



## 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.<sup>104</sup> 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.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> 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 illegitimately 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 affirmative probability to see a prophetic connection of 1 Sm 11:1-11 with 1 Sm 9:1-10:16.

<sup>105</sup> 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<sup>106</sup> 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).<sup>107</sup> 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).

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

<sup>107</sup> 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).<sup>108</sup> 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.<sup>109</sup>

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

---

<sup>108</sup> 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.

<sup>109</sup> 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 devalue 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 (*mōšîʿ*).

'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 structure 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.<sup>110</sup> Unlike the

---

<sup>110</sup> 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 dimension.

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 Sm 14:47.



narrator connected Gibeah with Saul at the crucial military crisis of Jabesh (Gilead). Gibeah was already indispensable to the tradition of Saul.<sup>111</sup>

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 *mōšē*’.

---

<sup>111</sup> 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 (*mōšēʿ*) (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<sup>a</sup>). 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). His 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).<sup>112</sup> 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<sup>113</sup> (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

---

<sup>112</sup> 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.

<sup>113</sup> 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).<sup>114</sup> 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).

---

<sup>114</sup> 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 interchangeably 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.<sup>115</sup>

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

---

<sup>115</sup> 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 6<sup>th</sup> 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 demurrals 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.<sup>116</sup> 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.<sup>117</sup> The narrative reveals a different perspective on the period of the Judges, and promotes the necessity of the monarchy in Israel.

---

<sup>116</sup> 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.

<sup>117</sup> 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 Benjaminites 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.<sup>118</sup> 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).

---

<sup>118</sup> 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.<sup>119</sup> 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

---

<sup>119</sup> 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’s 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).<sup>120</sup> 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

---

<sup>120</sup> 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 (אֵשֶׁר) 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.<sup>121</sup> 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-

---

<sup>121</sup> 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."<sup>122</sup> A translation of the phrase can be "on your height." As a funerary lament (Anderson 1989:13), however, the phrase does not

---

<sup>122</sup> 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.<sup>123</sup> On the other hand, he rhetorically criticized their unqualified kingship for not revering Yahweh (cf Dt 17:14-20).<sup>124</sup>

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

---

<sup>123</sup> See 2.2.3 for a possible Canaanite background of the deification of the deceased king.

<sup>124</sup> 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<sup>125</sup> and translation<sup>126</sup>

1 Samuel 11:1 וַיַּעַל נָחַשׁ הָעַמּוֹנִי וַיַּחֵן עַל־יָבֵשׁ גִּלְעָד וַיֹּאמְרוּ כָל־אֲנָשֵׁי יְבִישׁ אֶל־נָחַשׁ כִּרְת־לָנוּ בְרִית וְנַעֲבֹדְךָ: וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם נָחַשׁ הָעַמּוֹנִי בְּזֹאת אֶכְרֹת לָכֶם בְּנִקּוֹר לָכֶם כָּל־עֵינַי יָמִין וּשְׂמִיתִיהָ חֶרֶף עַל־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל: וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו זְקַנִּי יְבִישׁ הֲרַף לָנוּ שְׁבַעַת יָמִים וְנִשְׁלַחְהָ מִלְּאֲכִים בְּכֹל גְּבוּל יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאִם־אֵין מוֹשִׁיעַ אֶתָּנוּ וַיֵּצְאוּ אֵלָיֶךָ: וַיָּבֹאוּ הַמְּלָאכִים גְּבַעַת שָׁאוּל וַיְדַבְּרוּ הַדְּבָרִים בְּאָזְנֵי הָעָם וַיִּשְׂאוּ כָל־הָעָם אֶת־קוֹלָם וַיִּבְכּוּ: וַהֲנֵה שָׁאוּל בָּא אַחֲרַי הַבֶּקֶר מִן־הַשָּׂדֶה וַיֹּאמֶר שָׁאוּל מִה־לָּעַם כִּי יִבְכוּ וַיִּסְפְּרוּ־לוֹ אֶת־דְּבָרֵי אֲנָשֵׁי יְבִישׁ: וַתִּצְלַח רוּחַ־אֱלֹהִים עַל־שָׁאוּל בְּשִׁמְעוֹ אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה וַיַּחַר אָפוֹ מְאֹד: וַיִּקַּח צֶמֶד בָּקָר וַיִּנְתַּחֲהוּ וַיִּשְׁלַח בְּכָל־גְּבוּל יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיַד הַמְּלָאכִים לֵאמֹר אֲשֶׁר אֵינְנוּ יֵצֵא אַחֲרַי שָׁאוּל וְאַחַר שְׂמוּאֵל כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה לְבַקְרוֹ וַיִּפֹּל פַּחַד־יְהוָה עַל־הָעָם וַיֵּצְאוּ כָאִישׁ אַחָד: וַיִּפְקְדֵם בְּבִזָּק וַיְהִיו בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת אָלֶף וְאִישׁ יְהוּדָה שְׁלֹשִׁים אָלֶף: וַיֹּאמְרוּ לַמְּלָאכִים הַבָּאִים כֹּה תֹאמְרוּן לְאִישׁ יְבִישׁ גִּלְעָד מִחַר תְּהִיֶה־לָּכֶם תְּשׁוּעָה בַּחֶם הַשָּׁמֶשׁ וַיָּבֹאוּ הַמְּלָאכִים וַיַּגִּידוּ לְאֲנָשֵׁי יְבִישׁ וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ: וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֲנָשֵׁי יְבִישׁ מִחַר נִצָּא אֲלֵיכֶם וַעֲשִׂיתֶם לָנוּ כְּכָל־הַטּוֹב בְּעֵינֵיכֶם: וַיְהִי מִמַּחֲרַת וַיִּשֶׂם שָׁאוּל אֶת־הָעָם שְׁלֹשָׁה רָאשִׁים וַיָּבֹאוּ בְּתוֹךְ־הַמַּחֲנֶה בְּאֲשֶׁמֶרֶת הַבֶּקֶר וַיִּבְכוּ אֶת־עַמּוֹן עַד־חֹם הַיּוֹם וַיְהִי הַנִּשְׁאָרִים וַיִּפְצְצוּ וְלֹא נִשְׁאָרוּ־בָם שָׁנָיִם יָחַד:

<sup>125</sup> The Hebrew text comes from Bible Works 6.

<sup>126</sup> 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<sup>a</sup> 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,<sup>127</sup> ('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<sup>a</sup>. The three diverse texts testify to a different textual tradition. The textual discrepancy needs attention.

Tov (2001:342-343) reads the text of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, 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<sup>a</sup> 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<sup>a</sup> preserved the more authentic historical account than the other textual traditions (see Tov 2001:342-344; Cross 1980:105-119; McCarter 1980:199).

---

<sup>127</sup> The text of LXX, Rahlfs' edition comes from Bible Works 6 edition.



The textual reading of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, however, has been critically challenged by Barthélemy (1982:162-163) who argued that the addition of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> 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<sup>a</sup> 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<sup>a</sup> 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<sup>a</sup> 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<sup>a</sup>, 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<sup>a</sup> (Orlinsky 1975:113-114).

Although the three textual readings differ in specific cases, each reading shares the same or a similar textual tradition.<sup>128</sup> It is difficult to insist that any textual reading preserves the more authentic historical account. It is complicated to say that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> 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).

---

<sup>128</sup> Eves (1982:325) even contended four types of tradition for 1 Sm10:27-11:2: 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Josephus, LXX<sup>B</sup>, Origen’s Hexapla, and the Old Latin, boc2e2. His contention is that the tradition of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> differs from the readings of the Masoretic, Septuagint, or Samaritan Pentateuch tradition. Thus, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> “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*.<sup>129</sup> 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,<sup>130</sup> 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.<sup>131</sup> 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).

---

<sup>129</sup> 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 *Vulgärtex*te 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*."

<sup>130</sup> 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).

<sup>131</sup> 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 (וַיִּמְלֹכוּ) 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.<sup>132</sup> 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

---

<sup>132</sup> 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*<sup>133</sup> (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

---

<sup>133</sup> 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,<sup>134</sup> 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)<sup>135</sup>

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.

---

<sup>134</sup> 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.

<sup>135</sup> 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<sup>136</sup> against Jabesh-Gilead in the Trans-Jordan.<sup>137</sup> The well prepared and organized encampment of Nahash posed a tremendous threat to the people of Jabesh-Gilead. 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.<sup>138</sup> The first example comes from Judges 10:17-11:33 which narrates how Yahweh delivered the Israelites from the hands of the Ammonites.<sup>139</sup> 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

---

<sup>136</sup> Generally, the verb of the root  $\text{נָחַשׁ}$  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.

<sup>137</sup> The beginning of verse 1 is highlighted with *waw*-consecutive form,  $\text{וַיַּעַל}$  to introduce a new character,  $\text{נָחַשׁ}$ . 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,  $\text{καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς μετὰ μῆνα}$  ('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.

<sup>138</sup> 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.

<sup>139</sup> 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 fight against Goliath as the representative of Yahweh. He challenged Goliath and fought 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 (וַיַּעֲבֹדוּ). 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.<sup>140</sup> 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.

---

<sup>140</sup> In verse 2b the MT omits ברית from the phrase אָכַרְתָּ לָכֶם which LXX preserved and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> 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.<sup>141</sup>

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.<sup>142</sup> 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

---

<sup>141</sup> 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).

<sup>142</sup> 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 (הִרְרֵן) in verse 3. The meaning of the *hiphil* form in the imperative signifies the request of a certain time indicated by the preposition



↳ (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.<sup>143</sup> 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 **וַיִּחַרְדּוּ** 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 **וַיִּחַרְדּוּ** 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.

---

<sup>143</sup> 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.<sup>144</sup> 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 הָרְמָתָה וְשָׂאוּל עָלָה אֶל-בֵּיתוֹ וּגְבַעַת שָׂאוּל  
Then Samuel went to Ramah on the other hand Saul went  
up to his home in Gibeah of Saul' (my own translation).

---

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



The genitive form, 'Gibeah of Saul' (גִּבְעַת שְׂאוּל) is juxtaposed to the prepositional phrase, 'to his home' (אֶל-בֵּיתוֹ), paralleled with the adverbial expression, 'to Ramah' (הַרְמָתָה). Although it is grammatically uncertain what the function of the juxtaposition is, semantically it means the same as 'at his home in Ramah' (בְּבֵיתוֹ בְּרָמָה) in 1 Samuel 25:1. The implied nuance of the phrase is that Saul begins to lose 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 שְׂאוּל) 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:

וַיִּלְכְּדוּ דָוִד 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 conquer 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.<sup>145</sup>

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

---

<sup>145</sup> 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.

<sup>146</sup> The LXX gives a different textual tradition to the MT such as *καὶ ἔρχονται οἱ ἄγγελοι εἰς Γαββα 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).<sup>147</sup> 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.<sup>148</sup> 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

---

<sup>147</sup> 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.

<sup>148</sup> 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.<sup>149</sup> 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.<sup>150</sup> Hastely Saul queried<sup>151</sup> 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<sup>152</sup> was highly exceptional in 1 Samuel 10:24.<sup>153</sup> His appearance was not the expected appearance of a king, who had to be

---

<sup>149</sup> 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).

<sup>150</sup> The form of יִבְכוּ 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.

<sup>151</sup> Certainly מִזֶּה-לְעַם 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).

<sup>152</sup> 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.<sup>154</sup> 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.

<sup>153</sup> 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).

<sup>154</sup> 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'<sup>155</sup> 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.<sup>156</sup> 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.

---

<sup>155</sup> 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 devalue 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).

<sup>156</sup> 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 (*mōšēʾ*) 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).<sup>157</sup>

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.<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> Lind (1980:167) stated that Yahweh stood against the people of Israel to judge them.

<sup>158</sup> 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, **וַיִּנְתְּחֵהוּ** ('and he cut them in pieces'). The basic meaning of the root **נִתַּח** 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 determinantal 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 (וַיִּנְתְּחֶהוּ), one for Yahweh and one for Baal, to prove which one is God. It was a sacrifice. Another example comes from Judges 19:29.<sup>159</sup> 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 (וַיִּנְתְּחֶהוּ) 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

---

<sup>159</sup> 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.<sup>160</sup> 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.<sup>161</sup>

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 (וַיַּחַדֵּם) 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.<sup>162</sup>

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

---

<sup>160</sup> 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.

<sup>161</sup> 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.

<sup>162</sup> 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.<sup>163</sup>

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-

---

<sup>163</sup> 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 גְבוּל יִשְׂרָאֵל). Unlike the designation of twelve in Judges 19:27,<sup>164</sup> 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.<sup>165</sup> 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,

---

<sup>164</sup> De Geus (1976:113) confirmed that the designation of twelve for the tribes of Israel is a late addition (cf Schunck 1963:64).

<sup>165</sup> 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).



אַחֲרַי שְׂאוּל וְאַחֲרַי שְׂמוּאֵל. 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’ (פִּתְדֵי־יְהוָה)<sup>166</sup> 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.<sup>167</sup> 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.<sup>168</sup>

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

---

<sup>166</sup> The phrase, פִּתְדֵי־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)

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

<sup>168</sup> 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 losing 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)<sup>169</sup>

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.

---

<sup>169</sup> The initial verb brings another textual issue. In the MT, נִיאָמְרוּ, '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, נִיאָמְרוּ. 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.<sup>170</sup> 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 הַנְּשָׂאָרִים, (*niphal* participle masculine plural) and נִשְׂאָרוּ, (*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 (וַיִּפְצְצוּ) 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.

---

<sup>170</sup> In verse 11a וַיִּהְיֶה 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 וַיִּהְיֶה 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 וַיִּהְיֶה.



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 prerequisites 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*.<sup>171</sup> 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 *mōšīʿ*. Saul and the Judges can both be seen as *mōšīʿ*. However, *mōšīʿ* does not indicate the official role of the leaders. It rather focused on the function of leadership. The design of different terminologies

---

<sup>171</sup> 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).<sup>172</sup> 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 devalue 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

---

<sup>172</sup> 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.