The Downfall of Saul: A Study on 1 Samuel 15:1-16:13 & 28:3-25

Andrew Brockman

School of Religious Studies

Faculty of Arts

McGill University, Montreal

May 2022

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of PhD in Religious Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This dissertation argues for the textual unity of 1 Samuel 15:1-16:13 & 28:3-25. I claim the source division of 1 Samuel has been mischaracterized within scholarship. I contend that this has caused disparity amongst scholars about the strength of the theory of the Deuteronomistic History. I demonstrate a unity of style between the three pericopes through source-critical methods, additionally, I show a clear and logical progression between the events of the three pericopes in a way that clearly illustrates that they belong to the same narrative. I argue that no other pericopes in 1 Samuel satisfactorily meet the conditions for shared authorship with this narrative. Once the text's unity is demonstrated, I examine it from a literary perspective. Through this I argue that the text is an intentional reframing of the established narrative features of the rejection and death of Saul and the introduction of David. This is meant to provide a countercultural polemic against the characteristic deuteronomistic portrayal of the history of early kingship. This polemic was written by a prophetic author who emphasizes the prophetic role in kingship to a higher degree than elsewhere in 1 Samuel. Lastly, I engage with the one other critical examination of these three pericopes done by John Van Seters: who has a different interpretation of the text than I do. After covering his arguments, I contend that he does not interpret the intention of the author correctly, and thus his understanding of the text is misguided.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette thèse défend l'unité textuelle de 1 Samuel 15:1-16:13 & 28:3-25. Je soutiens que la division des sources de 1 Samuel a été mal caractérisée par les chercheurs. Je prétends que cette mauvaise caractérisation a causé une disparité parmi les chercheurs sur la force de la théorie de l'Historiographie Deutéronomiste. En utilisant des méthodes d'analyses critiques des sources je démontre une unité de style entre les trois péricopes. De plus, je montre une progression claire et logique entre les événements des trois péricopes d'une manière qui illustre clairement qu'elles appartiennent au même récit. Je soutiens qu'aucune autre péricope dans 1 Samuel ne remplit de manière satisfaisante les conditions d'une rédaction partagée avec ce récit. Une fois l'unité du texte démontrée, je procède à son examen d'un point de vue littéraire. Par ce biais, je soutiens que le texte est un recadrage intentionnel des aspects narratives qui cherche à établir le rejet et la mort de Saül et l'introduction de David qui sont destiné à fournir une polémique contre-culturelle en opposition à la représentation qui caractérise le récit du Deutéronomiste vis-à-vis les premiers rois. Cette polémique a été écrite par un auteur prophétique qui souligne le rôle prophétique dans le domaine de la royauté à un degré plus élevé qu'ailleurs dans 1 Samuel. Finalement, j'examine le seul autre analyse critique de ces trois péricopes, réalisé par John Van Seters, qui a une interprétation du texte différente de la mienne. Après avoir couvert ses arguments, je soutiens qu'il n'interprète pas correctement l'intention de l'auteur, et que sa compréhension du texte est donc erronée.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The road I took to completing this dissertation was a long and difficult one, and I have many people to thank for helping me to reach this point. First and foremost, thank you to my supervisor, Dr. Patricia G. Kirkpatrick for the years of guidance, and molding me into the scholar I am today. The idea for this dissertation came from a paper in one of her classes in my first year of doctoral studies, and ever since she has been a mighty boon in my research. Additionally, I wish to thank my fellow doctoral candidate, Amanda Rosini, for proof-reading the French translation of my abstract, and for being a friend and colleague that I could always discuss my ideas with and helped motivate me onwards when I was in the doldrums of research. Thank you to Ben Schell for his diligent editing help. As well, thank you to the many scholars who helped spark my passion for biblical studies along the years including Drs. Daniel Driver and Keith Bodner.

Thank you to the School of Religious Studies for being my academic home since I started my graduate studies in 2014 and for accepting me back to their doctoral program. I am the scholar I am today because I had the opportunity to study in your historic halls. Thank you as well for those who supported me financially over the past six years including the School of Religious Studies at McGill University and John H. McCall MacBain.

Finally, and most seriously, thank you to my wife, Katelyn, and daughter, Mackenzie, for being my support, my muse, and my motivation. Thank you, Katelyn, for allowing me the time to invest in this project while you worked hard to support our family.

INTRODUCTION

Though it was identified and named by Martin Noth in 1943, the composition of the Deuteronomistic History[1] has never been fully understood by scholars. Compared to the Pentateuch, sources that the Historian used are much less clear. The predominant view is that with the books of Samuel, there were two great works adopted by Dtr and can be found in their near entirety: The History of David's Rise[2] (1 Samuel 16-2, Samuel 5) and the Succession Narrative (2 Samuel 9-20, 1 Kings 1-2). However, this does not include the totality of the books of Samuel. Notably, the beginning of the reign of Saul is entirely excluded. Some scholars speak generally of a "Saul cycle", which includes several narrative reconstructions of the start of Saul's reign. There has been very little agreement in this regard.[3] This lack of consensus is caused by the narrative's fragmentary nature. The Historian appears to have incorporated a series of unrelated material together.[4] However, most agree that these fragments were incorporated by the compiler/author of DtrH, and thus the final stage of composition rests with them.

Between the fragments of the Saul cycle and the relative unity of the HDR—there is a short section that has perplexed scholars for decades. Beginning in chapter 15, Saul's rejection is restated, which retreads much of the original material from chapter 13. This, more confusingly, is

[1] The problem of labels with the Deuteronomistic History comes up regularly in works that reference it. To be very clear, henceforth the Deuteronomistic History refers to the entire block of text from Joshua to 2 Kings, and the short form DtrH will be used to identify it. The author of this block, the Deuteronomist—also called the Deuteronomistic Historian, or alternatively "the Historian"—will be referred to as Dtr. Meanwhile, the biblical book will be referred to by its name whereas the Pentateuchal source will be referred to as D.

[2] Henceforth HDR.

[3] See Walter Dietrich, "Israelite State Formation and Early Monarchy in History and Biblical Historiography," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Historical Books of the Hebrew Bible* (2020). Also, for a discussion of the non-narrative sources behind the text, see Richard D Nelson, "Historiography and History Writing in the Ancient World," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Historical Books of the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Brad E. Kelle and Brent A. Strawn (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), 12-17.

[4] For a general overview, see Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: a Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction* (London; New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 91-97.

followed by the first introduction to the character of David, which turns out to be one of three introductions to him.[5] Most of the work on these pericopes has been confined to discussing its relationship with the following HDR. The current position is that these two pericopes belong to the "Saul cycle". This is not a viable position to hold given the textual evidence. Rather, this dissertation will argue that nearly all scholarly writing on these pericopes have mistaken them, and they belong to one narrative which finds its conclusion much later in 1 Samuel.

Near the end of 1 Samuel, there is an esoteric tale about Saul visiting a medium to contact Samuel; the now-dead prophet. The ritual is successful, and Samuel condemns Saul to death before informing him that his successor will be his enemy, David. The pericope interrupts the narrative and has no connections to any stories surrounding it. This dissertation argues that this scene serves as the conclusion to chapters 15 and 16. This tale covers the inauspicious end to the reign of the first Israelite king, which I give the eponymous name: "The Downfall of Saul". However, this was not one of the sources used by Dtr. It was written after the fact as a polemic against DtrH. This argument is based on the work done by John Van Seters in identifying the unity between these three pericopes, though this interpretation differs from Van Seters'.

The first chapter will cover the history of scholarship on DtrH, the book of 1 Samuel, and more narrowly on the three chapters covered in this dissertation. Not much has been written on these pericopes, so much will be made of the growth of DtrH as a theory and the subsequent dismantling of the consensus in recent decades. Consequently, it will identify and discuss the development of two alternative interpretations of DtrH, one of which originated in Germany and the other in the United States. There is no uniform position on DtrH in recent years, so no scholars from the three primary positions have identified the unity between chapters 15, 16, and

[5] 1 Sam. 16:1-13, 16:14-23, 17:1-58.

28. Finally, it will discuss the scholarship of John Van Seters, how he represents a fourth perspective on DtrH, and briefly cover where the field rests now.

The second chapter will cover a source-critical analysis of chapters 15, 16, and 28. Careful attention will be paid to the structure of the text and the narrative artistry that can be found within the dialogue of the prophet Samuel. A unity of style will be demonstrated throughout the pericopes. In conjunction, all potential connections with the material from outside these three pericopes will be analysed to determine if other material should be seen as belonging to these texts. Two questions will be asked and answered. First, were these pericopes written by the same person? Second, was anything else within 1 Samuel also written by them? It will be demonstrated that chapters 15, 16, and 28 are the only ones that belong to this text within the book of Samuel. Additionally, it will be determined that the author was undoubtedly aware of the narratives about Saul and is intentionally commenting on them.

The third chapter will then analyze The Downfall of Saul's themes and messages to determine what the narrative is saying about its material and what it is saying about the surrounding Saul cycle. By analysing the thematic terms and dialogue the text's meaning will be revealed. Additionally, when read correctly a clear and unified text is uncovered that deftly incorporates its themes, characterization and, a plot to speak one message, with one voice. This message is consistent throughout all three pericopes. A careful literary analysis also serves as source analysis and reiterate the discoveries from the previous chapter.

The final chapter will discuss the work of John Van Seters on this text. Van Seters has written much on DtrH in his career and these chapters specifically. What he has written on these chapters has been secondary to his books' purposes. Therefore, while he is the only scholar to identify the unity behind these texts correctly—his interpretation still differs from mine. The

final chapter will analyze all he has written on these texts and their context to determine from where his interpretations stem. I will compare this interpretation to the analysis done in this dissertation. This will show that his understanding is based on several small, but key, misinterpretations. This has compounded into misconstruing the text as a parody erroneously. Finally, The Downfall of Saul will be retold one final time with the totality of the information uncovered included to give a concise but consistent interpretation of the story.

The discovery of a clearly unified narrative, untouched by the deuteronomistic editor, shapes how the origins of biblical historiography have been understood in scholarship. Rather than viewing the deuteronomistic redaction and authorship as the final stage of development; it should be understood as a significant, but at-best penultimate stage of authorship.

CHAPTER 1: THE DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY IN SCHOLARSHIP

It has been nearly a century since M. Noth first published his ideas on DtrH and still there is no scholarly consensus concerning its authorship or provenance.[6] J.G. Eichhorn said of the literature of ancient Israel: "Aber welches Volk wäre auch in so hohem Grad originell...oder welche Nationen, nicht bloß der neuern, sondern selbst der åltesten Zeiten, konnten sich rühmen, daß sie alles burch sid, selbst geworden? daß ihre Sitten und Religion von fremdem Einfluß immer fren geblieben, und ihr Geist nie durch eingewanderte Begriffe genáhrt und erwei ert worden wäre?"[7] Though he was speaking of the Hebrew text itself, his words equally apply to the field of biblical studies. Though there are seminal and foundational texts, it would be a mistake to believe that they are never "eingewanderte Begriffe genáhrt und erwei ert worden wäre."[8] These imports are not the cultural ideas and practices of large nations, rather, works and theories from both older and contemporary scholars. Any accurate survey of literature must account for this slow growth of new ideas because evolution does not happen due to the exceptional work of one scholar—instead—it happens due to the small and consistent progression through hundreds of publications. This survey will therefore attempt to acknowledge the vast background behind what led to advancements in the study of the Former Prophets.

---

[6] All reference to the books of Joshua to 2 Kings, either as a unit or individually, will be done with the title "Former Prophets." However, during the discussion of Martin Noth, this title will be dropped in favour of "Deuteronomistic History," except when inappropriate.

[7] "But, which people would be so highly original, or which nation, not only of modern times but also of the oldest, could boast that they became themselves breaking through everything? That their morals and religion have always been kept free from foreign influences, and their spirit has never been fed and expanded by imported ideas?" Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Weidmanns, 1803), 4-5. Translation mine.

[8] Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 5.

1.1. Wellhausen – Weiser

In his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels,* Julius Wellhausen identified only two discrete strands of narrative in the book of Samuel: one pro- and one anti-monarchy. He posited that the more ancient source favoured the monarchy and was penned during the Judahite kingship.[9] The later source was more in line with deuteronomistic ideals and was critical of the monarchy. It was considered by Wellhausen to have no historical value.[10] These narratives were originally independent yet have been preserved together by a deuteronomistic redactor.[11] Saul is elected to kingship in the older of these two narratives because *yhwh* selects him.[12] *yhwh* anoints Saul in response to the seeming good-faith cry of the people. Saul's election in the narrative is confirmed to him and the reader by signs and Samuel. The latter account describes the kingship of Israel as coming about through the people's demands, of which Samuel remains starkly against. Yet, *yhwh* acquiesces even though he accuses the people of rebellion and rejection of his desires.

The relationship of chapters 15 and 28 to these two narratives is not easily determined. Wellhausen explicitly identified these chapters as older than the duplicate scene at Gilgal in 1 Samuel 13:7-15.[13] Saul's rejection at Gilgal was artificially inserted into the text, as noted by inconsistencies in the position of Saul's army in the countryside.[14] Wellhausen charged that Saul's first recorded rejection at Gilgal in chapter 13:7-15 is a piece of the later narrative and is placed unnaturally early in the story to emphasize Saul's failure as king so early in his reign. Dtr argues that the kingship of Israel is a step in their backsliding from the commands of *yhwh.*

---

[9] Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 6 ed., De Gruyter Studienbuch, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2001), 223-24.
[10] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 245.
[11] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 244.
[12] 1 Sam. 9:16.
[13] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 255.
[14] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 254.

The older narrative does not report Saul's rejection with relish, but alongside Samuel's great mourning. However, chapters 15 and 28 are artificially inserted into older narratives: chapter 28 between 1 Samuel 28:2 and 29:1, and chapter 15 between 14:52 and 16:14. Wellhausen admitted the connection between 14:52 and 16:14 is less definitive, but they do connect.[15] While chapters 15 and 28 are linked together, they remain a separate narrative from the pro- and anti-monarchical stories identified by Wellhausen. Also, Wellhausen explicitly connected chapters 15 and 28, he noted that chapter 16:1-13 is still part of this story. He viewed chapter 15 as the prophetic prologue to the anointing of David in the first half of chapter 16. Likewise, chapter 28 is the prophetic description of the fall of Saul.[16] Though Wellhausen could not identify any addendum to this narrative that explicitly reports on his death. Presumably, it was either left out of the story or never written at all.

By the end of the 19th century, prevalent theories of the sources in 1-2 Samuel began to coalesce into a more straightforward and defined form. Like Heinrich Ewald before him, S.R. Driver theorized in 1891 that a considerable portion of 1-2 Samuel was written by multiple authors. However, Driver saw the development of these books as falling into two strata: original historical works contemporary to the events described within and a proto-deuteronomistic redaction and expansion to which chapter 15 belonged, amongst other sections[17]. This redactor is not the same as Deuteronomy's, nor are they[18] the redactor behind 1-2 Kings. Driver did posit that the redactor that worked on 1-2 Kings may have expanded upon chapters 7, 8 and 12 of 1 Samuel, but did not definitively make a claim either way. In this way, Driver separated 1 Samuel

[15] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 257-58.
[16] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 259.
[17] S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, New Revised ed. (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1916), 178-79.
[18] In using the plural "they" I merely mean to indicate the gender-ambiguity of the redactor, rather than implying there are multiple redactors behind the text. Similar gender-neutral language will be used for any unidentified authors of the biblical text.

15 and 16:1-13 into two different sources; the first being written after the latter. The source which he attributed 28:3-25 to is unclear. Driver noted the similarity in its style and language to chapter 15 and acknowledged that Wellhausen connected 15 and 28.[19] However, when he listed the chapters attributable to this redactor, 28 is excluded.[20] It appears that while he believed 15 and 16:1-13 to be from different authors, he remained unconvinced either way as to which source 28:3-25 belongs.

In 1890, Karl Budde set out to study the Great Book of Origins, and he noted a dual narrative running throughout the length of the entire book. When he started his investigation into the books of Samuel, he identified two likewise competing reports of Saul's inauguration to the throne. He would label these two narratives in Samuel by their respective locations of the crowning of Saul: Mispa and Gilgal.[21] Using the work of Wellhausen and Kuenen as a foundation, he identified the bounds of these two sources and then, in his evaluation of them, rejected the view which he attributed to Cornill; that M is inherently anti-royalty.[22] Nonetheless, he agreed with Cornill that The Elohist, rather than Dtr wrote M.[23] Likewise, he identified G as a part of the Yahwist, creating two long strands of narrative beginning in Genesis and ending at the end of Kings. Budde's general theory, therefore, was that E and J formed two grand narratives. Both of which were edited by a deuteronomistic redactor and then double edited by a post-exilic editor to form the final text. To Budde, chapter 15 belongs to the Elohist[24] as it does not carry any sign of deuteronomistic influence, and it could not be a part of the Yahwist. This limited his

[19] Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 181.
[20] Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 183-84.
[21] Karl Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau* (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1890), 169. Henceforth M and G.
[22] Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau*, 177-79.
[23] Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau*, 179.
[24] Budde primarily argues for chapter 15's inclusion in the Elohist; while likewise arguing against Carl Cornill, who does include the chapter with other parts of Samuel which themselves belong to E.

options significantly as Budde was working under a two-source paradigm. Budde attributed Exodus 17, the prelude to 1 Samuel 15, which shows Israel's initial conflict with Amalek to the Elohist. Budde did posit that a deuteronomistic editor combined these two strands, an idea growing in popularity at the time,[25] and well before Noth.

Though some scholars, such as Driver and Budde, sought to gain a more detailed understanding of the literary history of the books of Samuel, the scholarly world had reached a standstill, mainly being convinced by Wellhausen's dual narrative theory.[26] This did not happen suddenly and without counter-movements in response. In some cases, scholars argued that the first six books of the Hebrew Bible were one work—known as the Hexateuch.[27] Even still, scholars sometimes spoke of traces of the four sources of the Pentateuch as being found in the historical books. They did not view the entire block of six to nine books as being unified in any absolute sense. As shown above, Carl Cornill and Karl Budde argued that E and J could be found in 1 Samuel and DtrH. However, with the publishing of Wellhausen's *Prolegomena,* the presumed existence of the Pentateuchal sources within the historical books began to lose credibility.

At this time another analytical method was developing in Germany that compared the Israelite texts to works written in other Ancient Near Eastern cultures, such as Egypt, Assyria, and even Greece. The likes of Ewald and Driver drew an evolutionary line between the annals of concurrent historical writings and the more advanced tales and sagas of older, more interpretive societies. Scholars within Germany, such as Hugo Gressmann, Hermann Gunkel, and Sigmund

---

[25] Indeed, deuteronomistic influence on the Former Prophets was apparent as far back as de Wette, if not earlier. Paul B. Harvey Jr and Baruch Halpern, "W.M.L. de Wette's "Dissertatio Critica ...": Context and Translation," *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte.* 14 (2008): 60.

[26] Carl Heinrich Cornill, *Einleitung in Das Alte Testament mit Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen* (Freiburg: Akademische Verlags buchhandlung, 1896), 97. Rudolf Kittel, "Die Pentateuchischen Urkunden in den Büchern Richter und Samuel," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 65 (1892): 45.

[27] As mentioned above, Ewald's "The Great Book of Origins" was an early version of this.

Mowinckel began to doubt this paradigm. Gressmann would argue that annalistic writing and more legendary tales are, generally, mutually exclusive in Israel's contemporaries. Whereas Egypt and Assyria had annals that were more concerned with the kings' wars and building projects. Greece and Israel had fewer accounts, yet much more narrative output.[28] To label the infrequent annalistic records as the earliest texts in the Hebrew Bible, as Ewald did, was incorrect.

Gressmann's application of the influential approach of his colleague, Hermann Gunkel, into historical writings is noteworthy as it posited that a history of oral transmission preceded them. The saga is a narrative set in the distant past, including a religious framework pivotal to its heroes' lives.[29] From this point, the explanation for the rest of the material retained from Israel is an evolutionary framework beginning from this proto-literary form of storytelling. Gressmann argued that after the saga, two writing styles flourished: legend and history. Legend emphasizes the religious nature of the narrative, having the action play out alongside miracles and having the heroes nearly deified in their portrayal. On the other hand, history writing foregoes many references to the miraculous, though not the religious.[30] The final redactor combined these three genres of writing into the final product. Gressmann identified the redactor as a member of the deuteronomistic school and argued they are responsible for many of the legendary and historical narratives within the books of Samuel.[31]

In 1926 L. Rost penned his seminal work: *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids*. Rost was critical of literary-critical evaluations of the texts, arguing that previous

---

[28] Hugo Gressmann, "The Oldest History Writing in Israel," in *Narrative and Novella in Samuel: Studies by Hugo Gressmann and Other scholars: 1906-1923*, ed. David M. Gunn, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991), 12.
[29] Gressmann, "The Oldest History Writing in Israel," 14-15.
[30] Gressmann, "The Oldest History Writing in Israel," 14-15.
[31] Gressmann, "The Oldest History Writing in Israel," 20.

scholarship has ignored the role that style plays in determining and identifying the author's hand behind the text.[32] To Rost it was insufficient to purely rely on a consistent vocabulary to identify common source material. While each author may have a set vocabulary that they use most frequently, it is not unreasonable to assume that they often branch out and use unique words now and again.[33] It is nearly inconceivable for an author to alter their central moral focus or suddenly view a historical event through a different lens than they would usually. Thus, ethical approaches, themes and motifs are much more reliable to track source development than mere vocabulary choice.

By approaching the text in the above manner Rost concluded that the general agreement that scholars like Budde and Driver had arrived at, namely that the books of Samuel and Kings can be bifurcated into two sources akin to the Pentateuchal Jahwist and Elohist, was untenable. He posited that an editor, not an author, built this work, bringing together narrative units running back-to-back. Originally, these units were written independently. The conclusion of this great work was concerned with the impending succession to David's throne and finding an appropriate heir to the kingdom of Israel. Rost cited 1 Kings 1 as the principal thesis statement of this work: "And now, my lord the king, the eyes of all Israel are on you, to tell them who shall sit on the throne of my lord the king after him."[34] The editor of the larger work incorporated five narratives: The Ark Narrative, The Ammonite War Report, the Nathan Prophecy, the History of David's Rise, and the Succession Narrative.

Rost's theory that independent narratives carry a consistent style, isolated four of these units, and provided solid evidence that different authors wrote each one. Rost's approach

---

[32] Leonhard Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids*, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926), 1-2.
[33] Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids*, 1.
[34] 1 Kgs. 1:20, ESV.

generated different results than his contemporaries. Rost's delineation of The Ark Narrative, found in 1 Samuel 4-6, and 2 Samuel 6, went against others who exclude the latter chapter from the source. However, Rost argued it must be included because they share remarkably similar vocabulary, style, and theology.[35] If one were to isolate 1 Samuel 4-6 as belonging to the same work then they must acknowledge that it requires a conclusion: as chapter 6 ends with the Ark outside of Jerusalem. 2 Samuel 6 covers the returning of the Ark to Jerusalem which provides a satisfying narrative conclusion to the story.[36] Further, Rost contrasted the vocabulary and style with the narratives surrounding these chapters. He isolated 2 Samuel 6 as being starkly different from chapter 5, which according to Rost, serves as an epilogue to the long narrative of the HDR. In the context of that story ending, a sudden jump to the Ark's return to Jerusalem stands out as fragmented and disconnected from the narrative logic that has been so consistent for several chapters to that point.

Rost was, perhaps, the first scholar to posit the existence of a narrative formed by the interconnection of several smaller and older stories brought together by an editor located entirely within the Former Prophets.[37] The study of the creation of the Hebrew Bible through the lens of a redactional process would soon become one of the most critical forms of criticism in the study of the Old Testament.

At the time scholars accepted, or at minimum, appreciated Rost's conclusion. In a review of the work, H. Gressmann disagreed strongly with Rost's specific conclusions about the delineation of the sources but had to acknowledge the unique and well-crafted addition to the

---

[35] Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids*, 8 f.25.
[36] Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids*, 8.
[37] Leonhard Rost, *The Succession to the Throne of David*, Historic texts and Interpreters in Biblical Scholarship, (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1982), xxiv. Ewald's "Great Book of Origins" is similar in ways, though is mostly contained to the Pentateuchal books.

field that Rost made.[38] Gressmann, even without knowing the influence Rost would have with his book still instinctually saw the innate value of Rost's work. Otto Eissfeldt,[39] while acknowledging some novel and valuable discoveries within Rost's work, pointed out that Rost was inconsistent in what narrative units he viewed as either part of the larger work or entire literary blocks in and of themselves.[40]

In addition to his criticism of Rost's conclusions, Eissfeldt saw methodological issues with Rost's book. He criticized Rost for not engaging with the larger question of how the final text came into being, rather, for isolating his study to four self-contained narratives. Eissfeldt charged that this is problematic because limiting one's research to small-scale studies reduces one's ability to make accurate and reliable conclusions about the work as a whole.[41] Eissfeldt noted that Rost ignored the scholarly consensus of the proper source separation of the texts almost entirely in arguing for his thesis.[42] Eissfeldt argued that this decision becomes noticeable with Rost's questionable delineation of the beginnings and ends of his potential narratives.[43] Both of these issues made Rost's source division somewhat muddled and made Eissfeldt conclude that it was impossible to substantiate Rost's conclusion that the Pentateuchal sources do not continue into Samuel.[44]

In his own right Eissfeldt was greatly influenced by the works of Rudolf Smend. Like Smend, Eissfeldt argued the Pentateuchal sources stretched into Joshua to Kings and

---

[38] Hugo Gressmann, "Neue Bücher," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Nachbiblischen Judentums* 3 (1926): 310.
[39] When referencing the original German publications, Eissfeldt's name will be written as Eißfeldt.
[40] Otto Eißfeldt, "Noch einmal: Text-, Stil- und Literarkritik in den Samuelisbüchern," *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 31, no. 10 (1928): 803.
[41] Eißfeldt, "Noch einmal," 805-06.
[42] Eißfeldt, "Noch einmal," 805.
[43] Eißfeldt, "Noch einmal," 804-05.
[44] Eißfeldt, "Noch einmal," 805-06.

occasionally spoke of an Octateuch.[45] Eissfeldt was quick to point out the similarities between the sources of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and the books of Samuel and called them in both cases "parallel strands,"[46] which was a return to the theories of Eichhorn, whom he also cited. Eissfeldt first isolated the dual stories of the origins of Saul's kingship as principal markers of the concurrent narrative strands. He named 1 Samuel 7-8, 12 as characteristically Elohistic, while the rest resembled the Yahwist.[47] After this starting point Eissfeldt stated that these two stories, beginning in the Pentateuch, were once isolated stories separated and reassembled into their final form. These strands can be traced from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Samuel, at least.[48] It ought to be noted that after this initial claim two sources in Samuel can be identified as J and E. There is not much justification on why these Samuel narratives fit as a continuation of those Pentateuchal sources.

Artur Weiser published a short essay in 1936 examining the role of 1 Samuel 15 as a bridging narrative between the larger units of the story of Saul and the story of David's Rise. Weiser argued that chapter 15 was not originally written to connect to chapter 12, which he labelled as the end of the Saul Tradition, as the people take different roles and Saul's test in chapter 12 is not his failure in chapter 15. [49] Weiser hypothesized that chapter 15 is an older narrative, and it must have a different literary history than the Saul narrative.

1.2. Noth – Smend

In 1943, Martin Noth published the influential *Überlieferungsgeschichitliche Studien,* in which he argued that the formation of the books from Joshua to 2 Kings can be attributed to the

[45] Otto Eißfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament: unter Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen sowie der apokryphen- und pseudepigraphenartigen Qumrān-Schriften; Entstehungsgeschichte des Alten Testaments*, 3rd ed., Neue theologische Grundrisse, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964), 180.
[46] *Eißfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 359.*
[47] Eißfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 362.
[48] Eißfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 362-63.
[49] Artur Weiser, "I Samuel 15," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 54, no. 1-2 (1936): 1-2.

hand of an author and compiler from the deuteronomistic school. Noth would call this entire block the Deuteronomistic History. To Noth, DtrH is formed by a series of originally independent yet still interlocked and complete narratives. He noted that his identification of the books of Joshua to 2 Kings as deuteronomistic was not unique.[50] Noth was the first to truly study how Dtr used these texts and was the first to posit that the entire work, from Joshua to 2 Kings, was redacted by a single person.[51] As such, he began his study in Deuteronomy rather than in Joshua. Noth argued Deuteronomy 1-3 was not the opening to a "second law" but rather the opening to the historical overview written by Dtr.[52] This history presumes Deuteronomy as authoritative, and thus, Noth argued that the law was central to Dtr's framework and identity.[53] Dtr interpreted history through Deuteronomy, which is the introduction to the block and judged its characters by that basis. The fall of Judah, which is the climax and conclusion of the work, is caused by its inability to remain faithful to *yhwh*.[54] Noth also identified the law itself to be found in Deuteronomy 4:44-30:20.[55] He asserted that the law had not changed from its initial creation.[56]

Noth did argue DtrH was the work of a single compiler, yet Dtr did not write all the narratives. DtrH is composed of originally independent material, organized according to their chronological understanding of Israelite history.[57] There are several features common to DtrH: one being a reoccurring motif wherein a summarizing speech is put in the mouths of significant

---

[50] Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: die Sammelnden und Bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963), 3-4. As we have seen above, the practice of attributing some element of the Former Prophets to a deuteronomistic hand can be found in nearly every major scholarly work since Ewald.
[51] Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: a Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*, 23.
[52] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 13-14.
[53] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 13-14.
[54] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 86-87, 107ff.
[55] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 16.
[56] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 16-17.
[57] This aspect of Noth's theory is very reminiscent of Rost's theory of the Succession to the Throne of David.

figures after historical milestones.[58] These recapitulate the past while also anticipating the future and act as interpretive insertions to help guide the narrative.[59] Secondly, DtrH shares a common vocabulary. Noth notes that the vocabulary of the DtrH is the simplest out of itself, the Pentateuch, and Chronicles.[60] One can trace this simplistic vocabulary and style throughout the entire narrative. Lastly, and most relevant, DtrH is linked by a kerygmatic theology which Noth viewed as being a condemnation of the history of Israel's rebellious attitude towards *yhwh,* which led to the Exile. Dtr compiled and authored DtrH in the Exile, so their purpose in formulating this summation of Israelite history was to explain the significant trauma of losing their homeland while reckoning with its theological implications. To Noth this judgement was central to the entire narrative: Israel was given a special connection to *yhwh* in the Law and upon their rejection of it, they were punished by being exiled from the land given to them.[61] Noth argues one could trace these three characteristics throughout Joshua to 2 Kings.

Noth's theory on the Deuteronomistic History arguably became the groundwork for all critical analyses of Joshua to 2 Kings from 1943 onwards.[62] In some way, nearly all scholars would henceforth either corroborate Noth's argument or argue against it; whether intentionally or not. DtrH has acquired a quasi-canonical position in biblical studies.[63] This consensus was

[58] Found in Josh. 1:1-9, 12:1-6, 23:1-6, Judg. 2:11-3:6, 1 Sam. 12:1-15; 1 Kgs. 8:14-53, 2 Kgs. 17:7-23. Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: a Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*, 23.
[59] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 15.
[60] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 89.
[61] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 100ff.
[62] Though, through this survey, it should be clear that Noth's position, while influential, was not an aberration in the slightest. It was very much the product of its time. This does not diminish its impact in any way, which was pervasive at a minimum.
[63] Konrad Schmid, "The Emergence and Disappearance of the Separation between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History in Biblical Studies," in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 11.

significantly helped by the concurrent and coincidental studies that arrived at similar, but independent conclusions, namely those of Alfred Jepsen and Ivan Engnell.[64]

Jepsen analyzed the source-critical problem of the books of Kings in his *Die Quellen des Königbuches.* Though he published *Quellen* in 1953, he worked on it in the 1930s, the Second World War having delayed its publication.[65] Jepsen did mention Noth in the forward to *Quellen* but could not account for his findings in the body of his argument. Jepsen's argument was centered on the books of Kings and supported Noth so strongly that it is relevant to mention here. He identified two redactors behind the text of Kings, one which brought together a simple overview of the history until Hezekiah's reign[66] and a deuteronomistic redactor who greatly expanded this narrative.[67] This second redactor is responsible for the prophetic material in Kings as they were a Benjaminite with prophetic sympathies.[68] There was a third, less significant redactor who prepared the text's final form.[69] Meanwhile, in Sweden, Ivan Engnell published his introduction to the Old Testament, which laid out his view that D was absent from Genesis-Numbers and scholars should instead speak of a Tetrateuch.[70] Consequently, Dtr's role is exclusive to Deuteronomy itself and their evident influence on the books of the Former Prophets.[71]

The response to Noth's theory was immediate and highly favourable. Soon after its publication, Augustin Bea said of it: "Was Noth über die Benützung der Quellen durch den

---

[64] Alfred Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1953). Ivan Engnell, *Gamla Testamentet: en traditionshistorisk inledning* (Stockholm: Svenska Krykans, 1945).
[65] Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*, 116.
[66] Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*, 60ff.
[67] Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*, 76ff.
[68] Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*, 96ff.
[69] Jepsen, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches*, 102ff.
[70] Douglas A. Knight, *Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel*, 3rd ed., Studies in Biblical Literature, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 205ff.
[71] Engnell is well known, though, for his harsh polemic against literary criticism and devotion to the methods of tradition criticism. While his theories are like Noth's in result, they differ greatly in method.

Autor des «deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes» sagt, gehört zum Besten, was von kritischer Seite bisher darüber geschrieben worden ist." [72] Even amongst Noth's nominal critics, they still could not deny the importance and significance that his work had on the field. Scholars recognized that Noth's contribution broke the prolonged consensus since Wellhausen.[73] Because of this, a subset of scholars quickly began to take Noth's theory as accurate.[74]

While Noth was writing his massively influential work, so too was Gerhard von Rad writing what would turn out to be a rival study that would become a strong counter-thesis to the Nothian model. Von Rad's approach in "Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs," published in 1938, would pre-emptively contradict Noth's findings in his work. The paper analyzed the books of Genesis to Joshua and did not address the books of Samuel. Further, von Rad traced the sources of the Pentateuch into Deuteronomy and Joshua to the exclusion of the rest of the Former Prophets.[75] Therefore, von Rad was examining a different textual tradition entirely.

Von Rad saw the tendency towards literary criticism as alienating scholarship from the studying the text's final form. He asserted that the Old Testament was made as a statement of faith or creed and examining it without the framework for analysis halts proper understanding.[76] This approach of accounting for the text's original form is known as Form Criticism. Von Rad used this approach to conclude that Israel's "history" begins at the creation of the world but does

---

[72] "What Noth says of the uses of the sources by the author of the DtrH is the best of what has been written on it critically thus far." Augustin Bea, "Book Review: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. I (Schriften der Konigsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft. 18. Jahr. Geisteswissensch. Klasse, Heft 2) Halle (Saale) 1942, Max Niemeyer Verlgag. VIII, 266 S.," *Biblica* 27, no. 1-2 (1946): 143. Translation mine.
[73] Gerhard von Rad, "Hexateuch oder Pentateuch?," *Verkündigung und Forschung* 1-2, no. 2 (1942): 52.
[74] Hans Walter Wolff, "The Kerygma of the Yahwist," *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 20, no. 2 (1966): 133.
[75] Gerhard von Rad, "Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch," in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, Theologische Bücherei (München: Kaiser, 1958), 81ff.
[76] von Rad, "Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch," 1-3.

not end until the settlement in the land. Therefore, scholars should speak of a Hexateuch rather than a Pentateuch. This conclusion seems, at face value, unreconcilable with Noth's theory of a Deuteronomistic History.[77] Noth would explicitly deny the presence of Pentateuchal[78] sources in Deuteronomy and DtrH. Von Rad was a massively influential figure in biblical studies at the time; his reinvigorating form-critical methods led to a sharp increase in scholars preferring to analyze texts through that lens. All while criticizing the shortcomings of a purely literary approach.

Noth addressed this contradiction by offering a compromise of sorts:[79] he affirmed the existence of von Rad's hypothesized "Sinai tradition" and "occupation tradition"[80] while emphasizing that these strands stop at the beginning of Deuteronomy.[81] Noth immediately criticized those who argue that Pentateuchal sources bleed into the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua.[82] We have seen that this criticism would include most scholars actively studying the Pentateuch and DtrH. However, in moving directly into this criticism after mentioning the work of von Rad, the reader certainly could get the impression that Noth was explicitly referring to von Rad's work. Noth remarked that in Deuteronomy, there is a summary of the events previously written about in the four earlier books. The summary suggests that a new narrative begins in Deuteronomy.[83] Indeed, the theme in DtrH is not the same as the first four books, which held the Sinai tradition in high esteem and import, whereas DtrH now turns to speak of the

[77] Deuteronomy being essentially separate from the Pentateuch and prefixed to the rest of DtrH would necessarily eliminate any semblance of a conclusion to von Rad's conception of the original creed of the pre-settlement Israel.
[78] Literally, "Pentateuch" refers to the first five books of the Hebrew Bible, of which Deuteronomy is included. According to Noth's theory, Deuteronomy should not be included in this collection. However, Noth consistently uses the term "Pentateuch" nonetheless and so too shall this dissertation.
[79] The origin of this compromise is eloquently described in Schmid, "The Emergence and Disappearance of the Separation between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History in Biblical Studies," 15ff.
[80] These are original units that make up part of the Hexateuch in von Rad's conception.
[81] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 88.
[82] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 88.
[83] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 87-88.

occupation of the land as central to the narrative.[84] Noth saw no reason why these two themes should occupy the same narrative space.[85]

Noth opened himself up to a criticism that would become extremely important for more recent scholarly evaluations of DtrH. In a footnote on this section, Noth admitted that the Pentateuchal sources must have initially continued discussing the settlement of Israel in Canaan, rather than all of them simply ending at the Jordan River. Though the endings to these sources have been lost, and thus DtrH has replaced these original conclusions.[86] Scholars have criticized Noth's reasoning for why these sources have all had their endings severed inorganically as "inelegant." A tangible response to this criticism would not arrive for decades to come.

Von Rad, too, grappled with the implications of Noth's work on his theories. That led von Rad to review Noth's book further and criticize him based on the methodological failings of his approach.[87] Von Rad questioned whether anyone could objectively analyze and delineate a source without the due process of understanding its central nature or theology.[88] Von Rad's criticism is less against Noth and more so against the limits of a purely literary-critical analysis in favour of his form-critical way. There was a scholarly divide amongst scholars. Henceforth it is possible to trace a so-called *Nothian versus von Radian* approach towards analyzing DtrH.

Artur Weiser stood out as an ardent critic of Noth's theory. His criticisms came from multiple fronts: his most central critique was his denial that there is a single hand behind all the books of Deuteronomy to 2 Kings. Instead, he saw evidence of multiple sources and traditions in these books—which failed to suggest that Dtr was solely responsible for their development. These originally independent sources are not always brought together to support DtrH's central

[84] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 88.
[85] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 88.
[86] Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948), 35.
[87] von Rad, "Hexateuch oder Pentateuch?," 54-55.
[88] von Rad, "Hexateuch oder Pentateuch?," 55.

thesis. Leading Weiser to argue that Dtr was obliged to represent the narratives that did not support their view of the world.[89] This was a significant blow to Noth's argument, as his assertion that only one compiler was behind the text is supported by the consistent messaging of the entire work. Weiser also saw Pentateuchal strands within Joshua, which Noth denied.[90] Weiser did argue that Dtr revised Joshua after its initial formation, but E composed the most considerable portion of the books.[91] Within the rest of DtrH Weiser believed that the influence had by the deuteronomistic editors was not consistent throughout.[92]

For instance: Judges is structured by a deuteronomistic framework which reflects their view of history.[93] Dtr formed both the original draft of the book as well as its redaction in the exilic period.[94] However, 1-2 Samuel is a collection of many disparate sources behind which Dtr is only the organizer and editor. Though there is a concerted effort to homogenize the elements into a cohesive narrative.[95] Weiser identified the independent units of The Ark Narrative, The Rise of Saul, The History of David's Rise, and The Court History within the books of Samuel and Kings.

In 1966, Hans Walter Wolff set out to examine the message of DtrH. An essential aspect of Noth's study was arguing that DtrH was kerygmatic in nature, and the compiler had a clear theological understanding of history. Thus, DtrH served as an apologia of sorts for this worldview. Wolff disagreed with Noth in his understanding of the text. To Noth, Dtr was

---

[89] Artur Weiser, *Samuel: Seine Geschichtliche Aufgabe und Religiose Bedeutung. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu 1 Samuel 7-12*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 8.
[90] Artur Weiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), 119-20.
[91] Weiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 120.
[92] Weiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 138.
[93] Weiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 123-24.
[94] Weiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 124.
[95] Weiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 131-32.

presenting Israel's history fundamentally negatively.[96] Since Dtr placed the foundation of their worldview in Deuteronomy itself, the dichotomy of apostasy or faithfulness was an evaluating force behind the narratives, and one must ask whether Israel was falling into apostasy or not. DtrH answers this definitively in the affirmative, according to Noth. To Wolff the concluding scene of the entire corpus, in which Jehoiachin is left as a loose end and is treated relatively well,[97] contradicts this.[98] If the Israelite kingship experiment was a resounding failure, why would DtrH deign to remind their reader of the continuation of its line? Noth's explanation that DtrH was merely reporting the facts is insufficient to Wolff.[99]

Rather, Wolff insisted that DtrH was a call to return to the faithfulness found in Israel in the time of Judges.[100] At the end of Judges, Israel began to slip into apostasy, and DtrH is routinely calling to return to the order of the law. In this investigation, Wolff also identified the work of a later redactor of the corpus; one missed by Noth's original study. Wolff argued that the message of the latter work is still consistent within the broader DtrH; though it has more in common with Jeremiah linguistically than it does with the rest of DtrH.[101] Deuteronomy 28:63 and 30:9 refer to *yhwh*'s delight, which is unique amongst the DtrH but is repeated in Jeremiah 32:41. Jeremiah also shares some distinct vocabulary with Deuteronomy 30:1-11: הִדִּיחֲךָ, וְשָׁב, שְׁבוּתְךָ, and בִּקְצֵה.[102] Some of these terms are explicitly reflective of the theme of returning to

[96] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 100-01.
[97] 2 Kgs. 25:27-30.
[98] Hans Walter Wolff, *Bibel: das Alte Testament: eine Einführung in seine Schriften und in die Methoden ihrer Erforschung*, ed. Jürgen Schultz, Themen der Theologie, (Stuttgart; Berlin: Kreuz-Verlag, 1970), 67.
[99] Walter Brueggemann and Hans Walter Wolff, *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 85.
[100] Brueggemann and Wolff, *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*, 88-90.
[101] Brueggemann and Wolff, *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*, 94-96.
[102] Brueggemann and Wolff, *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*, 95.

yhwh. This later redactor would take the theme of return and retrospectively include it in Moses' speech, also taking influence from the Jeremiah traditions.[103]

Georg Fohrer, a German scholar, also heavily criticized Noth's theory of DtrH. He emphasized that Deuteronomy was a central part of the Pentateuch and could not introduce a new literary block of material for several reasons: firstly, the other Pentateuchal sources, J, E, and P, could all be found throughout the book of Deuteronomy.[104] All of these sources end with the death of Moses, and to eliminate Deuteronomy from their narrative would be to leave the story without a satisfying ending. To Fohrer, Deuteronomy was originally an independent literary unit, though it was eventually subsumed into the Pentateuch—as evidenced by his earlier arguments.[105] Fohrer specifically criticized the DtrH theory because the deuteronomistic hand on the books of Judges and Samuel is much different than in the books of Kings.[106] For Fohrer, Dtr is a clear editor of the former books; they are the author of the books of Kings, so the collection would not have a unity of style or direction.[107] He also criticized Noth for consistently deleting E texts in Joshua as mere "editorial additions" without critical evaluation.[108] As a result, Fohrer completely denied any form of DtrH. Instead electing to argue that each book within the so-called collection has its unique developmental history.[109]

After Wolff's work was published the tendency to posit multiple deuteronomistic redactions began to grow in popularity. In 1972, Helga Weippert published an investigation into Kings, which concluded that there was evidence for a threefold deuteronomistic redaction of the

---

[103] Brueggemann and Wolff, *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*, 96.
[104] Georg Fohrer and Ernst Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. David E. Green (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968), 147-48; 53-54; 79-80.
[105] Fohrer and Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 194.
[106] Fohrer and Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*.
[107] Fohrer and Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*.
[108] Fohrer and Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*.
[109] Fohrer and Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*.

book.[110] More influential still was a paper by Rudolf Smend, published in 1971, in which he posited the existence of a secondary redactional layer of DtrH. In a paper on the book of Joshua, Smend begins by noting a perceived gloss inserted into the introductory speech from *yhwh* to Joshua. Whereas *yhwh*'s initial call to Joshua starts as a call to arms and a promise of a seeming uncontestable dominion over the land,[111] in verses 7 to 9, we begin to see a subtle act of conditioning the earlier promise.[112] The insertion of the word רק at the beginning of this new section suggests the inclusion of a condition to the previous promise, which is curious as *yhwh* explicitly promised to be unconditionally present, Smend argued.[113]

He would argue that Joshua 1:7-9 represented the work of a different author than Dtr. The purpose of this other author was to emphasize that the success of Israel was inexorably linked to their continued obedience to the Law—specifically the Law of Deuteronomy.[114] This layer would thus be labelled the Deuteronomistic Nomist.[115] Since DtrN was adding redactional glosses to the original layer of DtrH, it was necessarily written after DtrH. The parts of Joshua that Smend attributed to DtrN are Joshua 1:7-9; 13:1bβ-6; 23.[116] Smend also found traces of DtrN in the book of Judges, which suggests its continuation throughout DtrH.[117]

---

[110] Helga Weippert, "Die "Deuteronomistischen" Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher," *Biblica* 53, no. 3 (1972). Though the paper was published in *Biblica* in 1972, Weippert presented her paper two years earlier in 1970.

[111] No man shall be able to stand before you all the days of your life. Just as I was with Moses, so I will be with you. I will not leave you or forsake you. Josh. 1:5, ESV.

[112] Only be strong and very courageous, being careful to do according to all the law that Moses my servant commanded you. Do not turn from it to the right hand or to the left, that you may have good success wherever you go. Josh. 1:7, ESV.

[113] Rudolf Smend, "The Law and The Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History," in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville, Sources for Biblical and Theological Study (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 96.

[114] Smend, "The Law and The Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History," 97.

[115] Henceforth, DtrN. Nomist being the theological position wherein once religious actions are based around the law.

[116] Smend, "The Law and The Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History," 96-105.

[117] Smend sees evidence of DtrN from Deut. 1:5 to the end of 2 Kings. Smend, "The Law and The Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History," 110.

There had been two major inflection points in scholarly understanding of the Former Prophets up to this point. Wellhausen was the peak of the earliest understanding of these books as continuations of Pentateuchal sources. Noth countered this consensus with the theory that DtrH was the work of a single author.[118] Noth's thesis became the new consensus amongst scholars for several decades after its publication. In the 1970s, arguably beginning with the publication of Smend's article, there was a veritable explosion of theories surrounding the composition of DtrH. From this point on, all semblance of consensus amongst scholars would disappear, so it is better to speak of schools of thought. Smend's approach began the Göttingen school of thought,[119] which is influential primarily amongst German scholars.

1.3. Cross – McCarter

Very shortly after Smend's article was published, Frank Moore Cross, an American scholar, also wrote on the structure of the DtrH; this time using the books of Kings as an example. Though his method was very different from Smend's. Smend identified literary layers by noting breaks in the narrative and identifying specific vocabulary oddities or repetitions that suggested another author. However, Cross noted two contradictory themes running throughout DtrH. Some sections of the books of Kings point to a Southern interpretation of the Northern Kingdom's destruction: Israel fell because of the sin of their king, Jeroboam. Their sin was creating a cultic centrum in Bethel and Dan in opposition to the temple in Jerusalem. These altars violate deuteronomic law. Every king of Israel rebelled against *yhwh*'s law due to their failure to live up to deuteronomistic ideals.[120] This theme is bourgeoned by a parallel stream of thought:

---

[118] This is not to suggest that there was any unanimity amongst scholars; just as there was not back at the time of Wellhausen.

[119] So named as it was spearheaded by Smend and his students who all studied at Georg August University of Göttingen.

[120] Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 279ff.

the promise of an eternal Davidic kingdom in the oracle of Nathan.[121] Thus, the sins of Israel were consistently despised, whereas *yhwh*'s promise to David tempers the wickedness of the Judaic kings.[122] This reflects DtrH's theology and indicates it was written after the fall of Israel but before the fall of Judah. Thus, Cross dated this first layer of DtrH to Josiah's reform.[123]

However, there is a "subtheme" in DtrH that Cross saw as a countercurrent to the pre-existent form of DtrH.[124] 2 Kings 21:2-15 reinforces the promise of an eternal Davidic covenant but immediately adds the coda: "I will set my name forever, nor will I again cause Israel's foot to wander from the land which I have given to their fathers, *only if* they be careful to do according to all which I commanded them and to all the law which my servant Moses commanded them."[125] Thus, an explicit condition is appended to the promise, reminiscent of the addendum identified by Smend from Joshua 1 attributed to DtrN. Cross identified a series of additions, as early as Deuteronomy 4 and as late as 2 Kings 20, which all speak of a conditional rejection of Judah if they continue in their sins. Cross argued the author did not necessarily have an interest in the law but suggested they wrote in the Exile, aware of the fall of Judah.[126]

Cross' theory was quickly expanded upon by his student, Jon D. Levenson, in a paper where he argued that much of the book of Deuteronomy was added to DtrH by the exilic author, which he called Dtr 2.[127] While Dtr 1[128] did not incorporate Deuteronomy, this does not mean that the deuteronomic law did not exist conceptually at the time of Josiah. Dtr 1 existed as a

---

[121] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 282.
[122] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 283.
[123] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 285.
[124] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*.
[125] 2 Kgs. 21:8, ESV. Emphasis mine.
[126] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 288.
[127] Jon D. Levenson, "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?," *Harvard Theological Review* 68, no. 3-4 (1975): 231. Dtr 2 is then juxtaposed with Dtr 1, the Josianic author. This source is elsewhere identified as Dtr^2.
[128] Levenson's label for the Josianic layer of DtrH.

propaganda piece for the book of the Law.[129] Levenson also argued that Deuteronomy was not introduced by Dtr 2. Levenson does show differences in the styles of Dtr 1 and Deuteronomy and their theologies. Therefore, while Dtr 2 was not the author of Deuteronomy, neither was Dtr 1. Deuteronomy was an independent unit written before either layer of DtrH.

Another scholar who bolstered Cross' model was Richard D. Nelson. His Th.D. Dissertation from 1973 was reworked several years later as *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History.* He criticized Smend's dual-source approach, mainly on its misattribution of chapters to their respective sources, which has ripple effects on how DtrH and DtrN are dated. As noted above, Smend found evidence of DtrN in 3 chapters in Joshua. However, Nelson denied that Joshua 23 could belong to DtrN as he noted a similarity in language between DtrN and Joshua 24.[130] As it happens, Nelson's criticism was significant because Smend based a lot of his division of sources on a contradiction between Joshua 23 and 24. Joshua 13 appeared to be a part of the original history as chapter 23 is dependent on chapter 13. Therefore, whichever source includes Joshua 13 must not include chapter 24. If there is a similarity in language between Joshua 24 and DtrN suggest that chapter 23 is a part of DtrH. Nelson's discovery does irrevocable harm to Smend's division of sources based on their view of the Law, as one can no longer point to a clear source division based on nomistic theology. Instead, Nelson favoured Cross' view that the secondary redactor is exilic. He also found faults with Walter Dietrich's expansion of Smend's view into a tripartite division of sources, which will be discussed below, arguing that the linguistic similarities between Dietrich's DtrP and DtrH suggest that they are not different, but the same source dealing with different material.

---

[129] Levenson, "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?," 224.
[130] Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, ed. David J. A. Clines, Phillip R. Davies, and David M. Gunn, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981).

Nelson's analysis of DtrH, focusing primarily on Kings, added four supporting arguments for the Crossian model: first, Nelson demonstrated a clear formula that described every Judaean king, and the subsequent breaking of this formula for the final four kings, suggesting that they are from the hand of an exilic author.[131] Secondly, he demonstrated linguistically a difference in the language of the historian and the exilic redactor, centred on the five-time repetition of the phrase וְלֹא שָׁמְעָתָם בְּקוֹלִי, "they did not listen to my voice", in Judges 2:1-5; 6:7-10; 2 Kings 17:7-20; 17:34*b*-40; 21:3-15. Basing the foundation on these, he then examined the linguistic similarities in form and language between these chapters to expand to other similar chapters as a tentative outline for the secondary redaction.[132] The final two chapters took strides to examine the purpose of the two strands of Dtr and their relationship with the conditional and unconditional oracles found therewithin.[133]

Concurrently, Rudolf Smend, Walter Dietrich, and Timo Veijola were significantly expanding the Göttingen model of deuteronomistic redaction. In 1972, Dietrich published *Prophetie und Geschichte*, in which he applied Smend's research to a study of the books of Kings.[134] Dietrich first found evidence of several pericopes throughout the books of Kings that share a uniformity of style and content, concerned mainly with prophetic speeches.[135] He concluded that, unlike the two-source division of Smend, there was a tripartite division of

---

[131] Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, 29ff.
[132] Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, 43ff.
[133] Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, 99ff. For other relevant Crossian writings, see Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: the Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works*, Harvard Semitic Monographs, (Chico: Scholars Press, 1981). Levenson, "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?." Baruch Halpern and Collection Mazal Holocaust, *The First Historians: the Hebrew Bible and History* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988); Brian Peckham, *The Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*, Harvard Semitic Monographs, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985); Brian Peckham, *History and Prophecy: the Development of Late Judean Literary Traditions*, The Anchor Bible Reference Library, (New York: Doubleday, 1993); Marvin A. Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah: the Lost Messiah of Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
[134] Walter Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte: Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).
[135] Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte*, 9ff.

sources: DtrH, DtrN, and DtrP. His starting point was four similar sections of Kings[136] which all have the formula of justification followed by announcement, with secondary evidence of the presence of the particles יַעַן אֲשֶׁר and הִנֵּנִי.[137] By analyzing and identifying the unique vocabulary of this layer, Dietrich greatly expanded the so-called DtrP layer. Three years later, Veijola published his doctoral dissertation, which was a project like Dietrich's, applying Smend's theoretical framework to the books of Samuel. He, too, found evidence of the three-part redactional layer of DtrH,[138] DtrN and DtrP. Veijola's work needs extra attention here as it is specifically relevant to this dissertation's project.

Veijola's approach shared similarities with Dietrich. To start, he isolated the clearest insertions and then established the purpose and vocabulary[139] of the redactionary layers. For instance, he began with an evaluation of 1 Kings 1-2, in which he found evidence of a DtrN redactional layer. This layer alters the original narrative from one in which the ageing David is being taken advantage of by Bathsheba to name her son, Solomon, as his heir, by asserting that Solomon's reign is divinely ordained.[140] Much like in Dietrich's work, a clear nomistic addition to the text allowed Veijola to examine and understand the DtrN's style, vocabulary, and theological viewpoint. Veijola also found two oracles, 1 Samuel 2:27-36 and 3:11-14, which come from two different hands while fulfilling in the same section: 1 Samuel 22.[141] Veijola's explanation for this was a redactional layer which, upon further evaluation, is routinely concerned with the prophetic movement and theologies—which lines up with Dietrich's DtrP.

---

[136] 1 Kgs. 14:7-11;16:1-4; 21:20bβ-24; 2 Kgs. 9:7-10a.
[137] Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte*, 9-13.
[138] Known to him as DtrG.
[139] Timo Veijola, *Die Ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der Deuteronomistischen Darstellung*, Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia Sarja B, (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975), 26.
[140] Veijola, *Die Ewige Dynastie*, 16ff. While being technically outside of his area of research of the books of Samuel, 1 Kings 1-2 serve as the conclusion to the original narrative layer of HDR.
[141] Veijola, *Die Ewige Dynastie*, 35-43.

DtrP generally does not glorify David, partially because they were writing after the fall of Judah and partially because the condemnation of the Davidic kingdom to ruin is a central theme in the formulation of DtrP.[142]

The approach from Smend, Dietrich and Veijola has continued to be influential, particularly on German-language works on DtrH to this day. Their approach differed from English writing scholars in that it focused on the diachronic approach rather than interpreting the text's final form. [143] In this diachronic approach, Dietrich and the German school of thought differ from the Nothian approach overviewed above. Where Noth viewed the text as being made up of generally completed texts, Dietrich viewed the text as displaying evidence of a much more gradual history of supplementation and redaction. This approach does not compress the "deuteronomistic" influence behind the text to one redactor, but multiple. To Noth, Dtr, while not necessarily a singular person, had a monolithic understanding of history, theology, and *yhwh*'s role in the narrative of Israel. Therefore, their interpretation of the texts was not subject to further divisions. While Noth's DtrH authored parts of the final text, DtrH was still much more of an editor than an author. They moulded texts written by other sources to their purposes rather than authored an edition of their history by themselves. Smend and his proteges, on the other hand, viewed Dtr as an author and an editor and did not view their theology as set in stone. Whatever perception of the world that may have originated in the legal text within Deuteronomy had enough fluidity that Smend and others were able to distinguish starkly different theologies within it.

---

[142] Veijola, *Die Ewige Dynastie*, 139-40.
[143] Walter Dietrich, "The Layer Model of the Deuteronomistic History and the Book of Samuel," in *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History*, ed. Cynthia Edenburg and Juha Pakkala (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 43.

By this time, the fragile consensus that Noth had brought upon scholarship had been broken apart, and new studies of Joshua-2 Kings were beginning to reflect this brand-new paradigm. For instance, P. Kyle McCarter's study of the books of Samuel applied the Crossian theory to an interpretation of these books. However, this interpretation seemed to borrow aspects from the Göttingen model. McCarter split the development of DtrH into a tripartite structure:[144] the authorship of the ancient narratives, the ordering of these stories into a consistent narrative, and the deuteronomistic overlay.[145] The overlay was a series of redactional notes adapting the narrative to consistent theology and form. McCarter argued that the second stage is understudied and undervalued in scholarship, and the second stage in Samuel conveys a distinct prophetic interest. Indeed, much of this comes from the all-important role that the titular character Samuel plays in the narratives. However, the prophetic interest of the author is very akin to the ones that Dietrich and Veijola identified. McCarter does not cite Dietrich or Veijola but rather references Fohrer and Bruce Birch.[146]

Turning to 1 Samuel 15, 16, and 28, it is of interest that McCarter echoed Wellhausen's assertion that 15-16:13 is a prophetic introduction to the beginning of HDR starting in 16:14ff. 1 Samuel 15-16:13 bridges the gap between two narratives identified by McCarter: the story of Saul in 8-15 and the History of David's rise starting in chapter 16. Neither of these narratives fulfills a unique purpose as other narratives better describe the rejection of Saul's kingship and other narratives recount the anointing of David. Chapter 28 remains notable as it is an unusual narrative that does not fit within the narrative flow of the end of 1 Samuel. McCarter argued that this pericope is inserted here by Dtr in the second stage of development to emphasize the

[144] P. Kyle McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman, The Anchor Bible, (Garden City: Doubleday 1980), 18.
[145] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 16-17.
[146] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 18.

prophetic importance and involvement found in Saul's death and his rejection.[147] McCarter attributed these narratives to the Josianic authorship of the deuteronomistic material. Therefore, these stories are exceedingly ancient.

1.4. Van Seters – Now

As the Göttingen school and the Crossian school began to expand and develop, some scholars continued to argue for the importance of viewing the entire DtrH as coming from a single hand.[148] John Van Seters argued that DtrH was, for the most part, the work of a single author which aimed to create an apology for Israelite Historiography.[149] The anti-monarchical strain, which many scholars had identified, was written after DtrH in the post-exilic period.[150] The other literary units were either incorporated into DtrH in an earlier stage of development or, more often, written by the Dtr.[151] Whereas literary units previously identified, such as the Saul saga and HDR, were understood by Van Seters as products of the DtrH, Van Seters acknowledged that chapters 15, 16, and 28 are a secondary addition.[152] He argued that the anointing of David in chapter 16 is modelled after the anointing of Saul in 1 Samuel 10:17-27. In both, the king is anointed in secret and is only revealed once Samuel sees them for the first

[147] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 271.
[148] Thomas Römer, one such scholar, labels this theory as "Neo-Nothian". This is an imperfect title because many of these scholars share very different conceptions of the formulation and understanding of the details of this work. However, considering that this thesis must group them together based on their shared belief in a single authorial hand, it will adopt this terminology for the time being; with the concession that more accurate labels could very well exist.
[149] Van Seters does see a second layer of development which he dates to after the DtrH; but this is of a very different type than DtrH. Van Seters would first argue this in his *In Search of History* in 1983 but would later expand upon this view in *The Biblical Saga of King David*, which will be examined in much greater detail in Chapter 4.
[150] John Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1983), 290.
[151] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 265, 70.
[152] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 263.

time.[153] However, a narrative commentary is added about not relying on physical beauty as a sign of godliness, which hints at the purpose of the added narrative.[154]

Neo-Nothians also aimed polemics at the Crossian and Göttingen schools of thought, as their evidence of multiple authors was confused. Steven L. McKenzie, for instance, argued that the exilic Dtr, as initially formulated by Cross, was not consistent in theme or tone. As a baseline, McKenzie used 2 Kings 23:26-25:26, which Cross, Nelson and Friedman all believed to be a part of the exilic DtrH.[155] McKenzie examined the verses Cross, Nelson, and Friedman added to Dtr 2[156] and analyzed whether he could reconcile the verses thematically or literarily with 2 Kings 23:26-25:26. In practice, McKenzie showed very few unifying features between these sections. For instance, 1 Kings 8, which many scholars see as secondary, cannot belong to Dtr 2 because 1 Kings 8 seems to suggest a possibility of mercy, whereas 2 Kings 23:26-25:26 uniformly rejects this possibility.[157] Indeed, Friedman, Cross and Levenson seemed to disagree heavily about 1 Kings 8 even amongst themselves. While acknowledging that Dtr 2 exists briefly, in 2 Kings 21:8-15 (16), and still could outside of Kings, McKenzie worked to demonstrate that the Crossian model was not as uniform as first thought. McKenzie, therefore, represents a bridge between the Crossian and Göttingen models.

Another important study on the development of DtrH comes from Antony Campbell in *Of Prophets and Kings*. A cursory overview of Campbell's thesis resembles the Göttingen school's DtrP, as both speak of an independent unit of texts concerned with prophetic material.

---

[153] Van Seters, *In Search of History*.
[154] Van Seters, *In Search of History*. John Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 121ff. Though *The Biblical Saga of King David* is not discussed in the body of this chapter, it was the catalyst for the analysis of chapters 15, 16, and 28 in this dissertation.
[155] Steven L. McKenzie, *The trouble with Kings: the Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, (Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1991), 136.
[156] McKenzie writes Cross' Dtr 2 as Dtr^2.
[157] McKenzie, *The trouble with Kings: the Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*, 138-39.

Campbell opened his work, arguing against the theory of Smend, Dietrich and Veijola. For all the work written on DtrN and DtrP, Campbell argued that not enough literary criticism had been made to confidently establish these texts as either reactionary additions or even independent units at all.[158] This is especially concerning because Dietrich's argument is contingent on DtrP being deuteronomistic. Campbell asserted that it had not been proven that DtrP's language is characteristic of Dtr.[159] This issue is compounded with further works in the Göttingen school, which began to take DtrP as an established work.[160]

Campbell then examined the text and argued for a pre-DtrH text he called the Prophetic Record.[161] This unified work came from the perspective of the northern prophetic circles that, among other goals, sought to deny the kingship of David and his descendants.[162] Thus, the Prophetic Record is responsible for many of the so-called anti-monarchical stories identified by Wellhausen a century beforehand. Over this original text lies a prophetic redaction buffing the narrative and layers in deuteronomistic language and themes. This is responsible for scholars' difficulty in identifying it.[163] There are significant ramifications in narratives such as The Story of David's Rise, which Campbell included in the Prophetic Record because it is a fiercely anti-Davidic text, but later prophetic redactors have altered the text dramatically. 1 Samuel 16:1-13 is

---

[158] Antony F. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: a Late Ninth Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)*, The Catholic Biblical Quarterly/Monograph series, (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986), 10.
[159] Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: a Late Ninth Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)*, 10.
[160] Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: a Late Ninth Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)*, 12ff.
[161] The material attributed to The Prophetic Record in Samuel is 1 Sam. 1-3; (4:1b-2, 4, 10-11, 12-18a; 7:2b, 5-6a, 7-12); 9:1-2a, 3-8, 10-13aαβb, 14a, 18-19, 22a, 24b-27; 10:2-4, 7, 9; 11:1-1. 14-15; 14:52; 15: 1aα, 2-9, 13-15, 17a, 18-22, 24-25, 31-35a; 16: 14-2 Sam. 5*; Sam. 7:1a, 2-5, 7*-10, 11b-12, 14-17; 8. Campbell's method and purpose is reminiscent of other scholarly approaches in identifying material behind a so-called Dtr redaction: Rolf Knierim, "The Messianic Concept in the First Book of Samuel," in *Jesus and the Historian. Written in Honor of Ernest Cadman Colwell*, ed. Ernest Cadman Colwell and F. Thomas Trotter (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968); John T. Willis, "An Anti-Elide Narrative Tradition from a Prophetic Circle at the Ramah Sanctuary," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90, no. 3 (1971). While these works predate Campbell and thus certainly don't agree with him, there is a common thread of noting the anointing motif that links the earliest texts together.
[162] Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: a Late Ninth Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)*, 71.
[163] Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: a Late Ninth Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)*, 20-21.

amongst these texts. Prophetic redactors inserted it at the onset of the Story of David's Rise to make the narrative more forgiving to David.[164]

The work that has stood out as the bedrock for its anti-Nothian paradigm was *Through the Looking Glass* by Graeme Auld. Auld's central argument has to do with the dating of the text to the post-exilic period based on the language used to describe prophets within the DtrH.[165] He also argued that much of what is attributed to Dtr is incorrectly appendaged to their work; instead, Dtr was responsible for some small segments of the book of Kings, for instance, in the discussion of Jeroboam after Solomon's reign.[166] His 1994 monograph, *Kings Without Privilege*, posited that DtrH is limited to the shared material between Kings and Chronicles.[167] With the findings of "Solomon and the Deuteronomists," the material Auld labelled as DtrH is extremely short and does not begin until the book of Kings.[168]

Therefore, Auld did not consider 1 Samuel 15, 16, or 28 as part of DtrH, which, as we have seen, is a reasonably standard view amongst scholars: its language and style do not fit that of DtrH. Auld also did not see these chapters as having a common theme with DtrH. Auld did not view the chapters as being connected in exclusion to their surrounding narratives. Auld argued that most of 1 Samuel is a consistent and single narrative.[169] Although, Auld did note the

---

[164] 1 Sam. 28:17-19a is also identified by Campbell to be a prophetic redaction meant to accomplish this same task. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: a Late Ninth Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)*, 70-71.
[165] A. Graeme Auld, "Prophets and Prophecy in Jeremiah and Kings," in *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld* (London; New York: Routledge, 2016); Auld, "Prophets through the Looking Glass: between Writings and Moses."
[166] Auld, "Solomon and the Deuteronomists."
[167] A. Graeme Auld, *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).
[168] Auld, *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings*, 104ff.
[169] This is a bit of an oversimplification. Auld understandably seemed to be primarily concerned with advocating for his "The Book of Two Houses," which is situated mostly in 2 Samuel. As for 1 Samuel, he viewed chapters 9-25:1 as being a likely facsimile of what a first draft of the Saul story would look like. The rest of 1 Samuel would have been appendaged to this large chunk of narrative after the fact. Auld's analysis seems to be mostly focused on reading the text as it stands in its final form, rather than its smaller divisions. A. Graeme Auld, *I & II Samuel: a Commentary* (Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 13.

literary connections between the chapters, such as the ironic interplay between *yhwh*'s warning to Samuel not to count on stature as a sign of divine blessing in 16:7, אַל־תַּבֵּט אֶל־מַרְאֵהוּ וְאֶל־גְּבַהּ קוֹמָתוֹ,[170] and the ultimate failure of Saul's great stature in 28:20, וַיְמַהֵר שָׁאוּל וַיִּפֹּל מְלֹא־קוֹמָתוֹ.[171] Auld attributed these to rewriting the main text to fit into the later additions affixed to them.[172]

These attacks on the Nothian model did significantly damage the widespread acceptance of his views. Nonetheless, they did not eliminate the prevalence of the Nothian model from the majority position it held from the 1940s onward. In the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, published in 1992, Steven McKenzie wrote, "the acceptance of [DtrH] has continued such that, to the extent that any position in biblical studies can be regarded as the consensus viewpoint, the existent of the [DtrH] has achieved almost canonical status."[173] However, aside from Cross, Smend, their students, and a handful of other scholars, most were still Neo-Nothians until the 1990s. Since McKenzie wrote that entry in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, this consensus has all but disappeared. A brief look at some titles published on DtrH in the past 25 years certainly gives this impression.[174]

Much of the fundamental shift since the 1990s is due to a renewed interest in the book of Deuteronomy itself. Deuteronomy has long been understood as the fulcrum between the Pentateuch and DtrH. Deuteronomy is also the channel by which Joshua through to 2 Kings has

---

[170] "Do not look at his appearance or his tall height".
[171] "Saul quickly fell supine".
[172] Auld, *I & II Samuel: a Commentary*, 13-14.
[173] David Noel Freedman, *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6 vols., vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 161.
[174] Linda S. Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie, *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: the Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*, ed. David J. A. Clines and Phillip R. Davies, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999). Claus Westermann, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?*, Theologische Bücherei: Altes Testament, (Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1994). Cynthia Edenburg and Juha Pakkala, *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists?: Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History*, ed. Thomas C. Römer, Ancient Israel and its Literature, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013); Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: a Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*; Thomas Römer, *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000).

been interpreted for over a century. Grave doubts have risen recently about whether Deuteronomy is a unity.[175] Other scholars have expanded on D and found traces of it in the Pentateuch.[176] Noth originally conceived Deuteronomy as being the theological and conceptual foundation for DtrH, which was sure to impact the academic understanding of this work.

The discussion regarding 1 Samuel 15, 16, and 28 within scholarship focuses on how the chapters relate to HDR. While the extent and form of DtrH have become the subject of greater speculation, there remains a generally solid scholarly consensus about the existence of the earlier narrative dictating King David's journey from shepherd to monarch.[177] Nonetheless, there is no similar unanimity about where the narrative begins within 1 Samuel.[178] Some scholars place the beginning after the summary of Saul's military exploits in 14:46-51, making HDR beginning with either 14:52 or 15:1.[179] With this view, the rejection of Saul and subsequent anointing of David are rightly linked together to form the beginning of the story in which David's election takes place. Others prefer that the beginning comes in between the story of Saul's rejection and

[175] See Reinhard G. Kratz, "The Headings of the Book of Deuteronomy," in *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History*, ed. Konrad Schmid and Raymond F. Person Jr., Forschungen zum Alten Testament: 2. Reihe (Mohr Siebeck, 2012).
[176] See Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Deuteronomic Contribution to the Narrative in Genesis-Numbers: A Test Case," in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: the Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*, ed. Linda S. Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Hans Ausloos, *The Deuteronomist's History: the Role of the Deuteronomist in Historical-critical research into Genesis-Numbers*, ed. Bob Becking, Oudtestamentische Studiën, (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2015). There has been an equally important antithesis to this movement, "it is important to avoid charges of 'pan-Deuteronomism'—the Deuteronomists have sometimes been praised or blamed for virtually every significant development within ancient Israel's religious practice…" Richard J. Coggins, "Prophecy - True and False," in *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Heather A. McKay and David J.A. Clines, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993). See also, Schearing and McKenzie, *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: the Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*.
[177] Sung-Hee Yoon, *The Question of the Beginning and the Ending of the So-Called History of David's Rise: a Methodological Reflection and its Implications*, ed. John Barton et al., Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, (Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2014), 2.
[178] Incidentally, there is also a debate as to when HDR ends. However, this is less relevant to the current debate.
[179] Eißfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 367-8.

David's selection.[180] The general support for this view is that it would have HDR beginning with the first appearance of David.

After the introduction of Goliath and the Philistine's persecution of Israel, there is a folkloristic story again introducing David to the narrative. Some view 17:12-31 as a late insertion and the true beginning of HDR.[181] Numerous scholars argue that the introduction of HDR is 16:14, with the introduction of David to Saul. There is a distinct difference in style and message between the characterization of David in 16:1-13 and 16:14ff. 16:1-13, the cultic anointment of David, with the guidance of God at the very center of its message. 16:14ff eliminates the cult almost entirely and focuses on David's role in Saul's court. It never indicates that David is the newly anointed king that will usurp Saul.[182] Sung-Hee Yoon analyses the phraseology of the three pericopes of chapters 15 and 16—15:1-35; 16:1-13; 16:14-23—and determines a style difference between the former two and the latter concludes that HDR begins with 16:14.[183]

More and more attention has been devoted to finding when Dtr wrote DtrH. For a long while, scholars believed Deuteronomy and DtrH were written in the time of Josiah, where the high priest Hilkiah finds "the book of the law" in 2 Kings 22, and this view remained prominent for some time.[184] However, even amongst scholars who argue for DtrH's authorship during the

---

[180] Artur Weiser, "Die Legitimation des Königs David: Zur Eigenart und Entstehung der sogen. Geschichte von Davids Aufstieg," *Vetus Testamentum* 16, no. 3 (1966): 326.

[181] This is bolstered by the absence of 17:12-31 from LXX^B where David is inserted into the story without a proper introduction, indicating that his anointing in 16:13 is the original link between David and this story. Yoon, *The Question of the Beginning and the Ending of the So-Called History of David's Rise: a Methodological Reflection and its Implications*, 32-33.

[182] Yoon, *The Question of the Beginning and the Ending of the So-Called History of David's Rise: a Methodological Reflection and its Implications*, 34.

[183] Yoon, *The Question of the Beginning and the Ending of the So-Called History of David's Rise: a Methodological Reflection and its Implications*, 34ff.

[184] The identification of Deuteronomy with the law book found in 2 Kings 22 is the primary motivating factor behind this dating. Scholars have connected Deuteronomy with this book as far back as Ewald and even some early Jewish rabbis and Patristic fathers. Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: a Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction*, 50. Yet, this dating for the earliest layer of DtrH has been assumed to be correct as recently as Römer in 2005.

reign of Josiah, many still acknowledge redactional layer(s) which originate in the Exile.[185] As attention towards these redactions grew, especially with the Cross and Göttingen schools—which expanded what counted as redactions significantly—this dating became more relevant because it placed more of the deuteronomistic school of thought into the exilic period.[186] Eventually, scholars, such as Van Seters, argued that DtrH was post-exilic.[187] In the past few decades, the majority opinion has tended towards viewing the DtrH being written sometime during or shortly after Exile.[188]

At the onset of this chapter, I argued that the field does not advance because of one scholar or publication but incrementally by a vast array of scholarly works. The restrictions of a survey cannot accurately reflect this reality. However, I hoped to show how each new theory was built upon the foundation of the works written before it. Over the past 150 years, three schools of thought have developed concerning DtrH within Samuel.[189] First is the view that prioritizes the unity of DtrH, generally called the Nothian approach. Second is the approach that originated in Germany that emphasizes the disunity in the material and appeals to a heavy redactionary process. Third is the approach that originated in America and argues for a historical series of additions built upon a base text identifiable by the thematic concerns of the text. Though this is a

---

[185] Notably, Noth's original conception of DtrH was dated to the Babylonian exile. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 91ff.
[186] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. McKenzie, *The trouble with Kings: the Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*. Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte*. Timo Veijola, *Leben nach der Weisung: Exegetisch-Historische Studien zum Alten Testament*, ed. Walter Dietrich and Marko Marttila, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008).
[187] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*. Auld, *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings*.
[188] Michael David Coogan et al., *The New Oxford Annotated Bible: New Revised Standard Version: with the Apocrypha: an Ecumenical Study Bible*, Fully rev. 4th ed. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 399.
[189] This is excluding the foundational theory which sees the Pentateuchal sources as continuing until 2 Kings. Other than Richard Elliot Friedman, this is no longer a popular theory. Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Hidden Book in the Bible: The Discovery of the First Prose Masterpiece* (San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 1999).

generalization and cannot contend with each approach's nuances, this is an uncontroversial presentation of the field.[190]

The next chapter will begin a source analysis of 1 Samuel 15:1-16:13 and 28:3-25. The chapter will argue that no other text within 1 Samuel shares the literary character present in these pericopes. Primarily, a reoccurring high-level prophetic artistry is absent throughout 1 Samuel but is characteristic of Samuel's dialogue within TDS. Additionally, the plot of TDS precludes it from being part of the other narratives within 1 Samuel. There events of the three pericopes within TDS follow from each other efficiently and logically. Thus, to include any other scene from 1 Samuel would make TDS less coherent. Finally, there is a consistency of characterization of Saul and Samuel, the two main characters of TDS, distinct from their presentation in the rest of the book. The wealth of these arguments will allow for a more systematic analysis of the text as a single narrative, which would be premature at this point.

[190] See a similar overview in Thomas Römer, "The So-Called Deuteronomistic History and its Theories," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Historical Books of the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Brad E Kelle and Brent A Strawn (New York: Oxford University of Press, 2020), 307-12, . Römer also includes a fourth category that denies the existence of DtrH, or limits it to the books of Samuel and Kings.

CHAPTER 2: SOURCE-CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF TDS

The previous chapter examined the past 150 years of study into DtrH to understand the field's development from the foundational texts of the 19th century to the more recent uncertainty that arose around the 21st century. By 1900, most scholars still believed they could trace the Pentateuchal sources to the end of the book of 2 Kings. This viewpoint reached its apex with Wellhausen's *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels'* publication in 1883 and still held prominence until the 1940s. Rost began to raise doubts about the status quo in *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids*. He argued that he found independent units within the Former Prophets, which could not be traced back to the Pentateuchal sources. Noth's *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* expanded upon Rost's work by attributing the redaction and authorship of these narrative units to a single deuteronomistic hand. Noth's theory held prominence in the field for the rest of the 20th century, though signs of its eventual dismantling began to appear around the 1970s with the Crossian and Göttingen schools' emergence. It was not until the turn of the 21st century that the confidence in the Nothian model eroded enough that it no longer held the pseudo-canonical position it once did. While some aspects of Noth's theory remain popular, and Rost's division of the text is still quite widespread, the attribution to a single author and redactor is currently under significant doubt.

This chapter will be a source examination into the first book of Samuel. It will use the source-critical method to argue for the unity of the pericopes in 1 Samuel 15-16:13; 28:3-25.[191] Firstly, it needs to be established that one author wrote the above chapters. Typically, this is done by establishing a consistent vocabulary, style, point of view, or logical continuance within the

[191] Terminology for this method is notoriously fractured as it has elsewhere been called source criticism, literary criticism, origin criticism, and more.

narrative.[192] Secondly, the above chapters and verses must be established as the only texts within the hypothesized narrative. When Rost wrote *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids*, scholars believed 1 Samuel 4-6 to be a unified narrative. However, Rost argued that 2 Samuel 6 was the conclusion to this text, and any study of 1 Samuel 4-6 which did not study 2 Samuel 6 was incomplete. In other words: the text boundaries need to be clearly defined.[193] As it pertains to TDS, this involves differentiating it from HDR and the narratives of Samuel and Saul preceding it.

When a literary unit is segmented and displaced, reconstructing it often begins with identifying inconsistencies within the text; whether grammatical, logical, theological, plot or otherwise. Sometimes these inconsistencies are signs of redactional seams between originally separate texts; whether different authors wrote the narratives or a redactor had displaced them from their original place.[194] It stands to reason that a literary unit should not have overt inconsistencies that rise to the level of incoherence. Meaning: a narrative will have certain unifying characteristics throughout—indicating that it is a product of a single author. The following analysis of TDS will identify these unifying characteristics primarily in the plot and the literary style and secondarily through common vocabulary choices and character representations. This analysis will also highlight inconsistencies that indicate when the surrounding texts are not part of the same narrative. This chapter will show that TDS is a text written by an author with a high degree of literary skill and a keen awareness of the broader literature of Israel.

---

[192] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 87ff. See George Arthur Buttrick, "Biblical Criticism," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), 412.
[193] Antony F. Campbell, "Preparatory Issues in Approaching Biblical Texts," in *The Blackwell Companion to the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, Blackwell companions to religion (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 5,7-9.
[194] It is worth emphasizing that this is not always the case. On occasion, inconsistencies are intentional on the part of the author; particularly in poetic texts. See John Barton, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism* (Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 9ff.

2.1. Textual Analysis

1 Samuel 15:1 – Samuel said to Saul, "It was I that yhwh sent to anoint you as king, over his people, over Israel. Now, listen to the voice of the words of yhwh.[195]

It is worth noting that both Samuel and Saul are suddenly brought into the narrative without introduction. Few scholars have ventured to reconcile this issue. Some connect the beginning of chapter 15 with the end of the previous chapter, specifically vv. 49-52. Ralph Klein, in the *Word Biblical Commentary*, calls vv. 49-52 a summary section about Saul's reign, introducing the following section describing how David superseded Saul.[196] The mention of the Amalekites in v. 48 appears to support this conclusion. Amalek, which gets so much attention in chapter 15, is only mentioned in 1 Samuel in these two chapters. The sudden interest in Amalek, which immediately precedes the story of Amalek's destruction, certainly indicates a relationship between the two sections. However, Eissfeldt had also drawn a connection between vv. 47-52 and 2 Samuel 8:1-15, a section summarizing David's victory over surrounding enemies, which is immediately followed by a list of David's officials. To Eissfeldt, these sections are the conclusions to their respective narratives rather than introductions.[197] Therefore, it may be more appropriate to consider vv. 47-52 as an appendix to the previous chapters rather than an introduction to chapter 15.

A close look at the contents of vv. 47-52 can also help determine its relationship to the sections immediately preceding and following it. The framing of Saul in this appendix is unusually positive.[198] However, this positivity contradicts the narrative in chapter 15. V. 48 says:

---

[195] All translations mine unless otherwise stated.
[196] Ralph W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard, and Glenn W. Barker, 2nd ed., Word Biblical Commentary, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 2008), 146.
[197] Eißfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 360.
[198] David Toshio Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, (Grand Rapids; Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 383. Peter D. Quinn-Miscall, *1 Samuel: a Literary*

וַיַּעַשׂ חַיִל וַיַּךְ אֶת-עֲמָלֵק וַיַּצֵּל אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיַּד שֹׁסֵהוּ.[199] Given that the reason for Saul's rejection in chapter 15 is his failure to smite Amalek completely, this would be an inappropriate introduction to the story if it indeed came from the same hand. There is a definite attempt to show that Saul's actions have reversed the crimes that Amalek committed in the past. Where Saul is said to "deliver" Israel, the word in Hebrew is וַיַּצֵּל which could also be translated as "plundered." This is in contrast with the description of Amalek's conduct against Israel in the past, שֹׁסֵהוּ. Both these verbs can be translated as "plunder." Further, Amalek is referenced numerous times in the Pentateuch, yet none of these times describe Amalek plundering Israel. The primary crime is reiterated in Deuteronomy 25:17, Amalek came and attacked Israel's weak and elderly at the rear of the column. Amalek took advantage of their fatigue in the wilderness, and therefore *yhwh* promises in Deuteronomy 25:18 that they will have revenge when they have rest. While it is possible to interpret this crime as Amalek looting Israel's supplies harboured by the rear-guard, there is no direct indication of this in the text.

Additionally, in Exodus 17, a battle was fought between Israel and Amalek. This was likely the original account of the conflict referenced in Deuteronomy and 1 Samuel. This account follows a scene in which Israel complains about being thirsty and Moses must request for divine intervention to help them. Once again, the juxtaposition between these two pericopes indicates that Amalek's crime was capitalizing on Israel's weaknesses rather than stealing their goods. Finally, Judges 6 reports that when Israel would first begin to sow their grain, Amalek would attack them, presumably destroying their crops before being harvested. This indicates that the Amalekites had unacceptably waged war in the past. The double reference to plundering in 1

Reading, Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 96. Keith Bodner, *1 Samuel: a Narrative Commentary* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008), 146.

[199] "Saul made an army, and he smote Amalek and delivered Israel from the hand of their plunderers."

Samuel 14 is of note because 1 Samuel 15 does show Saul stealing the best of Amalek's crop—a sign of plundering. It appears that the authors of these two chapters are either the same or that the latter one was aware of the other when writing their narrative. Given the connection between 14:47-52 and 2 Samuel 8, the latter solution seems more likely.

1 Samuel 15:2-3 – Thus, yhwh of hosts[200] *said, "I have noticed what Amalek did to Israel, what they put in the way when coming up from Egypt. Now, go and smite Amalek and exterminate all who are in it. Do not spare them. Kill from man to woman, from child to baby, from ox to sheep and from camel to donkey."*

As noted above, Amalek has been a consistent thorn in the side of Israel since the Exodus. It is unclear if this current act of retribution references Exodus 17:8-16 or Deuteronomy 25:17-19. Regardless, 1 Samuel 15:2-3 indicates that the author is familiar with either the Pentateuchal or deuteronomistic literature or perhaps both. Interestingly, there is a sudden lack of deuteronomistic language in chapter 15[201], perhaps indicating that the author of 1 Samuel 15 has the Exodus account in mind rather than Deuteronomy. This does seem to indicate that the author of TDS was not deuteronomistic. Additionally, both Saul and Joshua are reported to kill the Amalekites לְפִי־חָרֶב, "with the edge of the sword".[202] This is not an uncommon phrase in the Hebrew Bible, but alongside the complete lack of deuteronomistic language, this does lend credence to the idea that the author of TDS was alluding to the events of Exodus primarily. However, this does not suggest that the author was unaware of the deuteronomistic texts.

In 15:2, 3 & 6, Saul's actions are framed as retribution, both positive and negative, for events during the Exodus. Much like in 14:48, Saul's attack on Amalek is initially framed as a

[200] Usage of צְבָאוֹת in a war narrative intentionally emphasizes the war-like nature of *yhwh* in this context.
[201] Mark A. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: a Reassessment*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, (Freiburg; Göttingen: Universitätsverlag; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 130.
[202] Francesca Aran Murphy, *1 Samuel*, Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible, (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2010), 134.

divine judgement for the wrongs of the Amalekites. Only in chapter 15 Saul's failure to complete the destruction is an obstruction to *yhwh*'s revenge. There is evidence that חרם does not always result in the death of all the inhabitants of the city.[203] However, Saul's malfeasance here is not a failure to properly commit חרם, rather he took mercy on Amalek specifically, which has interrupted *yhwh*'s specific demand for their total annihilation. Barbara Green argued that Saul's battle against Amalek is symbolic, meant to correct a long felt wrong that goes back to the very foundation of Israel's relationship with *yhwh*.[204] Saul's unwillingness[205] to correctly complete this task speaks to a fundamental inability to rule Israel effectively. This battle was a test for the kingship of Saul, and he failed.[206] It is clear within three verses that the author of this narrative was highly familiar with many Israelite texts and wrote this story partially as a commentary on the failures of kingship. This trend will continue throughout their entire story.

1 Samuel 15:4-7 – So, Saul gathered the people together and accounted for them in Telaim: 200,000 foot soldiers and 10,000 men of Judah. Then, Saul came to the city of Amalek and lay in wait in the valley. But Saul said to the Kenites, "Go, depart, go down from among the Amalekites, lest I destroy you with them. You showed kindness to all the Israelites when they were coming up from Egypt. So, the Kenites departed from among the Amalekites. So, Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah to Shur, which is east of Egypt.

---

[203] Cf. Deut. 2:34-35; 3:6-7; Josh. 8:2, 26-27; 11:14. Susan Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible: a Study in the Ethics of Violence* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993). Barbara Green, *How are the Mighty Fallen?: a Dialogical Study of King Saul in 1 Samuel* (London; New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 249ff.
[204] Green, *How are the Mighty Fallen?: a Dialogical Study of King Saul in 1 Samuel*, 251.
[205] 1 Sam. 15:9.
[206] Some scholars view this narrative as sympathetic to Saul because they interpret Saul's sin as being an imperfect adherence to a vague law. D.M. Gunn is the premier example of this position. However, the connection to Ex. 17:14-16 makes this an untenable position. It is on this basis that I disagree with Van Seters, who also advocates for this view. This will be further examined later on. Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 126-28. See also, David M. Gunn, *The Fate of King Saul: an Interpretation of a Biblical Story*, ed. David J. A. Clines, Phillip R. Davies, and David M. Gunn, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980).

The description of this battle is unlike the one described in chapter 14. The army gathered by Saul in these verses is much larger than the army describes in chapters 13 or 14.[207] The repetition of the verb פָּקַד is of note here. פָּקַד can mean either "to take note of" or "to count". Whereas *yhwh* pays attention to the wrongs done to Israel, Saul "pays attention" to the size of his army.[208] By itself this would not suggest much. Yet it will become clear that Saul's interests routinely focus on his strength rather than the will of *yhwh* or the good of his people.

The central item of note here is Saul's approach to attacking Amalek. Saul has amassed an unimaginably large force to attack Amalek. Yet, his strategy is not described as besieging the city, nor even attacking it outright. Rather he is said to וַיָּרֶב in the valley. The root ארב is translated as "lay in wait" and it always used to describe setting up an ambush. It is not meant to suggest that they encamped in the valley, but rather they meant to set a trap. Additionally, the Amalekites were a nomadic tribe,[209] this, alongside the battlefield being described as מֵחֲוִילָה בּוֹאֲךָ שׁוּר [210] gives the impression that the battle occurred in multiple places from Havilah to Shur.[211] Perhaps Amalek was driven westward in retreat, however more likely is that Israel copied the Amalekite strategy and attacked their lines guerilla-style to take advantage of their strategic weaknesses. There is a direct parallel between v. 7 and Judges 6:4, which describes the Amalekite tactics as scorching the earth around the Israelites and attacking them עַד־בּוֹאֲךָ עַזָּה.[212] The term בּוֹאֲךָ is used in both verses. There is a connection being made between the vicious

---

[207] Also, it is interesting that the vanguard of the army is Israelite when the threat of Amalek is one felt on the Southern borders of Judah. David G. Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel,* ed. David W. Baker. Gordon J. Wenham, Apollos Old Testament Commentary, (Nottingham; Downers Grove: Apollos; InterVarsity, 2009), 173.
[208] Additionally, Saul's accounting of Judah separately from Israel may be of note and a hint towards his divided loyalty. Auld, *I & II Samuel: a Commentary*, 168.
[209] Some have taken this to suggest that the "city" that Saul attacked would have been little more than an encampment. McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 266. Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 393-94.
[210] "From Havilah all the way to Shur."
[211] The location of Havilah is not clear, but Shur is a large area to the northwest of Judah, on the banks of the Mediterranean Sea.
[212] "As far as Gaza."

fighting style of the Amalekites and the retribution being taken by Saul's army on multiple accounts.

While it is not clear which incident with the Kenites v. 6 is referencing, the Kenites were generally favoured in the Pentateuch and earlier portions of DtrH.[213] Additionally, they are elsewhere grouped alongside the Amalekites.[214] It seems very clear that the author of TDS is aware of the Pentateuchal sources and commenting on them. On multiple occasions they reference the Pentateuch as justification for Saul's actions both explicitly, as with *yhwh*'s decree, and implicitly as with the method of attack on Amalek. This fascinating section is more than a mere report of a battle; it is steeped in the memories of slights paid to Israel in their nascent stage.

1 Samuel 15:8-9 – And he captured Agag, the king of the Amalekites, alive. But all the people he exterminated with the edge of the sword. Yet, Saul and the people spared Agag, and they were not willing to exterminate the best of the sheep and cattle, and the second-best[215] of the

---

[213] Num. 24:21; Judg. 1:16; 4:11; 5:24. It is worth noting here that J.P. Fokkelman argues that Saul's magnanimous sparing of the Kenites here is the beginning of his rebellion from the command of *yhwh* as Saul would be supplanting *yhwh* as the sole arbitrator on those who have done "good" and "evil" to Israel. Keith Bodner echoes this interpretation. However, per Gwilym Jones, Samuel doesn't mention the Kenites when condemning Saul, therefore it does not seem to be a problem. The repetition of the root סר throughout the rest of the narrative does lend credence to Fokkelman's interpretation. J. P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II, The crossing fates (I Sam. 13-31 & II Sam. 1)*, vol. 2, Studia Semitica Neerlandica, (Assen/Maastricht; Dover: Van Gorcum, 1986), 91. Bodner, *1 Samuel: a Narrative Commentary*, 151-52. Gwilym H. Jones, "1 and 2 Samuel," in *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, ed. John Barton and John Muddiman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 207.

[214] Num. 24:20-21.

[215] It is not clear how this noun should be translated. The LXX renders it εδεσμάτων for "the bottom," which is thus understood as "food grown from the ground." The root in Hebrew is nominally related to שָׁנָה, "to repeat," thus some, such as Klein, choose to interpret it as double-sized or "fat". Fokkelman approaches it in an interesting manner. He notes the symmetrical manner of v. 9b, מֵיטַב הַצֹּאן וְהַבָּקָר וְהַמְּשֻׁנִים וְעַל הַכָּרִים, and reasons that because הַצֹּאן and הַכָּרִים have a conceptual relationship to one another, both being synonyms for "sheep," the same should be said of וְהַבָּקָר and וְהַמְּשֻׁנִים, thus rendering מְשֻׁנִים "two-year-old bulls." Neither of these renderings are convincing because elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, the same construction is straightforwardly rendered "the second in rank," 2 Kgs. 23:4; 25:18; Jer. 52:24; 1 Sam. 23:17. To translate the noun in this way creates an incremental description of the possessions from the most to the least valuable in a way that pleasingly reflects the compromise being made by Saul in this section. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 145-46. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 89-90.

rams, or any good thing. Meanwhile, any of the property that was worthless or wasted, they exterminated.

V. 9 opens with the verb וַיַּחְמֹל, "he spared", which is a direct reference to verse to v. 3 where *yhwh* commands Saul וְלֹא תַחְמֹל, "do not spare". Instantly the reader knows that Saul is breaking that apodictic command given by *yhwh*.[216] This is paralleled with the justification given for this action, וְלֹא אָבוּ הַחֲרִימָם, "they were not willing to exterminate them", also echoing back to *yhwh*'s command, וְהַחֲרַמְתֶּם, "exterminate [them]". Next, Saul "spares" the choicest of the produce and livestock from Amalek and is said even to have spared the second-best of the livestock. It is only the despicable and worthless that Saul and the army were willing to destroy. The two terms used for all that was destroyed is very telling. The first comes from the root בזה, meaning "to despise", and the second comes from מסס, meaning "to melt". The impression here is that all that the Israelites left for destruction was anything detestable and misshapen. The wording of this phrase indicates that Israel kept everything that was of any value at all.

1 Samuel 15:10-11 – The word of yhwh *came to Samuel, saying, "I regret that I crowned Saul as king because he has turned from following me and he has not followed my word." This angered Samuel and he cried out to* yhwh *all night.*

V. 10 uses a prophetic formula that is found frequently in the later prophets.[217] Certain scholars, such as Campbell, viewed this narrative as having prophetic origins, or at least that a redactor reworked it with prophetic sympathies because of this formula.[218] Much of the scholarly attention to vv. 10-11 is paid to the verb נִחַמְתִּי, "I regret", as it relates to its reoccurrence in v.

[216] Thus, appealing to other bans in the Hebrew Bible as precedence for taking the king alive, such as in Josh. 8:23-29, is not compelling. *yhwh*'s command is much more specific here than in Joshua, and the author clearly means to emphasize Saul's failure through their intentional word choice. Quinn-Miscall, *1 Samuel: a Literary Reading*, 101. See also Bodner, *1 Samuel: a Narrative Commentary*, 152-53.
[217] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 395.
[218] Antony F. Campbell, *1 Samuel*, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature, (Grand Rapids; Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishijng Company, 2003), 157-58.

29.[219] More relevant here is Samuel's reaction to *yhwh* in v. 11b. Samuel is said to וַיִּחַר, which is a verb that nearly unanimously represents the subject "burning" either with anger or sometimes non-descript passion.[220] Many still refer to Samuel's feelings here as being wounded and saddened by the news.[221] The news has roused Samuel to a fevered state as he cries out to *yhwh* all night. It is unclear as to whom Samuel is angry, but his fury at Saul in vv. 18-19, is more consistent with interpreting this reaction as Samuel burning with righteous anger alongside *yhwh* against Saul, rather than at *yhwh* on behalf of the king.

1 Samuel 15:12-15 – Then Samuel got up to meet Saul, in the early morning. It was told to Samuel, "Saul went to Carmel. Look, he erected a monument of himself, turned around, passed by, and went down to Gilgal." So, Samuel went to Saul, and Saul said to him, "Blessed are you, by yhwh*! I have followed the word of* yhwh*." But Samuel said, "So, what is this sound of sheep in my ears, and the sounds of oxen which I hear?" And Saul said, "they were brought from the Amalekites because the people spared the best of the sheep and the oxen to sacrifice to* yhwh *your God. But the leftovers we utterly destroyed."*

It is not clear why Saul stopped in Carmel,[222] but his ultimate destination, Gilgal is significant. The location for Samuel and Saul's final confrontation in Gilgal mirrors the similar scene of Saul's rejection in chapter 13. Gilgal was the location of cultic practices in Israel at the time of Saul; thus, the source of Saul's power.[223] Both stories have Saul make a grave error regarding sacrifice and so it is appropriate that they both take place there. Saul's destination

[219] This discussion will be saved for v. 29.
[220] Neh. 3:20.
[221] This may be because the LXX renders וַיִּחַר as ηθύμησε, "Samuel was depressed."Paul Borgman, *David, Saul, and God: Rediscovering an Ancient Story* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 26. Peter R. Ackroyd, *The First Book of Samuel*, The Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible, (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), 125. Bruce C. Birch, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: the Growth and Development of I Samuel 7-15*, SBL Dissertation Series, (Missoula: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1976), 98-99.
[222] Tsumura merely refers to it as a "convenient place for Saul to stop." Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 397.
[223] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 397. Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 174.

being Gilgal indicates that he intended to sacrifice some of the spoils from Amalek there. However, his stop at Carmel to glorify himself does speak to his priorities.[224]

Despite Saul's transgressions there is no indication that he is aware of his misconduct. The wording of Saul's greeting to Samuel is the exact opposite to *yhwh*'s words to Samuel in v. 11.[225] *Yhwh* claims Saul has הֵקִים לֹא דְּבָרַי, "not followed my word", whereas Saul opens his welcome with הֲקִימֹתִי אֶת־דְּבַר יְהוָה, "I have followed the word of *yhwh*". Evidence would suggest Saul has deluded himself, rather than engaging in a Machiavellian attempt to supplant *yhwh* and gaslight Samuel.[226] Nonetheless, Saul's impropriety stems from internal failings: greed,[227] lust for power, and pride.[228] Disqualifying him from kingship. A subtle difference between the words of Saul and *yhwh* may be of note here. Where *yhwh* claims Saul has not followed his words, Saul says he followed the word of *yhwh*.[229] This is an ironic self-condemnation from Saul because *yhwh* did not only command one thing, but multiple. *Yhwh* commanded Saul to put the Amalekites under the ban, not spare them, kill all the people, and destroy all the livestock. Saul only followed one of those commands. Saul put Amalek under the ban; according to the letter of the law.[230] As v. 22 states: obedience according to the letter of the law is inferior to obedience in the heart.

Samuel's Socratic response to Saul's surprising feign of innocence in v. 15 is clever. Rather than directly accuse him, he forces Saul to condemn himself by answering to the presence of livestock from Amalek around. If Saul believes himself to be innocent, then making him

---

[224] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 95.
[225] Birch, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: the Growth and Development of I Samuel 7-15*, 99.
[226] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 398.
[227] 1 Sam. 15:9.
[228] 1 Sam. 15:12.
[229] Quinn-Miscall, *1 Samuel: a Literary Reading*, 104.
[230] The defense of Saul given by Van Seters citing other instances of the ban, such as in Josh. 6 and Deut. 13, proves this point. Saul does follow the letter of the law, but ignores the spirit, as he ignores *yhwh*'s further commands to not only put Amalek under the ban, but also to not spare them at all. Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 127.

explain himself and confront the contradiction between his actions and *yhwh*'s command is central for Saul to realize his mistake. Samuel frames his response poetically:[231]

14a: וּמָה קוֹל־ הַצֹּאן הַזֶּה בְּאָזְנָי

14b: [232] וְקוֹל הַבָּקָר אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי שֹׁמֵעַ

This account of synonymous parallelism[233] is a prophetic condemnation against Saul.[234] The punishment in vv. 22-23 is the announcement of v. 14's accusation. Chapter 15 opens with condemnation against Amalek, but through his misconduct, Saul has transferred the wrath of *yhwh* to himself.[235] V. 14 also alludes to v. 9 but separates the once joined concepts of הַצֹּאן וְהַבָּקָר, "sheep" and "oxen". This allusion turns out to be quite impactful on our understanding of the chapter.

D.T. Tsumura refers to the separation of two literary units[236] in a poetic relationship, i.e. (AB) into two (A B) and subsequent insertion of an infix (X), as "literary insertion" (AXB Pattern).[237] A and B respectively refer to the first and second part of an enjoined unit, in this case, הַצֹּאן and הַבָּקָר, whereas X refers to any item inserted between the pair. The act of inserting X into the pair renders AB whole. In v. 14, A and B become a hendiadys for "livestock" since

---

[231] The question of what is or is not Hebrew poetry is one that has been raised more in recent years, for instance Robert Holmstedt, "Hebrew Poetry and the Appositive Style: Parallelism, Requiescat in Pace," *Vetus Testamentum* 69, no. 4-5 (2019). Rachel Krohn & Robert Holmstedt, "Hebrew Verse Structure, Revised" (SBL Annual Meeting, 2020). When material from 1 Samuel is referred to as "poetic," or "poems," it merely means contains some, though not necessarily all, of the characteristics of Hebrew poetry. See for example, Michael Patrick O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1980).

[232] Fokkelman suggests that מָה is doing "double duty" and thus is implicit in 14b. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 96.

[233] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 96. See Alex Preminger and Edward L. Greenstein, *The Hebrew Bible in Literary Criticism*, A Library of Literary Criticism, (New York: Ungar, 1986), 149.

[234] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 96. See Claus Westermann, *Grundformen Prophetischer Rede*, ed. E. Wolf, Beiträge zur Evangelischen Theologie: Theologische Abhandlungen, (Munchen: Christian Kaiser, 1960).

[235] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 87ff.

[236] Words, phrases, or clauses.

[237] David Toshio Tsumura, "Literary Insertion (AXB Pattern) in Biblical Hebrew," *Vetus Testamentum* 33, no. 4 (1983): 469.

sheep and cattle are now broadly brought together to refer to the general category of farm animals. Therefore, v. 14 is translated as "What is the sound of livestock I hear in my ears?"[238] However, if A and B here become a hendiadys, then that further illustrates the absence of וְהַמִּשְׁנִים וְעַל־הַכָּרִים, "the second-best of the rams", which are ostensibly included under that umbrella. Their exclusion becomes deliberate. If they refer to all that is second-best, then the implication is that they are not here. But "here" is the location of sacrifice. Thus, they are not being sacrificed.

1 Samuel 15:16-19 – Samuel said to Saul, "Quiet. I will tell you what yhwh *said to me at night." So, [Saul] said to him, "Speak." So, Samuel said, "Are you so small in your own eyes? You are the head of the tribes of Israel.* Yhwh *anointed you as king over Israel.* Yhwh *send you on a mission and said 'Go, exterminate the sinful Amalekites. Fight against them until they are destroyed.' So, why did you not listen to* yhwh*'s command? Why did you swoop onto the plunder and do evil in the sight of* yhwh*?"*

The Socratic accusation begun in v. 14 concludes here: Saul blames the people for his conduct and Samuel reminds him that he is the king; nothing happens without him. Saul claims he took the livestock to sacrifice and Samuel points out his greed. Saul claims he followed the word of *yhwh*; Samuel points out that he did not even listen to it. Saul has been forced to admit to every act that contradicts *yhwh*'s command. The curt חֶרֶף underlines Samuel's fatigue with Saul's dishonesty. The root חרף means "to relax" or drop something; Samuel demands Saul drop the dishonesty here. Also, *yhwh* has profiled Saul accurately; such that his perfect response to Saul's excuses came the night before Saul made them.

[238] See Tsumura, "Literary Insertion (AXB Pattern) in Biblical Hebrew," 474ff.

Many have pointed out a connection between v. 17 and 1 Samuel 9:21.[239] When Samuel first met Saul, Saul balked at Samuel's interest in him, saying: "הֲלוֹא בֶן־יְמִינִי אָנֹכִי מִקַּטַנֵּי שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל."[240] 15:17 appears to allude to 9:21, however, the author of 9:21 is not necessarily the same as chapter 15. Saul's introduction in chapter 9 directly links to his anointing in 10:1, which itself connects to Samuel's instructions in 10:5-8. This foreshadows the rejection of Saul in chapter 13—which is a doublet of chapter 15.

Further, the events of 16:1-13 are a doublet to 16:14-23, but those events recall 14:52 directly and continue seamlessly from them.[241] There are strong indications that 15:1-16:13 interrupt a fluid narrative that begins in 9:1. Nonetheless, TDS references 9:21. This suggests that the author of chapter 15 has chapters 9-14 on hand when writing his narrative.

1 Samuel 15:20-21 – So, Saul responded to Samuel, "I listened to the voice of yhwh. *I went on the mission on which* yhwh *sent me. I brought Agag, the king of Amalek, but I exterminated the Amalekites. The people took from the spoils of the best of the livestock that should have been destroyed to sacrifice them to* yhwh *your God in Gilgal."*

Saul reiterates his excuse from v. 15; yet this time it is reframed to reflect Samuel's accusations from vv. 18 and 19. In v. 13, Saul claims that he performed the command of *yhwh*, yet Samuel asks a simple question in return: If you performed the word of *yhwh*, why can I hear livestock? Saul is forced to admit that the people took spoils from Amalek, but they destroyed "the rest."[242] Already, Saul has changed his story to admit that he did not fully follow the command of *yhwh*. Samuel once again questions this answer from Saul: Why do you speak of the people when you are the king, and why did you not listen to *yhwh*? Saul can no longer hide

[239] Bodner, *1 Samuel: a Narrative Commentary*, 157. Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 175. McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 267. Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 400. Quinn-Miscall, *1 Samuel: a Literary Reading*, 104.
[240] "Am I not a Benjamite, from the smallest of the tribes of Israel?"
[241] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 121. See 122ff for thematic connections between 9-14 and 18-19.
[242] הַיּוֹתֵר.

behind the people's actions and take a passive role, as he did in v. 15. Saul must reckon with his part in the event. He no longer relies on the passive "the livestock was brought up from Amalek." Now, his recollection of the events of the battle is centered around first-person actions: "I listened," "I went…where I was sent," "I brought back," and "I exterminated." He stops short of admitting fault, as he blames the people for taking the best of the livestock. In doing this, he exposes the contradiction in his story. His excuse in v. 20 seems to be that he believed that he must only destroy the people; thus, he followed *yhwh*'s command. V. 21 exposes that he knew he should have destroyed all the animals. V .21 and v. 13 are also incompatible with each other.

1 Samuel 15:22-23 – "But Samuel said, "Is the delight given to yhwh *through burnt offerings or sacrifices like obeying* yhwh*'s voice? Behold, to obey is better than to sacrifice. To listen is better than the fat of rams. Because rebellion is divination, and stubbornness is wicked idolatry.[243]Because you rejected the word of* yhwh*, he has rejected you from kingship."*

Samuel's proclamation of judgement on Saul is the central feature of this pericope.[244] Fittingly, it is unparalleled in 1 Samuel in poetic artistry and literary mastery. Each verse forms a couplet; with each line being subdivided into two half-verses.[245] The first line asks a question that the second answers. Any possible good done by Saul in sacrificing the best from Amalek does not outweigh the immense damage of the great sin of rebelling against *yhwh*'s commands. However, this response is formulated through a chiasm with 2c mirroring 1a and 1b:

[243] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 400.
[244] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 98. Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 401.
[245] As such, we can refer to each respective half-verse as 1a, 1b – 4c, 4d, rather than by their verse number. This terminology is taken from Fokkelman. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2.

1a הַחֵפֶץ לַיהוָה

1a בְּעֹלוֹת וּזְבָחִים

1b כִּשְׁמֹעַ בְּקוֹל יְהוָה

2c הִנֵּה

2c שְׁמֹעַ

2c מִזֶּבַח

2c טוֹב[246]

2c is doing double duty in this poem because it also forms a parallelism with 2d. Both are three-word half-verses,[247] with the desirable act beginning the phrase—followed in a comparable relationship with a synonym for "sacrifice."[248] 3a and 3b also form a parallelism with each other. Each half-verse contains a simile which concludes with the sin that Saul has been accused of rebellion and stubbornness, respectively. Each also begins with a comparable sin that the reader will soon discover that Saul hates—in chapter 28.[249] The final line is the climax of the condemnation; proclaiming Saul's ineptitude once and for all and ending his claim on the throne. Even here, the verb מאס, "to reject", is repeated, making the moral of this pericope clear. Saul begins by being unwilling to follow *yhwh*'s commands and rejecting them. Thus, y*hwh* rejects Saul.

This poem is the absolute pinnacle of all the examples of prophecy in Samuel. Nowhere else is Samuel as eloquent as he is here. The stylistic flourish in vv. 22-23 is the most unambiguous indication that chapter 15 is written by a different hand than the rest of 1 Samuel,

[246] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 99.
[247] הִנֵּה is performing a very similar role as מֶה in v. 14, doing "double duty" in both 2c and 2d. This is hinted at by הִנֵּה acting as the "middle" of the chiasm between 1a and 2c.
[248] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 100.
[249] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 100.

excluding 16:1-13 and 28:3-25. The majority of 1 Samuel is written in prose; so, the frequent insertions of poetry stand out in this chapter as unconventional.[250]

1 Samuel 15:24-25 – Saul said to Samuel, "I have sinned. I have ignored the command[251] *of* yhwh *and your words. I feared the people and listened to their voice. Now, please forgive my sin and come back with me so I may worship* yhwh*."*

Saul admits that Samuel was correct, and he intentionally ignored the command of *yhwh* and instead let the people do what they wished. He exposes that he lied in v. 20 and knew that *yhwh* commanded that all the livestock should have been killed. The repeated words שָׁמַע and קוֹל are used once again. Saul claims that he was afraid of the people. It is worth noting that there was no indication of this earlier in the chapter. The inflated numbers in v. 4 may highlight the vast throng of Israelites and give credence to Saul's intimidation, though without a direct connection, it is hard to reach that conclusion.

1 Samuel 15:26-29 – But Samuel said to Saul, "I will not return with you because you rejected the word of yhwh, yhwh *has rejected you from being king over Israel." And as Samuel turned to leave, Saul*[252] *grabbed the edge of his robe, and it tore. So, Samuel said to him "*yhwh *has torn the kingdom of Israel from you today and has given it to your neighbour, one who is better than you. Further, The Eternal One of Israel does not lie; he will not regret. He is not a man that he can relent."*

Within this section, the author seemingly contradicts themselves when Samuel asserts that *yhwh* does not regret making Saul king. However, in v. 10, *yhwh* says the opposite. While

[250] Tod Linafelt, "Poetry and Biblical Narrative," in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Narrative*, ed. Diana Nolan Fewell (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 86.
[251] Lit. "mouth."
[252] Lit. "he."

the two verbs are syntactically identical,[253] Robert Chisolm Jr. argues that they differ semantically. The verb's usage in v. 11 and later in v. 35 indicates the emotional grief caused by Saul's sin. Meanwhile, v. 29 lies in a paranomastic relationship with *yhwh*'s earlier reaction; its meaning is more akin to "retract" or "change one's mind." These interpretations are bolstered by the text. In v. 11, when *yhwh* grieves over Saul, Samuel reacts similarly and weeps aloud in the same verse.[254] Likewise, in v. 35, both Samuel and *yhwh* are saddened by the rejection of Saul, with Samuel the term used is הִתְאַבֵּל and *yhwh* is once more said to נִחָם over Saul's reign. Finally, in v. 29, when Samuel says that *yhwh* will not change his mind, he parallels it by saying *yhwh* does not lie like men.

The unusual name "The Eternal One of Israel" reinforces the notion that *yhwh* is unchanging as the root of "Eternal" here is נצח which is derivative from the verb "to endure." Some scholars have used this apparent contradiction to hypothesize that v. 29 is an addition to the original layer of the text. McCarter, for instance, labels v. 29 as a prophetic addition, appended to the original to soften the view that *yhwh* could be swayed.[255] However, because Samuel's reactions clarify each iterant of the verb, נחם appears to indicate the unity of the narrative instead of suggesting its disunity.

Samuel concludes his condemnation of Saul by vaguely alluding to David's election, much like he does in 13:14, "*yhwh* has sought for himself a man after his own heart and *yhwh* has commanded him to be a prince over his people." The dual reference to Saul's successor in 13:14 and 15:28 is another reason why it is unlikely that these two accounts belong to the same

---

[253] Both share the root נחם while being Perfect Niphal verbs.
[254] וַיִּזְעַק.
[255] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 268. See also Antony F. Campbell and Mark A. O'Brien, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 256. Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: the Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*, Coniectanea Biblica/Old Testament Series, (Lund: Gleerup, 1976), 34-35.

source. Yet, the two rejections of Saul share so many similarities.[256] Scholars have argued that one must be a direct retelling of the other. According to Wellhausen: the account in chapter 15 is the earlier of the two,[257] though the more common view is that chapter 13 represents the older tradition.[258] It has already been argued that chapters 13 and 14 are likely of the same source, and TDS has demonstrated an awareness of chapter 14. Therefore, it is more likely that TDS is a later addition than chapter 13.[259]

Some scholars have connected the tearing of Samuel's robe in v. 27 with chapter 24;[260] the language of clothing is rather pervasive throughout the story of Saul.[261] It is certainly possible that this is a direct allusion to those scenes. If the visual metaphor of Saul's kingdom being torn from him being like a torn robe were added to this narrative, it would add significant weight to David's tearing of Saul's robes. Instead of a symbol of nonaggression, David tearing the robe from Saul would be coded with a hidden meaning to Saul. Just as Saul tearing Samuel's robe meant the kingdom of Israel is being torn from him. David tearing Saul's robe also indicates that David is stealing the kingdom from Saul. As such, the scene in v. 27 becomes a foreshadowing of David's rise to power, and Samuel's decree would echo this in the following verse that Israel has been given to a better candidate than Saul. However, this dual meaning is not found in much of chapter 24. Saul reiterates the surface meaning that David's act is a sign of his mercy rather than a prophetic act.

The one exception is found in 24:22, in which Saul says to David: "Indeed I know that you will surely be king, and the kingdom of Israel will be established in your hand." This differs

---

[256] See Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 260ff.
[257] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 255.
[258] Birch, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: the Growth and Development of I Samuel 7-15*, 94.
[259] Discussion on why the author of TDS has rewritten the events of chapter 13 will be saved for the next chapter.
[260] Klein, *1 Samuel*.
[261] See Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 176.

from the prophecy in chapter 15 in several ways. Firstly, the cutting of the robe is presented as evidence that David did not wish to harm Saul. It is a well-established fact that Saul has delusional paranoia regarding David raising a coup against him,[262] it is David's attitude that shows that he should become king. The robe is irrelevant to David becoming king. It is not a sign of the kingship of David; it is proof that he is worthy of the throne. Secondly, the term "into my/your hands" is repeated throughout the chapter and not only regarding Saul's cloak. In Saul's response to David, he does not reference his cloak at all, but instead, references that he was delivered into David's hand.[263] Therefore, it does not appear that Saul is referring to the cloak as a sign of the kingdom in v. 21. Thirdly, the trope of the hem of a cloak as verification of a proclamation is evidenced throughout Near Eastern culture.[264] In this sense, David brandishing the cut robe would be strong legal evidence of his innocence. This fits within the established logic of the text; wherein Saul is hunting David because he believes David is trying to kill him. Tsumura argues that the significance of the tearing versus the cutting of the robe has very different connotations in their respective passages.[265] In Near Eastern literature, grasping the hem of a cloak is a well-worn trope, symbolizing the supplication of one person to another.[266] Saul tearing the robe begins as an act of petition and becomes a visual parable signaling that Saul will lose his kingdom.[267] David cutting Saul's robe, however, has no indication of entreaty and likewise does not mean David will lose his kingdom; instead, it has legal and evidentiary significance.

---

[262] Notably at the beginning of David's service: 1 Sam. 18:8ff.
[263] 1 Sam. 24:19.
[264] Abraham Malamat, "Intuitive Propecy - A General Survey," in *Mari and the Bible*, Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 78.
[265] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 588.
[266] Edward L Greenstein, ""To Grasp the Hem" in Ugaritic Literature," *Vetus Testamentum* 32, no. 2 (1982): 217.
[267] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 406.

1 Samuel 15:30-31 – Saul said, "I have sinned. Now please honor me before the elders of the people and before Israel. Return with me so I may worship yhwh *your God." So, Saul turned back after Saul and Saul worshiped* yhwh.

It may appear as vv. 29-30 are a doublet with vv. 23-25. The notable difference between these two sections is that Saul abandons his request for forgiveness. He no longer feigns any spiritual interest in the matter, instead, asks for Samuel's political favour.[268] At this point, the significance of Saul's repeated and unusual choice of words in "*yhwh* your God" makes sense. Saul has never had a relationship with *yhwh* except through Samuel.[269] The only worth that *yhwh* can give to Saul now is temporary political favour. Samuel centers his reproach in vv. 28-29 around the notion that *yhwh* could have changed his mind once it was made up. Once Saul seemingly accepts this line of reasoning, Samuel has no great objection to returning with Saul to satisfy some minor concerns of the king.[270]

1 Samuel 15:32-33 – And Samuel said, "Bring Agag, the king of the Amalekites to me." So, Agag came to him in relief[271]. Agag said, "Surely, the bitterness of death has passed." But Samuel said, "Just as women have been made childless by your sword, so will your mother be made childless among women." And Samuel butchered Agag before yhwh *in Gilgal.*

Samuel kills Agag and it begs the question if he did so to correct Saul's wrong, or purely as a method of divine retribution for Agag's crimes, as indicated in v. 33. Samuel's

---

[268] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 107.
[269] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 108.
[270] Alter's contention that וְשׁוּב עִם and וַיָּשָׁב אַחֲרֵי are antonyms is not quite convincing given that וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֵיתִי is a conditional Hit'pael, which implies that Samuel's absence would prevent Saul from being able to worship. Robert Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, First edition. ed., 3 vols., vol. 2 (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2019), 238.
[271] Alter believes the root is related to עדן, "pleasure" which would indicate that Agag came to Samuel with a light heart. However, some have advocated for a metathesis in which the root is מעד, rendering the meaning "and Agag came to him in chains." Shemaryahu Talmon, "1 Sam 15:32b--a Case of Conflated Readings," *Vetus Testamentum* 11, no. 4 (1961). Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 239.

condemnation in v. 33 reflects the poetic skill that the author has shown throughout the entire chapter.[272] Each half-verse is composed of four words and each word is identical in function to the corresponding word in the opposing line. Fokkelman displays the structure as "abcd //a' b' c' d.'"[273] The half-verses open with the comparative compound "כֵּן...כַּאֲשֶׁר."[274] The two subsequent words in each half verse are identical but in differing forms "שִׁכְלָה...תִּשְׁכַּל" and "נָשִׁים...מְנָשִׁים" respectively. The final word differs but shares the possessive ךָ ending, which completes the rhyme.[275] The poem has such an impact because it is not until the final word that Agag discovers that his sentence is death; when he discovers that the final childless woman will be his mother.[276]

This illustrates a consistent style of writing for Samuel's dialogue throughout this chapter, at minimum. Additionally, as Fokkelman and Birch have argued, the shape of formal prophetic judgement speech strictly structures the narrative.[277] Samuel's presence and proclamations center the narrative relationship with the following two pericopes of the anointing of David and the encounter of Saul with the Witch of Endor. To exclude the prophetic material from a hypothetical base layer, as some have suggested,[278] would remove the backbone of the story's progression and amputate it from the context of Saul's replacement with David.

1 Samuel 15:34-35 – And Samuel went to Ramah and Saul went up to his home in Gibeah-Saul. And Samuel no longer saw Saul until he died. Nonetheless, Samuel mourned for Saul and yhwh *grieved that he made Saul king over Israel.*

---

[272] Fokkelman calls this a "small, but perfect, poem." Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 109.
[273] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 109.
[274] Ronald J. Williams and John C. Beckman, *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*, 3rd ed. (Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 2007).
[275] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 109.
[276] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 109.
[277] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 95-96, 111. Birch, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: the Growth and Development of I Samuel 7-15*, 97-98.
[278] See for instance, Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 157.

The final addendum to this pericope sees Samuel and Saul return to their respective homes. It is well established across sources that Saul lived in Gibeah,[279] and Samuel lived in Ramah.[280] The final verse connects this pericope to the other two narratives within this source by alluding to their contents: v. 35a alludes to Samuel seeing Saul after his death, and v. 35b directly links to 16:1, where Samuel is still grieving over Saul. V. 35 and v. 28 communicate to the readers that this narrative is not over and foreshadow the arrival of the true king, David, in the next chapter.

1 Samuel 16:1 – So yhwh *said to Samuel, "How long will you mourn about*[281] *Saul? I have rejected him from kingship over Israel. Fill your horn with oil and go, I am sending you to Jesse, the Bethlehemite because I have found for myself amongst his sons a king." But Samuel said, "How can I go? If Saul hears of it, he will kill me." And* yhwh *said "Take a sacrificial ox with you and say, 'I have come to sacrifice to* yhwh*.' Then, invite Jesse to the sacrifice and I will tell you what you will do, and you will anoint the one I name to you for me."*

Yhwh's admonition of Samuel's grief in 16:1 connects this pericope to the previous one, which was centered on Samuel's emotional reaction to the rejection of Saul, through the repetition of the root אבל, "mourn", and the phrase מְאַסְתִּיו מִמְּלֹךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל, "I have rejected him from kingship over Israel".[282] *Yhwh*'s command to Samuel in v. 3 is a parallelism "I will show you אֵת אֲשֶׁר you will do, and you will anoint for me אֵת אֲשֶׁר I name you." The chiasm begins with *yhwh*'s role "I will tell you" and "I came to you", אֵת אֲשֶׁר as the anchor, and concludes with Samuel's response, "you will do" and "you will anoint".[283] The indication is that Samuel's acts

[279] 1 Sam. 10:26; 11:4; 13:16; 14:2; 22:6; 26:1.
[280] 1 Sam. 1:19; 2:11; 7:17; 8:4; 19:18-22; 28:3.
[281] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 414.
[282] There are frequent allusions to chapter 15 through repetition of many of the main verbs in both chapters 15 and 16. Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 181. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 113.
[283] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 115.

follow directly from *yhwh*'s commands, in complete opposition to Saul's rejection of *yhwh*'s word in the previous chapter.[284] Both chapters 15 and 16 begin with a call to a servant to go and perform the call of *yhwh* and unnecessary usages of the personal pronoun.[285] Samuel says in 15:1, "I myself was sent to anoint you as king" and in 16:1, *yhwh* says both "how long will you yourself mourn" and "I myself have rejected him". The contrast between לִמְשָׁחֲךָ and מְאַסְתִּיו, "to anoint you" and "I have rejected him", and the repetition of the extraneous pronouns mark these as the first and second acts in this narrative. The beginning of the first act finds Saul anointed and consequently rejected; leading to the second where Saul is rejected and David is anointed. In both cases Samuel is "sent" to anoint the king over Israel. The theme of Saul "hearing" from chapter 15 is repeated as Samuel is afraid that Saul will hear of his treason.

Samuel does not balk at the idea of electing a new king. If this were indeed the same narrative as the anti-monarchal source primarily found in 7:3-8:22, one would expect a reckoning from Samuel when the king was rejected for impropriety only to be immediately replaced with another monarch. Samuel was not against the idea that Saul would be king in chapter 8 because he did not know of Saul. Rather, Samuel was against the idea of a monarch in general. *Yhwh* acquiesces to a renewed effort to redeem the kingship station, which is not necessarily problematic. After all, in 8:7, *yhwh* immediately accepts the people's demand for a king because the damage has been done. Samuel, though, remained unconvinced—albeit, compliant.[286] One would expect an allusion to that scene, though one does not. Instead, Samuel is concerned with his safety and grieving about how the kingship of Saul ended.

---

[284] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 116.
[285] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 415.
[286] J. Richard Middleton, "Samuel Agonistes: A Conflicted Prophet's Resistance to God and Contribution to the Failure of Israel's First King," in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Ancient Israelite Historiography*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Lissa M. Wray Beal (Winona Lake: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013), 72.

1 Samuel 16:4-5 – So, Samuel did what yhwh *said and he went to Bethlehem. The elders of the city came to him nervously and said, "do you come in peace?" And he said, "I've come peacefully to sacrifice to* yhwh*. Purify yourselves and come with me to the sacrifice." And he consecrated Jesse and his sons and invited them to the sacrifice.*

The elders come trembling to Samuel, but in the Hebrew, the preterite is not "to come" but rather "to be afraid".[287] This emphasizes the mood of the people higher than the action itself. Similarly, Samuel is hesitant to come to Bethlehem for fear of being killed by the king. The rest of this scene is dialogue-heavy, and the brief snippets of narrative action are designed to prompt new speeches from Samuel or responses from the recipient of his words.[288] Samuel's high-quality lyrical speeches continue into this chapter, which signals that the narrative continues from 15:35 into 16:1ff. Namely, the call and response between the elders of Bethlehem and Samuel in vv. 4b-5 has a strong metric structure. The elders confront Samuel with a simple two-word question: שָׁלֹם בּוֹאֶךָ, "do you come in peace?" Their fear followed by the first word being: "peace", leaves no doubt as to their anxiety. It is not so clear that the reader can infer anything from their fear other than a recognition that both Samuel and the people are fearful of Saul; which is a signal of his malfeasance.[289]

Samuel's response echoes the pattern of their question back at them and inserts his excuse that he is there to sacrifice his ox: שָׁלוֹם לִזְבֹּחַ לַיהוָה בָּאתִי.[290] This is a lie—or at least—it is not the whole truth. Samuel is not here to sacrifice, nor is he coming in peace. His intent is

---

[287] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 117.
[288] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 117.
[289] For instance, R. P. Gordon's theory that the elder's believed Samuel would be disciplining them does not have much justification and ignores the similarity between Samuel and the elders' fear. A similar criticism can be levied against Paul Evans' theory that the elders had heard of Samuel's ritual killing of the king of Amalek. Robert P. Gordon, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), 150-51. Paul S. Evans, *1-2 Samuel*, ed. Tremper Longman, III and Scot McKnight, The Story of God Bible Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 176.
[290] "I've come peacefully to sacrifice to yhwh."

treasonous in every sense of the word. He continues his response by repeating the words of *yhwh*, adding only for the elders to "sanctify themselves".[291] The literal repetition of *yhwh*'s word signifies Samuel's obedience. This contrasts with Saul in the previous chapter. Samuel's command to the elders to consecrate themselves is most likely a reference to the ritual purity needed to worship *yhwh* and once again shows that the author was well acquainted with the Pentateuchal material.[292] The sudden introduction of Jesse and his family is most likely a summary statement upon which the following scene expands.[293]

1 Samuel 16:6-10 – So, it happened when they came that he looked at Eliab and said, "Surely, the chosen of yhwh *is before me." But* yhwh *said to Samuel, "Do not look at his appearance or his tall height because I have rejected him because man does not see like God.*[294] *Man sees with the eyes but* yhwh *sees the heart." So, Jesse called to Abinadab and brought him before Samuel. And he said, "This one is also not chosen by* yhwh*" And Jesse brought Shammah, and he said, "This one is also not chosen by* yhwh*." Thus, Jesse brought 7 of his sons before Samuel and Samuel said to Jesse, "*Yhwh *has not chosen these."*

Eliab's brief role in this narrative is an allusion to Saul and the failing of Samuel the first time he selected a king.[295] In 9:2, Saul is described as "stout and handsome, no Israelite man was more handsome, his shoulders were higher up than every person." Saul and Eliab's appearance and height are emphasized. Despite his intimidating figure, Saul is consistently shown to be weak-willed in the face of serious challenges.[296] *Yhwh* is now looking inwards rather than outwards. Saul's description is not an indication of chapters 16 and 9 belonging to the same

[291] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 117.
[292] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 417.
[293] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 418.
[294] "God" is not supplied in the Masoretic text but does appear in the LXX: όφεται ο θεός.
[295] Gordon, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, 151. Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 240.
[296] See 1 Sam. 10:21-22; 13:9-12; 14:45-46; 15:9, 24.

source, because Saul is elsewhere described as tall and handsome in 10:23, which is often considered to be from a different hand than chapter 9.[297] It is more likely that the national memory of Saul is one of a "strongman" figure and this is equally represented throughout all different accounts of Saul's kingship. Eliab and Saul are both rejected, מאס, which solidifies that the connection between the two is intentional.[298]

Samuel's first impression of Eliab stands out in comparison to Saul's failure to listen to *yhwh* in the previous scene. In both cases, they are sent on a mission, where Saul is told to listen to the word of *yhwh*, Samuel is told that *yhwh* will show[299] him the one to anoint. Saul fails to listen and the repetition of the root שׁמע emphasizes this. In v. 6, Samuel fails to see properly. The sons come to him and he "looks"[300] but is not "shown."[301] Samuel interprets his intuition as the truth and asserts that his seeing[302] is *yhwh* showing[303] his anointed before[304] him. Samuel is wrong and *yhwh* chastises him through a threefold repetition of יִרְאֶה in the upcoming verse. In a sense, both Samuel and Saul failed to hear *yhwh* before making their own choices,[305] though Samuel listens to *yhwh*'s rebuke and anoints the correct king. The difference between *yhwh* and Samuel's seeing is a theme[306] running through this scene.[307]

Yhwh's speech to Samuel, which is the central focus of this pericope, is reminiscent of the style typical of TDS so far. The speech is made up of five half-lines[308]—7a and 7b prompt

---

[297] Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 247-48. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 61ff. McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 19-20. Eißfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 362.
[298] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 419.
[299] אוֹדִיעֲךָ from the root נגד.
[300] וַיַּרְא from the root ראה.
[301] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 120.
[302] ראה.
[303] נגד.
[304] נגד.
[305] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 120.
[306] See 1 Sam. 16:1, 6, 7, 12.
[307] For a discussion of ירא as a *Leitwort* in this scene, see the following chapter.
[308] Characterized here as 7a-7e.

the moral of the speech; that the appearance of a man does not indicate his character. Meanwhile, 7d and 7e form a parallelism with the structure (Subject/יִרְאֶה/Object); with the objects forming an antithesis to each other.[309] 7c acts as the fulcrum of the speech. 7b to 7d all begin with כִּי, while 7c to 7e all contain the thematic verb יִרְאֶה. The purpose of 7c is to separate 7a and 7b from 7d and 7e. The meaning of 7c has been disputed as there seems to be a missing subject, per the LXX, though not everyone accepts this.[310] However, if there is an ellipsis omitting the subject of "God," then the role of this central half-line is clear. 7a to 7b begins the speech with the visible nature of humans and what they are concerned with. 7c is the lesson of the speech and 7d and 7e is the justification. Samuel forgoes his intuition and once the other sons of Jesse walk by, there is little to no justification for their rejection. This is not problematic because Samuel and the reader are listening for *yhwh*'s decision.

1 Samuel 16:11-13 – And Samuel said to Jesse, "Was this all of the boys?" And he said, "There is still the youngest, but he keeps the sheep." And Samuel said to Jesse, "Send and bring him, we will not leave until he comes here." So, he sent and brought him, and he was young with bright eyes and a handsome face. And yhwh *said, "Get up. Anoint him. This is him." So, Samuel took the horn of oil and anointed him from amongst his brothers. The spirit of* yhwh *came onto David from that day onwards. So, Samuel got up and returned to Ramah.*

This verse is the extent of David's role in TDS. He never speaks and is only given a brief description: he is the youngest son, in charge of keeping the sheep, and has bright and wide eyes. TDS is definitively not about David. Instead, it is about the relationship between Saul and Samuel. Even though not much is made of his character; David is described physically. His description has prompted questions from some scholars as many translate 16:12b as "he was

[309] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 122.
[310] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 418.

ruddy with bright eyes and good looking."[311] 16:12b and 16:7 appear to contradict each other, as we have no indication that David is a good person; but we do know that he is handsome. אַדְמֹנִי has a connotation of extreme youth. Esau is described as ruddy when he was first born in Genesis 25:25. Eliab is defined by his stature, but David is by his youth. In comparison to Eliab and Saul: David is not visibly kingly. Jesse's evaluation of David reinforces this perception of David in v. 11, "there's still the youngest, but he keeps sheep." David's eyes are his sole distinct feature; it is appropriate then that he looks after the sheep.

V. 13 ends the narrative briefly with David's anointing. Though it is reported without much comment. Suddenly, v. 13b seems to be different from the previous pericope. V. 13b introduces the notion of the spirit of *yhwh*[312] and names David. At first glance it appears as though this is a redactional gloss is meant to connect the originally unrelated narratives of 16:1-13a and 16:14ff. After all, the theme of the spirit of *yhwh* is of considerable importance to HDR,[313] beginning in 16:14. Therefore, the anticipation of the theme in the previous verse and explicitly naming the anointed one who will replace Saul could be a redactional link. If this was the position taken, then one could easily view the only reference to David in chapter 28, an easily removable לְדָוִד, as another redactional inclusion and conclude that David was not a part of the original text.

This explanation is unlikely. The author emphasizes Jesse's family too much throughout the pericope to remove David from the text. David's late introduction, therefore, appears to be a dramatic choice; left to be named until the last possible opportunity to build tension for the unveiling of the king. One who will be the primary character of the following book and a half of

[311] Cf. Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 241. McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 274.
[312] Much more will be made of the meaning of the spirit of *yhwh* in TDS versus HDR in the next chapter.
[313] The spirit of *yhwh* is replaced by a troubling spirit from *yhwh*, רוּחַ־רָעָה מֵאֵת יְהוָה, which plagues Saul for the remainder of HDR.

the narrative.[314] An author does not play this type of narrative trick unless they know the importance of the character to the following text.[315] There have been repeated signs that the author of TDS is perfectly aware of the contemporaneous tales being told of Saul and David and is intentionally commenting on them to frame them in a favourable light according to their worldview.

1 Samuel 28:3-6 – So Samuel died and all of Israel cried for him and buried him in Ramah, his city. Saul had banished the necromancers[316] and mediums[317] from the land. The Philistines had organized and came to camp at Shunem,[318] so Saul mustered all of Israel and they encamped at Gilboa.[319] But when Saul saw the Philistine army, he was afraid, and his heart was greatly disturbed. When Saul entreated yhwh*, he did not answer him, neither by dreams nor by Urim[320] or by prophets.*

As the most enigmatic section of TDS by far, vv. 3-6 introduces the scene with the medium at Endor with an eclectic list of methods of divination. Both acceptable to Israelite

---

[314] David Jobling, *1 Samuel*, ed. David W. Cotter, Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry, (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 84.

[315] This is not to suggest that this pericope was necessarily meant to be a prelude to HDR. Rather, it suggests that the character of David was well known for his role in these stories, and his significance to the reader would not be overlooked by the author.

[316] The translation of אבות is unresolved. Scholars believe there may be an etymological link to the Sumerian *ab*, the Hurrian and Hittite *api* and the Akkadian *apu*, which would refer to a hole in the ground meant to reach the dead or afterworld (Ebach & Rüterswörden). There seems to be a direct connection to the dead in etymologically similar terms throughout the Near East. See K. van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter Willem van der Horst, *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, 2nd extensively revised ed. (Leiden; Boston; Köln; Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Brill; Eerdmans, 1999), 806-09. Udo Rüterswörden Jürgen Ebach, "Unterweltsbeschwörung im Alten Testament: Untersuchungen zur Begriffs- uns Religionsgeschichte des 'ob," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 9 (1977).

[317] Similarly to אבות, יִדְּעֹנִי does not have a clear translation. It is always in a parallelism with אבות. However, the root is more easily identifiable as "knowing": ידע. The parallelism thus signals one who can raise and speak to the dead. Toorn, Becking, and Horst, *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, 907-08.

[318] A city in Issachar, in the Jezreel valley.

[319] Southeast of Shunem, at the southeast edge of the Valley of Jezreel.

[320] Urim was a priestly garment that most believe aided with lots or divine oracles. It is etymologically linked to אור, "light." T. Desmond Alexander and David W. Baker, *Dictionary of the Old Testament : Pentateuch*, IVP Bible Dictionary Series, (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 644-46.

sensibilities in v. 6 and unacceptable in v. 3.[321] Much more will be made in later chapters about these practices and the relevant connections to contemporaneous Near Eastern societies. It is of note that TDS, which has prophetic interests, also appears to have a detailed understanding of magical practices both in and outside of Israel.

28:3-25 is a narrative interruption in the story of Saul's ultimately failed conquest against the Philistine army. This can be shown geographically in 28:3 as the Philistines camp at Shunem in the Jezreel Valley, but in 29:1, they are far away in the South at Aphek.[322] Some take this to suggest that it has been erroneously placed within the text, perhaps belonging closer to chapter 31, in which Saul dies.[323] However, Tsumura argues that the narrative is logically organized not by geography but by character as the editor alternated between stories about David and Saul as the finale of their story approaches.[324] As their story concludes through Saul's downfall at the hand of the Philistines; David is the inside perspective on the Philistine movements. It is prudent to alternate between point of views continually.

1 Samuel 28:7-10 – So, Saul said to his servants, "Find a woman who performs necromancy so I can go to her and inquire of her." And his servants said to him, "There is a woman who performs necromancy in Endor." So, Saul disguised himself and wore different clothing and went by himself and two men with him and they came to the woman at night. And he said, "Divine a spirit for me please and bring up for me the one I say to you." And the woman said to him, "Behold, you know what Saul did when he cut off the necromancers and mediums

[321] Whereas Saul criminalized הָאֹבוֹת and הַיִּדְּעֹנִים, thus making them unacceptable magical practices, his appealing to the cultic practices of dreams, as well as priestly and prophetic means to access the divine does illustrate a certain level of acceptable practice of divination. See Frederick H. Cryer, *Divination in Ancient Israel and its Near Eastern Environment: a Socio-Historical Investigation*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 229ff. Or, more recently Kerry M. Sonia, *Caring for the Dead in Ancient Israel*, Archaeology and Biblical Studies, (Atlanta: The Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2020).
[322] Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 290.
[323] Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau*, 236-37.
[324] Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*, 616.

from the land. So why did you betray[325] *me?" But Saul swore to her by* yhwh*, "By the life of* yhwh*, no harm for this act will come upon you."*

15:23 argues for a moralistic equivalence that is realized in this chapter. There, Samuel relates the sin of rebellion and stubbornness to witchcraft and idolatry. Where Saul had previously rebelled against *yhwh*'s word to put Amalek under the ban, Samuel likened this to witchcraft, a crime Saul had viciously condemned—per 28:3. Saul had fallen so far as to reject *yhwh* again, this time by trying to subvert *yhwh*'s rejection of him ironically through the exact method that Samuel warned him of—witchcraft. Saul uses the same word while requesting the necromancer to speak to the dead קָסֶמִי in 28:8, קֶסֶם in 15:23. After this stunning hypocrisy, Saul pledges an oath to the necromancer for her safety; one which is rendered absurd by the mere act of making it.[326] Saul has approached her because he cannot connect with *yhwh* and is committing a grievous crime. For Saul to deign to speak for *yhwh* at this moment is so riddled with irony that it is nearly humorous.

1 Samuel 28:11-14 – So, the woman responded, "Who should I bring up for you?" And he said, "Bring up Samuel for me." But the woman saw Samuel and she cried out with a great cry. "Why did you betray me? You are Saul!" The woman said to Saul. And the king said to her, "Don't be afraid, but what do you see?" The woman said to Saul, "I see a divine being coming up from the ground." And he said to her, "What form does he take?" And she said, "An old man is coming up and he is wrapped in a robe." Saul understood that it was Samuel and he bowed with his face to the ground and prostrated himself.

It is unclear why the woman is so immediately frightened by the man that she raises from the ground. Saul explicitly tells her that he wants her to raise Samuel. It is not until she sees him

[325] Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 295.
[326] Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 292.

that she realizes who Saul is. Her description of the figure is nondescript, so it is unclear why his appearance was so shocking. A popular solution to this complication is to hypothesize a redactionary layer over the original narrative. A popular proponent of this solution is McCarter; who views vv. 11-12a as a late insertion to the text.[327] In the original layer, Saul's confident reassurance that she would not be punished proves that he is the king.[328] However, this solution would alienate Saul's response in v. 13 as he assumes she has already raised Samuel when the narrative has not yet made this clear. To McCarter, Samuel was not a part of the original layer, nor referenced in chapter 15.[329] A more likely solution can be gleaned from the text and does not require an appeal to a redactor. The reference to Samuel's cloak in v. 14 references 15:27 and would be a strong signifier of the prophet's identity.[330] This solution is somewhat more likely because Samuel's cloak is also mentioned regarding his mother and his early life under Eli and is therefore unique to him as a specific identifier.[331] Once Saul hears of Samuel's robe, he does recognize him through description alone, so it is more likely that this was the indication to the woman that the spirit was the Prophet.[332]

1 Samuel 28:15-19 – And Samuel said to Saul, "Why did you bother me by raising me?" And Saul answered, "I am deeply struggling because the Philistines are battling against me, but God has turned away from me and does not answer me any longer, not by prophets or dreams. So, I called to you so you can let me know what I should do." So, Samuel responded, "Why ask me if yhwh *has turned away from you and is your enemy?* Yhwh *did what he said he would*

[327] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 423.
[328] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 423.
[329] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 423.
[330] Erasmus Gaß, "Saul in En-Dor (1 Sam 28) Ein Literarkritischer Versuch," *Die Welt des Orients* 42, no. 2 (2012): 164.
[331] 1 Sam. 2:19. Mark Verman, "Royalty, Robes and the Art of Biblical Narrative," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 30, no. 1 (2016): 31. Robert Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History Part Two: 1 Samuel* (Bloomington; Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993), 218-19.
[332] Verman, "Royalty, Robes and the Art of Biblical Narrative," 34. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 269.

through me because yhwh *has torn the kingdom from your hand and given it to your neighbor, to David. Because you did not listen to the voice of* yhwh, *nor did you act upon his terrible wrath against Amalek. Therefore,* yhwh *has done this thing to you today. But* yhwh *will also deliver Israel alongside you into the hand of the Philistines and tomorrow you and your sons will be with me, as well* yhwh *will deliver the army of Israel into the hand of Israel."*

For one final time, Samuel gives a long condemnatory speech against Saul. Once more, it matches the style we have come to expect from the author of TDS. Saul is "deeply struggling" for three reasons: he is at war, has lost favour from God, and can no longer communicate with him. Saul's response is an epic twelve-line diatribe made up of four triplets.[333] The poem begins in 16a with the fourth לָמָּה- question aimed at Saul this chapter. These four questions are all condemnatory and each direct act by Saul is responded to by a variant of a לָמָּה- question. When Saul asks the woman to raise a spirit, she responds, "why are you trying to entrap and kill me?" When Saul promises her safety, she responds with, "why did you betray me?" When Saul bows to Samuel and addresses him, he responds, "why did you bother me by raising me?" Finally, when Saul petitions for Samuel's help, he responds, "why ask me?" Saul is repudiated at every turn, which illustrates the depths he has fallen to where each decision is a mistake.

Samuel repeats Saul's words against him in 16b; reinforcing that bothering him was useless because he already has all the relevant information.[334] Interestingly, Samuel does not exactly repeat Saul's words, as Saul uses the more general אֱלֹהִים while Samuel uses the personal name יהוה. Saul has repeatedly distanced himself from *yhwh*, referring to him as "your God" to Samuel and even now, Saul uses the more general term, illustrating the separation between him

[333] Each of the twelve half-lines will be referenced by their verse number and position within that verse. For reference, the poem begins with 16a and ends with 19**c**. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 611.
[334] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 611.

and the divine that the story reiterates in this scene.[335] Samuel goes one step further in 16c by explaining why Saul can no longer speak to *yhwh* because he has become the enemy to *yhwh*.[336] Some have suggested that there is a textual error in v. 16 because of the final word, עָרֶךָ, is not clear.[337] There may have been a transmission error that interchanged the original צ with the current ע. This would mean the original word here would be צָרֶךָ, which would also mean "your enemy."[338] Another option is a metathesis which switched the ר and ע, leaving the original as רָעֶךָ, or "your neighbour."[339] V. 17 also ends with לְרֵעֲךָ which provides an interesting parallelism between the two verses. In this case, the verse would be translated as "*yhwh* has abandoned you and is with your neighbour." However, this translation is less intuitive than the original. This concludes the first triplet and the message is clear: this is a pointless act; you cannot reverse this decision. Saul has once again been rebuked twice for the same sin. Both here and in chapter 15, Saul is criticized for attempting to make *yhwh* change his mind,[340] and the message remains the same: the damage has been done, *yhwh* has rejected you.

V. 17 starts with a parallelism in 17a-b. Both half-verses begin with preterite verbs with יְהוָה as the subject and end with the noun יד attached to a pronominal suffix and prepositional prefix. The translation of יד differs in each case, 17a being akin to "through my agency" and 17b being more literally "from your hand." Both 17a-b communicate the same message, *yhwh* has already set these events in motion and neither Samuel, whom *yhwh* spoke through, nor Saul—who was the recipient—can change the outcome. The conclusion to the second triplet, in 17c, reports the reality of the present moment—*yhwh* has turned from Saul because he has turned to

[335] Quinn-Miscall, *1 Samuel: a Literary Reading*, 159.
[336] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2.
[337] Thomas Egger, "1 Samuel 28:16-20" (paper presented at the Hebrew Club Academic Year 2008-2009, Concordia Seminary, 2011).
[338] Egger, "1 Samuel 28:16-20."
[339] Egger, "1 Samuel 28:16-20."
[340] Klein, *1 Samuel*, 270.

David. As hypothesized above, if there is a metathesis in 16c, this would make a straightforward relationship between vv. 16-17. 16a and 17a both involve Samuel's role in the story and 17a answers the question posited in 16a. [341] Meanwhile, 16b and 17b both involve *yhwh*'s rejection of Saul in his turning away from Saul and his tearing the kingdom from him.[342] Finally, 16c and 17c both involve the next king; as *yhwh* has chosen David as Saul's successor and this relation is stronger if both use the same term רעך.[343]

The third and fourth triplets, in vv. 18-19, introduce a new paradigm; which is the announcement of judgement to the individual.[344] AJI contains three sections, though. In practice, only the final two are of great importance as the first is often skipped. The three sections are the introduction, the accusation, and the announcement.[345] The accusation begins 18a with the causal phrase כְּאֲשֶׁר, which is a typical formulation of this type of speech.[346] This is why Saul's specific sin is not discussed before this point. In order for the AJI to be effective, the sin must be made explicit in the accusation section.[347] The announcement begins in 18c, עַל־כֵּן, where Saul's true fate is revealed. He will no longer be king. He will also lose his life, his army, and his sons. This dramatic announcement is made through a chiasmus in v. 19. Both 19a and c are the longest of the 12-line poetic speech; concluding the condemnatory address epically. 19a and c are both nearly identical. Merely reworded to reiterate the same message. This draws the reader's attention to 19b which contains the cruel fate to which Saul is doomed: "tomorrow you and your sons will be with me." Saul's actions do not simply have political ramifications, they have existential ones as well; his children will be caught in the crossfire. This speech is the climax of

[341] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 612.
[342] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 612.
[343] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 612.
[344] As first discussed in Westermann, *Grundformen Prophetischer Rede*. Henceforth AJI.
[345] Westermann, *Grundformen Prophetischer Rede*, 93.
[346] Westermann, *Grundformen Prophetischer Rede*, 106.
[347] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 613.

TDS and demonstrates the same skill as Samuel's poems in chapters 15 and 16:1-13. Chapter 15 is linked with 28:18, part of the AJI structure, which indicates that it must be part of the core narrative unless 18-19 was added as a unit. Interestingly, Westermann sees another AJI in 15:10-31,[348] which gives a literary justification for 28:18-19 being original to the narrative. The author of TDS was very comfortable with this type of prophetic speech to include it twice in one short story.

1 Samuel 28:20-25 – Saul quickly fell supine to the ground and was terrified because of Samuel's words. There was no longer any strength in him since he has not eaten food all day or night. The woman came to Saul and saw that he was greatly distressed, and she said to him, "Behold, your maidservant has obeyed your voice and I put my life at risk, and I listened to the words that you spoke to me. So, please listen to the voice of your maidservant and let me serve you a slice of bread and eat so that you'll have strength whenever you leave." But Saul refused and said, "I will not eat." But his servants pestered him alongside the woman until he listened to their voice. And he stood up and sat on the bed. The woman had a fatted calf in the house, and she killed it in haste and took flour and kneaded and baked unleavened bread from it. Then she came before Saul and his servants, and they ate it. Then they got up and left that night.

The conclusion of the chapter, and narrative, has multiple references back to the material of TDS. Saul's fear is once more highlighted. Having grown since the beginning of the pericope; as he is now וַיִּרָא מְאֹד, "terrified". The woman is also said to see Saul' great perturbance, וַתֵּרֶא, and to have obeyed Saul's voice, שָׁמְעָה שִׁפְחָתְךָ בְקוֹלֶךָ.[349] Her seeing is a reference to Samuel's call to see in 16:1-13 and her obedience is in opposition to Saul's lack of obedience to *yhwh*'s voice

[348] Westermann, *Grundformen Prophetischer Rede*, 98.
[349] "Your maidservant has obeyed your voice".

in chapter 15. To emphasize this point, she begs Saul to listen to her voice, שְׁמַע־נָא גַם־אַתָּה בקוֹל,[350] a request to which he initially refuses, which also harkens back to his obstinance in the opening of TDS. Eventually he relents, וּיִשְׁמַע לְקוֹלָם,[351] and the woman makes a meal for him. This meal is emblematic of a sacrificial feast; with a fatted calf and unleavened bread. Thus, making it the third sacrifice within three chapters—effectively unifying the events of TDS within the framework of sacrifice. An analysis of these unifying features will be done in the following chapter.

This chapter has shown the uniformity of style throughout TDS, especially in the prophetic speeches from Samuel. Additionally, a logical narrative arc for Saul and Samuel has been demonstrated. Which, when examined separately from the rest of 1 Samuel, tells a story free from inconsistencies. Furthermore, no other text has been found in 1 Samuel that could reasonably be included in TDS that would share the similar style, plot, and avoid any logical irregularities that its inclusion would cause. Now that the unity of TDS has been illustrated, an in-depth analysis can be done to determine for what purpose the author is writing this narrative and how it interacts with the surrounding material in 1 Samuel. The following chapter will discuss the material of TDS one more time. This time paying close attention to the themes, characterization of the two primary characters of Saul and Samuel and analyse the purpose for the unifying features identified in this chapter and what they indicate about the meaning of the text.

[350] "Please listen to [my] voice".
[351] "He headed their voice".

CHAPTER 3: LITERARY ANALYSIS OF TDS

The previous chapter laid out a comprehensive argument for the literary consistency of 1 Samuel 15:1-16:13 and 28:3-25. TDS is notable for its advanced poetic styling; particularly in the dialogue of Samuel. This style is unrivalled throughout 1 Samuel. Additionally, each possible link to texts outside of TDS was successively shown to be necessarily written by a different hand. While TDS is consistently written, it is also distinct from the texts surrounding it. The weight of these arguments suggests that these chapters constitute a unity. While the author of TDS differs from the authors of different Saulide narratives, the evidence suggests that they were aware of these texts and even may have used them to craft their narrative.

However, the evidence provided above is sufficient to determine that TDS differs from its surrounding narratives; it does not determine why the author wrote the text. If the author had the narratives of Saul in front of them—then one might assume that the story of the first king was complete. However, the author of TDS must have believed that they needed to add to the Saul cycle and tell their version of the tale. To study why this is the case, this work must step away from source criticism and enter the field of literary criticism.

For this to begin, it must be evident what literary criticism entails: in biblical studies, the term "literary criticism", has been attributed to many approaches to the text. In some older German works, the methods used in the second chapter of this dissertation would be called literary criticism, or *Literarkritik*.[352] *Literarkritik* is not a literary discipline; it is a historical one that studies the literary history of the Bible. In other words, studies the history of how the text

[352] John Barton and John Muddiman, *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 2.

was written and put together into its final form.[353] Scholars will speak of historico-literary criticism, which, as its name suggests, is a method to study the history of the Israelite religion through its literature.[354]

This chapter will not be engaging with *Literarkritik* but with a method of literary criticism made popular within biblical studies in the 1970s by Robert Alter, a literary scholar who applied his methods to the Hebrew Bible in the landmark *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. In this book, Alter argues that the Hebrew Bible is a work of literary mastery and posits that studying the book while ignoring its purpose as a work of literature prevents readers from understanding the purpose of its authorship.[355] Attempts at this style of literary criticism before Alter were often misguided; such as form-critical scholars. They usually ended up misapplying anachronistic terms onto the text where they did not belong.[356] Alter's method requires comparing the text to itself to uncover the artistry and conventionality used in its writing.

Literary Criticism studies the Bible not as a means to access religious or historical truths but as an end.[357] The narrative elements of the text become the focal point of study; hence scholars will analyze the text for plot development, narration, dialogue, characterization, and any

---

[353] This term was more common at the onset of biblical scholarship, particularly around the nineteenth century.
[354] Alexander Rofé, "Joshua 20: Historic-Literary Criticism Illustrated," in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay, Dove Studies in Bible, Language, and History (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2005), 132-34.
[355] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 1-24.
[356] Alter in particular examines Eissfeldt's *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, which divides the text into Western genres such as myths, fairy tales, and sagas, among more. Indeed, Eissfeldt's description of these genres does give the impression that they are external categories applied to the text after the fact. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 15. Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: an Introduction, including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and also the Works of Similar Type from Qumran: the History of the Formation of the Old Testament*, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd, 3r ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1965; repr., 1964), 32-47.
[357] As it is put in *The Bible as Literature* by Gabel, Wheeler, and York, literary criticism examines the text as subject and not as object. John B. Gabel, Charles B. Wheeler, and Anthony Delano York, *The Bible as Literature: an Introduction*, 4th ed. (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 18-21.

textual elements the author may have used to enhance the presentation of their story.[358] These elements are considered throughout the entire text's final form; rather than the sources identified by source criticism.[359] There have been attempts at harmonizing literary and historical-critical methods,[360] most notably, the "Structural-Historical Approach" by S.D. Snyman.[361] Snyman's approach is an attempt to incorporate "text-internal" and "text-external" studies. "Text-internal" is, broadly, the type of analysis seen in the second chapter of this dissertation: demarcating the text, analyzing any relevant textual variants, and identifying grammatical and semantic techniques used. Alternatively, "text-external" is a literary analysis of the narrative's relationship with the broader contexts of biblical and Near-Eastern literature.[362] Only after doing this due diligence can the reader infer the meaning of the text.

In *The Art of Biblical Narrative,* Alter assumes certain things about the biblical text in his approach to reading it. Firstly: he assumes that it was written to be a work of narrative. He contends that the best label for the Bible is "prose fiction," adopting a term from Herbert Schneidau: "historicized prose fiction."[363] A text written to be narrative implies an artistry that the reader can access, analyze, and use to interpret the narratives. After all, a work of narrative

---

[358] David G. Firth and Jamie A. Grant, *Words & the Word: Explorations in Biblical Interpretation & Literary Theory* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2008), 35.
[359] Firth and Grant, *Words & the Word: Explorations in Biblical Interpretation & Literary Theory*, 41. Robert Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 1: The Five Books of Moses*, 3 vols., vol. 1 (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2019), 3-6. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 21.
[360] Though many of these attempts cover the integration of a more diverse array of methods than simply source and literary criticism, the harmonization of synchronic and diachronic methods is relevant to this discussion. Paul R. Nobel, "Synchronic And Diachronic Approaches To Biblical Interpretation," *Literature and Theology* 7, no. 2 (1993); Suzanne Boorer, "The Importance of a Diachronic Approach: The Case of Genesis-Kings," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (1989). Willem S Vorster, "The In/compatibility of Methods and Strategies in Reading or Interpreting the Old Testament," *Old Testament Essays* 2, no. 3 (1989). Ferdinand E. Deist, "The Bible as Literature: Whose Literature?," *Old Testament Essays* 7, no. 3 (1994). L.C. Jonker, *Exclusivity and Variety: Perspectives on Multidimensional Exegesis*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology, (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996).
[361] S. D. Snyman, "A Structural-Historical Approach to the Exegesis of the Old Testament," in *Words & the Word*, ed. David G. Firth and Jamie A. Grant (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2008).
[362] Snyman, "A Structural-Historical Approach to the Exegesis of the Old Testament," 63.
[363] Alter also posits that the inverse of the term, "fictionalized history," may also apply. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 27.

art is written to be consumed by an audience and must use conventions accessible by that audience to be comprehensible. The question is how modern readers can access those conventions if they have been lost to the passage of time. Alter does not spend much time addressing this problem. He does explore contemporary Near Eastern texts; such as the Enuma Elish and other texts from the Hebrew Bible as a representative example of the sorts of narratives circulating at the time.[364] The biblical text differs because it is an "imagined reenactment of history by a gifted writer."[365] So, by studying the creativity of this author, one can intuit the intention behind the text.

If the authors of the biblical texts were truly literary masters, as is assumed implicitly by the literary critical movement, then reading the texts while paying careful attention to the skillful way they wrote it should reveal the redactionary seams. Alter has argued that there are conventions that can be discerned as used by the authors of the biblical text. Of these, three may be of use here: type-scenes, repetition, and *Leitwort*. Type-scenes are subtle narrative conventions meant to communicate a message to the reader based on unspoken assumptions that they bring to the text. Most type-scenes are frequently repeated episodic frameworks which play on the readers' expectations to make an implicit point about the scene.[366]

Biblical authors often use repetition as an expository reiteration to speak to the unconscious motivations of its characters.[367] Often a character is given precise instructions and

---

[364] For instance, when examining the narrative artistry of the second creation account, Alter compares it to a similar scene in the *Enuma Elish* to argue that humanity is a pivotal character in Genesis, whereas humanity is a mere object to Marduk in the *Enuma Elish*. Therefore, in studying the contrasts, the reader can learn what the author was emphasizing based on the literary environment in which the text was written. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 31-36.

[365] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 40.

[366] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 56-57.

[367] While most scholars have argued that this repetition is a sign of the oral nature of the early stages of the texts. Alter acknowledges the existence of oral presentations of the narratives but denies that the necessary conclusion is that the texts were composed orally. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 113-14. For the improbability of an oral

they faithfully replicate those instructions; emphasizing their obedience. If a character differs ever so slightly from their instructions—the story often revolves around this disobedience.[368] A variety of this pointed repetition is the notion of *Leitwort*, which is the deliberate reiteration of a "word-root"[369] throughout a narrative or concerning a character. The *Leitwort* can imply a moral to the story that the biblical author often will not overtly state.[370] For instance: the *Leitwörter* in the story of Jacob is בְּכֹרָה, "birthright", and בְּרָכָה, "blessing". These link to each other with the dual stories of Jacob's theft of his brother's birthright in Genesis 25 and his blessing in Genesis 27.[371] These ground Jacob's story with the fraternal conflict that established him early in life. Recognizing these parallels emphasizes the unity in the narrative and allows the reader to evaluate the text properly. Inversely, any study of this text that does not recognize this parallel is missing a crucial element of the meaning and formulation of the text.

One can reasonably expect that if a different author wrote TDS than the surrounding material, two things would be true: first, it would not have the literary conventions of those other narratives and secondly, that it would have literary conventions that are not within those narratives. Literary criticism can reinforce the findings of a source-critical analysis of that text. If a text is a unity and these methods are effective, then the text should be analyzed from all these perspectives and still be a unity.

---

composition to the text see, Patricia G. Kirkpatrick, *The Old Testament and Folklore Study*, ed. David J. A. Clines and Phillip R. Davies, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988).

[368] Repetition is used in more ways that this one example illustrates, though for our purposes this suffices. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 126-27.

[369] For instance, if the *Leitwort* was דבר, then the author would be liable to use all of the semantic range of the triconsonantal root, certainly דָּבָר/דִּבֶּר and דֶּבֶר but even דֶּבֶר (pestilence), דֹּבֶר (pasture), דְּבִיר (backmost), or מִדְבָּר (wilderness).

[370] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*.

[371] Michael Fishbane, *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts*, The Schocken Jewish bookshelf, (New York: Schocken Books, 1979), 50-51.

3.1. Leitwort in the Story of Saul

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Saul's failure to "hear"[372] is the central theme of TDS. [373] Saul is routinely told to listen to the voice of *yhwh*, an expression meaning "to obey." Saul is only ever said to have שׁמע the people. Frequently, he is told this shortly after he is told that he should be listening to *yhwh*. The story opens with a command to listen to *yhwh*, yet, Saul is said to שׁמע the people. This is often translated as "summoned". Given the context of Saul frequently listening to the people over *yhwh*, it is notable why this verb is selected.[374] After the battle, Samuel confronts Saul with his failure by paranomastically hearing the livestock that Saul has stolen. Saul was supposed to hear *yhwh,* but instead he heard the people. Samuel could hear this failure. Samuel frames his condemnation of Saul around his failure to hear. Samuel asks Saul why he did not hear and after Saul's denial, he lays out the central message of TDS: to hear is better than all moral acts. To not hear, conversely, is as bad as any evil act. Saul finally admits he heard the people and ignored *yhwh.*

After his rejection in chapter 16, Samuel privately frets that Saul will hear of Samuel's treason. While Saul fails to hear *yhwh*, his ears are very attuned to all that can affect him politically. Once Saul has the necromancer raise Samuel, the prophet reiterates what has already been said: *yhwh* rejects Saul because he would not hear. In the conclusion of the narrative the necromancer says twice that she had listened to Saul when it was dangerous for her to do so and thus begs him to hear her. While he initially rejects her, he relents and hears his servant's advice,

[372] שׁמע.
[373] 1 Sam. 15:1; 4; 14; 19: 20; 22; 24; 16:2; 28:18; 21; 22; 23.
[374] Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 173.

eats, and goes off to die. The theme of קוֹל [375] is intimately linked to the theme of Saul's hearing is a secondary aspect to the same theme.

Chapters 15 and 28 stand apart from the Saul saga as the only pericopes which שׁמע is a *Leitwort*.[376] Chapter 9 is distinguished by another sensory verb, ראה, which is used three times in quick succession in the center of the story. The narrator gives Samuel the moniker הָרֹאֶה, "the seer", and explains this term by claiming that prophets used to be referred to as seers. God justifies selecting Saul as king because he has רָאִיתִי, "seen", his people on account of their wailing. Samuel רָאָה, "sees", Saul coming and *yhwh* signals that this is the man about whom he told him. *Yhwh* calls for a king because of his seeing and then he informs Samuel, the seer, of his choice when he sees him.

ראה is used seven times in ten verses; all within a dense section in the middle of the tale. ראה is not an uncommon word in the Hebrew Bible, but each usage is notable for one reason or another. The moniker of "seer" is so unusual that the narrator needs to add a supplementary gloss to explain its usage. The author uses this term in place of the more appropriate נביא, "prophet", leading the reader to wonder why? ראה in verse 16 seems to be the wrong choice of word. *Yhwh* says he chose Saul to save his people because: "I saw my people because their outcry has come to me." One would expect that God would say he שׁמע, "heard", his people because their cry has come to him; yet the thematic verb ראה is used instead. Samuel's first encounter with Saul is through seeing him in verse 17, which is unsurprising because Saul's physical appearance is given considerable attention earlier in the story.

However, a problem arises if chapter 9 does have ראה as a *Leitwort* because chapter 16 does as well. This suggests a unity between these chapters. Alter identifies רָאִיתִי, "I have found"

[375] 1 Sam. 15:1; 14; 19; 20; 22; 24; 28:12; 18; 21; 22; 23.
[376] In 1 Sam. 9-15, the root שׁמע is used 18 times, 8 of which are in chapter 8. It is used another 5 in chapter 28.

in verse 1 as an antonym of מְאַסְתִּיו, "I have rejected him",[377] as God says to Samuel: "I have rejected [Saul] from kingship over Israel…I have found for myself among his sons a king." Whereas ראה functions as *Leitwort* for chapter 16, מאס was a key term within chapter 15, as the last chapter discussed at length. If Alter is correct, then the author of TDS has flipped the *Leitwort* between chapters 15 and 16; using antonyms to distinguish the kingship of Saul and David, the future king. Alter posits that the switching of *Leitwort* from שׁמע to ראה to reflect the prophet's "seeing" what it takes to be king.[378] מאס is repeatedly used in chapter 16 as the key term for the rejection of David's brothers. However, as discussed above, chapter 16 implicitly references chapter 9; so, it is not surprising that TDS employs similar language.

3.2. The Spirit of the Lord in the Story of Saul

The author's use of ראה and מאס is not the only way they comment on Saul's introduction from chapter 9. In the climax of David's anointing, he is set upon by the spirit of the Lord.[379] This plays upon a common trope found in the book of Judges. The SOL comes upon someone in Judges on seven occasions where it bestows a divine charisma upon the recipient to empower them to do supernatural acts and enact the salvific will *yhwh*. Lee Roy Martin describes the role of the SOL as an authorization to equip God-appointed leaders to save Israel from its enemies.[380] Wilf Hildebrandt argues that the spirit bestows charisma on the judges to fulfill the mission of *yhwh*.[381] Martin also shows that the רוּחַ from God is the "energizing presence" of *yhwh*.[382] In

[377] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 185.
[378] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 117-18.
[379] Henceforth, SOL.
[380] Lee Roy Martin, "Power to Save!?: The Role of the Spirit of the Lord in the Book of Judges," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 16, no. 2 (2008): 50.
[381] Wilf Hildebrandt, *An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1995), 113.
[382] Roy Martin, "Power to Save!?: The Role of the Spirit of the Lord in the Book of Judges," 26.

other words—the רוּחַ is how the divine hand affects history and enables humanity to enact *yhwh*'s will.

However, the SOL is also frequently found in the Saul story. The first mention of the SOL in 1 Samuel comes in 10:1-16. After meeting with Saul, the prophet secretly anoints Saul as the leader over the *yhwh*'s "inheritance" (1 Samuel 10:1). Samuel then tells Saul of three signs that will occur to confirm that God is with him (1 Samuel 10:7). The final of these signs is that Saul will meet a band of prophets; after which the spirit of the Lord will "rush" upon him, וְצָלְחָה. Samuel says the spirit will send Saul into ecstasy and he will "turn into another man." The reader does not see the first two of these signs. The third occurs in 10:10. After this scene, bystanders confusedly comment on the bizarre occurrence and ask: "What has come over the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?" The author then says that "Is Saul also among the prophets" has become a proverb.

The immediate sequel to Saul's prophesying comes in 1 Samuel 11:1 with an account of the treachery of Nahash, the Ammonite. Saul, having returned home, is beseeched by the elders of Jabesh-Gilead to come to their aid because Nahash has threatened them with destruction. In response, the SOL comes powerfully on Saul, and in a rage, he dismembers his oxen and sends the pieces throughout Israel. This highly evocative metaphor rouses the passions and fear of Israel and Saul raises a militia to attack Nahash. This attack is ultimately successful as Saul ambushes Nahash and the Ammonites and defeats them.[383]

The narrative of Saul's revenge against Nahash fits nicely into the pattern established in the book of Judges. Albrecht Alt wrote about a similar idea: saying that the step from judges to

[383] Saul's actions are evocative of Judges 19, in which a Levite dismembers his concubine who was sexually assaulted by men in Gibeah and sends the pieces throughout Israel to energize them to go to battle to take vengeance on the men who attacked her. The story of the Levite does not involve a judge, nor the SOL, and although a brand of charisma is employed to bring the Israelites together to avenge the criminals, there is no indication that the divine charisma is a motivating factor behind the man's actions.

kingship within Israelite leadership occurred during the rise of Saul; primarily through his charismatic leadership. Alt framed the rise of judges before Saul as failed attempts at centralized leadership.[384] McCarter also identified the type of story in chapter 11 as best known from the Book of Judges.[385] He also suggests that the office of kingship follows from the legendary age of the judges and the shared characteristic of the leaders in these two periods is divine charisma.[386]

Chapter 11 is not the final instance of the SOL rushing on Saul. In 1 Samuel 19:18-24, David flees from a deranged Saul and takes refuge with Samuel in Ramah. Saul sends his men to capture David, but they happen upon a group of prophets and the SOL comes upon them. His men begin prophesying alongside the prophets. After three failed attempts to send men, Saul goes himself only for the SOL to come upon him as well. In prophetic ecstasy, Saul strips naked and prophesies all day and night. The proverb "Is Saul also among the prophets" is attributed to this scene. Chapters 10 and 19 reinforce the effect the SOL is having in bringing about charismatic energy in the one who receives it. David Firth labels the second time Saul prophesies in the spirit as a parody of the first.[387] In chapter 10, the SOL is the sign that *yhwh* chose Saul to be king; in chapter 19, it proves that Saul is wrong as it physically prevents him from murdering David. The saga of Saul's relationship with the SOL begins and ends with antithetical scenes that show the decline in the king's relationship with *yhwh*. The sign that he was chosen is ironically used against him to mark his rejection.

In 1 Samuel 16:14, King Saul has lost the SOL and a troubling spirit is disturbing him. Initially, this spirit merely causes Saul discomfort, but by chapter 18, it has driven him mad to the extent that he attempts to murder David. This spirit is the impetus behind Saul's pursuit of

[384] Albrecht Alt, "Die Staatenbildung Der Israeliten in Palästina," in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (München: C.H. Beck, 1953).
[385] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 205.
[386] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 206.
[387] Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 219.

David in chapter 19. While these are not instances of the SOL interacting with Saul; the two spirits are related. 16:14ff evokes chapter 10 because the troubling spirit has come upon Saul in place of the SOL. Additionally, it was *yhwh* who sent the troubling spirit. There is also a connection through the role of music in these two scenes. While the SOL was brought upon Saul in chapter 10 through the prophet's music, in chapter 16, the evil spirit is soothed by David's music. In both cases, the lyre is the instrument played. Much like in chapter 10, the music of the lyre lifts Saul's spirit. Where it once brought it to ecstatic heights, now it only raises him from the depths of despair.

These are the four scenes that involve the SOL and Saul. In each Saul progressively sinks deeper into rejection and madness.[388] While the spirit plagues Saul as a sign of his election; the comments of the onlookers imply that Saul has embarrassed himself. Through the power of the SOL, Saul unites Israel through military might and becomes king. Once crowned, his experience with the spirit takes an ironic turn. A troubling spirit replaces the SOL and he falls into great turmoil. Saul hires David to soothe him from these depths of mental anguish. However, by 18:10, the spirit has become so troubling that Saul attempts to kill David the first time; followed by a second attempt in 19:9. David leaves the king's service, only for Saul to pursue him. Finally, *yhwh* protects David by having his spirit come onto Saul one last time and incapacitating him by placing him in an ecstatic mania. Mirroring his first encounter with the spirit. The narrative is bookended by the proverb "Is even Saul among the prophets."

The above narrative has a chiastic structure that centers on Saul's crowning and choice to hire David. In chapter 10, the SOL rushes on Saul, and he prophesies as a sign of his election. In chapter 19, the SOL comes upon him as a sign of how far he has fallen. In chapter 11, the SOL

[388] See Siam Bhayro's novel approach that argues that Saul's madness is first mentioned in 13:1. Siam Bhayro, "The Madness of King Saul," *Archiv für Orientforschung*, no. 50 (2003).

rushes onto Saul and the divine charisma expresses itself in Saul's military force. In chapters 18 and 19 a troubling spirit rushes on Saul and fails to express any military might while trying to kill David. The mirrored structure emphasizes the role of the SOL on Saul. The presence of the divine charisma in chapters 10 and 11 gives Saul's actions power and the lack of charisma in the final two scenes illustrates Saul's weakness.

Each representation of the SOL in this narrative is consistent with the spirit's effect elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. It brings about 'divine mania' that results in the alteration of the recipient into a "different man." The SOL comes upon Saul when the divine will move him to act, either as a sign of his election, to unite the country in battle or to stay his hand from attacking David.

The anointing of David in chapter 16 does not conform to this portrayal of the effects of the SOL. After the SOL rushes onto David, the result is not apparent. David does not react in any way; he does not speak at all. There is no sign of any prophetic reaction. Nor is David empowered to do a great act. The SOL being upon David is not mentioned again until his last words in 2 Samuel 23. In comparison to the consistent representation, the SOL has in the story of Saul, the spirit rushing on David seems more like an afterthought.

That is, if it were not followed by the scene of the troubling spirit coming upon Saul. As stated above, in 16:14, the SOL leaves king Saul. This series of events gives the reader the distinct impression that the SOL leaves Saul because Samuel anointed David as king.[389] If this were the case, one would assume that the SOL's presence was necessary for being king. In chapter 10, the spirit rushing onto Saul is not essential for his crowning. Neither the spirit

[389] This is not to suggest that the author of TDS meant for their text to be read before the story of the evil spirit and Saul, as the ordering of the texts was most likely done by a third party. Rather, they were commenting on an established tradition of king Saul's relationship with the SOL and wrote their own narrative to be conceptually related to the Saul story.

coming upon him, nor seeing men carrying bread and wine were essential for his crowing. However, they were signs that he was anointed as a prince. He was not anointed king until the end of chapter 11. There is a conceptual gap between Saul's anointing and the SOL rushing on him that does not exist in David's anointing.

By looking at each instance of the SOL coming upon a king—the difference in 16:13 becomes apparent. In chapter 10, the spirit rushes onto Saul as a sign of his anointing. In chapter 11, the SOL manifests an energetic spirit in Saul to facilitate the unity of Israel through his leadership. In chapter 19, the SOL is a roadblock intending to protect David. However, in 16:13, the SOL comes onto David solely because he was king. Seemingly the only purpose of its inclusion is to contrast with 16:14, where the SOL leaves Saul and a distressing spirit replaces it. The SOL is never causally linked to Saul's kingship. The only link to kingship is in 16:13.

The question remains: why is the representation of the SOL in 16:13 so different? The answer lies in the characters of Samuel and David. Samuel is a significant figure in the history of Israelite leadership as his position as leader of Israel bridges the period of the judges and the kingship. Accordingly, his duties are somewhat kingly and somewhat judicial. In anointing Saul, he affirms Saul's reign as the next step of leadership in Israel. Conversely, David does not have an equivalent scene of being anointed by Samuel. If 16:1-13 were removed from 1 Samuel, David would not have the same affirmation for his reign. Samuel's role as a kingmaker is crucial to the first 14 chapters of 1 Samuel. Yet it is absent when it comes to the true king of Israel. When David encounters Samuel in chapter 19, this meeting is entirely secondary to Saul's encounter with the SOL. Therefore, David's anointing is inserted into this story so that Samuel affirms David much in the way that he does to Saul.

3.3. Literary Analysis of TDS

With the major *Leitwort* analyzed and a significant commentary identified in the usage of SOL in 16:13—we may now reexamine the contents of TDS to understand what the author intended the text to say within its context. In chapter 2, the connection between the beginning of TDS and 14:48, the first mention of Saul's conquest against Amalek, was made clear.[390] The previous chapter argued that 14:48 implies a positive interpretation of Saul's actions, whereas TDS does not. Given that, it appears that TDS was intended to be an interpretive gloss. The author used Saul's attack on Amalek as a framework for their narrative of his rejection.

3.3.1. 15:1-3

The narrative opens in 15:1 with an introduction to the story's themes instead of an introduction to the characters of Samuel and Saul, saying: "It was I that *yhwh* sent to anoint you as king, over his people, over Israel. Now, listen to the voice of the words of *yhwh*." Samuel commands Saul to listen to *yhwh* because he has been anointed as king "over his people." The relationship between Saul, *yhwh*, the people, and Saul's "listening" will become the central focus for much of chapter 15 and thus the introduction of these three concepts is appropriate here.

A strong connection is made between Saul's actions and *yhwh*'s call. Samuel's role is as a mediator; but his words should be understood as coming from *yhwh.* Therefore, Saul must obey. As Robert Chisolm points out: TDS begins in this verse and the next, with several indications that Saul's attack on Amalek is *yhwh*'s and that Saul is more of an instrument in the matter than an active participant.[391] This may be why Samuel begins speaking to Saul with the superfluous personal pronoun. As discussed previously, the extra pronoun structurally binds

[390] See pp. 43-44.
[391] Robert B. Chisholm, *1 and 2 Samuel*, ed. Mark L. Strauss and John H. Walton, Teach the Text: Commentary Series, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2013), 143.

chapters 15 and 16 together,[392] but there has not been a good narrative reason found to insert an extra pronoun into Samuel's speech.

Many scholars view the unnecessary אֹתִי as emphasizing Samuel's role in the relationship between *yhwh* and Saul. Birch argues that Samuel is basing his current authority to command the king in his previous duty to anoint Saul.[393] Fokkelman argues along the same line. Pointing out that אֹתִי is the object of the sentence, rather than the subject.[394] V. Phillips Long, however, views this move as reinforcing *yhwh*'s authority over Saul; as it establishes that *yhwh* established Saul's kingship by anointing him over his people. Though this relationship is prophet-mediated, Saul's role in the transaction is the lowest priority.[395] Other scholars view this interaction more cynically. McCarter frames Samuel's speech as "asserting his own prerogative".[396] Richard Middleton argues that Samuel is taking credit for Saul's reign as a way of strongarming Saul into following his orders.[397] Keith Bodner's approach is somewhat softer, though similarly critical, arguing that Samuel's words rhetorically place him at the center of the scene over Saul; making it clear that he is in charge rather than the king.[398]

Alter argues that Samuel is being placed as the central figure of this scene as a rhetorical device to establish the authority over the kingship that he will wield at the end of the chapter when he rejects Saul.[399] The extra pronoun is undoubtedly a rhetorical device, not from Samuel, but the narrator. The three major themes of this story are all found in the first verse of TDS.

---

[392] See p. 64.
[393] Birch, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: the Growth and Development of I Samuel 7-15*, 96.
[394] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 86.
[395] V. Philips Long, *The Reign and Rejection of King Saul: a Case for Literary and Theological Coherence*, ed. David L. Petersen and Charles Talbert, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 135-36.
[396] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 265.
[397] Middleton, "Samuel Agonistes: A Conflicted Prophet's Resistance to God and Contribution to the Failure of Israel's First King," 78-79.
[398] Bodner, *1 Samuel: a Narrative Commentary*, 149-50.
[399] Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 234.

Samuel's centrality in this speech echoes his centrality in TDS. Saul's rejection is filtered through the perspective of Samuel's point of view and emotions. It is appropriate that the narrative begins with Samuel as the first speaker and first word of his speech. Further, Samuel establishes his role in Saul's anointing as a means of exposition for the reader. While there is no introduction to the characters in a literal sense, this acts as an introduction to their dynamic.

3.3.2. 15:4-9

As discussed in the previous chapter, Saul's tactics in his attack on the Amalekites are surprising considering the available information. He amasses the largest army in his tenure as king. Regardless, he resorts to stealth and trickery; setting a trap for the nomadic Amalek. The language in this narrative is, on multiple occasions, evocative of the account of the attack from the Amalekites in Judges 6. In both cases, the offending party attacks בּוֹאֲךָ, "to", another location, giving the impression of a persistent attack on a retreating enemy. The Amalekites destroy all of Israel's sheep, ox, and donkeys. Saul is said to destroy all of Amalek's ox, sheep, camel, and donkeys.[400] It is unclear whether the author disapproves of Saul's conduct with Amalek. Saul's adoption of the very fighting style that terrorized the Israelites may be seen as a just tactic against Amalek. Much in the way 14:48 lauds Saul for plundering those who plundered Israel; perhaps the author approves of this reversal of fortune. However, by v. 8, Saul's misconduct has begun. The king and his army begin systematically sparing the worthwhile possessions of the Amalekites. Fokkelman rightly describes this scene so extensively that Saul and the army "spare so much that [the] exception becomes the rule."[401] *Yhwh*'s call for חרם was comprehensive and

[400] Diana Vikander Edelman, *The Fabric of History: Text, Artifact, and Israel's Past* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 99-100.
[401] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 89.

leaves no room for ambiguity.[402] Saul's disobedience here is described in such deliberate terms that similarly leaves no room for ambiguity about his guilt in this matter.[403]

Beginning in verse 8, Saul's conduct illustrates his clear lust for wealth in manifold ways. Firstly, the emphasis on Saul "not being willing" to destroy the livestock places the onus on Saul, rather than *yhwh* correcting cosmic wrong.[404] Secondly, as noted in the previous chapter, there is some justification for the best livestock saved from a city under the ban.[405] However, what is entirely unjustifiable is the second-best also being saved. Alongside the explicit note that the people were unwilling to destroy these items, there is a clear impression that the people desired the wealth from this plundering, rather than, as Saul will claim later, to save them for sacrifice.

3.3.3. 15:10-12

While returning from the southern Amalekite region, Saul makes a stop in Carmel and in Judah, to erect a statue of himself and continued to Gilgal—which lies on the border of Judah and Benjamin. It is not immediately clear what a יָד refers to as it is used infrequently and only three times to a kingly monument.[406] Rachelle Gilmour argues that a יָד refers to a physical landmark that signals the power and memory of a king's great deeds.[407] Saul sets up the monument as an apparent victory stele. Absalom sets his monument up before his death in lieu of a son to do so for him. Gilmour argues that both instances of יָד erection implicitly relate to

[402] See Fokkelman's discussion on the arrangement of these verses and how the verb forms speak to Saul's systematic disobedience to *yhwh*'s commandment. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 88-89.
[403] Walter Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel*, Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1990), 110.
[404] Artur Weiser also argues that the inclusion of the Kenites at the onset of the narrative is an early indication for the importance of this mission, historically. Weiser, "I Samuel 15," 6-7.
[405] See p. 46.
[406] 1 Sam. 15:12, 2 Sam. 18:18, and both 2 Sam. 8:3 and 1 Chr. 18:3.
[407] Rachelle Gilmour, "The Monuments of Saul and Absalom in the Book of Samuel," in *Collective Memory and Collective Identity: Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History in their Context*, ed. Johannes UnSok Ro and Diana Edelman, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 250.

territorial possession.[408] Sara Japhet claims that the semantic range of יַד includes "portion of land,"[409] while Francesca Stavrakopoulou builds on this to argue that grave memorials act as physical land markers.[410] In both cases, the יַד glorifies the erector, namely Saul, and claims the land won in battle.

That Saul made a stop for the express purpose of creating a statue to commemorate his great deeds is telling. Saul has already supplanted the divine motive for setting Amalek under the ban and has not been willing to follow his commands to destroy everything in the city. Then he takes all of the praise for himself. Saul took advantage of the divine call for חרם to expand his territory and increase his legacy. Further, the author seems to want to draw our attention to this monument because they preface it with the הִנֵּה. Where the initial call to battle was meant to correct a historical grievance with the Amalekites—Saul has used it as a ruse to increase his power and wealth.

3.3.4. 15:13-23

Upon meeting Samuel, Saul greets him as though he has done his job perfectly. However, as discussed in the previous chapter, in doing so, condemns himself. In 15:1, Samuel commands Saul to listen to the דִּבְרֵי, "words," of *yhwh*, Saul greets him by claiming he has done the דְּבַר "word" of *yhwh*. *Yhwh* gave Saul four commands. However, in the battle description, Saul performs only one of these four commands adequately.

[408] Gilmour, "The Monuments of Saul and Absalom in the Book of Samuel," 248.
[409] Sara Japhet, "יד ושם (Isa 56:5) - A Different Proposal," *Maarav* 8 (1992): 69-80.
[410] Francesca Stavrakopoulou, *Land of our Fathers: the Roles of Ancestor Veneration in Biblical Land Claims*, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies, (New York; London: T&T Clark, 2010), 125.

Command from *yhwh*	**Saul's action**
(3a) וְהִכִּיתָה אֶת־עֲמָלֵק	(7a) וַיַּךְ שָׁאוּל אֶת־עֲמָלֵק
(3b) וְהַחֲרַמְתֶּם אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ	(9b) וְלֹא אָבוּ הַחֲרִימָם
(3c) וְלֹא תַחְמֹל עָלָיו	(9a) וַיַּחְמֹל שָׁאוּל
(3d) וְהֲמַתָּה מֵאִישׁ עַד־אִשָּׁה	(8a) וַיִּתְפֹּשׂ אֶת־אֲגַג מֶלֶךְ־עֲמָלֵק חָי

Saul performs the first of these commands as he smites Amalek. However, where *yhwh* commands him to exterminate, or put under the ban, all who live in Amalek, the text says that Saul is not willing to exterminate them. Where *yhwh* commands Saul not to spare them, Saul does spare them. Finally, where *yhwh* commands Saul to kill everyone, Saul captures Agag alive. Therefore, in his assertion of his obedience, Saul admits his failings.

When Samuel accuses Saul of this failure, his response differs from his greeting in v. 13. In v. 13, Saul claims that he performed the command of *yhwh*; the subject is Saul, not Saul and the people. However, his response is formulated differently in v. 15. He says the spoils "were brought" from Amalek because "the people" wanted to sacrifice them to "Samuel's" God. Saul is absent from the action until the last word: "we" utterly destroyed the leftovers. Saul doubles down on his claim in his greeting. His only involvement in the process was to place Amalek under the ban. This indicates a guilty conscience because his words would reflect the truth if he believed he did right.

Samuel does not accept Saul's reasoning. In a prescient response that is effective against Saul's upcoming excuses in vv. 20-21, Samuel assures Saul that he is responsible for the people's actions. Samuel sarcastically chides Saul for his cowardice: "are you so small in your own eyes?" *Yhwh* chose him as king, and thus he is responsible for the people's actions. The chapter begins with Samuel reminding Saul that he was the one to anoint him as king. This reads

as an exasperated response to a king who is making bad excuses. This reading is supported by the opening חֶרֶף, which gives the impression that Samuel is tired of Saul's lies and wants to move past them. Samuel's response directly relates to the opening of the chapter. Per Bodner, Samuel here reminds Saul of three facts: he is the anointed king, sent on a mission, and supposed to destroy everything.[411] Samuel efficiently summarizes the introduction to the chapter and TDS. The author intentionally crafted his opening to foreshadow the events of the following scene.

Saul has not learned his lesson and his second denial continues to shift blame onto the people. This denial is split into two parts. In the first, Saul reiterates his active role in the conquest being perfectly obedient. שָׁמַעְתִּי בְּקוֹל יְהוָה וָאֵלֵךְ בַּדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־שְׁלָחַנִי יְהוָה, "I listened to the voice of *yhwh*" and "I went on the mission on which *yhwh* sent me." These refer to the first few verses of TDS where Samuel commands Saul שְׁמַע לְקוֹל דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה, "listen to the voice of *yhwh*"[412] and עַתָּה לֵךְ, "Now, go…".[413] However, Saul makes a minor concession here—the first indication of his guilt, וָאָבִיא אֶת־אֲגַג מֶלֶךְ עֲמָלֵק וְאֶת־עֲמָלֵק הֶחֱרַמְתִּי, "I brought Agag, the king of Amalek, but I exterminated the Amalekites." Saul frames this decision as an act of obedience. As though the king of Amalek was not one of the people. Many scholars do not know what to make of this seeming crucial misunderstanding on Saul's part. Graeme Auld merely asserts that Saul does not justify himself,[414] whereas V. Philips Long claims that Saul is merely admitting to an undeniable fact and thus implies that he knows that he is guilty of this disobedience.[415]

Saul is acting consistently at this moment with how he has been portrayed so far. Recall that TDS opens with Samuel's claim that Israel is *yhwh*'s people and that Saul is subservient to the divine command. However, Saul subverts this battle for his resources. Saul then erects a

[411] Bodner, *1 Samuel: a Narrative Commentary*, 157.
[412] 1 Sam. 15:1b.
[413] 1 Sam. 15:3a.
[414] Auld, *I & II Samuel: a Commentary*, 176.
[415] Long, *The Reign and Rejection of King Saul: a Case for Literary and Theological Coherence*, 149.

monument to his glory; claiming the land on which the battle occurred. Most notably, while defending himself, Saul consistently holds himself, the king, as separate from the people. Where the people brought spoils from the battle—Saul remained faithful. Where the people took plunder from Amalek—Saul exterminated Amalek. In v. 21, Saul says that the plunder is meant to sacrifice to *yhwh*, Samuel's God. Therefore, it is not surprising that he does not view Agag as an Amalekite because it does not appear that he views himself as an Israelite.[416]

Samuel's response to Saul's second excuse is the climax of the chapter. The conclusion of the prophetic poem calls back to the first words spoken by Samuel in the chapter, in v. 1.[417] There, Samuel entreats Saul to listen to the voice of *yhwh;*[418] a phrase that is repeated throughout the chapter.[419] Samuel tells Saul to do this because he is king. The indication here is that it is the job of the king to listen to the commands of *yhwh*. To not listen is equal to rebellion and rebellion is just as grievous as witchcraft. This is Saul's narrative arc in TDS: he does not listen to *yhwh*, which leads him to disobey his command and visit a necromancer.[420] Therefore, this is not merely the climax of this chapter, but the central point in the entire narrative. The prophetic decree that explicitly communicates the author's moral lesson to their audience.

Some scholars have contended that Saul's reaction to his interaction with Samuel indicates that he was ignorant of any wrongdoing and that the reader is meant to sympathize with him. The foremost advocate for this view is David Gunn. His argument builds on an analysis of the conceptual limits of חרם and whether Saul's actions could be justified by appealing to the

---

[416] Elsewhere in 1 Samuel, Saul shows signs of increased alienation from the people of Israel. See David Firth's discussion of the ambiguity of 1 Sam. 18:1-9 in David G. Firth, "Ambiguity," in *Words & the Word: Explorations in Biblical Interpretation & Literary Theory*, ed. David G. Firth and Jamie A. Grant (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2008), 173-76.
[417] Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel*, 113.
[418] שְׁמַע לְקוֹל דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה.
[419] 1 Sam. 15:1, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26.
[420] Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, trans. J. S. Bowden, The Old Testament Library, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), 128.

historical expectations of what חרם implied. Gunn devotes a considerable portion of his work to pondering if חרם and זבח are mutually exclusive—or if חרם is strictly a profane exercise.[421] It has been well established here that the central question of note to the author is not what constitutes a faithful enaction of חרם, but how Saul repays Amalek for their historical wrongdoings to Israel. A carefully constructed analysis of חרם is undoubtedly helpful to this discussion; but it does not have the explanatory power necessary to answer why Saul fell short of his duties.

3.3.5. 15:24-31

Saul finally admits his wrongdoings and apologizes for his impropriety. Saul's immediate request to remove the sin and come back to sacrifice to *yhwh* undercuts the credibility of his apology. The verb translated as "forgive" here is נשׂא, "to lift" or "remove". Saul is asking Samuel to remove a burden placed on him, which is more acutely, the burden of the consequences—rather than the sin itself. Saul's request here to "return" so he can "worship" is suspicious. Why would Samuel need to go to Gilgal for Saul to worship *yhwh*? Saul repeats his request in v. 30 and it becomes clear that he was merely asking that Samuel could reinforce his kingship externally to please the people.[422] Most likely, he is asking Samuel to help sacrifice the stolen spoils as an act of political support. This means Saul is already returning to the sinful behaviour for which he is supposedly apologetic.[423] Saul is not repenting; he is asking Samuel, and in turn, *yhwh*, to repent[424] from his condemnation. As Alter has stated: to be publicly rejected by Samuel not sacrificing with him would be akin to humiliation in front of the people he fears.[425]

---

[421] Gunn, *The Fate of King Saul: an Interpretation of a Biblical Story*, 53-55.
[422] Borgman, *David, Saul, and God: Rediscovering an Ancient Story*, 28-29.
[423] Borgman, *David, Saul, and God: Rediscovering an Ancient Story*, 28-29.
[424] The verb used for "turn back" is שׁוּב and is frequently used to mean "repent."
[425] Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 238.

Saul has repeatedly attempted to use *yhwh* to increase his political power. From coopting the divine retribution against Amalek to gain territorial gains to taking spoils from the battle under the guise of sacrifice. Here, Saul again uses his desire to sacrifice to *yhwh* as a ruse for his benefit; wanting Samuel to forgive him so he may remain a divinely appointed king. Where he once claimed: "I have followed the word of *yhwh*," he now admits that: "I have ignored the command of *yhwh* and your words." He previously countered that he "listened to the voice of *yhwh*". He has now reversed this claim and admits that it was not *yhwh* that he listened to, but the people: "I listened to their voice."[426]

Samuel repeats his words from v. 23 in v. 26—a sign that Saul's call to relent has been rejected. Nothing more needs to be said because as Samuel himself explained, the decision of *yhwh* cannot be so easily overturned with mere words.[427] In a desperate attempt to stop the inevitable, Saul grabs hold of the train of Samuel's cloak. It is hard to see how this is accomplished without Saul physically falling on his knees to do so. This is the most submissive that Saul has been so far; as his previous attempts at placations have been wrought with excuses and petitions for mercy. Samuel uses this as a visual metaphor for Saul's rejection and scolds Saul for suggesting that *yhwh* could change his mind.

It is of note that Saul never asks *yhwh* to נחם, "regret", but for Samuel to נשׂא, "forgive", and שׁוּב, "come back". Samuel says that he will not return; interpreting Saul's second request as being aimed at him. However, Samuel then says that *yhwh* will not "lie, he will not regret." He has interpreted Saul's request to forgive his sin as a request for *yhwh* to regret. Of course, this is not a mistake on Samuel's part, but it does relate to the chapter's themes. Saul exclusively speaks

[426] Long, *The Reign and Rejection of King Saul: a Case for Literary and Theological Coherence*, 155-56.
[427] Birch, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: the Growth and Development of I Samuel 7-15*, 102.

to Samuel and rarely speaks to *yhwh*. Samuel takes his role as mediator seriously and consistently removes himself from the discussion.

The play on words around נחם in vv. 11, 29, and 35 has confounded scholars and led many to argue that the pericope contradicts itself.[428] However, as discussed previously, the author seems to be exploring the semantic range of נחם for some purpose. As noted previously, each reference to *yhwh*'s נחם is clarified by Samuel's own mental state. In v. 11 *yhwh* is sorry he made Saul king, to which Samuel reinforces the reaction by חרה, "grieving". In v. 29 *yhwh* does not relent, to which Samuel reinforces the reaction by calling *yhwh* נֵצַח, "enduring". Finally, in v. 35 *yhwh* regrets making Saul king, to which Samuel reinforces the reaction by הִתְאַבֵּל, "mourning". Therefore, the prophet is still the intermediary, only now between *yhwh* and the reader, rather than Saul. It is through Samuel that the reader is able to properly interpret what *yhwh* is feeling, and in fact those feelings are quite complex. Initially, *yhwh* is emotionally hurt over Saul's betrayal, but nonetheless steadfast in his rejection. By the end of the chapter, this cycle repeats with *yhwh* regretting Saul's kingship, but he does not let this stop him from his decision to anoint a new king, by the beginning of the second pericope.

Saul's final words to Samuel are his shortest so far. Eliminating all but a one-word admission, חָטָאתִי, "I have sinned", and his resilient request, "honour me" and "return with me." Diana Edelman claims that שׁוב is a *Leitwort* in this pericope; occurring five times in total.[429] Four instances occur in quick succession at the end of the chapter: Saul asks Samuel to return, Samuel says no, Saul asks once more, and Samuel finally does so. However, the term's first usage occurs in v. 11 when *yhwh* says to Samuel: "I regret that I crowned Saul as king because

[428] See a longer conversation on p. 58.
[429] Diana Vikander Edelman, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 102.

he has turned from following me." The proximity of these two terms, שׁוב and נחם is interesting. Saul's request for Samuel to do the very thing that caused him to become rejected may have prompted Samuel's second oration; reiterating Saul's rejection through physical metaphor.[430] With these words, Samuel finishes the חרם of Amalek and returns home. As he leaves, the reader is left with an ominous note: "And Samuel no longer saw Saul until he died." It seems the implication is that the two will not meet until Samuel dies, which is true. However, this may also be saying that the two will not meet until the day of Saul's death; which is certainly possible given the proximity his meeting with the medium of Endor has with his death in Gilboa.

3.3.5.1. Excursus

Before discussing chapter 16, it is now appropriate to briefly discuss how Saul's rejection in chapter 15 relates to his rejection in chapter 13 and indeed to the Saul story that began in chapter 9 and the Samuel story that began in chapter 1. A brief excursus needs to be made about the source composition of chapters 1-14. Firstly, it is well accepted that 1 Samuel 4:1-7:1 and 2 Samuel 6 constitute an independent narrative known as the "Ark Narrative." In my view, the rest of 1 Samuel 1-14 shows evidence of two distinct narratives. The first beginning in 1 Samuel 1:1—charts the birth and career of Samuel as prophet and pseudo-judge over Israel.[431] It is another account of quite different quality. It begins with Saul and his search for "lost donkeys", only to meet Samuel coincidently and be anointed as King seemingly without reason.[432] These two accounts have long been distinguished as very different: S is centred on Samuel as the protagonist. Whereas, Saul is the central figure in LA. LA's tone is more akin to a folkloric tale. S shares remarkable similarity with Judges and the most noted distinction between them is that

[430] Incidentally, Samuel's decision to eventually וַיָּשָׁב leads me to believe that שׁוב is not a *Leitwort* in this pericope because it does not align with the message of Saul' total rejection.
[431] Henceforth S.
[432] Henceforth LA.

LA appears to be pro-Saulide monarchy. S is skeptical of monarchy as an institution. LA has been viewed as earlier than S; since Wellhausen. The source division of the two sources are as follows: S is 1:1-4:1a; 7:3-8:22; 10:17-10:27; 12, while LA is 9:1-10:16; 11; 13-14.

One question now remains: does chapter 15 naturally continue either the narrative of LA or S? While many have argued that since chapters 13 and 15 appear to be doublets of the same event, that necessarily disqualifies chapter 15 from being a part of the folkloric narrative of Saul's lost donkeys. While this is a convincing reason to view these two accounts as originating from different hands, there are repeated scenes within single sources. Instead, the more compelling argument that these pericopes originated from different sources is that chapter 14 naturally connects to 16:14, rendering 15:1-16:13 an insertion into the narrative progression. As for S, there are numerous indications of Dtr editing within the story which is absent within TDS.

3.3.6. 16:1-5a

15:1 and 16:1 share notable similarities that reflect their roles as establishing the themes of the upcoming pericopes. Both verses refer to the שׁלח, "sending", of Samuel to anoint a king with oil. Both use the superfluous pronoun when referring to Samuel. As well, both use the *Leitwort* of the pericope; with Samuel telling Saul to שְׁמַע לְקוֹל דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה[433] and *yhwh* telling Samuel that he has רָאִיתִי בְּבָנָיו לִי מֶלֶךְ.[434] At the onset of the pericope of David's anointing the *Leitwort* has switched to ראה. Edelman argues that ראה is chosen to evoke the ראה metaphor from chapter 9, as well as a contrast with the שׁמע imagery of the previous chapter.[435] There is one last evocation of the שׁמע theme in v. 2 as Samuel frets "if Saul hears of it, he will kill me." This

[433] "Listen to the voice of the words of *yhwh*."
[434] "I found for myself amongst his sons a king."
[435] Edelman, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah*, 113.

ironic turn on the previous chapter's *Leitwort* yet again illustrates Saul's inability to hear, as the ruse set by *yhwh* ensures that a new king is anointed under the nose of Saul.

Samuel responds to this command with fear which is echoed by the elders of Bethlehem approaching him nervously.[436] It is unclear why the elders should be nervous about meeting Samuel and while it could be explained by news of Saul's rejection being widespread—it would be an extraneous addition to the text. Instead, the attitudes of all involved continue a minor theme from the previous chapter; but one which will grow in prevalence in chapter 28. For now, it is worth noting that Saul's disobedience was caused, according to him, because he יָרֵאתִי אֶת־הָעָם וָאֶשְׁמַע בְּקוֹלָם, "feared the people and listened to their voice". This anchors the theme of fearing to the *Leitwort* of "hearing." Consequently, Samuel fears Saul hearing of his anointing of a new king. It is essential to note that ירא is not used in 16:1-13.

The trickery planned by *yhwh* to avoid Saul's attention on Samuel is to plan the ritual sacrifice of an ox. This is a reference to Saul's downfall coming because of a sacrifice[437] and the initial anointing of Saul occurring after a sacrificial meal.[438] The anointing of David reflects the circumstances of Saul's; yet this time several crucial mistakes will be corrected. Scholars have commented that Samuel is more active this time—going out to find the king rather than waiting for the king to find him.[439] More crucially, the election of the king is not going to be based on how they appear, but rather how they see.

3.3.7. 16:5b-13

After sanctifying Jesse and his sons, though interestingly not David, Samuel takes a measure of them all and nearly makes the same error as he did with Saul. Eliab is a stand-in for

[436] Edelman, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah*, 114.
[437] Bodner, *1 Samuel: a Narrative Commentary*, 168. Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 182.
[438] Edelman, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah*, 114.
[439] Quinn-Miscall, *1 Samuel: a Literary Reading*, 115. Bodner, *1 Samuel: a Narrative Commentary*, 167.

Saul in this scene. His stature is explicitly compared to Saul's; as is the language used around him. Saul was more handsome than all of Israel and was a head taller than them; God tells Samuel not to pay attention to Eliab's appearance or stature. God has learned his lesson from Saul's kingship. The author is commenting on this narrative and subverting it for their purposes. The *Leitwort* of this story reinforces this message. ראה appears in chapter 16 seven times. Firstly, God finds, רָאִיתִי, a king amongst Jesse's sons. Then, Samuel looks at, וַיַּרְא, Eliab, but God reprimands him with a trifold usage of ראה: כִּי לֹא אֲשֶׁר יִרְאֶה הָאָדָם כִּי הָאָדָם יִרְאֶה לָעֵינַיִם וַיהוָה יִרְאֶה לַלֵּבָב, "because man does not *see* like God. Man *sees* with the eyes but *yhwh sees* the heart." This is the central message of the narrative and it centers around the *Leitwort* of ראה. Further, it is a direct condemnation of Saul's kingship as represented in 1 Samuel 9.

Alter also includes two usages of ראה in 16:14ff as part of this theme. In 16:17, Saul asks his servants to find a musician for him and in the following verse, the servant responds that they have seen David playing before. 16:14ff is not part of TDS and the inclusion of these two instances of ראה into the thematic usages of the previous pericope is doubtful. All usages of ראה in 16:1-13 are there to reinforce the central message of the passage. In instances where ראה could be used but would not be thematically appropriate—another term replaces it. In 16:7, God says to Samuel: "אַל־תַּבֵּט אֶל־מַרְאֵהוּ," "do not look at his appearance", using נבט rather than ראה. Rather than seeing the brothers, Jesse has his sons "pass by" Samuel; avoiding the term again. It appears the *Leitwort* of chapter 16 is intentionally crafted to comment on Saul's introduction in chapter 9.

There is one final usage of ראה, which illuminates what sets David apart from Saul. In 16:12 David is described as אַדְמוֹנִי עִם־יְפֵה עֵינַיִם וְטוֹב רֹאִי, "young with bright eyes and a handsome face". It was argued in chapter 2 that this description highlights David's relative youth; especially compared to Eliab and Saul's stature. The author has snuck a pun into this description

that is only obvious when considering the *Leitwort* of the pericope. The final of these three descriptors is טוֹב רֹאִי, or literally "good seeing". As it is used in Genesis 16:13: אֵל רֳאִי, "the seeing God." In context, it appears to mean that David was good to look at; as the previous two descriptors imply. However, in a narrative emphasizing how important it is to see, it is noteworthy that David is described as having "beautiful eyes" and "good seeing."[440] This inverts how the *Leitwort* is used in the previous pericope. Samuel commands Saul to listen to the word of *yhwh,* but he listens to the people instead and thus making him of 'poor' hearing. Here, *yhwh* tells Samuel that he looks at the heart and his choice for the king has beautiful eyes and is good at seeing.

3.3.7.1. David's Role in TDS

David is seemingly incidental to TDS. One must ask, then, why include him at all? Why not exclude 16:1-13 totally? As TDS is undoubtedly a story about the relationship between Samuel and Saul. Some argue that David is included because 16:1 begins the narrative of HDR.[441] There is strong evidence to conclude that 16:14ff comes from a different hand than 15:1-16:13.[442] David acts as a quasi-passive character in this scene—which would be an inappropriate introduction indeed to his grand narrative. David is included because HDR does not contain a scene where Samuel anoints David despite being favourable to his kingship. The only scene in which the two interact is in chapter 19:18-24, where Samuel protects David from Saul. Though Samuel does not speak to David in this scene. It is almost certain that 19:18-24 is not a part of TDS.

[440] Edelman, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah,* 116.
[441] See Weiser, "Die Legitimation des Königs David: Zur Eigenart und Entstehung der sogen. Geschichte von Davids Aufstieg."
[442] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 30, 258ff.

Samuel stands as the bridge between the period of the judges and the kings. His role in anointing Saul is paramount in both S and LA. However, when one excludes TDS from 1 Samuel, the prophet's absence from David's story is stark. Samuel's role as kingmaker was of tremendous importance to the authors of S and LA; yet this does not translate into HDR. David's anointing was inserted into the greater narrative to connect HDR to Samuel's story and retain his importance on the advent of kingship in Israelite history. There is evidence that the author of TDS had prophetic interests, thus, the exclusion of Samuel in David's story would have provoked a great objection from them.

3.3.8. 28:3-6

The opening to the final pericope once again establishes the central themes that will be important to the climax of TDS. V. 3 introduces two central plot points that will cause conflict to Saul in this chapter and lead to his embarrassment. Firstly, Samuel had died. Secondly, Saul has banished all illicit forms of divination from Israel. Samuel's death is reported in 25:1 but is written with a preterite: "And Samuel died," while 28:3 uses a perfect, "And Samuel had died."[443] Thus, the impression is that 28:3 is reminding the audience of something prudent to the story; as indeed it is. TDS is referring to something separate from its own account and the author must place his final pericope in a context for the sake of their readers. Alongside this report, the reader is given new information that Saul had banished inappropriate divination practices from the land. Since this is the first time this news is reported, it implies that it will be significant to this addition. It also calls to mind the legal texts in which such practices are banned and the consequences of these actions being death.

[443] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 388. Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 293.

In chapter 31, Saul dies at Mount Gilboa. TDS establishes that the Israelite army is encamped broadly "at Gilboa" to prepare the narrative for the climax of the final battle. Meanwhile, the Philistines are camping at Shunem in the Valley between Gilboa and Moreh. Endor is on the slopes of the Hill of Moreh,[444] quite a distance from the Israelite camp. Endor is very close to the Philistine camps and to get there, Saul needs to pass perilously close to enemy territory, indicating how desperate Saul is to speak with *yhwh*.[445]

ירא, foreshadowed already in the previous two pericopes; acts as the *Leitwort* of this chapter. Saul was described as: וַיִּרָא וַיֶּחֱרַד לִבּוֹ מְאֹד, "afraid and his heart was greatly disturbed". The term חרד is used here and in 16:4; describing the elders of Bethlehem when meeting Samuel. This links those terms and solidifies them as part of the theme of fear found in chapters 15, 16, and 28. This theme is intensified by the recurrent adverb מאד; which crescendos Saul's terror and leads to his collapse at the end of the chapter.[446] While the theme of Saul's "fearing" is less prevalent than his "hearing" in chapter 15, the two themes are not separate at all. The reason Saul failed to hear is that he feared the people; per 1 Samuel 15:24. Indeed, the next time Saul fears is when he sees the army of the Philistines and in response, he asks *yhwh* for guidance; effectively asking to hear his voice. However, his method is improper. This reinforces his inauspicious habit that he resorts to immoral practices whenever he fears people. Saul has only shown fear of people and consequently, he has only heard people and done what people want him to do.

Conversely, since Saul has never heard *yhwh*, he does not fear him and has rejected *yhwh*'s demands of him. Much like when Saul appealed to the necromancer on behalf of *yhwh* despite being unable to speak with him, Saul asks for the necromancer not to be afraid despite

---

[444] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 420, 38.
[445] Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 282.
[446] Gaß, "Saul in En-Dor (1 Sam 28) Ein Literarkritischer Versuch," 158. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 619.

being wracked with fear. Once he is rejected anew by Samuel, his fear finally advances to the point where he cannot move. He is literally sprawled out on the ground. Saul's fear have led him to hear the people but ignore *yhwh*. Yet this is why he is overcome with fear.

הָאֹבוֹת and הַיִּדְּעֹנִ are both listed here and in Deuteronomy 18:9-14; which catalogues all of the forbidden sorcery practices to Israelite law. Alter hypothesizes that the entire list in Deuteronomy could be a series of synonyms rather than multiple distinct practices.[447] His argument is somewhat bolstered by how these terms are grouped. יִדְּעֹנִי is always listed alongside אֹבוֹת and the latter is only used six times alone.[448] Within the Israelite authors' mind, there may be a conceptual amalgamation of these two concepts. Interestingly, Alter also suggests that Israelites despised these practices because of their perceived lack of efficacy rather than inherent maleficence.[449] Therefore, one could argue that הָאֹבוֹת and הַיִּדְּעֹנִים are a synecdoche for improper magic practices.

The etymologies for הָאֹבוֹת and הַיִּדְּעֹנִי are unclear. Some argue that אבות and אָב, father are etymologically linked and thus אבות is a term used in ancestor cults. Others argue that אבות is distantly related to the Akkadian *apu*, "pit", and reasons that the term refers to spirits of the pit.[450] Christopher Hays argues for an etymological link to the Egyptian *3bwt* for "family, household, image".[451] The usage in Egyptian seems to have a broader semantic range than אָב and denotes the entire family unit; including dead ancestors.[452] Meanwhile, ידעני is generally accepted

[447] Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 1: The Five Books of Moses*, 1, 680.
[448] Toorn, Becking, and Horst, *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, 860, 907.
[449] Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 1: The Five Books of Moses*, 1, 680.
[450] Christopher B. Hays, *Death in the Iron Age II and in First Isaiah*, Forschungen zum Alten Testament, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 170-71.
[451] Hays, *Death in the Iron Age II and in First Isaiah*, 171.
[452] Hays, *Death in the Iron Age II and in First Isaiah*, 172.

to be a cognate of ידע[453] and thus signified one with extraordinary knowledge.[454] Therefore, it is damning that after banning הָאֹבוֹת and הַיִּדְּעֹנִי, Saul wants to speak to someone who can receive knowledge from the dead.

Similarly, the terms "by dreams nor by Urim or by prophets" is the antithetical synecdoche, here standing for proper divining means.[455] There are three categories of accepted divination in Israel: oneiromancy, cleromancy, and prophecy.[456] Teraphim and Urim are conceptually linked; often paired together and can be broadly applied to the priestly institution of casting lots to determine the will of *yhwh*.[457] Saul has shown proper adherence to cultic practices without avail and as the scene goes on, he will eventually submit himself to the less savoury magical arts to seek aid. Saul was once viewed as one of the prophets[458], yet now he cannot hear *yhwh* and must demean himself and stoop to witchcraft and divination.[459] Within the rest of Saul's story there is no indication that he loses his prophetic talents. TDS introduces the notion that a symptom of disobedience is the loss of access to *yhwh*; a particularly stark fate for the prophetically inclined author.

3.3.9. 28:7-10

Saul commands his servants to בַּקְּשׁוּ־לִי אֵשֶׁת בַּעֲלַת־אוֹב, "find a woman who performs necromancy". His "seeking" of a medium has elsewhere been linked to the introductory search

[453] Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The New Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic*, 13th ed. (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2010), 396. Auld, *I & II Samuel: a Commentary*, 325.
[454] Toorn, Becking, and Horst, *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, 907.
[455] Alter suggests as much. Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 293.
[456] Cryer, *Divination in Ancient Israel and its Near Eastern Environment: a Socio-Historical Investigation*, 263ff.
[457] Alexander and Baker, *Dictionary of the Old Testament : Pentateuch*, 643-46.
[458] 1 Sam. 10:11; 19:24.
[459] This narrative arc has been studied among literary critics. See in particular the work of Matthew Michael. Matthew Michael, "The Prophet, the Witch and the Ghost Understanding the Parody of Saul as a 'Prophet' and the Purpose of Endor in the Deuteronomistic History," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38, no. 3 (2014). Matthew Michael, "Saul's Prophetic Representations and its Parody in 1 Samuel," *Old Testament Essays* 26, no. 1 (2013): 129ff.

of his missing donkeys.[460] In chapters 9 and 28, Saul is given a prediction of his fate; though the end is much grimmer in this scene. Saul violates the law, notably Leviticus 19:31, "Do not turn to necromancers[461] and mediums,[462] do not seek[463] them to become unclean by them." Some scholars point out Saul is already in violation of the law in v. 5 as he feared the rival army of the Philistines; which is prohibited in Deuteronomy 20:1. "When you go out to battle with your enemies, and you see more horses, chariots, and people than you, do not be afraid of them for your God *yhwh*, who brought you up from the land of Egypt, is with you."[464] Saul's fear, which motivates his actions throughout the chapter, is based on a lack of faith in *yhwh* and thus his inability to contact *yhwh* is appropriate.

The author of TDS symbolizes the nefarious act in which Saul is partaking through his clothing. As we have seen, cloaks have been a recurring theme in TDS and will continue to be. Just as Samuel's cloak tore to symbolize Saul's loss of the kingdom of Israel, Saul here dons a new and deceptive cloak in a desperate attempt to cling to his failing reign. Notably, Saul removes his royal garb while trying to remain the king. Alter notes that this moment is a symbolic representation of Saul losing the kingship.[465] Additionally, this scene is first chronologically in a series of stories where a character disguises themselves and a king attempts to escape the inevitable will of *yhwh*.[466] Richard Coggins suggests that the motif of disguise is

---

[460] Auld, *I & II Samuel: a Commentary*, 327. Michael, "The Prophet, the Witch and the Ghost Understanding the Parody of Saul as a 'Prophet' and the Purpose of Endor in the Deuteronomistic History," 322. Michael here goes over 15 thematic parallels between chapter 28 and the rest of the story of Saul. Notably, of these 7 are from earlier chapters in TDS, 6 are from pericopes that TDS has actively been commenting on (Saul's introduction in 9:1-10:16 and the SOL leaving Saul in 16:14), and 1 from the pericope that immediately proceeds the introduction to TDS (14:37). Only 1 fall outside these texts, and it is a general pun on Saul's name (שׁאל for "ask").
[461] הָאֹבֹת.
[462] הַיִּדְּעֹנִים.
[463] תְּבַקֵּשׁוּ.
[464] Quinn-Miscall, *1 Samuel: a Literary Reading*, 167. Edelman, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah*, 241.
[465] Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 294.
[466] 1 Sam. 28:3-25; 1 Kgs. 14; 20:35-43; 22:29-40; 2 Chr. 35:20-25.

used in cases in which kingship is rejected by *yhwh* and in all cases—the disguises fail.[467] The disguise is a convention that, when adopted by a king, illustrates the king's desperation and their inevitable downfall by the immutable will of *yhwh*.

If this is true, then the reader knows by verse 8 what will happen to Saul and the dramatic irony overshadows the enacting of these events that the reader has already recognized that they are witnessing a dead man walking. This allows the reader to identify the literary tools that highlight the descent of Saul as they happen—rather than in retrospect. As Saul commands the woman at Endor to "divine a spirit" for him, קָסֶם־, this is immediately reminiscent of Samuel's decree in 15:22-23: "Is the delight given to *yhwh* through burnt offerings or sacrifices like obeying *yhwh*'s voice? Behold, to obey is better than to sacrifice. To listen is better than the fat of rams. Because rebellion is divination[468], and stubbornness is wicked idolatry." The realization of that proclamation has come. Saul refused to listen, שׁמע, in chapter 15. It was the central message of the chapter and Samuel predicted that this tendency would be equivalent to divining spirits. Now Saul is found asking for a spirit to be divined for him. Perhaps Saul banished the necromancers and mediums to prove Samuel wrong; or perhaps, he had done it before the events of chapter 15. His unwillingness to hear *yhwh* in 1 Sam, 15:19, led him to be unable to hear *yhwh* in 1 Samuel 28:6. Which led him to the sin of divination in 1 Samuel 28:8.

What role does the medium at Endor play in the story? There has been considerable discourse analyzing the portrayal of the medium in this pericope. Given the strict prohibitions on divination in the Pentateuch, one would expect a diviner to be portrayed negatively; yet many

[467] Richard J. Coggins, "On Kings and Disguises," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 16, no. 50 (1991): 55.
[468] קֶסֶם.

scholars argue that the medium is portrayed favourably.[469] Susan M. Pigott argues that she is displayed in such a positive light to contrast the king who is the antagonist of the pericope.[470] Edelman notes that her role is not dissimilar to Abigail's in chapter 25; which notably is introduced with the first notice of Samuel's death,[471] If the audience is privy to the inevitable failure of Saul, then she certainly does act as a surrogate to the audience; giving voice to their concerns as Saul blindly marches to his doom. She is the one to remind Saul of the law that he made; making her trade illegal. In fact, she questions Saul's motives when he requests her services; which implies that she is not currently practicing divination. Making her a more faithful practitioner of the law than the king.

3.3.10. 28:11-14

Much like in their last meeting, the truth is revealed through Samuel's cloak. After hearing that the medium sees a man in a cloak, Saul knows that the spell has worked. The medium is disturbed. While Saul cannot see Samuel, perhaps a clever allusion to the *Leitwort* of chapter 16, the woman can see him and she is afraid of him. Why? W.A.M. Beuken notes the unusual brevity of the scene, as after Saul asks for Samuel, he immediately is present—as though the woman could not perform her magic.[472] Joseph Blenkinsopp has a much more cynical reading of the text. Arguing that she screamed because she did not expect the magic to work

[469] For a good overview of different portrayals of the medium and Saul in this pericope, see Suzie Park, "Saul's Question and the Question of Saul: A Deconstructive Reading of the Story of Endor in 1 Sam. 28:3-25," in *T&T Clark Handbook of Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics*, ed. Uriah Y. Kim and Seung Ai Yang, T&T Clark Handbooks (London: T&T Clark, 2019), 242-44.
[470] Susan M. Pigott, "1 Samuel 28—Saul and the Not So Wicked Witch of Endor," *Review & Expositor* 95, no. 3 (1998): 440.
[471] Bodner argues that this similarity is intentional as both pericopes feature a woman predicting the future of a king. Bodner, *1 Samuel: a Narrative Commentary*. Cf. Quinn-Miscall, *1 Samuel: a Literary Reading*, 167.
[472] W. A. M. Beuken, "I Samuel 28: the Prophet as "Hammer of Witches"," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 3, no. 6 (1978): 8. See also Quinn-Miscall, *1 Samuel: a Literary Reading*, 168.

since she was a fraud.[473] This interpretation depends on the readers to have a dubious expectation of the efficacy of necromancy, though since this scene is unique to the Hebrew Bible, the interpretation is not necessarily unreasonable.[474]

The medium was certainly in unfamiliar territory as she misdescribes Samuel as אֱלֹהִים.[475] S Fischer appeals to Isaiah 8:19 to argues that אֱלֹהִים refers to deceased ancestors.[476] Kerry Sonia has a slightly different interpretation. Arguing that these אֱלֹהִים are cultic heroes. In which case, Samuel would be an appropriate candidate for such a term.[477] Grenville J.R. Kent argues that the difference in language between the medium and Saul distinguishes them as polytheist and monotheist, respectively.[478] Meanwhile, Theodore J. Lewis draws a connection between 1 Samuel 28:13 and the Ugaritic King List (*KTU 1.113*), which uses the cognate *ilu* to describe the dead kings.[479] Citing equivalent examples in other Near Eastern texts, Lewis concludes that after death, ancestors were referred to as *ilu*; a revered state that is distinct from deification.[480] The wealth of examples provided by Lewis is convincing that referring to deceased ancestors is within the semantic range of אֱלֹהִים.

---

[473] Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Saul and the Mistress of the Spirits (1 Samuel 28.3-25)," in *Sense and Sensitivity: Essays on Reading the Bible in Memory of Robert Carroll*, ed. Alastair G. Hunter and Phillip R. Davies, Journal For The Study Of The Old Testament Supplement Series (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 55-56.
[474] W. Lee Humphreys, "The Rise and Fall of King Saul: a Study of an Ancient Narrative Stratum in I Samuel," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 5, no. 18 (1980): 81.
[475] Though אֱלֹהִים is written in plural form, there is no reason to infer that there were multiple spirits present, as is argued in Brian B. Schmidt, "The "Witch" of En-Dor, 1 Samuel 28, and Ancient Near Eastern Necromancy," in *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, ed. Paul Mirecki and Marvin Meyer (Brill, 2015), 122-26. Schmidt relies on the LXX to make his argument, which replaces the MT מַה־תָּאֳרוֹ, "what form does he take," with τί ἔγνως, "what are you acknowledging?" See Sonia, *Caring for the Dead in Ancient Israel*, 72-73.
[476] S. Fischer, "1 Samuel 28: The Woman of Endor - who is she and what does Saul see?," *Old Testament essays* 14, no. 1 (2001): 30-31.
[477] Sonia, *Caring for the Dead in Ancient Israel*, 92.
[478] Grenville J. R. Kent, ""Call up Samuel": Who Appeared to the Witch at En-Dor? (1 Samuel 28:3-25)," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 52, no. 2 (2014).
[479] Theodore J. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, ed. Frank Moore Cross, Harvard Semitic Monographs, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 49.
[480] Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, 50.

The final oddity in this section is how the medium immediately recognizes Saul once she recognizes Samuel. Many scholars admit ignorance regarding this question.[481] The lack of information in the text makes it difficult to receive a clear answer. Early interpretations assumed that the great prophet Samuel would not have arisen if not for the call of a king.[482] More recently, McCarter appeals to redactionary insertions to explain the difficulty.[483] These remain unconvincing as they assume the presence of Samuel is a secondary amendment to an original folkloric story and this undermines the message of TDS. Other interpretations read the scene as an unprompted vision rather than a divining of a spirit, in which a vision of Samuel comes upon the woman before she can perform her illegal magic. In this case, the knowledge of Saul's identity appears to her instead of her intuiting it.[484] These interpretations rely on information not provided in the text. Instead, the most appealing explanation is that the wealth of information has finally allowed the medium to intuit that her client is the king. Much like Saul, when the medium sees Samuel's distinctive robe, she recognizes his identity and realizes who her client is in front of her.

3.3.11. 28:15-19

Perhaps the medium acts as an intermediary between Saul and Samuel in the upcoming scene, but she fades into the background for the sake of narrative expediency.[485] Saul's desired meeting does not go well. Samuel immediately opens his conversation with Saul by rebuking him: "Why did you bother me by raising me?" While the act of being raised from the dead is

---

[481] Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 292-93. Quinn-Miscall, *1 Samuel: a Literary Reading*, 168. Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 282-83. Bodner, *1 Samuel: a Narrative Commentary*, 296-97.
[482] F. C. Cook and J. M. Fuller, *The Bible Commentary: 1 Samuel to Esther*, Barnes' Notes, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987; repr., 1879), 66. Karl Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel*, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1902), 180.
[483] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 421.
[484] Beuken, "I Samuel 28: the Prophet as "Hammer of Witches"," 9.
[485] Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume II*, 2, 609.

certainly a tiring experience, Samuel's question is most likely a condemnation of the method by which he was able to speak to him again.[486] Saul's response cannot help but reveal his turmoil: צַר־לִי מְאֹד, "I am deeply struggling", using the thematic מְאֹד once more. His speech is lengthy but composed of many brief assertions, reminiscent of the "garrulous" speech given by the young women he met in his first scene.[487] Alter notes that the language of the speech is evocative of Saul's desperate breathlessness.[488] Saul is in dire straits and this is his final option.

Samuel is irritated by Saul, and he rebukes him one final time: "Why ask me if *yhwh* has turned away from you and is your enemy? *Yhwh* did what he said he would through me." Saul has experienced what Samuel foretold in their last meeting. *Yhwh* rejected Saul as king and the kingdom was torn from him. Samuel's response uses Saul's name in his rebuke, וְלָמָּה תִּשְׁאָלֵנִי, "why ask me", as שׁאל means both "Saul" and "to ask."[489] Amidst his humiliation, the author needles him some more by equivocating his name with the pointless questioning he is aiming at Samuel.

A novel fact comes from this interaction. In 15:28, Samuel merely informed Saul that *yhwh* has selected "one who is better than you" as the next king. Here Saul is finally informed that his successor is David; his general. While the intermediary stories about Saul and David are written by a different hand than TDS, they inform the background that this story is set in and thus the pathos in this scene remains. Saul's fears about David have been actualized:[490] "And now, behold, I know that you shall surely be king, and that the kingdom of Israel shall be established in your hand. Swear to me therefore by the Lord that you will not cut off my

[486] Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 293.
[487] Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 207.
[488] Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 295.
[489] Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 294.
[490] Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 294.

offspring after me, and that you will not destroy my name out of my father's house."[491] Not only will he lose the kingship, but his sons with die and his name that he took care to establish[492] will be removed from the world—"tomorrow you and your sons will be with me."

3.3.12. 28:20-25

Saul collapses from dismay and fatigue after hearing these words. For the second time in TDS, Saul prostrates himself before Samuel; but Samuel has already left. This last scene serves as a great conclusion to TDS as it reiterates the themes from each of the three pericopes in quick succession. Saul's great fear,[493] has finally driven him to the brink of destruction and it seems to remove all will to action from him. The medium sees,[494] his emotion and says, "Behold, your maidservant has obeyed,[495] your voice and I put my life at risk, and I listened,[496] to the words that you spoke to me. So, please listen,[497] to the voice of your maidservant." Emphasis is placed on שׁמע as it is the source of Saul's downfall. Saul initially refuses with a feeble לֹא אֹכַל, "I will not eat", having nearly no energy to speak, but eventually, he listens,[498] to their voice and eats her food before leaving.

Some focus has been placed on the meal that the woman makes for Saul and his men. Kent argues that the meal is a sacrificial slaughter. The word used to describe the killing of the calf is וַתִּזְבָּחֵהוּ, which is mainly used for ritual sacrifice.[499] Additionally, the מַצּוֹת, "unleavened

---

[491] 1 Sam. 24:20-21, ESV.
[492] 1 Sam. 15:12.
[493] וַיִּרָא מְאֹד.
[494] וַתֵּרֶא.
[495] שָׁמְאעָה.
[496] וָאֶשְׁמַע.
[497] שְׁמַע.
[498] וַיִּשְׁמַע.
[499] Kent, ""Call up Samuel": Who Appeared to the Witch at En-Dor? (1 Samuel 28:3-25)," 146.

bread", is a component of sacrifices; as per Leviticus 2:4-11.[500] Whether the meal was inappropriately prepared or not—its role is to bookend Saul's story with ritual meals.[501] The is a dark twist on his introductory scene—where he was hailed as an oncoming king at a ritual meal very similar to this one. Now, Saul eats a perverse facsimile of that meal, perhaps still catatonic from shock; only to get up to his death.[502]

With this, TDS ends. The reader is left knowing that the king dies in shame and humiliation; his body mutilated and displayed as a sign of his defeat. In the previous chapter, TDS was shown to have a distinct style and artistry implemented throughout. It has been shown that the narrative of TDS is similarly artfully displayed, with integrated themes that span pericopes but blend to tell a story of a kingship that fell apart due to an unwillingness to acknowledge the authority of the deity who delivered the monarchy. The story ends in a dramatic climax, full of pathos and emotion and leaves the king empty; unable to do anything but acknowledge the inevitability of his situation and face it grimly.

In the final chapter of this dissertation I will discuss one final interpretation of TDS: that of John Van Seters. He is the lone scholar to identify that TDS is a distinct narrative from 1 Samuel and analyze the chapters as such. However, though his source analysis is correct, his interpretation of the material is very different from my own. Viewing it as a pro-Saulide and anti-prophetic narrative. Consequently, the final chapter will fully expand his argument, determine the logic behind his decisions and interpretation, and argue why he concluded as he did. Crucially, it will argue why his reasoning is incorrect and argue for my own interpretation of

---

[500] Kent, ""Call up Samuel": Who Appeared to the Witch at En-Dor? (1 Samuel 28:3-25)," 147.
[501] Kent acknowledges this aspect of the allusion, listing it as one part of a long sequence of inappropriate sacrificial actions by Saul, much of which are not relevant once TDS is acknowledged as a separate source. Kent, ""Call up Samuel": Who Appeared to the Witch at En-Dor? (1 Samuel 28:3-25)," 146.
[502] Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2.

the material. It discuss why the narrative was written and what it is saying about the surrounding material of 1 Samuel.

CHAPTER 4: JOHN VAN SETERS AND THE PURPOSE OF TDS

The previous chapter analyzed the themes and literary artistry the author of TDS used to cultivate his narrative about the end of King Saul's reign. It is established that TDS was never meant to stand alone as a story but is crafted to supplement the accepted wisdom about the reign of King Saul and the conditions that led to King David taking the throne. The following chapter will now turn to the question of why? Why did the author of TDS find it necessary to add to the story of King Saul? This chapter will engage with the work of John Van Seters and his analysis of this text. As the first chapter mentioned, Van Seters is one of the few scholars who recognizes that 1 Samuel 15:1-16:13, 28:3-25 are a unity. In fact, he was the first to identify that TDS could not belong to the HDR and consequently must be a unity due to the relative cohesion of the surrounding material. I am indebted to Van Seters for much of my arguments about TDS, including its role as a commentary on previous material and its connection to later prophets. However, despite being aligned on so much, our interpretations are dissimilar because Van Seters views the text as pro-Saulide. I, on the other hand, see it as unambiguously anti-Saulide. This would not normally be the case. This chapter will carefully unpack all Van Seters has written about TDS and determine why he interprets it the way he does and whether his interpretation is correct.

4.1. In Search of History

Van Seters first wrote about TDS in 1983 in his *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. The book challenged established assumptions about the genre of the biblical texts and how their Near Eastern contemporaries influenced their writings. Before Van Seters could argue that certain biblical texts constitute

history writing; he defined what he meant by "history writing."[503] His definition included five criteria. History writing is an intentional genre of literature—it is never composed accidentally.[504] History writing is more than an accurate retelling of events. It also includes the significance of the events and why they are being reported.[505] History writing is designed to explain the present circumstances through past events. Van Seters notes that ancient iterations of history writing tend to attribute moral causes to present events.[506] History writing is not biographical, but is nationalistic.[507] Finally, history writing plays a role in the tradition of the people it is about.[508]

An extensive overview of Van Seters' argument throughout the book is not necessary here; a brief coverage of the more relevant points will be given. Van Seters opens his argument by evaluating current research into relevant forms of historiography, including early Greek, Mesopotamian, Hittite, Egyptian, and other Near Eastern historiographies. Amongst his conclusions is the conceit that biblical scholars were working with outdated information and a far too narrow scope of material. Van Seters wrote *In Search of History* at the peak of form criticism's influence on biblical studies and was writing in contradiction to the view that Israelite literature developed free from the influence of its Near Eastern counterparts.[509] A considerable amount of time is devoted to arguing against the notion that Hebrew literature arose from early epic poetry—a view from Frank Moore Cross, his student William Freedman, and William

[503] Van Seters does distinguish between history, history writing, and historiography. He uses them interchangeably; most often using historiography. This discussion of his work will follow suit.
[504] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 4.
[505] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 4-5.
[506] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 5.
[507] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 5.
[508] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 5.
[509] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 8.

Foxwell Albright.[510] These scholars' arguments were covered in the first chapter of this dissertation. They hold much less sway now than when Van Seters wrote *In Search of History*. The strength of these arguments were based on their reliability to identify signs of oral tradition. This would be proved decisively by Kirkpatrick by the end of the decade, was an untenable position to hold.[511]

Van Seters assumed the development of Israel's contemporaries' literary traditions were like Israel's. Since the time of Gunkel and Von Rad, biblical studies assumed the opposite. Israel's literary development was unique from its neighbours. Therefore, Van Seters is working against the grain. Van Seters concludes that the biblical text grew from a complex literary tradition and its growth is based on a series of authors basing their work on written narratives of the past.[512] He argues against the conclusions of Gunkel and Von Rad that history writing in Israel grew from sagas and tales; appealing to a lack of evidence in other cultures for a similar trajectory occurring. Additionally, any theory that concludes the skillful authorship of the text is an incidental result of redactional composition should be rejected.[513] In this way, Van Seters is in harmony with Alter; though their approaches differ.

Many theories about the composition of 1 & 2 Samuel that were covered in the first chapter rely on the theory that Israelite history writing arose from primitive genres of legend or folktale counteracts. Van Seters' argument has significant effect. This change is felt most strongly in the early parts of 1 Samuel; with the story of Saul. Most scholars viewed the earliest narrative of Saul to begin in chapter 9, with the folkloric tale of the donkeys. Through certain anti-monarchical additions, the Dtr altered this core tale into a history of the first king of

[510] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 19-20.
[511] Kirkpatrick, *The Old Testament and Folklore Study*.
[512] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 51.
[513] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 38.

Israel.[514] This theory now becomes less tenable if more evidence supports a complex literary tradition arising concurrently. This dissertation has already argued against the tendency to segment pericopes to discover the core older tradition.[515]

Throughout much of his book, Van Seters systematically shows that scholars have held long-standing assumptions about the textual composition of DtrH that are based on outdated beliefs and are no longer defensible. Amongst these assumptions are that the Succession Narrative, which Van Seters calls the Court History, was incorporated into the historical text by Dtr and that there was an independent Samuel or Ark Narrative circulated separately from DtrH. Rather, Van Seters argues that the Samuel and Ark Narratives are "logoi" used by the Dtr[516] and that the Court History is a post-Dtr work that contradicts its views on monarchy.[517] Therefore, the majority of 1 Samuel is a Dtr work. That is, other than TDS.[518]

Ch. 15 has frequently been labelled as an older tradition, yet the author comments on the earlier stories of Saul frequently; especially on the secret anointing scene of 1 Samuel 9. This strongly indicates that TDS is a later addition to the text. It is notable that Van Seters specifically identifies 1 Samuel 15:1-16:13 and 28:3-25 and agrees that they are later. Van Seters labels three major blocks of material as logoi behind the text of Dtr: 11:1-11, 15-19; 13:2-4a, 5-7a, 15b-14:46; 13:4b, 7b-15a. However, Van Seters treats the material of TDS separately because it does not appear to have been "in fixed written form"[519] as the other three narratives were.

---

[514] Most notably in Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*.
[515] In particular see Campbell's "Prophetic Record" and his tendency to separate a hypothesized prophetic addition from the base layer. Campbell, *1 Samuel*. For another argument for the unity of chapter 15, see Weiser, "I Samuel 15."
[516] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 347-535.
[517] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 277-91.
[518] It is worth repeating here that while TDS is the nomenclature used in this dissertation, it is entirely foreign to Van Seters. It is only being used as a shorthand for 1 Sam. 15:1-16:13 and 28:3-25 rather than implying that Van Seters uses it. While Van Seters labels TDS as a separate tradition from the Saul and David cycles, he does not name it. Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 258-64.
[519] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 258.

Van Seters does not provide much in the way of analysis proving the unity of TDS. He appeals, somewhat generally, to the "obvious" connections between the three pericopes.[520] Also, he highlights 15:35 and 28:17-18 as evidence of the relationship between the two chapters. As for chapters 15 and 16, he appeals to shared terminology of מָלַךְ over נָגִיד and the commonality of a religious maxim in 15:22-23 and 16:7. Van Seters argues that these chapters interrupt 1 Samuel, noting the connections between 14:47-52 and 16:14, noted above, as well as 28:2 and 29:1.[521] These interruptions are the primary reasons given for TDS' distinction from the broader material of 1 Samuel.

Van Seters asserts several points about TDS. First, the accounts of Saul's rejection in chapters 13 and 15 are doublets. *Yhwh* twice rejects Saul for not following his explicit commands regarding sacrifice. Saul appears unaware of his misdeeds in both accounts. Even the moral clearly made in chapter 15 is implicit in chapter 13. Unlike scholars such as Birch, Van Seters denies that the same author could write them as the differences in chapter 15 are too minuscule to be conceptually significant.[522] Secondly, Van Seters notes several links to the earlier Saul cycle: the reference to Saul's anointing in 15:1 and the allusion to Saul's hesitance in his first meeting with Samuel in 15:7. As noted above, these are not evidence of the same author being behind both accounts, rather, evidence of TDS' dependance on the Saul cycle. Despite acknowledging that TDS is secondary to the broader Saul cycle and the Story of David's Rise, he does not make a clear argument as to the dating of TDS in *In Search of History*.

Van Seters argues that TDS' account of Saul's rejection primarily differs from its parallel account because it includes Saul admitting his guilt. This is the justification for Van Seters'

[520] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 263.
[521] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 262.
[522] Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 260-61.

interpretation of TDS. He argues that TDS portrays Saul sympathetically—even having the medium of Endor prepare a meal for him affectionately. Samuel and *yhwh* reject Saul despite his apology and the commendable purifying of the land of false practices. Saul's portrayal is conversely loathsome, manic, and ruthless in the Story of David's Rise. Because of this, Van Seters sees TDS as a pro-Saul narrative. This chapter will expand on Van Seters' interpretation later.

4.2. Van Seters and imitatio

The next relevant work by Van Seters that must be analyzed is the presidential address delivered at the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies in May 2000 and later printed in Studies in Religion volume 29 and finally in his 2011 book *Changing Perspective I: Studies in the History, Literature, and Religion of Biblical Israel*. His argument in this paper is that the notion of *imitatio* or *mimesis*: a form of artistry based in imitation. This is an understudied element of the biblical text. Much of the conclusions of redaction criticism rely on a misunderstanding of literary imitation.[523] According to Van Seters literary imitation: "is the primary understanding of intertextuality within classics."[524] There is very little discussion of imitation in the Bible within biblical studies. Within classical imitation, allusion is made to the text being copied in place of direct citation. Thus, copies of earlier material contain emulation of the "spirit" of the text as opposed to direct word-to-word recreation.[525] Frequently this is done through allusion. Authors also parody earlier material to entertain or criticize.[526] Van Seters will expound the latter concept in his 2009 book *The Biblical Saga of King David*; which expands upon his discussion of the

[523] John Van Seters, "Creative Imitation in the Hebrew Bible," *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 29, no. 4 (2000).
[524] Van Seters, "Creative Imitation in the Hebrew Bible," 397.
[525] Van Seters, "Creative Imitation in the Hebrew Bible," 398.
[526] Van Seters, "Creative Imitation in the Hebrew Bible," 398-99.

books of Samuel within *In Search of History* and contains his most robust analysis of TDS thus far.

4.3. Parody in biblical studies

Before moving on to *The Biblical Saga of King David*, it is prudent to develop the notion of parody in biblical studies briefly. As Van Seters notes, parody is an infrequently analyzed topic amongst biblical scholars.[527] Likewise, Will Kynes argues that scholars employ the concept of parody as an analytical tool *ad hoc.* The term should only be attributed after a thorough analysis of the meaning of parody.[528] The few scholars who define the term do not incorporate a consistent definition.[529] The nearest example of such a project was Kynes', who engaged in

[527] There are no large-scale works examining the forms of parody in the Bible, all instances of biblical scholars applying the term "parody" to the text are done in reference to specific texts. See Kasper Bro Larsen, "Chapter Three: Recognition In Conflict (John 5–19)," in *Recognizing the Stranger: Recognition Scenes in the Gospel of John*, Biblical Interpretation Series (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 145-48. David M. Valeta, "Polyglossia and Parody: Language in Daniel 1– 6," in *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies*, ed. Roland Boer, Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007); David M. Valeta, *Lions and Ovens and Visions: a Satirical Reading of Daniel 1-6*, Hebrew Bible Monographs, (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008). Nathaniel B. Levtow, *Images of Others: Iconic Politics in Ancient Israel*, Biblical and Judaic Studies, (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008). John A. Miles, "Laughing at the Bible: Jonah as Parody," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 65, no. 3 (1975).The same can be said of Jewish Studies, though Israel Davidson wrote about the topic in his 1907 doctoral dissertation *Parody in Jewish Literature*, but he opens with "while the Bible abounds in various forms of satire, it does not contain a single example of parody." Israel Davidson, "Parody in Jewish Literature" (Columbia University Press, 1907), 1. David Stern, who disagrees with Davidson's later argument that there is no parody in the Rabbinic literature, admits that the origins of parody in the Bible are murky. David Stern, "The Alphabet of Ben Sira and the Early History of Parody in Jewish Literature," in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation : Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, ed. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 425. A couple texts have had more extensive analyses as examples of parodic texts, those of Job and Is. 14: For Job see Franz Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Job*, Clark's Foreign Theological Library, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1866), 124. Katharine J. Dell, The Book of Job as Sceptical Literature (De Gruyter, 2013); Katharine J. Dell, Job : where shall wisdom be found?, Phoenix guides to the Old Testament ; 14, (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013); Will Kynes, My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: Job's Dialogue with the Psalms (De Gruyter, 2012).Bernard Sarrazin, "Du Rire dans la Bible? La théophanie de Job comme parodie," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 76, no. 1 (1988). For Isaiah see Timothy Allen Little, "The Identity of the King of Babylon in Isaiah 14:4–21" (Ph.D., Clarks Summit University and Baptist Bible Seminary, 2018); Gale A. Yee, "The anatomy of biblical parody: the dirge form in 2 Samuel 1 and Isaiah 14," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 50, no. 4 (1988).

[528] Will Kynes, "Beat Your Parodies into Swords, and Your Parodied Books into Spears: A New Paradigm for Parody in the Hebrew Bible," *Biblical Interpretation* 19, no. 3 (2011): 276-77.

[529] For instance, Stern cites Abrams, "A parody imitates the serious manner and characteristic features of a particular literary work, the distinctive style of a particular author, or the typical stylistic and other features of a serious literary genre, and deflates the original by applying the imitation to a lowly or comically inappropriate subject" M. H. Abrams and Geoffrey Galt Harpham, *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, 11th ed. (Stamford: Cengage Learning, 2015),

literary studies to develop a coherent definition of parody and attempt to attribute it to relevant biblical texts. Kynes draws on the work of Linda Hutcheon[530] to develop the following theory of the range of parodic work:

mood / authority	humorous	serious
parody (precursor as "target")	I Ridiculing 1. imitation 2. antithesis 3. subversion 4. humor	II Rejecting 1. imitation 2. antithesis 3. subversion
precursor (precursor as "weapon")	III Respecting 1. imitation 2. antithesis 4. humor	IV Reaffirming 1. imitation 2. antithesis

[531]

As shown above, Kynes argues that a parody contains two features that can distinguish it from other parodies: its mood and where it places its authority. Certain definitions of parody, including those used by biblical scholars Gale Yee and John A. Miles, include humour as a necessary feature.[532] Some literary critics agree that humour is necessary for parody, namely Margaret Rose, who claims that the presence of humour is what differentiates parody from

41. Cited in Stern, "The Alphabet of Ben Sira and the Early History of Parody in Jewish Literature," 423. Valeta relies on Bakhtin, Valeta, "Polyglossia and Parody: Language in Daniel 1– 6." Still others rely one the relatively simple definition of parody, for example in Miles, "parody is that breed of satire in which the standardized behavior to be exposed is literary." Miles, "Laughing at the Bible: Jonah as Parody," 168.

[530] Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody: the Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* (New York: Methuen, 1985).

[531] Kynes, "Beat Your Parodies into Swords, and Your Parodied Books into Spears: A New Paradigm for Parody in the Hebrew Bible," 292.

[532] Gale A. Yee, "The Anatomy of Biblical Parody: the Dirge Form in 2 Samuel 1 and Isaiah 14," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50, no. 4 (1988): 568. Miles, "Laughing at the Bible: Jonah as Parody," 168.

imitation.[533] This does not account for the existence of serious parodies.[534] If these are genuinely parodies, the definition must include a distinction between the serious and humourous parodies.

Similarly, many view parody to be necessarily subversive and mocking of its literary "precursor."[535] Alongside allowing for the existence of serious parodies, Linda Hutcheon argues for respectful parodies.[536] Thus, this definition allows for the above four types of parody. The relevance of this discussion to Van Seters' work will be examined later.

4.4. The Biblical Saga of David

Van Seters' 2009 book *The Biblical Saga of David* expanded the latter half of *In Search of History*. Where *In Search of History* examined the books of Samuel to discover the origins of Israelite historiography in the Hebrew Bible, *The Biblical Saga of David* examined the sources of the books of Samuel and analyzed their storylines. This dissertation is framed in honour of the work done in Van Seters' book; though his source and literary analysis are incorporated together rather than separated. Van Seters' argument in the book is that most of 1 & 2 Samuel is composed of two parallel sources that discuss similar material, though from starkly different perspectives. The first of these sources is the DtrH; which scholars had well discussed up to that point. Continuing his argument from *In Search of History*, Van Seters argues that the remaining material is not made up of sources used by, but not written by, DtrH. The second source in the books of Samuel is a literary work meant to comment on and criticize the portrayal of David

[533] Margaret A. Rose, *Parody//Meta-Fiction: an Analysis of Parody as a Critical Mirror to the Writing and Reception of Fiction* (London: Croom Helm, 1979), 240.
[534] Linda Hutcheon, "The Politics of Postmodern Parody," in *Intertextuality*, ed. Heinrich F. Plett, Research in Text Theory; Untersuchungen zur Texttheorie (Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 225-26.
[535] This term, used by Kynes, refers to the target of the parody, so in the case of *Batrachomyomachia*, a satirical epic, the precursor would be Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Kynes, "Beat Your Parodies into Swords, and Your Parodied Books into Spears: A New Paradigm for Parody in the Hebrew Bible," 278.
[536] Hutcheon, "The Politics of Postmodern Parody," 225-26.

within the DtrH. Consequently, this second source, the eponymous "David Saga,"[537] is the latest of the sources in Samuel.

The first three chapters are not necessary to cover in-depth here. Chapter 1 reviews the history of scholarship; much of which was covered earlier in this dissertation. Chapters 2 and 3 attempt to locate the sources in history using archaeological sources and analyzing the text in the context of possible historical counterparts. Chapter 2 covers the fraught history of the so-called "biblical archaeology" movement[538] and its critiques and the subsequent rise of the "Tel Aviv School."[539] The possibility of a United Monarchy has been shown to be archaeologically unlikely. The portrayal of the reigns of Saul and David are necessarily historically suspect.[540] In the third chapter, Van Seters attributes these assumptions about the historical setting of the text and examines the genre of the text. Ultimately, he finds that rather than historical documents, the earliest material comprising the books of Samuel are legends; suggesting a later composition of the text.[541] Finally, Van Seters argues that the presentation of mercenaries, a concept used consistently throughout the books of Samuel, is most accurately representative of Persian Period mercenary groups. Dating the authorship of these texts to the late Persian period.[542] The ultimate takeaway from this lengthy discussion is that any interpretation of the text that characterizes it as a type of royal propaganda or relies on it being contemporary with the events described needs to be rejected.[543]

---

[537] Van Seters sometimes calls the entire block of material from 1 Samuel 16 onward, which some would call the History of David's Rise, the David Saga. However, he even though calls both the second source and the entire block "the David Saga," it is generally easy to differentiate to which text he refers. Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 196.
[538] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 60-64.
[539] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 64-73.
[540] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 88.
[541] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 90-99.
[542] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 99-118.
[543] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 120.

With the historical setting firmly established, Van Seters then begins a source analysis of the texts of 1 Samuel 16 onwards. To begin this project, he analyses the numerous repeated accounts within the books of Samuel. The first example of which, includes Saul's second rejection. However, Van Seters' discussion of the material in TDS will be left until last. As stated before: Van Seters argues for two concurrent strands of narrative throughout the books of Samuel. One written by the DtrH and the other a commentary and criticism of DtrH; which he calls "The David Saga."

4.4.1. DtrH

DtrH, as mentioned in an earlier chapter, Van Seters sees a link between 14:52 and 16:14; which continues the story of Saul found broadly in chapters 9-14. Saul is abandoned by the SOL, which came upon him in 10:6-7, 9-10. Van Seters argues that in the original narrative, the SOL abandons Saul because of his rejection in 13:13-14.[544] David is hired as a military man; a skillful member of an elite corps and the king's court musician. In this scene's sequel, 18:5-16,[545] David is sent on military missions and gains the love of the people; becoming more popular than the king. In a rage, the evil spirit grips Saul and he attempts to kill David for the first time.[546] In 18:17-30, David marries Saul's daughter, Michal. These are all adopted into the DtrH because they follow the theme of David's military prowess; which Van Seters argues should belong to one source.[547]

---

[544] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 123. I made a similar argument in the excursus in chapter 3, though Van Seters and I disagree about the role of 1 Sam. 19:18-24 in this series of events. I view it to be the conclusion of the theme of the SOL with Saul and Van Seters views it as a parody of the initial scene. Instead he attributes it to the David Saga.

[545] Though Van Seters acknowledges that there is a disparity in vv. 10-11 and they may be a scribal embellishment. Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 165.

[546] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 163-65.

[547] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 165. Incidentally, I agree with him here, but disagree that the theme of the evil spirit and David's military prowess belong to the same source.

As tensions rise between David and Saul, Saul's two children—Jonathan and Michal, help David by first appeasing Saul and eventually smuggling David out of the house; found in 19:1-17. While Jonathan is introduced earlier in the story in 18:1-4, Van Seters that this is the first exploration of David and Jonathan's relationship in DtrH because Jonathan is given the patronymic "son of Saul,"[548] and seems to ignore the bond established between them in chapter 18. Michal's scene with David is established by their marriage in 18:27. In 21:11-16, David flees to the King of Gath; who refers to 18:7 in his greeting to David. Because he was recognized, David flees to Adullam, in 22:1-5.[549] Once in hiding, David begins to form a rag-tag group on malcontents into a viable fighting force (David's Men). He also allies with the king of Moab to harbour his parents until it is safe for them to return to Judah. A quick succession of stories follows the formation of David's Men. To Van Seters: they are not all a part of one account. The determining factor is the role of Abiathar. Abiathar joins David's Men in 22:20-23 and the next pericope shows David contacting the deity for advice on whether he should attack the Philistines. In 23:6, Abiathar brings an ephod to David. Van Seters argues that its placement suggests that David contacted the deity in 23:1-5 through Abiathar's ephod and it was added after the fact. Thus 22:20-23 and 23:1-5 are from the DtrH. The next scene expands on David's relationship with Jonathan; with Jonathan pledging himself to David over his father. Van Seters argues that this scene is not aware of the previous covenant between David and Jonathan in chapter 18.[550]

Saul, who arrived in the area in 23:15, chases after David's Men. Only to be called off to go to war with the Philistines. This scene preempts the first account of David saving Saul's life

[548] Ultimately, this is not convincing as whether Van Seters attributes this scene to DtrH or the David Saga, Jonathan has already been introduced: chapter 14 in DtrH and 18:1-4 in the David Saga. It seems more likely that this is a part of the David Saga; which eliminates the need to explain away the reference to Goliath in 5a, which Van Seters calls a "later attempt to tie the David and Goliath story more closely to the whole." Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 167.
[549] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 175.
[550] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 169.

in 24:1-23. Van Seters rejects the argument that there is an oral tradition behind both accounts of David saving Saul's life. Instead, one account, which belongs to the David Saga, alters the other deuteronomistic account.[551] To Van Seters, the primary distinguishing feature between these accounts is the roles of the secondary characters. There are three named secondary characters in chapter 26: Abner, Abishai, and Ahimelech. Van Seters argues that these three characters are essential to the David Saga; thus chapter 23:24b-28, and the ensuing chapter 24 are a part of the DtrH. This scene is the final interaction between David and Saul in the DtrH and it ends with Saul admitting that David will be king and begging for the lives of his offspring once David takes the throne.

DtrH ends in 1 Samuel with Saul's death in the war with the Philistines. The location of the war is established in 28:1a, 4—which is the earliest account of the beginning of the war.[552] Saul's three sons are killed in battle and Saul takes his own life when he sees that the war is lost; the Philistines desecrate his body in triumph. DtrH continues into 2 Samuel, but as this dissertation is limited in scope to 1 Samuel, this synopsis will end here.[553]

4.4.2. The David Saga

Turning to the David Saga: its introduction is the David and Goliath narrative. After a lengthy discussion of the implication of the differences between the LXX and the MT, which does not need to be repeated here, Van Seters concludes that the MT's longer account is original. His comments on chapter 17's relationship with its sequel in 17:55-18:5 require a closer look. Saul inquires after David's father's name, which would contradict 16:18-22 if it were not from a different source. Saul knowing David merely by his father's name will become relevant later in

[551] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 180.
[552] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 194-95.
[553] The contents of DtrH in 2 Samuel include: 2 Sam. 1:1*, 2-4, 11-12, 17-27 (see below); 2:1-2aα, 3; 5:1-2, 2b, (4); 5:6-12, 17-25; 8:1; 8:2-14, 10:15-19; 6:2-3a, 5, 15, 17-19; 7:1-10a, (10b-11aα), 11aβ-29. Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 362.

the story. However, the following scene where David and Jonathan make a covenant is composed of two parts stitched together awkwardly. Vv. 1, 3 and 4 relate to David and Jonathan's relationship and subsequent covenant. Whereas vv. 2 and 5 relate to David joining Saul's army. Van Seters does not argue that these come from different sources but merely calls this bridging narrative a "highly artificial literary construction."[554] If the LXX is original, where it appears that David is already known to Saul, then this scene must be separated from the story of David and Goliath. Following Van Seters' argument that the MT is original—these difficulties disappear.[555] The following account in 18:6-30 is confusing, as the text needs to harmonize the account of David and Goliath with the unrelated song of the women in v.7. Van Seters' solution is to posit an insertion in v. 6: וַיְהִי בְּבוֹאָם [בְּשׁוּב דָּוִד] מֵהַכּוֹת אֶת־הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי, It happened as they were coming back [as David was returning] from the slaughter of the Philistines".[556] This solves several awkward syntactical features of this sentence; including the double temporal infinitives and the plural verb being followed by a singular verb.

The David Saga does not continue until 19:18 with David's flight from Saul to the prophet Samuel in Ramah. Included in this scene is the second time that the SOL besets Saul; but here he raves like a madman rather than prophesying. Van Seters labels this scene a caricature of an earlier one and thus the entire pericope is part of the David Saga.[557] After David flees from Ramah, he approaches Jonathan and asks him to entreat Saul on his behalf. This scene is connected to the preceding pericope by the inclusion of וַיִּבְרַח דָּוִד מִנָּיוֹת [בָּרָמָה], "David fled from Naioth [in Ramah]", and includes a continuation of David and Jonathan's relationship,

[554] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 160.
[555] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 160.
[556] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 160.
[557] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 171.

established in chapter 18, thus is a part of the David Saga.[558] Also included in this scene is Abner; introduced to the story in chapter 17.

David flees to Nob and meets with Ahimelech; introduced here. David reports that he was sent on a mission in haste and requires food and arms, but Ahimelech has only holy bread and the sword taken from Goliath; David takes both items. In the process, Doeg the Edomite, spots David. The reference to Goliath connects this scene to the David Saga.[559] The sequel to this scene is in 22:6-23, where Doeg comes to Saul and tells him that he saw David with Ahimelech. In response, Saul commands his men to slaughter the priests of *yhwh* and when they refuse, he gets the foreigner Doeg to do it instead. Alongside the earlier reference to Goliath, Saul makes mention of David's covenant with Jonathan; connecting both scenes to the David Saga.[560] The ending of this pericope mentions Abiathar, a son of Ahimelech, who links this scene to its sequel in 23:6.

Saul hears that David is hiding in Keilah and he besieges the city to capture David. David, with the assistance of Abiathar, learns that he is no longer safe in Keilah and escapes to the land of Ziph. The role of Abiathar in the story places it in the David Saga.[561] Once in Ziph, the Ziphites tell Saul where David is located. Van Seters draws a connection between the attitudes of the residents of Ziph and Keilah. In 23:1-5, David saves the inhabitants of Keilah. In the following scenes in vv. 6-14 and 19-24, the people turn on David. This is incongruous with the adoration the people give to David throughout DtrH. Thus, these scenes both belong to the David Saga.[562]

---

[558] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 168-69.
[559] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 160.
[560] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 172-73.
[561] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 200.
[562] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 200.

The unrelated tale of David and Abigail are separated into two accounts of David sparing Saul. Van Seters connects this pericope to the David Saga for two reasons: first, David is portrayed poorly in chapters 25 and 26 and secondly, there are numerous connections between the tale of Abigail and the events of the Court History; which he attributes to the same author as the David Saga.[563] David then confronts Saul in chapter 26. Unlike in DtrH, Saul does not predict David's future reign but merely blesses him for his kindness.

After his encounters with Saul, David flees to take refuge amongst the Philistines. He brings his entourage and constructs a scheme where he is contracted to attack Judah but instead attacks Philistine towns and takes their belongings. There are numerous indications that this belongs to the David Saga. For one, there is no indication that the King of Gath knows that he has already met David in 21:11-16.[564] Another, the named entourage includes his two wives, Ahinoam and Abigail, introduced in chapter 25.[565] The sequel—the beginning of the war with the Philistines, shows David as Achish's retinue; but the commanders of the Philistine army reject him because of the infamy gained through the proverb sung by the women in chapter 18. Oddly, Van Seters gives no defense as to why the two instances of the proverb are not included in the same source. Given his interpretation of DtrH and the David Saga, he must assume that this scene negatively satirizes chapter 18.

Upon returning from the war to his home in Ziklag, David finds it raided by the Amalekites, with the inhabitants taken as prisoners of war. David calls on Abiathar for the ephod and entreats *yhwh*; who tells him that he should chase after the Amalekites. David does so and is victorious. He takes the spoils and sends them throughout Israel and the places "where David and

[563] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 186-90.
[564] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 191.
[565] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 191.

his men had roamed."[566] As this follows the sequences of the David Saga and includes characters such as Abiathar, the designation of this pericope is less controversial. However, some have argued that it is related to 1 Samuel 15 as a thematic conclusion to this scene. Van Seters rejects this idea because the Amalekites were all destroyed by Saul in chapter 15. Thus, this scene makes no sense as a sequel.[567]

This concludes the David Saga within 1 Samuel.[568] Before moving on to Van Seters' interpretation of these narratives, it is prudent to examine one more pericope. In 2 Samuel 1, David learns of Saul and Jonathan's death and mourns their loss with a lament. There is an incongruity between this scene and Saul's death in chapter 31. In chapter 31, Saul kills himself. However, in 2 Samuel 1, Saul asks the messenger—an Amalekite warrior—to kill him and he obliges. Van Seters does not view this scene to be entirely a part of the David Saga; rather, he sees two layers of material. An earlier source in 1:1-4, 11-12, 17-27 and a supplement in vv. 5-10 and 13-16. The original layer concerns an anonymous messenger from the battle reporting on the deaths of Saul and Jonathan and David immediately rending his clothes and lamenting their deaths in song. Meanwhile, the supplement identifies the messenger as an Amalekite twice, goes into detail about Saul's death, including the contradictory material with chapter 31 and has David kill him.

Van Seters gives numerous reasons for this segmenting of the narrative: David's response to the news of his best friend's death is awkward, first asking for clarification before launching

---

[566] 1 Sam. 30:31.
[567] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 192.
[568] The material of the David Saga in 2 Sam. include: 2 Sam. 2:4-4:12; 1:1aβb, 5-10, 13-16; 2:2aβb; 5:3a, (4), 5, 13-16; 6:1, 3b-4, 6-14, 16, 20-23; 8:16-18, 20:23-25; 9-20. Material from the David Saga in 1 Kings include: 1 Kgs. 1:1-52; 2:5-9, 13-46. Material from the Court History include: 2 Sam. 9; 10:1-14, 19b; 11-12; 13; 14; 15-18; 19; 20; 1 Kgs. 1-2. Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 363.

into a dramatic but delayed mourning ritual.[569] In similar scenes of messengers delivering tragic news, such as in 1 Samuel 4:12-18 and 2 Samuel 18:19-19:1, there is no similar delay of grief. This indicates that what separates the news, from David's reactions, was inserted after the fact. The supplemental material fits uniquely within the David Saga. Saul and his spear make another appearance;[570] as does a double mention of the Amalekite messenger.[571] The mention of a resident alien is contrary to deuteronomistic ideals. David is given the crown and armlet of Saul, which fits with his collection of valuable materials.[572] The mention of *yhwh*'s anointed relates to chapter 26, in which David refuses to harm Saul for a similar reason. These connections do not exist in the base text, which, Van Seters therefore attributes to DtrH.[573]

Anyone reading through the David Saga presented by Van Seters would quickly note minimal plot progression between pericopes. It seems to be a series of individual events with little to no logic connecting why one event logically follows the other. For instance: after the fight between David and Goliath, David suddenly flees from Saul's service without explaining why he felt the need to do so. This is a feature of what the David Saga is meant to accomplish. Van Seters proposes that the David Saga, rather than being an independent narrative, is an expansion of DtrH and thus its pericopes are meant to comment on a parallel account in DtrH rather than stand for themselves. The pericopes in the David Saga, for the most part, have a narrative equivalent in DtrH to which they should be compared:

[569] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 208-09.
[570] 1 Sam. 26.
[571] 1 Sam. 30.
[572] See 2 Sam. 12:20, but also 1 Sam. 21:8-9, 27:8-9, 30:16-20.
[573] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 208.

DtrH	David Saga
	17:1-54 *David vs. Goliath*[574]
23:16-18 *Jonathan supports David*	17:55-18:4 *David's covenant with Jonathan*
10:5-13 *The spirit of* yhwh *strikes Saul*	19:18-24 *David flees to Samuel*
19:1-7 *Jonathan warns David*	20:1-41 *David confronts Jonathan*
21:11-22:5 *David flees to Gath and Moab*	21:2-10, 22:6-23 *Saul kills the Nob priests*
23:1-5 *David flees to Keilah*	23:6-14 *Keilah betrays David*
	25:1-44 *David and Abigail*[575]
24:1-22 *David spares Saul's life*	26:1-25 *David spares Saul's life again*
21:11-16 *David flees to Gath*	27:1-12 *Achish hires David*
26:18/20:1 *David is innocent before Saul/Jonathan*	29:1-11 *The Philistine commanders reject David*
	30:1-31 *David defeats the Amalekites*[576]

[577]

Van Seters repeatedly calls the David Saga an "expansion" rather than a narrative.[578]

4.4.3. 1 Samuel 15:1-16:13 & 28:3-25

What does not belong to DtrH or the David Saga from 1 Samuel 15 onwards is counted amongst the first expansion of DtrH by an unknown author. This includes 1 Samuel 15:1-16:13 and 28:3, 5-25.[579] This is nearly identical to TDS with the minor exclusion of 28:4. That verse: "The Philistines had organized and came to camp at Shunem, so Saul mustered all of Israel and

[574] David vs. Goliath was an originally independent tale incorporated into the David Saga, thus not of the author's hand. Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 198.
[575] This unit, rather than satirizing a particular pericope, generally reframes David and his men as brigands rather than a righteous army. Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 201.
[576] Cynically, the gift from David at the end of the narrative is read as a bribe, setting the scene for his rise to power. Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 206.
[577] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 198-206.
[578] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 183, 90, 97, 268.
[579] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 197.

they encamped at Gilboa" is such a minor exclusion as not to be worth quibbling over its placement in the sources. This is the precise reason that I reject Van Seters' assertion that it belongs to the earliest stratum of the account of the war with the Philistines. Van Seters' hypothetical early stratum reads: "Now it happened at that time that the Philistines mustered their forces for war to fight with Israel *and came and encamped in Shunem while Saul mustered all Israel and encamped at Gilboa.* The Philistines fought against Israel and the men of Israel were routed before Philistines and the corpses fell on Mount Gilboa."[580] If one were to exclude 28:4 from the above account, it would neither add to nor reduce the comprehensibility of the introduction to the war. One must ask why a hypothetical redactor, or the author of the David Saga as it might be, would bother to displace the original placement of this text to include it in a different account? Van Seters' solution here seems to be a rare instance of him appealing to a redactor for its own sake, rather than improving the text's comprehensibility. Van Seters has a lengthy polemic against this exact type of redaction criticism earlier in this book,[581] as well as in *In Search of History*. HGM Williamson levied this same criticism against Van Seters.[582] I reject this exclusion, even though it would not weaken my argument to accept it.

Van Seters argues that 15:1-16:13 interrupts a natural progression between 14:52 and 16:14. Further, placing a text that ends in: "The spirit of *yhwh* came onto David from that day onwards" before a narrative that begins with: "Now the spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord tormented him" falsely gives the impression that David received the SOL at the same time that Saul lost it.[583] This is not implied by the base narrative text of 16:14ff; thus indicating that the previous text is an insertion. Many of Van Seters' other

[580] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 194-95.
[581] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 20-21.
[582] HGM Williamson, "John Van Seters, The Biblical Saga of King David," 62, no. 1 (2011).
[583] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 123. I wrote about this in depth above. See pp. 86-91.

arguments support TDS as a unity, distinct from DtrH and the David Saga. As many of his arguments are repeated from *In Search of History*. Van Seters plainly states that the author of chapter 15 must be different from chapter 13 because it is inconceivable that the same author would write such a similar narrative twice. Here, Van Seters begins to expand on why a second author would feel it necessary to rewrite a narrative already written.

Van Seters sees an oddity at the onset of the narrative because the expected prophetic address is inverted in chapter 15. Typically, the king will consult with a prophet for affirmation or advice at the onset of war. However, in chapter 15 the prophet commands the king to go to war and is the domineering figure in the pericope.[584] Van Seters argues that the portrayal of Samuel is at odds with portrayals of prophecy in the DtrH. Thus, he argues that it is a parody of prophecy as it is put forth in Deuteronomy 18:15-22.[585] Van Seters then builds on the argument of David Gunn from *The Fate of King Saul*. He argues that King Saul's error was so small as to imply that Saul was doomed from the start.[586] Much like Gunn, Van Seters believes that Saul's sin is an imperfect performance of חרם.[587] This would be an unfair reason to reject Saul because the law is not clear and therefore one could argue that Saul did perform חרם correctly.[588] The triviality of the sin echoes his rejection in chapter 13. There is one main difference: Saul defends himself in chapter 15. This crucial difference leads to Samuel's response that *yhwh* does not change his mind. Van Seters argues that this is demonstrably untrue. *Yhwh* frequently changes his mind; primarily because of the intercession of the prophets. According to Samuel, he is powerless against the unyielding power of *yhwh*'s steadfastness. Therefore, this scene is a parody

[584] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 126.
[585] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 126.
[586] Gunn, *The Fate of King Saul: an Interpretation of a Biblical Story*, 70-75.
[587] Gunn, *The Fate of King Saul: an Interpretation of a Biblical Story*, 45-46. Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 126-27.
[588] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 127.

of the theme of "divine mercy and forgiveness and the role of the prophet as the one who can mediate divine commands."[589]

The scene at Endor offers another instance of parody. In that scene, Saul, on the eve of battle—much like in chapter 15—faces a mute deity and cannot access the prophetic mediation that began the narrative. In desperation, he visits a medium who succeeds at contacting the dead. Samuel repeats Saul's sentence and does not yield once again. In response, Saul is downtrodden and the medium becomes kindly and restores his spirits before he leaves. The message here is that humans may be compassionate; where the deity is not.[590] This scene is a parody of DtrH and its representation of the history of Israel.[591] The preponderance of parodic scenes in TDS leads Van Seters to posit a new interpretation of David's anointing in 16:1-13. This new anointing scene is placed before David's introduction to Saul in 16:14ff and to Van Seters, its placement suggests that it is meant to colour our interpretation of those scenes.

David is already anointed, so he acts as Saul's successor, not as a faithful servant to the king in DtrH. Further, the maxim: "Do not look at his appearance or his tall height because I have rejected him because man does not see like God. Man sees with the eyes, but *yhwh* sees the heart" is tainted by this scene. The anointing scene looks innocent, but hides something sinister: a grave act of treason.[592] In all, Van Seters views TDS as rejecting the notion that the kingdom's fate lies not on the inherent goodness of the king, but that history plays out through fate or the will of *yhwh*.[593]

---

[589] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 131.
[590] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 132.
[591] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 133.
[592] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 134.
[593] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 135.

4.5. Analysis

I agree with Van Seters' identification of TDS as a unity and I also agree that it constitutes an expansion over a narrative; though our interpretations differ wildly. Before levying specific critiques, I wish to offer two general comments on Van Seters' style; which I believe plays a significant role in his interpretations failing to represent the text accurately. Van Seters represents the text in such a creative and colourful way that makes him a captivating author and an engaging scholar. However, on occasion, his descriptions become more creative than accurate; as he reads motivations into the text that do not appear to be there.

A characteristic example of this tendency is in his interpretation of the David and Abigail pericope. A surface reading of the text would interpret it as a simple story of David's men coming to someone under their protection asking for aid and him rudely rejecting them; even though they have served him faithfully.[594] The implications of the text certainly seem to favour this reading as David commands to his men include four instances of שלום and four instances of reminding Nabal[595] of the protection they have offered him. Abigail's reaction certainly implies that David's men were in the right unless one were to suspect that she married David out of pure self-preservation. Van Seters' interpretation differs wildly from this reading. He paints David's men as brigands and their protection as being upheld under threat of destruction: "David and his men [are] a band of "brigands" who live off the wealthy land-owners by providing "protection," whether they want it or not."[596] I do not mean to suggest that David is portrayed entirely

[594] For an in-depth reading of the scene between Nabal and David, see Joseph Lozovyy, *Saul, Doeg, Nabal, and the "Son of Jesse": Readings in 1 Samuel 16-25*, ed. Claudia V. Camp and Andrew Mein, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies, (New York; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 51-83, 153-58. Lozovyy argues that Nabal is a stand-in for Saulide ideology, and thus is portrayed negatively to reflect onto Saul.
[595] The meaning of Nabal's name, "senseless" or "foolish," certainly does not imply that he is meant to be read as a sympathetic victim.
[596] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 186-87.

positively in this scene; certainly, his reaction to Nabal's insult is extreme.[597] However, Van Seters' interpretation is as negative as possible and his argument relies on the premise of the scene being this negative to David; which does not seem to be true.

In a compelling critique of Van Seters, Tzemah Yoreh reframes David's actions throughout the David Saga in a more positive light, thus representing the material differently. For the Abigail pericope, he describes the text as: "David protects the defenseless and weak such as Abiathar, the sole survivor of the Nob massacre and Nabal's shepherds."[598] Yoreh identifies a severe weakness of Van Seters' work; though he does not seem to recognize it in the review. Van Seters' initial claim is that David's portrayal in this scene is "clearly similar to the image of the David in chap. 26 rather than chap. 24."[599] By this, he simply means that David is portrayed negatively. However, if Yoreh can see a positive interpretation of this scene, can this statement be taken as correct?

There are brief connections to later scenes to bolster his source division; namely 2 Samuel 13, 14, and 16. However, these are weak at best. The connection to 2 Samuel 13 is entirely based on the presence of a feast in which a drunk member dies. Yet the drunk man in 2 Samuel 13 is Amnon and Absalom murdered him because he had raped Tamar. If Nabal is meant to be a precursor to Amnon, David surely should not be interpreted negatively. 2 Samuel 16 is connected by the food given to David by Abigail in 1 Samuel 25 and Ziba in 2 Samuel 16. Although the amounts are not the same, Van Seters cites Gunn, who calls this an "oral pattern."

---

[597] The call to violence notwithstanding, the coarse language used in v. 22, "a single pisser against the wall," which is used in lieu of "boy," certainly paints the picture of a man so furious that he is speaking so vulgarly. Alter, *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets*, 2, 282.

[598] Tzemah Yoreh, "Van Seters' Saga of King David," *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 10, no. 1 (2010): 104.

[599] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 187.

Van Seters suggests that this is a case of literary dependence.[600] Therefore, there are three options: this is from the same author, a later author is alluding to this scene, or the differences in numbers suggest that the narratives are not related. Finally, there is undoubtedly a connection between Abigail and the wise woman of Tekoa. At this point, there is no longer enough evidence to guarantee that the authors of the two are the same. Regardless of whether the two stories are the same, Van Seters' assumption that David is portrayed negatively in either the narrative with Abigail or with any of the texts above is not sufficient evidence to base a source division. Yoreh accuses Van Seters of presenting his interpretations without a balancing perspective.[601] He argues that this weakness is amplified because the biblical text is often reticent to interpret its own material.[602] Van Seters' source division and interpretation are intrinsically linked, and thus this criticism is also very effective at attacking the foundation of his argument for an extensive expansion of the text.

The second general concern with Van Seters' methodology is that while he outwardly decries certain trends in biblical studies, particularly ones which were in vogue during his formative years as a scholar, he nonetheless engages with them to the cost of his analysis. One example of this has already been shown with his source division of the beginning of chapter 28. As Williamson notes: Van Seters rejects the conclusions of redaction criticism but "it is simply that Van Seters is reading the evidence with different spectacles."[603] This is a fanciful way of

---

[600] David M. Gunn, "Traditional Composition in the "Succession Narrative"," *Vetus Testamentum* 26, no. 2 (1976); David M. Gunn, "Narrative Patterns and Oral Tradition in Judges and Samuel," *Vetus Testamentum* 24, no. 3 (1974); David M. Gunn, "David and the Gift of the Kingdom (2 Sam 2-4, 9-20, 1 Kgs 1-2)," *Semeia* 3 (1975). Cited in John Van Seters, "Oral Patterns or Literary Conventions in Biblical Narrative," *Semeia* 5 (1976): 149. Elsewhere, Van Seters seemed to suggest that the question is up for debate. John Van Seters, "Problems in the Literary Analysis of the Court History of David," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 1, no. 1 (1976): 26.
[601] Yoreh, "Van Seters' Saga of King David," 104.
[602] Yoreh, "Van Seters' Saga of King David," 103.
[603] Williamson, "John Van Seters, The Biblical Saga of King David," 147.

saying that though Van Seters rejects the title of redaction criticism, as well as the findings of it, he nonetheless incorporates the methods, though admittedly to a smaller scale.[604]

This same criticism applies to Van Seters' rejection of form criticism. Van Seters' criticism of the Hebrew Bible was decades ahead of its time; which is probably the reason that it was, according to Van Seters himself, "largely ignored."[605] However, his work has been shown to be in large part correct. While Van Seters may have been ahead of his time, he still is a scholar of his time. One good example is in his treatment of the David and Goliath story. He accepts that behind the text's final form is an original "folktale" of a young boy defeating an imposing enemy to become a national hero.[606] By stripping out the theological material, which is nearly all contained to dialogue and thus easy to remove, what is left is a quaint tale. Similarly, Van Seters claims, taking inspiration from Gunn, that the role of the Davidic tales can be compared to Icelandic family sagas. In both, the past is treated in a way to provide "serious entertainment." However, what is a folktale, what constitutes a story meant for entertainment? These questions are not answered, yet they are assumed without argument.

Van Seters accepts Rofé and Gunn's views, thus adopting them into his understanding of the development of the David Saga. Van Seters' argument is reminiscent of Hermann Gunkel and Gerhard von Rad. In his commentary on Genesis, von Rad sees the Hexateuch as being built around originally independent credos built into a larger narrative after the fact. Much like Van Seters, these traditions do not belong to the larger work they are incorporated into but are

---

[604] Incidentally, Williamson criticizes Van Seters for this from the perspective of one who supports the use of redaction criticism, whereas I am doing so from the perspective of one who totally rejects it.
[605] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 34-35.
[606] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 152-53. This view was first put forth by Alexander Rofé. Alexander Rofé, "The Battle of David and Goliath. Folklore, theology, eschatology," in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, ed. Jacob Neusner, Baruch A. Levine, and Ernest S. Frerichs (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).

composed separately and an author works them into their current context.[607] Like Gunkel, Van Seters sees the origins of these texts to be "serious entertainment."[608] Van Seters' argument avoids the very thorny assumption of oral patterns underlying the text;[609] instead opting for a literary origin.

What this does not avoid is a criticism by Kirkpatrick. As Van Seters claims, the David narratives were initially serious entertainment to an earlier group of people. Why should a story written for those people be relevant to an unrelated, very different group of people who lived perhaps hundreds of years later?[610] If the story of David and Goliath was written initially as folklore, then why would an author believe it wise to incorporate an ancient tale into their fresh critique of monarchy? Would the sting of the criticism of the monarchy be lessened by the author claiming that the king was part of a story that was well known to be unrelated to him? Further, Van Seters believes that a still older tradition was the original—in which Elhanah of Bethlehem was the original vanquisher of Goliath—as per 2 Samuel 21:19.[611] Clearly a variant of the Goliath tale in which Elhanah is the hero was known and therefore the notion that the story was coopted by an author intending to develop a critique of the king loses much of its explanatory power.

---

[607] Gerhard von Rad, *Das Erste Buch Mose: Genesis*, ed. Artur Weiser, Das Alte Testament Deutsch: Neues Göttinger Bibelwerk, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 1-6.
[608] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 41-42. Cf. Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 1910). Van Seters adopts this language from David M. Gunn. David M. Gunn, *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation*, ed. David J. A. Clines, Phillip R. Davies, and David M. Gunn, vol. 6, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, (A&C Black, 1978), 26.
[609] Kirkpatrick, *The Old Testament and Folklore Study*. Elsewhere, she seems to suggest that similar arguments avoid the majority of the weight of her criticism above. Patricia G. Kirkpatrick, "The Jacob-Esau Narratives: From Form to Function," in *The Function of Ancient Historiography in Biblical and Cognate Studies*, ed. P.G. Kirkpatrick and Timothy D. Goltz (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 8.
[610] Kirkpatrick, "The Jacob-Esau Narratives: From Form to Function," 7-8.
[611] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 136.

Likewise, the use of the Icelandic saga[612] as a cultural counterpart seems like a non sequitur. As the Icelandic family saga and ancient Israelite historiography are entirely unrelated. Van Seters selects the Icelandic saga as the most comparative material to the biblical material. By itself, noting similarities between the Bible and Icelandic sagas is harmless. The problem arises when Van Seters compares the biblical texts and the sagas to understand the former better. The name of his David Saga is derived from the Icelandic saga. Van Seters sees a utility in comparing the two genres.[613] Van Seters lists several similarities between the saga and biblical text to prove his point: the content covers characters from a foundational age, it supplements an older historical text, the author remains anonymous, it is "serious entertainment," it incorporates literary conventions, and it glorifies the past.[614] Perhaps unintentionally, all of these characteristics are present in TDS and thus this comparison is very apt to this discussion.

Interestingly, Van Seters had previously rejected the comparison between biblical texts and sagas, though in this case, he did so on the grounds of a purported similar oral composition.[615] To Van Seters, Gunkel's uncritical acceptance of André Jolles' understanding of *Sage* is based on a view that has been thoroughly disproven by Icelandic scholars.[616] Additionally, Icelandic scholars have agreed that the saga developed from literary works rather than oral tradition.[617] Van Seters relies on Ari Thorgilsson for the history of the Icelandic saga, yet Thorgilsson accepts the role of oral tradition into his history.[618] Van Seters seems to be

---

[612] Though the use of saga here is apropos given its proximity to Gunkel's discussion of *Sage*, Van Seters is clear to differentiate the two. Though the similarity in terms appears, at the very least, to be an omen of the weaknesses in his arguments. Following Van Seters, when I use "saga" in the future, I will be referring to the Icelandic saga rather than the German *Sage*.
[613] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 42.
[614] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 49.
[615] John Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (Brattelboro: Echo Point Books & Media, 2014), 134-36.
[616] A similar point is made in Kirkpatrick, *The Old Testament and Folklore Study*, 40-41.
[617] Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition*, 136.
[618] Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Another Contribution to the Succession Narrative Debate (2 Samuel 11–20; 1 Kings 1–2)," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38, no. 1 (2013): 52.

falling victim to the same errors as Gunkel, but now with one degree of separation between him and the material.

There are three problems that I can identify with Van Seters' comparison. First, neither Icelandic sagas nor biblical narratives are understood enough by scholars to seriously provide information to aid the other field. Second, Iceland and ancient Israel are so far apart geographically and historically that any similarity are necessarily a coincidence. Third, Iceland adopted Christianity and thus was aware of the Old Testament narratives while forming its sagas.[619] Any similarities that are not coincidental might be adopted from the Bible by Icelandic authors. Thus, to rely on similarities in the saga to elucidate the authorship of the biblical text is thoroughly circular.

While this last criticism is general, it does relate closely to the first of the significant specific criticisms that can be levelled at Van Seters' interpretation of TDS. Van Seters repeatedly refers to the intention of the David Saga and TDS as being a parody of DtrH. He never explains what he means by parody; nor does he ever argue for the existence of parody elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. It seems he uses the term to be mean "similar but critical." As noted above, certain scholars require humour within a parody—such as Yee and Miles—which would exclude both the David Saga and TDS. Kynes'[620] definition of parody shows that serious parody is a viable genre.[621] Leaving the David Saga behind, TDS would firmly be a "Rejecting" parody; a severe critique of its base text. As all four types of satire include imitation and

---

[619] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 46. Citing M. Magnusson and H. Palsson, *Njal's Saga Translated by Magnus Magnusson and Hermann Palsson*, The Penguin Classics, (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1960), 24.
[620] Van Seters' treatment of TDS as a parody falls under Kynes' identification of *ad* hoc attribute of the term parody.
[621] Though there is a definition of parody that could include TDS, Van Seters not justifying his use of parody, which typically would not include TDS, must be a serious criticism.

antithesis,[622] we may set those aside for the moment and focus on the third condition: subversion. To fit in this category, TDS must intend to subvert the authority of DtrH. If this cannot be demonstrated, our understanding of TDS must be more straightforward.

Let us return to Van Seters' identification of the parody within TDS. The first instance was the prophetic address in 15:1-3. Van Seters asserts that the usual form of the prophetic call to war is proceeded by a king reaching out for guidance. The lone example that Van Seters gives is 1 Samuel 13. However, it is not clear that this is true. By v. 3, Jonathan had already attacked the Philistines without the blessing of Samuel. The text certainly views Jonathan as a stand-in for Saul in this case as the following verse says: "Saul has attacked the Philistine outpost." It is not evident that chapter 15 reverses the order of events from chapter 13. Additionally, it is not clear that chapter 15 is an unusual form of the prophetic address as there are other instances in the Hebrew Bible of a prophet receiving an oracle for a king to engage in war.[623]

Van Seter's second point is that Samuel's role as a domineering presence parodies the conception of prophecy from Deuteronomy 18:15-22.[624] Deuteronomy 18:15-22 describes the role of the prophet in the deuteronomistic worldview. The people are given a test to discern if the prophet is real. The prophet's purpose is to tell the people the words of *yhwh*. If the prophet predicts something that does not occur—they are false prophets. Samuel passes the word of *yhwh* and does predict the future. It is hard to see how this could be a parody of Deuteronomy 18 if it aligns perfectly.

Van Seters does not see how Saul's sin warrants the intense rejection he receives from *yhwh*. However, his understanding of Saul's sin is that he did not ideally engage in חרם. This

[622] I do see evidence of imitation and antithesis within TDS, particularly regarding DtrH. However, this is not sufficient to label TDS a parody.
[623] Is. 13:1ff, Joel 4:9ff, Jer. 51:27-28, 2 Kgs. 6:8-20.
[624] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 126.

dissertation has explained that Saul's sin is more accurately shown to be that he took an instance of divine retribution and used it for personal glory and gain. Therefore, Van Seters' criticism does not follow. Additionally, Van Seters' argument that Saul followed *yhwh*'s command because in both חרם and sacrifice, the actor devotes an animal to *yhwh*, is extremely thin. Sacrifice and the ban are not equivalent, as eloquently stated by Artur Weiser:

> Die Haltung, die Saul in seinem Ungehorsam bewiesen hat, daß der den Bann nicht nach Jahwes Befehl durchführte, sondern mit der Opferung eines Teils des Banngutes einverstanden war, offenbart im Grunde die gleiche Eigenmächtigkeit des Menschen Gott gegenüber wie die des Zauberers. Auf diese Haltung gesehen, zeigt sich der grundlegende Unterschied zwischen Bannvollzug und Opferung des Bannguts, den Saul nicht wahrhaben wollte: beim Bann ist der Mensch lediglich ausführendes Organ des göttlichen Willens, indem er Gott übergibt, was Gott schon gehört; beim Opfer steht der Mensch als selbständig handelnder Partner mit -eigener Leistung der Gottheit gegenüber, indem er Gott gibt aus seinem eigenen Besitz, Uber welchen er das Verfügungsrecht hat.[625]

This interpretation fits with the understanding of Saul in TDS as greedy and opportunistic. Rather than being a vehicle for divine retribution, he treats the war against the Amalekites as an opportunity for personal and national growth; thus misappropriating the divine call for personal gain. Further, the command is חרם is clarified in 15:3, not to spare them, kill every living being. The command to חרם is also couched in the language of retribution, not sacrifice. Thus, to equivocate חרם as a "kind of sacrifice" misunderstands the purpose of the command.[626] This also ignores the territorial gains claimed by Saul and the "second-best" being taken by the people as evidence that the notion of sacrifice in Gilgal was a ruse.[627]

---

[625] Weiser, "I Samuel 15." "The attitude shown by Saul in his disobedience, that he did not carry out the ban according to Yahweh's command but agreed to the sacrifice of part of the ban's goods, reveals basically the same autonomy of man towards God as that of the sorcerer. Seen in this light, the fundamental difference between the execution of the ban and the sacrifice of the ban goods, which Saul refused to acknowledge, becomes apparent: in the ban, man is merely the implementing agent of the divine will, handing over to God what already belongs to God; in the sacrifice, man stands before the deity as an independently acting partner with his own power, giving to God from his own possessions, over which he has the right of disposal."

[626] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 127.

[627] See pp. 48-49.

Further, Van Seters contrasts Saul's conduct with David's raids on the Amalekites and takes the booty for his gain. Van Seters then claims that Saul "looks like a religious zealot", compared to David.[628] Every instance of David taking booty as a reward for his conquests is in Van Seters' David Saga, which was written after TDS, and according to his theory, the author of TDS would not be aware of them. Within DtrH, David never benefits from his services. The lone example where David does take booty is against the Philistines, when he defends Keilah in 23:1-5. The Philistines are in Keilah looting them and David defeats them and loots them in return. His taking of livestock is placed in the context of the Philistines' looting and it is immediately said that David saved the people of Keilah. Compared to David, Saul's actions are all the more blatantly self-serving.

Van Seters repeats his argument from *In Search of History* that the lone difference between chapters 13 and 15 is that Saul admits his wrongdoing in the latter chapter. This allows Samuel to respond that *yhwh* does not change his mind. Van Seters joins Gunn in arguing that *yhwh* did change his mind in 15:10-11. However, as discussed previously, the repeated usage of נחם shows the semantic range of the term and its meaning is echoed in Samuel's reaction in both instances; thus further highlighting the unity between the deity and his prophet.[629]

Van Seters argues that Samuel and *yhwh* take opposite paths in their feelings about Saul's failures. At first, *yhwh* is angry and then changes his mind to reject Saul. Whereas Samuel is angry, but changes his mind to grieve over Saul. According to Van Seters, this is a parody of the theme of divine forgiveness in the prophets.[630] However, it is unclear here what is being parodied. Van Seters lists multiple examples of prophetic intercession to the divine leading to

[628] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 128.
[629] See p. 58.
[630] Jer. 18:8, 10; 26:3, 13, 19; Jon. 3:10; 4:2. Cited in Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 130.

yhwh relenting of his anger. Likewise, he lists many instances of *yhwh* being described as quick to forgive in prophetic literature. He notes that the Balaam oracle, which he believes is being quoted here, when being asked to curse Israel—Balaam three times blesses them because *yhwh* had already blessed them. He then says: "God is not a human being, that he should lie, or a mortal, that he should change his mind."[631] This is not contradictory with 1 Samuel 15. In the Balaam saga, God will not bless what has been cursed. In TDS, God will not curse what has been blessed. What remains the same is God's decision. Therefore, this is not an example of God "be[ing] persuaded by the intercession of prophets" but quite the opposite. Further, if Numbers can disagree with the prophets, it does not seem to be a problem for TDS to disagree as well. The prophets do not speak in a univocal voice and we can expect some disagreement within them. This scene is not an instance of parody of the theme of prophetic intercession because it is not an instance of prophetic intercession. It is almost certainly a criticism of the deuteronomistic worldview; a point that will be expanded upon later.

Van Seters' understanding of 16:1-13 is that it is treasonous. This is correct in the literal definition of the word; though the implication does not follow from Van Seters' argument. While Samuel is anointing another king under the current monarch's reign, this does not cast "a shadow over all that David says and does."[632] The divine election of David is the crucial element that Van Seters is ignoring. TDS is consistent in its message that the king is whomever *yhwh* says it is. Therefore, once Saul is rejected, he is only the king in practice; but kingship is granted by *yhwh*. Therefore, politically, Samuel and David are treasonous, but morally, they are aligned with the divine will—unlike Saul.

---

[631] Num. 23:19, NRSV.
[632] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 135.

This is not meant to subvert our reading of DtrH, because TDS was not written to be inserted before DtrH. The conception of the final order of the text is anachronistic to the story. The author of TDS did not know that his story would be chapters 15, 16, and 28 of 1 Samuel. Even though TDS is a commentary on DtrH, it was written as an independent unit. After the biblical text is put together, it is much more challenging to separate the texts again. Initially, these narratives existed as separate creations. For TDS to make the reader understand David differently, it would need to be written to make readers believe it was a part of DtrH. As we will see, this is very unlikely. If there was a public exposure to DtrH, it would be done in public readings. It is inconceivable that an author would write their text to be inserted into this public reading. Rather, it was meant to enter the zeitgeist as an alternate tradition, separate from DtrH, but aligned in topic. TDS is almost exclusively not about David and thus, if it intended to subvert David's story, it would be doing a very bad job of it indeed.

The final proof of parody is found in the concluding scene at Endor. Despite banning divination in accordance with deuteronomic law—Saul is still rejected. All proper means of contacting God fails, but he succeeds when Saul stoops to contact a medium. Van Seters reads this pericope as implying that the legitimate means are less effective than the illegitimate ones. Likewise, humans are compassionate, where the divine is not. Van Seters concludes that this is a final parody of the presentation of Israelite history by the DtrH. Once again, TDS almost certainly criticizes DtrH's presentation of King Saul. However, this is not an instance of parody because there is very little evidence of subversion within the narrative. Saul's interaction with the medium did not work: he contacted Samuel, but he wanted forgiveness and did not get it. Once Saul is properly seen as the villain in the story, the compassion that the medium shows him seems less like a moral right and more like incidental kindness. *Yhwh* and Samuel are correct

within the narrative. Though the medium is kind; to be kind to an immoral king does not intrinsically approve of their conduct. Rather, the medium's compassion is a vehicle to conclude the narrative; as seen in the previous chapter.

What does this imply about understanding the meaning of TDS? Applying the same level of cynicism that Van Seters shows towards the text is not warranted. Thus, a straightforward reading is more accurate than one that implies a subversive meaning to the text.

4.6. Interpretation of TDS

Van Seters shows many connections with DtrH within TDS in his description of it. The two rejection scenes of Saul are too alike to be coincidental.[633] Specifically, the notion that Saul was rejected due to a sacrificial error at war appears to be central to Saul's rejection. In both accounts, Saul takes control of the sacrificial rites; placing himself above the authority of Samuel. Samuel opens chapter 15 by establishing himself as the mediator between *yhwh* and Saul. He enforces his role as intercessor and the events of chapter 28 reinforce this status. In both cases, Saul supplants Samuel as the prophet. One must ask: why did the second account needed to be written? The inevitable conclusion is that some distinction between the two necessitated a repeated rejection narrative. This distinction will be made evident as further connections are highlighted.

Van Seters also identifies a connection briefly and though he does not make much of it, I think it is crucial for our understanding of the text. Saul rids the land of mediums and necromancers in line with deuteronomic law.[634] However, as Van Seters points out, Saul is not credited for this action.[635] One would expect that a text so hostile towards Saul, which blames his

[633] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 125.
[634] Deut. 18:9-12.
[635] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 131-32.

fall on his moral failings, would not include him faithfully performing the law. However, this connection and the links to DtrH above suggest that TDS comments on the deuteronomic system and makes a point about its inefficiency. Why this might be, remains unclear.

Unlike most biblical texts, TDS aids the reader's interpretation because it contains two maxims as summarizing morals. When examined in succession, the narrative's message becomes clearer to see. The maxims are as follows:

> Is the delight given to *yhwh* through burnt offerings or sacrifices like obeying *yhwh*'s voice?
>
> Behold, to obey is better than to sacrifice. To listen is better than the fat of rams.
>
> Because rebellion is divination, and stubbornness is wicked idolatry.
>
> Because you rejected the word of *yhwh*, he has rejected you from kingship. (15:22-23)
>
> Do not look at his appearance or his tall height because I have rejected him
>
> because man does not see like God.
>
> Man sees with the eyes
>
> but *yhwh* sees the heart.[636] (16:7)

There has been very little scholarly recognition that these two maxims are compatible with each other. Shared between both is the notion that faithfulness to *yhwh* is found internally rather than

[636] One may wonder why 28:16-19, the poetic climax of the final pericope of TDS, is not included among these maxims. There are several structural connections between the above maxims that are missing in 28:16-19. Firstly, each maxim contains the relative *Leitwort* of the pericope they are contained within. This is not the case with 28:16-19 which does not include reference to ירא. Secondly, both maxims contain a reversal of a crucial verb in its final line, showing an ironic cause to the circumstances: "You *rejected* the word of *yhwh*, he has *rejected* you from kingship," and "Man *sees* with the eyes but *yhwh sees* the heart." This is missing from any section of chapter 28. Finally, 28:16-19 is too specific to function as a maxim, relating particularly to Saul's circumstances. The maxims appear to be developed from proverbs, which could have existed before their usage here, though I doubt they did: "to obey is better than to sacrifice. To listen is better than the fat of rams" and "Man sees with the eyes but *yhwh* sees the heart." 28:16-19 appears to be a summary section of TDS and is impossible to simplify to a proverb.

through external actions. Though the second maxim is ostensibly about Eliab and even more about—it is also about how *yhwh* identifies accepted people: from the quality of their heart.

This is not a unique message in the Hebrew Bible. Many commentators have noted the connection in theology between 15:22-23 and the written prophets or the psalms.[637] Hosea 6:6 shares a lot in common with 15:22-23. They both emphasize God's preference for inward faithfulness over sacrifices. Both share the roots חפץ, עלה, and זבח. When placed beside each other, 1 Samuel 15:22b and Hosea 6:6 are remarkably similar.

הֲנֵה שְׁמֹעַ מִזֶּבַח טוֹב לְהַקְשִׁיב מֵחֶלֶב אֵילִים	כִּי חֶסֶד חָפַצְתִּי וְלֹא־זָבַח וְדַעַת אֱלֹהִים מֵעֹלוֹת
(1 Samuel 15:22b)	(Hosea 6:6)

Both are parallelisms, both use the comparative מ־, and the object of both is זבח and עלה. To be clear, this does not suggest shared authorship, merely shared theology and literary conventions. Amos 5:21-24 shares the same preference for obedience but illustrates a more hostile attitude towards sacrifice and expands its scope to holy days and festivals. Isaiah 1:10-17 likewise shares the vocabulary with Hosea 6:6 of חפץ, עלה, and זבח, but shares the broader scope of Amos 5:21-24. Jeremiah 6:19-20 equivocates empty sacrifices with a rejection of the law, sharing a message and root מאס with 1 Samuel 15:23. Jeremiah grounds this rejection in the law, referencing the many calls for obedience in the wilderness. Micah 6:6-8 asserts that *yhwh* desires obedience and justice. The author of TDS is in alignment with a great swath of prophetic literature.

Returning to the first rejection of Saul, we find that there are more differences than merely Saul's apology between the two accounts.[638] Saul's rejection is not given this message of obedience over sacrifice. In chapter 13, the sacrifice is entirely incidental; serving as a

[637] McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*, 267-68. Jakob H. Grønbæk, "Die Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids (1. Sam. 15-2. Sam. 5): Tradition und Komposition" (Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1971), 58. Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 175-76.
[638] Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David*, 128-29.

convenient framing device rather than an instrumental piece of the action. Saul's sin in chapter 13 is indeed disobedience. He chooses to impatiently sacrifice rather than wait to the end of the seventh day as commanded in 10:8.[639] It is also one of unfaithfulness, as he did not believe that Samuel would bless him.

Saul sacrifices to *yhwh* before the battle rather than after. The connotation here is different; as is Saul's excuse. Saul claims that he sacrificed in order to receive the blessing of *yhwh*: "Now the Philistines will come down upon me at Gilgal, and I have not entreated the favour of the Lord'; so, I forced myself, and offered the burnt offering."[640] Saul understands his relationship with *yhwh* to be a transactional one: where he offers sacrifice in exchange for blessing. His excuse that Samuel is late does not relieve him of his—as some commentators charge.[641] Even if we accept that Samuel was late, which is unclear as the text is vague, Saul is still is overstepping his boundaries to take charge of the sacrifices. Samuel's command was for Saul to wait so that Samuel could sacrifice for the king. Samuel tells Saul to wait until he comes so that: "I will show you what to do."[642] It is possible that Saul does not know how to sacrifice properly; perhaps explaining the unusual wording of וָאֶתְאַפַּק, "I forced myself". The focus on the timing is a red herring. By taking charge of the sacrifice, Saul is disobeying the prophet's command; whether he was late or not. The grey area of timing allows for some excuse for Saul and the retelling in chapter 15 eliminates this excuse.

Saul's faithlessness and mistrust in the might of *yhwh* are reminiscent of similar instances that all ignite the wrath of *yhwh*. When the twelve scouts go into Canaan and report back that they will inevitably fail, as their enemies are greater than they are, *yhwh* is enraged and asks

---

[639] Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 154-55.
[640] 1 Sam. 13:12, NRSV.
[641] Bodner, *1 Samuel: a Narrative Commentary*, 120-21.
[642] 1 Sam. 10:8.

Moses: "how long will this people despise me? And how long will they *refuse to believe in me*?"[643] Likewise, Saul refuses to believe that he will have *yhwh*'s blessing unless he sacrifices. This belief is entirely unsubstantiated and it appears to be rooted in disbelief. *Yhwh* is looking for a king who will have faith in him and when Saul proves himself unworthy, *yhwh* chooses אִישׁ כִּלְבָבוֹ, "a man after his heart".

The two rejections are not identical. The prophetic message of obedience over sacrifice would not have been an appropriate insertion into chapter 13.[644] It is added to chapter 15 bolster the view that cultic obedience is insufficient to be a faithful Israelite. The second difference between the two rejection accounts is that in chapter 13 *yhwh* is not present. Saul's first rejection is entirely explained through the narrator and dialogue between Saul and Samuel. *Yhwh* has an active speaking role in the second account, which does several things: it reinforces Samuel's authority, which TDS holds to a high standard given his heightened dialogue and it adheres more closely to classically prophetic texts where the words of *yhwh* are given overtly. The prophetic tendencies of these texts have long been noted and while scholars tend to justify their addition based on redactional activity,[645] the weight of arguments in this dissertation should show that this is no longer a convincing conclusion. The narrative itself is delivered in a way emphasizing the prophetic role of Samuel; both in speech and action. The SOL is discontinuous with the rest of DtrH but is included so that King David would have a proper anointing scene from Samuel. This all points to an author with prophetic interests and crucially, one who disagreed with the primarily deuteronomistic presentation of the reign of King Saul.

---

[643] Num. 14:11, NRSV. Emphasis mine.
[644] This is contrary to Van Seters who claims: "'obedience is better than sacrifice' is still implicit in the first story and explicit in the second."' Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 261.
[645] Yoreh, "Van Seters' Saga of King David," 110. See especially Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte*. and McCarter Jr, *I Samuel*.

4.7. The Downfall of Saul

So, what is TDS? What is it trying to say and how is it doing it? One more summary of the plot of TDS will answer this question.

TDS is a story about the relationship between prophets and kings. It begins by describing the role of the prophet, the king and the deity. The narrative begins *in media res* with a conversation between the prophet Samuel and King Saul. Samuel charges Saul to go to war with Amalek. Samuel can command the king because he was chosen by *yhwh* to anoint him; giving him the authority of *yhwh*. Saul is to take revenge for the sins that Amalek did to them in the wilderness; fulfilling *yhwh*'s promise to Moses: "I will utterly blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven."[646] In accordance with the wording of the promise, Saul is charged to devote Amalek to the ban; killing all who live there and destroying their wildlife. Saul musters his army and travels south to where Amalek was stationed. On the way, he warns the Kenites, neighbours of Amalek, to flee the area to avoid collateral damage. This is appropriate because the battle takes place over a large area of land. However, Saul does not act as a faithful servant during the battle. He almost immediately breaks *yhwh*'s commands not to spare anyone. He takes the best of the livestock and only destroys what has no value; supplanting the battle's purpose to be about spoil instead of divine retribution. Afterwards, he erects a monument displaying his victory and taking ownership of the land. He takes both the spoil and the glory of the battle from *yhwh*.

Yhwh speaks to Samuel about Saul's actions and the two communicate in furious passion all night. Samuel rises and travels to Gilgal, where Saul has brought the spoil. Upon arrival, Saul greets Samuel, utterly unaware of his trouble. Samuel begins questioning Saul as to the events

[646] Ex. 17:14, NRSV.

that led them here. When asked why there is livestock nearby, Saul admits they were brought from the war, assuming he acted correctly. Notably, the best livestock has been brought to Gilgal, though the rest is conspicuously absent. Samuel proclaims the word of *yhwh*: Saul is disobedient. He took the livestock as booty from the battle instead of following the command of *yhwh* to destroy Amalek utterly. Saul pushes back, claiming what he did was in line with the command of *yhwh*; the spoils were brought to sacrifice to *yhwh*. In his response, he intentionally minimizes his role; not taking full responsibility for his actions and admitting guilt. As for Agag, Saul never acknowledges that the king is a member of the Amalekites; reflecting his attitude towards his relationship with his people. Saul is separate from the Israelites, much like Agag is separate from Amalek.

Samuel is not pleased. *Yhwh* did not ask for sacrifice. He asked for obedience and Saul failed. He disregarded the words of *yhwh,* following his own intuition. Samuel draws a connection between Saul's actions and divination; in both cases, *yhwh* is ignored in favour of another. As a result, Saul is rejected. Saul apologizes for his actions and admits he did wrong but he blames it on the people. Samuel refuses to forgive him and in desperation, Saul falls to his knees and grabs Samuel's robe, tearing it. Using this visual prophecy, Samuel reveals that *yhwh* has already chosen another. Saul admits defeat but asks for Samuel to honour him in front of the elders. Acquiescing, Samuel returns to Gilgal and kills Agag, the last of the Amalekites, before returning home.

Though their relationship is over, Samuel still grieves for Saul; though *yhwh* wants him to anoint Saul's successor. Though initially nervous, understanding the dangers of anointing a new king under the nose of the old one, Samuel goes to Bethlehem to find the next king. The elders share in Samuel's trepidation and come trembling to the prophet asking if he is coming

peacefully. A growing terror has been building since Saul rejected *yhwh*'s call, favouring his own. First being felt by Saul, then Samuel, now the elders, and finally, most fully, by Saul again. Under the pretense of a sacrificial meal, Samuel invites the elders and the family of Jesse alongside him. *Yhwh* has told Samuel that one of Jesse's sons would be the next king. However, Samuel has not yet learned from the failures of Saul. He initially identifies the eldest, Eliab, as the obvious choice; as he is the strongest and most impressive. However, *yhwh* tells him that now he is looking for inner qualities as qualifications for a king. Though Samuel initially made a mistake, he learns from his error and does not impose his opinion until *yhwh* makes his choice clear. The least likely of the sons is chosen to be king: David, the youngest; whom his father did not even invite. David is young and small, but he "sees" well. He is wise and has characteristics that Saul lacks. Samuel anoints David, who receives the SOL. Samuel then goes home, where he stays until his death, having performed his last act as authority over the king.

The narrative does not continue until the final days of Saul, where the weight of *yhwh*'s condemnation has caused him to go to greater and greater extremes to speak with *yhwh*, to no avail: despite his faithful practicing of the law. Much like in chapter 15, when Saul sacrificed despite not obeying, Saul is banning illicit practices, but this does not mean he is obedient; proven by his willingness to break the law to get advice. Saul and Israel are encamped near mount Gilboa on the eve of a battle against the Philistines. Out of desperation, Saul asks for a medium, one who has extraordinary knowledge of the dead, because he needs aid. Saul sneaks past enemy lines in disguise and visits the medium at Endor. He asks for help, but the medium initially refuses because the king has outlawed necromancy. After being reassured, she accepts and Saul asks the woman to bring up the prophet Samuel. However, upon seeing the man, with the characteristic cloak of Samuel, she immediately understands who Saul is and accuses him of

tricking her. Saul reassures her once again and she acts as an intercessor for the final interaction between Saul and Samuel.

Samuel is upset that he was disturbed and demands to know why Saul is bothering him. Saul asks for help, explaining his circumstances, but Samuel is not sympathetic. Samuel confirms that *yhwh* is working against Saul and that Saul has been rejected. He relates that Saul's commander, David, has been selected as his successor. Samuel prophesies that Saul will die tomorrow, alongside his sons and that his army will fall before the Philistines. Saul is left in a broken mess, succumbing to his physical weakness caused by his fasting. In an act of goodwill, the medium prepares Saul and his men food, a sacrificial meal, mirroring the error that led Saul here. Saul eats and leaves to face his fate.

TDS is an entirely consistent narrative that repeatedly makes several points. First that the role of the prophet is of more importance than the role of the king. Second, that a faithful heart for *yhwh* is more important than faithful adherence to the law. Third, that the prophet is a divinely appointed position and prophets communicate directly and speak for *yhwh*. Finally, the role of the king is to faithfully follow the commands of the deity, as communicated through the prophet, and not to supplant their desires over *yhwh*. In presentation, plot, and dialogue, these messages are communicated reliably.

This chapter has evaluated the arguments of Van Seters, one of the very few scholars who has recognized the relative unity of 15:1-16:13 and 28:3-25. However, it has shown that his interpretation relies on certain critical misunderstandings of the text. He believes Saul's sin was a failed חרם when Saul is routinely shown to disregard the will of *yhwh*. The totality of these errors led him to incorrectly label TDS as a parody; using parody as an interpretive lens with which to view the text. Once this mistake was made, his interpretation follows logically from assuming

the TDS was representing the prophetic office satirically. Samuel's role, which TDS holds as paramount, appears ridiculously large. Saul's actions, which TDS views as dangerously misguided, therefore appear tragic. The pathos underlying the final scene, which results from the author's heightened narrative style, is misread as evoking sympathy. These mistakes are not unreasonable, but they are mistakes, nonetheless.

Instead of Van Seters' interpretation, my own was put forward. The author of TDS has prophetic interests and during his time, the lone representation of the early monarchy was written by an author with deuteronomistic interests. The author of TDS was dissatisfied with the presentation of Saul and the pre-reign of David and elected to craft a reinterpretation of Saul's demise in three parts. Part one reinterpreted Saul's fatal mistakes. The trappings of the scene were kept the same: Saul errs in some element of sacrifice at war and is rejected by Samuel. However, key details are added. The story is told through the eyes of the prophet rather than the king. *Yhwh* is shown to command Saul's rejection. Saul is shown to be more irresponsible. Most importantly, the message behind the scenes is made clear: obedience to the letter of the law is not sufficient for faithful worship of *yhwh*.

Scene two was the election of David; a crucial scene. In DtrH, David is anointed by the people. This was unacceptable because it erased the importance of the prophets in the reign of Israel's first dynastic king. Much of David's life was kept the same: he is the son of Jesse, and his older brothers' names are the same. However, now he is described as the antithesis of Saul, small but wise. Once more, the meaning of the text was made clear: the qualities of a good king are not found externally but are internal.

Scene Three was a replacement for the death of Saul; not physically but emotionally. Saul has fallen so far that he must visit a medium and shame himself to visit Samuel for help.

Nothing he can do can save him from *yhwh*'s judgement—not sacrifice, not following the law, not even following the practices of Israel's neighbours. He manages to contact Samuel, where he learns that David will succeed him; something that he has feared since his rejection. Saul, utterly despondent, leaves to face his death at the hands of the Philistines.

CONCLUSION

At the onset of this study, it was pointed out that the lines between the generally accepted, if poorly delineated, “Saul Cycle” and the relatively well-established HDR were uncharacteristically blurry. From 1 Samuel 13-18, there are two stories of Saul’s rejection and three stories introducing his successor, David. The typical conclusion that there were two original strands of narrative weaved together by a compiler, in this case DtrH, could not be comfortably held. Some concluded that it represented an earlier story adopted by DtrH. Some argued it was the introduction to HDR,[647] while others divorced chapters 15 and 16 from each other and labelled 16:1-13 as the beginning of HDR.[648] However, this dissertation has conclusively shown that none of these options are satisfactory. Primarily, chapters 15 and 16 cannot be separated from each other as they show remarkable unity of style and the events of chapter 16 follow directly from chapter 15.

Additionally, there are too many contradictions between the introductions of David for it to be reasonably concluded that the author of HDR adopted it as their introduction, as Grønbæk asserts. Finally, TDS is an independent tradition, but TDS is aware of the material of the early DtrH and consequently could not have been incorporated by the compiler into their history. The only remaining conclusion is that the author of TDS wrote their narrative after Dtr wrote DtrH and responded with an antithetical work to emphasize their understanding of history and theology, which differed from the deuteronomistic one.

---

[647] Grønbæk, "Die Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids (1. Sam. 15-2. Sam. 5): Tradition und Komposition," 26-27.
[648] Weiser, "Die Legitimation des Königs David: Zur Eigenart und Entstehung der sogen. Geschichte von Davids Aufstieg," 325-26.

What are these differences? Primarily, Saul's rejection is given extra force because *yhwh* speaks to Samuel, thus giving the prophet legitimacy. Along that same line, Samuel's importance to the kingship is given extra weight as the narrative opens: "it was I that *yhwh* sent to anoint you as king, over his people, over Israel. Now, listen to the voice of the words of *yhwh*." Thus, the prophet holds a mediatory role between the king and the deity. This concept is absent in the first 14 chapters of the book. The author gives Samuel grand and eloquent speeches in lieu of dialogue—which holds him as the preeminent figure in the narrative; Despite Saul being the story's subject. In addition, David is explicitly anointed by Samuel, even though the future king has no role in the story and is not given dialogue. Finally, there are direct connections to the prophetic books, particularly in the religious maxim of chapter 15 "is the delight given to *yhwh* through burnt offerings or sacrifices like obeying *yhwh's* voice? Behold, to obey is better than to sacrifice. To listen is better than the fat of rams. Because rebellion is divination, and stubbornness is wicked idolatry." TDS has connections to the prophetic school, either directly or by shared theology.

By writing a competing rejection and quasi-death story for Saul and an introduction for David, while demonstrably being aware of the alternative traditions, the author is necessarily arguing against some aspect of the earlier materials. The sacrificial system is criticized in the typical prophetic way as expressed in Amos, Hosea, and other prophetic books.[649] Despite performing the deuteronomic law properly, Saul is portrayed negatively in 1 Samuel 28:3. The deuteronomistic portrayal of kingship is unsatisfactory for the prophetic author and thus they pen a revised narrative that emphasizes a prophetic role in kingship.

---

[649] Paba Nidhani de Andrado, "Ḥesed and Sacrifice: The Prophetic Critique in Hosea," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 78, no. 1 (2016); Göran Eidevall, *Sacrificial Rhetoric in the Prophetic Literature of the Hebrew Bible* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2012); Maricel Ibita, "What to Me is the Multitude of your Sacrifices?: Critique of Sacrificial Cult in the Prophetic Lawsuit (RYB) Metaphor (Isa 1: 2-20; Mic 6: 1-8)" (paper presented at the SBL Annual Meeting, Chicago, 2012).

Thus, the prophetic author behind TDS writes a new narrative that adopts several features of the established tradition. Saul is rejected because of a sacrificial error in battle by Samuel. David is made king as his successor and Saul dies in a battle against the Philistines at Gilgal. However, the details are subtly different to emphasize the author's worldview. Saul is rejected because he failed as *yhwh*'s appointed leader of Israel. His sins are amplified to reinforce the justice of the prophetic rejection of the king. He is made to look greedy and cunning, supplanting the will of *yhwh* for his purposes and using the office of the king for personal wealth. Meanwhile, Samuel speaks to *yhwh* personally and receives genuine council and divinely appointed authority over the king. Consequently, the prophet's words are unquestionable. The prophet speaks for *yhwh,* and he is unchanging and cannot regret or change his mind.

Several explicit conclusions can be drawn from this dissertation. TDS exists and was a countercultural reading of the Saul story. HDR must be understood as beginning with 1 Samuel 16:14 at the latest, if it can be said to exist at all, of which I have my doubts. Lastly, Dtr was not the final redactor of the Former Prophets because there are strands of narrative later than their work within the text. Several implicit conclusions can be equally inferred from this work. The deuteronomistic worldview was not the unilateral position held by the elite of Judah; though it may have been the dominant one. Secondly, the prophetic school's works cannot be limited to the books of the Major Prophets and the Twelve, but they wrote at minimum one historical text. Finally, at least in some way, the prophetic school was at odds with the deuteronomistic one; a dynamic that has not been sufficiently considered up to this point.

5.1 – Areas of Further Research

The primary area of research that should be done on TDS as I see it is exploring the relationship between it and the prophetic texts. I have intentionally avoided any in-depth

discussions on dating and specific authorship as a truly honest treatment of either topic would overwhelm this dissertation and expand it beyond reasonable length. However, I am open to the possibility that TDS was written by an acolyte of any named prophets within the Major Prophets or the Twelve. To determine this, a careful analysis of the language and theology of all works would need to be done. It is also possible that TDS was written by an author not present elsewhere in the biblical text. I believe this is likely. However, a comparison between the prophetic texts and TDS would still be worthwhile to understand further the composition of the prophetic worldview about their interpretation of history. As for the topic of dating, I have no great theory about when TDS was written, only an idea that relative to the rest of the DtrH, it was later. Thus, it is likely that TDS is an exilic text. Though this depends on the dating of DtrH, a topic currently being debated.

The second major area of work that needs to be undertaken after this dissertation is an examination of the other books of Joshua - 2 Kings for evidence of the hand of the author of TDS. I see no inherent reason why TDS should be limited in scope to the reign of Saul. Surely, if a prophetic author deemed it necessary to create a polemic against Dtr and an apology for their worldview, then they would recognize the extent of the DtrH and would have written more than this brief narrative. It would be of interest to study 2 Samuel and see if 1 Samuel 28:3-25 is the true conclusion to TDS or if it is merely the conclusion of TDS within 1 Samuel. Given the predominance of Samuel and Saul in TDS, my instinct would be that this narrative is limited to chapters 15, 16, and 28; but I see no reason why other self-contained narratives written by the same author could not be found within the Former Prophets.

Finally, more work needs to be done on DtrH. As discussed in the first chapter, scholarship is currently in flux regarding DtrH, with many scholars beginning to reject the notion

altogether. It seems that this is because of a misunderstanding of Dtr's sources and role as a redactor. The predominant idea that the sources used by Dtr within 1 Samuel are HDR, the Ark Narrative and a series of unrelated stories is not a satisfactory position. I can only hope this isolation of a small narrative outside of the scope of DtrH will allow for a more nuanced understanding of the diachronic development of the text.

APPENDIX

The Downfall of Saul - Translation

Samuel said to Saul, “It was I that *yhwh* sent to anoint you as king, over his people, over Israel. Now, listen to the voice of the words of *yhwh*. Thus, *yhwh* of hosts said, ‘I have noticed what Amalek did to Israel, what they put in the way when coming up from Egypt. Now, go and smite Amalek and exterminate all who are in it. Do not spare them. Kill from man to woman, from child to baby, from ox to sheep and from camel to donkey.’”

So, Saul gathered the people together and accounted for them in Telaim: 200,000 foot soldiers and 10,000 men of Judah. Then, Saul came to the city of Amalek and lay in wait in the valley. But Saul said to the Kenites, “Go, depart, go down from among the Amalekites, lest I destroy you with them. You showed kindness to all the Israelites when they were coming up from Egypt.” So, the Kenites departed from among the Amalekites.

So, Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah to Shur, which is east of Egypt. And he captured Agag, the king of the Amalekites, alive. But all the people he exterminated with the toedge of the sword. Yet, Saul and the people spared Agag, and they were not willing to exterminate the best of the sheep and cattle, and the second-best of the rams, or any good thing. Meanwhile, any of the property that was worthless or wasted, they exterminated.

The word of *yhwh* came to Samuel, saying, “I regret that I crowned Saul as king because he has turned from following me and he has not followed my word.” This angered Samuel and he cried out to *yhwh* all night.

Then Samuel got up to meet Saul, in the early morning. It was told to Samuel, "Saul went to Carmel. Look, he erected a monument of himself, turned around, passed by, and went down to Gilgal."

So, Samuel went to Saul, and Saul said to him, "Blessed are you, by *yhwh*! I have followed the word of *yhwh*."

But Samuel said, "So, what is this sound of sheep in my ears, and the sounds of oxen which I hear?"

And Saul said, "they were brought from the Amalekites because the people spared the best of the sheep and the oxen to sacrifice to *yhwh* your God. But the leftovers we utterly destroyed."

Samuel said to Saul, "Quiet. I will tell you what *yhwh* said to me at night."

So, [Saul] said to him, "Speak."

So, Samuel said, "Are you so small in your own eyes? You are the head of the tribes of Israel. *Yhwh* anointed you as king over Israel. *Yhwh* send you on a mission and said 'Go, exterminate the sinful Amalekites. Fight against them until they are destroyed.' So, why did you not listen to *yhwh*'s command? Why did you swoop onto the plunder and do evil in the sight of *yhwh*?"

So, Saul responded to Samuel, "I listened to the voice of *yhwh*. I went on the mission on which *yhwh* sent me. I brought Agag, the king of Amalek, but I exterminated the Amalekites. The people took from the spoils of the best of the livestock that should have been destroyed to sacrifice them to *yhwh* your God in Gilgal."

But Samuel said, "Is the delight given to *yhwh* through burnt offerings or sacrifices like obeying *yhwh*'s voice? Behold, to obey is better than to sacrifice. To listen is better than the fat

of rams. Because rebellion is divination, and stubbornness is wicked idolatry. Because you rejected the word of *yhwh*, he has rejected you from kingship."

Saul said to Samuel, "I have sinned. I have ignored the command of *yhwh* and your words. I feared the people and listened to their voice. Now, please forgive my sin and come back with me so I may worship *yhwh*."

But Samuel said to Saul, "I will not return with you because you rejected the word of *yhwh*, *yhwh* has rejected you from being king over Israel."

And as Samuel turned to leave, Saul grabbed the edge of his robe, and it tore. So, Samuel said to him "*yhwh* has torn the kingdom of Israel from you today and has given it to your neighbour, one who is better than you. Further, The Eternal One of Israel does not lie; he will not regret. He is not a man that he can relent."

Saul said, "I have sinned. Now please honor me before the elders of the people and before Israel. Return with me so I may worship *yhwh* your God."

So, Saul turned back after Saul and Saul worshiped *yhwh*. And Samuel said, "Bring Agag, the king of the Amalekites to me."

So, Agag came to him in relief. Agag said, "Surely, the bitterness of death has passed."

But Samuel said, "Just as women have been made childless by your sword, so will your mother be made childless among women." And Samuel butchered Agag before *yhwh* in Gilgal.

And Samuel went to Ramah and Saul went up to his home in Gibeah-Saul. And Samuel no longer saw Saul until he died. Nonetheless, Samuel mourned for Saul and *yhwh* grieved that he made Saul king over Israel.

So *yhwh* said to Samuel, “How long will you mourn about Saul? I have rejected him from kingship over Israel. Fill your horn with oil and go, I am sending you to Jesse, the Bethlehemite because I have found for myself amongst his sons a king.”

But Samuel said, “How can I go? If Saul hears of it, he will kill me.”

And *yhwh* said “Take a sacrificial ox with you and say, ‘I have come to sacrifice to *yhwh*.’ Then, invite Jesse to the sacrifice and I will tell you what you will do, and you will anoint the one I name to you for me.”

So, Samuel did what *yhwh* said and he went to Bethlehem. The elders of the city came to him nervously and said, “do you come in peace?”

And he said, “I’ve come peacefully to sacrifice to *yhwh*. Purify yourselves and come with me to the sacrifice.” And he consecrated Jesse and his sons and invited them to the sacrifice.

So, it happened when they came that he looked at Eliab and said, “Surely, the chosen of *yhwh* is before me.”

But *yhwh* said to Samuel, “Do not look at his appearance or his tall height because I have rejected him because man does not see like God. Man sees with the eyes but *yhwh* sees the heart.”

So, Jesse called to Abinadab and brought him before Samuel. And he said, “This one is also not chosen by *yhwh*” And Jesse brought Shammah, and he said, “This one is also not chosen by *yhwh*.” Thus, Jesse brought 7 of his sons before Samuel and Samuel said to Jesse, “*Yhwh* has not chosen these.”

And Samuel said to Jesse, “Was this all of the boys?”

And he said, “There is still the youngest, but he keeps the sheep.”

And Samuel said to Jesse, “Send and bring him, we will not leave until he comes here.”

So, he sent and brought him, and he was young with bright eyes and a handsome face. And *yhwh* said, "Get up. Anoint him. This is him." So, Samuel took the horn of oil and anointed him from amongst his brothers. The spirit of *yhwh* came onto David from that day onwards. So, Samuel got up and returned to Ramah.

So, Samuel died and all of Israel cried for him and buried him in Ramah, his city.

Saul had banished the necromancers and mediums from the land. The Philistines had organized and came to camp at Shunem, so Saul mustered all of Israel and they encamped at Gilboa. But when Saul saw the Philistine army, he was afraid, and his heart was greatly disturbed. When Saul entreated *yhwh*, he did not answer him, neither by dreams nor by Urim or by prophets.

So, Saul said to his servants, "Find a woman who performs necromancy so I can go to her and inquire of her."

And his servants said to him, "There is a woman who performs necromancy in Endor."

So, Saul disguised himself and wore different clothing and went by himself and two men with him and they came to the woman at night. And he said, "Divine a spirit for me please and bring up for me the one I say to you."

And the woman said to him, "Behold, you know what Saul did when he cut off the necromancers and mediums from the land. So why are you trying to entrap and kill me?"

But Saul swore to her by *yhwh*, "By the life of *yhwh*, no harm for this act will come upon you."

So, the woman responded, "Who should I bring up for you?"

And he said, "Bring up Samuel for me."

But the woman saw Samuel and she cried out with a great cry. “Why did you betray me? You are Saul!” The woman said to Saul.

And the king said to her, “Don’t be afraid, but what do you see?”

The woman said to Saul, “I see a divine being coming up from the ground.”

And he said to her, “What form does he take?”

And she said, “An old man is coming up and he is wrapped in a robe.”

Saul understood that it was Samuel and he bowed with his face to the ground and prostrated himself.

And Samuel said to Saul, “Why did you bother me by raising me?”

And Saul answered, “I am deeply struggling because the Philistines are battling against me, but God has turned away from me and does not answer me any longer, not by prophets or dreams. So, I called to you so you can let me know what I should do.”

So, Samuel responded, “Why ask me if *yhwh* has turned away from you and is your enemy? *Yhwh* did what he said he would through me because *yhwh* has torn the kingdom from your hand and given it to your neighbor, to David. Because you did not listen to the voice of *yhwh,* nor did you act upon his terrible wrath against Amalek. Therefore, *yhwh* has done this thing to you today. But *yhwh* will also deliver Israel alongside you into the hand of the Philistines and tomorrow you and your sons will be with me, as well *yhwh* will deliver the army of Israel into the hand of Israel.”

Saul quickly fell supine to the ground and was terrified because of Samuel’s words. There was no longer any strength in him since he has not eaten food all day or night.

The woman came to Saul and saw that he was greatly distressed, and she said to him, “Behold, your maidservant has obeyed your voice and I put my life at risk, and I listened to the

words that you spoke to me. So, please listen to the voice of your maidservant and let me serve you a slice of bread and eat so that you'll have strength whenever you leave."

But Saul refused and said, "I will not eat."

But his servants pestered him alongside the woman until he listened to their voice. And he stood up and sat on the bed. The woman had a fatted calf in the house, and she killed it in haste and took flour and kneaded and baked unleavened bread from it. Then she came before Saul and his servants, and they ate it. Then they got up and left that night.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, M. H., and Geoffrey Galt Harpham. *A Glossary of Literary Terms.* 11th ed. Stamford: Cengage Learning, 2015.

Ackroyd, Peter R. *The First Book of Samuel.* The Cambridge Bible Commentary: New English Bible. Cambridge: University Press, 1971.

Alexander, T. Desmond, and David W. Baker. *Dictionary of the Old Testament : Pentateuch.* Ivp Bible Dictionary Series. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003.

Alt, Albrecht. "Die Staatenbildung Der Israeliten in Palästina." In *Kleine Schriften Zur Geschichte Des Volkes Israel*. München: C.H. Beck, 1953.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative.* New York: Basic Books, 2011.

———. *The Hebrew Bible Volume 1: The Five Books of Moses.* 3 vols. Vol. 1, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2019.

———. *The Hebrew Bible Volume 2: Prophets.* First edition. ed. 3 vols. Vol. 2, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2019.

Andrado, Paba Nidhani de. "Ḥesed and Sacrifice: The Prophetic Critique in Hosea." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 78, no. 1 (2016): 47-67.

Auld, A. Graeme. *I & Ii Samuel: A Commentary.* Louisville Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011.

———. *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

———. "Prophets and Prophecy in Jeremiah and Kings." In *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld*. London; New York: Routledge, 2016.

———. "Prophets through the Looking Glass: Between Writings and Moses." In *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld*. London; New York: Routledge, 2016.

———. "Solomon and the Deuteronomists." In *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld*. London; New York: Routledge, 2016.

Ausloos, Hans. *The Deuteronomist's History: The Role of the Deuteronomist in Historical-Critical Research into Genesis-Numbers.* Oudtestamentische Studiën. Edited by Bob Becking. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2015.

Barton, John. *The Nature of Biblical Criticism.* Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.

Barton, John, and John Muddiman. *The Oxford Bible Commentary.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Bea, Augustin. "Book Review: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. I (Schriften Der Konigsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft. 18. Jahr. Geisteswissensch. Klasse, Heft 2) Halle (Saale) 1942, Max Niemeyer Verlgag. Viii, 266 S.". *Biblica* 27, no. 1-2 (1946): 141-47.

Beuken, W. A. M. "I Samuel 28: The Prophet as "Hammer of Witches"." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 3, no. 6 (1978): 3-17.

Bhayro, Siam. "The Madness of King Saul." *Archiv für Orientforschung*, no. 50 (2003): 285-92.

Birch, Bruce C. *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of I Samuel 7-15.* Sbl Dissertation Series. Missoula: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1976.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Another Contribution to the Succession Narrative Debate (2 Samuel 11–20; 1 Kings 1–2)." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38, no. 1 (2013): 35-58.

———. "Deuteronomic Contribution to the Narrative in Genesis-Numbers: A Test Case." In *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*, edited by Linda S. Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

———. "Saul and the Mistress of the Spirits (1 Samuel 28.3-25)." In *Sense and Sensitivity: Essays on Reading the Bible in Memory of Robert Carroll*, edited by Alastair G. Hunter and Phillip R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 49-62. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Bodner, Keith. *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary.* Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008.

Boorer, Suzanne. "The Importance of a Diachronic Approach: The Case of Genesis-Kings." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (1989): 195-208.

Borgman, Paul. *David, Saul, and God: Rediscovering an Ancient Story.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The New Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic.* 13th ed. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2010.

Brueggemann, Walter. *First and Second Samuel.* Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1990.

Brueggemann, Walter, and Hans Walter Wolff. *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions.* 2nd ed. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.

Budde, Karl. *Die Bücher Richter Und Samuel, Ihre Quellen Und Ihr Aufbau.* Giessen: J. Ricker, 1890.

———. *Die Bücher Samuel.* Kurzer Hand-Commentar Zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1902.

Buttrick, George Arthur. "Biblical Criticism." In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Campbell, Antony F. *1 Samuel.* The Forms of the Old Testament Literature. Grand Rapids; Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishijng Company, 2003.

———. *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10).* The Catholic Biblical Quarterly/Monograph Series. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986.

———. "Preparatory Issues in Approaching Biblical Texts." In *The Blackwell Companion to the Hebrew Bible*, edited by Leo G. Perdue. Blackwell Companions to Religion, 3-18. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

Campbell, Antony F., and Mark A. O'Brien. *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Chisholm, Robert B. *1 and 2 Samuel.* Teach the Text: Commentary Series. Edited by Mark L. Strauss and John H. Walton. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2013.

Coggins, Richard J. "On Kings and Disguises." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 16, no. 50 (1991): 55-62.

———. "Prophecy - True and False." In *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on His Seventieth Birthday*, edited by Heather A. McKay and David J.A. Clines. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 80-94. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Coogan, Michael David, Marc Zvi Brettler, Carol A. Newsom, and Pheme Perkins. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible: New Revised Standard Version: With the Apocrypha: An Ecumenical Study Bible.* Fully rev. 4th ed. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Cook, F. C., and J. M. Fuller. *The Bible Commentary: 1 Samuel to Esther*. Barnes' Notes. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987. 1879. 1879.

Cornill, Carl Heinrich. *Einleitung in Das Alte Testament Mit Einschluss Der Apokryphen Und Pseudepigraphen.* Freiburg: Akademische Verlags buchhandlung, 1896.

Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Cryer, Frederick H. *Divination in Ancient Israel and Its near Eastern Environment: A Socio-Historical Investigation.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

Davidson, Israel. "Parody in Jewish Literature." Columbia University Press, 1907.

Deist, Ferdinand E. "The Bible as Literature: Whose Literature?". *Old Testament Essays* 7, no. 3 (1994): 327-42.

Delitzsch, Franz. *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Job.* Clark's Foreign Theological Library. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1866.

Dietrich, Walter. "Israelite State Formation and Early Monarchy in History and Biblical Historiography." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Historical Books of the Hebrew Bible*, 2020.

———. "The Layer Model of the Deuteronomistic History and the Book of Samuel." In *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History*, edited by Cynthia Edenburg and Juha Pakkala. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

———. *Prophetie Und Geschichte: Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung Zum Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

Driver, S. R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.* New Revised ed. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1916. 1891.

Edelman, Diana Vikander. *The Fabric of History: Text, Artifact, and Israel's Past*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

———. *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Edenburg, Cynthia, and Juha Pakkala. *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists?: Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History.* Ancient Israel and Its Literature. Edited by Thomas C. Römer. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

Egger, Thomas. "1 Samuel 28:16-20." Paper presented at the Hebrew Club Academic Year 2008-2009, Concordia Seminary, 2011.

Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried. *Einleitung in Das Alte Testament.* Weidmanns, 1803.

Eidevall, Göran. *Sacrificial Rhetoric in the Prophetic Literature of the Hebrew Bible.* Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2012.

Eißfeldt, Otto. *Einleitung in Das Alte Testament: Unter Einschluss Der Apokryphen Und Pseudepigraphen Sowie Der Apokryphen- Und Pseudepigraphenartigen QumrāN-Schriften; Entstehungsgeschichte Des Alten Testaments.* Neue Theologische Grundrisse. 3rd ed. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964.

———. "Noch Einmal: Text-, Stil- Und Literarkritik in Den SamuelisbüChern." *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 31, no. 10 (1928): 801-12.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: An Introduction, Including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and Also the Works of Similar Type from Qumran: The History of the Formation of the Old Testament.* Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. 3r ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1965. 1964. 1934.

Engnell, Ivan. *Gamla Testamentet: En Traditionshistorisk Inledning.* Stockholm: Svenska Krykans, 1945.

Evans, Paul S. *1-2 Samuel.* The Story of God Bible Commentary. Edited by Tremper Longman, III and Scot McKnight. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018.

Firth, David G. *1 & 2 Samuel.* Apollos Old Testament Commentary. Edited by David W. Baker. Gordon J. Wenham. Nottingham; Downers Grove: Apollos; InterVarsity, 2009.

———. "Ambiguity." In *Words & the Word: Explorations in Biblical Interpretation & Literary Theory*, edited by David G. Firth and Jamie A. Grant. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2008.

Firth, David G., and Jamie A. Grant. *Words & the Word: Explorations in Biblical Interpretation & Literary Theory.* Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2008.

Fischer, S. "1 Samuel 28: The Woman of Endor - Who Is She and What Does Saul See?". *Old Testament essays* 14, no. 1 (2001): 26-46.

Fishbane, Michael. *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts.* The Schocken Jewish Bookshelf. New York: Schocken Books, 1979.

Fohrer, Georg, and Ernst Sellin. *Introduction to the Old Testament.* Translated by David E. Green. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.

Fokkelman, J. P. *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Volume Ii, the Crossing Fates (I Sam. 13-31 & Ii Sam. 1).* Studia Semitica Neerlandica. Vol. 2, Assen/Maastricht; Dover: Van Gorcum, 1986.

Freedman, David Noel. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* 6 vols. Vol. 2, New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Friedman, Richard Elliott. *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works.* Harvard Semitic Monographs. Chico: Scholars Press, 1981.

———. *The Hidden Book in the Bible: The Discovery of the First Prose Masterpiece.* San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 1999.

Gabel, John B., Charles B. Wheeler, and Anthony Delano York. *The Bible as Literature: An Introduction.* 4th ed. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Gaß, Erasmus. "Saul in En-Dor (1 Sam 28) Ein Literarkritischer Versuch." *Die Welt des Orients* 42, no. 2 (2012): 153-85.

Gilmour, Rachelle. "The Monuments of Saul and Absalom in the Book of Samuel." In *Collective Memory and Collective Identity: Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History in Their Context*, edited by Johannes UnSok Ro and Diana Edelman. Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 243-62. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021.

Gordon, Robert P. *I & Ii Samuel: A Commentary.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999.

Green, Barbara. *How Are the Mighty Fallen?: A Dialogical Study of King Saul in 1 Samuel.* London; New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

Greenstein, Edward L. ""To Grasp the Hem" in Ugaritic Literature." *Vetus Testamentum* 32, no. 2 (1982): 217-18.

Gressmann, Hugo. "Neue Bücher." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Nachbiblischen Judentums* 3 (1926): 298.

———. "The Oldest History Writing in Israel." Translated by David E. Orton. In *Narrative and Novella in Samuel: Studies by Hugo Gressmann and Other Scholars: 1906-1923*, edited by David M. Gunn. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 9-58. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991.

Grønbæk, Jakob H. "Die Geschichte Vom Aufstieg Davids (1. Sam. 15-2. Sam. 5): Tradition Und Komposition." Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1971.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Genesis.* Göttingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 1910.

Gunn, David M. "David and the Gift of the Kingdom (2 Sam 2-4, 9-20, 1 Kgs 1-2)." *Semeia* 3 (1975): 14-45.

———. *The Fate of King Saul: An Interpretation of a Biblical Story.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Edited by David J. A. Clines, Phillip R. Davies and David M. Gunn. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.

———. "Narrative Patterns and Oral Tradition in Judges and Samuel." *Vetus Testamentum* 24, no. 3 (1974): 286-317.

———. *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Edited by David J. A. Clines, Phillip R. Davies and David M. Gunn. Vol. 6: A&C Black, 1978.

———. "Traditional Composition in the "Succession Narrative"." *Vetus Testamentum* 26, no. 2 (1976): 214-29.

Halpern, Baruch, and Collection Mazal Holocaust. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History.* San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988.

Harvey Jr, Paul B., and Baruch Halpern. "W.M.L. De Wette's "Dissertatio Critica ...": Context and Translation." *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte.* 14 (2008): 47.

Hays, Christopher B. *Death in the Iron Age Ii and in First Isaiah.* Forschungen Zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. *I & Ii Samuel: A Commentary.* Translated by J. S. Bowden. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Hildebrandt, Wilf. *An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God.* Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1995.

Holmstedt, Rachel Krohn & Robert. "Hebrew Verse Structure, Revised." SBL Annual Meeting, 2020.

Holmstedt, Robert. "Hebrew Poetry and the Appositive Style: Parallelism, Requiescat in Pace." [In English]. *Vetus Testamentum* 69, no. 4-5 (2019): 617-48.

Humphreys, W. Lee. "The Rise and Fall of King Saul: A Study of an Ancient Narrative Stratum in I Samuel." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 5, no. 18 (1980): 74-90.

Hutcheon, Linda. "The Politics of Postmodern Parody." In *Intertextuality*, edited by Heinrich F. Plett. Research in Text Theory; Untersuchungen Zur Texttheorie. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991.

———. *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms.* New York: Methuen, 1985.

Ibita, Maricel. "What to Me Is the Multitude of Your Sacrifices?: Critique of Sacrificial Cult in the Prophetic Lawsuit (Ryb) Metaphor (Isa 1: 2-20; Mic 6: 1-8)." Paper presented at the SBL Annual Meeting, Chicago, 2012.

Japhet, Sara. "יד ושם (Isa 56:5) - a Different Proposal." *Maarav* 8 (1992): 69-80.

Jepsen, Alfred. *Die Quellen Des Königsbuches.* Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1953.

Jobling, David. *1 Samuel.* Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry. Edited by David W. Cotter. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998.

Jones, Gwilym H. "1 and 2 Samuel." In *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, edited by John Barton and John Muddiman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Jonker, L.C. *Exclusivity and Variety: Perspectives on Multidimensional Exegesis.* Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.

Jürgen Ebach, Udo Rüterswörden. "Unterweltsbeschwörung Im Alten Testament: Untersuchungen Zur Begriffs- Uns Religionsgeschichte Des 'Ob." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 9. (1977): 57-70.

Kent, Grenville J. R. ""Call up Samuel": Who Appeared to the Witch at En-Dor? (1 Samuel 28:3-25)." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 52, no. 2 (2014).

Kirkpatrick, Patricia G. "The Jacob-Esau Narratives: From Form to Function." In *The Function of Ancient Historiography in Biblical and Cognate Studies*, edited by P.G. Kirkpatrick and Timothy D. Goltz. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

———. *The Old Testament and Folklore Study.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Edited by David J. A. Clines and Phillip R. Davies. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.

Kittel, Rudolf. "Die Pentateuchischen Urkunden in Den Büchern Richter Und Samuel." *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 65 (1892): 44-71.

Klein, Ralph W. *1 Samuel.* Word Biblical Commentary. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. 2nd ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 2008.

Knierim, Rolf. "The Messianic Concept in the First Book of Samuel." In *Jesus and the Historian. Written in Honor of Ernest Cadman Colwell*, edited by Ernest Cadman Colwell and F. Thomas Trotter. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.

Knight, Douglas A. *Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel.* Studies in Biblical Literature. 3rd ed. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Kratz, Reinhard G. "The Headings of the Book of Deuteronomy." In *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History*, edited by Konrad Schmid and Raymond F. Person Jr. Forschungen Zum Alten Testament: 2. Reihe: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Kynes, Will. "Beat Your Parodies into Swords, and Your Parodied Books into Spears: A New Paradigm for Parody in the Hebrew Bible." *Biblical Interpretation* 19, no. 3 (2011): 276-310.

Larsen, Kasper Bro. "Chapter Three: Recognition in Conflict (John 5–19)." In *Recognizing the Stranger: Recognition Scenes in the Gospel of John*. Biblical Interpretation Series, 143-84. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.

Levenson, Jon D. "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?". *Harvard Theological Review* 68, no. 3-4 (1975): 203-33.

Levtow, Nathaniel B. *Images of Others: Iconic Politics in Ancient Israel.* Biblical and Judaic Studies. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

Lewis, Theodore J. *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit.* Harvard Semitic Monographs. Edited by Frank Moore Cross. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Linafelt, Tod. "Poetry and Biblical Narrative." Chap. 6 In *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Narrative*, edited by Diana Nolan Fewell. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Long, V. Philips. *The Reign and Rejection of King Saul: A Case for Literary and Theological Coherence.* Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series. Edited by David L. Petersen and Charles Talbert. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Lozovyy, Joseph. *Saul, Doeg, Nabal, and the "Son of Jesse": Readings in 1 Samuel 16-25.* Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies. Edited by Claudia V. Camp and Andrew Mein. New York; London: T&T Clark, 2009.

Magnusson, M., and H. Palsson. *Njal's Saga Translated by Magnus Magnusson and Hermann Palsson.* The Penguin Classics. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1960.

Malamat, Abraham. "Intuitive Propecy - a General Survey." Chap. 6 In *Mari and the Bible*. Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient near East, 59-82. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

McCarter Jr, P. Kyle. *I Samuel.* The Anchor Bible. Edited by William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. Garden City: Doubleday 1980.

McKenzie, Steven L. *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1991.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings.* Coniectanea Biblica/Old Testament Series. Lund: Gleerup, 1976.

Michael, Matthew. "The Prophet, the Witch and the Ghost Understanding the Parody of Saul as a 'Prophet' and the Purpose of Endor in the Deuteronomistic History." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38, no. 3 (2014): 315-46.

———. "Saul's Prophetic Representations and Its Parody in 1 Samuel." *Old Testament Essays* 26, no. 1 (2013): 111-36.

Middleton, J. Richard. "Samuel Agonistes: A Conflicted Prophet's Resistance to God and Contribution to the Failure of Israel's First King." In *Prophets, Prophecy, and Ancient Israelite Historiography*, edited by Mark J. Boda and Lissa M. Wray Beal. Winona Lake: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013.

Miles, John A. "Laughing at the Bible: Jonah as Parody." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 65, no. 3 (1975): 168-81.

Murphy, Francesca Aran. *1 Samuel.* Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2010.

Nelson, Richard D. "Historiography and History Writing in the Ancient World." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Historical Books of the Hebrew Bible*, edited by Brad E. Kelle and Brent A. Strawn. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Nelson, Richard D. *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Edited by David J. A. Clines, Phillip R. Davies and David M. Gunn. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.

Niditch, Susan. *War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence.* New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Nobel, Paul R. "Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Biblical Interpretation." *Literature and Theology* 7, no. 2 (1993): 130-48.

Noth, Martin. *Überlieferungsgeschichte Des Pentateuch.* 2nd ed. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948.

———. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die Sammelnden Und Bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke Im Alten Testament.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963. 1943.

O'Brien, Mark A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment.* Orbis Biblicus Et Orientalis. Freiburg; Göttingen: Universitätsverlag; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
O'Connor, Michael Patrick. *Hebrew Verse Structure.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1980.
Park, Suzie. "Saul's Question and the Question of Saul: A Deconstructive Reading of the Story of Endor in 1 Sam. 28:3-25." In *T&T Clark Handbook of Asian American Biblical Hermeneutics,* edited by Uriah Y. Kim and Seung Ai Yang. T&T Clark Handbooks, 241-51. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
Peckham, Brian. *The Composition of the Deuteronomistic History.* Harvard Semitic Monographs. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
———. *History and Prophecy: The Development of Late Judean Literary Traditions.* The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
Pigott, Susan M. "1 Samuel 28—Saul and the Not So Wicked Witch of Endor." *Review & Expositor* 95, no. 3 (1998): 435-44.
Polzin, Robert. *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History Part Two: 1 Samuel.* Bloomington; Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993.
Preminger, Alex, and Edward L. Greenstein. *The Hebrew Bible in Literary Criticism.* A Library of Literary Criticism. New York: Ungar, 1986.
Quinn-Miscall, Peter D. *1 Samuel: A Literary Reading.* Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.
Rofé, Alexander. "The Battle of David and Goliath. Folklore, Theology, Eschatology." Chap. 6 In *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel,* edited by Jacob Neusner, Baruch A. Levine and Ernest S. Frerichs, 117-51. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
———. "Joshua 20: Historic-Literary Criticism Illustrated." In *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism,* edited by Jeffrey H. Tigay. Dove Studies in Bible, Language, and History. Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2005.
Römer, Thomas. *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History.* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000.
———. "The So-Called Deuteronomistic History and Its Theories." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Historical Books of the Hebrew Bible,* edited by Brad E Kelle and Brent A Strawn. New York: Oxford University of Press, 2020.
———. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction.* London; New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
Rose, Margaret A. *Parody//Meta-Fiction: An Analysis of Parody as a Critical Mirror to the Writing and Reception of Fiction.* London: Croom Helm, 1979.
Rost, Leonhard. *Die Überlieferung Von Der Thronnachfolge Davids.* Beiträge Zur Wissenschaft Vom Alten Und Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926.
———. *The Succession to the Throne of David.* Historic Texts and Interpreters in Biblical Scholarship. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1982.
Roy Martin, Lee. "Power to Save!?: The Role of the Spirit of the Lord in the Book of Judges." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 16, no. 2 (2008): 21-50.
Sarrazin, Bernard. "Du Rire Dans La Bible? La Théophanie De Job Comme Parodie." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 76, no. 1 (1988).
Schearing, Linda S., and Steven L. McKenzie. *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Edited by David J. A. Clines and Phillip R. Davies. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Schmid, Konrad. "The Emergence and Disappearance of the Separation between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History in Biblical Studies." Chap. 1 In *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Thomas Römer and Konrad Schmid, 11-24. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Schmidt, Brian B. "The "Witch" of En-Dor, 1 Samuel 28, and Ancient near Eastern Necromancy." In *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, edited by Paul Mirecki and Marvin Meyer: Brill, 2015.

Smend, Rudolf. "The Law and the Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History." Translated by Peter T. Daniels. In *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*, edited by Gary N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study, 95-110. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

Snyman, S. D. "A Structural-Historical Approach to the Exegesis of the Old Testament." Chap. 2 In *Words & the Word*, edited by David G. Firth and Jamie A. Grant, 51-73. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2008.

Sonia, Kerry M. *Caring for the Dead in Ancient Israel.* Archaeology and Biblical Studies. Atlanta: The Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2020.

Stavrakopoulou, Francesca. *Land of Our Fathers: The Roles of Ancestor Veneration in Biblical Land Claims.* Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies. New York; London: T&T Clark, 2010.

Stern, David. "The Alphabet of Ben Sira and the Early History of Parody in Jewish Literature." In *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation : Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, edited by Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.

Sweeney, Marvin A. *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "1 Sam 15:32b--a Case of Conflated Readings." *Vetus Testamentum* 11, no. 4 (1961): 456-57.

Toorn, K. van der, Bob Becking, and Pieter Willem van der Horst. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible.* 2nd extensively revised ed. Leiden; Boston; Köln; Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Brill; Eerdmans, 1999.

Tsumura, David Toshio. *The First Book of Samuel.* The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids; Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2007.

———. "Literary Insertion (Axb Pattern) in Biblical Hebrew." *Vetus Testamentum* 33, no. 4 (1983): 468-82.

Valeta, David M. *Lions and Ovens and Visions: A Satirical Reading of Daniel 1-6.* Hebrew Bible Monographs. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008.

———. "Polyglossia and Parody: Language in Daniel 1– 6." In *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies*, edited by Roland Boer. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

Van Seters, John. *Abraham in History and Tradition.* Brattelboro: Echo Point Books & Media, 2014.

———. *The Biblical Saga of King David.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

———. "Creative Imitation in the Hebrew Bible." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 29, no. 4 (2000): 395-409.

———. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1983.
———. "Oral Patterns or Literary Conventions in Biblical Narrative." *Semeia* 5 (1976): 139-54.
———. "Problems in the Literary Analysis of the Court History of David." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 1, no. 1 (1976): 22-29.
Veijola, Timo. *Die Ewige Dynastie: David Und Die Entstehung Seiner Dynastie Nach Der Deuteronomistischen Darstellung.* Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia Sarja B. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975.
———. *Leben Nach Der Weisung: Exegetisch-Historische Studien Zum Alten Testament.* Forschungen Zur Religion Und Literatur Des Alten Und Neuen Testaments. Edited by Walter Dietrich and Marko Marttila. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
Verman, Mark. "Royalty, Robes and the Art of Biblical Narrative." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 30, no. 1 (2016): 30-43.
von Rad, Gerhard. *Das Erste Buch Mose: Genesis.* Das Alte Testament Deutsch: Neues Göttinger Bibelwerk. Edited by Artur Weiser. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
———. "Das Formgeschichtliche Problem Des Hexateuch." In *Gesammelte Studien Zum Alten Testament*. Theologische Bücherei. München: Kaiser, 1958.
———. "Hexateuch Oder Pentateuch?". *Verkündigung und Forschung* 1-2, no. 2 (1942): 52.
Vorster, Willem S. "The in/Compatibility of Methods and Strategies in Reading or Interpreting the Old Testament." *Old Testament Essays* 2, no. 3 (1989): 53-63.
Weippert, Helga. "Die "Deuteronomistischen" Beurteilungen Der Könige Von Israel Und Juda Und Das Problem Der Redaktion Der Königsbücher." *Biblica* 53, no. 3 (1972): 301-39.
Weiser, Artur. "Die Legitimation Des Königs David: Zur Eigenart Und Entstehung Der Sogen. Geschichte Von Davids Aufstieg." *Vetus Testamentum* 16, no. 3 (1966): 325-54.
———. *Einleitung in Das Alte Testament.* 4th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.
———. "I Samuel 15." [In English]. *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 54, no. 1-2 (1936): 1.
———. *Samuel: Seine Geschichtliche Aufgabe Und Religiose Bedeutung. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen Zu 1 Samuel 7-12.* Forschungen Zur Religion Und Literatur Des Alten Und Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.
Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena Zur Geschichte Israels.* De Gruyter Studienbuch. 6 ed. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2001.
Westermann, Claus. *Die Geschichtsbücher Des Alten Testaments: Gab Es Ein Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* Theologische Bücherei: Altes Testament. Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1994.
———. *Grundformen Prophetischer Rede.* Beiträge Zur Evangelischen Theologie: Theologische Abhandlungen. Edited by E. Wolf. Munchen: Christian Kaiser, 1960.
Williams, Ronald J., and John C. Beckman. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax.* 3rd ed. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 2007.
Williamson, HGM. "John Van Seters, the Biblical Saga of King David." 62, no. 1 (2011): 146-47.
Willis, John T. "An Anti-Elide Narrative Tradition from a Prophetic Circle at the Ramah Sanctuary." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90, no. 3 (1971): 288-308.

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Bibel: Das Alte Testament: Eine Einführung in Seine Schriften Und in Die Methoden Ihrer Erforschung.* Themen Der Theologie. Edited by Jürgen Schultz. Stuttgart; Berlin: Kreuz-Verlag, 1970.

———. "The Kerygma of the Yahwist." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 20, no. 2 (1966): 131-58.

Yee, Gale A. "The Anatomy of Biblical Parody: The Dirge Form in 2 Samuel 1 and Isaiah 14." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50, no. 4 (1988): 565-86.

Yoon, Sung-Hee. *The Question of the Beginning and the Ending of the So-Called History of David's Rise: A Methodological Reflection and Its Implications.* Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Edited by John Barton, Ronald Hendel, Reinhard G. Kratz and Markus White. Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2014.

Yoreh, Tzemah. "Van Seters' Saga of King David." *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 10, no. 1 (2010): 103-14.