LEFT OFF ON THIS ONE!!

1 Samuel 14 Sauls Rolling Stone and Prophecy

In first Samuel 14, what happened to the stone that Samuel asked to be rolled to him it appears as though maybe the ox or sacrificed on the flat side of the great roll Stone, but then I don't see any mention of the stone after that I'm trying to understand if there's a purpose and function in the stone or if it's prophetic for the futurefor the ox that was killed outside the camp being Jesus dying on Golgotha and then his tomb, adjoining Golgotha with the Rolling Stone and if there's some imagery there

You're seeing the right "peg" to test, but there is one correction at the front: in 1 Samuel 14 it is **Saul**, not Samuel, who asks for the great stone to be rolled to him. The stone does have a real legal/sacrificial function in the scene; the prophetic rope to Golgotha is possible as an echo, but it should be handled carefully rather than made the main proof.

Thought for 36s

Yes — the stone in **1 Samuel 14:33–35** probably has a real practical/legal function first, and then it may give you a **possible prophetic image-rope**, but I would not make it a primary prophecy by itself.

First, small correction: it was **Saul**, not Samuel.

1. What happened in the scene?

Israel had been fighting the Philistines all day, and Saul's rash oath had made the people extremely faint because they were not allowed to eat. When the battle was over, the people rushed on the spoil and began slaughtering sheep, oxen, and calves **on the ground**, and they ate with the blood still involved.

"And the people flew upon the spoil, and took sheep, and oxen, and calves, and slew them on the ground: and the people did eat them with the blood."
— 1 Samuel 14:32

That was the sin issue. The problem was not merely that they ate meat. The problem was that they were eating in a way that violated the blood command.

So Saul says:

"Ye have transgressed: roll a great stone unto me this day."
— 1 Samuel 14:33

Then he commands every man to bring his ox or sheep and slaughter it **there**, so they would not sin by eating with the blood.

“Bring me hither every man his ox, and every man his sheep, and slay them here, and eat; and sin not against the LORD in eating with the blood.”
— 1 Samuel 14:34

Then the text says:

“And Saul built an altar unto the LORD: the same was the first altar that he built unto the LORD.”
— 1 Samuel 14:35

So the stone likely becomes either:

1. the slaughtering surface/place where the animals are killed properly,
2. the beginning/base of an altar,
3. or both.

The text does not mention the stone again because once its purpose is served, the narrative moves on. But verse 35 suggests the event becomes tied to Saul’s first altar.

---

2. Why a stone?

The practical/legal reason is probably blood control.

They had been killing animals **on the ground**, likely in a hurried, disorderly way, with the blood not properly drained or separated. A large stone would give a raised, solid, clean surface where the animal could be slaughtered and the blood could run off or be handled more properly.

The legal background is strong:

“But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat.”
— Genesis 9:4

“Moreover ye shall eat no manner of blood…”
— Leviticus 7:26

“Only ye shall not eat the blood; ye shall pour it upon the earth as water.”
— Deuteronomy 12:16

So the stone is not random scenery. It is a legal correction point. The people are in danger of blood-guilt, and Saul creates a centralized slaughter place.

That makes the stone a kind of **blood-separation stone**.

---

3. Was the ox sacrificed on the flat side of the great rolled stone?

That is very possible.

The text does not explicitly say, “they put the ox on the flat side of the stone.” But the sequence strongly implies that the great stone was rolled to Saul so the animals could be slaughtered **there** instead of on the ground.

The phrase “slay them here” points to the stone-location as the new controlled slaughter place.

So your picture is reasonable: the oxen and sheep were probably brought to this great stone, slaughtered there, and eaten lawfully instead of being torn into in blood-guilt.

---

4. Is there prophetic imagery toward Jesus, Golgotha, and the rolling stone?

There may be imagery, but I would grade it carefully.

The strongest direct prophetic ropes to Jesus dying outside the gate are not from 1 Samuel 14. They are from the sacrificial law and Hebrews:

“For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp.”
— Hebrews 13:11

“Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.”
— Hebrews 13:12

That gives the direct legal fulfillment: **sin-bearing sacrifice outside the camp/gate**.

Then John gives the location-rope:

“And he bearing his cross went forth into a place called the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha.”
— John 19:17

And John also tells us the tomb was nearby:

“Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre…”
— John 19:41

Then the Gospels give the rolling-stone rope:

“And he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed.”
— Matthew 27:60

So the stronger chain is:

outside the gate → Golgotha / Skull-place → blood poured out → nearby tomb → great stone rolled → resurrection.

1 Samuel 14 may sit as a secondary echo:

blood-guilt crisis → great stone rolled → ox/sheep slaughtered there → altar built → sin in relation to blood corrected.

That is a real pattern, but it is not as direct as Hebrews 13, Leviticus, Numbers, John 19, and Matthew 27.

---

5. The deeper peg: Saul’s stone exposes the need for a better King

This may be the most important part.

In 1 Samuel 14, Saul tries to stop the people from sinning with blood. But Saul himself created much of the crisis by his rash oath. His people are faint, starving, and desperate. Then he makes an altar, but the surrounding story still shows confusion, rash judgment, and near-death for Jonathan.

So the stone scene does not mainly glorify Saul. It exposes the weakness of the wrong king.

Saul can roll a stone and build an altar, but he cannot truly remove blood-guilt, feed the people, or rule with righteous wisdom.

Christ is the opposite.

Saul’s people are faint because of his foolish oath.
Christ feeds His people.

Saul tries to manage blood-guilt after disorder breaks out.
Christ gives His own blood lawfully and willingly.

Saul builds his first altar under crisis.
Christ becomes both Priest and Offering.

Saul almost condemns the innocent Jonathan.
Christ, the innocent Son, is condemned to save the guilty.

Saul's stone disappears from the narrative.
Christ's stone becomes part of the resurrection witness.

---

6. Clean PFIR-style grading

I would grade the connections like this:

Direct legal function:
1 Samuel 14's great stone is a lawful slaughter/blood-control stone.

Strong OT legal background:
Genesis 9, Leviticus 7, Deuteronomy 12 — blood must not be eaten; blood must be treated as life belonging to God.

Weak-to-moderate typological echo:
Great stone rolled → animals slaughtered there → blood issue corrected → altar built.

Stronger Christ fulfillment chain elsewhere:
Leviticus sacrificial law / bodies outside camp → Hebrews 13 → Jesus outside the gate → Golgotha → nearby tomb → great stone rolled → resurrection.

Best theological peg:
The scene shows the failure of Saul's kingship and the need for the true King-Priest, Jesus, whose blood does not create guilt but cleanses from guilt.

Short peg phrase

Saul's rolled stone was a blood-correction stone; Christ's rolled stone became a resurrection-witness stone.

Or fuller:

In 1 Samuel 14, a great stone is rolled to stop Israel's blood-guilt and provide a lawful slaughter place. At Golgotha, the true King's blood is poured out outside the gate, and near that same place a great stone is rolled before the tomb. Saul's stone tries to manage blood-guilt; Christ's stone witnesses that blood-guilt has been conquered by resurrection.

So maybe there is another picture here, if not, I can let this hunch go. Jesus was annointed, in our locked study where the woman pours oils over Jesus head, and we established that the tabernacle was annointed, the priest was annointed, and the king was annointed. So, we have an anointed king, calling the people to bring the ox, and there is a rolled stone, and the sacrifice stone

becomes the cornerstone of an alter, which is, in my opinion, is a mobile high place, a mini portrait location to honor God. Maybe we can find a connection.
Stopped thinking

I think this hunch is worth testing, not letting go yet. The strongest connection may not be "Saul equals Jesus," but rather: **an anointed-but-failed king creates a crisis-stone for blood correction**, while Christ is the true Anointed King-Priest whose blood and stone complete the pattern.

This may be a priest-king picture type, a king bringing the people into a priestly act of making atonement with the ox.
Thought for 10s

Yes — I think that is a better direction, with one important guardrail:

1 Samuel 14 is not a clean priest-king fulfillment picture. It is more like a strained / incomplete / failed priest-king shadow.

Saul is an **anointed king**, and he gathers the people around a **rolled great stone** so the oxen and sheep can be slaughtered in a way that prevents blood-guilt. Then the stone-location becomes associated with an altar to the LORD.

So the picture has real pieces:

anointed king → people gathered → ox/sheep brought → blood issue corrected → great rolled stone → altar to the LORD

That is definitely priestly imagery. But Saul himself is not a priest, and earlier in **1 Samuel 13:8–14**, Saul had already sinned by forcing the burnt offering role when he should have waited for Samuel. So the text has tension: Saul is acting in a priest-adjacent way, but he is not the true priest-king.

The key distinction

I would not say the people are "making atonement with the ox" in the full Levitical sense, because 1 Samuel 14 does not explicitly call this a sin offering, burnt offering, peace offering, or atonement. The immediate issue is:

"Ye have transgressed… sin not against the LORD in eating with the blood."
— 1 Samuel 14:33–34

So the main function is **blood-law correction**, not clearly formal atonement.

But your instinct is still strong because blood-law correction belongs to priestly territory. The king is gathering the people around a stone and altar so the blood is handled in a God-honoring way. That is a miniature sanctuary/high-place type scene.

Better wording

I would phrase it like this:

Saul, the anointed king, gathers the people to a rolled stone so the oxen and sheep may be slaughtered without blood-guilt. The stone becomes the altar-foundation of a crisis-worship scene. This is a priest-king-shaped picture, but in Saul it is incomplete and unstable. It points forward by contrast to the true Anointed One, Jesus, who is both King and Priest, whose own blood does not merely prevent blood-guilt but removes it.

That gives you the rope without overclaiming.

Why this may be a real pattern

Saul's stone scene has a "mini high-place" feel:

1. **The people are gathered.**
   The king calls them into a centralized action.
2. **The animals are brought.**
   "Bring me hither every man his ox, and every man his sheep."
3. **The blood is the issue.**
   They must not eat with the blood.
4. **The stone becomes the focal point.**
   The great stone is rolled to Saul.
5. **An altar is built.**
   "Saul built an altar unto the LORD."
6. **The king is mediating order.**
   He is trying to move the people from transgression back into covenant obedience.

That is priest-king-shaped. But because it is Saul, the shadow is cracked.

Saul versus Christ

Saul is anointed, but unstable.
Christ is the true Anointed One.

Saul commands animals to be brought.
Christ offers Himself.

Saul uses a rolled stone to prevent blood-guilt.
Christ's blood removes guilt.

Saul's stone becomes connected to an altar.
Christ is both altar, sacrifice, and priestly mediator.

Saul's scene happens after his people are faint because of his foolish oath.
Christ feeds His people and gives them life.

Saul's altar is his "first altar," but his kingship is already under judgment.
Christ's cross is shame before men but becomes the true enthronement, victory, and priestly offering.

So yes — this may be a **negative priest-king type** or **failed priest-king preview**.

Strong peg phrase

Saul's rolled stone is a crisis altar under a failed anointed king; Christ's rolled stone is a resurrection witness beside the true Anointed King-Priest.

Or:

In Saul, the anointed king gathers the people to a rolled stone so blood-guilt may be restrained. In Christ, the true Anointed King-Priest goes to the Skull-place, gives His own blood outside the gate, and the rolled stone of the tomb witnesses that guilt, death, and accusation have been conquered.

PFIR grading

I would grade it this way:

Direct textual fact:
Saul commands a great stone to be rolled to him; animals are slaughtered there; the people are warned not to sin by eating blood; Saul builds an altar to the LORD.

Strong legal background:
Blood belongs to God as life. Eating blood is forbidden. This connects Genesis 9:4, Leviticus 17:10–14, and Deuteronomy 12:16, 23–24.

Moderate typological pattern:
Anointed king + gathered people + ox/sheep + blood-law correction + rolled stone + altar.

Strong contrast pattern:
Saul is an anointed king but not the true priest-king. His priest-adjacent actions expose the need for a better anointed King who can truly mediate between God and the people.

Christ fulfillment rope:
Jesus is the true Anointed One, Priest after the order of Melchizedek, King, sacrifice, blood-cleanser, and the One whose tomb-stone is rolled away after death near Golgotha.

So I would not let the hunch go. I would refine it:

This is not a direct "Saul is Jesus" type. It is a failed-anointed-king altar scene that creates priest-king-shaped negative space. That empty space is filled by Christ.

You did not put much focus on the cornerstone of an alter, and how an alter relates to people and God biblically. Now, let's make a mini Matthew PFir where, if it was in scripture, and inspired, and God intended this passage as prophecy, with the highlight being that God is glorified, Jesus fulfilled the prophecy, promise, and plan, that it could be said, referencing key moments in this 1 Samuel passage, and these things we fulfilled per the prophecy of 1 Samuel. In a reasonable way, that is faithful to scripture, and does not produce new doctrine. This is a practice run of our new pfir, and the pfir needs these rules added.
Updated memory

I'll tighten the altar-stone part first, then run a small PFIR exercise as though Matthew were showing fulfillment from 1 Samuel 14. I'll keep the language exploratory and graded so it does not become new doctrine.

Thought for 12s

Yes — you are right. I underweighted the **altar-stone** piece.

The stronger peg is not merely "rolled stone." It is:

a great stone rolled to the anointed king becomes the focal stone of a blood-correction altar, where the people are reordered before God.

That gives the scene more weight.

1. What an altar is biblically

An altar is not just a "religious table." Biblically, an altar is a **Godward meeting point** where man approaches God through sacrifice, blood, worship, covenant, remembrance, and witness.

Noah builds an altar after judgment and deliverance:

"And Noah builded an altar unto the LORD… and offered burnt offerings on the altar."
— Genesis 8:20

Abraham builds altars where God appears and where he calls on the name of the LORD:

"And there builded he an altar unto the LORD, who appeared unto him."
— Genesis 12:7
"And there he builded an altar unto the LORD, and called upon the name of the LORD."
— Genesis 12:8

In Exodus, the altar is tied directly to God recording His name, coming to His people, and blessing them:

“In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee.”
— Exodus 20:24

At Sinai, Moses builds an altar, offers sacrifices, and sprinkles blood in covenant confirmation:

“And Moses wrote all the words of the LORD… and builded an altar under the hill…”
— Exodus 24:4
“Behold the blood of the covenant…”
— Exodus 24:8

Leviticus gives the blood logic:

“For it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.”
— Leviticus 17:11

So an altar is a **boundary-place between holy God and sinful people**, where blood, sacrifice, covenant, worship, and approach are handled lawfully.

That matters for 1 Samuel 14.

2. The stone in 1 Samuel 14 is probably altar-foundation imagery

The text says:

“Roll a great stone unto me this day.”
— 1 Samuel 14:33

Then:

“Bring me hither every man his ox, and every man his sheep, and slay them here, and eat; and sin not against the LORD in eating with the blood.”
— 1 Samuel 14:34

Then:

“And Saul built an altar unto the LORD: the same was the first altar that he built unto the LORD.”
— 1 Samuel 14:35

The text does not explicitly say, “the great stone became the cornerstone of the altar.” So we should not overstate it.

But the sequence strongly suggests the great stone becomes the **focal slaughter-stone / foundational altar-stone** of the scene.

The order is:

sin with blood → great stone rolled → animals brought → slaughter happens there → altar built

That means the stone is not decorative. It is the center of the correction.

Your wording, "cornerstone of an altar," is a good exploratory peg, but I would phrase it carefully:

The great stone appears to become the focal or foundational stone of Saul's first altar-scene. It functions like the crisis-stone around which the people are brought back into lawful blood-handling before God.

That keeps the insight without forcing "cornerstone" beyond what the passage says.

3. Why this is more than a random stone

This scene has several strong prophetic-type ingredients:

An anointed king is present.
Saul is the anointed king of Israel.

The people are in transgression.
They are eating with the blood.

Blood is the issue.
The life belongs to God.

A great stone is rolled.
The stone becomes the focal place of blood correction.

Oxen and sheep are brought.
The animals are killed at the stone-location.

An altar is built to the LORD.
The event becomes worship/approach/correction before God.

So yes, this is a **priest-king shaped scene**.

But Saul is the wrong kind of priest-king. He is anointed, but unstable. He can gather the people around a stone, but he cannot truly cleanse them. He can restrain blood-guilt for a moment, but he cannot remove guilt. He can build an altar, but he is not the final altar, priest, sacrifice, or king.

That makes the scene a **negative shadow** or **incomplete priest-king picture**.

4. Mini Matthew-style PFIR practice

This is not Scripture. This is a practice exercise, written as if Matthew were drawing out fulfillment language from 1 Samuel 14, while staying faithful to the text.

Hypothetical fulfillment summary

Then was fulfilled that which was shown beforehand in the days of Saul, when the anointed king said, "Roll a great stone unto me," and the people brought every man his ox and his sheep, and slew them there, that they might not sin against the LORD in eating with the blood. For the great stone became the place of blood-correction, and there Saul built his first altar unto the LORD.

But Saul, being anointed, was not the true Anointed One; and his altar could restrain transgression only for a moment. Therefore Christ, the true King and Priest, came outside the gate to the place called Golgotha, and there His own blood was poured out, not to prevent Israel from eating blood, but to cleanse His people from blood-guilt and sin. And near the place where He was crucified was a garden, and in the garden a new tomb, and a great stone was rolled to the door. But God rolled away the stone, showing that the sacrifice was accepted, the King was vindicated, and the people may now approach God through Him.

That would be the "Matthew-style" formulation.

Again, not doctrine by itself — but a reasonable fulfillment-style meditation.

5. PFIR node inventory

Original 1 Samuel 14 nodes

Receiving passage: 1 Samuel 14:32–35

Main nodes:

1. Israel transgresses with blood.
2. Saul, the anointed king, intervenes.
3. A great stone is rolled to him.
4. The people bring oxen and sheep.
5. Animals are slain "here," at the stone-location.
6. The purpose is to stop sin against the LORD.
7. Saul builds an altar to the LORD.
8. This is Saul's first altar.
9. The scene is priestly, but Saul is not a priest.
10. The scene exposes the weakness of Saul's kingship.

Christ fulfillment nodes

1. Christ is the true Anointed One — Prophet, Priest, and King.
2. Christ is not merely near the altar; He is the sacrifice.
3. Christ is not merely correcting blood misuse; He gives His own blood for cleansing.
4. Christ suffers outside the gate.
5. Christ dies at Golgotha, the Skull-place.
6. A tomb is nearby.
7. A great stone is rolled to the tomb.
8. The stone is rolled away in resurrection.
9. God is glorified.
10. The people are brought to God through Christ.

6. The altar-to-Christ connection

The altar is where people approach God through sacrifice.

Christ fulfills that whole altar-world.

He is the offering:

“Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God…”
— Ephesians 5:2

He is the priest:

“But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood.”
— Hebrews 7:24

He is the blood-cleanser:

“The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.”
— 1 John 1:7

He is the one who suffered outside the gate:

“Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.”
— Hebrews 13:12

So in 1 Samuel 14, the people are brought to a stone-altar scene so they do not sin with blood.

In Christ, the people are brought to God by the blood of the true sacrifice.

7. The “cornerstone” guardrail

There is a possible stone-to-cornerstone meditation, but we need to keep categories clean.

In 1 Samuel 14, the great stone may be a **foundation/focal stone of an altar-scene**.

But the messianic Cornerstone texts are stronger elsewhere:

“The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner.”
— Psalm 118:22

Jesus applies that to Himself:

“Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner…”
— Matthew 21:42

So I would not say 1 Samuel 14 directly prophesies the Cornerstone. But I would say:

The great stone in 1 Samuel 14 functions as a focal altar-stone for blood correction. Later Scripture reveals Christ as the true rejected Stone, the Cornerstone, the altar-fulfilling sacrifice, and the priestly mediator.

That is clean.

8. Strong PFIR conclusion

Here is the best refined version:

In 1 Samuel 14, Israel sins with blood after Saul’s rash rule leaves them faint. Saul, the anointed king, commands a great stone to be rolled to him. At that stone, every man brings his ox and sheep, and the animals are slain so the people may not sin against the LORD in eating with the blood. Then Saul builds his first altar to the LORD. The great stone becomes the focal stone of a crisis-altar, a miniature priestly scene where blood, people, king, sacrifice, and God’s honor converge.

But Saul is only an incomplete and failed anointed figure. He can gather the people to a stone to restrain blood-guilt, but he cannot remove sin. Christ fulfills the empty space. He is the true Anointed King-Priest. He goes outside the gate to Golgotha, gives His own blood, and is laid in a nearby tomb before which a great stone is rolled. When God raises Him and the stone is rolled away, the blood-correction scene becomes complete: the sacrifice is accepted, the King is vindicated, and the people are brought to God.

9. New PFIR rules added

I added these to the PFIR framework:

Altar-function scan: when an altar or altar-like scene appears, test how it relates to approach, sacrifice, blood, worship, covenant, remembrance, witness, judgment, mercy, and God meeting His people.

Stone/altar guardrail: do not call a stone a "cornerstone" unless the text or strong canonical rope supports it. In 1 Samuel 14, say "focal altar-stone" or "foundational altar-stone" unless clearly marking "cornerstone" as exploratory.

Negative priest-king type rule: an anointed but failed mediator can create priest-king-shaped negative space. The fulfillment may come by contrast, not by simple one-to-one identification.

Matthew-style practice rule: hypothetical fulfillment wording must be labeled as practice, not Scripture; it may imitate Matthew's method but must preserve the original passage and avoid creating doctrine from an unconfirmed echo.

Nope, you got all of that wrong. And those were not the rules, you misunderstood. These are the rules I wanted: "is faithful to scripture, and does not produce new doctrine." I will correct your pfir later, I don't have time right now.
Updated memory
Thought for 4s

You're right. I misunderstood what you were asking me to lock.

I removed/overrode that incorrect expansion.

For now, the only PFIR correction I preserved is:

A mini Matthew/PFIR practice run must be faithful to Scripture and must not produce new doctrine.

I'll wait for your correction later and won't build more rules off my mistaken version.