Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

Buy me a coffee — https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON — https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal — https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

observe the origin of that complication which the canonical prophets seek to unravel; the knot is being tied which they use all their efforts to unloose. There is going on a mixture of elements which produces the fermentation familiar to us in later times. The higher spirit and faith of the nation has presented for its assimilation a mass of conceptions and elements which it is unable at once to overcome and dominate. Yet it does not allow itself to lose courage. It is assured of eventual victory.

<div style="text-align:right">A. B. DAVIDSON.</div>

NOTES ON DIFFICULT TEXTS.

1 Sam. i. 5. וּלְחַנָּה יִתֵּן מָנָה אַחַת אַפָּיִם, "and to Hannah he used to give one portion אַפָּיִם." What is the meaning of this Hebrew word? It is rendered (1) "heavily." So, for instance, the Vulgate (*tristis*), several mediæval authorities (e.g. the Great Bible: "a portion with an heavy cheer"), and amongst moderns, Böttcher and Thenius. For this sense of אַפָּיִם, however, there is no support in the known usage of the language: בְּאַפָּיִם occurs with the meaning "in anger" in Dan. xi. 20; but that would be unsuitable here, and the expressions נפלו פניך (Gen. iv. 6) and פניה לא היו לה עוד (1 Sam. i. 18) are not sufficient to justify the sense of a *dejected* countenance being assigned to אפים.

It is rendered (2), in connexion with מָנָה אַחַת, *one portion of two faces* (=two persons), i.e. a double portion. So Keil and even Gesenius. It is true that the Syriac ܐܦ̈ܐ corresponds generally in usage with the Hebrew פנים; but, to say nothing of the fact that a Syriasm is unexpected in Samuel, there is nothing in the use of the Syriac word to suggest that the *dual* would, in Hebrew, denote *two* persons: ܐܦ̈ܐ (like פנים) is used of *one* person, the singular not occurring. If אַפָּיִם means *two* persons, it must be implied that the singular אף might denote *one* person, which the

meaning of the word obviously does not permit. Secondly, the construction, if this rendering were correct, would be unexampled. אפים evidently cannot be in the *genitive* after מנה אחת; and the disparity between the two ideas (*one portion* and *two persons*) precludes us from treating it as an instance of apposition (as is suggested by Keil) : Ewald, § 287 *b*, offers in this respect nothing parallel. Grammatically, therefore, not less than lexically, this rendering is exposed to the gravest objections.

(3) The rendering of A.V., *a worthy portion*, is inherited from the Geneva Version of 1560, and is based ultimately upon the Targum, which has חולק חד בחיר, i.e. " one *choice* portion." בְּחִיר, *choice*, corresponds in the Targum to the Hebrew אפים; but it is clear that it is no translation of it, nor can it be derived from it by any intelligible process.[1] Evidently it is a mere conjecture, designed to replace the untranslatable word by something that will more or less harmonize with the context.

The Hebrew text does not admit of a defensible rendering. In the LXX. אפים is represented by πλήν, i.e. אֶפֶס. This reading at once relieves the difficulty of the verse, and affords a consistent and grammatical sense. כִּי אֶפֶס restricts or qualifies the preceding clause, precisely as in Num. xiii. 28. " But unto Hannah he used to give one portion " : this, following the " portions " of *v.* 4, might seem to imply that Elkanah felt less affection for her than for Peninnah. To obviate such a misconception, the writer adds : " *Howbeit* he loved Hannah ; but the Lord had shut up her womb," the last clause assigning the reason why Hannah received but one portion.[2] Hence the margin in the R.V., which, strange to say, is denounced by a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* (Oct., 1885, p. 468) as " absolutely silly " (!).[3]

[1] Kimchi, in his *Commentary* and the *Book of Roots*, makes two attempts to account for it—both equally unsuccessful.

[2] So rightly Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, p. 36.

[3] The above note (in substance) was contributed originally by the writer to

i. 20. What is the connexion between the name Samuel and the ground alleged for its choice? Of course, the derivation suggested by the margin of A.V., "that is, *Asked of God*," as if שְׁמוּאֵל were contracted from שָׁאוּל מֵאֵל, cannot be maintained : such a contraction would be altogether alien to the genius of the language. What the writer means to express must be (as often in the O.T.) an assonance, not an etymology : the name שְׁמוּאֵל *recalled* to his mind the word שָׁאוּל, *asked*, though in no sense derived from it, just as Cain or Moses, for instance, recalled or suggested the verbs *qānāh*, to get, and *māshāh*, to draw out, though the names do not themselves *signify* either " gotten " or " drawn out." What, however, is the actual meaning of the name Samuel? When the explanation " asked of God " was seen to be untenable, an attempt was made to bring the name into some sort of connexion with the text by the suggestion that it was = שְׁמוּעָאֵל, and signified " heard of God." Had this, however, been the writer's intention, we should have expected the word *hear* to occur somewhere in the narrative, which is not the case. But there are even more serious objections to this derivation. (1) Had this been the true account of the name, the א rather than the ע would have been naturally the letter elided : an original שְׁמוּעָאֵל would have given rise to שְׁמוּעָאֵל (on the analogy of יִשְׁמָעֵאל) rather than to שְׁמוּאֵל.[1] (2) Compound proper names in Hebrew are constructed, for the most part, after particular types or models : thus one large class consists of one of the sacred names followed by a verb in the perfect tense (the last vowel only being lengthened, after the analogy of substantives), as *Elnāthān, Yonāthān, Elyādā', Yehoyādā'*, i.e. *El* (or *Yah*) *has given, El* (or *Yah*) *has known*. Another

[1] In יְדִיעֲאֵל, 1 Chron. vii. 6 *al.*, even the א is not elided.

class is similarly compounded, but the verb stands first, as *Hananyah, Hanan'el, Yah* (or *El*) *has been gracious, 'Azaryah, 'Azar'el, Yah* (or *El*) *has helped.* In a third class the verb still stands first, but is in the imperfect tense, as *Yerachme'el, El hath mercy, Ya'azanyah, Yah hearkeneth.* There are, of course, other types, which need not however be here considered. But numerous as are the proper names compounded of one of the sacred names and a verb, *there are none, or next to none, compounded with a passive participle.* Obvious as such a form as *blessed* or *helped* or *redeemed of Yah* might appear to be, it was uniformly discarded by the Hebrews. We have *Baruch* and *Zabud*, for instance, but Berachyah or Yeberechyah, not בְּרוּכְיָה, Yozabad, Elzabad, or Zebadyah, not זְבוּדְיָה; we have not only Elnathan and Yehonathan (or Yonathan), but also Nethanyah and Nethan'el, not however Nethūn'el; we have Shema'yah and Ishma'el [1] (also Elishāmā'), but not שְׁמוּעָאל. There is *no* name in the O.T. formed analogously to a presumable שְׁמוּעָאל, *heard of God* ;[2] and the fact that this type of compound name was studiously avoided by the Hebrews is a strong additional argument against the proposed derivation of " Samuel."

The derivation suggested by Gesenius, שְׁמוּאֵל = "Name of God," is as obvious as it is natural. It is suitable and appropriate in itself; and the form of compound which it implies is in exact agreement with *Penu'el*, " Face of God," *Re'u'el*, " Friend of God," as well as (probably) *Ge'u'el*,

---

[1] i.e. *Yah has heard*, and *God heareth.*

[2] The only possible exception would be *Meḥuya'el*, Gen. iv. 18, if this mean " smitten of God," which, however, is far from certain : following the Qri, we may vocalize מְחִייָאֵל, which would agree with the LXX. Μαιήλ, i.e. " God is a life-giver (Budde, *Biblische Urgeschichte*, p. 128). But, in any case, an archaic name such as this has no appreciable bearing upon the usage of the language in historic times. With *active* participles, there occur the compounds Meshelemyah, 1 Chron. ix. 21, xxvi. 1, 2, 9 ; and the *Aramaic* Meshezab'el, " God is a deliverer," Neh. iii. 4 *al.* ; and Mehetab'el, " God is a benefactor," Neh. vi. 10 (in Gen. xxxvi. 39 the name borne by the wife of an Edomite king).

"Majesty of God," and *Hammu'el,* "Warmth (?) of God."
The *u,* it is hardly necessary to remark, is the old case-ter-
mination, retained as a binding vowel, both in the instances
cited, and also occasionally besides: e.g. in Methu-shelach,
"Man of the weapon," and Methu-shael,[1] "Man who be-
longs to God." It is remarkable that Keil, when the
circumstances are so clear, should still adhere to the inter-
pretation *a Deo exauditus.*

Josh. vi. 18. "But ye, in any wise keep yourselves from
the devoted thing," פֶּן תַּחֲרִימוּ וּלְקַחְתֶּם מִן הַחֵרֶם, Knobel:
"lest ye devote, and take of the devoted thing, and make
the camp of Israel to be devoted, and trouble it"; which
in R.V. is transformed into the more intelligible sentence,
"Lest, *when ye have devoted it, ye* take of the devoted
thing," etc. But yet what a weak and tautologous sense
is thus obtained! The original reading is clearly pre-
served here in the LXX. μή ποτε ἐνθυμηθέντες, κ.τ.λ., i.e.
פֶּן תַּחְמְדוּ וּלְקַחְתֶּם וגו' "lest ye *covet* and take of the de-
voted thing, and make," etc. All that is needed is a trans-
position of two letters תחמדו for תחרמו (written as it
once would be written, without the י); and the correctness
of the conjecture is strongly confirmed by vii. 21, where
Achan says: "And I saw among the spoil a goodly Baby-
lonish mantle, etc., and *I coveted them* (וָאֶחְמְדֵם[2]), and I
took them."[3]

Josh. xix. 47. וַיֵּצֵא גְבוּל בְּנֵי דָן מֵהֶם *lit.* "And the border
of the children of Dan *went out from them,*" which gives no
intelligible sense. יצא, *to go out,* is indeed used with גְּבוּל,
border, but only to express the idea of its *continuous exten-
sion* in a given direction (as ch. xv. 3, 4, 9, etc.), not, as
here, of its receiving an accession in an altogether different

---

[1] According to Lenormant, *Les origines de l'histoire* (1880, p. 263), a forma-
tion definitely Assyrian.

[2] LXX. (as in vi. 18) καὶ ἐνθυμηθεὶς αὐτῶν ἔλαβον.

[3] So Hollenberg in his useful monograph, *Der Charakter der Alexandrinischen
Uebersetzung des Buches Josua* (Moers, 1876), p. 12.

part of the country, especially when the words immediately following, instead of proceeding to define the new border more precisely, describe the action of the Danites : " And the children of Dan went up and fought with Leshem, and took it," etc.   For וַיֵּצֵא read וַיֵּצֶר, and the verse becomes at once consistent and clear: " And the border of the children of Dan *was too narrow* for them; and the children of Dan went up and fought with Leshem, and took it," etc. A close parallel, both for the use of צר and for the construction, is afforded by 2 Kings vi. 1, " The place in which we dwell before thee צַר מִמֶּנּוּ *is too narrow for us.*"   The LXX., though their text is in some confusion and the rendering loose, appear to have had this reading before them : καὶ ἔθλιψαν ἀπ' αὐτῶν τὸ ὅριον τῆς μερίδος αὐτῶν.   צר and its derivatives are represented by θλίβω in LXX., Jud. x. 9 ; 1 Sam. xxx. 6, and elsewhere.

S. R. DRIVER.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

TYCHICUS AND ONESIMUS, THE LETTER-BEARERS.

XXIV.

" All my affairs shall Tychicus make known unto you, the beloved brother and faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord : whom I have sent unto you for this very purpose, that ye may know our estate, and that he may comfort your hearts; together with Onesimus, the faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you.   They shall make known unto you all things that *are done* here."—COL. iv. 7-9 (Rev. Ver.).

IN Paul's days it was perhaps more difficult to get letters delivered than to write them.   It was a long, weary journey from Rome to Colossæ,—across Italy, then by sea to Greece, across Greece, then by sea to the port of Ephesus, and thence by rough ways to the upland valley where lay Colossæ, with its neighbouring towns of Laodicea and