



CHAPTER 3

SOCIO-RELIGIOUS CONTEXT

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on elucidating the background in 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16, especially divine sanction of Saul's kingship, in relation to 1 Samuel 11:1-11. Understanding the social and religious background of Saul's kingship makes it possible to perceive how the leadership of Saul (1 Sm 11:1-11) was perceived as kingship of Saul (cf 1 Sm 11:15). The background further provides a perspective to resolve conflicts and inconsistencies happened in 1 Samuel 8-12 regarding the kingship of Saul.

A major argument in the preceding chapter is that two distinctive perspectives on the kingship are evident in 1 Samuel 8-12 (cf Wellhausen 1957: 245-272): pro-monarchic and anti-monarchic perspectives.⁴⁶ The pro-monarchic viewpoint is evident in 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 11:1-11 (cf 1 Sm 11:15). On the other hand, anti-monarchic position is seen in 1 Samuel 8, 10:17-27, and 12. Of the pro-monarchic standpoint, the prophetic aura is conspicuously seen in the coupling of 1 Samuel 10:1-16 with 1 Samuel 11:1-11 (cf Jobling 1998:89; Polzin 1989:99-108; 114-117; Campbell 1986; Gunn 1980:63; Knierim 1968; Weiser 1961:166).⁴⁷ The critical moment depicted in

⁴⁶ On the issue Lind (1980:100) rightly pointed out that the issue of 1 Sm 8-12 is not a matter of pro- or anti-kingship in terms of the two source theory. It is rather a matter of how to deal with the whole issue of kingship. Although his understanding of the materials of 1 Sm 8-12 is dubious, his perspective on the whole issue is properly addressed. As far as he was concerned, the Dtr attempted to harmonize traditional materials and historical traditional materials. He proposed that traditional materials emphasize the superiority of Yahweh's kingship on the human institution of kingship. The Dtr aimed to show "the historical fact of the Yahweh's covenant with the Davidic monarchy." His basic understanding of the unit comes from observing a literary pattern: a meeting (8:4-22), action (9:1-10:16), a meeting (10:17-27), action (11:1-13), and a meeting (11:14-12:25). He believed that "It is only in the meetings that one would expect issues to be discussed . . . the historical veracity should be evaluated following an examination of the issues as they are set forth . . ."

⁴⁷ McCarter (1980b:19-20) pointed out that an old folklore of 1 Sm 9:1-10:16 was revised by the prophetic writer with some additions and then the revised story was connected with the original Saul tradition that had a little revision. Unlike McCarter, this researcher, however, contends that 1 Sm 9:1-10:16 and 11:1-11 were originally one prophetic tradition, since the two biblical narratives are well conceived in unity. If 1 Sm 11:1-11 was an independent historical narrative, then the question is who preserved and wrote it down and for what



1 Samuel 11:6 is the fulfillment of the prophecy of 1 Samuel 10:7. In 1 Samuel 10:6 Samuel prophesied that Saul will be empowered by the spirit of Yahweh,⁴⁸ turning into another man, and become one of the ecstatic prophets.⁴⁹ The prophecy of Samuel was designated to demonstrate a sign of the authenticity for his anointing (Atwell 2004:157). In 1 Samuel 10:9 the narrator further explicates that all the signs occur on the same day. The people who have known Saul formerly witness Saul's ecstatic prophecy (1 Sm 10:11), prophesied in 1 Samuel 10:13. Analogously, in 1 Samuel 10:10 the "spirit of God" entered into Saul. As a result, Saul characterizes himself as a prophet among the bands of ecstatic prophets.

The dtr devaluation (1 Sm 10:11-12) rests on what follows the event of Saul's prophesizing in the question of those who have known Saul: "What has happened to the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?" The question can be given in this way: Can Saul become a prophet? The question does denote that the people do not want to acknowledge the status of Saul as a prophet, although they cannot avoid witnessing a certain drastic change of characteristic of Saul (cf Goldman 1949:55). According to Hendel (1995:188), a prophet should have either a personal experience of calling as a prophet or the recognition of the prophetic calling by others. However, unlike the intention of the Dtr, the sayings rather pinpoints a historical reality

reason? As the content of the biblical narrative displays, it is pro-Saulide. As it later will be discussed in detail, a convincing conjecture follows that the only possible historian of the prophetic tradition of Saul was from the prophetic group from the high place in Gibeah.

⁴⁸ According to Zimmerli (2003:77-78), the influence of the spirit on a prophet is a typical and significant phenomenon, particularly in preliterary prophecy. It does, he believed, show the power of Yahweh not for any unintelligence of a prophet. As Zimmerli pointed out, the concept of the spirit shows up again in the phrase, "the hand of Yahweh" (יְדֵי יְהוָה) in the narrative of Elijah in 1 Kg 18:46. The synonymous connotation of the phrases in the prophecy is irrefutable. In Ezekiel, the term, "the hand of Yahweh" (יְדֵי יְהוָה) appears to show how Ezekiel began to see the oracle of Yahweh. It is worthy of notice that, unlike the so-called classical prophets such as Isaiah and Amos, Ezekiel inherited prophetic phenomenon of preliterary prophecy.

⁴⁹ In the sentence, three verbs, וַיִּצְלַחְהוּ, וַיְהַתְנַבֵּיתָ, and וַיְנַהֲפֶכְתָּ, have a waw-consecutive with the second person suffix. All the verbs in the sequence indicate that they are involved in a certain dynamic action. Empowering by the spirit of Yahweh (רוּחַ יְהוָה), prophesying, and becoming another man are inseparable (cf Long 2002:164). All the actions happen coincidentally.



involved in Saul's prophesizing in a positive way (Gunn 1980:63).⁵⁰ The comment from the people implied Saul's non-prophetic status.⁵¹ They, however, could not deny the prophetic scene that appeared before them. Although the Dtr implied a nuance of unqualified prophetic status for Saul, his attempt hardly overturned the historical reality of the event. The implication of the Dtr is part of the theologically traditionalized history in the narrative. Its historical and political value is concealed in the text of the DH. The final text of the narrative shows that the Dtr used various biblical sources and traditions with a religious perspective.

The next saying⁵² in 1 Samuel 10:12 evinces that the people can not refute Saul's activity as that of a prophet: "who is their [prophetic] father?" However, the bypasser's customary astonished question uncovers that all the reactions from the people are negatively intended in order to reject Saul's authority in

⁵⁰ Davies and Rogerson (2005:68) stated that the proverb suggests that "Saul was either propelled into leadership against the Philistines by the prophetic groups led by Samuel, or that he enlisted the aid of these groups." Wilson's provocative article is worth briefly to be discussed here. Wilson (1979:321-337) observed the different social backgrounds of the ancient prophetic groups in Israel. The point of Wilson is to solve an issue of the relationship between ecstasy and the so-called writing prophets. He reviewed the issues in three ways. He contended that denying ecstasy in the writing prophets is a simplistic observation of the ecstatic phenomena among them. Secondly, according to him, writing prophets were not always writing down an oracle received in ecstasy but in some cases, in ecstasy they deliver an oracle (Jr 4:19, 23:9). Finally, he said that a distinction between words in written form and ecstatic utterances do not help to explain the relationship between ecstasy and prophetic writings. His initial point is that ecstasy is not only a means of divine communication of a prophet but also "*observable behavioral characteristics* exhibited by a person in communication with the divine world." He proposed certain anthropological approaches, specifically the "social roles of divine-human intermediaries." His major contribution is that the anthropological approach helps to view the different characteristics of prophetic behaviors in ancient Israel. The point helps to understand different behavioral characteristics of a prophet even in the same type of prophets or of a characteristic feature of a prophetic group among prophetic circles. Second, an Israelite prophetic group would also show stereotypical behaviors in the society. That means that certain groups react positively or negatively to specific stereotypical behaviors, based on their stereotypical behavioral patterns. His study is significant for this research, since it provides a critical question why and by whom prophetic behavior is evaluated.

⁵¹ Sturdy (1970:206-213) argued that the saying is rather legendary and expected the answer "no." "I(j)t represents Davidic propaganda against Saul". He did not see the probable original historical setting of the tradition that provided a critical moment for Saul's kingship in a positive way.

⁵² See Weiss (2006:74-76) on the grammatical point in the use of the phrase לִיהִי לִמְשָׁל. His view is that it signifies transformation as it is mostly translated. His viewpoint and analysis of the metaphor confirm that the saying originated from a historical happening in the time of Saul.



prophecy. The Dtr used the saying to reflect negatively on Saul. This inquisitive question may have been intended by the Dtr to indicate that Saul was seen by the prophetic tradition as a king who acts like a father of prophets through his role.⁵³

In this case a tension is seen here. The people looked negatively on the prophesying scene of Saul, since they knew that Saul is not a prophet. Although the people's attitude was negative toward Saul, the possible later tradition of a prophetic group who supported the kingship of Saul became positive toward Saul. Thus, a positive traditional context is given to 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 11:1-11.⁵⁴ The positive context could not survive the time of Josiah and eventually of the exile. In the two redactional layers, redactions in the Josian (1 Sm 8:5, 20; 11:8) and the exilic period (1 Sm 8:8; 9:16; 10:8, 11-12, 17-27; 11:7, 12-15; 12:6), the tradition of Saul was encompassed within negative attitudes (cf Cross 1973:274-289; Friedman 1981:1-43). Conjecturally, the negative perspective of the relation of Saul with *bamah* was critically reviewed by the Dtr in the time of Josiah (cf 2 Ki 22:8-23:25). Later, in the exile, the concept was linked to the view that the earthly kingship is rooted in the transgression against Yahweh, the God of Israel (cf Ezk 20:28-32).⁵⁵ To the bypasser (1 Sm 10:12) in the narrative, the happening of Saul was undoubtedly part of a prophetic scene. The man did not deny Saul's existence among the bands of the ecstatic prophets. Thus, his inquiry was natural in the scene. Saul's identity as an ecstatic prophet was safeguarded with his empowering by the spirit of God to prophesy in ecstasy

⁵³ There is a certain perspective that the king in the ANE, specifically in Mesopotamia is a leader of ecstatic prophets (Haldar 1945). By the same token, McCarter (1980b:184) acknowledged that the saying indeed shows a historical consciousness of the people that Saul is their leader.

⁵⁴ A positive characterization of Saul is seen in his saying of 1 Sm 9:21: Saul answered, "I am only a Benjamite, from the least of the tribes of Israel, and my family is the humblest of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin. Why then have you spoken to me in this way?" The humble expression of Saul is paralleled with the narrative of David in 1 Sm 16:6-13 in that the two narratives show the legitimacy of the "junior right" of leadership (Rothstein 1998:50-51). The latter narrative tells that David is not generically the first son but the seventh. The former one tells that Saul represents the "youngest tribe" (Rothstein 1998:51). Rothstein (1998:56) concluded that "ultimogeniture was, in fact, the ancient tradition and practice of the early Hebrew goes back in folklore to the earliest beginnings."

⁵⁵ See 3.2.2.3 in this dissertation for a further discussion of the issue.



(cf Atwell 2004:152; 1 Sm 10:10). The narrator tells that once Saul became another man, an ecstatic prophet, he promptly went to the high place (1 Sm 10:13).

The prophetic context displayed in 1 Samuel 10:1-16 is in continuity with 1 Samuel 9:1-27. In 1 Samuel 9:15 Saul appeared in town by the design of the word of Yahweh. Samuel as the seer received the word and proclaimed it (1 Sm 9:27). In the context it is highly significant to observe the setting of the high place. In 1 Samuel 9:14 and 9:19 Samuel showed his close relationship with the high place. Specifically in 1 Samuel 9:19 Samuel introduced himself to Saul as the seer, asking Saul to go up to the high place to meet him there for a party with those who were invited. A serious question arises about who the guests were. Why did the narrator not provide their identity (1 Sm 9:22)? Does the non-identification mean the event is unimportant? Why did Samuel prepare the meeting for Saul as well as for the people (1 Sm 9:22-24)? Why did Samuel prepare the meeting at the time of the sacrifice when all the possible people came (1 Sm 9:12-13)? Is it related to the dubious question of Saul's uncle at another high place (1 Sm 10:13-16)? All these questions imply that the occasion at the high place was significant.

An answer to these questions comes from the biblical text, as well as from the meaning of the Hebrew word **הַעֲרָה**. In 1 Samuel 9:12 some girls answered the question of Saul and his servant, that the seer is there to bring a sacrifice for the people (**הַעֲרָה**) gathered on the high place.⁵⁶ They were speaking with confidence of telling about the matter.⁵⁷ In the verse the people (**הַעֲרָה**) mentioned by the girls are most probably regular worshippers at the

⁵⁶ Garsiel (1983:78-81) depicted a literary characterization of Saul in the meeting with the girls referring to the analogy of Moses in Ex 2:15-17. Saul met with girls at the critical turning point of his life just as Moses met the daughters of Jethro at the time that he began his training as a leader of Israel. As Garsiel pointed out, the moment is significant for Saul in that Saul would go up to the high place to meet Samuel as well as the called guests.

⁵⁷ When Saul and his servant asked them, 'Is the seer in town,' without hesitating they responded to them, 'indeed' (**הִנֵּה**). Cronauer (2005:78) sees the way of the answering as a common affirmation of the question in the OT. The examples he provided are from 1 Sm 23:11-12, 2 Sm 5:19, and 1 Kg 21:20.



sacrifices, and not specifically invited people. The general description of the people (הָעָם) indicates that they were not elders or any socially high positioned people. An implication of the sayings of the girls is that Samuel invited ordinary people or that the invited are ready to meet Saul in secret in the public place. An indication of a “communal celebration” of the sacrifice to Yahweh is prevalent in the event.⁵⁸ Thus, the meeting can be kept secret as a customary meeting. However, the goal of the meeting at the sacrifice was betrayed with the remark of Samuel that he invited people (1 Sm 9:24).⁵⁹ Samuel repeated that he invited the people (1 Sm 9:24).⁶⁰ The invitation of Samuel hints that it was rather oriented by a political concern of Samuel. In the political manner, Samuel’s special treatment of Saul was no surprise to the invited people. If they were elders or any socially high positioned people, they might have been surprised to see the special treatment of Saul before them. Saul, in the text, was a young man and stranger (cf 1 Sm 9:5-10). Thus, conjecturally the invited people were aware of what was to happen as they were invited by Samuel. A special relationship between Samuel and the invited people is conceived in the application of קָרָאתִי in 1 Samuel 9:24.

Strikingly enough, the Hebrew word, קָרָאתִי in 1 Samuel 9:24 is reminiscent of the story of Samuel’s calling in 1 Samuel 3:5-6.⁶¹ The story in 1 Samuel 3 indicates that God chose Samuel who listened to the calling of God, when Eli could not hear it. Eli said, “I did not call you.” In 1 Samuel 9:24 Samuel said, “I did call the people” for the reception of Saul. Samuel listened to God’s

⁵⁸ Zph 1:7 suggests that the sacrifice to Yahweh generally indicated a “communal celebration” of the Israelites with Yahweh (Smith 2002:141).

⁵⁹ It is by analogy of 1 Sm 16:3-5 that the narrator specified those who are invited as the family of Jesse, to a sacrifice to Yahweh. Both invitations were extended in the emergence of a new leadership, Saul and David, respectively.

⁶⁰ As suggested by Matthews (2001:44), the design of the meeting (1 Sm 9:22-24) looks private. In reality, no one realized that the meeting triggered the emergence of another political and social revolution in Israel, the monarchy. However, the narrator informed his readers that it was planned by Samuel to introduce Saul among the invited people, consequently motivating him to be anointed as *nagid* (1 Sm 10:1). The predominant role of Samuel provided a role model for prophets, “who will be involved in the selection of kings and also serve as their chief critics from this point on” (Matthews 2001:44).

⁶¹ It is worthy to observe the possible royal context of the narrative. Cook (1999:54) contended that 1 Sm 3:8-14 and 2 Sm 6:12-13 exemplified struggles of Saul and David in performing priestly roles, attempting “to balance the powers of priest and king.”



calling (1 Sm 3:5-6). In 1 Samuel 9:22-24 Samuel called specific people in advance to an explicit occasion. The moment was significant because Saul appeared in public with the invited people (cf Miscall 1986:58). The occasion is also analogous to the encounter of Saul with the prophetic band from the high place (1 Sm 10:5, 10). The appearance implies that Saul was publicly identified with the prophetic figures.

Eslinger (1985:313) explicated that the secret anointing of Saul was an intention of Samuel (1 Sm 10:1). However, one should be cautious to conclude that the political orientation of the meeting was designed to be concealed from the invited people. The people were united by the invitation of Samuel and witnessed the special treatment from Samuel of Saul before them (1 Sm 9:22-24). Samuel's individual treatment of Saul was public in front of the invited people. It is unclear whether Samuel did not make it known to the invited at the banquet. Even the narrator did not later tell whether the invited people knew why they were invited or not. Thus, if we consider that the people were simply invited to the reception of the new *nagid* or king-in-preparation, the meeting was unnecessary for Saul as well as for Samuel who anointed him later in secret. Thus, a logical conjecture follows. The invited people were part of the prophetic groups, who were later incorporated into Saul's regime. Further, they were primarily responsible for preserving the tradition of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 11:1-11, for legitimizing the leadership of Saul, and idealizing Saul as divinely sanctioned leader as king in Israel.

If the above mentioned conjecture is correct, the meeting suggests that it was a significant political convocation as part of the emergence of the kingship of Saul. The meeting marks Saul's appearance at a high place under Samuel's leadership. The presence of Saul was planned by Samuel probably to endorse his choice of Saul among the prophetic group. Samuel surely showed his hospitality to Saul and to them (1 Sm 9:22-24). Thus, Samuel prepared them that the time for the monarchy of Israel had come. Samuel



began to group his prophetic disciples based on the high place. It denoted the beginning of their motivation for a political movement that would actualize their religious beliefs in the form of the monarchy. The political manner of the meeting implies that at the time there were several prophetic groups at the high places (cf 1 Sm 10:14-16). Accordingly, it is natural to see a certain tension among their prophetic activities. Samuel's mobilization of the prophets forms the critical part in the emergence of the kingship. The meeting signified that Saul is among the prophets. They provided religious authority for him and his leadership as a sign of the divine sanction for the monarchy.

After the convocation at the high place, Samuel anointed Saul secretly (1 Sm 10:1), and gave him signs of what would happen to him (1 Sm 10:2-7). On the way home, Saul experienced the fulfillment of the signs the very same day (1 Sm 10:9): Saul met a band of ecstatic prophets from the high place, experiencing the "spirit of Yahweh," and prophesied with them.

After the anointment, Saul went to another high place where his uncle resided (1 Sm 10:14). Saul's uncle did not welcome him with the ordinary greeting, 'you come in peace' (cf 1 Sm 16:4) or what happened that you came to me? He asked him a very dubious question, "where did you go? (1 Sm 10:14).⁶² How could he ask him, unless he had already known where Saul had been? Perhaps the report of Samuel's invitation reached to him: "where did you go? Saul perceived the implication of the question, namely that his uncle was suspect of him who had met Samuel. Saul answered the

⁶² Campbell (2003:106) stated that the episode of Saul's uncle is bizarre and difficult to understand and pointed out that seemingly the question would have been from Saul's father. He suggested that Stoebe's translation of a "trusted friend" is more proper and implied that the only clue for the rendering comes from the context of the present text. Campbell (2003:106) suggested further that "The episode might be understood to account for Saul's 'anonymity' in ch. 11." Campbell just showed how he felt frustrated by the encounter of Saul with his uncle in the high place. His rendering does not give any help to understand the context. Rather it makes it much more complicated in understanding the story. Although there is no specific mention of Saul's uncle, it is rather reasonable to see that Saul went to meet his uncle. It is worth noting to observe that the military commander of Saul was the son of his uncle, Abner (1 Sm 14:50). The dubious attitude of Saul's uncle shows a political concern rather a religious one. See footnote 64 of this dissertation.



question wisely. Saul did not divulge his secret anointment nor his prophesying. The narrator implied where Saul had to go. Saul kept his uncle in the dark about what happened to him, although Saul accepted the anointment as king.⁶³ The course of events implies that Saul's uncle may have been part of another religious group.⁶⁴

The context of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 elucidates that the Dtr used a tradition that came from a prophetic group with strong relationships with high places. 1 Samuel 11:1-11 was originally part of that prophetic tradition. This tradition promulgated divine sanction of Saul's kingship and charismatic leadership. Thus, the focus of this chapter is on the dynamics in the formation of the traditions that built the character of Saul. Two factors will be highlighted: the role of the prophetic groups and of the people. The Dtr used different materials to denote opposite viewpoints. The prophetic tradition of Saul should be understood from its macro structure, since in the hands of the Dtr the prophetic tradition is used to support the Davidic royal ideology, from Judges 17 to 2 Samuel 1.

The conjecture for the following discussion will indicate that the Dtr1 used the prophetic traditions to legitimize the reform of Josiah, specifically to defile the high places and to promote cultic centralization. Since the emergence of the kingship in Israel, the high places were the centers of social religious life in

⁶³ Campbell (1986:50) indicated after Schmidt that "Possibly the redactors may even have understood the anointing to constitute Saul king, but a secret king."

⁶⁴ 1 Sm 14:50 gives the name of Saul's uncle, Ner. Abner, the son of Ner became the chief army commander of Saul. An interesting observation comes from the time of the appearance of Abner who came after Samuel's annoyance in 1 Sm 13:13-14. Chapter 13 denotes that politically there was a serious tension between Saul and Samuel. After the tension, probably Saul's uncle and Abner supported Saul like Ahijah, the priest from the priestly line of Shiloh, did in 1 Sm 14:3. Probably Abner and Ahijah were politically and religiously opposed to Samuel. In 1 Ki 11:29; 14:4, 5, 6; 2 Chr 10:15 another Ahijah appeared as prophet of Shiloh. The connection of Ahijah with Shiloh would be dtr for royal propaganda for Josiah. Knoppers (1993:182-186) viewed the oracle for Jeroboam in 1 Ki 11:29-39 as a dtr expansion. Particularly, the speech of Ahijah shows, according to him (Knoppers 1993:186), the typical way of the Dtr: a "pattern of sin, punishment, and the emergence of new hope to depict a crucial transition in Israelite history." However, he disregarded the dtr connection of Ahijah with Shiloh. As to the priestly line of Shilonite, Brueggemann (2000:145-146) emphasized the role of Shiloh as the older shrine for "radical Mosaic notions of social organization." According to him, the act of Ahijah represents a community deeply involved in the older shrine against the way of Solomonic ruling.



the whole country. 2 Kings 18:4 and 21:3 report that Hezekiah partially succeeded to remove the high places, which his son Manasseh rebuilt. During the exile, the Dtr2 redacted the traditions and the Dtr1's work with the hope to revive the Davidic kingdom.

The ongoing discussion will clarify some dynamics in the formulation of traditions that built the narrative of Saul traditions which were concerned with the social and religious life behind the text. The prophetic groups and the people were striking role players in the formulation of traditions about the establishment of Saul's monarchy. The process of traditionalization of historical events helps to recognize the macro structure of 1 Samuel 11:1-11. The discussion will provide the background for the reasoning in 1 Samuel 11:1-11.

3.2 Dynamics shaping traditions of the emergence of Saul's kingship

3.2.1 Introduction

The traditions about the emergence of the kingship of Saul had been referred to multiple factors in terms of the process of traditionalization such as a historical event, political and religious interpretations of an event, and social circumstances.

The starting point in the discussion of the dynamics of tradition depends on the acceptance of the historical value of the narratives, specifically of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 1 Samuel 11:1-11. The narratives show a historical consciousness of specifically recorded events of what actually happened. But the historical claim of the events in 1 Samuel 11:1-11 was based on the reception of the traditions by the people. Brueggemann (2003:121) indicated the oral traditions as data of the historical narrative, since they form the historical narrative through the process of traditionalization which centered on Yahweh.⁶⁵ The use of reimagination of Brueggemann shows a certain

⁶⁵ Brueggemann (2003:121) stated that "the book of Judges is . . . a historical narrative through which Israel reimagines its conflictual life in the land of promise according to the decisive reality of YHWH. The accent in this characterization is upon the act of *reimagination*"



limitation on the understanding of a historical narrative. The process of traditionalization is not driven by the reimagination of Israel but by the reflection on the faith in Yahweh. The reflection of faith in Yahweh was indispensable for the social-religious life of the Israelites. Since Israel was aware of Yahweh's promise of the land, even during the exile, they hoped on the fulfillment of the promise of the land made to their fathers. The reflection of faith in Yahweh caused them to turn to Yahweh from the transgression in her social-religious life. The process of traditionalization points to various traditions from different viewpoints.

The traditions around Samuel and Saul referred to the emergence of the political entity resulted in the monarchy (1 Sm 10:11-12; cf 1 Sm 19:24). They demonstrate the influence of various social, political, and military factors on each other in the transformation of the society (Cook 2006:37; Birch, Brueggemann, Fretheim & Petersen 2005: 216-218). It is indispensable for the traditions to depict religious and social-political life (cf Schniedewind 1999:25; 1 Sm 18:7). A depicted intention of the traditions is to support a specific political entity, especially at a time when there was no central government in the early history of Israel (cf Jdg 18:1; 19:1; 21:25).

Ancient Israel up till the reign of Solomon lacked central control, in particular from its religious organization (cf 1 Kg 6:1-38). It is hardly to deny that building the Temple of Jerusalem impacted tremendously on the society of Israel (Schniedewind 1999:26). The royal Temple began to impact on the religious life of ancient Israel, since it signified that the people had an official central cultic place in their religious life. In the ANE, the temple was the place where the divine kingship was proclaimed (Atwell 2004:18). Eventually, the Temple of Jerusalem facilitated the Davidic kingship for royal ideology (Schniedewind 1999:28-39; 2 Sm 7:1-17).

whereby the traditioning process takes up (a) old memories and (b) remembered historical "facts on the ground," and formulates all of that as "data" according to the rule of YHWH."



The death of Solomon escalated the separation of the kingdom into the Northern and Southern Kingdoms (1 Ki 11:43-12:20). Thus, at least until the Southern Kingdom, Judah (the time of Hezekiah) regained the religious and political power over the territory of Israel; the idealization of the Davidic kingship could not be actualized (cf 2 Chr 30:5). But the tradition of Saul was probably preserved in written forms in the time of Jeroboam in Bethel,⁶⁶ as 1 Samuel 11:1-11 exhibits the historical claim based on the events to propagate Saul's charismatic leadership as essential for the king of Israel.

3.2.2 Prophetic groups

The prophets in the ANE were, as a rule, deeply involved in the political matters of the king (Cook 2006:25; cf Sweeney 2005:23-28). In ancient Israel it was the same (Atwell 2004:153), although their role changed from time to time (Emmerson 1997:10-14). Based on the biblical narrative (1 Sm 9:1-10:16), it is clear that the emergence of the kingship of Saul came with strong religious support from a prophetic group.⁶⁷

Undoubtedly Samuel is the most significant prophetic figure at the time of Saul.⁶⁸ Initially Samuel referred to the high places and to a group of prophets from the high place (1 Sm 9:11-25; cf 1 Sm 10:5). Later on he appeared as the father of the prophetic groups in Ramah (1 Sm 19:20). He played the most imperative role of endorsing the kingship in Israel (cf Jobling 1998:69; 1 Sm 10:1, 24) as a result of the request of the elders of Israel for a king (1 Sm

⁶⁶ Birch (2005:120) dated some portions of the tradition in a written form to the late eighth century: 1 Sm 1:1-3; 7:8:1-12; 13; 15; 16; 28; 2 Sm 7; 11:1-12; 24.

⁶⁷ Cook (2006:37) conceived that various social, political, and military factors promoted the emerging of the monarchy in Israel during the transitional era. Among the factors, she pointed out that the religious factor stands as the significant reason for establishing the form of government, monarchy. For instance, the description of 1 Sm 9:1-10:27, to her, insured that "the king as human leader would continue in the way of Moses as a divinely appointed leader who would honor the relationship between God and the people." More specifically, Emmerson (1997:11) suggested that the prophetic group might be "patriotic figures resisting the foreign domination of the time." He viewed the notion of a Philistine garrison as the implied motivation for their support of Saul. Further he implied that the prophetic group was identical with the Ramah group of 1 Sm 19:20. Seemingly he disregarded the existence of various prophetic groups at the time.

⁶⁸ The appearance of Samuel evinces that various prophecies existed in ancient Israel: A group of ecstatic prophets, Samuel the seer, and temple prophets (Atwell 2004:152).



8:5). Samuel was the one who anointed Saul as *nagid* or king (1 Sm 10:1). He guided Saul to be publicly part of a group of ecstatic prophets from the high place (1 Sm 10:5-7). Later Samuel turned into the major opponent of Saul's kingship (1 Sm 13; 15) because he could not accept Saul's action for making an offering (1 Sm 13:13-14) and the disobedience of Saul to his word (1 Sm 15:17-23). Consequently he brought about the transfer of the kingship to David (1 Sm 16:1-13).

Introducing a group of ecstatic prophets to Saul is striking in the role of Samuel to bring the kingship through Saul into Israel (1 Sm 10:5, 10).⁶⁹ The biblical text suggests that it was a highly critical moment for Saul to meet the prophetic group in the course of building his kingship. The encounter was announced by Samuel after his anointing of Saul as *nagid*. The prophetic event brought multiple results. First, Saul turned into a different man to prophesy among a prophetic group from the high place (1 Sm 10:6, 11-12). Second, the event actualized a probable prophetic connection of Saul with the prophetic group in building his leadership (1 Sm 10:10; cf 1 Sm 9: 22). Third, the prophetic experience of Saul brought a serious attention from the people (1 Sm 10: 11-12). As a result, the event led to a saying about Saul among the people. In other words, Saul became a public figure as a prophet. Particularly, the prophetic connection between Samuel and the ecstatic group of prophets from the high place is highlighted in the positive context of the kingship of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16). In conjecture later the prophetic group played a critical role to actualize the kingship of Saul (cf 1 Sm 10:10).

⁶⁹ A striking contention came from Schley (1989:196-197) who reconstructed the relation between Eli and Saul based on the tradition of Shiloh. A crucial hint for the idea is that 1 Sm 1-2 and 14 show a close relationship between them, since his view is that 1 Sm 1-2 is originally from Saul. He noted the word play of *sha'al*, indicating *Sha'ul*. Further, he perceived a cultic aura from a certain action of Saul, that Saul is accompanied with the ark at his war as well as a "representative from the priests of Shiloh." As a result, he concluded that "the Shilonite sanctuary and priesthood played a key role in the rise of the Israelite monarchy." His contention, unfortunately, did not focus on perceiving a clear relationship between Samuel and Saul as the prophetic father and his son at least at the onset of the kingship that caused tension between Samuel and the priestly group of Shiloh.



The narrative of 1 Samuel 10:10, in which the activities of prophetic groups appear, is part of the same narrative of the emergence of the kingship in Israel. Saul's encounter with the prophetic group was prophesied by Samuel (1 Sm 10:5), together with the indication of the place on the way to Gibeah, the city of Saul (1 Sm 11:4). Based on the utterances of the dweller who watched the scene (1 Sm 10:11-12), the prophetic activities were at the time rather popular among the people. However, the prophetic group did not seemingly have any social stratification yet.

3.2.2.1 *Nabi*

The Hebrew word נביא (prophet)⁷⁰ refers to various traditions that make difficult a general statement about it.⁷¹ The term itself was associated with non-prophetic figures such as Abraham (Gn 20:7), Aaron (Ex 7:1), and the elders (Nm 11:26-29). It was used not only for the prophets of Israel, but also for foreign prophets. For instance, in 1 Kings 18:19 the prophets of Baal and the prophets of Asherah were called prophets. The term was also applied, not only for true prophets, but also for false prophets (1 Ki 22:22, 2 Chr 18:21, Lm 2:14, Ezk 13:4, etc). The term indicated prophets of northern Israel (2 Ki 3:13) as well as of Jerusalem (Jer 23:15). In some places the prophet appeared to be identical with the seer (cf 1 Sm 9:9). The various usages of

⁷⁰ There are other terms for the prophet such as the man of God and the seer. On the one hand, the different terms show various historical realities of religious activities in ancient Israel (Petersen 1981). On the other, it is far from clear that they demonstrate a typical type of a prophecy or one involved in a specific prophetic activity, since the use of the term is not limited to a specific situation or temporal condition. In the end, the prophetic characterization by the terms is considered as identical with *nabi* (Floyd 2000:127). For instance, the man of God also appeared as the messenger of God to prophesize the collapse of the house of Eli as priest in Shiloh in 1 Sm 2:12. In 1 Sm 9:6 the man of God was introduced by the servant of Saul as they were searching for the lost ass of Saul's father. In another place he was assumed to be the seer (1 Sm 9:11). In 1 Sm 9:14 he was identified as Samuel. He was introduced as the father of the prophetic group in Ramah, as *nabi* (1 Sm 19:20). In Jdg 13:6 the mother of Samson called the messenger of Yahweh the man of God. In Dt 33:1 Moses was called the man of God. He is also called the prophet in Dt 34:10. More strikingly, in 1 Ki 13:2 the man of God from Judah pronounced the oracle of judgment on the house of Jeroboam. As seen above, the role of the man of God and his identity as a prophetic figure remain unclear. Rather his role as well as his identity is subsumed under the general term *nabi*. Therefore it is legitimate to acknowledge the diversity of prophesy in various social settings (Floyd 2000:126-127).

⁷¹ Jassen (2007:26) stated that the prophetic designation of *nabi* is etymologically inconclusive.



the title imply that the traditions about prophets are complicated, since they covered a broad chronological scope with various social settings.

Some scholars described the prophet as a cultic prophet (Koch 1983:25). Koch (1983:25) defined *nabi* as “the term used for a cultic prophet who, like a priest, performed particular tasks laid down for him at the sanctuary, though he certainly also had the explicit function of spontaneously proclaiming God’s intentions for the future.” In Koch’s view, the *nabi* was involved in the cultic matters of the sanctuary. He (Koch 1983:25) indicated that the *nabi* was connected to the sanctuary for a specific cultic function. The *nabi* differed from the priest. According to Koch (1983:19) the group of prophets in 1 Samuel 10 was “the first ecstatic *nabi* groups.” The prophetic group of 1 Samuel 10 was ecstatic. Koch, however, did not indicate whether the spontaneous prophesying happened at the sanctuary or any place.

Eichrodt (1961:314) cautioned that *nabi* was the generic term for a prophet and not a “type of sanctuary official(s).” In a sense, the term itself presupposes a cultic setting. The social setting of *nabi* frequently had a cultic background, since most of the prophets were concerned with cultic matters. Petersen (2002:7) argued that it is safe to maintain that an “absolute distinction between prophets and priests did not exist in ancient Israel.”

That it is difficult in the ANE to distinguish between the prophetic role and the priestly role is a well known fact. Prophets in the ANE commonly played a “priestly or quasi-priestly role(s)” for the deities in local temples (Sweeney 2005b:132). Likewise, as Petersen (2002:7) observed, Jeremiah came from a priestly family in Anathoth; Ezekiel said that he was a priest (Ezk 1:3); Zechariah came from a priestly family (Zch 1:1; Neh 12:16). Joel (1:13-14, 19, 2:18-20) and Zephaniah (3:14-15) belonged to such groups. The statement of Petersen (2002:7) is highly compelling that the “priestly-prophet connection is even stronger than matters of lineage.”



The mode of their prophesying shows various settings among contemporary prophets. As seen in 1 Samuel 10:5, 10 the group of *n^eviim* played musical instruments on the way. This accompanied their empowerment by the “spirit of God” while prophesying (1 Sm 10:6, 10). The characteristic of their prophesying is spontaneity and uncontrolled. Their way of prophesying differed from the prophetic group in Ramah (1 Sm 19:23-24) who had Samuel as father of the prophets. They controlled their way of prophesying with the leadership and authority of Samuel.

An analogous example comes from Numbers 11:24-26 where seventy elders were possessed by the spirit of Yahweh and prophesied in support of Moses’ leadership over them and the Israelites (Levison 2003:505). It happened in the presence of Moses as they stood surrounding the tent (Nm 11:24). When they began to prophesy, two of the elders who were absent at the tent started prophesying in the camp (Nm 11:26). Then Joshua son of Nun asked Moses to forbid their prophesying (Nm 11:28). The reply of Moses testifies of his authority to exercise control over the prophetic happening⁷²:

Are you jealous for my sake? I wish that all the LORD’s people were prophets and that the LORD would put his Spirit on them! (Nm 11:29).

Moses ruled the elders as leader.

The prophetic phenomenon of empowerment by the spirit of Yahweh was still evident in the time of Ezekiel. Ezekiel (8:1) was empowered by the hand of Yahweh so that he might see the oracle of Yahweh. Analogously, the setting of Ezekiel’s empowerment was reminiscent of the event in Numbers 11. In both cases the elders witnessed it, although the elders of Numbers 11 experienced the empowerment of the spirit themselves. The prophetic phenomenon in Ezekiel differed from other contemporary prophets, like Jeremiah, whose prophecies were characterized by auditory elements

⁷² Levison (2003:504) contended that the experience of the elders was based on a “visionary experience within a controlled cultic setting.”



(Zimmerli 2003:56).⁷³ Thus, it can be said that the phenomena of prophecy differed in different settings (Floyd 2000:125-130), particularly as far as ecstasy is concerned. Ecstatic phenomena had various outward appearances and social contexts (Levison 2003:505).

The controlled prophesies in Numbers 11:29 were drastically different from the prophetic group of Saul in 1 Samuel 10:10. Further, in 1 Samuel 19:23-24 Saul was possessed by the spirit of God, and prophesied on the way to Naioth in Ramah. He stripped off his clothes and prophesied all day and night. There was no control over Saul's prophesying. His prophesying was spontaneous and uncontrolled. A similar depiction of prophesying is displayed in 1 Kings 18:26-29. These prophets of Baal danced, shouted with a loud voice, and cut themselves with swords and spears. The prophets of Baal tried to force their god to answer their prophetic practices, since they did it according to their faith custom. The account showed that their manner of prophesying was uncontrolled and without any controlling authority. The cases mentioned are characterized by the possession by the spirit of God. Although this was a common phenomenon,⁷⁴ they tended to be different prophetic traditions.

The prophetic tradition of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 differs from that of 1 Samuel 19:18-29 (cf McCarter 1980b:184). The latter (1 Sm 19:18-29) was related to a group of prophets in the sanctuary in Ramah of Samuel (1 Sm 28:3; cf 1 Sm 7:17). The former (1 Sm 9:1-10:16) referred to a group of ecstatic prophets whose probable prophetic father was Samuel. They were related to the high place. The specific connection of Samuel with the high place, from where the ecstatic prophetic group came down, implies Samuel's prophetic

⁷³ See Jr 7:1-2; 11:1-2; 18:1-2 etc.

⁷⁴ The characteristic of the possession by the spirit of a divine being is attested from "the Journey of Wen-Amon to Phoenicia," although the nature of the possessing by a divine is in dispute. The report is as follows: "Now while he [the prince of Byblos] was making offering to , his gods, the god seized one of his youths and made him possessed." Wilson (1958:18) understood the sentence as evidence that gives some information of an ecstatic phenomenon. Unlike him, Isbell (1976:63-64) rejected the understanding, since she could not see any common ecstatic features from the report which was ambiguous.



relationship with them (1 Sm 9:11-27; 10:5). If the prophets were generally depicted as ecstatic prophets in the time of Samuel, their social and religious settings might have been different.

1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 shows an explicit relationship between Samuel and the ecstatic prophetic group, particularly with regard to Saul. In the biblical narrative, a group of ecstatic prophets appeared to meet Saul in the course of Samuel's prophecy (1 Sm 10:5, 10). The encounter is designed for Saul as the moment when he turns into a different man after the spirit of Yahweh came upon him. The relationship between Samuel and the prophetic group was underlined by their specific connection with the high place in the narrative. Samuel had authority over the ecstatic prophetic group from the high place as their prophetic father. The high place eventually played a crucial role to establish the kingship of Saul as a religious base for idealizing his leadership.

However, Samuel's new prophetic organization in Ramah shows that their prophetic relationship had been broken. The narrative of Samuel in Ramah (1 Sm 19:18-29) contrasts two prophetic phenomena, namely an ecstatic prophecy (Saul) and governed and trained prophecy (Samuel). The narrative suggests two different prophetic traditions involved in the relationship between Samuel and Saul as reflected in 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 1 Samuel 19:18-29 respectively. The former tradition (1 Sm 9:1-10:16) came from the ecstatic prophets on a high place, while the latter (1 Sm 19:18-29) originated with the prophetic group in Ramah with Samuel.

The different prophetic traditions characterized different prophetic figures based on their distinctive mode of prophesying. Samuel or Moses, who stood as a prophetic father or leader, controlled and governed the prophesying of a prophetic group or the elders. On the other hand, a group of ecstatic prophets from the high place and Saul featured uncontrolled and spontaneous mode of prophesying.



However, the prophetic modes themselves do not provide any legitimacy to the prophets. Samuel was the one who introduced a group of ecstatic prophets to Saul. In his affirmative role of building the kingship of Saul, Samuel guided Saul to meet the prophetic group. Samuel had a specific connection with the prophetic group until he built another prophetic school in Ramah (1 Sm 19:18-24). A shift of Samuel's cultic base is evident. He moved from the high place (1 Sm 9:1-24) to a sanctuary in Ramah (1 Sm 19:18-24). There is no mention of Samuel in relation to the high places, since Samuel anointed Saul. When Samuel appeared with a group of ecstatic prophets from the high place, he was a pro-monarchist. On the other hand, he was anti-monarchist when he taught his prophetic disciples in Ramah and opposed the kingship of Saul. Ramah as the place of Samuel is highlighted after the departure of Samuel from Saul (1 Sm 15:34). Again, Ramah is introduced in prophetic connection with Samuel (1 Sm 19:18). By analogy, Moses judged positively about the prophetic activity of the elders when they stood in front of the Tent of Meeting (Nm 11:16-30). The contrasted prophetic narratives indicate that a lawful cultic place provided legitimacy for prophecy (cf Dt 18:20). It is an indication that the group with the leading authority and the Dtr belonged to the same line of prophecy (see Wilson 1979:321-337).

Controlled and governed prophetic activity in a legitimate cultic place (Ramah) (1 Sm 19:18-29; see also Nm 11:24-30) serve to devaluate Saul's prophetic status, since the prophetic characterization of Saul provided divine sanction for his leadership in the prophetic tradition from the high place (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11). The Dtr tried to disunite the prophetic bond which supported Saul in the emergence of the monarchy in Israel (1 Sm 10:11), and emphasized the particular negative manner of Saul's prophecy (1 Sm 19:23-24). In 1 Samuel 19:18-24, the prophetic phenomena about Saul and his men are drastically contrasted with those of Samuel and his disciples in Ramah. The prophetic scene is depicted negatively. The narrator connected the men of Saul with the prophetic event as it happened to Saul later (1 Sm 19:23-24).



In conjecture, the Dtr implied Saul's prophetic leadership over his men. The prophetic phenomenon of Saul's men is one time happening. The tradition also intended to dissociate Samuel from any prophetic group from the high places (1 Sm 10:5). Thus, it is safe to conclude that the tradition of 1 Samuel 19 differs from that of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16.

3.2.2.2 The political guild

A prophetic movement was closely concerned with politics, specifically with the emergence of the kingship in ancient Israel (cf Matthews 2001:44). In 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 the main political party is the prophetic group in that the appearance of group was focused on introducing the kingship into Israel. The prophetic group was convened in the high place by Samuel.⁷⁵ The prophetic meeting signified that the prophetic appearance came with the emergence of the kingship. Thus, it is probably conjecturable that the prophetic personnel who were called to the meeting with Saul were a pro-Saulide party. It is, however, not certain that the prophetic group outside the feast was identical with the group of prophets from the high place who met Saul on the way home.

Political participation of prophetic groups or prophets is not unknown throughout the history of Israel (Petersen 2002:8). In a sense, the destiny of prophetic movements arose with the kingship and fell with the kingship. Even right after the fall of Jerusalem certain prophets tried to reconstruct the political map of the Davidic kingship to create in hope (Jeremiah and

⁷⁵ Arnold (1990) hypothesized that Saul himself hid as one of the prophets in the banquet to assassinate the local governor of the Philistines. As a result, he fled to Gilgal and there the people came to Saul to expel the garrison of the Philistines. Eventually, the assassination caused the establishment of the kingship through Saul. His understanding of the meeting in the high place is fresh in that he implied that the people are the prophets, but it is a limited perception. How could the people gather around Saul against the Philistines? Is it just because of a blow of Saul for assassinating the Philistine governor? That is not the case here. If he did, the people should have been afraid of being with Saul owing to the Philistine's reprisal. Further there is obviously no indication that Saul assassinated the Philistine governor in any place. Further the understanding is not helpful to explain the event of anointing Saul on the day feast. A valuable thought from him is that a political intrigue was involved in an activity of the group of the ecstatic prophets. The group of the ecstatic prophets was surely strong supporters to Saul.



Ezekiel).⁷⁶ Particularly, at the time of the rise of new kingships the political role of prophets is conspicuous.

3.2.2.2.1 Nathan

The prophet Nathan came to make Solomon king of Israel while Adonijah proclaimed himself as king (1 Ki 1:5-53). In his critical role Solomon gained the kingship with a political trick. David was persuaded to announce Solomon as his successor (1 Ki 1:12).⁷⁷ No religious reason or a word of God endorsed Solomon as king of Israel. Nathan's concern was obviously political. Nathan is the one who came to rebuke and judge David's adultery and murder for Bathsheba (2 Sm 12). In 2 Samuel 7:1-17 Nathan gave the word of Yahweh on building the house of the Lord through David's son. He also announced an everlasting covenant with the Lord. In neither case was there any specific mention of who would succeed David except that David's own son will succeed him:

When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your ancestors, I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come forth from your body, and I will establish his kingdom (2 Sm 7:12).

A close textual analysis discloses that the focus of the everlasting promise is on the son of David, not on David (see 2 Sm 7:12-15). In 2 Samuel 12:25 the son of David is specified as the beloved son of the Lord. In that case Yahweh sent Nathan to give Solomon another name that designated an expression of the Lord's special concern and favor on him, Jedidiah. The context, however, is obscure about why the Lord loved him. There is even no hint that the Lord gave exceptional favor to Bathsheba, the former wife of Uriah. Solomon is just the son of Bathsheba. The son in 2 Samuel 7:12 can easily be

⁷⁶ It is even noticeable that the prophetic orientation in Kings is one of the most ostensible thrusts of the history of Israel (cf Leithart 2006:17-28).

⁷⁷ 1 Kg 1:7 tells of two political parties in a political conflict to claim the kingship. Fritz (2003:16-17) pointed out the contrastive political background of each party. One party is centered on the close relationship serving David as king. They were Joab and Abiathar who support Adonijah. The other one is rather connected with a political function of a court. They were Zadok, Benaiah, and Nathan who stand for Solomon.



recognized as Solomon in 2 Samuel 12:25, since he would build the house of the Lord and receive special love. Nathan, the prophet, played a central role throughout the kingship of David and in the appointment of Solomon as the successor of David. Nathan's political role was explicitly conceived in his intrigue to make Solomon as king of Israel. In reality, the narrative was intended to propagate the kingship of Solomon.

3.2.2.2.2 Ahijah

In 1 Kings 11:29-40 the prophet Ahijah gave an oracle from God to Jeroboam on his kingship.⁷⁸ Ahijah explained why the Lord tore the kingdom of Solomon into two, since he went astray from serving Yahweh faithfully. An apparent condition for Jeroboam for his coming kingship was to walk before Yahweh just as David did (1 Ki 11:38). In 1 Kings 14:1-16 Ahijah announced that the condition was broken by Jeroboam's sins. The two traditions about Ahijah differ from each other. In the former (1 Ki 11:29-40) Ahijah came out to meet Jeroboam. In the latter (1 Ki 14:1-16) the wife of Jeroboam went to look for the old Ahijah. The latter narrative was possibly told to emphasize the break of the given condition. Unlike Nathan, the prophet Ahijah did not actively participate in political matters.

3.2.2.2.3 Elisha

In 2 Kings 9:1-10 Elisha played the role of the agent to anoint Jehu as king of Israel. Compared to the previous cases, Elisha did not anoint Jehu but sent one of his prophetic sons to Jehu. The intention of anointing Jehu was to destroy the house of Ahab, who persecuted the prophets and the people of Yahweh (2 Ki 9:7). Elisha was involved in various traditions (see 2 Ki 4:1-7, 8-37; 6:1-7, etc).⁷⁹ His most striking characteristic was that he was a father of

⁷⁸ A close literary pattern of the narrative is shown by Walsh (1996:147-149) in the story of David, Saul, and Samuel. He noted that the intended pattern by the narrator "invites us to interpret the present situation in terms of the past." He pointed out two ideas of the parallels to the story of David, Saul, and Samuel: the readiness of Yahweh to bring a new beginning as seen in the choice of David instead of Saul, and of Jeroboam instead of Solomon. The second idea is Yahweh's unceasing faithfulness to the Davidic monarchy in hope.

⁷⁹ Overholt (1997:94-111) saw various characteristics of Elijah and Elisha as the distinctive feature of a Shaman who heals people in a specific way (1 Ki 17:21; 2 Ki 4:34-35). He



a prophetic group as well as an active politician. He aggressively partook in political issues (2 Ki 5:1-19) as well as military actions (2 Ki 6:8-7). The lament of king Jehoash of Israel evinced the main concern of the tradition of Elisha:

My father, my father! The chariots of Israel and its horsemen! (2 Ki 13:14)

The above mentioned examples show how the political support of a prophetic group was significant in establishing the kingship as well as maintaining it. Prophetic support was probably a significant factor in the kingship in Israel.

3.2.2.2.4 Samuel

It is the significance of the prophetic role in the kingships; in particular in forming the kingship (1 Sm 1-12) (McKenzie 1966:169-175) that McKenzie (1966:169-175) observed the political role of the prophetic groups who fulfilled the Israelite law and tradition that Yahweh ruled over the king. His idea came from the hypothesis that 1 Samuel 1-12 demonstrated the four Samuels, that is, the four offices or positions which Samuel represented.

First Samuel appeared as a priest. In one of the critical roles as priest, Samuel condemned Saul because he sacrificed (1 Sm 13:8-15). McKenzie (1966:170) denied the historicity of the narrative based on the fact that a king could offer a sacrifice.

The second Samuel was a prophet (1 Sm 3; 15; 28). Samuel as a prophet of doom rejected Saul as the king (1 Sm 15). Without giving a specific explanation, McKenzie (1966:170) judged that the episode was unhistorical. He alleged that the narrative is a portrayal in retrospect of Samuel and came

contended that characteristics of Elijah and Elisha did not belong to any special group but is rather part of the whole of society in their contemporary times. Probably prophets were not free from their religious and cultural context. The issue, however, is that the major thrust of their traditions was to show them as men of God in the history of Israel. They remained steadfast to Yahweh in their historical situation to show the concern of Yahweh for His people.



from prophetic circles which “modeled Samuel after the heroes of these circles.”

The third Samuel was the seer (1 Sm 9:1-10:16) who was different from later prophets (McKenzie 1966:171). In this episode the role of Samuel was evidently reduced, since he was just a “mere instrument of Yahweh” (McKenzie 1966:171). The spirit was the major agent in the event of the deliverance of Israel (McKenzie 1966:171).

The fourth Samuel was the judge of 1 Samuel 1, 7:3-8:22, 10:17-25, 12. McKenzie (1966:173) concluded that “none of the four Samuels is the real historical Samuel.” The historically attested office, the sons of the prophets, merely contained the significance of Samuel in tradition. They were a cultic group as well as a political group as they appeared in 1-2 Kings. They were enthusiastic for Yahweh and preserved “what they conceive to be the pure ideals and traditions of Israel” (McKenzie 1966:174). “Once the monarchy was instituted, they supported it, but asserted that the king was as much submitted to the will of Yahweh as any Israelite” (McKenzie 1966:174). Finally, McKenzie contended that “The possibility must be considered that the sons of the prophets were more active in opposing Saul than the sources reveal” (1966:174).

The hypothesis of McKenzie is striking in that the sons of prophets were the authors of 1 Samuel 1-12 and that the story of Samuel was fiction. A probable indication from the hypothesis is that the sons of prophets modelled Samuel as their prophetic and political father. His analysis, however, lacks explicating the relationship between a group of the prophets from the high place (1 Sm 10:5-6; cf 1 Sm 9:22) and the prophetic sons of Samuel in Ramah (1 Sm 19:20). Except the prophetic episode (1 Sm 9:1-10:16) Samuel had never been involved in the prophetic activity with a group of the prophets of the high place, directly or indirectly. McKenzie possibly ignored multiple



tasks of figures such as seers or prophets in a social condition in which “major concerns are not sharply separated from each other” (Buss 1980:5).

3.2.2.2.5 *Bamot* (local sanctuaries)

Orlinsky (1971:268-279) saw the local sanctuaries, *bamot* as the bases of the seer-priests. In the *bamot*, he supposed, the seer-priests practiced as scribes. For instance, the seers, Samuel, Nathan, Iddo, Gad, Ahijah, and Shemaiah, according to Orlinsky (1971:270), had the direct responsibility to write down the royal chronicles (1 Chr 29:29; 2 Chr 9:29; 12:15; 13:22). Orlinsky (1971:270-271) concluded that the seer-priests were later incorporated into the kingship, which became the royal seer-priest group although some groups of the seer-priests remained in the *bamot* as scribes who were the local seer-priest group. His observation was based on the view of the continuous influence of the high places in the life of the Israelites.

The significance of Orlinsky’s thought came from differentiating the seer-priest group based on their social settings from the prophet (Orlinsky 1971:271).⁸⁰ The seer-priest group, according to Orlinsky (1971:271), referred to a group and a sanctuary whereas the prophet was individualistic. Orlinsky conceived the continuity of the seer-priest group in the kingship of Israel and Judah. However, he did not provide any reason why some seer-

⁸⁰ Fohrer (1972:223-229) contended for two types of prophecies in ancient Israel in the context of the ANE. One form of prophecy originated from the nomadic world as seen in the patriarchs or Balaam (Fohrer 1972:224). Fohrer (1972:224) viewed that the seer represented the prophetic form of the nomadic world thus the seer was not necessarily connected with a sanctuary. On the other hand, he (Fohrer 1972:225) proposed that another prophetic form was rooted in the settled region of the ANE. Ecstatic prophets (*nabi*), according to Fohrer (1972:225), showed this prophetic form that referred to sanctuaries or royal courts. Fohrer (1972:228-229) argued that the “originally nomadic Israelites” brought the “institution of the seer” to Palestine where the “institution of the nabi” existed. Two forms of prophecy, according to Fohrer (1972:228-229), were creatively transformed into something unique and different form under the “influence of Yahwism.” He (Fohrer 1972:228) was convinced that the two forms of prophecy existed at least about 1000 BCE in the forms of “Yahwistic seers (Nathan) and nabis” (1 Sm 10:5). However, it is questionable to see the origin of Israelite’ prophecy into two forms, since as seen in the case of Samuel the seer (1 Sm 9:10-14), the man of God (1 Sm 9:6-10) and the prophet (1 Sm 3:20) were applied to one prophetic figure. Although his understanding of two forms of prophecy is insightful to understand the origins of the prophecies, however his observation is uncompromised to explicate the multiple roles of Samuel (1 Sm 1-12; 15-16) such as the man of God, the seer and the prophet. Samuel was closely seen in relation with sanctuaries such as Shiloh (1 Sm 3:1-21) and Ramah (1 Sm 19:20-24).



priests such as Samuel, Nathan, Iddo, Gad, Ahijah, and Shemaiah accompanied the kings, specifically in their political role. The question is, what kind of relationship existed between the royal seer-priest group and the local seer-priest group? It is uncertain why some seer-priest groups of the *bamot* were incorporated into the royal-priest group and how other seer-priest groups were remained in the *bamot*. The *bamot* were simply more than local cultic places, particularly in the emergence of the kingship of Saul. The *bamot* appeared as a political base in 1 Samuel 9:22-24.

3.2.2.3 *Bamah* as prophetic group's religious and political base

3.2.2.3.1 The role of *bamah*

The connotation of the Hebrew word, *bamah*, as the high place came from a general perception of its locality, although it was not always a high place.⁸¹ The general idea of *bamah* as 'high place' originated from a practice of the Canaanites from the period of the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan.⁸² Archaeological evidence disclosed that the religious practice at the *bamah* can be traced in the religious life of the Canaanites as found at Nahariyah and En-Gedi (Tubb 1998:76). Some biblical evidence proves that the major social-religious background of the *bamah* was a local cultic sanctuary (Catron

⁸¹ For example, as seen in Jer 7:31 and 32:35, the place was sometimes far from a high place.

⁸² A worthy summary of the religion of pre-state Israel came from Doorly (1997:46) as follows: (1) The first god of Israel was El and the earliest form of religion consisted of rural varieties of Canaanite Baalism. An ancient mythology provided a background, but little evidence of this mythology has survived in the Hebrew bible. (2) Yahweh, a warrior god from the wilderness south of Judah, was introduced to Israel (the northern clans) by a group that had had an important Exodus experience. Yahwism spread, but the fragmented geography of Israel produced various forms of both Yahwism and Baalism. (3) There were several levels of religious experience involving the extended family and the community (area wide agricultural feasts, for example). In addition there was much private superstitious activity typical of prescientific rural life. (4) Throughout Israel there were many examples of theological contradiction and inconsistency, but there was no one in a position to take notice or be concerned. (5) Priesthoods associated with regional shrines began to emerge, and efforts were made to control ritual and belief in certain areas (Shechem, Gibeon, Hebron, Shiloh). (6) Since there was no state, there was no state religion. In general most of his description can be applied to the time of Saul, since the monarchy of Saul is rather a chieftaincy. The emergence of the regional cultic places did not strongly relate to Yahwism alone. Although that is the case, Saul really pursued to be a Yahwist (see Van der Toorn 1993:519-542).



1995:164).⁸³ In fact, *bamah* was the place where the tabernacle resided for a while in the time of David, particularly at Gibeon (1 Chr 16:39; 21:29). At the high place of Gibeon, Zadok the priest regularly offered the burnt offerings. Even Solomon went to the same place to offer sacrifices (1 Ki 3:4). In 2 Kings 23:15 Jeroboam built a high place in Bethel that was harshly criticized by the man of God from Judah. Eventually Josiah destroyed it. The callous destruction of the *bamah* by Josiah was one of his major aims of his religious reform (2 Ki 22:8-23:25). The destruction analogously revealed that the prime role of the *bamah* was to be the local cultic sanctuary. 1 Kings 3:2 states what the principal role of *bamah* and why the Dtr supported the reform:

The people were sacrificing at the high places, however, because no house had yet been built for the name of the LORD.

This biblical passage tells that the high places were the places where the people offered sacrifices. A nuance of the passage is to condemn the “establishment of these cult places and of the type of cult practiced there” (Schunck 1977:144).

3.2.2.3.2 Relationship between Samuel and prophetic group of *the bamah*

In 1 Samuel 9:11-10:16 the initial appearance of *bamah* is connected with Samuel. Samuel stood in close relationship with the high place as he anointed Saul as *nagid* (1 Sm 9:12, 19, 25). Samuel the seer showed to make offerings in a local cultic sanctuary (*bamah*) (1 Sm 9:11-14). His prophetic activities were implied in connection with the high place (1 Sm 10:1-6; cf 1 Sm 10:9-13). The high place was certainly the religious and

⁸³ Catron (1995:155) described the identity of *bamah* with three different religious and social backgrounds: It first came with the prophetic activity in 1 Sm 10:5; secondly it was given with the Tophet as seen in Jr 7:31; 19:5; and 32:35 and lastly from the funeral shrines by archeological observations. Catron rejected background of the funeral shrines. She (Catron 1995:164) contended that the primary function of *bamah* was cultic practices that were similar to that of the Jerusalem Temple. The same observation came from archeological evidence, specifically the high place at Tell-Arad.



political base of Samuel the seer.⁸⁴ In this perspective, a band of ecstatic prophets (1 Sm 10:5, cf 1 Sm 19:20) from the high place could be seen in the close relationship with Samuel the seer.

The relationship between Samuel and the prophetic group of the high place shows that there was probably a certain political issue among them. In 1 Samuel 10:5 a band of the ecstatic prophets received positive recognition from Samuel. In the prophetic tradition, the appearance of the prophets played a positive role in establishing the kingship of Saul. The encounter of the ecstatic prophetic group with Saul was given as one of the critical signs for Saul that would change him into “another man” (1 Sm 10:5). However, once Samuel withdrew from Saul (1 Sm 15:34-35), he didn’t show up in the correlation with the high places anymore. Rather Samuel went to anoint Saul’s successor (1 Sm 16), even though Saul was in success of military operations (1 Sm 15:4-8). The withdrawal of Samuel from Saul and anointing the successor by Samuel indicates a political upheaval happened between both of sides.

Later David escaped from Saul to Samuel in Ramah (1 Sm 19:20). In Ramah Samuel gathered another prophetic group that differed from the prophets at the high place in Gibeah (1 Sm 10:5). The name of their residence in Ramah was given as Naioth to indicate its social setting as different from the high place (1 Sm 19:20). Samuel remained in Ramah as the political opposer to Saul (cf 1 Sm 7:15-17). The absence of a prophetic group based on a high place implied that they no longer had a relationship with Samuel.

In sum, Samuel was in the middle of the relationship between Saul and the prophetic group of the high place in the emergence of the kingship of Saul.

⁸⁴ It is conspicuous because Samuel originated from Shiloh under the priesthood of Eli. According to 1 Sm 3 Samuel received an oracle at the sanctuary of Shiloh. The distinctive remark from 1 Sm 3:1 is that the words and vision of the Lord had been communicated at the sanctuary. The oracle, however, was rare in the time of Eli. This contrasted with the favor of Yahweh for Samuel in 1 Sm 3. Since Samuel had the favor of Yahweh, he devoted himself to serve Him in the sanctuary. In this way Samuel served Israel as judge after the fall of the sanctuary in Shiloh (1 Sm 4).



Once Samuel left Saul, the Samuel's relationship was also over with the prophetic group. But the strong connection of Saul with the prophetic group was sustained in the kingship of Saul (cf Schunck 1975:143). The well-built bond of Saul with the prophetic group of the high place indicates that the prophetic group supported the kingship of Saul and played a major role to preserve the prophetic tradition with regard to the royal leadership of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11).

3.2.2.3.3 Personnel

The prophetic tradition gives rise to the question of who the personnel of the high place were. Although prophetic groups were related to a high place, they were not the only personnel of the place. Supposedly there was no restriction to bar any religious Israelite from the place. Samuel was there. David's priest Zadok offered sacrifices at the high place in Gibeon (1 Chr 16:39). Jeroboam king of Israel built an altar at the high place in Bethel as a cultic center with attending priests (1 Ki 12:34, 13:3). A reconstruction of the personnel of the high place includes Samuel, the band of ecstatic prophets, the uncle of Saul, Zadok and unnamed priests.

As evidenced by the reform of Josiah, the high places thrived among the people until Josiah's time.⁸⁵ After destroying the places, the personnel of the high places were engaged into the Temple of Jerusalem according to 2 Kings 23:9 (Barrick 2002:187-196). Even in the exilic time, Ezekiel specified the Levitical priests of Zadok's lineage (Ezk 44:15). It is a complicated phrase, since the ascendancy of the Zadokites is ambiguous and not identified with the Levites. Block (1998:633) reckoned that the connotation of the Levitical priests is a dtr construct "identifying authorized cult functionaries in Israel, in contrast to illegitimate counterfeits who surface occasionally in the OT narratives." The dtr phrase was probably added during or after the exile. It

⁸⁵ The Dtr considered that the high places vitalized a syncretistic religion of the Canaanites in Israel (cf Schunck 1975:144).

implies that the Levitical priests from the high places were already absorbed into the Temple of Jerusalem.⁸⁶

3.2.2.3.4 A cultic sanctuary for Yahweh

Originally the high place was not only designed for foreign gods, but also for Yahweh (Smith 2002:160-162; 180-181). The idea probably suffered under the various religious practices at the high place, for example, the offering of sacrifices for Chemosh and Molech at the time of Solomon (1 Ki 11:5-8). The construction of a high place in Bethel by Jeroboam was seen by the Dtr as a cultic place for foreign gods.

It is noticeable to observe a certain religious intrigue about the high place of Saul in relation with Yahweh and God (1 Sm 10). The biblical narrator indicated that Saul was bound not only to God but also to Yahweh. Seemingly Saul was repeatedly informed that he was closely connected with God as seen some passages: The coming of the 'spirit of God' upon Saul (1 Sm 10:10; cf 1 Sm 11:6), 'Gibeath of Elohim' (1 Sm 10:5), and 'God' changing Saul's heart (1 Sm 10:9). But Saul was seen in the connection with Yahweh, for example, the "spirit of Yahweh" (1 Sm 10:6).

Long (1989:228) explained that the narrator avoided connecting Saul with Yahweh. By doing this, according to Long (1989:228), the narrator showed his negative attitude toward Saul. The understanding implies that the biblical writer intentionally associated Saul with God and not with Yahweh. Long (1989:228) reckoned that the Dtr was probably a Yahwist who believed that Yahweh is his national God. Either Saul was not a Yahwist, or else the Dtr did not connect Saul with Yahweh so that Saul might not be seen as one of their party. Long's argument is that the omniscient narrator deemed Saul to be the one who broke the covenant with his national God, Yahweh, by not

⁸⁶ 2 Chr 31:9 explains that Levite priests existed in the several towns. In 2 Chr 31:10 the chief priest Azariah of the house of Zadok is distinguished from Levite priests. The biblical evidence does elucidate that only in the time of Josiah were the Levite priests in the towns absorbed into the priestly personnel of the Temple.



keeping his words and commandments. But Long did not provide a convincing explanation of the issue. The relationship between Saul and Yahweh was even emphasized in the dtr passage (1 Sm 10:22, 24).⁸⁷ The argument of Long is certainly lack of perceiving a social religious background of Saul.

1 Samuel 14:35 informs that Saul built an altar for Yahweh to remember His deliverance in the victory over the Philistines. Repeatedly Saul is characterized as one who asked Yahweh for an answer (cf Jobling 1998:89-90; 1 Sm 28:6). In 1 Samuel 28:10 Saul swore by Yahweh to protect the life of the medium of Endor.

The relation between Saul and Yahweh cannot be a construct of the Dtr. It rather contains the historical reality of Saul's relation with Yahweh during his reign. Conspicuously, the action of Saul shows his reverence for Yahweh as his national God (Van der Toorn 1993:19-42; cf Breytenbach 2000:56). Although there is an indication that the Dtr attempted to devaluate the religious attitude of Saul, it shows that the Dtr could not refute the attitude of Saul to Yahweh because the tradition of Saul about religion had already been historicized. The tendentiousness of the Dtr is again evident in his reevaluating of the event from his perspective of Yahweh. The religious attitude of Saul should be understood in the context of 1 Samuel 13:9, 12. In combat with the Philistines, Saul is aware that Yahweh is the One who defeated them.

⁸⁷ Scheffler (2000:270) argued that Saul was a Yahwist who introduced the "Israelites [to] their religion." He (Scheffler 2000:262) contended that the Dtr downplayed Saul in order to enhance King David as the first real king of Israel. Scheffler (2000:270) proposed a historical Saul as follows:

He was a king on a lower scale.

He was the father of the Israelite state and nation.

He was in conflict with Samuel, but always acted honourably.

He largely succeeded in his military tasks by providing security for the Israelites.

He died a heroic death.

He did not exploit the people as later king have done (cf. the lament).

He gave the Israelites their religion.



Barrick (2002:185-186) strongly contended that the *bamoth* served as a cultic place for Yahweh just as the Temple did. As in the case of Saul, it is true that Saul was connected to the high place, however, he remembered the deliverance of Yahweh and built an altar for Yahweh. Anderson (1988:1-23) stated that the way in which the Israelites offered sacrifices did not differ from the Canaanites' way. They had a different God to whom their sacrifices were offered. Smith (1987:11-42) argued that the religious life of ancient Israel was syncretistic (cf 2 Ki 22-23). The Israelites worshipped Yahweh as well as regional gods such as Baal. But the syncretism was always challenged by the "Yahweh alone-movement." Saul was a Yahwist. His connection with Elohim would have been a design of the Dtr. Yahweh was worshipped at the high place as well as at his sanctuaries in Gilgal and Mizpah (cf 1 Chr 21:29).

3.2.2.3.5 Israelite kings' relation with the *bamot*

Since Solomon, most of the Israelite kings, and the northern and southern kings were judged by their relation with the *bamot*. In the book of Kings two occasions were related to the building of a *bamah*, one in the northern kingdom (1 Ki 12:32; 17:29-32) and two events in the southern kingdom (2 Ki 21:3; 23:13).

In northern Israel, Jeroboam is a conspicuous figure in building a *bamah* at Bethel (1 Ki 12:32). Although the kingship of Jeroboam originated with an oracle of Ahijah, the prophet from Shiloh, his kingship is later criticized by the man of God from Judah. The man of God appeared to Jeroboam to prophesy that Josiah, the Davidic king, would destroy the high place in Bethel. Another case of the construction of the *bamot* in Israel is described in 1 Kings 17:29-32. People brought to Samaria by the Assyrians built the high places after the fall of Israel.

In Judah Manasseh restored the high places that were destroyed by his father Hezekiah (2 Ki 21:3). Josiah defiled and removed these high places in his religious reform. Of removing the high places two accounts are noticeable



(2 Ki 23:8-13; 2 Ki 23:19-20). 2 Kings 23:8-13 unfolds how Josiah destroyed all the high places that Solomon built. To mention Solomon as the builder of high places around Jerusalem is significant (2 Ki 23:13), since he is also the builder of the Temple in Jerusalem. On the other hand, according to 2 Kings 23:19-20, Josiah even went up to Samaria to destroy all the high places that Jeroboam built. He slaughtered all the priests of the high places in Samaria. In two accounts, the narrator emphasized Josiah as the king who destroyed all the high places in Samaria and Judah. Solomon and Jeroboam are denounced as kings who brought people into the high places for cultic practices.

It is worth observing an explication of the Chronicles about the religious reform of Josiah, particularly removing the high places, even though the Chroniclers take a different theological interpretation and understanding of a historical nature of events from the Dtr (Knoppers 1999:194). The theological perspective of the Chronicles about the reform shows that they accepted the theological position of the Dtr toward the Israelite kings in terms of the high places (cf Scheffler 2000:267). For instances, 2 Chronicles 17:6 gives an account of why the high places remained in the time of Jehoshaphat. The people did not put their heart on the God of their fathers, although Hezekiah attempted to remove the high places. In 2 Chronicles 34:3 the biblical writer clarified that the God of their fathers is the God of David. The Chronicles reported that Josiah destroyed all the high places, because he sought guidance from the God of his father David (2 Chr 34:3). In Judah only two kings attempted to remove the high places, namely Jehoshaphat and Josiah. One of them, Josiah, is the only one who succeeded in removing all the high places in Judah as well as in Samaria.

Based on the tradition of the high places, the tradition in Kings focused on Jeroboam and Josiah. In 1 Kings 12:32 Jeroboam was presumably the one who brought the wrong cultic practice to the high place in Bethel. Jeroboam built the high places and appointed the priests of the high places. Josiah



defiled and removed all the practices of the high places in Bethel and Samaria and fulfilled the prophecy of the man of God (2 Ki 23:15-20). A man of God from Judah prophesied that Josiah would destroy all the wrong practices in the high places. An old prophet in Bethel specified the destruction of the high places in Bethel and Samaria (1 Ki 13:32).

The dtr passages (1 Ki 12:32; 13:32; 2 Ki 23:15-20) in Kings indicate that Jeroboam's sin in building and maintaining the high places caused the fall of northern Israel. On the other hand Josiah, the king of Judah, is the hero of Yahweh by destroying all the high places in Israel and Judah. The dtr narrative showed that prophets play a central role in prophecy and fulfillment.

In analogy with the narrative of 2 Kings 23:13-20, a significant phrase appears in Ezekiel 20:28-32:

For when I had brought them into the land that I swore to give them, then wherever they saw any high hill or any leafy tree, there they offered their sacrifices and presented the provocation of their offering; there they sent up their pleasing odors, and there they poured out their drink offerings (I said to them, What is the high place to which you go? So it is called Bamah to this day). Therefore say to the house of Israel, Thus says the Lord GOD: Will you defile yourselves after the manner of your ancestors and go astray after their detestable things? When you offer your gifts and make your children pass through the fire, you defile yourselves with all your idols to this day. And shall I be consulted by you, O house of Israel? As I live, says the Lord GOD, I will not be consulted by you. What is in your mind shall never happen-- the thought, "Let us be like the nations, like the tribes of the countries, and worship wood and stone."

Ezekiel judged that visiting the *bamah* means serving the idols that are the major cause of the fall of Israel and Judah.⁸⁸ The prophet emphasized that

⁸⁸ Allen (1990:13) saw the phrase of 'high places' as a "prophetic fragment" that propagandistically aimed to assault "unorthodox religion." He (Allen 1990:13) further stated that "Ezekiel thought in terms of two eras in Yahweh's dealings with his people: an old era



their practice at the *bamah* began in the land that God promised to the fathers of Israel. The prophet in exile judged the history of Israel from the beginning of her settlement in Canaan after the Exodus. The obvious connection of Israel's transgression to the *bamah* is striking, since, unlike the judgment of Ezekiel there was no direct mention of *bamah* as a cultic place in Judges. Judges only described how Israel transgressed against Yahweh (Jdg 2:11-13; 3:7; 4:1; etc).

An obvious nuance of Ezekiel 20:28-32 is that Israel had no own land because of wrong religious practices at a *bamah*. The judgment is formulaic in that Ezekiel announced the judgment of God in the prophetic speech, "Thus says the Lord GOD" (Westermann 1991:100-103).⁸⁹ God announced that by visiting a *bamah* is to defile Israel. As a result of visiting the *bamah*, Israel had no land. Israel would also not have an answer from God, since God took an oath that He would not answer Israel when they defiled Him by abiding *bamot*.

An obvious remark from the judgment of Ezekiel (20:28-32) is that the intention of Israel to go to *bamah* was to become like the nations: "'Let us be like the nations'" (Ezk 20:32) The last phrase echoes of what the elders of Israel said to Samuel when they requested a king (1 Sm 8:5, 20). The priestly prophet in Babylon (Ezk 1:1-3) blamed the fall of Israel on the beginning of the kingship, since the kingship introduced the people of Israel to the high places. The prophetic speech pointed to the main reason for the fall of Israel, namely the wrong cultic practices. Unlike the account of 2 Kings 23:13-15, Ezekiel attributed the evil practices at the *bamah* to the emergence of the

dogged by a deuteronomistic type of theology featuring the eventual wearing down of divine grace by human disobedience and a renewed and bondage to the past removed."

⁸⁹ Cook (2006:17-23) followed Westermann (1991:100-103) to explain that the prophetic formula indicated the origin of the prophecy, as 'messenger speech.' According to her, it referred to other forms of prophetic speech such as the judgment speech or the salvation speech. Cook (2006:17-19) presented "words of judgment" into four categorizations: "announcement of judgment to Israel," "announcement of judgment to the nations," "woe oracle," and "admonition."



kingship, that is, the kingship of Saul. In the reign of Saul the *bamah* in Gibeah was the central political and religious base of Saul.

Another reference to Saul's kingship in Ezekiel is the use of the Exodus tradition as described in 1 Samuel 8:8 and 12:6 (Ezk 20:28-32). The Exodus tradition was attested to Judges 2:11-13 in the form of the summary of Israel's sin during the time of the judges. The tradition was used by Jeremiah. In the prophetic speech of Jeremiah, Yahweh is the One who brought Israel from Egypt (Jer 2:5-7). The Exodus tradition highlighted who Yahweh is and what Israel sins were. It reminded Israel of Yahweh as the warrior who defeated the Egyptians (cf Jos 24:7-8).

The book of Ezekiel implied that there were two dtr redactions. The Dtr concentrated on the reform of Josiah as the model of the Davidic kingship, since Josiah destroyed all the high places in Samaria and Judah in order to centralize the religious practices of Israel in the Temple of Jerusalem.⁹⁰ On the other hand, the Dtr in the exile, as seen in Ezekiel (20:28-32), emphasized the evil origin of the kingship of Israel as the cause of the fall of Israel which led to the exile of the people.⁹¹ Ultimately, Ezekiel turned to

⁹⁰ Sweeney (1998:69-94) argued that the latter prophets had their own traditional settings (Rad 1965). Ezekiel was a Zadokite priest, because the oracle of Ezekiel emphasized the centrality of the Temple of Jerusalem in the world (Sweeney 2005:81). Ezekiel showed that his vision was to restore the Temple (Ezk 40-44) and the kingship (Ezk 44:3; 45:8).

⁹¹ Clements (1996:145-169) presented a different perspective on the point. He (1996:167) believed the original prophecy of Ezekiel was negative towards "the future of the Davidic dynasty and kingship (cf Ezk 19:14) while he hoped for the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem. He contended that the favorable attitude to the monarchy was rather "secondary elaborations (cf Ezk 17:24-28)." He even proceeded to contend a further modification of the favorable attitude towards the monarchy (Ezk 45:7). Unlike the original attitude of Ezekiel, Jeremiah had a favorable view of the monarchy and of the Jerusalem Temple, according to Clements (1996:149). His arguing is obvious that the explicit distinction between Jeremiah and Ezekiel should be viewed from their different situations and the specific condition of which each prophetic school to interpret the original prophecy. According to him, the distinctive theological and literary characteristic of Jeremiah came from the DH. Ezekiel shared the common theological perspective with the so-called Holiness Code (Lv 17-21). His contention was that the dtr perspective of the favor for the Davidic kingship in Ezekiel came late. If so, which historical time and situation brought the necessity of the Davidic kingship in such a late period? He did not inform on the specific historical situation and time for the late addition to Ezekiel. Further his contention did not explain why the same dtr phrases appear in 1 Sm 8 and 12 and in Ezk 20. Ezekiel in the exile supposedly distinguished the evil origin of the kingship in general and the favorable Davidic kingship in particular.



favor a monarchy that protected the priestly system (Ezk 45:17; cf Ezk 44:3). Ezekiel suggested that the rejection of the king of Israel was the original reason for the fall of Israel.

In sum, prophetic groups were essential to bring the kingship into Israel. When the kingship emerged, various prophetic groups existed together. Each prophetic group had a different mode of prophesying and a different base for their prophetic activities such as *Naioth* in Ramah (1 Sm 19:18-23) and the high places (1 Sm 9:14-27; 10:9-13). Initially the kingship of Saul began with the strong supports from Samuel and the ecstatic prophetic group of the high place (1 Sm 9:15-10:7). The kingship of Saul, however, lost the prophetic favor of Samuel (1 Sm 13:13-14; 15:17-23). Samuel was closely related to the prophetic group of the high place until he withdrew his prophetic endorsement for the kingship of Saul. The prophetic group of the high place including Samuel took direct responsibility to build the kingship of Saul (1 Sm 10:1-13). The prophetic group attempted to idealize the kingship of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11). On the other hand, the Dtr inherited prophetic tradition of Samuel, as seen in Ezekiel 20:28-32, criticizes the kingship of Israel in terms of the high places. The prophetic Dtr attributed the wrong origin of the kingship of Israel to the kingship of Saul that emerged with the support of the prophetic group of the high place.

3.2.3 People's role in appointment of kingship

What follows is about the people who affected the kingship of Saul critically in the context of that of the ANE (1 Sm 8:5, 19-20). The kingship of the ANE was generally engaged in propagating divine sanctions of the kingship. The idea of divine sanctions provides a probable context of the kingship of Saul in relation with the people.

The appearance of Saul in the prophetic tradition (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11) shows that the king had to demonstrate an extraordinary qualification of his leadership. This is necessary not just for protecting the people from the



enemies but also to show that he was divinely sanctioned. The description of the prophetic status of Saul demonstrates to the people his divine sanction as king (1 Sm 11:6; cf 1 Sm 13:9). His prophetic status evinced his charismatic leadership in terms of prophecy and fulfillment (1 Sm 10:7; 11:6-7). It assured his kingship among the people (cf 1 Sm 11:7). The prophecy of Saul (1 Sm 10:6) was foretold by Samuel in the course of being *nagid* (cf Herrmann 1981:136). 1 Samuel 8:5 showed why the people of Israel asked for a king and what kind of a model for the kingship they desired in their ANE context (cf Schniedewind 1999:24). They wanted to be like all the other nations.⁹² The kingship in the ANE was mainly to protect the wealth of the people and to keep their life in well-being. Thus, the request of the elders on behalf of the people meant that they wanted to be protected from their enemies and to keep their wealth.

1 Samuel 11 explained what kind of kingship the people asked for. Although it is not clear who the primary enemy of the people of Israel was, charismatic leadership was obviously a main requirement of the people. In the narrative (1 Sm 11) Saul demonstrated his leadership like a king to protect his people, who consequently kept their wealth.

Another example of the people's consciousness of kingship comes from 1 Samuel 13:8. Saul was about to fight against the Philistines. He waited seven days for Samuel to come and offer the burnt offering and the peace offerings. But Samuel did not come. It became a critical moment for Saul. The people began to disperse. Then Saul decided to offer the sacrifices himself. When he had finished, Samuel appeared to rebuke Saul.

⁹² Gabriel (2003:200) said that the Israelites had two possible models for their kingship: The Egyptian model and the Mesopotamian model. "The Egyptian model of a divine god-king possessed of absolute authority ran completely against the grain of Israelites values and history. The more Mesopotamian model, on the other hand, afforded a king that was surely mortal and whose authority had always been subject to two counter-checks, the assembly of elders and the gods themselves who could punish him directly or signal his loss of moral authority." Unlike the understanding of Gabriel, as seen in the chapter 2, the divine sanction was the critical factor for the kingship in the ANE in general, although there was a certain degree of understanding and idealization of the kingship in Mesopotamia. Thus, it is questionable whether the kingship of Israel, particularly the Davidic kingship, followed any specific model of the ANE.



The text, however, reveals equivocally why the people began to dissipate from Saul, whether Samuel did not appear or Saul did not offer the offerings. Samuel denounced the action of Saul (1 Sm 13:13-14). If the people expected from Saul not only a strong kingship but also a priestly leadership (cf KTU 1.14), they may have realized that Saul was not the king that the people originally wished to have (cf 1 Sm 8:5, 20).⁹³

Based on 1 Samuel 13 and 15, the best reason for the failure of Saul's kingship was his conflict with Samuel. The clue comes from 1 Samuel 11:1-11 that does not reveal any confrontation between Saul and the priestly prophet. 1 Samuel 11:1-11 illustrates Saul's military as well as his religious leadership.⁹⁴ The king that the elders of Israel requested in 1 Samuel 8:5 possibly had to have military as well as religious leadership with divine sanction like another king of the ANE (cf Polish 1989:11): "appoint for us, then, a king to govern us, like other nations" (1 Sm 8:5).

The expectation of the people about kingship eventually resulted in the fall of Saul. As indicated in 1 Samuel 8 and 12 Saul's kingship was evil according to the Dtr who was in the exile. Grotanelli (1999:91-92; 100) contended that Saul's monarchical model itself made him to fail as king of Israel, because ultimately, Saul could not be a prophet, military leader, and sacrificer. The omniscient narrator in 1 Samuel 13 and 15 suggests that the kingship of Saul was failed, since the kingship was modeled that of the ANE. Further the narrator tells that the choice of the people for king Saul was wrong. The omniscient narrator denotes that the people's expectation of the sovereignty of Saul was frustrated and eventually he was seen as illegitimate.

⁹³ If so, the departing of the people from Saul did not just mean that he lost the people in army in the battle; rather he was about to lose one of the significant foundations for building his kingship. Herrmann (1981:135-136) saw that the kingship of Israel was founded upon 'the consent of the people' and divine assent signified in anointing.

⁹⁴ For a detail discussion will be given in 4.3.2.2.3.



The role of the people was to force Saul to bring the kingship like that of all the other nations (1 Sm 8:5, 20). They wanted to see the same role of a king of the nations from Saul who might lead and protect them. The people were characterized as those who attempted to make Israel among the nations with Saul.

3.3 Process of traditionalization

3.3.1 Introduction

To understand any historical account is deeply dependent on perceiving the perspective of its author. No historical account sustains itself only by a report of what happened at a specific moment. By the same token, a historical narrative has to present how and why it happened, particularly so in the DH. As part of the DH, the tradition about Saul poses serious questions to the understanding of its historical value. The narrative reveals a process of understanding (an event), acceptance (an oral and written tradition), and reevaluation of the account about Saul (the narrative). Thus, the focus of this section is to perceive what has been claimed in the prophetic tradition of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11) as a historical reality, and what happened to the tradition in the process of reevaluation of the Dtr.

3.3.2 Historical claims are compatible

The Dtr, on the whole, persisted in keeping the historical accounts of the different traditions he used. Consequently, the different viewpoints of the traditions about Saul brought conflict and inconsistencies (1 Sm 10:9-12; 19:23-24; 1 Sm 9:2; 10:17-24). The conflicts and inconsistencies required the historian's interpretation (1 Sm 8; 12) and ordering of the traditions as it stands.

A narrative on the destruction of the high places gives a theological portrayal of the Dtr: The one in Judah to underline Josiah's legitimate kingship (2 Ki 23:4-14) and the other in Samaria (2 Ki 23:15-20). The dtr focus was to

highlighten Solomon and Jeroboam's direct responsibility for the building of the high places (Cohn 2000:158).

A theological thrust of the narrative in 2 King 23:4-20 contradicted the tradition of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 1 Samuel 11:1-11. In the Saul tradition the Dtr highlighted the connection between Saul and the high places in the emergence of his kingship in Israel. In the tradition this connection provided an essential foundation to Saul, namely a prophetic factor to build the kingship of Saul. On the other hand, in 2 King 23:4-20, the Dtr aims to explicate that worship at a central sanctuary brings restoration of the divided kingdoms of Israel (House 1995:389). The Dtr did not change the historical facts of the two occasions, but reevaluated each from his perspective. For instance, 1 Samuel 9:1-2 tells that Saul was physically well-built and from a decent family line.⁹⁵ On the other hand, his striking physical advantage was devaluated by Saul's hiding (1 Sm 10:23). The Dtr used the historical information of Saul's superior physical appearance but presented it another way in different traditions. The Dtr was a historian who used historical traditions of what actually happened, but he told the traditions in different contexts.

3.3.3 Incompatibility of religious dynamics

Religious dynamics played a major role in the traditionalization of the characters Saul and David in the final narrative.⁹⁶ Particularly, a contrasted

⁹⁵ The description can be seen in the context of the royal family line shown in Nebuchadnezzar I, 1123-1103 BCE in the Sumerian king List discussed in the chapter 2. The verses in Samuel highlighted Saul's physical advantage and his legitimate ancestral line as king.

⁹⁶ Gottwald (1996:136-149) pinpointed that prophetic ideology and ideologies were deeply rooted in the social religious situations of the Prophets, the so-called scriptural Prophets. Their ideology was generally composed of four aspects, the systematic idea, the specific point of view in social circumstances, but reality of conceptual form, and unrealistic social settings. First, he (Gottwald 1996:138-140) contended there were at least three conceptual processes in the original prophets in "literary construction": Amos, Micah, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. They were the fountains of the following prophetic ideas, their tragic view of Israel's fall later merged into the comic concept of universal salvation. Second, their prophetic ideology (Gottwald 1996:140-143) experienced a shift in point of view concerning their different social occurrences; for the pre-exilic prophets it was mainly social approach of injustice in various cultic existences. The post-exilic prophets hoped for a revitalized cult in



description of Saul and David in 1 Samuel 16-31 show how the Dtr redacted to present the traditions of Saul and David (cf Pate, Duvall, Hays, Richards, Tucker & Vang 2004:62). The religious dynamics, especially of the prophets, was evinced by the possession of divine knowledge.

Lasine (2001:79-82) pointed out the significant role of the king in knowing for the royal ideology of Israel, specifically in the Davidic kingship. He suggested five types of “royal knower” and a place of kings in knowing. First of all, the king was “all-knowing” as shown in David and Solomon (2 Sm 3; 1 Ki 1). The second was the Saul-type of “Kings who do not know what they need to know and are therefore helpless (including kings who are unable to keep their secret information private).” The third type was the Pharaoh of the Exodus and Rehoboam of “kings who think they know and/or control more than they do.” The fourth was rarely seen, for example, David (2 Sm 15-16) and Rehoboam (1 Ki 12) were “Kings who employ counselors in order to make decisions from known data.” The fifth case was evidenced by David (2 Sm 15-17) as “Kings who get off the throne in order to acquire knowledge or experience first-hand.” Lasine suggested the place of “kings in bed” and “kings who know in the biblical sense” for the “royal knower.”

In his understanding of royal knowledge Lasine was unaware of the relationship between the kings and the prophets. The prophets were certainly the primary recipients of divine knowledge (cf Westermann 1991:118-120). Later knowledge was transferred to the kings in terms of salvation and judgment (cf Westermann 1991:120-126).

an unified cultic setting. Third, the prophets were false in their concepts, socially, religiously, and theologically, since they had an unrealistic consciousness of judging the other parties (Gottwald 1996:143-147). Thus, only the later generations could properly evaluate their prophetic utterances and attitudes (see Sweeney 2005:78-93). Last, they had a fantastic faith in God (1996:147-148). Gottwald (1996:148-149) concluded that as we perceive the nature of the ideology of the Prophets, we will better perceive their boundaries and implications that will eventually lead us to clarify our hermeneutical peripheries and orientations towards the Prophets.



The divine knowledge of the two professions differed. First, the prophets were privileged to pronounce the will of God as his prophets (cf Westermann 1991:100-103). They remained in the divine favor. Second, the designated king claimed divine sanction for his kingship. Once he received the divine knowledge, he established his kingship, for example, David by Samuel (1 Sm 16:1-13), Jeroboam by Ahijah (1 Ki 11:29-40), and Jehu by Elisha (2 Ki 9:1-13). Without doubt, they all became kings through designation by a prophet. In these cases, the reception of the divine knowledge through the prophets was essential to become a king.

To have knowledge was essential to become king. For instance, 1 Kings 1 explains how Solomon became king of Israel. David's succession by Solomon was based on the knowledge he received from the prophet Nathan (cf Hens-Piazza 2006:14-17). The political conspiracy showed that it was meticulously planned to have royal knowledge or not. First of all, Nathan the prophet revealed the ignorance of Adonijah of king David (לֹא יָדָע), as he asked Bathsheba to tell David about Adonijah (1 Ki 1:11). Nathan emphasized the arrogance of Adonijah towards David. Later, in 1 Kings 1:18 Bathsheba pinpointed the unawareness of David (לֹא יָדָעָהּ) of the action of Adonijah to be king. In fact, Adonijah, who was about to be king, did not become king. By having knowledge of what happened, Adonijah was disqualified as king as well as was David who did not know what Adonijah was doing. David should have passed his kingship on to his son Solomon through the prophet Nathan. The political implication was that having knowledge meant becoming king. Having knowledge was actualized as a sign of divine sanction of kingship.⁹⁷

Divine knowledge was essential for a king in the ANE, specifically when he went to war against the enemies. Through the war he could reveal the divine sanction of his kingship. Without divine knowledge there was no victory. Thus,

⁹⁷ As highlighted in 1 Ki 5:9, the kingship of Solomon was idealized as the royal institution based on divine knowledge that led to the building of the Temple of Jerusalem.



the question was whether the king in the ANE received the divine knowledge or not. An example came from the story of Keret (Wyatt 2002:178) of how he could win the war. He obediently followed the divine command given to him in a dream. In the dream the god commanded him to offer sacrifices to him. After waking up, Keret followed the command: he made sacrifices, mustered his army, and marched against the enemy. Keret followed an order of El exactly and won Hurriy as his wife. Here the king played the role of a priest. He received the oracle and he offered the sacrifice.

Unlike the story of Keret, biblical narratives give a different explication of divine knowledge in a war situation. A striking example comes from 2 Kings 3.⁹⁸ As Joram, son of Ahab, and Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, and the king of Edom march to fight Moab, they are out of water for men and horses. Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, asked for any prophet of Yahweh to ask the will of Yahweh. An officer of Israel mentioned Elisha. The three kings came to meet him. Elisha said that only by reason of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, would he give them the words of Yahweh. Elisha's prophecy was fulfilled. The Dtr narrative declared that Joram king of Israel was evil and Jehoshaphat king of Judah was good. The true prophet Elisha, by virtue of Jehoshaphat, announced the word of Yahweh which came true.⁹⁹ The Dtr made clear that divine knowledge came from the mouth of prophets chosen by Yahweh (Dt 18:15-22).

In other biblical traditions, Saul and David asked God how to attack the hostile Philistines. While Saul did not receive an answer from God that day (1 Sm 14:37), David received a specific answer from Yahweh on how to attack

⁹⁸ Fritz (2003:243) contended that 2 Ki 3 was a result of later additions to the account of the military operation of the kings of Israel and Judah against Mesha of Moab. The prophet is highly focused on propagating Jehoshaphat as king of Judah in v14. The theological implication of the addition is overt enough to say that it aims to show God's will in the campaign.

⁹⁹ A historical implication of the tradition however did not endorse the faithfulness of Jehoshaphat of Judah, since Jehoshaphat was one of the three kings who did not ask the will of Yahweh before they marched. He jumped to the suggestion of Joram to fight against Moab. Supposedly, the Dtr propagated the Davidic kingship in contrast with the kingship of Israel.



the Philistines (2 Sm 5:23). In both cases, the motivation to ask was the same. Both were kings, but the result was different. The Dtr suggested that the legitimate king received the divine answer right at the time of the crisis or the emergence. The dtr judgment about Israelite kings is evident in 1 Samuel 13 where Saul offered untimely sacrifices. In 1 Samuel 13 the prophet Samuel was responsible for the delay of the sacrifice.

Israelite kings offered sacrifices at a politically critical moment, such as in a war or during coronation. Examples are Saul (1 Sm 13:9), David (2 Sm 24:25), Solomon (1 Ki 3:3), and Jeroboam (1 Ki 12:33). But the kings were not priests. Biblical evidence did not present them as priests or that any one of them who were priests became kings; neither did any priest attempt to build a kingship based on his priesthood. Their sacrifices at their initiation were part of their royal ideology to prove that they had divine sanction for their kingship. In reality the priesthood was not limited to a specific figure or family line. Leviticus 7:28-38 stated that the offering of sacrifices belonged to the priestly domain. Offering sacrifice was functional to support the kingship of Israel. Thus, kings as well as priests could bring offerings to God. Both approached God directly to ask for his guidance that previously was part of the prophetic vocation.

In Leviticus 8:1-36 Moses anointed Aaron and his sons as priests, just Samuel (1 Sm 10:1; 16:13) and one of Elisha's prophetic sons (2 Ki 9:6) did for the king. Moses was identified as a prophet in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 and 34:10. The description of Moses as a prophet emphasized the divine authority of a prophetic group. The Exodus tradition is closely related with some prophetic groups in 1 Samuel 8:8 and 12:6 and Ezekiel 20:28. Prophets anointed kings and priests.

In a different manner, in 1 Kings 1:34, king David asked Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet to anoint Solomon as king. 1 Kings 1:39 identified Zadok the priest as the one who anointed Solomon. The tradition of 1 Kings 1:34



confirmed that the act of anointing Solomon was performed not only by Zadok the priest but also Nathan the prophet. The verse ascribes specific role to Nathan the prophet who brought the kingship to Solomon.

The basic understanding of having divine knowledge is related to the royal ideology of the Davidic kingship. Divine knowledge was a critical sign of the divine sanction for the everlasting kingship. A striking example comes from Isaiah 11:1-5, the so-called royal oracle (Seitz 1993:96).

A shoot shall come out from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. The spirit of the LORD shall rest on him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the LORD. His delight shall be in the fear of the LORD. He shall not judge by what his eyes see, or decide by what his ears hear; but with righteousness he shall judge the poor, and decide with equity for the meek of the earth; he shall strike the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips he shall kill the wicked. Righteousness shall be the belt around his waist, and faithfulness the belt around his loins.

The text underlines that divine knowledge was given to the Davidic king who ruled with righteousness and faithfulness.¹⁰⁰ The passage has a prophetic connection. Isaiah as the true prophet gave the word of Yahweh to be fulfilled by the Davidic king.¹⁰¹ The divine knowledge of the Davidic king was prophetic in that Isaiah gave it to be fulfilled.

The divine knowledge of the Davidic king is contrasted with the prophetic role of Saul in his kingship. Saul was designated as a prophet (1 Sm 10:10-13) in the course of becoming *nagid* (1 Sm 10:1). But in 1 Samuel 28:15 Saul cried out that he couldn't get any answer from God. In other words, Saul failed to get an answer from God.

¹⁰⁰ Righteousness and faithfulness are well known themes of the royal ideology in the ANE (see 2.2).

¹⁰¹ Nielsen (1989:123-144) suggested that Is 10:33-11:10 can be seen as royal ideology with the image of the tree "between tree-felling and new sprouting."



In Numbers 12:6 Yahweh elucidated how He reveals himself to a prophet. Yahweh revealed himself to a prophet like Aaron in a vision or dream. His revelation implies that a prophet should be empowered by the spirit of Yahweh. If a prophet does not listen to Yahweh, he will mislead the people (Lm 2:14) and deceive them (Jr 2:30; 27:9, 16; 29:8; 37:19).

In 1 Samuel 28:6 the narrator tells that Yahweh didn't answer Saul through dreams or the Urim or the prophets. The nuance is clear that the spirit of Yahweh was no longer with Saul. The departure of the spirit of Yahweh from Saul was obvious (cf Cogan 1995:319). To have the divine knowledge was a characteristic of the true *nabi*. The dttr passage verifies that Saul was not a true *nabi*. The prophetic status of Saul was designed to uncover illegitimacy of his divine sanction of Yahweh.

Sweeney (2005:78-93) argued about criteria for true and false prophets. According to him, the criteria are determined from when and how the prophecies were interpreted. For instance, Isaiah was a true prophet in the historical and political situation during the time of Hezekiah. On the other hand, Isaiah presupposed that the Temple provides the protection of Yahweh for Jerusalem (Sweeney 2005:85). The presumption of Isaiah was challenged by Jeremiah who argued the presence of the Temple couldn't promise protection of Jerusalem in the time of fall of Judah (Sweeney 2005:84). Sweeney (2005:93) pointed out that "the truth of earlier prophetic tradition is relative to the circumstances and means by which it is interpreted and by which it might ultimately be realized." In conclusion, he (Sweeney 2005:93) said that "truth must be recognized as a debated or contingent category, both within the Bible itself and among its interpreters." The prophecy of Isaiah would not be realistic in his own time and even in the time of Jeremiah. However, it was interpreted as true in the New Testament in the messianic conception of Jesus. Sweeney's remark is that the prophet was accepted as true by the early church and in the messianic idea of Jesus.



Nissinen (2004:23) argued that the criterion to judge between true or false prophets is their acceptability by addressees. He (Nissinen 2004:23) spelled out:

The social dynamic of the prophetic process of communication is substantially characterized by the faith-based divine component. The acceptability of prophecy depends on the social acknowledgment of the speaking deity and the prophet; therefore, prophetic communication cannot be just one-way correspondence from a deity to humans but interacts perforce with the social hierarchy and belief systems of any given community.

The contentions of Sweeney (2005:78-93) and Nissinen (2004:23) emphasize that prophesying itself cannot be criterion for true or false prophet but the acceptability by addressees. Their contention convincingly clarifies that Saul was characterized as a false prophet by the Dtr.

3.3.4 Synthesis

The Dtr presented Saul as a truncated king, once he was rejected by Samuel who anointed him (1 Sm 10:1). Samuel was his intermediary who mediated the word of God to him (1 Sm 8 and 12). Their compromised relationship brought other social and religious conflicts that resulted in transfer of the kingship from Saul to David. My proposed conjecture is that Saul associated with the ecstatic prophets of the high place at Gibeah and no longer with Samuel in Ramah.¹⁰² Although the mode of the prophetic practices had been intentionally different between them, the significant distinction between them was their different social religious base: the high place (Saul) versus the

¹⁰² In contrast to the prophetic activities in the relation between Samuel and Saul, the narrator implied that the prophetic aura of Saul originated from uncontrolled and roving prophetic bands. However, it is difficult to identify the prophetic group with whom Saul remained as a roving band. Although their prophesying was ecstatic, it is not a proof that they had no religious base for their prophetic activities (cf Elijah, Elisha, and Ezekiel). They were just a prophetic group among prophetic groups in the time of Samuel and Saul. The concern of the Dtr was Saul's connection with a prophetic group from the high places, not with their manner of prophesying.



sanctuary (Samuel). Saul was a Yahwhist. However, the Dtr didn't validate him as Yahwhist.

In the case of Solomon the relationship of the king with the Temple system is a striking phenomenon.¹⁰³ First, Solomon offered the burnt offering at the high place in Gibeon. Thereafter he received a divine dream in which he acquired the promise of knowledge (1 Ki 2:4-15). This oracle is different from that of the ecstatic prophets. Solomon built the Temple, prayed in front of the altar, and offered multiple sacrifices (1 Ki 8:10, 22, 54). The picture of Solomon is rather one of a priest (cf Grabbe 1995:23), as a priestly king, but not a priest himself, since he had Zadok as priest. However, his kingly priesthood was later accused by the prophets, because his direct access to the altar misled him to bring in foreign gods for his wives (1 Ki 11:1-8).

The main concern of the prophets was to maintain the Yahweh cult rather than to multiply sacrifices as seen in the case of Saul (1Sm 15:22-23). Samuel rebuked Saul in reply to his excuse that he kept the sheep and cattle to sacrifice to Yahweh. 1 Samuel 15:22-23 reads:

And Samuel said, "Has the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Surely, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to heed than the fat of rams. For rebellion is no less a sin than divination, and stubbornness is like iniquity and idolatry. Because you have rejected the word of the LORD, he has also rejected you from being king."

Samuel's reproach emphasized obedience to the word of Yahweh, a constant failure of the kings of Israel (Dt 17:18-20). This also applies to Saul.

¹⁰³ According to 2 Sm 8:18 David had sons who became priests (see Grabbe 1995:22-23). But the phrase is controversial, since it is isolated from the other historical account of David's sons. Further there is no possible evidence for sons of a king who became priests (see Amerding 1975:75-86, Wenham 1975:79-82). In ancient Israel the king had probably the privilege to appoint priests as in the case of Jeroboam (1 Ki 12:31) and to dispel them like Solomon did (1 Ki 2:27). The phrase rather signifies that David had priests who were appointed by him. Thus the relationship between David and the sons was supposedly like that of Elijah and Elisha in 2 Ki 2:12; 13:14.



In the context of the DH, the saying of Samuel is analogous to 2 Kings 23:25 about Josiah:

Before him there was no king like him, who turned to the LORD with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses; nor did any like him arise after him.

The passage emphasizes that Josiah was unique among the kings of 1-2 Kings in keeping the Law of Moses (Leithart 2006:19-20). The broader context elucidates Samuel's intention for the kingship of Saul. True kingship depended on receiving the word of Yahweh through a true prophet.

The Dtr agreed with Samuel that true kingship reveals divine knowledge. Saul's loss of divine knowledge was the critical point in his loss of legitimacy as king of Israel. The kingship of Saul was an attempt to model that of the ANE in terms of royal ideology that emphasized divine sanction on the kingship. The divine sanction of the kingship of Saul was referred to his prophetic appearance. But the lack of divine knowledge of Saul signified that he was a false prophet. As a result, the Dtr attempted to show that the divine sanction of Saul was wrong.