since Noth (Frolov 2004:15). The date of the layer(s) of redaction, as well as the viewpoint(s) of the redactor(s) are debated. From the history of tradition the conception of redactions was criticized (Frolov 2004:15-16). A critic from the history of tradition was Weiser (1961:159-161). Recently, Campbell (2003) endeavored to revitalize tradition criticism. Four approaches will now be discussed on issues like sources, layers of redaction, traditions, and literary context: source approaches, redactional approaches, tradition critical approaches, and new literary approaches.

Fifth, *tribal organization and identity tend to be more sharply defined in the higher levels of organization*.

Sixth, *tribal organization took shape not only in relation to other tribes, but also, and especially, in relation to regional powers or states*.

Seven, *tribal designations and relations took shape in the interface of tribe and monarchic court.*

Eighth, *ethnicity does not automatically relate to tribalism in the modern period and there is no reason to think it did in antiquity*.

Ninth, *politics explains descent sooner than descent politics*.

Tenth, *tribalism has no necessary connection with pastoralism or pastoral nomadism*.

Eleventh, *evolutionary views of social development have no place in the description of social change in Palestine from the thirteenth to the fifth centuries B. C. E.*

Twelfth, *to adopt an instrumentalist approach to Israelite tribalism is not to deny the social reality of tribes*.

2.3.1 Source approaches

Wellhausen (1957:245-256) suggested two distinctive sources interwoven in 1 Samuel 8-12: a pro-monarchic source (1 Sm 9-10:16, 11) and an anti-monarchic source (1 Sm 8; 1 Sm 10:17-27; 1 Sm 12). He contended that the pro-monarchic source is older than the anti-monarchic source which came late during the Babylonian exile. He conceived a specific literary connection between 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 1 Samuel 11:1-11, 15 in terms of the prophecy and fulfillment of the seer (Wellhausen 1957: 251-253). Wellhausen (1957:251) saw 1 Samuel 11:1-11, 15 as originally connected to 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16. To him the two passages belonged to the same literary source. He did not give any historical credibility to the anti-monarchic source, and understood that it contradicts the original tradition of the kingship. He argued that the anti-monarchic source does not show any connection with Judges 19-21 that tends to display a pro-monarchic attitude. He concluded that the anti-monarchic source is post-Deuteronomic, and of Jewish origin.

The idea of different dates and sources for 1 Samuel 8-12 was taken up by Driver (1913:175-178) who connected the anti-monarchic source with 1 Samuel 7:2-17. Driver (1913:177) departed from Wellhausen in saying that the older narrative (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 10:27[b] [as in LXX]; 11:1-11, 15; 13-14), is "Hebrew historiography," that "the scenes are brought vividly before the reader, and are full of minute incidents," whereas the later one (1 Sm 8; 10:17-27[a]; 12) is Deuteronomic. He obviously put the date of the pro-monarchic source earlier than Wellhausen.

Unlike the traditional division of source approach, Halpern (1990; 1981:64) contended that the position of 1 Samuel 11 is significant. Traditionally the chapter was attributed to the so-called pro-monarchical source. Halpern (1981:64), however, argued that 1 Samuel 11 has various connections with 1 Samuel 10:17-27 that is part of the anti-monarchic source. He contrived a timetable wherein the dismissal of the assembly (1 Sm 10:25), the place of Saul at Gibeah (1 Sm 10:26), and the renewal of the kingship of Saul (1 Sm

10:17-27) are closely referred to in 1 Samuel 11. He contended that 1 Samuel 8, 10:17-27, 11, and 12 show a logical literary unity. He maintained that the sequence of the literary unit follows a pattern of the designation of Saul, his acclamation, confirmation, and ruling (cf Edelman 1991:27-36; Long 1989:173-94).[23] Halpern (1981:70) found the sequence of the pattern, explicitly in the Jephthah narrative, in Judges 2:11-19, and also implicitly in the narratives of all the major judges: designation, acclamation, confirmation in victory, and ruling. Halpern (1981:79) accepted the historical credence of Samuel's speech in 1 Samuel 8 (cf Birch 1976:132), since he saw no anti-monarchical attitude in Israel after David. He (Halpern 1981:79) rejected any dtr notion in 1 Samuel 8.

Source approaches open a way to reconcile the inconsistencies and conflicts about sources in 1 Samuel 8-12. It is unconceivable that historians would not have used historical sources. It means that the ancient historian used sources for his biblical account. However, source approaches did not succeed to explain why the historian used only two sources. They are even divided on the criteria to divide the sources. Generally speaking, source approaches are limited in their explanation that 1 Samuel 8-12 is interwoven with two sources, although it clarified that there were two particular perspectives on the kingship in Israel. Thus, source approaches paved the way for redactional approaches to explicate how the perspectives come together.

2.3.2 Redactional approaches[24]
Since Noth (1991) proposed the idea of the DH from Joshua to Kings as a unit,[25] the idea had wide influence until recent discoveries of various layers of

---

[23] McKenzie (2000:293, see n.29) saw only two stages: designation (1 Sm 9:1-10:16) and confirmation (1 Sm 11), contending 10:17-27a as a dtr composition. Consequently, he (2000:293) proposed that the pattern set for Saul is the invention of Dtr.
[24] For an exhaustive and thorough review of the issue, see Römer and De Pury, Deuteronomistic historiography (DH): History of research and debated issues, 24-141, in De Pury, Römer & Macchi (eds) (2000).
[25] See McCarthy (1973:401-12) for a specific case study of 1 Sm 8-12 as a theological unit. Cf Van Seters (1983:250-264).

redaction in the DH, contrary to the idea of Noth. Noth (1991:4) saw the Dtr as a single compiler of the text in the exilic period. According to him, the Dtr used various materials with his own interpretation from his chronological framework. He (Noth 1991:89-99) used the law of Deuteronomy as his guideline to interpret the history. The viewpoint of the Dtr is retrospective in seeing the hope and the warning for the kingship that Israel had experienced since Saul. Noth (1991:49-53) claimed that 1 Samuel 8 and 1 Samuel 12 were interpolated by the Dtr with his own interpretation of the kingship.[26] Thus, he alleged that the DH is the result of a single writer. The main idea, however, has been challenged in many ways by redactional approaches (cf Auld 2000:19-28; Veijola 1977:115-122), tradition critical (cf Campbell 1986:17-21; McCarter 1980:18-23), and other approaches.

Until the 1970s and 1980s two approaches were predominant in the discussion of layers of redaction (Person 2002:2-3): the so-called Harvard school (Cross 1973; cf Nelson 1981; Friedman 1981) and the Göttingen school (Veijola 1975; Dietrich 1973; Smend 1971). The Harvard school contended for two editions (a pre-exilic redaction and an exilic redaction), and the Göttingen for three redactional editions, namely DtrG (a history writer), Dtr (a prophetic redactor), and DtrN (a nometic redactor) (Person 2002:2-3).

Cross (1973:274-289) claimed that the periods of Josiah and the Babylonian exile provide two timetables for redactions of the DH: a pre-exilic redaction in Josiah and an exilic redaction (see Nelson 1982:22-28). He (Cross 1973:275) argued that certain concepts and observations do not settle in the exilic period, specifically the conventional expression, like "to this day." He (Cross 1973:275-285) observed that the phrase appears not only in the sources but also in the dtr portions such as 2 Kings 8:22 and 16:6 in the criticism on the house of Jeroboam (1 Ki 13:34) and the concept of the chosen kingship in David (1 Ki 11:12, 13, 32, 34, 36; 15:4; etc.) that culminated in Josiah (2 Ki

---

[26] Ahlström (1993:389-390) held that 1 Sm 12 was pre-Deuteronomistic, since the chapter does not show any awareness of Joshua's conquest of Canaan.

22:1-23:25). According to Cross (1973:289), all these observations indicate that redactional work existed prior to the Babylonian exile. Thus, he concluded that the Josiah reform of religion certainly provided the backdrop of the earlier redaction.

The theory of two redactions is specifically noteworthy in Friedman (1981), since he complemented the idea of Cross. Friedman (1981:6) observed, which absence of criticism on the last four kings of Judah regarding the *bamot* that is applied to all the kings of Judah except two, namely Hezekiah and Josiah, who attempted to destroy the *bamot*, the local sanctuaries. Friedman (1981:6) pointed out that the promise to David was no longer an issue in the last period. He (Friedman 1981:7) maintained that Josiah was the essential focus of the DH (Cross 1973:274-289). His observation (Friedman 1981:1-43) signified that the redactors inherited a priestly heritage: P^1 (pre-exilic texts; P signifies a priestly redaction) and P^2 (exilic texts).

A quite different understanding of the nature of the redactions came from Veijola (1977:115-122). Veijola (1977:115-122) saw two different attitudes to the kingship in the DH, specifically in 1 Samuel 8-12. He, however, departed from the traditional idea that two redactors, DtrG (the basic Deuteronomistic text) and DtrN (Nomistic) are behind the text. According to him (Veijola 1977:115-119), the first redactor, DtrG, used a pre-dtr source which comprised of Judges 17-21; 1 Samuel 7:5-15, 17; 8:1-5, 22b; 9:1-10:16; 10:17-18a*a*, 19b-27a; 10:27b [LXX]-11:15. The source that DtrG used has a pro-monarchic attitude. Judges 17-21 is placed in the pro-monarchic attitude with 1 Samuel 11:1-11. In this regard he agreed with Wellhausen. Unlike the first redactor, the second redactor DtrN evaluated kingship negatively and critically based on his perspective on the dtr law (Veijola 1977:119-122). As Noth pointed out, the dtr law serves as the canon to assess the kings of Israel. Veijola (1977:115, 119) suggested that the work of DtrN encompassed 1 Samuel 7:2-4; 8:6-22a; 10:18a*bc*b-19a; 12:1-25. Furthermore, Veijola (1977:115-122) proposed that the primary concern of the first redactor was to

preserve the pro-dtr historical materials, whereas the later redactor was concerned with the law of Deuteronomy. The two different concerns of the Dtr signify the development of their attitudes to the kingship, from positive to negative. The recognition of the shift in the viewpoints helps to understand the different perspectives on the kingship of Israel. However, Veijola's discussion is somewhat unclear on the social and religious settings of DtrG.

Soggin (1989:210-214), who viewed 1 Samuel 8-15 as the result of redactional work, but put forwards three versions: First is 1 Samuel 8; 10:17-27; 12. Second is 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16; 13:5-15. Third is 1 Samuel 11; 13:1-4; 16-23, 1 Samuel 14. Soggin (1989:210) held the first version (1 Sm 8; 10:17-27; 12) as a later interpolation in 1 Samuel 8-15, since the redaction presupposes the tribal league as an ideal regime (cf Jobling 1986:84-87). He (Soggin 1989:210) was convinced that the concept resulted from the exilic experience of the nation in 587/6 BCE. According to Soggin (1989:211), the second version (1 Sm 9:1-10:16 and 13:5-15) is legendary (cf Lemche 1998:31-34, 120-122; Campbell 1986:17-21) and favored the monarchy. The third version (1 Sm 11, 13:1-4; 16-23; 14) originated in the north of Palestine and was later inserted (Soggin 1989:211). It is favorable toward the monarchy. Soggin (1989:211) argued that the appearance of Saul as king showed a stereotyped theme from antiquity in narratives, that is "the lowly figure who rises to the highest position of rule" (cf Gn 37, 39-50).

More recent studies tend to see more layers of redaction[27] or to refute the existence of the DH. For instance, Auld (2000:19-28) held that the books of Samuel and Kings belong to the post-exilic period. He (Auld 2000:19) asserted that Samuel-Kings and Chronicles use a "shared source text" that is characterized as interested in the phenomenon of prophecy. Auld (2000:20-22) further noticed two types of prophets, namely Nathan and Isaiah, who were engaged in the "succession to David and the deliverance of Jerusalem,"

---

[27] Jobling (1986:45-46) retorted that, although there is a seemingly uncontrollable motivation in finding layers of redaction (Person 2002:4), there is no legitimate attempt to explain how those different layers of redaction stand in a unit.

and Samuel, Elijah and Elisha, on the other hand, were involved with Saul and the house of Omri and Ahab. Auld (2000:28) considered that "the shared Text on the house of David" exists in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, and argued that "Sam-Kings and Chron--or at least their prototypes-- may have been subject to similar influences and to mutual influences." Accordingly, he alleged that a DH did not exist.[28]

Redactional approaches provided a perspective to understand different historical viewpoints of a story, and the historical context of the final redaction. It is believed that the final redactor rendered the present biblical text of DH. It defines the different historical contexts of the redactions, if any. The approaches, however, are deficient on the kind of materials used by redactors, and where they found them.

2.3.3 Tradition-critical approaches

Critical scholars proposed from three traditions (Lemche 1988) to various traditions for 1 Samuel 8-12 (Campbell 2003:13-17, 1986:17-21; Birch 1976:131-154; Weiser 1961:159-163). The recognition of multiple traditions deviated from the approach of Noth's essential unitary view on the DH. Tradition critical approaches seriously challenged the idea of Noth.

Critique of the view of Noth came from Weiser (1961:159-163) who saw "repetitions, doublets, [and] inconsistencies" as markers of different literary traditions. According to Weiser (1961:159), the book of Samuel is not a unified literary work of one redactor or writer such as the Dtr. Differing narratives or traditions come from multiple authors or bearers of traditions, based on their own traditional settings. Weiser (1961: 159-161) stated that 1 Samuel 8-15 is an entity of loosely connected narratives about the rise of Saul as king, since he observed different materials: 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 (folk tale), 1 Samuel 8; 10:17-21; 11:15; 9-10:16; 11 (an independent historical narrative), 1 Samuel 13 and 14. According to him, the idea of two

---

[28] There are still scholarly attempts that defend the traditional view of Noth, viz DH as a literary unit (Knoppers 2000:119-134, 1993-4:1:135-223; 2:13-120).

perspectives on the kingship, a negative and a positive attitude, could not be sustained (cf Lemch 1988:120-122). Weiser (1961:161) challenged Noth that "It is not without some violence that he [Noth] attempts to adjust or to explain the contradictions and discrepancies; but his efforts reveal the weaknesses and limitations of the simplifying method of literary criticism which he applies rather one-sidedly and they are unable to remove the difficulties conclusively." The perspective of Weiser to 1 Samuel 8-12 helps to reveal literary inconsistencies and theological views. However, he could not explain how those discrete materials came together. Paradoxically, the recognition of different materials acknowledges that there is a redactor who combined them. Thus, the question should be asked about the historical circumstances and perspectives that motivated the redactor's work. Undeniably there were dynamics to unify the various literary traditions which arose in different historical settings. For instance, Weiser insisted that the story of the rise of Saul in 1 Samuel 9-10:16; 11; 13 and 14 is a historical narrative, and that 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 is a folk tale. The question remains why and who collected them and arranged them in the present form and order.

Speculatively Birch (1976:154) noted prophetic traces in 1 Samuel 7-15 (cf McCarter 1980:18-23). He (Birch 1976:131-154) declared 1 Samuel 7-15 to be composed of various traditions that show different forms, genres and times. Birch (1976:132) indicated old traditions that were genuine historical memory: 1 Samuel 8:1-7; 9:1-14, 18-19, 22-24; 10:2-4, 9, 14-16a, 10-12, 20-24, 26-27 and 11:1-11, 15. Among them he pointed out two forms of traditions that were "complete tradition," such as 1 Samuel 11:1-11, and traditions in "fragmentary form," like 1 Samuel 10:20-24. Birch (1976:154) observed obvious prophetic involvement in the origin of kingship, implying prophetic activity as the historical setting of the traditions. The Dtr edited those various traditions from different historical contexts "to interpret the people's request as raising the danger of apostasy" and kingship as "tempting the people to apostasy."

Recently, Campbell (2003) published a commentary on 1 Samuel based on his tradition-form approach. Methodologically speaking, his approach is somewhat ambiguous, since it is hard to tell whether he focuses on the layers of tradition or of redaction. Campbell (2003:87) saw six components in 1 Samuel 7-12: four assembly scenes, 1 Samuel 7:2-17 (Mizpah), 1 Samuel 8:1-22 (Ramah), 1 Samuel 10:17-25 (Mizpha), 1 Samuel 12:1-25 (Gilgal); and two prophetic scenes, 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16, 1 Samuel 11:1-15. These six components embrace the prophetic scenes literarily at the beginning, in the middle, and in the end (Campbell 2003:85-90). He claimed that a Josianic dtr redactor used the combination of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 with 11:1-11 and 1 Samuel 15 from prophetic redactions, because the redactor showed favor for Josiah and for the idea of kingship in the emergence of Israel (Campbell 2003:128-129). According to Campbell (2003:130-131), the reason for using 1 Samuel 11:1-11 is to circulate "a prophetic claim" in a well established kingship.[29] The next level of redaction, according to Campbell (2003:129-130), is a revised DH, motivated by the sudden death of Josiah, in which two different groups of editors partook: one group was highly involved in judging the kingship, 1 Samuel 7:2-8:22; 10:17-25, and the other group was involved in criticizing the people's apostasy, 1 Samuel 7:3-4; 8:7b-8; 10:18-19; 12:1-25. Campbell (2003:130-131) focused on the artistic composition of the different traditions in the present text. He contributed by identifying prophetic redactors who combined two different traditions that may point to a historical reality in the emergence of the kingship in Israel.

Unlike the previously discussed scholars, Lemche (1988:120-122) did not see any historical value in 1 Samuel 8-12. According to him, the three traditions in the biblical text came from different places. He said that the traditions betray the structure of legends or sagas. The first narrative (1 Sm 9:1-10:16) he (Lemche 1988:121) defined as a "fairytale." Characteristic of the narrative is "no mention of Samuel, nor of any particular locality where Saul encounters the prophets" (Lemche 1988:121). The second narrative (1

---

[29] Miller (1974:157-174) saw that the kingship of Saul may have been well established in 1 Sm 11:1-11, 15.

Sm 10:17-27) is a fairytale of the lot-casting (Lemche 1988:121). He (Lemche 1988:121) contended that lot-casting is not the historical way to choose someone for a significant office. The third (1 Sm 11) is the "heroic legend" (Lemche 1988:121). Lemche (1988:122) insisted that 1 Samuel 11 shows a well formed pattern, a "fairytale, which ends when the hero obtains the entire kingdom. Lemche (1988:121) contended that the Dtr simply juxtaposed three traditions to anticipate which tradition would be considered historically correct. It ventured to reconstruct this history with available materials as well as possible extra-biblical materials. Unfortunately, however, he did not explain why the dtr historians collected three different fairytales to refute the kingship. If the Dtr really attempted simply to let the traditions be assessed as a historical report, they would rather have chosen specific historical material to boost the historical value of the text.

2.3.4 New literary approaches

The observation of Jobling (1986:45) is noteworthy for these approaches that the atomic understanding of the text does not prove how various sources or traditions had cooperated in a unit (Gunn 1980:11-19). In fact the reality of the text itself proves that there is a certain factor that unites different points of view in the text.

Gunn (1980:11) explored the literary plot that bounds the story of Saul as a unit from 1 Samuel 8 to 31. He (Gunn 1980:14) suggested that the final text has an "overall flow and coherence." The major contention of Gunn (1980:19) is that the story of Saul from 1 Samuel 8-2 Samuel 2 is the tragedy that Saul is destined to be tragic (cf also Coogan 2006:235). In 1 Samuel 8-12, Saul is a "secondary figure in Yahweh's scheme of things" and "walks a tightrope" (Gunn 1980:65). That Saul's beginning would be bright, but his future dark is implied in the prophetic contact, reverberating in the proverb of 1 Samuel 10:11, and also in the public's despising him in 1 Samuel 10:27 (Gunn 1980:63-64). Eventually, Saul's position is depicted as insecure. In his literary

analysis, Gunn (1980:116:123) expressed his appreciation for Saul in his characterization and his role in the plot.

Eslinger (1985:49-53) read 1 Samuel 11:1-11 within a broader literary context of 1 Samuel 1-12. He contended that 1 Samuel 1-12 as a unit is distinguished thematically from the period of the judges, as well as from the period of the kingship. He read 1 Samuel 1-12 within 'the covenant framework.' Thus, Yahweh is the agent of the military victory in 1 Samuel 11. Saul is only his designate.

Polzin (1989:1-17) ardently criticized the method of historical-critical exegesis, specifically of 1 Samuel 8-12, and in general of the DH. Polzin (1989:1-17) was not convinced that reconstructing pre-texts or layers behind "the real text" could detect authorial intention or artistic intention in the text as a whole (cf Jobling 1986:45). Polzin (1989:124) indicated the role of the narrator in 1 Samuel 8-12 that showed the divine direction in this history. He (Polzin 1989:125) commented, "Whatever one may say about the genius of the Deuteronomist's human characterizations, the LORD will remain, for author and reader alike, ever mysterious." Thus, the Lord would be the omnicient narrator who is encoded in the intention of the structure and in the meaning of the whole. Polzin approached the DH holistically and artistically. However, he was criticized that his methodological point of departure comes from the historical-critical approach (cf Römer & De Pury 2000:99). In fact, the DH is a construct of the historical-critical approach, and seen as the product of the exilic experience.

Jobling (1986:12-13) conceived 1 Samuel 8-12 within the framework of the judges-period, but as seen from the post-exilic situation. His methodology is deconstruction ("indeterminacy of texts") from Derrida's theory that tried to show "structures of sense-making" and "structures of failing-to-make-sense." In his deconstructive viewpoint of the text he was concerned with the liberation theologies, such as feminist theology that was influenced by

Gottwald (1979). Jobling attempted to connect his two major concerns by looking at biblical texts, such as Genesis 2-3.

The application of Jobling's methodology is seen in his understanding of the DH, in particular of 1 Samuel 8-12. Jobling (1986:13) contended that "there is a deep 'indeterminacy' in the DH between pro-and anti-monarchical attitudes, which does not immediately seem 'usable.'" His contention (Jobling 1986:44-87) is that 1 Samuel 8-12 is placed within the chronological framework of the judge-period beginning with Judges 2:11 up till 1 Samuel 12 (cf Dumbrell 1983:23-33). Jobling (1986:45) followed the pattern of leadership in the Judges-period. It had certain exceptions: the judgeship of Judges 2:11-16:31 (with kingship in anticipation in Jdg 6-9), no leadership in Judges 17-19 (anticipating kingship in the debate), judgeship in 1 Samuel 1-7 (nothing about kingship), and kingship in 1 Samuel 8-12 (judgeship still in being until 1 Sm 12). In the historical perspective of his pattern, it is difficult to detect where the two leaderships appear respectively. Jobling's pattern of the structure of Judges to 1 Samuel 12 is more literary-oriented than indicating historical sequence.[30] Another significant idea in his structure is the so called gap. For example, in Judges 17-21 he understood that the gap between Samson and Eli is the reason why bad conditions were pervasive in a period without a king. Jobling (1986:85) judged Saul in 1 Samuel 8-12 to be a faithful judge, but Gideon an unfaithful king, since Saul did not pursue a hereditary monarchy, but stood faithfully with Yahweh. Saul is a "unifier who avoids playing the tyrant." Jobling (1986:87) concluded that the DH does not tend to be one-sidedly pro-monarchic or anti-monarchic but it "lets monarchy be seen for good and bad, and judgeship for good and bad."

Fokkelman (1993:320) inferred that in 1 Samuel 8 and 12, Samuel represents the pro-monarchic position. Fokkelman (1993:320) observed that

---

[30] Ahlström (1993:371-390) contended that the leadership of judge and kings should be regarded as identical. He (Ahlström 1993:374) supposed that "The distinction that usually has been made between 'charismatic' judgeship and dynastic kingship is an ideological simplification of a historical phenomenon."

historical critics saw that Samuel played a major role to inaugurate Saul as a king. Fokkelman (1993:320) viewed that historical critics considered the different roles of Samuel do signify a diachronic circumstance of 1 Samuel 8-12. Thus, the critics dichotomize two viewpoints on kingship, pro-and anti-monarchy (Fokkelman 1993:320). Unlike the understanding of historical critics, Fokkelman (1993:320) stressed that the recognition of the omniscient narrator is the key to solve the complicate viewpoints on the kingship; since he is assured that the authority of a character could not contain that of the omniscient narrator. He (Fokkelman 1993:320) acknowledged scholars who have already reconciled the issue of the viewpoints on the kingship by ordering the units according to three different assemblies. Fokkelman (1993:320) considered that these assemblies were necessary to establish the new form of state. Fokkelman (1993:320-322) understands the different points of view of kingship in literary manner.

Fokkelman (1993:322-324) explicated his viewpoints with a structural analysis. Structurally, 1 Samuel 8 and 12 function as an inclusio with various remarks on the kingship. In 1 Samuel 9, God appears as driving the course to establish the kingship through Samuel by informing him on the matter beforehand. Even in 1 Samuel 10, God revealed himself as the giver of information for the prophecy of Samuel. In 1 Samuel 10:17-27, God implied that God of Samuel determines lot-choice. God does not speak in 1 Samuel 11 and 12, but He sends his spirit to Saul and the thunderstorm on Samuel's request. God's omniscient involvement is structured in the three speeches of Samuel: 1 Samuel 8; 10:17-27; 12. Fokkelman distinguished the three units in the course of the establishment of the kingship in Israel.

The analysis of the micro structure is based on his macro-plot in which "the single story is called a literary unit" (Fokkelman 1999:161). Fokkelman saw the literary unit composed of two levels. The lowest levels are concerned with sounds, words, and sentences that are "the texture of the story or poem." The next level involves "sequences," "scenes or story segments." Fokkelman

(1999:186-187) saw 1 Samuel 2 to 2 Samuel 1 as the macro-plot of 1 Samuel 8-12, since the plot is positioned between two theological poems, the song of Hannah (1 Sm 2) and David' lament (2 Sm 1) that are part of the three poetic pillars of the two books of Samuel. The third pillar is the song of "Thanksgiving" (2 Sm 22). It is a highly speculative analysis of the structure of this biblical text, not only on its micro-level but also on its macro-level. The approach of Fokkelman, though, is compelling in how the biblical text is contextualized from the lowest level to the higher levels. His structural understanding gives more credit to Noth's idea of the Dtr as a single creative writer. It is, however, dubious whether the ancient writer really intended such artistic ideas for the ancient story.

2.3.5 Synthesis

The above mentioned approaches basically converge on finding inconsistencies and conflicts in the account of the origin of the kingship of Saul in two ways, diachronically and synchronically. The diachronic approaches aim to identify the kind of layers behind the text, such as sources, traditions, and redactions. Although there are different views on the layers of biblical materials, there is agreement that the present text is the result of complex historical and theological processes and growth. The diachronic approaches generally pinpoint that 1 Samuel 11:1-11 is isolated by additional dtr passages, 1 Samuel 10:17-27 and 1 Samuel 11:12-14 and 1 Samuel 12.

The synchronic approaches see the text as a literary unity, as seen in the DH and the new literary approaches. The DH is a scholarly hypothesis rather than a biblical designation. On the other hand, the new literary approaches see various artistic techniques that unravel or bind inconsistences and contradictions. The new literary critics understood that these approaches can replace historical concerns with a literary paradigm (cf Barton 2007:31). The approaches appreciate the artistic beauty and dynamics in the unity although they do not inform about possible historical aspects and characters in the text.

The synchronic approaches explicate that 1 Samuel 11 is part of the unified context of the DH.

2.4 Aspects of leadership in ancient Israel

2.4.1 Introduction

The study of multiple social-political factors in the development of the kingship in Israel does not rely on the biblical account of 1 Samuel 8-12, but on comparative social models. [31] A major issue of the social scientific approach to the Old Testament is seen in Coote and Whitelam's comment (1986:108-109) that "The tradition of the Hebrew Bible with their theological stances and complex and largely hidden history of development, transmission, adaptation and reformulation spanning a millennium or more, provide an immense obstacle for the historian." Thus, Coote and Whitelam were convinced that historical reconstruction is an essential task from various disciplines including biblical studies.[32]

Two major aims of social scientific approaches are solving literary and historical riddles, and solving social problems (McNutt 1999:17). Literary materials and social models are both evidences of complex social circumstances. The goal of social scientific approaches is mainly to find a proper social model from cross-cultural studies to deal with the social

---

[31] Methodologically speaking, Coote and Whitelam (1987; 1986) thought that the historical perspective is likely identical with the social scientific approach (see Whitelam 1995:149-165). For the issue, Long (1994b:376) indicated, "For purposes of *historical* reconstruction, the social sciences must resist the anti-literary tendency and remain in some measure dependent on written sources."

[32] A major step of the sociological approach comes from Gottwald (1999; 1979), since he utilized models and methods of social sciences in the study of the Old Testament. Specifically on the subject of the origin of Israel, he is strongly oriented to social sciences. In his study he proceeded from the Marxist perspective, and adopted a variety of methods from the social sciences inter alia structural-functionalism and cultural-materialism. Steinberg (1995:47) focused on sociology and anthropology rather than on religion and history in order to obtain "the social structures and social circumstances that lie within the text, as well as those behind the text" (Gottwald 1985:26). Steinberg (1995:53) further contended that "In order to investigate the complexity of these socioeconomic relations, cross-cultural models are potentially relevant for illuminating obscure aspects of social life. The modern interpreter must bear in mind that neither the ancient world nor the modern one can always be expected to conform to the rules; there are always exceptions, and we must recognize that the biblical text may preserve evidence of both the exception and the rule." See also Coote & Whitelam (1986:109).

circumstances in ancient Israel, since "the biblical traditions are *models* or *constructs* of reality" (McNutt 1999:4). The comparative study of social models provides compelling evidence about the formation of the kingship in Israel. According to Esler (2006:3) the representative meaning of models lies in its "essentially simplifications, exemplifications, and systematizations of data used for comparative processes." Fundamental to social critical approaches are the reconstruction of history with its models.

Social critical approaches see the kingship as a result of the culmination of socio-political and economic processes in Israel (Whitelam 1992:40-48; Gottwald 1986:77-106; Chaney 1986:53-76; Coote & Whitelam 1986:107-147; Frick 1986:37-52). Generally, social scholars agree that the kingship in Israel is not the result of a single factor, but of more factors. Coote and Whitelam (1987:23), for example, suggested that multiple factors effected the forming of the monarchy in Israel, such as population pressure, agricultural development, and inter-regional trade. On the whole, they viewed the kingship as an advanced and indispensable political institution to guide the economy. They highlighted inter-regional trade and contended that inter-regional trade eventually caused social stratification because not many people received direct benefits from trade. It is a specific labor group in Israel that benefitted from trade. The distinction between the groups accelerates. Trade is based on the need of people, and the ability to control labor' so. The majority of the people are unaffected by trade. Eventually inter-regional trade plays a major role in the formation of a state.

The major focus of the social critical approaches is to explicate the key and other factors in forming the monarchy from the previous chieftaincy or judgeship (cf Coote & Whitelam 1987:23). The next section focuses on the kind of leadership before the onset of the monarch, which includes judgeship and chieftaincy.

2.4.2 The Judges

2.4.2.1 Introduction

The traditional view of the organization of the period of the judges[33] has been changed from the idea of the unity of twelve tribes (cf Bright 1981:162) to that of a fragmented society (Steinberg 1995:45-46; Whitelam 1992:40-48; Rendtorff 1985:27). One of the reasons for the shift is that this pan-Israelite idea came supposedly from a later ideology about the monarchy (Hackett 1998:177-218). The idea of a national entity of Israel has to contend with complicating and contradictory materials in Judges. There is no specific mention of Israel as a national unit in Judges, nor any extra-biblical evidence (Ahlström 1993:373).[34] These observations make it difficult to see the twelve tribes as a unity in the time of judges.[35] Against the idea of a national unity in the judges period another piece of evidence is rather explicit. The activities of the so-called major judges indicate that their leadership was rather confined to a specific region or to a few tribal areas, mainly in the central mountainous area (Hayes & Miller 1977:320).[36]

---

[33] Ahlström (1993:373) indicated a certain ambiguity involved in the general designation of the period, since he believed that even before the Saulide period there existed a kingship as seen in the case of Gideon and Abimelek. The terms used in the period of the judges are unclear in that the judges were "princes, rulers, chieftains over certain territories and clans, societies that were more or less well organized". Thus, for him, there is no specific distinction between the judges and the later kings. He did not perceive any distinction between the period of the judges and the time of Saul. However, it is difficult to view the periods synchronically, based only on the biblical accounts, since it is difficult to distinguish between the time of the events and the period narrated in the text of 1 Sm 8-12.

[34] The mention of Israel in the Merneptah stela cannot be considered as a national designation since it denotes a people (See Hackett 1998:195-196).

[35] Dever (2004:77) stated that "the doubling of population from the initial stages of settlement in the twelfth century BCE (the 'Period of the Judges' or "Proto-Israelite' horizon) to the tenth century (or 'United Monarchy') is not only impressive, but suggests an evolutionary stage of growth, urbanization, prosperity, stability and ethnic self-consciousness that often (although not necessarily) accompany nascent statehood" (See also Dever 2001:108-125).

[36] In Jdg 5 Deborah sings a song of the victory against the Canaanites, particularly on Jabin the king of Hazor. A major focus of the song is that the leadership of Yahweh is highly superior to the kingship of the Canaanites (Jdg 5:11). The leadership was only actualized in the willingness of Israel to follow Yahweh's leaders in a unified organization as seen in the ten tribes of Israel (Jdg 5:2; cf Jdg 4:14). On the one hand, the song denotes an archaic feature of ancient original poems (see McNutt 1999:40), on the other hand, it is somehow difficult to have a clear territory described in the names of the tribes, particularly of Makir. A clear observation was made of Judah that represented the southern part of Israel. Thus, it is probable to say that the ten tribes indicate the northern area and a part of Trans-Jordan, namely Gilead.

The different type of leadership of the judges is seen from the differentiation between the so-called major judges and the so-called minor judges. The major judges are Othniel (Jdg 2:6-10), Ehud (Jdg 3:12-30), Shamgar (Jdg 3:31), Deborah (Jdg 4-5), Gideon (Jdg 6-7), Jephthah (Jdg 10-11), and Samson (Jdg 13-16). All of them except Samson were mainly involved with military conflicts with the enemies. The minor judges, Tola and Jair (Jdg 10:2-5), Ibzan, Elon, and Abddon (Jdg 12:8-15) are reported as leaders who judged Israel.

2.4.2.2 Role of the judge

The connotation of the Hebrew term *šōpēt* as a 'judge' is misleading (Yee 2007:1-3; Block 1999:21-25; Flanders, Crapps, & Amith 1996:251; Ahlström 1993:371-390; Mafico 1987:69-87). The term, a 'judge,' indicates that this leader was mainly involved in judicial work. However, except in the case of Deborah, the prophetess, the primary role of the so-called major judges was to defeat the enemies. They were saviors and sometimes civil rulers (Jdg 3:10; 4:4; 12:7; 15:20; 16:31; cf 1 Sm 4:18, 7:6) (See Malamat 1976:152-68). The military role of the major judges are indicated by the term, *mōśīᵃ'* (savior; Jdg 3:9, 15; 6:36; 12:3). The judicial work did even appear in the account of the so-called minor judges. They were not reported as judging a law case. Besides the major judges' tasks as military leaders Block (1999:21-25) saw a general tone of leadership. He indicated the lack of judicial judgeship throughout Judges, not only in the main body of the book, but also in the so-called prologue, Judges 1:1-2:5 as well as in the so-called epilogue, 17:21-21:25. Block (1995:25) concluded that *šōpēt* was a general term for the normal leaders such as tribal rulers, leaders, and governors of Israel.

The major judges were empowered by the 'spirit of Yahweh.' It marked them as Yahweh's representatives to expel the enemies. They provided

charismatic leadership (Jdg 3:10; 11:29; 13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14). [37] As deliverers, they demonstrated that Yahweh is the source of their power.[38]

McKenzie (1966:16-17) understood the judges to be theologically idealized as prototypes of the later kingship in the dtr formulation. He inferred that the kingship of Israel resulted from the subsequent development of the Israelite belief of a charismatic leader: that "the king is one upon whom the spirit rests permanently, and the king in turn is the type of the Messiah." According to McKenzie (1966:17), the 'spirit of Yahweh' is the central thrust to show the continuity between the concept of a judge and a king in Israel.

Ahlström (1993:371-372) attempted to place the role of the judges within the ancient Near Eastern context. He (1993:372) contended that the cognate of the word *šōpēt* in the Mari text, *šapātum,* meant to judge and administer an appointed region on behalf of the king. The root of *špt* is also attested in Canaanite as well as in Phoenician literature (Block 1999:21-25; Mafico 1987:69-87; cf Rendtorff 1985:28):

> CTA 6.6.29:
> Surely he will overturn the throne of your kingship;
> Surely he will break the scepter of your rule.
>
> Phoenician
> May the scepter of his rule be torn away:
> May the throne of his kingdom be overturned (translation
> from Block 1999:24)

Ahlström (1993:373) concluded that *šōpēt* implied the role "princes" or "rulers" in the ancient Near Eastern context. He (Ahlström 1993:374) refuted a distinction between "charismatic judgeship" and "dynastic kingship" as an ideological designation (cf also Rendtorff 1985:27).

---

[37] Buber restricted charismatic leadership to the so-called major judges who were differentiated from the so-called minor judges. Charismatic leadership appeared in temporary alliances of tribes for defence against the enemies (Herrmann 1980:131). The distinction between the major judges and the minor judges, according to Alt (1989:171-237), signifies different roles. The latter are judicial leaders while the former are military leaders.
[38] In most cases in Judges the Hebrew verbal root *yāšā* appears in the context of delivering the people (Jdg 2:16; 3:9; 6:14; 8:22; 9:22; 10:12, etc.).

The viewpoints of McKenzie and Ahlström on *šōpēt* complement each other. As a proto-model of the kingship of Israel, the terms *mōšîᵃ'* and *šōpēt* differ from the kings of Israel, particularly in their role in the Davidic monarchy. Their role was limited by the social, religious, and political circumstances of their time. Retrospectively, the Dtr decribed their temporary and inconsistent roles in comparison with that of the kings. *šōpēt* characterized a leader who was inferior to the kings of Israel. Despite the inferior role of the *šōpēt,* his/her role was enhanced by the empowerment by the 'spirit of Yahweh.' He is called savior (*mōšîᵃ'*).The term is used for a divinely sanctioned military leader of Israel, whether he or she is a *šōpēt,* [39] *nāgîd* [40] or *melek*. [41] The depiction of the military leader as savior ultimately points to Yahweh as the only savior of Israel (Ps 7:11; 17:7), since it is the title of Yahweh as protector of Israel (Is 19:20). Yahweh is the only One who can raise a savior and He withholds a savior from the people of Israel when they are unfaithful to Him (Dt 28:29). [42] The principal roles of major and minor judges are therefore to save their people from enemies, or to make a decision at a critical moment of the tribe, or to rule the people as a governor as their divinely sanctioned leader (cf Flanders, Crapps, & Smith 1996:251).

2.4.2.3 Amphictyonic theory

Noth (1960:85-109) proposed an idea of amphictyony for the organization of the tribes in the time of the judges period. The term was adopted from Greece and Italy for a loosely connected organization with a central cultic place and a common culture (Noth 1960:88; cf Alt 1989:179-180; Bright 1981:162). Noth (1960:91-97) noted that each tribe took a turn to lead the ceremony of the renewal of the covenant at Shechem (cf Flanders, Crapps, & Smith 1996:246). The so-called 'minor judge' in Israel, sent to the central cultic place, was the amphictyonic leader with the responsibility to preserve

---

[39] See Jdg 3:9 (Othniel), 15 (Ehud); 6:36 (Gideon); 12:3 (Jephthah).
[40] See 1 Sm 11:3 (Saul).
[41] See 2 Ki 13:5 (Jehoahaz).
[42] See Is 43:11; 45:15; Zch 8:7.

and interpret the divine law (Noth 1960:101-102). The 'major judge' was Yahweh's savior for Israel (Noth 1960:101). The savior figures were usually decribed as major judges. Major judges were raised to save the people in a military conflict, while minor judges judged Israel (Jdg 10:2, 3; 12:8, 11, 13). Noth (1960:101) saw succession in the role of the minor judges (Jdg 10:3; 12:8, 11, 13). For him the office of minor judges was the center of the amphictyony (Noth 1960:102).

The amphictyonic idea was met with harsh criticism (Lindars 1979:95-112). Nowhere in Judges is the tribal unity denoted as the confederacy of twelve tribes. The narratives of the so-called major judges do not cover the whole country but only limited areas, mainly of Ephraim and Benjamin. De Geus (1976:112-113) contended that the role of the so-called major judges later arose from a pan-Israelite sense. Rendtorff (1985:25) also doubted the historical claim about 'the sons of Israel' (Jdg 2:11, 3:7, 12, etc) or of Israel as a unity. He held that the narratives always refer to a limited area and a confined clash. Noth's major idea of a central sanctuary has been seriously doubted in view of Israel's cultic places in Gilgal, Shiloh, Shechem, and Bethel.

The idea of amphictyony, however, did not disappear. Revised opinions of Noth allege that this religious confession was the dynamics of a uniting tribal confederacy (cf Bright 1981:163). The number twelve was flexible, possibly denoting monthly or bimonthly sanctuary service by a tribe, although the existence of twelve tribes was doubtful. The number twelve became sacred for Israel in later periods (Flanders, Crapps, & Amith 1996:246). Shechem, as the central shrine, possibly symbolized the unity of the Israelite tribes in the period of the judges. Although there is uncertainty about its position, the central shrine of Shiloh kept the ark and the tabernacle, which suggest an "amphictyonic heritage." The idea of a central shrine was reinforced by the tradition of establishing a confederacy (Flanders, Crapps, & Smith 1996:246).

2.4.3 Chieftaincy

The actual historical period described by 1 Samuel 8-12 is for Flanagan (1981:47-73, 1976) part of the transitional period between tribal organization and a fully established monarchy in Israel. Flanagan (1981:65-67) saw Saul and the early period of David as the last stages of the chieftaincy in Israel.[43] He (Flanagan 1981:49) pointed to the immature conception of secondary societies as the major obstacle to see internal factors other than politics outside their boundaries. Methodologically, he (Flanagan 1981:48-52) used the evolution theory of the social anthropology of Service (1962) and Renfrew (1974:69-88). Flanagan (1981:48) endorsed the idea of Service that in ancient Israel there were four stages, namely bands, tribes, chiefdoms, and states, to describe the social-political development of Israel from a tribal organization to a monarchy. Flanagan (1981:51-52) posed the transitional stage of the chieftaincy, and noted most of the twenty characteristics given by Renfrew for ancient Israel.

On the distinction between *nagid* and *melek* Flanagan (1981:67-68) pointed out certain ambiguities mainly focused on the "different aspects of a leader's authority or to different times in the office-holder's reign." The ambiguities can, according to him, be resolved "by the gradual evolution in the role of the *nagid* as chiefdom gave way to monarchy" (cf Liverani 2005:89; McNutt 1999:114-142; Gottwald 1985:320). Flanagan proved the historical value of the biblical text by placing the story of Saul (1 Sm 9-15) in the period of the typical chieftaincy, without any textual amendment. The main contribution of his approach is his cross-cultural perspective for the understanding of the social-political factor in the origin of the kingship in Israel.

---

[43] In his discussion, Flanagan didn't specify when the chieftaincy began among the Israelites. Thus, it is difficult to place the time of Saul and the early stage of David in order to recognize the role they played as the final chieftains among the people. Presumably, Flanagan implied that the judges were chieftains. The historical nature of his transitional period from the judges to the monarchy and from segmentary society to a central administrated state comes under critique (Flanagan 1981:65-67).

Frick (1986; 1985) used the idea of a chieftancy to sketch the society of Saul as a transitional stage from a segmentary society to a state. He focused on archeological data and brought them together as a model to describe African sociopolitical systems anthropologically. Frick (1986:22-24, 1985:28-32) proposed three approaches for understanding the formation of the state: the conflict approach, the integrative approach, and the synthetic approach.

These approaches stress different major social factors in the understanding of the social system. For example, the view of the conflict approach is that internal or external conflict in a society forms the major social factor in forming a state. The integrative approach acknowledges conflicts as factors but coordination and organization among the people are characterized as the main factors. The synthetic approach discloses multiple factors in state formation, but is based largely on ethnographic and archaeological data.

Frick (1985:32) argued that the state system is composed of various reaction systems that are preceded by pre-state politics. These politics reciprocally react to selective pressures "by changing some of their internal structures, or by subduing a competing group, or by establishing themselves as dominant in a region, or by gaining control to water resources, etc." Frick (1986:21-22) delineated three types of the early state derived from Claessen and Skalník's (1978:22-24) "processual model": the inchoate early state, the typical early state, and the transitional early state. The understanding of the early state is primarily focused on the role of kinship in a society. The inchoate early state is characterized by the dominant relations of kinship and community in the political position. "The typical early state [the later David] exists where kinship ties are offset by territorial ones" (1978:22). The transitional early state features the administrator's control over the state.

On the Israelite state, Frick (1986:23) stated that Saul and David were military leaders. Frick (1986:25) insisted on the significance of the inner dynamics of the Israelite society in relation to religion, "to a particular

adaptive strategy or strategies on the part of the Israelites in their own distinctive environmental situation/s." His study provides a starting point to reconstruct a possible social structure of the Israelite monarchy and of religious practices and ideas within that structure (Frick 1986:37).

Liverani (2005:88-89) described the charismatic kingdom of Saul as a chiefdom based on the limited territory from Ephraim to Benjamin, though his kingdom had certain ambiguous familial relationships and intertribal cooperations with Negev as well as with Beth-Shean through intrusion. From the Saul tradition Liverani (2005:88) reconstructed historical and political situations for which Ephraim provided religious bases at Shiloh, Bethel and Gilgal. Benjamin had political centers at Mizpah, Gibeah, Ramah, and Michmash. The territory of Saul's kingdom comprised only of two tribes and was rather chiefdom than a kingdom.

Liverani (2005:88) suggested a complementary relationship between Ephraim and Benjamin that upheld the leadership of Saul. Ephraim provided the religious motivation and support for Saul, whereas Benjamin the political-military power. Liverani's last comment (2005:91) on the kingdom of Saul was:

> Saul's court was unable to transmit any propagandistic or historiographical version of events to rival that of David. But later on his denigration was reread (check) in the light of the relationship between monarchy and priesthood (the only legitimate interpreter of God's will), in a period when this relationship was the subject of violent disagreement.

Based on this reconstruction, it is striking that both Samuel and Saul came from Benjamin, Ramah, and Gibeah respectively. Although Samuel's religious birthplace was Shiloh in Ephraim, Ramah played a critical role in his religious and political life. 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 shows that Saul's initial religious supporters came from a group of ecstatic prophets, including Samuel, based on the high places in Benjamin. Saul was acclaimed in Gilgal according to another tradition in 1 Samuel 11:15 (cf 1 Sm 12). Liverani's

(2005) explication drew attention to the conflict involved in explaining the political situation depicted in 1 Samuel 8-12.

Gottwald's (1985:296) view of the biblical text is reminiscent of Noth's basic dtr understanding. Gottwald (1985:296) said that the Dtr(s) used a variety of material from multiple sources combined with his interpretative framework. The Dtr(s)'s theological interpretation was encoded in the form of introductory and summary statements, speeches, and prayers, mainly through the speeches of major characters of the monarchic history from Samuel to Kings. Gottwald (1985:296) categorized the materials of the DH into the following:

- independent cycles of traditions about Samuel, Saul, David, and Solomon;
- administrative documents from the united monarchy;
- excerpts from the royal archives ("chronicles") of the divided kingdoms;
- excerpts from the Jerusalem temple archives;
- cycles of prophetic tales.

In this categorization Gottwald (1985:318) detected a certain "pro-Saul" source. This source was heavily damaged by "intentional order" and superimposed in the course of the prophetic activity by the Dtr. Gottwald acknowledged that Saul was the scapegoat of the Davidic apology. To prove the Davidic apology, Gottwald (1985:310-312) conducted a statistical survey to demonstrate three things: the absence of sources, the underrepresentation of Saul, and the imbalance between the political-historical documentation of Samuel, Saul, David, and Solomon. The source understanding of Gottwald implies that the pro-Davidic prophetic redactor reformulated the available sources to compose the David apology. My question to Gottwald is why Saul attempted to associate with the prophetic group in 1 Samuel 9-10:16 if the prophetic redactor disapproved of him. Gottwald did not explain his comment on the meaning of the prophetic course of the Dtr.

2.5 Synthesis

This historical review calls for a careful evaluation of 1 Samuel 11:1-11, as seen in the critical discussion of 1 Samuel 8-12. The general orientation of the discussion on 1 Samuel 11:1-11 does not differ from that on 1 Samuel 8-12, with regard to the necessity of kingship in Israel. The understanding of the kingship in 1 Samuel 11:1-11 requires a discussion on the royal ideology of the ANE.

As discussed previously, Day's (1998:72-90) basic assumption that the kingship of the Canaanites was the major influence at the onset of the kingship of the Israelites came from at least two political and geographical centers. He considered the proximity of Canaan an indispensable factor of her influence on Israel. At the beginning of the monarchy in Israel, Egypt and Mesopotamia were not close to influence Israel politically. Therefore he concluded that Canaan exercised the most influence on the kingship of Israel.

However, geographical proximity as such cannot play a major role in forming the kingship of Israel. Baines (1998:46) indicated that the dtr characteristic of hostility to kingship was also present in the ANE. Occasionally Mesopotamian kings experienced a hostile attitude as a result of the withdrawal of divine sanction.

This historical review underscores the necessity of a more detailed investigation of the specific traditions on the kingship of Saul and its relation to the prophetic activities as part of the complicate social occurrences. Saul is depicted in close connection to the judges even in his rising moment (1 Sm 11:1-11) which signified the critical moment in the establishment of a new social and political system. In social scientific terms, the initial stage of his leadership was closer to the chieftaincy (cf Miller & Hayes 2006:135-136; Hackett 1998:200-201; Matthews & Moyer 1997:97), since Israel consisted of loosely connected self governed tribes. The social transformation from a tribal league to a monarchy cannot be understood in terms of the single

exterior factor, namely the Philistines. The kingship originated from a complex of various social and political circumstances (Meyers 1998:225; Frick 1986:18-19). The dynamic behind the multiple social factors is religion, as confirmed by the royal ideology of the ANE with its emphasis on divine sanction for kings.

In the case of Israel, the establishment of the kingship was also associated with religion as a common ideological factor together with the royal ideology as understood in the ANE (cf Ahlström 1993:430).[44] In the time of Saul and the Judges, the religion of Israel did not center on the worship of Yahweh as their national God. Even within the circle of religious groups there were various groups, with different social and religious practices. Thus, conjecturally speaking, the different religious groups, specifically the prophetic groups were probably involved in the establishment of the kingship of Saul, which eventually led to conflict among the groups. The conflict appears in the different perspectives of the tradition.[45]

This historical review clarified the macro contexts of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 as well as its micro context. It disclosed various traditions and perspectives on the understanding of the events in the text. The insight in the various traditions and perspectives leads to the conclusion that there certainly is a major historical and religious thrust that brought the multiple traditions into the dtr narrative. It follows that a proper textual analysis of 1 Samuel 11:1-11

---

[44] In a similar manner, Flanagan (1981:66) also contended that the period of Saul and David was a chiefdom characterized by religious roles: "As we would expect in chiefdoms, the religious functions mentioned in the biblical narratives also indicate that Saul's and David's reigns were theocracies. Both indiciduals were anointed by Samuel; both performed cultic rites; both used priests and prophets. In short, religion was used by both [Saul, David] to legitimate their authority and to help maintain social control."
[45] Coote (2006:48-49) summarized that traditions of tribal Israel played a central dynamic role in the political situation of Israel to achieve the monarchic sovereignty of Israel. As a result, the idea of twelve tribes is encoded in imaginary forms to support the Davidic sovereignty in Israel. The DH as the product of scribes, according to Coote, is a polemical account for propagating the Davidic sovereignty over Israel, whose original intention is rooted in the early time of the house of David, and supplemented by two earlier editions composed under Hezekiah and Josiah, respectively. The final form of the DH obviously justified the Davidic sovereignty and hoped to restore the sovereignty. It helps to see the role of tradition in the forming of the kingship of Saul.

should not only be pursued synchronically. The analysis should be done from the synchronic as well as the diachronic perspective of the broader context. Chapter 3 is an attempt to trace and point out the social and religious factors that contributed to the text's understanding