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Abstract
This article discusses the centrality of 1 Kings 2:15 for the interpretation of the entire text of 1 Kings 2 and its function in constructing an imaginative picture of a friendly communication style as part of the ruler’s policy in running his government. To achieve this goal, I use Paul Ricoeur’s hermeneutics of phenomenology, which is sharpened by John Comaroff’s and Jean Comaroff’s hermeneutics of suspicion. I will use this perspective as a framework for Oliver Glanz’s shifting participant theory as a basis for analysis of 1 Kings 2:15. The result is a friendly and generous communication style in a balanced and proportional way.
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INTRODUCTION
This article does not describe the chronological development of hermeneutics; instead, it combines several relevant contemporary biblical hermeneutics and applies them to a selected text, namely, 1 Kings 2. The article focuses on analyzing two or more authoritative Old Testament manuscripts (according to Emanuel Tov) according to the perspectives of Paul Ricoeur’s hermeneutics of phenomenology, which is sharpened by John Comaroff and Jean Comaroff’s hermeneutics of suspicion. Based on these combined perspectives, I use Oliver Glanz’s shifting participant to
create an imaginative picture of the public policy based on the centrality of 1 Kings 2:15.

Contemporary biblical hermeneutics\(^1\) is part of a long history of biblical interpretation, even rooted in interpretive practices that produce specific texts. There is a process of adapting, rethinking, or redrawing previous texts.\(^2\) The classic example is the book of Chronicles due to its historical rewriting of the books of Samuel and Kings, although the author did not have complete freedom in writing his own opinion.\(^3\) Tov concluded that there may have been several authoritative texts of the Old Testament at different times and places, especially the Masoretic Text (MT), Septuagint (LXX), and Qumran (DSS). Moreover, he asserts that the discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls clarifies a unified text that never existed before the common era (BCE).\(^4\) The interaction between these texts is an integral part of the exegetical work\(^5\) because of its foundational belief that each text is a divine and a human product.\(^6\) The texts contain errors due to imperfect transmission, manuscript corruption, copying errors, or other causes at the human level of writing. Tov emphasized that this fact is not a

---

1 See F. Budi Hardiman, *Seni Memahami: Hermeneutik dari Schleiermacher sampai Derrida* (Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2015), 12, and Richard E. Palmer, *Hermeneutics: Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, 1969), 8, 13. Based on their understandings, I define hermeneutics as “an activity to understand and reveal the meaning of a text that is often beyond human understanding but transmit it into a form that can be achieved by human intelligence.”


serious problem given the presence of comparative texts as tools to correct the error.7 However, it proves that complete reliance on one text is not conducive to understanding the meaning.8

Tov’s assertion of several authoritative Old Testament texts opens up the question of the text’s pluriformity of meanings. Here, Ricoeur’s hermeneutics of phenomenology makes a valuable contribution. On the one hand, Ricoeur’s phenomenology is one of the answers to the hot debate about the issues of historicity in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.9 On the other hand, Ricoeur’s concept distinguishes “the world of the text.”10 The world of life can be known through the experience of reading texts because reading texts is more than the effort to expose the meaning of the text. It is a reflective experience to find the meaning of life.11 Furthermore, the world of readers goes beyond text narratives because the communication, one of them through metaphors,12 is projecting a horizon of understanding that sometimes contradicts or even subverts the previous version.13 This understanding must be further

7 Tov’s principle was applied by Adrian Schenker, “The Septuagint in the Text History of 1-2 Kings,” in The Book of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception, ed. André Lemaire and Baruch Halpern (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 10-11. He concluded that the different details of Manasseh in MT and LXX texts of 2 Kings 21:2-9, 2 Chronicles 33:2-9, and Latin texts did not erase the substantive narrative.


9 See Hayden White, Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1973), 50. He mediates the dichotomy of remarkable history (based on the author’s invention) and historical writings (based on actual and proven events) by mentioning the satirical history (a critique using fictional characters or events).

10 As an application of the distinction between “identity” (idem-identity or sameness) and “self” (ipse-identity or selfhood), cited by Claude Romano, “Identity and Selfhood: Paul Ricoeur’s Contribution and Its Continuations,” in Hermeneutics and Phenomenology in Paul Ricoeur: Between Text and Phenomenon, ed. Scott Davidson and Marc-Antoine Vallée (Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2016), 45–46.

11 Hardiman, Seni Memahami, 241.


refined by the hermeneutics of suspicion from John Comaroff and Jean Comaroff. It emphasizes that the text also has additional messages after several vital questions were asked. For example, What is something that does not appear in these sources? Are there any clues as to what happened to the frame of mind behind the text? What is hidden or polished to make it look good? Through these two perspectives above, I believe that there is an alternative path to forming creative tension between seeking confirmation of previous understandings and the courage to accept new experiences without creating an independent text.

The pluriformity of meaning of the text was expressed in Glanz’s surrealism to reveal different—and unexposed—text elements to enrich its meaning. He focused on shifting participants—especially person, number, and gender (PNG) discrepancies—and shifting discourse, which is often ignored or discussed sporadically in the interpretive tradition. Uniquely, he does not always understand the discrepancy as a scribal error but as a marker of certain functions and meanings in the text. For example, Glanz mentioned the shifting participant from third-person singular (Judah mourns and her gates languish…) in Jeremiah 14:2 to second-person plural (Although our iniquities testify against us, act, O Lord, for your name’s sake…) in verse 7. In Glanz’s category, this phenomenon addresses the subjective and inner emotional life of the participant under God’s anger.


16 Surrealism is the principles, ideals, and practices that produce fantastic or incongruous images or effects in art, literature, film, or theater through juxtaposition or a combination that is unnatural or irrational. See *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, s.v. “surrealism.”


20 Glanz, *Understanding*, 265.
In my opinion, Glanz successfully identifies the various aspects of the text and its meaning. On the surface, the text does not mention the personal and emotional aspect of Judah, but it is exposed through his analysis of the third- and second-person discrepancy in the MT. I imagine how much richer the meaning of the text would be if Glanz’s analysis had gone further, for example, through analysis of the LXX and a comparison between the two of them.

**ADONIJAH AND BATHSHEBA’S CONVERSATION, 1 KINGS 2:15-17**

The story of Adonijah and Bathsheba’s conversation in 1 Kings 2:15-17 will serve as a test case. The passage is pivotal to the overall story of 1 Kings 2 because it marks a shift of direction in the chapter. Previously, the text focuses on David’s advice to Solomon to “act like a man” in loyalty to God’s Law. However, the conversation between Adonijah and Bathsheba shifts the focus toward the extermination of Solomon’s political opponents. On the surface, the text legitimates Solomon’s execution, but through the shifting participants, there is a sign of another “voice” about a friendly communication style, specifically two-way communication that promotes understanding, including understanding amid disagreement. I argue that the text’s phenomenology, which is sharpened by the suspicion of the text as a framework analysis of shifting participants in 1 Kings 2:15, offers an imaginative construction of a friendly communication style in 1 Kings 2. Through the tiger metaphor, I describe three models of communication styles that lead to familiar communication styles. The first is the phenomenon of the sleeping tiger as the description of the implied communication. Second is the phenomenon of the awakened tiger because of the neglect of persuasive communication. The third is the imaginative picture of the tiger lying beside the sheep by adapting the prophecy of Isaiah 11:6-8 to emphasize the presence of friendly communication.

**THE PHENOMENON OF THE SLEEPING TIGER**

I used the image of a sleeping tiger because phenomenologically, Adonijah’s previous failure did not bring up any purging decisions against Solomon’s enemy. The purge took place only after Adonijah’s request—
through Bathsheba—to take Abishag as a wife infuriated Solomon (1 Kgs 2:15-17). The proposal, which provokes the assumption of Adonijah’s attempts to sue and reclaim the kingship,\textsuperscript{21} awakens the sleeping tiger and produces a terrible roar of strict orders to attack, overthrow, and kill his opponents.

The phenomenon of a sleeping tiger as a sign of Solomon’s kingdom of peace\textsuperscript{22} is scattered throughout 1 Kings 2. The first is Bathsheba’s question to Adonijah, “Have you come with a peace?” (1 Kgs 2:13). This question implies the peaceful situation after Solomon’s enthronement as king. Adonijah freely met Bathsheba in person without security protocols. However, Bathsheba’s question also implies a dividing line between Adonijah and Solomon (including Bathsheba). Adonijah’s failed attempt to become king is compatible with Absalom’s failed coup (1 Kgs 2:28). This phenomenon is essential to show that the gap still exists, because there had been prolonged conflicts in the palace: between Amnon and Absalom or between Absalom and David, and now Adonijah and Solomon. Second, the picture of a peaceful situation is also reflected in Solomon’s pardon of Adonijah (1 Kgs 1:50-53). Interestingly, while the MT uses the standard sentence “Go to your house” (v. 53), the LXX uses a nonstandard word, deuro (deu/ro), so it can be translated “Come, (enter) into your house,” or “Go into your house.” I examined the use of the word deuro (deu/ro), which appears sixty-seven times in the LXX,\textsuperscript{23} and found that its usage can be subsumed under three categories. In the first category (twenty-three times), this word contains the meaning of “go,” while in the second category, the meaning of “come or come near” appears twelve times. Interestingly, as many as thirty-two times, the word signifies an invitation to approach or go somewhere with both parties involved. The distribution of that third category is as follows:

\textsuperscript{21} Robert I. Vasholz, “The Wisdom of Bathsheba in 1 Kings 2.13-25,” 	extit{Presbyterian} 33, no. 1 (2007): 49; or, the analysis of Ken Stone, 	extit{Sex, Honor, and Power in the Deuteronomic History} (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 121. Stone categorized Absalom’s act of sexual intercourse with David’s concubines as a declaration that David no longer has control over his women, even over the kingdom and the people. Solomon had the same assumption regarding Adonijah’s request.

\textsuperscript{22} Alternatively, the expression “come to rest” by Burke O. Long, “A Darkness between Brothers: Solomon and Adonijah,” 	extit{Journal for the Study of the Old Testament} 19 (1981): 82.

\textsuperscript{23} According to the search engine of Bible Works 7.
a. The invitation to come with the ultimate goal of going at the requester’s will (Gn 37:13; Nm 22:6, 11, 17; 23:7 [2x]; Jgs 18:19; 2 Chr 16:3; Neh 6:2, 7).

b. Invitation to go together (Nm 10:29; 23:27; Jgs 4:22; 19:11, 13; 1 Sm 9:5, 9, 10; 14:1, 6; 1 Kgs 13:15; 2 Kgs 6:3; 10:16).

c. Invitation to go to fight one on one in war (1 Sm 17:44; 2 Kgs 14:8; 25:17).

d. An invitation to do something together (Gn 19:32; 24:31; 31:44; 2 Sm 13:11; Prv 7:18).

Based on a hermeneutic of suspicion, I doubt that 1 Kings 1:53 tells us about Solomon’s forgiveness of Adonijah. I prefer the LXX’s rendering (deuro) to deliver the message about an implied and conditional communication from Solomon to Adonijah. Solomon wants Adonijah to do something together or according to Solomon’s will. There is a “coal in the husk” in the relationship, ready to reignite when the trigger appears. These indicate that a sleeping tiger is not in a deep sleep because a few sparks can rekindle the vengeance and justify the removal of opponents.

**THE PHENOMENON OF A TIGER AWAKENED FROM SLEEP**

I chose the passive form “awakened from sleep” because phenomenologically, the text of 1 Kings 2:15-17 displays at least three levels of conversation. The first level is explicit, wherein Adonijah talks to Bathsheba about his desire to have Abishag. At this level, Bathsheba conveyed Adonijah’s request to Solomon. The second level is the implicit level. It contains Adonijah’s motive to have Abishag, particularly compensation for losing the opportunity to become a king. I agree with Walter Brueggemann that his request was foolish because he expressed his dissatisfaction with the wrong person. Furthermore, the third level is the inner-struggle level, which leads to acceptance or rejection of something. Adonijah has an unresolved internal struggle. 1 Kings 2:15 illustrates this phenomenon interestingly through the presence of shifting participants.

---

is written: “…wēʾālay šāmū kāl-yiśrāʾēl pēnēhem limlōk” (…and on me, all Israel put/set their faces, to be a king) and “kī mywh häytā lō” (…because from the GOD it happened to him). There is a shift from “their faces” (as a representation of Israel’s expectation toward Adonijah) in the plural form into GOD’s determination in the singular. In other words, Adonijah admits (half-heartedly?) that Israel’s hope is not according to God’s will. Grammatically, two facts support the validity of the shifting participant’s marker. The first is the verb šāmû, which is translated as “they have placed/established” and often points to what God decreed. Here, however, it refers to the Israelites. When finally talking about God’s decree, the narrator only wrote “because of God, it happened” without using the verb “to put/place/set” or something similar.

The second fact is the placement of God’s will at the very end of the sentence, notably, after Adonijah delivered all the arguments centered on his understanding. That kind of argument becomes more apparent when we compare the MT and the LXX. The MT uses the phrase “the position as king (that) has existed for me,” which indicates availability. The LXX, however, uses “the kingdom (that) is mine,” which suggests ownership. Adonijah thought that he had already earned his position but now had lost it. Another difference appears from MT’s “their face,” while LXX only uses “face.” Thus, there is a participant’s shift in LXX, from “all Israel” (which indicates the plural form) to “his face” (which is singular) and gives the impression that the Israelites really expected Adonijah to be king of Israel. Based on these facts, I concluded that Adonijah’s speaking style reflects the attitude that hardly accepted David’s decision of the succession—for Solomon and not him—as God’s will.

The above phenomenon shows that Adonijah did not learn from his previous mistakes. He had awakened the sleeping tiger. Previously he woke up David, an old tiger deemed incompetent to rule. Still, David was surprisingly able to make important decisions about succession, which was not in Adonijah’s favor. Now, he “woke” up Solomon—the young tiger who had forgiven him—so Solomon is justified in finishing off his opponents, including Adonijah. Adonijah’s main fault lies in his failure to communicate elegantly. Previously, he failed to understand that succession or transfer of power had to be decided by the previous ruler:

27 See the classification of Glanz, Understanding, 270.
King David. In the monarchy system, it is not the commander-in-chief—or even the opinion of a few people\(^{28}\)—that determines the king. Despite the possibility that Nathan and Bathsheba fabricated\(^ {29}\) David’s promise to make Solomon a king and how they met, David demonstrates the importance of persuasive communication\(^ {30}\) that respects David himself as a formal determinant and decision-maker.\(^ {31}\) The fact that succession or inheritance transfer is not always based on primogeniture (the eldest son’s exclusive right to inherit all of his father’s property)\(^ {32}\) but also on ultimogeniture (a system of inheritance in which the youngest son inherits ownership)\(^ {33}\) shows that a father has the right to exercise discretion and make a choice.\(^ {34}\) Therefore I cannot entirely agree with the opinion that the author of 1 Kings 1-2 deliberately criminalizes Adonijah by portraying him in the darkest shades as part of political propaganda.\(^ {35}\) The main reason for Adonijah’s failure in communication is his reluctance to meet his father as Nathan and Bathsheba did. Now, Adonijah makes the same mistake for fear of meeting Solomon personally. If the thesis about the existence of two parties—the Adonijah party and the Solomonic party—is right,\(^ {36}\)

\(^{28}\) See Eric A. Seibert, *Subversive Scribes and the Solomonic Narrative: A Rereading of 1 Kings 1-11* (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 117. Rather than his suggestion, “many people,” I prefer the expression “few people” in considering how quickly Adonijah’s declaration was swept away by Solomon’s declaration.


\(^{30}\) As expressed by Alter, *The Art*, 98.

\(^{31}\) Contra Long, “A Darkness”: 85, and Jones, *1 and 2 Kings*, 93. They think that David was in a state of inactivity, insensitivity, trembling, and even senile. I agreed with David Marcus, “David the Deceiver and David the Dupe,” *Prooftexts* 6, no. 2 (1986): 166. He pictured David who could take action and command an immediate coronation of Solomon.

\(^{32}\) See *American Heritage Dictionary*, s.v. “primogeniture.”

\(^{33}\) See *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, s.v. “ultimogeniture.”


\(^{35}\) Contra Seibert, *Subversive*, 120-121.

the option to choose the king’s mother as an intermediary is bad because Bathsheba is on Solomon’s side, as clearly narrated in 1 Kings 1. Finally, the complete reconciliation dissolves due to his ridiculous action. The tiger woke up; the picture was gloomy for Adonijah. The narrator uses the verb *pāgaʿ*, which means “to reach, strike, drop, kill,” describing the three men who executed Adonijah on Solomon’s orders (1 Kgs 2:25, 29, 31, 32, 34). Remarkably, this word is used three times to describe Joab’s execution. It fulfills the formula “measure to measure”: what Joab did before (attacked, killed) is now applied to him (attacked, killed). The failure in communication is the root of this entire horrible scene.

**Imaginative Image of a Tiger Lying next to a Sheep**

In contrast with the closing statement “the kingdom was thus firmly established in Solomon’s hand” (1 Kgs 2:46), the story is far from over. The narrative of David’s succession in 1 Kings 1-2 creates a never-ending debate between those who regard it as pro-Solomonic or as anti-Solomonic propaganda. I believe it is pro-Solomonic, but it critically raises an

---


38 Alter, *The Art*, 92. He compared that dramatic expression with King Lear’s words: “kill, kill, kill ....”


42 I followed Brueggemann, 1 & 2 Kings, 21. He states that the Adonijah party represents
important question: Is the behavior of a tiger roaring and killing its enemies the ideal description of David’s heir to the throne as the fulfillment of God’s eternal promise in 2 Samuel 7? For me, the answer is no. Thus, it is possible to have a different “voice” in assessing Solomon’s policy, given the interaction between one source and another in the process of composition to its final form through the scribes’ activities. Karel van der Toorn describes these activities as painters who add brush strokes to the same image.43 This understanding elevates the importance of shifting participants in 1 Kings 2:15. As previously mentioned, Adonijah grammatically places the people and their hopes in the leading position while GOD and his decrees are placed at the very end. Furthermore, I thought that the scribes “stroked” this phenomenon intentionally and addressed it not only to Adonijah but also to Solomon because as Solomon’s supporters, the scribes didn’t have to agree with him. In other words, the text—which is pro-Solomonic—holds the possibility or the hidden message about how the ruler was actually guided by God’s will and did not use “God’s will” as only a slogan or a stamp of legitimacy for the victorious and powerful parties.

The final purpose of that phenomenon is the construction of another model of kingship characterized by friendly communication. One of the most prominent images of friendly communication is found in the metaphorical description of Isaiah 11:6-8 about wild animals—including tigers—that live in peace with livestock. This metaphor emphasizes the domestication of wild animals: eating grass and hay, not meat anymore (v. 7). I follow Joshua J. Van Ee with his hyperbolic rhetoric of blessing concerning the shepherd’s pastoral life. He interprets the young boy as the shepherd who leads and protects the flock without a fight with the beasts because the spirit of God endows him with God’s wisdom and understanding.44 However, I disagree with his non-allegorical interpretation because, in my opinion, the nonviolent leadership of the shepherd that results in the domestication of wild animals is the additional consequence—

not the main purpose—of his leadership. His core leadership must be related to another person. Therefore, I believe that Isaiah 11:6-8, as part of Isaiah 11:1-9, talks about a new and future Davidic kingship\textsuperscript{45} in its ideal form\textsuperscript{46} and wider perspective,\textsuperscript{47} which not only supports the kings but also implicitly criticizes them.\textsuperscript{48} In line with this understanding, I believe that 1 Kings 2 inherently proposes another style of rulers’ behavior and communication that can bring peace and tranquility as mentioned in Isaiah 11:8: a small child—a metaphor for the weak and helpless—feels safe and is not afraid to play with beasts.

The following facts become a foundation of the existence of another “voice” in 1 Kings 2. The first is the distinction between “telling” and “showing.” According to Leo G. Perdue, the narrator “tells” something in the first or third person and has the authority to explain and evaluate the characters by providing comments and explanations and assessing the event’s significance. Meanwhile, attempts to “show” something include withholding the narrator’s honest evaluation and commentary.\textsuperscript{49} Based on this distinction, I assert that the use of the word five times symbolizes the brutal suppression of the enemy. The author attempts to “show” what happened and withhold comments and evaluations by leaving it to the reader’s judgment of the event. On the other hand, the author also “shows” that from three of David’s instructions to Solomon, the act of generosity to the children of Barzillai is the only instruction without its implementation!\textsuperscript{50} However, it is important to remember that the instructions are arranged in a sandwich or chiasmus pattern as follows:

---


\textsuperscript{46} David Peterson, \textit{Christ and His People in the Book of Isaiah} (Leicester, UK: IVP Press, 2003), 129.


\textsuperscript{50} Brueggemann, \textit{1 & 2 Kings}, 41.
A. The negative evaluation of Joab (2:5-6)
B. Positive evaluation of Barzilai’s son (2:7)
A’. The negative evaluation of Shimei (2:8-9)

Through that pattern, the text gives a sign to the reader that the spirit of generosity—and not violence—should be the heart of Solomon’s wisdom in establishing his kingdom. Furthermore, that kind of spirit should be apparent in 1 Kings 2, but unfortunately, it evaporates and completely disappears in this section. What emerges is the dark picture of the merciless execution of Solomon’s opponents.

The second fact relates to Bathsheba’s role as an intermediary. Before Bathsheba delivered Adonijah’s message, Solomon used a gentle and intimate expression: “ask, my mother.” After Bathsheba conveys Adonijah’s request, Solomon’s expression instantly turns into a strong and relationally distant expression, without the title “mother.” It means that Bathsheba’s position has shifted: from the object of love as his mother to the object of wrath as his opponent. In other words, Bathsheba failed in her role as mediator for Adonijah (concerning Abishag), but at the same time, she succeeded in her intermediary role with Solomon (in delivering hostility and judgment to Adonijah). However, the final intention of the text is not hostility and judgment. As mentioned earlier, it is not only Adonijah’s communication style that is problematic (because of the ignorance of the persuasive aspect) but also Solomon with his implicit and suspicious communication. Therefore, the text is an open-ended text that narratively projects the imaginative picture of Bathsheba’s intermediary role for Solomon (in delivering forgiveness and generosity). The text intentionally uses five verbs in one verse (1 Kgs 2:19) in explaining Solomon’s proportional respect for Bathsheba. Specifically, there are four verbs that Solomon did: rise, meet, kneel, and sit, plus one other verb done by someone at Solomon’s command. As an imaginative picture of Bathsheba’s intermediary role for Solomon, I see all those verbs as representative of the imaginative picture of a friendly but still proportional communication style of a wise ruler. Specifically, Solomon’s act of “rising to meet” represents the image of a ruler “who welcomes all who meet him.” Meanwhile, Solomon’s “kneeling” action means a ruler acting proportionally: toward his mother, he showed respect; toward others, he would have behaved
differently. Furthermore, Solomon’s “sitting” represents his authority as king toward anyone, including his mother. Finally, Solomon’s order, most likely to his subordinate, to prepare a seat illustrates Solomon’s willingness to sit together with anyone and to deal with them, positively and negatively, regarding the important issues in the community.

Finally, I follow Perdue, who mentioned the existence of other “voices” in the text through the dynamic characterization of David, mainly two contrasting views of how David ruled as king. On the one hand, David is exercising power brutally and mercilessly, while on the other hand, he acts with mercy and forgiveness. Therefore, he argues that the text “shows” two possibilities: rule by force or by mercy. Ironically, Solomon chose the first one. He did not consider the reasons why David did not execute Shimei during his reign, possibly to avoid further rebellion on the part of Saul’s descendants. If certain political motives had compelled David not to execute Shimei, why couldn’t the absence of a political motive for Shimei’s actions compel Solomon to pardon Shimei instead of executing him? Furthermore, was the extermination of Solomon’s political opponents not wholly successful given the emergence of another opponent (see 1 Kgs 11:14-43)? Are all of these texts signs of another way to eliminate the influence of people who disturb the community’s peace? For example, the text mentions the concept of exile imposed on Shimei, although Solomon finally changed his mind and chose to execute Shimei based on the strict implementation of the law. This fact proves that Solomon had the option of not executing his opponents according to David’s will. As a wise person, Solomon had to follow God’s wisdom to treat his opponents appropriately, and the death penalty is not the only option for establishing his authority.

53 Provan, “Why Barzillai”: 115. He had no other alternative than to punish and finish off the intruder. Even more terrifying is the term “demons” used for Adonijah’s group by Peter J. Leithart, Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible: 1 & 2 Kings (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos, 2006), 37-38.
54 See August H. Konkel, The NIV Application Commentary: 1 & 2 Kings (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006), 60. He explained Shimei’s endeavor to circumvent the prohibition literally by going south and west toward Gath by not crossing the river Kidron.
Conclusion

The presence of shifting participants in 1 Kings 2:15 makes this passage the center of interpretation of 1 Kings 2. Its presence implies Adonijah’s half-hearted reception of God’s decree on Solomon which leads to incorrect signaling. That signal was received by Solomon incorrectly, too. Therefore, by “showing” the bad communication between both of them, the text shows an imaginative picture of a friendly communication style as part of the ruler’s policy in running his government. A friendly communication style essentially starts with a change of heart, filled with generosity, thereby minimizing subjective prejudice. A friendly communication style is about behaving appropriately in various situations with the willingness to understand the problem well. Nevertheless, friendly communication remains concerned with national stability, and if resilience is disturbed, then the ruler can act wisely, for example by isolating those trying to eliminate peace. Extermination of opponents is not the only option as shown later that Solomon still has an enemy after he exterminates his opponents (see 1 Kgs 11:14-40).
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