

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

ART. IV.—GRAY'S "HEBREW PROPER NAMES" AND HOMMEL'S "ANCIENT HEBREW TRADITION."

CERTAIN questions with reference to Hebrew personal names, in their bearing on modern theories in regard to the Old Testament, have at the present moment come into special prominence, owing to the recent publication of the two works above named, viz., "Studies in Hebrew Proper Names," by Mr. G. Buchanan Gray, and "The Ancient Hebrew Tradition," by Professor Hommel. The two books were written independently of each other, but both writers have since contributed observations on the subject to some of the periodicals. The object of the present article is to endeavour to indicate, from the "traditional" point of view, the position as it appears to stand at present; and, in doing so, to answer certain of Mr. Gray's arguments which, so far as the writer is aware, have not hitherto been particularly replied to.

The two books have been written from very opposite points of view. Mr. Gray is a believer in the opinions of the Higher Critics as to the lateness of date and artificiality of the so-called "Priestly Code." Professor Hommel, on the other hand, believes in its antiquity and genuine character. The controversy, so far as these two writers are concerned, centres in the question as to the genuineness or otherwise of the personal names, and the lists of such names occurring in the Priestly Code, especially in the Book of Numbers, chaps. i., vii., xiii., and xxxiv., which give the names of the princes of the tribes of Israel and their fathers, and also the names of the spies. Wellhausen asserted that these lists of names were not genuine; and Mr. Gray, in his work "Hebrew Proper Names," under the influence of similar ideas, has come, it would appear, to the same conclusion.

In opposition to Wellhausen, on the other hand, Professor Hommel, in "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," has adduced a very large number of names from both the Babylonian inscriptions of the time of the Arabian dynasty of Khammurabi, the Amraphel of Gen. xiv. (*circa* 1900 B.C.), and also from ancient Arabian, Minnaean, and Sabæan inscriptions, by which he shows that the principle of name-formation exhibited in the personal names which occur in the Priestly Code is similar to that which prevailed amongst the Western Semites from the second millennium B.C. On the strength of this evidence supplied by the inscriptions, Professor Hommel considers himself justified in characterizing as an assertion of a hasty and dictatorial character the statement which Well-

hausen made to the following effect ("Prolegomena," 2nd edit., p. 371; cf. English translation, p. 350):

"The long lists of names in Num. i., vii., and xiii., are nearly all cast in the same mould, and are in no way similar to genuine ancient personal names."

Professor Hommel concludes his ninth chapter, "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 302, with the words:

"It is quite certain, therefore, that the names contained in these lists in the Book of Numbers cannot be rightly assigned to any other period than that of Moses. In spite, therefore, of the presence of some names (especially in Num. xiii.), which seem to indicate that the text is corrupt in places, these lists have been shown, by the external evidence of the tradition preserved in inscriptions of the second millennium B.C. (*vide supra* chap. iii.), to be genuine and trustworthy documents, before which historical theories built up by modern critics of the Pentateuch must 'collapse irretrievably.'"

Mr. Gray, on the other hand, from his investigations into the personal names occurring in the Priestly Code, comes to the following conclusions ("Hebrew Proper Names," p. 209):

"Briefly, then, P's names consist in part of ordinary names that were current early, in part of ordinary names that only originated at a late period, and in part of artificial names that were never current in ordinary life at any time. . . . The systematic lists of tribal princes, etc., found in P are valueless as records of the Mosaic Age."

From these extracts it can be readily perceived how, on the crucial question as to the antiquity and genuine character of the names in the Book of Numbers, Professor Hommel and Mr. Gray are diametrically opposed.

The following passage from an article in the *Expositor* for September, 1897, contributed by Mr. Gray, indicates the names on which in his book he directly based his conclusions. He writes (p. 179):

"The names on which I directly based my conclusion that some of P's names are late, artificial creations are: (a) Six compounds with either *Tsâr* or *Shaddai*; (b) compounds with a preposition or participle *Lael* and *Shelumiel*; and (c) 'perhaps certain others,' e.g., *Pedahel* and *Nethaneel*."

The six compounds with either *Tsâr* or *Shaddai* referred to by Mr. Gray are as follow (note, p. 179): "*Pedahtsâr*, *Elitsâr*, *Tsuriel*, *Tsuri-Shaddai*, *Ammi-Shaddai*, *Shaddai-ur* (E.V., *Shedeur*; also *z* for *ts* in *tsur*)."

"The question mainly turns," writes Mr. Gray, "on the compounds with *Tsâr* or *Shaddai*. Did the ancient Hebrews, or did they not, employ names of this type?"

With regard to *Tsûr* (rock), Mr. Gray, in "Hebrew Proper Names," had written as follows (p. 194):

"The fact that names of this type occur nowhere outside the Priestly Code would be at once and entirely explained if they were artificial creations of their author; the other explanation that has been offered, viz., that these names were ancient and became obsolete at a very early date, is in itself less satisfactory. Why do we find no instances in JE or Judges? Yet since we find only five in P, we need not press this absence from other sources too much. Still, admitting that it is inconclusive, we are left with two equally plausible explanations; if it is possible to determine between them, it will only be by a detailed examination of the names."

It will be seen later on that the "other explanation," which Mr. Gray considered "in itself less satisfactory," namely, that "these names were ancient, and became obsolete at a very early date," has been pretty well established as the true explanation by Professor Hommel.

Mr. Gray, after having gone into a detailed examination of names in *Tsûr*, writes as follows ("Hebrew Proper Names," p. 196):

"The usage of *Tsûr* in Hebrew literature thus gives no ground for supposing that it was an ancient name or epithet, which could be used absolutely and undefined for God; nor that at an early date it was frequent even in comparisons; God is spoken of as a Rock much more frequently in late than in early literature."

So much as to Mr. Gray's opinions in regard to *Tsûr*. Now let us see what his opinions were at the time when he was writing his book in regard to the other name, *Shaddai*. He says (p. 196):

"*Shaddai* is certainly an ancient term for God, but in early times, to judge from its usage in literature, quite infrequent. . . . It continued in use later, but except in P and Job was still quite infrequent."

It will be seen that here Mr. Gray assumes the lateness of P and Job.

"Over against this infrequency in the ordinary usage of the word we have to set its great frequency in Job (thirty-one times) and its frequency in P (five times)."

Mr. Gray sums up:

"Frequent as an archaism, *Shaddai* is most infrequent at any time in ordinary usage, and, in fact, occurs only as a poetical epithet of God. From this we more easily infer that *Ammi-Shaddai*, *Zuri-Shaddai*, and *Shaddaiur* are archaic, artificial formations than that they were names actually current at any period."

We shall see presently how, by the evidence of the inscriptions brought forward in Professor Hommel's work, these theories of Mr. Gray have, even by his own admission, been badly damaged, although, in spite of that fact, he still clings to the hypothesis that P's lists are "late artificial compilations."

Let us now see, on the other hand, what Professor Hommel has to say in regard to these two names *Tsûr* and *Shaddai*. In an Appendix, (b) "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 319, Professor Hommel, under the heading of "The Divine Name *Tsûr*," writes as follows:

"In regard to the ancient Hebrew name *Tsûr* (rock), which came to be applied as a Divine appellation (*vide* p. 300), special prominence being given to it in the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 4, "The Rock His work is perfect;" v. 37, "the Rock in which they trusted"), as well as in other passages in the Old Testament (*e.g.*, 1 Sam. ii. 2; in the Song of Hannah; in Ps. xviii.; and 2 Sam. xxii., etc.), and which occurs as a place-name in *Beth-Tsûr* (*cf.* Beth-el) near Hebron, I have just come upon this in a South Arabian votive inscription from Harim, where it occurs in the name of a female slave or temple hand-maiden, apparently of Midianite origin."

The name thus found by Professor Hommel is *Tsuri-addana*, "which in Hebrew," he says, "must have been written *Tsuri-addan*;" and in notes he adds, "*Cf.* Hebrew *Yehô-addan*, 2 Kings xiv. 2, the mother of King Amaziah (= my Rock, *i.e.*, God, is pleased);" also in another note, "*Cf.* Num. xxv. 15, where a prince of the Midianites bears the name *Tsur*, an abbreviation from *Tsuri-el*."

The inscriptions in which the name *Tsûri-addana* was found date, Professor Hommel says, from the time of the Sabæan priest-kings—*i.e.*, from the eighth century B.C. at latest, or perhaps a good deal earlier.

"In the Zingerli inscriptions, again (N. Syria, eighth century B.C.), we find *Tsûr* in the name of King *Bir-Tsûr* (= the God *Bir* is a Rock). . . . As I have elsewhere pointed out ('Das graphische h. im Minäischen,' *vide supra*, p. 276, note 1), these inscriptions came down to us from races who were originally natives of Edom or Midian."

Professor Hommel continues (p. 321):

"Now, since this name *Tsûr* crops up in the eighth century B.C. as a Divine appellation employed both in South Arabia and in Sam'al, and in both cases as an importation from N. W. Arabia (thus indicating a common source), it is evident that its first introduction into the land of Midian must have taken place at least some centuries earlier, a fact which is of

decisive importance in determining the antiquity of Hebrew names compounded with Tsûr."

This would appear to be practically decisive as to the antiquity of the element Tsûr in such names as *Elitsôr*, *Tsuriel*, *Tsuri-Shaddai* and *Pedahtsôr*; and Mr. Gray himself, though not without some protests against the inferences of Professor Hommel—which he says he rather confuses with facts—appears to be obliged to concede that names compounded with Tsûr are at least actual personal names. He writes in the *Expositor*, September, 1897, p. 183:

"Similarly in view of Tsûri-addana, the compounds with Tsûr may be accepted as actual personal names."

And, somewhat more grudgingly, in an article in the *Expository Times* of the same month—September, 1897—at p. 556, where he writes:

"Briefly, Professor Hommel appears to me to have diminished the probability of the compounds with *tsur* being artificial (*i.e.*, nowhere current as actual personal names), but to have fallen far short of proving or even rendering it particularly likely that such names were current (far less frequent, as the lists of P would suggest) among the Hebrew contemporaries of Moses."

Yet in the very next paragraph, in which Mr. Gray discusses Professor Hommel's argument in favour of the genuineness of compounds with *Shaddai*, he seems to admit that, if Professor Hommel's contention were established, that the name of the Babylonian King of the Arabian Dynasty (*circa* 2000 B.C.)—*Ammi-satana*—is equivalent to the name *Ammi-shaddai*, he would in such case "consider the suspicion of the artificial character of the names compounded with *Tsûr* or *Shaddai* removed; and, further, the antiquity of *Ammi-shaddai* in particular established."

Professor Hommel's hypothesis was, that in the name of the Babylonian King *Ammi-satana*, the final *na* was the Arabic prenominal suffix, and that *sata* was the Babylonian reproduction of the Arabic *saddu* = mountain, this Arabic word for mountain having a religious significance as well. *Ammi-satana* then would be = "my uncle (*i.e.*, as we have already learned 'God') is our mountain." Professor Hommel says (p. 110):

"Among the Assyrian personal names of the eighth century B.C. we find *Marduk-shadûa* = 'Marduk (*i.e.*, *Bel-Merodach*) is my mountain,' and *Bel-shadûa*; and in the next century *Bel-Harran-shadûa* = 'the Lord of Harran (*i.e.*, *Sin*) is my mountain,' with which may be coupled the names *Sin-shadûni* = 'Sin is our mountain,' and *Shadûnu*, or *Shadûni* = 'our mountain (*sc.*, is God)' obtained from other texts (*cf.* Delitzsch, 'Prolegomena,' pp. 205 and 208)."

"It is, therefore," Professor Hommel goes on, "something more than a mere coincidence that in ancient Hebrew, and that as early as the time of Moses, if we may accept the testimony of tradition, a name *Ammi-shaddai* occurs which not only contains the subsequently obsolete Divine name *Shaddai*, but also exhibits almost exactly the same elements as *Ammi-sata-na*. Now, it matters not whether we adopt the later or earlier system of vocalization of the Hebrew word *Shaddai* (LXX. *Σαδδαι*)—it is, for instance, quite within the range of possibility that the original reading was *El Shaddi* = 'God my Mountain'—the fact remains that this Divine name by which Yahveh revealed himself to Abraham and Jacob (Gen. xvii. 1 and xxxv. 11) must, as has been abundantly proved by the facts stated above, be of the very highest antiquity. At the time at which Abraham migrated from Ur, both the Arabic *saddu* (spelt *satu* by the Babylonians), and the Babylonian rendering *shadu* possessed the same religious meaning in Babylonia, viz., mountain = God."

A remarkable confirmation of Professor Hommel's identification of the name of the Babylonian King *Ammi-satana* with the name *Ammi-shaddai* has come to light since Mr. Gray's articles of September, 1897, were written, as will be seen by the following note by Professor Hommel in the *Expository Times* for February, 1898, p. 235 :

"It will interest many readers of my 'Ancient Hebrew Tradition' to learn that the identification there proposed (p. 109 f.) for the first time of *Ammi-satana* and *Ammi-shaddai* has now received positive inscriptional attestation in offering-lists dating from the time of Sargon of Agadi (*circa* 3000 B.C.). In his 'Tablettes Chaldéens inédites' (*Extrait de la Revue d'Assyriologie*, vol. iv., No. 3, p. 5, note 1), M. Thureau Danguin notes the personal names *Satu*, *Satu-na*, and *Beli-satu*, and thus furnishes the final proof for the correctness of my analysis of the name (dating from the time of Abraham) *Ammi-satana* into *Ammi-sata-na*."

If the analysis of this name by Professor Hommel, then, has been thus proved to be correct—as it would seem to have been—Mr. Gray would appear to be in the position of having to admit that he must "consider the suspicion of the artificial character of the names compounded with *Tsir* and *Shaddai* removed, and, further, the antiquity of *Ammi-shaddai* in particular established."

In other words, as regards these names, and the sceptical conclusions which he based on them, his position has been completely carried by Professor Hommel. So it would naturally seem from his admission in the passage just quoted, taken from his article in the *Expository Times*; by reference,

however, to his article in the *Expositor* of the same month, we find that, even though the principal arguments on which were based his theories in regard to these names were refuted, Mr. Gray would still precariously hang on to the theories themselves. He writes (p. 183):

"But several of the considerations derived from a study of the history of Hebrew names remain unaffected. The *comparative frequency* of the names in P's lists still stands in striking contrast to their entire absence from all other Hebrew sources, and their extreme rarity in other Semitic sources. The use of Pedah and the prefixing of the perfect in *one* of the compounds remain as before *suggestive* of late date" (the italics are mine).

These seem rather shadowy and minute objections on which to found the drastic conclusion that these lists are "late artificial compilations"; but to Mr. Gray they appear perfectly sufficient. He goes on:

"It still seems to me, therefore, that the *hypothesis* that P's lists are late artificial compilations from names of various sources and periods alone accounts, *even in the case of this particular group of names*, for all the facts—those derived from the Hebrew as well as from the inscriptional sources" (the italics again are mine).

One is irresistibly reminded by all this of a passage relating to a different portion of the Bible which occurs in Dr. Salmon's "Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament," where he writes (p. 297):

"If you know nothing of the history of the controversy, you will perhaps imagine that such a concession as I have quoted, and which is no more than is readily made by all critics of the same school, amounts to a recognition of the antiquity of the Book of the Acts. But this is not the only case where theorists of the sceptical school will make a forced concession, and hope to save the main part of their hypothesis from destruction. These hypotheses are like some living beings of low organization, which it is hard to kill, because when you lay hold of one of them the creature will leave half its body in your hands, and walk off without any apparent inconvenience."

In discussing in his book the other personal names in the Priestly Code, Mr. Gray is not more successful in establishing against them anything definite, except the main objection, on which he eventually relies—namely, that too large a proportion of them have the Divine name *El* as the *last* element of the name. As to the names compounded with *Tsâr* and *Shaddai*, we have seen what he thought of them, and how he was subsequently compelled to modify his opinions. He goes

on ("Hebrew Proper Names," p. 200 ff.) to discuss the other names. Of the five names, *Shelumiel*, *Pagiel*, *Deuel*, *Gamaliel*, *Pedahel*, he says they are "apparently late, for in every case *El* stands at the end of the name, and in *Pedahel* after a perfect. . . . As to the other constituent elements, *Pedah* is frequent in late names, but unknown in any that are unquestionably early (*i.e.*, earlier than the seventh century). The use of the other four roots in proper names is without much significance."

It will be seen that Mr. Gray has no very special objection to urge against these five names :

"Of the remaining fourteen names peculiar to the two lists" (Num. i. and xxxiv.), "two . . . must without hesitation be considered ancient—*Abidan*, *Ahira*. The rest of the names are uncompounded, and with reference to them the data are scantier and less decisive. Yet there is probability that the following are of pre-Exilic origin—*Zuar*, *Gideoni*, *Ocran*. . . . In the nine names now left I find nothing suggestive, but note that three, *Enan*, *Azzan*, *Shiptan*, have the termination *an*. *Parnach* is quite unique; *Jogli*, if it mean 'led into exile,' as the Oxford Lexicon suggests, with a ?, would probably be late; but it may equally well signify 'rendered conspicuous,' or perhaps 'exultant,' meanings which may reflect any period. The other names are: *Helon*, *Shelomi*, *Ephod*, *Chislon*."

On these last four names Mr. Gray appears to have no remark to make, and it will be observed how little of anything definite he is able to say against any of them.

Mr. Gray goes on next to discuss eighteen names occurring in these lists which also occur elsewhere. He writes (p. 203 f.):

"In the case of four of these, not only the names, but also the persons, are known to us from other sources. *Caleb* can be traced in the earliest narratives; *Jephunneh* with certainty only to D² . . . Both *Nahshon* and *Amminadab* are mentioned in a genealogy (Ruth iv. 18 ff.), the early origin of which I see no reason to question. . . . Possibly *Elidad* (Num. xxxiv. 21) is identical with the *Eldad* (a mere orthographical variation) of Num. xi. 26 (J E); the latter passage in any case proves the antiquity of the name."

"The remaining thirteen names occur elsewhere, but only as the names of different persons. Four of them—*Eliab*, *Elishama*, *Shemuel*, *Paltiel*—are known to have been current in or before the Davidic period. Five others are probably of early origin, though we cannot trace them up to any very early period in extant early literature. These are *Ammihud*, the name of three persons in these lists; but, in any case, the

existence of the parallels *Abihud*, *Ahihud*, favours interpreting *Ammi* as kinsman, and consequently regarding the name as of early origin. *Ahihud*, *Ahiezer* are presumably early, on the ground of their first element (see p. 38); with the latter cf. the unquestionably early names *Abiezer*, *Eliezer*. *Elizaphan*, though current after the Exile, can be traced up to the end of the seventh century; *Elisaph* . . . is to be regarded on the ground of the formation (*El* prefixed to pf.) as at least pre-Exilic. Two others, *Hanniel* and *Kemuel*, are less decisive, though the latter occurs as the name of a foreigner in Gen. xxii. 21 (J E)."

"Only one name is more probably late than early, *Nethaneel*, on the form *El* postfixed to a pf. (see p. 192). The name occurs elsewhere of two post-Exilic persons, a post-Exilic family, and six persons mentioned only in Chronicles; it is also frequent in the post-Biblical period. In reference to Bukki, I note that it also occurs of a descendant of Aaron in 1 Chron. v. 31, etc."

It will be seen that these names have come out of Mr. Gray's crucible with their character for antiquity, even in his opinion, but little scathed. Even he admits that "only one name is more probably late than early." And, in addition to this, Professor Hommel has shown in "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," by comparison with kindred Babylonian and South Arabian names, the ancient and genuine character of these names in the lists in the Book of Numbers. See the summing up of his opinion in "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 299 ff.

On pp. 207 f. Mr. Gray sums up. We shall leave his conclusion No. 1 to the last.

Conclusion 2. "The names, even those *peculiar* to P, are not similar in character to those current *in ordinary life* in the post-Exilic period.

"Proofs: (a) Entire absence of compounds with *Yah*.

"(b) The occurrence of compounds with *Abi*, *Ahi*, *Ammi*.

"(c) The large proportion of compounds with *El* in certain lists. Both in Num. i. and xxxiv. they are more than a third of the whole; in the post-Exilic priestly list they are less than a third; in post-Exilic lay list less than a seventh.

"(d) The compounds with *Tsûr* and *Shaddai*.

"(e) Certain individual names, e.g., *Tsuar*, *Gideoni*, *Ocran*."

This conclusion of Mr. Gray's, it will be seen, is *favourable* to the antiquity of the names contained in the lists in the Book of Numbers, in so far as it goes to show that these

names were not similar in character to those current in ordinary life in the post-Exilic period.

Conclusion 4. "Some of the names peculiar to P do not appear to have been coined by the author nor by any late writer, nor to have been current after the Exile."

This conclusion is also, of course, so far as it goes, *in favour* of the antiquity of the names. Mr. Gray notices (*Expositor*, p. 179) that on these two points Professor Hommel agrees with him, "though no doubt," he adds, "he would express himself in somewhat different language."

Mr. Gray's conclusions *unfavourable* to the antiquity and genuine character of the names are as follows :

Conclusion 3. "Some of the names are late artificial creations.

"Proofs: (a) Compounds with *Tsûr* and *Shaddai*.

"(b) Compounds with a preposition (*Lael*), and a participle (*Shelumiel*), and perhaps

"(c) Certain other names, e.g., *Pedahel*, *Nethaneel*."

With regard to these "proofs," it may be remarked that (a) has been amply dealt with by Professor Hommel; (b) seems to be relinquished now by Mr. Gray himself. He writes of these names (*Expositor*, p. 183):

"Interesting as they are in themselves, they are too isolated and uncertain to form by themselves any strong argument for artificiality or lateness of formation."

(c) is put forward so dubiously by Mr. Gray himself that it seems to call for no particular notice.

There remains :

Conclusion 1. "The names in P are not, as a whole, pre-Davidic in character.

"Proofs: (a) The large proportion, especially in certain lists, of compounds with a *Divine name*.

"(b) The large proportion of names among compounds with *El*, in which *El* is the *last element* in the word.

"(c) The presence of names in which the perfect is prefixed.

"(d) The formation with a preposition (*Lael*) and a participle (*Shelumiel*). The compounds with *Tsûr* and *Shaddai* are also to be noted."

This is really *the* important conclusion to which Mr. Gray has come, and may be said to embody the opinion which he professes to have formed from his investigations into Hebrew proper names, with reference to the character of the personal names contained in the "Priestly Code." "The names in P," he says, "are not as a whole pre-Davidic in character."

The last of the four proofs of this conclusion on which Mr. Gray relies (*d*) has been noticed already under conclusion 3. There remain (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*).

Proof (*a*): "The large proportion, especially in certain lists, of compounds with a Divine name."

Mr. Gray's argument in support of this may be found at pp. 193 f. He takes two lists in the Book of Numbers, viz., (1) Num. i. 5-16 (the princes of the tribes of Israel and their fathers), and (2) Num. xxxiv. 19-28 (the princes of the tribes of Israel, who were to divide the land, and their fathers); and he observes that in list 1 there are 12 names compounded with a Divine name (9 with *El* and 3 with *Shaddai*), against 12 other names—proportion 1 : 1; and in list 2 there are 7 names compounded with a Divine name (*El*), against 11 other names (omitting the well-known persons Caleb and Jephunneh)—proportion 1 : 1½. He then compares the proportions shown in these two lists with that shown by names collected from a certain limited number of chapters—ix. to xx. of the Second Book of Samuel—which he says (p. 186) show the proportion 1 : 3. Mr. Gray also builds on a coincidence which he has discovered, namely, that in Num. i. the proportion is identical with that found in the list of post-Exilic laity in Ezra x. 25-43, "from which, however," he has to acknowledge, "the list in Numbers is sharply distinguished by this fact: in the names of Ezra x. the Divine name compounded is generally *Yah*, in Numbers exclusively *El* or *Shaddai*."

There does not seem to be much in these arguments of Mr. Gray, either in the comparison with names gathered from selected chapters in 2 Samuel, or in the coincidence with the list of post-Exilic laity in Ezra. But perhaps the best answer to all this is, that inasmuch as these lists in the Book of Numbers are composed of the names of princes and their fathers, they are entitled to be compared, as regards the proportion of the names which are compounded with a Divine name, not with lists of ordinary names, but with lists of kings and princes.

And amongst kings and princes in ancient times the proportion of names compounded with a Divine name was very large, indicating a custom which prevailed among the Hebrews as well as among other Semitic nations. Mr. Gray himself has pointed out ("Hebrew Proper Names," p. 260), in reference to the Divine name *Yah*, that:

"The names of the twenty-one successors of David—all of his family—on the throne of Judah are, with six exceptions, compounds with *Yah*. The exceptions are Solomon, Rehoboam, Asa, Ahaz, Manasseh, and Amon. One of these, Ahaz,

is probably enough only apparent; and an alternative name of Solomon was Jedidah. The proportion is in any case most striking, and *greatly above the normal during the period over which the succession ranges*" (the italics are mine).

Mr. Gray also pointed out that "the tendency was as strong in the northern as in the southern kingdom to give the heirs to the throne a name compounded with *Yah*."

In other nations also, it is almost needless to observe, the names of kings, princes, and high officials of State were in a very large proportion compounds with some Divine name. Out of fifty-three kings of Assyria, for example, going back to the nineteenth century B.C., some forty at least bore names into which a Divine element entered, and lists of Babylonian dynasties show a similar feature. So also in the list of Assyrian eponyms, which comprises the names of kings of Assyria and high officers of State, each of whom in succession gave his name to a particular year; out of about 287 names decipherable on the tablets, 189 at least are compounds with a Divine name ("Assyrian Eponym Canon," G. Smith, pp. 57 ff.).

From this can be deduced the following table of names, viz :

	<i>Compounded with a Divine name.</i>	<i>Others.</i>	<i>Proportion.</i>
Kings of Judah	16 ...	5 ...	$3\frac{1}{5} : 1$
Kings of Assyria	53 ...	40 ...	$1\frac{1}{3} : 1$
Assyrian eponyms	287 ...	189 ...	$1\frac{1}{2} : 1$
Princes of Israel (Num. i.) ...	12 ...	12 ...	$1 : 1$
Princes of Israel (Num. xxxiv.)	7 ...	11 ...	$1 : 1\frac{1}{2}$

This table shows that the proportion of names compounded with a Divine name in these lists in the Book of Numbers, when compared with lists of kings and high officials of State, does not appear to be by any means excessive, but is in reality what might be expected.

Mr. Gray's next proof that the names in P are not as a whole pre-Davidic in character is :

"(b) The large proportion of names among compounds with *El* in which *El* is the last element in the word."

This is the real basis on which now appear to rest Mr. Gray's arguments against the antiquity and genuine character of the lists of names in the Book of Numbers. His quarrel with the lists, and the names contained in the lists, as expressed above, would seem to be that the proportion of the names in these lists in which the Divine name *El* is pre-fixed, as compared with those in which it is post-fixed, does not agree with what he appears to consider to have been the proportion which such names bore to each other in the pre-Davidic period. This opinion of Mr. Gray's as to the normal pro-

portion which such names bore to each other in the pre-Davidic age may be said to be mainly based on certain figures contained in two tables in his book, one giving, as he would seem to imply, the correct pattern of lists of names compounded with *El*, deduced from seven names; the other giving the correct pattern for lists of names compounded with *Yah*, deduced from six, or perhaps only two, names.

The table of names compounded with *El* is given in "Hebrew Proper Names" (p. 166). Names in which *El* is prefixed are indicated by the letter A; those in which *El* is post-fixed by the letter B. The following are the "number of (personal or tribal) names first referred by approximately contemporary literature" (which means that the Priestly Code and Chronicles are in this table (I.) ignored) "to Period I." (the pre-Davidic), A 7, B 8, total 15.

This would seem to show—supposing such meagre figures could show anything definite—that in the pre-Davidic period B formations were slightly more prevalent than A. It is right, however, to observe that in a note Mr. Gray throws a doubt on two of the A names and on six of the B, thus reducing the names genuinely personal to A 5, B 2, total 7. This would seem to amount to a *reductio ad absurdum*, on the part of Mr. Gray himself, of any argument based by him on figures so truly insignificant. *Seven* names for the whole pre-Davidic period!

As for the names compounded with *Yah* in the pre-Davidic period, on which Mr. Gray relies, the figures for these are given in Table I., p. 159, and are A 5, B 1, total 6 ("at most"). "At most," Mr. Gray says, probably because, as explained in note, p. 174, these names may be reduced from A 5, B 1, to A 3, B 1—or even to A 1, B 1. *Two* names for the whole pre-Davidic period!

These be large figures on which to base a theory.

Mr. Gray gives also a Table in which he includes the names in the Priestly Code and Chronicles, but it is really only to the names in the former Table that he attaches any authority as to the pattern of names in the pre-Davidic period. In this Table II., p. 167, Mr. Gray gives the number of names compounded with *El*, first referred by any Old Testament writer to Period I. (the pre-Davidic), as A 11, B 33, total 44 (in P., A 4, B 25).

Here it will be perceived that when the names in the Priestly Code and Chronicles are included, the numbers of names in the pre-Davidic period of the A and B formation respectively are, not A 5, B 2, total 7, but A 11, B 33, total 44—quite a different result; and even if the names in Chronicles were excluded, the result would be but little affected.

Now, we have already seen that Mr. Gray has failed to establish any definite objections against the names in the Priestly Code when he examined them individually, and accordingly his objections to these names now centre in this: that whereas personal names formed with *El* happening to occur in writings which he admits to be approximately contemporary show the pattern A 5, B 2, these names in the Priestly Code show the pattern A 4, B 25—this is the head and front of their offending. He supports his small figures, A 5, B 2, by other small figures of names formed with the Divine name *Yah*, viz., A 5, B 1; or perhaps only A 1, B 1. What does his argument amount to? A 4, B 25 is "late and artificial," because it does not conform to A 5, B 2. Does Mr. Gray claim that the latter insignificant figures represent the normal pattern of such names in the pre-Davidic age? Seeing that by his particular examination of the names in the Priestly Code, he seems to have failed to establish anything definite against their antiquity and genuine character, would it not be reasonable to claim that the evidence of these names should be included when a theory is being formed as to what was the normal pattern of such names in the pre-Davidic period? If Mr. Gray claims that these names should be excluded merely because he believes that the Priestly Code, in which they occur, is itself "late and artificial," then he is not proving anything *about* these names, but merely begging the very question at issue respecting them.

We must then deny to these insignificant figures any claim to being a correct representation of the pattern of names of this kind in the pre-Davidic age; such a claim on their behalf can only be set up by excluding the names in the Priestly Code, which amounts to an egregious begging of the question.

But if Mr. Gray merely claims for these names that they are a *specimen* of names of the pre-Davidic period, brought together by chance out of narratives contained in certain books of the Bible, the Priestly Code and Chronicles being excluded, then we would maintain that these insignificant figures thus brought together, as it were, by accident, are not in any sense a concrete entity (as each of the lists in Numbers is) but constitute a mere fragment separated from their natural connection, not only with the names in the Priestly Code, but also with whatever other names, recorded in the Book of Chronicles or unrecorded in the Bible, may have been in existence in the pre-Davidic age; and that accordingly

We need not feel concerned to show that the pattern of the names in the Priestly Code conforms to that of such a mere fragment; and further still we say that even if the

true pattern of such names in the pre-Davidic age could be ascertained, it would not follow that particular lists of names might not be perfectly truthful and genuine, even though they might not be found to conform to the general pattern.

And we are here brought to a more general question which lies behind all this, and that is, Are the conclusions which Mr. Gray seeks to found on these fragments of statistics as to the relative proportions of two formations of personal names to each other—*e.g.*, *El* pre-fixed or *post*-fixed—of the slightest value whatsoever, or are they not rather most probably utterly misleading? Do fragmentary statistics of this kind in regard to names necessarily reproduce the complexion of the entire statistics of which they form a fragment? The case will, on the contrary, often be found to be actually the reverse.

It is well known what queer tricks those two notorious imps Names and Figures, even when taken separately, can be made to play; and by each of them has often been proved—or, rather, made to appear to be proved—many a thing that "never was on sea or land." But when you put these two mischievous monkeys into the same cage, as Mr. Gray has done, they are, to say the least of it, worth watching.

It occurred to the writer to endeavour to test the way that names and figures work in a case of this kind by taking two forms of names very prevalent in Ireland and comparing some of the statistics as to their respective prevalence in regard to each other. The names selected are those in connection with which there was a Bill some time ago before the House of Commons—that is to say, names having as their first element "Mac" and "O'" respectively, the force of each being "descendant of," and both being connected with the ancient septs or clans of Ireland, and in some instances with the Scottish clans. It seemed most convenient to the writer to take the figures for his own county, and accordingly from the local directory¹ have been extracted the following particulars of the relative prevalence of the two forms of names in the County and City of Cork:

NUMBER OF DISTINCT NAMES.					
	<i>Mac.</i>		<i>O'.</i>		<i>Proportion.</i>
Cork County ...	71	...	51	...	$1\frac{2}{3} : 1$
Cork City ...	81	...	43	...	$1\frac{1}{3} : 1$

It will be seen that these statistics, which are full and exhaustive, agree sufficiently nearly with each other, and show that the number of names formed with "Mac" considerably exceed those formed with "O'." We might be

¹ "Guy's City and County Cork Almanac and Directory, 1898." Guy and Co., Limited, Cork. Price sixpence.

inclined to infer from this that the number of householders bearing the name of "Mac" would also be in the majority. But here one of those anomalies and surprises which are apt to lie in wait for confidently-formed theories meets us, as will be seen from the following table:

NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDERS BEARING THESE NAMES.

	<i>Mac.</i>		<i>O'.</i>		<i>Proportion.</i>
Cork County ...	878	...	1812	...	1 : 2 $\frac{1}{4}$
Cork City ...	390 ¹	...	710 ¹	...	1 : 1 $\frac{3}{8}$

These statistics, which again are full and exhaustive, agree sufficiently closely with each other; but reverse what might have been expected from the previous table, and show that, although *names* in "Mac" are the more numerous, householders bearing such names are greatly in the minority.

The figures for Cork County include the country towns, excluding only the city and suburbs of Cork. But if we take the figures for these names in the several country towns with the district around each, we shall find the most varying proportions—varying both from each other and also from the figures for the county at large, of which they are a part. The following are given as examples, and probably in the case of no town in the county would the proportions be found to correspond with those of the county at large:

NUMBER OF DISTINCT NAMES.

	<i>Mac.</i>		<i>O'.</i>		<i>Proportion.</i>
Cork County ...	71	...	51	...	1 $\frac{2}{5}$: 1
Bandon ...	9	...	15	...	1 : 1 $\frac{2}{3}$
Kinsale ...	7	...	9	...	1 : 1 $\frac{1}{3}$
Mallow ...	6	...	18	...	1 : 3
Mitchelstown ...	4	...	15	...	1 : 3 $\frac{1}{2}$

The figures in the various country districts, it will be seen, vary widely in their proportions—as well from each other as from the county of which they form a part. With all the names regularly tabulated in the directory before one, it is easy to understand how this apparent anomaly is to be explained, and to see that the figures for each district can be perfectly genuine and trustworthy—as regards the limited number of facts to which they refer—although they differ so much in the proportions which they show both from each other, and from the county at large.

But supposing we had not these names thus regularly tabulated before us, and that the question concerned times long past, it might not be very easy to explain the anomaly

¹ In the case of the city, the number, under each name is exaggerated, owing to many names being given in the Directory twice, first at private and secondly at business addresses.

or to "remove the suspicions" of prejudiced and unfriendly critics. And we can well imagine what specious and plausible arguments—based on these anomalies—might be brought forward to prove that lists of names referring to some of these limited areas were "late and artificial." Nor would it be safe to infer that even the fairly large number of such names in the County of Cork correctly represented the proportion in which these names were formed through all the period of Irish history. A learned writer, Mr. John O'Hart, who devoted the greatest labour and research to the elucidation of Irish names and pedigrees, both Celtic and Anglo-Irish, published a few years ago a work, "Irish Pedigrees" (O'Hart, 1881), and from the Index of Surnames, p. 759—a list very extensive, but not absolutely exhaustive—have been obtained the following figures in respect to names of these formations through all periods of Irish history, viz., names formed with "Mac" 327, with "O" 432, proportion $1 : 1\frac{1}{3}$, whilst those for the County of Cork in the present day we have seen to be "Mac" 71, "O" 51, proportion $1\frac{2}{3} : 1$.

It would have been misleading then to have drawn from the statistics of the County of Cork in the present day the conclusion that, through the past course of Irish history, names formed with "Mac" were more numerous than those with "O". The contrary was really the case. From these facts the following conclusions would seem to be deducible:

(a) It is only from pretty full statistics that any reliable general conclusion as to the relative prevalence of two particular formations of names can be drawn—and even in such case only with caution.

(b) Fragmentary statistics in regard to the relative prevalence of such formations cannot be relied on to present the same phenomena as the larger statistics of which they are a fragment. They may present quite different phenomena.

(c) Yet such partial statistics, although disagreeing with the phenomena of the larger statistics of which they form a part, may be perfectly trustworthy and genuine in regard to the limited matters to which they refer.

If these conclusions are rightly drawn, they would certainly appear to cut the ground from under the attempts which Mr. Gray has made in "Hebrew Proper Names" to draw wide and drastic conclusions from small sums in proportion, based on meagre and petty statistics; and also from under his assumption, that if two sets of names—for instance, his seven names formed with *El* in the pre-Davidic period on the one hand, and the names in the Priestly Code on the other—do not agree in the proportions in which names of two different formations are included, one of such sets of names

must probably be unreal and artificial. It has, I trust, been shown, on the contrary, that both may be perfectly trustworthy and genuine.

We must therefore decline to allow ourselves to be entangled in the network of misleading statistics—even if those statistics were less meagre and scanty than they are—by which Mr. Gray in this work of his, "Hebrew Proper Names," has laboriously attempted to enmesh us.

ANDREW C. ROBINSON.



ART. V.—THE BREAD OF LIFE.

"I am that Bread of life."—JOHN vi. 48.

IT was in the little synagogue at Capernaum that our Lord pronounced this memorable discourse. As soon as the momentous words in the text were uttered, the Jews began murmuring to each other their dissatisfaction. They did not pay any attention to the explanation which Christ was giving, but seized with obstinate malignity on the point which they did not understand in its barest and most striking form. "*Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph?*" they mutter. With dogged dulness, they refuse to think how the Person before them can be anything beyond what He seems. With stupid sarcasm and irony, they ask themselves, "Have we been mistaken? Is He not just that young man from Nazareth? We know the respectable Joseph. We know that quiet woman Mary. We know all about Him. What is this talk about coming down from heaven? Whatever He may have done for us in the wilderness yesterday, we are plain, practical men, and we won't stand it." Joseph, you will remember, by not putting away Mary, became legally, from a human point of view, the reputed father of her child.

The murmuring is among the crowd who are listening to the statements of Jesus, and the criticisms are not openly stated to Him. The word which St. John uses means a confused hum of objections in an undertone. Jesus asks them not to grumble amongst themselves, and quietly goes on with the subject of His discourse. He sees that this is no fit opportunity to enter into a personal explanation of His antecedents. With calm, fearless distinctness, for the warning of those who were murmuring, and for the encouragement of those who were beginning to follow Him, He continues to explain how it is that some believe and some reject. "*No man can come to Me except the Father which sent Me draw him.*" The Father was willing to prepare and draw every-