

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

1-1-1924

Alleged Discrepancies of Second Samuel

Tr. Rehwaldt

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rehwaldt, Tr., "Alleged Discrepancies of Second Samuel" (1924). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 590. <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/590>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES OF SECOND SAMUEL

A Thesis Presented As Partial Fulfillment for the
Degree of Master of Sacred Theology

By

Tr.H.Rehwaldt, B.A.
(University of Wyoming)

Concordia Theological Seminary
St. Louis
1924

CONTENTS

Section	Page
Introduction.....	2
I. Discrepancies Directly Ascribed To Redactors Or Redactional Additions.....	4
A. Saul's Death. 2 Sam. 1, 1-16; 1 Sam. 31, 3-5.....	4
B. Ishbosheth's Age and Reign. 2 Sam. 2, 10. 11; 5, 5.....	9
C. Saul's Dowry. 2 Sam. 3, 14; 1 Sam. 18, 25. 27.....	15
D. Absalom's Sons. 2 Sam. 14, 27; 18, 18.....	19
E. Goliath's Brother. 2 Sam. 21, 19; 1 Sam. 17, 1; 1 Chron. 20, 5.....	22
II. Discrepancies Ascribed To An Alteration In Accordance With Later Views.....	29
A. The Philistine Images. 2 Sam. 5, 21; 1 Chron. 14, 12.....	29
B. Obed-Edom, The Gittite. 2 Sam. 6, 10; 1 Chron. 26, 1. 4-8; 15, 18. 24; 16, 38.....	33
C. Jehovah And Satan. 2 Sam. 24, 1; 1 Chron. 21, 1.....	37
III. Discrepancies The Origin Of Which Is Not Especially Stated By The Critics.....	41
A. The Wood Of Ephraim. 2 Sam. 18, 6; Josh. 17, 15-18.....	41
B. Abishai Or Joab? 2 Sam. 20, 6. 7ff.....	44
C. David's Census. 2 Sam. 24, 9; 1 Chron. 21, 5.....	48
D. Michal's Sons. 2 Sam. 21, 8; 6, 23.....	53
General Conclusion.....	54
Bibliography.....	55

Alleged Discrepancies Of Second Samuel

Introduction

The documentary or redactional hypothesis which in the last forty-five years, since the days of Julius Wellhausen, has also been applied to the Books of Samuel finds a strong support in the alleged discrepancies which are thought to indicate traces of various redactors, editors, and revisers, under whose efforts this book of the Old Testament finally was completed. As concerns this section of the Massoretic Text this theory has been briefly summarized thus:¹⁾

"Our book is not the work of an author, or authors, who narrated in their own or in borrowed language the events contained therein. It is rather the work of one or more redactors who pieced together excerpts from various documents, differing in age, in point of view, and in reliability, and often mutually overlapping and contradictory. These redactors dealt freely with their material, altering, omitting, and supplementing according as it suited their purpose or their religious views. They often tried, more or less skilfully, to hide or gloze over the inconsistencies between the various excerpts, but often, again, they allowed these inconsistencies to remain."

The purpose, then, of this treatise regarding the Second Book of Samuel is to examine the discrepancies, expressly alleged by critical²⁾ scholars. Are the objections raised against the passages involved justified? Must the inaccuracies be ascribed to a certain document, a later redactor, or reviser? Are the discrepancies real or merely apparent? These are the questions which come into consideration.

With regard to each discrepancy the mode of procedure is as follows: (1) Statement of Objections; (2) Summary of Assumptions Involved; (3) Answer to the Assumptions; (4) Conclusion.
.....

1) Segal, M. H. Studies In Bks Of Samuel. Jewish Quar. Rev. Vol. 6, p. 268.

2) While there are many more apparent difficulties in 2 Sam., the majority of which being ascribed to errors in transcription, they are not expressly declared discrepancies by the critics. Compare, e.g., 2 Sam. 3, 3 with 1 Chron. 3, 1: Chileab-Daniel; 5, 25 with 1 Chron. 14, 16: Goba-Gibeon; 8, 1 with Chron. 18, 1: Meheg-ammah -Gath; 8, 17 with 1 Chron. 18, 16; 24, 6; etc.: Ahimelech, son of Abiathar, instead of reverse; 8, 28 with 1 Chron. 18, 17 and 1 Kgs 4, 5: David's sons, priests; 17, 25 with 1 Chron. 2, 13. 16: Abigail's father, Nahash-Jesse; 17, 25 with 1 Chron. 2, 17: Amasa's father, Ithra, an Israelite-Jether, an Ishmaelite; 21, 18 with 1 Chron. 20, 4: Gob-Gezer; 23, 11 with 1 Chron. 11, 13:

The discrepancies have been arranged in the following order:

I. Discrepancies, directly ascribed to redactors or redactional additions:

A. Saul's Death. 2 Sam. 1, 1-16; 1 Sam. 31, 3-5.

B. Ishbosheth's Age and Reign. 2 Sam. 2, 10. 11; 5, 5.

C. Saul's Dowry. 2 Sam. 3, 14; 1 Sam. 18, 25. 27.

D. Absalom's Sons. 2 Sam. 14, 27; 18, 18.

E. Goliath's Brother. 2 Sam. 21, 19; 1 Sam. 17, 1; 1 Chron. 20, 5.

II. Discrepancies, ascribed to an alteration in accordance with later views:

A. The Philistine Images. 2 Sam. 5, 21; 1 Chron. 14, 12.

B. Obed-Edom, the Gittite. 2 Sam. 6, 10; 1 Chron. 26, 1. 4-8; 15, 18. 24; 16, 38.

C. Jehovah and Satan. 2 Sam. 24, 1; 1 Chron. 21, 1.

III. Discrepancies, the origin of which is not especially stated by the critics:

A. The Wood Of Ephraim. 2 Sam. 18, 6; Josh. 17, 15-18.

B. Abishai or Joab? 2 Sam. 20, 6. 7ff.

C. David's Census. 2 Sam. 24, 9; 1 Chron. 21, 5.

D. Michal's Sons. 2 Sam. 21, 8; 6, 23.

.....

Barley-field -lentils; 23, 27 with 1 Chron. 11, 29; Mebunnai-Sibbecai.- For numerical difficulties compare 8, 4 with 1 Chron. 18, 4; 18, 13 with 1 Chron. 18, 12 and Ps. 60, title; 10, 18 with 1 Chron. 19, 18; 15, 7 with 8 Kgs 2, 11; 23, 8 with 1 Chron. 11, 11; 24, 13 with 1 Chron. 21, 11. 12; 24, 24 with 1 Chron. 21, 25.

Alleged Discrepancies Of Second Samuel

I. Discrepancies Ascribed To Redactors Or Redactional Additions:

A. Saul's Death

2 Sam. 1, 1-16; 1 Sam. 31, 3-5.

The first alleged discrepancy in Second Samuel concerns Saul's death. One description of this event is found in 1 Sam. 31, 3-5. It is that of the historian himself. In 2 Sam. 1, 1-16 an Amalekite, bringing the news to David, also describes Saul's death, however in a different manner.

Objections Stated

1)
Henry Preserved Smith says:

"It seems impossible to reconcile the two accounts. The easiest hypothesis is that the Amalekite fabricated his story. But the whole narrative seems against this. David has no inkling that the man is not truthful, nor does the author suggest it. The natural conclusion is that we have here a document different from the one just preceding."

2)
Karl Budde says:

"V. 6-10 widerspricht durchgaengig der Erzaehlung in Cap. 31. Daran, dass der Amalekiter sich mit fremden Federn schmuecken soll, darf man nicht denken, weil die Luege nicht aufgeklaert wird. Dazu kommt der Widerspruch mit 4, 10. Danach hat David den Boten von der Gilboaschlacht eigenhaendig getoetet, und der Vergleich mit v. 11 beweist sicher, dass dieser Bote nicht Hand an Saul gelegt hatte." - Hence he ascribes v. 6-10. 14 ff. to E.

3)
J. Wellhausen says:

"Man koennte allenfalls 1 Sam. 31 und 2 Sam. 1 mit einander vereinigen, wenn die Erzaehlung des Amalekiters fuer erlogen hielte; aber das waere doch nur ein Notbehelf."

T. K. Cheyne lists these accounts as one of the eleven pairs of
4)
"doublets," which he has found in Samuel, and remarks:

"Of these inconsistent reports, the former is evidently the more credible. b (with its discrepant account of Saul's death) was substituted by the editor for a short passage of Da / i. e. "another account of David, also written in Judah and dating from the 10th or 9th century," p. 67, relating how David received the bearer of the evil tidings."
.....

1) The Books of Samuel, p. 254, sub 2 Sam. 1, 1-27.

2) Die Buecher Samuel; p. 193.

3) Die Composition des Hexateuchs u. der histor. B. des A. Testaments, p. 254.

4) Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism, pp. 8 and 12f.

Similar views are also held by Ewald,¹⁾ Bleek,²⁾ Nowack,³⁾ and Dhorme.⁴⁾

Assumptions Involved

The critics, then, while generally admitting that, if the Amalekite's story is a fabrication, the difference in the two reports are accounted for, indicate that it cannot be considered as such and, therefore, relegate this section of 2 Sam. as less credible to a later redactor. Such action is mainly justified on the basis of the following assumptions:

1. The whole narrative seems against the view that the Amalekite was a prevaricator.

2. The author does not suggest it.

3. David has no inkling that the man is not truthful, even not according to 2 Sam. 4, 10.

4. Also 2 Sam. 4, 10 is contradictory to our account, since there David kills the Amalekite with his own hand, whereas here (v. 15) he commands that he be killed by one of his men - all, of which again points to a different document.

Answer To The Assumptions Involved

1. In examining the narrative a person is more apt to gain exactly the opposite impression, namely, that the Amalekite was a prevaricator. Four points have been held against his truthfulness, as will be noted from the following quotations:

5)

Keil, speaking of the Amalekite's story, says:

"It has an air of improbability, or rather of untruth in it, particularly I in the assertion that Saul was leaning upon his spear when the chariots and horsemen of the enemy came upon him, without having either an armour-bearer or any other Israelitish soldier by his side, so that he had to turn to an Amalekite who accidentally came by, and to ask him to inflict the fatal wound."

.....

1) Gesch. des Volkes Israel, III, p. 137 N. 3.

2) Einleitung in das A. T. p. 221.

3) Die Buecher Samuelis, p. 148.

4) Les Livres De Samuel, p. 268.

5) Commentary on the Bks of Samuel, p. 286. Sub 2 Sam. 1, 5ff.

M.H.Segal has found in addition three other reasons why he discredits
1)
the Amalekite. He says:

"His lies stare one in the face. First/2/, he did not, as he says come to Gilboa by mere chance ('ש'777' א' 777' vers 6). He came there either as a combatant, or as a thief to strip the dead and wounded. Secondly/3/, he could not have managed to get right into the thick of the battle—also by mere chance!—and penetrate through the chariots and horsemen, so as to reach the wounded king. Thirdly/4/, if the king had already been overtaken by the enemy's cavalry, he would not have had the time to engage the Amalekite in a conversation (Vers. 7-9)."

2)
Sayce also says:

"The fact that he had robbed Saul's corpse shows that he must have come to the ground after the flight of the Israelitish soldiers; he was, in fact, one of those Bedawin thieves, who, in Oriental warfare, still hang on the skirts of the battle in the hope of murdering the wounded and plundering the dead when it is over and the victors are pursuing the vanquished."

2. It is not believed that the Amalekite was a falsifier, because the author does not suggest it. But such a suggestion would be superfluous:

a. Just in the preceding chapter, 1 Sam. 31, the true account has been related and a special explanation here, then, is unnecessary; and the Jewish commentators have taken this story as a pure fabrication, e.g., Quimchi and
3)
Ralberg, the Jewish mind clearly finding no trouble in understanding the Jewish way of recording history.

b. It is only natural to ascribe the discrepancies, existing between these two accounts, to that stranger, and especially so in view of the parallel account in 1 Chron. 10, 1-5, which harmonizes precisely with 1 Sam. 31, 3-5.

3. Critics claim that David has no inkling that the Amalekite is not truthful—even not according to 2 Sam. 4, 10. In answer to this assumption, the following:

a. Scripture records no statement which says that David really believed the conflicting details of the Amalekite's story. He merely accepts the general truth of Israel's defeat and Saul's death, as testified by the trophies, held by the stranger.
4)

b. How can any one expect to find David's characterization of the Amalekite in 2 Sam. 4, 10, merely to be an allusion to Saul's death! Even
.....

1) Studies In The Bks of Samuel. Jew. Q. Rev. Vol. 8, p. 92f. 3) Segal, ibid. p. 92.

2) The Early History of the Hebrews, p. 395, N. 2.

4) See Segal, ibid. p. 93.

1)
Kittel admits: "Allein es ist nicht ausgeschlossen, dass 4,10 nur kurz zusammen-
fasst, die Haupterzählung 1,6ff. als bekannt voraussetzend."

c. If not 2 Sam. 4,10, then, at least, the following verse (v. 11) seems to imply that David knew what sort of a scoundrel the Amalekite was. Budde, as quoted above, therefore, says, ".....der Vergleich mit v. 11 beweist sicher, dass dieser Bote nicht Hand an Saul gelegt hatte." David, then, speaking the words of verses 10 and 11, certainly knew that the Amalekite was not trustworthy, when claiming that he had killed Saul.

4. The fourth assumption that 2 Sam. 4,10 contradicts v. 15 of 2 Sam. 1 and to infer from it that the adoption of a late redaction is thereby necessitated shows but the weakness of the opposition.

The expression in 4,10, "I took hold of him and slew him," need not mean that David slew the Amalekite with his own hand, not any more than, for example, the expression: "David built round about the Millo inward," 2 Sam. 5,9, means that he constructed this fortress himself without the assistance of his men. The same usage of expression is current this very day.

Conclusion

To resort to any redactional contrivance with regard to these sections and to find a trace of a different document in them is unwarranted. While readily admitting that the two accounts of Saul's death are irreconcilable, we find at the same time that just this should be expected, since the account in 2 Sam. is a fabrication of the Amalekite, made by him in the hope of receiving a reward from the hand of David, 2 Sam. 4,10, and naturally would disagree with the true account of the historian in 1 Sam. 31.

This solution is supported by many testimonies:

2)
A. F. Kirkpatrick says:

"This account of Saul's death is obviously inconsistent with that given in 1 Sam. xxxi. It is useless to attempt to harmonize them, but it is quite unnecessary to assume that we have two different traditions of the manner of Saul's death. The Amalekite's story was clearly a fabrication. In
.....

1) Gesch. des Volkes Israel, II, p. 42.

2) The Second Book of Samuel, p. 52-subl, 16.

wandering over the field of battle he had found the corpse of Saul and stripped it of its ornaments. With these he hastened to David, and invented his fictitious story in the hope of securing an additional reward for having with his own hand rid David of his bitterest enemy and removed the obstacle which stood between him and the throne." 1)

2)
August Koehler says:

"Da nun leicht zu begreifen ist, weshalb der Amalekiter gern sich selbst als den darstellte, welcher den toedtlichen Streich gegen Saul fuehrte, dagegen kein Grund abzusehen ist, weshalb der Erzaeher von 1 Sam. 31, waere die Darstellung des Amalekiters richtig, davon abwich, so ist..... die Darstellung des Amalekiters als eine von ihm mit Bewusstsein gefaerbte anzusehen."

Ehrlich too admits this solution as plausible, while Kittel who otherwise applies the documentary theory in this case discards it. They say,

3)
Ehrlich:

"Dies/i.e., dass die Erzaehlung des Amalekiters eine Flunkerhi sie, die er dem David vormachte/ist sehr plausibel, da der Mann David gegenueber sich als Faktor bei dem Tode Sauls darstellen konnte, lediglich weil er dadurch eine groessere Belohnung fuer seine Botschaft zu erzielen hoffte."

4)
Kittel:

"Allein.....alle Widersprueche zwischen I, 31 u. II, 1 in einzelnen erklaren sich leicht, wenn der Amalekiter David eine Unwahrheit sagt, um sein Dienst zu vergroessern."

5)
Winer's remark in this connection is, indeed, not beside the point:

"In einem andern als einem biblischen Schriftsteller wuerde man gewiss nicht um diese Verschiedenheit willen auf eine Composition des Buches aus zwei Relationen schliessen."

1) So also Stoeckhardt, Bibl. Geschichte, A.T., p. 241; Kretzmann, Popular Com., in loco.

2) Lehrbuch der Bibl. Geschichte A. Testamentes, III. p. 235 N. 3.

3) Randglossen zur Hebr. Bibel, p. 272, -sub 2 Sam. 1, 6.

4) Gesch. des Volkes Israel, II p. 42.

5) Bibl. Realwoerterbuch, Bd II, p. 392.

B.Ishbosheth's Age And Reign.

2 Sam.2,10.11;5,5.

2 Sam.2,10.11 offers a twofold chronological difficulty; One is that concerning the age of Ishbosheth, which according to the M.T. is 40 years, when he becomes king over Israel; the other concerns the duration of his reign, set at 2 years, while in accordance with v.11 and 2 Sam.5,5 we might expect $7\frac{1}{2}$ years.

Objections Stated

1)

J. Wellhausen says:

"Da 2,10b unmittelbar an V.9 anschliesst, so ist V.10a eingeschoben. In Wahrheit ist Isbaal nicht 40 Jahr alt gewesen, sondern noch ziemlich unmuendig und wie es scheint unverheiratet. Auch 2,11 ist eingearbeitet, denn V.10b wird durch V.12 fortgesetzt."

2)

H.P. Smith says:

"The data are suspicious. Ishbaal could hardly have been forty years old, and it seems altogether likely that he reigned more than two years." Again "The authorities are pretty well united in the supposition that 10a.11 are redactional insertions."

3)

Karl Budde says:

"Die Zahlen sind wertlos. Das Alter Isbaals ist unbedingt zu hoch, u. seine Regierung muesste nach v.11 u.5,5 vgl. mit 5,1ff. sieben Jahre gedauert haben, sodass man das $7\frac{1}{2}$ mit Wellhausen ebenso erklaren kann wie $13\frac{1}{2}$. Auch hier wird zunaechst ein leeres Schema eingefuegt sein."

1) Die Composition des Hexateuch u. der histor. Buecher des A.T. p. 256.

*Isbaal, another name for Ishbosheth, cf. 1 Chron. 8, 33; 9, 39.

2) International Critical Commentary, in loco.

3) Buecher Samuelis, p. 204, in loco.

4) Wellhausen has this explanation: "Bezeichnender Weise ist 1 Sam. 13, 1 nur das Schema angegeben; Saul war -- Jahre alt und -- Jahre regierte er; aber die Zahlen sind nicht ausgefuellt; denn die Zwei an der zweiten Stelle ist deutlich falsch und einfach aus $7\frac{1}{2}$ geflossen. Aehnlich 2 Sam. 2, 10; Isbaal war 40 Jahre alt und 2 Jahre regierte er; auch hier ist die Zwei, die gleich dem folgenden Verse widerspricht, aus $7\frac{1}{2}$ geflossen, die Vierzig aber vollkommen absurd, und die ganze Angabe deutlich erst nachtraeglich zwischen V. 9 u. 10b eingesetzt, ebenso wie V. 11 zwischen V. 10b und V. 12." Composition des Hex. u. der histor. B. des A.T., p. 264f.

1)

Thenius-Loehr says:

"10b schliesst sich unverkennbar an v.9 an.V.a ist also eingeschoben. Seine beiden Daten sind unrichtig:1) ist E./I.e., Esbaal /nicht 40 Jahre alt gewesen, sondern stand in noch unmuendigem Alter. Das beweist a) sein ganzes Verhaeltis zu Abner u. b) die Tatsache, dass Saul kein Greis war, als er fiel, und dass Jonathan, sein aeltester Sohn, etwa in Davids Alter stand. Und dieser war bei Saul's Tode B.5,4f. 30 Jahre alt. 2) Hat E. nicht 2 Jahre regiert. Denn waere E. im Ganzen nur zwei Jahre Koenig gewesen, so muessten, da nach v.11 Dav.7² Jahr zu Hebron ueber Juda allein (B 5,5) regierte, nach E.'s Tode 5¹/₂ Jahre vergangen sein, ehe auch die anderen Staemme Dav als Koenig anerkannten 5,1ff; aber diese Anerkennung ist die fast unmittelbare Folge von Abners (der die Sache vorbereitet hatte 3,17ff.) u. Ishoseths Ermordung gewesen."

Similar objections are raised by Bleek,²⁾ Klostermann,³⁾ Dhorme,⁴⁾ Kittel,⁵⁾ Driver,⁶⁾ and others.

Assumptions Involved

I. Concerning Ishbosheth's age:

1. Ishboseth could hardly have been forty years old, when ascending the throne.

2. On the other hand, he was still a minor, as seen a) from his relation with Abner and b) from the fact that Saul was not an old man when he fell and that Jonathan, his oldest son, was of about David's age, who was at the time of Saul's death 30 years old, 2 Sam. 5, 4f.

II. Concerning the reign of two years:

1. It seems likely that he reigned longer than two years, in fact, as long as David did over Judah alone, namely, ca ¹/₂ years, 2 Sam. 2, 11; 5, 5.

2. According to the chronological notation of the Hebrew text (v.10.11) ¹/₂ years—the difference between Ishboseth's and David's reign—must have passed by, before also all Israel acknowledged David as their king; however, his immediate acknowledgment is but the natural consequence after Abner's and Ishbosheth's assassination, especially since Abner had already made preparations to this end, 2 Sam. 3, 17ff.

.....

- 1) Buecher Samuelis, in loco.
- 2) Einleit. in das A.T. p. 230.
- 3) Die Buecher Sam. u. der Koenige, in loco.
- 4) Les Livres De Samuel, in loco.
- 5) Gesch. des Volkes Israel II, p. 190 N. 1.
- 6) Notes on Hebrew T. of Bks of Sam. in loco.

Answer To The Assumptions

I. Concerning Ishboseth's age:

1. In regard to the first assertion that Ishboseth could hardly have been forty years old at his accession to the throne, other considerations indicate that he could have reached that age very well;

a. In the beginning of Saul's reign we find Jonathan, the oldest son of Saul, entrusted with the command over a division of the army, which leads to the supposition that he then already must have been a young man, to say the least. Cf. 3 Sam. 13, 2. 3; 14.

b. Also other of Saul's children seem not so young, e.g., Merab and Michal which shortly after are marriageable. Cf. 1 Sam. 18, 17ff.

c. Saul's long reign of 40 or circa 20 to 22 years favor this age.¹⁾ Furthermore, as will be seen, after Saul's death 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ years elapsed, before Ishboseth became king.

2. Against the claim that Ishboseth was a minor the following may be noted:

a. Concerning his relation with Abner: (a). Ishboseth's appearance as a weakling over against Abner, 2 Sam. 3, 7f., need not necessarily be ascribed to a supposed youthfulness; it may have been due to a lack of physical courage and aggressiveness. (b). The incident concerning Saul's concubine and his remonstrance with Abner also favors this idea.

b. Concerning Saul's age at his death and the age of Jonathan:

(a). The remarks under I, 1, as found above, point to the fact that Saul was an elderly, perhaps, an old man at the time of his death, and necessarily so, if he actually reigned 40 years. No statement in Scripture militates against this view. 1 Sam. 9, 2: "He [Kish] had a son, whose man was Saul, a choice young man," does not make Saul a young man at the beginning of his reign, since the

1) Acts 13, 21 and Josephus, Antiq. vi. 14, 9 have 40 years; others accept ca 20-22 as the length for Saul's reign, including into the 40 of Acts Samuel's judgeship. Cf. Keil, Com. of 1 Sam., sub 13, 1 and Winer, Realwoerterbuch, sub Saul; Koehler, Lehrb. Bibl. Gesch. II, 4. p. 37, N. 5.

original merely has ~~7772~~¹², i.e., a chosen one, excellent, as Keil says, "in the full vigour of youth, probably about forty or forty-five years old." (b). To say that Jonathan was about David's age is a mere conjecture. 2 Sam. 5, 4f. deals only with David's age, when he became king. Even a great disparity in age could have existed between the two, and yet their friendship could have been warm and true, indeed.

II. Concerning Ishboseth's reign of two years:

1. Ishboseth's reign of 2 years is rejected in view of 2 Sam. 2, 11 and 5, 5, according to which passages David reigned $7\frac{1}{2}$ years over Judah in Hebron.

a. But to reject the M.T. on the basis of mere outward appearance and comparison with the length of David's reign is wholly unjustified.

b. The fact that David reigned $7\frac{1}{2}$ years does not necessitate that Ishboseth's reign must be of the same number of years.

c. It is well known that the Hebrew historian at time only notes the simple fact, without describing its development, how it came to be thus. Such was the case with the massacre of the Gibeonites by Saul, 2 Sam. 21, with the flight of the Beerthites to Gittaim, 2 Sam. 4, 3, and this seems to be the case also here.

2. It is held that the Hebrew text (v. 10. 11) shows that $5\frac{1}{2}$ years must have elapsed before all Israel accepted David as their king, while other indications show that he was acknowledged soon after Ishboseth's and Abner's death.

a. V. 10 and 11 only note the length of the terms and do not necessarily place the $5\frac{1}{2}$ years after Ishboseth's death.

b. There is nothing in the way of the supposition that $5\frac{1}{2}$ years elapsed before Ishboseth actually reigned over all Israel. Just the two years, during which Ishboseth reigned, bear out this fact in the following manner:

.....

1) Commentary on Samuel, sub 1 Sam. 9, 1. 2. See also Koehler, Lehrbuch der Bible Gesch. II, 4. p. 37, N. 5.

Verses 8 and 9 of chapter 2 inform us that Abner upon Saul's death brought Ishboseth to Mahanaim, on the east side of the Jordan, and then made him king over Gilead and over the Ashurites, Jezreel, Ephraim, Benjamin, and over all Israel. However, all the West-Jordanic land, immediately after Saul's defeat was again in the hands of the victorious Philistines. It is but reasonable, then, to suppose that before Abner could make Ishboseth king over all Israel, he first had to recover the lost territory, a process easily requiring about $5\frac{1}{2}$ years. This having been accomplished, Ishboseth began his reign of two years, during which period Abner already had made preparations for Israel to accept David also as their king (3, 17ff.), which consequently was done shortly after both, Abner and Ishboseth, were murdered.

Conclusion

The claim that 2 Sam. 10 and 11 are later redactional insertions is unfounded. Not having proof to the contrary that Saul in the beginning of his reign already had grown-up sons and daughters, why should we not believe that Ishboseth, his fourth son,¹⁾ $5\frac{1}{2}$ years after his father's death, was 40 years old?

Budde in a different treatise grants the possibility of this assertion²⁾ when he says: "40 may be explained as a round number."

Likewise A. Kuehnen, setting the length of Saul's reign at only $7\frac{1}{2}$ years,³⁾ finds no difficulty in regard to Ishboseth's age. He says,

"So much is certain, that Jonathan had already reached the age of manhood when his father began to reign (1 Sam. 14), and that shortly after Saul's daughters, Merab and Michal, were marriageable (1 Sam. 18, 17ff.). If he had reached the age of fifty at the time of his elevation to the throne, his son Ishboseth can have been forty (or about forty) seven and a-half years afterwards."

In like manner also the statement about Ishboseth's reign must be upheld. The difference of $5\frac{1}{2}$ years is accounted for on the basis of the two

1) Cf. 1 Chron. 8, 33; 9, 39.

2) Haupt's Critical Ed. of O.T., Books of Sam. Part 8, p. 76.

3) The Religion of Israel, I, p. 185.

preceding verses, 8 and 9. While Ishboseth may have been king over Gilead and other East-Jordanic portions all the while, over all Israel he reigned and could reign only for two years, after the recovery of the lost territory.

This solution is borne out among other testimonies by the following:

1)
Kirkpatrick says:

"The duration of Ishboseth's reign is probably reckoned from the time when Abner succeeded in establishing his authority over all Israel. Five years and a half were occupied with reconquest of the land from the Philistines, and these two years synchronize with the last two of David's reign at Hebron. No great interval seems to have elapsed between the deaths of Abner and Ishboseth, and David's recognition asking of Israel."

2)
August Koehler says:

"Es wird.....2 Sam.2,9.10 im Verhaeltnis zu v.11 mit Ew.Gesch. III,153f.; Dillman, BL.I, 586; Schlier, David S.156; Graetz, Gesch.I, 439; Kl; Erdmann(vgl. auch H.Weiss, David S.140f.) dahin zu verstehen sein, dass es, nachdem Ishboscheth in Mahanaim zum Koenige ausgerufen war u. die ostjordanischen Staemme sich ihm unterworfen hatten, noch eines mehr als fuenfjaehrigen Krieges bedurfte, bis Abner ihm auch das von den Philistern besetzte Westjordanland wieder vollstaendig zurueckerobert hatte, u. dass erst von diesem Zeitpunkte an seine zweijaehrige Herrschaft ueber Gesamtisraël mit Ausnahme Juda's zu datieren ist. Ueber den Gang der Ausbreitung des Reiches Ischboeth's geben v.8 u.9 Auskunft."

.....

1)The second Book of Samuel,in loco.

2)Lehrb.der Gesch.des A.T.,p.246.N.4.

C. Saul's Dowry.

2 Sam. 3, 14; 1 Sam. 18, 25, 27.

2 Sam. 3, 14 compared with 1 Sam. 18, 25, 27 is said to present a numerical difficulty. According to the latter passage, Saul demands as dowry from David one hundred foreskins of the Philistines, which requirement he fulfills and exceeds by killing two hundred enemies. Now in 2 Sam. 3, 14 David says of his wife, thus gained, "Michal, which I espoused to me for an hundred foreskins of the Philistines." Objections have been raised against both passages, as they are found in the M.T.

Objections Stated.

1)

W.M.L. De Wette says:

"Die Angabe 2 Sam. iii, 14 (100 Vorhaute) widerspricht der fruere-
ren 1 Sam. xviii, 27 (200 Vorhaute)."

2)

Karl Budde says of 1 Sam. 18, 27:

"Statt zweihundert bietet LXX nur hundert = 37 אֶבְרָתָי, entsprechend der Forderung v. 25; indessen ist es nichts weniger als sicher, dass das den ur-spruenglichen Wortlaut darstellt. Ein keckes Uebertrumpfen der Aufgabe laege besonders in E.'s Art, und leicht koennten die 200 aus E in J uebertragen sein, um dann nachher von den peinlichen Schriftgelehrten, die die Vorlage von LXX B/i.e. Codex Vaticanus schufen, wieder auf das gebotene Mass beschraenkt zu werden, was allerdings durch אֶבְרָתָי אֶבְרָתָי אֶבְרָתָי (lies so nach LXX u.s.w.) u. II 3, 14 gefordert wird."

3)

S.R. Driver says of 1 Sam. 18, 27, אֶבְרָתָי אֶבְרָתָי :

"LXX אֶבְרָתָי, which both agrees with the express statement II, 3, 14, and also (as We. observes) is alone consistent with the following אֶבְרָתָי אֶבְרָתָי (or better, as LXX² Aq. Theod. Vulg. אֶבְרָתָי אֶבְרָתָי), i.e. completed the tale of them to the king. The change was no doubt made for the purpose of magnifying David's exploit."

4)

H.P. Smith likewise holds that the אֶבְרָתָי אֶבְרָתָי is a change, "intended to

5)

6)

magnify David's zeal"; and Nowack and Cheyne have voiced similar views.

.....

1) Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einl. in die Bibel Alten und N. Test. p. 224.

2) Buecher Samuel, in loco.

3) Notes on The Hebrew Text of Bks of Samuel, in loco.

4) Commentary in loco.

5) Die Buecher Samuelis, 1 Sam. 13, 27.

6) Critica Biblica, Pt 3, p. 231, 1 S. 18, 25-27.

Assumptions Involved

De Wette being the only one expressly stating that these passages contradict one another, the other scholars quoted imply it, when they dispose with the difficulty by alleging a wilful change in the M.T., 1 Sam. 18, 27, and accepting as the true figure 100 throughout. This is done on the basis of the following assumptions:

1. The Septuagint has only $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\delta\upsilon\alpha\varsigma$.

2. This figure agrees with 2 Sam. 3, 14.

3. It is consistent with the $\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ of 1 Sam. 18, 27.

4. There is a motive underlying such changing, the magnification of David.

Answer To The Assumptions

1. With regard to the Septuagint two points should be kept in mind:

a. The $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau$ of 1 Sam. 18 is a variant in a translation, and it is a rule of hermeneutics to abide with the received reading, unless it can be established with certainty that it is false. We know of no cogent reason; ¹⁾ validating the rejection of the M.T.

b. It is a well attested fact that the LXX in not a few instances shows a rationalistic tendency. ²⁾ This change here from 200 to $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau$ illustrates what is meant. Klostermann also calls ³⁾ the $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau$ of the Seventy "eine rationalistische Besserung."

2. No change at all is necessary, and the $\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ of 1 Sam. 18, 27 harmonizes perfectly with the $\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ of 2 Sam. The fulfillment of the contract, so to speak, existing between Saul and David in regard to his marriage with Michal, consisted simply in the capture of 100 foreskins of the Philistines. David, however, slew twice the number of enemies demanded. Later, then, when dealing with Ishboseth concerning the restoration of his wife, it is only

1) Fuerbringer, Theol. Hermeneutik, p. 6, N. 3; cf. also Peck, The Bible, p. 171.

2) Compare, e.g., Gen. 29, 8; Is. 37, 36; Ex. 24, 10. 11; Gen. 2, 2; Jer. 29, 10; Josh. 5, 6 of LXX with M.T. Preuss, Ed., Zeitrechnung der Sept. p. 24ff (Vom Charakter der Siebenzig).

3) Buecher Sam. u. der Koenige, 1 Sam. 18, 25.

natural for David to point back to that contract and its terms, asserting that they had been met by the 100 foreskins. The fact that he had done more than required need not be mentioned.

5. ¹⁾ *וְיָרַד אִתּוֹ אֶל־מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל* means: "He gave them in full number (the foreskins)" to the king, i.e., as many as were captured, including the extra one hundred. Why *וְיָרַד* alone is consistent with this phrase (Driver) needs to be proved. If one hundred already fulfilled all requirements, the others were merely submitted as being supererogatory, which certainly causes no inconsistency as to the agreement between Saul and David nor in the text itself.

4. When recalling that one of David's own heroes, Abishai, slew 300 enemies, as it seems single-handed, 2 Sam. 23, 18, another, v. 8, as many as 800 and then reading that David, "he and his men," 1 Sam. 18, 27, killed only 200 Philistines, a person could hardly call such a changing of 100 into 200 a magnification of David.

2)

Dhorme too holds such a supposition unnecessary over against Budde.

Conclusion

Knowing of no reason which leads to the acceptance of the LXX version in preference to the original, it becomes necessary to accept the M.T. Furthermore, any supposed indications of E or J are imaginary, since the "contradiction" between 2 Sam. 3, 14 and 1 Sam. 18, 25, 27 is a manufactured one and vanishes, in so far as David only asserts the price demanded in 2 Sam. 3, 14, namely, the 100 foreskins of 1 Sam. 18, 25, whereas in 1 Sam. 18, 27 he had actually captured again as many.

This solution is well supported:

4)

G.F. Keil says:

"It/2 Sam. 3, 14/ agrees perfectly with 1 Sam. 18, 25, according to which Saul had demanded only 100. Of this David avails himself in dealing with Ishboeth, because he had here to do only with the price demanded, and not with the circumstances that David had actually brought the double."

.....

1) Gesenius Lexicon, sub: *וְיָרַד*

4) Introd. to the O.T., p. 240.

2) He says: "Il n'est donc pas nécessaire de dire, avec Budde, que les "deux cent" sont passés du récit de E dans J.", Les Livres De Sam., sub 1 Sam. 18, 27.

3) See Fuerbringer, Einleit. in das A.T., p. 31.

1)
Chr.Fr.D.Erdmann says:

"Wenn 1 S.18,27 David 200 Vorhaute der Philister fuer Michal darbringt,dagegen 2 S.3,14 nur von 100 redet,so loest sich auch dieser angeblicher Widerspruch auf,wenn man 1 S.18,25 hinzunimmt,wonach Saul die letztere Zahl von Vorhauten gefordert hatte;nur diese,nicht die wirklich dargebrachten 200 werden an jener Stelle von David erwahnt."

2)
August Koehler says:

"Wenn David nach dem hebraeischen Texte von 2 S.3,14 in anscheinendem Widerspruch mit 1 S.18,27 sagt,er habe sich die Michal um den Preis von 100 Vorhauten der Philister erfreit,so erklaert sich dies daraus,dass der von Saul geforderte Kaufpreis sich nicht hoeher belief u.David die weiter vorgezeigten 100 als freiwillige Dareingabe betrachtete."

.....

1)Die Buecher Samuelis,p.12.

2)Lehrb.der Bibl.Geschichte II,1.p.198.N.1.

D. Absalom's Sons.

2 Sam. 14, 27; 18, 18.

According to 2 Sam. 14, 27 Absalom had three sons. In ch. 18, 18, however, when the reason is stated for the erection of his pillar, he is quoted as saying: "I have no son to keep my name in remembrance."

Objections Stated

1)

Karl Budde says:

"v. 27 puts itself in contradiction with 18, 18 and the mention of the sons without their names is of itself striking."

2)

H. P. Smith says:

"The verse /14, 27/ gives Absalom three sons and a daughter. The harmony of this with 18, 18 is secured by supposing that all the sons died in infancy. But if this were so, the author would have mentioned it ~~here~~."

Again he says:

"The ~~statement~~ /18, 18/ seems to conflict with 14, 27. Of the two, this seems more likely to be original, as it is quite in place to explain why Absalom had a monument in the king's dale."

3)

Thenius-Loehr records the views of Budde, Kittel, and Wellhausen:

"Budde 14, 25-27 In S B an den Rand verwiesen, durch die Farbe als midrashartig bezeichnet.

Kittel 18 aB ist Glosse, vgl. 14, 27.

Wellh. v. 18 Glosse, in Widerspruch zu 14, 27."

Assumptions Involved.

1. 2 Sam. 14, 27 and 18, 18 are contradictory statements, the former passage being a midrash or the latter a gloss.

2. If the supposition, that the sons died in infancy, were correct, the author would have mentioned it here.

3. 2 Sam. 18, 18 seems more likely to be the original, as it is in place to explain the cause for the existence of Absalom's monument.

.....

1) Haupt's Critical Ed. of O. T., Bks of Samuel. Part 8, in loco.

2) Commentary in loco.

3) Die Buecher Sam. Vorbemerkungen, p. lviii and lix.

Answer To The Assumptions

1. The first assumption listed is really twofold. It asserts an addition to the M.T. and a contradiction.

a. Although 2 Sam. is one of the books whose original in instances undeniably has suffered in the course of time and that more than others, nevertheless before any one is justified to conjecture such tampering with the M.T., he must be able to submit evidence to this effect. This is not done.

b. As for the other claim, that we have here a contradiction, it is not necessary to accept this view. *Distingue tempora et concordabunt scripturae*: is the key to a possible solution of this apparent discrepancy. Before the construction of his monument Absalom had children, three sons and a daughter, while later on the sons ¹⁾ may have died.

Ehrlich offers still another explanation, which seems to be in full conformity with Absalom's vanity and his character, in general. He says: ²⁾

"Dieser Passus (2 Sam. 18, 18) fliesst aber wegen *לֹא יָדָע* nicht notwendig aus einer andern Quelle als 14, 27, wonach Absalom drei Soehne hatte. Denn der fragliche Ausdruck mag nicht absolut, sondern nur mit Bezug auf *אֵלֶּיךָ יָשָׁב וְיִזְכָּר* gefasst werden wollen. In diesem Falle waere hier der Sinn: ich habe keinen Sohn, der tuechtig waere, meinen Namen in wuerdiger Weise in Erinnerung zu erhalten."

2. The second assumption that, is the sons died in infancy, the author would have mentioned it here is inconclusive. Neither do we hear that the sons of Absalom were living at this time, which statement is just as forceful as the former, both being based upon the argument from silence. ³⁾

As will be admitted, there are frequent allusions in the Books of Samuel to events which are assumed as being known, e.g., the removal of the tabernacle from Shiloh to Nob (1 Sam. 1, 39; 21, 1ff.); the massacre of the Gibeonites by Saul (2 Sam. 21); the banishment of the necromancers out of the land in the time of Saul (1 Sam. 28, 3); and the flight of the Beerothites to Gittaim (2 Sam. 4, 3). ⁴⁾ In like manner, regardless, of what solution is true, an explanation of this difficulty evidently seemed unnecessary to the

1) So already Bilienthal, *Die gute Sache der goettlichen Offenb.* III, p. 206, #162; Haley, *Discrep. of Bible*, p. 380; Ewald, *Gesch. des V. Israel* III, p. 239, N. 1; Koehler, *Lehrb. der Btbl. Gesch.* II, 1, p. 344, N. 1; Segal, *Jew. Quar. Rev.* Vol. IX, p. 61; the commentaries of Keil, Cook, Kirkpatrick, and Erdmann, in loco.

2) *Randglossenzur Hebr. Bibel*, p. 320, sub 2 Sam. 18, 18. 4) See Keil, *Commentary*, in loco.

3) See chapter on Argument from Silence, *Studies in Bk of Daniel*, R. D. Wilson, p. 1f

21

to the author, and his readers fully understood what he meant to convey. Contrary to general usage the names of the sons are not given, while that of the daughter is mentioned. This alone may have been of a special significance to a Jew, possibly indicating that the sons had died or pointing to some other reason why they were not named.

3. The last assumption, that 2 Sam. 18, 18 seems more likely to be original on account of its explanatory nature, likewise is not justifiable. 2 Sam. 14, 27 is one of the passages introducing the rebellion of Absalom, and it is not unusual for the Hebrew historian to give a few personal data concerning the chief character of the event which is to be related and concerning his family.¹⁾ In any event 2 Sam. 14, 27 is not out of place and seems just as original as the subsequent passage—to use the same argument, also being of an explanatory nature.

Conclusion

One passage does not render the other untruthful nor brands it as coming from a different source. Time brings about a change. On account of the early death of his sons or for some other reason, not mentioned here, Absalom actually had no son to keep his name in remembrance.

.....

1) There are also similar data about Ishboseth's relative, Mephibosheth, cf. 2 Sam. 4, 4.

E. Goliath's Brother.

2 Sam. 21, 19; 1 Sam. 17; 1 Chron. 20, 5.

Three times in the Old Testament do we hear of or about a Goliath of Gath, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam: 1 Sam. 17, David slays Goliath of Gath; 2 Sam. 21, 19, Elhanan, the son of Jaareoregim, a Bethlehemite, slays Goliath the Gittite; and, finally, 1 Chron. 20, 5, Elhanan, the son of Jair, slays Lahmi, the brother of Goliath the Gittite. The difficulty is embedded particularly in 2 Sam. 21, 19.

Objections Stated

T. K. Cheyne lists also 1 Sam. 17 and 2 Sam. 21, 19 as one of the eleven pairs of "doublets", which he has discovered in the Books of Samuel, and remarks:

"In the composite Book of Samuel we find two inconsistent accounts. The one is given in 1 Sam. 17, and is also presupposed in 1 Sam. 21, 9; the other in a very ancient record of David's heroes which states (2 Sam. 21, 19) that Goliath of Gath, 'the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam', was killed in the reign of David by a mighty man of Bethlehem called Elhanan. The author of the Books of Chronicles was much perplexed by this double account of Goliath's death, and to clear away the inconsistency supposed that Elhanan slew not Goliath but Goliath's brother..... like many good men of a later age, he was entangled in the meshes of literalism; that is, he read the Books of Samuel as if they were the work of one writer, and as if they always presented a prosaic, matter-of-fact narrative."

3)
Karl Budde says:

"Aussert wichtig ist nun, dass Elhanan denselben Goljat aus Gat erlegt, den nach I. 17 David selber, u. zwar als Knabe, bezwungen hat. Dass der gleiche Mann gemeint ist, dieselbe aelteste Volksueberlieferung hier und dort zu Grunde liegt, beweist vor allem die Gleichheit der letzten vier Worte mit dem Anfang von I. 17, 7. Die Abstammung aus E dort, aus J oder Vorlage hier, kommt neben dem natuerlichen Triebe der Ueberlieferung, die Thaten der Helden ihrem Anfuhrer beizumessen, dafuer vollkommen auf; aber fuer den Glauben an die Unfehlbarkeit des Buchstabens war es eine harte Nuss. Die Schwierigkeit wurde auf zweierlei Weise beseitigt. Der Midras, aus dem Chr schoepfte, machte aus יֵהוּא בֶן-נֵחֵם ein יֵהוּא בֶן-נֵחֵם, aus יֵהוּא בֶן-נֵחֵם ein יֵהוּא בֶן-נֵחֵם, also Lahmi, den Bruder Gäljats."

- 1) The A. V. has "the brother of Goliath the Gittite," which is not exact.
- 2) Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism I, pp. 8 and 81f.
- 3) Die Buecher Samuelis, in loco.

1).

Thenius-Loehr says:

"Nach unserer Stelle 2 Sam. 21, 19 hat, im Widerspruch mit a 17, Elhanan, der Bethlehemit, den Goliath aus Gath erschlagen. Der Chronist, um diesen Widerspruch zu beseitigen, d.h. David den Ruhm des Goliathtoedters zu erhalten, laesst Elhanan den Lahmi, den Bruder des Goliath, erschlagen."

2)

H.P. Smith says:

"The harmonistic purpose of the Chronicler in making the victim 'the brother of Goliath' is evident."

3) 4) 5)

Nowack, Dhorme, and Ehrlich hold similar views.

Assumptions Involved

1. 2 Sam. 21, 19 being the original account and forming the background for 1 Sam. 17, Elhanan slays the same Goliath as did David:

a. The same phrase is used *וַיַּגִּדְוּ בְּיָמָיו אֶת־גִּלְיָתִים*, 2 Sam. 21, 19 b and 1 Sam. 17, 7 a.

b. The natural trend of tradition is wont to ascribe great deeds of a hero to favorite leaders (Budde⁵⁾).

2. The two accounts in Samuel being inconsistent, the Chronicler harmonizes them to retain the glory of killing Goliath for David.

Answer To The Assumptions Involved

Before answering the assumptions, as they follow, it will be necessary to examine the M.T. of 2 Sam. 21, 19 and 1 Chron. 20, 5. A corruption here or there generally is admitted. The portions in question are the following:

2 Sam. 21, 19 : *וַיַּגִּדְוּ בְּיָמָיו אֶת־גִּלְיָתִים* *וַיַּגִּדְוּ בְּיָמָיו אֶת־גִּלְיָתִים*
1 Chron. 20, 5 : *וַיַּגִּדְוּ בְּיָמָיו אֶת־גִּלְיָתִים* *וַיַּגִּדְוּ בְּיָמָיו אֶת־גִּלְיָתִים*
* *וַיַּגִּדְוּ בְּיָמָיו אֶת־גִּלְיָתִים*

It is evident that the *וַיַּגִּדְוּ בְּיָמָיו אֶת־גִּלְיָתִים* of 2 Sam. was added to the text by an

- 1) Die Buecher Sam. in loco.
- 2) The Bks of Sam. in loco.
- 3) Die Buecher Sam. in loco.
- 4) Les Livres de Samuel, in loco.
- 5) Randglossen zur hebr. Bibel, in loco.
- 6) So also Cheyne, "It is well known that the unconscious legend-making faculty is wont to rob less favoured heroes of their great deeds for the benefit of popular favourites." Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism, I, p. 10.

error in transcription from the line below, where it is the Hebrew for
"weavers."¹⁾

The difference between '79' and 7'9' is merely a matter of transposition, perhaps also caused in Sam. by the accidental insertion of ז'ל7כ'. The form 7'9' seems to be preferable.

In regard to the next phrase, since, as the context in both passages unquestionably shows, these passages are parallel, the question now arises which of the two represents the original, the 57כ' 7077757 ז' of 2 Sam. or the 77כ' 7077757 of 1 Chron. The answer is in favor of Chron.: "Elhanan the son of Jair slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath," for the following reasons:

1. 2 Sam. with its ז' ל7כ' in any event shows marks of corruption, while Chronicles clearly is the purer text.

2. It is hardly probable that Elhanan according to parallel accounts killed two different giants, Goliath, the Gittite, and Lahmi, the brother of Goliath, the Gittite.

3. The difference existing between the parallel passages bears reasonable explanation in favor of Chronicles.

4. While the possibility of the existence of two Goliaths of Gath, one slain by David and the other by Elhanan (1 Sam. 17 and 2 Sam. 21, 19), cannot be denied, such an assumption is rendered highly improbable by the parallel passage of Chron. to 2 Sam. 21, 19 and by the explanations concerning the origin of the difference in the M.T.

The two explanations concerning the origin of the corruption in 2 Sam. 21, 19 are these:

1. The recollection of another Elhanan, the Elhanan of Bethlehem, a celebrated officer of David (2 Sam. 23, 24; 1 Chron. 11, 26) might easily have led to an identification of the Elhanan, the son of Jair, mentioned here and in 1 Chron. 20, 5, with that officer and so occasioned the alteration of 7077757 into 7077757, the radicals being very similar. This alteration was then followed by that of 57כ' 77כ' into 57כ' 77כ', and all the more easily from the fact that the description of Lahmi's spear corresponds word for word with that of Goliath's spear in 1 Sam. 17,²⁾ 7.

.....

1) So Friedrich Delitzsch with others; he says: "Spreiche das erste ז' ל7כ' 2 S. 21, 19 (vgl. 1 Chron. 20, 5), der Blick des Schreibers eine Zeile tiefer

2. According to the second explanation the divergent readings arose from an original also containing the ¹⁾ **לַחֲמִי בֵּיתְלֵחֶם**, namely, in this manner:
 'שֵׁרַיִל בֵּיתְלֵחֶם יָרָא לַחֲמִי בֵּיתְלֵחֶם בֶּן־יָרֵי' ¹⁾

Elhanan, the son of Jair, the Bethlehemite, slew Lahmi, the brother of Goliath, the Gittite.

If this represents the original, as is very plausible, no change in the text took place, but the recurrence of ²⁾ **לַחֲמִי**, as "Lahmi", and the termination of "Bethlehemite", may have confused the transcriber and thus led to the omission of one of the words in each text.

Just which explanation is the true solution for the variance in the texts remains unanswered; ³⁾ however, that the reading of Chronicles: "Elhanan the son of Jair (possibly the "Bethlehemite") slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath ⁴⁾ the Gittite", is the original seems to be the inevitable conclusion. In any case the original readings offered no difficulty.

Having established the reading of the texts, it is in place to answer the assumptions:

1. According to the first assumption, 2 Sam. 21, 19 supposedly being the original account and forming the background for 1 Sam. 17, it is alleged that Elhanan slew the same Goliath as David. This is supported a) by the fact that the same phrase is used, **וְיָרָא לַחֲמִי בֵּיתְלֵחֶם**, 2 Sam. 21, 19 b and 1 Sam. 17, 7 a, and b) by the supposition that the natural trend of tradition is wont to ascribe great deeds of some hero to a popular favorite leader.

.....
 abgeschweift. Das Wort fehlt in G.² Die Lese- u. Schreibfehler im A. Test., #100a.

2) Keil, Commentary in loco.

1) So Graetz, Gesch. I, 427, as Driver says, Notes on Hebr. T. of Bks of Sam., in loco.

2) Holy Bible with Commentary. N.B. p. 448. F.C. Cook.

3) Haevernick remarks: "Die letztere [i.e. Erzählung, 2 Sam. 21, 19] ist uns in einer schwerlich korrekten Gestalt erhalten, wie die Parallelst. 1 Chron. 20, 5 zeigt, u. wiewohl sich ueber die Art der Corruption streiten laesst, so folgt daraus, dass wir unser Urteil hier bis nach ausgemachter Sache zu suspendieren haben." Einleitung in das A.T. II, p. 137.

4) So according to Keil also Piscator, Olericus, Michaelis, Movers, Commentary, sub 2 Sam. 21, 19; Koehler mentions in addition Erdmann, Speaker's Bible z. 2 Sam. 21, 19; Zueckler z. 1 Chron. 20, 5; Roeck, BL. II, 509; Graetz, Gesch. I, 427f.; Seinecke, Gesch. I, 287. Lehrbuch der Bibl. Gesch. p. 194, N. 2.

Contra a) note the following:

(1) The *וְיָרֵךְ אֶת־הַיָּדָיו* is a descriptive expression, denoting the extraordinary size of a weapon. This is brought out clearly by 1 Chron. 11, 23, where the same phrase is used, not in connection with a giant of Gath, but with an Egyptian giant, whom Benaiah, one of David's heroes, slew (v. 22): "He slew an Egyptian.....and in the Egyptian's hand was a spear like a weaver's beam," *וְיָרֵךְ אֶת־הַיָּדָיו*.

The recurrence of such an expression is but natural and should be expected in certain historical accounts and does not at all prove that these are identical. To be consistent it would become necessary for those who argue thus to trace all passages containing this phrase, 1 Sam. 17, 7; 2 Sam. 21, 19; and 1 Chron. 11, 23; 20, 5, to one common source and decide which is the original or, in other words, who in the final analysis was the owner of that spear "whose staff was like a weaver's beam," Goliath, the Gittite, 1 Sam. 17, 7; Lahmi, the brother of Goliath, 1 Chron. 20, 5; or the Egyptian giant, 1 Chron. 11, 23.

(2) 2 Sam. 21, 19 and 1 Sam. 17 are similar events, as among other indications the expression quoted shows; but similar events are not necessarily identical. History is full of occurrences which more or less bear comparison. However, to infer from that that one forms the background to the other is nonsensical.

Contra b) note the following:

(1) That the natural trend of tradition is wont to function in the manner asserted may be possible; but how this rule applies in regard to

1) There is, e.g., the well-known example of the two Presidents Edwards, father and son, both named Jonathan Edwards, the grandsons of clergymen. Both were pious in their youth, were distinguished scholars, and were tutors for equal periods in the colleges where they were respectively educated. Both were settled in the ministry as successors to their maternal grandfathers, were dismissed on account of their religious opinions, and were again settled in retired country towns, over congregations singularly attached to them, where they had leisure to pursue their favorite studies, and to prepare and publish their valuable works. Both were removed from these stations to become presidents of colleges, and both died shortly after their respective inaugurations; the one in the fifty-sixth, and the other in the fifty-seventh year of his age; each having preached, on the first Sabbath of the year of his death, on the text: "This year thou shalt die," Memoir prefixed to the Works of Edwards the younger, p. xxxiv, quoted in Haley, Discrep. of Bible, p. 26f.

1 Sam.17, thus making it a legend, needs to be proved.

(2) On the other hand, there is sure ground for the claim that the account of 1 Sam.17 is historical:

a. The original texts of 2 Sam.21,19 and 1 Chron.20,5 and 1 Sam.17¹⁾ are not inconsistent.

b. The defeat of Goliath by David is presupposed by 1 Sam.19,5; 21,9; and 22,10.

c. It is difficult to imagine how the author of the Books of Samuel or a supposed redactor should have been so thoughtless as to first ascribe the defeat of Goliath, the Gittite, to David and subsequently to one of David's heroes, Elhanan.

d. Taking 1 Sam.17 as a legend, brings us into another difficulty: How is one to explain David's sudden leap into popularity and the jealousy of Saul?²⁾

e. The M.T. of 2 Sam.21,19, as it stands, need not necessarily contradict 1 Sam.17, since there possibly may have been two Goliaths.

Some of these reasons have been mentioned by Koehler, who summarizes the argument in favor of 1 Chron.20,5, as the original reading, and the historicity of 1 Sam.17, as follows:³⁾

"Da,,,,,.....in 2 S.21,19 jedenfalls Textverderbnis (נִי־יָמִית׳ ׳יָמִית׳) angenommen werden muss, da ferner auch anderweitig die Ueberwindung Goliath's durch David in der Zeit Saul's vorausgesetzt wird (21,10; 22,10 vgl. auch 19,5), da weiter der Verf. des Samuelbuches kaum die Gedankenlosigkeit begangen haben wird, David's Kriegeruhm durch seinen Kampf mit Goliath zu fundamentieren u. dann hinterher doch durch Mitteilung einer anderslautenden Ueberlieferung Goliath's Ueberwindung einem andern Helden zuzuschreiben, u. da endlich sich die Entstehung des Textes in 2 S.21,19 aus dem Texte von 1 Chr.20,5 nicht minder leicht erklaren laesst, als die Entstehung dieses Textes aus jenem, so wird die Textgestalt in der Chronikstelle fuer die urspraengliche zu halten u. Goliath's Ueberwindung in der That auf David zurueckzufuehren sein."
.....

1) Budde's remark, as noted above, certainly is beside the point: "Fuer den Glauben an die Unfehlbarkeit des Buchstabens war es eine harte Nuss." It is also unfair, since he must have known—every other critical scholar does—that the M.T. either of Sam. or Chr. has been tampered with, if only accidentally.

2) See Rev. Segal, Studies in the Bks of Samuel, Jew. Quarterly Rev., Vol. 6, p. 300.

3) Lehrb. der Bibl. Gesch. Alten Testam. II, 1. p. 194, N. 2.

22

2. According to the second assumption 1 Chron. 20,5 is a deliberate alteration of the text by the Chronicler, whose design it was to harmonize the inconsistency of 1 Sam. 17 and 2 Sam. 21, 19 and thus retain the glory of defeating Goliath for David. It will suffice to briefly note these two points:

1)
a. As Keil points out, a deliberate alteration of the text, to speak more accurately, an intentional falsification of the historical account is out of the question, as not a single example of anything of the kind can be submitted from Chron..

b. As has been shown, an inconsistency between 1 Sam. 17 and 2 Sam. 21, 19 is only imaginary and even need not be implied if the M.T. of 2 Sam. is accepted in its present form. Furthermore, that 1 Sam. 17 is historical is beyond dispute. Hence, there is no need of harmonizing and no motive impelling the harmonizer.

Conclusion

There is harmony in every way in regard to the passages in question, if considered as herewith suggested: 1 Sam. 17 pictures David as slaying Goliath, the Gittite; 2 Sam. 21, 19 and its parallel, 1 Chron. 20, 5, picture Elhanan as slaying Lahmi, the brother of Goliath. A documentary hypothesis is superfluous.

II. Discrepancies Ascribed To An Alteration In Accordance With Later Religious Views:

A. The Philistine Images

2 Sam. 5, 21; 1 Chron. 14, 12.

After the defeat of the Philistines at Baalperazim it is said of them, 2 Sam. 5, 21: And there they left their images, $\text{וְיָצְאוּ אִלֵּיהֶם}$, and David and his men took them away, $\text{וַיִּשְׂרֹף דָּוִד וְאֶת־בְּנֵי־יָמָיו}$ ¹⁾. The Chronicler, however, reads: And when they had left their gods, $\text{וְיָצְאוּ אִלֵּיהֶם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם}$, there, David gave commandment, and they were burned with fire, $\text{וַיִּשְׂרֹף דָּוִד וְאֶת־בְּנֵי־יָמָיו}$.

Objections Stated

H.P. Smith says:

"The latter [the $\text{וְיָצְאוּ אִלֵּיהֶם}$ of Chronicles], which was also read by G [i.e., the LXX] here, is doubtless the original. A late scribe hesitated to call the idols gods. The Chronicler adds that David burned them with fire, and a similar addition is made by GL [i.e., the LXX edition by Lagarde]. But this seems to have been an addition to accord with the views of later times."

W. Nowack says:

"Es schien dem Chronisten offenbar gegen die Wuerde David's, des Mannes nach dem Herzen Gottes, zu verstossen, dass David diese Gottesbilder heimbrachte, er dachte offenbar an Dt. 7, 5. 25."

Thenius-Loehr says:

"Statt ' $\text{וְיָצְאוּ אִלֵּיהֶם}$ ' bietet der Chron. $\text{וְיָצְאוּ אִלֵּיהֶם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם}$ bewusste Veraenderung des urspr. T.; man wollte den Anstoss beseitigen, dass Dav sich ueberhaupt mit Goetzenbildern nur befasst habe und hatte Dt. 7, 5. 25 vor Augen."

Karl Budde says:

"Was eine spaetere gesinnungstuechtige Hand in M. T. mit dem $\text{וְיָצְאוּ אִלֵּיהֶם}$ bezweckte, hat Chr gruendlicher Besorgt, indem sie b durch $\text{וְיָצְאוּ אִלֵּיהֶם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם}$ ersetzte. Wie konnte David die Goetzenbilder aufheben!"

Assumptions Involved

The quotations involve a number of assumptions, directed against the M. T., thereby labeling it as inaccurate.

- 1) The A. V. translates inaccurately, "burned them"; the R. V. has "took them away."
- 2) The Bks of Samuel, p. 290f. 2 Sam. 5, 21.
- 3) Die Buecher Samuelis, 2 S. 5, 21.
- 4) Die Buecher Samuelis, p. 137f. 2 S. 5, 21.
- 5) Die Buecher Sam. p. 225 in loco.

1. Later influence substituted אלילים for אלהים , the original reading.

2. The אלהים of 2 Sam. has been supplanted in Chronicles by אלילים because a) it accords with the views of later times and Dt. 7, 5 and b) removes the offence against David's dignity as "the man after the heart of God."

Answer To The Assumptions

1. Later influence is said to have substituted אלילים , "idols" for אלהים "gods", a late scribe hesitating to call the idols gods. This conjecture is unfounded:

a. Idols were frequently called "gods", אלילים , a general term for true or false deities, as the context decides. אלילים designates idols in such passages as Ex. 12, 12; Gen. 35, 2. 4; Deut. 29, 18; etc. Even granting that there was a later influence, why, then, should such a change be made?

b. If a change was made through later influence in 2 Sam., ought we not find a similar change in 1 Chron. 14, 12, instead of אלהים אלילים ? How could a late scribe permit the אלילים to be burned!

c. The אלילים of the LXX likewise is a general term, in this case clearly a designation for idols, in harmony with the context and Chronicles.

2. The אלילים in Chron. is said to be a substitution for אלהים of 2 Sam., a) made in accordance with the views of later times and Dt. 7, 5 and b) because of David's piety.

a. The reason given for the supposed change, accordance with the views of later times and Dt. 7, 5, takes the hypothesis for granted that the Pentateuch is a late production, which, however, is far from being established. It will suffice to point to just a few remarks by modern scholars:

1)
James Orr says of Deuteronomy:

"The historical laws and narratives which Deuteronomy presupposes must, in some form, have existed earlier than the present book, if not earlier than the delivery of the discourses."

2)
Robert Dick Wilson:

"That Moses with his education in all wisdom of the Egyptians at

1500 B.C. might have produced the laws of the Pentateuch under the divine guidance seems beyond dispute."

1)

Edouard Naville simply remarks:

"For the Pentateuch, I know only of Moses the author, and Ezra the compiler."

Furthermore, accepting that the Pentateuch is a late production and that there was a different religious view, agreeing with Dt. 7, 5, it does not follow that a substitution was made in this Samuel passage. The נָשַׁף may very well have been followed by David's command to his men that the idols should be burned. Heathen kings even did not always keep the captured gods. In an inscription of Tiglath Pileser I, translated by Sir H. Rawlinson, is found the following sentence:

2)

"I captured this city; their gods, their wealth, and their valuables I carried off, and burnt with fire."

Again, the verb נָשַׁף may mean "to take away" in the sense of destroy, e.g. Job 32, 22; Hosea 1, 6.

b. Another reason for the change in Chron., as is held, is the removal of the offence against David's dignity. However, it is much more in harmony with David's character, as consistently portrayed through 2 Sam., to believe that he in no wise dealt with the images of these Phlistines, as is supposed in the objections and otherwise. To say that David took them away, i.e. home, and preserved them is not agreement with the words of both passages. David was no idolater.

3)

As already mentioned above, נָשַׁף may mean "destroy", and if it is merely to be taken in the sense of "remove", this removal clearly was undertaken for the destruction of the idols.

.....

1) Archaeology of the O.T. p. 130.

2) Babylonian, Armenian and Assyrian Literature, p. 223.

3) Consider here, e.g., a quotation from Jeremias who says: "Conquests were sealed by carrying away the statues of the strange gods and articles of the cultus. In 2 Sam. v. 21 a precedent is recorded of David. In contradiction to pure Jahveh religion, which the Mosaic law required, and which established Jahveh's lordship over the whole world and over all nations, the Jahveh popular religion saw in the gods of the heathen real powers, gods of the land, who were irrevocably bound up with the fate of their territories." O.T. In Light Of The Ancient East. Vol. II, p. 190. - Of Amaziah it is known that he worshipped the conquered gods of the Edomites, 2 Chron. 25, 14; but to make a similar assertion about David is false.

Conclusion

The M.T., then, offers no real discrepancy. While in 2 Sam. we are informed of the capture and removal of the idols of the Philistines, their destruction possibly being implied, the passage in Chronicles definitely informs us of their subsequent destruction with fire in accordance with Deut. 7.

August Kœhler¹⁾ in criticism of Bertheau says:

"Bertheau ist geneigt, die Angabe vom Verbrennen der philistaeischen Goetzenbilder 1 Chr. 14, 12 nur auf eine Schlussfolgerung des Chronisten aus Dt. 7, 5. 25 zurueckzufuehren; aber selbst wenn dem Chronisten fuer seine Angabe keine andere Quelle vorlag, als 2 S. 5, 21, hat sie alle Wahrscheinlichkeit fuer sich, da ja doch nicht anzunehmen ist, dass David die Goetzenbilder in israelitischen Tempeln oder in Museen aufstellte."

C.F. Keil²⁾ says:

"The reading in the Chronicles gives the true explanation of the fact, as David would certainly dispose of the idols in the manner prescribed in the law (Deut. 7, 5. 25)."

.....

1) Lehrb. der Bibl. Gesch. II, 1. p. 279, N. 1.

2) Commentary on Bks of Samuel, p. 324, in loco.

B.Obed-Edom The Gittite.

2 Sam.6,10;1 Chron.26,1.4-8;16,38.

After the sudden death of Uzzah, as related in 2 Sam.6,6.7 the ark of God was placed in the house of Obed-Edom the Gittite, so designated in 2 Sam.6,10(1 Chron.13,13). Now according to 1 Chron.26,1.4-8;15,18.24; 16,38; Num.16,1 this Obed-Edom was a Levite, belonging to the family of the ¹⁾ Korahites, who again were descended from Kohath. - In their statements concerning Obed-Edom some critical scholars implicitly deny the truthfulness of such identity, by calling him a Philistine. If Obed-Edom was a Levite, he could not have been a Philistine, and vice versa.

Objections Stated

2)

H.P.Smith says:

"That the man was a Gittite, and therefore a Philistine, is purposely ignored by the Chronicler, who takes pains to enroll him as a Levite and puts him among the doorkeepers. Of course, as a follower of David and a resident in the land of Israel, he was a worshipper of Yahweh."

3)

Karl Budde says:

"Obed-Edom von Gat (Edom wird einen Gott bezeichnen, vgl. den Nachweis des Gottes bei W. Max Mueller, Asien u. Europa, 315f.) ist sicher ein Philister, aber ebenso sicher ein Diener Davids, wohl schon von Siglag mitgekommen. Die Eigenschaft, der er es verdankt, die Lade beherbergen zu duerfen, ist die unbedingte "Hundetreue", deren hohes Lied, ebenfalls einem Philister gegueber, 15, 18-22 singt. Wer weiss, ob irgend ein Israelit sich bereit gefunden haette, das gefaehrliche Heiligtum aufzunehmen; wer weiss, ob wir nicht zu ergaenzen haben, dass Obed-Edom sich dazu erbet. Natuerlich wird er so gut wie Dabg I 21, 8 Jahwediener geworden sein; aber eine be-greifliche Kuehle in dem uebernommenen Dienst mag ihm seine Kaltbluetigkeit erhalten haben, wo die Uebrigen den Kopf verloren. Sein Haus steht sicher in Jerusalem, aber ausserhalb Koenigsburg. Der Chronik (I 15, 18 u. s. w.) musste der Philister zum Leviten werden, damit sich die Unterbringung der Lade bei ihm rechtfertigte."

4)

W. Newack says:

"Offenbar war dieser Philister Schutzbuenger in Ismael geworden, der als solcher auch die Pflicht des nationalen Kultus auf sich zu nehmen
....."

1) Cp. especially 1 Chron. 26, 4.5 with 26, 1 and Num. 16, 1. There seems to have been another Obed-Edom, a Merarite Levite. See Bible Dictionary.

2) Commentary on Bks of Samuel, sub 2 Sam. 6, 10.

3) Buecher Sam. p. 230.

4) Die Buecher Sam. in loco.

hatte, so begreift es sich, dass Yahwe's Lade bei ihm Staette findet. Der Name des Mannes hat also fuer ihn seine urspruengliche Bedeutung verloren."

1)

David F. Roberts says:

"Obed-edom is an illustration of the service rendered to Heb religion by foreigners, reminding one of the Simon of Cyrene who bore the cross of Jesus (Mt 27, 32, etc.). The Chronicler naturally desired to think that only Levites could discharge such duties as Obed-edom performed, and hence the reference to him as a Levite."

Similar views are held by Klostermann,²⁾ Sayce,³⁾ Thenius-Loehr,⁴⁾ Kittel,⁵⁾ and Driver.⁶⁾

Assumptions Involved.

1. Obed-Edom was a Gittite and therefore a Philistine or some other foreigner.

2. Obed-Edom signifies "servant of Edom", a deity.

3. The Chronicler calls him a Levite to justify the transference of the ark into his care.

Answer To The Assumptions

1. The term Gittite does not necessarily make Obed-Edom a Philistine of Gath or some other foreigner:

a. That גת is a gentile noun from גת is clear. However, several Gaths are mentioned in the Old Testament: (1) Gath, one of the chief cities of the Philistines; (2) Gath-hepher, a city of Zebulun, Josh. 19, 13, and birth-place of the prophet Jonah, 2 Kgs 14, 25; (3) Moresheth-gath, a place named by Micah, ch. 1, 14; and (4) Gath-rimmon, a Levitical city in the tribe of Dan or Manasseh, which was assigned to the Kohathites, Josh. 21, 24, 25. Since Obed-Edom is simply called a Gittite and not, in addition to that, a stranger, as was Ittai, 2 Sam. 15, 19, he may very well have been a native of Palestine. Furthermore, in view of what we know of him in Chronicles that he was a Levite and moreover a Kohathite, it is evident that he hailed from Gath-rimmon or was connected with it, and that for this reason he is designated as the Gittite.

.....

1) International Standard Bible Encycl., sub Obed-edom. 4) Commentary, in loco.

2) Die Buecher Sam. u. Koenige, p. 152 in loco. 5) Geschichte des V. Israel, p. 208

3) The Early Hist. of Hebrews, p. 413. 6) Notes on Hebr. T. of Bks of Sam. p. 206, in loco.

b. Again, supposing that '77 really refers to the Gath of the Philistines, still it does not follow that Obed-Edom was a foreigner. This is corroborated by Koehler:¹⁾

"Dass er ein Philister gewesen sei, und dann einer der 600 Gathiter oder Helden von 2 S. 15, 18 (so Wellhausen, Prolegomena S. 44, 182; Stade, Gesch. S. 272, u. hiezu neigt auch Riehm, HWB. S. 1102), koennte aus dem Beisatze '77 selbst dann nicht gefolgert werden, wenn dieser sich auf die philistaische Stadt Gath bezoege."

In explanation of this conclusion he refers to David's 600, also called Gittites,²⁾ 2 S. 15, 18 and says:

"Da sie sich bereits waehrend seiner Flucht vor Saul um ihn gesammelt hatten (Op. 1 Sam. 23, 13; 25, 13; 27, 2; 30, 9 with 22, 2) und dann mit ihm aus einem Exile im Koenigreiche Gath nach Hebron und Jerusalem gezogen waren (2 Sam. 2, 3; 5, 6), so nannte man sie auch die Gathiter."

2. If Obed-Edom means "servant of Edom" - "Verehrer des (Gottes) Edom", as is held - this definition favors, indeed, the supposition that he was a foreigner. But only so much seems certain that Obed-Edom may mean "servant of Edom." According to Thenius - Loehr W. Max Mueller has only shown from Egyptian inscriptions that there was a god, known as 777.³⁾ He says:⁴⁾

"Auffallend ist..... der Name des Mannes, mit der Bedeutung "Verehrer des (Gottes) Edom." Zwar enthalten die Namen mit 777 nicht immer als zweites Element einen Gottesnamen, Barthgen, Beitrage S. 10; aber doch vielfach, vgl. Beispiele bei Driver. Dazu kommt, dass wir die Gottheit des 77, jetzt durch die aegyptischen Inschriften koennen als erwiesen ansehen, W. Max Mueller."

Driver, referred to in this quotation, leaves the matter just as unsettled.⁵⁾ He says in regard to Obed-Edom:

"The analogy of 7777, and of the Phoenician 7777 7777 7777 7777 7777 (CIS)*....., makes it far from improbable that 777 was the name of a deity; Obed-edom was no Israelite, but a Philistine. At the same time, this reference cannot, at least as yet, be regarded as certain; for no independent evidence of a deity 77, has been discovered hitherto; and though the pr. name 777, 777 occurs at Carthage (CIS. 295), it is not clear that the second element in this is more than the Hebrew (and Phoenician) word 777 "men."⁶⁾

.....

- 1) Lehrbuch der Bibl. Gesch. Alt. Testam. II, 1. p. 314, N. 2.
- 2) Ibidem, p. 295.
- 3) According to Sayce Edom was the wife of the Canaanitish fire-god, Reshpu, Early History of Hebrews, p. 413.
- 4) Die Buecher Sam. sub 2 Sam. 6, 10.
- 5) Notes on Hebrew T. of the Bks of Sam. p. 206, 2 Sam. 6, 10.

*CIS=Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, Tom. I. Parisiis, 1881-1887, containing Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions.

6) In proof "that Semitic names formed with 777 are not necessarily com-

Incidentally Driver offers a different explanation of נָשִׂיךְ-אֶדֹם which is in full harmony with the texts under consideration—simply, "servant of men." Also others explain this name in the same manner.¹⁾

Again, this name may possibly refer to some memorable event in the life of the family of Obed-Edom, as, for instance, to the servitude of one of its members to the Edemites.²⁾ In any event, there is no cogent reason, compelling any one to think of Obed-Edom as indicating that the bearer of this name came from a heathenish stock.

3. In the preceding section the third assumption has already been answered. In so far as Obed-Edom really is a Levite, no justification of leaving the ark in his care is necessary. A Kohathite, furthermore, was especially singled out for the service "about the most holy things," including the ark of the Lord. Num. 4, 4. 5f; 7, 9.

Conclusion

The difference, existing between these passages, is only apparent. Obed-Edom is both a Gittite and a Levite, the former term giving information to the locality from which he comes or with which he was connected, the latter informing us concerning the position which he holds.

A quotation from Blunt's Undesigned Coincidences brings out the harmony still more:³⁾

"We learn from the Book of Joshua, that Gath (distinguished from other towns of the same name, by the addition of Rimmon, Josh. 21, 24) was one of the cities of the Levites; nor of the Levites only, but of the Kohathites, (v. 20) the very family specially set apart from the Levites, that "they should bear the Ark upon their shoulders," Num. 7, 9. If, therefore, Obed-Edom was called the Gittite, from this Gath, as he doubtless was so called from some Gath or other, then must he have been a Levite; and more than this actually a Kohathite; so that he would be strictly in his office when keeping the Ark; and because he was so, he was selected; David causing the Ark to be "carried aside," or out of the direct road, (for that is the force of the expression)⁴⁾ precisely for the purpose of depositing it with a man of an order, and of a peculiar division of that order, which God had chosen for his ark-bearers."

.....
pounded with the name of a deity," Driver points also to Noeldeke, in Euting's Nabat, Inschriften, p. 32f. and Wellh. Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten III. P. 2.

.....
D) Internat. Standard Bible Encycl., sub Obed-Edom.

2) So Kirkpatrick, The Second Bks of Samuel, p. 93, in loco.

3) P. 138 4) See Num. 20, 17 where the same Hebrew word is used, and 22, 23. So Blunt, p. 138.

O. Jehovah and Satan

2 Sam. 24, 1; 1 Chron. 21, 1

According to 2 Sam. 24, 1 God moved David to number the people. In 1 Chron. 21, 1, however, "Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel." Among the objections and statements, implying objections, are the following:

Objections Stated

1)

Lyman Abbott:

He asserts as an inconsistency in the historical narratives "in the Book of Samuel that Jehovah moved David to number Israel, and in the Book of Chronicles that Satan tempted him."

2)

W. Nowack says:

"In Chr. 21, 1 ist /⁶ Subj., eine Veraenderung, die hoechst bezeichnend ist fuer die Wandlung des Gottesbegriffs, die sich inzwischen vollzogen hat."

3)

A. B. Ehrlich says:

"Was hier /² Sam. 24, 1 / dem Zorn JHVHS zugeschrieben ward, wurde jedoch spaeter anders aufgefasst; sich zu 1 Chr. 21, 1."

4)

Thenius-Loehr says:

"Eine spaetere, theologisch fortgeschrittenere, religioes weniger kraeftige Zeit hat J von dieser Thaetigkeit, Suende hervorzurufen, befreit und sie dem Satan zugewiesen, Paralip. c. 21, 1."

5)

Karl Budde says:

"Bis zur Chr ist der Gottesbegriff zu weit vorgeschritten, um die Anstiftung durch Jahwe zu ertragen; aber statt dass die Quelle der Versuendigung in David selbst gesucht wird, schiebt sich mit einem ^{לַעֲשׂוֹת} Satan in die Luecke. Man bemerke, dass er nicht mehr der Anklaeger wie bei Sakarja u. wesentlich noch im B. Hiob (vgl. 2, 3) ist, sondern der Versucher und Verderber auf eigene Faust; dass er dem entsprechend auch nicht mehr ^{מַלְאָכִים} heisst, als der Engel, der jenes Amt versieht, sondern ohne Artikel ^{לַעֲשׂוֹת}, als Eigenname gebraucht."

6)

In Haupt's polychrome edition of the O.T. the same author says:

"The reading of Chr. (1, 21, 1): ^{לַעֲשׂוֹת} must be regarded as a dogmatic development." Similarly W. T. Bade and H. P.

8)

Smith.

.....

- 1) Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews, p. 7. 5) Die Buecher Samuel, in loco.
- 2) Die B. Samuelis, in loco. 6) Bks. of Sam. Part 8, in loco.
- 3) Randglossen zur Hebr. Bibel, III, in loco. 7) O.T. in the Light of To-Day, p. 67, N 4
- 4) Die Buecher Samuelis, in loco. 8) Comment. on Bks of Sam., in loco.

Assumptions Involved

1. 2 Sam. 24, 1 and 1 Chron. 21, 1 are inconsistent.

2. 1 Chron. 21, 1 connotes a change in the text, incited by a dogmatic development, holding a different conception of God and of Satan.

Answer To The Assumptions

1. In regard to the first assumption a twofold answer may be given, showing that there is no inconsistency between these passages.

a. The word used for Satan in 1 Chron. 21, 1 is שָׂטָן without the article, and for that reason may simply be translated "an adversary." This is compatible with good Hebrew usage of the term. ¹⁾ שָׂטָן without the article, in the sense of adversary or opponent, is used in the following passages: 1 Kgs 5, 4; 11, 14, 23, 25; 1 Sam. 29, 4; Ps. 109, 6; Zech. 3, 1; 2 Sam. 19, 22; Num. 22, 22, 32.

Furthermore, that שָׂטָן without the article may be employed in a good sense and also of God is shown plainly by Num. 22, 22 and 32, where the אֱלֹהִים; שָׂטָן becomes an adversary, a שָׂטָן , unto Balaam. Here as well as in Sam and Chronicles, then, God becomes an opponent, but to the good of him whom He opposes, in that He thereby brings the sinner to the acknowledgement of his transgressions.

According to this explanation Chronicles would read: And an adversary i.e. God stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel - in full agreement with 2 Sam. ²⁾

b. On the other hand, accepting the translation of the A.V. with the majority of commentators, yet there is no real inconsistency; for in so far as God granted permission to Satan that he instigate David to take the census, it is correct to say: God moved David, 2 Sam. 24, 1; and in so far as Satan was the one who received the permission, it likewise is correct, when we read: Satan stood up against Israel and provoked David to number Israel, 1 Chron. 21, 1. ³⁾

.....

1) Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebr. Grammar lists שָׂטָן as one of the few instances where the original appellatives have completely assumed the character of real proper names and are, therefore, used without the article. #125, f. - Satan need not be taken in that sense here.

2) Similarly Cook, Holy Bible with Com., in loco, also Haley, Disc. of Bible, p. 333.

3) Cf. Haley, Disc. of Bible, p. 333; Lilienthal, Die gute Sache der Offenb.,

1)

Buddeus pithily remarks:

"Possunt enim et Deus et diabolus ad unum idemque facinus concurrere, sed diverse ratione: hic impellendo et concitando, ille permittendo."

2)

A good summary of this explanation is given by Kirkpatrick:

"The statement that God incited David to do what was afterward condemned and punished as a heinous sin cannot of course mean that He compelled David to sin, but that in order to test and to prove his character He allowed the temptation to assault him. Thus while we read that "God Himself tempteth no man" (James 1, 13), we are taught to pray "Bring us not into temptation" (Matt. vi, 13). In 1 Chron. xxi. 1 we read "Satan stood up against Israel and moved David to number Israel." The older record speaks only of God's permissive action; the latter tells us of the malicious instrumentality of Satan. The case is like that of Job (Job 2, 12, II. 10)."

According to the second assumption the original text of 2 Sam. 24, 1 was changed into that of 1 Chron. 21, 1 by the author in accordance with the views of his days, a period of later dogmatic development. This period is said to have a conception of God and Satan different from that of the older passage in 2 Samuel. There God is conceived of as the source and Satan merely an accuser; while here God ceases to be the instigator of sin, and the devil appears as such, at the same time acting more independently as the tempter and corrupter (Budde). In answer to this assumption note the following:

a. With either of the two explanations of the difficulty, as given above, the assumption becomes untenable, and the changing of the text—a case of which (i.e. a deliberate change), as already mentioned, cannot be found in Chronicles—is rendered unnecessary.

b. Divine truth shows no marks of development; it merely bears repetition. Thus, upon examination, it will be found that God throughout the O.T.

3)

is portrayed as the unchangeable Holy Lord of Israel. James Orr says:

"Already in its first pages—before the word "holy" is yet met with—the O.T. sets itself against sin in heart and deed. Cf. Dillman, Alttest.

Vol. 3, p. 868; Keil, Com. on Samuel, p. 503; also Erdmann, Com. in loco, and others.

1) Historia Ecclesiastica, Sect. III, P. 202.

2) Commentary on Second Bk of Samuel, in loco.

3) Problem of O.T., p. 43f.

Theol. p427. God accepts and vindicates righteous men like Abel, Enoch, and Noah; overwhelms with His judgments a world corrupted by sin; destroys wicked cities like Sodom and Gomorrah. He requires that Abraham shall walk before Him and be perfect; Abraham's assurance about Him is that the Judge of all the earth will do right / Gen. 17, 1; 18, 25, etc. 7. "

In view of this 1 Chron. 21, 1 can hardly show a later "dogmatic development" and place Jehovah upon a higher plane.

The same consistency will be found in regard to the conception of Satan. The devil sinneth from the beginning, throughout the ages appearing as the tempter and corrupter on his own account, not only at a later period, as Budde says, as "Versucher und Verderber auf eigene Faust." But always is Satan kept in check, within certain limitations, by the hand of the Almighty. Thus he appears in the very beginning, Gen. 3, and in later days, Job 1; thus he appears also to Christ, Matt. 4, and in the last days, Rev. 12, 10.

Conclusion

Also in regard to this alleged discrepancy the conclusion is justifiable that it is but apparent. To assume that Chron. has been influenced by later development is unwarranted and brings a person in by far greater and numerous difficulties.

Both of the explanations offered are supported. W. G. Blaikie

1)
summarizes them in this manner:

1/ "According to some commentators, the Hebrew word is not to be translated 'Satan', because it has no article, but 'adversary', as in parallel passages: 2) "The Lord stirred up an adversary unto Solomon, Hadad the Edomite," (1 Kgs 11, 23). Perhaps it was some one in the garb of a friend, but with the spirit of an enemy, that moved David in this matter. 2/ If we suppose Satan to have been the active mover, then Bishop Hall's words will indicate the relation between the three parties: "Both God and Satan had then a hand in the work—God by permission, Satan by suggestion; God as a Judge, Satan as an enemy; God as in a just punishment for sin, Satan as in an act of sin; God in a wise ordination of it for good, Satan in a malicious intent of confusion. Thus at once God moved and Satan moved; neither is it any excuse to Satan or to David that God moved, neither is it any blemish to God that Satan moved."

.....

1) The Second Bk of Samuel in Expositor's Bible, p. 377.

2) According to Blaikie / 6 / is not to be identified with the Lord, but is taken in a general sense as meaning some unknown opponent.

III. Discrepancies The Origin Of Which Is Not Especially Stated By The Critics:

A. The Wood Of Ephraim

2 Sam. 18, 6; Josh. 17, 15-18.

2 Sam. 18, 6 places the battle, which quenched Absalom's rebellion, in the wood of Ephraim, the $\text{אֲרְבֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן}$. In view of Josh. 17, 15-18, where אֲרְבֵי again is used, this battle field naturally is sought west of Jordan.

1)
Various other considerations, however, make it certain that it was on the east side. Also this passage and especially the term $\text{אֲרְבֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן}$ has been attacked.

3) Objections Stated

W. Nowack says:

"Est ist verlorene Muehe Vermutungen darueber aufzustellen, was einst an Stelle von $\text{אֲרְבֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן}$ stand."

4)
Karl Budde says:

"M. $\text{אֲרְבֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן}$, unquestionably wrong; G^L/I. e. Lucian's recension of the LXX $\text{Μαυραρ} = \text{אֲרְבֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן}$ would be good, but is perhaps a guess. We could very well

1) Among others may be listed: (1) Before the battle David was in Mahanaim and Absalom, having passed over the Jordan, in Gilead, 2 Sam. 17, 24. 26; (2) 2 Sam. 18, 3 implies that the battle was fought in the vicinity of Mahanaim; (3) At the close of the battle David clearly still is in Mahanaim, at the city-gate, 18, 24; 19, 8; (4) the return of Joab and the army took place on the same day, a movement, hardly possible, had the battle been beyond the Jordan, 19, 3. 5; (5) if the scene of Absalom's defeat was on the west side of the river, both messengers necessarily would have come "by the way of the plain," $\text{אֲרְבֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן}$ v. 23, i. e. "the floor of the valley through which the Jordan runs" (So Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, p. 482, #12; also G. A. Smith, Hist. Gee. p. 335, M.); but only one takes that route; (6) for some time after the battle David still is on the east side of the Jordan, cf. 2 Sam. 19, 15. 18. 31.

2) So already Lillenthal, Gute Sache der goettl. Offenb. III, p. 211; Ewald, Gesch. des V. Israel III, p. 237, N. 1; Kittel, Gesch. des V. Israel, p. 226; Keehler, Lehrbuch der Bibl. Gesch. A. T. II, p. 354, N. 3; Sayce, Early Hist. of Hebrews, p. 433, N. 1; Kent, Bibl. Gee. and Hist., p. 161; Blunt's Undesigned Coincid., p. 156ff.; Cheyne, Critica Biblica, III, p. 292; the commentaries of Cook, Kirkpatrick, Thenius, in loco; Intern. Standard Bible Encycl.; Bible Dict.'s, sub Ephraim. - Among the few locating the wood of Ephraim west of the Jordan are Keil, Erdmann, commentary in loco.

3) Buecher Sam., in loco.

4) Haupt's Critical Ed. of O. T., Bks of Sam., in loco.

do without the word, but it is hard to account for its origin out of nothing."

Assumptions Involved

1. $\aleph: \aleph \aleph$ is not the original reading.
2. It is unquestionably wrong.

Answer To The Assumptions

1. When assuming that $\aleph: \aleph \aleph$ is not the original reading, the $\aleph: \aleph \aleph$ of the LXX (Lucian's recension) or the form: $\aleph: \aleph \aleph$ ¹⁾, pl. of $\aleph: \aleph$, a gentile name for an ancient Canaanitish tribe beyond the Jordan, has been deemed preferable. Concerning all these forms, however, nothing certain has been established, and, as Budde admits, it is hard to account for the origin of $\aleph: \aleph \aleph$ out of nothing.

As regards the Septuagint, the Vatican edition expressly has the translation of the original: $\kappa\alpha\iota \ \epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\tau\omicron \ \delta \ \nu\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma \ \epsilon\tau \ \epsilon\tilde{\nu} \ \delta\epsilon\mu\omega\tilde{\nu} \ \epsilon\phi\theta\alpha\iota\mu$, and this at the same time discredits the $\aleph: \aleph \aleph$ as well. It seems but reasonable to retain the M.T. and more so in view of the following.

2. No argument has been advanced why the $\aleph: \aleph \aleph$ is "unquestionably wrong." On the other hand, various reasons have been found which explain why this $\aleph: \aleph$ on the east side of the Jordan is called the $\aleph: \aleph \aleph$ $\aleph: \aleph$:

a. The "wood of Ephraim" was a continuation of the great Ephraimitic forest, west of the Jordan.²⁾ Kent writes of ³⁾ "wild hills and deep ravines still clad with great groves of oaks, whose spreading branches often reach down to only a few feet from the ground. The traveller through that region to-day has little difficulty in picking out in imagination the great oak whose extended branches he can picture catching and holding the head of the fleeing Absalom."

b. On the basis of Jg. 12, 4 it has been suggested⁴⁾ that there was a settlement of Ephraimites in that respective district, who attempted to have a lot there as well as Manasseh, being from the first dissatisfied with their portion, Josh. 17, 14-18.

.....

1) So Graetz, *Gesch.* I, 443 accord. to Koehler, *Lehrb. Bibl. Gesch.* II 1, p. 354, N. 3.

2) Cook, *Holy B. with Com.*, in loco.

3) Kent, *Bibl. Geo. and Hist.*, p. 161.

4) A. Henderson in *Hasting's Dict. of Bible*, sub Ephraim. Cf. also G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geo.*, p. 335 N.

c. The name may have had its origin from other transactions—think, e.g., of the naming of the Teutoburger Wald in Germany—in which the Ephraimites took part, such as the slaughter of the Midianites, Jg. 7, 24, 25, or preferably, their own slaughter, Jg. 12, 6, mentioned also by Josephus.¹⁾ In the latter occurrence almost all the fighting men of Ephraim found their death. Rightly, therefore, Blunt says:²⁾

"Now an event so singular, and so sanguinary, was not likely to pass away without a memorial; and what memorial so natural for the grave of a tribe, as its own name forever assigned to the post where it fell, the Acaldema of their race?"

Conclusion

Upon examining what criticism has to offer in rejecting the M.T. and in the way of suggesting possible corrections, it is but natural to conclude that אֶפְרַיִם, after all, is a more reasonable, in fact, the correct reading.

In regard to this apparent difficulty the following remark is noteworthy:³⁾

"Thus does a seeming error turn out, on examination, to be an actual pledge of the good faith of the historian; and the unconcern with which he tells his own tale, in his own way, never pausing to correct, to balance, or adjust, to supply a defect, or to meet an objection, is the conduct of a witness to whom it never occurred that he had anything to conceal, or anything to fear, or, if it did occur, to whom it was well known, truth is mighty and will prevail."

Another testimony is offered by G.A. Smith:⁴⁾

"And, indeed, why should it be thought unlikely that the name Ephraim should have crossed the river, and fastened on the eastern bank? In the course of the history of that tribe, especially in the days of the Judges, a hundred adventures were likely to occur to cause the Ephraimites, who so frequently passed over, to leave their name behind them when they went back."

.....

1) Antiq. of Jews, Bk v. Sec. II.

2) Blunt's Undesigned Coincidences, p. 157.

3) Ibid. p. 158

4) Historical Geo. of Holy Land, p. 335. N. 2.

B. Abishai Or Joab?

2 Sam. 20, 6. 7ff.

2 Sam. 20, 6 ff. presents another difficulty revolving about one term, that of 'אֲבִישַׁי'. According to v. 6 Abishai is commissioned to follow after the rebel Scheba; but according to v. 7ff. Joab, though degraded (2 Sam. 19, 13), appears as the commander. Against 'אֲבִישַׁי', various objections have been raised.

Objections Stated

1)

August Koehler says:

"Statt Abischai ist Vers 6 mit Syr.; Jos. ant. vii, 10. 6; Thenius; Stachelin, David S. 85; Wellhausen, vgl. auch Boettcher, zu lesen Joab. Denn dieser erscheint weiterhin als die Hauptperson bei der aus Jerusalem zur Verfolgung ausrückenden Besatzung, vgl. besonders Vers 7. 8. 10b. 11. Beider Lesart des massoretischen Textes, welcher z. B. Kl. Erdmann, Speaker's Commentary; Ew., Gesch. III, 262; Graetz, Gesch. I, 289; Stade, Gesch. S. 291; Weiss, David S. 242, folgen, ist die Erzählung ohne willkürliche und dabei vielfach unwahrscheinliche Eintragungen nicht zu verstehen."

2)

S. R. Driver says:

"Pesh. אֲבִישַׁי' rightly; otherwise, as v. 7 speaks only of the 'men' of Joab, the mention of Joab in v. 8 is unprepared."

3)

Thenius-Loehr says:

"'אֲבִישַׁי' dass Syr statt dessen אֲבִישַׁי' liest, bedeutet an sich wenig. Wohl aber ist das ganze folgende cap. ein unabweishares Argument dafür, dass 'א' in אֲבִישַׁי' zu ändern ist: v. 7 sind die Leute Joabs, das "Heer" B8, 11, doch wohl unter Jos' Führung zu denken, nachdem es Amasa nicht gelungen ist, den Heerbann zusammenzubringen; in v. 9b weiss man nicht, wo Jo herkommt, wenn er nicht vorher gewahrt ist; in v. 10b wird Jo an erster Stelle genannt, nach ihm Abisai; in v. 11 hat die Forderung: wer—der folge Joab! keinen Sinn, wenn Jo nicht Generalissimus ist; im ganzen cap., beachte v. 13, 16ff. 22, erscheint er als solcher."

Assumptions Involved

The M. T. is rejected on the basis of the following assumptions:

1. With the reading of the Hebrew original the narrative can be understood only by making arbitrary and to a great extent improbable al-
.....

1) Lehrb. der Bl. Gesch. A. T. II, 1. p. 361, N. 3. Koehler here is quoted since he follows Wellhausen. See above.

2) Notes on Hebr. Text, Bks of Sam., in loco.

3) Buecher Samuelis, in loco.

lowances.

2. The entire subsequent portion of the chapter, v. 6ff. is ^aconvincing argument in favor of אֲדָוָה, the reading of the Syr and Jos. ant. vii, 10.6.

Answer To The Assumptions

1. In answer to the first assumption the attention may be directed to the following points:

a. To reject the M.T. in favor of Syr. and Josephus, which translations, as is admitted, signify little (Thenius-Loehr), while all other versions favor אֲדָוָה, is much more arbitrary, to say the least, and wholly unjustifiable.

Again, the words אֲדָוָה and אֲדָוָה¹⁾ graphically are so different that a scribal error or some other accidental change seems out of the question. A rationalistic tendency, then, especially, the desire to explain Joab's presence v. 8.9f. evidently is at the bottom of the variant reading; and this is in full agreement with Josephus' character and that of the Syriac in comparison with the M.T.

b. With אֲדָוָה as the accepted reading v. 7 becomes superfluous. But this is not the case when אֲדָוָה is retained, in which event the statement becomes striking: "And there went out after him I.e. Abishai, since Joab had been degraded and the new commander, Amasa, had not yet returned Joab's men."

c. Finally, as long as there is not one cogent reason for rejecting it, the original reading must be preferred to אֲדָוָה. His presence, as assisting his brother or as a soldier, is nothing exceptional; and his commanding position afterward is explained by Amasa's murder, the removal of his only rival.

The various explanations given for this difficulty are all but arbitrary and certainly are probable. Some of them are herewith submitted:

2)
Keil's explanation:

"This difficulty can hardly be solved in any other manner than by the simple assumption that David had told Abishai to go out with Joab, and

1) So Ehrlich, Randglossen zur Hebr. Bibel, in loco; also Keil's Com., p. 454, N.

2) Commentary on Bks of Samuel, p. 453f.

that this circumstance is passed over in the brief account in ver. 6, in which the principal facts alone are given, and consequently the name of Joab does not occur there."

1)

The explanation of Clericus:

"Mention has hitherto been made simply of the command given to Abishai, but this included an order to Joab to go as well; and there is nothing to preclude the supposition that Joab's name was mentioned by the king, although this is not distinctly stated in the brief account before us."

2)

Ehrlich's explanation:

"Die Sache ist jedoch einfach. Der obige Auftrag Davids an Amasa zeigt zwar, dass er diesen an Joabs Statt eingesetzt hatte, wie er ihm nach 19, 14 versprochen. Joab war also nicht mehr Heerfuhrer, aber er hoerte deshalb nicht auf, Krieger zu sein und als solcher zog er nun mit der Mannschaft unter der Fuehrung Abisais raus." 3)

4)

Erdmann's explanation:

"Joab war ja noch offiziell der Oberbefehlshaber Davids, wenn dieser auch unbesonnen und unklug genug aus vermeintlicher politischer Klugheit dem Amasa die Uebertragung des Oberkommando versprochen hatte; die Entsendung des Amasa zur Zusammenbringung des gegen Seba zu schickenden Heeres war zwar ein durch jenes Versprechen veranlasster Schritt Davids; aber noch war dem Joab seine Oberbefehlshaberstelle nicht genommen. Jedoch nicht mit ihm, sondern mit Abisai, seinem Bruder, spricht David ueber Amasa's Verzoeigerung und deren Folgen, weil er mit ihm ohnehin widerwaertigen Joab um so weniger jetzt etwas zu tun haben mochte, als demselben die Entsendung des Amasa mit jenem Auftrage hatte befremdlich sein muessen."

5)

H.P. Smith simply says:

"As Joab is in disgrace it seems more natural that Abishai should be called upon. Joab apparently accompanied the expedition in a subordinate position. But his energy and habit of command made him the real leader."

2. In the various explanations, given above, already is found the answer to the second assumption. Viewed in the light of one possible explanation alone, the latter section of chapter 20 becomes rather a convincing argument for the M.T.

.....

1) As recorded in Keil's Com., p. 453f.

2) Randglossen zur Hebr. Bibel, in loco.

3) In a similar manner also Kirkpatrick, Com. in loco, also Sayce, Early History of the Hebrews, p. 436.

4) Buecher Samuelis, in loco; similarly also Budde, Die Buecher Sam., in loco.

*Taking 2 Sam. 19, 13 as a promise to Amasa and not as the degradation of Joab itself, this explanation has much in its favor.

5) Commentary on Second Sam., in loco.

In regard to v.10ff.it may be added,as before intimated,that,s'nce Amasa was dead,Joab naturally returned to his former position of commander-in-chief,regardless of the commission to Abishai.This is shown especially by v.22, and his degradation by the king was tacitly set aside.¹⁾

Conclusion.

Considering that the Hebrew original is well attested,that there is not one valid reason against it,and that the difficulty permits a reasonable explanation,it becomes necessary to accept the M.T.
.....

1)Liekwise Sayce,Early Hist.of Hebrews,p.436.

C. David's Census.

2 Sam. 24, 9; 1 Chron. 21, 5

The passages concerning David's census apparently disagree:

Men of Israel	Men of Judah
2 Sam. 24, 9: 800,000	500,000
1 Chron. 21, 5: 1,100,000	470,000

Objections Stated

1)

Karl Budde says:

"The numbers are, of course, of no authority; Chronicles (1^c, 21, 5) actually gives us 1,100,000 and 470,000. There is a remote possibility, by striking out there ל'אלפים שבעים and ל'אלפים שבעים , of restoring the original and approximately credible 100,000 and 70,000."

2)

W. Nowack says:

"Die Zahlen sind ausserordentlich hoch: nach Jd c 5 stellt Israel zu jenem grossen Entscheidungskampf unter Debora-Barak etwa 40,000 Mann; von Dan ziehen nach Jd c 17 600 Mann nach dem Norden; Gideon bietet von seinem Geschlecht 300 zur Blutrache auf Jd c 8, 3ff. Selbst wenn man in Erwägung zieht, dass Israel inzwischen die vorisraelitische Bevoelkerung aufgesogen hat, so erscheinen doch diese Zahlen noch immer sehr hoch; wir wuerden fuer die Gesamtbevoelkerung des unrisenen Gebietes eine Bevoelkerung von etwa 5-6 Million anzunehmen haben, eine Bevoelkerung, die dies Gebiet nicht zu ernaehren vermoechte. Die Zahlen koennen demnach auf geschichtliche Treue keinen Anspruch erheben."

3)

A. Kuehnen says:

"We find.....most conflicting statements side by side.-The numbering of the people under David results in showing that Israel could bring 800,000 men into the field, and Judah 500,000 (2 Sam. xxiv. 9). The numerical proportion of Israel to Judah, which was given so entirely different in 1 Sam. xi. 8; xv. 4 (not as 8 to 5, but as 10, nay 20 to 1), surprises us here, besides the enormous figures. But in addition to this, the result of the same numbering in Chronicles is 1,100,000 men from Israel, and 470,000 from Judah (1 Chr. xxi. 5). Who will venture to depend upon such contradictory figures? Who does not recognize in them estimates in round numbers, derived, not from authentic records, but from the imagination of the writers?"

.....

- 1) Haupt's Critical Ed. of O. T., Bks of Sam., in loco.
- 2) Die Buecher Samuelis, in loco.
- 3) Religion of Israel, Vol. I, Notes on Ch. II, p. 173f.

Assumptions Involved

1. The figures are contradictory, derived from unauthentic records.
2. A population of 5-6 million for Palestine, as implied by the figures, is too high.

Answer To The Assumptions

In answer to the first assumption the following facts should be kept in mind:

a. The present day knowledge of the Hebrew mode of recording figures is deficient. The variations may be due to different methods of reading the original signs, which themselves harmonize. R. D. Wilson makes this statement: 1)

"As to the variations in numbers in the different sources, they are probably due to different readings of the original signs. But we do not know what signs the Hebrews used; and so we cannot at present discuss intelligently the reasons for the variations, and never shall until the system of numerical signs used by the Israelites has been discovered."

b. Numerical signs especially are very liable to suffer corruption; but this surely does not render the historical record itself unauthentic.

2)
Rawlinson observes:

"Nothing in ancient MSS. is so liable to corruption from the mistakes of copyists as the numbers; the original mode of writing them appears in all countries of which we have any knowledge to have been by signs, not very different from one another."

3)
Isaac Taylor expresses himself in a similar way:

"No parts of ancient books have suffered so much from errors of inadvertency as those which relate to numbers; for as one numeral letter was easily mistaken for another, and as neither the sense of the passage, nor the rules of orthography nor of syntax, suggested the genuine reading, when once an error had arisen, it would most often be perpetuated, without remedy."

Therefore, he adds:

"Hence nothing can be more frivolous or unfair than to raise objections against the veracity or accuracy of an historian, upon some apparent incompatibility in his statement of numbers." 4)

.....
1) Is Higher Criticism Scholarly? P. 53.

2) Historical Difficulties of O. and N.T., p. 9, quoted in Haley, Discrep., p. 21f.

3) Transmission of Ancient Books, p. 24, 25, as quoted in Haley, Discrep. p. 24.

4) In this connection it is interesting to note Orr's observation: "A curious illustration of the facility of error is afforded by the fact that, in the very act of stating the large number of Jeroboam's army in 2 Chron. xiii. 3

c. While the difference in the numbers in these passages may have been caused by a corruption of one or both texts, yet there is reason enough which points to the contrary. Speaking of the instances of numbering in the O.T., twelve in all, William Smith submits among others these considerations: (1) Great pains were taken to ascertain and register the numbers of the Jewish people at various times; (2) the readings with but trifling variations are the same as those presented by the LXX and by Josephus; (3) the fertility of Palestine in former times was much greater, making a dense population possible; and (4) there is the positive divine promise to the Jews of great populousness.

Again it should be noted that throughout this section the chronicler has varied considerably from its parallel in 2 Sam. in the way of paraphrases, abridgment, explanation, and addition; but especially that the result of the census in this case was not inserted in the annals of the kingdom, 1 Chron. 27, 24. Perhaps, then, an agreement was not at all intended by the author, 2 Sam. having a different basis of figuring than 1 Chron.. 1 Chron., e.g., may have recorded the sum total, while 2 Sam. has only a part of it.

d. Various solutions have been offered. Of these the simplest is as follows: 1 Chron. 27, 1-5 informs us that David appointed 24,000 men for service in each month under twelve different commanders, which presupposes a standing army of about 300,000 men. This figure, while included in 1 Chron. 25, 1 and omitted in 2 Sam. 24, 9, accounts for the difference existing between these passages.

More in detail the explanation is as follows:

"There were twelve divisions of generals / 1 Chron. 27, who commanded monthly, and whose duty was to keep guard on the royal person, each having a body of troops consisting of 24,000 men, which, together, formed an army of

in Smith's Dict. of Bible, i. p. 113, the 800,000 is misprinted 300,000." Problem of the O.T., p. 390, N. 9.

1) Dict. of Bible 1918 and Mc Clintock and Strong Encycl., sub census.

2) Cook, Holy B. with Com., sub 2 Sam. 24, 9.

3) Cf. Lilienthal, Gute Sache d. Goettl. Offenb., Vol. 3. p. 217ff.; Pfeiffer, Dubia vexata; Haley, Discrep. of Bible, p. 389.

4) Davidson's explanation, as given in Com. of Jamieson-Fausset-Brown, sub 2 Sam. 24, 9.

288,000; and as a separate detachment of 12,000 was attendant on the twelve princes of the twelve tribes mentioned in the same chapter, so both are equal to 300,000. These were not reckoned in this book, because they were in the actual service of the king as a regular militia. But 1 Chronicles 21, 5 joins them to the rest, saying, 'all those of Israel were one million, one hundred thousand; whereas the author of Samuel, who reckons only the eight hundred thousand, does not say, 'all those of Israel,' but barely 'and Israel were,' etc.. It must also be observed that, exclusive of the troops before mentioned, there was an army of observation on the frontiers of the Philistine's country, composed of 30,000 men, as appears by ch. 6. 1; which, it seems, were included in the number of 500,000 of the people of Judah by the author of Samuel; but the author of Chronicles, who mentioned only 470,000, gives the number of that tribe exclusive of those thirty thousand men, because they were not all of the tribe of Judah, and therefore does not say, 'all those of Judah,' as he had said, 'all those of Israel,' but only, 'and those of Judah.' Thus both accounts may be reconciled (Davidson." 1)

2) Accepting the numbers, as they stand, the population of Palestine would amount to about five or six million, the possibility of which has been denied, however, without good ground;

The immense ruin-fields of modern Palestine testify of the former fertility and of the fact that the land could support such a population.

2)

A.P. Stanley says:

"The countless ruins of Palestine, of whatever date they may be, tell us at a glance that we must not judge the resources of the ancient land by its present depressed and desolate state. They show us not only that 'Syria might support tenfold its present population, and bring forth tenfold its present produce,' but that it actually did so."

3)

C.F. Keil says:

"There is no ground, however, for regarding the numbers as exaggerated, if we only bear in mind that the entire population of a land amounts to about four times the number of those who are fit for military service, and therefore 1,300,000, or even a million and a half, would only represent a total population of five or six million, - a number which could undoubtedly have been sustained in Palestine, according to thoroughly reliable testimony as to its unusual fertility."

4)

A.F. Kirkpatrick says:

"The numbers have been attacked as exaggerated, and far exceeding the possible capacity of the country. The numbers given imply a total

1) R.D. Wilson met with a similar discrepancy: "I once inquired what was the population of a certain Southern city. One told me 40,000; another, 120,000. When I asked for an explanation of the discrepancy, I was told that there were 40,000 whites and 80,000 Negroes. Both estimates were true; but had they been written down in two different documents what charges of inconsistency might not have been made by future scientific historians!" Is H. Crit. Scholarly?, P. 53.

2) Sinai and Palestine, quoting Moore, Consul-General of Syria. He adds: "It is needless to adduce proofs of a fact as well attested, both by existing vestiges, and by universal testimony, as the populousness of Syria, not only in the times of the Jewish monarchy, but of the Greek kingdom, the Roman

5

population of five or six Millions at least, and the area of the country is estimated at about 11,000 square miles. This gives (making allowance for the excepted tribes) between 500 and 600 to the square mile, a high but not impossible rate of population when the extreme fertility of the country in ancient times is taken into consideration. The ruins with which Palestine is covered in every direction proves that the population was exceptionally dense."

Finally, those who regard a population of five or six million for David's kingdom as impossible may lose their doubt in contemplation of modern Belgium, which is about of the same size as Palestine with an area of 11,373 square miles. The population in 1910 was 7,423,784 or 652 to the square mile.¹⁾

Conclusion

In view of our meager knowledge of the Hebrew system of numerical signs and the possibility of an accidental change in the text no one is justified to speak of numbers," derived not from authentic records, but from the imagination of the writers; on the other hand, in view of possible solutions and knowing of nothing which militates against such a large population, it again is more reasonable to accept rather than to reject the M.T. of these passages.

.....

empire, and the middle ages" P. 120 and N. 2.

3) Com. on Second Sam. p. 505. Cf. also Raumer, Palaestina, 2nd edit., p. 89; pp. 427f.

4) Second Bk of Samuel, in loco.

.....

1) The Standard Reference Work. 1920. Sub Belgium.

D. Michal's Sons.

2 Sam. 21, 8; 6, 23.

In 2 Sam. 6, 23 the judgment of barrenness was pronounced upon Michal. Later on, however, in 2 Sam. 21, 8 we read of five sons of Michal

whom she bare ¹⁾ to Adriel, אֲדִיֶּלֶת בְּרֵיתֵי מִיכָל חַמְטֵי בְּרֵיתֵי אֲדִיֶּלֶת
בְּרֵיתֵי אֲדִיֶּלֶת בְּרֵיתֵי מִיכָל חַמְטֵי בְּרֵיתֵי אֲדִיֶּלֶת

No objection has been raised against these passages in any of the writings previously quoted, the reason being that the Hebrew original of 2 Sam. 21, 8 has suffered through transcriptions, as is generally recognized. But since in recent days ²⁾ "Michal's" sons have been held up as a contradiction to 2 Sam. 6, 23, a few explanatory remarks are in place.

An explanation given occasionally is that Michal had children during the fourteen years that she was the wife of Phalti, i.e., before she was condemned to the reproach of childlessness. However, 2 Sam. 21, 8 mentions five sons whom Michal bare to Adriel, the son of Barzillai, the Melohathite, who cannot be the same as Phaltiel or Phalti, the son of Laish of Gallim, Michal's former husband, 1 Sam. 25, 44; 2 Sam. 3, 15. But Adriel was the husband of Merab, Michal's sister, 1 Sam. 18, 19, and, accordingly, it is plain that either אֲדִיֶּלֶת is a scribal error for אֲדִיֶּלֶת ⁴⁾ or that an additional phrase has dropped from the M.T., e.g., אֲדִיֶּלֶת בְּרֵיתֵי מִיכָל חַמְטֵי ⁵⁾ אֲדִיֶּלֶת, Merab, the older sister of Michal.

In any event to find a real contradiction in regard to the sons of Adriel and 2 Sam. 6, 23 is absurd.
.....

- 1) The A.V. has "whom she brought up for Adriel", but אֲדִיֶּלֶת means "bare."
- 2) So, for example, in a recent debate staged in New York by Dr. C.F. Potter versus Rev. J.R. Straton.
- 3) Cf. The Bible Champion, Vol. 30, No. 3, p. 122 and also The Lutheran Witness, Vol. XLIII, No. 10, p. 190.
- 4) In agreement with Lucian's recension of LXX and other MSS. of LXX; Vulg.; Targ.; Pesh.; cf. also the commentaries of Keil, Erdmann, Kirkpatrick, Smith, Nowack, etc., etc.
- 5) So Jonathan in prophetæ chaldaice ed. de Lagarde, as given in Klostermann's Com., in loco.

37

General Conclusion

In conclusion it can only be explicitly stated what already has been intimated in connection with the various discrepancies that the documentary hypothesis rather than supported by the alleged difficulties stands refuted by them. No redactional contrivance is necessary to account for the discrepancies, which are but apparent; and if real contradictions exist, "it is more likely that they were not in the ancient documents and that they arose in the process of transmission through the vicissitudes of many centuries"¹⁾ than that they should have been inserted or caused by a later redactor.

.....

Wilson, Is H.C. Scholarly? P. 38f.

Bibliography

Commentaries and Critical Studies of Second Samuel.

- Budde, Karl: Die Buecher Samuel. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum A.T., D. Karl Marti. Marti, Abt. VIII. Tuebingen u. Leipzig. 1902.
- Budde, K.: The Books of Samuel. Critical Ed. of the Hebrew Text (Polychrome). Paul Haupt. Part 8. Leipzig 1894.
- Cheyne, T.K.: Aids To The Devout Study Of Criticism. Part I. The David-Narratives.
- Cheyne, T.K.: Critica Biblica. Part III. First and Second Samuel. London 1903.
- Cook, F.C.: Holy Bible with Commentary. London 1872.
- Dhorme, Le P. Paul: Les Livres De Samuel. Paris 1910.
- Driver, S.R.: Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel. Oxford 1890.
- Ehrlich, Arnold B.: Randglossen zur Hebraeischen Bibel. Dritter Band. Leipzig 1910.
- Erdmann, Chr. F.: David; Die Buecher Samuelis. Bielefeld und Leipzig 1873.
- Keil, C.F.: Commentary on the Books of Samuel. T. and T. Clark. 1866.
- Kirkpatrick, A.F.: The Second Book of Samuel. London 1884. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.
- Klostermann, August: Die Buecher Samuelis u. der Koenige. Noerdlingen 1887. Kurzgefasster Kommentar, Strack u. Zueckler.
- Nowack, W.: Handkommentar zum A.T., Die Buecher Samuelis. Goettingen 1902.
- Segal, M.H.: Studies in the Books of Samuel. Jew. Quarterly Rev. Vol. V. VI. VIII-X.
- Smith, Henry Preserved: The Books of Samuel. The International Critical Commentary. New York 1902.
- Thenius-Loehr: Die Buecher Samuelis. Kurzgefasst. exegetisches Handbuch zum A.T. Vierter Band. Leipzig 1898.
- Wellhausen, J.: Die Composition des Hexateuch U. Der Histor. Buecher Des Alten Testaments. Berlin 1889.

Histories and Historical Works.

- Ewald, Heinrich: Geschichte Des Volkes Israel. Bd III. 2 Aufl. Goettingen 1853.
- Kittel, Rud.: Geschichte Des Volkes Israel. Bd II. Dritte Auflage. Gotha 1917.
- Koehler, Aug.: Lehrbuch der Bibl. Geschichte Alten Testaments II, 1. Erlang. 1884.

Kuenen, A.: The Religion of Israel. Trans. by Alfred Heath May. Vol. I. London 1874.

Smith, Henry Preserved, : O.T. History. International Theol. Library. 1906.

Sayce, A.H.: The Early History of the Hebrews. London 1899.

Introductions To the Old Testament.

Bleek, Friedrich: Einleitung in das A.T. 4 Auflage v. J. Wellhausen. 1878.

De Wette, W.M.L.: Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einl. in die Bibel Alten u. Neuen Testaments. Berlin 1852.

Fuerbringer, L.: Einleitung in das A.T. St. Louis 1913.

Haevernick, H.A. Ch.: Einleitung in das A.T. II. Erlangen 1839.

Keil, C.F., Introduction To The O.T. Translated from Second Edition. Vol. E. T. and T. Clark. 1866.

Miscellaneous.

Orr, James, The Problem Of The O.T. New York 1914.

Wilson, R.D., Is Higher Criticism Scholarly? Philadelphia 1922.

Haley, John W., Alleged Discrepancies Of The Bible. 1874.

International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia.

Encyclopaedia Biblica, Cheyne and Black.