

$\frac{161}{205}$ M $\frac{1}{610}$

$\frac{161}{205}$

HEBREW PROPER NAMES

Nº 34221.

M¹₆₁₀ STUDIES 161
IN 205.
HEBREW PROPER NAMES

BY

G. BUCHANAN GRAY, M.A.

LECTURER IN HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY IN MANSFIELD COLLEGE
LATE SENIOR KENNICOTT SCHOLAR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

No 34221.

LONDON

ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK

1896

PREFACE

THE present volume has grown out of an essay written for the Senior Kennicott Scholarship in 1893. During the past three years I have been able to make the collection of data for my arguments more complete and more exact—more especially by a closer examination of the textual tradition of the names. Comparatively little has been done in the way of a systematic treatment of the text of the Old Testament proper names, although in the recent dictionary by Siegfried and Stade good service has been rendered by giving under the various names the Greek equivalents, which frequently indicate the degree of uncertainty attaching to particular instances. The notes to Kittel's edition of Chronicles (in Haupt's Bible) also afford valuable help; but my own notes were practically complete before this appeared. Under the circumstances I am hopeful that, apart from the arguments and theories of



my book, the notes on the text of the names (contained chiefly in Appendix II., but also scattered throughout the book) will be found of help by other workers in this subject. I should explain that I have examined the testimony of the versions for all *hapax legomena* to which I have had occasion to refer, and for many other names which appeared to be of questionable genuineness. Where a form is cited from the LXX, it may be understood that none of the MSS. represented by Swete's edition, nor the Lucian recension as printed by Lagarde gives a variant presenting any material (*i.e.* more than orthographic) difference from the form cited, unless the contrary is distinctly stated or implied. For the text of the Targums, the Samaritan and the Syriac, I have used Walton; for the last also Lee's text. I need scarcely add that I am not unmindful of the necessarily provisional character of all work of this kind in the present stage of Old Testament textual criticism; but even now several names in the Massoretic text ought to be dismissed as the result of transcriptional or other error, and others are, entirely or in particular usages, so questionable that they should be used in argument only with extreme caution. I have made it my aim, though possibly without uniform success, to give the benefit of the doubt (when the evidence was evenly balanced)

to readings (as also to etymologies) unfavourable to my arguments, or at least in all important cases to draw attention to the uncertainty; the arrangement of Appendices II. and III. will moreover render it easy for any one to test in detail the character of the data for the several arguments.

The original essay has been amplified in almost every part, and was re-written in the latter part of last year; but the main line of argument and the chief conclusions, though they have been generally strengthened, have not been greatly modified by my more recent investigations. One or two details with regard to changes may be referred to: in Chapter II. the section dealing with compounds in 'Am has been modified and very greatly enlarged; the discussion of the geographical names in Ba'al is new, so also is the geographical analysis of the animal names (pp. 105 ff.); in Chapter III. the analysis of the names in the Priestly Code is much more detailed, and consequently the conclusions I have felt myself justified in drawing are much more definite. Three years ago little more than the peculiarity of these names was clear to me; the causes of it were obscure. Some obscurity in details remains and probably must do so; but Dillmann's comments (especially on Num. i.), which then weighed with me, have ceased to incline me

to the opinion that the whole or even the main cause of this peculiarity of the names might be their antiquity. The application of my results to test the historical character of individual sections of Chronicles (pp. 226-242) is also fresh, and may, I hope, throw some light on the obscure section (cc. i.-ix.) with which that book opens. But I would explain that any abruptness and positiveness of expression which may mark that part of my book is due to the desire for brevity, not to the attribution of undue importance or certainty to the results.

In discussions where so much often turns on the form of the name, it has seemed desirable to give the Hebrew characters rather than a transliteration. On the other hand where the form is of less importance, and especially in summarising sections, I have frequently preferred to give the recognised English equivalent rather than a more exact transliteration.

The name of Nestle is indissolubly associated with the subject of Hebrew proper names: from his monograph on the subject and from his subsequent contributions I have derived the greatest assistance. My indebtedness to the writings of other scholars, notably Nöldeke, Robertson Smith, and Wellhausen, has also been great, as the references in the notes will sufficiently indicate.

Finally, I must give myself the pleasure of thanking all those from whom I have received help through personal communication; and more especially would I record here my warm gratitude to Professor Driver for the constant encouragement and frequent advice which I have received from him, to Dr. Neubauer who, under circumstances which have rendered the act one of singular kindness, has read large parts of my book while it has been passing through the press, and given me the benefit of many valuable suggestions, and to my colleague, Mr. Thatcher, who has assisted me in a most welcome manner by reading the proof-sheets and favoured me with numerous criticisms which have enabled me materially to improve the exposition of my subject.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD,
August 1896.