

# JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

FIFTEENTH YEAR—1896—PARTS I. AND II.

## The Sources E and J in the Books of Samuel.

PROF. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

LAKEWOOD, N.J.

BUDDE'S recently published text of Samuel in Professor Haupt's series<sup>1</sup> puts into form the theory of the author that the Hexateuchal sources E and J extend into the Books of Samuel. The theory was already known by the same author's essays in the *Z.A.T.W.*, republished in his work *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel* (Giessen, 1890). It has obtained the adherence of Cornill in his *Einleitung*. For the Book of Judges it has also received the modified approval of Professor Moore in his commentary.<sup>2</sup> Professor Stade on the other hand has protested against it (*Th.L.Z.*, 1896, i.), though he was understood to recognize E and J in the Book of Judges. Possibly this recognition extends only to Jud. i. 1–ii. 5. But this in itself almost forces the conclusion that J (who is here concerned) must have carried his work further. For with a summary, such as this passage gives, no author would conclude his history. If the work of J extended to this point, we have no reason to doubt that it also went further. And if it went further, there is no reason why it should have stopped short of the accession of David. For the author of this history, as we can now reconstruct it, Israel came into complete possession of the promised land only with the conquests of David. However, we cannot decide the question on a mere presumption. The object of the present paper is to examine the linguistic evidence.

The Books of Samuel (originally one book, and including also 1 Kings i. and ii.) are so evidently a compilation that we need take no time to prove the fact. Two main documents are easily sepa-

<sup>1</sup> *The Books of Samuel . . . printed in Colors.* Leipzig and Baltimore, 1894.

<sup>2</sup> *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*, by George Foot Moore. New York, 1895.

rated, and the analysis of Budde is substantially accepted by all critics. The reader may be referred for convenience to his edition. One main document is colored blue (the different shades show different strata of composition), the other is left uncolored. Naming the two documents B (= blue) and W (= white), the question before us is: Is B a part of the Hexateuchal writing which we know as E; and is W a part of the Hexateuchal writing which we know as J?<sup>3</sup>

A carefully compiled vocabulary of each of the Hexateuchal documents is given by Holzinger (*Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, 1893), and on the basis of his lists for J and E, I shall examine the usage of Samuel. Omitting those words which do not occur at all in Samuel, the result is as follows:

1. ארמה, of the *surface of the earth*, where E uses ארץ. Four instances in Samuel (1 S. xx. 31; 2 S. ix. 10, xiv. 7, xvii. 12) belong to W, and one (1 S. xx. 15) is 'redactional.' Three instances of 'adāmā as material ('earth upon his head') also occur, but they represent both W and B. Of the phrases in which the word occurs we should note 2 S. ix. 10—*ונכרת את-הארמה* (W)—which is distinctively J (Gen. ii. 5, iii. 23, iv. 2, 12).

2. אֹת as a *miracle*, where E uses מֹפֶת. It is doubtful, however, whether the Hebrew conception of a miracle was definite enough for us to make this a test. It is better to note the phrases in which the word occurs. *וזה הֵאֱתָהּ* occurs in 1 S. ii. 34, xiv. 10; the latter is in W, the former in a Deuteronomistic expansion of the text. The only strict parallel in the Hexateuch is Ex. iii. 12, which is generally assigned to E.

3. אָרָר, "oftener in J, in execrations." The three cases in Samuel represent the two documents: 1 S. xiv. 24, 28 (W), xxvi. 19 (B).

4. כְּוֹךְ in defining extent of country. Here again the two parts of Samuel are represented: 1 S. xv. 7, xvii. 52 (B), and 2 S. v. 25 (W).

5. בֵּי אֲדָנִי (five times J, once E): 1 S. i. 26 = B. The two cases in Judges (vi. 15, xiii. 8) are both assigned to J.

6. גְּבוּל, in the meaning *territory* (but also in E). The phrase *גְּבוּל יִשְׂרָאֵל* in 1 S. xi. 3, 7, xxvii. 1; 2 S. xxi. 5 (all W), is parallel to *גְּבוּל מִצְרַיִם*, Ex. x. 14, 19 (J).

<sup>3</sup> The earliest point to which I am able to trace this theory is De Wette's *Einleitung*<sup>8</sup> (1869), in which Schrader (the editor) identifies one of the two authors of the Books of Samuel with the Theocratic (E), the other with the Prophetic (J) narrator of the Pentateuch.

7. כדברים האלה, in both B (1 S. ii. 23, xvii. 23) and W (xviii. 24).

8. אם עודני חי, 1 S. xx. 14 (*Redactional* according to Budde), may be compared with העודנו חי, Gen. xliii. 27, etc. (J).

9. חי יהוה, a favorite expression of W (1 S. xiv. 39, 45, xx. 3, etc.), but also used in B (xix. 6, xxvi. 10, 16), is not found in the Hexateuch. The nearest approach to it is חי אני (Num. xiv. 21, 28), in a passage of uncertain origin, probably late. It occurs in Jud. viii. 19, referred to J by Professor Moore.

10. החל with ל (generally J, once E) occurs in 1 S. xiv. 35, xxii. 15 (both W). Without ל, 1 S. iii. 2 (= B); in the Hexateuch, Num. xvii. 11, 12 (P); Dt. ii. 31; and Josh. iii. 7 (uncertain).

11. מצא חן בעיני (J, or JE, once D) is found once in B (1 S. i. 18), no less than eight times in W (1 S. xvi. 22, xx. 3, 29, xxv. 8, xxvii. 5, etc.).

12. עשה חסד עם (prevailing J, but also found in E) in 1 S. xv. 6 (B); xx. 8, 14 (R); 2 S. iii. 8, ix. 1, 3, 7, x. 2 (all W). חסד ואמת (J) in 2 S. ii. 6, xv. 20 (both W).

13. טרם is assigned to J; בטרם to E. The former occurs in B (1 S. iii. 3), the latter both in B (1 S. ii. 15) and in W (ix. 13).

14. ידות = parts or portions, Gen. xliii. 34, xlvi. 24 (J), is found in 2 S. xix. 44 (W).

15. היטיב, in the sense of doing good to one, occurs in 1 S. ii. 32 (a late passage) and xxv. 31 (= W). In J, Gen. xii. 16, xxxii. 13; in E, Josh. xxiv. 20.

16. מיטב, in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxii. 4) and in a late insertion (? P) in Genesis (xlvi. 6), is found in 1 Sam. xv. 9, 15 (B).

17. הציני (J, once D) is found in both parts of Samuel, 1 S. v. 2 (B) and 2 S. vi. 17 (W).

18. ותכבד יד, 1 S. v. 6 (11) = B, is found in J, Jud. i. 35.

19. ויאמר אל-לבו, Gen. viii. 21 (J); cf. 1 S. xxvii. 1 (W).

20. דבר על לב, in the sense of 'comforting one,' 2 S. xix. 8 (W); Gen. xxxiv. 3; 1. 21 (E). דבר על לב, in the sense of 'speaking to one's self' (not audibly), 1 S. i. 13 (B), may be compared to לב אל לב, Gen. viii. 21, xxiv. 45. The confusion of על and אל in the current Hebrew text is notorious.

21. שים לב, 1 S. ix. 20, xxv. 25; 2 S. xviii. 3 (all W), is found in Ex. ix. 21 (J). Perhaps we should correct לשום המי אל לבו (2 S. xix. 20) to את לבו after this analogy. But cf. 2 S. xiii. 33 where אל is undoubtedly original. שית לב (also in J, Ex. vii. 23) is found in both parts of Samuel (1 S. iv. 20; 2 S. xiii. 20).

22. **לֹב לֹב** in W (2 S. xv. 6) is similar to Gen. xxxi. 20, 26, of which, curiously, one verse is assigned to E and one to J.<sup>4</sup> That in Samuel the form is pointed as Piel does not disturb the resemblance.

23. **הִתְמַהֵּמָה** (J) occurs in 2 S. xv. 28 (W).

24. **מִנְזוּרִים** (J twice) occurs in both strata of Samuel, 1 S. xii. 2, xvii. 33 (B), and 2 S. xix. 8 (W).

25. **סָפָה** = *to destroy* (J), is found in B (1 S. xii. 25, xxvi. 10) and in W (xxvii. 1).

26. **עָצַב** (J) occurs in 1 S. xx. 3, 34; 2 S. xix. 3 (all W).

27. **עָתָר** (J), in 2 S. xxi. 14, xxiv. 25 (W), also Jud. xiii. 8 (assigned to J by Boehme and Moore).

28. **כַּפְעִים כַּפְעִים** is found in 1 S. iii. 10 (B) and 1 S. xx. 25 (W). In the Hexateuch we find it in Num. xxiv. 1 (J). It occurs also three times in Judges, once probably J (xvi. 20), the other two late (xx. 30, 31).

29. **בַּפְעַם הַזֹּאת** (J and Rje), once in W (2 S. xvii. 7).

30. **צִלְחָה רוּחַ** is a favorite expression of W (1 S. x. 6, 10, xi. 6, xviii. 10, and xvi. 13, which is in a late insertion and evidently imitated from the main narrative). It does not occur in the Hexateuch, but is found in Judges (xiv. 6, 19, xv. 14) in a narrative showing affinities with J.

31. **רַב** = *enough!* is found in J, D, and P (but not in E). The only instance in Samuel is 2 S. xxiv. 16 (W).

32. **רֵעַ** = *a friend*, twice in J (Gen. xxxviii. 12, 20) and once in D (xiii. 7), occurs in 2 S. xiii. 3, xvi. 17, with which we may put **רֵעֵה** xv. 37, xvi. 16 (all W).

33. *To lie down with one's fathers* (in death) is a mark of J (Gen. xlvii. 30; Dt. xxxi. 16 is not certainly J) and occurs 2 S. vii. 12 (B).

34. **שִׂפְחָה** (J where E has **אִמָּה**, but also found in P) occurs a number of times in Samuel; — twelve of them belong to W, two to B.

35. **הַשְּׁקִיף** (four times J, once D) occurs in 2 S. xxiv. 20 (W). With this we may couple **הַנְּשַׁקְפָה** 1 S. xiii. 18 (W) and **נִשְׁקָפָה** 2 S. vi. 16 (W), parallel to which are Num. xxi. 20, xxiii. 28, both commonly assigned to E, though Cornill gives one of them to J.

36. **נִשְׁקַל** with **ל** is characteristic of E. It occurs in 2 S. xiv. 33, xv. 5, xx. 9 (all W). With the direct object it is found in J and in 1 S. x. 1 (W), xx. 41 (Redactional).

37. **מִלֵּט** with a genitive (J) is found 1 S. xiv. 29, 43 (W).

<sup>4</sup> It is altogether likely that this expression belongs to J in both verses.

38. **אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל** (Josh. ix. 6, 7, J) is frequent in W (1 S. xiii. 6, xiv. 22, and ten times in 2 S.) but occurs also in B (1 S. xvii. 19, 24, 25).

39. **אֵבֶן** (Gen. xxviii. 16; Ex. ii. 14, J) in 1 S. xv. 32 (B).

40. **מָאוֹז** (J and JE, once D) in 2 S. xv. 34 (W).

The results of the inquiry to this point may be briefly summed up, as follows: Leaving out No. 9 and No. 16, we find the expressions characteristic of J occurring in W eighty-nine times, in B twenty-five times. But it must be remembered that the extent of B is less than that of W. In quantity they are almost exactly in the proportion of eleven to thirty. Making allowance for this difference we see that the proportion of J expressions in W is only slightly greater than in B. If the two elements were equal in quantity W would show about *nine* J expressions to *seven* in B. This is, to be sure, an appreciable preponderance. But to find out how much it means we should extend our examination to the idioms characteristic of E. Following the list of Holzinger again, we get this result:

1. The *Amorite*, supposed to be characteristic of E, is found 1 S. vii. 14 (B), whereas the *Canaanite* (J) is found in W (2 S. xxiv. 7).

2. **אָכַל לֶחֶם** (twice E, once doubtful) is found in 1 S. ii. 36 in a Deuteronomistic expansion, otherwise in W (1 S. xiv. 28, xxviii. 20, xxx. 12; 2 S. ix. 10). Does not the fact that we have **בָּרַה לֶחֶם** in 2 S. iii. 35, xii. 17, xiii. 5, point to a different source from any in the Hexateuch?

3. **אָמָה** (E, where J has **שִׁפְחוֹה**) occurs twice in B (1 S. i. 11, 16), but nine times in W (1 S. xxv. 24, etc.).

4. **בַּעַל** = *husband*, is found in E where J uses **אִישׁ**. The two words are found close together in 2 S. xi. 26.

5. **בַּעְלֵי**, of the burghers of a city, is used by E (Num. xxi. 28, where, however, the text is doubtful; Josh. xxiv. 11, and a number of times in Jud. 9) and in 1 S. xxiii. 11, 12; 2 S. xxi. 12 (all W).

6. **גִּדּוּל**, of the older child (E), in 1 S. xvii. 28 (B).

7. **חֹכֵכַח**, 2 S. vii. 14 (B); cf. Gen. xxi. 25 (E).

8. **יָפֵה מְרֵאָה** (E) is found in 1 S. xvii. 42 (B); 2 S. xiv. 27 (R). **יָפֵת הָאָרֶץ**, also ascribed to E, occurs in 1 S. xxv. 3 (W).

9. **כָּלְכָל**, in the Hexateuch in E, in 2 S. xix. 33, 34, xx. 3 (W).

10. **נָכַר** (E and D), 2 S. xv. 19 (W).

11. **נָסַח** (generally E or D), 1 S. xvii. 39 (B).

12. **נָשָׂא** = *to forgive* (E, Ex. xxiii. 21; Josh. xxiv. 19) is found in both parts of Samuel (1 S. xv. 25, xxv. 28).

13. **נָתַן** = *to permit*, is also used in both, 1 S. xviii. 2 (B), xxiv. 8 (W).

14. **הצלה**, of the bringing out of Egypt (E and some late passages), is found in 1 S. x. 18, xii. 6 (B).

15. **התפלל** (E, once D), in 1 Samuel always B (1 S. i. 10, 12, 27, ii. 25, vii. 5, viii. 6, xii. 23; 2 S. vii. 27), except the late title 1 S. ii. 1.

16. **פלל** is found in Gen. xlviii. 11 (E); 1 S. ii. 25 (B), but the difference in meaning is so great that argument from one to the other is precarious.

17. **צידה** (generally E) is found once in W (1 S. xxii. 10).

18. **הלך**, which is supposed to characterize E (where J prefers **לכת**), is not found in Samuel. Both parts use **לכת**.

19. **מרגלים** (E) occurs in 1 S. xxvi. 4 (B); 2 S. xv. 10 (W).

20. **שרה וכרם** (E). The plurals are joined in 1 S. viii. 14 (B) and xxii. 7 (W).

21. **משרת**, both in B (1 S. ii. 11, 18, iii. 1) and in W (2 S. xiii. 17, 18).

22. **תמול שלשם**, favorite of E, found in both parts of Samuel with some variation in the form: **בתמול ש'**, 1 S. xxi. 6 (B); **אתמול ש'**, 1 S. iv. 7 (B); **כאתמול ש'**, 1 S. xiv. 21 (W), xix. 7 (B); **מאת ש'**, 1 S. x. 11 (W), etc.

23. **על אודת** (E), 2 S. xiii. 16 (W), where, however, the text is apparently corrupt.

24. The repetition of the proper name in direct address, as, Abraham! Abraham! Gen. xxii. 11, and similar passages in E (Gen. xlvi. 2; Ex. iii. 4, etc.), is duplicated in the call to Samuel, 1 S. iii. 4, 6, 10 (B), as restored from the versions.

The summing up here is to the effect that (leaving out Nos. 4, 18, 23, from which a direct argument cannot be drawn) the vocabulary of E appears in about an equal number of cases in the two strata which we are investigating (W thirty-one, B thirty, if I have counted correctly). Here also we must remember that W is nearly three times the bulk of B. If, therefore, we had the same amount of material in the two cases, B would show nearly three times as many E expressions as are found in W.

The provisional conclusion to which we come is that J shows a perceptibly stronger influence on the white portions of Budde's Samuel than on the blue portions, while E shows a much stronger influence on the blue portions than on the white.

Before we can accept this as an established conclusion it will be necessary to examine a little more closely the nature of the matter distinguished as E. It is already classified by two shades of color, the dark blue being E<sup>1</sup>, and the light blue being E<sup>2</sup>. Taking these

latter sections first, we notice that three of them, at least, have a close resemblance in style and thought. They are 1 S. vii. 2-viii. 22, xii. 1-25, and the intermediate section x. 17-24. In all these sections Samuel appears as the theocratic ruler of the people, and the desire of the people for a king is regarded as sinful rejection of Yahweh. Deuteronomic expressions are found frequently in these chapters,—or rather Deuteronomistic expressions. For example: they turned *after Yahweh* (vii. 2); establish your hearts *to serve* (סָבַר) *him alone; Yahweh our God*; they took *bribes* (שָׁחַד); they forsook me and served *other gods*; if ye fear Yahweh and serve Him and *hearken to His voice*. These expressions recur in these sections, and are familiar to us in the framework of the Book of Judges. The point of view of the author is that of Jud. ii. 6-iii. 6. The sections from 1 Samuel serve as a commentary on that theological essay. The people have been serving Baal. At the invitation of Samuel they put away the strange gods and serve Yahweh. As soon as they do this they are delivered out of the hand of the Philistines, “not by might nor by power,” but by the direct intervention of Yahweh. The result is that Samuel becomes judge and the people apparently have rest as long as he lives. In his old age, however, they are dissatisfied with the conduct of his sons, and will not wait for Yahweh to raise up another judge, but demand a king. The demand is another example of their incurable apostasy. For the hardness of their hearts the king is given them, but in an extended discourse Samuel makes plain their sinfulness in asking him. The whole belongs together, and is an epilogue to the account of Judges conceived in a post-Deuteronomic spirit.

It seems to me, therefore, that we must put these chapters (at least) later than they are put by Budde; that is to say, we must not count them a part of the work of E<sup>1</sup> (not even of E<sup>2</sup>), and that we must not rely upon their resemblances to E; for, of course, if they are Deuteronomistic they are influenced by the vocabulary of J, E, and D.

Again, chapters iv. 1-vii. 1, which are assigned to E<sup>1</sup> by Budde, are markedly different from other sections which he designates in the same way. It is difficult to rely on linguistic indications for a comparatively small section like this. But I find very slight resemblance to E. Only one of the instances given in the vocabulary above as belonging to E falls within this section, while there are some distinct analogies with J. For the present, at least, this portion should be marked with a query. Possibly it may be composite. The plague

of *mice* which appears so unexpectedly in ch. vi. may be derived from a different document from the one which tells only of *tumors* in the preceding chapter.

But the difficulties are not yet all enumerated. In ch. xv. we have an account of Saul's disobedience and rejection, which Budde puts in dark blue: E<sup>1</sup> therefore. But it shows no particular affinities with E above J or D: if they are there at all, I do not discover them. In tone it has nothing in common with iv.-vi., while it has much in common with vii., viii., and xii. Samuel appears as the theocratic arbiter of the nation. He unmakes kings, just as he makes them, at the divine command. And this being so, there is no reason why the next following section (printed in orange by Budde) should not be added to this, since the deposition of Saul is naturally followed by the anointing of his successor. For the comparatively late date of ch. xv. I should adduce the carrying out of the ban, which is the *programme* of Deuteronomy, but which becomes history only when the history is narrated by later authors.

The object of the present paper is to state the question of E and J in the Books of Samuel, rather than to answer it. What I have tried to do is to show exactly what are the resemblances to E and J which make us naturally attribute the greater part of the Books to the Hexateuchal documents. Then in the second place I have tried to point out the phenomena which make against our theory, at least so far as to emphasize the need of caution in this identification.