
A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

work which ye dare not perform!' Here is scornful humour, as there is 'pleasant' humour in the comparison of the 300 to dogs.

But why were they to watch 'from Mount Gilead'? For two reasons. *First*, because the war was west of Jordan, while Gilead was east; Gideon bids them seek safety *beyond the river*, just as the Hebrews did in the days of Saul (1 Sam. xiii 7). *Secondly*, Gilead is mentioned because Gideon's words did not come from an emendator's study, but hot from the field of battle. Looking eastward down the valley of Jezreel Gideon points to the hills of Gilead, and says to the deserters, 'Watch from yonder heights the issue of the battle'.

TWO PASSAGES IN DAVID'S LAMENT.

(2 SAM. i 19 AND 21.)

THE first recorded exploit of Jonathan took place on a rocky crag near Michmash. The crag was all but inaccessible, but Jonathan went up on hands and feet, slaying the Philistines and creating a panic (1 Sam. xiv 1–16). His last deeds also were performed on the heights; he fell fighting by his father's side in the mountainous district of Gilboa. Without doubt he deserves the eulogy passed on the mighty men of Gad that 'they were as swift as the roes (or gazelles, *ṣĕbā-īm*) upon the mountains' (1 Chron. xii 8).

The lament over Saul and over Jonathan (rather 'over Jonathan and over Saul') begins with the words:—

'Gazelle (הַצְּבִי) of Israel, art thou slain upon thy high places?'

Such is the Massoretic text, and I venture to say that it contains as much poetry, good sense, and good grammar as any of the emended readings. Its chief rival, the Septuagint text, deserves consideration no doubt, but it is open to two criticisms: (1) it is not so personal and direct in its appeal; it is *less living*; (2) it is undoubtedly corrupt after the first two words.

Στήλωσον, Ἰσραήλ, ὑπὲρ τῶν τεθηνκότων ἐπὶ τὰ ὕψη σου τραυματιῶν.

Here there is a doublet: *either* ὑπὲρ τῶν τεθνηκότων and ἐπὶ τὰ ὕψη σου represent the same group of Hebrew letters, *or* τεθνηκότων and τραυματιῶν are doublets. There is a variation between codd. A and B, but the reading of A seems to be secondary. The conflate reading of B gives us the nearest approximation to the original Greek which can be obtained without emendation.

But it is the first two words which really matter. The Greek text opens David's lament by suggesting to Israel the erection of a tomb-

stone, various emendators suggest to Israel that she should *be grieved* (הֶעָצְבִי Klostermann and H. P. Smith), while according to the Massoretic text David only asks, 'Can it be true that the mountain-warrior of Israel is lying dead upon his mountains?' David cannot yet bring himself to pronounce his friend's name; he is content to describe him as 'the Gazelle of Israel'.

But this is impossible, say the grammarians, for a noun in construction does not take the article. True, but the initial letter of הַצְּבִי is *not* the article, but the interrogative particle. 'In some instances the context alone can decide whether the prefix ה is a mark of Interrogation or for the definite article.' For an instance of the interrogative particle being followed by *dagesh*, we need look no farther than 2 Sam. iii 33,

הַכְּמוֹת נבל ימות אבנר

'Should Abner die as a fool dieth?'

This passage illustrates, it will be seen, a more important matter than spelling. Here a dirge of David begins with a sudden and direct question; then why not also in 2 Sam. i 19?

The question asked in fresh anguish at the beginning of the dirge is answered in resigned sadness towards the close (ver. 25). The two verses (19 and 25) are antithetical: they are framed to correspond one to the other. The first asks,

'Gazelle of Israel, art thou slain upon thy high places? (How are the mighty fallen!)'

The second answers,

'(How are the mighty fallen!) Jonathan, thou art slain upon thy high places.'

I am almost ashamed to remind the reader that the editor of Samuel in the *International Critical Commentary* questions the text of this verse on the ground that the pronoun ('*thy* high places') 'must refer to Israel in order to make sense'. Had not Jonathan (in the poet's eyes) made the high places *his own* by his deeds and by his death?

If all emendation is to be rejected in ver. 19, the case of ver. 21 is somewhat different. The suggestion to strike out the copula in the phrase וּשְׂדֵי תְרוּמֹת seems to be reasonable. The parallelism of the verse is improved by this slight change. And the change is slight, for the omission (or addition) of the copula is one of the commonest various readings in the MSS of the Hebrew Bible. The verse will then stand thus:—

Ye mountains in Gilboa, let there be no dew;
And let there be no rain upon you, O fields of Terumoth:
For there the shield of the mighty was cast away,
The shield of Saul, as if he had not been anointed with the oil.

The expression שדי תרומת, 'fields of Terumoth', is not easy to explain. The word תרומה is common in the ritual books of the Pentateuch in the sense of 'offering', or specially 'heave offering' (Lev. vii 14 *al.*). It is possible that in the book of Samuel the word bore some less specialized sense, e. g. 'height'. The whole expression might then mean something like 'mountain slopes'. If, on the other hand, we are compelled to translate 'fields of offerings' (LXX ἀγροὶ ἀπαρχῶν), the reference may be to offerings made on the battlefield by the Philistines in thanksgiving to their gods for their victory.

The literalism of the modern commentators (and of the LXX) is illustrated not for the first time in this poem by their treatment of the words, 'Not anointed with the oil',

בלי משיח בשמן

The word *anointed* is the Hebrew word 'Messiah', and the emphatic addition 'with the oil' seems to fit best with the view that the poet is thinking of the sacred oil with which kings were hallowed (1 Sam. xxiv 6; xxvi 9). But the temptation to drag in a little antiquarian knowledge, and at the same time to make an emendation of the Hebrew, has proved too strong for commentators. Shields were treated with fat or oil to prevent them from cracking and to make the surface slippery (Isa. xxi 5, משחו מנן). Wellhausen proposed further to read משוח for משיח as more suitable in reference to a material object. The shield is cast away, no longer oiled and cared for! How laboured does the subject of the shield become!

Surely the poet is leading us to think rather of the fallen hero than of his belongings. Step by step he takes us,

'The shield of the mighty ones is cast away.'

Yes, many valiant ones have fallen!

'The shield of Saul.'

Yes, the great leader himself lies on the field!

'As though he had not been anointed with the oil.'

Yes, the man whom JEHOVAH had hallowed for Israel lies dead!

There is one writer whom we have recently lost, whose services to Hebrew learning are very great, whose work the readers of this note would doubtless expect to find referred to here. I will only say that in writing this note I have carefully weighed all that Dr Driver has written on these verses. If I dissent from his views it is with silent respect for a great scholar.

W. EMERY BARNES.