# THE REJECTION OF SAUL: A STUDY OF SOURCES

STEPHEN S. YONICK, O.F.M., *Loyola University of Chicago*

The tradition concerning the rejection of Saul is preserved in four passages of the Hebrew Scriptures, 1 Sm. 13:8-15; 15; 28:15-19; 1 Chr. 10:13-14. Of these four citations, 1 Sm. 15 possesses a theological dimension of great quality since it presents the rejection of Saul as a crucial point in the history of Israel, a pivotal point marking the end of the Old Covenant and the beginning of the New Covenant under David. The author of 1 Sm. 15 does not demonstrate how to write about an "historical event" according to twentieth century standards of historical criticism. However, he does offer the student of the Hebrew Scriptures a very fine example of how the Hebrew genius gave meaning to an "event" by means of a religious interpretation of history—what the German analysts called *Heilsgeschichte*.

Since no writer of the Hebrew Scriptures functioned in a vacuum, including the author of 1 Sm. 15, the basic question arises: what are the sources of the tradition of the rejection of Saul as described in 1 Sm. 15? Where did he get his materials, how did he manipulate the data toward an integral presentation, and where does he stand within the long line of Israelite tradition? In this study, we propose to offer some answers to these questions by comparing 1 Sm. 15 with 1 Sm. 13:8-15 on literary grounds in an attempt to uncover its theological purpose and function in the context of the deuteronomic-prophetic tradition. We do not understand the term "deuteronomic" in the classic sense of the "deuteronomic historian" or of the "deuteronomistic school". Nor do we interpret the expression "prophetic" as the "prophetic school." We understand both terms simply in the sense that the works of the deuteronomists and of the prophets have been sufficiently established in Hebrew experience and tradition so as to be sources for more sophisticated attempts in the theological effort. These clarifications are of the utmost importance in attempts to understand what was going on in the mind of the author of 1 Sm. 15.

In order to answer the question of sources for 1 Sm. 15, we shall detail the stylistic similarities and dissimilarities between 1 Sm. 15 and 1 Sm. 13:8-15—two traditions or sources for the rejection of Saul as King of Israel. For the same reason, references will be made to the two other passages, namely, 1 Sm. 28:15-19

and 1 Chr. 10:13-14, whose sources in turn will also be made manifest. Out of the total analysis the theology of 1 Sm. 15 will emerge.

Hence, our study will proceed in three parts: first, the stylistic similarities in 1 Sm. 13:8-15 and 1 Sm. 15 under the headings of (1) content; (2) form; (3) vocabulary; (4) literary genre. Secondly, the stylistic dissimilarities in 1 Sm. 13:8-15 and 1 Sm. 15, principally in vocabulary. Thirdly, the theology of 1 Sm. 15 under the headings, (1) the relationship between Samuel and Saul, each considered separately in his proper function; (2) the time-factor of the rejection; (3) the content of the divine command in five parts; and (4) the nature of Saul's sin. The conclusion follows.

## STYLISTIC SIMILARITIES IN 1 SM. 13:8-15 AND 1 SM. 15

The text of 1 Sm. 10:8; 13:8-15 reads as follows[1]:

> You must go down before me to Gilgal; I will join you there to offer holocausts and communion sacrifices. You are to wait for seven days for me to come to you, and then I will show you what you are to do. . . .
>
> Saul waited for seven days, the period Samuel had stipulated, but Samuel did not come to Gilgal, and the army, deserting Saul, was dispersing. So Saul said, "Bring me the holocaust and the communion sacrifices." Then he offered the holocaust. Just as he was completing the offering of the holocaust, Samuel came, and Saul went out to meet him and greet him. But Samuel said, "What have you done?" Saul explained, "I saw that the army was deserting me and dispersing. You did not come at the time which you yourself had determined. While the Philistines were mustering their forces at Michmash, I began to think that the Philistines will now fall on me at Gilgal, and I

---

1. Verse 8 is usually considered an insertion, preparing for 13.8-15. 1 Sm. 10.8 is also one piece of Old Testament evidence on which a priesthood of Samuel is based. A publication of the Pontifical Biblical Institute offers the following evaluation: ". . . texts showing Samuel sacrificing probably did give Israelites of later times the impression that Samuel was a priest; hence his inclusion in the Levitical genealogies of Chronicles, at a time when a priest had to be counted as a Levite, and when sacrificing required a priestly hand and had to be performed at a legitimate sanctuary. But that Samuel's sacrificing was looked upon as priestly in the formative days of Samuel traditions, when a priest was still looked upon as a sanctuary minister whose principal function still was the oracular consultation which was turning into the giving of *tora*—and when sacrifice was not yet bound to a sanctuary —is far from certain." Aelred Cody, *A History of Old Testament Priesthood*, Rome, 1969, pp. 73-74.

have not as yet implored the favour of the Lord. So I felt obliged to act, and therefore offered the holocaust myself. Samuel reacted, "You have acted the fool. If you had carried out the order of the Lord your God as commanded, the Lord would have confirmed your sovereignty over Israel forever. But now your sovereignty will not last; the Lord has searched out a man for himself after his own heart to designate him as leader of his people, since you have not carried out the command of the Lord." Samuel then stood up and left Gilgal to continue his journey to Geba of Benjamin.

The above text presents an earlier tradition concerning the rejection of King Saul. Saul himself is said to have offered sacrifice. In 1 Sm. 10:8, after Samuel had anointed Saul as king (1 Sm. 10:1), he directed Saul to proceed to Gilgal since the prophet himself would come to offer the holocaust and to perform the communion sacrifices prior to battle. Samuel then ordered Saul to wait for seven days,[2] at which time Samuel would arrive to offer the communion sacrifices and then to instruct Saul as to what he must do. 1 Sm. 13:8 apparently is the logical continuation of the former text since it states that Saul had waited out the appointed time. Moreover, in both instances, there is the question of a similar type of sacrifice, namely, holocausts and communion sacrifices. Once the people had dispersed at a time of judgment against the Philistines, Saul began to offer the holocaust. However, at that very moment—as if it were prearranged—Samuel is said to have arrived. The hagiographer makes it quite clear that Saul himself had offered the sacrifice Moreover, Saul had

---

2. The seven-day motif occurs in Ugaritic documents, cfr. Cyrus H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature*, Rome, 1949, Texts 51:VI:20-33; Krt: 105-109, 114-119, 195-221, the seven-fold questions in the ritual of exorcism in 126:V:7-29; 2 Aqht: 1:1-17; II:30-41; II:45-V:4;124:20-25; Text 3 in which the seven-day motif is related to the return of the king for the immolation of a peace offering. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan*, Leiden, 1965, p. 298, interprets the seven-days as "simply a literary device to tide over an indefinite period", and "the interval before the final conflict of Baal and Mot is similarly given as 'seven years', which in this case, however, may have a ritual significance, referring . . . to a seven-year cycle of agriculture such as was prescribed for Israel culminating in the Sabbatical year." For the moment, we would understand the use of the motif in 1 Samuel as a seven day period of ritual preparation for the offering of the communion sacrifices prior to battle. For more information, cfr. A. S. Kapelrud, "The Number 7 in Ugaritic Texts", *VT* 18 (68), pp. 494-499; H. J. Kraus, "The Seven Year Period in Ras Shamra Texts", Excursus in *Gottesdienst in Israel*, 1954, pp. 29f; S. E. Loewenstamm, "The Seven-Day-Unit in Ugaritic Epic Literature" *IEJ*, 15 (65), pp. 121-33.

explicitly commanded that the holocaust be brought to him: there is the use of the sacrificial term *pāgash* in 1 Sm. 13:9.[3]

The inquisition follows. Even before Saul had time to greet Samuel in v. 10, Samuel curtly asked: "What have you done?" (v. 11). The very same question is asked in Yahweh's inquisition with Cain after the act of fratricide in Gn. 4:10. Saul gave his reason to the effect that, because of the imminent attack of the Philistines, he was forced to carry out the appropriate sacrifice (vv. 11-12). Saul knew very well that he was guilty of offering sacrifice and attempted to justify himself: "So I felt obliged to act." Samuel then announced that Saul's act was a deliberate act of disobedience against the wishes of the Lord (v. 13), for which reason the Lord has already chosen another man as king (v. 14). On the basis of the LXX and the Vulgate, both depart, and Saul together with the people proceeds to Gibeah or Geba of Benjamin.[4]

### (1) *Similarities in Content*

There are many similarities in content between the two pericopes describing the rejection of Saul. Samuel anointed Saul as king and proxy of the Lord (1 Sm. 10:1; 15:1). There is a divine command in each case (1 Sm. 10:8; 13:13; 15:3), together with an act relative to the command (1 Sm. 13:8; 15:4). Moreover, the command is frustrated (1 Sm. 13:9-10; 15:8-9) at the time of the Holy War, with subsequent inquisition in the same place, namely, at the sanctuary of Gilgal (1 Sm. 13:10-12; 15:10-23).

In the inquisition itself, there are many elements common to both narratives: the advent of Samuel (1 Sm. 13:10a; 15:13a); Saul's greeting addressed to Samuel (1 Sm. 13:10b; 15:13b); Samuel's question (1 Sm. 13:11a; 15:14); Saul's response and justification of action (1 Sm. 13:11b-12; 15:15, 20-21).

After the inquisition, a judgment follows, whose result is the same in both cases, namely, the rejection of Saul's kingdom (1 Sm. 13:14; 15:22-28a), and the transmission of the kingdom to another (1 Sm. 13:14; 15:28b). The post-judgment event is the geographic separation of Samuel and Saul. According to the LXX and the Vulgate, as we have already seen, Samuel went to Ramah in 1 Sm. 15:34, and Saul departed for Gibeah according to 1 Sm. 15:34 (where 1 Sm. 13:15 *à la* LXX and Vulgate also send

---

3. Aelred Cody, *A History of Old Testament Priesthood*, Rome, 1969, does not even take this word into consideration, though he does discuss 1 Sm. 13.8-15 on pp. 73, 85, 109, 124.

4. Probably on account of the localization of Saul . . . etc., in *Geboah* in the following verses.

Samuel). In both traditions, the generic sin is one of disobedience to a command issued by Samuel.

(2) *Similarities in Form*

Formally, the schema of the two narratives is the same:
I. The Command:
   A. Personae Dramatis: Samuel and Saul (1 Sm. 10:1; 15:1).
   B. The Command (1 Sm. 10:8; 13:13; 15:3).
II. Faulty Execution of the Command:
   A. The Act in Relation to the Command (1 Sm. 13:8; 15:4-7).
   B. Frustration of the Command (1 Sm. 13:9-10; 15:8-9).
III. The Inquisition:
   A. The Advent of Samuel (1 Sm. 13:10a; 15:13a).
   B. Saul Greets Samuel (1 Sm. 13:10b; 15:13b).
   C. Samuel's Questioning (1 Sm. 13:11a; 15:14).
   D. Saul's Response (1 Sm. 13:11b-12; 15:15, 20-21).
   E. Explicit Accusation (1 Sm. 13:13a; 15:19).
IV. The Rejection:
   A. The Rejection Itself (1 Sm. 13:14; 15:22-29).
   B. Event after the rejection: separation of Samuel and Saul (1 Sm. 13:15; 15:34-35).

(3) *Similarities in Vocabulary*

Moreover, there are many similar expressions in both narratives. Thus, a good case for literary interrelationship becomes even stronger.

  (1)  1 Sm. 10:8: *liz$^e$bboah zib$^e$he*
       1 Sm. 15:15: *z$^e$boah*
       1 Sm. 15:21: *liz$^e$bboah*
       1 Sm. 15:22: *mizzebah*
  (2)  1 Sm. 10:8: *w$^e$yarad$^e$ta . . . yered*
       1 Sm. 15:12: *wayyered*
  (3)  1 Sm. 10:1: *ki m$^e$shahaka Yahweh $^c$al-nahalato l$^e$nagid*
       1 Sm. 15:1: *shalah Yahweh lim$^e$shahaka l$^e$melek $^c$al-$^c$ammo*
       1 Sm. 15:17: *wayyim$^e$shahaka Yahweh l$^e$melek $^c$al-yisra'el*
  (4)  1 Sm. 10:1: *$^c$al-nahalato*
       1 Sm. 15:5: *bannahal* (Dt. 25: 19: nahalah)
  (5)  1 Sm. 10:8: *w$^e$hinneh* (also in 1 Sm. 13:10 and 1 Sm. 15:12)
  (6)  1 Sm. 10:8: *haggil$^e$gal* (also in 1 Sm. 13:8, 12, 15; 15:12; *baggil$^e$gal* in 1 Sm. 15:21, 33)

(7) 1 Sm. 13:8: *ha$^c$am* (in 1 Sm. 15:4, 9, 15, 21, 24).
(8) 1 Sm. 13:8: *me$^c$alayw*
    1 Sm. 13:11: *me$^c$alay*
    1 Sm. 15:28: *me$^c$aleka*
(9) 1 Sm. 13:9: *haggishu 'elay* (also in 1 Sm. 15:32)
(10) 1 Sm. 13:10: *ba'* (also in 1 Sm. 15:12; *wayyabo* in
    1 Sm. 15:5).
(11) 1 Sm. 13:10: *liq$^e$ra'to (liq$^e$ra't* in 1 Sm. 15:12)
(12) 1 Sm. 13:10: *l$^e$barako (baruk* in 1 Sm. 15:13)
(13) 1 Sm. 13:11: *wayyo'mer shemu'el umeh . . .*
    1 Sm. 15:14: *wayyo'mer shemu'el umeh . . .*
(14) 1 Sm. 13:11: *w$^e$'attah ('attah* in 1 Sm. 15:13, 17)
(15) 1 Sm. 13:12: *up$^e$ne Yahweh*
    1 Sm. 15:33: *lip$^e$ne Yahweh*
(16) 1 Sm. 13:13: *wayyo'mer shemu'el 'el-sha'ul* (also in
    1 Sm. 15:1, 16, 26).
(17) 1 Sm. 13:13: *Yahweh 'eloheka* (in 1 Sm. 15:21, 30)
(18) 1 Sm. 13:12, 13: *$^c$attah* (cfr. 1 Sm. 15:3).
(19) 1 Sm. 13:14: *w$^{ec}$attah* (cfr. 1 Sm. 15:1, 25)
(20) 1 Sm. 13:13: *mamelakt$^e$ka* (also in v. 14; *maml$^e$kut* in
    1 Sm. 15:28)
(21) 1 Sm. 13:13: *'el-yisra'el ($^c$al-yisra'el* in 1 Sm. 15:1, 17,
    26, 35)[5]

Since we are in the context of vocabulary evidence for a case of literary dependence between the two major narratives describing the rejection of Saul, we can go even further at this point to indicate that another narrative in 1 Sm. 28:12, 16-19 depends on 1 Sm. 15 for its vocabulary source.

(1) 1 Sm. 15:11: *wayyiz$^{ec}$aq* (1 Sm. 28:12)
(2) 1 Sm. 15:32: *sar* (1 Sm. 28:16)
(3) 1 Sm. 15:28: *me$^c$aleka* (1 Sm. 28:16)
(4) 1 Sm. 15:28: *l$^e$re$^c$aka* (1 Sm. 28:17; *$^c$areka* in 1 Sm.
    28:16, *$^c$im-re$^c$aka* with the LXX and the Syriac)
(5) 1 Sm. 15:12: *yad (b$^e$yadi* in 1 Sm. 28:17; *miyyadeka* in
    1 Sm. 28:17; *b$^e$yad* in 1 Sm. 28:19)
(6) 1 Sm. 15:19: *lo'-shama$^c$ta b$^e$qol Yahweh* (cfr. 1 Sm.
    28:18)
(7) 1 Sm. 15:2: *$^c$asah*
    1 Sm. 15:19: *wata$^c$as*
    1 Sm. 28:18: *w$^e$lo- $^c$asita*
(8) 1 Sm. 15:2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 20, 32: *$^c$amaleq (ba$^c$amaleq*
    in 1 Sm. 28:18)

---

5. The phenomenon of interchanging *'el* for *$^c$al* is common in Jeremiah.

(9) 1 Sm. 15:28: *hayyom* (as in 1 Sm. 28:18)
(10) 1 Sm. 15: 28: *unetanah*
 1 Sm. 28:17: *wayyitenah*
 1 Sm. 28:19: *w$^e$yitten* . . . *yitten*
(11) 1 Sm. 15:27: *m$^e$$^c$ilo* (*m$^e$$^c$il* in 1 Sm. 28:14)

Evidently, the narrative in the 1 Sm. 28:12, 16-19 depends on the tradition of the rejection as presented in 1 Sm. 15. However, there is an additional effect to the rejection which is even more proximate: "You and your sons will be with me" (namely, in Sheol) (1 Sm. 28:19). The definitive rejection of Saul in 1 Sm. 15 is even stronger at this point, namely, including his sons who will fall in battle against the Philistines.

*(4) Similarity in Literary Genre*

There is a final element for consideration, at least briefly, which the two narratives of 1 Sm. 13 and 15 have in common, namely, the literary genre of the *rib-pattern,* which occurs in the inquisition section. Since we can see some elements from this literary genre in both 1 Sm. 13:8-15 and in 1 Sm. 15, it would appear that both narratives pertain to a style that is both prophetic and deuteronomic in tradition. Although 1 Sm. 13 has some elements of the pattern, 1 Sm. 15 presents the strongest case in the prophetic-deuteronomic tradition.

Between the years 1914 and 1962, several authors have studied and analyzed this literary genre.[6] For analogies from extra-

---

6. H. Gressman, "Die literarische Analyse Deuterojesajas", in *ZAW*, 34 (1914), pp. 254-297; L. Koehler, "Deuterojesaja stilkritisch untersucht", in *Beihefte zur ZAW*, 37, Giessen, 1923, pp. 110-120; H. Gunkel and J. Begrich, *Einleitung in die Psalmen: Die Gattungen der religioesen Lyrik Israels,* Goettingen, 1933, pp. 324ff., 329, 330, 364-366; J. Begrich, "Studien zu Deuterojesaja", in *Beitrage zur Wissenschaft von A. und NT* 77, Stuttgart, 1938, pp. 19-42; H. W. Robinson, "The Council of Yahweh", in *JTS*, 45 (1944), pp. 151-157; A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament* I, Copenhagen, 1952, pp. 199-200; E. Wuerthwein, "Der Ursprung der prophetischen Gerichtsrede", in *ZTKi*, 49 (1952), pp. 1-16; F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah", in *JNES*, 12 (1953), pp. 274-277; F. Hesse, "Wurzelt die prophetische Gerichtsrede im israelitischen Kult?" in *ZAW*, 65 (1953), pp. 45-53; B. Gemser, "The RIB or Controversy-Pattern in Hebrew Mentality", in *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East,* in *Supple. VT* III, Leiden, 1955, pp. 120-137; G. E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East,* Pittsburgh, 1955, p. 34; H. B. Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets", in *JBL,* 78 (1959), pp. 285-295; and J. Harvey, "Le Rib-Pattern réquisitoire prophétique sur la rupture de l'alliance", in *RB* 43 (1962), pp. 172-196.

biblical literature of the Ancient Orient, a few authors of recent times have pointed out similarities between biblical texts and documents with the form and vocabulary of the inquisition-form from Mesopotamia and Anatolia.[7] We have not discovered a complete list of vocabulary and expressions that pertain to the *rib-pattern* in our narratives as they do occur in Hebrew mentality.[8] However, we have come across, for example, the expression *rib* in one of its forms in 1 Sm. 15:5, the verb *paqad* in 1 Sm. 15:2, and implicitly the concept of *shama*[c] as "hearing the case" in 1 Sm. 15:16, "Then Samuel said to Saul, 'stop! Let me tell you what Yahweh said to me last night.' Saul said, 'Tell me.' " None of these verbs, however, occur in the pericope of 1 Sm. 13:8-15. The case is strongest in 1 Sm. 15.

But if the sections on the inquisition in 1 Sm. 15 and 1 Sm. 13:8-15 are taken solely from a formal aspect, then we do have the formal elements similar to those of the literary genre which authors tend to call *Gerichtsrede* or the *rib-pattern*. According to Huffmon, there are in general two forms of the pattern,[9] which we shall merely indicate by means of the following schemas without detailed descriptions:

THE FIRST FORM:
    I. Description of the place for judgment.
    II. The Presentation of the Plaintiff.
        A. Heaven and Earth as judges or witnesses
        B. Summoning the Guilty: the Defender.
        C. Speech in the Second Person to the Guilty:
            1. The Accusation
            2. Refutation of the Defender's Arguments.
            3. Specific Accusation.

THE SECOND FORM:
    I. Description of the place for judgment.
    II. The Speech of the Judge.
        A. Speech to the Guilty.
            1. The Reproach (based on the accusation).
            2. The Message: the Accused has no Defence.
        B. Message of the Guilty Party.
        C. Judgment.

---

7. Cfr., e.g., B. Gemser, *op. cit.,* p. 124 (with notes 2 and 3), 126 and 127 (with note 1); also Huffmon, *op. cit.,* pp. 291-292; Harvey, *op. cit.,* pp. 180-188.
8. Cfr. Gemser, *op. cit.,* pp. 122-128; as for some similarities in vocabulary, cfr. Harvey, *op. cit.,* pp. 182-184.
9. Cfr. Huffmon, *op. cit.,* pp. 285-286.

On the basis of Harvey's study,[10] there are two types in the Hebrew Scriptures, the *rib-condemnation*[11] and the *rib-admonition*.[12] Nevertheless, both types have the same form. Since the context in 1 Sm. 15 and 1 Sm. 13:8-15 concerns the rejection of Saul, the concept of *rib-condemnation* would be appropriate. Hence, we offer the following schema of comparison. However, we would like to point out immediately that for the first factor, the *Introduction,* the author does not call on the heavens and the earth in 1 Sm. 15 and 1 Sm. 13:8-15; nevertheless, in 1 Sm. 15, we do find Samuel calling Saul's attention to the point at hand:

I. INTRODUCTION:

Calling on the heavens and earth, or calling attention to the matter at hand:
Dt. 32:1-2 (Elohistic tradition)
Jer. 2:12
Ps. 50:1-7b (especially vv. 4, 6)
1 Sm. 13:10b
1 Sm. 15:10-13 (Since 1 Sm. 15:16 is a reference to 1 Sm. 15:10-11, it could very well be considered calling the attention of King Saul to the issue.)

II. INTERROGATION:

First implicit accusation:
Dt. 32:1-2 (Elohistic tradition)
Jer. 2:5-6.
Ps. 50:16b.
1 Sm. 13:11-12
1 Sm. 15:14-15.

III. REQUISITION:

I.e., declaration of the fault that disrupted the covenant; a recollection of Yahweh's beneficence and the ingratitude of Israel:
Dt. 32: 7-14, 15-18 (Elohistic tradition)
Jer. 2:7-30
1 Sm. 13:13
1 Sm. 15:16-21

---

10. Harvey, *op. cit.*, pp. 177-180.
11. Harvey's analysis includes Dt. 32; Jer. 2; and Ps. 50. More data is available in studies on Deutero-Isaiah.
12. Occurrences in Is. 1.2ab-20; Mich. 6.1-8; and Ps. 50. According to Harvey's analysis, Ps. 50 includes both types.

IV. REFERENCE TO THE EMPTINESS OF RITUAL COMPENSATION:

Dt. 32:16-17 (Elohist)
Jer. 2:26-28
Ps. 50:8-13
1 Sm. 15:22-23a

V. DECLARATION OF CULPABILITY AND TOTAL DESTRUCTION:

Dt. 32:19-25 (Elohist)
Jer. 2:31-37
Ps. 50:22-23
1 Sm. 13:14
1 Sm. 15:23b, 26, 27-29.

In applying the result of Harvey's research to the narratives in 1 Sm. 15 and 1 Sm. 13:8-15, there seems to appear in the narratives, particularly in the section on the inquisition, the literary genre known as the *rib-pattern*. This form occurs also in Jeremiah, Dt. 32 and Ps. 50—for the present moment at least until other examples are worked out.[13] We could add 1 Sm. 15 immediately as another example (— 1 Sm. 13:8-15 does not have the element of the emptiness of ritual compensation) and aptly so. For Samuel as a prophet not only has received the *dabar Yahweh* concerning Saul's sin in a nocturnal revelation (1 Sm. 15:10-11), but also, in a good deuteronomic fashion in judging the Kings of Israel and Judah, had the responsibility of judging Saul's disobedience to a divine command (1 Sm. 15:16-31; Dt. 18:14-20, 13-20; the books of the Kings, *passim*).

STYLISTIC DIFFERENCES IN 1 SM. 13:8-15 AND 1 SM. 15
1 SM. 15

Stylistically, the principal differences in vocabulary are:

(1)  1 Sm. 13:13: *lo' shamarta*
     1 Sm. 13:14: *lo' shamarta*
     1 Sm. 12:2: *shema$^c$*
     1 Sm. 15:19: *lo' shama$^c$ta*
     1 Sm. 15:20: *shama$^c$ti*
     1 Sm. 15:24: *wa'eshma$^c$*

(2)  1 Sm. 13:13: *miswat Yahweh*
     1 Sm. 15:2: *debar Yahweh* (also in vv. 11, 13, 26)
     1 Sm. 15:19, 20: *beqol Yahweh*

---

13.  More recent data in Karl Pauritsch, *Die neue Gemeinde: Gott sammelt Ausgestossene und Arme (Jesaia 56-66)*, Rome, 1971, pp. 62, 64, 95, 189, 190ff., 213, 214f. and 222.

Differences of vocabulary in 1 Sm. 13:8-15 and 1 Sm. 15 are: first of all, the narrative of 1 Sm. 13:8-15 uses the verb *shamar* whereas 1 Sm. 15 uses the verb *shama$^c$*. Secondly, 1 Sm. 13:13 verbalizes the concept "command of the Lord" as *miswat Yahweh;* on the contrary, 1 Sm. 15 prefers rather to speak of the *debar Yahweh* (vv. 2, 11, 13, 26) or *beqol Yahweh* (vv. 19, 20). The use of the verb *shamar* and the substantive *miswat* in 1 Sm. 13:8-15, particularly in the singular form, is indicative of the deuteronomic tradition. But the same phenomenon occurs also in 1 Sm. 15 with its use of the verb *shama$^c$* and the expressions *debar Yahweh* and *beqol Yahweh*. The latter are prophetic equivalents of the more technical *miswat* of the deuteronomist, betraying a prophetic influence on the latter. Perhaps this is another indication of a priority in time for the narrative of 1 Sm. 13:8-15. Perhaps both narratives are basically deuteronomistic, but from two different periods of time in an era of deuteronomistic theologizing.

There is another point concerning interrelationships of style in 1 Sm. 13:8-15; 15; 28:12-19; and 1 Chr. 10:13-14. In all cases, it is interesting to note the presence of the verb *shama$^c$* in 1 Sm. 28:18 as in 1 Sm. 15, rather than the *shamar* of 1 Sm. 13:13, 14. On the contrary, the hagiographer of 1 Chr. 10:13 uses the verb *shamar* as we have it in the narrative of the rejection in 1 Sm. 13:8-15. But 1 Chr. 10:13 does not use the expression *miswat* as in 1 Sm. 13:13, but rather the expression *debar Yahweh* as we find it in 1 Sm. 15:2, 11, 13, 26, although 1 Sm. 28:18 uses the expression *beqol Yahweh* from 1 Sm. 15:19, 20. For this reason, we could say that 1 Sm. 28:12-19 betrays a literary relationship with 1 Sm. 15. On the other hand, 1 Chr. 10:13 depends both on 1 Sm. 13:8-15 and on 1 Sm. 15. Due to such dependence, it appears that the hagiographer of 1 Chr. 10:13 knew both narratives and welded both into one literary strand without attempting any reconciliation of the two narratives on the level of theological conception.

Even if 1 Chr. 10:13 manifests a literary dependence on both versions of Saul's rejection in 1 Sm. 13:8-15 and 1 Sm. 15, it also uses an expression which occurs in neither of the two narratives. For when the Chronicler's text describes the "sin" of Saul, it uses the expression *ma$^c$al,* which belongs to the tradition of the *Priesterschrift,* as also in Chr. 9:1; 12:2; 28:19, 22; 30:7; 2 Chr.

28:19; 29:19; 33:19; 36:14.[14] Particularly, the Chronicler, after a brief allusion to the twofold tradition as he found it, gives an additional reason for the rejection in vv. 13-14, namely, seeking counsel with the help of the witch of Endor—a moral judgment demonstrating respect for the deuteronomic tradition (Dt. 18:9-22).

On the basis of vocabulary and literary form, we would strongly propose the following chronology for the texts concerned with the rejection of Saul. 1 Sm. 13:8-15 would belong to the earlier deuteronomistic tradition and pre-prophetic period, but 1 Sm. 15 and 1 Sm. 28:12-19 to the later deuteronomistic tradition with a strong prophetic influence and more proximate to the period of the Chronicler.

## THEOLOGY OF 1 SM. 15

The most convincing argument for a late date for 1 Sm. 15 is its sophisticated theological exposition of a highly developed deuteronomistic-prophetic tradition which not only lays bare radical conceptual differences between 1 Sm. 13:8-15 and 1 Sm. 15, but also presupposes an already established canon for the Pentateuch as such. We shall now assemble the various concepts of the theological exposition of 1 Sm. 15 systematically under four major points: (1) the relationship between Samuel and Saul; (2) the time-factor of the rejection; (3) the content of the divine command; and (4) the nature of Saul's crime.

### 1. *The Relationship between Samuel and Saul*

In 1 Sm. 15, the hagiographer presents Samuel as a prophet and Saul as the king of Israel. Both are interrelated and are set up functionally in relation to Yahweh.

### (a) *Samuel*

In 1 Sm. 15, Samuel is a prophet who possesses duties as spokesman, inquisitor, mediator and priest. First, Samuel is the spokesman for Yahweh. Samuel was sent to anoint Saul (1 Sm. 9:16; 10:1; 15:1) just as Elijah was sent to anoint the king (1 Jgs. 19:15), where the phrase *shalah Yahweh* expresses a special mission as in the prophetic tradition. And according to 1 Sm. 15:2, Samuel is sent with the duty to announce the divine command of *herem* against Amalek. For Samuel had pronounced the Word of the Lord which Yahweh himself had spoken: *koh 'amar Yahweh seba'ot,* an expression that pertains to the prophetic tradition,

---

14. Verbal and substantive forms from the root *ma^cal* occur in LV. 5.15, 21; 26.40; Nm. 5.6; 12, 27 (P); 31-16 (P); Dt. 32.51; Jos. 7.1; 22.16, 20, 22, 31; Ezr. 9.2, 4; 10.2, 6, 10; Neh. 1.8; 13.27; Ez. 14.12, 13; 15.8; 17.20; 20.27; 39.23, 26; Dn. 9.7; Job 21.34; and Prov. 16.10. It is a priestly expression, and chiefly late.

especially with Jeremiah. Moreover, as again in Jeremiah, Samuel demands in 1 Sm. 15:1 that Saul listen and obey. Furthermore, the hagiographer, in his exposition of the divine motive concerning the *herem,* uses an expression which Dt. 25:17-18a places in the mouth of Moses, and places the very same words in the mouth of Samuel:

Dt. 25:17-18a reads: *zakor 'et 'asher-ᶜasah ᶜamaleq leka 'asher qareka badderek beso'tekem mimmisrayim*

1 Sm. 15:2 reads: *paqadti 'et 'asher-ᶜasah ᶜamaleq leyisra'el 'asher-sam lo badderek baᶜaloto mimmisrayim*

Later in 1 Sm. 15:10-11, the Word of the Lord comes to Samuel again at which time the rejection of Saul as king is solemnly pronounced. This divine message was delivered to Saul by Samuel in Sm. 15:16-19, 23b, 26 and 28.

Besides being a prophet, Samuel appears as the grand inquisitor of Yahweh in 1 Sm. 15:10-23. In 1 Sm. 13:8-15, Samuel is described as coming on his own initiative—as a good judge acting for the general welfare of the people. In 1 Sm. 15, emphasis is placed on the fact that Samuel acted as he did because of a special divine mission. His reaction to the advent of the Word of Yahweh in 1 Sm. 15:10-11 is in a mode comparable to that of the great prophets for "Samuel was sad and cried to the Lord all that night" (1 Sm. 15:11), just like Jeremiah's inner tension, frustration and pain when commanded by God to preach destruction for Jerusalem. Samuel demonstrated that he was unwilling even to the point of anguish, since the *dabar Yahweh* moved him to inaugurate the inquisition which would terminate with the rejection of Saul as king of Israel. Nonetheless, Samuel carried out the inquisition with all his power, particularly in his dispute with Saul concerning the spoils of war, a symbolic act in which Saul's authority was being radically challenged. Also after each explanation of Saul concerning the spoils of war (1 Sm. 15:15, 20-21), Samuel did not accept the explanations, but always reprimanded the king for his act of disobedience to the divine mandate (1 Sm. 15:19, 22-23).

Samuel also appears as mediator (intercessor) with Yahweh. Saul presented his petition. At first, Samuel did not respond to his petition (1 Sm. 15:26), but later he did (1 Sm. 15:31). When Saul requested Samuel to condone his sin, namely, for Yahweh to condone the sin through his prophetic instrument, the prophet Samuel, the text describes Samuel's duty in terms of a prophetic mediator. A similar quality is evidenced also in the case of

Elijah (1 Kgs. 18:36-37), Elishah (2 Kgs. 4:33; 6:17), Trito-Isaiah (Is. 63:9-17), Jeremiah (Jer 14:11) and Amos (Am. 7:2, 3, 5, 6), but especially in the case of Moses (Ex. 8:12:P, 30:J; 32:11-13, 32:E). The similarity between Samuel and Moses as intercessors with Yahweh agrees very well with a text from Jer. 15:1, where Yahweh says: "Even if Moses and Samuel would be standing before me, I would not pay any attention to this people; take them away from my presence so that they might leave."

When Samuel responded to Saul's petition, he acted in the capacity of priest in sacrificial context. The reason is that in the second part of his petition, Saul said "return with me that I may adore the Lord" (1 Sm. 15:25a). In this statement, the verb *shahah* seems to signify "to sacrifice", as also in Gn. 22:3, 5 (E); 1 Sm. 1:3. Moreover, we are in a sacrificial context due to the verb *zabah* in 1 Sm. 15:15, 21, 22. Saul petitioned in 1 Sm. 15:30 after he also requested to make a public appearance with Samuel. Then in 1 Sm. 15:31, the hagiographer narrates "and Samuel turned to follow Saul and they offered sacrifice to Yahweh" (with LXX) at Gilgal, a holy place.

(b) *Saul*

The hagiographer presents Saul as king of Israel with a special mission, a factor that is not present in the narrative of 1 Sm. 13:8-15. Saul is the *anointed* king on the basis of 1 Sm. 9:16; 10:1, where Saul was anointed as *nagid*. The substantive *nagid* is synonymous with the substantive *melek,* since in many instances (1 Sm. 9:16; 10:1; 13:14; 25:30; 2 Sm. 5:2; 6:21; 7:8) the immediate contexts are in relation to the kingdom, the king, or royalty. As *nagid-melek,* Saul should have been a shepherd or pastor just as a David (2 Sm. 5:2; 7:7, 8) or as the only king under Yahweh (Ez. 34:24). Besides, the hagiographer described Saul as *ro'sh shibte yisra'el* (1 Sm. 15:17), in which capacity Saul as king must lead the people into battle, since the king is the military chief, as also in Is. 7:1-9; Hos. 2:2; 3:5; Jb. 29:25. Saul was the divinely appointed proxy for Yahweh, the War-Lord of Israel.

Even though Israel is now a people subject to a king (1 Sm. 15:30; Is. 7:17), she ever remains above all the people of Yahweh (1 Sm. 15:1). Saul as king was chosen and anointed by Yahweh through the hands of Samuel the prophet. Because of the prophet's role as the anointing one, Saul as king was subject to his authority. Furthermore, as a king chosen and anointed by Yahweh, Saul was truly supposed to have been Yahweh's vicar. As Yahweh's vicar, Saul was expected to rule not just over a people, but over people related to him by blood, over Yahweh's

people—". . . it must be a king of Yahweh's choosing whom you appoint over you; it must be one from among your brothers that is appointed king over you; you are not to give yourself a foreign king who is no brother of yours" (Dt. 17:15). As shepherd, he had been expected to perform all pastoral duties in tending the people as flocks of sheep, namely, those who know him. As military chief, he was supposed to lead Yahweh's people into battle. Yahweh is the principal king-pastor-military chief. Saul is an instrumental king-pastor-military chief. As such, Saul was in no way independent of Yahweh in the performance of his proper duties. Saul's duties were nothing more or less than the will of Yahweh as expressed through the prophet Samuel.

For this reason, Saul must respond in obedience to the divine command (1 Sm. 15:1). This is also the reason why Saul received the mandate: "Go and cut down . . . anathematize . . . etc." (1 Sm. 15:3). Moreover, in his duties in leading the people, Saul was reprimanded by Samuel in 1 Sm. 15:17: "Even though you may seem to be small in your own eyes (cfr. 1 Sm. 9:21), are you not the leader of the tribes of Israel? Has not Yahweh anointed you king of Israel?" Such a relation between king and people expressedly but indirectly is brought out by the hagiographer when he describes Saul's attempt to transfer the responsibility to the people in 1 Sm. 15:15, 20, but even more so when Saul admits that he had preferred the will of the people more than the will of Yahweh in 1 Sm. 15:24.

A comparison between 1 Sm. 9:21; 15:17 and Jgs. 6:15 is helpful and of interest. When Yahweh ordered Gideon to liberate Israel from the hand of Madian, Gideon responded: *hinneh 'alpi haddal bimnashsheh we'anoki massa$^c$ir bebet 'abi,* i.e., "My clan, you must know, is the weakest in Manasseh, and I am the least important in my family." In 1 Sm. 9:21, Saul says to Samuel, "Am I not of Benjajmin, from the weakest *(qaton)* of Israel's tribes, and is not my family the least *(sa$^c$ir)* of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin?" The tradition in 1 Sm. 15:17, where *qaton* is used, is the same as in Gn. 43:39 (J); 44:12 (J); and Ps. 68:28. The contrast between Gideon and Saul may have more meaning than we would suspect. Gideon's response in action was one of complete obedience. The effect was total victory. Consequently, Israel asked Gideon to rule over them. But Gideon responded that only Yahweh could be Israel's king. On the contrary, Saul was chosen by Yahweh to rule Israel. However, Saul's response in action at a time of war was disobedience to the divine command. Therefore, even if Saul was of the tribe of Benjamin, nevertheless, he was also the chosen and anointed one of Yahweh

as Israel's leader. Gideon never did possess this prerogative; nevertheless, it was Gideon who manifested good will to the divine command. Saul was lacking in such good will. Parenthetically, there appear to be some analogies in reverse to the Pauline language of the first and second Adams in the letter to the Romans!

## 2. *Time-factor of the Rejection*

In 1 Sm. 13:8-15, the rejection of Saul happens prior to a battle against the enemy, in this case, the Philistines. On the contrary, according to 1 Sm. 15, the rejection of Saul occurs after a battle against Israel's enemy, Amalek. Reference to the latter is made in 1 Sm. 14:48. 1 Sm. 15 follows immediately, wherein the later deuteronomistic narrator presents his way of reading the sacred history of Saul's rejection.

The time factor of the rejection of Saul in 1 Sm. 15 after the war with Amalek correlates well with deuteronomistic techniques. The basic reasoning is found in the relationship of Dt. 25:19 with 1 Sm. 14:48, together with 1 Sm. 15:2-3. In Dt. 25:19 we read: "When therefore Yahweh your God has given you rest from all your enemies everywhere in the land, then the Lord your God will give you an inheritance to occupy that land, you will wipe out the memory of Amalek from under the heavens: see to it that you never forget." In 1 Sm. 14:47, the narrator states that Saul, having confirmed his kingdom in Israel, fought throughout the entire land against all enemies. Immediately, therefore, 1 Sm. 14:48 states that Saul fought furiously against and cut down Amalek, thereby freeing Israel from the hands of her despoiler. If Dt. 25:19 and 1 Sm. 14:47-51 are taken together, then the proper occasion presents itself concerning the fulfilment of the divine command to wipe out from under heaven the memory of Amalek, since 1 Sm. 14:47-48 insinuates that it is *now* a time of peace and quiet in the land after the wars. Therefore, Yahweh announces his determination to punish Amalek in 1 Sm. 15:2. This concept is emphasised by the narrator when he uses the expression *ʿattah,* "now therefore," in 1 Sm. 15:3. Hence, we can say that the rejection of Saul in 1 Sm. 15 happens, as the deuteronomist already stated in his major document, at a time of peace for Israel after war, and not prior to a war as in 1 Sm. 13:8-15.

## 3. *Content of the Divine Command*

The content of the command in 1 Sm. 15 is the classic *herem.* On the contrary, the immolatory act in preparation for battle forms the content of the command in 1 Sm. 13:8-15.

Yahweh is the author of the command in 1 Sm. 15; Samuel himself authors the command in 1 Sm. 13:8-15. *Herem* is that element of the Holy War subsequent to the act of war. On the contrary, the immolatory act in 1 Sm. 13:8-15 is preparatory to war.

1 Sm. 14:48 is a brief account of Saul's war against Amalek, together with the mention of Saul's victory. Our writer seems to refer to this victory in 1 Sm. 15:12, where he states that Saul had erected a *yad* at Carmel. More probably, the *yad* is a monument commemorating the victory over the Amalekites, analogous to the case of the Mesha-stele.

However, after the war against Amalek in 1 Sm. 14:48, and the establishment of a time of peace, according to the writer of 1 Sm. 15, there still remained another anciently traditional obligation against Amalek, namely, to wipe him out completely: the so-called *herem bellicum* in which the vanquished and all his goods were anathematized. Saul was commissioned to carry out this further obligation.

The author of 1 Sm. 15 speaks of Amalek's sin against Israel in 1 Sm. 15:18. The Lay-Source of Ex. 17:8-16 describes Amalek's battle against Israel in the Wady Raphidim, an Israel who, according to Dt. 25:18, was famished and very tired. Because of this crime, three maledictions are hurled against Amalek in Ex. 17:14b, 16b; Nm. 24:20 (J); and Dt. 25:19b. The reason why the hagiographer must have thought specifically of this sin as presented in the Pentateuch is that he clearly betrays a literary dependence between Dt. 25:17-18a and his passage in 1 Sm. 15:2. We also sense our writer as reading Saul into the context of the fourth oracle of Balaam which announces the second curse against Amalek in Nm. 24:20 (J). The immediate context of this curse in verses 17 and 19 speaks of *the one from Jacob and Israel who would be the victor and would exercise dominion over the enemy.*

The content of the divine command is covered by the following points: (a) the persons who fulfil *herem;* (b) the extension of the *herem* to all things belonging to Amalek, including the animals; (c) extension of *herem* geographically; (d) limitation of *herem* to Amalek; and (e) *herem* assimilated to sacrifice.

(a) *Individuals Who Fulfil* Herem

The *herem bellicum* is most of all an act of Yahweh. When Yahweh makes known through the mouth of the prophet Samuel his determination to visit Amelek with punishment in the form

of *herem,* Yahweh is known as the War Lord since he is *Yahweh seba'ot.* As War Lord, he himself leads his people in *herem* against Amalek for, in Ex. 17:16 (L), the battle against Amalek is called *milhamah leYahweh.*

Saul, as king and leader, the vicar of Yahweh through the instrumentality of the prophet Samuel, assembled all of Israel (1 Sm. 15:4). The concept is cosmic, supra-temporal and theological, rather than pertaining to a specific army at the time of the historical Saul. The convocation involved the entire people, namely Israel as Israel, under the leadership of the victor promised in Nm. 24:17, 19, since in Dt. 25:19b, Moses commanded the people as such and not just one or another tribe to fight against Amalek at a time of peace.

(b) *Extension of* Herem

The author places emphasis on the fact that the *herem* of 1 Sm. 15:3 certainly must be complete, as universal as the participants themselves and as universal as the enemy of Israel, Amalek. There must be no exception; no single booty is overlooked. This is clear from the occasion of Samuel's inquisition, for, when Saul refers to spoil in a manner of explanation, Samuel refused to accept any such explanation and simply stated that Saul had not completely obeyed the command (1 Sm. 15:18-19, 22-23, 26). Thus, the comprehensive and extensive—and we might add, quite artificial—nature of the list of beings which must be subjected to the anathema in 1 Sm. 15:3 is illustrated. We added the adjective "artificial" since it seems that the hagiographer made his compilation of the list with dependence on 1 Sm. 22:19 on account of the expression *me^colel we^cad yoseq* and on 1 Sm. 27:9 because of the expression *miggamal we^ad hamor.* Also it appears that the hagiographer depends on Jer. 51:3 where the verbs *hamal* and *haram* occur in parallelism, for both verbs are also found in the proposition of *herem* in 1 Sm. 15:3.

(c) *Geographical Extension of* Herem

Also since the hagiographer uses the geographical expression "from Havila all the way to Shur" in 1 Sm. 15:7—an expression that is attributed also to the Ishmael-tradition of Gn. 25:18 (J) since Ishmael and Amalek are related genealogically—it appears that the expression understands Amalek again in a global sense and transfers its concept of *herem* to the supra-temporal theological scope of the history of the Exodus and the Conquest of the Promised Land. Surely, from Ex. 17 to and including Ps. 83, Amalek is portrayed in biblical tradition as an ever persistent

enemy. Amalek manifested its hostility many times all alone, e.g., in Ex. 17:8-16 (L); 1 Sm. 14:48; 30:1, 14, but were also often associated with other enemies of Israel, e.g., in Nm. 14:39-45 (J); Jgs. 3:12-13; 6:1-6; 1 Sm. 14:47; Ps. 83. According to the geography of the sacred writers, the hostility of Amalek is distributed in many places in relation to the Exodus, to the Conquest, and to the actual Settlement in the land. He is practically analogous to the conception of Satan and the Anti-Christ in New Testament traditions.

The expression "from Havila to Shur" in 1 Sm. 15:7 geographically seems to indicate in global dimension the territorial extent of the enemy Amalek, but theologically indicates the state of hostility of Amalek against Yahweh-Israel in the history of the Exodus and Conquest, and therefore the necessary extension of *herem* to global dimensions for the sacred writer of 1 Sm. 15 against all of Amalek.

(d) *Limitation of* Herem *to the Amalekites*

On the contrary, in 1 Sm. 15:6, the hagiographer excludes the Kenites from *herem* because of the *hesed* shown by the Kenites to Israel. Hence, the *herem* pertains exclusively to the Amalekites. The *hesed* of the Kenites seems to pertain to the pact between Moses and Jethro in Ex. 18:12 (JE). The author demonstrates in his own way the contrast between Amalek and the Kenites in 1 Sm. 15:3, 6; 1 Sm. 15:2, 6. First of all, Amalek must be anathematized; on the contrary, the Kenites will continue to enjoy their own proper freedom. Secondly, the sin of Amalek is contrasted with the virtue of the Kenites. Thirdly, we find the theological contrast between the "history-of-mercy" of the Kenites and the "history-of-hostility" of Amalek, both in the context of Exodus-theology.

(e) Herem *Assimilated to Sacrifice*

Furthermore, the killing of Agag in 1 Sm. 15:32-33 is the theological climax of the *herem*. The vocabulary in these verses is "sacrificial", namely, the verb *nagash,* and the expression *lipne Yahweh* at Gilgal, a holy place or sanctuary.

We do not wish to conclude that the killing of Agag, King of the Amalekites, by the prophet Samuel—well up in years to handle a sword so briskly although the power of God works through the weakness of his aged prophet—was a real sacrifice. But the killing of Agag by the prophet Samuel occurs in a sacred context of the *lex talionis* of Ex. 21:23-25 which the author has Samuel apply to the case at hand. The *herem* perhaps assumes a sacrificial quality insofar as there could be no better ultimate

victim to end a history of hostility than Agag, King of Amalek. Thus in 1 Sm. 15:33, the very last remaining obligation of Holy War is taken care of. Yahweh, the War-Lord, has finally experienced the ultimate destruction of his old enemy in the image of King Agag.

## 4. *Nature of Saul's Sin*

The differences between 1 Sm. 13:8-15 and 1 Sm. 15 already noted enable us to understand differences in understanding Saul's sin. In 1 Sm· 13:8-15 and 1 Sm. 28:16-19, the sin of Saul is an act of disobedience to the divine command. 1 Chr. 10:13 described the sin of Saul as "unfaithfulness", *maᶜal* which is a priestly expression. In 1 Sm. 15, the nature of Saul's sin is described in the context of the *herem bellicum.*

1 Sm. 15:11 described Saul's disobedience as "a turning away from Yahweh", a non-fulfilment of the divine command. Later, in 1 Sm. 15:19, Saul's sin is specifically related to the spoils and is called an "evil", *haraᶜ,* characteristically deuteronomic. Then in 1 Sm. 15:22-23, which pertains to the prophetic tradition, the sin of Saul is called a rebellion and a turning away from Yahweh.

The author of 1 Sm. 15 compares the sin of rebellion to the sin of idolatry. The people are also included in the analogue since they are jointly responsible with King Saul for taking spoils. The people claim to want to sacrifice the spoils to Yahweh; but because of rebellion in transgressing the divine command, the people had committed idolatry in their aversion from Yahweh. The author indirectly condemns idolatry, divination and the use of teraphim; but he also indirectly recognises the value of sacrifice. However, being highly deuteronomic in his thought patterns, he emphasises obedience to the divine will, as does the theological historian of the Books of the Kings.

When Saul finally admits his sin in 1 Sm. 15:24, he admits that he has sinned, *hata'* against "the mouth of Yahweh and your words," namely, of the prophet Samuel. Hence, the sin of Saul is not only a fault against Yahweh as rebellion, but also is rebellion against the prophet who acted only on the basis of divine authority. In the same verse 24 of 1 Sm. 15, the final description of Saul's sin consists in that Saul preferred to obey the people out of fear. Samuel makes the same observation in 1 Sm. 15:17: Saul was not a real leader of the people, since he acted evilly against his status as king-commander by preferring to follow the will of the people rather than the will of Yahweh.

Saul's sin in 1 Sm. 15 is a ritual sin against the Holy War whose final obligation was the act of *herem*. More probably this ritual sin is illustrated expressly when the prophet Samuel killed Agag as a fulfilment of the priestly law of Lv. 27:29. The ritual sin is not only against the divine command, but also against Saul's vocation, both of which he received from Yahweh through the prophet Samuel. As a ritual sin, Saul's sin according to 1 Sm. 15 pertains to the same genus of sin as presented in 1 Sm. 13:8-15. However, the specific difference between these two sins very well illustrates that the hagiographer speaks of a sin against *herem* rather than of a sin against the exercise of a duty proper to the priestly office as is spelled out by the writer of 1 Sm. 13:8-15.

Because of his sin, Saul was completely rejected in terms of an immutable decision of Yahweh. In 1 Sm. 15:29 the sacred writer emphasizes the immutable decision of Yahweh by using an expression from Nm. 23:19, for "God is no man that he should lie, no son of Adam to draw back. Is it his to say and not to do, to speak and not fulfil?" To dramatize this decision, 1 Sm. 15:34-35 announces the complete separation of the prophet Samuel and King Saul. He should not thereby be judged as antimonarchistic, for in 1 Sm. 15:31, the two *personae dramatis* make a public appearance together. Monarchy is not rejected, but Saul certainly is. Why? 1 Sm. 15 is the prologue of the epic of the Davidic monarchy which begins in 1 Sm. 16. At the same time, 1 Sm. 15 can be understood theologically as the end of the Old Covenant and the end of the Exodus with the beginning of the New Era under David.

As archaeologists analyze the various strata of a Tell, so since the time of Karl Budde, many scholars have tried to identify the independent strata in Samuel in terms of source-theories by applying the scissors of modern critical methods as has been done to an extreme in Pentateuchal studies. The results have been good and profitable. But more has to be done.

Using his literary method, Kennedy has long recognized the presence of the prophetic and deuteronomic hand in Samuel. We would like to add the following.

(1) Concerning 1 Sm. 13:8-15, the basic story appears to be the original tradition, and for the moment, we would follow Eissfeldt by assigning it to a Lay-source. However, Samuel's speech is the work of the deuteronomic historian, perhaps the same hand that had passed judgment in the Books of the Kings. But since Samuel has the role of the classic judge, we would

prefer a date prior to a deep rooting of the classic pre-exilic prophets in the Hebrew religious psyche.

(2) 1 Chr. 10:13-14 must be confined to the opposite end of the spectrum due to the simple fact that it is a conflation of 1 Sm. 13:8-15 and 1 Sm. 15, at a post-exilic date already influenced by the established *Priesterschrift.* It presupposes the existence of the Books of Samuel and a period in Israel's history when David had become an idyllic theological symbol of the New Covenant. Moreover, it may be that the Chronicler himself had to some extent had a hand in the later redactions of the Samuel-documents prior to the composition of his own *Summa.*

(3) 1 Sm. 15 should be dated very late and close to if not actually in the period of the Chronicler. Its prototype would have been 1 Sm. 13:8-15, with an already D influence, due principally to the stylistic similarities as we have described them at the beginning of this study. The symbolic dimensions of 1 Sm. 15 argue more for theology rather than history, in a period far removed from actual fact, in a period of high religious culture already possessing the Pentateuch and the prophetic scrolls— especially that of Jeremiah, and in a period of nostalgia for the glories of the Davidic dynasty.

(4) 1 Sm. 15 is a crucial theological construct of 1 Samuel, occupying a very strategic position at the half-mark of the scroll, which, from chapter 16 on, parallels the growth of the symbolic David and the ongoing tragedy of Saul's fall. It marks the end of an Exodus-theology and the beginnings of a David-theology under the New Covenant.

(5) 1 Sm. 28:15-19, dependent on 1 Sm. 15 and providing the Chronicler with an additional reason for Saul's rejection, graphically dramatizes the depth of degradation to which Saul had subjected himself, for having no other way of consulting with Yahweh. he resorted to witchcraft and necromancy.