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.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

NOTES ON DIFFICULT TEXTS.

1 Sam. i. 5. "and to Hannah he used to give one portion שִׁלַּח וּמְנַהְגֶּהָ אָחָה אֶפְּסָם. 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 שְׁלַח, however, there is no support in the known usage of the language: שְׁלַח occurs with the meaning "in anger" in Dan. xi. 20; but that would be unsuitable here, and the expressions בֶּן לָא פְּלִדָּה (Gen. iv. 6) and נַפּל לָא פְּלִדָּה (1 Sam. i. 18) are not sufficient to justify the sense of a dejected countenance being assigned to שְׁלַח.

It is rendered (2), in connexion with בּוֹנָה אָחָה, one portion of two faces (＝two persons), i.e. a double portion. So Keil and even Gesenius. It is true that the Syriac פָּלָשׁ corresponds generally in usage with the Hebrew פָּלָשׁ; 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: פָּלָשׁ (like פָּלָשׁ) is used of one person, the singular not occurring. If פָּלָשׁ means two persons, it must be implied that the singular פָּלָשׁ 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. אֶפִּים evident cannot be in the genitive after עֵגָלוֹת; 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, § 287b, 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 חלְמִיק וּר בות्र, i.e. "one choice portion." יִבָּל, choice, corresponds in the Targum to the Hebrew אֶפִּים; but it is clear that it is no translation of it, nor can it be derived from it by any intelligible process. 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. אֶפִּים is represented by πλὴν, i.e. ἠπεῖν. This reading at once relieves the difficulty of the verse, and affords a consistent and grammatical sense. יִבָּל 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. 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" (!).

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
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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 were contracted from 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 recalled to his mind the word asked, though in no sense derived from it, just as Cain or Moses, for instance, recalled or suggested the verbs qanah, to get, and mashah, 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, 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 נ rather than the י would have been naturally the letter elided: an original would have given rise to (on the analogy of) rather than to.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 Elnathān, Yonathān, Elyādā’, Yehoyādā’, i.e. El (or Yah) has given, El (or Yah) has known. Another

1 In 1 Chron. vii. 6 al., even the נ is not elided.
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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 בַּרְכָּה, Yozab-ad, Elzabad, or Zebadyah, not בָּרָכָה; we have not only Elnathan and Yehonathan (or Yonathan), but also Nethanyah and Nethan’el, not however Nethûn’el; we have Shema’yah and Ishma’el ¹ also Elishama’), but not שְׁמוֹאֵל. There is no name in the O.T. formed analogously to a presumable שְׁמוֹאֵל, 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, שְׁמוֹאֵל = “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. 16, if this mean “smitten of God,” which, however, is far from certain : following the Qri, we may vocalize מְחלֵיָּֽל, which would agree with the LXX. Ἰωσήφ, i.e. “God is a life-giver (Budde, Bibliische 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).
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"Majesty of God," and Hammu'el, "Warmth (?) of God." The 创投, it is hardly necessary to remark, is the old case-termination, 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 belongs to God." It is remarkable that Keil, when the circumstances are so clear, should still adhere to the interpretation a Deo exauditus.

Josh. vi. 18. "But ye, in any wise keep yourselves from the devoted thing," ופ התפקידו הפרשה מ God, 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 preserved here in the LXX. μὴ ποτὲ ἐνθυμηθεὶς ἐντεύξεως, κ.τ.λ., i.e. ופ התפקידו הפרשה מ "lest ye covet and take of the devoted thing, and make," etc. All that is needed is a transposition of two letters ופ for ופ (written as it once would be written, without the '); and the correctness of the conjecture is strongly confirmed by vii. 21, where Achan says: "And I saw among the spoil a goodly Babylonish mantle, etc., and I coveted them (אָמָה), and I took them." 3

Josh. xix. 47. ויתא גבלו בני דנ ח modulus lit. "And the border of the children of Dan went out from them," which gives no intelligible sense. גבלו, to go out, is indeed used with גבול, border, but only to express the idea of its continuous extension 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 formation definitely Assyrian.
2 LXX. (as in vi. 18) καὶ ἐνθυμηθεὶς αὐτῶν Ὑαβωρ.
3 So Hollenberg in his useful monograph, Der Charakter der Alexandrinischen Übersetzung 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 נשי read נטס, 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 כ and for the construction, is afforded by 2 Kings vi. 1, "The place in which we dwell before thee 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 ἔθησαν ἀπ' αὐτῶν τὸ ὀρον τῆς μερίδος αὐτῶν. כ and its derivatives are represented by θήβω 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