

SMALLER BOOKS.

1. THE CHRIST OF THE HIGHER CRITICS. BY THE REV. WILLIAM SPIERS, M.A., F.G.S. (*Kelly*. 1s.)

2. THE PRESENT STATE OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM AS REGARDS THE NEW TESTAMENT. BY A. H. CHARTERIS, D.D. (Edinburgh: *Thin*.)

3. THE ANCIENT BRITISH CHURCHES. BY THE REV. W. M. SINCLAIR, D.D. (*Elliot Stock*. 1s.)

4. THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SACERDOTIUM. BY THE REV. N. DIMOCK, M.A. (*Elliot Stock*. 1s. 6d.)

5. THE RIVAL POLICIES. BY THE REV. W. MUIR, B.D., B.L. (Leith: *Nimmo*.)

6. ESCHATOLOGY. BY THE REV. R. F. GARBETT. (New Zealand: *Christchurch Press*.)

7. JUDAS, ANCIENT AND MODERN. BY R. M'LEAN. (Glasgow: *Westbank Place*. 2d.)

8. SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-SEVEN. BY THE REV. DAVID HEATH. (*Burroughs*. 2d.)

Professor Hommel on the Evidential Value of Hebrew Proper Names.

BY G. BUCHANAN GRAY, M.A., MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

THE attention of readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES was directed a few months since¹ to a then forthcoming volume of Professor Hommel's, and to my own recently published work, *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*. It was clear even then that Professor Hommel and myself were at variance with regard to the historical character of the names in the Priestly Code. In the interval Professor Hommel's work has appeared, and in the preface to the English edition he claims that, although it was written without knowledge of my work, the investigations contained in it, 'based as they are on material obtained from inscriptions, furnish a sufficient reply to Gray's contention.' External evidence 'must be the banner under which all students of Old Testament literature are to range themselves in the future.' Professor Hommel's book is likely to come into the hands of many readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and I therefore gladly avail myself of the opportunity offered me to indicate the grounds on which I consider the claim of Professor Hommel's preface unjustified, and many of the conclusions drawn in the volume itself insecure. For a fuller vindication of my own position and more detailed criticism of some of Professor Hommel's suggestions, I may refer those who are interested in the subject to an article in a forthcoming number of the *Expositor*.

In the first place, I must explain that the

¹ In the April number, pp. 329 f.

implication in Professor Hommel's preface, as cited above, that my book has neglected the inscriptions, is unfounded. My investigations were carried out with constant reference to the inscriptions; and, with one or two exceptions to which I will refer, the whole of the names from the inscriptions mentioned by Professor Hommel were known and weighed by me when writing, and many of them are actually mentioned in the book. Then, again, Professor Hommel uses 'external evidence' in a curious way. To regard the Hebrew scriptures as a source of secondary importance in studying Hebrew names is extraordinary; nor, of course, does Professor Hommel actually do this; but that being so, his sentence, so far as it has reference to myself, becomes meaningless. I feel it necessary to draw attention to these facts to check the inference which is suggested by Professor Hommel's preface, that his book is based on new and superior material unknown to and unused by myself. This is not the case. Relevant Hebrew inscriptions do not exist. The inscriptions used by Professor Hommel are mainly Assyrian and South Arabian; these contain most valuable indirect evidence with regard to the history of Hebrew proper names; but they contain no direct evidence as to the names in use among the Hebrews of the Mosaic period. The cause of the difference between Professor Hommel and myself lies not in the use of different material,

but in the different inferences drawn from the same material. For all the additional significance which Professor Hommel's long and wide acquaintance with the inscriptions has enabled him to detect in this class of evidence, I am much indebted to him. I hope that in turn he will in future discussions give due attention to the more thorough analysis of the history of the Hebrew names which my book contains. We are agreed on many points which had been previously established—*e.g.* that compounds with *ab*, *ah*, etc., are ancient. But I have further attempted an analysis of the chronological relations of the various different formations of compounds, especially those compounded with *-yah* and *-el*. It is likely enough that this may require some modification; but I cannot think that ultimate agreement on the historical character of the names in P (or Chronicles) will be reached till due weight has been given to the facts to which I have called attention.

The most important piece of new inscripational evidence in Professor Hommel's book is contained in Appendix (*b*), pp. 319 ff., and relates to the use of *tsûr* as a divine name. This unquestionably has a bearing on the antiquity and on the real or artificial character of the four names compounded with *tsûr* contained in P (Num. 1⁵. 6. 10 3³⁵). My own conclusion, based on my analysis of the usage of *tsûr* in Hebrew literature (pp. 195 f.), was that there 'was 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.' I was, of course, referring here to Hebrew names only. Still I should have worded my conclusion somewhat differently had the facts now brought forward by Professor Hommel been known to me. He does not indeed produce from the inscriptions any *Hebrew* name compounded with *tsûr*, nor any name at all so compounded of the Mosaic period. But he cites from a South Arabian inscription belonging to the eighth century B.C. at latest, and probably to a somewhat earlier period, the name of a female slave—*Tsuri*'addana. This, of course, proves once for all that compounds with *tsûri* were a real Semitic formation; and that is all that is *decisively* proved. A certain amount further follows, with more or less probability, inferentially. From the name *Bir*-*tsur*

(or *Bar*-*tsur*—*בר צור*), in the Zinjerli inscriptions, Professor Hommel infers that *tsûr* was also in use as a divine appellation in N. Syria in the eighth century. In this he is probably enough right whether he correctly interprets the name, 'the god *Bir* is a rock,' or whether, following the suggestion of D. H. Müller's transliteration, *Bar*-*Jsûr* and the analogy of the name *Bar*-*Rekûb* in the same inscription, we interpret 'son of *Tsûr*'; instances of a divine name following the term 'son' in Semitic proper names are not uncommon (see *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, p. 68). Now, combining these two facts, the use of *tsûr* as a divine appellation both in Sam'al and in South Arabia in the eighth century, and with a conclusion reached in an earlier work, Professor Hommel *infers* that *tsûr* must have been introduced into Midian some centuries earlier. This inference, which he terms a fact, he then proceeds to describe as being 'of decisive importance in determining the antiquity of Hebrew names compounded with *tsûri*.' I think it will be clear that the proof is still far from certain. Briefly, Professor Hommel appears to me to have diminished the probability of the compounds with *tsûr* 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.

The fresh argument brought forward by Professor Hommel in favour of the genuineness of compounds with *Shaddai* is much less direct. It depends on a different interpretation of the now familiar name of one of the kings of the Khammu-rabi dynasty, namely, *Ammi*-*satana*. It is now generally admitted that most (or, as Professor Hommel holds, all) of the names of this dynasty are of non-Babylonian, Western Semitic origin. Professor Hommel considers them definitely Arabic in origin. The final syllable of *Ammi*-*satana* he considers to be the 1st plural suffix, and the name as a whole to mean, 'My uncle is our mountain'; further, *sata* = the *Shadd* of *Shaddai*. In other words, the problematical *Shaddai* (= (God) Almighty) is at last explained, and means 'My mountain,' and *Ammi*-*satana*, the name of a Babylonian king of about the year 2000 B.C., is virtually the same as *Ammi*-*shaddai*, one of the tribal princes mentioned in Numbers i., the only difference being that in the one

case the suffix is plural, in the other singular. These suggestions of Professor Hommel's are full of interest, but far too hypothetical to be safely made the *basis* of an argument. Granting that *satana* is the correct transliteration of the second element in the Babylonian name, the possibility of its being a verbal and not a substantival form still remains; and finally, it remains to be seen whether the explanation of Shaddai thus offered gains general acceptance. But if the equivalence of Ammi-shaddai and Ammi-satana ultimately commends itself, I should 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. I should still remain very doubtful whether Pedahtsûr was an early Hebrew name.

I will not pursue in detail Professor Hommel's arguments in favour of the antiquity of particular names. What I wish rather to do is to remind the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES that in my judgment a serious question would remain even if every separate name in the Priestly Code could be shown to have been in use among the Hebrews or some other Semitic people before 1300 or 1400 B.C., *i.e.* if the utmost that Professor Hommel attempts to prove had been proved. It is this: Does such a list as we meet with in Numbers i. possess, *as a whole*, an ancient complexion? Have we there not only ancient names, but the same variety of ancient names as exist in other early records? Are the various classes represented in approximately the same proportions as other ancient lists would lead us to expect? The analyses contained in my book supply a negative answer to each of these questions. I have also indicated that in some respects certain lists in P show a striking resemblance to very late lists of angelic names. Until Professor Hommel has taken account of these facts he cannot claim that he has supplied an answer to my contention; nor do I think that anyone will be wise in using the lists in question as typical illustrations of the nomenclature of the Mosaic period.

In conclusion, I cannot but express my regret that Professor Hommel has been somewhat misrepresented by the English translation. In a number of cases neutral expressions of disagreement with or disapproval of certain scholars and their conclusions are heightened and coloured into disparaging and offensive remarks; and in some

cases remarks of Professor Hommel which were presumably displeasing to the S.P.C.K. are suppressed or modified. I will refer to but a few. 'Die Aufstellungen der sog. modernen Pentateuchkritik' (*i.e.* the assertions, or positions, of the so-called modern criticism of the Pentateuch) is rendered 'the cobweb theories of the so-called higher critics' (p. xii). 'Higher critics,' by the bye, appears to be the regular but quite unwarrantable rendering of the German 'modern criticism.' Professor Hommel appears to use his term with particular reference to a special section of critics, and certainly had not in view such a 'higher critic' as Dillmann (cf. the reference on p. 21); and several of the best known English critics are excluded if we may judge by the inapplicability of what Professor Hommel says to their standpoint. A 'higher critic,' too, it must be remembered, is Professor Hommel himself; he definitely refuses, for instance, to abandon one of the results most generally connected in the popular mind with criticism—the analysis into sources (see pp. 12 f., 18 f.). The difference of view between Professor Hommel and his translator is again indicated by the insertion of the word 'sources' in inverted commas (p. 12). The suggestion of the inverted commas is obvious; but it is Mr. M'Clure's and not Professor Hommel's. Similarly, Bericht (account, narrative) is rendered wrongly and senselessly 'passage' (p. 271). Again, on p. 202, the word 'absurdity,' which is twice used, is unjustifiable; Professor Hommel uses the term 'Unmöglichkeit' of a theory which he considers *impossibly* correct. On p. 290 the following sentence is *omitted* without any note to that effect:—'The popular tradition in contrast to the priestly often represents a coarsening (Vergröberung), and has a tendency to the romantic and to legendary adornment.' This description of one of the sources of the Pentateuch was no doubt displeasing to the translator; its omission is a fresh piece of clear evidence that his standpoint and Professor Hommel's are not identical.

This unnecessary infusion of terms of disparagement and offence does not favour the advance of knowledge; and recognising that, widely as we differ on some points, Professor Hommel and myself have this common end in view, I have thought it desirable to point out that many of these expressions which hamper discussion have not sprung from Professor Hommel. Nor can we observe without deep regret that a Society which

exists for the promotion of Christian knowledge should resort in its translations to the practice of suppression or alteration of important sentences, and the insertion of expressions which tend to obscure the clear atmosphere in which Truth is best discerned.

The foregoing criticism of Professor Hommel's

argument from Proper Names reached the Editor just too late for insertion in the August number. The postponement, however, enables me to express the pleasure with which I have read Professor Margoliouth's searching criticism of Professor Hommel's general line of argument, with one part of which alone my own note is concerned.

G. B. G.

Recent Foreign Theology.

An Exposure.

THE literary supplement to the *Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung* of 14th June contains a witty exposure by Professor D. Kaufmann of a pamphlet published anonymously at Crefeld, bearing the title *Das 104 Blatt aus dem Register des Thorschreibers von Jerusalem*, and professing to be an edition of a papyrus leaf of the year 27 A.D. which belonged originally to the visitors' book of the gatekeeper at Jerusalem, and contains, among other important records, a notice of a visit of 'Jesus the man of God,' whom the anonymous editor very naturally identifies with our Lord. The original document is offered for sale in the dealer's list, which occupies the inside of the cover, and only 20,000 marks, or £1000, demanded for it; and if the editor were accurate in his description of its contents, this price could not be called 'sehr teuer,' a phrase which the dealer substitutes for figures in pricing some of his articles. Unfortunately, it is as clear as daylight that the editor has made a mistake of a thousand years in the date of his document; that the leaf belongs not to Jerusalem, but to Cairo; and that the notion that it came from a visitors' book is only due to the editor's absolute ignorance of Arabic, the language in which the leaf is written; so that for the notices 'came,' 'went,' and 'dwelt' we should substitute 'bushels,' 'halves,' and 'quarters.' Professor Kaufmann apologises for calling attention to this pamphlet, on the ground that it is apparently only the first of a series, and that such publications tend to cast discredit on the restoration of ancient literature, in which English workers especially have been so successful. What surprises us most is that the anonymous editor

hints that he consulted Euting, who pointed out one fact about the document as 'bedenklich.'

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

Oxford.

Among the Periodicals.

The Date of the Fourth Gospel.

READERS OF THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will perhaps recall the attempt of Mr. Halcombe to upset the current opinion as to the relative dates of the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. A similar position has been recently maintained in Germany by Lic. Wuttig, whose work is reviewed in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* of 10th July last by no less an authority than Professor HOLTZMANN. By the way, it is rather singular that neither the author nor his reviewer appear to have heard of Halcombe's *Historical Relation of the Gospels*. The thesis maintained by Wuttig is that the Fourth Gospel was written not after, but before, the Synoptics, that it was the work of John the son of Zebedee, who composed it about A.D. 62 or 63, when he was about sixty years of age, and before he settled at Ephesus. The work was undertaken as the result of an understanding with a large body of apostles and witnesses, hence the plural in John i. 14 and 1 John i. 1-3. The latter passage, according to Wuttig, was originally intended to form the introduction to the Gospel, but was afterwards expanded into the First Epistle, which along with John xxi. 1-23 served as a 'Begleitschreiben' to the Gospel. This last chapter of the Fourth Gospel he holds to have been written shortly after the martyr death of St. Peter (c. 64 or 65 A.D.), and possibly after the composition of the Synoptics. At a still later