הָעָלֶיהָ, 1 Sam. ix. 24.

BY MACY M. SKINNER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

IN 1 Sam. ix. we have part of the older narrative of Saul's appointment as king over Israel. Saul had been sent out by his father in search of the lost asses, and, unsuccessful in his quest, had turned aside at his servant's suggestion to consult the man of God. Samuel had been forewarned by Yahweh of Saul's coming and bidden to anoint him king over Israel. Accordingly he made a sacrifice in preparation for the event and invited some thirty (seventy according to the LXX) guests to the meal. On Saul's arrival he was conducted by Samuel to the feasting hall and placed in the seat of honor at the head of the table. Samuel then turned to the cook and said, "Bring the portion which I gave thee, of which I said unto thee, 'Set it by thee;'" whereupon the narrative continues, "and the cook took up הַשּׁוֹק וְהָעָלֶיהָ and set (it) before Saul." The A.V. and the R.V. translate this phrase by "the thigh and that which was upon it." But this rendering is not satisfactory. Even if the text were pure, the exact significance of "what was upon it" would not be clear.[1] The whole verse is corrupt, especially the middle portion, but we shall confine ourselves here to the term הָעָלֶיהָ.

The first consideration is to decide whether הָעָלֶיהָ can be, in its present form, a part of the original text. If so understood, the ה would have the force of a relative. But the employment of ה as a relative is not sanctioned by the usage of classic Hebrew.[2]

(*a*) With a verb form in old Hebrew its construction depends simply on the punctuation. By departing from the Massoretic point-

[1] Rashi and Kimchi, probably following the Targum, interpret the expression as equivalent to הירך. See their comment, *ad loc.* The explanation offered by Dath., *Lib. Hist.* p. 221, note b, and Maur., *Comment.* vol. 1, p. 159, *jus quocum caro edebatur, i.e.* broth with which the meat was eaten, is fanciful and unsupported.

[2] Cf. Ewald's *Lehrbuch der heb. Sprache*, § 331[b] 1 and *note;* Davidson's *Syntax*, § 22, Rem. 4; and especially Driver's *Samuel* on 1 Sam. ix. 24.

ing,[3] we may read the participle instead of the perfect 3d singular (*e.g.* for הַבָּאָה, Gen. xviii. 21, read הַבָּאָה, Qal ptcp. fem., and for הַנּוֹלַד, Gen. xxi. 3, read הַנּוֹלָד, Nif. ptcp. masc.), and thus obtain a legitimate and common classical Hebrew construction.[4] The cases where the construction depends on the consonants are substantiated, and being all in the later writings[5] seem to point to Aramaic influence.

(*b*) With a preposition (Gr. τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῆς) the article is not used at all, unless the passage under consideration be such a case. Accordingly, as Driver remarks, "the usage here is doubly exceptional and entirely unsupported by precedent or parallel." We cannot then consider הָעֲלִיָּה, as it stands, part of the original text.

A number of scholars holding this word העליה to be a text corruption have favored emending it to a noun.

(*a*) הָאַלְיָה, 'the fat-tail.' This was first suggested by R. Johanan[6] (rather, however, as interpretation than as emendation), and is given in turn by Houbigantius,[7] Geiger,[8] Wellhausen,[9] Driver,[10] and Budde.[11] This word, however, occurs only in the ritual of P, and always denotes a sacrificial portion burned on the altar.[12] There is no evidence that the אַלְיָה was used as human food.[13] "In old Israel," says W. Robertson Smith, "all slaughter was a sacrifice."[14] The fat of the slaughtered animal, as we learn from 1 Sam. ii. 15, 16, was regularly burned. אליה is classed as fat in Ex. xxix. 22[15]; Lev. viii. 25, ix. 19, as evidently as it is included under the general term חֵלֶב in such passages as Lev. iii. 9 and vii. 3. On Lev. iii. 9 Dillmann states

[3] As we are justified in doing, for the Massoretes themselves are inconsistent in their pointing. Cf. Gen. xii. 7 and 1 Kings xi. 9, also Gen. xxxv. 1, xlvi. 26.

[4] הַהֹלֶלָה (Ezek. xxvi. 17) may be ptcp. Pu'al without מ; cf. אֹכֵל (Ex. iii. 2). In Jer. v. 13 we are probably to read with the LXX הַדָּבָר (so Hitzig) or consider with Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, § 156, 2), a), דִּבַּר as a noun, meaning *speech*.

[5] 1 Chron. xxvi. 28, xxix. 17; 2 Chron. i. 4, xxix. 36; Ezra viii. 25, x. 14, 17. In middle Hebrew, Joshua x. 24 הֲהָלְכוּא is an isolated case of the third plural with ה relative; but this is evidently a text corruption from הַהֹלְכִים (so Driver).

[6] See comment. of Kimchi on 1 Sam. ix. 24.

[7] *Notae Criticae*, vol. i. p. 297.

[8] *Urschrift*, p. 380.

[9] *Text der Bücher Samuelis*, p. 72.

[10] *Samuel*, pp. 57, 58.

[11] *The Books of Samuel*, p. 58.

[12] See Benzinger's *Heb. Archäologie*, p. 456. 5 and *note* 1.

[13] That in the East to-day this part of the sheep is considered a rich and delicate morsel (Driver) does not prove that it was used as food in ancient Israel.

[14] *Religion of the Semites*, p. 223.

[15] It is interesting to note, however, that the LXX in this passage does not represent האליה.

that if the LXX be followed in iii. 9 and vii. 3, and ו placed before האליה, another view will be obtained by which האליה did not belong to the fat forbidden as food. If this emendation be accepted, the significance of חלב, in iii. 9 at least, becomes obscure. However, even if we should grant that the text as emended is the correct one, האליה, as in Ex. xxix. 22 and Lev. viii. 25, would still apparently be classed as fat by virtue of its position between חלבו (or, if ו be considered the connective, החלב, the initial ה having been lost after the final ה of the preceding word) and ואת־החלב המכסה את־הקרב in Lev. iii. 9, and between ואת כל־חלבו and ואת־החלב המכסה את־הקרב in Lev. vii. 3. The general prohibition of eating fat, in Lev. iii. 17, even though it limited itself to the three chief sacrifices, would still apply to האליה, which, according to the view stated above, is specifically mentioned as fat in iii. 9 and elsewhere.[16]

(*b*) הַכְּלָיָה, 'the kidney,' was suggested by Klostermann.[17] Budde correctly rejects this emendation, on the ground that this word is never employed in the singular in the O.T. הכליה is also open to the same objection as האליה; namely, that we have no evidence of its being used as human food. It was burned upon the altar.[18]

There is, further, a syntactical objection which might be urged against seeing a noun in the word under discussion. The accusative sign את is employed with השוק, but not with העליה. The usage in Samuel is strongly in favor of the employment of את with the second of two objects connected by ו if the first is so introduced.[19] I have found forty-five cases, in 1 and 2 Samuel, in which two or more objects under the same verb are connected by ו and the first is introduced by את. Of these, five cases occur in which את is not repeated with all the objects. Only two of these five are cases in which *two* objects closely connected in sense are united by ו (1 Sam. vii. 3 and xxx. 20). In 1 Sam. vii. 3 את is omitted with the second object, possibly because of the intervening expression הַנֵּכָר מִתּוֹכְכֶם, which apparently is sufficient to weaken the construction and allow the omission of את. Cf. 1 Sam. vii. 4 את־הבעלים ואת־העשתרת, where the same word עשתרת occurs with את. In the other passage (1 Sam. xxx. 20, אֶת־כָּל־הַצֹּאן וְהַבָּקָר), הצאן and הבקר are

[16] For a discussion of this term, in which the two opposing views as held by the Karaites and the Rabbanites are set forth, see Geiger's *Urschrift*, pp. 467–469.

[17] *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*, p. 29. Thenius (*Die Bücher Samuelis*) interprets העליה as referring to 'the kidney,' without, however, emending the text to הכליה.

[18] Ex. xxix. 13; Lev. iii. 4, 5, *et passim*.

[19] I am indebted to Prof. D. G. Lyon for this suggestion.

evidently treated as a unit and defined by the term כל, the את being prefixed to the expression considered as a whole.[20]

It is noteworthy that the versions do not lend support to either of the above mentioned emendations, האליה or הכליה.

There is a possibility then that העליה may represent a verb form.[21]

(*a*) If we should consider this verb a part of the original text, we might with some degree of probability emend the present text to וַיַּעֲלֵיהָ. The change required is very slight. Moreover, a certain completeness of detail, such as we might expect to find in early Hebrew prose narration,[22] is obtained. The cook, whose position, if this view be correct, was probably at the foot of the table, at Samuel's command raised the *shōḳ*, bore it up, and placed it before Saul.

(*b*) The word העליה may represent a gloss to וַיָּרֶם,[23] as רום was the technical word for 'heaving' the offering before Yahweh.[24] The form of the gloss was possibly הַעֲלָה (Hiph. perf.), and when it became incorporated into the text, the final ה was considered suffix of the 3d fem. singular, and a *yod* introduced as the last letter of the stem. If considered a gloss, the probable view is, that the expression וירם השוק was written before the phrases שוק הַתְּרוּמָה, הֵרִים תְּרוּמָה, had become stereotyped in the ritual. When once they had become technical, a scribe added the gloss in I Sam. ix. 24 to explain that in this passage the words had a meaning different from that ordinarily assigned to them, and also conceivably to remove offence.

[20] The above reasoning assumes the correctness of the Massoretic text in I Sam. vii. 3, xxx. 20. But in the first of these passages it is not improbable that העשתרות is a gloss. In that case the passage offers no exception to the rule. In xxx. 20 likewise, as is agreed by Wellhausen, Driver, and Budde, the Massoretic text is corrupt. Without discussing this passage at length, I should like to suggest (possibly this has been done before, but if so it has escaped my notice) that the original form was

ויקחו את כל הצאן והבקר נהגו לפניו ואמרו זה שלל דוד

i.e. and they took (for themselves) the צאן, while the בקר they led before him and said, This is David's spoil. If this emendation be correct, here also we have no exception to the rule.

[21] Davidson, *Syntax*, § 22, R. 4, mentions Hitzig's reading העליה as "imp. hiph.," but adds a question mark as though doubtful of the sense intended.

[22] Cf. I Sam. xvii. 51, also ix. 3 and xxii. 18.

[23] I am indebted to Prof. G. F. Moore for this suggestion.

[24] Cf. שוק התרומה (Lev. vii. 34, x. 14; Num. vi. 20); ידמו ליהוה תרומה (Num. xviii. 24; cf. 26, 28, 29; also Num. xv. 19 and Lev. xxii. 15).

A comparison of the versions on this passage is of considerable interest.[25] The Vulgate does not render והעליה. The Peshiṭto translates it עליתא, 'the top part.' The rendering of the Targum, וְיַרְכֵיהּ, is an interpretation rather than a translation of the word. These readings of the Peshiṭto and the Targum are of no other value than to inform us that at the time they were made, something was in the Hebrew text, probably the present word הָעֲלִיָּה. The corruption, therefore, lies back of these versions.[26]

The LXX has no word in the text to represent והעליה. This fact shows apparently, that the Hebrew text at the time of the translation of the LXX had nothing between השוק and וישם. The gloss and its incorporation into the text came at a later period, but probably not very much later. וירם is rendered in the LXX by *καὶ ἤψησεν*, 'and he boiled,' which is obviously a corruption from *καὶ ὕψωσεν*.[27] It is interesting to note, further, that שוק is translated by *κωλέα* in this verse, but elsewhere by *βραχίων* or *κνήμη*.

From the foregoing discussion, our general conclusions would be that והעליה is not, as it stands, part of the original Hebrew text, and that it cannot be emended to a noun, for the syntactical reason mentioned above. The particular objection to אליה, the most generally accepted emendation, and כליה, is that they represent parts of the animal which, as far as we can judge from the evidence of the O.T., were not used as human food. They were sacrificial portions burned on the altar.

The two explanations which may be offered for the term are: (1) that it is a text corruption from וַיַּעֲלִיָּה, and (2) that it was not originally in the Hebrew text, but was a late Hebrew gloss to ירם, which in the process of time became incorporated into the text. The latter of these alternatives is probably to be preferred, inasmuch as the omission in the LXX can be thereby more satisfactorily explained.

[25] It is noteworthy that certain Hebrew MSS. omit the expression והעליה, viz. 89, 93, 174, 178 of Kennicott. See *Var. Lect.* on 1 Sam. ix. 24.

[26] In the omission of the word by the Vulgate, we can see, I think, some influence of the LXX, possibly through the Old Latin version.

[27] So Schleusner, *Lex. in LXX* under Ἕψω, and Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis* on 1 Sam. ix. 24. Grabe in his edition of the Septuagint (1707–1720) has emended *ἤψησεν* to *ὕψωσεν*, placing the former in the margin. The word *ὑψόω* is frequently employed to render רום in Qal, Pi'el, Hiph. Cf. Gen. xxxix. 15.