

The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1922

DARIUS THE MEDE

It is about six years since my first volume of *Studies in the Book of Daniel* was published; and now that the second volume is about to appear, it seems like an opportune time to reply to some of the criticisms of the reviewers of the first. The most elaborate of the criticisms was one by Professor Kemper Fullerton of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology which appeared in the Bulletin of my alma mater, the Western Theological Seminary, at Allegheny, Pa., for October 1918. Had Professor Fullerton's criticism been confined to myself, I would have forever held my peace; but inasmuch as I am merely the occasion for a violent onslaught on the veracity of the book of Daniel, I shall be excused for referring at length to his strictures. It is high praise, though intended as blame, to be spoken of by him as a "bringer-up-to-date" of the work of such men as Hengstenberg, Keil, Pusey and Green, with whom I am classed as a belated example of the same anti-critical animus and unscientific method.

And, first, let me say, that I do not deem it a reproach to have produced "a typical example of the harmonistic method," which is one of the most serious charges brought against me by Professor Fullerton; but that I fail to see that I have used this method as distinct from the "historical" method, whatever that means. Words break no bones, it may be; but since Professor Fullerton evidently aims to put me in the wrong at the very start and, by necessary implication, all through my studies, by affirming that in my method I am harmonistic as distinct from historical, it is well to pause just here in order to come to an understanding

NOTES AND NOTICES

MEDEBA OR THE WATERS OF RABBAH

When David was king, the Ammonites defied Israel, prepared for war, and hired auxiliaries from the Aramaeans. Joab led an army of Israelites against the Ammonites, and encamped before their city (2 Sam. x and 1 Chron. xix). The royal city of the children of Ammon was Rabbah, that is "the capital"; but the hired Aramaeans, in going to the assistance of the Ammonites, marched, according to the Chronicler, to the town of Medeba in the territory of Israel, about twenty miles to the southwest of Rabbah (1 Chron. xix. 7).

This movement is somewhat surprising. Two theories have been advanced to account for it. One is that the Ammonites themselves had invaded the land of Israel and occupied Medeba, and that Joab marched against that city, and not Rabbah, and was besieging it, when the Aramaeans arrived from the north.¹ The other theory is that the army of Israel had, indeed, marched against Rabbah, and were besieging the Ammonites in their capital, but the hired Aramaeans advanced against Medeba in order to compel Joab to withdraw from the siege of Rabbah and hasten to the relief of the Israelites in Medeba; or at least in order to devastate the country between Rabbah and the fords of the Jordan and cut off Joab's retreat from Rabbah.² The strategy is intelligible; but with Joab and the Israelite army at Rabbah and the Aramaeans at Medeba, the rest of the story does not readily fit.³ It would appear, therefore, that the

¹ Kirkpatrick, *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges: Samuel*, 1881, p. 117; Woosung Wade, *Old Testament History*, 1901, p. 253; Chapman, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, 1898-1902, article Medeba.

² Keil, *Die Bücher Samuels*, 2^{te} Aufl., 1875, S. 293 and 295; Köhler, *Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte*, 1884, II Hälfte, S. 283; Stenning, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, 1898-1902, article Rabbah.

³ For the narrative states that Joab, seeing that he was beset before and behind, chose the better troops and set them in array against the Aramaeans, and ordered his brother Abishai to draw up the other soldiers against the Ammonites of the city. Instructing Abishai to come to his aid if the Aramaeans proved too strong, and promising to help his brother if the Ammonites pressed his brother's troops too hard, he drew nigh unto the battle against the Aramaeans (2 Sam. x. 9 and

Aramaeans presently resumed their march and, quitting Medeba, turned to the northeast, advanced to Rabbah, and encamped in the field near the city in order to aid their allies in the actual battle with Joab.⁴ The surprise at the mention of Medeba is allayed, since the movements of the Aramaeans are quite intelligible, and seem to have followed a well-conceived plan.

The question, however, is legitimate, and must be asked by the historian, whether Medeba is, indeed, the town to which the Aramaeans advanced;⁵ and the suggestion is herewith

13). Now with one part of the army at Rabbah and the other at Medeba, as the theory presupposes, with a distance of two days' ordinary march between them, it is difficult to see how one commander could learn of the need of the other, and having learned could march to his assistance, in time to avert disaster or turn defeat into victory. To have done so is perhaps not impossible, but these manoeuvres do not readily fit into the story.

⁴ Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1845, S. 618; Reuss, *La Bible*, 1878, 4^{me} partie, p. 100; Sime, *The Kingdom of All-Israel*, 1883, p. 306.

⁵ The statement in 1 Chron. xix. 7 is held to be historically trustworthy by scholars of various schools of criticism. Der "zusatz 1 Chr. xix. 7 ist gewiss ächtgeschichtlich" (Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1845, S. 618), "beruht gewiss auf geschichtlicher Ueberlieferung und ward von dem Chronisten in seiner Quelle vorgefunden" (Bertheau, *Die Bücher der Chronik*, 1854, S. 185); die Syrer stellten sich bei Médeba auf (Köhler, *Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte*, 1884, 2^e Hälfte, S. 283), Joab is sent with an army "auf die Kunde, dass die israelit. Stadt Medba . . . von Aramäern belagert wird" (Klostermann, *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*, 1887, on 2 Sam. x. 6), the Aramaeans encamped near Rabbah "Maedebäs belagerung aufgebend" (Ewald, *loc cit.*; Reuss, *La Bible*, 4^{me} partie, 1878, p. 100). Heide, in *Vigouroux Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 1908, article Medaba.

The statement of the Chronicler is ignored by Stade (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1887, Bd. I., S. 278) and Renan (*Histoire du Peuple d'Israël*, 1889, tome 2^{me}, p. 38). It is rejected with disdain by Wellhausen (*Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 1871, S. 179); and is declared to be "sachlich unmöglich" by Benzinger (*Die Bücher der Chronik*, 1901, S. 60) and "wertlos" by Budde (*Kurzer Hand-Commentar: Die Bücher Samuel*, 1902, S. 248).

Probably interpreting Medeba as "aquae quietis, v. rad. אַבְרָ" (Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 775) Hitzig says: "Verleitet durch die 'Wasserstadt' C. 12, 27, lässt der Chronist die Syrer vor Medaba lagern; allein Medaba im Süden Hesbons, eine Opferstätte (medhavà Skrt), ermangelt des Wassers" (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1869, S. 146). Medeba "liegt erheblich südlicher [als Rabbah] im rubenitischen bezw. moabitischen Gebiet. Daher kann es sich fragen, ob ein Grund vorlag,

hazarded that the name has been misread. It is common knowledge that the letters *daleth* and *resh*, as written at one period, were scarcely distinguishable from one another, and in the transmission of the Scriptures have been confused many times. In this very narrative the confusion has occurred twice, and in such a manner as to affect the whole recital.⁶ Instead then of reading Medeba, מֵידְבָּה, read מֵי רַבָּה, the waters of Rabbah.⁷ The letter *he* rather than *aleph* would be expected as the feminine ending of Rabbah; but the Chronicler, who names the town twice elsewhere (1 Chron. xx. 1), may have used *aleph* in this instance, since the employment of *aleph* final instead of *he* in feminine formations is too common in Chronicles and other late books to cause surprise: thus Raamah and Raama in the same verse (1 Chron. i. 9); Sabtah in Gen. x. 7, but Sabta in 1 Chron. i. 9; Salmah in Ruth iv. 20, but Salma in 1 Chron. ii. 11; Shimeah, brother of David, in 2 Sam. xiii. 3 and 32, but Shimea in 1 Chron. ii. 13 and xx. 7; Uzzah and Uzza in 2 Sam. vi. 3, 7, 8, but Uzza in 1 Chron. xiii. 7; and similarly, though not in a feminine formation, the Raphah in 2 Sam. xxi. 20, but the Rapha in 1 Chron. xx. 6; and the nouns feminine *korḥa'* and *maṭṭara'*, the pronominal suffix third person singular feminine in *kulla'* (Ezek. xxvii. 31; xxxvi. 5; Lam. iii. 12; all of which occur elsewhere with final

sich so weit nach Süden zu wenden. Vielleicht liegt ein geographischer Irrtum des Verfassers oder ein Verstoss eines Späteren vor" (Kittel, in Nowack's *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament: Die Bücher der Chronik*, 1902). "In some way it may have been confused with Rabbah of Ammon" (Curtis, *International Critical Commentary: The Books of Chronicles*, 1910).

⁶ Hadadazer in 2 Sam. viii, but Hadarezer in 2 Sam. x and 1 Chron. xviii and xix. And הַעֲבִיר for הַעֲבִיר in 2 Sam. xii. 31 (R.V. margin; and compare Gen. xlvii. 21 R.V. margin). So Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 1874, I. 256; Hoffmann, *ZATW*, 1882, p. 66; Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1887, Bd. I. 278; Budde, *The Books of Samuel: Critical edition of the Hebrew text*, 1894; H. P. Smith, *International Critical Commentary: Samuel*, 1899, p. 327; and compare Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. 228.

The Hebrew noun מַלְבָּן, in this same passage, 2 Sam. xii. 31, became Madebba during the transmission of the Greek text (see Lucian).

⁷ An interesting comparison is furnished by Deut. xxxiii. 25. רַבָּה is translated "strength." So Septuagint, Peshitta, Onkelos, where the reading רַבָּה is presupposed (Dillmann).

he), the verb *gab° ha'* (Ezek. xxxi. 5), and the proper names in Neh. vii. 48 and 58, compared with Ezra ii. 45 and 56. Or, if in the record as originally made by the Chronicler the final letter of Rabbah was *he*, yet just as soon as the *resh* was read as *daleth*, and the familiar name Medebah appeared, the tendency would assert itself to conform to the customary mode of writing Medeba.⁸

Like the waters of Jericho, the copious stream that bursts from the ground at the foot of the mound on which the town stood, and flows off as a little river through the plain (Josh. xvi. 1), or like the waters of Nephtoa which pour forth boldly from the hillside at Lifta and flow down the slope from basin to basin (Josh. xv. 9), or like the waters of Dan, a source of the Jordan, which spring from the ground as a full-grown river (Book of Enoch, xiii. 7[8]), or like the waters of Dibon, the perennial stream of the Arnon (Isa. xv. 9), or like the waters of Megiddo, the ever-flowing river Kishon, that ancient river (Judg. v. 19), so the waters of Rabbah are the uppermost source of the Jabbok, the living waters that gush from the spring-head up the valley, a mile west of the hill on which the citadel stood, and flow unceasingly past the foot of that hill summer and winter, a goodly stream, only to be swallowed up and disappear during a part of each year in the rocky bed of the valley a mile and a half below the town.⁹ The

⁸ Curiously enough, and illustrating the ease with which the name becomes corrupted, Driver in mentioning the Hebrew form of the name (*Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, 1890, p. xc, note to line 8 of the Moabite Stone), and Kittel, in a note on 1 Chron. xix. 7 (*The Books of Chronicles: Critical edition of the Hebrew text*, 1895, p. 68), and Francis Brown in referring to the name on the Moabite Stone (*Hebrew and English Lexicon*, 1906, p. 567), write the name with final *he* instead of *aleph*. Accidentally doubtless, for Kittel in his editions of the text of Chronicles uses the final *aleph* which appears in the name elsewhere in the Old Testament and on the Moabite Stone (lines 8 and 30; transcribed by Noeldeke, *Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab*, 1870; Smend und Socin, *Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab*, 1886; Clermont-Ganneau, *Examen critique du Texte*, in *Journal Asiatique*, 1887, pp. 72 ff.; Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphie*, 1898, S. 415, and after a new study of the stone *Ephemeris I*, 1900, S. 8).

⁹ *The Survey of Eastern Palestine*, pp. 5 and 52 f.

"flowing valley" of Rabbah was famous (Jer. xlix. 4); and Rabbah itself or a part of it, a suburb of the acropolis, was called the city of waters (2 Sam. xii. 27).¹⁰

Joab and the Israelites were encamped at Rabbah, before the gate, and blocked the approach to the city through the valley. The Aramaeans came to the aid of the besieged, and pitched their camp in the open field, before the great fountain known as the waters of Rabbah (2 Sam. x. 8; 1 Chron. xix. 7 and 9).¹¹ They had encamped beyond the mouth of the narrow valley, and were a mile or more from the city gate.¹² Joab now found himself between the Ammonites in the city and the Aramaeans in the field. Accordingly he divided his forces. He put a part of his army in array to hold the Ammonites in check, who had come forth from the city and were drawn up for battle at the entrance of the gate; and he himself with his best troops turned and fell upon the Aramaeans. The Aramaeans were put to flight; and the Ammonites, seeing their allies discomfited, retired behind the protecting walls of their city. Thus ended the first campaign.

But the war was not ended. Rabbah, the royal city, the residence of the king and the seat of the worship of Milcom, the god of the children of Ammon, had not fallen. Accordingly in the spring of the following year, in the second campaign, "Joab fought against Rabbah and took the royal city." He send word of his achievement to David, saying, "I have fought against Rabbah; yea, I have taken the city of waters." Probably he had gained entrance to the town, and was able at his

¹⁰ Klostermann would read עַיִן instead of עֵיִר, fountain of waters instead of city of waters (*Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*, on 2 Sam. xii. 27).

¹¹ With "before the waters of Rabbah" compare "before the river," לפני, Dan. viii. 3 and 6.

¹² The reference seems always to be to one particular gate (2 Sam. x. 7; xi. 23 f.). It may be the gate on the southern wall of the citadel. A part of the city, however, may have lain in the valley, along the river. If so, it did not extend west of the branch wady which bounds the hill on the west; for burials took place outside of cities, and not within the walls, and the ancient tombs at Rabbah are found west of the branch wady (*Survey of Eastern Palestine*, p. 26). A gate that gave entrance to this part of Rabbah would stand somewhere east of the junction of the branch wady with the valley.

pleasure to cut off from the acropolis the supply of fresh water. When that should be done the capitulation of the fortress was assured. Accordingly he urged David to come and direct the final operation, in order that the glory of the capture might belong to the king of Israel and not to a subordinate (2 Sam. xi. 1; xii. 26 f.).

Princeton.

JOHN D. DAVIS