



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE “ENCYCLOPAEDIA BIBLICA” (VOLS. I
AND II) AND THE TEXTUAL TRADITION
OF HEBREW PROPER NAMES.

Two of the four volumes of which the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* is to consist have now appeared, and it is already apparent that this great work will be much more than a mere survey and summary of the work of scholars and investigators. It is full of original suggestions, and contributes greatly in many departments to the advance of Biblical study. To judge from some of the reviews this is accounted in certain circles a vice rather than a virtue: in such a work originality appears to be unwelcome because it is unexpected. One thing—though by no means a grudging reception—this characteristic of the new work certainly seems to call for, and that is to draw attention to, and where necessary to criticize, what is here freshly said or mooted lest it should be unused, or for lack of criticism become misused.

In the present article I confine myself to a single subject, and to a large extent to a single aspect even of that; I intend to indicate the nature of the contributions made in these volumes—often in obscure articles and out-of-the-way sections—to the study of Hebrew Proper Names, and more especially to consider the question of the textual tradition of those names.

The comprehensive article on “Names¹” to which, when

¹ One section of this, dealing with Place Names, is contributed by myself: in vol. i I have written the article “Ammi, Names in.” Neither of these, and consequently none of my own work, is discussed in the present article.

the work is complete, the reader interested in the subject will naturally first turn, will appear in a later volume. But there are several articles of a general character, more or less directly and intimately connected with the subject, in the first two volumes, and especially in the second a large number of brief articles the importance of which is out of all proportion to their size. Were it but for these alone the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* must henceforth be constantly in the hands of all serious students of the subject, for they will find that the knowledge acquired in the past is here fully and succinctly stated; and that no previous work has so systematically broken fresh ground in the discussion especially of the textual validity but also of the philological, historical, and religious significance of the proper names of the Old Testament.

The following series of articles deals with the particularly interesting groups of names compounded with an element denoting kinship—Abi, Ammi, Dod, Hamu or Hami.

In *Abi* Professor Cheyne discusses somewhat fully both the philological and religious problems presented by the names containing that element. He independently supports the view which I have elsewhere¹ defended at length, that names of the type Abiel are sentences, and that the "i" is not pronominal. In the second section of the article he discusses the question which part of the name is predicative, and concludes that it is the term of kinship when the other term is divine; but that in such a name as Abiram, Abi is the subject, and ram (exalted) the predicate. Here again I find Professor Cheyne in agreement with myself² as against, for example, Professor Moore. In the last two sections Professor Cheyne discusses the religious significance of these names, and rightly criticizes Professor Hommel's

¹ *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names* (1896), pp. 75-86. This work will be cited henceforth throughout the article as *H. P. N.*

² *Ibid.* 140; cf. 137, n. 3, and see the interpretation of the names Ahikam, Adonikam, Adoniram, in the *Encyc. Bibl.* Note also the Phoen. אִיקָא cited under Ahikam.

undiscriminating use of the parallel Babylonian names on the ground that proof of a tendency among the Babylonians is no sufficient proof that the same tendency existed among the Hebrews.

Professor Cheyne also writes the article on *Dod*, Mr. Hogg that on *Hamu*: but whereas Mr. Hogg explains *Hamu*, which occurs at most in one or two names, as a term of kindred, Professor Cheyne decides that *Dod*, which is a rather more frequent though still rare component of names, is not a term of kindred. The two articles should have been correlated; the decision in the one case can hardly be altogether unaffected by that in the other. I decided myself¹ that in both cases the balance of evidence, which was too incomplete and ambiguous to be decisive, was in favour of the interpretation as a term of kindred. No fresh evidence is yet forthcoming², and to Professor Cheyne the balance seems the other way; he expressly indicates that this judgment is provisional. Certainly in itself it does not favour his view that he has to interpret the at least superficially similar names *Eldad* and *Dodiyah* (see s. v. *Dodavah*), in two different ways, viz. *Dad* is *God*, and *Yah* is a divine patron. In the article *Hamuel* it should have been noted that the single *m* of the Greek text is quite indecisive evidence as against the double *m* of the Massoretic text, and that for the reason given in *H. P. N.*, 323. In *Hamul* the reading חמואל (Hamuel) of the Samaritan text might with advantage have been cited. Under *Abner* Lagarde's view that *Ab*=*Aben*=*son*, is referred to, but the full argument³ against it is not indicated.

One of the chief difficulties in utilizing the evidence of Hebrew Proper Names to the full, lies in the numerous ambiguities and uncertainties of the lists in the opening

¹ *H. P. N.*, 60 ff.

² But in modification of what is said in *H. P. N.*, 61, against 77 = to love, the Assyrian *dādū*, as cited in the article, should be noted.

³ See *H. P. N.*, 23.

section of the books of Chronicles. It is a long while now since Wellhausen¹ showed what valuable historical matter lay concealed there; several of the articles in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* contain bold and instructive attempts to unsolve the riddles of those chapters, or at least to read the riddles aright; chief amongst such articles may be mentioned those by Mr. Hogg on the various tribes (e.g. Asher, Benjamin, Ephraim), some of which have been preceded by thorough studies in the recent volumes of this REVIEW, and Mr. Stanley Cook's illuminating article on *Genealogies*.

But I turn now to the shorter articles. Every student is laid under deep obligation to the editors for the fullness—a fullness quite unrivalled in any work of the kind before—with which they have given the Greek forms of the names. Many have no doubt found Stade and Siegfried's *Hebrew Dictionary* useful for the very reason that the Greek equivalents are regularly given under the proper names; yet even there it is as a rule only the usual equivalents that are cited. In the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, we find not only the regular forms in the different Uncial MSS., and the Lucianic recension, but curious variants and manifest corruptions. Thus to cite one or two instances: *Jaaziel* (יָאָזִיאֵל . . . οξείηλ [B s], Ιηουλ [A], Ιειηλ [L]); *Jabez* (יָבֵז, Ιγαβης, Γαμες [B], Ιαγβης, Γαβης [A], Ιαβιης, Ιαβηλ, Ιαβε[ι]ς [L]); *Japhlet* (יָפֶלֶט . . . Ιφαμηλ, Αφαληχ, Ιαφαληλ [B], Ιαφαλητ [A], -φλετ [L]). It is most convenient and full of instruction, to have the forms thus brought together; one can thus see at a glance the kind of errors that arose, and judge of the value of the testimony of the Greek text in particular instances.

The feature of the work just alluded to is all the more in place, since the attitude of the writers of the various articles² to the Hebrew text is sceptical, and the emendations suggested are radical. The extent and nature of

¹ In his *De Gentibus et Familiis Iudaeis* (1870).

² A large number of the articles in question are signed T. K. C[heyne]; a large number are unsigned.

the corruptions to which, according to these suggestions, Hebrew proper names have been subject, either in the transmission of the text or in popular use before they were committed to writing, may be indicated by the following illustrations; the instances cited, it must be understood, are the merest selection from an immensely larger number to be found even in these first two volumes of the work. Names occurring but once in the Old Testament are marked with a †. The emendations will be found under the several articles except where a number is given; this refers to the column where the suggestion is made.

†Besodeiah בסוריה	{ is a corrup- tion of }	Hasadiah חסדיה
Bezalel בצלאל	„	Hilleşel חלצאל
Jahleel יחלאל	„	„ „
Jahzeel יחצאל	„	„ „
†Hazeleponi הצללפוני	„	„ „
(Je) Kabzeel (י)קבצאל	„	(Je)halleşel (י)חלצאל
Ziklag צקלג	„	Haluşah חלצה 2649
†Habaziniyah חבצניה	„	Kabzeel = Jehalleşel
Isaac יצחק	{ is an ancient popular corruption of }	Ahihalas אחיהלגן
Jacob יעקב	„	Abicabod אביכבד
Abraham אברהם	„	Abraham אברהם 2365 f
Israel ישראל	}	Jizrahel יזרחאל 2311 2290
Jezreel יזרעאל		
Issachar יששכר		
†Hiel חיאל	{ is a corrup- tion of }	Jehu יהוא
Ichabod איכבד	„	Jochebed יוכבד
Hamutal חמוטל	„	Hamutub חמוטב
Abital אביטל	„	Abitub אביטב
Elioenai אליועני	„	Elishama אלישמע
Job איוב	„	Eabani איבן
†Jemimah ימימה	„	Temimah תמימה
†Keren Happuch קרן הפוך	„	Reah Tappuhim ריה תפוחים
Ezion Geber עציון גבר	„	Neşib Edom נציב אדם
†Eth-Kezin עתה קצין	„	Ir Kaşiu עיר קציו

Endor (in 1 S. xxviii. 5-25) עין דור	} is a corrup- tion of }	En H̄arod עין הרד
†En-H̄addah עין חדה		
Zelophehad צֶלְפַחַד	} „	Salecah or Salhad
Gilead גִּלְעָד		1947 סלכה or סלחר
†Ishod אישהוד	} „	Girzites גִּרְזִי
Mahlah מחלה		
Perizzites פְּרִזִּי	} „	
Girgashites גִּרְגָּשִׁי		

The merest glance down the foregoing list can hardly fail to raise the question, Can we be sure in any case that the Old Testament has preserved for us the original form of a name? that, even if the form still stands as it was first written down, it is not a form that had previously been corrupted in popular use? If the most familiar and most frequently recurring names, like those of the patriarchs, or of places so frequently mentioned as Ziklag, are corruptions, what ancient names are likely to have survived in their original forms? And then the further question arises, If the writers of the articles are justified in their scepticism of the traditional forms, what value attaches to the alternatives they suggest; what kind of evidence for their emendations is available?

The *Encyclopaedia Biblica* thus raises a most important question which hitherto has scarcely been sufficiently faced. What is the extent of corruption to which proper names have been subjected in their transmission? With what degree of assurance can we in specific cases accept the traditional as the original form, or surmise the original now only represented by a corrupt traditional form?

I will bring my criticism of details under suggestions for an answer to these questions.

In the first place, it has long been generally recognized that the proper names of the Old Testament have suffered in part from intentional, in part from unintentional or accidental corruption. The best known and clearest instance of intentional corruption consists in the substitution

of *bosheth* (shame) for Baal in names originally containing the latter element¹. This particular corruption is not to be attributed to an *early* class of editors or scribes, for whereas in the Hebrew text of Samuel the corrupt form regularly appears, in the Greek text of Samuel sometimes, and in the Hebrew text of Chronicles regularly, the original form with Baal is preserved. These considerations weigh against the at first sight attractive suggestion adopted after Klostermann and Marquart that the difficult form Jeroboam is merely an intentionally corrupted form of Jerubbaal. The name occurs so frequently that we should have expected, as in the case of other compounds with Baal, that the form with Baal would appear occasionally either in the Greek text of Kings or the Hebrew text of Hosea or Chronicles. Yet it probably never appears at all, for in view of the variants of the Greek MSS. we cannot be sure that we have a solitary example in the *Ιεροβααλ* (*al. Ιεροβοαμ*) of Hos. x. 14. On the other hand, that Manasseh's mother (2 Kings xxi. 1) was Hephzibaal is probable enough. The controlling evidence of Chronicles is in this instance lacking.

But by far the more numerous corruptions of names have been unintentional and accidental.

These accidental corruptions have unquestionably been very numerous, as any one who will compare the parallel lists of the Hebrew text, or the Hebrew with the Greek text of e. g. 1 Chron. i-ix, must immediately become convinced. So numerous are they that it should be freely granted that a name of strange form or in any way suspicious that occurs but once in the Old Testament should only be accepted in the most provisional way and used with the extreme of caution in argument. And this even if the versions support the Hebrew text; for their agreement only carries back the evidence for the form at the highest, and then only in the case of names in the Pentateuch to \pm 250 B. C. Hitherto there has prevailed a far too general credulity in

¹ Cf. *H. P. N.*, 121, where in n. 1 I ought also to have referred to Vatke, *Rel. des A. T.*, 675, n. 3.

accepting the traditional forms of names, and the scepticism of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* is a wholesome corrective.

But the more frequently a name occurs, the more improbable is it that it has suffered *accidental* corruption in the transmission of the document in which it occurs. To take an example. On the ground of the improbability of the form, Professor Cheyne denies the existence of the name Bezael (בְּזַאֵל, generally explained as "in the shadow of God"), and proposes as the original form Hilleṣel. Now the only form in which the suggestion can be admitted in the light of the facts and the theory of probabilities, even for a moment, is that we suppose the corruption to have arisen as far back as the source from which P, in whom the name of the builder of the tabernacle is first mentioned, derived his information, or in the act of copying from that source. For the facts are these—this Bezael is mentioned six times in Exod. xxxi–xxxiv, and twice in Chronicles (1 Chron. ii. 20, 2 Chron. i. 5). Now a scribe may well have copied Hilleṣel as Bezael with the double mistake (b for ḥ and ṣ and l transposed) once, he would not *accidentally* have made the *same double* mistake six times. No doubt then Professor Cheyne means us to understand that the mistake occurred in the transmission of P's source rather than of our present text of Exodus. That he does not say so is unfortunate, for it is well in considering a conjecture to see at once what is involved in it, and exceedingly important to consider at what period a supposed corruption of the text may have originated. The general principle that names suffered corruption in the early history of their transmission stated elsewhere (col. 1586, n. 3) certainly ought to be admitted; but does it satisfactorily account for all the facts connected with the name Bezael? Bezael also appears as the name of a contemporary of Ezra (Ezra x. 20). Now it is improbable that another scribe would have made just the same mistake, for it is by no means the most obvious error or the one most likely to occur in copying Hilleṣel. But unless this were so we are carried back to the name in actual

use. How are we to account for it? Did the father of the child hunt up some musty document, and finding the name there confer it on his child? This is just possible¹, but hardly probable. On the whole, then, I must consider Professor Cheyne's case against Bezalel not made out, and his suggestion that it is a corruption of Ḥilleṣel improbable². It follows that the argument against Besodeiah falls to the ground, though if it stood an entirely isolated instance of its type, this name, which occurs but once, might not unreasonably be suspected.

The following appears to me a sound canon of criticism :
*When a name occurs several times, and has not been subject to intentional corruption, the genuineness of the form is not to be questioned unless reasonable cause can be shown for supposing that its transmission has been at one stage solely by means of a document in which the name occurred but once or twice (or in which at least it did not occur several times). In many cases it is by no means obvious that such a canon has been respected by those who in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* have explained traditional forms as due to accidental corruption.*

One of the cases in which it is most difficult to believe that a name can be explained as a mere transcriptional error is Elioenai (אלי(ה)ועיני). This name occurs some ten times in Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and of some seven or eight different persons; and yet it is suggested that it is merely a mis-written Elishama (אלישמע). In spite of its strange form³, which has few parallels, the name Elioenai

¹ Cf. *H. P. N.*, 7 f.

² Probably the number of cases in which it is suggested the element עני in proper names has suffered corruption (see list above) has been overdone. That the simple name עני is verbal not segholate as in the Massoretic Text is probable (see s. v. HELEZ); G transliterates $\chi\alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\varsigma$ (with double λ and η), not $\chi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\varsigma$, which would represent the segholate form. I think it not improbable that עני lies concealed in the somewhat obviously corrupt עניעני , and in any case Professor Cheyne's explanation of the last part of the form seems sound.

³ Cf. *H. P. N.*, 158.

must be admitted as genuine. The truth is, after the Exile, possibly under Babylonian influence, there appears to have been for a time a tendency to try forms of names unfamiliar to the earlier Hebrews¹. To one of these unusual types belong Bezalel and Besodeiah just discussed; to another Eliphelehu (אליפלהו), to which, curiously enough, the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* takes no exception; to yet another חשבניה, if we accept the pointing suggested under Ḥashab-niah and the emendation of the name Ḥashbadana². Some of these late names are referred to early personages by the Chronicler who, when at a loss, was more often content to supply himself with names current in his own day than to frame for himself "uncommon names in the interest of edification³."

The canon just formulated involves a corollary, viz. *no element in a proper name is to be suspected which occurs in several different names*. The only instance in which this is violated, so far as I have observed in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, is not a violent one, since the element occurs in only two names. Nevertheless, the occurrence of the element טל (dew) in the two corresponding names, Abital and Ḥamutal, appears to me a far stronger reason for maintaining the genuineness of the tradition of these names than the reasons adduced for supposing it to be a corruption of טב. Indeed, one of these reasons is truly astonishing. What has the resemblance of ג and ל in the *Palmyrene* characters to do with the matter? Is there any reason for supposing that the early Hebrew script resembled the

¹ Cf. *H. P. N.*, 220 ff.

² Mr. Cooke's explanation of this suspicious name (indifferently supported by the Versions), as due to dittography of surrounding names, is highly probable.

³ Professor Cheyne thinks that the names in 1 Chron. xxv. 4 f., which have most frequently been cited as instances of the latter method, can be attributed to textual corruption (col. 2015). It is difficult to believe that design had nothing to do with these curious names, though it may have been the design of a scribe (operating on half-illegible names) rather than that of the author.

Palmyrene? The error, if error there be, must have arisen early, when it is far more probable that Hebrew writing resembled that of the Moabite stone and early Hebrew seals in which כ and ל are not particularly similar. Then, again, why is it "very improbable" that a name should be compounded with טל? Is the statement "the father is dew" (cf. Hos. xiv. 5) more improbable than "the brother is dawning light" (Ahishahar; Abishahar is suggested as an emendation for Abishur)?

In the preceding paragraphs I have given illustrations of what appears to me failure to appreciate the weight of evidence in favour of the traditional forms of names. I may now refer to one or two instances of insufficiency in the force of positive arguments brought forward against particular names. Jahmai (יהמי) is questioned on the ground that the root חמה "does not appear to be used in Hebrew." But, as Gesenius long ago pointed out¹, the proper names not infrequently contain roots which do not happen to occur in the extant Hebrew literature, though they are well enough known to us from the cognate languages. His list may need revision, but Hogleh may be cited as a good instance; the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, indeed, questions the genuineness of the form in the case of Zelophehad's daughter, but allows it to stand in Beth-Hogleh. I will add the case of the root זכר: this occurs in quite a number of names, but otherwise survives in the Old Testament in a single phrase alone—in the explanation of the name Zebulon (זכרני אלהים אחי זכר טוב). Again, previous failure to explain the form of a name is not in all cases decisive argument against it; the form Jemima (ימימה) may be difficult; Professor Cheyne's suggestion here (Temimah תמימה) is very simple and easy, for in the earlier script ת resembled י much more closely than in the square, and the two letters were, as a matter of fact, frequently confused; but I question whether he has sufficient ground for abandon-

¹ *Gesch. d. hebr. Sprache u. Schrift*, 48 f.

ing the text, or, at least, whether his emendation is more probably original than the traditional form. I have already referred to the insufficiency of the argument against Bezalel and Besodeiah on the ground of the manner of their composition.

I have so far been criticizing the rejection of traditional forms of names and indicating the limits within which, and the grounds on which, we may accept the text of the Old Testament names. I turn now to the positive side of the matter—the character of the emendations proposed. There are unquestionably a great number of corrupt names in the Old Testament, and a great number which, if not obviously corrupt, are still far from being certainly correct. The writers in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* have in these cases resorted to emendations with unexampled frequency and boldness. The forms they suggest are of course always possible; but the question is, Are they in the particular cases more than the merest possibilities? Have they as much probability as the form in the text? Have they more probability than several others that could be suggested?

Once again, actual evidence which has hitherto been insufficiently regarded undoubtedly brings us face to face with hard and rude fact. We are compelled (by an examination, as before, of e. g. 1 Chron. i–ix, with parallel lists and the Greek Version) to admit that any combination of letters might on occasion become, in the course of transcription, any other combination. So long as we have evidence, whether derived from versions or parallel lists, to support emendations, very extensive changes in names may be justified as the result of transcriptional accident. Further, it may be granted that many similar corruptions took place before our earliest versions. But what follows? A great probability that many forms in the Hebrew text, though supported by the versions, are mere textual corruptions. Manifestly, then, considerable scepticism with regard to any form not established by the canon stated above, nor

supported by the contemporary evidence of inscriptions, is perfectly reasonable. A conjectural form may consequently often possess much more probability of being the original than does the form in the text. But in order that the conjectural form may possess any high degree of probability *on textual grounds*, it must differ from the form in the text, owing to reasons which can be shown to have been *frequent* causes of accidental corruption. To take a simple instance, in any case, where אַרַם (Aram) now stands in the Hebrew text, it is equally probable, on textual grounds, that the original reading was אֶדוֹם (Edom), for the two letters ך and ך are so similar as to be almost identical, and were, as a matter of fact, constantly confused. If there is the slightest reason in the context for reading Edom instead of Aram, or vice versa, textual considerations render the emendation highly probable. But it is conceivable that אֶדוֹם might on occasion arise by faulty copying of מוֹאב; ך and ך are frequently confused, so that מוֹאב might easily be copied מוֹאם; sometimes letters are transposed in copying, and מוֹאב might become מוֹאם, and then if the first ך happened to be a little faultily written, this might become אַרַם. All this is possible: and if there were overwhelming reasons in the context for reading Moab instead of Aram, and *nothing but* Moab, we might admit the emendation as probable, and the error as due to pure transcriptional accident. But in this case it could not be urged that the emendation was *supported* by textual considerations; the changes involved are occasional, not frequent, and consequently in the particular instance possible, not probable. Moreover, if Aram were contextually possible, it would be textually more probable; and unless Moab were contextually the only possible reading, it would be very uncertain, since several other readings might be textually as probable.

Now, many of the emendations and alterations suggested in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, which presuppose textual corruption just as little likely as that of Moab into Aram, rest in the main quite clearly on historical, geographical, or

mythological considerations. With these in the present article I have nothing to do. But there are frequently added notes which may, and in some cases cannot but, be taken as suggesting that the emendations proposed are *textually* probable.

I must content myself with referring to one or two details. Granting that the suspicions raised against **בצלאל** be justified, what value does the emendation proposed possess? As it appears to me, practically none. Transpositions doubtless took place, and **ח** and **ב** may no doubt occasionally have been confused, though in the older Hebrew alphabets they are not similar. Consequently, **חלצאל** might have been accidentally copied **בצלאל**; but, then, several other names might equally well be the original, and if we are to guess, why not guess **אצלאל** (cf. **אצליה**), which involves much less change; or if we are to call the Phoenician to our aid, why not **צלחאל** (cf. the Phoenician proper names **צלח**, **בעלצלח**, **אשמןצלח**)? But when several emendations are equally probable, any particular name furnished by one of the alternative emendations is of very uncertain reality.

Sometimes the emendations suggested appear at first sight to have more textual probability than they really possess. Professor Cheyne's suggestion that Hena (**הנע**) is a mere mis-writing of Avvah (**עוה**) is a happy one. He is possibly right in thinking Avvah a corruption of Gaza (**עוה**); but, if so, the corruption was an early one, and in the early alphabet the letters **ו** and **ז** resembled one another much less closely than in the square characters. The proposed corruption was then *possibly* accidental, since any letter at times was confused with any other letter; but it is not *textually probable*, since at the time when the error was made the letters confused were dissimilar.

If emendation is to be anything more than the product of the ingenuity of the individual scholar, it must be controlled by considerations of probability which may constitute something at least approaching an objective standard.

Where the versions are available, they constitute such a standard; the value of the evidence may be differently regarded, but evidence exists. But in a large number of cases the versions are not available. How far is it possible, then, to subject emendations to a standard of textual probability? Just so far as it is possible to establish the *frequency* of specific confusions. This has been done to a considerable extent for the period when the Greek version was made; it has been shown that certain letters are, as a matter of fact, subject to much more frequent confusion than others. But at that period it is probable that the Hebrew text was written in an early form of the square character¹. Can the same thing be done for the period when the text was written in the "unmodified archaic character" in which the letters that most closely resemble one another are not in all cases the same as in the square alphabet? Possibly something, if a collection were made of variations in parallel lists as between forms which are the same in the Hebrew and Greek texts. The corruptions in most of these cases probably date back beyond the Greek version. Now, there are scattered about through the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* notes² on the confusion of letters which assume confusions that have not generally been admitted as frequent. On what are these assumptions based? On such an induction as I have suggested? Or on emendations proposed in the work? In either case it is to be desired that the evidence should be given³. If the inductions are based on the emendations, then it can only have weight in so far as they are drawn from emendations which commend themselves independently

¹ See e.g. Driver, *Samuel*, p. lxv.

² e.g. "מ is frequently miswritten for נ," col. 1950, top. "הקקע... comes from רחמאל by ordinary corruption and transposition," 1976, top. ע=ר, 1274; ר=ז, 1961, top.

³ There is no indication in any of the notes alluded to that this evidence will be given in later volumes of the work. Perhaps it is not too late to express the hope that it may.

of textual considerations. We need to have the evidence arranged and tested, for certainly in some cases emendations, far from certain, and indeed, as far as can be judged from the evidence actually given, extremely hazardous, are made the basis for further changes. For example, it is proposed¹ to reject the names Kabzeel, Jekabzeel, admitted to be "in themselves likely forms," as corruptions of Hilleṣel, Jehalleṣel, on the ground that the conjecture involved would be "not very much less probable than the restoration of Ḥaluṣah for Ziklag"! And these hypothetical compounds with hilleṣ lead to the suggestion that Isaac goes back to the primitive form Ahi-ḥalaṣ.

I will not discuss the probability of the various conjectures as to popular corruptions, such as that just cited, or the proposal that Jacob is a worn-down form of Abi-cabod. They are not to be judged by textual considerations, though criticisms similar to those offered above seem pertinent here. The objections to the originality of the forms Isaac and Jacob (יצחק and יעקב) are insufficient; the forms are not in themselves impossible—quite the reverse. Then, again, we have no well-established laws of the oral corruption of names, though the modern forms of some ancient Palestinian forms may warn us that Hebrew, like other names, might become much transformed in the course of centuries. Here, then, everything depends on the sufficiency of the historical, mythological, or similar argument for the originality of the proposed form.

I merely allude to this class of proposed corruption in order to emphasize the necessity for greater clearness than is often to be found in the articles as to the character and age of the supposed corruption. Four stages or periods at which names in our Hebrew Bibles may have suffered corruption may be distinguished. Corruption may have taken place (1) before the name was committed to writing; or (2) while the text was written in the archaic

¹ s. v. KABZEEL.

characters ; or (3) after the text had come to be written in primitive square type, but before the date of the Greek version ; or (4) after the date of the Greek version. Only in the case of corruptions of the fourth period can we expect variants in the Greek version ; in the case of earlier corruptions, we can only fully judge of the probability of a proposed emendation when we have first clearly considered the period to which it is proposed to refer the corruption.

In any fruitful inquiry into a subject, we need to start with the surest and best evidence. In casting doubt on much that has generally passed for good in the case of Hebrew names, the writers in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* have rendered great service. It is doubtful whether the majority of their emendations are such as to afford us fresh evidence of the kind or to constitute a safe starting-point for further investigation, though they are often highly suggestive and in some cases exceedingly probable.

The nature of my criticism has led me to refer mainly to points of difference and to methods that appear open to improvement. But I cannot bring it to a conclusion without recording afresh my sense of the value of the brief articles and the parts of the longer articles which deal with the form and meaning of the proper names. Thought has played freshly on the innumerable details, many of which have little opportunity of being systematically reviewed except in such a work as the present, and even in such works are too often neglected or most perfunctorily dealt with. And the details themselves, though they appear to lie off the more frequently trodden paths of Biblical studies, are not infrequently shown to be a serious help or hindrance to progress along those paths.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.