UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

"COME OUT AFTER SAUL AND AFTER SAMUEL!": A CASE FOR TEXUAL ANALYSIS OF 1 SAMUEL 11:1-11

BY

JEONG BONG KIM

SUBMITTED AS PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES

FACULTY OF THEOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

PRETORIA

APRIL 2008

PROMOTER: PROFESSOR D J HUMAN

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Halleluyah! I praise the Lord who has helped me to complete this dissertation. The only hope that I have never given up during my writing this dissertation is that I am in God's plan for His name sake. I am very thankful for His blessings. He is an awesome God!

Above all, my deep thankfulness goes to my family: Mr. Jin Kuk Kim (father), Mrs. Kum Yeo Kim (mother), Rev. Ho Nam (father-in-law), and Mrs. Jung Ja Lee (mother-in-law). Without their love and support this work could not have happened.

This work is the result of many, many people's contributions. Some of those whom I would especially like to thank include: Rev. Soon Heung Jang, a godly couple: Mr Kae Soo Kang and Mrs Soon Ok Han, faithful friends: M. D. Joong Sup Kwak, Mrs. Young Jin Oh, Dr. In-Cheol Shin, and Rev. Jae Soon Kim.

I am also deeply indebted to those churches that provided me with spiritual or financial help: Dae Myong Baptist Church (Daegu, Korea), Shintajin Baptist Church (Daejeon, Korea).

I am especially thankful to my supervisor Prof. D J Human. Wow! He was amazing to guide me to complete this dissertation. His scholarly love and guidance were more profound and insightful than I am able to show in this dissertation.

I am also deeply appreciative of the guidance and encouragements for my professors, Dr. Heung Won Lee (Korea Baptist Theological University), Dr. Gary A Long (Jerusalem University College, Israel), Dr. G Klein (Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Texas). Also I cannot forget to express my thankfulness to the late Prof. Martin J Selman (Spurgeon's

college, London) who gave me insightful thoughts and comments about my study.

Help in correcting my English was enormous in making this work turn out in good shape. I would like to thank retired Prof. Francois S Malan (Pretoria) and associate dean of the Libraries of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Dr. Robert L Phillips.

Lastly, I must express that I am such a blessed man to have a wonderful family: my beloved wife, Dong Mi Nam, and my adored children, David, Deborah, and Elizabeth. Thank you all! I know this work is a result of your love, patience, and support. I love you all!

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	Freedman, D N (ed), *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
ANET	Pritchard, J B (ed), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament (Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn)
ASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BDB	Brown, F & Driver, S R & Briggs, C A (eds). *A Hebrew and English lexicon of the Old Testament.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1907
BI	*Biblical Interpretation*
BZAW	*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alltestamentliche Wissenschaft*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBOTS	Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament Series
CBQMS	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CHANE	Culture and history of the ancient Near East
DH	Deuteronomistic History
Dtr	Deuteronomist
dtr	Deuteronomistic
DtrG	A history writer
DtrN	A nomistic redactor
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GKC	Kautzsch, E (ed). *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Translated by Cowley, A E. 2nd English ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monograph Series
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
KAI	Donner, H & Röllig, W 1962-1964. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
KB	Köhler, L & Baumgartner, L W & Stamm, J J 1966. *The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament*. 4 vols. Richardson, M E J (ed). Leiden: Brill.
KTU	Dietrich, M, Loretz, O & Sanmartín, J 1976. *Die Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit*, 1: *Transkription* (AOAT 24/1). Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag
KTU^2	Dietrich, M, Loretz, O & Sanmartín, J 1995. *The cuneiform alphabetic texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and other places (KTU)*. 2nd ed. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag

LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament studies
MMA	Monographs in Mediterranean Archaeology
NAC	The New American Commentary
NICOT	The New International Commentary on the Old Testament
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
Or	*Orientalia*
OTE	*Old Testament Essays*
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Oudtestamentische Studiën
NRS	New Revised Standard Version
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation (or Monograph) Series
SBEC	Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity
SEÅ	*Svensk exegetisk årsbok*
SHANE	Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East
SOTS	The Society for Old Testament Study
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publication
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen* (Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn)
UMI	University Microfilm International
VE	Verbum et Ecclesia
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus testamentum
WBC	Word Bible Commentary
WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

ABSTRACT

1 Samuel 11:1-11 is royal ideology for the kingship of Saul. The biblical text informs that Saul was divinely sanctioned as leader of Israel. The heroic leadership of Saul was prominent to rescue his people from the imposed national shame by Nahash the Ammonite. The leadership of Saul was endorsed by the spirit of Yahweh. The spirit of Yahweh pinpoints the prophetic connection of Saul with a group of ecstatic prophets from the high place (1 Sm 9). An original textual context for the royal ideology is referred to 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 that provided a prophetic connection with the royal ideology.

1 Samuel 11:1-11 was involved in various textual and historical processes to form the present text and context. Through delicate redactional intentions the biblical text was incorporated in the macro-context of the royal ideology of David. In 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 Saul was anointed as *nagid* by Samuel as the answer for the crying of the people (1 Sm 9:16). The anointing guaranteed a divine sanction for the leadership of Saul (1 Sm 11:1-11). The tradition of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11) idealized the leadership of Saul as a divinely sanctioned kingship after the defeat of the Ammonites (cf 1 Sm 11:15). However, Saul was judged as the rejected and unfaithful king of Israel throughout the Deuteronomistic History (DH). Strikingly, Saul was connected with the evil origin of the kingship in Israel.

The kingship of Saul can be perceived in the background of the ancient Near East (ANE) in terms of royal ideology. A prominent characteristic of the royal ideology in the ANE is to emphasize a divine sanction of the kingship in the ANE. In the ANE the king had to prove his divine sanction for the kingship. The tradition of Saul tells how the kingship of Saul was divinely sanctioned in the perspective of the ANE. On the other hand, the Deuteronomist emphasized the divine sanction of Saul was illegitimate in connection with his

prophetic connection with a group of ecstatic prophets from the high place. Further Saul was characterized as lacking of divine knowledge in the DH.

The research shows that 1 Samuel 11:1-11 is the royal ideology for Saul. The appearance of the kingship of Saul was inevitable in the critical period of the Israelite history. The leadership of Saul was divinely sanctioned in the prophetic manner. Such a prophetic characteristic of Saul was highly welcomed by the people.

It is a comprehensive approach resulting from synthesizing various approaches such as historical critical approaches, new literary approaches, and social scientific approaches. The methodology distinguished embedded historical information in the text from a final redactional intention, that is, theological purpose of the redactor.

Key Words

Royal ideology
The ancient Near East (ANE)
Kingship
The high place (*Bamah*)
Deuteronomist(s)
A group of ecstatic prophets
Redaction
Tradition
Nagid
Saul
Samuel

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

1.2 Research problem

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.3 Aims and objectives

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

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

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

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

1.4 Methodology

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.5 Hypothesis

The hypothesis of the study is that

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

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

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

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

1.6 Outline of chapters

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.7 Terminology and orthography

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER 2
HISTORICAL REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

2.2 Royal ideology

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.2.1 Egypt

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

> Golden Horus: meaning uncertain, in late times related to Horus defeating his enemy Seth;
> Dual King (*nyswt byty*): the 'throne name' and first cartouche name adopted at ascession, expressing the king's relation with the sun god Re;
> Son of Re: second cartouche name, which is the incumbent's birth name, placed after a title that expresses the king's dependence on and tutelage by the sun god; in two periods followed by the 'dynastic' name Ramesses or Ptolemy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.2.2 Mesopotamia

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.2.3 Canaan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

While bandits raid you turn (your) back,
And you entertain feuding rivals.
You have been brought down by your failing power.
You do not judge the cause of the importunate.
You do not banish the extortioners of the poor,
You do not feed the orphan before your face
(nor) the widow behind your back.
(KTU[2]1.16.VI.43-50; cf 1.16.VI.30-34.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

[22] Many scholars discussed the ideology in 1 Sm 8-12 in the context of the Davidic ideology (McCarter 1980a: 489-504; cf Edelman 2000:67-84; Frick 1994:79-92; Liverani 1992:474-77; Ishida 1977:54). One of strong contentions comes from Ishida (1977:54). He argued that initially Samuel was positive and endorsed Saul's kingship, since he hoped to reestablish his authority through the kingship. Samuel's insistence faded on account of the request of the people and the elders for a strong monarchy. The request of the people meant that the political leadership usurped the religious authority of Samuel (Ishida 1977:39). Ishida argued that a strong political motivation played a critical role in the appearance of the monarchy. The political motivation also symbolizes the departure from the old religious system towards politics in Israel. Thus, the new monarchy brought a new religious system in Israel. To Samuel, according to Ishida, the request of the people and the elders signified idolatry (Ahlström 1993:371-390). A different perspective on the biblical text comes from Coote (2006:37). To him, the DH is royal literature that displays the royal sovereignty over states that intentionally propagated a certain social organization. The idea of the twelve tribes reveals the role of social organization under the state sovereignty. Coote (2006:40-47) proposed twelve characteristics of the tribes:

> First, *tribal structures and identities are fluid*.
> Second, *kinship levels . . . also tend to be elastic*.
> Third, *the ambiguity of kinship levels relates directly to the blurring of the boundaries of kinship functions*.
> Fourth, *though territoriality might well be a reflex of endogamy, it is not intrinsic to kinship as a political metaphor*.

2.3 Biblical perspectives on the origin of kingship

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

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

Fifth, *tribal organization and identity tend to be more sharply defined in the higher levels of organization*.
Sixth, *tribal organization took shape not only in relation to other tribes, but also, and especially, in relation to regional powers or states*.
Seven, *tribal designations and relations took shape in the interface of tribe and monarchic court.*
Eighth, *ethnicity does not automatically relate to tribalism in the modern period and there is no reason to think it did in antiquity*.
Ninth, *politics explains descent sooner than descent politics*.
Tenth, *tribalism has no necessary connection with pastoralism or pastoral nomadism*.
Eleventh, *evolutionary views of social development have no place in the description of social change in Palestine from the thirteenth to the fifth centuries B. C. E*.
Twelfth, *to adopt an instrumentalist approach to Israelite tribalism is not to deny the social reality of tribes*.

2.3.1 Source approaches

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.2 Redactional approaches[24]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.3 Tradition-critical approaches

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.4 New literary approaches

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.5 Synthesis

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

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

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

2.4 Aspects of leadership in ancient Israel

2.4.1 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.4.2 The Judges

2.4.2.1 Introduction

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

2.4.2.2 Role of the judge

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

[37] Buber restricted charismatic leadership to the so-called major judges who were differentiated from the so-called minor judges. Charismatic leadership appeared in temporary alliances of tribes for defence against the enemies (Herrmann 1980:131). The distinction between the major judges and the minor judges, according to Alt (1989:171-237), signifies different roles. The latter are judicial leaders while the former are military leaders.

[38] In most cases in Judges the Hebrew verbal root *yāšā* appears in the context of delivering the people (Jdg 2:16; 3:9; 6:14; 8:22; 9:22; 10:12, etc.).

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

2.4.2.3 Amphictyonic theory

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

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

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

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

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

2.4.3 Chieftaincy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.5 Synthesis

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[44] In a similar manner, Flanagan (1981:66) also contended that the period of Saul and David was a chiefdom characterized by religious roles: "As we would expect in chiefdoms, the religious functions mentioned in the biblical narratives also indicate that Saul's and David's reigns were theocracies. Both indiciduals were anointed by Samuel; both performed cultic rites; both used priests and prophets. In short, religion was used by both [Saul, David] to legitimate their authority and to help maintain social control."

[45] Coote (2006:48-49) summarized that traditions of tribal Israel played a central dynamic role in the political situation of Israel to achieve the monarchic sovereignty of Israel. As a result, the idea of twelve tribes is encoded in imaginary forms to support the Davidic sovereignty in Israel. The DH as the product of scribes, according to Coote, is a polemical account for propagating the Davidic sovereignty over Israel, whose original intention is rooted in the early time of the house of David, and supplemented by two earlier editions composed under Hezekiah and Josiah, respectively. The final form of the DH obviously justified the Davidic sovereignty and hoped to restore the sovereignty. It helps to see the role of tradition in the forming of the kingship of Saul.

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

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 prophesized 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" (יַד־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" (יַד־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, וְצָלְחָה, וְהִתְנַבֵּיתָ, and וְנֶהְפַּכְתָּ, 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 coincidently.

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 saying[52] 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(i)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 הִיה ל from יִתָּה לְמָשָׁל. 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 ecstacy

[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 Benjaminite, 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 הָעָם. 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 (הָעָם) gathered on the high place.[56] They were speaking with confidence of telling about the matter.[57] In the verse the people (הָעָם) 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 קְרָאתִי in 1 Samuel 9:24.

Strikingly enough, the Hebrew word, קְרָאתִי 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 prophesized 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 prophesized 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*^{e}*viim* 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 prophecying 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 happening[72]:

> 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 Elish 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 Yahwhism 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. Grottanelli (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 loose 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 compatable

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 Adohijah towards David. Later, in 1 Kings 1:18 Bathsheba pinpointed the unawareness of David (לֹא יָדַעְתָּ) 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 dtr 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.

CHAPTER 4

EXPOSITION OF 1 SAMUEL 11:1-11

4.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses the discussion on understanding the historical and theological value of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 within its macro and micro contexts. The understanding of the biblical text provides a case for a literary analysis that demonstrates the historical significance of the described events in the text in general, the selectivity of traditions in particular, and the perspectives of redactions in the text. The original historical and theological value of the portrayed events in the text will be distinguished in its macro context.

1 Samuel 11:1-11 was originally part of the prophetic tradition of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16, which promulgated the leadership of Saul as kingship.[104] Its original historical and literary value was overshadowed by the Dtr whose aim was to idealize the Davidic kingship in the time of Josiah and later during the exile. Although each redactional activity had its own purpose, the dtr redactions were aimed to idealize the Davidic monarchy that built the Temple in Jerusalem. The two redactional processes developed the prophetic tradition into the form of the narrative as it stands today.[105]

[104] Long (1991:231-232) saw 1 Sm 11 as part of the negative description of the narrative of Saul. He contended that 1 Sm 9 and 10 served as the negative context for the appearance of Saul in 1 Sm 11. The negative context of Saul was highlighted by the appearance of Saul as a judge in 1 Sm 11. Thus, he argued that 1 Sm 11 itself shows that Saul was illegitimatly king of Israel. Long did not see the historical consciousness in the historical materials of the narrative. His literary analysis lacks understanding of the processes of traditionalization and historicization of the event concerning Saul. As to a prophetic connection of 1 Sm 11:1-11, Campbell (2003:118) refused any relation with a prior prophetic commission, although he spelled out the possibility, at least in conjecture. He, however, did not analyze the connection of two prophetic traditions in 1 Samuel (a group of ecstatic prophets in Gibeah and a prophetic group in Ramah) in conflict with which the Dtr suffered in dealing with the tradition of a group of ecstatic prophets. The observation of the prophetic conflicts in 1 Samuel would provide an affimative probability to see a prophetic connection of 1 Sm 11:1-11 with 1 Sm 9:1-10:16.

[105] Green (2003a:1-23) gave an insightful thought for understanding the broader context of 1 Sm: “I posit that 1 Samuel shapes the character of the first king to epitomize Israel’s experience with kings: how kingship came to be, what went awry, how and why failure compounded, and how to move past the discredited royal leadership post exile.” The final Dtr attributed the evil origin of the kingship of Israel to Saul. However, it is hard to persist with the kingship itself was wrong and illegitimate before Yahweh, because the kingship didn’t

The conjecture of this study is that the redacted prophetic tradition about Saul started with the high place at Gibeah[106] during the reign of Saul (cf 1 Sm 10:5, 10; 13:15; 14:14-17; Jdg 7:22-28). The prophetic tradition was transferred to the sanctuary at Bethel by Jeroboam as part of the royal tradition in the northern kingdom. Although there is no specific mention of the attempt to connect the kingship of Jeroboam with that of Saul, it is highly probable that northern Israel claimed its own historical and political identity along the line of the Saulides against Rehoboam (1 Ki 12:16).[107] Later the main political stream of northern Israel came down to Judah after the northern kingdom was destroyed by Assyria.

2 Chronicles 31:6 gives a particular account of the existence of the Israelites as distinguished from the men of Judah in the towns of Judah during the reform of Hezekiah. It recounts that the Israelites participated in the religious reform of Hezekiah by presenting a tithe from their flocks. The phrase is striking in that in the previous phrase (2 Chr 31:5), the Israelites appear in a general sense as the people who obey this commandment to keep the religious order. In 2 Chronicles 31:6 the narrator distinguishes the people as the men of Judah and the Israelites. A possible intension of the distinction in the reform is that the Israelites (v 5) mean the covenant people in general (Selman 1994b:504). Even the letters of Hezekiah sent to "all Israel and Judah" indicate Israel as a whole (2 Chr 30:1). If so, the Israelites in the towns of Judah were still accepted as the covenant people, even after they experienced the fall of Samaria (cf McKenzie 2004:344). The existence of the

---

survive. The Davidic monarchy resulted in the Temple of Jerusalem, the symbol of life of ancient Israel even during the exile (Ezk 6:16-18).

[106] Some other scholars, e. g. Weiser (1962:69) and Hertzberg (1964:91), contended different cultic places such as Mizpah and Gilgal.

[107] The historical consciousness about the political thrust of the emerging northern Israel in relation to Saul against Rehoboam can be appreciated. The criticism of the Israelites on Rehoboam in 1 Kg 12:16 is reminiscent of Saul's challenge to his officials in 1 Sm 22:7, specifically with regard to the son of Jesse. The cases supposedly showed that northern Israel led by Jeroboam inherited the basic concept about Saul against David and his monarchy.

Israelites supposedly provided the religious support to the reform of Josiah directly or indirectly.

The Dtr in the time of Josiah used the redacted prophetic tradition about Saul as a historical source to legitimize the Davidic kingship, in particular the kingship of Josiah (cf Cross 1973:274-89).[108] One of the main purposes of the reform was to demolish the high places (2 Ki 23). The final redaction during the exile was done by the Dtr who was directly responsible for the present shape and placement of traditions in the narrative.[109]

The historical reliability of the events described in 1 Samuel 11:1-11, in general, has been accepted in the critical historical discussion (Alt 1966:183-6; cf Klein 2002:173). Although the unity of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 is recognizable, its connection with the following verses is in dispute (cf Miscall 1986:67-69).

1 Samuel 11:12-14 are generally agreed as dtr addition (Campbell 2003:117-118; McCarter 1980b:205; Birch 1976:60-61; McKenzie 1966:171; cf Miscall 1986:67-69). Birch (1976:60-61; *contra* Long 1989: 224-228; Halpern 1983:201) asserted that the verses originated from old traditions. McCarter (1980b:205) contended a single narrative unit of 1 Samuel 10:27b-11:11. He (McCarter 1980b:205) emphasized that 1 Samuel 10:26-27a and 11:12-15 are "notices about the response to his [Saul's] kingship" (see also Campbell 2003:117-118). The historical narrative (1 Sm 11:1-11) detached itself from 1 Samuel 10:17-27 that was directly connected to 1 Samuel 11:12-14 (Smith

[108] With the recovery of the law in the Temple (2 Ki 22:8-11), the reformists, the high priest Hilkiah, the prophetess Huldah in Jerusalem, and the scribe Shaphan, undertook to purify the Yahweh religion from the Canaanite syncretism in 2 Ki 22-23 (Day 2000:434-437). All three factors in the reform, even including Josiah, originated from Jerusalem. Hilkiah the high priest was the key factor in the reform. He found the book, and stroved for the reform with Josiah. Shaphan the scribe brought Josiah's attention to the book. Huldah the prophetess endorsed the reform with the words of Yahweh. The reform (2 Ki 22-23) evinced that Saul's kingship was illegitimate, since Saul's kingship was deeply connected with the ecstatic prophets on the high place.

[109] Hertzberg (1974:94) contended that the skillfully ordered location of 1 Sm 11:1-11 is intended to evince that "the Lord is with Saul and the doubters are wrong." To Hertzberg the day of the victory was certainly the day of Saul as the deliverer, who led Israel from depths to heights. However, in the context of 1 Sm 8-12, the order is too speculative to devaluate the legitimacy of Saul as king of Israel.

1977:76; Hertzberg 1974:94; cf Campbell 2003:118; *contra* Halpern 1981:59-96).

Hayes and Miller (1977:325) argued that 1 Samuel 11:15 was originally related to verses 1-11, since they viewed the verse to be fully connected contextually as the climax of the event. Verse 15 was related to verses 1-11 in that the savior action of Saul was linked directly to the establishment of the kingship of Israel. Wellhausen (1957:251-253) did suggest that a prophetic connection between 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 1 Samuel 11:1-11, 15 is apparent in terms of the prophecy and fulfillment of the seer.

However, it is a commanding task to perceive that verse 15 results from the perspective of idealized tradition of Saul in a later period. The tradition of Saul's deliverance of Jabesh (Gilead) is presumed as a historical event not only to the people of Israel but also to the prophetic group who held it as a historical event. The idealized understanding of the event could provide the royal ideology with divine sanction (Ahlström 1993:430). 1 Samuel 11:1-11 serves a royal ideology as part of the larger prophetic tradition.

The prophetic tradition idealized the leadership of Saul as sanctioned by God through the prophetic designation (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11). The prophetic tradition focused on the concept of leadership like kingship, and not on the kingship itself. In the tradition the leadership promulgated at the time of Saul was rather like chieftainship, since it could not get any political and religious achievement for the centralization of this leadership. The tradition held that Saul had the legitimacy to centralize his leadership as kingship with the divine sanction of Yahweh (1 Sm 9:16; 11:6-7).

For the prophetic group it was not necessary to elucidate that in Gilgal the people confirmed Saul as king over them (1 Sm 11:15). Miscall (1986:68) stated that "1 Sam. 11:1-11 is a demonstration of Saul's military ability, and that is sufficient." McCarter (1980b:205) acknowledged that "In [1 Sm]

10:27b-11:11 the new king's ability to save is demonstrated." The close literary relation between 1 Samuel 10:17-27 and 1 Samuel 11:12-13 implied that the kingship of Saul was already historicized. The correlation was made within the broad literary context of the Davidic ideology by the Dtr during the exile.

Further, the convocation at Gilgal in 1 Samuel 11:15 is not the same event which was foretold by Samuel to Saul in 1 Samuel 10:8 (Flanagan 1976:21). The designation of Gilgal in 1 Samuel 10:8 is a redactional insertion by the Dtr to legitimize the fall of Saul in 1 Samuel 13. By the same token, the event of Gilgal (1 Sm 11:15) was intended to signify Saul's wrong connection with Gilgal in a broader context (1 Sm 8-15). Verse 15 was added by the Dtr during the exile to provide the context to emphasize that the evil kingship in Israel originated from Saul and not from David (cf 1 Sm 12:12). Thus, this dissertation proposes that 1 Samuel 11:1-11 shows its own historical and literary value in relation to 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16.

4.1.1 Literary issues

A significant textual observation comes from the conversation between Nahash and the elders of Israel. Nahash challenged all Israel (1 Sm 11:2). The elders requested Nahash to let them find a deliverer for them. All Israel and the deliverer were paralleled. The narrator denoted that Nahash did not know any royal figure among the Israelites. Neither did the elders express explicitly whether they could have any help from the king of Israel or not. Rather their expression was ambiguously focused on the term, a deliverer (*mōšīᵃʿ*).

'Deliverer' was the typical term for a judge in the period of judges (Jdg 3:9, 15; 6:36; 12:3). If the elders meant 'a judge,' then the critical question arises why they did not go to Samuel directly. He was a judge who could bring them out of the disaster, if his leadership as the judge was still guaranteed by Yahweh as in 1 Samuel 7:7-14. In the biblical narrative (1 Sm 7:7-14) Samuel

was the central figure in the defeat of the Philistines. According to 1 Samuel 7:15, Samuel judged Israel through his whole life. Samuel's death is only recorded in 1 Samuel 25:1. The death of Samuel came at least after anointing David the successor of Saul, and providing the political and religious background for David to rise against Saul. Thus, in the crisis of Jabesh Gilead they should have turned to Samuel for his military leadership to deliver them from the enemies.

Or if the biblical narrative in 1 Samuel 10:17-27 preceded the event in 1 Samuel 11, which was the chronological intention of the narrator, then why do they not challenge Nahash that they will ask their king to rescue them from Nahash the Ammonite. The conversation between Nahash and the elders showed that Nahash as well as the elders seemingly did not expect any religious or political leader such as Saul or Samuel to save them. Critical questions arise about the presence or absence of Saul and Samuel in the war. The contextual inconsistency poses the textual problem of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 in the macro strucutre of the narrative.

In 1 Samuel 11:1-11 Samuel's role had already been lessened as a political leader, unlike in 1 Samuel 7:7-14. The narrative (1 Sm 7:7-14) is certainly part of prophetic redactional work to present Samuel as the religious and political leader throughout his life time (cf Vriezen & Woude 2005:293-294; Hertzberg 1964:66-67). But why did the Dtr underscore the highly respected role of Samuel? Was it just to emphasize "Judgeship based on the LORD's choice"? (Polzin 1989:79; *contra* Vriezen & Woude 2005:294) The answer could possibly come from the relationship between Saul and David in 1 Samuel 16 to 2 Samuel 1 as part of the royal Davidic ideology. In this ideology Samuel played a crucial role to anoint David as the successor of Saul. He stood as the most faithful religious supporter of David.[110] Unlike the

[110] The literary nature of the narrative, according to Polzin (1989:76), is to reflect a triumphant victory of David over the Philistines in 2 Sm 5:17-25 and 2 Sm 8. McCarter (1980b:150) noticed that the narrative shows an idiosyncratic parallel with the success of David through Samuel, although he disregarded viewing it in its final form as Polzin indicated. If so, the point would suggest that the defeat of the Philistines referred to the emergence of

strong support Samuel gave to David, he criticized Saul, refuted his kingship, and finally proclaimed the message of Yahweh's rejection of Saul as his chosen leader over the Israelites in 1 Samuel 13 and 15. The literary context of 1 Samuel 16 to 2 Samuel 1 suggests that the Dtr contrasted Saul and David under the religious authority of Samuel in order to indicate the reason for the fall of Saul and the rise of David. Their respect for the religious leadership of Samuel was the crucial dividing point between David and Saul. The leadership had a political dimention.

The second question is the existence of Saul's kingship in the time of crisis, since in the previous literary context (1 Sm 9:1-10:16, 17-27) the narrator conveyed the historical consciousness of Saul's kingship. Saul was king of the Israelites, although his real leadership did not look like a king who had absolute authority over his subjects. Thus, a probable implication of this observation is to observe ideological or theological intentions in the narratives.

Another conspicuous textual issue is that although the elders implored, "we may send messengers to all the territory of Israel" (1 Sm 11:3), it seems unlikely that they sent them to all the territory, but rather to Gibeah of Saul only. It is indistinct whether the messengers came to Gibeah of Saul directly or not. It is remarkable that the narrator connected Gibeah to Saul. It implies that Gibeah had already been traditionalized as the city of Saul, and the

---

the monarchy in Israel. The defeat of the Philistines marked the divine sanction of the monarchy. The narrator informed that the Philistines were the most serious enemy to the existence of Israel at the time, as implied in 1 Sm 10:5. The existence of a Philistine outpost in Gibeah of God highlighted how serious the Philistines' threat was to Israel. One further question here is whether Gibeah of God is identical with Gibeah of Saul in 1 Sm 11:4. If Gibeah of God is identified as Gibeah of Saul, how was the kingship of Saul possible with a Philistine post there? Throughout the period of Saul, the Philistines were the prime enemy of Israel (1 Sm 14:52). Even until 1 Sm 11, there was no mention of destroying the Philistine post. Thus, some others attempted to reconstruct the order of the narratives (see Miller 1974:157-174). There are complicated textual problems. Another critical issue is that in the macro-context Saul did not directly relate to the defeat the Philistines, although the narrator gave an explication of Saul's victory against the Philistines in 1 Sm14:47.

narrator connected Gibeah with Saul at the crucial military crisis of Jabesh (Gilead). Gibeah was already indispensable to the tradition of Saul.[111]

The last observable textual issue in the narrative is that the counting of the numbers of Israel as well as of Judah was hyperbolically expressed in 1 Samuel 11:8 (Hertzberg 1964:93): "When he numbered them in Bezek, the Israelites were three hundred thousand, and the men of Judah thirty thousand." If the counting was not from the original historical narrative, then the expression poses a serious question of why and by whom it was given. It consequently leads to the question about the time of the addition of the hyperbolic expression in the narrative. The hyperbolic expression intends at least two things. First of all, it boasts the military leadership of Saul. Up until that time, there was no other military leader who could organize such a successful mobilization. Second, the expression clarified the existence of Judah in the time of a crisis. The narrator emphasized that Judah had allied with Jabesh (Gilead) since they were confronted by the deadly threat of the enemy. As seen in 2 Samuel 2 there was a critical tension between Judah and Israel throughout the emergence of the kingship of David, which exploded after the death of Solomon (1 Ki 12). In fact the context of the narrative shows that the territory of Saul's monarchy only covered Benjamin, Ephraim, and Jabesh (Gilead). It is thus legitimate to say that the hyperbolic expression was added later by the redactor for specific purposes, probably for religious as well as political reasons.

All these textual issues should be addressed in order to decide whether Saul was a judge or a king in 1 Samuel 11:1-11. The issues appear in a better perspective once we see them in the broader context of the exchange between *melek*, *nagid,* and *mōšīª'*.

[111] The correlation of Saul with Gibeah is analogous with Ramah of Samuel as well as Jerusalem of David (2 Sm 5:7). In the cases of Gibeah and Ramah the cities belonged to the territory of the Israelites. Of Jerusalem, however, a different historical situation is involved as David captured it for his capital and later it became the religious center of the national sanctuary.

- The people requested a king (*melek*) (1 Sm 8:5).
- Samuel anointed the king as a military leader (*nagid*) (1 Sm 10:1).
- The people acclaimed Saul as king (*melek*) but Samuel announced him as chosen by Yahweh (1 Sm 10:24).
- The elders of Jabesh (Gilead) implore to have a chance to find a deliverer (*mōśīª'*) (1 Sm 11:3).
- All the people made Saul king of Israel (*wayyiyamlikû*; see 1 Sm 11:15).

This synopsis poses the following critical questions: if Saul's kingship is denied in 1 Samuel 11:1-11, how can the current place of the text in 1 Samuel 8-12 be explained? How can Saul be crowned king of Israel right after repelling the threat of Ammonites where he played the role of a judge? These questions have to be dealt with in the textual analysis.

4.1.2 Historical issues

The text (1 Sm 11:1-1) displays a great military exploit of Saul that led to the acclamation of him as king of Israel (cf 1 Sm 11:15). The conflict arose with the attack of Nahash, the Ammonite, against Jabesh (Gilead). It was dreadful to the people of Jabesh. They attempted to make a treaty with the attacker Nahash. Soon they realized that they could not make a treaty with him. The elders of the people appeared to confront the deadly crisis against Nahash, the Ammonite. Saul was regarded as the deliverer of Jabesh, and ultimately of Israel (1 Sm 11:2, 8).

The text does not report on the historical circumstances involved in the confrontation. According to 1 Samuel 11:2 Nahash aimed to humiliate all the Israelites. As his confrontation was intended against all the Israelites, he would not have granted a treaty to Jabesh. The historical issue involved is to recognize Nahash as king of the Ammonites. The historical consciousness in the text revealed that the leadership of Nahash was like a kingship. The

Ammonites had already established a monarchy. In 1 Samuel 11:1 the narrator implied that Nahash represented the kingdom of the Ammonites (cf 4QSam^{a}). In contrast, the narrator declared that Jabesh Gilead did not have any single political leader among them. They were dependent on other tribes. Initially it appeared as if the Gileadites had the right to make a political treaty that signified them as a member of a loosely connected tribal league of Israel. The question is why the historical circumstance explicated the leadership of Saul over them as a kingship. The question is what kind of leadership he had among them.

In 1 Samuel 9 Saul appeared as a result of the oracle of Yahweh to Samuel. Consequently Saul was secretly anointed as *nagid* by the seer (1 Sm 10:1). Samuel confirmed his secret anointing with the prophecy that Saul would encounter a group of ecstatic prophets, and start prophesying with them. As a result, Saul became another man! Now Nahash, the Ammonite, started a military campaign against Jabesh (Gilead). Then Saul was empowered by the "spirit of God" as prophesied by Samuel in 10:7 (the "spirit of Yahweh"). The campaign brought public acclamation for Saul, to recognize him a king of Israel. Thus, it can be understood why no one in the tradition expressly recognized Saul as king. Therefore, scholars confirmed the logical flow in the historical account that described Saul as a savior-judge of Judges 3-12 (Foresti 1984:158).

Another historical understanding of the kingship is challenged by the idea of the judgeship of Saul. How could Saul muster the people without being acclaimed as king? Scholars (Halpern 1981:65-67; Gordon 1986:122) connected 1 Samuel 11 with 1 Samuel 10:17-27 to explain that Saul showed his authority as king by mustering the people in 1 Samuel 11. According to 1 Samuel 10:17-27, it is hard to say that the authority originated from public acclamation, since there is no explicit mention of Saul's kingship in 1 Samuel 11:1-11. It rather came from Saul's self confidence as result of his kingship. It is further guaranteed by the encounter with the spirit of God and prophesied

by Samuel. Saul appeared after the prophecy of Samuel to become another man as *nagid* of Israel (cf 1Sm 10:9-13, 15).

Ahlström (1993:446-447) contended somewhat differently that 1 Samuel 11 witnessed the historical conflict between the kingdom of Saul and the Ammonites. He viewed the leadership of Saul in the text as a kingship where the dependence of Jabesh-Gilead on Saul depicted the relationship between a suzerain and a vassal. He argued that the judge-like appearance of Saul was intended to minimize Saul's status as the first king of Israel in order to honor David. Perhaps the form of the kingship of Saul, Ahlström contended, is the description of kingship of the recording of the event at a later date. Therefore the time of the event differs from the time of its recording, where the conception of kingship in the later time is used to portray the earlier leadership role of Saul.

4.1.3 Literary setting

1 Samuel 11:1-11 serves as an essential narrative about the beginning of the monarchy of Israel, since the result of the event led to the monarchy of Saul (cf 1 Sm 11:15). The narrative suggests that the leadership of Saul originated from the spirit of God. In the narrative, Gibeah of Saul was focused on to resolve the conflict of Jabesh (Gilead) as well as to introduce Saul's leadership. The divine confirmation of Saul's leadership departed from the decision to choose a king for Israel in 1 Samuel 10:17-27. In this narrative Saul was chosen as a king by lot. In the scene, he was reluctant to be publicly exposed.

Obviously these two narratives do not agree about the appearance of the king. In 1 Samuel 10 the role of Samuel is strikingly dominant in the choice of Saul as king of Israel. The divine lot sanctioned the kingship of Saul. 1 Samuel 10:17-27 differs from 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 in that 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 introduced Saul as the result of the people's cry to Yahweh for a king. 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 focused to introduce Saul in a prophetic aura. The

narratives presume that each has its own literary setting. The further question is to see the possible literary connection between 1 Samuel 11:1-11 and 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16, since the narratives exhibit the pattern of prophecy and its fulfillment. The prophetic connection calls for an examination of the macro context for a proper locus of the prophetic tradition (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11).

According to the biblical narrative (1 Sm 1-15), Eli, Samuel, and Saul attempted to create a hereditary leadership in Israel, which was a critical aspect of kingship. In their attempts they based their religious and political power at certain regional places.

Eli, the powerful priest with dominant political power in Israel, resided and ruled Israel from Shiloh, the central cultic place at that time (1 Sm 1:9). He attempted to transfer his authority to his sons (1 Sm 2:12-17). It was attempt to establish a hereditary judgeship based on the religious authority of his sons turned out to be a failure (1 Sm 4:11). At the same time Samuel began to gain public recognition and support to establish his religious and political rule (1 Sm 3:19-20).

When he successfully established his leadership in Ramah, Samuel desired to transfer his leadership to his sons in Beersheba (1 Sm 8:2). This attempt was refuted by the request of the elders for a king of Israel (1 Sm 8:5). The biblical account elicited uncertainty whether the sons of Samuel, judged in Beersheba or not (Davies & Rogerson 2005:68), since it is not certain that the authority of Samuel reached as far as that southern area (cf Campbell 2003:97; Robinson 1993:51; Klein 1983:75; *contra* Baldwin 1988:84; Birch 1976:28-29). It can be doubted that a loosely connected tribal confederacy had a close and strong political relationship with Judah (Davies & Rogerson 2005:67-68). Beersheba was introduced in a formulaic phrase with Dan to express ‘all Israel’ (cf 2 Sm 24:2; 2 Chr 30:5; 1 Chr 21:2; 2 Chr 30:5; Am

8:14).[112] The formulaic territory from Dan (the northern frontier) to Beersheba (the southern border) is the result of an idealized territory of Israel since the time of Hezekiah, supposedly formed in the time of Josiah[113] (Cf Herzog 2006:92; *contra* Block 1999:31). In conjecture, the account propagated the territory of the Davidic kingship. The point is that 1 Samuel 8 tends to idealize the Davidic kingship, while not refuting a general kingship of Israel.

1 Samuel 1-15 reports that in the time of Eli and Samuel there were constant attempts to establish firm leadership based on the religious power from the priestly perspective. These attempts, however, turned out to be a failure. Since then, the people thought that a king would give sanction to their political and economic life. Unlike Eli and Samuel, Saul showed up in the course of history. His encounter with the group of the ecstatic prophets provided legitimacy to Saul's place at Gibeah as the political and religious center. A group of such prophets ardently persisted in Yahwism which brought them severe persecution by Jezebel in the time of Ahab (cf 1 Kg 18:4, 13; see also Jensen 2006: 44-47). 1 Samuel 8 to 31 does refer to the emergence of Yahwism in the reign of Saul.

Deuteronomy 18:9-22 states that Yahweh raised up a prophet for Israel. Yahweh raises a prophet among his own people to speak in the name of Yahweh. If what the prophet says would happen, it will prove him a true

[112] Japhet (1993:940) observed a close relationship between the geographical phrase, from Dan to Beersheba (cf 2 Sm 24:2) and the ethnic term, 'all Israel,' in representing the whole as shown in 2 Ch 30:10-11, 18. However, verses of 10-11, 18 of 2 Chr 30 indicate the limited area of Israel, as northern Israel. Polzin (1993:209) contended that Beersheba signifies 'totality and completion' like seven in a numerical sense in 2 Sm 24:2. McKenzie (2004:343-344) suggested that the phrase reflects an ideal of the Chronicler, since he saw the idea of observing the Passover as a national and centralized feast in Jerusalem during the reign of Hezekiah as an anachronism (cf Ex 12). Block (1999:31), however, argued that the phrase originated from the early monarchical period, since he saw that the phrase only appears in the early kingdom. In 1 Ch 21:2 the formulaic phrase shows a reversed direction from Beersheba to Dan. Klein (2006:419) agreed that the reversed expression shows a preference of the Chronicler for the south (Judah) over the north. Thus, it is legitimate to contend that the phrase is formulated in the late monarchy, during the period of Josiah.

[113] Herzog (2006:87) contended that ecological considerations in archaeology prove "the area of the Beersheba Valley only identified as Judeans after the region was incorporated into the kingdom of Judah," that is, around the time of Hezekiah.

prophet. There will be false prophets to whose words Israel should not pay attention to.

Deuteronomy 18:9-22, according to Isbell (2002:99), echoed a monarchical background, “an era in which the prophetic office had already become established in Israel as authentic.” If so, the distinctive description of the true prophets is seen in contrast with the false ones in the context of the monarchy of Israel. Certain phrases indicated how the priestly redactor of 1 Samuel 11 criticized the prophetic activities of Saul. According to 1 Samuel 10:10-13, Saul was an ecstatic prophet among the prophetic group from the high place. His prophetic status was reported in a saying of the people as a prophet (1 Sm 19:24). In fact, he was obliged to show his royal knowledge to the people.

The prophetic standard (Dt 18:9-22) gives a partial answer to why Saul did not receive an answer from the prophets. Supposedly, Saul asked the false prophets. He himself showed up as a false prophet who could not get an answer from God.

Deuteronomy 18:9-22 states two criteria to identify false prophets. They speak in the name of other gods (Dt 8:20a), and what they predict fails to happen (Dt 8:22). The criteria are somehow ambiguous in the light of the story of the necromancer of Endor, since her prophecy about Saul’s death came true. The woman cautiously agreed to help Saul. In 1 Samuel 28:9 the woman indicated that what the disguised Saul asked from her is closely related to the practices of the mediums and spirits whom Saul attempted to demolish. She reasoned that she could do it for him, if Saul would not know of it (1 Sm 28:9). Her fear was calmed by the disguised Saul’s swearing in the name of Yahweh. The description of 1 Samuel 28:9 implies that she relied on Yahweh; however her way of practicing in mediums was rejected. The issue is seemingly not the identity of the woman as a necromancer but on her way of practicing necromancer. The ambiguity of the criteria for false

prophets in relation to the story of the necromancer of Endor led to the conjecture that the story is a pre-dtr account (cf Humphreys 1980:74-87).

The biblical narratives of 1 Samuel 8 to 31 imply certain prophetic activities during the time of Saul. These prophetic accounts differ from Samuel's model of prophetic activity for the Dtr. It partially explains the Dtr's negative judgment of Saul as a king, although the Dtr was not an anti-monarchist.

4.1.4 Historical setting

Historically the time of Saul was the opportune moment to establish the kingship (Gabriel 2003:189).[114] Syro-Palestine was free from any other political powers in the early first millennium, since no great powers existed to influence the region (Barton & Bowden 2004:135). The regional rulers could form states without being involved in any political threat from outside (Barton & Bowden 2004:135).

The period of Saul (1030-1010 BCE) in ancient Israel was therefore a transition "between the loosely organized tribes during the time of the tribal leaders, and that of the more effective united people under King David and King Solomon" (Nigosian 2004:92). It is obvious that Saul did not attempt to build a national cultic shrine according to the tradition of Saul. His indifference or inability of building such a temple reflects that his leadership was not fully institutionalized. In the ANE temple building was an essential factor to institutionalize a leadership into a kingship in a state (Schniedewind 1999:26). The historical situation of Saul indicates that Saul was a transitional figure "between the charismatic judges and the later institutionalized royalty" (Davison & Steussy 2003:101).

[114] Gabriel (2003:189) summarized the historical circumstance of Saul's period as follows: "The Hittite Empire had disappeared completely, destroyed by foreign invasion, famine, and migration. Babylon was now subject to Assyria, while Assyria itself was only beginning its rise to the status of a world power. For the time, however, Assyria's commercial and security interests were satisfied by its attention to Syria and Lebanon. It wasn't until the middle of the ninth century BCE. that any Assyrian king would be concerned with events in Palestine. During Saul's time, the fates of the Israelites and Philistines were completely in their own hands without any threat of outside interference by the great powers." As Gabriel clarified, the political context of the ANE was favorable for Israel to build the kingship.

This chapter presents a proper textual analysis that involves a comprehensive discussion of the text (1 Sm 11:1-11). The comprehensive discussion starts with the issue of textual traditions, which is not insignificant in the understanding of historical and literary issues. Next the text will be investigated in terms of the theologized history in the narrative. Then, the terms *nagid* and *melek* will be discussed in detail in an excursus, since the two terms repeatedly appear interchangbly in the macro-context of the text. The question is how the different terms can appear together in the same context with the same role. In this way the discussion will produce a better understanding of the context as well as the meaning of the terms. In the main section, the detailed textual analysis follows to understand the text as part of the theologized history in the narrative.

4.2 Narrative as macro structure

4.2.1 Introduction

The logical sequence of the narrative of Israel's kingship is the following: It explains first its necessity for the religion and cult connected to it (Jdg 17-21), and secondly for its political life (1 Sm 1-7); third the narrative describes the failure of Saul's kingship (1 Sm 8-12), whereafter the indispensable emergence of legitimate kingship in David (1 Sm 13-2 Sm 1) is portrayed.[115]

The narratives as theologized history reveal that they were composed from various literary traditions. Traditionally all three narrative blocks were different

[115] Edelman (1991:14) viewed 1 Sm 8-2 Sm 1 as the narrative of Saul. She (Edelman 1991:14) contended that the chapters were intentionally used by the biblical writer "within a larger account of Israel's relationship to its god Yahweh through time." She explained that Jdg 17-21 and 1 Sm 1-7 could not be part of the narrative of Saul. Her contention, however, is not consistent on the relationship between Yahweh and His people Israel in terms of the necessity of the kingship. Green (2003b:xxii) contended that Saul was the answer to guide the community that just returned from exile in the 6th century BCE. Her analysis of the characterization of Saul covers 1 Sm 1 to 2 Sm 1. She (Green 2003b:xxii) considered the story of Saul as "the story of the request for a king, the repudiation of that asking, the king's demurral and then his determination." I agree with her basic understanding of the historical circumstances of the story in terms of the final redaction. However, I do not concede to see the hope of the community in the Davidic monarchy, since their hope had two dimensions, the religious renewal (Jdg 17-21) and the political sovereignty (1Sm 1-7).

compositions (cf McCarter 1980a:489-504): Judges 17-21 is the epilogue to the book of Judges; 1 Samuel 4:1b-7:1 (including 1 Sm 2 or 2 Sm 6) is the oldest narrative in this section; 1 Samuel 16-2 Samuel 5 was added on the story of David's rise.[116] This research accepts the idea of various compositional sources and traditions of which the narrative is composed of, but the focus is on the reasons why the materials were inserted in one composed block.

4.2.2 Necessity of kingship (Jdg 17-21)

An outstanding expression on the necessity of the kingship in Israel is "In those days Israel had no kings; everyone did as he saw fit" (Jdg 17:6; 21:25; cf Jdg 18:1; 19:1). The phrase characterizes the distinction of this narrative from the rest of Judges. The rest of Judges (Jdg 1-16) narrates the cycle of Israel's sin, its punishment by Yahweh, and the deliverance from the enemies by a savior raised by Yahweh (Jdg 2:11-18). Obviously, the formulaic cycle cannot be applied in this narrative (Jdg 17-21). No specific judgment of any cultic sin of Israel against Yahweh is mentioned in Judges 17-21. Neither is there punishment by Yahweh, nor deliverance by a savior. It narrates the society's disordering and inter-tribal conflicts. Therefore, the Dtr explained that the reason for this disorder and conflict was the absence mark of a king.[117] The narrative reveals a different perspective on the period of the Judges, and promotes the necessity of the monarchy in Israel.

[116] See Dietrich and Naumann (2000:277-318) on the compositional relationship between the so-called story of the rise of David and the so-called succession narrative (2 Sm 10-20 and 1 Ki 1-2). Dietrich and Naumann explained the so-called story of the rise of David as additional layers to the Succession narrative.

[117] Yee (2007:138-160) contended that Jdg 17-21 as a unit was written to support the Josianic religious reform and his powerful kingship. Yee (2007:151-152) observed that Jdg 17-21 focus to depict the rural Levites negatively. Brettler (2002:83:84) rejected the argument of the unity of Jdg 17-21. Particularly, Brettler (2002:84-91) saw that Jdg 19 is "a very learned text, full of allusions to other biblical texts [Gn 19; 1 Sm 11:7]" and a literary product of the post-exilic period. Brettler (2002:80-81) further contended that Jdg 17-21 is not an appendix but is integrated into the book of Judges. As Brettler (2002:80-81) indicated, judges are absent in Jdg 17-21 and the chapters are connected with the phrase, "In those days Israel had no kings; everyone did as he saw fit." Thus, whether or not the date of the composition of the chapters is obscure, it is legitimate to say that the chapters are highlighting the necessity of the kingship in Israel.

The narrative used two traditions. The one tradition is present in Judges 17-18 and the other in Judges 19-21. The latter one deals with the inter-tribal wars between the Benjaminites and the rest of all Israel. The former tells of the Danites' conquering of Laish. The two independent traditions came together to propagate the kingship of Israel. The intention of the Dtr is apparent in the phrase of the royal ideology that "there was no king" as well as in the phrase of pan-Israel to signify the twelve tribes (Jdg 19:29) and the ideal territory for Israel from Dan to Beersheba (Jdg 20:1).

The phrase of the royal ideology (Jdg 17:6; 21:25; cf Jdg 18:1; 19:1) condemned the fabrication of priestly objects and the appointing of a priest as not comparable with the Temple of Jerusalem. The phrase reflects the situation of the Israelites in exile without the Temple and a king. Everything was happening without any control of the Temple and the king, the two centers of their society in their religious and political life. Thus, a focus of the Dtr for the people in the exile was to emphasize the need to return to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem and to reestablish the kingship of David whose house built the Temple.

In Judges 17-18, a Levite from Bethlehem is identified (Jdg 17:7). The home of the Levites was identical with that of David (1 Sm 16:1) but they fulfill contrasting roles in the different places. The Levite led the Danites into wrong cultic observations (Jdg 18:31) while David later prepared for the building of the Temple of Jerusalem by his son Solomon (1 Chr 22:2-5). The focus of the tradition (Jdg 17-18) itself was not to idealize the Davidic kingship, but on rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem. The dtr redaction implies who the Dtr probable is. He was certainly not a Levite, but a Zadokite. The Zadokite Dtr emphasized that eventually the divine favor of Yahweh would rest on Israel again. Apparently, Judges 17 charged the unknown Levites for bringing false cultic practices for Yahweh among the families of Ephraim and Dan.

In Judges 19-21 there appeared an unknown Levite from Ephraim who brought a terrible disaster, not only on the Benjaminites, but also on the rest of Israel. The focus of the tradition (Jdg 19-21) is on the false role of the Levite in the story. He did not act according to the law as expected from a Levite (cf Lv 21:1-15). The Levite let his woman die among the people of Gibeah to save his own life. He summoned Israel by cruelly cutting her corpse into twelve pieces. The act of the Levite to cut his woman implied his skill in slaughtering sacrifices. The narrator contrasted his skill in ritual performance to his ethical and religious integrity as a priest. His summons to the Benjamites united all the Israelites, although there was a tribe that did not show up. It suggested the unity of Israel with the exception of Benjamin and the people of Jabesh in Gilead. This implicated Saul's origin and his kingship (cf 1 Sm 11). The Dtr conspicuously emphasized the wrong origin of the kingship of Saul. A historical implication of the tradition noted the regret of the Israelites after they nearly destroyed one of their tribes.[118] The narrative reveals the importance of the consolidation of Israel. Consequently the Dtr propagated the rise of the Davidic kingship as lawful, since this kingship united the Israelites, an aim in which the kingship of Saul failed.

The Dtr was specifically concerned with the Davidic kingship. The main purpose of the narrative is therefore not to devaluate the kingship of Saul (*contra* Amit 2000:182-187) but to highlight the Davidic kingship in terms of the royal ideology, which is specifically based on the Temple of Jerusalem. With his critique of the Levites in these two discrete narratives (Jdg 17-18; 19-21), the Dtr probably foreshadowed the fall of the family of Eli in Shiloh (1 Sm 2:27-36). Consequently the family link led to Ahijah, the priest of Saul (1 Sm 14:3).

[118] Miller (2005:118) pointed out that Ai and Khirbet Raddanah had experienced overcrowded population around 1150 BCE. He conjectured that the destruction of Gibeah and Bethel would be the possible reason. However, he stated that there exists no archeological evidence for the relation between the overcrowded population and the destruction. "There may be no connection at all between 1125 BCE and Judges 20, but the possible connection is worth musing upon" (Miller 2005:118).

1 Chronicles 9:10-13 allotted direct control of the Temple to the Zadokites, while the Levites played a subsidiary role in the Temple (1 Chr 9:14-34). The subsidiary role of the Levites in the Temple probably originated from their incorporation into the system of the Temple from their high places during the reform of Josiah (2 Ki 23:8). Although there is no further direct biblical evidence that they were associated with practices on the high places, there is a strong probability that the Levites supported Saul with the ecstatic prophetic groups from the high places. This implication suggests that two religious groups belonged to the royal party of Saul, namely the Levites and the group of ecstatic prophets from the high places.

The Dtr collected and used a tradition of the Benjaminites that had already been traditionalized as historical account and which a later generation accepted as an event that really happened among their fathers. The Dtr used it, not just to devaluate Saul as king, but to accentuate the kingship of David. It is not a royal apology, but a royal ideology.[119] Thus, the Dtr hoped for the rebuilding in the Temple of Jerusalem with the Davidic kingship.

The historical settings of the two traditions (Jdg 17-18; 19-21) cannot be described as a literary invention. On the one hand, the traditions have their own historical setting and claim in the period of the Judges. On the other hand, they were redacted later on to propagate the royal ideology of the Davidic kingship. Judges 17-21 is not the epilogue of Judges, but the prologue of the ideology of the Davidic kingship from 1 Samuel to 2 Samuel 1

[119] Unlike the contention here, McCarter (1980a:489-504) argued that the "so-called history of David's rise" is a royal apology. His contention is based on the analogy of the Hittites, on the apology of Hattushilish III. He viewed certain compositional apologetic features, specifically based on thematic analysis. First of all, he defined that "Apologetic literature by its very nature assumes a defensive attitude toward its subject matter, addressing itself to issues exposed to actual or possible public censure." He proposed seven charges against David: (1) "David sought to advance himself at court at Saul's expense." (2) "David was a deserter." (3) "David was an outlaw." (4) "David was a Philistine mercenary." (5) "David was implicated in Saul' death." (6) "David was implicated in Abner's death." (7) "David was implicated in Ishbaal's death." Therefore, McCarter (1980a:502) proposed David's own time as the compositional date for the apology of David. His contention, however, does not fit in the compositional issue of the whole story of David, not just for the so-called story of David, but also for the tradition of Saul as well as the prologue of the whole Davidic ideology which propagated his kingship at the reform of Josiah as proposed in this research.

(cf Yee 1995:146-170; Soggin 1989:210; *contra* Mayes 2001:241-258). Overall, Judges 17-21 motivates the necessity of the kingship in Israel (Davison & Steussy 2003:103).

4.2.3 Political perspective on kingship (1 Sm 1-7)

A major literary thrust of 1 Samuel 1-7 appears to contrast Eli and Samuel. The fall of the family of Eli as the priest in Shiloh is juxtaposed with the rise of Samuel as the leader of Israel, as a priest (cf 1 Sm 2:18), a prophet (1 Sm 3:20), and a judge (1 Sm 7:5, 15). In the narrative, the rise of Samuel is contrasted with the wrongdoings of Eli's sons as priests. The word of God came to Eli through a man of God (1 Sm 2:27). This man of God referred to the event of the Exodus to remind Eli of how God showed favor to his family. Although the judgment is on the family of Eli, it is analogous with the sermon of Samuel (1 Sm 8 and 12) where Samuel warned the people that they will be in jeopardy of their chosen kingship. In both cases, Yahweh was disrespected by Eli (1Sm 2:29) and the people (1 Sm 8:8; 12:12). In 1 Samuel 2:10 the Dtr emphasized that Yahweh would give his strength to the king, his anointed. However Yahweh would destroy anyone who stands against Him (Saul). Yahweh promised that He would be with his anointed king (the Davidic king). The Dtr did not hesitate to refer to the legitimacy of the Davidic kingship (1 Sm 2:10). The Dtr showed that the divine origin of the Davidic kingship coincided with the rise of Samuel. The rise of Samuel was closely related to the fall of Eli (1 Sm 2:35).

Eli did not understand who the caller of Samuel was until Samuel awakened him the third time in the middle of the night (1 Sm 3:5, 6, 8). The scene hinted at Eli's unduly eyes (1 Sm 3:2). Sasson (2004:175) reminded that Eli's physical eyesight was not too weak to scrutinize Hannah's lips (1 Sm 1:12). Sasson (2004:187) concluded that the deteriorating eyesight of Eli symbolized Eli's loss of capacity to focus on God and to serve Him. Consequently, the family of Eli did not protect the people of Israel from the threat of the Philistines, which eventually led to the Philistines' capture of the

ark of God (1 Sm 4:11). The defeat of the Israelites by the Philistines was apparently contrasted with the description that Samuel led the people to defeat the Philistines (1 Sm 7). Analogously Saul could not defeat the Philistines in that time, but he was killed in the war with the Philistines (1 Sm 31) just like the sons of Eli were killed (1 Sm 4:11). Like David, Samuel (1 Sm 7) successfully defeated the Philistines in his life time (2 Sm 5:25; 8:1). The rest of the family of Eli suffered an early death with Saul (cf Klein 1983:135; see 1 Sm 14:3; 21:2-10), whereas David and Samuel were prosperous.

4.2.4 Evil origin of the kingship of Saul (1 Sm 8-12)

The literary framework that encompasses the tradition of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11) was skillfully enveloped by the dtr passages of Samuel, 1 Samuel 8 and 12 (Cartledge 2001:110; Klein 1983:74; 112-114; cf Campbell 2003:85-90). In the final narrative (1 Sm 8-12) the distinctive theological thrust is that the kingship of Saul originated from the evil demand of the people. Samuel apparently warned about the evil nature of the kingship (1 Sm 8:10-18). His farewell speech (1 Sm 12) denounced the kingship of Saul as evil because it disregarded the kingship of Yahweh over Israel. It struck the Dtr that the attack of Nahash, the Ammonite, caused the kingship of Israel to arise (1 Sm 11). The theological implication of the Dtr indicated that the emergence of the kingship was the threat of the Philistines (1 Sm 9:16). The aim of the narrative is to emphasize the evil origin of the kingship of Saul and the wrong motivation of the people to ask for a king.

In 1 Samuel 8:10-18 the narrator warns certain disadvantages of the kingship in the speech of Samuel. The end of the warning is striking in that the people will suffer from the king that they choose. Furthermore, they cannot get an answer from God for the relief from the king.

In 1 Samuel 8 and 12 the narrator showed two perspectives on the kingship. He acknowledged the necessity of the kingship for Israel as inescapable (1 Sm 8:22; 12:14). But he also criticized the kingship (1 Sm 8:6; 12:17).

When the Dtr experienced the exile, he identified the evil origin of the kingship. He looked back to Saul as the most striking threat to the Davidic kingship (1 Sm 18-24; 26-27). Saul should have defeated the Philistines, not the Ammonites (cf 1 Sm 11:1-11; 12:12).[120] The people acclaimed Saul as king because they saw his charismatic leadership in the defeat of the Ammonites (1 Sm 11:15). Saul as king of Israel had to prove his power against the enemies. His anointment as king was the most striking feature of his divine sanction which distinguished him from his predecessors, the judges. Although he may appear like a judge, he was involved in a different political and historical context. The role of Saul (1 Sm 11) shows that his leadership was that of a king.

The Dtr, however, portrayed that Saul's leadership did not guarantee freedom from the Philistines. Ironically in front of the people of Israel, Saul was rejected in his war with the Philistines (1 Sm 13). The Dtr linked Saul's incapability to defeat the Philistines with the evil of his kingship. On the other hand the Dtr advanced the kingship of David. The historical narrative of 1 Samuel 8-12 aimed at featuring the legitimate kingship of David.

4.2.5 Necessity for renewal of kingship in David (1 Sm 13-2 Sm 1)

The risky foundation of Saul's kingship was confronted with a critical moment in 1 Samuel 13 when he fought the Philistines. He lost the favor of Samuel and the divine favor of Yahweh that exemplified Saul's unqualification of a king (Cartledge 2001:171). Saul was not faithful to Samuel and to Yahweh to

[120] Long (1994:271-284; 1989: 52-55) contended that the initial commission of Samuel to Saul to go the hill of God (1 Sm 10:5) meant to give him a hint that the repelling of the Philistines was his primary task as *nagid*. Arnold (1990:40-42) noted that the hill of God was identical with Gibeah. He contended that the command referred to the commission of Saul to assassinate the governor of the Philistines. However, unlike his understanding, the hill of God rather specified where Saul had to go. The place was limited by the relative pronoun (אֲשֶׁר) that specified where Saul would meet a group of ecstatic prophets coming down from the high place. The indication specified the place where Saul would meet the ecstatic prophetic groups who come down from the high place. Saul should perform prophesying to acquire the status of a prophet among the prophetic group. The scene is connected to the empowerment of the spirit of the Lord (1 Sm 11:7).

maintain the model of kingship held up by Samuel (McCarter 1980b:229-230; cf Campbell 2003:138). He broke away from the cultic and religious leadership of Samuel and from Yahweh. Arguably he attempted to bring the cultic and the religious leadership on him from Samuel (cf Grottanelli 1999:91-92, 100). Samuel could not tolerate the attempt of Saul with the result that he considered it to be evil, not only from the political side but also from the religious position.

The narrative block of 1 Samuel 13-2 Samuel 1 started with Samuel's rebuke (1 Sm 13) which was substantiated in 1 Samuel 15, where Saul again transgressed the command of Samuel which is part of the covenant with Yahweh (1 Sm 15:18-19). At the end Saul failed to sustain his kingship, and lost his heart for Yahweh in his last combat with the Philistines (1 Sm 31).

In the narrative Saul's lack of royal wisdom is conspicuous throughout his life. This confirmed his illegitimacy as a king. Even in his critical moment (1 Sm 13:10) Saul displayed his ignorance of what he had done, until Samuel rebuked him. In 1 Samuel 14:18, Saul asked Ahijah the priest to bring the ark of God and to ask God what he had to do while Jonathan was winning over the Philistines. The situation is reminiscent of the event in 1 Samuel 4 where the Israelites were defeated and the ark of God, which they hoped would bring victory, was taken by the Philistines. Although the Dtr did not indicate the aim of bringing the ark (1 Sm 4), Saul also probably thought that it might bring a victory against the Philistines (1 Sm 14:18), as the people thought in 1 Samuel 4. Neither of the parties asked God about the war nor did they bring a sacrifice to God. In 1 Samuel 14:35, the Dtr says that Saul built an altar for Yahweh with the implied intention to show that Saul worshipped Yahweh at an improper moment in the middle of the war. The historical consciousness of the event, however, was that Saul sought divine favor for the victory.

After being rejected by Samuel (1 Sm 15) Saul struggled to survive, while his kingship had already been transferred to David. David appeared as Yahweh's chosen and anointed king (1 Sm 16). To propagate David's charisma the Dtr placed the theologized account out of order in 1 Samuel 17.[121] Obviously the event where David, as a boy, wins against the Philistine champion Goliath, shows that David is a model for the Dtr in his understanding of the history of Israel, since David is the founder of the Temple in Jerusalem (2 Ch 28:1-21). David fought with Goliath under the name of Yahweh Almighty (1 Sm 17:45). To the Dtr the Temple is the place where the name of Yahweh dwells (Dt 12:5; cf 1 Chr 22:6). The young boy David knew that the name of Yahweh the Almighty meant that the presence of Yahweh is with him during the combat. The following events reflected the tension between David and Saul. In his critical situation the prophetic group of Samuel in Ramah protected David (1 Sm 19:18-24). Eventually they became part of the kingship of David.

As in the case of Saul, the prophetic group in Ramah did not take up any specific position in David's kingship although their presence provided significant political and religious protection to him (1 Sm 19:18-24). Perhaps, the social situation of Saul and David was not so developed to have them as royal officials in political or cultic matters (cf Flanagan 1981:47-73). Roberts (2002:369) analyzed the religious conflict between Samuel and Saul. While Samuel represented one of the old authorities in Israelite history Saul was the exponent of the beginning of new authorities (Roberts 2002:369). "The religious opposition to Saul all seems to have come from professional religious types whose status was threatened by any growth in Saul's royal power" (Roberts 2002:369). Roberts (2002:368-370) observed the failure of Saul displayed in 1 Samuel 15 and 14:18-19, 36-38 as disobeying Samuel's prophetic call and the oracular responses of the priests. Roberts (2002:368-

[121] McCarter (1980b:296-297) conceived the story as an "idealization of the founder of the southern dynasty that one would expect in the capital of Judah, and it shares the basic outlook of several other passages, also introduced secondarily into the old narrative about the rise of David, which seem to be of Jerusalemite and probably Josianic origin."

370) conjectured the identity of the new group who founded the kingship with him.

Saul's misfortune was aggravated when his daughter fell in love with David, and his prince Jonathan became the dear friend of David (1 Sm 19-20). Both of them helped David to flee from the death threat of their father Saul. A significant event in the narrative is seen in 1 Samuel 20 and 21. The critical confrontation between Saul and the priests in Nob arose because the priests helped David to flee from Saul. The whole priestly family was slaughtered except Abiathar who later became a priest of David. Losing his priestly support was decisive for Saul because he lost his priestly support, specifically from the priestly line of Shiloh (cf 2 Ki 2:26-27). No mention was made of Ahijah or any priest as a priest for Saul since then. Saul's ignorance about what was happening to him is placed in David's mouth in 1 Samuel 24 and 26. Even in his last days he did not know what would happen to him. Only once did help come from Samuel, who was called up by the necromancer in Endor (1 Sm 28).

Saul experienced a drastic fall in his life and in his kingship. David, on the other hand, gained more people (1 Sm 22:2; 23:13), power (1 Sm 25:39-44) and political fortune (1 Sm 29; 30). Finally Saul and his family come to a critical end (1 Sm 31). Then it was time for David to show his respect for Saul and his friend Jonathan for their courage and leadership as king and prince (2 Sm 1).

The tradition of Saul and his son Jonathan's death in 2 Samuel 1 is significant as it enveloped Saul's initial cycle. In David's dirge for Saul and Jonathan, David used rhetorical metaphors, particularly in 2 Samuel 1:19, 25: "on your high places."[122] A translation of the phrase can be "on your height." As a funerary lament (Anderson 1989:13), however, the phrase does not

[122] Anderson (1989:17) rejected the translation. He said it simply denotes a "height" or "ridge." He noted the possibility that "later Israelites may have seen a possible association between the illegitimate high places and the tragic sacrifice 'offered' on Mount Gilboa."

apply to the length of Saul or Jonathan. The spot of their death was on the mountain of Gilboa (1 Sm 31:8). The corpse of Saul was hung on the wall of Beth Shean (1 Sm 31:10). Saul's death was connected with the mountain and the high place.

> "Your glory, O Israel, lies slain upon your high places! How the mighty have fallen!" (2 Sm 1:19)

David further indicated Saul as "Your glory" implying the divine. Isaiah pronounced that glory is an exposé of Yahweh (Is 28:5):

> In that day the LORD of hosts will be a garland of glory, and a diadem of beauty, to the remnant of his people.

The rhetoric of the poem was not accidental, when seen in the broader context of the DH (cf 1 Sm 8:7). 2 Samuel 1:19 depicted Saul and Jonathan as the glory of Israel. In the prophetic literature in ancient Israel, 'glory' is an attribute of Yahweh, not of any human being (Is 28:5) nor of any nations (Is 13:19, 23:9) nor of any creature (Ezk 20:6, 15). David eloquently described Saul and Jonathan with supernatural quality.[123] On the other hand, he rhetorically criticized their unqualified kingship for not revering Yahweh (cf Dt 17:14-20).[124]

2 Samuel 1:21 depicts that the death of Saul and his son Jonathan caused an astonishing climate sequence on the mountains of Gilboa. The impact on the climate resulted in failure of crops, to such an extent, that dew and rain were not enough for the grain offering (Noll 1997:109). In the ANE, the king was depicted as keeper of order, signified in the Egyptian title, 'Two Ladies.' Even in Mesopotamia, the king was regarded as the representative of the god to fulfill the divine order. In the context of the ANE, David indicated that

[123] See 2.2.3 for a possible Canaanite background of the deification of the deceased king.
[124] Anderson (1989:15) pointed out a certain characteristic of funerary laments such as "*once* and *now* or *past* and *present*" in the dirge. He (1989:15) said that the dirge "stresses the good points and qualities of the dead, and no ill is spoken of the departed." However, in verse 21 David negatively expressed Saul (Campbell 2005:24; Cartledge 2001:357): "For there the shield of the mighty was defiled, the shield of Saul, anointed with oil no more."

Saul and his son failed the kingship of Israel. The description of their death is contrasted by what is said in the concept of the king of Egypt in Sinuhe R, 6-7:

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

The rhetorical purpose of David's poem was to judge the monarchy of Saul and Jonathan as immoral and disqualified it according to the law of Deuteronomy (Dt 17:14-20) that Yahweh was the king of Israel (1 Sm 8:7). On the other hand it served to legitimize and idealize the kingship of David. The lament of David is characteristic of the Dtr.

4.2.6 Synthesis

The discussion in the section focused on the historical understanding of the cycles of Saul traditions in Judges 17-2 Samuel 1. The traditions about Saul functioned not only in the micro-context but also macro-context of 1 Samuel 11:1-11. In the narrative (Jdg 17-2 Sm 1) the traditions were incorporated to commend the kingship of David, specifically, the Davidic kingship in general. Two major redactions during Josiah's reign and during the exile provided theological perspectives on the kingship in general. This was related to the Temple and eventually to the hope of the rebuilding the Temple by the Davidic kingship. Although the Davidic kingship eventually caused the fall of Israel and Judah, it essentially founded the Temple. Thus, the Dtr of Josiah arranged the given traditions and sources as propaganda for the kingship of Josiah, since he rebuilt the central cultic system in the Temple and destroyed all the high places. The Dtr blamed the origin of the evil role of the high place at the emergence of the kingship of Saul. In his redaction he connected Saul with the prophetic group from the high place, although he did not give any credit to the prophetic status of Saul. Noth (1984:229-249) contended that the distinctions between the priest, the king and the prophet was certain. Mettinger (1976:191) argued that Saul could not be a priest, since he was not

connected to any specific sanctuary. But it is difficult to apply their argument to the case of Saul, since the time of Saul was different in a historical situation from the following monarchic period of Israel.

The specific connection between 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and 1 Samuel 11:1-11 evinces the probability of the close relationship between Saul and the high place as “his royal sanctuary or central sanctuary” (cf Schunck 1975:143). The Dtr of the exile interpreted the redacted narrative (Jdg 17-2 Sm 1) from his experience in the exile. He criticized the wrong practices of the kingship of Saul and kindled the hope that Israel might rebuild the Temple under the Davidic kingship.

The Dtr did not lower the leadership of Saul to a chieftain over few tribes (1 Sm 11:7-8). He designated Saul as the king of Israel, and as the prophetic group considered him. The Dtr needed the leadership of Saul as model of a failed kingship with the wrong onset of the kingship itself. His critique of the leadership of Saul and his kingship provided legitimacy for the kingship of David, who founded the Davidic kingship which built the Temple and preserved the central cultic system in Israel. The Davidic line profiled the Saul kingship’s inability and unfaithfulness to Yahweh. The Dtr, however, only criticized their wrong religious practices, but did not judge them as rejected kings, since they were from the line of David. The wrong origin and religious practices at the high place were all attributed to the kingship of Saul.

The fall of Saul signified the failure of his wrong model of kingship. The fall of Saul came about because Samuel left Saul when Samuel realized that he failed to establish the kingship of Yahweh through Saul.

The prophetic tradition of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; 11:1-11) designed Saul’s kingship. It portrayed certain premature attempts to idealize the Israelite kingship in the context of the ANE. The historical consciousness of the events was rooted in the people, and the social circumstances among them

denoted that they needed a king “like all the nations have.” The answer was king Saul. It should be acknowledged that the kingship of Saul was premature; however, the design of the kingship itself cannot be denied, in light of the attempt of the prophetic groups to propagate the kingship of Saul (1 Sm 9-10:16; 11:1-11).

4.3 Text[125] and translation[126]

1 Samuel 11:1 וַיַּ֤עַל נָחָשׁ֙ הָעַמּוֹנִ֔י וַיִּחַ֖ן עַל־יָבֵ֑שׁ גִּלְעָ֗ד
וַיֹּאמְרוּ֙ כָּל־אַנְשֵׁ֣י יָבֵ֔ישׁ אֶל־נָחָ֖שׁ כְּרָת־לָ֣נוּ בְרִ֑ית וְנַעַבְדֶֽךָּ׃
2 וַיֹּ֤אמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם֙ נָחָ֣שׁ הָעַמּוֹנִ֔י בְּזֹ֖את אֶכְרֹ֣ת לָכֶ֑ם בְּנָק֥וֹר
לָכֶ֛ם כָּל־עֵ֥ין יָמִ֖ין וְשַׂמְתִּ֣יהָ חֶרְפָּ֑ה עַל־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵֽל׃
3 וַיֹּאמְרוּ֩ אֵלָ֨יו זִקְנֵ֜י יָבֵ֗ישׁ הֶרֶף֙ לָ֣נוּ שִׁבְעַ֣ת יָמִ֔ים וְנִשְׁלְחָ֥ה
מַלְאָכִ֖ים בְּכֹ֣ל גְּבוּל֑ יִשְׂרָאֵל֙ וְאִם־אֵ֣ין מוֹשִׁ֣יעַ אֹתָ֔נוּ וְיָצָ֥אנוּ
אֵלֶֽיךָ׃
4 וַיָּבֹ֣אוּ הַמַּלְאָכִים֮ גִּבְעַ֣ת שָׁאוּל֒ וַיְדַבְּר֤וּ הַדְּבָרִים֙ בְּאָזְנֵ֣י
הָעָ֔ם וַיִּשְׂא֥וּ כָל־הָעָ֖ם אֶת־קוֹלָ֑ם וַיִּבְכּֽוּ׃
5 וְהִנֵּ֤ה שָׁאוּל֙ בָּ֣א אַחֲרֵ֣י הַבָּקָ֔ר מִן־הַשָּׂדֶ֑ה וַיֹּ֣אמֶר שָׁא֔וּל
מַה־לָּ֣עָם֙ כִּ֣י יִבְכּ֔וּ וַיְסַפְּרוּ־ל֖וֹ אֶת־דִּבְרֵ֥י אַנְשֵׁ֖י יָבֵֽישׁ׃
6 וַתִּצְלַ֤ח רוּחַ־אֱלֹהִים֙ עַל־שָׁא֣וּל בְּשָׁמְעוֹ֔
אֶת־הַדְּבָרִ֖ים הָאֵ֑לֶּה וַיִּחַ֥ר אַפּ֖וֹ מְאֹֽד׃
7 וַיִּקַּ֤ח צֶ֙מֶד֙ בָּקָ֔ר וַיְנַתְּחֵ֖הוּ וַיְשַׁלַּ֣ח בְּכָל־גְּב֣וּל יִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל בְּיַד
הַמַּלְאָכִים֙ לֵאמֹ֔ר אֲשֶׁ֥ר אֵינֶ֖נּוּ יֹצֵ֣א אַחֲרֵ֣י שָׁא֔וּל וְאַחֲרֵ֖
שְׁמוּאֵ֑ל כֹּ֥ה יֵעָשֶׂ֖ה לִבְקָרֽוֹ׃ וַיִּפֹּ֤ל פַּחַד־יְהוָה֙ עַל־הָעָ֔ם וַיֵּצְא֖וּ
כְּאִ֥ישׁ אֶחָֽד׃
8 וַיִּפְקְדֵ֖ם בְּבֶ֑זֶק וַיִּהְי֣וּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל שְׁלֹ֤שׁ מֵאוֹת֙ אֶ֔לֶף וְאִ֖ישׁ
יְהוּדָ֥ה שְׁלֹשִׁ֖ים אָֽלֶף׃
9 וַיֹּאמְר֣וּ לַמַּלְאָכִ֗ים הַבָּאִים֙ כֹּ֣ה תֹאמְר֔וּן לְאִ֖ישׁ יָבֵ֣ישׁ גִּלְעָ֑ד
מָחָ֣ר תִּהְיֶה־לָּכֶ֗ם תְּשׁוּעָה֙ בְּחֹ֣ם הַשָּׁ֔מֶשׁ וַיָּבֹ֥אוּ
הַמַּלְאָכִ֖ים וַיַּגִּ֣ידוּ לְאַנְשֵׁ֣י יָבֵ֑ישׁ וַיִּשְׂמָֽחוּ׃
10 וַיֹּאמְרוּ֙ אַנְשֵׁ֣י יָבֵ֔ישׁ מָחָ֖ר נֵצֵ֣א אֲלֵיכֶ֑ם וַעֲשִׂיתֶ֥ם לָ֛נוּ
כְּכָל־הַטּ֥וֹב בְּעֵינֵיכֶֽם׃
11 וַיְהִ֣י מִמָּחֳרָ֔ת וַיָּ֤שֶׂם שָׁאוּל֙ אֶת־הָעָ֣ם שְׁלֹשָׁ֣ה רָאשִׁ֔ים וַיָּבֹ֨אוּ
בְתוֹךְ־הַמַּחֲנֶ֜ה בְּאַשְׁמֹ֣רֶת הַבֹּ֗קֶר וַיַּכּוּ֙ אֶת־עַמּ֣וֹן עַד־חֹ֔ם הַיּ֑וֹם
וַיְהִ֣י הַנִּשְׁאָרִ֗ים וַיָּפֻ֙צוּ֙ וְלֹא־נִשְׁאֲרוּ־בָ֔ם שְׁנַ֖יִם יָחַֽד׃

[125] The Hebrew text comes from Bible Works 6.
[126] The translation of the Hebrew text of 1 Sm 11:1-11 is my translation.

1: When Nahash the Ammonite went up to camp against Jabesh Gilead, all the men of Jabesh said to Nahash, “Make a covenant with us so that we may serve you.”

2: Then Nahash the Ammonite replied to them, on this condition I will make a covenant with you that everyone’s right eye be blinded. I will make shame for all Israel.

3: The elders of Jabesh said to him, “Give us time for seven days so that we may send messengers to the whole of Israel. If we find no deliverer, we will come out to you.”

4: The messengers arrived at Gibeah of Saul and spoke these words in the ears of the people, and all the people raised their voices and wept.

5: Now look! Saul was coming from the field behind the oxen, and asked, “What happened to the people that they weep?” And they told him the words of the men of Jabesh.

6: Now the spirit of God forced entry into Saul when he heard these words and his anger was greatly kindled.

7: Thus he took a yoke of oxen, cut them in pieces and sent them throughout all the territory of Israel by the hands of the messengers. Saying, “Whoever does not come out after Saul and after Samuel so shall it be done to his oxen.” Then the fear of the Lord fell upon the people, so they came out as one man.

8: When he counted them in Bezek, the Israelites were three hundred thousand, and the men of Judah thirty thousand.

9: They said to the messengers who came, “Thus you shall say to the men of Jabesh Gilead, tomorrow you shall have deliverance when the sun is hot.” Then the messengers came to tell it to the men of Jabesh and they were glad.

10: Therefore the men of Jabesh said, “Tomorrow we will come to you, and you may do with us whatever seems good in your eyes.”

11: The next day Saul divided the people into three units. At the morning watch they came into the camp and struck down the Ammonites until the heat of day. Where there were survivors, they dispersed. Thus, no two of them remained together.

4.3.1 Textual criticism

The issue of the tradition of the text arises because there is a longer account of the event in 4QSam^{a} which gives the reason why Nahash campaigned

against Jabesh (Gilead). This text reports that the attack of Nahash on Gad and Reuben was the preliminary cause of the event in 1 Samuel 11:1-11. Unlike the Qumran text, the MT is silent about the direct reason for the attack. On the other hand, the LXX obscurely introduced a chronological phrase, καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς μετὰ μῆνα,[127] ('after one month') in verse 1. The phrase is ambiguous. It is not clear whether the phrase refers to the previous event in 1 Samuel 10:17-27 or 1 Samuel 10:1-16. Another possibility is that it refers to Nahash's attack on Gad and Reuben, as reported in 4QSam[a]. The three diverse texts testify to a different textual tradition. The textual discrepancy needs attention.

Tov (2001:342-343) reads the text of 4QSam[a], which is reconstructed by Cross, as follows:

> 6 [And Na]hash, king of the children of Ammon, sorely oppressed the children of Gad and the children of Reuben, and he gouged out a[ll] their 7 right eyes and struck ter[ror and dread] in Israel. There was not left one among the children of Israel bey[ond the] 8 [Jordan who]se right eye was no[t go]uged out by Naha[sh king] of the children of Ammon; except seven thousand men 9 [fled from] the children of Ammon and entered [J]abesh-Gilead. (above the line: About a month later, Nahash the Ammonite went up and besieged Jabesh-[Gilead]) and all the men of Jabesh said to Nahash 10 [the Ammonite, "Make] with [us a covenant and we shall become your subjects."] Nahash [the Ammonite said t]o [th]em, ["After this fashion will] I make [a covenant with you] . . .

As seen above, 4QSam[a] reports in detail that the attack on Jabesh (Gilead) is part of the attack on Gad and Reuben by Nahash. The additional explication of the attack led some scholars to believe that 4QSam[a] preserved the more authentic historical account than the other textual traditions (see Tov 2001:342-344; Cross 1980:105-119; McCarter 1980:199).

[127] The text of LXX, Rahlfs' edition comes from Bible Works 6 edition.

The textual reading of 4QSam^{a}, however, has been critically challenged by Barthélemy (1982:162-163) who argued that the addition of 4QSam^{a} is simply a gloss added later to explain the reason for the attack of Nahash. Barthélemy (1982:162-163) argued that the text of 4QSam^{a} could not be the original one. Rofé (1982:129-33) also contended his preference of the MT to the Qumran text. He saw the addition in 4QSam^{a} simply as a "characteristic midrashic feature: the duplication of biblical events." The understanding of Barthélemy (1982:162-163) and Rofé (1982:129-33) is, according to Pisano (1984:91-98), that 4QSam^{a} simply witnessed the later tendency to expand texts. They followed the textual principle that the shorter and more difficult textual reading is original as seen in the comparison between the MT and the LXX.

Others prefer the LXX text (Peterson 1999:67; Parry 1996:106-25; Na'aman 1992:643; Driver 1913:85; Smith 1912:76). There is a striking similarity between the text of LXX and 4QSam^{a}, which is in contrast to the reading of the MT. The different *Vorlage* of the MT and the LXX accords, in most cases, with that of 4QSam^{a} (Orlinsky 1975:113-114).

Although the three textual readings differ in specific cases, each reading shares the same or a similar textual tradition.[128] It is difficult to insist that any textual reading preserves the more authentic historical account. It is complicated to say that 4QSam^{a} preserved the original text while it conserved one of the traditions transmitted to the Qumran community which simply added more information as their practice, as a *midrashic* interpretation was (cf Edelman 1991:60).

[128] Eves (1982:325) even contended four types of tradition for 1 Sm10:27-11:2: 4QSam^{a} and Josephus, LXX^{B}, Origen's Hexapla, and the Old Latin, boc2e2. His contention is that the tradition of 4QSam^{a} differs from the readings of the Masoretic, Septuagint, or Samaritan Pentateuch tradition. Thus, 4QSam^{a} "must be recognized as additional, independent witnesses to the textual situation in Palestine." His conclusion was that the addition in the Qumran text only served the etiology of the event.

Thus, the focus of the text critical issue here is not to find the original text of the event, but to understand the different textual traditions which probably originated from an *Urtext*.[129] A further presupposition is that the different traditions of 1 Samuel 11 evince that each reading had its own literary value in various historical contexts.

4.3.2 Excursus: *Melek* and *Nagid*

> The role and status of a *nagid* are far from obvious (Ishda 1999:57; cf Flanagan 1981:67-68). The relation between *melek* and *nagid* is also unclear. Thus, the focus of the brief discussion is rather to perceive the striking word play in the different layers of traditions. Its discussion is limited to the traditions of Saul and David in the DH.
>
> The discussion, first of all, requires a brief explication of the role and status of *nagid*, since it shows the complicated process of its practical use. The term frequently refers to a king in Samuel and Kings,[130] whereas in Chronicles, Job, and Proverbs it is connected with religious and general leaders such as an army commander, an official of a palace, and a leader of a tribe.[131] Thus, scholars proposed various understandings of the term, as referring to the 'king-designate' (Ahlström 1993:431; McCarter 1980b:178-179), the 'crown prince' (Paul 2005:363; Mettinger 1976:151-184), 'commander' (Cross 1973:220-221), and king (Carlson 1964:52).

---

[129] Talmon (2000:156) formulates that "The existence of ancient different 'editions' of biblical books would seem to lend support to the contemporaneous currency of 'pristine' traditions as assumed by the *Vulgärtexte* theory. However, by characterizing one of the editions as either a 'shorten' or 'expanded recension,' that edition is shown to be dependent on the other and thereby deprived of 'originality,' and the other—in practically all cases the extra-masoretic version, whether shorter or longer—is *de facto* pronounced the *Urtext*."

[130] Saul (1 Sm 9:16; 10:1), David (1 Sm 13:14; 25:30; 2 Sm 5:2; 6:21; 7:8), Solomon (1 Kg 1:35), Jeroboam (1 Kg 14:7), Baasha (1 Kg 16:2), and Hezekiah (2 Kg 20:5). Exceptions come from Ezekiel and Daniel for a king of Tyre (Ezk 28:2), the king as anointed one (Dn 9:25, 26), and a general indication of a king (Dn 11:22).

[131] Two categorizations can be applied to the term: a religious leader and a secular leader. For the religious role of *nagid* see 2 Chr 31:13 (Azariah in the time of Hezekiah); 2 Chr 35:8 (Jehiel in the reign of Josiah); Jr 20:1 (Pashhur, the chief official in the Temple in the reign of Zedekiah). For a secular leader as *nagid*, refer to 1 Chr 13:1 (a military leader in the time of David); 1 Chr 27:16 (a leader of the tribes of Israel for Solomon); 2 Chr 11:11 (a military leader as well as official in Rehoboam); 2 Chr 19:11 (Zebadiah, the leader of the tribe of Judah in Jehoshaphat); 2 Chr 28:7 (Azrikam, the leader of the palace of Ahaz); 2 Chr 32:21 (foreign officials); Job 31:37 (a generalized leader); Is 55:5 (a leader of the people). In Pr 28:16 it is associated with a general ruler in the comparison of the righteous and the wicked of verse 1 in the same chapter.

The majority of scholars prefer to interpret *nagid* as the king-designate (Edelman 1991:30-31; 1984:207; Eslinger 1985:60-61). Why then did Samuel anoint Saul as "designate" who should prove his ability as "designate" of Yahweh to the people? In other words, the choice of Yahweh would be incomplete until the choice will be proven as successful. Why then was the divinely chosen Saul to be rejected by Yahweh, once his ability had been publicly proven? Theologically there exists an inconsistency in the idea of *nagid*.

Rather, Saul was anointed as *nagid* on the request of the people. Saul was Yahweh's positive answer to the kingship. There is no reason for the anointed designate of Yahweh to be tested by the people. It is illogical to have a stage that tests the kingship by the people who urgently asked Samuel to appoint a king over them. If testing was necessary, it was not for the people but for the conviction of the prophet. If the account of 1 Samuel 11 was designed as a test for Saul's kingship, Saul proved his qualified kingship. On the other hand, if 1 Samuel 13 was a test for the benefit of the prophet, the testing was behind schedule, for Saul supervised the army as king of Israel in the battle. If Saul was king in 1 Samuel 13, he did not deserve to be criticized by Samuel (1 Sm 13:13, 14). This discussion brings up the next issue for deliberation.

The intricate interplay in the use of *melek* and *nagid* has been noticed in the context of 1 Samuel 8-12. In 1 Samuel 8:5 the elders requested a king (מֶלֶךְ) and the Lord commanded Samuel to appoint a king (מֶלֶךְ) on their demand (1 Sm 8:22). As a result, Samuel chose Saul as king over Israel by casting the lot (1 Sm 10:20-24). The people acclaimed Saul as the king (הַמֶּלֶךְ) (1 Sm 10:24). They confirmed Saul as the king who governs them (וַיַּמְלִכוּ) after defeating Nahash, the Ammonite, under his leadership (1 Sm 11:15). The role of *melek,* as seen above, is that it indicated him as the one to rule the people and to protect them.

The term *nagid* appears mainly in the prophetic tradition of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16). In 1 Samuel 9:16 the Lord commanded Samuel to anoint a man from the land of Benjamin as *nagid*. In 1 Samuel 10:1 Samuel anointed Saul as *nagid*. Within the tradition, the use of *nagid* is distinguished from *melek*. The major purpose of the tradition is to

provide divine legitimacy for Saul's leadership which turned into kingship (cf 1 Sm 11:15). What then is the specific role of *nagid* in terms of the kingship? (cf Ishida 1977:50. n.127). A remarkable example comes from 2 Samuel 5:1-2:

> For some time, while Saul was king over us, it was you who led out Israel and brought it in. The LORD said to you: It is you who shall be shepherd of my people Israel, you who shall be ruler (*nagid*) over Israel.

The biblical passage tells that all the tribes of Israel confessed the divine legitimacy of David's leadership over Israel. Their acknowledgment is emphasized by the terms shepherd and *nagid* (cf also 1 Chr 11:2). What was their intention to call David their shepherd and *nagid*, since he had already been anointed as king of Judah in 2 Samuel 2:4?

David's acknowledgment by the people of Israel (2 Sm 5:2) emphasized his superseding role over Saul. The emphasis is that, while Saul was king, David played an authentic role as king over the people. Thus, the term shepherd and *nagid* were used identical with *melek* (cf Ezk 34:2).

In acknowledging the role of shepherd and *nagid* in terms of *melek*, it is legitimate to see the representation of David the shepherd as a rhetorical device as well (1 Sm 16:11; 17:34). In fact, David was anointed by Samuel while he was still a shepherd (1 Sm 16:11-13). What the people needed from David as shepherd-king was protection and well-being. By having no king Israel is deserted, without a shepherd to protect and take care of them.[132] Israel formally requested the protection of David. When the people of Israel endorsed David as their shepherd (cf Ezk 34:23) and *nagid*, all the elders of Israel made a covenant with David, anointing him as king of Israel.

The metaphor of the people as the flock, pastured by a shepherd and ruled by a *nagid,* is similarly used for the relationship between Israel and Yahweh (Ps 80:1; Mi 7:14; Ezk 34:12). For instance, in Psalm 23:1 the

[132] Van Hecke (2005:200-217) contended from comparative studies of Egyptian and Mesopotamian literature that the metaphor of shepherd is mainly to emphasize the responsibility of a king to protect and take care of his people as well as to take care of a Temple. The implication of the metaphor to legitimate the supremacy over his people is less convincing. Conclusively, he said that "If personal or socio-political crises occurred, the pastoral metaphor was questioned and reversed, resulting in novel and, at times, iconoclastic metaphorical expressions" (Van Hecke 2005:217).

psalmist confessed his sufficiency because of Yahweh's pasturing of him.

The LORD is my shepherd, I shall not want.

The striking point of his confession referred to his commitment to the house of Yahweh in Psalm 23:6. The psalmist overtly connected the metaphor of the shepherd with the Temple of Jerusalem.

The prophets of Israel clarified that pasturing was a commission of Yahweh to the kings of Israel (cf Ezk 34:2; Zch 11:16-17). Particularly, in Ezekiel 34:8 the shepherd is depicted as the representative of Yahweh, since Israel is the sheep of Yahweh:

> As I live, says the Lord GOD, because my sheep have become a prey, and my sheep have become food for all the wild animals, since there was no shepherd; and because my shepherds have not searched for my sheep, but the shepherds have fed themselves, and have not fed my sheep.

The understanding that shepherd signified the agent of Yahweh can be seen in Isaiah 44:28. Yahweh called Cyrus, king of Persia, to be his shepherd:

> [Yahweh] who says of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and he shall carry out all my purpose; and who says of Jerusalem, it shall be rebuilt, and of the Temple, Your foundation shall be laid.

The passage indicated the close connection between the shepherd and his religious duty. Cyrus, as king of Persia, was appointed as the shepherd of Yahweh to rebuild His Temple in Jerusalem. The designation of the shepherd of Yahweh points to his royal role rather than to his royal title (Goldingay 2005:259).

As discussed above, it can be surmised that the term shepherd referred to religious commitment, with Yahweh pasturing the people of Israel. In this context, the role of *nagid* could be understood as the one who is anointed to protect and to take care of the people of Yahweh. His commission as a leader emphasized his role as the representative of Yahweh to the people.

In analogy *nagid* is synonymous to *melek*. However, the original connotation of *nagid* was different from *melek*[133] (see Ishida 1999:58, n. 9). It was used to idealize the leadership as divinely sanctioned, particularly in the tradition of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16; cf 1 Sm 11:1-11). As in royal titles of the ANE, it is probable to conjecture that *nagid* idealized the leadership of a king in its royal ideology. Analogously the term implicated that *nagid* in Israel was the political representative of Yahweh, supported by a prophetic group (1 Sm 10:1, 5-7). Thus, the term designated the combination of the political and religious ideologies in kingship. However, conjecturally once the term had won the recognition of divine sanction for the leadership of Saul as well as of David, its connotation began to give way to *melek* during the reign of Solomon, particularly after the construction of the Temple in Jerusalem. The Temple itself provided the divine sanction of the Davidic monarch as protector and keeper of the people. It is noticeable that most of the uses of *nagid* as a political and a religious leader come from Chronicles whose author/editor supported the reform of Josiah (2 Chr 34:1-33). The observation opens a probable conjecture that the term, *nagid,* in terms of royal ideology in the ANE, was forsaken unnecessary after the centralization of the Temple in the reform of Josiah (2 Ki 23). Later it began to indicate any religious and political leader who served a king. Social-politically the meaning of *nagid* was closer to that of a chieftain (Miller & Hayes 2006:135-136; Liverani 2005:88-89; Flanagan 1981:65-67), but religio-politically it was strongly connected with the king who was divinely sanctioned (cf Ahlström 1993:430), particularly by the spirit of Yahweh. In summary, in the light of the ANE, an intention of the term *nagid* was to emphasize a religious legitimacy of the kingship, particularly in the building of the kingship while *melek* was a general term for a king in the DH.

4.4 Detailed textual exposition

4.4.1 Introduction

The text can be divided into three sections, according to the three major literary themes that reveal the historical circumstances behind it: Deliverance

[133] Murray (1998) provocatively contended the different political orientations of *nagid* and *melek*. He (Murray 1998:247-280) particularly examined the case of David as *melek* (king) and *nagid* (leader). He contended that David pursued to be *melek,* not *nagid* that Yahweh originally intended for him to be. He (Murray 1998:304-305) suggested that *melek* was a politically centered term, whereas *nagid* was a religious centered one (cf Alt 1966:195).

or shame (1-3). Appearance of Saul as deliverer (4-9). No shame but victory (10-11). All the literary themes indicate that 1 Samuel 11:1-11 narrates an original historical event in a literary unit,[134] reporting on warfare. Theological intentions of the Dtr governed the historical claims and traditions of the event. A particular focus of the text is to exemplify the necessity of the king. It demonstrates how the monarchy works for the people of Israel in protecting them. The text shows that it characterizes royal ideology in the context of the ANE.

4.4.2 Deliverance or shame (vv 1-3)[135]

The section focuses on signifying that national shame directly resulted from not having any deliverer (cf Lemos 2006:225-241). There is no doubt to refute that having a deliverer is an essential foundation to sustain a national entity. In the speech of Nahash, he attempted to subject Israel as an entity through shame. In the challenge, Nahash presumed himself to be the winner of the military exercise. He is characterized as arrogant and full of self-esteem. However, the narrator implied that his pride could not guarantee his expected victory. A king in the ANE had to have divine knowledge from a god who provided the power to control his people. The divine awareness of the king could also shape the events in a war. The narrator did not report any divine qualification of Nahash when he implored the elders of Jabesh (v 3). In this way the narrator indirectly suggested that Nahash was foolish without the typical characterization of a king in the ANE. His foolishness is suggested by his pride and magnanimity in granting the suggestion of the elders. Nahash could neither foresee that Israel would have a deliverer empowered by the spirit of God, nor that Yahweh would defeat him through Saul.

---

[134] The literary unit of the victory in warfare aims to show how the leader of the people, Saul, appeared and obtained the victory over the enemy. Its characteristic as literary unit is more striking compared to any other report of a victory in warfare. For instance, the so-called song of Deborah (Jdg 5) showed how Yahweh helped them to defeat their enemies. The focus of its report is on the role of Yahweh, not on the military leaders. But the report of Saul's victory is to demonstrate his triumphant leadership.

[135] Fokkelman (1993:454-455) saw the shift of place as one of the main criteria of the structure of 1 Sm 11:1-11. Verses 1-3 and 10-11 focus on the events in Transjordan, verses 4-9 in Cisjordan. The observance of the spatial facet brings a helpful insight in the development of the events in the narrative: problem, body, and solution.

4.4.2.1 Nahash versus the people of Jabesh-Gilead (v 1)

Nahash, the Ammonite, encamped[136] against Jabesh-Gilead in the Trans-Jordan.[137] The well prepared and organized encampment of Nahash posed a tremendous threat to the people of Jabesh-Gildead. Accordingly, all the people of Jabesh come out to make a covenant with him. It seems that they did not have any possible military preparation for the attack. The attack surprised them, particularly because they had not any military leader among them.

In the broader literary and historical context of the DH, the theme of encampments in a war contrasts figures who either trust Yahweh or not.[138] The first example comes from Judges 10:17-11:33 which narrates how Yahweh delivered the Israelites from the hands of the Ammonites.[139] The military conflict arose from the encampment of the Ammonites at Gilead. The conflict caused the people, the chieftains of Gilead, to recognize that they had no leader among them to fight against the Ammonites. Fortunately, they found a leader, Jephthah, in the land of Tob. At first, Jephthah condemned the elders of Gilead for what they had done to him in the past. He doubted whether they could make him their leader (Jdg 11:9). After deliberation, both

[136] Generally, the verb of the root חנה denotes to encamp for a military operation, as for instance, Nm 10:31, Jos 4:19; 5:10; 10:5, Jdg 6:4; 20:19, 1 Sm 16:2, 2 Sm 12:28; 23:23, 1Ki 16:15, 2 Ki 25:1. In some other cases the verb from the same root is connected with the tabernacle as in Nm 1:50-53 (Homan 2002:15-16). The denotation of the root strikingly refers to a well organized and prepared encampment as shown in 1 Sm 13:5, 2 Sm 12:28.

[137] The beginning of verse 1 is highlighted with *waw*-consecutive form, וַיַּעַל to introduce a new character, נָחָשׁ. Syntactically speaking, the introduction is unusual in that normally in the biblical narrative, a new character stands at the beginning of the sentence or with *waw*-conjunction form of *hyh*. Semantically the introduction does not fit in the context of the previous verses. Suddenly, the narrative introduces a new character to lead a new event. The reading of the LXX, καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς μετὰ μῆνα ('after one month)' seems to fill the gap of 1 Sm 11:1 and 1 Sm 9:1-10:16 (Driver 1913: 85). But as Veijola (1977:49) argued, the phrase could be a redactional connection. In the context of 1 Sm 9:1-10:16, the phrase provides a more smoothly reading.

[138] Cook (1986:27-48) clarified that a literary and historical linearity exists in the narratives. His idea clearly brings an insightful spectrum to view them synchronically.

[139] Guillaume (2004:144-155) pointed out that the Jephthah narrative is about the loser, anti-savior. He considered the narrative as not typical of savior narratives, since it ends up with "an annual grieving ritual in memory of his daughter" in Jdg 11:40. He believes that the narrative had been inserted among the savior narratives as part of the process of editing in terms of "Deuteronomistic Yahwism," that is "Yhwh becomes creator and king of humans rather than of other gods."

parties made a covenant before Yahweh (Jdg 11:10). On this critical occasion, Jephthah accentuated that he would be the representative of Yahweh against the Ammonites. His avowal for Yahweh is well attested in his blazing contention with the king of the Ammonites, in that the land was granted by Yahweh who defeated the Amorites (Jdg 11:23). However, the victorious appearance of Jephthah for Yahweh is overshadowed by his imprudent and immoral decision (Jdg 11:30-31). As a result, Jephthah couldn't escape his vow to kill his daughter (Jdg 11:39). As the leader of Gilead, he was involved in a massive combat with the Ephraimites (Jdg 12:1-6).

Saul also appeared as hero who saved his people from the Ammonites (1Sm 11:1-11). After he built an altar for Yahweh, once he defeated the Philistines (1 Sm 14:35). Before his final military conflict with the Philistines, Saul cleansed Israel of the mediums and spirits (1 Sm 28:3). However, his triumphant victory was eclipsed by his foolish vow (1 Sm 14:24), and in 1 Samuel 14:37 (cf 1 Sm 23:6) he was characterized as the one who could not get an answer from Yahweh. As a result, he almost killed his son, Jonathan (1 Sm 14:44). Eventually the historicized narrative emphasized his unfaithfulness to Yahweh (1 Sm 28:4-6). Overall, Saul's poor leadership without Yahweh was stressed in 1 Samuel 28:8-25. His death evinced that he failed as Yahweh's leader of Israel (1 Sm 31:1-13).

The narratives of Jephthah and Saul characterized both as devoted to Yahweh, but at the end, they were deemed unqualified as Yahweh's leaders of Israel. In the DH the apparent literary pattern of the two narratives is that a military conflict brings a temporary hero. Eventually Saul was not qualified to be the leader of Israel because of his unfaithfulness to Yahweh. The major role of these narratives was rather to highlight the necessity of the kingship under Yahweh.

1 Samuel 17 describes a different figure who remained faithful as representative of Yahweh, namely David. During the serious military conflict between Israel and the Philistines David came out to fought against Goliath as the representative of Yahweh. He challenged Goliath and fights against him in the name of Yahweh, the Almighty. The encampments of Israel and the Philistines marked David's faith in Yahweh. The salient point in the narrative is the 'name of Yahweh.' The 'name of Yahweh' is a characteristic motif of Deuteronomy related to the chosen place to worship Yahweh (Dt 12:5).

Firm faith in Yahweh in a military campaign is depicted in the contrast between the king of Israel and the king of Judah. In 2 Kings 3 Joram, son of Ahab, king of Israel, and Jehoshaphat, king of Judah marched against Moab to suppress a revolt against Israel. The king of Edom was invited to join the military operation. During their march they were confronted with a water-famine that could force them to retreat, or even to die. While the king of Israel complained to Yahweh, the king of Judah cried to find Elisha, the prophet of Yahweh. Elisha condemned Joram but advised them because of Jehoshaphat (2 Ki 3:10). Although Joram acknowledged Yahweh, he did not put his faith in Yahweh. Jehoshaphat trusted in Yahweh. The narrative (2 Ki 3) is clearly designed to advance the Davidic monarchy. The biblical author criticized Joram that he followed the ways of Jeroboam (2 Ki 3:2), even though he removed the sacred stone of Baal. The author clarified that the Davidic kingship is legitimate under Yahweh.

The theme of encampment in the DH displays the contrast between the faithful one under Yahweh and the unfaithful under Yahweh. Specifically the contrast of the faith in Yahweh is pinpointed in the relation with Saul and David, as well as the king of Judah from the king of Israel. Only the Davidic house is legitimate under Yahweh. The legitimation of the kingship is guaranteed by the Temple of Jerusalem.

In 1 Samuel 11:1 it is a historical issue to decide whether Jabesh Gilead denoted the name of the tribe or simply the region, since the phrase itself is not clear without any relating attributive phrase. In Judges 5:17 Gilead appeared in one of the oldest songs of ancient Israel. Deborah sang a song of the victory over Jabin the king of Canaan and over Sisera the commander of his army: of how wonderfully Yahweh defeated them through the Israelites who fought against them. Among the Israelites, Gilead was mentioned as one of the ten tribes. It is clear that it was used as the name of the people as part of the ten tribes (De Geus 1976:110). Apparently Deborah referred to Yahweh as the God of the ten tribes of Israel (Jdg 5:11, 14-18). However, unlike the indication of Gilead in the song of Deborah, there is no obvious distinction between the entity of the tribe and its territory in other places, for instance, 'the dwellers of Jabesh-Gilead' (1 Sm 31:11), 'the men of Jabesh-Gilead' (2 Sm 2:4), and 'in the city of Gilead.' Jabesh-Gilead itself was connected to the people as well as to the place. The case in 1 Samuel 11:1 is a good example of how Jabesh-Gilead was used in two ways. Nahash encamped against Jabesh-Gilead, which is not clear. But then all the people of Jabesh came out to make a treaty with him. The phrase, 'all the people of Jabesh' indicates the regional area, like 'Gibeah of Saul' (1 Sm 11:4).

The men of Jabesh voluntarily attempted to make a covenant with the attacker (1 Sm 11:1). Making a covenant signified that they were willing to serve Nahash as their suzerain (Edelman 1991: 61). They did not hesitate to propose the possible treaty to Nahash. Their independent proposal gave evidence that they formed a sovereign political entity. There is no indication that they had any other superior political entity. But although the text showed that Jabesh-Gilead was a political independent entity, they had a strong connection with other tribes of the Israelites, particularly with the Benjamites (cf 1 Sm 11:4; Jdg 21). The historical implication given in this verse shows that a tribe had its own independent political responsibility in a military crisis. It suggests that the tribal league of the Israelites was rather loose and independent of each other (Gordon 1986:123; cf Gunn 1978:66-68).

Verse 1 shows a highly artistic way of speech, rhetorically designed by the omniscient narrator. Syntactically, the first sentence is an imperative preceded by a simple *waw* conjunction. Particularly, the verb כרת in verse 1 is *qal* masculine singular imperative connected with a simple *waw* conjunction to a prefix form of the root עבד with second masculine suffix (וְנַעַבְדֶךָּ). The speech denotes that the men overtly approached Nahash. They were the diplomatic representatives of Jabesh-Gilead. They put their proposal in an imperative speech form. Perhaps they considered themselves to be an equal party by suggesting that they would make a covenant with him. They did not implore Nahash. Their aim, however, could not be fulfilled. The omniscient narrator explained that the people were not sufficiently aware of their critical situation. By analogy, in 1 Samuel 8:19-20 the people of Israel requested a kingship, the nature of which was unacceptable to Samuel:

> But the people refused to listen to the voice of Samuel; they said, No! but we are determined to have a king over us, so that we also may be like other nations, and that our king may govern us and go out before us and fight our battles.

In both cases the people stuck to their own diplomatic proposal. They made a serious mistake to solve the situation. Further they were unaware of the superiority of the other party, Nahash.

4.4.2.2 A treaty. It is shame on you (v 2)

The men's proposal incited Nahash to boost his pride. He put a cruel condition on the covenant according to verse 2.[140] The proposal itself showed that the people of Jabesh were not shrewd enough to propose a covenant that could free them from the deadly attack of Nahash.

[140] In verse 2b the MT omits ברית from the phrase אֶכְרֹת לָכֶם which LXX preserved and 4QSam[a] indicated with a space that it once preserved the word (McCarter 1980b:200). The omission of ברית is clearly an unusual reading, since ברית is normally part of the idiom, with כרת that refers to the cutting of the sacrificial animals to make a covenant (Köhler, Baumgartner & Stamm 1996 (hereafter KB): כרת).

Verse 2 shows another skillfully constructed rhetoric intention of the omniscient narrator. It can be recognized from the connotation of the word כרת that denotes the cutting of animals (KB: כרת; Gordon 1986:123). In Genesis 15:9-11 Abram cut all the sacrifices that he brought to Yahweh into two pieces. Cutting the sacrifices symbolized that he is the other party to observe the covenant with Yahweh. In Jeremiah 34:18-20 the ritual of making a covenant is particularly elucidated in a specific phrase:

> And those who transgressed my covenant and did not keep the terms of the covenant that they made before me, I will make like the calf when they cut it in two and passed between its parts: the officials of Judah, the officials of Jerusalem, the eunuchs, the priests, and all the people of the land who passed between the parts of the calf shall be handed over to their enemies and to those who seek their lives. Their corpses shall become food for the birds of the air and the wild animals of the earth.

The connotation of cutting an animal produces a conspicuous irony in the following occasions of the narrative. Apparently Nahash rejected the cutting of an animal to make a covenant. The rejection rebounds on Nahash in a terrible manner. Certainly the irony of making a covenant later reverberated in the action of Saul to cut the oxen in his summons to the Israelites at the most critical moment. Saul cut his oxen into pieces as signified in the making of the covenant (1 Sm 11:7). Hereby the omniscient narrator suggested that the delay of Nahash to make a covenant ironically caused his retreat in the end. Although Nahash did not know what would happen to his rejection of the treaty with Jabesh, the omniscient narrator knew exactly what would happen to him. Again, the narrator encoded his omniscient knowledge that the Ammonite will stumble over his pride and eventually be defeated.

Nahash proposed one cruel condition for making a covenant. He would gouge out everyone's right eye. The action, he thought, would bring shame on the people of Israel. The mention of shame is quite an astonishing remark

by Nahash. Such cruel actions were used in the ANE (Davis & Whitcomb 1980:207). But it is not clear how it would bring shame on the people, and in which dimension the shame will rest upon the people whether politically, ideologically, or religiously.[141]

A probable indication comes from the request of the elders of Jabesh to leave them for seven days to find a deliverer in Israel. The deliverer indicates a charismatic leader who would save the people such as in Judges, like Othniel (Jdg 3:9), Ehud (Jdg 3:15), Gideon (Jdg 6:36), and Jephthah (Jdg 12:3). In the period of the judges a deliverer was always raised by Yahweh, as his representative. The significant factor about the deliverer is that Yahweh raised him or her for His people. In the challenge of Nahash, the elders implied that they will find a representative of their God, Yahweh. If they could not find a deliverer, they would come to Nahash to be shamed by him. They would deserve to be ashamed, since they would not have the favor of God. The narrator judged that the elders knew Yahweh who could save them. Historically they had experienced the deliverance of God (Jdg 11). Remembering the experience of God's deliverance was one of the ways to escape from shame.[142] In fact, the implication of the narrator is that Nahash challenged the God of Israel whether or not He could save them from his hands and his god. Ideologically, Yahweh chose Saul as his representative to save the people. The narrator knew that the challenge of Nahash would rebound to shame him. Nahash was ignorant of the deliverer, Saul and of the

[141] The study of Stiebert (2002) on shame in the Prophets clarified that some ideological factors influenced the biblical writings. Stiebert (2002:171) conceived of languages of shame in "politicized rhetoric and literary modes of discourse." Her observation is probably useful in the discussion of shame in 1 Sm 11:2 in that the context of shame is historicized in the royal ideology for Saul. Thus, the context of the text would be the prime clue for understanding shame. Since it is difficult to distinguish between religion and politics in ancient Israel, it is suggestive to acknowledge diverse dimensions involved in the connotation of shame in the text. Socially the society of Saul was oriented to avoid public humiliation and shame (Jemielity 1992:32).

[142] Lapsley (2000:143-173) contended that in Ezekiel Israel was depicted as shameful, since she didn't remember experiencing God's deliverance in history. Even if she had been granted to have knowledge of God, she didn't remember it and acted according to her moral identity that caused her to be ashamed of herself. His point is based on the psychological perspective and not theological. However, it is worthy to notice the relation between shame and grace in knowing God, particularly based on experiencing God.

God of Israel. The point of the omniscient narrator was to characterize Nahash as a disqualified king, in the concept of the ANE, and to pave the way for the preparation to idealize the emergence of Saul for his people.

There is no doubt that the men felt dreadful before Nahash, for they realized that they could not manipulate a diplomatic resolution. They rather aggravated the situation. They were confronted to accept Nahash as the authority that will judge their future lives. Nahash considered himself to be the ultimate judge of the future for the people of Jabesh Gilead. The fate of Jabesh-Gilead was seemingly in his hands. Although Nahash acted as the final judge of the future, the narrator did not give him any historical credit in the matter. The narrator suggested rather that the situation Nahash created would be a snare to him.

4.4.2.3 An opportunity to find a deliverer (v 3)

Once the attempt of the diplomatic resolution failed, the elders of Jabesh appeared to request seven days respite to find a savior. The suggestion opened the way for fruitful resolutions. It meant a short relief from the situation, and enough time for Israel to prepare for the help of Jabesh-Gilead.

The manner of the elders approached Nahash differed from that of the people (v 1). The people (v 1) seemingly pushed Nahash to make a covenant with them. The elders tried to persuade Nahash (v 3). The elders basically accepted his condition for the covenant. They acknowledged his superiority over them and asked him to grant them seven days to find a savior. Nahash prided himself on his power as the last judge who could decide between war or a treaty.

In the request, the narrator implied his omniscience of the proposal that would lead to Nahash's destruction. A critical observation comes from the *hiphil* imperative verb (הָרֶף) in verse 3. The meaning of the *hiphil* form in the imperative signifies the request of a certain time indicated by the preposition

לְ (KB: 1277). Other biblical usages of the phrase provide better nuances of the verb. The same form appears at least five more times in other places such as Deuteronomy 9:14, 1 Samuel 15:16, 2 Samuel 24:16, 1 Chronicle 21:15, and Psalm 37:8 (Even-Shoshan 1996:1089). In all the cases, except Psalm 37:8, the imperative form is used in the relationship between an addressor and an addressee regarding the addressee himself (Samuel to Saul in 1 Sm 15:16) or a third party (Yahweh to the people through Moses in Dt 9:14; 2 Sm 24:16; Yahweh to his angel in 1 Chr 21:15). In all the cases the implied intention of the addressor refers to deliver a negative event to the addressee or the third party.

For instance, in Deuteronomy 9:14 the Lord was preparing to destroy the Israelites owing to their iniquity. The nuance of the word (let alone) brings a certain negative result to the people. In 1 Samuel 15:16 Samuel forced Saul to stop making an excuse. He was about to announce God's rejection of him. In 2 Samuel 24:16 and 1 Chronicles 21:15 Yahweh's wrath was burning on account of the census of David. Thus Yahweh was about to bring his wrath upon the people. The imperative verb form implies that a negative event will happen to the addressee or the third party. In 1 Samuel 11:1-11, the request of the elders anticipated that a similar situation will befall Nahash.

The role of the elders is worthy of discussion detail. Generally in the DH the elders appeared as a strong political entity, representing the people as well as the decision makers in the crisis. In 1 Samuel 4:3 the elders showed up as the decision makers, who brought the ark from Shiloh to Ebenezer. As the Israelites fought against the Philistines, they were defeated, and retreated to their camp in Ebenezer. They felt no hope to succeed in the war. In their despair, the elders appeared and decided to bring the ark of Yahweh, since they were convinced that it would bring the victory for them. Their conclusion, however, was unworthy. Even worse, the conclusion humiliated Yahweh before the Philistines. Contrary to their wish, Israel was fatally defeated, and the ark captured by the Philistines (1 Sm 4:5-11). The elders were the worst

losers in the war. The elders of Israel similarly appeared in 1 Samuel 8:5 to request a king from Samuel. Samuel acknowledged their leadership as representative of the people, but had an aversion to their request. He felt that they reject him in lieu of Yahweh (1 Sm 8:7; 12:1-5). Later Samuel implied that their request would prove to be a failure (1 Sm 12:14-15). Unlike the elders in 1 Samuel 8:5, the elders of Jabesh played a highly positive political role (1 Sm 11:3). They appeared to resolve a very complicated situation. Their political leadership and their decision were highly contrastive to the occasions discussed above.

The elders represented a formal leadership which continued at least until David became king of Israel. However, the narrator gave a different nuance to the supremacy of their leadership. Although their leadership was significant, its value was reduced in favor of David.

In 1 Samuel 15:30 Saul asked Samuel to honor him before the elders of his people and Israel. Saul was afraid of losing their esteem. In the previous verses of the same chapter, the narrator described that Saul's fate moved drastically up and down. He experienced a sheer victory over the Amalekites (1 Sm 15:4-8). However, his triumph soon turned into a disaster because he transgressed a commandment of Yahweh (1 Sm 15:11) and was rejected by Yahweh (1 Sm 15:23). Once Saul repented his transgression, he begged Samuel to honor him before his people and the elders by returning with him to the sacrifice for Yahweh. The narrative indicates that Saul was seemingly much more afraid of losing the respect of the elders, than being rejected by Yahweh as king of Israel.

In analogy 1 Samuel 16:4 gave a different image of the elders. Samuel came to Bethlehem according to the commandment of Yahweh (1 Sm 16:1). The elders of Bethlehem shivered to meet Samuel. It is uncertain why they felt so awful to meet him. A probable reason is that the visit of Samuel was unusual to them. Although the elders of Bethlehem did not anticipate any sudden visit

from Samuel, it is still a question why they greeted him with the cautious question, “Do you come in peace?” The context gave at least two probable reasons. First of all they may have been afraid of the visit of Samuel on account of Saul’s threat of them. Samuel rebuked and rejected Saul in the previous chapters. If they welcomed Samuel, it might be interpreted as disloyalty to Saul.[143] They might have devoted their allegiance to Saul (cf 1 Sm 12-16). Or it might have been to show their respect to Samuel whose religious leadership was evident in the battle against the Amalekites (1 Sm 15).

The Hebrew word וַיֶּחֶרְדוּ was also used in 1 King 1:49 to signify how Adonijah and his guests reacted to the news of Solomon’s coronation. They were enjoying Adonijah’s political victories king of Israel. The Hebrew verb denoted that they trembled because of their transgression against Solomon. Hosea 11:10 suggested that the children of Ephraim would come trembling before the wrath of Yahweh, since they knew that they served the Baals (Hs 11:2). Their trembling showed that they knew what Yahweh can do on account of their transgressions. Even in Genesis 42:28 the brothers of Joseph felt like dead men. They were afraid of how they would be criminally charged. All these cases show that the Hebrew verb וַיֶּחֶרְדוּ denotes that the subject of the verb is terrified of any possible charge on account of their wrongdoings. Besides the meaning of the Hebrew verb, the appearance of the elders itself gave some indication of their role. Probably they considered the visit of Samuel more politically than religiously. In the DH the elders appeared to settle down all political matters. Thus, it is reasonable to understand that the elders of Bethlehem were frightened on account of their loyalty to Saul. The scene showed that the two lines of the political powers, Saul and Samuel, coexisted until the regime of Saul collapsed. The elders of Israel were presented as a strong political body on Saul’s side.

[143] The disloyalty of the priests in Nob can be compared to the response of the elders in Bethlehem (1 Sm 16:4; see Taggar-Cohen 2005:251-268).

The omniscient narrator's perspective about the elders (1 Sm 11:1-11) is in contrast with that of the Dtr. The narrator in 1 Samuel 11:1-11 showed his favor for the decision of the elders, since he knew how the situation would end. Consequently, the implication of the existence of the elders in the verse was that they supported the kingship of Israel, particularly of Saul. Eventually, they would see Saul as the deliverer (1 Sm 11:11). On the other hand, as seen above, the omniscient narrator of the DH criticized the role of the elders in establishing the kingship and supporting it. He devaluated their leadership as being subjugated to the leadership of David (2 Sm 5:3) where all the elders of Israel came to anoint David as the king of Israel, since they had no other king over them (cf 2 Sm 5:7)

4.4.3 Appearance of Saul as deliverer (vv 4-9)

4.4.3.1 Introduction

This section highlights the emergence of Saul as the empowered leader of Israel. As signified in verse 3, he was the savior who could deliver the people of Jabesh-Gilead from the hand of Nahash, the Ammonite. Eventually he would be the one who would receive honor from all the Israelites (cf 11:12, 15). The moment was about to produce the anticipated national leader as their king. He would be the king of Israel unlike the king of the Ammonites, who was depicted as a foolish and overconfident figure. Above all, Saul was empowered by the 'spirit of God.' It was the most significant moment of the divine sanction of Saul. In 1 Samuel 10:5-7 the kingship of Saul was divinely guaranteed by the prophet, Samuel. Here the divine sanction was made public in a critical moment of the people of Israel.

4.4.3.2 Gibeah of Saul (v 4)

The messengers of Jabesh-Gilead came to 'Gibeah of Saul' and reported what had happened to them. Once the people of Gibeah heard it, they wept aloud. The threat reported to them was not only against Jabesh, but also against all the Israelites. A close observation reveals that verse 4 is involved

in certain critical issues connected to Gibeah of Saul as well as in the loud weeping by the people of Gibeah.

Grammatically speaking, Gibeah of Saul is a genitive form. It is not quite certain whether it denotes possession or attribution.[144] If it indicates the possession of Saul, the narrator assumed that Gibeah belonged to Saul. If not, the genitive form indicates that Gibeah was characterized by Saul. It is worthy to notice the broader context, since a critical clue for perceiving a proper relation between Saul and Gibeah can be given from the nuance in the context.

The constructive form, Gibeah of Saul, only appears twice in other texts: 1 Samuel 15:34 and Isaiah 10:29. 1 Samuel 15:34 describes that Saul and Samuel went to their own places: Gibeah of Saul and Ramah of Samuel (1 Sm 25:1). Seemingly, the contrast was designed to emphasize the official departure from one another. Samuel critically rebuked Saul (1 Sm 13:14), and went to Gibeah in Benjamin, the political center of Saul (cf 1 Sm 11:4). He did not withdraw his official support from Saul. The temporary support of Samuel, however, did not last long. A clear indication of 1 Samuel 15:34 is that Samuel and Saul departed permanently away, since Samuel withdrew his official support from Saul. Ultimately their relationship was terminated. Consequently, the contrast between Ramah and Gibeah meant not only their separation, but the existence of a different power base.

The context, however, does not fully help to perceive the relation between Saul and Gibeah. The Hebrew structure of 1 Samuel 15:34 is noteworthy for discussion:

> וַיֵּלֶךְ שְׁמוּאֵל הָרָמָתָה וְשָׁאוּל עָלָה אֶל־בֵּיתוֹ גִּבְעַת שָׁאוּל
> Then Samuel went to Ramah on the other hand Saul went up to his home in Gibeah of Saul' (my own translation).

[144] For more details about the grammatical discussion of the construction, see Waltke & O'Connor (1990:136-160).

The genitive form, 'Gibeah of Saul' (גִּבְעַת שָׁאוּל) is juxtaposed to the prepositional phrase, 'to his home' (אֶל־בֵּיתוֹ), parallelled with the adverbial expression, 'to Ramah' (הָרָמָתָה). Although it is grammatically uncertain what the function of the juxtaposition is, semantically it means the same as 'at his home in Ramah' (בְּבֵיתוֹ בָּרָמָה) in 1 Samuel 25:1. The implied nuance of the phrase is that Saul begins to loose his ultimate religious support for his kingship. Now his kingship is doomed.

A similar nuance of the same phrase is attested to in Isaiah 10:29: 'Gibeah of Saul (גִּבְעַת שָׁאוּל) flees.' The place name, 'Gibeah of Saul' is a metaphor for the people of Gibeah. The characterization indicates that the people are now doomed.

A somewhat different example of the genitive form comes from 2 Samuel 5:7:

> וַיִּלְכֹּד דָּוִד אֶת מְצֻדַת צִיּוֹן הִיא עִיר דָּוִד
> However David captured the stronghold of Zion, the city of David (my own translation).

The sentence obviously shows that the genitive form, 'the city of David' means that the city now belongs to David. It is his possession. A similar case is attested to in Numbers 21:26-28:

> For Heshbon was the city of King Sihon of the Amorites, who had fought against the former king of Moab and captured all his land as far as the Arnon. Therefore the ballad singers say, "Come to Heshbon, let it be built; let the city of Sihon be established. For fire came out from Heshbon, flame from the city of Sihon. It devoured Ar of Moab, and swallowed up the heights of the Arnon.

The biblical passage informs Heshbon as the city of Sihon, king of the Amorites, since Sihon, king of the Ammorites, conquered Heshbon and named it after himself. The information tells that Heshbon belongs to Sihon as his possession. It is not an isolated case of naming a place after the name

of the conqueror in biblical materials (see Nm 32:41). Naming a place after the name of the conqueror means characterizing it with his name. It is obvious that the biblical author characterized Heshbon as the city of Sihon.

As seen above, naming a place after the name of the conqueror signifies the relation between the place and the conqueror as his possession. Indeed, the place belonged to the one who named it. However, the cases of Gibeah of Saul in 1 Samuel 15:34 and Isaiah 10:29 displays a different nuance as the phrase in 1 Samuel 11:4.

In 1 Samuel 11:4 the city is idealized as indication of the leadership of Saul, the savior of Israel. The prophetic writer of the phrase idealized Gibeah as the possession of Saul, and as the political base of his protection of the people, although Saul did not conqueror it. When the event of 1 Samuel 11 was written down, the monarchy of Saul and his leadership as king had already been idealized. Later, however, Gibeah was negatively attributed as the city characterized by Saul, as seen in 1 Samuel 15:34 and as in Isaiah 13:15. Gibeah was once idealized positively as the city of Saul and later traditionalized negatively.[145]

The messengers came directly to Gibeah of Saul. It is not surprising to see their expectation of Gibeah of Saul.[146] Although the circumstances of their arrival are ambiguous, their close relation can be seen in Judges 21 (cf 1 Sm

[145] In a somewhat similar manner Jerusalem was recognized in Chronicles as the city of David. Kalimi (2005:109-112) observed a reluctant attitude of the Chronicler to depict Jerusalem as the city of David. According to him, the Chronicler intentionally avoided the use of the phrase, city of David, for Jerusalem. The Chronicler even changed the information given by Samuel not to attribute to David the name Jerusalem as the city of David in 1 Chr 11:7. He concluded that the Chronicler avoided characterizing Jerusalem as the city of David. Although he did not give a specific reason for the Chronicler's tendency, it is presumably understood that the Chronicler aimed to stress the cultic function of the city rather than the political reality of the Davidic monarchy.

[146] The LXX gives a different textual tradition to the MT such as καὶ ἔρχονται οἱ ἄγγελοι εἰς Γαβαα πρὸς Σαουλ. The possible interpretation of the text is that the messengers came to Gibeah, to Saul.

31:11-13; 2 Sm 2:9-10).[147] It is legitimate to assume that the messengers originally intended to go to Gibeah of Saul directly.

4.4.3.3 Divinely leadership (vv 5-7)

4.4.3.3.1 Introduction

The leadership seen in these verses describes whence the divine leadership of Saul originated, and how the leadership worked. The narrator shows that, once empowered by the spirit of God, Saul magnificently demonstrated his leadership by mustering the people as a unit.[148] This depiction of Saul's leadership was to distinguish him from the so-called major judges, such as Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson. The narrator indicated that Saul differed from them, since his leadership is equivalent to that of Samuel (1 Sm 7:3-17). This section successfully described that Saul's authority as leader of Israel was divinely sanctioned by the spirit of God, which was confirmed by the terror of Yahweh on the people.

As a result, the mustering was successful. The success was the direct result of the divine sanctioned leadership, which had been implied in the secret meeting with the prophetic group at the high place (1 Sm 9:22-24). The people actualized the leadership of Saul by their immediate response to become his army. Before this actualizing of his leadership, Saul was just part of the people (cf 1 Sm 10:12). The suggestion is that the traditionalized prophet, Saul among the people, was actualized as their leader for whom they awaited to be their king in a specific situation. The people now came to

[147] De Geus (1976:111) contended that Benjamite, Ephramite, and probably also Reubenite clans were the inhabitants of Gilead, so that Gilead was always seen by the Israelites as a colonized region. His point of colonization is not accepted, since the text shows that Gilead had its own independent sovereignty, as discussed in the verse 1.

[148] Goldingay (2003:551) understood that the depiction of Saul plowing practically makes a good impression of the designated king who had to prove his ability to the people to confirm his designation. Although Goldingay indicated the positive aspect of Saul's appearance to the people, he overemphasized the role of Saul as designated king. There is no specific biblical account to mention of Saul's public designation in the prophetic tradition, 1 Sm 9:1-10:16 and 1 Sm 11:1-11. 1 Sm 10:17-27 rather delivers the public designation of Saul as king of Israel. However, it is a dtr interpolation to devaluate the divine sanction of Saul's kingship in 1 Sm 9:1-10:16.

Saul their king. The unity of Israel to fight against the enemy was what they expected of the kingship (cf 1 Sm 8:20).

4.4.3.3.2 Arrival of Saul (v 5)

Saul appeared at the very moment when the people of Israel needed him. In Samuel 9:17-19 Saul showed up with Samuel at the time when Samuel anticipated meeting him. As evinced in 1 Samuel 17:23, David came at the right moment when the people of Israel needed a hero to fight against Goliath, the Philistine. His heroic quality contrasted with their and Saul's fear (1 Sm 11, 24). David was ready to represent the name of Yahweh (1 Sm 17:45). In 1 Samuel 11:5 Saul showed up as the hero, who was well prepared to rescue his people. The motif of readiness idealized the leadership of Saul.[149] The focus of the narrator was that the hero came to the right place at the right time.

When Saul arrived, he saw the people of Gibeah weeping.[150] Hastely Saul queried [151] the people. His urgency implied that he had something in mind. Saul surely was forewarned by Samuel to wait for the occasion when God would raise him (1 Sm 10:7). This was surely the occasion.

The appearance of Saul[152] was highly exceptional in 1 Samuel 10:24.[153] His appearance was not the expected appearance of a king, who had to be

[149] Unlike the depiction of the narrative, the main representation of Saul in the DH is that he was not the right figure at the right moment (cf 1 Sm 13; 14).
[150] The form of יִבְכּוּ in the direct speech poses the question of the function of the *yiqtol* form as modal form or verbal form (Joosten 1997:76). Joosten (1997:76) contended that the *yiqtol* form expresses "the real present in questions" as in 1 Sm 1:8. Joüon & Muraoka (1991:367) clarified that the form in the interrogative surely expresses a durative action.
[151] Certainly מַה־לָּעָם the non-verbal interrogative clause conveys the eminency of the situation that Saul regarded. His imminent concern is intensified by the preposition לְ before the object, the people (Waltke & Connor 1990:323).
[152] Observe that the appearance of Saul is highlighted with the emphatic particle and the disjunctive conjunction *waw*, וְהִנֵּה (Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley 1910:307-308; hereafter GKC). The use of the particle, as seen in 1 Ki 13:24-25, refers to the introduction of a new character (Berlin 1983:94) rather than merely providing any point of view of a character (Miller 1996:88). In the narrative, another way of introducing a new character is seen in 1 Sm 11:1a (Nahash) and 6a (the spirit of God). In both cases the new characters are introduced

acclaimed king of Israel (1 Sm 10:24). Long (1989:231) explicated that it indicated Saul's reluctance towards his election as king. However, the description rather specified the positive characterization of Saul. He kept his anointing by Samuel in mind until the right occasion arrived (1 Sm 10:7). His patience was a positive qualification as anointed leader and ecstatic prophet (1 Sm 10:9-13). A point of reference is the description of the appearance of Elisha (1 Ki 19:19, 21):

> So he [Elijah] set out from there, and found Elisha son of Shaphat, who was plowing. There were twelve yoke of oxen ahead of him, and he was with the twelfth. Elijah passed by him and threw his mantle over him . . . He returned from following him, took the yoke of oxen, and slaughtered them; using the equipment from the oxen, he boiled their flesh, and gave it to the people, and they ate. Then he set out and followed Elijah, and became his servant.

The depiction is in a way reminiscent of Saul, especially the comparison of the relationship between Elijah and Elisha, with that of Samuel and Saul. Samuel told Saul about his mission (1 Sm 10:7). Now the time had come. He slaughtered the oxen and sent the pieces throughout Israel to summon them. Saul, the farmer, turned into the deliverer. Likewise, Elisha was farming when Elijah came to him. He also slaughtered his oxen to feed the people, and followed Elijah as his attendant. A similar motive is involved in both narratives. [154] Their appearances and actions are identical. After the occasions, Saul became king of Israel, and because Elisha a powerful prophet who played a critical role to anoint kings, to rescue the people from

---

with a *waw*-consecutive form. The distinction of the appearance of Saul does underscore a striking role of Saul in the narrative.

[153] Gordon (1986:123) saw the possibility that the appearance of Saul was "for his agrarian pursuits". The LXX tried to harmonize the description of Saul in the context of 1 Sm 10:17-27: 'καὶ ἰδοὺ Σαουλ ἤρχετο μετὰ τὸ πρωὶ ἐξ ἀγροῦ', ('and look! Saul was coming after the morning out of field).

[154] The description of Saul's leadership is somewhat reminiscent of the story of Gideon in Jdg 6. Gideon was also a farmer when the angel of the Lord came to him. Although Gideon had been hesitant to obey the calling of the angel, eventually he sent messengers to summon the people throughout all the hill country of Ephraim. Although there is a similar nuance in the literary context of the narrative of Saul and the story of Gideon, the differences between them are more striking: First of all, the way of summoning the people and secondly the response of the people to their leader.

their enemies, and to heal people. The close relationship between Samuel and Saul in establishing the kingship like that of Elijah and Elisha is undeniable.

The characterization of Saul in the verse is that Saul was the very hero that Israel wanted to have, since he appeared at the right moment. The characterization idealizes that he was well prepared to rescue his people.

4.4.3.3.3 Empowerment by the 'spirit of God' (v 6)

Saul turned into a different person (cf 1 Sm 10:6), after the 'spirit of God'[155] empowered him. His anticipated moment arrived. Saul's empowerment by the spirit of God became the sign of the occasion. To the people it was a confirmation of the divine sanction of Saul's leadership (Nicholson 2002:100).

Semantically the verse is obscure. In verse 6a the agent of the action is the spirit of God and its patient is Saul. In 6b the agent is his anger. The narrator did not clarify whose anger it is. If the agent was the spirit of God, the anger came from the spirit of God. If it was Saul's own anger, then it was not the spirit of God who caused Saul's fury.[156] Although it is semantically unclear who the agent of this anger was, contextually the anger is the result of his empowerment by the spirit of God. It is one of the most critical moments for Saul's leadership and his monarchy.

[155] Noticeably the different agent of the spirit is seen between the "spirit of God" (1 Sm 11:6) and the "spirit of Yahweh" (1 Sm 10:6). The different agent between the phrases shows a redactional intention involved to harmonize 1 Sm 11:1-11 with 1 Sm 10:17-27, which is a redactional interpolation of the Dtr. The prophetic tradition of 1 Sm 9:1-10:16 and 11:1-11 was disrupted by 1 Sm 10:17-27 to devaluate the divine sanction of the kingship of Saul. The Dtr intentionally changed the agent of the phrase from Yahweh to God in 1 Sm 11:6 and in 1 Sm 10:10. The redactional intention pinpointed the connection of Saul with the high places (cf 1 Sm 10:5).

[156] A similar case comes from Jdg 14:19. The verse shows that the empowering of the spirit of Yahweh does not relate to the anger of Samson. His anger came from the reason that the people of Timnah could solve his riddle. The narrator described it as the spirit of Yahweh that forced entry into Samson. As a result, he went down to Ashkelon to kill thirty men in the town. He stripped them to get thirty pairs of clothing, and gave it to those who had answered the riddle. After that, he left for his father's house in a rage. Semantically the spirit of Yahweh did not relate to the anger of Samson (cf Hertzberg 1974:93).

By his empowerment of the 'spirit of God' Saul was God's warrior against the enemy. The idea of the divine warrior is prevalent in the DH, since the enemies of Israel were the enemies of Yahweh (Barstad 2001:61). In a typical dtr passage David charged Goliath as the enemy of the God of Israel (1 Sm 17:45). Insulting the army of Israel is identical with being offensive against the God of Israel. The difference between 1 Samuel 17:41-49 and 1 Samuel 11:1-11 is striking. David defeated the enemy in the name of Yahweh. Saul routed the enemy in the spirit of God. The difference however cannot characterize the two figures as divine warriors, since David was also characterized by the empowerment of the 'spirit of Yahweh' (1 Sm 16:13). Both phrases, the spirit of the divine, and the name of the divine, indicated that the divine is the warrior who defeated the enemy. Historically in ancient Israel, the savior (*mōšīʿ*) represented the divine as warrior (1 Sm 11:3). Obviously the biblical traditions acknowledged that Yahweh himself is the very warrior who overpowers the enemies (Barstad 2001:61).[157]

The idea of the divine warrior gives an indication that the historicity of the narrative of Saul survived until the exilic period. The Dtr did not deny the historical consciousness of the empowerment of Saul.

4.4.3.3.4 Mustering all the Israelites (v 7)

Saul, who turned to a different man, took another step to show his powerful leadership by mustering the people of Israel. He cut oxen into pieces and sent them right across Israel to demonstrate his power and in which way he depicted the critical situation. His way of mustering reinforced the people to gather in unity, just as the pieces of the oxen symbolized all the people in one organization.[158]

[157] Lind (1980:167) stated that Yahweh stood against the people of Israel to judge them.
[158] Coogan (2006:235) understood that the action of cutting the oxen reminded the Israelites of "their mutual obligations under the covenant." However, it remains unclear what he means by "their mutual obligations under the covenant," since he only saw the established kingship of Saul after the defeat of the Ammonites. Indeed, the action of Saul implied a cultic characteristic. Unfortunately he disregarded why Saul would send a message with a cultic implication.

It is appealing to observe the use of the verb, וַיְנַתְּחֵהוּ ('and he cut them in pieces'). The basic meaning of the root נתח is 'to cut something in pieces' for sacrifices. The root only appears in the *piel* form, mainly to indicate the cultic activity in the sacrifice, as shown in Leviticus 1:6 and 12 that tell about the duty of the priests in the sacrifice (Driver 1913:86).

Saul's action had political as well as religious implications. His leadership and identity indicate how his action was understood during his time.

A probable historical and cultural background of Saul's action can be seen in the ANE, particularly from the Mari letter (Wallis 1952:57-61):

> To my lord speak: Thus (says) Bahdilim your servant: for five days after the time I have awaited the Hanaians and the people do not assemble. The Hanaians occupy extensive territory and have fortified sites. Once, twice I have sent to their sites and summoned them. But they have not assembled. Even on the third day they have not assembled. Now, if it is in accordance with my lord's wishes, let one of the culprits be killed, his head cut off, and in the area between the cities as far as Hudnim and Appan it will be sent, in order that the people will fear and assemble quickly and that I may undertake a campaign in accordance with the order which my lord has given (translation from Miller 1974:168).

In the letter Bahdilim the king of Mari asked to permit him to kill one of the Hanaians for mustering the people in the region of Hudnim and Appan. In asking permission, he expressed that mustering the people was the privilege of the king. Bahdilim pointed out that not responding to the call of the king was clearly an offense against the king. Thus, he pleaded for the right to kill one of them to make an example of the head of the corpse for criminal charges. He thought that the punishment would bring a quick and huge mustering. At least two issues are clear from the letter. The first is that killing a criminal for mustering the people belonged to the sovereignty of the king. The second is that the suggested way of mustering is efficient. The letter

showed the significance of mustering. The form of the intended punishment is confirmed in Jeremiah 34:18:

> And those who transgressed my covenant and did not keep the terms of the covenant that they made before me, I will make like the calf when they cut it in two and passed between its parts.

By analogy, the letter provides the historical and political context of Saul's mustering. As part of the ANE, Israel was about to form a national political entity under a leadership like the king. The king of Israel showed that he was aware of how to muster his people and to represent them as the leader in a critical war. He seriously warned how he would punish them in case they did not listen to him. His mustering was therefore politically designed.

It is determinental to observe the action in a cultic context, since the way of mustering reflected a cultic activity. For instance, in 1 Kings 18:23 Elijah asked the people to bring two oxen to be cut in pieces (וִינַתְּחֻהוּ), one for Yahweh and one for Baal, to prove which one is God. It was a sacrifice. Another example comes from Judges 19:29.[159] In this verse an anonymous Levite challenged the tribes of Israel to come out to punish the Benjamites, as he cut the corpse of his concubine into pieces (וַיְנַתְּחֶהָ) to be sent right across Israel. His concubine was a Bethlehemite. On the way home from Bethlehem, the Levite happened to meet a serious sexual attack in Gibeah (Jdg 19:22). As a result, he owed his life to his concubine (Jdg 19:27). Once returned to his home, he cut the corpse of the concubine into pieces and sent them right over Israel to muster a military action to punish the people of

[159] A close regional description of the narrative serves to indicate a possible close relation between Gibeah and Jabesh-Gilead. In Judges 19 Gibeah is targeted by the other Israelites because of her iniquity. In the critical crash Jabesh is absent in attacking Gibeah. In the end, the Benjamites as well as Jabesh-Gilead are destroyed by the Israelites. Later on, four hundred virgins of Jabesh-Gilead are forced to get married to the surviving Benjamites. The close relationship between Gibeah and Jabesh-Gilead is reflected in 1 Samuel 11 as the people of Jabesh-Gilead seek a deliverer in Gibeah of Saul. Polzin (1989:108-114) thus saw "judicial echoes" of Judges 19-21 in relation with 1 Samuel 11. Consequently he argued that the literary analogy signifies a negative evaluation of Saul. His literary analysis, however, results from the ignorance of the historical nature of 1 Sm 11:1-11 as the royal ideology of Saul.

Benjamin. On the one hand, his action showed infidelity and willful sin as a priest. On the other hand, it showed that he was well practiced in the offering of sacrifices.[160] It is significant to note that the Levite was a priest in the house of the Lord, since his priesthood provided a cultic background to the narrative. It is clear that the Levite priest transgressed the law that prohibits desecration of the land that Yahweh gives (Dt 21:23). His action obviously signified his infidelity and his willful sin.[161]

The analogy suggests a probable cultic context for Saul. A likely cultic tone of the action is seen in the immediateness of Saul's mustering. The narrator said that Saul immediately cut the oxen with him from the field, as the spirit of God empowered him. His action itself implies that he cut (וַיְנַתְּחֵהוּ) them with a knife. There is implication of the instrument to cut them with. The focus is on immediateness. A probable conjecture is that the narrator indicated that Saul was practiced and well prepared to kill sacrificial animals.[162]

The implication of Saul's action revealed some intentions. One is that Saul announced to the people who he was in the political as well as the religious context. He challenged the people to know who he was. He was the superior party as the people's suzerain. If they recognized him as suzerain, the people

[160] He was a priest. In Jdg 19:18 the Levite specifically mentioned that he was going to the house of the Lord. There is a textual inconsistency between the MT and the LXX on the verse. The LXX reads the house of the Lord as 'my house.' The translation of the LXX, however, does not fit smoothly in the text, and is insufficient to explain how the Israelites rapidly responded to the call of the Levite. Thus, the reading of the MT is preferable. Certainly, the action of the Levite is better seen in the cultic setting described in Lv 1:12.
[161] Wenham (2000:67-68) pointed out that the narrator describes the action of the Levite as a crime. At the same token, he contended that Saul's action, reflecting that of the Levite, is discredited. In a somehow similar way, Amit (2000:182-187) contended the negative intention of the narrative of the Levite on Saul's action. She believed that the action of the Levite is an allusion to that of Saul in 1 Sm 11:7. Thus, the action of the Levite should be regarded as an "artificial and forced motif." Conclusively, she stated that the place of the incident in Gibeah is intended "to strengthen the negative side with regard to Saul in what follows, to obscure the tragic effect, and thereby prepare the reader to welcome the change in rule and to prefer David." Her approach, however, does not give a critical answer why Saul had to look back to the Levite. Furthermore, Saul's action shouldn't be regarded as a horrible and cruel thing to the people as indicated in Jdg 19. First of all, the people were accustomed to participating in offering sacrifices. Secondly, Saul challenged the people, "I will do the same thing to your oxen." His challenge is not to the life of the people.
[162] Smith (1912:78) quoted Ewald for the possible case that the oxen were slaughtered for a sacrifice.

should respond to his call. In fact, the people responded to his call. Knowing each party surely served to sustain the covenantal relationship between them, as implied in Deuteronomy 9:24 and 2 Samuel 7:20 (Coogan 2006:113). Second, Saul emphasized the unity of Israel. His implied intention shows his understanding of his leadership. He was not a judge, but a king who represented the power of all the people among the nations. The concept of the unity intended for a centralized government. The narrator showed that Saul intended to establish his leadership in a firmly centralized sovereignty. Overall, Saul demonstrated the kind of a leadership the people expected to have from a king like nations had. As discussed in the royal ideology in the ANE, the people expected to have a king who could protect them from the enemies, and who could represent them to Yahweh in the cultic practice.[163]

In sending the parts of the slaughtered oxen it is questionable who the messengers were. The identity of the messengers is ambiguous because of the definite article. Generally the definite article identifies something or someone mentioned earlier. However it may define something or someone that is not yet introduced (GKC 1910:407). Thus, the phrase itself does not give any clear indication of the identity of the messengers. It is worthy to observe the reading of the LXX, where the definite article is deleted, ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλων. This reading indicates that the messengers, sent back to Jabesh-

[163] The religious position of Saul reminds of his massacre of the priests of Nob in 1 Sm 21:11-19. Polzin (1989:198-200) pointed out a literary continuity of the narrative (1 Sm 21) with the events narrated in 1 Sm 14. Particularly, he saw Ahimelech playing in the role of Jonathan in the events, in the crossway of death and ignorance. He surmised that the event highlights an emergence of "the new Saul," in contrast with showing "the old Saul" who attempted to kill his son as seen in 1 Sm 13-14. Others contended that the massacre shows a serious conflict "between an increasingly tyrannical king and the traditional leadership that had formerly ruled" (Ben-Sasson 1976:93). Indeed the brutal and tyrannical characterization was intended in 1 Sm 21. However, a further question should be given here, since it deals with a historical event of Saul. The religious status of Saul gives a probable hint how he could kill the priests of Nob, since even his guards were not willing to kill the priests of Yahweh (1 Sm 21:11-19). Above all, if he might consider the priests as the only official ones to inquire from God for him, how could he order to kill them all? Secondly, as shown in his officials' reluctant attitude to kill them he might not kill them just for a political reason. Supposedly, at the time there were numerous cultic figures even including Saul. On the one hand, Saul obviously aimed to disconnect any possible religious supporters from David (cf Bergen 1996:228). On the other hand he was supposed to show his sovereignty over the priests to the people. In the end, the massacre indicates that there was a serious conflict between Saul and the priests in Nob.

Gilead (v 9), were not the same messengers who were sent to deliver Saul's message (McCarter 1980:200). Although there is an ambiguity of their identity, it is impelling to understand who the messengers from Gibeah were. Logically it should be the people of Gibeah, since Saul was from Gibeah. They could impact directly on the people through the message of Saul. Thus, the messengers should be regarded as the people from the Gibeah of Saul, rather than the messengers from Jabesh Gilead.

Saul mustered the Israelites throughout all the territory of Israel with an astonishing warning, 'Whoever does not come out after Saul and after Samuel so shall it be done to his oxen.' Saul's designation of the place where the slaughtered oxen were to be sent was analogous to 1 Judges 19:27: 'throughout all the territory of the Israel' (בְּכֹל גְּבוּל יִשְׂרָאֵל). Unlike the designation of twelve in Judges 19:27,[164] there is no specific number to signify the number of the tribes of Israel. The phrase, 'throughout all the territory of Israel,' poses the question of the identity of Israel.[165] Although the historical identity of Israel as a national entity at the time is unclear, the intention of the narrator indicates Saul as the leader over Israel. The scene is conspicuous in contrast with the description of 1 Samuel 11:8 in which Saul numbered the Israelites into two groups, as Israelites and the men of Judah.

Saul's purpose for mustering the Israelites in a specific manner should be understood in the political and religious contexts. However, the consideration is clearly contrastive with the phrase, "after Samuel." One scholarly discussion, generally accepted it as a redactional addition (Veijola 1977:49; Flanagan 1976: 21).

Internal evidence for the thought comes from the phrase itself. The preposition preceding Saul is different from the one before Samuel,

[164] De Geus (1976:113) confirmed that the designation of twelve for the tribes of Israel is a late addition (cf Schunck 1963:64).
[165] It is generally viewed that Saul had ruled "over northern territories in the highlands" (Finkelstein & Silberman 2001:150). The designation of Israel in the verse is applied to the territory of the northern tribes of Israel (cf Herrmann 1981:140).

אַחֲרֵי שָׁאוּל וְאַחַר שְׁמוּאֵל. No active role for Samuel is reported in 1 Samuel 11:1-11 (Mettinger 1976:84-85). It is surprising to see no role of Samuel in such a highly critical moment for Israel such as the initial stage of Israel's monarchy. A possible indication of the absence of Samuel's leadership is that the focus of the narrative was now on Saul, and not on Samuel.

The phrase, "after Samuel," is ambiguous in the text. The text indicates that Saul did not have any direct contact with Samuel. Even the messengers of Jabesh-Gilead did not recognize the leadership of Samuel when they looked for a deliverer.

By adding Samuel's name, the redactional intention was probably to place the kingship of Saul under the leadership of Samuel, as the prophetic authority. The redactional context of 1 Samuel 9 and 10 focuses on the close relation between Saul and Samuel as far as prophecy is concerned. In 1 Samuel 10:1 Saul was anointed by Samuel. In 1 Samuel 10:24, under the leadership of Samuel, Saul was chosen by the lot. The choice of Saul was publicly announced by Samuel to the people. In 1 Samuel 11:7 Saul had the opportunity to actualize his leadership as king of Israel. Therefore Saul could send his message to the people with the authority of Samuel.

As mentioned earlier, however, the conjecture does not provide any compelling answer for the use of the phrase, "after Samuel." The appearance of Saul seemed like that of a farmer. Samuel was the agent who anointed Saul. In 1 Samuel 11:1-11 the anointed leader was then publically recognized as the divinely sanctioned king. The role of Samuel should be limited to the royal ideology of Saul's kingship. Although the prophetic narrator of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 propagated the royal ideology for Saul, the phrase was added by the Dtr in the exilic period (Dtr2) to stress the role of Samuel. Eventually the Dtr2 attempted to devaluate Saul's leadership under the authority of the prophet.

The narrator in 1 Samuel 11:7 states that the people of Israel came out as one man, since the 'fear of Yahweh' (פַּחַד־יְהוָה)[166] fell upon them. He connected Saul's mustering with the fear of Yahweh. Again, the phrase suited the royal ideology of Saul as a divinely sanctioned king.

4.4.3.4 Successful mustering: Israel together with Judah (v 8)

The historical narrative reports that 300,000 Israelites and 30,000 men of Judah were numbered for war. Without doubt, the hyperbolic expression emphasized how extraordinarily the people responded to Saul's calling.[167] The huge rally proved the triumph of Saul's leadership over Israel. However, the division of the Israelites and Judah in the army is strange since, as discussed in verse 7, the focus on the mustering is the unity of Israel.[168]

It is hard to accept the phrase ('those from Judah seventy thousand') as original. It rather reflects the intention of the Dtr in Josiah (Dtr1) (cf Flanagan 1976: 21; Foresti 1984:21). The Dtr1 did reflect the historical reliance of Saul's leadership in the event. He did not reject the historical claim of the event, but used it with his theological design to promulgate a role of Judah, the political and religious hub of the Davidic monarchy.

In analogy, it is remarkable to see Ephraim's challenge to Jephthah in Judges 12:1. The Ephraimites complained that Jephthah intentionally eliminated them from the war against the Ammonites. They saw the success

[166] The phrase, פַּחַד־יְהוָה appears 7 times: 1 Sm 11:7; 2 Chr 14:13; 17:10; 19:7; Is 2:10, 19, 21. Three different literary contexts could be observed for the phrase. First, it is involved in military activities as in 1 Sm 11:7; 2 Chr 14:13; 17:10. Second, a judicial purpose is given to the phrase as in 2 Chr 19:7 where Jehoshaphat king of Judah instructs judges to judge with the fear of the Lord. The last one referred to the eschatological aspect where in Isaiah the phrase connects with "on that day" as the day of the judgment of the Lord against Judah and Jerusalem. In all the cases the phrase emphasizes the condition of the case. Literarily the fear of Yahweh intensifies the degree of fear by using a "divine epithet" (Williams 1976:18)

[167] The figure, however, is not in accordance with other traditions. For instance, the LXX lists 600,000 Israelites and 70,000 Judahites and 4QSam[a] confirms the 70,000. The disagreement sometimes detracts from the historical source.

[168] Herrmann (1981:148) clarified that Israel represents a single entity and is conscious of being one 'people. The distinction between the Israelites and the men of Judah appeared after the fall of Samaria as seen in 2 Chr 30:1 and 31:6.

of the war, and worried about loosing their role in resolving a critical tribal matter.

In the time of Josiah, the Dtr experienced the political and religious revival under the kingship. Therefore they viewed the kingship positively. Supposedly, they attempted to legitimize the emergence of the kingship in Israel. At the same time they criticized the religious customs of the high places that served as religious guardians of Saul's kingship.

4.4.3.5 Promise to save Jabesh (v 9)[169]

Saul pledged his victory against the Ammonites. To the messengers of Jabesh-Gilead he gave a pledge to save them. In his promise he gave them the specific time of their deliverance. The absolute confidence in his victory was a significant sign from the leader of the people. Since he guaranteed the deliverance of the people, he might demand their complete loyalty. The narrator presumed that Saul was indeed qualified as king of Israel.

The characterization of Saul while he was swearing is contrastive to that of Saul depicted in 1 Samuel 14:36-46. In the critical battle against the Philistines, Saul swore to punish anyone who eats food until he defeated the enemies. In that occasion he also specified the time when he would finalize the combat. However, in that event the idea of swearing characterized his unqualified kingship, since his swearing showed that he did not have the sovereignty to resolve the issue.

[169] The initial verb brings another textual issue. In the MT, וַיֹּאמְרוּ, 'they said,' differed from the LXX, καὶ εἶπεν, 'and he [Saul] said.' In general, scholars prefer the reading of the LXX, since it provides a better literary context (Mettinger 1976:84). In verse 8a, the subject of the sentence is indicated as Saul by the verb, וַיִּפְקְדֵם. Contextually, it is preferred to read that he [Saul] numbered . . . he [Saul] said . . . However, each textual tradition has its own literary and theological intention. The shift of the agent of the action is of the prime importance, since changing the agent from Saul to the people does bring a drastic impact on the characterization of Saul in the text. Indeed, the intention of the change is to diminish the role of Saul as representing the people at Jabesh-Gilead. In conjecture, the change was to harmonize the narrative with 1 Sm 10:17-27 in which Saul was reluctantly brought out by the people to the public.

In sum, the prophetic writer of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 differed from the Dtr as to the qualification of Saul as the leader of Israel. The Dtr devaluated the qualification of Saul's leadership over Israel. On the other hand, the prophetic writer guaranteed that Saul should be king of Israel. In the verse his absolute confidence of victory demonstrated his divinely sanctioned leadership. The fate of Jabesh-Gilead was identical with their faith in Saul as representative of the 'spirit of God.' When the good news arrived, the people of Jabesh were about to have the deliverer (cf 1 Sm 11:11).

4.4.4 No shame but victory (vv 10-11)

4.4.4.1 Introduction

The final section focused on Saul's position as the deliverer who thwarted the possible national shame. Eventually he confirmed his leadership as king of Israel (cf 1 Sm 11:15). The narrator indicates that in this critical moment Yahweh confirmed the kingship of Israel.

4.4.4.2 Shame on Nahash (v 10)

The men of Jabesh came to Nahash to trick him in that they pretended that they would be shameful on the next day (cf Hamilton 2001:204). Literarily speaking, it is a remarkable scene in that the people attempted to deceive the leader who represented the people (cf Jos 9:3-27). Generally, a theme of deceitfulness in the OT illustrates that person tries to deceive a person or a group (Gn 30:25-43; 38:12-30; 1 Sm 21:10-15).

A similar literary pattern of deceit (1 Sm 11:10) is seen in another narrative. In Judges 3:15-23 Yahweh raised a savior, Ehud, for Israel as a response of the cry of Israel who suffered from Eglon, king of Moab. The strategy of Ehud to assassinate Eglon was clever. Ehud prepared a sharp sword, and strapped it to his right thigh under his clothing. Before the murder, he gained Eglon's trust. After he presented the tribute to the king of Moab, he alone returned to the king. His reappearance seemed strange to Eglon, but he did not doubt him. The narrator described Eglon as a fat man, which implied that

he was satisfied with the tribute of Ehud and his companions. He further implied that Eglon might have expected more valuable offerings from Ehud in secret. In contrast, he was clandestinely assassinated by Ehud.

Nahash, king of the Ammonites, was also deceived in a similar way. His over self-confidence prevented him from perceiving what was going on. The people of Jabesh did not say that they came out to him because they did not find a deliverer. Their action implied that he would presuppose that they did not find a deliverer. As in the case of Ehud, Jabesh caused Nahash to pride himself as the only judge in the matter. He was self-confident that he could decide to shame the people of Jabesh or not. The narrator characterized Nahash as a fool. He was a poor judge of the situation, and would be shamed on the next morning.

4.4.4.3 Victory for Jabesh (v 11)

On the next day Saul divided the army into three divisions, broke into the encampment of the Ammonites, and killed the Ammonites.[170] Saul's strategy was brilliant, whereas Nahash was too inert to fight against him. In this verse the passiveness of Nahash is highlighted with the passive voice of הַנִּשְׁאָרִים, (*niphal* participle masculine plural) and נִשְׁאֲרוּ, (*niphal* perfect third person masculine plural). Now Nahash, the attacker, fled to save his life, in shame, instead of the Israelites in v. 2d. The passiveness of the Ammonites is enveloped in contrasting verbs in verse 11f (וַיָּפֻצוּ) and verse 1(וַיַּעַל). In verse 1, Nahash the Ammonite stood as the attacker and the men of Jabesh attempted to make a treaty. But in verse 11 Saul, the deliverer, attacked the Ammonites and they fled before him. The comparison shows that the literary focus of the narrative is on the characters rather than on the event itself.

[170] In verse 11a וַיְהִי brings a new situation in a temporal circumstance. The temporal clause is followed by a chain of *waw*-consecutives which describes actions in sequence (cf Long 2002:164). Niccacci (1990:52) understood that this kind of *waw*-consecutive expresses "a single past action." The chain is broken with another וַיְהִי in v. 11e to emphasize a newly developed situation. The narrator intended to report the actions undertaken by Saul in sequence. With the sequence, the narrator reported the immediacy of the action. Thus, the narrator stressed the results of the action with the chain following וַיְהִי.

Saul's attack brought total victory over the Ammonites. Supposedly the enemies were not ready to fight in the attack of Saul. They were totally tricked by the saying of the people of Jabesh. The description of the victory and the annihilation of the enemies are in harmony with the Near Eastern royal ideology (see 2.2.1). For the perfect victory, Saul attacked the Ammonites vigilantly. He divided his army into three parts and started the military action when it was dark to bring about the effective result (cf Jdg 7:16; 9:43). The strategy confirmed Saul's military leadership.

4.4.5 Summary

The purpose of the whole narrative was to exalt Saul as king. The narrative itself evinced that Saul was the only deliverer in the military crisis. A strong military ability had been proved to be one of the significant traits of the kings in the ANE (Spalinger 2005:101). In the New Kingdom of Egypt learning the art of war was one of the most significant prerequites for a prince to become a victorious war leader and accepted king (Spalinger 2005:101).

In 1 Samuel 11:7 Samuel was added by the Dtr to demonstrate that the leadership of Saul was partly from Samuel's authority. In the narrative Saul distinguished himself from the judges by his mustering of Israel behind him. To some extent Saul shared the tradition of the judges, since his social background was rooted in the time of the judges. Saul's political motive, however, differed from the judges. He had been anointed as *nagid*.[171] The term clearly indicated the difference of Saul from that of the judges, who have mainly been called *sophet*. The major role of the *sophet* refers to a military conflict in terms of *mōšīª'*. Saul and the Judges can both be seen as *mōšīª'*. However, *mōšīª'* does not indicate the official role of the leaders. It rather focused on the function of leadership. The design of different terminologies

[171] Flanagan (1976:21) saw that Saul as the last judge, in connection with Jdg 19-21. Saul's leadership came from his charisma from the spirit of God and he was not anointed by Samuel. Unfortunately Flanagan did not give any details of Saul's similarity with Jdg 19-21 that could support his opinion.

for the leaders showed that their leadership differed from one another. In the prophetic narrative of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16), the leadership of *nagid* was supported by Samuel the seer and by the group of the ecstatic prophets in the high place. Saul demonstrated his leadership and actualized it in the kingship. Conclusively, the event was the fulfillment of the prophecy of 1 Samuel 10:5-6.

4.5 Synthesis

In the context of the kingship there were two distinct perspectives: pro-monarchy and anti-monarchy. Ironically both these perspectives were interwoven in the figure of Samuel. Samuel was designated to anoint Saul as the leader and king over Israel. On the one hand, Samuel guided him into the next procedure to confirm Saul as *nagid*/king in 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 (cf 1 Sm 11:12-15). On the other hand, Samuel was strongly opposed to the monarchy in 1 Samuel 8:1-19, 10:17-27 and 1 Samuel 12:1-25. The request for a human king was, according to these texts, to reject Yahweh as king over them.

In the anti-monarchic narrative Samuel judged and challenged Saul to focus on confirming the supremacy of Yahweh over Israel (cf Falk 1994:50). In fact, 1 Samuel 8:5 demonstrates that the nature of the kingship was pagan: “appoint for us, then, a king to govern us, like other nations." The request was in striking contrast to the motive of Yahweh’s supremacy and reign in 1 Samuel 9:16:

> He shall save my people from the hand of the Philistines; for
> I have seen the suffering of my people, because their outcry
> has come to me.

In the anti-monarchic narrative the kingship originated from the request of the elders. On the other hand, Yahweh was the agent in the pro-monarchic narrative. In the context of the narratives, 1 Samuel 11:1-11 seemingly combined the two perspectives. The initiative of the elders was to request a

king to judge them like all the nations (1 Sm 8:5). However, the motif of Yahweh and his supremacy was to elect a king to deliver his people from the hand of the Philistines. In 1 Samuel 11:1-11 Saul appeared like a judge rather than a king until he delivered Jabesh-Gilead from the Ammonites. Saul did not appear to deliver Israel from the hand of the Philistines, but to rescue Jabesh-Gilead from the Ammonites.

In the broader context, Saul was depicted as the symbol to represent the deteriorating relationship between Yahweh and Israel. When Samuel withdrew his support from Saul, contrary to his initial attitude towards him, their close religious and political relationship broke up. The three main jars between Samuel and Saul were, first, Saul's performing the role of priest before the battle with the Philistine (1 Sm 13:9-14), second, his disobedience to the divine punishment on Amalek (1 Sm 15:10-35), and the final scene, his engagement with the medium at En-dor (1 Sm 28:3-25). Falk (1994:50) saw that the conflicts originated from "the ideological basis for a differentiation between 'divine matters' and 'matters of the king,' which sometimes led to clashes between them." But the kingship of Saul was not distinct from 'divine matters' as seen in those conflicts. Saul considered 'divine matters' of the priest as part of 'matters of the king.'

The Dtr focused on the illegitimate kingship of Saul and at the same time implied the legitimacy of David as king of Israel. 2 Samuel 11-12 depicted David as the one who suppressed the Philistines as well as the Ammonites. The text illustrates that Saul's exploit had been downplayed (cf Campbell 2003:116). The legitimacy of David would be related to the Dtr's messianic hope in the exile (cf Knierim 1968:20-51).

The narrator of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 endeavored to idealize the leadership of Saul as a divinely sanctioned kingship. However its attempt had been coated by the hands of the Dtr. Basically, the social structure of Saul's time was not advanced to a monarchy but close to a chieftaincy. The attempt of the

prophetic narrator for the kingship was premature in the background of the social consciousness of his time, although the society obviously needed to advance into a monarchy, owing to the external factors (the Philistines and the Ammonites) and the internal factors (economic needs and religious stability).[172] The Dtr1 attempted partially to insert the role of Judah in the emergence of the monarchy of Israel to provide legitimacy for the Davidic monarchy (1 Sm 11:8). However, a striking point of the redactional phrase is to distinguish Judah from Israel where the monarchy originated with its evil concept without Yahweh. In verse 7, the Dtr2 tried to restrict the role of Saul in terms of Samuel's leadership. Thus, the Dtr2 did devaluate Saul's monarchy. In fact, the monarchy of Saul was a struggle throughout his life (1 Sm 13 and 15). A theological consciousness of 1 Samuel 11:1-11 is that Saul was divinely sanctioned leader/king (*nagid*) in the context of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16. A group of ecstatic prophets supported the divinely sanctioned leadership of Saul in terms of the royal ideology from the high place in Gibeah. Later the idealized report had slightly been redacted by the hands of the Dtr1 in the time of Josiah. Eventually, with the redactional phrase of the Dtr2, "after Samuel," the historical narrative was placed in its current place to idealize the Davidic monarchy.

This research summarizes two strong positions about Saul. Although Saul was king in the event of 1 Samuel 11:1-11, his appearance was like that of a judge (Edelman 1984:207). Saul was devaluated into the shape of the judges tradition. Long (1991:228-232), however, thought that 1 Samuel 11 itself was a unity and was not a "purely pro-Saulide account." It contained a negative description of Saul in terms of a "pre-monarchic judge." He contended that "Saul has apparently done little, if anything, to realize his kingship." The understanding of Long implies that Long was governed by the Dtr's theological judgment of Saul in the text (1 Sm 11:1-11) as well as its macro

[172] Brueggemann (1990:122) stated that the "emergence of the monarchy, culminating in Solomon, is not to be viewed-as is conventional-simply as a defensive organizational posture to resist the Philistines. Rather it reflective of a changed social position that had economic and military roots and that required intellectual, religious legitimation."

context (1 Sm 8-2 Sm 1). His contention is far from a historical consciousness of the event in the text (1 Sm 11:1-11) with 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16. The other position is that the text (1 Sm 11:1-11) shows a strong and firmly established kingship of Saul as *nagid*. The leadership depicted in the text (1 Sm 11:1-11; cf 1 Sm 11:15) was just that of the kingship (Miller 1974:157-74).

In conclusion, the textual exposition of 1 Samuel 9:1-10:1-16 is in accordance with the description of 1 Samuel 11:1-11. It implies that Saul's kingship was divinely sanctioned and that he proved it in a critical war. He was anointed as king of Israel in terms of prophecy (1 Sm 10:1). He was chosen by Yahweh in advance (1 Sm 9:16). The prophet, Samuel confirmed it. Consequently Saul made his kingship public in the war to save his people from the Ammonites. All his heroic actions fit in the description of his family line (1 Sm 9:1-2).

The discussion clearly demonstrated that 1 Samuel 11:1-11 highly idealized Saul's divinely sanctioned kingship in the prophetic narrative of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16). Social politically, the attempt of the royal ideology was premature. There was no achievement of any religious and social centralization under this kingship. The situation is the same with David. However, the observation facilitates the understanding of the historical narrative in a prophetic context. In fact, the narrative shows a religious attempt to idealize Saul.

CHAPTER 5
SYNTHESIS

5.1 Introduction

1 Samuel 11:1-11 was involved in various textual and historical processes to form the present text and context. Since the biblical narrative talks about the critical moment of the emerging kingship in Israel, it serves as a historical source for the probable event of that time. On the one hand, the historical description of the narrative is valuable, particularly the event in which Saul achieved a sheer victory over the Ammonites. On the other hand, the way in which his leadership and his presence are presented is highly idealized with implied intentions of the narrator. The narrator illustrated how the leadership of Saul was divinely sanctioned for the kingship of Israel. Saul's prophetic group designed the royal ideology. The text also underwent redactional activites of the Dtr in the time of Josiah and the exilic period.

Through delicate redactional intentions the narrative was incorporated in the macro-context of the royal ideology of David. It was an apology in that the Dtr attributed the evil origin of the kingship to Saul in order to provoke the Davidic character. Although many successive Davidic kings failed in their loyalty to Yahweh, their transgressions had eventually been ransomed by the Davidic monarchy. In the time of Josiah the Dtr tried to idealize the Davidic kingship and the religious tradition based on the Temple of Jerusalem. During the exile the Dtr propagated the legitimacy of the Davidic kingship that could revive the political and religious life of Israel based in Jerusalem. In the macro-context the narrative was skillfully ordered and theologically redacted.

This chapter summarizes the previous discussions and organizes the characterization of Saul in the historicized and theologized Saul, in order to point to the distinctions between historical Saul and redactional perspectives on Saul. This summary synthesizes the proposed research problem, the aims and objectives, and the methodology of this research.

5.2 Saul, the divinely sanctioned king (the prophetic tradition)

After the defeat of the Ammonites (cf 1 Sm 11:15) the tradition of Saul idealized the leadership of Saul as a divinely sanctioned kingship. The heroic achievement of Saul caught the attention of all the tribes of Israel (1 Sm 12:12). The people of Israel awoke to unite politically for their protection (cf 1 Sm 8:5). They experienced that unstable leadership resulted in destroying the religious confidence in Yahweh (1 Sm 4:1-11). There were some people who looked forward to more than the political and religious benefits from the kingship, namely permanent social benefits (cf 1 Sm 10:26). Finally, the people realized that the heroic achievements of Saul demonstrated how the leadership of the king could bring national well-being. In this well-being all their hopes could materialize (1 Sm 11:15). The people realized that Saul's leadership had been divinely sanctioned by the spirit of God, and fulfilled as prophecized (1 Sm 10:7; 11:6-7). The awareness of the divine sanction of the leadership of Saul caused them to believe that the monarchy came from Yahweh (cf 1 Sm 9:16). They knew that their expectations could only be actualized by a monarchy like the one among the nations.

By providing divine support to Saul, the prophetic group could justify their prophetic activity. In the time of Saul two prophetic groups were conspicuous: The prophetic group of Samuel in Ramah (1 Sm 19:18-20) and a group of ecstatic prophets from the high places (1 Sm 10:10-13; cf 1 Sm 10:5-7). The presence of two prophetic groups shows a possible religious conflict between them. The power game happened among the prophetic groups to grasp the religious and political hegemony in the kingship of Saul. Their religious activities were indispensable to form the kingship into a political reality among the people.

Gradually Saul became aware that he was the focal point to combine the religious, political, and social factors in his kingdom (cf 1 Sm 13:9; 14:49-51; 22:6-19). Saul's decisive and direct leadership evoked memories of victories against the enemies (1 Sm 14:47-48, 52). He was devoted to defend his

people from the enemies, the Philistines (1 Sm 31). Religiously he was devoted to make Yahweh known as the God of Israel. Practically, he presented offerings to Yahweh (1 Sm 11:7; 13:9). On the other hand, he consistently relied on answers of Yahweh to fulfill the people's expectation of him in his critical moments as king of Israel (1 Sm 14:18, 37-41; 28:6 cf 1 Sm 8:5). His religious reverence for Yahweh was expressed in building an altar for Him (1 Sm 14:35). A highly striking historical reference about Saul was depicted in his repentance before Samuel and Yahweh (1 Sm 15:24-31). Although Samuel announced Yahweh's rejection of his kingship, Saul went to worship Him (1 Sm 15:31). Several times the historical consciousness about Saul evinced that he attempted to serve Yahweh by his own way not in keeping the commands of Samuel. Samuel thought that Saul challenged his religious authority to represent Israel to Yahweh. Saul understood his kingship with regard to political and religious matters in terms of protecting the people. His temptation to be the prime figure in Israel eventually brought a serious conflict with Samuel and his disciples in Ramah (1 Sm 13:10-14; 15; 19:18-24).

In sum, Saul appeared as the king who was divinely sanctioned by Yahweh (1 Sm 11:7; cf 1 Sm 10:6). He was devoted to protect his people from their enemies throughout his life (1 Sm 31; 2 Sm 1:17-27). His real failure was that he could not build his kingship to be permanent.

5.3 Saul divinely rejected king (a redactional perspective)

5.3.1 Introduction

Throughout the DH, Saul was judged as the rejected and unfaithful king of Israel. According to the implication of the Dtr, the evil origin of the kingship was brought by Saul to Israel. Further his kingship was stained by his initial connection at the high places. The Dtr attributed the ultimate failure of the kingship of Israel to the wrong cultic practices in the high places. The Dtr considered that the cultic practices at the high places were oriented at other pagan worships. Unfaithfulness to the cultic practices in the Temple of

Jerusalem signified disloyalty to Yahweh. The Dtr longed to see the revival of the cultic life in the Temple of Jerusalem and the renewal of the Davidic monarchy. Indeed, Saul was destined to fail in the perspective of the Dtr in favor of the idealization of the Davidic kingship.

5.3.2 Saul, a leader lacking knowledge

The Dtr highlighted Saul's lack of knowledge as king of Israel. The ANE king had to prove his divine knowledge to his people as a sign of the divine sanction of his kingship. The intention of the Dtr was to indicate Saul's lack of knowledge of what was to happen. Without this knowledge a king such as Nahash (1 Sm 11:1-11) would have failed.

One of the contentions of this dissertation is that 1 Samuel 11:1-11 was originally designed as part of the royal ideology of Saul's kingship. In this narrative the royal knowledge of Saul was juxtaposed with that of Nahash. The intention of the narrator was to propose Saul's divine leadership as well as his knowledge as attested in his victory over Nahash's foolish attitude in judging future events. Indeed Saul was a legitimate king whereas Nahash was an improper king according to the idea of the ANE.

However, in the macro-context the idea of royal knowledge was applied to Saul negatively. Furthermore, it is seen in the redactional phrase, "after Samuel," and in the biblical narrative. In 1 Samuel 11:9 the Dtr intentionally changed the agent conducting the military operation from Saul to the people of Israel, "they said" (וַיֹּאמְרוּ). The voice in the sentence is hardly to be believed as the original one, since the text itself focused on idealizing Saul's definite and powerful leadership as king of Israel.

The concept of royal knowledge was highly significant to the Dtr in the relation between Samuel and Saul. Saul was initially introduced by Samuel to the prophetic group of the high place. Since then, Samuel always attempted to play a superior role over Saul, particularly in religious matters. Samuel

prophesized that Saul was to meet a prophetic group, to turn into another person, and to do what he wished to do (1 Sm 10:5-7). In 1 Samuel 13 Samuel claimed responsibility over the cultic activity that Saul performed to demonstrate his right to his people before the critical battle with the Philistines. In 1 Samuel 15 Samuel officially withdrew his support from Saul, departing from him forever. Samuel was the only prophet who could give Saul the divine answer (1 Sm 28).

The relationship obviously implied Saul's dependence (Czovek 2002:170-171; cf Rendtorff 2005:107) in the dtr context. Saul was dependent on Samuel, on his son Jonathan (1 Sm 14:1-23) and on David (1 Sm 17). The Dtr explicates that Saul absolutely relied on Samuel's leadership to build his kingship among the people (1 Sm 10:17-27). Saul was even underscored as one who relied on a medium in his final moment as king of Israel (1 Sm 28). On the contrary, in the prophetic tradition of Saul (1 Sm 11) Saul was independent and confident to resolve the crisis of Jabesh-Gilead.[173] That was the right charismatic leadership. The independence and resolution of the charismatic leadership would bring success. But the dependent leadership was not part of the charismatic leader. The dependent characterization of Saul was designed to show the illegitimacy of Saul's kingship.

Lack of divine knowledge characterized Saul with the evil religious practices denounced by the law of Deuteronomy (Dt 18:15-22). The deliberate choice and ordering of the narratives by the Dtr was designed to emphasize the evil

[173] Czovek (2002:173) payed close attention to the dependent characterization of Saul as the crucial point to observe Saul's real failure when rebuked by Samuel: "My contention is that Saul, by taking action on his own, unintentionally issued a challenge to the authority structure established by Samuel. Saul did not prove to be subservient. That the king may become independent of the prophet by establishing a second centre of power not under his control posed a real threat to Samuel." His point is that Saul's failure was not because of sin against Yahweh in the cultic activity (1 Sm 13). His failure was rather intended by Samuel who wanted to bring "the king under his prophetic control-by vague 'prophetic' formulations, delay and prophetic denouncement" (Czovek 2002:173). Although he pointed to the significant relation between Saul and Samuel, he did not give further explication on the absence of Samuel's role in 1 Sm 11. Why did Samuel intend to fail Saul's charismatic leadership in 1 Sm 13? No specific answer was given; his point was ambiguous in explaining the probable reason for Samuel's rejection.

origin of the kingship of Israel in Saul. The beginning of Saul's appearance referred to the high places (1 Sm 9:15-27; 10:13). The final moment in his life captured his visit to the medium in 1 Samuel 28. Even in his kingship Saul is characterized as the one who breaks the prophetic word to keep the cultic practice (1 Sm 13). Isaiah 44:25 pointed out that diviners and soothsayers were the origin of foolishness:

> who frustrates the omens of liars, and makes fools of diviners; who turns back the wise, and makes their knowledge foolish.

The explication of Chronicler (1 Chr 10:13-14) about the religious practices of Saul shows how the Chronicler understood the judgment of the Dtr on Saul:

> So Saul died for his unfaithfulness; he was unfaithful to the LORD in that he did not keep the command of the LORD; moreover, he had consulted a medium, seeking guidance, and did not seek guidance from the LORD. Therefore the LORD put him to death and turned the kingdom over to David son of Jesse.

The focus of the Chronicler[174] was on the story of the medium at Endor (1 Sm 28). The inquiry of Saul from the medium (1 Sm 28) was apparently seen as unfaithfulness of Saul to Yahweh.

The perspective of the divine knowledge in the DH was surely intended by the Dtr. Saul consistently tried to have an answer from Yahweh. As he confessed to Samuel (1 Sm 28:6), he was devoted to finding the answer of Yahweh from dreams, from the Urim, or from the prophets. Saul's lack of the divine knowledge was the view of the Dtr from their particular historical situation, namely the reform of Josiah and the exilic period.

[174] Dyck (1998:145) viewed the idea of "unfaithfulness" as central in Chronicles, referring to unfaithfulness to the cult; further the idea of "seeking Yahweh" concerned the legitimate cult. The Chronicler convincingly characterized Saul as the one who was unfaithful to the cult of Yahweh.

5.3.3 People-oriented characterization of Saul

The appearance of Saul in 1 Samuel 11:1-11 was closely related to his hearing of the cry of the people (vv 4-6). His careful and attentive listening gave him the chance to show his divinely sanctioned leadership as king. Nahash intended to bring national shame on Israel (1 Sm 11:2). Saul appeared on the scene to protect the dignity of Israel against the intended shame. The kingship of Israel was triggered to protect the national honor. The event clarifies why the people of Israel rushed to proclaim Saul as their king (1 Sm 11:15). They certainly witnessed how Saul protected them against the insult of the enemies. The event showed that a responsibility of the monarchy of Israel was to protect the honor of the people of Israel.

This specific positive characteristic of Saul was considered negatively by the Dtr. The Dtr characterized him as driven to fail because of his attitude as the rejected king. Samuel considered Saul unfaithful in that he did not keep his command to destroy Agag and all the valuable animals and things (1 Sm 15). His positive people-oriented character was challenged as unfaithful to Yahweh.

The society of Saul was rather an 'honor-oriented society' that tried to avoid shameful and dishonorable considerations from a specific figure or group of people (cf Jemielity 1992:32). Saul's inclination to behave like he did in his people-oriented society is observed in this context.

In 1 Samuel 15:30-31 Saul implored Samuel to accompany him before the elders of Israel. He was really afraid of loosing his respect and honor before the elders. Indeed the respect and honor of the elders guaranteed his kingship socially, since their honorable attitude to Saul would result in the same respect from the people. As the political head of the people, Saul hated to be treated shamefully.

The Dtr theologized that the people-oriented character of Saul drove him to grasp a kingship by accumulating political and religious authority like that of all the other ANE nations. The attempt of Saul was unjustifiable to Samuel and to the Dtr and therefore was challenged by them. The Dtr saw it as unfaithfulness to Yahweh.

In the end, the Dtr characterized Saul's kingship as illegitimate and failed in terms of the divine favor. First, Saul was not a proper judge, since he did not stand in the traditional line of the judges, as represented by Gideon who rejected the offer of kingship by the people because he acknowledged the divine kingship. Second, Saul was not a proper king who could represent all his people as well as their national God, Yahweh. He did not acknowledge the leadership of Samuel as the father of prophetic group. He rather tried to take over Samuel's fatherly role as a prophet as well as a priest.

5.4 Synthesis

Keys (1996:149-150) confirmed that there is little personal information about Saul except 1 Samuel 9-10. Further, the macro-text of the narrative of Saul focuses on showing him as king and as the king in conflict with Samuel (1 Sm 11; 13-14; 15; 17). Keys (1996:150) inferred that the only concern of the biblical text is "with his [Saul's] fall from divine favor and ultimately from his office." Indeed, the perspective of the macro-context complies with the comment of Keys.

The agenda of the Dtr was to illustrate that the kingship of Israel was originally designed as a way to make the God of Israel, Yahweh, known. This clearly departed from the intention of the people who asked to have a king. The Dtr saw the kingship that the people requested was the improper institution to make Yahweh known, unless they listened to the voice of Yahweh (1 Sm 12). To the Dtr, Saul was a typical example of one who does not make Yahweh known. Consequently, he was disqualified as king of Israel because he should have led the people to know their God, Yahweh.

As in Saul's case, the kingship of Israel failed to keep the divine knowledge. That was the reason for their exile. Ezekiel repeatedly emphasized why the kingship of Israel disappeared: "and they shall know that I am Yahweh."[175] In 1 Samuel 11:7 the Dtr emphasized the idea of knowing Yahweh with an additional phrase, "after Samuel."

1 Samuel 11:1-11 shows that the appearance of the kingship of Saul was inevitable in the critical period of the Israelite history. The leadership of Saul was divinely sanctioned in the prophetic manner. Actually his religious and political base came from the strong support of a prophetic group at the high place. Such a prophetic characteristic of Saul was highly welcomed by the people, since that was just the kingship that the elders requested to Samuel: "a king that all the nations have" (1 Sm 8:5).

However, in the redactional context, the value of Saul's kingship was judged highly negative because his kingship did not lead the people to know their God, Yahweh, in keeping the Mosaic covenant. The Dtr attempted to demonstrate the way which Saul's kingship held to wrongly oriented cultic practices. This kingship did not keep the people faithful in observing the covenant. According to the Dtr, as evinced in the fall of Jerusalem, the high places prevented the keeping of the covenant in knowing Yahweh. They caused the people to worship false gods. Thus, the Dtr endeavored to attribute a direct cause of the fall of Israel to the origin of the kingship of Saul who was closely connected with the high places to build his kingship. The Dtr was motivated to clarify that the political and religious base of Saul was the original reason that prevented the people of Israel to know who Yahweh is. Yahweh is the only king of Israel that the people should know.

In conclusion, the phrase, "Come out after Saul and after Samuel," shows the success of the Dtr to indicate that the leadership of Saul worked only when

[175] Matthews (2001:133) observed that the phrase appears more than eighty times in Ezekiel, for instance, Ezk 5:13; 6:14; 7:27; 20:26; 39:6 and so on. A similar phrase appears mainly in Isaiah (9:8; 19:21; 37:20; 41:20; 49:26).

supported by Samuel. In other words, Saul's leadership was not a completed kingship because the kingship of Saul was oriented in keeping with Samuel. In the end, the original royal ideology of Saul pave the way to David, according to the Dtr. Saul was refuted by Samuel and rejected by Yahweh as king of Israel. Indeed the intention of the phrase, "after Samuel," is not for Saul but for Samuel. It is the history of the Dtr!

The summary of the synthesized research is concisely as follows:

- Saul was king of Israel when he rescued the people of Jabesh-Gilead (1 Sm 11:1-11).
- A major historical and religious thrust brought the multiple traditions into the dtr narrative.
- The social and religious background of Saul in the emergence of his kingship pinpointed his close connection with ecstatic prophetic group of the high place.
- 1 Samuel 11:1-11 highly idealized Saul's divinely sanctioned kingship in the prophetic narrative of Saul (1 Sm 9:1-10:16).
- The research proposed the characterization of Saul in terms of a prophetic tradition and a dtr redaction.
- The methodology distinguished embedded historical information in the text from a final redactional intention, that is, theological purpose of the redactor.

The discussion in the dissertation confirms my hypothesis, namely that two prophetic groups were directly involved in the emergence of the kingship of Saul: Samuel and his priestly prophetic group based on Ramah and Saul and the group of ecstatic prophets of the high place in Gibeah. Their prophetic distinction was focused on their different prophetic and cultic base. The kingship of Saul was negatively characterized with the prophets of the high places (1 Sm 19:24; cf 1 Sm 28:6, 15) by the Dtr who inherited a prophetic tradition from Samuel. The divinely sanctioned leadership of Saul in 1

Samuel 11:1-11 was paradoxically devaluated in the dtr context. The dtr redaction aimed not only to demonstrate Saul's unqualified kingship but also the evil origin of the kingship so that the Dtr could protect the kingship of David in the exilic time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, J S 1991. Who can stand before YHWH, this holy God? A reading of 1 Samuel 1-15. *Prooftexts* 11 (fall), 1-24.

Albertz, R 1994. *A history of Israelite religion in the Old Testament period*, vol. 1, *from the beginnings of the end of the monarchy*; vol. 2, *from the Exile to the Maccabees*. Translated by Bowden, J (OTL). Louisville: Westminster.

Albright, W F 1961. Samuel and the beginnings of the prophetic movement. *Proceedings of the Goldenson lecture, Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati.* Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press.

Allen, L C 1990. *Ezekiel 20-48* (WBC 29). Dallas: Word.

Alström, G W 1993. *The history of ancient Palestine from the Paleolithic period to Alexander's conquest with a contribution by Gary O. Rollefson and edited by Diana Edelman* (JSOTSup 146). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Alt, A 1966. *Essays on Old Testament history and religion.* Translated by Wilson, R A. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Amerding, C E 1975. Were David's sons really priests? *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation,* 75-86.

Amit, Y 1994. Literature in the service of politics: Studies in Judges 19-21, in Reventlow, H G, Hoffman, Y & Uffenheimer, B (eds), *Politics and theopolitics in the Bible and postbiblical literature*, 28-40 (JSOT Sup 171). Sheffield: JSOT.
_____1999. *History and Ideology: Introduction to historiography in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
_____1999. *The Book of Judges: The art of editing*. English ed. Leiden: Brill.
_____2000. *Hidden polemics in biblical narrative*. Translated by Chipman, J. Leiden: Brill.

Anderson, A A 1989. *2 Samuel* (WBC 11). Dallas: Word.

Anderson, G A 1988. *Sacrifices and offerings in ancient Israel: Studies in their social and political importance* (HSM 41). Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Arnold, P M 1990. *Gibeah: The search for a biblical city* (JSOTSup 79). Sheffield: JSOT.

Assmann, J 1990. *Ma'at. Gerechtigkeit und Unsterblichkeit im alten Ägypten*. Munich: Beck.

Atwell, J E 2004. *The sources of the Old Testament: A guide to the religious thought of the Hebrew Bible*. London: T & T Clark.

Auld, A 2000. Prophets share-but recycled, in Römer (ed), 19-28.
_____2004. *Samuel at the threshold: Selected works of Graeme Auld* (SOTS). Hants, England: Ashgate.

Baines, J 1998. Ancient Egyptian kingship: Official forms, rhetoric, context, in Day, 16-53.

Baldwin, J 1988. *1 and 2 Samuel: An introduction and commentary*. Leicester: Inter-varsity.

Bar-Efrat, 1989. *Narrative art in the Bible*. Sheffield: Almond.

Barrick, W B 2002. *The king and the cemeteries: Toward a new understanding of Josiah's reform*. Leiden: Brill.

Barstad, H M 2001. Deuteronomists, Persians, Greeks, and the dating of the Israelite tradition, in Grabbe, L L (ed), *Did Moses speak attic? Jewish historiography and scripture in the Hellenistic period* (JSOTSup 317), 47-77. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Barthélemy, D et al 1982. *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament: Josué, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther*. Rapport final du comité pour l'analyse textuelle de l'A.T (OBO 50/1). Göttingen: hébreu institute par l'Alliance Biblique Universelle.

Barton, J & Bowden, J 2004. *The original story: God, Israel and the world*. London: Darton.

Barton, J 2007. *The nature of biblical criticism*. Westminster: Louisville.

Becker, U 1990. *Richterzeit und Königtum* (BZAW 192). Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

Becker, U 2005. *Exegese des Alten Testaments: ein Methoden-und Arbeitsbuch.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Ben-Sasson, H H (ed) 1976. *A history of the Jewish people*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bergen, R D 1996. *1, 2 Samuel* (NAC 7). Nashville: Broadman.

Berlin, A 1983. *Poetics and interpretation of biblical narrative*. Sheffield: Almond.

Birch, B C 1976. *The rise of the Israelite monarchy: The growth and development of 1Samuel 7-15* (SBLDC 27). Missoula: Scholars Press.
_____2005. The first and second books of Samuel, in *The New Interpreter's Bible: Old Testament survey*, 118-129. Nashville: Abingdon.

Birch, B C & Brueggemann, W & Fretheim, T E & Petersen, D L 2005. *A theological introduction to the Old Testament.* 2nd ed. Nashville: Abingdon.

Blenkinsopp, J 1975. The quest of the historical Saul, in Flanagan, J W & Robinson, A W (eds). *No famine in the land: Studies in honor of John L Mckenzie*, 75-99. Missoula: Scholars Press.

Block, D I 1998. *The book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48* (NICOT). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
_____1999. *Judges, Ruth* (NAC 6). Nashvill: Broadman.

Bluedorn, W 2001. *Yahweh versus Baalism: A theological reading of the Gideon-Abimelech narrative* (JSOTSup 320). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Boling, R G 1975. *Judges*. Garden city, NY: Doubleday.

Brettler, M Z 2002. *The book of Judges*. London: Routledge.

Breytenbach, A P B 2000. Who is behind the Samuel narrative? In De Moor & Van Rooy, 50-61.

Bright, J 1981. *A history of Israel*. 3rd ed. London: SCM.

Brueggemann, W 1990. The social significance of Solomon as a patron of wisdom, in Gammie, J G & Perdue, L G (eds), *The sage in Israel and the ancient Near East*, 117-132. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
_____2000. *1 & 2 Kings* (Smith & Helwys Bible commentary). Macon, Georgia: Smyth.
_____ 2003. *An introduction to the Old Testament: The canon and Christian imagination.* Louisville: Westminster.

Buss, M J 1980. The social psychology of prophecy, in Emerton, J A (ed). *Prophecy: Essays presented to Georg Fohrer on his sixty-fifth birthday 6 September 1980*, 1-11 (BZAW 150). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Campbell, A F1986. *Of prophets and kings: A late ninth-century document (Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)* (CBQMS 17). Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.
_____2002. The storyteller's role: Reported story and biblical text. *CBQ* 64, 427-441.

_____2003. *1 Samuel*: *The forms of the Old Testament Literature volume VII*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
_____ 2005. 2 Samuel*: The forms of the Old Testament Literature volume VIII*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Carlson, R A 1964. *David, the chosen king: a tradition-historical approach to the Second Book of Samuel*. Stockholm: Almqvist.

Cartledge, T W 2001. *1 & 2 Samuel*: *Smyth & Helwys Bible commentary*. Macon, Georgia: Smyth.

Catron, J E 1995. Temple and bāmāh: Some consideration, in Holloway & Handy, 150-165.

Chaney, M L 1986. Systemic study of the Israelite monarchy. *Semeia* 37, 53-76.

Childs, B S 1979. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Claessen, H J & Skalník, P 1978. *The early state*. The Hague: Mouton.

Clements, R E 1996. *Old Testament prophecy: From oracles to canon*. Louisville: Westminster.

Cogan, M 1995. The road to En-dor, in Wright, Freedman & Hurvitz, 319-326.

Cohn, R L 2000. *2 Kings* (Berit olam: Studies in Hebrew narrative & poetry). Collegeville, Minnesota: The liturgical Press.

Collins, J J 2004a. The politics of biblical interpretation, in McCarthy, C & Healey, J (eds), *Biblical and near eastern essays: Studies in honour of Kevin J. Cathcurt*, 195-211. London: T & T Clark.
_____2004b. *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible with CD-Rom*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Coogan, M D 1998 (ed). *The Oxford history of the biblical world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
_____2006. *The Old Testament: A historical and literary introduction to the Hebrew Scriptures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, A 1986. Fiction and history in Samuel and Kings. *JSOT* 36, 27-48.

Cook, J E 1999. *Hannah's desire, God's design: Early interpretations of the story of Hannah* (JSOTSup 282). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
_____2006. *Hear O heaven and listen O earth: An introduction to the prophets.* Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical.

Coote, R B 2006. Tribalism: Social organization in the biblical Israels, in Esler, P F (ed), *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in its social context*, 35-49. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Coote, R B & Whitelam, K W 1986. The emergence of Israel: Social transformation and state formation following the decline in Late Bronze Age trade. *Semeia,* 37:53-76.
_____1987. *The emergence of early Israel in historical perspective*. Sheffield: Almond.

Crawford, H 2004. *Sumer and the Sumerians*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Craigie, P C 2004. *Psalms 1-50* (WBC). 2nd ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Cronauer, P T 2005. *The stories about Naboth the Jezereelite: A source, composition, and redaction investigation of 1 Kings 21 and passages in 2 Kings 9* (LHBOTS 424). London: T & T Clark.

Cross, F M, Lemke, W E, & Miller P D (eds) 1976. *Magnalia Dei: The mighty acts of god*. New York: Doubleday.

Cross, F M 1973. *Canaanite myth and Hebrew epic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Czovek, T 2002. Three charismatic leaders: Part one: Saul. *Transformation* 19/3, 169-182.

David, A R 1986. *The pyramid builders of ancient Egypt: A modern investigation of Pharaoh's work force*. London: Routledge.

Davies, J, Harvey, G & Watson, W G E 1995. *Words remembered, texts renewed: Essays in honour of John F A Sawyer.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Davies, P R 1992. *In search of ancient Israel* (JSOTSup 148). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Davies, P R & Rogerson, J 2005. *The Old Testament world*. 2nd ed. Louisville: Westminster.

Davis, J J & Whitcomb, J C 1980. *A history of Israel: From conquest to exile*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Davison, L W & Steussy, M J 2003. Samuel and Kings, in Steussy, M (ed), *Chalice introduction to the Old Testament*, 97-118. St. Louis: Chalice.

Day, J (ed) 1998. *King and messiah in Israel and the ancient near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament seminar* (JSOTSup 270). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
_____1998. The Canaanite inheritance of the Israelite monarchy, in Day, 72-90.

De Geus, C H J 1976. *The Tribes of Israel: An investigation into some of the presuppositions of Martin Noth's amphictyony hypothesis*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

De Moor, J C & Van Rooy, H F 2000. *Past, present, future: The Deuteronomistic history and the prophets*. Leiden:Brill.

De Pury, A, Römer, T & Macchi, J (eds) 2000. *Israel constructs its history: Deuteronomistic historiography in recent research* (JSOTSup 306). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Dever, W G 2001. *What did the biblical writers know & when did they know it? What archaeology can tell us about the reality of ancient Israel*. Grand Rapid: Eerdmans.
_____2003. *Who were the early Israelites and where did they come from?* Grand Rapid: Eerdmans.
_____2004. Histories and non-histories of ancient Israel, in Day, J (ed), *In search of pre-exilic Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament seminar*, 65-94 (JSOTSup 406). London: T & T Clark.

Dietrich, W 1972. *Prophetie und Geschichte: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (FRLANT 108). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
_____*1987. David, Saul und die Propheten: Das Verhältnis von Religion und Politik nach den prophetischen Überlieferungen vom frühesten Königtum in Israel*. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer.
_____2000. History and law: deuteronomistic historiography and deuteronomistic law exemplified in the passage from the period of the Judges to the monarchical period, in De Pury, Römer & Macchi, 315-342.

Dietrich, W & Naumann, T 2000. The David-Saul narrative, in Knoppers, G & McConville, J G (eds), *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent studies on the Deuteronomistic history*, 277-318. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Doorly, W J 1997. *The religion of Israel: A short history*. New York: Paulist.

Driver, S R 1913. *An introduction to the literature of the Old Testament*. 9th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Dumbrell, W J 1983. 'In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes': The purpose of the book of Judges reconsidered. *JSOT* 25, 23-33.

Dyck, J E 1998. *The theocratic ideology of the Chronicler*. Leiden: Brill.

Edelman, D V 1984. Saul's rescue of Jabesh-Gilead (1 Samuel 11:1-11): Sorting story from history. *ZAW* 96, 195-209.
_____1991. *King Saul in the historiography of Judah*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
_____2000. The Deuteronomist's David and the Chronicler's David: Competing or contrasting ideologies?, in Römer, 67-84.

Eichrodt, W 1961. *Theology of the Old Testament.* London: SCM.

Emmerson, G 1997 (ed). *Prophets & poets: A companion to the prophetic books of the Old Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon.
_____ 1997. General introduction, in Emmerson, G (ed), *Prophets & poets: A companion to the prophetic books of the Old Testament*, 9-15. Nashville: Abingdon.

Emerton, J A 1990. The site of Salem, in Emerton, J A (ed), *Studies in the Pentateuch* (VTSup 41), 45-71. Leiden: Brill.

Esler, L 1983. Viewpoints and point of view in 1 Samuel 8-12. *JSOT* 26, 61-76.
_____1985. *Kingship of God in crisis: A close reading of 1 Samuel 1-12*. Sheffield: Almond.
_____1989. *Into the hands of the living God* (JSOTSup 84). Sheffield: JSOT.

Esler, P F (ed) 2006. *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in its social context*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
_____2006. Social-scientific models in biblical interpretation, in Esler, 3-14.

Eslinger, L M 1985. *Kingship of God in crisis: A close reading of 1 Samuel 1-12*. Decatur: Almond.
_____2004. Beyond synchrony and diachrony. Hyperchrony, an archai framework for cultural criticism, in Dietrich, W (ed), *David und Saul im Widerstreit-Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit: Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuches* (OBO 206), 31-50. Göttingen: Academic Press Fribourg.

Even-Shoshan, A 1996. *A new concordance of the Bible: Thesaurus of the language of the Bible Hebrew and Aramaic roots, words, proper names phrases and synonyms.* Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer.

Eves, T 1982. One Ammonites invasion or two? 1 Sam 10:27-11:2 in the light of 4QSam[a]. *WTJ* 44, 308-326.

Falk, Z W 1994. Religion and state in ancient Israel, in Reventlow, H G, Hoffman, Y & Uffenheimer, B (eds), *Politics and theopolitics in the Bible and postbiblical literature* (JSOTSup 171), 49-54. Sheffield: JSOT.

Finkelstein, I & Silberman, N A 2001. *The Bible unearthed: Archaeology's new vision of ancient Israel and the origin of its sacred texts.* New York: The Free Press.

Flanagan, J W 1981. Chiefs in Israel. *JSOT* 20, 47-73.

Flanders, H J, Crapps R W & Smith, D A 1996. *People of the covenant: An introduction to the Hebrew bible*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Floyd, M H 2000. "Write the revelation!" (Hab 2:2): Re-imagining the cultural history of prophecy, in Ben Zvi, E & Floyd, M H, *Writings and speech in Israelite and ancient near eastern prophecy*, 103-143. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Fohrer, G 1969. Altes Testament-"amphiktyonie" und "Bund"? *BZAW* 115, 84 -119.
_____1972. *History of Israelite religion*. Translated by Green, D E. Nashville: Abingdon.

Fokkelman, J P 1993. *Narrative art and poetry in the books of Samuel: A full interpretation based on stylistic and structural analyses, volume IV, vow and desire (I Sam. 1-12)*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
_____1999. *Reading biblical narrative: An introductory guide*. Translated by Smit, I. Louisville: Westminster.

Foresti, F 1985. *The rejection of Saul in the perspective of the deuteronomistic school: A study of 1 Sm 15 and related texts*. Roma: Edizioni Del Teresianum.

Foster, B R 1995. *From distant days: Myths, tales, and poetry of ancient Mesopotamia*. Bethesda, Maryland: CDL.

Freedman, D N (ed). *Anchor Bible Dictionary (vol 1-6)*. New York: Doubleday.

Fretheim, T 2005. *God and world in the Old Testament: A relational theology of creation.* Nashville: Abingdon.

Frick, F S 1986. Social science methods and theories of significance for the study of the Israelite monarchy: A critical review essay. *Semeia* 37, 9-22.
_____1994. Cui Bono?-History in the service of political nationalism: The deuteronomistic history as political propaganda. *Semeia* 66, 79-92.

Friedman, R E 1981. *The Exile and biblical narrative: The formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly codes* (HSM 22). Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Fritz, V 2003. *1 & 2 Kings: A continental commentary*. Translated by Anselm, H. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Frolov, S 2004. *The trun of the cycle: 1 Samuel 1-8 in synchronic and diachronic perspective* (BZAW 342). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Gabriel, R A 2003. *The military history of ancient Israel*. Foreword by Mordechai Gichon. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Gadd, C J 1973. Hammurabi and the end of his dynasty, in *The Cambridge ancient history*, 3rd ed. 2:1, 176-227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gammie, J G 1971. Loci of the Melchizedek tradition of Genesis 14:18-20. *JBL* 90, 365-96.

Garbini, G 1988. *History and ideology in ancient Israel* (Originally published in Italian in 1986). London: Xpress.

Garsiel M 1983. *The first book of Samuel: A literary study of comparative structure, analogies and parallels*. Ramat-Gan: Revivim.

Goldingay, J 2003. *Old Testament theology: Israel's gospel.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
_____2005. *The message of Isaiah 40-55: A literary-theological commentary.* London: T & T Clark.

Goldman, S 1949. *Samuel: Hebrew text & English translation with an introduction and commentary*. London: Soncino.

Goman, M J 2001. *Elements of biblical exegesis: a basic guide for students and ministers.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Gordon, R P 1982. *1 & 2 Samuel*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
_____1986. *1 & 2 Samuel: A commentary*. Exeter: Paternoster.

Gottwald, N K 1979. *The tribes of Yahweh: A sociology of the religion of liberated Israel,1250-1050 B. C. E*. Maryknoll: Orbis.

_____1985. *The Hebrew Bible: A socio-literary introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
_____1986. The participation of free agrarians in the introduction of monarchy to ancient Israel. *Semeia* 37, 77-106.
_____1996. Ideology and ideologies in Israelite prophecy, in Reid, 136 -149.

Goulder, M D 1996. *The Psalms of Asaph and the Pentateuch* (JSOTSup 233) Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Grabbe, L 1995. *Priests, prophets, diviners, sages: A socio-historical study of religious specialists in ancient Israel*. Valley Forge, PN: Trinity press.

Green, B 2003a. Enacting imaginatively the unthinkable: 1 Samuel 25 and the story of Saul. *BI* 11/1, 1-23.
_____ 2003b. *King Saul's asking.* Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press.

Gressmann, H 1910. *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels von Samuel bis Amos und Hosea*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Grimal, N 1992. *A history of ancient Egypt*. Translated by Shaw, I. Oxford: Basil.

Grottanelli, C 1999. *Kings & prophets: Monarchic power, inspired leadership, & sacred text in biblical narrative.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Guillaume, P 2004. *Waiting of Josiah: The Judges* (JSOTSup 385). London: T. & T. Clark.

Gunkel, H 1998. *Introduction to Psalms: The genres of the religious lyric of Israel.* Completed by Bergrich, J & Translated by Nogalski, J D. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

Gunn, D M 1980. *The fate of king Saul: an interpretation of a biblical story* (JSOTSup 14). Sheffield: JSOT.

Hackett, J A 1998. There was no king in Israel: the era of the Judges, in Coogan, 177-218.

Hadly, J M 2000. *The cult of Asherah in ancient Israel and Judah: Evidence for a Hebrew Goddess* (UCOP 57). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haldar, A 1945. *Associations of cult prophets among the ancient semites*. Uppsala: Almqvist.

Halpern, B 1981. The uneasy compromise: Israel between league and monarchy, in Halpern, B & Levenson, J D (eds), *Traditions in transformation: Turning points in biblical faith*, 59-96. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

_____1983. *The emergence of Israel in Canaan* (SBL 29). Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Hamilton, M V 2005. *The body royal: The social poetics of kingship in ancient Israel*. Leiden: Brill.

Hamilton, V P 2001. *Handbook on the historical books: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, Esther*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Harvey, V A 1967. *The historian as the believer: The morality of historical knowledge and Christian belief.* London: SCM.

Hayes, J H & Miller, J M (eds) 1977. *Israelite & Judaean history*. London: SCM.

Healey, J 1984. The immortality of the king: Ugarit and the Psalms. *Or* 53, 235-54.

Heller, R L 2006. *Power, politics, and prophecy: The character of Samuel and the deuteronomistic evaluation of prophecy.* London: T & T Clark.

Hendel, R S 1995. Prophets, priests, and the efficacy of ritual, in Wright, Freedman & Hurvitz, 185-198.

Hens-Piazza, G 2006. *1-2 Kings*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Herrmann, S 1981. *A history of Israel in Old Testament times*. Rev ed. London: SCM.

Hertzberg, H 1974. W. *I & II Samuel: A commentary*. 3rd ed. Translated by Bowden, J. London: SCM.

Herzog, Z 2006. Beersheba valley: Archaeology and its implications for the biblical record, in Lemaire, A (ed), *Congress volume Leiden 2004* (VTsup 109), 81-102. Brill: Leiden.

Hoftijzer, J 1959-60. Enige opmerkingen rond het Israëlitische 12-stammensysteem. *NThT* 241-63.

Holloway, S W & Handy, L K (eds) 1995. *The Pitcher is broken: Memorial essays for Gösta W. Ahlström* (JSOTSup 190). Sheffield: Sheffield.

Homan, M M 2002. *To your tents, O Israel: The terminology, function, form, and symbolism of tents in the Hebrew Bible and the ancient near East*. Leiden: Brill.

Hornung, E 1997. The Pharaoh, in Donadoni, S (ed), *The Egyptians*, 283-314. Translated by Bianchi, R (Originally published in Italian in 1990). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

House, P 1995. 1, 2 Kings (NAC 8). Nashville: Broadman.

Humphreys, W L 1980. The rise and fall of king Saul: A study an ancient narrative stratum in 1 Samuel. *JSOT* 18:74-90.

Isbell, C D 1976. The origins of prophetic frenzy and ecstatic utterance in the Old Testament world. *WTJ* 11: 62-80.
_____2002. *The function of Exodus motifs in biblical narratives: Theological didactic drama* (SBEC 52). Lampeter, Wales: Edwin.

Ishida, T 1977. *The royal dynasties in ancient Israel: A study on the formation and development of royal-dynastic ideology*. New York: W. de Gruyter.
_____1999. *History and historical writing in ancient Israel: Studies in biblical historiography*. Leiden: Brill.

Japhet, S 1993. *1 & 2 Chronicles: A commentary*. London: SCM.

Jassen, A P 2007. *Mediating the divine: Prophecy and revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and second Temple Judaism* (STDJ 68). Leiden: Brill.

Jemielity, T 1992. *Satire and the Hebrew prophets*. Louisville, KY: Westminster.

Jensen, J 2006. *Ethical dimensions of the prophets*. Collegeville, MIN: Liturgical Press.

Jobling, D 1986. *The sense of biblical narrative: Structural analyses in the Hebrew Bible II* (JSOTSup 39). Sheffield: JSOT.
_____1998. *1 Samuel: Berit olam: Studies in Hebrew narrative & poetry*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical.

Joüon, P & Muraoka, T 1991. *A grammar of biblical Hebrew*. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblio.

Joosten, J 1997. Workshop: meaning and use of the tenses in 1 Samuel, in Wolde, E V (ed), *Narrative syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg conference 1996*, 72-83. Leiden: Brill.

Kalimi, I 2005. *An ancient Israelite historian: Studies in the Chronicler, his time, place and writing* (SSN 46). Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum.

Kaltner, J & Stulman, L (eds) 2004. *Inspired speech: Prophecy in the ancient Near East; Essays in honour of Herbert B. Huffmon*. London: T & T Clark.

Kautzsch, E & Cowley, A E 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Kemp, B J 1983. Old Kingdom, middle kingdom and second intermediate period c. 2686-1552, in Trigger, B C, Kemp, B J, O'Connor, D & Lloyd, A B (eds), *Ancient Egypt: A social history*, 71-182. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keys, G1996. *The wages of sin: A reappraisal of the 'succession narrative'* (JSOTSup 221). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Kilian, J 1985. *Form and style in theological texts*. Pretoria: University of South Africa

Klein, J 2002. *David versus Saul: Ein Beitrag zum Erzählsystem der Samuelbücher*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Klein, R W 1983. *1 Samuel* (WBC 10). Waco, TX: Word.
_____ 2006. *1 Chronicles: A commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Klement, H H 1999. Modern literary-critical methods and the historicity of the Old Testament, in Long, 439-459.

Knierim, R 1968. The messianic concept in the first book of Samuel, in Trotter, F T (ed), *Jesus and the Historian: Written in honor of Ernest Cadman Colwell*, 20-51. Philadelphia: Westminster.
_____1970. Die Messianologie des ersten Buches Samuel. *Evangelishe Theologie* 30, 113-33.

Knoppers, G N & McConville, J G (eds) 2000. *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent studies on the Deuteronomistic history*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Knoppers, G N 1993-4. *Two nations under God: The deuteronomistic history of Solomon and the dual monarchies* (HSM 52; 2 vol). Atlanta: Scholars Press.
_____2000. Treasures won and lost: Royal (Mis)appropriations in Kings and Chronicles, in Graham, M P & McKenzie, S L (eds), *The Chronicler as author: Studies in text and texture*. 181-208 (JSOTSup 263). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Koch, K 1983. *The prophets: The Assyrian period*, vol.1. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Köhler, L, Baumgartner, L W & Stamm, J J 1996. *The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament*. 4 vols. Richardson, M E J (ed). Leiden: Brill.

Kratz, R G 2005. *The composition of the narrative books of the Old Testament.* Translated by Bowden, J (Originally published in German in 2000). London: T & T Clark.

Laato, A 1997. Second Samuel 7 and ancient Near Eastern royal ideology. *CBQ* 59, 244-269.
_____1999. Psalm 132: A case study in methodology. *CBQ* 61, 24-33.

Lambert, W G 1960. *Babylonian wisdom literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
_____1974. The seed of kingship, in Garelli, P (ed), *Le Palais et la Royauté*. XIX^{e} Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Paris: Geuthner.
_____1998. Kingship in ancient Mesopotamia, in Day, 54-70.

Lapsley, J E 2000. Shame and self-knowledge: The positive role of shame in Ezekiel's view of the moral self, in Odell, M S & Strong, J T (eds), *The book of Ezekiel: Theological and anthropological perspectives*, 143-173. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Lasine, S 2001. *Knowing kings: Knowledge, power, and narcissism in the Hebrew Bible*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Leick, G 2003. *The Babylonians: An introduction*. London: Routledge.

Leithart, P J 2006. *1 & 2 Kings*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos.

Lemche, N P 1988. *Ancient Israel: A new history of Israelite society*. Sheffield: JSOT.

Lemos, T M 2006. Shame and mutilation of enemies in the Hebrew Bible. *JBL* 125/2, 225-241.

Levinson, B M 2001. The reconceptualization of kingship in Deuteronomy and the deuteronomistic history's transformation of Torah. *VT* 51, 511-534.

Levison, J R 2003. Prophecy in ancient Israel: The case of the ecstatic elders. *CBQ* 65, 503-521.

Lewis, T J 1989. *Cults of the dead in ancient Israel and Ugarit* (HSM 39). Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Lind, M C 1980. *Yahweh is a warrior: The theology of warfare in ancient Israel*. Scottdale, PA: Herald.

Lindars, B 1979. The Israelite tribes in judge, in Emerton, J A (ed), *Studies in the historical books of the Old Testament* (VTSup 30). Leiden: Brill.

_____1995. *Judges 1-5: A new translation and commentary*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Liverani, M 1990. *Prestige and interest: International relations in the Near East ca. 1600-1100 BC*. Padova: Sargon.
_____1992. Propaganda, in Freedman, 5:474-477.
_____2005. *Israel's history and the history of Israel*. London: Equinox.

Long, G A 2002. *Grammatical concepts 101 for biblical Hebrew: Learning biblical Hebrew grammatical concepts through English grammar*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Long, V P 1989. *The reign and rejection of king Saul: A case for literary and theological coherence* (SBL 118). Atlanta: Scholars Press.
_____1994. How did Saul become king? Literary reading and historical construction, in Millard, A R, Hoffmeier, J K & Baker, D W (eds), *Faith, tradition, and history: Old Testament historiography in its near Eastern context*, 271-284. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
_____1994b. *The art of biblical history. Foundations of contemporary interpretation: Six volumes in one*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
_____1999 (ed). *Israel's Past in present research: Essays on ancient Israelite historiography*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Mafico, T L 1987. The term saitum in Akkadian documents. *JNSL* 13, 69-87.

Malamat, A 1976. Charismatic leadership in the Book of Judge, in Cross, Lemke & Miller, 152-168.

Malek, J 2000. The old kingdom (c. 2686-2125 B. C.), in Shaw, I (ed), *The Oxford history of ancient Egypt*, 89-117. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maré, L P 2006. Psalm 121: Yahweh's protection against mythological powers. *OTE* 19/2, 712-722.

Margalit, B 1995. K-R-T studies, *UF* 27, 215-315.

Matthews, V H 2001. *Social world of the Hebrew prophets*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Matthews, V H & Moyer, J C 1997. *The Old Testament: Text and context*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Matthews, V H & Benjamin, D C 2006. *Old Testament parallels: Laws and stories from the ancient Near East*. 3rd ed. New York: Paulist.

Mayes, A D H 2001. Deuteronomistic royal ideology in Judges 17-21. *BI* 9/3, 241-258.

Mazar, B (ed) 1971. *The world history of the Jewish people*, vol. III. London: Allen.

McCarter, P K 1980a. The apology of David. *JBL* 99/4, 489-504.

_____1980b. *1 Samuel* (AB 8). Garden City: Doubleday.

McCarthy, D J 1973. The inauguration of monarchy in Israel: A form-critical study of 1 Samuel 8-12. *INT* 27, 401-412.

McKenzie, J L 1966. *The world of the Judge*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McKenzie, S L 2000. The trouble with kingship, in Pury, Römer & Macchi, 286-314.

_____2004. *1-2 Chronicles*. Nashville: Abingdon.

McNutt, P 1999. *Reconstructing the society of ancient Israel*. Louisville: Westminster.

Merill, A L 1968. The house of Keret: A study of the Keret legend. *SEÅ* 33, 5-17.

Mettinger, T N D 1976. *King and Messiah: The civil and sacral legitimation of the Israelite kings* (CBOTS 8). Lund: CWK Gleerup.

Meyers, C 1998. Kinship and kingship: The early monarchy, in Coogan, 221-271.

Millard, A 2002.History and legend in early Babylonia, in Long, V P, Baker, D W & Wenham, J G (eds), *Windows into Old Testament history: Evidence, argument, and the crisis of "biblical Israel,"* 103-110. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Miller, C L 1996. *The representation of speech in biblical Hebrew narrative: A linguistic analysis* (HSMM 55). Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Miller, J M 1974. Saul's rise to power: some observations concerning 1 Sam 9:1-10:16, 10:26-11:15 and 13:2-14:46. *CBQ* 36, 157-174.

_____1993. Reading the Bible historically: The historian's approach, in Haynes, S R & McKenzie, S L (eds), *To each its own meaning: An introduction to biblical criticisms and their application,* 11-26. Louisville: Westminster.

Miller, J M & Hayes, J H 2006. *A history of ancient Israel and Judah*. 2nd ed. Louisville: Westminster.

Miller, P D, Hanson, P D & Mcbride, S D 1987. *Ancient Israelite religion: Essays in honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Miller, P D 1973. *The divine warrior in early Israel* (HSM 5). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Miller, R.D 2005. *Chieftains of the highland clans: A history of Israel in the 12th and 11th centuries B. C.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Miscall, P D 1986. *1 Samuel: A literary reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Moenikes, A 1999. Psalm 2, 7b und die Göttlichkeit des israelischen Königs. *ZAW* 111, 619-621.

Montet, P 1964. *Eternal Egypt*. Translated by Weightman, D (Originally published in French). London: Weidenfeld.

Morkot, R G 2005. *The Egyptians: An introduction*. London: Routledge.

Mowinckel, S 1987. Cult and Prophecy. *Prophecy in Israel*. Translated by Schaaf, J L Philadelphia: Fortress.

Murray, D F 1998. *Divine prerogative and royal pretension: Pragnatics, poetics and polemics in a narrative sequence about David (2 Samuel 5.17-7.29)* (JSOTSup 264). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Na'aman, N 1992. The pre-Deuteronomistic story of king Saul and its historical significance. *CBQ* 54, 638-658.

Nelson, R 1982. *The double redaction of the Deuteronomistic history* (JSOTSup 18). Sheffield: JSOT.

Nemet-Nejat, K R 2002. *Daily life in ancient Mesopotamia*. Peadbody, MA: Hendrickson.

Niccacci, A 1990. *The syntax of the verb in classical Hebrew prose*. Sheffield: JSOT.

Nicholson, S 2002. *Three faces of Saul: An intertextual approach to biblical tragedy* (JSOTSup 339). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Nielsen, K 1989. *There is hope for a tree: The tree as metaphor in Isaiah* (JSOTSup 65). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Nigosian, S A 2004. *From ancient writing to sacred texts: The Old Testament and apocrypha.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Nissinen, M 2004. What is prophecy? An ancient near eastern perspective, in Kaltner & Stulman, 17-37.

Noll, K L 1997. *The faces of David* (JSOT Sup 242). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Noth, M 1966. *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels*. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
_____1967. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. 3rd ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
_____1984. Office and vocation in the Old Testament, *The laws in the Pentateuch and other studies*, 229-249.
_____1991. *The Deuteronomistic History*. 2nd ed. Translated by Nicholson, E W (Originally published in German in 1943) JSOTSup 15. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press

Orlinsky, H M 1971. The seer-priest, in Mazar, 268-279.

Overholt, T W 1997. Elijah and Elisha in the context of Israelite religion, in Reid, 94-111.

Pardee, D G 1988. *Les Textes paramythologiques de la 24e campagne (1961)*. Ras Shamra-Ougarit, 4. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Parry, D W 1996. *Current research and technological development on the Dead Sea scrolls: Conference on the texts from the Judean desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995.* Leiden: Brill.

Pate, C M, Duvall, J S, Hays, J D, Richards, E R, Tucker, W D & Vang, P 2004. *The story of Israel: A biblical theology.* Leicester, England: IVP.

Paul, S M 2005. *Divrei Shalom: Collected studies of Shalom M. Paul on the Bible and the ancient Near East 1967-2005* (CHANE 23). Leiden: Brill.

Person, R F 2002. *The deuteronomic school: History, social setting, and literature.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Petersen, D L 1981. *The roles of Israel's prophets* (JSOTSup 17). Sheffield: JSOT.
_____2002. *The prophetic literature: An introduction*. Louisville: Westminster.

Peterson, E H 1999. *First and second Samuel*. Louisville: Westminster.

Pisano, S 1984. *Additions or omissions in the books of Samuel: The significant pluses and minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran texts*. Fribourg, Switzerland: The Fribourg University Council.

Polish, D 1989. *Give us a king: Legal-religious sources of Jewish sovereignty*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav.

Pollock, S 1999. *Ancient Mesopotamia: The Eden that never was*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Polzin, R 1989. *Samuel and the deuteronomist: A literary study of the deuteronomic history: 1 Samuel*. San Francisco: Harper.
_____1993. *David and the Deuteronomist: A literary study of the deuteronomistic history.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Postgate, J N 1992. *Early Mesopotamia: Society and economy at the dawn of history*. London: Routledge.

Provan, I, Long, V P & Longman III, T 2003. *A biblical history of Israel*. Louisville: Westminster.

Rad, G von 1965. *Old Testament theology. Vol. 2: The theology of Israel's prophetic traditions*. Translated by Stalker, D M G. New York: Harper.

Redford, D B 1984. *Akhenaten. The heretic king*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Reid, S B 1996 (ed). *Prophets and paradigms: Essays in honor of Gene M. Tucker* (JSOTSup 229). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Rendtorff, R 1985. *The Old Testament: An introduction*. London: SCM.
_____2005. *The canonical Hebrew Bible: A theology of the Old Testament.* Translated by Orton, D E. Leiden: Deo.

Rice, M 2003a. *Egypt's legacy: The archetypes of western civilization 300-30 BC*. Paperback ed. London: Routledge.
_____2003b. *Egypt's making: The origins of ancient Egypt 5000-2000 BC*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Richter, W 1970. *Die sogenannten vorprophetischen Berufungsberichte. Eine literaturwissenschaftliche Studie zu 1 Sam. 9, 1-10, 16, Ex. 3f. und Ri. 6, 11b-17* (FRLANT 101). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Ritner, R K 1993. *The mechanics of ancient Egyptian magical practice* (SAOC 54). Chicago: Oriental Institute.

Roberts, J J M 1987. In defense of the monarchy: The contribution of Israelite kingship to biblical theology, in Miller, Hanson & Mcbride, 377-396.

_____2002. *The bible and the ancient Near East: Collected essays*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Robinson, G 1993. *Let us be like the nations: A commentary on the books of 1 and 2 Samuel.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Rofé, A 1982. The acts of Nahash according to 4QSam[a]. *IEJ* 32/2-3, 129-133.

Römer, T & De Pury, A 2000. Deuteronomistic historiography (DH): History of research and debated issues, in De Pury, Römer, 24-141.

Römer, T (ed) 2000. *The future of the Deuteronomistic history*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Rothstein, A M 1998. *Re-thinking biblical story and myth: Critical essays on biblical interpretation: Selected lectures at the Theodor Herzl Institute 1986-1995.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Rowley, H H 1967. Melchizedek and David, *VT* 17/4, 485.

Sasson, J M 2004. The eyes of Eli: An essay in motif accretion, in Kaltner & Stulman, 171-190.

Scheffler, E 2000. Saving Saul from the Deuteronomist, in De Moor & Van Rooy, 263-271.

Schley, D G 1989. *Shiloh: A biblical city in tradition and history* (JSOTSup 63). Sheffield: JSOT.

Schmidt, B 1994. *Israel's beneficent dead* (FAT 11). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Schniedewind, W M 1999. *Society and the promise to David: The reception history of 2 Samuel 7:1-17*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schökel, L A 1999. Narrative art in Joshua-Judges-Samuel-Kings, in Long, 255-278.

Schunck, K 1963. *Benjamin* (BZAW 86). Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann.
_____1975 bāmāh, in Botterweck, G J & Ringgren, H (eds), *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, 139-145. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Seitz, C R 1993. *Isaiah 1-39. Interpretation: A Bible commentary for teaching and preaching.* Louisville: John Knox.

Selman, M J 1994a. *1 Chronicles: An introduction and commentary*. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity.
_____1994b. *2 Chronicles: A commentary*. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity.

Service, E R 1962. *Primitive social organization.* 2nd ed. New York: Random.

Shirai, Y 2005. Royal funerary cults during the Old Kingdom, in Piquette, K & Love, S (eds), *Current research in Egyptology 2003: Proceedings of the fourth annual symposium University college London 2003*, 149-162. London: Oxbow.

Smend, R 1971. Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redactionsgeschichte, in Wolff, H W (ed), *Probleme biblischer Theologie: G. von Rad zum 70. Geburstag*, 494-509. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.

Smith, M 1987. *Palestinian parties and politics that shaped the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. London: SCM.

Smith, M S 2002. *The early history of god: Yahweh and the other deities in ancient Israel.* 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Smith, S T 1997. State and Empire in the middle and new kingdoms, in Lustig, J (ed), *Anthropology and Egyptology: A developing dialogue* (MMA 8), 66-89. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Soden, W von 1994. *The ancient orient: An introduction to the study of the ancient Near East.* Translated by Schley, D G (Originally published in German in 1985). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Soggin, J A 1989. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Translated by Bowen, J. Louisville, KT: Westminster.

Sparlinger, A J 2005. *War in ancient Egypt: The new kingdom*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Steck, O H 2000. *The prophetic books and their theological witness*. Translated by Nogalski, J D. St. Louis: Chalice.

Steinberg, N 1995. Social scientific criticism: Judges 9 and issues of kinship, in Yee, 45-64.

Stiebert, H 2002. *The construction of shame in the Hebrew Bible: The prophetic contribution* (JSOTSup 346). London: Sheffield Academic Press.

Sturdy, J 1970. The original meaning of “Is Saul also among the prophets?” *VT* 20, 206-213.

Sweeney, M A 1998. The Latter prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel), in McKenzie, S L & Graham, M P, *The Hebrew Bible today: An introduction to critical issues*, 69-94. Louisville: Westminster.

_____2005a. *Form and intertextuality in prophetic and apocalyptic literature* (FAT 45). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
_____ 2005b. *The prophetic literature.* Nashville: Abingdon.

Tadmor, H 1983. Autobiographical apology in the royal Assyrian literature, in Tadmor, H & Weinfeld, M (eds), *History, historiography and interpretation: Studies in biblical and cuneiform literatures*, 36-57. Jerusalem: Magness.

Taggar-Cohen, A 2005. Political loyalty in the biblical account of 1 Samuel xx-xxii in the light of Hittite texts. *VT* 53/2, 251-268.

Talmon, S 2000. Textual criticism: The ancient versions, in Mayes, 141-170.

Terrien, S 2003. *The Psalms: Strophic structure and theological commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Thompson, R J 1963. *Penitence and sacrifice in early Israel outside the levitical law*. Leiden: Brill.

Tov, E 2001. *Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible.* 2nd Rev. ed. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Troeltsch, E 1913. *Gesammelte Schriften*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Tsumura, D T 2007. *The first book of Samuel* (NICOT). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Tubb, J N 1998. *Peoples of the past: Canaanites*. London: British Museum Press.

Van de Mieroop, M 1997. *The ancient Mesopotamian city*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Van der Toorn, K 1993. Saul and the rise of Israelite state religion. *VT* 43, 519-542.

Van Hecke, P J 2005. Pastoral metaphors in the Hebrew Bible and in its ancient near eastern context, in Gordon, R P & De Moor, J C (eds), *The Old Testament in its world: Papers read at the winter meeting, January 2003 the Society for Old Testament study and at the joint meeting, July 2003 the Society for Old Testament study and het Oudtestamentisch werkgezelschap in Nederland en België*, 200-217. Leiden: Brill.

Van Seters, J 1983. *In search of history: Historiography in the ancient world and the origins of biblical history*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
_____2006. *The edited Bible: The curious history of the "editor" in biblical criticism*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Veijola, T 1977. *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomisticschen Historiographie. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (AASF 198). Helsinki: Helsinki Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Vriezen, T C & Woude, A S van der 2005. *Ancient Israelite and early Jewish literature*. Translated by Doyle, B. Leiden: Brill.

Wallis, 1952. Eine Parallele zu Richter 19, 29ff und 1 Sam. 11, 5ff aus dem Briefarchiv von Mari. *ZAW* 64, 57-61.

Walsh, J T 1996. *1 Kings*. Berit olam: studies in Hebrew narrative & poetry. Collegeville, MIN: Liturgical Press.

Waltke, B & O'Connor, M 1990. *An introduction to biblical Hebrew syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Walton, J H 2006. *Ancient near eastern thoughts and the Old Testament: Introducing the conceptual world of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Weiser, A 1961. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. London: Darton.

Weiss, A L 2006. *Figurative language in biblical prose narrative: Metaphor in the book of Samuel* (VTSup 107). Brill: Leiden.

Wellhausen, J 1957. *Prolegomena to the history of ancient Israel*. Translated by Menzies & Black (Originally published in German in 1876). New York: Meridian.

Wenham, G J 1975. Were David's sons priests? *ZAW* 87, 79-82.
_____2000. *Story as Torah: Reading the Old Testament ethically*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Westermann, C 1991. *Basic forms of prophetic speech.* Louisville: Westminster.

Whitelam, K W 1989. Israelite kingship. The royal ideology and its opponents, in Clements, R E (ed), *The world of ancient Israel: Sociological, anthropological and political perspectives. Essays by members of the Society for Old Testament study*, 119-139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
_____1992. King and kingship, in Freedman, 4:40-48.
_____1995. Sociology or history: Towards a (human) history of ancient Palestine? In Davies, Harvey & Watson,146-166.

Williams, R J 1976. *Hebrew syntax: An outline*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Wilson, J A 1958. The journey of Wen-Amon to Phoenicia, in Pritchard, J B (ed), *The ancient Near East: an anthology of texts and pictures*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Wilson, R R 1979. Prophecy and ecstasy: A reexamination. *JBL* 98, 321-337.

Wright, D P, Freedman, D N & Hurvitz, A (eds) 1995. *Pomegranates and golden bells: Studies in biblical, Jewish, and near eastern ritual, law and literature in honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Wyatt, N 2002. *Religious texts from Ugarit*. 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Yee, G A (ed) 2007. *Judges & method: New approaches in biblical studies*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress.
_____2007. Ideological criticism: Judges 17-21 and the dismembered body, in Yee, 138-160.

Younger, K L 1990. *Ancient conquest accounts: A study in ancient near eastern and biblical history writing* (JSOTSup 98). Sheffield: JSOT.
_____1994. Judges 1 in its near eastern literary context, in Millard, A R, Hoffmeier, J K & Baker, D W (eds), *Faith, tradition, and history: Old Testament historiography in its near eastern context*, 207-227. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Zenger, E 2005. *Psalm 2: A commentary on Psalms 51-100*. Translated by Maloney, L M. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Zimmerli, W 2003. *The fiery throne: The prophets and Old Testament theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress.