Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to submit a revised version of my article. Below is a list of the main changes and corrections that I have made in the article in response to the readers’ comments.

1. The central criticism of the two reviewers was the insufficient reference to previous chapters that described the rejection of Saul. I have added an entire section at the end of the article (pp. 18–19), which relates to this matter and explains the difference between what is described in the earlier chapters and what is described in the current chapter.
2. The first reader asked for a sharpening of the description of the aim of the article in the introduction, and for explanations of the literary method employed in the article. I have added an explanatory paragraph at the end of the introduction, and I have also added footnotes 6–8, which point to the central studies related to the literary techniques mentioned in the article.
3. The first reader recommended moving some of the debate with previous scholars up into the body of the article. This comment was not written in an obligatory manner, and for the sake of the smooth reading of the article, I preferred to leave the debate with scholars in the footnotes.
4. With respect to the reader’s remark that it is not clear that there is a violation of the law in verses 24–25, I have added a sentence clarifying this matter (on p. 12).
5. The second reader suggested that contrary to my claim, Saul continues to function as a king even after ch. 28. This comment indicates that I did not convey my meaning sufficiently clearly. I propose that Saul underwent a mental-psychological process that led him to stop seeing himself as a leader and as somebody with leadership in his future. Technically speaking, it is obvious that he continued in his role until his death. I clarified this matter on page 19 and in note 35.
6. The second reader commented that I did not address the calf that was offered to Saul, and did not interact with Reis’s article. This article is cited twice in the course of the study (notes 5 and 21). I refer to Reis’s negative attitude to the sorceress, and to the idea that the food that she offers is meant for the spirits of the dead. This approach does not fit with the process that is proposed in my article. It should be noted that the word “calf” appears in the books of the former prophets only once—in the current chapter, and in any case it cannot be seen as a Leitmotif (in contrast to the word “bread”, which was emphasized in the article.
7. In response to the comment of the second reader, I added interaction with Michael's article. His article presents the decline in Saul’s status from a different point of view than that presented in my article. It should be noted that he hardly addressed the topic of my article—the meal at the sorceress.

In general, I would like to note that I found it difficult to address some of the reviewers’ comments, which were occasionally overly general. For example, one reader wrote:

“It is a pity that the first section focuses on questions of hierarchy, and not, more broadly, on the interplay between the protagonists.”

Another example is the statement:

“the author shows a tendency to focus on some aspects of the story recounted in 1 Sam 28:20-25, and ignores or omits others”

It seems to me that in the case of a biblical story that has been the subject of so many articles and academic research, it is impossible to address every detail. I tried to highlight the aspects that contribute to strengthening my main theses. Even so, I did not neglect studies that put forth alternative perspectives, and these are cited in the footnotes.

If the article will be re-submitted to one of the first-round readers, I would appreciate it if you would attach this letter for their consideration.