

Rejection of the King by the Prophet:  
A Man After God's Own Heart

Linda D. Buchanan

A Thesis  
in  
The Department  
of  
Theological Studies

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts (Theological Studies) at  
Concordia University  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

April 2012

©Linda D. Buchanan, 2012

**CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY**  
**School of Graduate Studies**

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By:           \_\_\_ Linda D. Buchanan \_\_\_\_\_

Entitled:     \_\_\_Rejection of the King by the Prophet: A Man After God's Own Heart \_\_\_

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

\_\_\_Master's Of Arts in Theological Studies\_\_\_\_\_

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

\_Dr. Mathew Anderson \_\_\_\_\_ Chair

\_Dr. Andre Gagne \_\_\_\_\_ Examiner

\_Dr. Jean-Michel Roessli \_\_\_\_\_ Examiner

\_Dr. Marie-France Dion \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Chair of Department or Graduate Program Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of Faculty

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## **Abstract**

Rejection of the King by the Prophet: A Man After God's Own Heart  
Linda D. Buchanan

The rejection of the first king of Israel, Saul, has been understood in many different and even contradictory ways. Linda D. Buchanan offers a new translation using a Macro Syntactical Analysis as elaborated by Alvierro Niccacci, to offer insight on the question of Saul's fault in 1 Samuel 13. Through Source and Redaction criticism she argues for 3 tiered work; beginning with the oldest literary stratum which includes the conflict between the Israelites and the Philistines. The first redactional layer belongs to the work of a northern prophetic agenda and includes the rejection account of Saul. The final pieces were added by the Deuteronomistic Historiographer, and include Saul's regnal formula and the inclusion of his son Jonathan. The combination of Source Criticism and a Macro Syntactic reading bring to light the problem of suggesting David as the man after God's heart, instead Buchanan argues that this is not meant as a title and should be viewed within the ideology of the prophetic work. 'A man after [God's] own heart' is the one who listens to God's commands, as given by his prophet. The methodologies used are Historical Critical in order to better understand the reason for Saul's rejection from kingship, by the prophet in 1 Samuel 13.

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to thank the many people who contributed to the completion of this thesis. Dr. Marie-France Dion for constantly challenging me; you have encouraged me to ask the hard questions and to challenge my own pre-supposition without fear. Elisa Pistilli, Suzanne Amro, Stephen Trepanier, Robert Smith, Sabrina Tucci, Sharon Austin, Lindsey Sandul, Jessica Legere, Daniel Tesolin and ‘My’ Connie for making Grad School more of a community effort; I thank you for your friendship. My parents and my sisters for supporting me in many different ways; thank you for getting me this far and for keeping me entertained along the way. To my friends who have encouraged me in so many different ways, without you I don’t think I would have been able to finish. Sandra Buchanan, Jen Richardson, Colin Babin, Jen ‘Chalut’ Duhamel, Jillian Lalonde, BreeAnn Dunnett and Janet Lamarche, thank you for our walks, our talks, for a little extra inspiration, a thorough edit, a lift to wherever I was going and even a place to stay. Thank you to all my friends, and I am looking forward to catching up.

## **Dedication**

To my grand-parents; you are my heroes.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

<i>TABLE OF CONTENT</i> .....	<i>vi</i>
<i>Abbreviations</i> .....	<i>viii</i>
<i>Introduction: The Rejection of the King by the Prophet</i> .....	<i>1</i>
<i>Chapter 1: Review of Literature and Problematic</i> .....	<i>4</i>
1.1 The State of the Question: Divine Rejection Stories.....	<b>4</b>
1.1.1 The Problematic Chapter 13 .....	4
1.1.1.1 Saul Did Not Wait for Samuel .....	5
1.1.1.2 Saul Usurped the Prophets Function.....	8
1.1.1.3 Question of Obedience.....	11
1.1.2 The Prophet and the King.....	12
1.1.2.1 Saul Upsets the Roles.....	13
1.1.2.2 Saul Upset the Balance of Power.....	14
1.1.2.3 Institutional Leadership .....	18
1.1.2.4 Still No Solution .....	20
1.1.3 “My Own Choosing” .....	21
1.1.4 Theological Problems and the Rejection of Saul.....	24
1.1.4.1 Rejection: Lack of Faith.....	25
1.1.4.2 Successor David: Deuteronomistic Editor .....	25
1.1.4.3 Prophet before King: Prophetic Editor .....	29
1.1.5 Consensus: More Questions than Answers .....	30
<i>Chapter 2: Establishing the Text</i> .....	<i>32</i>
2.1 Introduction to the ‘King’ .....	<b>33</b>
2.2 The War Against the Philistines.....	<b>34</b>
2.3 Saul’s Actions and Explanation .....	<b>39</b>
2.4 Promise and Judgment .....	<b>44</b>
2.5 Movement of Samuel, the People and the Philistines .....	<b>47</b>
2.6 Israel’s Weapons .....	<b>49</b>
2.7 Conclusion: Establishing the Text.....	<b>51</b>
<i>Chapter 3: Understanding the Story behind the Story</i> .....	<i>52</i>
3.1 Introduction to the King: 1 Samuel 13:1 .....	<b>52</b>
3.2 Saul, Jonathan and the War Against the Philistines: 1 Samuel 13:2-7 .....	<b>54</b>

3.3	Actions, Explanation and Judgment: 1 Samuel 13:8-14 .....	<b>60</b>
3.3.1	Insertion: Deuteronomistic Historiographer .....	61
3.3.2	Insertion: Prophetic Editor .....	66
3.3.3	Saul Cycle or Prophetic Connection .....	71
3.3.4	Conclusion concerning vv.7-15: prophetic Insertion Pre-Dtr .....	72
3.4	The Last Pieces: Movement and Metal: 1 Samuel 13:15-23 .....	<b>73</b>
3.4.1	Connection to vv.2-6 .....	73
3.4.2	Connection to Chapter 14 .....	76
3.4.3	Connection to 1 Samuel 13:7-15 .....	77
3.4.4	Conclusion concerning vv.15-23: Inconclusive .....	78
3.5	Conclusion on Sources .....	<b>78</b>
	<i>Chapter 4: Understanding the Story</i> .....	<i>80</i>
4.1	Synthesis and Interpretation .....	<b>80</b>
4.1.1	A Man After [God's] Heart .....	80
4.1.2	Jonathan .....	82
4.1.3	Northern Prophetic Message .....	85
4.1.4	Saul Cycle and the Prophetic Record .....	87
	<i>Conclusion : The Question of Saul's Fault</i> .....	<b>89</b>
	<i>Appendix A: The Sources of 1 Samuel 13:1-23</i> .....	<i>91</i>
	<i>Bibliography</i> .....	<i>94</i>

## Abbreviations

ANE	Ancient Near East
bg	Background information (the narrative is at rest)
c.	Chapter
chs.	Chapters
CNC	Compound noun clause (clause with a conjugated verb in second position)
Dtr	Deuteronomistic Historiography/ Deuteronomistic Historiographer
Est	Esther
fg	Foreground information (the narrative progresses)
Gen	Genesis
Isa	Isaiah
JSOT	Journal for Study of the Old Testament
LXX	Septuagint, Ancient Greek text
Mss	Manuscripts
SNC	Simple Noun Clause (clause with no conjugated verb)
v.	Verse
vv.	Verses

### Symbols:

fg	foreground
bg	background
↑	Retrieved information
↓	Anticipated information
0	Degree 0

## **Introduction: The Rejection of the King by the Prophet**

Saul, the first king of Israel, has been understood in many different and even contradictory ways. His story recounts the beginnings of the Israelite monarchy in the Hebrew Bible; the prequel to King David. The story of King Saul, is found in the first book of Samuel. The narrative begins in c.9, where Saul is a young man searching for his father's donkeys, and ending in his death in c.31, where he throws himself on his own sword after being wounded by the Philistines. He is made into the villain of David's rise to kingship, and in contrast to most other villains in the Hebrew Bible, King Saul is given much space and time for his story to be told. Saul's story is a combination of heroism and a man's descent into, what some have labeled, madness.

My research will focus on the beginnings of Saul's decline and the events that lead to his rejection. I will be attempting to answer the question; what did Saul do that caused the rejection in c.13? This question is by no means innovative; however, scholars are far from a consensus on the matter, and studies in the past have brought more questions than answers. Some questions that frequently arise include: is this a personal failure of Saul's, either based on his inability to measure up to even the least likely of judges, or is it a psychological block that prevents him from rising above his lowliness to be king? Do we consider Saul's decline to be his fate or do we look at Yahweh's and Samuel's motives? Is Saul's failure a lack of faith, an inability to trust in God or is this king an 'experiment', a bad choice done on purpose? Is Saul's downfall simply the work of redactors bringing the character of Samuel and the prophetic agenda to the forefront? Is this about his failure to obey instructions, or his choice to perform the sacrifice, or his

failure to go straight into battle and rescue the people? My intent is to shed new light on the subject of Saul's rejection as king.

The present work is particularly concerned with Saul's fault in 1 Samuel 13. The narrative in this chapter includes new characters, mighty heroism, fear and confusion. The reader is brought along on an adventure as Saul prepares to face the Philistine army for the first time and victory is not certain.<sup>1</sup> We are introduced to Jonathan, Saul's son, who can be considered Saul's heir: the potential second King of Israel. Complications arise when Samuel declares that another has been chosen, 'a man after [God's] own heart.' The identity of this man is not yet revealed.

My hypothesis is that we can understand the rejection of c.13 without referencing c.15, and that we can identify 'a man after [God's] heart' without jumping to c.16. For this reason, I will concentrate my exploration of Saul's fault on the adventure, heroism and confusion found in 1 Samuel 13.

The methodology used in this thesis is historical-critical since the source and redaction criticism will help determine to whom (what author/redactor) the rejection pericope in c.13 should be attributed. I will begin by providing the reading on which this thesis will be based. There are three direct witnesses (Hebrew manuscripts) and six indirect witnesses (ancient translations) for I Samuel c.13 and these manuscripts (mss.) present variant readings. These need to be compared in order to reconstruct the most archaic form of the biblical text and to draw conclusions explaining the different

---

<sup>1</sup> According to an explanation at the end of 1 Samuel 13, the Philistines would have been the Israelites biggest threat, due to their monopoly on iron weapons.

variants.<sup>2</sup> I will use the Massoretic text as found in the Leningrad Codex as my primary text for translation.

A Macro-Syntactical Analysis as elaborated by Alviero Niccacci, will be the tool used when translating the text of 1 Samuel 13. This type of analysis considers the morphology of verbs within the literary unit rather than just in a sentence. It will facilitate understanding the structure of the text in addition to bringing to light levels of communication in the text. This methodology will also assist in identifying source and redactional layers in the text. By using Text Linguistics to translate the text, I will be able to argue against some of the present theories, support others, and offer new insight on the first account of the failed king's rejection.

Most scholars agree that the final product of the Books of Samuel and Kings are to be attributed to a Deuteronomistic redactor. Helped by the Macro-Syntactical Analysis, I will attempt to identify the oldest literary stratum within I Samuel 13 (Source Criticism). The redactional layers will also be explored and evaluated (Redaction Criticism). The results of the Source Criticism and Redaction Criticism in this thesis will call into question the motives, suggested by scholars, for the rejection of Saul's kingship.

There are many different hypotheses concerning the fault of Saul, nonetheless I am of the opinion that by using the Macro-Syntactical analysis as my tool for translation, I will be able to narrow down the options and gain a better understanding concerning the fault of Saul.

---

<sup>2</sup> RICHARD N SOULEN and R. KENDALL SOULEN, *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition (Louisville/London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 189. PETER KYLE MCCARTER, "The Art and Science of Textual Criticism" in *Textual Criticism, Recovering the Text of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press (Guides to Biblical Scholarship, 1986), 12 and 31.

## Chapter 1: Review of Literature and Present Problems

### 1.1 The State of the Question: Divine Rejection Stories

The divine rejection of King Saul is told three times in the book of I Samuel.

1. 1 Samuel 13; the Prophet Samuel reprimands Saul for having been foolish and not having kept the commandment of Yahweh, and consequently, his kingdom will not continue (v. 13).
2. 1 Samuel 15; Saul spares the life of the Amalekite king, for this reason Saul is told that Yahweh has rejected him from being king.
3. 1 Samuel 28; Saul, in desperation, seeks the help of a medium to consult Samuel who is now dead, he is then told by the spirit of Samuel that Yahweh has become Saul's enemy, due to the Amalekite incident (vv. 16-18).

The last two stories provide a clear reason for the divine rejection of Saul. Chapter 13, on the other hand, is problematic and considered by scholars to be the most ambiguous of all the rejection stories.

#### 1.1.1 The Problematic Chapter 13

The reason provided in c.13 for the divine rejection of Saul's kingship is not clear. The Philistines are mustering to fight with Israel. Saul is in Gilgal waiting for Samuel to arrive, but the people are distressed and are beginning to slip away (v. 8). As a result Saul decides to offer the burnt offering (v. 9). When Samuel arrives, Saul tells him that he forced himself to offer the burnt offering (v.12). It is following this explanation that Samuel tells him he has acted foolishly and did not keep the commandment of Yahweh, consequently his kingdom will not endure (vv. 13-14). The difficulty is in determining the commandment Saul disobeyed. Most scholars will refer to I Samuel c.10 where Saul is told:

“you shall go down to Gilgal ahead of me; then I will come down to you to present burnt offerings and offer sacrifices of well-being. Seven days you shall wait, until I come to you and show you what you shall do” (v. 8)<sup>3</sup>

Samuel’s command was for Saul to wait, the problem is that according to c.13, Saul did wait seven days, and it is Samuel who did not arrive at the appointed time (13:8). It is only after Samuel’s failed appearance and the scattering of the Israelite army that Saul performed the sacrifice. Scholars are divided on the question concerning how Saul disobeyed God. Anto Popovic suggests that the assumptions can be divided into two categories.<sup>4</sup>

1. Saul did not wait for Samuel
2. Saul offered up a Sacrifice

In what follows we shall see how these categories are insufficient to account for the diversity of scholarly opinions on the subject.

#### 1.1.1.1 Saul Did Not Wait for Samuel

Using a synchronic approach to the text, Philip Long, Sarah Nicholson and Robert Polzin, argue that Saul’s failure was that he did not wait for the prophet Samuel. Long uses the collection of chs.10-13 to show that Saul’s fault was a failure to listen to the prophet. Nicholson, through a study on the relationship between the characters, decides

---

<sup>3</sup> ANTONY F. CAMPBELL, *1 Samuel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 140. HANS WILHELM HERTZBERG, *1 and 2 Samuel: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 105. KEITH BODNER, *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2008), 120. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1980), 228. RALPH W. KLEIN, *1 Samuel* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1983), 138. TONY W. CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2001), 171. PETER R. ACKROYD, *The First Book of Samuel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 105. BRUCE C. BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976), 80. DAVID JOBLING, *First Samuel* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998), 81. DAVID TOSHIO TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2007) 340.

<sup>4</sup> ANTO POPOVIC, "Saul's Fault in 1 Sam 13,7b-15a: Why Has the First Israelite King Fallen?" *Antonianum* 68 (1993): 154.

that Saul should have waited. Although Polzin questions whether Samuel should bear some of the responsibility in Saul's failure, he still presumes that Saul's failure is linked to his inability to wait for the prophet. In what follows, I will present each argument as it bears on this present work.

Philips V. Long argues that there is a literary coherence in chs.10 through 13, affirming that it was, indeed, Saul's inability to wait for the prophet that led to his downfall.<sup>5</sup> By re-evaluating the seemingly contradictory commands in c.10, he maintains that they are, in fact, complimentary. These two commands happen in vv.7-8; the first is 'do what your hands find to do' (1 Samuel 10:7), while in the following verse Samuel tells Saul 'go down ahead of me to Gilgal [and] wait' (1 Samuel 10:8). He clarifies that "the execution of the second [is] contingent on the fulfillment of the first", meaning that Saul was to *go* and *do* before he was to *wait*.<sup>6</sup> The first command: 'do what your hands find to do', is a military saying, and is interpreted as a command to go into battle.<sup>7</sup> The instructions, from Samuel, involving the wait at Gilgal concerns what Saul must do after he attacks the Philistine garrison. Long contends that it is Jonathan, by attacking the Philistine garrison in c.13, and not Saul, who completed the first task. Samuel is delayed because Saul did not complete the task that was given to him. Using the literary technique of 'gapping,' Long affirms that Samuel's reprimand of Saul had been building up within the preceding chapters, and the command to "go and do whatever your hands find to do"

---

<sup>5</sup> Long will argue that the coherent nature of the story continues from chapter 10 through chapter 15. PHILIPS V. LONG, "How Did Saul Become King? Literary Reading and Historical Reconstruction," in *Faith, Tradition, and History: Old Testament Historiography in Its Near Eastern Context*, edited by A.R. Millard, J.K. Hoffmeier and D.W. Baker (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 278.

<sup>6</sup> LONG, "How Did Saul Become King?: Literary Reading and Historical Reconstruction," 278.

<sup>7</sup> For more on the use of this expression in the Hebrew Bible see M. F. Dion, *À l'origine du concept d'élection divine* (Montréal/Paris: Médiaspaul, 2006), 98.

is not completed with the victory over the Ammonites in c.11.<sup>8</sup> He notes that the focus of 10:7 is the Philistines and not the Ammonites.<sup>9</sup> For Long, Saul's rejection is because of a failure to obey the command "do what your hands find to do," for he did not battle against the Philistines.

Sarah Nicholson's approach is to compare the story of the rise and fall of King Saul with later Greek tragedies. Her work looks at the characters and their relation to one another, specifically their relationship with Yahweh. She explores the ambivalent attitude that Yahweh seems to show towards the entire notion of Kingship in Israel.<sup>10</sup> She surveys the interaction between Yahweh and Saul, displaying how Yahweh's attitude towards Saul is ambivalent and removed. I believe that the insight she brings to the interactions between Saul and his God is very interesting, even though she does not allow this characterization to effect the reasons for Saul's failure. Instead she states that it is Saul's inability to wait, and not Yahweh's motives, that is Saul's downfall, for in doing so he broke the command from Samuel "to wait."<sup>11</sup>

According to Polzin, the work of the Dtr is to demonstrate how the monarchy leads Israel to disaster.<sup>12</sup> He considers the story of King Saul's divine rejection as a literary unit beginning with Jonathan's initial attack (c.13) and ending with Saul's rejection (c.15).<sup>13</sup> He also questions whether Samuel should bear some responsibility in

---

<sup>8</sup> 'Gapping' is done when there are blanks in the text, aspects of the story are not told, and scholars are left to fill in the blanks to make the story intelligible. LONG, *How Did Saul Become King*, 280.

<sup>9</sup> LONG, "How Did Saul Become King?: Literary Reading and Historical Reconstruction," 277.

<sup>10</sup> SARAH NICHOLSON, *Three Faces of Saul: An Intertextual Approach to Biblical Tragedy* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 84.

<sup>11</sup> NICHOLSON, *Three Faces of Saul: An Intertextual Approach to Biblical Tragedy*, 41.

<sup>12</sup> ROBERT M. POLZIN, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History: Part Two: 1 Samuel* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989), 12.

<sup>13</sup> POLZIN, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History*, 151.

Saul's failure as king.<sup>14</sup> Samuel is portrayed as one with a "lack of insight" and "self-serving actions".<sup>15</sup> It is Samuel who manipulates the kingship, coming and going on his own schedule, ignoring that his presence is needed immediately. Saul is dependent on Samuel for divine knowledge, and Samuel abuses this position to the point that Saul's reign is now his. Samuel is the grand master puppeteer, while Saul is the front man. Thus, the end of Saul's kingship or leadership is as much Samuel's fault as it is Saul's. This scholar points out a word play in 13:13 and 13:14 that pertains to Saul's failed 'appointment' in connection to Yahweh's failed 'appointment' of Saul as *nagid*.<sup>16</sup> The semantics of the verb צִוָּה (šiwwāh) ranges from 'to command someone' to 'to appoint someone'. This word play would support the theory that Saul's rejection is linked to his inability to wait for the prophet, since Saul failed to follow the command given by Samuel to wait, he has lost the appointment from Yahweh as king.

As demonstrated, the synchronic work of Long, Nicholson and Polzin, all argue that Saul should have waited for Samuel. The king's actions were hasty, unable to wait for the expected prophet, and for that reason he is rejected. The second category of assumption concerning Saul's fault, revolves around the offering of the sacrifice and how in doing so Saul violated the functions of king and prophet.

#### 1.1.1.2 Saul Usurped the Prophet's Function

The second category of assumption regarding Saul's failure considers how he upsets the balance between the prophet's role and the king's role by offering the sacrifice.

---

<sup>14</sup> POLZIN, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History*, 129-131.

<sup>15</sup> POLZIN, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History*, 130.

<sup>16</sup> POLZIN, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History*, 127.

We will revisit the question relating to roles later, and presently focus on the views of Jan P. Fokkelman and Anto Popovic, concerning Saul's fault in performing the sacrifice.

Fokkelman reflects on 1 Samuel as a "piece of verbal art" that tells the story of "Saul as a tragic Hero."<sup>17</sup> He believes Yahweh to be almost ambivalent in the choice of Israel's first king.<sup>18</sup> He questions Saul's ability to lead, whether because he is shown to be humble or even sheepish or because of the limitations that Samuel puts on the new king.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, Fokkelman looks at c.13 through c.15 to conclude that Saul's failure can be summed up by sacrificial irregularities, which are evident in all three chapters.<sup>20</sup> For example, in c.13 Saul usurped Samuel's offering of the burnt sacrifice. Later in c.14 Saul makes an oath which was broken by Jonathan, who did not suffer the consequences, and in c.15, he disobeyed the rules of holy war by not killing the Ammonite king. The contention is that all three involve sacrificial irregularities; burnt offering, broken oath and broken holy war rules. Fokkelman's theory on Saul's fault in c.13, concerning sacrificial irregularities, is entirely dependent on c.14 and c.15.

Popovic, on the other hand, looks at the redactional layers in c.13 and presumes that the fault of Saul is that he performed the sacrifice. Rather than looking forward to c.14 and c.15, as Fokkelman did, he looks within c.13 and to preceding narratives. His focus is 13:7b-15a, which he understands to be mostly redactional. Although he is not

---

<sup>17</sup> JAN P. FOKKELMAN, "Saul and David: Crossed Fates", *Bible Review* 5.3 (1989): 20.

<sup>18</sup> Fokkelman's argument concerning the ambivalent nature of Yahweh is similar to Nicholson (see above).

<sup>19</sup> FOKKELMAN, "Saul and David: Crossed Fates," 21- 25.

<sup>20</sup> DAVID JOBLING, "Saul's Fall and Jonathan's Rise: Tradition and Redaction in 1 Sam 14:1-46." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95.3 (1976): 367-376. and FOKKELMAN, "Saul and David: Crossed Fates," 27.

However, Jobling's main concern is the character of Jonathan in these chapters and he contrasts the unfavourable light in which Saul is depicted with the "tendency to exalt the figure of Jonathan" [p.367]. Saul's desire to take credit for Jonathan's action should point the reader to understand that it is now through Jonathan that "Yahweh acts on Israel's behalf" [p.369].

alone in this assertion, he deviates from the ‘in-secure’ consensus.<sup>21</sup> The traditional pieces in these verses would be vv.2-9 and 15-23 comprising the Philistine danger, Saul’s encouragement of the people by offering the sacrifice and the people’s despair, all of which disappear with Samuel’s arrival. The redactional layer would then be vv.10-12 and vv.13-14. Thus the meeting between Samuel and Saul (vv.10-12), along with the announcement of judgment (vv.13-14), is redactional. Therefore it is the redactional layer that holds the answer to Saul’s failure, and this is “probably the product of the prophetic redaction.”<sup>22</sup> Popovic insists for a connection between the commission in chs.9-10 and the fulfillment in chs.13-14, but this connection was considerably modified by the prophetic redactor(s). He asserts that the Ammonite war in c.11 is an insertion which deprives the reader from seeing the link between the commission in 9-10 and the fulfillment in 13-14. With the removal of chs.11 and 12, Popovic places 9:1-10:16 on “the same redactional horizon” as 13:9-15a.”<sup>23</sup> He then compares 1 Sam10:1 to vv.16 and 17 in c.9. Thus, he concludes that Saul was given the double task to: 1) rescue God’s people from the Philistines (9:16a) and 2) keep God’s people under control (9:17b). By arguing that the commissioning story be put right before the fulfillment story, Popovic presumes that Saul failed, for he gave a peace offering,<sup>24</sup> instead of going into battle and rescuing God’s people which is “what he was supposed to do.”<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> POPOVIC, “Saul’s Fault in 1 Sam 13,7b-15a: Why Has the First Israelite King Fallen?” 159.

<sup>22</sup> POPOVIC, “Saul’s Fault in 1 Sam 13,7b-15a: Why Has the First Israelite King Fallen?” 162.

<sup>23</sup> POPOVIC, ‘Saul’s Fault in 1 Sam 13,7b-15a: Why Has the First Israelite King Fallen?’ 167.

<sup>24</sup> Popovic says that “there was no need for him to appease God”, for he was at war with the Philistines not God. POPOVIC, “Saul’s Fault in 1 Sam 13,7b-15a: Why Has the First Israelite King Fallen?” 168.

<sup>25</sup> POPOVIC, “Saul’s Fault in 1 Sam 13,7b-15a: Why Has the First Israelite King Fallen?” 166.

To summarize, Fokkelman and Popovic understand that Saul's rejection was because he performed a sacrifice, which was the role of Samuel. By offering the sacrifice Saul was going against what Samuel had commanded him to do.

There is a third point of view concerning the fault of Saul, which essentially brings the preceding two categories of assumption together.<sup>26</sup> The following will delve into the question of Saul's obedience; this premise is fully reliant on the Saul story as a whole.

#### 1.1.1.3 Question of Obedience

David Gunn and Diane Edelman investigate the question of Saul's obedience; Gunn looks at his obedience to Samuel, the prophet, while Edelman looks at his obedience to Yahweh. Gunn uses a literary approach, looking at the larger narrative to survey that it was the combination of Saul's failure to wait for the prophet and his initiative in offering the sacrifice that caused the first king's rejection.<sup>27</sup> The hypothesis is that Samuel's instruction to 'wait' was given to prevent the priestly problem, caused by performing a sacrifice that was to be done by the prophet.<sup>28</sup> Edelman's mythological<sup>29</sup> look at Israel's first king, examines the literary devices used in the "larger narrative block"<sup>30</sup> to comprehend the narrative function of c.13, and then sums up Saul's failure to be his inability to "obey Yahweh's directives, and this is what prevents the establishment

---

<sup>26</sup> The two categories of assumption being 1) Saul's failure to wait and 2) That Saul offered the sacrifice.

<sup>27</sup> DAVID M. GUNN, "The Fate of King Saul: An Interpretation of a Biblical Story", JSOT 14 (1980): 9.

<sup>28</sup> GUNN, "The Fate of King Saul: An Interpretation of a Biblical Story," 35.

<sup>29</sup> This methodology is used within narrative criticism, and looks at the story as a myth which was written to inform humanity about itself and the world lived in.

<sup>30</sup> DIANA V. EDELMAN, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 30.

of his leadership in Israel”.<sup>31</sup> Edelman questions whether vv.13-14 include a legitimate prophetic pronouncement or if it is simply a warning from Samuel<sup>32</sup> while Gunn states that the “question therefore resolves itself into one about the motives of Samuel and Yahweh.”<sup>33</sup>

At this point, diminishing Saul’s fault to two categories, failure to wait and/or the act of sacrificing, is insufficient when attempting to grasp the rejection of Israel’s first king. I agree with Popovic when he says that the text “neither confirms nor denies the previous solutions” concerning the reason for Saul’s rejection.<sup>34</sup> Using Edelman and Gunn’s question of motives as a spring board, the following will look at the role of Samuel, since it is his voice that is used in Saul’s rejection.

### 1.1.2 The Prophet and the King

Many scholars analyze the role of Samuel in both Saul’s election and rejection. This is the first time that Israel finds itself with two leaders; a king and a prophet. The relationship between these characters is important in discerning their individual roles, as the awareness of Samuel’s role is crucial for understanding the rejection of Saul in 1 Samuel 13. The two main deductions to discuss are:

- 1) It was Saul that upset the balance between the prophet and the king<sup>35</sup>, or
- 2) It was Samuel that did not give Saul the room to be king.<sup>36</sup>

Here we will explore both of these concerns as possibilities for Saul’s rejection.

---

<sup>31</sup> EDELMAN, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah*, 76.

<sup>32</sup> EDELMAN, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah*, 80.

<sup>33</sup> GUNN, “The Fate of King Saul: An Interpretation of a Biblical Story,” 40.

<sup>34</sup> POPOVIC, “Saul’s Fault in 1 Sam 13,7b-15a. Why Has the First Israelite King Fallen?” 154.

<sup>35</sup> JAMES S. ACKERMAN, *Who Can Stand before YHWH, This Holy God? A Reading of 1 Samuel 1-15, Prooftexts* 11(1991): 16.

<sup>36</sup> EUGENE H. MALY, *World of David and Solomon* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966.), 32.

### 1.1.2.1 Saul Upsets the Roles

Anthony F. Campbell maintains that c.13 of 1 Samuel is concerned with the new roles of prophet and king. He considers c.13 as a demonstration of how these roles are violated by Saul and create a power struggle between king and prophet.<sup>37</sup> The text is not explicit concerning Saul's offence, but "he seems to have usurped the role assigned to Samuel in holy war."<sup>38</sup> This is why Samuel was not satisfied with Saul's attempt to justify himself, and he tells Saul that his dynasty will not rise, and that Yahweh has already chosen someone else.<sup>39</sup>

Eugene H. Maly posits that the problem was a personality conflict between Saul and Samuel. He uses Samuel's late arrival to show that the prophet was destructive to the reign of Saul.<sup>40</sup> He believes that Samuel was trying to trap Saul in a compromising situation.<sup>41</sup> His work also explores the possible historical context around the rule of the first king of Israel. It advocates that what was needed, above all else, was not so much a king, but a warrior capable of uniting and leading the people against their enemies.<sup>42</sup> *Nagid* indicates Saul is to be a "military commander."<sup>43</sup> Here Maly notes two important points: first, there was no dynastic mentality at this time period, and second, the prophetic exclusivity of priestly sacrifice had not yet been established. Knowing this helps to establish traditional and non-traditional themes and material within c.13. For this means

---

<sup>37</sup> CAMPBELL, *1 Samuel*, 127.

<sup>38</sup> CAMPBELL, *1 Samuel*, 128.

<sup>39</sup> CAMPBELL, *1 Samuel*, 123.

<sup>40</sup> Maly questions whether Samuel was nearby waiting to appear in order to catch Saul red handed [MALY, *World of David and Solomon*, 32].

<sup>41</sup> MALY, *World of David and Solomon*, 32.

<sup>42</sup> MALY, *World of David and Solomon*, 14.

<sup>43</sup> MALY, *World of David and Solomon*, 23. For more concerning the term *nagîd* see: M. F. DION, *À l'origine du concept d'élection divine*, 90-94.

that Saul, as king, “offering a sacrifice was perfectly in harmony with ANE practice”<sup>44</sup> and that the assumption would be that Saul’s reign was not limitless.<sup>45</sup> His conclusion is that it was Saul who proved that Israel could move from an independent tribal structure to a unified nation, the traditional Saul was a hero.<sup>46</sup> The conflict between prophet and king becomes a part of Israel’s history through the characters of Saul and Samuel. For the above scholars it is Saul that failed by disrupting the balance between Israel’s leaders, I will proceed to present some of the current thoughts and theories concerning Samuel’s fault in the rejection of Saul.

#### 1.1.2.2 Saul Upset the Balance of Power

Many scholars contend that a power struggle lead to the rejection of the first Israelite king, however, it is unclear whether it is Saul’s actions that create this power struggle, or if it is Samuel that becomes destructive to Saul’s reign because of a personality conflict.<sup>47</sup> Another line of questioning concerning Saul’s relationship with Samuel, reports that Saul was incapable of being king.<sup>48</sup> Is Samuel hanging around to keep Saul off balanced or is it that Saul is unable to do anything by himself? The arguments become circular as we wonder who had the upper hand; the prophet or the king. Within the whole story Saul is seen as a mistake, but Samuel can be blamed for being in Saul’s way.

---

<sup>44</sup> MALY, *World of David and Solomon*, 32.

<sup>45</sup> MALY, *World of David and Solomon*, 26.

<sup>46</sup> MALY, *World of David and Solomon*, 34.

<sup>47</sup> HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 103. BODNER, *I Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 126. CAMPBELL, *I Samuel*, 127. KLEIN, *I Samuel*, 141. JOBLING, *First Samuel*, 86.

<sup>48</sup> TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 348. JOBLING, *First Samuel*, 30

Thomas R. Preston focuses on the themes of “the rise of the lowly” and “the fall of the mighty”. He surmises that both Saul’s rise and his fall were the result of his lowliness (or modesty).<sup>49</sup> He demonstrates this by showing the constant presence of the one that Saul is to replace; Samuel. Preston states that it is unclear whether this ongoing presence of Samuel is because of Saul’s incapability or if it “serves to keep Saul unbalanced and insecure” never allowing him the room to truly become king.<sup>50</sup>

Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg suggests that the existence of the Saul narrative in the Israelite history is a clear indication that the United Kingdom would not have come about if it was not for Saul’s part in it. If this were not the case the entire character would have been suppressed by the final compiler.<sup>51</sup> Even with the compiler’s “friendly disposition towards the first king”, Saul is still rejected; he is seen as a mistake.<sup>52</sup> He states that this is because the narratives following Samuel’s interaction with Saul in c.13, do not take into account any sort of loss for Saul.<sup>53</sup> It is expressed as a vindication as opposed to a rejection, since Saul did what needed to be done, and if anyone is in the wrong it would be Samuel. The rejection in c.13 is a foreshadowing of the rejection that will follow in c.15. It is within the “history of Saul as a whole”<sup>54</sup> that the reader comes to comprehend the rejection of Israel’s first king. In the end, Saul falls not by the hand of his enemy but by the voice of God through his prophet Samuel, who “intervened in the fate of people

---

<sup>49</sup> THOMAS R. PRESTON, “The Heroism of Saul: Patterns of Meaning in the Narrative of the Early Kingship,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 24 (1982) 28.

<sup>50</sup> PRESTON, “The Heroism of Saul: Patterns of Meaning in the Narrative of the Early Kingship,” 34.

<sup>51</sup> HERTZBERG, *1 and 2 Samuel: A Commentary*, 19.

<sup>52</sup> HERTZBERG, *1 and 2 Samuel: A Commentary*, 20.

<sup>53</sup> HERTZBERG, *1 and 2 Samuel: A Commentary*, 105.

<sup>54</sup> HERTZBERG, *1 and 2 Samuel: A Commentary*, 106.

and king.”<sup>55</sup> Hertzberg states that vv.7b-15a are inserted to demonstrate that “Saul’s kingship was perverted from the beginning.”<sup>56</sup>

James S. Ackerman takes a different approach asking whether the king can act without the prophet, or if the king is to act as a prophet. He determined that in c.10, it is Samuel, in fact, who mixes the two roles when he guides Saul to receive the prophetic spirit. He adds that although c.12 alludes to the end of Samuel’s career, he nevertheless continuously reappears in the realm of Saul’s leadership.<sup>57</sup> He includes that: “Saul was about to help us discover whether Israel can be led by kingship alone” but he is rejected before having the chance to combine the roles of prophet and king.”<sup>58</sup> For Samuel, Saul has upset the balance between prophet and king, and that up until c.15 it is possible for the reader to side with Saul.<sup>59</sup> Although, the argument leads towards it being Samuel who is at fault, he nevertheless explains that in c.14 Saul combines the religious with the military, and “is incapable of functioning without prophetic guidance.”<sup>60</sup> In the end, Ackerman draws the conclusion that c.15 is used to fill in the blanks explaining that here the reader begins to agree with the rejection of Saul.

Lowell K. Handy describes the character of Samuel, in c.13, as “a weird figure” saying that he dabbles in the fate of others while “appearing and disappearing from narratives at awkward moments.”<sup>61</sup> He states that the early writer purposely did this to show the reader that Saul did wait long enough for Samuel. Other scholars, such as

---

<sup>55</sup> HERTZBERG, *1 and 2 Samuel: A Commentary*, 103.

<sup>56</sup> HERTZBERG, *1 and 2 Samuel: A Commentary*, 106.

<sup>57</sup> JAMES S. ACKERMAN, “Who Can Stand before YHWH, This Holy God? A Reading of 1 Samuel 1-15,” *Prooftexts* 11 (1991): 15.

<sup>58</sup> ACKERMAN, “Who Can Stand before YHWH, This Holy God? A Reading of 1 Samuel 1-15” 20.

<sup>59</sup> ACKERMAN, “Who Can Stand before YHWH, This Holy God? A Reading of 1 Samuel 1-15” 16-18.

<sup>60</sup> ACKERMAN, “Who Can Stand before YHWH, This Holy God? A Reading of 1 Samuel 1-15” 17.

<sup>61</sup> LOWELL K. HANDY, “The Characters of Heirs Apparent in the Book of Samuel,” *Biblical Research* 38 (1993): 8.

Preston and Maly, perceive c.13 as an example of the ‘undercutting’ that Samuel does to Saul. It is the narrator who wants the reader to know that “Samuel was in fact close by, waiting to catch Saul and then to reprove him, as Samuel immediately does.”<sup>62</sup> Handy, Preston and Maly all examine Samuel’s motives in the rejection of Saul; at the same time, they are very careful not to give the prophet the full blame for the situation, considering Saul ultimately as the villain.

Tamas Czovek investigates this further by looking at the dependant nature of the character of Saul. Saul is dependant right from the beginning.<sup>63</sup> Up until Saul’s appointment, Israel’s leaders received direction straight from God, whereas Saul was fully dependent on the prophet for this communication.<sup>64</sup> This would prove to yield negative results for Saul. It is the fault of Samuel, that puts Saul in the “shadows of the judges” and “the prophet destines Saul to inevitable failure.”<sup>65</sup> Interestingly, he illuminates the textual critical problem concerning the age of Saul (being only one year old when he started to reign (13:1)) as the narrators attempt to emphasize that Saul was totally dependent on Samuel, and the reign of 2 years characterizes an unsuccessful reign.<sup>66</sup> The denunciation by Samuel is unclear and leads him to clarify: “my contention is that Saul, by taking action on his own, unintentionally issued a challenge to the

---

<sup>62</sup> PRESTON, “The Heroism of Saul: Patterns of Meaning in the Narrative of the Early Kingship,” 34.

<sup>63</sup> In 1 Samuel 9:5-Saul is dependent on his father; in 9:6,8 Saul is incapable of doing anything without the suggestions of his servant; in 9:11 Saul needs the guidance of the girls at the well; and 9:18 begins his long dependant relation with the seer [CZOVEK, Tamas. *Three Seasons of Charismatic Leadership: A Literary-Critical And Theological Interpretation of the Narrative of Saul, David and Solomon* (Oxford, U.K: Regnum Books International, 2006), 46.].

<sup>64</sup> CZOVEK, *Three Seasons of Charismatic Leadership: A Literary-Critical and Theological Interpretation of the Narrative of Saul, David and Solomon*, 49.

<sup>65</sup> CZOVEK, *Three Seasons of Charismatic Leadership: A Literary-Critical and Theological Interpretation of the Narrative of Saul, David and Solomon*, 62.

<sup>66</sup> CZOVEK, *Three Seasons of Charismatic Leadership: A Literary-Critical and Theological Interpretation of the Narrative of Saul, David and Solomon*, 66.

authority structure established by Samuel.”<sup>67</sup> Samuel is characterized as manipulative and power hungry, and because of this, Saul was unable to really function as king. Czovek concludes that Saul in c.13 is rejected not by God, but by the prophet Samuel.<sup>68</sup>

To review, Preston, Hertzberg, Ackerman, Handy and Czovek all deal with the relationship between Saul and Samuel. The arguments seem to go in circles. Samuel did not give Saul room to be king or Samuel was hanging around because Saul was incapable of being a king. The power struggle is obvious enough to go beyond the relationship between the two individuals and instead look at the groups that they represent; prophets and kings.

#### 1.1.2.3 Institutional Leadership

It has also been argued that the rejection of Saul by Samuel is a judgment on institutional leadership in Israel. This view begins by emphasizing that the rejection of Saul is a rejection of all Israelite kings. One must then question the sources behind the rejection of the king in favor of the prophet. What follows is a look at James S. Ackerman, Peter K. McCarter and Anthony Campbell and their views of the prophetic leadership and how this relates to institutional leadership.

Ackerman asserts that the story of the rejection of Saul causes the reader to be wary of any kind of institutional form of leadership. He states:

“Thus the answer to the people’s question ‘who can stand before YHWH, this holy God?’ is that no one can, though someone must. Israel must somehow live as God’s people in a context that denies divine authorization to any

---

<sup>67</sup> CZOVEK, *Three Seasons of Charismatic Leadership: A Literary-Critical and Theological Interpretation of the Narrative of Saul, David and Solomon*, 69.

<sup>68</sup> CZOVEK, *Three Seasons of Charismatic Leadership: A Literary-Critical and Theological Interpretation of the Narrative of Saul, David and Solomon*, 66-72.

institutional form that elicits our suspicion of all claims to the contrary, even when they are made by a man of God heralding a messiah.”<sup>69</sup>

The rejection of Saul, in the eyes of Ackerman, was a judgment on all the kings of Israel.

McCarter and Campbell both explore the influence of the prophetic redactor on the entire Saul narrative. These scholars maintain that the prophetic edition was done before the Dtr School did its work, and that this prophetic edition reworked “older material”.<sup>70</sup> The insertion within this material has been referred to as a prophetic oracle of judgment (13:7b-15a).<sup>71</sup> Through the characterization of the personages of Eli’s sons, Samuel and Jonathan, Handy portrays the author of the Book of Samuel to be someone who “had a much more skeptical vision of persons in position of power than is sometimes suspected.”<sup>72</sup> This skeptical view of kingship is often suggested as a theme expressed by the prophetic redaction. McCarter classifies the rest of c.13 as ‘old’, possibly an early northern tradition. He connects it with c.14 and insists that it was originally entirely independent of the surrounding text.<sup>73</sup> He notes a problem concerning the seven day wait, for in 10:8, Saul is portrayed as a youth, while ‘seven days’ later (13:8) he is not only a military commander, but has a grown son of his own.<sup>74</sup> He claims it is the prophetic edition that established a strong correlation between kingship and obedience to Yahweh’s

---

<sup>69</sup> ACKERMAN, "Who Can Stand before YHWH, This Holy God? A Reading of 1 Samuel 1-15," 21.

<sup>70</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 18-20, 230.

<sup>71</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 228.

<sup>72</sup> HANDY, “The Characters of Heirs Apparent in the Book of Samuel”, 22.

<sup>73</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 27.

<sup>74</sup> Like Polzin, McCarter looks at the word play concerning “Saul’s appointment as king and his appointment with Samuel” [MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 228.]

prophet.<sup>75</sup> The association was done by linking the events of c.10 to those of c.13 thus demonstrating that the king is “subject to the controlling authority of the prophet.”<sup>76</sup>

We need to keep in mind that Saul and Samuel are a part of a historiography representing more than their individuality. The question of a pre-Dtr northern prophetic circle will continue to be explored throughout this thesis. For the story of 1 Samuel 13 makes the reader wonder: who is in charge, the king or the prophet?

#### 1.1.2.4 Still No Solution

As we have seen there are many diverging ideas and questions when considering the role of Samuel in the rejection in c.13. In his commentary, Campbell is unclear how Saul failed; he seems undecided.<sup>77</sup> By connecting c.13 to the rejection story in c.15, he arrives at the conclusion that the problem is a lack of obedience. Then, by using c.17, he claims that Saul’s fault has to do with Saul’s problem with fear.<sup>78</sup> This position shows that although the ‘reason’ provided for the rejection may be unclear, the motives are clear. The purpose is to establish that prophets take precedence over kings.<sup>79</sup> This gives a strong argument to show that the redactor of the text had an agenda which was to elevate the prophet above the king. After characterizing Samuel as a ‘weird figure’, Handy affirms that it was “the mishandling of sacrifice”<sup>80</sup> that lead to Saul’s downfall. Hertzberg exclaims: “He [Saul] is the anointed; he is loved by many, even by his opponent Samuel, he is pious in the extreme, brave yet modest, without doubt a man of the stuff of which

---

<sup>75</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 229.

<sup>76</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 230.

<sup>77</sup> CAMPBELL, *I Samuel*, 128.

<sup>78</sup> CAMPBELL, *I Samuel*, 141.

<sup>79</sup> ANTONY F. CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and Kings: a Late-Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986), 113.

<sup>80</sup> HANDY, “The Characters of Heirs Apparent in the Book of Samuel,” 88.

kings are made.”<sup>81</sup> On the other hand, this caricature is in contradiction to the theme of a “perverted” beginning that is suggested for Saul’s reign.<sup>82</sup> The denunciation by Samuel is unclear and leads Czovek to declare: “my contention is that Saul, by taking action on his own unintentionally issued a challenge to the authority structure established by Samuel.”<sup>83</sup> Maly states that Saul is the one who proved that Israel could move from an independent tribal structure to a unified nation,<sup>84</sup> conversely, the question remains that if Saul is the hero then why was he rejected? A similar problem arises when Preston gives details describing Saul as the hero of the story, a man called to be king to fulfill military needs, while David ends up becoming king like ‘other nations.’ Saul is looked at favorably since “the narrator establishes him as a very sympathetic character in the reader’s eyes.”<sup>85</sup> Why then was Saul rejected, or who rejected him?

### 1.1.3 “My Own Choosing”

1 Samuel 13 includes the expression “a man after his [God’s] own heart”. This phrase has often been used in reference to piety, and has been linked to Saul’s rival King David. Scholars have suggested that ‘a man after God’s heart’ could be an idiom meaning God’s own choosing.<sup>86</sup> Dominic Rudman surveys the kingly roles played by both Saul and David, and the type of calling given to each individual. Barbara Green analyzes Saul’s failure to take responsibility in his job as king as Saul’s downfall.<sup>87</sup> Edwin Good’s

---

<sup>81</sup> HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 133.

<sup>82</sup> HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 133.

<sup>83</sup> CZOVEK, *Three Seasons of Charismatic Leadership: A Literary-Critical and Theological Interpretation of the Narrative of Saul, David and Solomon*, 69.

<sup>84</sup> MALY, *World of David and Solomon*, 34.

<sup>85</sup> PRESTON, *The Heroism of Saul: Patterns of Meaning in the Narrative of the Early Kingship*, 32.

<sup>86</sup> CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 175. TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 348. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 230.

<sup>87</sup> GREEN, BARBARA, *King Saul's Asking* (Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 2003), 58.

observations concern how Saul tries to gain the favor of the people.<sup>88</sup> Green and Good are not specifically focused on c.13, nevertheless their insight on Saul's leadership, or lack thereof, is valuable in the quest for Saul's fault. For these scholars, Saul is not the one 'chosen' by God.

Some scholars have proposed that 'a man after God's heart' could be an idiom implying that God will choose the next king himself.<sup>89</sup> Tony Cartledge examines whether v.14 contains an 'expression' (after his own heart) or an 'idiom' (of his own choosing), and agrees with the second saying that it was simply "a matter of divine choice." For him, the difference between Saul and the next king is one of divine election and suggests that Saul's selection was not done by Yahweh.<sup>90</sup> Cartledge asserts that vv. 2-7a and vv.16-22 are to be understood as an older narrative. Verses 7b-15 are deemed to have been "an anti-kingship episode inserted to discredit Saul's leadership,"<sup>91</sup> and v.1 is believed to be from the hand of the Dtr. Moreover, 10:8 is an insertion providing a "convenient connective device"<sup>92</sup> with the account of Saul's anointing in c.10.

Dominic Rudman compares the characters of Saul and David, to investigate their individual calls to kingship, and the reasons for their kingly appointment. David's role is described as the one who will "shepherd my people Israel" (II Sam 5.2), while Saul is commissioned to "restrain my people" (I Sam 9:17).<sup>93</sup> He reasons that Saul's inability to 'restrain' the people was his ultimate downfall. He, unlike others, separates the two

---

<sup>88</sup> GOOD, EDWIN M., *Irony in the Old Testament* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1981), 68.

<sup>89</sup> BODNER, *1 Samuel : A Narrative Commentary*, 126. TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 346. CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 174-175.

<sup>90</sup> CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 175.

<sup>91</sup> CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 170.

<sup>92</sup> CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 171.

<sup>93</sup> DOMINIC RUDMAN, "Why Was Saul Rejected? A Reassessment of 1 Samuel 9-15," *Scripture Bulletin* 31 (2001): 104.

rejection accounts to demonstrate that both stories show, in a different manner, Saul's inability to 'restrain' the people. In c.13, Saul himself justifies his inability to carry out his appointment, when he tells Samuel that the people were leaving him; so he felt constrained to offer the sacrifice himself and not wait any longer for Samuel to arrive. The command which Saul broke was not the inability to wait, but the inability to 'restrain' the people.<sup>94</sup> "Saul, then, is rejected not simply for disobedience, but for a fundamental failure to perform the task for which he had been chosen."<sup>95</sup>

Barbara Green recognizes the character of Saul as one who "represents the whole experience of Israel with kings."<sup>96</sup> In her book *King Saul's Asking*, she studies 'why' and 'how' Saul fails and the significance of his failure.<sup>97</sup> When exploring c.13, Green seeks to understand how Saul failed to take responsibility; whether through his obsession with rituals or his dependence on the actions of his son Jonathan, as it was Jonathan that attacked the garrison. While looking at 1 Samuel 13 through 15, Green discusses 3 failures of Saul: 1) hearing poorly thus a lack of communication with God, 2) lack of obedience and understanding towards the prophet, and 3) he listens to the people rather than to the prophet.<sup>98</sup>

Edwin Good affirms that Saul works to try and gain the favor of the people. He focuses on the literary problems of c.13; his research is specifically concerned with Saul's relationship with the people and the tragic nature of the events. He refrains from combining c.13 and c.15 to respond to the questions that arise out of c.13. Instead, he

---

<sup>94</sup> RUDMAN, "Why Was Saul Rejected? A Reassessment of 1 Samuel 9-15," 105.

<sup>95</sup> RUDMAN, "Why Was Saul Rejected? A Reassessment of 1 Samuel 9-15," 107.

<sup>96</sup> GREEN, *King Saul's Asking*, 47.

<sup>97</sup> GREEN, *King Saul's Asking*, 45.

<sup>98</sup> GREEN, *King Saul's Asking*, 58.

classifies the second (c.15) as Yahweh's rejection of Saul, while the first is Samuel's rejection of the king. Samuel is angered by the need to reject Saul a second time, believing that his own rejection should suffice. The moments that Saul turns to, listens to, or tries to gain the favor of the people, are highlighted and directly connected to Saul's rejection.<sup>99</sup> The response to the question "what did Saul do" is resolved with the words of the prophet: "though you are little in your own eyes, are you not in fact the chief of the tribes of Israel?" (1 Samuel 15:17).<sup>100</sup> For Good, Saul's problem is not that he listened to the people, but that he depended on them and sought their acceptance. "He failed to trust Yahweh to make him king in fact as well as in name, and hence he has lost his trust in the people in whom he had put greater store."<sup>101</sup>

When seen as an idiom, that is to mean 'of [God's] own choosing,' the rejection comes down to a matter of choice. Saul is rejected and the one whom God has chosen will take his place. Scholars who see this as an idiom identify David as the one chosen by God.

#### 1.1.4 Theological Problems and the Rejection of Saul

This final section explores the theological issues that brought Saul to his rejection. The three main directions examined, by scholars, concerning the theology behind Saul's rejection are:

- 1) Saul's lack of faith is an example of why one would be divinely rejected,
- 2) Saul's entire down fall, is to prove the validity of David's kingship, and

---

<sup>99</sup> GOOD, *Irony in the Old Testament*, 67-71.

<sup>100</sup> GOOD, *Irony in the Old Testament*, 70.

<sup>101</sup> GOOD, *Irony in the Old Testament*, 77.

3) Saul is downplayed to emphasize the elevated position of the prophet.<sup>102</sup>

#### 1.1.4.1 Rejection: Lack of Faith

Keith Bodner and John Martin hold that the first book of Samuel is “about a prophetic utterance gradually finding its fulfillment”.<sup>103</sup> That ‘prophetic utterance’ is found in 1 Samuel 13:14, where Saul is notified that his kingdom will end. Saul is rejected, not because he did not wait long enough<sup>104</sup> or because he performed a sacrifice. Rather these scholars state that it is in light of the whole of the Saul narrative that the reader is shown that his downfall was due to a lack of faith.<sup>105</sup>

#### 1.1.4.2 Successor David: Deuteronomistic Editor

There is a variety of scholars who look towards the second king of Israel to understand the first king’s rejection, especially when it concerns ‘a man after [God’s] heart.’<sup>106</sup> Marc Brettler acknowledges that the editor/author does everything to elevate David, by explaining Saul’s drastic downfall.<sup>107</sup> He examines the ideology behind the story in order to appreciate the motives or purpose behind the writing. He comes to the conclusion that the writer wanted to defend David’s kingship by demonstrating that

---

<sup>102</sup> We first looked at this in the section concerning the relationship between Saul and Samuel when viewed through the motives of the prophetic redactor. The following reexamination will be brief.

<sup>103</sup> JOHN A. MARTIN, “The Structure of 1 and 2 Samuel,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 141(1984): 2.

<sup>104</sup> BODNER, *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 120.

<sup>105</sup> BODNER, *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 120. MARTIN, “The Structure of 1 and 2 Samuel,” 35.

<sup>106</sup> ACKROYD, 106. HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 103. KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 124, 140. TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 348. JOBLING, *First Samuel*, 84. BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy*, 83. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 229. BODNER, *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 123. CAMPBELL, *1 Samuel*, 127. CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 174.

<sup>107</sup> MARC Z. BRETLER, “Biblical Literature as Politics: The Case of Samuel,” in *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*, ed. Adele Berlin (Bethesda, MD: University of Maryland Press, 1996), 90.

David did not usurp the kingship from Saul.<sup>108</sup> He highlights the pro-Saul corpus, and expresses how it was changed into an anti-Saul narrative by supporters of the Davidic line. Dietrich and Naumann also support this view while attributing this editorial work to the Dtr editor.<sup>109</sup> They argue that “Pre-deuteronomistically there was no connection between” the stories of Saul and David; “only with the Deuteronomistic editing were the major traditions of the first kings brought together.”<sup>110</sup> In a later work, Dietrich presents a portrait of Saul, a man in the shadows of David, who seems merely to be the negative background for the rise of David. He points out that Saul is ready with an account or justification, when Samuel first speaks to him in 1 Samuel 13; nonetheless, Saul is silent upon being given the final verdict. The story of Saul seems “strangely incomplete, indecisive, unfavorable, and unfortunate.”<sup>111</sup>

Mobley, on the other hand, observes the heroics of Saul through the critique of Saul by the pro-Davidic redactor. He does this by isolating stories in 1 Samuel, chs.9-14, and connecting them to stories from chs.15-31 for the sake of contrasting David with Saul. For example; the comparison between the description of Saul’s physical appearance in 9:2 and 10:23 and the description of David’s inner appearance in 16:7. The powerful ‘breath of Yhwh’ that Saul receives to defeat the Ammonites is downplayed; this gift then gradually turns into a mark of Saul’s madness. Even Saul’s signature weapon, his spear, a sign of a hero, is used against Saul when David not only steals it, but could be accused of

---

<sup>108</sup> BRETTLER, "Biblical Literature as Politics: The Case of Samuel," 87.

<sup>109</sup> Here, 1 Samuel 13:13-14, is considered the redactional work of DtrN (late exilic or even post-exilic), which is primarily interested “in the identity of Israel as the people of Yahweh and in the Torah” [p.309].

<sup>110</sup> WALTER DIETRICH and THOMAS NAUMANN, “The David- Saul Narrative,” in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*, eds GARY N. KNOPPERS and J. GORDON MCCONVILLE (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 308.

<sup>111</sup> WALTER DIETRICH, *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.*, Trans. Joachim Vette (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature. 2007), 42.

gloating over it (c.26).<sup>112</sup> The last contrast involves the proverb “is Saul among the prophets” which is used positively in c.10, but negatively in c.19.<sup>113</sup> Scheffler looks at the pro-Saul and pro-monarchic material and concludes that this early narrative would have been compiled “in Benjamin after the death of Saul amongst those circles that regarded him as a successful king and who believed that one of his sons should be heir to the throne of Israel.”<sup>114</sup> These authors see Saul as a successful king and a hero, even though this was later downplayed by editors to legitimize David’s kingship.

This disqualification of Saul for the sake of David is also examined through the other two main characters: Jonathan and Samuel. David Jobling observes the role of Jonathan, Saul’s son, in the rejection of Saul and the election of David.<sup>115</sup> He considers chs.13-15 as merely a preamble to the structure that shows the theological importance of the character of Jonathan. For Jobling, Jonathan’s character is written to replace Saul, and at the same time to be replaced by David.<sup>116</sup> He further considers Saul’s ultimate rebellion to be about his refusal to know; know that David will be king.<sup>117</sup> Investigating in a different direction than Jobling, Miller questions the use of Samuel’s character in the text. It is the insertion of the character of Samuel in the story that reveals the ‘theological’ motives for elevating David. Miller states that if his “reconstruction<sup>118</sup> is correct, the

---

<sup>112</sup> GREGORY MOBLEY, “Glimpses of the Heroic Saul,” in *Saul in Story and Tradition*, ed. Carl S. Ehrlich ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 81-83.

<sup>113</sup> MOBLEY, “Glimpses of the Heroic Saul,” 85.

<sup>114</sup> EBEN SCHEFFLER, “Saving Saul from the Deuteronomist,” in *Past, Present Future: The Deuteronomistic History of the Prophets*, edited by Johannes Cornelis deMoor and H.F. Van Rooy (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 254.

<sup>115</sup> DAVID JOBLING, *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Three Structural Analyses in the Old Testament* (Sheffield: University of Sheffield Pr, 1978), 5.

<sup>116</sup> JOBLING, *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Three Structural Analyses in the Old Testament*, 11.

<sup>117</sup> JOBLING, *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Three Structural Analyses in the Old Testament*, 130.

<sup>118</sup> His reconstruction connects c.13 directly to the ending of the narrative of Saul and his search for the lost donkeys, arguing that the story originally said that Saul attacked the Philistine garrison and not Jonathan [p.161] in fulfillment of the command “do whatever your hands find to do”. It is the narrative concerning

cycle of revised narratives was neither pro-Saul nor specifically pro-monarchic, but intended to support David's claims to the throne."<sup>119</sup>

The heroism of Saul is not expressed by all scholars. McKenzie considers most of c.13 and c.14 to be early accounts, while viewing 13:4b and 7b-15a as Dtr. This scholar sees the Dtr insertion as emphasizing an already negative portrayal of Saul; negative since Saul is overshadowed by his son Jonathan who is the one who has the courage to attack the Philistines.<sup>120</sup> In this perspective, Saul is jealous and irrational, serving as a bridge between the Judges and David; Saul is a one dimensional character providing contrast to David. McKenzie states that, at the very least, the Deuteronomist adopted this vilification of Saul for his own purposes, which has obscured the historical character of Saul.

The rejection of Saul by the Dtr is for the sake of David. The Dtr elevates David over Saul throughout its historiography by continually comparing the two characters. The personality of Jonathan is a pro-Davidic tool, written to replace Saul and at the same time to be substituted willingly by David. These scholars understand the man after God's heart to be David.

---

the Philistines that presuppose the instructions in c.10 and not the one concerning the Ammonites [p.162]. The older version includes 1 Samuel 13:4-18, 14:20-23, and 31-35, which are simply "a continuation of the revised account" [p.162] of Saul in chapters 9-10. Redactional layers include: Samuel's anointing of Saul (chapter 10), and the confrontation at Gilgal (chapter 13). While the second older version represents the deeds of the heroic young Jonathan (14:1, 4-9, 24-30, 36-45) when he defeated the Philistines at Michmash.

<sup>119</sup> J. MAXWELL MILLER, "Saul's Rise to Power: Some Observations Concerning I Sam 9:1-10:16; 10:26-11:15 and 13:2-14:46," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36.2 (1974): 172.

<sup>120</sup> STEVEN L. MCKENZIE, "The Trouble with Kingship," In *Israel Constructs its History*, eds. Albert dePury, Jean-Daniel Macchi and Thomas Romer (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 291.

#### 1.1.4.3 Prophet before King: Prophetic Editor

As discussed above (1.2.3.2 *Saul Upsets the Balance of Power*), some scholars dispute that it was the Dtr historian who edited the rejection of Saul. Instead it is the work of a pre-Dtr prophetic circle whose intent was to show “the perverse nature of kingship as a whole from the perspective of Samuel and prophetic circles.”<sup>121</sup> Klein argues that for the prophetic circle, it is fear that unravels Saul right at the beginning of his reign. The impact will not just be on Saul, but also on other kings since it is “a claim that the legitimacy of royal authority was dependent on obedience to God’s will declared by the prophet.”<sup>122</sup> This redactional layer is marked by its elevation of the prophet over the king. Samuel’s role in kingship is paralleled to God’s role “in this new development.”<sup>123</sup> The redaction brings out the connection between Samuel’s word and God’s command; “Saul’s responsibility is not to raise political or military issues but to obey.”<sup>124</sup>

Other scholars, for example Humphreys, understand that the Saul story was first redacted by a northern prophetic group, who made Saul into Samuel’s opponent, subordinate. This redactional layer (vv.7-15) highlights that even in military situations the King is subordinate to the prophet.<sup>125</sup> This was later re-worked by a southern and Davidic circle whose interest was to confirm David’s kingship. In fact in this redactional layer, David’s appearance on the scene coincides with Samuel dropping from the story

---

<sup>121</sup> KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 75.

<sup>122</sup> KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 141.

<sup>123</sup> KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 25. He even says that Samuel is the new symbol of God, as the Ark is absent in most of the first book of Samuel (chapter 4 only to reappear in 2 Sam 6) [p.30].

<sup>124</sup> KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 138.

<sup>125</sup> W. LEE HUMPHREYS, “From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 22 (1982): 105. “The ambiguity serves to underline the submission of royal authority, even in times of military crisis, to that of the prophet.”

and along with him the “distinct prophetic perspective vanishes as well.”<sup>126</sup> Therefore 13:7b-15a can be seen as a prophetic addition.<sup>127</sup> For Humphreys, Saul begins as a tragic hero, who is transformed into a villain by the prophetic circle and is finally rejected as king and set “against the elect David who stands under unconditional blessing” by the southern Davidic circle.<sup>128</sup>

The weakness of these arguments is that they continue to understand David as the intended ‘man after God’s heart.’ Neither theories, Dtr or Prophetic Record, are fully satisfactory and nor do they account for the disparities concerning the 7 day wait.

#### 1.1.5 Consensus: More Questions than Answers

As we have seen there is very little consensus concerning the fault of Saul. The various views bring about more questions than answers. Is the failure a lack of trust and faith or Saul’s fear? How does Yahweh’s ambivalent attitude effect Saul’s rejection, or is this king an ‘experiment’? Is it a personal failure of Saul, whether based on his inability to measure up to even the least likely of judges, or a psychological block that prevents him from rising above his lowliness to be king? Do we consider this Saul’s fate or do we look at Yahweh’s and Samuel’s motives? Is Saul’s downfall simply the work of redactors bringing the character of Samuel, and the prophetic agenda to the forefront, or the work of redactors making David’s overthrow favorable? Is this about Saul’s failure to obey instructions, or his choice to perform the sacrifice, or his failure to go straight into battle

---

<sup>126</sup> HUMPHREYS, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel," 108.

<sup>127</sup> HUMPHREYS, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel," 109.

<sup>128</sup> The Davidic redaction would have occurred just after the fall of Samaria (722 BCE), when under Hezekiah, “the Davidic house was again in the position to assert genuine claims to authority [HUMPHREYS, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel," 110].

and rescue the people? Can the answer be found in a connection with the story in c.9 and c.10, or with c.12? Is it God that rejects Saul, or is it Samuel? Should the rejection be attributed to the Dtr editor, or to a pre-Dtr prophetic redactor? Does Yahweh reject His king or the people's king? Is Saul rejected because he listened to the 'voice of the people', or are the people disqualified for electing Saul? And finally; who is "a man after [God's] own heart"? The abundance of questions that still exist concerning Israel's first king is why I believe the question of Saul's fault needs to be re-visited.

## **Chapter 2: Establishing the Text**

This chapter will first present a division of I Samuel 13 by clauses in order to proceed to a Macro-Syntactical Analysis of the text. The arguments put forward are based on my translation. The composite nature of the text, the interpretation of its parts and of the text as a whole cannot be achieved without the use of this tool. Furthermore, the textual critical issues that are significant to the interpretation of the text will also be discussed. For the purpose of this chapter, the text is divided in six parts:

- Introduction to the King (v.1),
- The War Against the Philistines (v.2-7),
- Saul's Action and Explanation (v.8-12),
- Promise and Judgment (v.13-14),
- Movement of Samuel, the People and the Philistines (v.15-18),
- Israel's Weapons (v.19-23).

The translation provided in this chapter will then be used in the following chapters in the attempt to better understand the fault of Saul.

## 2.1 Introduction to the ‘King’

v.1	בֶּן־שָׁנָה שָׁאוּל בְּמֶלֶכּוֹ וּשְׁתֵּי שָׁנִים מָלַךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל:	SNC SNC Qatal
-----	--	---------------------

### (v.1) Saul, a year old, was made king; and for 2 years he ruled over Israel.

The textual problems of v.1 have stumped many scholars. The text seems corrupted and numbers seem to be missing. It is an empty regnal formula, given to state the length of a kings reign as well as their age upon coronation; empty because unlike Ishbaal (2 Sam 2:10) and David (2 Sam 5:4), it seems as though the numbers were dropped out of the text.<sup>129</sup> Dietrich will argue that the Dtr did not have the specific dates, and the text was filled in by later mss.<sup>130</sup> Emanuel Tov suggests the opposite, that the numbers originally made sense (such as 30 or 21) nonetheless, in the received text they have been lost.<sup>131</sup> Some Greek mss add the number ‘30’ for the age of Saul at the beginning of his reign, while the Syriac introduces the number 21. Other Greek mss, however, do not attempt to correct the problem and simply leave the age blank.<sup>132</sup> What is clear is that the simple noun clause (SNC) introducing the reign of Saul puts the emphasis on Saul as subject. Additionally, the first three clauses work together as a prologue to the narrative; the two simple noun clauses combined with the X-Qatal

<sup>129</sup> EMANUEL TOV, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 10.

<sup>130</sup> DIETRICH, *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.*, 43.

<sup>131</sup> TOV, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 10.

<sup>132</sup> The *codex versionis Graecae*, the *Textus Graecus ex recensione Luciani* and *Origenis* leave the age blank, the partial *Luciani* includes the number 30 and these are the only Greek mss that v.1 is included in the text.

“provides information which has to function as a prelude to the narrative which follows.”<sup>133</sup> I chose to translate the Massoretic text as is, difficulties included.

## 2.2 The War Against the Philistines

v.2	וַיִּבְחַר-לוֹ שָׂאוּל שְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲלָפִים מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהִי עִם-שָׂאוּל אֲלָפִים <sup>134</sup> בַּמִּכְמָשׁ וּבַהַר בֵּית-אֵל וְאֶלֶף הָיוּ עִם-יֹנָתָן בְּגִבְעַת בְּנִימִין וַיִּתֵּר הָעָם שְׁלַח אִישׁ לְאַהֲלָיו:	Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>135</sup> Wayyiqtol (fg 0) Waw-X-Qatal <sup>136</sup> (bg ↑) Waw-X-Qatal <sup>137</sup> (bg ↑)
v.3	וַיִּךְ יֹנָתָן אֶת נַצִּיב פְּלִשְׁתִּים אֲשֶׁר בְּגִבְעָה וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ פְּלִשְׁתִּים וּשְׂאוּל תָּקַע בְּשׁוֹפָר בְּכָל-הָאָרֶץ לֵאמֹר	Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>138</sup> Wayyiqtol (fg 0) Waw-X-Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>139</sup>
	וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ הָעֲבָרִים:	Yiqtol (Jussive fg ↓) <sup>140</sup>
v.4	וְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמְעוּ לְאֹמֶר הַכָּה שָׂאוּל אֶת-נַצִּיב פְּלִשְׁתִּים	Waw-X-Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>141</sup> Qatal (fg 0) <sup>142</sup>
	וְגַם-נִבְאָשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּפְּלִשְׁתִּים וַיִּצְעֲקוּ הָעָם אַחֲרָי שָׂאוּל הַגִּלְגָּל:	Waw-X-Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>143</sup> Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>144</sup>
v.5	וּפְלִשְׁתִּים נֶאֱסָפוּ לְהִלָּחֵם עִם-יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁלֹשִׁים	Waw-X-Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>145</sup>

<sup>133</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press (JSOTSup. 86), 1990, 48 S27 and 108 S77.

<sup>134</sup> “Mīkh<sup>c</sup>mās” [transliteration of the Hebrew], Michmash [English translation]. Some mss have a *w* instead of an *sh* however this different pronunciation is consistent within v. 11, 16 and 23. Therefore it is possible that the audience of Mss<sup>c</sup> simply preferred the pronunciation of the *w*.

<sup>135</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.

<sup>136</sup> The Waw-X-Qatal interrupts the Wayyiqtol chain to show a simultaneous action. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 63 S41.]

<sup>137</sup> The Waw-X-Qatal along with the resultative piel, express an action that was completed in the past. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 66 S45.]

<sup>138</sup> The Wawyiqtol brings us back into the main story. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

<sup>139</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 63 S41.

<sup>140</sup> The Yiqtol verb form in first position in discourse is volitive in nature. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 75-76 S55.]

<sup>141</sup> The Waw-X-Qatal, in connection to verse 3c, is continuing the bg information. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 66 S45.]

<sup>142</sup> Qatal is the normal discourse mode [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 41 S22.]. Interestingly some translations presume this part of the verse is Narrative rather than discourse.

<sup>143</sup> Waw-X-Qatal is retrospective commenting on what came before. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 64 S44.]

<sup>144</sup> We have a return to the Wayyiqtol narrative, the verb form that carries the story forward in narrative. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

	אֶלֶף רֶכֶב וְשֵׁשׁ אֲלָפִים פָּרָשִׁים וְעַם כְּחֹל אֲשֶׁר עַל־שַׁפְת־הַיָּם לְרֶב וַיַּעֲלוּ וַיַּחֲנוּ בְּמִכְמֹשׁ קִדְמַת בַּיִת אֹזֶן:	SNC <sup>146</sup> Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>147</sup> SNC <sup>148</sup>
v.6	וַאִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל רָאוּ כִּי צָרָלוּ כִּי נִגַּשׁ הָעָם וַיַּחֲבֹאוּ הָעָם בְּמַעְרוֹת וּבְחַוְחִים וּבְסַלְעִים וּבְצֻרֹתִים וּבְכַבְרוֹת:	Waw-X-Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>149</sup> כ-Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>150</sup> Wayyiqtol (fg 0) SNC (continuation) <sup>151</sup>
v.7	וְעַבְרִים עָבְרוּ אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן אֶרֶץ נָדַד וְגִלְגָּל וְשָׂאוֹל עֹרְנוּ בְּגִלְגָּל וְכָל־הָעָם חָרְדוּ אַחֲרָיו:	Waw-X-Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>152</sup> SNC (extra information) SNC <sup>153</sup> Waw-X-Qatal (bg ↑)

(v.2a) Saul selected for himself 3000 out of Israel/ (v.2b) with Saul were 2000 in Michmash and in the mountain of Bethel/(v.2c) while a thousand were with Jonathan at Gibeah Benjamin/(v.2d) and the remaining people he [Saul] had sent away each man to his tent.

(v.3a) Jonathan struck the garrison of the Philistines which was in Geba (v.3b) and the Philistines heard (v.3c) that Saul had blown the horn saying: (v.3d) “Let the Hebrews hear.” (v.4a) And all Israel had heard saying: (v.4b) “Saul struck a garrison of the Philistines.” (v.4c) Indeed, Israel had made themselves odious to the Philistines; (v.4d) the people were summoned behind Saul to Gilgal. (v.5a) While the Philistines assembled to wage war with Israel three thousand chariots and six thousand horseman (v.5b) and the people were like the sand on the seashore in the multitude. (v.5c) They [the Philistines] went up and camped in Michmash (v.5d)

<sup>145</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 63 S41.

<sup>146</sup> SNC commenting on what came before. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 20 S3.]

<sup>147</sup> Wayyiqtol returns us to the main story line. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

<sup>148</sup> Simple Noun Clause, giving extra information for the preceding verse. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 20 S3.]

<sup>149</sup> Waw-X-Qatal showing simultaneity. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 63 S41.]

<sup>150</sup> When a Qatal is preceded by a כ this is causal. It is “the protasis of the two-member syntactic construction.” This is a connection to the following clause, which is the apodosis, they were hard pressed SO the people hide. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 180 S150.]

<sup>151</sup> Continuation form. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 40 S19.]

<sup>152</sup> Waw-X-Qatal is retrospective commenting on what came before. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 64 S44.]

<sup>153</sup> The SNC→ We-X-Qatal construct can work together in a protasis/apodosis relationship in a clause of time to express simultaneity. When Saul was in Gilgal the people trembled behind. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 138 S108].

**East of Bethaven. (v.6a) [Each] man of Israel saw that he was in distress. (v.6b) The people were hard pressed,<sup>154</sup> (v.6c) so the people hid themselves in caves and hollows and in cliffs (v.6d) and in burial chambers and in cisterns. (v.7a) The Hebrews had crossed the Jordan, (v.7b) the land of Gad and Gilead, (v.7c)<sup>155</sup> Saul was still in Gilgal, (v.7d) and all the people trembled behind him.**

The Wayyiqtol chain at the beginning of v. 2 signals the end of the prologue and the story begins to move forward. The Waw-Qatal construction in v. 2c-d interrupts this natural flow to express simultaneity.<sup>156</sup> It allows the narrator to provide the information of Saul's military organization. The syntax of this verse signals the beginning of the story, while expressing the preparation for war. Verses 2-7 will be regarded as a unit for syntactical reasons, as well as for source critical purposes, which will be discussed in the following chapters. This section is Israel's call to arms by Saul, against the Philistines. This call to arms is intensified through the syntax, thus bringing an ancient war story to life. Verse 3 begins with two Wayyiqtols carrying the story forward and then is interrupted again with a Waw-X-Qatal providing background information; (v.3c) 'the Philistines heard that Saul HAD blown the horn.' I believe that this indicates that the attack was not done only by Jonathan or without his father knowing; rather, the horn sounding is part of the attack.<sup>157</sup> The assault on the Philistine garrison was well planned and orchestrated by Saul. This part of the story is very much about the preparation and beginnings of battle, for we find this Waw-X-Qatal construction also at the beginning of

---

<sup>154</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 180 S150.

<sup>155</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 138 S108.

<sup>156</sup> There are a few reasons for the interruption of a Wayyiqtol chain (see NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 36 S15)..For its use in expressing simultaneity see NICCACCI, 63 S40, 41, 42.

<sup>157</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 63 S41.

v.6 where we are told that the Philistines were gathering at the same time as Saul summoned his people.<sup>158</sup>

In v.3 and v.7 the presence of the term Hebrews has been questioned by many scholars. Would Saul have used the word ‘Hebrews’ in reference to his people Israel? The *Septuagint* (LXX) reads “the slaves have revolted,” which could very well have been the starting point for this line of questioning. McCarter translates this clause in discourse: ‘The Hebrews have revolted,’ placing the words into the mouths of the Philistines; other scholars agree that the only time the Israelites are referred to as the Hebrews is when it is in the speech of foreigners.<sup>159</sup> Other scholars assert that this is referring to a potential third party that Saul is appealing to for them to come and join the Israelites. This third party is considered the ‘Apiru,’ who are sociologically understood as outlaws with military specialization, who were willing to join Saul and his efforts against the Philistines.<sup>160</sup> Both of these suggestions ignore the syntax of v.3 and v.4. Saul’s words in v. 3d are presented with a grammatical construction of a Yiqtol first position, which in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person is considered jussive, as in a “mild command or strong wish.”<sup>161</sup> The Waw-X-Qatal of v.4a is antecedent information, and the narrator chooses to use the title ‘all Israel’ instead of Hebrews to reference the people.

v.3c That Saul had blown the horn saying    Let the Hebrews hear.

v.4a And all Israel did hear saying            Saul struck a garrison of the Philistines.

---

<sup>158</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 63 S41.

<sup>159</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 227. HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 101. CARTLEDGE, *I and 2 Samuel*, 173. TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 337.

<sup>160</sup> CAMPBELL, *I Samuel*, 126. KLEIN, *I Samuel*, 139. TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 338.

<sup>161</sup> GARY D. PRATICO and MILES V. VAN PELT, *Basics of Biblical Hebrew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007):131 #12.11.5.

The syntax is putting the word ‘Hebrews’ into Saul’s mouth, then the narrator clarifies by having the Israelites respond. Some scholars harmonize v.3 with v.7 and leave out the second reference to the ‘Hebrews’ all together, while others simply ignore its reappearance.<sup>162</sup> Even though this is considered unusual, the syntax points to the ‘Hebrews’ meaning the same group as ‘all Israel’.

In v.5, I show the simultaneity of the Waw-X-Qatal with the use of ‘while’; the Philistines gather at the same time as Saul summons his people.<sup>163</sup> Some manuscripts inflate the number to 30000, which is generally considered as a way to express to the audience that they had great numbers, in order to make the dwindling of the Israelite numbers more drastic. Bodner agrees that the escalation of numbers was to emphasis the trouble that Saul was facing.<sup>164</sup> The *Graecus Luciani* and the *Syriac* use the smaller number of 3000 men.

The second clause in v.6 holds an X-Qatal construction which is preceded by a  $\text{ז}$ . It is the protasis of the two-member syntactic construction. The connection with the following verse, the apodosis, is causal in nature.<sup>165</sup> They were hard pressed SO the people hid. Another protasis/apodosis relation in this grouping of verses is in v.7 where the SNC followed by a Waw-X-Qatal construction works together creating a clause of time to express simultaneity. When Saul was in Gilgal the people trembled behind him.<sup>166</sup>

There is a problem with the plural and the singulars found in v.6a. The subject is “a man of Israel” and “he was in distress” is singular, however, the verb “to see” is plural.

---

<sup>162</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 224.

<sup>163</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 63 S41.

<sup>164</sup> BODNER, *I Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 120.

<sup>165</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 180 S150.

<sup>166</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 138 S108.

The Greek mss corrects the verb to agree with the subject, making it ‘he saw.’ McCarter drops the entire clause, while Campbell and Hertzberg translate the whole verse in the plural.<sup>167</sup> Driver calls the אִישׁ a collective saying it is not uncommon for a singular noun to govern a plural verb.<sup>168</sup> Tov and Sperber leave the text as is, probably for this very reason. It may seem odd that the first verb in the clause is plural (רָאוּ “saw”), while the second verb is singular (צָר “he was in distress”), however, the ‘man’ being a collective singular can account for this.<sup>169</sup> For if the collective אִישׁ is translated into “each man” then both the plural and the singular verbs can be easily translated: ‘each man of Israel saw that he was in distress.’

### 2.3 Saul’s Actions and Explanation

v.8	וַיִּיחַל שְׁבַעַת יָמִים לְמוֹעֵד אֲשֶׁר שָׁמוּאֵל וְלֹא־בָא שְׁמוּאֵל הַגִּלְגָּל וַיִּפֹּץ הָעָם מֵעֵלְיוֹ:	Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>170</sup> Waw- לא -Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>171</sup> Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>172</sup>
v.9	וַיֹּאמֶר שָׂאוּל	Wayyiqtol (fg 0)
	הַגִּישׁוּ אֵלַי הָעֵלָה וְהַשְׁלֵמִים	Qetol <sup>173</sup> SNC

<sup>167</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 224. CAMPBELL, *I Samuel*, 121. HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 101.

<sup>168</sup> BRUCE K. WALTKE and M. O’CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 113.

<sup>169</sup> See PAUL JOÜON, *Grammaire de l’hébreu biblique* (Rome : Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1987), 459 S 150<sup>e</sup>.

<sup>170</sup> The story continues back to the main narrative with the Wayyiqtol [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.].

<sup>171</sup> The Waw-X-Qatal expresses contrast with the Wayyiqtol that precedes it [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 64 S42.].

<sup>172</sup> The story continues back to the main narrative with the Wayyiqtol [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.].

<sup>173</sup> SNC using the Imperative [PRATICO and VAN PELT, *Basics of Biblical Hebrew*, 103.].

	וַיַּעַל הָעֵלָה:	Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>174</sup>
v.10	וַיְהִי כְּכַלְתּוֹ לְהַעֲלוֹת הָעֵלָה וַהֲנִיחַ שְׂמוּאֵל בָּא וַיֵּצֵא שְׂאוֹל לְקִרְאתוֹ לְבָרְכוֹ:	Macro-Marker (SNC) <sup>175</sup> We-Qatal (bg, ↑) <sup>176</sup> Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>177</sup>
v.11	וַיֹּאמֶר שְׂמוּאֵל	Wayyiqtol (fg 0)
	מֶה עָשִׂיתָ	X-Qatal (bg, ↑) <sup>178</sup>
	וַיֹּאמֶר שְׂאוֹל	Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>179</sup>
	כִּי־רָאִיתִי כִּי־נִפְץ הָעָם מֵעָלַי וְאַתָּה לֹא־בָאתָ לְמוֹעֵד הַיָּמִים וּפְלִשְׁתִּים נֹאֲסָפִים מִכְּמוֹשׁ:	כי-Qatal (bg, ↑) <sup>180</sup> כי-Qatal (bg, ↑) we-Qatal (bg, ↑) <sup>181</sup> SCN <sup>182</sup>
v.12	וַאֲמַר עָתָה יֵרְדוּ פְּלִשְׁתִּים אֵלַי הַגִּלְגָּל וּפָנִי יִהְיֶה לֹא חֲלִיתִי וְאַתָּאֲפִק וְאֵעֲלֶה הָעֵלָה: ׀	Wayyiqtol (bg, ↑) <sup>183</sup> X-Yiqtol (fg, ↓) <sup>184</sup> We-Qatal (bg, ↑) <sup>185</sup> Wayyiqtol (bg, ↑) Wayyiqtol (bg, ↑)

(v.8a) He waited seven days for the appointed time because of Samuel, (v.8b) but Samuel did not come [to] Gilgal, (v.8c) and so the people scattered from him (Saul). (v.9a) Then Saul said: (v.9b) “Bring me (v.9c) the burnt offering and the sacrifices.” (v.9d) He offered the sacrifice. (v.10a) As soon as the burnt offering was completed, (v.10b) behold Samuel arrived, (v.10c) so Saul went out to meet him to bless him.

<sup>174</sup> Wayyiqtol of narration, the pronoun “he” is referring to Saul. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

<sup>175</sup> This SNC with the Macro-Syntactical sign וַיְהִי “introduces a new element into the main narrative thread so that that element becomes an integral and important part of the account.” [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 48 S28.]

<sup>176</sup> Waw-X-Qatal combined with the Macro-Syntactical marker וַהֲנִיחַ, used to show emphasis on the arrival of Samuel; Saul finished with the burnt offering as Samuel arrived. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 96 S67.]

<sup>177</sup> Wayyiqtol of narration. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

<sup>178</sup> X-Qatal is the main verb form for the linguistic attitude of discourse [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 21 S3.]

<sup>179</sup> Wayyiqtol of narrative [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

<sup>180</sup> X-Qatal of discourse [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 21 S3.]

<sup>181</sup> Waw-X-Qatal of anteriority. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 73 S54.]

<sup>182</sup> SNC of simultaneity [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 187 S161.]

<sup>183</sup> Wayyiqtol continues the narrative discourse [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

<sup>184</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 101 S73 and 181 S153.

<sup>185</sup> Waw-X-Qatal of anteriority [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 73 S54.].

**(v.11a) Samuel said: (v.11b) “What did you do?” (v.11c) Saul said: (v.11d) “Because I saw (v.11e) that the people were scattering from me, (v.11f) and YOU, you had not come at[the] appointed time, (v.11g) and during that time the Philistines were gathering [at]<sup>186</sup> Michmash.” (v.12a) “so I said: (v.12b) Now the Philistines will come down to me in Gilgal. (v.12c) And I had not entreated the favor of Yahweh. (v.12d) I restrained myself (v.12e) and offered up the burnt offering.”**

The story continues; Saul waits for Samuel, but he does not show up. In v.8a the use of the word **וְשָׁמַר** makes certain that the reader knows that it is BECAUSE<sup>187</sup> of Samuel that Saul is waiting, while the Waw-X-Qatal expresses contrast with the Wayyiqtol that precedes it. Saul is waiting BECAUSE of Samuel BUT Samuel did not come.<sup>188</sup>

The desperateness of Saul’s situation is highlighted by the SNC in v.11g; in connection with the previous clause, it provides more information by “describing an action simultaneous with the main action.”<sup>189</sup> Samuel did not show up and the Philistines were gathering against Saul. The indicative future of v.12b, along with **עַתָּה** (*‘atah*), brings out the immediacy of the danger. “NOW the Philistines will...” Samuel’s tardiness leads the reader to see that Saul, at the very least, believed he was trapped between a rock and a hard place.

The writer goes through much pain to create a large amount of ambiguity concerning Saul’s actions and his fault. Verse 8b includes a negation which clarifies the

<sup>186</sup> Several Mss have the prefix b (‘in Michmash’) comparable to the Greek and Syriac. This prefix makes sense, for even if it was not there the translation would have to add it in.

<sup>187</sup> **וְשָׁמַר** is translated as a conjunctive, as opposed to a relative pronoun, with a causal force (also found in Deuteronomy 3:21, Joshua 4:7, 22:31, 1 Samuel 2:23, 15:15, 20:12). It is a conjunctive “approximating in usage to **וְ**.” [FRANCIS BROWN, *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1979), 83.]

<sup>188</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 64 S42.

<sup>189</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 187 S162.

Waw-X-Qatal as a subordinate clause expressing a contrast with v.8a.<sup>190</sup> Saul waited BUT Samuel did not come, expressing blame towards Samuel, the prophet. This is underlined with an emphasis in v.11f, for there is both a suffixed pronoun and an independent pronoun. “YOU, you did not come.” I bring this emphasis out by including both in my translation, because on the level of interpretation it seems that Saul is specifically blaming Samuel.<sup>191</sup>

The syntax of these verses also elevates the character of Samuel within this text; his very arrival is seen as important even within the syntax of the narrative. הִנֵּה, [‘Behold’] (v.10b) is used to call special attention to the statement.<sup>192</sup> In this case it is calling special attention to the arrival of Samuel. The combination of the וַיְהִי (wayehi), הִנֵּה (hinneh) from the preceding clause (v10a) and the Waw-X-Qatal construction in v.10b points to the immediacy in the text.<sup>193</sup> The arrival of Samuel is shown to have happened immediately after the burnt offering was completed. The syntax brings the character of Samuel to the forefront of the story, for his very arrival is written to command the reader’s attention.

Some mss, such as the Greek, Latin (93.94) and Targum, go even further to elevate this character by adding the verb “אָמַר” (‘he said’) before the name Samuel in v.8a. This verb can be translated as a command;<sup>194</sup> therefore the clause would be read as “He waited seven days for the appointed time which Samuel commanded.” Without this

<sup>190</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 64 S42.

<sup>191</sup> CAMPBELL, *1 Samuel*, 126. He comes to the same conclusion without emphasizing the double pronoun.

<sup>192</sup> WALTKE and O’CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 300, #16.3.5b.

<sup>193</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 63 S41

<sup>194</sup> WALTKE and O’CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 640 #38.4a.

addition, the particle אֲשֶׁר stands to demonstrate this as a causal clause.<sup>195</sup> Therefore, Saul waited BECAUSE of Samuel and the word “אֲנִי” is not necessary. This variant will be taken into account, however, using the rule of *Lectio Brevior* my translation will not include this comment concerning the words of the prophet.

I raise here a question on the choice of words when translating v.12. In v.12d there is the Wayyiqtol of continuation, in narrative dialogue, which carries the Linguistic Perspective of what came before.<sup>196</sup> The Waw-X-Qatal in v.12c is background, therefore, the following clauses are translated “I had not”, “I forced”, and “I offered.” Verse 12d has been interpreted in two different ways. The first demonstrates that Saul knew what he was doing wrong,<sup>197</sup> and that even Saul himself was reluctant to offer the sacrifice.<sup>198</sup> Conversely the second interpretation believes that this is Saul’s way of taking charge and being king, translating it as “I pulled myself together” or “I got control of myself.”<sup>199</sup> In my view, however, both of these translations are problematic. The word וַאֲתַפֵּק occurs 6 other times in the Hebrew Bible, and every time, other than c.13, it appears in reference to the ‘restraining’ of oneself (Gen 43.31, 45.1, Est 5:10, Isa 42.14, 63.15 and 64.11). ‘Restraining’ oneself is considerably more passive than the “I forced myself” translation. At this point the ramifications are simply that the previously offered arguments, in my opinion, need to be revised.

---

<sup>195</sup> WALTKE and O’CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 640 #38.4a. BROWN, DRIVER AND BRIGGS, *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew-English Lexicon* (Peabody, Hendrickson Publisher: 1979), 56.

<sup>196</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.

<sup>197</sup> JOBLING, *First Samuel*, 82.

<sup>198</sup> CAMPBELL, *I Samuel*, 126.

<sup>199</sup> POLZIN, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist, A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History*, 129.

## 2.4 Promise and Judgment

v.13	וַיֹּאמֶר שְׁמוּאֵל אֶל-שָׁאוּל	Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>200</sup>
	נִסְכַּלְתָּ לֹא שָׁמַרְתָּ אֶת-מִצְוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר צִוְּךָ כִּי עָתָה הִכִּין יְהוָה אֶת-מַמְלַכְתְּךָ אֶל-יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד-עוֹלָם:	Qatal (Fg 0) <sup>201</sup> לֹא-Qatal (bg, ↑) <sup>202</sup> X-Qatal (bg, ↑) כִּי-עָתָה-Qatal (bg, ↑) <sup>203</sup>
v.14	וְעַתָּה מִמְּלַכְתְּךָ לֹא-תִקּוּם בִּקְשׁ יְהוָה לּוֹ אִישׁ כְּלִבּוֹ וַיִּצְוֶהוּ יְהוָה לְנָגִיד עַל-עַמּוֹ כִּי לֹא שָׁמַרְתָּ אֶת אֲשֶׁר-צִוְּךָ יְהוָה: פ	וְעַתָּה-Yiqtol (fg, ↓) <sup>204</sup> Qatal (fg, 0) <sup>205</sup> Wayyiqtol (fg, 0) <sup>206</sup> כִּי-לֹא-Qatal (bg, ↑) <sup>207</sup> X-Qatal (bg, ↑) <sup>208</sup>

**(v.13a) And Samuel said to Saul: (v.13b) “You are foolish. (v.13c) You did not keep the commandments of Yahweh your God<sup>209</sup> (v.13d) which he had commanded you. (v.13e) For then he would set up your kingdom on Israel forever” (v.14a) “Now your kingdom will not rise. (v.14b) Yahweh seeks for himself a man according to his heart, (v.14c) Yahweh commands him as a leader over his people, (v.14d) but you did not listen to (v.14e) what Yahweh had commanded you.”**

<sup>200</sup> The Wayyiqtol brings the reader back to the main narrative. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

<sup>201</sup> Qatal is the normal discourse mode, the present situation [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 41 S22], followed by a X-Qatal chain which is all bg information. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 44 S25.]

<sup>202</sup> The X-Qatal is background information; the inclusion of the negation is used to create a contrast. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 63 S41.]

<sup>203</sup> The כִּי-X-Qatal is bg information, however, this combined with the macro-syntactic marker עָתָה ‘now’ is used to introduce a result [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 101 S73].

<sup>204</sup> X-Yiqtol is indicative Future, while the Macro-Syntactical marker introduces “the conclusion to be drawn concerning the present action.” [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 101 S73 and 181 S153.]

<sup>205</sup> Qatal is the normal discourse mode, the present situation [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 41 S22].

<sup>206</sup> Wayyiqtol continues the narrative discourse. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

<sup>207</sup> Waw-X-Qatal of anteriority. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 73 S54.]

<sup>208</sup> X-Qatal is bg information. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 44 S25.]

<sup>209</sup> There are three instances, in 1 Samuel 13, that a ‘waw’ is either added or removed depending on different Hebrew mss. Before לֹא (“no/not”) in v.13, many mss add a ‘waw’, which is comparable to the Latin, and 2 mss prefix a כִּי, which is comparable to the LXX, Latin (93.94) and the Syriac. The probable addition of the כִּי could have been added by a later redactor/editor or simply added in ancient translations in order to clarify that the ‘cause’ of Saul’s foolishness is that he did not keep the commandment of God.

The Qatal in v.13b begins the discourse. This is immediately followed by an X-Qatal chain which is background information.<sup>210</sup> You ARE foolish (fg), you DID not keep (bg), which he HAD commanded (bg), for then he WOULD have set up your kingdom (bg). The final clause in v.13, X-Qatal, would normally simply continue the background information, however, when this construct is combined with the Macro-Syntactical marker עתה 'now', it introduces a result.<sup>211</sup> Additionally, in v.13c, the לְ - Qatal is used to express contrast. All of this suggests that God was prepared to set up Saul's kingdom, but that this is no longer the case. According to Samuel, God changed his mind.

Most scholars understand v.14b in a past tense, stating that Samuel is telling Saul that he has already been replaced and many assume, with confidence, that David is the one who is being referred to.<sup>212</sup> Even though most scholars translate this in the past, there is still confusion around the matter. Polzin states that God "has appointed another" but then, in the same paragraph, confuses the matter by saying that "the Lord will seek out another."<sup>213</sup> Cartledge argues that the choosing is future tense, and that God WOULD appoint another.<sup>214</sup> The matter is further confused by the resultative עתה-כי-Qatal, which outlines that God "would have set up" Saul's kingdom. How could someone, other than Saul, have been already chosen if the original plan was for God to set up Saul's

<sup>210</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 41 S22 and 44 S25.

<sup>211</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 101 S73.

<sup>212</sup> BODNER, *1 Samuel : A Narrative Commentary*, 123. HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 105. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 229. TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 346. JOBLING, *1 Samuel*, 83. BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy*, 83. CAMPBELL, *1 Samuel*, 127. CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 174. KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 140.

<sup>213</sup> POLZIN, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist, A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History*, 131.

<sup>214</sup> CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 174.

“kingdom on Israel forever?” Therefore I present a different translation using the Macro-Syntactical analysis; the implications of this will be demonstrated in the following chapter.

I argue that v. 14b and 14c are not to be understood as past, nor are they to be understood as future (as Cartledge believes). As we have demonstrated earlier in this chapter the use of the Qatal in discourse is the same as the Wayyiqtol in narrative, which means it carries the story forward.<sup>215</sup> This is not background information but foreground. The Wayyiqtol in discourse acts as a continuation form, following the linguistic prominence of the verbal construction that precedes it and the linguistic prominence of the X-Qatal is background.<sup>216</sup> Therefore I have translated v.14 as followed:

“Now your kingdom will not rise	X-Yiqtol (Ind. Fut.)
Yahweh seeks for himself a man according to his heart	Qatal (carries the story)
Yahweh commands him as a leader over his people	Wayyiqtol (continuation)
But you did not listen to	כִּי – Qatal (causal)
What Yahweh had commanded you.”	X-Qatal (background)

I entitled this section ‘Promise and Judgment’ because as we have explored in v.13 it explains that God WOULD have set up an everlasting kingdom for Saul, but NOW his kingdom will not rise. I will highlight how this translation changes the understanding of this verse when analyzing the sources behind the text and the redactional layers involved.

---

<sup>215</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 41 S22.

<sup>216</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140 and 44 S25.

## 2.5 Movement of Samuel, the People and the Philistines

v.15	וַיִּקָּם שָׁמוּאֵל וַיַּעַל מִן־הַגִּלְגָּל גִּבְעַת בְּנֵימִן וַיִּפְקֹד שָׂאוּל אֶת־הָעָם הַנִּמְצָאִים עִמּוֹ כִּשְׁשׁ מֵאוֹתָאִישׁ:	Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>217</sup> Wayyiqtol (fg 0) Wayyiqtol (fg 0) SNC <sup>218</sup>
v.16	וּשְׂאוּל וַיּוֹנְתָן בְּנוֹ וְהָעָם הַנִּמְצָא עִמָּם יֹשְׁבִים בְּגִבְעַת בְּנֵימִן וּפְלִשְׁתִּים חָנוּ בְּמִכְמֹשׁ:	SNC SNC Waw-X-Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>219</sup>
v.17	וַיֵּצֵא הַמְּשִׁחִית מִמִּשְׁמַח הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים שְׁלֹשָׁה רֵאשִׁים הָרֵאשׁ אֶחָד יָפְנָה אֶל־דֶּרֶךְ עֶפְרָה אֶל־אֶרֶץ שׁוּעַל:	Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>220</sup> X-Yiqtol (bg ↑) <sup>221</sup>
v.18	וְהָרֵאשׁ אֶחָד יָפְנָה דֶּרֶךְ בֵּית חֲרוֹן וְהָרֵאשׁ אֶחָד יָפְנָה דֶּרֶךְ הַגְּבוּל הַנִּשְׁקָף עַל־גֵּי הַצְּבָעִים הַמְּדַבְּרָה: ס	X-Yiqtol (bg ↑) X-Yiqtol (bg ↑) SNC <sup>222</sup>

(v.15a) Samuel got up (v.15b) and went up from Gilgal to Gibeath of Benjamin. (v.15c) Saul mustered the people, (v.15d) those who were found with him, around 600 men<sup>223</sup>. (v.16a) Saul and Jonathan, his son, and the people found with them, (v.16b) those residing in Geba Benjamin, (v.16c) while the Philistines encamped (decline) in Mishmash. (v.17a) The raiders went out from the camp of the Philistines in 3 companies; (v.17b) one company turned to the road to Ophrah to the land of Shual, (v.18a) one other company turned to the road to Beth-Horon, (v.18b) and one company turned to the road to the boundary territory (v.18c) looking down on the valley of Zebboim [towards] the wilderness.

<sup>217</sup> Brings back the main narrative with a Wayyiqtol chain. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

<sup>218</sup> SNC giving extra information. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 20 S3.]

<sup>219</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 181 S153.

<sup>220</sup> Wayyiqtol continues main narrative. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

<sup>221</sup> The tense shift Wayyiqtol to X-Yiqtol can be used to introduce a comment, which is the case in v. 17. This is background information, the story is not moving forward. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 117 S88.]

<sup>222</sup> SNC is giving extra information, commenting on the preceding clause. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 20 S3.] This clause is particularly commenting on the location of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Philistine company.

<sup>223</sup> In most mss the verb הַנִּמְצָא is singular (“to be found”), however some mss make the verb plural, which is comparable to the LXX and the Targum. However, in the Hebrew it is not necessary to make this verb plural for “the people” is singular, expressing a collective.

These four verses deal with the movement of people; beginning with Samuel, then the Israelites with Saul and Jonathan, and finally the Philistine army. The Wayyiqtol chain carries the story forward, saying that Samuel leaves Gilgal for Gibeath of Benjamin, which was originally mentioned as Jonathan's pre-battle location in v.2, while Saul brings the people together. Verse 16 is a string of simple noun clauses explaining who is with Saul, however, this verse is awkward and it is difficult to know if they are currently in Geba Benjamin, or if these are the people who reside in Geba Benjamin. The Waw-X-Qatal that closes this verse expresses simultaneity, for the Philistines are still in Michmash, which is the location they have been in since v.5. The text seems to be an account of the whereabouts concerning the characters in the text, however, the location of Saul (the main character) and the people is not clear.

Locations in this chapter are problematic. Some translations attempt to harmonize Geba and Gibeath into one location. This might stem from the existence of two mss that do not have גִּבְעָה (Gēba<sup>ʿ</sup>) even though the name appears twice in 1 Samuel 13 (v.3 and v.16). Within these witnesses v.2 and v.16 are harmonized to read גִּבְעָתָה (Gīv<sup>eʿ</sup>ath). The LXX replaces the Gēva<sup>ʿ</sup> of v.3 with “on the hill”. This, however, was also probably done to harmonize with v.2 and v.16 which they translate as Gabee. The problem with the names of these locations has been examined by a number of scholars, but no consensus has yet been achieved.

Verses 17 and 18 tell of the movement of the Philistine troupes in three directions. These are all expressed as bg information using the X-Yiqtol verbal construct.<sup>224</sup> The emphasis is on the Philistines and not their movement, for it is expressed through a

---

<sup>224</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 188 S163.

compound nominal clause.<sup>225</sup> This series of CNCs holds a descriptive function, giving “comment in guise of narrative.”<sup>226</sup> What follows will examine this syntactical construction as a narrative comment; it is also important to note that this X-Yiqtol chain is continued in v.19.

## 2.6 Israel’s Weapons

v.19	וְחָרֵשׁ לֹא יִמָּצֵא בְּכֹל אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי־אָמַר פְּלִשְׁתִּים	X-Yiqtol (bg ↑) X-Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>227</sup>
	פֶּן יַעֲשׂוּ הָעִבְרִים חֶרֶב אוֹ חֲנִית:	X-Yiqtol (fg ↓) <sup>228</sup>
v.20	וַיִּרְדּוּ כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים אִישׁ אֶת־מַחְרָשְׁתּוֹ וְאֶת־אֶתּוֹ וְאֶת־קַרְדָּמוֹ לְלִטּוֹשׁ וְאֵת מַחְרָשְׁתּוֹ:	Wayyiqtol (fg 0) SNC <sup>229</sup> SNC
v.21	וְהָיְתָה הַפְּצִירָה פִּים לַמַּחְרָשֶׁת וְלֵאמֹתִים וְלִשְׁלֵשׁ קִלְשׁוֹן וְלִהְקַרְדָּמִים וְלִהְצִיב הַדְּרָבָן:	We-Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>230</sup> SNC
v.22	וְהָיָה בַיּוֹם מִלְחָמָה וְלֹא נִמְצָא חֶרֶב־שׁוֹחֲנִית בְּיַד כָּל־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר אֶת־שְׂאוֹל וְאֶת־יֹנָתָן וְתִמְצָא לְשְׂאוֹל וְלִיֹּנָתָן בְּנוֹ:	We-Qatal (bg ↑) <sup>231</sup> Waw-לא-Qatal (bg, ↑) <sup>232</sup> SNC Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>233</sup>
v.23	וַיֵּצֵא מִצֵּב פְּלִשְׁתִּים אֶל־מַעְבַּר מִכְמֹשׁ: ס	Wayyiqtol (fg 0) <sup>234</sup> SNC <sup>235</sup>

<sup>225</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 189 S165.

<sup>226</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 112 S83.

<sup>227</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 180 S150.

<sup>228</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 77 S55.

<sup>229</sup> SNC giving extra information, commenting on the preceding clause. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 20 S3]. Telling the reader what they would have sharpened.

<sup>230</sup> We-Qatal in narrative is repeated, bg information. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 182 S156.]

<sup>231</sup> We-Qatal of continuation [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 82 S57.] continuing the bg information of the Israelites weapons.

<sup>232</sup> We-Qatal, continuation form [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 82 S57.]

<sup>233</sup> Wayyiqtol of the linguistic attitude of narrative [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.], this ends the bg information on the weapons of the Israelites.

<sup>234</sup> Wayyiqtol return to the main narrative based on the mention of Michmash. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 175 S140.]

<sup>235</sup> SNC giving extra information. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 20 S3]

**(v.19a) There was no craftsman to be found, (v.19b) because the inhabitants of Philistia had said: (v.19c) “Lest the Hebrews make a sword or a spear.” (v.20a) So all of Israel would go down to the Philistines, (v.20b) [Each] man to sharpen his plowshare and his axe blade and his axe (v.20c) and his plowshare.<sup>236</sup> (v.21a) The sharpening was two third a shekel for the plowshares (v.21b) and three to sharpen the axes and to have the iron tip fixed. (v.22a) [So] when the day of the battle had come (v.22b) he could not find a sword or a spear in the hand of any of the people<sup>237</sup>, (v.22c) that were with Saul and Jonathan. (v.22d) With Saul and Jonathan, his son, it [swords] was to be found. (v.23a) He went out to the garrison of the Philistines, (v.23b) passing Michmash.<sup>238</sup>**

While I have separated these verses from the preceding grouping, I submit that there is a syntactical connection in the use of the X-Yiqtol construction. Although the rest of the chapter uses the X-Qatal construction to express the linguistic perspective of background information, here the X-Yiqtol is used. Verse 19 holds a two part syntactical construction, for the X-Yiqtol and the  $\text{ז}$ -Qatal creates a protasis/apodosis relationship demonstrating a causal effect.<sup>239</sup> The Philistines had the monopoly on metal so that all of Israel had to go to them. The third clause is discourse expressing a simple future using the X-Yiqtol.<sup>240</sup> The Wayyiqtol returns the narrative to the foreground, with SNC to give extra information and We-Qatals giving us background information on the weapons of the Israelite army.

The chapter ends with a sense of impending doom. This is not a typical end to a story; the reader continues to read because the story does not seem finished. The Israelite

---

<sup>236</sup> It is important to mention that there is a problem with the Hebrew, for it repeats itself using the word plowshare in both v.19c and in the previous clause v.19b. The LXX and the Latin fix the doubling problem by adding a fourth tool (sickle or pruning hook). What is interesting is that this extra plowshare is in a clause all on its own. My proposed translation remains faithful to the Hebrew, admittedly without fully understanding its inclusion.

<sup>237</sup> In the case of v. 22, a ‘waw’ is removed from  $\text{וַיִּשְׁׁרְטוּ}$  in two manuscripts. This missing waw is comparable to the Syriac, Vulgate, and two copies of the Targum. The deletion of this ‘waw’ does nothing to change the syntax of the clause, therefore, although noted, it will not be inserted into our translation.

<sup>238</sup> Coming back to the main story, based on the return of Michmash.

<sup>239</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 180 S150.

<sup>240</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 77 S55.

army is seriously outnumbered by the Philistines and only two Israelites have weapons. On top of this disadvantage, raiding parties are sent out to, at the very least, terrorize the surrounding villages.

## 2.7 Conclusion: Establishing the Text

The Macro-Syntactical Analysis facilitates the understanding of some of the problems with the text. It particularly clears up some verbal inconsistencies. The translation in this chapter is the building block towards getting a clearer view of the sources behind the text, as well as a better understanding of the fault of Saul. What follows will include a closer look at the questions that arise out of the present translation, including the introduction of Saul, the involvement of Jonathan in the initial attack, the appearance and presence of Samuel within the narrative, and the question of ‘a man after [God’s] own heart.’

### Chapter 3: Understanding the Story behind the Story

Most scholars believe that the oldest literary stratum of 1 Samuel 13 is quite “old”<sup>241</sup> being a part of the “so-called early source.”<sup>242</sup> Some scholars argue that the most ancient part of the text was written by people close to the events. This oldest literary stratum was then re-worked into what is often viewed as a patchwork of sources and redactional work; at the very least v.1 is an addition. This chapter will explore the potential sources as well as the redactional work that scholars have seen within the text. To understand ‘why’ Saul was rejected, we need to explore the layers of composition in this chapter to understand ‘who’ rejected Israel’s first king. This can be determined by looking at the potential motives of the writer/redactor, and exploring the historical context surrounding the different redactional layers. The motives and realities behind the words of the ‘author/redactor’ will at times support current perception and at other times call into question the status quo. In some instances I will include new possibilities in answering the puzzling question of Saul’s fault. While looking at potential sources I will draw on what the language and syntax tells us, and, at the same time, I will also look at themes and characters to find connections within the story of c.13.

#### 3.1 Introduction to the King: 1 Samuel 13:1

Although most scholars, myself included, have questions remaining concerning the textual problems of this chapter’s first verse, I find it interesting how this verse elevates the character of Saul. We will start by looking at suggestion given by the Targum concerning the innocence of Saul. Then we will explore how Saul was given the

---

<sup>241</sup> MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 27. CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 170.

<sup>242</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 74.

title of King by the writer of the kings. This elevation is also expressed through the syntax of the prologue. Although there are textual difficulties, this does not mean that we should not question the motives of the redactor for creating this introduction for Saul.

It has been mentioned that the number for Saul's age in his regnal formula has been lost from the text, others have suggested that the age categorizes Saul as innocent. The Targum offers an explanation saying that "a year" is a characterization of Saul being innocent.<sup>243</sup> The phrase בן־שָׁנָה [English: male a year old] is only used one other time in the Hebrew Bible; Exodus 12:5 "Your lamb shall be an unblemished male a year old; you may take it from the sheep or from the goats." This connection strengthens the idea of Saul's innocence. There is a level of sympathy in this verse, leaving the impression that the redactor wanted to portray Saul as innocent or blameless. Some scholars express "two years" as how the author characterized Saul's reign; whether it was short lived,<sup>244</sup> considered insufficient,<sup>245</sup> or a foreshadowing of the negative direction Saul's reign as king will take.<sup>246</sup> Other scholars have suggested that Saul's age was left out on purpose so that the redactor could express Saul's innocence while also showing that he was doomed to fail in the process of kingship almost before he even started.

Following scholars such as Dietrich, most modern scholars agree that 1 Samuel 13:1 is an insertion made by the Dtr to match with the stories of other kings found within the Dtr.<sup>247</sup> Birch considers this a *regnal* formula which was given to Israelite kings by

---

<sup>243</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 222. .

<sup>244</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 78.

<sup>245</sup> BODNER, *I Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 119.

<sup>246</sup> JOBLING, *I Samuel*, 80.

<sup>247</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 222. BODNER, *I Samuel*, 118. CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 170. CAMPBELL, *I Samuel*, 122. HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 103.

the Dtr, although Saul's is incomplete.<sup>248</sup> For McCarter, this Deuteronomistic insertion is to provide an introduction to Saul and the information needed was simply not available to him, or it was subsequently lost.<sup>249</sup> Scholars have understood the '2 year' reign as sufficient for the Dtr's timeline of the reign of Saul.<sup>250</sup> Although the Dtr's motives in naming Saul king goes beyond the scope of this present work, it seems odd that the Dtr would even bother to give the failed king such a kingly introduction. Many agree that this regnal formula belongs in the work of the Dtr, but most shy away from questioning the Dtr's motives in this royal foreword.

The character of Saul is elevated in this verse. First by being given innocence and sympathy, then he is seated among kings. Although the nature of this verse may never be completely understood, the syntax shows that Saul is the center of the narrative. The syntax displays this as a prologue to the story in which Saul is the main character. Although there are still unanswered questions concerning this, I stand with the consensus that this was an insertion by the Dtr; to fit with the other Israelite kings.

### 3.2 Saul, Jonathan and the War Against the Philistines: 1 Samuel 13:2-7

Since Wellhausen there have been questions concerning the early source of 1 Samuel 13. The story recorded is of an encounter between Saul, and the Israelites, against the Philistines. Although the Israelites seem organized and ready, after an initial advance they cower at the presence of an overwhelming Philistine army. In the following section I

---

<sup>248</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 78.

<sup>249</sup> MCCARTER, 223.

<sup>250</sup> CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 171. BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 78. MARTIN NOTH, *History of Israel* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1966), 176-177.

will look at the form of this pericope to reveal its epic nature. Then I will argue Saul as the ancient hero in the story; and not his son Jonathan. Next, I will explain the redactional layer based on a location mentioned in the text. Finally, I will critique the present view of v.7 and offer my own thought before moving on to the following text.

We begin by looking at the form and nature of this text. Birch explains that 1 Samuel 13:2-7a and 15b-22 is old archival material, in the form of a report holding no dialogue and with “little concern for the personalities involved.”<sup>251</sup> Although I agree with Birch that this is old material, I disagree with his understanding of the nature of the material. It is more than a simple report of events, instead, it is the telling of a heroic attack on the Philistine garrison.<sup>252</sup> It is an epic calling of the Israelite people to take up arms and follow Saul, their leader, into battle. I find it interesting that the problem the Israelites face here in 1 Samuel 13 is similar to other Biblical narratives.<sup>253</sup> This is not simply an explanation of army movement but a tale of an ancient battle where the Israelites are heavily outnumbered by their opponent. It is a hero war story cut short, missing a miraculous ending where Israel is triumphant and victorious because of the power of Yahweh their God. No matter the form, a report or a tale, what is clear is that this is an old, even ancient, story written before the Deuteronomist, suggesting that it was an early development of the history of 1 Samuel, possibly, even written fairly close to the

---

<sup>251</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 79.

<sup>252</sup> Parts of this story seem to be almost repeated in 1 Samuel 14, we will return to this idea later in this chapter.

<sup>253</sup> My thesis is not focused on this narrative as a type of ‘block’ story, therefore a further exploration of similar stories, such as Deborah (Judges 4), Gideon (Judges 7), or even the escape from Egypt (Exodus 14), is outside the scope of this present study. I believe, however, that it is interesting enough to mention.

events themselves.<sup>254</sup> I support the argument for this being an ancient text, perhaps during the period of the divided monarchy.

Verses 2-7 have been generally seen as a unit that is directly connected to 1 Samuel 14 and other ancient stories concerning Israel's leader Saul. Chapters 13 and 14 share the main theme of an Israelite attack on a Philistine garrison and a war with the Philistines. These, along with 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and c.11, have been viewed by scholars as a collection of narrative about the heroic Saul; called the 'Saul Cycle.'<sup>255</sup> The idea that these three stories (Saul and his father's lost asses, Saul's Defeat of the Ammonites, and Saul encounters the Philistines) existed together before the Deuteronomistic editor, has been widely accepted by scholars.<sup>256</sup> For instance, Miller, while agreeing with the ancient connection within the three stories, believes that chs.13-14 originally followed the story of chs.9-10. According to him Saul was to attack the Philistines. He did not face the Ammonites until later. This was then followed by the anointing story of c.11.<sup>257</sup> Miller considers c.11 as the conclusion of the Saul story placing it after chs.13-14. We will explore the 'Saul Cycle' theory throughout my discussion concerning sources. For now, what is important is that scholars, who argue for a connection between these three stories, believe Saul to be the connecting link.

---

<sup>254</sup> W. LEE HUMPHREYS, "The Rise and Fall of King Saul: A Study of an Ancient Narrative Stratum in 1 Samuel," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 18 (1980): 87. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 228.

<sup>255</sup> HUMPHREYS, "The Rise and Fall of King Saul: A Study of an Ancient Narrative Stratum in 1 Samuel," 76. FABRIZIO FORESTI, *The Rejection of Saul in the Perspective of the Deuteronomistic School* (Rome: Edizioni del Teresianum, 1984. 157-190), 158.

<sup>256</sup> JOHN VAN SETERS, *In Search of History : Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1983), 254-58. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 18- 20 and 228. BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 75. BODNER, *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 126. JOBLING, *First Samuel*, 80.

<sup>257</sup> MILLER, "Saul's Rise to Power: Some Observations Concerning I Sam 9:1-10:16; 10:26-11:15 and 13:2-14:46," 162.

The character of Jonathan appears for the first time in c.13; however, his presence in the narrative does little more than confuse the reader concerning the intended hero of the story. Jonathan is named five times in 1 Samuel 13. The first two mentions do not explain the identity of this character. In v.16 the reader is told that Jonathan is Saul's son, and this is then repeated in v.22. The fifth mention is also in v.22; where he is mentioned in the same statement as Saul. With the exception of v.3 Jonathan is always mentioned with Saul; not quite as an equal for Saul is always first and is given the larger army. The narrator does not explain the personality of Jonathan, but creates an illusion that the reader already understands his presence. Scholars have different viewpoints concerning Jonathan in the war against the Philistines. McKenzie and Jobling argue that Jonathan is the real hero of the story, for Jonathan is fighting Saul's battle.<sup>258</sup> Hertzberg and Klein see Jonathan as the "initiator of the Philistine war,"<sup>259</sup> going one step further Bonder states that Saul only sounds the horn after Jonathan attacks.<sup>260</sup> Campbell understands that the credit is given to both Jonathan and Saul, nevertheless, he questions if Saul is given credit because of his role as king, and not because he initiated anything.<sup>261</sup> I believe that these ideas stem from a confusion created by a later redactor. The syntax, however, indicates that Saul is the intended hero. The Waw-X-Qatal (v.3c) that interrupts the Wayyiqtol narrative chain is antecedent information, telling us that the call to arms from Saul occurred before 'the Philistines heard' (v.3b).<sup>262</sup>

---

<sup>258</sup> STEVEN L. MCKENZIE, "Deuteronomistic History" in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary Vol. 2* (New York: Double Day, 1992), 62. JOBLING, "Saul's Fall and Jonathan's Rise: Tradition and Redaction in 1 Sam 14:1-46," 367. HUMPHREYS, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: a Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel," 98.

<sup>259</sup> HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 104. KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 137.

<sup>260</sup> BODNER, *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 119.

<sup>261</sup> CAMPBELL, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 125.

<sup>262</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 63 S40.

(v.3a) Jonathan struck the garrison of the Philistines which was in Geba and the Philistines heard that Saul HAD blown the horn saying: "Let the Hebrews hear."

This insinuates that the horn sounding was a part of the attack.<sup>263</sup> Verse 2 is also expressing a form of military organization under Saul's leadership. The assault on the Philistine garrison was well planned and orchestrated by Saul. The inclusion of Jonathan in v.3 confuses the reader; by taking attention away from Saul as the hero. Although many scholars have attempted to underplay Saul's role here, or over play Jonathan's, the syntax states that Saul blew the horn before the Philistines had heard, insinuating a fully planned assault, or maybe a rebellion.

The inclusion of Jonathan not only takes away from the heroism of Saul it also creates problems in the Saul cycle as a whole. For example, many scholars have picked up on how the timeline between chs.9-10 and chs.13-14 is disconnected. In chs.9-10, Saul is a young man living in his father's house, but in chs.13-14 he is the father of a warrior. Little has been suggested to remedy this jump in the timeline. Miller argues that in the older story it was Saul who attacked the garrison, and not his son Jonathan.<sup>264</sup> The discrepancy in time, combined with how the character of Jonathan takes away from the heroism and Miller's theory which makes Saul the one who attacked the garrison; leads me to question the inclusion of Jonathan in the old military story. We will continue to inquire the role of Jonathan in this story by placing him on a redactional layer apart from both the 'old' narrative and the redactional level that connects this Saulide story to the anointing narrative in chs.9-10.

---

<sup>263</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 63 S41.

<sup>264</sup> MILLER, "Saul's Rise to Power: Some Observations Concerning I Sam 9:1-10:16; 10:26-11:15 and 13:2-14:46," 161.

The locations mentioned in this pericope are problematic. Consider the mention of the location **בֵּית אֵוֶן** (Bethaven) in the last clause of v.5; Campbell states that no one knows its location. The prophet Hosea (4:15, 5:8, 10:5), uses this as a pejorative reference to **בֵּית-אֵל** (Bethel - ‘the House of God’);<sup>265</sup> leading McCarter to assume that **בֵּית אֵוֶן**, ‘Bethaven) is a reference to **בֵּית-אֵל** (Bethel).<sup>266</sup> The problem is that Bethel has already been named in v.2 of this story, so why would the author now change the name of the city? If this is to mean the same location then, arguably, the author would have used the same name twice. Driver and Tsumura understand it as a separate location south-east of Bethel, near Ai.<sup>267</sup> No matter where ‘Bethaven’ might be, it was thought necessary to explain that these events were taking place in Benjamin. In other words either ‘Bethaven’ and Bethel are two different locations, or the mention and explanation of ‘Bethaven’ is an addition by a latter redactor. The problem is resolved if the mention of Bethel is placed in the same redactional layer as Jonathan and the mention of ‘Bethaven’ with Saul.

Many scholars split the text in the middle of v.7, arguing that the second half of the verse is a later insertion. I believe, however, that the whole verse is at odds with the preceding narrative. For example, the term ‘Hebrews’ resurfaces; being the ones who ‘passed over the Jordan,’ in v.7a.

(v.7) while the **Hebrews** crossed the Jordan, the land of Gad and Gilead, Saul was still in Gilgal, and **all the people** trembled behind him.

---

<sup>265</sup> CAMPBELL, *I Samuel*, 126.

<sup>266</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 227.

<sup>267</sup> S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 99. TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 339.

I explained above (2.2 *The War Against the Philistines*) how the syntax of v.3 demonstrates that the ‘Hebrews’ is a reference to ‘all Israel.’ Contrary to this connection, v.7 supposes that the ‘Hebrews’ comprise a different group from ‘all the people’ who are the ones trembling behind Saul. The mention of the ‘Hebrews’ in the first half of v.7 ignores the earlier use of this term and the connection already made between the ‘Hebrews’ and ‘Israel’ in v.3. I suggest that the second mention of the ‘Hebrews’ is a later redaction meant to harmonize the ‘old’ narrative with the additions concerning Saul’s rejection (vv.8-14).<sup>268</sup> Thus v.7 is an insertion to introduce what will follow; summing up the situation before beginning the sequence of events that will lead to Saul’s rejection.

In light of the preceding argument, vv.2-6 should be viewed as a unit, taken from an ancient source but with some minor redactional work. The ancient narrative is an epic story of Israel’s first king, however, it is cut short. I argue that v.7 is entirely redactional; summing up the story so far and creating a platform for the next story. Saul is at the center of the ancient narrative found in 1 Samuel 13:2-6, but, as we shall see, he will not remain at the center for long.

### 3.3 Actions, Explanation and Judgment: 1 Samuel 13:8-14

Verses 8-14, including the account of Saul’s action, his explanation and finally Samuel’s judgment against Israel’s first king, are seen as an insertion by many scholars. It is interesting that Saul gives such a detailed answer to Samuel’s question explaining his actions, his intentions and his reasoning, while Samuel’s own response to Saul’s answer

---

<sup>268</sup> Saul’s rejection is discussed in the following section.

is very general.<sup>269</sup> Saul's specific fault is not even outlined. The following will include a summary of the three main theories concerning the insertion of the rejection narrative into this text. The first theory is based on the Dtr's need to reject Saul in favor of David. The second is based on the writer being from a northern circle with a prophetic agenda dating before the writing of the Dtr. The third theory offers arguments for the existence of an old pro-Saul cycle. It is important to understand who is communicating the story in order to fully understand what these verses are trying to convey. Source criticism may help determine the motives behind the inclusion of vv.7-15. These are the verses that create the problem pertaining to Saul's fault in the rejection of his dynasty.

### 3.3.1 Insertion: Deuteronomistic Historiographer

Most scholars believe that the rejection of Saul was inserted in order to elevate David over Saul. The following will include the views expressed by those who understand this as a Dtr insertion. I will then present the translation using the Macro-Syntactical Analysis, which brings into question the connection between God's heart and David. Finally, I will offer another possibility concerning 'a man after [God's] heart.'

Scholars who credit the Dtr<sup>270</sup> for the insertion of vv.7b-15 argue that this story is "less concerned with the details of Saul's sin, than it is to make the point that Saul was rejected by God in favor of David."<sup>271</sup> Jobling argues that this story is trying to address the problem of the monarchy being inherently dynastic, even though Israel's monarchy is not traced back to its first king. Hertzberg simply says it is meant to show that Saul's

---

<sup>269</sup> BODNER, *I Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 122.

<sup>270</sup> NADAV NA'AMAN, "The Pre-Deuteronomistic Story of King Saul and its Historical Significance," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54.4 (1992): 645.

<sup>271</sup> MCKENZIE, "Deuteronomistic History," 63.

kingship was perverted from the beginning.<sup>272</sup> For those who argue this insertion is Dtr, chs.13 and 14 are intended to be the representation of Saul’s reign in the chronological scheme of the Dtr; the style, language and ideology (including the ground work for a dynastic promise) is presented with a Dtr flavor. The phrase ‘a man after [God’s] own heart’<sup>273</sup> is seen by most, if not all, scholars as a reference to David. Campbell writes that this “is clearly David”.<sup>274</sup> Miller argues that the editor inserted the rejection narrative, claiming David as the man after God’s heart, saying that this “revised narrative was neither pro-Saul nor specifically pro-monarchic, but intended to support David’s claim to the throne.”<sup>275</sup>

As we have mentioned earlier, other scholars have seen this more as an idiom expressing David as God’s choice. ‘A man after [God’s] own heart’ is intended to mean ‘a man of God’s own choosing.’<sup>276</sup> Those that understand it as such believe that this passage “asserts the freedom of the divine will.”<sup>277</sup> Scholars use Jeremiah to back up their claims:<sup>278</sup>

“Then I will give you shepherds according to my heart [כַּלְבֵּי], who will feed you on knowledge and understanding.” Jeremiah 3:15

---

<sup>272</sup> JOBLING, *First Samuel*, 80. HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 105.

<sup>273</sup> I place this saying in apostrophes because it has become used in Christian circles to express a pious attitude mirrored after David, even though it only appears this one time in the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>274</sup> CAMPBELL, *I Samuel*, 127. TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 346. KLEIN, *I Samuel*, 140. HERTZBERG, *I and 2 Samuel: A Commentary*, 105. MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 229. BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of I Samuel 7-15*, 85. MARK K. GEORGE, “Yhwh's Own Heart,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64 (2002): 446.

<sup>275</sup> MILLER, “Saul's Rise to Power: Some Observations Concerning I Sam 9:1-10:16; 10:26-11:15 and 13:2-14:46,” 172.

<sup>276</sup> BODNER, *I Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 123. CARTLEDGE, *I and 2 Samuel*, 175. MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 229. MCKENZIE, “The Trouble with Kingship,” 62. GEORGE, “Yhwh's Own Heart,” 446.

<sup>277</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 229.

<sup>278</sup> DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, 101.

It is not clear how this verse expresses that these shepherds are of God's choosing. McCarter interprets 'shepherds' to mean 'kings' to further connect David as chosen by God.<sup>279</sup> Those who write concerning this idiom assume that God's choice is David, and that this is Saul's problem; David and not Saul was chosen by God.<sup>280</sup>

Scholars have argued for three levels of redaction, or editions, of the Dtr.<sup>281</sup> The DtrH, being the earliest, is pro-Davidic and pro-dynastic, while the DtrP is more critical of David. The DtrN is friendly towards David, then again is more interested in "the identity of Israel as the people of Yahweh and in the Torah."<sup>282</sup> Most scholars who understand the Dtr to have inserted the rejection pericope of ch.13 and ch.15 suggest that it was the work of DtrP. There are many similarities between the rejection in c.13 and c.15, such as the characters, the theme of rejection and the theme of sacrificial irregularities. We find the ideologies and motifs of the Dtr even more striking in c.15.<sup>283</sup> DtrP is considered the redactor who inserted prophetic speeches and stories while revising and expanding the stories of the DtrH. DtrP also tends to point out the "political and cultic apostasy of the northern royalty."<sup>284</sup> Foresti ascribes 1 Samuel 15 to DtrP, whose purpose would be to clarify the gravity of Saul's actions and subsequent rejection. His argument is that DtrP highlighted the ideology of dynasty with a stronger Davidic flavor, while building up the idea of God's mercy and patience towards repentant sinners.

---

<sup>279</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 229.

<sup>280</sup> GEORGE, "Yhwh's Own Heart," 446.

<sup>281</sup> GARY N. KNOPPERS, *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies, V 2: The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of Israel, and the Reign of Josiah* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 37-38.

<sup>282</sup> DIETRICH and NAUMANN. "The David- Saul Narrative," 309.

<sup>283</sup> VAN SETERS, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*, 259-260.

<sup>284</sup> The DtrH is known for its stories which were written to elevate David and his claim to the throne and dynasty. KNOPPERS, *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies*, 37.

This concept of mercy is considered a motif for an exilic audience.<sup>285</sup> The assertion that c.15 belongs to DtrP is based primarily on the inclusion of the character of Samuel: a prophet.

I question the assertion that attributes the insertion of 1 Samuel 13:8-15 to the DtrP. Chapter 15 expands and even explains c.13. This later chapter goes into much detail to ensure that the answers to questions left by a seemingly incomplete rejection in c.13 will be brought to light. Why create questions in c.13 only to fill in the blanks in c.15? Another problem is that DtrP was concerned with a post-exilic audience and, therefore, did not have a custom of elevating David. Even though these chapters share expressions and motifs<sup>286</sup> c.15 is best regarded as the work of a later writer.<sup>287</sup>

Some scholars do not believe that the Dtr influenced c.13 at all.<sup>288</sup> The argument presented is for a pre-Dtr connection with the stories of chs.9-10 and c.11.<sup>289</sup> What I find interesting is that even those who argue for a pre-Dtr connection, still assert David as the man after God's heart. I believe that this Davidic driven theory works against the hypothesis of a pre-Dtr connection. I hope to strengthen the pre-Dtr theory with a different reading of v.13 and 'a man after [God's] heart.'

---

<sup>285</sup> FORESTI, *The Rejection of Saul in the Perspective of the Deuteronomistic School*, 167-168. MCKENZIE, "The Trouble with Kingship," 62.

<sup>286</sup> MCKENZIE, "The Trouble with Kingship," 309-310

<sup>287</sup> VANSETERS, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*, 259-260.

<sup>288</sup> DIETRICH and NAUMANN, "The David- Saul Narrative," 309.

<sup>289</sup> NA'AMAN, "The Pre-Deuteronomistic Story of King Saul and its Historical Significance," 648. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 228. FORESTI, *The Rejection of Saul in the Perspective of the Deuteronomistic School*, 174.

As shown in the previous chapter, I have provided a different translation of vv. 13- 14, particularly the ‘judgment’ in v.14.

“Now your kingdom will not rise,  
Yahweh seeks for himself a man according to his heart.  
Yahweh commands him as a leader over his people,  
But you did not listen to what Yahweh commanded you.”

As mentioned earlier many scholars consider this to be a reference to David and attribute it to the Dtr. The Macro-Syntactical Analysis, however, does not indicate that anyone has been or will be chosen to replace Saul. The verb **בִּקֵּשׁ** (seek) and **יִצְוֶהוּ** (command) are neither in the future nor in the past. It is simply stating the requirements of Yahweh and that Saul has not done what he was told, therefore his kingdom will not rise. There is no reason to project this statement into the future to mean that someone in particular (i.e. David), would replace him.

If ‘a man according to God’s heart’ is not David, then the present consensus and understanding of this statement must be re-evaluated. In the preceding chapters there are mentions of both Saul’s and God’s heart. In 1 Samuel 10:9, Saul is given a new heart **לֵב** (or his heart is changed) by God. Some scholars believe that this reference is linked to I Sam 13:14.<sup>290</sup> It seems more likely, however, that it refers to 9:19-20 where Samuel says that he will reveal Saul’s heart **בְּלִבְבָּהּ** to him and then tells him not to worry about the lost donkey which are “on his heart” **לִבָּהּ**. Therefore, arguably Saul’s changed heart is a reference that remains within its own pericope that is 1 Samuel 9-10.

Another mention of heart in the preceding chapters of 1 Samuel is found in 2:35;

---

<sup>290</sup> GEORGE, “Yhwh's Own Heart,” 450.

“But I will raise up for Myself a faithful priest who will do according to what is in My heart and in My soul; and I will build him an enduring house, and he will walk before My anointed always.” 1 Samuel 2:35

This is in the mouth of God to his servant the High Priest Eli concerning who will lead the people instead of Eli’s wicked sons. This ‘faithful priest’ was Samuel, which raises the question of the connection between God’s heart and his servant; Samuel the priest and prophet.

In what follows, I will be taking a fresh perspective on the relevant text without the assumption that Saul’s condemnation in 1 Samuel 13 is intended to point towards David, the second king of Israel. Nor will I consider the understanding that this insertion is connected to the Dtr, for I believe that this assumption provides us with more questions than answers. I will explore another option centered on the character of the prophet Samuel and made possible with the removal of Davidic ideologies from 1 Samuel 13:7b-15.

### 3.3.2 Insertion: Prophetic Editor

Campbell and Birch followed by Humphreys and Breytenbach believe that the addition of vv.7-15 is prophetic in nature.

In his book *Of Prophets and Kings*, Campbell brought to light a pre-Dtr redaction with a prophetic flavor. He calls the work of the prophetic influenced redactor the ‘Prophetic Record.’ The central focus and purpose of the Prophetic Record are threefold:

- 1) To emphasize the action of the Prophet as Yahweh’s instrument
- 2) To establish Israel’s institutions and monitor their performance
- 3) To ensure that fidelity and obedience to Yahweh are not eroded.<sup>291</sup>

---

<sup>291</sup> CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document*, 104.

These are all themes that appear in c.13. The problem is that Campbell does not believe that c.13 is part of the Prophetic Record. Instead, he contends that c.15 is the rejection account for the Prophetic Record and is connected to 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16, also prophetic.<sup>292</sup> One of the reasons Campbell is lead to this conclusion is because he claims that c.13 is not even about Saul.<sup>293</sup> Although I am confident that c.13, rather c. 15, is connected to chs. 9-10, Campbell's work on the prophetic schema is the building block for understanding the prophetic ideology. Therefore, I will continue to explore the implications and significance of the 'Prophetic Record' with the first rejection of King Saul (1 Samuel 13).

Birch studied the form of this insertion (vv.7b-15a) and claims it is a Prophetic Oracle of Judgment announced against an individual.<sup>294</sup> He explains how the syntax in v.16 expresses that Saul and Jonathan continued to be camped at Gibeah while the Philistines camped at Michmash. In other words, the move to Gilgal does not fit into the syntax of the story. It is separate from the surrounding story (vv.2-6 and vv.16-23).<sup>295</sup> Birch argues that vv.8-10 are to be understood as the introduction to the Oracle of Judgment and its formulation depends on the context; in this case it is formulated around the need for a sacrifice upon entering into a holy war. Verses 11-13a form the accusation, which can be given in the form of a question, but here it is in the form of an assertion. Finally, the announcement of judgment is in v.13b and v.14. Other uses of this form, the 'Prophetic Oracle of Judgment against an individual,' are found in 2 Samuel 12 (Nathan's judgment against David) and 1 Kings 14:7 (Ahijah's judgment against Jeroboam). Both

---

<sup>292</sup> CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document*, 43.

<sup>293</sup> CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document*, 127.

<sup>294</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 81.

<sup>295</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 76.

of these, along with Saul's second rejection story in c.15, contrast the promise against the judgment.<sup>296</sup> Along with Westerman, Birch understands the overlap of the accusation and announcement as a style that probably originated from prophetic circles during the period of the kings before the writing prophets.<sup>297</sup> This form shows that the time of writing, for the insertion, should be dated "roughly to the late eighth century,"<sup>298</sup> which means that it could not have been written by the Dtr. A weakness of Birch's argument is that although he sees this as pre-Deuteronomist, he still believes that v.14 is a clear reference to David.<sup>299</sup>

Humphreys builds on Birch's theory by explaining how this prophetic influence used the character of Samuel to oppose kingship. The older narrative was "utilized and partially broken by later circles in the service of quite distinct interest."<sup>300</sup> The northern prophetic circle found a hero in the character of Samuel as he was northern born as well as a prophet. At the same time they "found in Saul an illustrative model of all that was wrong-headed in Israel's kings."<sup>301</sup> The Northern circle was opposed to the traditional form of monarchy in the ANE patterns and, instead, saw the prophet as an authoritative

---

<sup>296</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 82.

<sup>297</sup> WESTERMAN, Claus, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, translated by High C. White. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), 138.

<sup>298</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 83.

<sup>299</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 85.

<sup>300</sup> HUMPHREYS, "The Rise and Fall of King Saul: A Study of an Ancient Narrative Stratum in 1 Samuel," 75.

<sup>301</sup> HUMPHREYS, "The Rise and Fall of King Saul: A Study of an Ancient Narrative Stratum in 1 Samuel," 75.

figure making the king subordinate.<sup>302</sup> This prophetic revision recast the character of Saul, using Samuel as the main character to illustrate all that is wrong with kingship.<sup>303</sup>

Breytenbach connects the insertion to a northern prophetic circle by comparing the character of Samuel to that of Moses.<sup>304</sup> Humphreys maintains that this text was edited just after, or even just before, the fall of Samaria (722 BCE), and argues for a connection with the prophets Elijah and Elisha.<sup>305</sup> Breytenbach expands this connection by comparing Samuel to another legendary northern Israelite prophet; Moses.<sup>306</sup> The main similarities in their arguments include the characterization of a prophet, their direct contact with God and the role they played as the intercessor for the people. Breytenbach argues that Samuel is a character created by the Zadokites (in order to associate him with Moses' brother Aaron) during the time of Hezekiah. These Zadokites characterized the prophet Samuel as a second Moses, who was of the northern tribes.<sup>307</sup> Placing Samuel in the company of Moses would serve Northern Prophetic circles, such as the disciples of Elijah and Elisha, by giving the prophet authority over the king. The insertion would have occurred when the northern people were facing strong outside adversity, while experiencing friction between their king and the prophets.

---

<sup>302</sup> HUMPHREYS, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel," 103.

<sup>303</sup> HUMPHREYS, "The Rise and Fall of King Saul: A Study of an Ancient Narrative Stratum in 1 Samuel," 85. HUMPHREYS, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel," 106.

<sup>304</sup> ANDRIES BREYTENBACH, "Who Is Behind the Samuel Narrative?" in *Past, Present Future: The Deuteronomistic History of the Prophets*, eds. Johannes Cornelis deMoor and H.F. Van Rooy (Leiden: Brill), 55, 53.

<sup>305</sup> HUMPHREYS, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel," 106.

<sup>306</sup> BREYTENBACH, "Who Is Behind the Samuel Narrative?" 55, 53.

<sup>307</sup> BREYTENBACH, "Who Is Behind the Samuel Narrative?" 60.

The syntax clearly outlines Saul as the main character in vv.2-6, but in vv.7-15 Samuel is at the center of the story. In the previous chapter we looked at the syntax surrounding the arrival of Samuel on the scene. The הִנֵּה (Behold) is used to bring out the immediacy and importance of Samuel's arrival, while the וַיְהִי (*wayehi*) introduces a new and integral element to the narrative. The character of Samuel is central to the insertion and through this prophetic character we see the "prophetic history of the origins of monarchy in Israel."<sup>308</sup> In vv.1-6, the syntax indicates that Saul is the main character, while vv.7-15 put Samuel at the center of the narrative. This leads me to believe that vv.7-14 is an insertion and at the center of this insertion is the prophet Samuel.

In summary, c.13 is considered to have been reworked by the prophetic circle that used the character of Saul to demonstrate the superiority of the prophet. It highlights that even in military situations the king is subordinate to the prophet.<sup>309</sup> The insertion of vv.7-15 is built around the character of Samuel to underline the problem the prophetic circles had with kingship.<sup>310</sup> Based on the above observation, I agree that vv.7-15 should be understood as an insertion belonging to a northern prophetic group around the time the north fell to the Assyrians. The following will express the connection between 1 Samuel 13:8 and 1 Samuel 10:8. We will look at the previous theories concerning their strengths and weakness in light of the Macro-Syntactical Analysis.

---

<sup>308</sup> BREYTENBACH, "Who Is Behind the Samuel Narrative," 52. HUMPHREYS, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel," 106.

<sup>309</sup> HUMPHREYS, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel," 105.

<sup>310</sup> W. LEE HUMPHREYS, *The Tragedy of King Saul: A Study of the Structure of 1 Samuel 9-31*, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 6 (1978): 18.

### 3.3.3 Saul Cycle or Prophetic Connection

Some scholars have argued for a cycle of stories written for the sake of Saul (Pro-Saul), however, I will argue that what connects these stories is not Saul but Samuel.<sup>311</sup> We will look at the ideas behind the theory of a ‘Saul Cycle’. Then we will look at the two main problems with this theory and then present another solution. These problems concern 1) the timing in the story and 2) the identification of the important character as Samuel and not Saul.

The first book of Samuel has undergone a complex formation, especially the first 15 chapters, and scholars, including Wellhausen and Noth, have questioned the existence of a ‘Saul-Cycle’ that was written to elevate Israel’s first king.<sup>312</sup> The most commonly attributed narrative to this ‘Saul Cycle’ includes Saul’s Anointing by the Seer in 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16, Saul’s victory over the Ammorites, in c.11, and the Philistine War of chs.13 and 14. Although different chronological orders have been suggested for these three stories, what they all have in common is the presence of Saul.

There are two main difficulties in this ‘Saul Cycle’ theory, and they both stem from 1 Samuel 13:8 and the ‘seven day wait’ ordered by Samuel. A central connecting piece of the ‘Saul cycle’ is the comparison of 1 Samuel 10:8 and 13:8.<sup>313</sup>

(10:8) [Samuel to Saul] “Wait there seven days until I come and tell you what to do”

(13:8a) He waited seven days for the appointed time because of Samuel

The first difficulty is in how the circumstances around the two settings, are drastically different. In c.10 the reader finds Saul the youth searching for his father’s lost asses,

---

<sup>311</sup> ACKROYD, *The First Book of Samuel*, 105. CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 171. KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 139. JOBLING, *First Samuel*, 80. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 228. BODNER, *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 120.

<sup>312</sup> FORESTI, *The Rejection of Saul in the Perspective of the Deuteronomistic School*, 163.

<sup>313</sup> KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 138. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 228. HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 105. JOBLING, *1 Samuel*, 86. CAMPBELL, *1 Samuel*, 126.

while c.13 finds Saul to be the father of a young warrior. This problem can be resolved if all reference to Jonathan is removed from the oldest literary stratum within 1 Samuel 13 and then left out of the prophetic redaction also. The second difficulty is that Saul is not the central character in the connection of these stories. 1 Samuel 10:8, which promotes Samuel, anticipates 13:4b and 7b-15,<sup>314</sup> which also emphasize the role of Samuel. Most scholars agree that 1 Samuel 10:8, is an insertion.<sup>315</sup> The additions in c. 13 (vv. 4b and 7b-15) that connect these two narratives are also in the interest of Samuel, the prophet and not Saul, the king.

### 3.3.4 Conclusion concerning vv.7-15: prophetic Insertion Pre-Dtr

To conclude on this section of the text (vv.7-15):

1. Verses 7-15 are an insertion made by the northern prophetic influence prior to the Dtr.
2. The syntax brings the character of Samuel to the forefront of the insertion.
3. The syntax of vv.13-14 does not point to the individual David. This source/redactor had little or no interest in David or his Dynasty.

For these reasons, I do not believe that ‘a man after [God’s] heart’ is a reference or a foreshadowing of David. Rather, I posit that it is a northern prophet, in the tradition of Elijah, Elisha and Moses, who is at the heart of this insertion. The connection of 1 Samuel 10:8 to 13:8 serves the interest of the prophet Samuel and not Saul.

---

<sup>314</sup> MILLER, “Saul’s Rise to Power: Some Observations Concerning I Sam 9:1-10:16; 10:26-11:15 and 13:2-14:46,” 160.

<sup>315</sup> MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 228. FORESTI, *The Rejection of Saul in the Perspective of the Deuteronomistic School*, 160. ACKROYD, *The First Book of Samuel*, 105. CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 171. BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 84. KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 139.

### 3.4 The Last Pieces: Movement and Metal: 1 Samuel 13:15-23

Not much is known about vv.15-23 of c.13. Research on these final verses is somewhat limited. The section deals with two main themes: the movement of the people and the Philistine's monopoly on metal. Verse 16 acts as a summary, while vv.17-23 provide more information, highlighting the Philistines as Israel's 'huge' opposition. As stated earlier, this has the making of an epic account, of a triumphal victory story, where the only possible victory would be a divine intervention, but the chapter ends somewhat anti-climactically. In the following section, I will demonstrate three possible ways to view this section of the text.

- 1) the connection to vv.2-6
- 2) the connection to 1 Samuel 14
- 3) the theological connection to vv.7-14

A suggestion concerning the source behind the text will also be verified, and finally, we will look at the problems concerning the locations of the groups within the story. Many questions and problems will nonetheless remain concerning these last verses.

#### 3.4.1 Connection to vv.2-6

Birch considers that with the removal of the rejection (vv.7b-15a), c.13 becomes a straight forward account,<sup>316</sup> but this is an over simplification. Although there is a connection between vv.15-23 and vv.2-6, simply removing vv.7b-15a from the story creates a lack of narrative flow. The narrative feels strange, for this story has all the makings of an epic military victory story, but without a victory. Some scholars have

---

<sup>316</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 78-79.

called vv.19-22 a ‘delayed exposition.’<sup>317</sup> A ‘delayed exposition’ is when the reader is given more information concerning an earlier account. In the text, the comments relating to the lack of weapons (vv. 19-22) is the ‘delayed exposition’ revealing that Saul’s situation was even worse than originally believed. It is important to remember that the use of the chain of the X-Yiqtol verb form, which is descriptive in function, is acting as a comment to the narrative.<sup>318</sup> This could support the ‘delayed exposition’ theory. With this connection, through the ‘delayed exposition,’ along with the removal of v.7 and v.15ab from the oldest literary stratum a smoother narrative flow is revealed. Saul, at the beginning, is the main character and protagonist, but with the appearance of Samuel, Saul loses his place as the main character. In the final section the Wayyiqtol continues Saul’s narrative. These final verses offer new information concerning Israel’s enemy the Philistines, which is mostly extra information.

The explanation concerning Israel’s lack of weapons has been seen as a separate tradition. In spite of this, I argue that the syntax holds these verses together. According to Birch, in these last verses (vv.19-22), the text lacks narrative flow and feels like material that was taken from some sort of official records.<sup>319</sup> Many agree that this section of the text is very old, although most commentaries say very little about the ‘who’, ‘when’, or ‘why’ concerning the composition of this section of the text (vv.15-23).<sup>320</sup> Hertzberg argues that these “accounts derive from someone who was close to the events in every

---

<sup>317</sup> BODNER, *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 128. CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 176.

<sup>318</sup> NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 119 S90, 112 S83, 188 S163.

<sup>319</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 78-79.

<sup>320</sup> Birch sees the inclusion of the metal and its costs as a “genuinely old tradition” [BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 80.] Driver, however, believes the prices given are incredibly high. [DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, 105.]

respect, even to the king and his action.”<sup>321</sup> Klein adds that it is written in “a terse and allusive Hebrew” using vocabulary that is not found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>322</sup> As some scholars have stated it is possible that the information of these last few verses were drawn from some sort of official documentation. Birch sees vv.15b-18 and 23, along with 13:2-7a, to be annalistic in character and vv.19-22 as a separate tradition, conversely the syntax suggests that vv.17-19 are connected.<sup>323</sup>

Although vv.19-22 can be considered a unit, based on theme, it is vv.17-19 that stand together syntactically. These verses (vv.17-19) stand out through the use of the X-Yiqtol of narrative.<sup>324</sup> As explained earlier (section 2.6 *Israel’s Weapons*), up until this point, the writer has always used the Waw-X-Qatal to demonstrate bg, but in vv.17-19, the writer/redactor chooses to use the X-Yiqtol construction. This X-Yiqtol chain begins with the displacement of the Philistines and continues through to the statement concerning the lack of craftsmen in Israel. Tsumura notices this trend of X-Yiqtols, yet does not question it further.<sup>325</sup> This switch in the choice of verb forms corresponds to what I previously mentioned concerning the ‘delayed exposition’ but it also keeps vv.17-18 connected to v.19. At this point it is difficult to understand the nature of the last few verses of this chapter. It is possible that the information contained in these verses is old in nature, but due to the connecting syntax it is difficult to argue that they are from separate sources.

---

<sup>321</sup> HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 107.

<sup>322</sup> KLEIN, *I Samuel*, 144.

<sup>323</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of I Samuel 7-15*, 80.

<sup>324</sup> Here we have the beginning of an X-Yiqtol chain; X-Yiqtol in narrative is repeated information. [NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, 117 S88.]

<sup>325</sup> TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 350.

### 3.4.2 Connection to Chapter 14

Scholars have argued that 1 Samuel chs. 13 and 14 formed a unit within the hypothetical ‘Saul Cycle.’<sup>326</sup> Verses 15-23 of c.13 would be the beginning of the next narrative to prepare the reader for a triumphal victory in c.14. The information pertaining to the metal monopoly would serve to heighten God’s victory through Jonathan<sup>327</sup> by illustrating:

- 1) The Philistines superiority over the Israelites, for they have managed to disarm their enemy entirely<sup>328</sup>;
- 2) The Philistines subjugating the rebellious Israelites<sup>329</sup>; and
- 3) The Philistine occupation of what the Israelites believed to be their land.<sup>330</sup>

While it is clear that the text underscores Israel’s inferiority to the Philistines, there are two significant problems in considering 1 Samuel 13:15-23 as simply an introduction to the c.14; one based on theme and the second on syntax.

Birch argues that the goal of vv.15-23 is to “heighten the dramatic quality of the victory in ch14,” specifically Jonathan’s victory.<sup>331</sup> The first problem is that c.13 makes it quite clear that Jonathan has a sword, and in c.14 it is Jonathan alone who attacks the garrison (with his servant). Why heighten the dramatic quality by removing the power of metal, all the while keeping this power in Jonathan’s, the hero, hands by underlining that he has a sword? If this was inserted to heighten the victory of c.14, Jonathan has no need

---

<sup>326</sup> Klein sees c. 13 as an introduction to c.14(KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 145); Tsumura sees c.14 as continuing the story of c.13(TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 353); while Polzin (POLZIN, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History*, 132) and Birch (BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 79) include the last 8 verses of c.13 as the beginning of the story of c.14. Birch simply states that these verses set the scene for the events of c.14, while Polzin outlines a three part narrative, starting with the ‘Battle of Michmash’(13:15-23), ‘Saul’s oath’ (14:24-35), and ‘Jonathan selected by lot’ (14:36-46)..

<sup>327</sup> TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 351. CAMPBELL, *1 Samuel*, 128.

<sup>328</sup> HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 107.

<sup>329</sup> MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 238.

<sup>330</sup> MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 238.

<sup>331</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 80.

for a sword. The story telling of chs.13 and 14 together is especially awkward when the Philistines are attacked by Jonathan in c.14 and become so confused that they “fight sword on sword.” If they, the Philistines, had disarmed the Israelites in c.13 who did they think they were fighting in c.14? Even though it is not uncommon for God to send panic on Israel’s enemies, it seems disjointed to have this comment on Israel’s lack of weapons as the introduction to the Philistine’s fighting themselves with weapons - that is, unless the redactor intends to ridicule the Philistines. The second problem brings us back to the grammatical constructions (X-Yiqtol) indicating the prominence of the text as background and the linguistic perspective as being retrospective. This means the text is stating what came before and not what is coming. So the connection to c.14 is not as clear set as scholars have argued.<sup>332</sup>

### 3.4.3 Connection to 1 Samuel 13:7-15

Some scholars believe that vv.19-23 are to be understood in connection with vv.7-15. Verses 7-15a demonstrate Samuel’s position over Saul, while vv.15b-23 demonstrate the Philistines’ power over Saul. The Philistines hold a monopoly of weapon production, while Samuel holds a monopoly on God’s commandments. The implication is that Saul will not survive Samuel’s Judgment, nor will he survive the Philistine conflict. At least this is seen in the overall view of the Saul narrative. If there is a parallel between Saul with Samuel and Saul with the Philistines then vv.15-23 would have been inserted after or with the rejection of vv.7-14. The question becomes which redactor might have found

---

<sup>332</sup> The study of c.14 is outside of the scope of this thesis. I would, however, like to note first the similarity between chs.13 and 14 and second that the relationship between these two chapters is more complicated than originally thought.

value in this comparison and for this argument to be convincing a thorough study would be needed concerning the role of the Philistines throughout Saul's reign. The redactor behind this section of the text is still unknown.

#### 3.4.4 Conclusion concerning vv.15-23: Inconclusive

There are still many questions concerning the nature of this final piece of 1 Samuel 13, however, this present thesis will not explore the question further. The X-Yiqtol that is bg information, along with the theme of Jonathan's sword, creates a problem with simply having vv.15-23 stand as an introduction to 1 Samuel 14. The parallel between Saul-Samuel and Saul-the Philistines requires a more in-depth look at 1 Samuel 14, and a study of the role of the Philistines throughout Saul's reign. I believe that further exploration is simply outside the scope of this present project. It is clear that these final verses (vv.15-23) thoroughly express the power that the Philistines have over the Israelites and their king, Saul.

#### 3.5 Conclusion on Sources

1 Samuel 13 has been seen as a patchwork of sources, and although there are still many questions unanswered, we can better understand the motives behind the rejection of the first king of Israel. Verse 1 follows a tradition of the Dtr. This does not offer much to the question of Saul's fault, but the Dtr's agenda would have found this rejection useful. Verses 2-6 form a unit, an introduction to an epic story of the first King of Israel; a story that now seems incomplete. I have argued that there is some small redactional work done to this unit; such as the mention of Jonathan. Verse 7 does not belong strictly to the

preceding verses; instead it sums up the story so far and introduces the next. I argued against any kind of Davidic influence on the insertion of vv.8-14, and instead gave further weight to the argument for a pre-Dtr redactor. This redactor favors the prophet over the king, in connection to other legendary northern prophets. This would possibly date the story to a time when there was friction between prophet and king; close to the time of King Hezekiah. Concerning the 'Saul Cycle,' I argued that it is the rejection and the character of Samuel that joins these stories together and not Saul. Understanding concerning the source/redactor of vv.15-23 is not as clear and further study is needed for a better understanding. In the following and final chapter, we will explore the implication concerning the rejection as a pre-Dtr insertion and look at 'a man after [God's] own heart.'

## Chapter 4: Understanding the Story

### 4.1 Synthesis and Interpretation

In what follows, I will provide a synthesis of the ideas previously explored. This will facilitate a better understanding of the text and underscore the fault of Saul in 1 Samuel 13. First, will be a review of the syntax in which the prophet is elevated, followed by a re-examination of the arguments for excluding Jonathan from the earliest literary stratum placing this character as the work of the Dtr. Next will be a re-assessment of the view of the prophet within the rejection of c.13. Lastly, I will provide an overview of the theories connecting c.13 with 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16, which will highlight the fault of Saul according to the pre-Dtr prophetic writer.

#### 4.1.1 A Man After [God's] Heart

Although the beginning of the narrative makes it quite clear that Saul is the main character of the story, the arrival of Samuel is made to stand out syntactically. The combination of the Macro-Syntactical Marker **וַיְהִי** and the word **הִנֵּה** (behold) is used to express the importance of Samuel's arrival. Even with the emphasis on the character of Samuel, I agree with Humphreys when he states that, the redaction is done with a heavy amount of ambiguity.<sup>333</sup> As can be seen in v.8, the syntax is clear that Saul waited BECAUSE of Samuel, BUT Samuel did not come. This is emphasized with the use of the emphatic pronoun in v.11. 'You, you did not come.' Hertzberg wonders whether this was

---

<sup>333</sup> HUMPHREYS, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel," 75-105.

written to exonerate Saul, understanding the problem in c.13 as Samuel's fault.<sup>334</sup> Other scholars place the blame on Samuel for Saul's rejection, whether because Samuel was self-serving, or Saul challenged the roles of prophet and king.<sup>335</sup> The theory that understands this as a vindication for Saul helps to answer some of the questions concerning the ambiguity in the text. On the other hand, it is peculiar that a redactor would place a vindication about a character into a story where that same character is trapped in a compromising situation. To reiterate; Saul and his army are in trouble and his ability to lead called into question, why would a redactor use this backdrop to defend this first king? Although this text is not explicit, and even though Saul is the hero in the beginning of the chapter, the syntax of the inserted rejection brings out the character of Samuel as the one to be obeyed. Ambiguity remains, yet it is clear that the prophet is the center of the dismissal of the king.

My translation of vv.13-14 may be unconventional, however, when one removes the Davidic foresight and reevaluates, we are left with far fewer questions.

*(v.13) And Samuel said to Saul: "You are foolish. You did not keep the commandments of Yahweh your God which he had commanded you. For then he would have set up your kingdom on Israel forever" (v.14) "Now your kingdom will not rise. Yahweh seeks for himself a man according to his heart, Yahweh commands him as a leader over his people, but you did not listen to what Yahweh had commanded you."*

I do not believe that 'a man according to his heart' was ever meant to be a title, for if it was it would occur elsewhere in the Saul and David narrative. I do think that this holds

---

<sup>334</sup> HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 106.

<sup>335</sup> POLZIN, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 130. MALY, *World of David and Solomon*, 32. ACKERMAN, "Who Can Stand before YHWH, This Holy God? A Reading of 1 Samuel 1-15," 16-18. HANDY, "The Characters of Heirs Apparent in the Book of Samuel," 8. TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 348. BODNER, *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*, 125.

meaning in the mouth of the prophet, because it asserts the style in which God seeks his leaders. The idiom ‘of his own choosing’ is especially interesting when combined with the contrasts that arise in the syntax of the text. The text expresses that God was ready to set up Saul’s kingdom, and that it is because of Saul’s actions that this will not occur. The emphasis in the syntax occurs in v.13 (using the resultative עָתָה -כִּי-Qatal) and in v.14 (expressing contrast לְךָ -כִּי-Qatal ). ‘For then he WOULD have set up your kingdom’ ‘BUT you did not listen.’ God changed his mind; he had chosen Saul BUT Saul was not up to the task.<sup>336</sup> In what follows we will re-examine my arguments for excluding Jonathan from the oldest literary stratum and the prophetic insertion.

#### 4.1.2 Jonathan

Jonathan is mentioned five times in this chapter, and only one of these mentions Jonathan without his father Saul being named first. For example:

- v.16 *Saul and Jonathan, his son, and the people found with them*
- v.22 *that were with Saul and Jonathan*
- v.22 *With Saul and Jonathan, his son, it [swords] was to be found.*

The fourth time he is mentioned after his father is in v.2, where the narrator gives us a little more detail concerning Saul’s Israelite troops. Saul is credited with military strategy in his division of the troops; the inclusion of Jonathan takes away from Saul’s credit.

- v.2 *Saul selected for himself 3000 out of Israel, with Saul were 2000 in Michmash and in the mountain of Bethel while a thousand were with*

---

<sup>336</sup> Cartledge goes further than this present hypothesis understanding Saul’s rejection as simply a matter of divine choice [CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 20.].

*Jonathan at Gibeah Benjamin and the remaining people he [Saul] had sent away each man to his tent.*

These 4 pieces can be seamlessly removed from the text. The fifth time that Jonathan is mentioned is in v.3;

v.3 *Jonathan [Saul] struck the garrison of the Philistines which was in Geba.*

In *Saul's Rise to Power*, Miller suggests that the story originally held Saul as the one who attacked the garrison.<sup>337</sup> Based on his arguments and Miller's suggestion, I agree that the mention of Jonathan was not part of the oldest literary stratum (v.2-6) and it was Saul who attacked the Philistine garrison.<sup>338</sup> The following will demonstrate the necessity for placing Jonathan on a separate redactional layer made after the insertion of the Gilgal account.

Removing Jonathan from the oldest literary stratum, answers some of the questions concerning the connection between this chapter and c.9-10:16. Chapter 13 explains that Saul "waited seven days for the appointed time because of Samuel." This can be linked back to 1 Samuel 10:8, and the story of Saul's anointing. As mentioned previously, however, there is a problem in the flow of the story, for in c.9 Saul is a youth in his father's house, while in c.13 he has a grown warrior son. Removing Jonathan from the redactional layer that inserted the rejection account would also solve this problem.

I submit that Jonathan was inserted into this text by the Dtr. It has been suggested that Jonathan is a pro-Davidic figure in the Saul-David narrative.<sup>339</sup> The Saul and David

---

<sup>337</sup> MILLER, *Saul's Rise to Power: Some Observations Concerning I Sam 9:1-10:16; 10:26-11:15 and 13:2-14:46*, 161.

<sup>338</sup> Reference Appendix A.

<sup>339</sup> DIETRICH, *Saul's Rise to Power: Some Observations Concerning I Sam 9:1-10:16; 10:26-11:15 and 13:2-14:46*, 279.

stories were combined to legitimize David's, and subsequently Solomon's, claim to the throne, all the while maintaining that the position of king is not to be usurped.<sup>340</sup> The inclusion of Jonathan in the David/Saul account is done so that Jonathan may receive the kingdom from his father Saul and give the kingdom to his friend David. For these reasons I remove Jonathan from the oldest literary stratum, placing him on the Dtr's redactional layer.

I also removed the account of the Israelite troop movement, for it is closely connected to the character Jonathan. Removing this section also helps to clarify some confusion concerning locations within the story. Many scholars have noticed the confusion in the many locations mentioned in c.13.<sup>341</sup> When the rejection insertion is removed and the Jonathan layer removed the movements within the story become easier to follow. Michmash and Geba of Benjamin are a part of the oldest literary stratum, while Gibeath and Gilgal are redactional.

Removing Jonathan helps to answer some questions regarding c.13. In taking Jonathan out of the narrative the story suffers no real loss. It also deals with questions concerning the link with c.9-10, and the confusion surrounding the many locations stated within the narrative. The character does little more than confuse the story, taking away from the heroics of Saul and all the while confusing the Saul narrative as a whole. I propose that it is reasonable to group the mentions of Jonathan on the same redactional layer as v.1, which as demonstrated above is the work of the Dtr.<sup>342</sup>

---

<sup>340</sup> DIETRICH, *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.*, 231, 306.

<sup>341</sup> CAMPBELL, *1 Samuel*, 125. KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 138. BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 75. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, 230. CARTLEDGE, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 172-173. TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel*, 338.

<sup>342</sup> See sections 2.1 and 3.1 *Introduction to the King*.

#### 4.1.3 Northern Prophetic Message

At the center of this ancient story is an insertion; a conflict between Saul and Samuel, king and prophet. The story asserts the superiority of the prophet over the king, simply by having the prophet reject the king. Whether because Saul challenged Samuel, or because Samuel was jealous of Saul, in the end it does not matter for it is Samuel who wins, Saul is rejected. The insertion makes of Samuel a hero for the northern prophetic circles. As previously mentioned, there is a connection between Samuel and three other prominent prophets; Elijah, Elisha and Moses:<sup>343</sup>

- 1) their characterization as prophet
- 2) their direct contact with God
- 3) the role they played as the intercessor for the people
- 4) they are all northern Israelite.

Characterized as a second Moses, Samuel becomes the hero for the northern prophetic circle, and, at the same time, he is used to demonstrate the prophet's authority over the king. Samuel becomes an example for the disciples of Elijah and Elisha. The insertion serves the prophetic agenda of the north.

The northern prophetic redaction would have probably taken place before the North fell to the Assyrians. Breytenbach's has argued that the rejection was introduced into the text around the time of Hezekiah (King of Judah). Westerman and Birch believe that the form of the accusation points to a time during the periods of kings before the writing prophet.<sup>344</sup> It is believed that after the fall of Israel, northern refugees who fled

---

<sup>343</sup> BREYTENBACH, "Who Is Behind the Samuel Narrative?" 55, 53. HUMPHREYS, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: a Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel," 106.

<sup>344</sup> BIRCH, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*, 83.

to Judah brought with them their written traditions.<sup>345</sup> I suggest that the story of Saul and his conflict with Samuel would have been among these northern documents that were brought to the south.

Besides vv.7-15 there is another mention of Gilgal, which belongs to the same redactional layer as the prophetic rejection of the king. This is found in v.4d where ‘the people were summoned behind Saul to Gilgal.’ It may seem awkward to simply remove the clause which mentions Gilgal since the grammatical construction presents the action in this clause as occurring simultaneously with the action in the following clause, v.5a. On the other hand, when v.4c is directly connected to v.5a, it continues a Waw-X-Qatal chain indicating bg information.

(v.4c) Indeed, Israel had made themselves odious to the Philistines; (Waw-X-Qatal)

(remove v.4d)

(v.5a) And the Philistines had assembled to wage war with Israel (Waw-X-Qatal)

Therefore, syntactically it is possible to join v.4c to v.5a.

The insertion of the rejection of King Saul, traced back to northern prophetic circles around the time of Hezekiah, clarifies the motives behind the rejection in c.13. Samuel is placed in the company of Moses, a legendary northern figure, to build Samuel into a hero for the disciples of Elijah and Elisha. This northern prophetic connection helps in clarifying the nature of the text as well as the fault of Saul. Before I conclude, I will briefly explain what the connection between 1 Samuel 10:8 and 13:8 has to offer in the interpretation of Saul’s fault.

---

<sup>345</sup> DIETRICH, *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.*, 309.

#### 4.1.4 Saul Cycle and the Prophetic Record

It has been suggested that this narrative is part of a larger cycle, or record. Here I will revisit questions concerning the oldest literary stratum and a larger narrative of Saulide stories, sometimes referred to as the ‘Saul Cycle.’ Then I will question the exclusion of c.13 from Campbell’s Prophetic Record, in favor of the second rejection narrative in c.15. Additionally, I will show that the inclusion of c.13 is the work of the redactor of the larger narrative.

Dietrich argues in favor of an ancient Saul Cycle, or a Saul/Samuel novella.<sup>346</sup> One of these stories is 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16, Saul’s anointing by a seer<sup>347</sup> and the second is 1 Samuel 1, which began as Saul’s birth narrative but is now Samuel’s birth narrative.<sup>348</sup> Interestingly it is the mention of the Prophet Samuel that links these stories together. In my view, the Saul stories (or traditions) were first brought together by a northern prophetic redactor. Prior to this, these stories existed independently.

A problem also exists in placing this rejection (1 Samuel 13:7-15) amidst the Prophetic Record, for Campbell excludes c.13 from his theory in favor of c.15. Although c.13 would come from the same prophetic circles, it is the rejection of c.15 that is connected to the commissioning in 9:1-10:16.<sup>349</sup> The argument is that because c.13 is about Jonathan and not Saul, it has no consequence to the Prophetic Record.<sup>350</sup> In the previous chapters, I argued that the narrative of c.15 builds on and even fills in the blanks of c.13, therefore arguing a later date for c.15 than for c.13. I also have explained why

---

<sup>346</sup> DIETRICH, *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.*, 273.

<sup>347</sup> DIETRICH, *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.*, 269.

<sup>348</sup> DIETRICH, *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.*, 254, 272. Also see M. F. DION, *À l’origine du concept d’élection divine* (Montréal/Paris : Médiaspaul, 2006), 63-116.

<sup>349</sup> CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and King: A Late Ninth-Century Document*, 53.

<sup>350</sup> CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and King: A Late Ninth-Century Document*, 127.

the mention of Jonathan should be removed from the oldest literary stratum. The hero of the attack on the Philistine, before the work of the redactor, is Saul. Although it is not the purpose of this thesis to argue for the existence of a Prophetic Record, I would nonetheless like to present Campbell's Prophetic Record themes in connection to c.13.

The setting of the Prophetic Record is among the disciples of Elisha and is intended, to show the prophet's role in the designation and rejection of kings.<sup>351</sup> It is quite possible that the Prophetic Record came into being over a period of time.<sup>352</sup> The central focus of the Prophetic Record is;

- 1) Action of the prophet as Yahweh's instrument
- 2) To establish Israel's institutions and monitor their performance
- 3) Ensure fidelity and obedience to Yahweh are not eroded.<sup>353</sup>

Campbell states: "Ultimately the prophetic record is a statement about YHWH and Israel. Yahweh revealed himself to Israel through the prophetic word" and it was this prophetic word that guided the establishment of the institution of kings.<sup>354</sup> I propose that these are the themes that brought together 1 Samuel 9:1-10:16 and c.13, and are responsible for the rejection pericope in c. 13. No matter who joined the stories of chs.9-10 and c.13, it is this connection that answers the question of Saul's fault. It may be that there never existed a chronological collection of narratives with Saul as their hero. It is clear, however, that Samuel is the character who unites these stories. Although Campbell does not include c.13 in the Prophetic Record, the narrative corresponds to its themes and goals and its connection to chs.9-10 are more obvious and direct than c.15.

---

<sup>351</sup> CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and King: A Late Ninth-Century Document*, 106, 109.

<sup>352</sup> CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and King: A Late Ninth-Century Document*, 108.

<sup>353</sup> CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and King: A Late Ninth-Century Document*, 104.

<sup>354</sup> CAMPBELL, *Of Prophets and King: A Late Ninth-Century Document*, 110.

## Conclusion: The Question of Saul's Fault

This thesis was primarily concerned with Saul's fault in c.13. An overview of the literature on the subject shows that scholars do not agree on why Saul was rejected and neither do they agree on the interpretation of v.13-14: "A man after [God's] on heart." The contribution of this thesis to research is twofold. First Saul's rejection in c.13 is examined in and of itself without referring to c.15. Secondly, I have used a Macro-Syntactical Analysis that provided a different translation and helped with the source and redaction criticism as well as for the interpretation of the text.

In this thesis, I have shown that the story of Saul's rejection by Samuel is best understood as redacted by a northern prophetic circle who opposed the monarchical institution:

- The character of Saul functions as a model of all that was wrong with northern kings,<sup>355</sup>
- It asserts the superiority of the prophet,
- The prophet has direct communication with the Divine,<sup>356</sup>
- The texts show a power struggle between Israel's two forms of leadership.<sup>357</sup>

When the story is understood in the light of this prophetic agenda and when connected with 1 Samuel 10:8, the multiplicity of theories that exist can be brought together and the nature of Saul's fault becomes clear. Questions concerning whether a king could offer a sacrifice become unimportant. Also, the shadow cast over Saul's heroism by his son disappears when Jonathan is removed from the pre-Dtr text. The fault

---

<sup>355</sup> HUMPHREYS, "The Rise and Fall of King Saul: A Study of an Ancient Narrative Stratum in 1 Samuel," 75. GREEN, *King Saul's Asking*, 47.

<sup>356</sup> CZOVEK, *Three Seasons of Charismatic Leadership: A Literary-Critical and Theological Interpretation of the Narrative of Saul, David and Solomon*, 49.

<sup>357</sup> CAMPBELL, *1 Samuel*, 128.

of the king is his refusal to listen to and to obey the prophet. No matter how late Samuel was, Saul should have done what Yahweh commanded, through the prophet, and waited. “The man according to his (God’s) heart” is whoever follows the command of God, which is given through the prophet.

A Macro-Syntactical Analysis has provided us with a reading that creates far fewer problems than originally thought. By considering the motives and world views of the author and/or redactor it becomes clear that the characters of both Saul and Samuel stand for more than just two individuals and represent the groups with whom they share their title, whether of Prophet or King.

The thesis has also provided new venues of thought concerning primarily the interpretation of “a man after [God’s] own heart.” Further research, however, would be needed to explore this further. The text seems to suggest that in God’s eyes, Israel’s political regime is theologically unimportant. As long as the state leader, whether he be a king (monarchic period), a prophets or a priest (post-exilic period), is ‘a man after [God’s] own heart.’ The book of I Samuel demonstrates this by the stories of Eli’s son (priests), Samuel’s sons (prophets), and now the rejection of King Saul. All of these stories are connected, however, by the mention of Samuel the prophet. He replaces Eli’s sons. He rejects his own sons. He chooses and rejects the king. How these stories are connected to the prophetic agenda needs to be explored further.

Appendix A: The Sources of 1 Samuel 13:1-23

Oldest Literary Stratum	Pre-Dtr Prophetic Agenda	Dtr
<p>(v.2) Saul selected for himself 3000 out of Israel</p> <p>and the remaining people he [Saul] had sent away each man to his tent. [Saul] struck the garrison of the Philistines which was in Geba, and the Philistines heard that Saul had blown the horn saying: “Let the Hebrews hear.”</p> <p>(v.4) And all Israel had heard saying: “Saul struck a garrison of the Philistines.” Indeed, Israel had made themselves odious to the Philistines</p> <p>(v.5) While the Philistines assembled to wage war with Israel; three thousand chariots and six thousand horseman and the people were like the sand on the seashore in the multitude. They [the Philistines] went up and camped in Michmash, East of Bethaven.</p> <p>(v.6) [Each] man of Israel saw that he was in distress, because the people were hard pressed, so the people hid themselves in caves and hollows and in cliffs and in burial chambers and in cisterns.</p>	<p>the people were summoned behind Saul to Gilgal.</p> <p>(v.7) while the Hebrews crossed the Jordan, the land of Gad and Gilead. Saul was still in Gilgal, and all the people trembled behind him. (v.8) He waited seven days for the appointed time because of Samuel, but Samuel did not come [to] Gilgal, and so the people scattered from him (Saul). (v.9) Then Saul said: “Bring me the burnt offering and the sacrifices.” He offered the sacrifice. (v.10) As soon as the</p>	<p>(v.1) Saul, a year old, was made king; and for 2 years he ruled over Israel.</p> <p>with Saul were 2000 in Michmash and in the mountain of Bethel while a thousand were with Jonathan at Gibeath Benjamin</p> <p>(v.3) Jonathan</p>

<p>Saul mustered the people, those who were found with him, around 600 men. (v.16) Saul and the people found with them, those residing in Geba Benjamin, while the Philistines encamped in Mishmash.</p> <p>(v.17) The raiders went out from the camp of the Philistines in 3 companies; one company turned to the road to Ophrah to the land of Shual, (v.18) one other company turned to the road to Beth-Horon, and one company turned to the road to the boundary territory looking down on the valley of Zebboim [towards] the wilderness. (v.19) There was no craftsman to be found, because the inhabitants of Philistia had</p>	<p>burnt offering was completed, Behold Samuel arrived, so Saul went out to meet him to bless him.</p> <p>(v.11) Samuel said: “What did you do?”</p> <p>Saul said: “Because I saw that the people were scattering from me, and YOU, you had not come in [the] appointed days, all the while the Philistines were gathering [at] Michmash.” (v.12) “so I said: Now the Philistines will come down to me in Gilgal. And I had not entreated the favor of Yahweh. I restrained myself and offered up the burnt offering.”</p> <p>(v.13) And Samuel said to Saul: “You are foolish. You did not keep the commandments of Yahweh your God which he had commanded you. For then he would set up your kingdom on Israel forever” (v.14) “Now your kingdom will not rise. Yahweh seeks for himself a man according to his heart, Yahweh commands him as a leader over his people, but you did not listen to what Yahweh had commanded you.”</p> <p>(v.15a) Samuel got up and went up from Gilgal to Gibeath of Benjamin.</p>	<p>and Jonathan, his son,</p>
---	--	-------------------------------

<p>said: “Lest the Hebrews make a sword or a spear.” (v.20) So all of Israel would go down to the Philistines, [Each] man to sharpen his plowshare and his axe blade and his axe and his plowshare. (v.21) The sharpening was two third a shekel for the plowshares and three to sharpen the axes and to have the iron tip fixed. (v.22) [So] when the day of the battle had come he could not find a sword or a spear in the hand of any of the people, that were with Saul</p> <p>With Saul it [swords] was to be found. (v.23) He went out to the garrison of the Philistines, passing Michmash.</p>		<p>and Jonathan.</p> <p>and Jonathan, his son,</p>
---	--	--

## Bibliography

- ACKERMAN, James S., "Who Can Stand before YHWH, This Holy God? A Reading of 1 Samuel 1-15." *Prooftexts* 11(1991): 1-24.
- ACKROYD, Peter R., *The First Book of Samuel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- BIRCH, Bruce C., *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.
- BRETTLER, Marc Z., "Biblical Literature as Politics: The Case of Samuel." In *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*, edited by Adele Berlin,. Bethesda, MD: University of Maryland Press, 1996, 71-92.
- BREYTENBACH, Andries. "Who Is Behind the Samuel Narrative?." In *Past, Present Future: The Deuteronomistic History of the Prophets*, edited by Johannes Cornelis deMoor and H.F. Van Rooy, Leiden: Brill, 2000. 50-61.
- BODNER, Keith., *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2008.
- BROWN, Francis, *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew-English Lexicon*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publisher, 1979.
- BUSS, Martin J., *Biblical Form Criticism in its Context*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- CAMPBELL, Antony F., *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986.
- CAMPBELL, Anthony F., *1 Samuel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- CARTLEDGE, Tony W., *1 and 2 Samuel*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2001.
- CZOVEK, Tamas, *Three Seasons of Charismatic Leadership: A Literary-Critical and Theological Interpretation of the Narrative of Saul, David and Solomon*. Oxford, U.K: Regnum Books International, 2006.
- DIETRICH, Walter. *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.*, translated by Joachim Vette. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. 2007.

- DIETRICH, Walter and Thomas NAUMANN, "The David-Saul Narrative." In *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*, edited by Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000, 276-318.
- DION, Marie-France, *À l'origine du concept d'élection divine*. Montréal/Paris: Médiaspaul, 2006.
- DION, Marie-France, "The Voice of the People and the Story of King Saul". *Society of Biblical Literature International Congress*. Auckland: New Zealand, 2008.
- DRIVER, S. R. , *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- EDELMAN, D. V., *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- FORESTI, Fabrizio, *The Rejection of Saul in the Perspective of the Deuteronomistic School*. Rome: Edizioni del Teresianum, 1984.
- FOKKELMAN, Jan P., "Saul and David: Crossed Fates." *Bible Review* 5.3 (1989): 20-32.
- FRANKE, John R., *Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1-2 Samuel*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- FRIEDMAN, Richard Elliott, "The Recession of Biblical Source Criticism" in *The Future of Biblical Studies: The Hebrew Scriptures*, edited by Richard Elliott Friedman and Hugh Godfrey Maturin Williamson, Atlanta; Scholars Press, 1987, 81-101.
- GEORGE, Mark K., "Yhwh's Own Heart," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64 (2002): 442-459.
- GILLINGHAM, S.E., *One Bible Many Voices: Different Approaches to Biblical Studies*, Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- GOOD, Edwin M., *Irony in the Old Testament*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1981.
- GREEN, Barbara, *King Saul's Asking*. Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- GUNN, David M., *The Fate of King Saul*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press (JOSTSup. 14), 1980.
- HANDY, Lowell K., "The Characters of Heirs Apparent in the Book of Samuel." *Biblical Research* 38 (1993): 5-22.

- HAYES, J.H. and C.R. Holladay, *Exegesis: A Beginner's Handbook*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.
- HAYES, Stephen R. and Steven L. MCKENZIE (eds), *To Each its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and their Application*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.
- HERTZBERG, Hans Wilhelm, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.
- HUMPHREYS, W. Lee, "The Tragedy of King Saul: A Study of the Structure of 1 Samuel 9-31." *JSOT* 6 (1978): 18-27.
- HUMPHREYS, W. Lee., "The Rise and Fall of King Saul: A Study of an Ancient Narrative Stratum in 1 Samuel", *JSOT* 18 (1980): 74-90.
- HUMPHREYS, W. Lee, "From Tragic Hero to Villain: A Study of the Figure of Saul and the Development of 1 Samuel." *JSOT* 22 (1982): 95-117.
- JOBLING, David, "Saul's Fall and Jonathan's Rise: Tradition and Redaction in 1 Sam 14:1-46." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95.3 (1976): 367-376.
- JOBLING, David, *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Three Structural Analyses in the Old Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1978.
- JOBLING, David, *First Samuel*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- JOÜON, P., *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*. Rome : Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1987
- KLEIN, Ralph W., *1 Samuel*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1983.
- KNOPPERS, Gary N., *Two Nations under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies, V 2: The Reign of Jeroboam, the Fall of Israel, and the Reign of Josiah*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- LONG, V. Philips., "How Did Saul Become King?: Literary Reading and Historical Reconstruction." *Faith, Tradition, and History: Old Testament Historiography in Its Near Eastern Context*, edited by A.R. Millard, J.K. Hoffmeier and D.W. Baker, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994, 271-284.
- MALY, Eugene H., *World of David and Solomon*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- MARTIN, John A., "The Structure of 1 and 2 Samuel." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 141 (1984): 28-42.

- MCCARTER, Peter Kyle, *Textual Criticism, Recovering the Text of the Bible: Guides to Biblical Scholarship, Old Testament Series*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1986.
- MCCARTER, P Kyle, Jr., *I Samuel*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1980.
- MCKENZIE, Steven L., "Deuteronomistic History" In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary Vol. 2*, edited by David N. Freedman, New York, NY: Double Day, 1992, 160-168.
- MCKENZIE, Steven L., "The Trouble with Kingship." In *Israel Constructs its History*, edited by Albert dePury, Jean-Daniel Macchi and Thomas Romer, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000, 286-314.
- MILLER, J Maxwell, "Saul's Rise to Power: Some Observations Concerning I Sam 9:1-10:16; 10:26-11:15 and 13:2-14:46." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36.2 (1974): 157-174.
- MOBLEY, Gregory, "Glimpses of the Heroic Saul." In *Saul in Story and Tradition*, edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, 80-87. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- MOSHE, Garsiel, *The First Book of Samuel: A Literary Study of Comparative Structures, Analogies and Parallels*. Ramat Gan: Revivim, 1985.
- MURFIN, R. and S. M. RAY, *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*. Boston, MA: Bedford Books, 1997.
- NA'AMAN, Nadav, "The Pre-Deuteronomistic Story of King Saul and its Historical Significance." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54.4 (1992): 638-658.
- NICCACCI, Alviero, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press (JSOTSup. 86), 1990.
- NICHOLSON, Sarah, *Three Faces of Saul: An Intertextual Approach to Biblical Tragedy*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- NOTH, Martin, *History of Israel* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., translated by D.R. Ap-Thomas. Edinburgh: Oliver and Byod, 1966.
- PERRIN, N., *What is Redactional Criticism?* Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1969.
- POLZIN, Robert M., *Samuel and the Deuteronomist. A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History: Part Two: I Samuel*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.
- POPOVIC, Anto., "Saul's Fault in 1 Sam 13,7b-15a. Why Has the First Israelite King Fallen?" *Antonianum* 68(1993): 153-170.

- POWELL, M.A., "Scripture as Story", in *What is Narrative Criticism?: Guides to Biblical Scholarship*, edited by Dan O. Vio Jr., Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991, 1-9.
- PRATICO, Gary D., and Miles V. VAN PELT, *Basics of Biblical Hebrew*, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007.
- PRESTON, Thomas R., "The Heroism of Saul: Patterns of Meaning in the Narrative of the Early Kingship." *JSOT* 24. (1982): 27-46.
- RUDMAN, Dominic, "Why Was Saul Rejected? A Reassessment of 1 Samuel 9-15." *Scripture Bulletin* 31(2001): 101-107.
- SCHEFFLER, Eben, "Saving Saul from the Deuteronomist." In *Past, Present Future: The Deuteronomistic History of the Prophets*, edited by Johannes Cornelis deMoor and H.F. Van Rooy, Leiden: Brill, 2000, 263-271.
- SOULEN, Richard N., and R. Kendall SOULEN, *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Louisville, KY/London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- STECK, Odil Hannes, *Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to Methodology*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- TOV, Emanuel, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1992.
- TSUMURA, David Toshio, *The First Book of Samuel*. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007.
- VAN SETERS, John. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983.
- WALTKE, Bruce K., "Textual Criticism of the Old Testament and its Relation to Exegesis and Theology" In *A Guide to Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, edited by Willem A. VanGemeren, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House. 1997, 48-64.
- WALTKE, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- WESTERMAN, Claus, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, translated by High C. White. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.

WÜRTHWEIN, Ernest, *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., translated by Erroll F.Rhodes. Grand Rapids, MI: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.

(CONSULTED BUT NOT CITED)

- AMIT, Yairah, "The Delicate Balance in the Image of Saul and Its Place in the Deuteronomistic History." In *Saul in Story and Tradition*, edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006, 71-79.
- BARNES, Ian, *The Historical Atlas of the Bible: the Fascinating History of the Scriptures*. London: Cartographica Press, 2006.
- BRETTLER, Marc Z., "Biblical Literature as Politics: The Case of Samuel." *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*, edited by Adele Berlin, Bethesda, MD: University of Maryland Press, 1996, 71-92.
- BROWN, Raymond E., Joseph A. FITZMYER and Roland E. MURPHY eds. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1968.
- CAMPBELL, Anthony F., and Mark A. O'BRIEN, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2000.
- Cazeaux, Jacques, *Saul, David, Solomon: La royauté et le destin d'Israël*. Paris: Cerf, 2003.
- COHEN, Kenneth I., "King Saul: A Bungler from the Beginning." *Bible Review* 10.5 (1994): 34-39, 56.
- COOK, Stephen L., "The Text and Philology of 1 Samuel xiii 20-1." *Vetus Testamentum* 44 (1994): 250-254.
- CORTESE, Enzo, and Silas MUSHOLT. *Deuteronomistic Work*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1999.
- CROY, Clayton. *A Primer of Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999.
- CULPEPPER, R. Alan. "Narrative Criticism as a Tool for Proclamation: 1 Samuel 13." *Review & Expositor* 84 (1987): 33-40.
- DICK, Michael B., "The 'History of David's Rise to Power' and the Neo-Babylonian Succession Apologies." *David and Zion: Biblical Studies in Honor of J.J.M. Roberts Bernard F. Batto*, edited by Bernard F. Batto and Kathryn L. Roberts, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004, 3-19.

- DIETRICH, Walter. "History and Law: Deuteronomistic Historiography and Deuteronomic Law Exemplified in the Passage from the Period of the Judges to the Monarchical Period." In *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*, edited by A. dePury, T. Romer and J-D. Macchi, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000, 315-342.
- DRAGGA, Sam., "In the Shadow of the Judges: The Failure of Saul." *JSOT* 38 (1987): 39-46.
- EPSTEIN, Marc Michael, "Seeing Saul." In *Saul in Story and Tradition*, edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006, 334-345.
- FAUST, Avraham, "Settlement Patterns and State Formation in Southern Samaria and the Archaeology of (a) Saul." In *Saul in Story and Tradition*, edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006, 14-38.
- FINKELSTEIN, Israel, "The Emergence of the Monarchy in Israel: The Environmental and Socio-economic Aspects." *JSOT* 44 (1989): 43-74.
- FORESTI, Fabrizio, *The Rejection of Saul in the Perspective of the Deuteronomistic School*. Rome: Edizioni del Teresianum, 1984.
- FRETHEIM, Terence E., "Divine Foreknowledge, Divine Constancy, and the Rejection of Saul's Kingship." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985): 595-602.
- GEORGE, Mark K., "Yhwh's Own Heart." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64 (2002): 442-459.
- GREEN, Barbara, *How the Mighty Are Fallen? A Dialogical Study of King Saul in 1 Samuel*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- GREEN, Adam, *King Saul: The True History of the First Messiah*. Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2007.
- IGNATIUS, Peter, "1 Sam 9,1-10,16: Have the Davidic Propagandists Capitalized on the Folktales about Saul to Enhance the Image of David?" *Bible Bhashyam* 28 (2002): 632-655.
- JOBLING, David, "What, if Anything, is 1 Samuel?" *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* vol.7 no.1 (1993): 17-31.
- KELLEY, Page H., *Biblical Hebrew: An Introductory Grammar*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992.

- KEOWN, Gerald L., "Prophecy in 1 and 2 Samuel". *Review & Expositor*, 99 (2002), 175-184.
- KREUZER, Siegfried, "Saul -Not Always- at War: A New Perspective on the Rise of Kingship in Israel." In *Saul in Story and Tradition*, edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006, 39-58.
- LISS, Hanna, "The Innocent King: Saul in Rabbinic Exegesis." In *Saul in Story and Tradition*, edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006, 245-260.
- LONG, Philip V., "Scenic, Succinct, Subtle: An Introduction to the Literary Artistry of 1&2 Samuel." *Presbyterian* 19/1 (1993): 32-47.
- LONG, Philips V., *The Reign And Rejection of King Saul: A Case for Literary And Theological Coherence*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- MARTIN, John A., "The Literary Quality of 1 and 2 Samuel." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 141(1984): 131-145.
- MAYES, Andrew, "Deuteronomistic Ideology and the Theology of the Old Testament." In *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*, edited by Albert dePury, Jean-Daniel Macchi and Thomas Romer, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000, 456-480.
- MCKENZIE, Steven L., "Saul in the Deuteronomistic History." In *Saul in Story and Tradition*, edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006, 59-70.
- REISS, Moshe, "Samuel and Saul: A Negative Symbiosis." *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 32.1 (2004): 35-43.
- ROBINSON, Gnana, *Let Us Be Like the Nations: A Commentary on the Books of 1 And 2 Samuel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- SANFORD, John A., *King Saul, the Tragic Hero: A Study in Individuation*, New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1985.
- SMITH, Henry Preserved, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1899.
- TUCKER, Gene M., *Form Criticism of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- WALTERS, Stanley D. "Saul of Gibeon". *JSOT* 52 (1991), 61-76.
- WHITE, Marsha, "Searching for Saul." *Bible Review* 17.2 (2001): 22-27.