

ESSAYS

IN

BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY AND CRITICISM

London
HENRY FROWDE



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.

✓
STUDIA BIBLICA
ET ECCLESIASTICA

ESSAYS

IN BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY AND CRITICISM

AND KINDRED SUBJECTS

BY

MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF OXFORD

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

M DCCC LXXXV

[*All rights reserved*]

I.

RECENT THEORIES ON THE ORIGIN AND
NATURE OF THE TETRAGRAMMATON.

[S. R. DRIVER.]

IN the Khorsabad inscription of Sargon¹, that monarch names, among those who had attempted insurrection against him, one *Ya-u-bi-'i-di*, king of Hamath; the word is accompanied by an indication that part of the compound is the name of a deity: and the supposition that this name is *Yahu* is confirmed by the remarkable fact that in a parallel inscription the same king bears the name *Ilubid*. A Hamathite king, it appears, could be called indifferently *Yahubid* or *Ilubid*, much in the same way that the king of Judah who before he came to the throne bore the name of Eliakim, was known afterwards as Jehoiakim. The discovery that the name *Yahu* was thus not confined to the Israelites led Schrader, in 1872, to the conjecture that it may have come to both Hebrews and Hamathites alike from Assyria; and the conjecture was adopted, and supported with positive arguments, by Friedrich Delitzsch, son of the well-known commentator, in his book *What was the Site of Paradise?* published in 1881.

I will begin by stating briefly Professor Delitzsch's theory, and the grounds upon which he defends it.

¹ Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das A. T.*, 1872, p. 3 f.; 1883, p. 23; *Records of the Past*, ix. p. 6.

The view generally held hitherto by scholars has been that *Yahweh* is the original form of the sacred name, of which *Yahu* (found only in proper names) and *Yah* are abbreviations. Professor Delitzsch adopts an opposite opinion, arguing as follows:—

1. *Yahweh* was never the name of the God of Israel in the mouth of the people; the popular name was always יהוה or יהו, as is shown by the fact that the former constitutes part of no proper name, while large numbers are compounded with the latter.

2. The abbreviations themselves show that the significant part of the word was felt to lie in the *ya*, which was always retained, although upon the usual theory this would be merely a prefix.

3. It is improbable that a name handed down from remote times would have included the abstract idea of *being*: such a signification bears the impress of a later period of theological reflexion.

4. *Yahu* was a name of God among other Canaanite nations besides Hebrews. In addition to *Yahubid* just cited, there are besides, the Damascene *Ya'-lu-'* found in an inscription of Esarhaddon¹; the Phœnician *Abdai*², *Yoel*³, *Bithias*⁴, the Philistine *Mitinti*, *Silká*, *Padi*, names of kings of Ashdod, Ashkelon, and Ekron respectively, mentioned by Sennacherib⁵, and formed precisely like the Hebrew *Mattithiah*, *Zedekiah*, and *Pedaiah*, the Hamathite *Yoram* (2 Sam. viii. 10), the Hittite *Uriah*, and the Ammonite *Tobiah*⁶, all of which show traces of the same name. If *Yahu* was thus a general Canaanite name, it cannot well be derived from יהוה: for this root,

¹ KAT., p. 24, note; p. 207, 24.

² A Tyrian Suffete, named in Menander (Schröder, *Phoen. Gramm.*, p. 152).

³ יוֹאֵל, on the fifth Maltese inscription (Wright, in the ZDMG. xxviii. 143 f.; Nestle, *Israelitische Eigennamen*, 1876, p. 86).

⁴ Verg. Aen. i. 738; Schröd., p. 114.

⁵ KAT., pp. 289-290 (on the Taylor-cylinder).

⁶ The name of the Hebronite *Hoham* (Josh. x. 3) is too uncertain to be added (Baudissin, *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, 1876, i. p. 224).

though known to Aramaic and Hebrew, is not Phœnician¹. Its source, therefore, must be sought not in Palestine, but in Babylonia, the common home of nearly the entire Canaanitish Pantheon; and remarkably enough, a sign denoting God (*ilu*), which hitherto had been read ideographically, has been discovered to have a phonetic value, and to be pronounced *i*, or with the ending of the Assyrian nominative *ya-u*. In other words, among the old Accadian population of Babylonia, from whom the Semitic immigrants derived their cuneiform writing, the supreme God bore the name *I*, which, in the mouths of the Semitic Babylonians, would readily become *Yā-u*.

Delitzsch accordingly propounds the following theory. The forms *Yahu*, *Yah*, current among the people, are of foreign origin. The form *Yahweh*, on the other hand, is distinctively Hebrew: it is a modification of *Yahu*, so formed as to be connected with **הוה** *to be*, and designed to express a deep theological truth: this prevailed among the prophets and priests, but not among the people generally. A distinction, it will be observed, is drawn between *Yahu* and *Yahweh*, and the theory is guarded thereby against the objection to which it might otherwise be exposed from a theological point of view. Delitzsch does not divest *Yahweh*, the usual form met with in the Old Testament, of the associations attached to it on the ground of Exod. iii and vi: he argues, on the contrary, that *Yahu* is the foreign word which was transformed into *Yahweh* just for the sake of giving expression to the truths taught in those passages. In fact, *Yahu* has no real connexion with *Yahweh*, and is merely the material framework upon which it is modelled.

The theory, however, though not open to objection upon theological grounds, is not free from difficulties in other directions, and exception was taken to it in most of the notices

¹ In Phœnician, as in Arabic and Ethiopic (**אֵל** *feri* by the side of **אלוה** *esse*), the substantive verb is **אָנָּן** (e.g. **אָנָּן לַכַּהֲנָן** in the remarkable inscription, relating to sacrifices, found at Marseilles).

of Professor Delitzsch's book. C. P. Tiele, in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* for March 1882, declared himself unconvinced, and recently it has been examined at greater length by F. A. Philippi¹ in the second part of the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie* for 1883², whose arguments against it I proceed now to state.

1. It is an exaggerated and untenable view to treat *Yah* as the popular form. In all colloquial expressions, in the language of every-day life, we uniformly in the Old Testament find *Yahweh*: it is used even in formulae of swearing and other common phrases, where a shorter form, if in use, might have been naturally expected to occur: of the shorter forms, *yahu* is confined entirely to proper names (where the longer one would have been cumbrous; imagine such a word as מלכיהרה!), and *yah* to proper names and poetry,—and even in poetry chiefly in later liturgical forms (e.g. Halleluyah, twenty-four times out of forty-seven³). Against the suggestion that possibly editors or scribes substituted at a later date the longer form, the testimony of Mesha is decisive; on his stone (line 18) he writes *Yahweh*⁴: the longer form must accordingly have been in popular use in the ninth century B. C. And in proper names abbreviations in accordance with the normal methods of the language (as יהו and יה would be) would not be against analogy.

2. The contractions do not cause difficulty. The transition from *Yahweh* to *-i* (י—) would not be made at once, but gradually. The last syllable being apocopated, after the

¹ Author of several important contributions to the comparative study of the Semitic languages, in particular, *Wesen und Ursprung des Status constructus* (1871), an article on the Root of the Semitic verb in *Morgenländische Forschungen* (Leipzig, 1875), on the numeral *two* in Semitic, in the *ZDMG.*, 1878, p. 21 ff., etc.

² P. 175 ff.

³ According to B. Davidson's *Concordance* (London, 1876). [Is. xxxviii. 11 bis.]

⁴ The reading admits of no doubt: Nöldeke and Dr. Wright do not question it; and the suggestion made since this paper was read to vocalize *Yahu'a* and to treat this as the name of a man (E. King, *Hebrew Words and Synonyms*, i. p. 35) is devoid of probability. The sense of כלי is determined naturally by the context, which is here strongly in favour of יהוה being the name of a God.

analogy of verbs ל"ו and ל"ר , there arose first *yahw*; next, the final *w* being first vocalized and then dropped, came *yahu* and *yah* (with the aspirate sounded — יָה)¹: after a while the aspirate ceased to be sounded, though it continued always to be written: and thus, though it is true that at last, in proper names, only the sound *ya* remained, its continuity with the earlier stages was unbroken, so that its real origin would always be felt. The forms, moreover, in which י or יְ alone appears (as עֲבָדֵי , בְּיָהוִי) are at best of uncertain derivation: it is possible that they are not connected with *yah* at all².

3. The objection drawn from the abstract nature of the idea shall be considered presently; the name, it is probable, was understood to express a moral, not a metaphysical, conception of being.

4. The Philistine names are too uncertain in their formation for an argument to be based upon them; and the others³ are too isolated to prove a general worship of a deity

¹ The apocopation causes no difficulty: it is in strict accord with other analogies presented by the language. The habit of apocopating the imperfect tense of verbs ל"ו was so familiar to the Hebrews that a word of similar formation, especially when forming the second part of a compound name, must have lent itself to it quite naturally. The phenomenon is isolated because other names of the same form from verbs ל"ו do not occur (the form is itself a rare one): יְהוִה is shortened as naturally to יְהו in יְשַׁעְיָהוּ as יְשַׁעְיָהוּ to יְשַׁעְיָהוּ after the *waw* conversive in בְּיְשַׁעְיָהוּ (in pause בְּיְשַׁעְיָהוּ).

² Renan, in an article *Des Noms Théophores apocopés* in the *Revue des Études juives*, v. (1882), p. 161 ff., regards the termination in these cases as disguised forms of the suffix of the 3rd pers. sing., referring to God. Others treat at least the *-ai* as adjectival (see Ewald, § 273 e; Olshausen, § 217 a, b). In an appendix to this essay will be found a representation and description (which I owe to the kindness of R. S. Poole, Esq., Keeper of Coins and Medals at the British Museum) of a remarkable coin found in the neighbourhood of Gaza, and bearing the letters יהו .

³ As regards *Yo'el* (יֵאוֹל), Dr. Wright, in the *Transactions of the Bibl. Archaeol. Soc.*, 1874, p. 397, had already remarked that the vocalization is conjectural. Whether, however, Nestle (*l.c.*) is right in connecting it with יֵאוֹל , *voluit* (הוֹאִיל), and interpreting *strong-willed*, must remain uncertain: it is at any rate precarious to seek support for this meaning in the וּלְיֹוֹל and וּלְיֹוֹלִי of the Sinaitic Inscriptions (Levy in the ZDMG. xiv. pp. 408, 410): for the proper names in those inscriptions appear mostly to have Arabic affinities (Blau, *ib.*, xvi. p. 377; Nöldeke, xvii. p. 703 f.). See also the *Corpus Inscr. Sem.*, p. 163.

Yahu—individual cases of borrowing from Israel are no improbability.

5. Admitting a Babylonian *yau*, it is difficult to understand how a Hebrew *yahu* can have arisen from it: the form which the regular phonetic laws would lead us to expect is *yó*; and if *yau* became in Hebrew indiscriminately יָהוּ, or יְהוּ, how is it that the latter appears never at the end of a compound proper name, the former never at the beginning? This difference can be accounted for upon the ordinary view, but not by Delitzsch's theory. 'The יְהוּ abbreviated from יְהוּה, when standing at the beginning of compound names became *y'hau*, *y'hó*, after the analogy of גְּבַר from *גְּבַר, because *yāhú*, in such a position, as part of a compound word with an accent of its own, would have drawn the tone unduly back, whereas יָהוּ for יְהוּ, in the second part of the compound, was excellently adapted to receive the tone.'

The question of a Babylonian *yau* is an intricate one, and cannot be satisfactorily discussed except by those who have made the cuneiform inscriptions their particular study. But the discussion may fortunately be dispensed with. Not only do both Tiele and Philippi raise objections to Delitzsch's reasoning, contending, for example, that the Assyrian *I* itself is not satisfactorily established as the name of a deity, but Professor Sayce, whose authority is not less than that of Professor Delitzsch, has declared¹ that his attempt to derive *Yahweh* from an Accadian origin is unsuccessful. Our knowledge of Babylonian mythology, he remarks, is tolerably complete: and no such name as *Yahweh* is contained in it. A derivation from the Accadian, which Professor Sayce abandons, need surely not occupy our attention further².

The rejection of a Babylonian origin for the Tetra-

¹ *The Modern Review*, 1882, p. 853.

² Mr. King, *u. s.*, pp. 15, 24, is of opinion that the ultimate source of יְהוּה is the Accadian *An* or *Anu*; but such a position (as may readily be imagined) is defensible only by aid of a series of assumptions, philological and critical, of the most questionable kind. An examination in detail is, I venture to think, needless.

grammaton does not, however, preclude the possibility of its having some other foreign, non-Hebraic, origin. Older scholars had indeed already suggested this, on the strength of certain notices in Greek writers¹; and as the view has been recently revived, I may be allowed, for the sake of completeness, to consider it briefly here, referring for further particulars to the full examination of it by Count Baudissin in the first volume of his *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte* (1876), p. 181 ff. Several ancient authorities (e. g. Diodorus Siculus², Origen, Theodoret, Jerome) speak of the God of the Jews under the name 'Ιάω: and the same name appears in some of the Gnostic systems³. Here it is evidently derived from the Old Testament, being found by the side of other names plainly of Hebraic origin. This is the case not only in the lists given by Irenaeus and other ancients, but also on the Gnostic rings and amulets, representations of which have been given by Macarius⁴, Montfaucon⁵, Kopp⁶, C. W. King⁷, and others. Abrasax, for example, we learn from Irenaeus, was the name given to the First Cause in the Basilidean system⁸. If therefore we find the name ΙΑΩ coupled with CABAΩΘ or ΑΔΩΝΑΙ under the strange composite figure which denoted Abrasax—the head of a hawk, or

¹ See the article: *ΙΕΡΟΥΣΑΛΗΜ*, by Mr. W. A. Wright, in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, i. p. 953 f.

² i. 94 Παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις Μωσῆν [sc. προσποιήσασθαι τοὺς νόμους αὐτῶν διδόναι] τὸν Ἰάω ἐπικαλούμενον θεόν.

³ The names of the spirits which, according to the Ophites, presided over the seven planets, are thus given by Irenaeus (i. 30, 5):—'Eum enim qui a matre primus sit Jaldabaoth vocari; eum autem qui sit ab eo, Iao; et qui ab eo Sabaoth; quartum autem Adoneum et quintum Elaeum et sextum Oreum, septimum autem et novissimum omnium Astaphaeum.' Origen (*c. Cels.*, vi. 32) rightly perceived that the third, fourth, and fifth of these were derived from the Hebrew Scriptures.

⁴ *Abraxas seu Apistopistus* (Antwerp, 1657).

⁵ *L'Antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures*, Paris, 1722 (vol. ii. p. 353 ff. : *Supplém.*, 1724, p. 209 ff.).

⁶ *Palaeographia Critica* (Mannheim, 1817–1829), vols. 3 and 4.

⁷ *The Gnostics and their Remains* (London, 1864). Specimens of the inscriptions (without, however, the figures) are given in abundance by Baudissin.

⁸ *Iren.* i. 24, 7. Abrasax (the letters of which, estimated numerically, equal 365) was the *princeps* or ἀρχων of the 365 heavens.

sometimes of a jackal, the arms of a man, one arm often bearing a whip, with two serpents diverging below as legs—



Reverse: IAΩ CABAΩ¹.

it will not surprise us; some mystic meaning or magical power may well have been supposed to reside both in the figure and in the name. If it was known (as it certainly must have been²) that the Jews hesitated to pronounce the name, its value as a magical token would be the greater. But what are we to say when we read the name IAΩ, as we often can, associated with the image of the youthful Horus, resting on a lotus leaf—Horus, the Egyptian god of the awakening life of spring?



From 'The Gnostics and their Remains,' pl. iii. 8³.

¹ King, pp. 35, 234.

² Allusions are frequent, e.g. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 25 *end*, 26 (ii. p. 166, *Mangey*). See Lev. xxiv. 16 in the Versions.

³ Elsewhere the Abrasax and Horus figures are combined (also with the name 'Iáω), as in pl. vii. 4.

Here 'Ιάω stands alone, unaccompanied by any Jewish or Christian symbol. From this evidence, taken in conjunction with some notices (especially the reputed oracle of the Clarian Apollo¹) which appeared to connect 'Ιάω with the Phœnician *Αδωνις², Lenormant, in 1872³, considered it clear that the populations of Phœnicia and Syria recognized a god 'Ιάω, and threw out the suggestion that the name was an old one, denoting properly *the existent*, which, as being the least closely attached to a definite mythological personage, might have been the model upon which the Mosaic *Yahweh* was constructed. Not, however, that Lenormant supposed *Yahweh* to be *derived* from 'Ιάω: from the beginning, he adds, the Israelitish name was used in an altogether different sense from the Phœnician; the resemblance was purely external: though the similarity of name, he thought, might help to explain the readiness with which the Israelites afterwards exchanged the worship of *Yahweh* for a Canaanitish cult. But the grounds for such a theory are precarious: the Hamathite and Phœnician names are not numerous enough to bridge over the chasm which separates the late classical times (at which 'Ιάω is first attested) from the age of Moses. Baudissin, after a careful examination of the facts, concludes, with great probability,

¹ Macrobius (fifth cent. A. D.), *Saturnalia*, i. 18:—

Ἔργια μὲν δεδαῶτας ἐχρῆν νεοπένθεα κεύθειν
 Ἐν δ' ἀπάτῃ παύρῃ σύνεσις καὶ νοῦς ἀλαπαδνός.
 Φράζεο τὸν πάντων ὑπατοῦ θεὸν ἔμμεν' Ἰάω,
 Χείματι μὲν τ' Αἰδῆν, Δία τ' εἴαρος ἀρχομένοιο,
 Ἡέλιον δὲ θέρευς, μετοπώρου δ' ἀβρὸν Ἰάω.

The verses are cited for the purpose of establishing the identity of Helios and Dionysus.

² The grounds for the identification may be seen in Lenormant, *Lettres Assyriologiques*, First Series, tom. ii. pp. 193 f., 209-212, or more fully in Movers, *Die Phönizier* (1841), i. 542-547. They consist chiefly in the similarity (*πάντων ὑπατος*) or identity (*ἀβρός*) of the epithets applied in the oracle to 'Ιάω, and in other ancient writers to Adonis (e.g. Theocr. xv. 128 *ἀβρὸν Ἀδωνιν*); partly also in a connexion supposed by some of the ancients to subsist between Dionysus and Adonis on the one hand (Plutarch, *Symp.*, iv. 5, 3), and the God of the Jews on the other (on account, probably, of observances connected with the Feast of Tabernacles: *ib.* iv. 6, 2; Tacit. *Hist.*, v. 5, who, however, himself rejects the identification).

³ *L. c.* pp. 196-201.

that 'Iáω with the Horus figure is simply derived, as in the previous cases, from the Old Testament, and its occurrence in that connexion is merely a piece of religious syncretism, such as meets us often elsewhere in Gnosticism, especially when its home is in Egypt (pp. 205-207). Baudissin discusses at the same time the identification of this 'Iáω with Dionysus or Adonis, and the oracle of Apollo: his conclusion with regard to the latter is that even if it be admitted to be the work of a Greek in pre-Christian times¹, it would not follow that the 'Iáω named in it was other than the God of the Jews himself: and that consequently that name could not be alleged as the source whence the Jewish *Yahweh* was derived. The Greek 'Iáω, it may be concluded, is everywhere dependent on the Hebrew יהוה².

Professor Sayce, lastly, though, as we saw, not admitting its Accadian origin, still attaches weight to Delitzsch's arguments for *Yahu* being the original and popular form; and expresses himself inclined to assign to it a Hittite origin. How important the great Hittite empire of Kadesh on the Orontes was in the ancient world we know now from many sources. Hamath, Professor Sayce remarks, appears to have been a sort of Hittite dependency: Abraham had dealings with Hittites: David had not only a Hittite warrior, Uriah, but was on friendly terms with a king of Hamath: the kings of the Hittites are spoken of, long after David's time, as ready to give help to a king of Israel (2 Kings vii. 6); and the inscriptions mention no names compounded with *yahu*, except in Israel and Hamath. *Yahweh*, he concludes,

¹ This oracle has been usually regarded as spurious, but the authority of Lobeck has led it to be viewed in some quarters with greater favour; and it is defended accordingly by Land (see the next note) and Lenormant (*l. c.*). Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, i. 399 ff., argues strongly on the other side.

² The theory of a Canaanitish origin of the name יהוה had been proposed in a somewhat different form by J. P. N. Land in the *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1868, p. 156 ff. It was criticized by Kuenen in 1869 (*Religion of Israel*, i. 400), who pointed to the song of Deborah, as in his judgment conclusive against it. Land's reply may be read in the *Tijdschrift* for 1869, p. 347 ff. Tiele, *Histoire Comparée des Anciennes Religions* (1882), p. 349 f., agrees with Kuenen.

was as much the supreme God of Hamath as of Israel¹. Should this conjecture be discarded, he is disposed to fall back on the view of Professor Robertson Smith (see below), that the word denoted originally the sender of lightning or rain.

The general conclusion at which we arrive is, that while there are no substantial grounds for abandoning the ordinary view that *yahu* and *yah* are abbreviated forms of *Yahweh*, the possibility of a foreign origin for the latter cannot, in face of the Phœnician and other non-Israelitish names in which it seems to appear, be altogether denied. This, indeed, is the opinion of the most competent scholars of the present time. Thus Hermann Schultz, writing in 1878²: 'The opinion that the word may once have been current in a wider circle of peoples than Israel alone, cannot be said to be exactly refuted.' While concluding himself that it is *most probably* of Hebrew origin, he concedes that a different view is still tenable and that the name 'may have only acquired a definite religious significance in Israel.' Dillmann³ and Delitzsch⁴ express themselves similarly: the latter remarking that more ought perhaps, under the circumstances, to be granted than the conclusion of Baudissin (p. 223) that the God of the Jews was adopted by some of the neighbouring peoples into their Pantheon. But, like Schultz, both these scholars are careful to add, that, even if that be so, the name received in Moses' hands an entirely new import⁵.

¹ Stade (*Gesch. Israel's*, i. p. 130 f.) following Tiele (*l. c.*, p. 350 f.) conjectures that it may have been borrowed by Moses from the Kenites. The Egyptian *anuk-pu-anuk*, which was compared (after Brugsch) by Ebers, in *Durch Gosen zum Sinai*, 1872, p. 528 (the note is omitted in the 2nd edition of 1882), is declared by Le Page Renouf (*Hibbert Lectures*, 1879, p. 244 f.; *Academy*, xvii. (1880), p. 475) to mean *I, even I*, and not to be capable of the rendering *ich bin, der ich bin*.

² *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, p. 488 f.

³ *Exodus und Leviticus* (1880), pp. 33 bottom, 34.

⁴ Herzog's *Real-encyclopädie*, vi. (1880), article JEHOVAH, p. 507.

⁵ Kuenen expresses himself most emphatically against such theories as have been here discussed, *Hibbert Lectures* (1882), pp. 58-61, 310 f. And Dillmann, notwithstanding his concessions to logical possibility, views them evidently with disfavour. The history of the name (on Israelitish ground) prior to Exod. iii. 14 is uncertain. As is well known, the two main sources of the Pentateuch,

Assuming then *Yahweh* to be a derivative of הוה *to be*, we may proceed now to consider the signification attaching to it. In form, *Yahweh* belongs to a class of words hardly found in Hebrew beyond a few proper names¹, but used somewhat more widely in Arabic and Syriac², which are considered to denote an object or person from some active or prominent attribute. Jacob, the supplanter, Isaac, the laughter, Jephthah, the opener, Jair, the illuminator, are familiar examples of the same formation. Hebrew scholars will, however, at once perceive that the vocalization *Yahweh* (which we may here assume to be the correct one, or at least the most probable by far that has been proposed³) may belong to two conjugations or voices, may have a neuter or a causative force, may express grammatically either *he that is*, or *he that causes to be*. Formerly the name was supposed almost

P (the Priests' Code) and J, differ in their representation of the antiquity of the name: in J it is used from the beginning (cf. Gen. iv. 26), P consistently eschews it till Ex. vi. 3. (The passage Ex. iii. 9-14 is assigned by critics to E.) But though promulgated anew, and with a fresh sanction, by Moses, it can hardly have been *unknown* before, though its use may have been more limited. It is an old and not improbable conjecture of Ewald's (*Hist.*, ii. p. 156 f.), based partly on the name of Moses' mother *Yochebed*, partly on the early occurrence of the abbreviated form *Yah* (in the Song, Ex. xv. 2), and confirmed by the singular expression in the same verse, 'God of my father' (cf. iii. 6, xviii. 4), that the name was current in the family of Moses (comp. Delitzsch, *Genesis*, p. 29 f.; Dillmann, pp. 28, 54); see also, now, König, *Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgesch.*, 1884, p. 27. The derivation of מוֹרִיָּה is obscure: but philological reasons are decisive against the opinion that it means *shown of Yah*; for not only are proper names compounded with participles almost unknown in Hebrew, but a transition such as that from מְרִאָּה, which such a compound would have given (cf. מְרִאָּה, מְרִאָּה, מְרִאָּה) to מוֹרִיָּה, is altogether without precedent: where does the disappearance of a lengthen a preceding vowel, or indeed take place at all after a quiescent *shwa*? (Comp. Delitzsch on Qoh., xii. 5.)

¹ See Olshausen, *Lehrbuch*, § 277 g; Stade, *Lehrbuch* (1879), § 259.

² Dietrich, *Abhandlungen zur Hebr. Grammatik* (1846), pp. 136-151.

³ See the correspondence between Dietrich and Delitzsch (bearing in particular on the vocalization of the second syllable), published recently in Stade's *Ztsch. für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1883, pp. 280-290: 1884, pp. 21-28.

On the origin of the form ΠΙΠΙ, which appears on the margin, and sometimes also in the text, of Greek MSS. of the Old Testament (cf. Field, *Hexapla*, on 1's. xxv. 1), and which passed thence into Syriac MSS., see, in addition to Jerome, *Ep.* 136 *ad Marcellam*, the Scholion of Jacob of Edessa (A. D. 675), published with explanations by Nestle, in the ZDMG. xxxii. (1878), pp. 465-508 (also p. 735 f. and xxxiii. 297 ff.).

universally to convey the sense *he that is*, but latterly there has been a growing consensus in favour of *he that causes to be*. Not, indeed, that this interpretation is a new one; it is as old as Le Clerc, who, in his Commentary on Exod. vi. 3 (1696), both gives the pronunciation *Yahweh*, and explains the name as = $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon\pi\gamma\acute{o}\nu$. In more modern times the same view has been favoured (in some instances independently) by authorities of considerable weight: it was thrown out as a suggestion by Gesenius¹ in 1839 (*creator* or *life-giver*), and is adopted by Land², Lagarde³, Kuenen⁴, Schrader⁵, Baudissin⁶, Nestle⁷, H. Schultz⁸, Tiele⁹. Not by all, however, quite in the same sense. Kuenen, for instance, interprets the name as denoting the giver of existence: Schrader and Schultz as the giver of life and deliverance: Lagarde and Nestle, following Le Clerc¹⁰, as *he who bringeth to pass*, i. e. the performer of his promises. Lagarde finds similarly in Exod. vi, in the contrast between *El Shaddai* and *Yahweh*, the transition from the idea of God's might to that of his covenant faithfulness. The thought is a suggestive one; but even in this, the most favourable form of the causative view, there are difficulties which are a serious obstacle to our accepting it.

It is true that יהיה is used of the fulfilment of a promise or prediction (1 Kings xiii. 32 כִּי הִיָּה יִהְיֶה וְזָדַבֵּר), but hardly

¹ *Thesaurus*, p. 577 note. ² *L. c.*, 1868, p. 158 (de levengever, Schepper).

³ ZDMG. xxii. (1868), p. 331; Symmicta, i. 104: supported with further arguments in the *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos Hieronymi* (1874), p. 153 ff. (originally *creator*) and *Orientalia*, ii. (1880), pp. 27-30. [*Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1885, p. 91: 'He who calls into existence the events of history, whence the idea of performer of promises must have necessarily developed.']

⁴ *Religion of Israel*, i. 279, 398 ('probably').

⁵ In Schenkel, *Bibel-Lexicon*, s. v.

⁶ *L. c.* (1876), p. 229.

⁷ *Isr. Eigennamen*, p. 88 f.

⁸ *L. c.* (1878), p. 487 ff.

⁹ *Histoire Comparée*, etc., p. 345 (*Celui qui fait être*: the explanation *Je suis celui qui suis* is an adaptation, not the primitive sense of the word).

¹⁰ 'Uno verbo Graece non ineleganter dixeris $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon\pi\gamma\acute{o}\nu$ *existentiae effectorem*, qua voce Clemens Alexandrinus alique Patres usi sunt, ut significetur $\delta\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon \dot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$.' The Patriarchs, he continues, had known God as *El Shaddai*, but had not seen the fulfilment of his promises which 'jam (יהוה) ut esset facturus erat. Hinc Deus hic orationem orditur his erbis יהוה אנו, hoc est, is sum qui re praestiturus sum quod olim promisi.'

in the abstract, without the object of the promise being indicated in the context: and the fact that scarcely any Semitic language uses the causative form of יהיה, whether in the sense of creating or bringing to pass, appears to make it additionally improbable¹. The same lexical consideration tells further against the view that the name had in its origin, before it was spiritualized as in Exodus, some other causative force, such as, e.g. *he who causes to fall* (sc. rain, or lightning²). It is true, as Arabic shows, that *to fall* was almost certainly the primitive meaning of the root; it even occurs once with this sense in Hebrew³: but it is questionable whether the causal form used absolutely would have conveyed such a special meaning as this, without the object being distinctly expressed. Rather, as Professor W. H. Green observes⁴, it would signify *the destroyer*—أَمْوَى is used in the Qor'an (53, 54) of God's *ruining or throwing down* the cities of the Plain.

¹ The exception is in the case of Syriac: but even there, to judge by Payne Smith's *Thesaurus*, the use is rare, the few examples given being of late date, and apparently artificial formations such as Syriac lends itself to readily, so that they justify no inference as to what may have been the usage some 2000 years previously. The question has been recently a subject of controversy in Germany. Delitzsch, in the *Zeitschr. für Luth. Theologie*, 1877, p. 593 ff., criticizing the explanation of יהיה as a *hifl*, had observed that whenever, in post-Biblical times, a causative of היה was required (in philosophical terminology) the *piel* was the form employed; and quotes an explanation of יהיה by Aaron ben Elijah, of Nicomedia, the Karaite (in his *עץ חיים*, written in 1346, and published by Delitzsch in 1841 in the *Anekdota zur Gesch. der mittelalterlichen Scholastik*, p. 93) as *צַבֵּחַ כְּהִיָּה כֹל הוּוּה*, the source of all being. Nestle, in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, 1878, p. 126 ff., answers that this explanation of יהיה by the *piel* may have been determined by the *shwa'* under the י, and appeals in support of its having been a *hifl* to the examples in the Syriac. He appears, however, to make more of these latter than they deserve. Lagarde's most recent discussion of the subject is in his *Orientalia*, ii. (1880), p. 28 f., which is in fact a reply to Delitzsch, though that scholar is not named. It remains a possibility that יהיה may have had a causal idea, but the arguments advanced by Lagarde do not appear to me to have made it probable. Even Schultz, though inclined to regard the causal sense with favour, nevertheless expresses himself with reserve, when he says (p. 487), 'It cannot be denied that the view has great probability: but in no case can it be regarded as certain.'

² W. Robertson Smith, *Old Test. in the Jewish Church*, p. 423.

³ Job xxxvii. 6. See Fleischer in Delitzsch's Commentary (Engl. Tr.); or Dr. Wright's luminous note in the *Trans. Bibl. Arch. Soc.*, iii. (1874), p. 104 ff.

⁴ *Moses and the Prophets* (New York, 1883), p. 42.

It appears then that *Yahweh* cannot be safely regarded except as a neuter (*gal*); and we must take as our guide in its interpretation the parallel passage in Exod. iii, which, indeed, is clearly meant as an exposition of what it implies.

In an instructive essay on this question, in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* for 1876, Professor Robertson Smith observes that the modern disposition to look on *Yahweh* as a causal form is in large measure a protest against the abstract character of the exegesis of Exod. iii. 14. A double exegetical tradition, he proceeds to remark, is connected with that verse, the Palestinian, deriving from it the idea of God's eternity and immutability, and the Hellenistic or Alexandrian, deriving from it the idea of his absolute nature (already in LXX. $\delta \ \acute{\omega}\nu$). Either of these views, but especially the latter, assigns to the revelation an improbably abstract, metaphysical character, and moreover does not do justice to the word or the tense employed. היה is $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, not $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\acute{\iota}$; and אהיה suggests the meaning *come to be*, or *will be*, rather than *am*. The phrase denotes thus not $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\alpha \ \delta \ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\alpha$, but either $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota \ \delta \ \gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota \ \delta \ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$. This was seen by Franz Delitzsch¹ and Oehler², who, adopting the former of these alternatives, observe that the name does not express fixity, but change,—not, however, a change regulated by caprice, but by design and conscious choice—‘*I am*,’—not that which fate or caprice may determine, but—‘*that I am*,’ what my own character determines. It implies that God's nature cannot be expressed in terms of any other substance, but can be measured only by itself (cf. the phrases iv. 13; xxxiii. 19; 2 Kings viii. 1). But further, since היה is not mere existence, but emerging into reality (*werden*, $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, *come to pass*), it implies a living and active personality, not a God of the past only, but of the future, one whose name cannot be defined, but whose nature it is ever to express itself anew, ever to manifest itself under a fresh aspect

¹ *Commentar über die Genesis* (1872), pp. 26, 60 (der Begriff des V. היה, oder הוה, nicht sowol der des ruhenden, als des bewegten Seins, oder der Selbstthätigkeit ist, u. s. w.).

² *Theology of the Old Testament*, § 39.

(ein immer im Werden sich kundgebendes), whose relation to the world is one of ever progressive manifestation (in stetem lebendigem Werden begriffen ist). It denotes him, in a word, not as a transcendental abstraction, but as one who enters into an historical relation with humanity.

If we interpret אהיה as a future, we get a somewhat different meaning. This rendering is found in Rashi (eleventh century), who paraphrases ‘*I will be with them in this affliction what I will be with them in the subjection of their future captivities*’¹. So Ewald, in his last work² (regarding Exod. iii. as an effort to import new meaning into a word the sense of which had become obscure and forgotten), explains ‘*I will be it*,’ viz. the performer of his promises; ver. 12, God says, ‘I will be with thee;’ ver. 14 explains how: ‘*I will be it!* I (viz.) *who will be it*,’ will be, viz. what I have promised and said. This is the view adopted also by Professor Smith, though he construes more simply, ‘I will be what I will be.’ From the use of *I will be* just afterwards by itself, he argues that אהיה אשר אהיה is epexegetical and not part of the name itself. He next points out how this *I will be* rings throughout the Bible,—‘I will be *with thee, with them, their God*,’ etc., and finds in this often-repeated phrase the key to the name here. ‘*I will be*’—something which lies implicitly in the mind of him who uses the name: in the mouth of the worshipper, ‘*He will be it*,’ an assertion of confidence in Jehovah as a God who will not fail or disappoint his servants: in one word, *He will approve himself*. At the same time *what* he will be is left

¹ The paraphrase is suggested evidently by *Berachoth*, 9b (quoted in the commentaries *ad loc.*):—אֱהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיָּה א"ל הַק"וּבָה לְמַשָּׁה לְךָ אֲמַר לְהַם לְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֲנִי הֵייתִי עִמָּכֶם בְּשַׁעֲבֹד זֶה וְאֲנִי אֱהִיָּה עִמָּכֶם בְּשַׁעֲבֹד מְלָכִיּוֹת אֲמַר לְפָנָיו רְבוּנוּ שֶׁל עוֹלָם דִּיה לְצַרָּה בַּעֲתָהָהּ אֲמַר לִיה הַק"וּבָה לְךָ אֲמַר לְהַם אֱהִיָּה שְׁלַחֲנִי אֲלֵיכֶם Similarly, Jehudah ha-Levi (twelfth century), who, commenting on אהיה, *Cusari*, iv. 3 (p. 262, ed. Buxtorf: p. 304, ed. Cassel), writes:—וּרְצָה בּו לְמַנוּעַ מִהֲשׁוּב בְּאִמְתוּת הַעֲצָם אֲשֶׁר יִדְעוּהוּ נִמְנַעַה וְכֹאשֶׁר שָׁאֲלוּ וְאֲמַר וְאֲמַרו לִי מַה שָׁמְרוּ עֲנֵהוּ לְאֲמַר מַה לְהַם לְבַקֵּשׁ מַה שְׁלֹא יוּכְלוּ לְהַשִּׁיגוּ רֹמֵמָה לְמַה שָׁאֲמַר הַמְּלַאֲךְ לְמַה זֶה הַשָּׁאֵל לְשִׁמִּי וְהוּא פְּלִאֵי אֵךְ אֲמַר לְהַם אֱהִיָּה וּפִירוּשׁוֹ אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיָּה וְהַעֲצָם הַנִּמְצָא אֲשֶׁר אִמְצָא לְהַם בַּעֲתָה שִׁיבְקִשׁוּנִי אֵל יִבְקִשׁוּ רֵאִיָּה גְדוּלָּה מִהַפְּצִא עֲמָהּ וְיִקְבְּלוּנִי כִּי:

² *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott* (1873), ii. p. 337 f.

undefined, or defined only in terms of himself, for the very reason that his providential dealings with his people in their ever-varying needs are inexhaustible—are more than can be numbered or expressed. The vagueness is intentional, as when Moses says, ‘Send now by the hand of him that thou sendest,’ i. e. send me, then, if it must be so. So here, ‘I will be that which I am to be’ to you: what I have promised and you look for; I will approve myself—though *how* he will approve himself is an ἀνεκφωνητόν. And in Hos. i. 9 Professor Smith finds an allusion to the phrase, ‘I will save Judah by (or as) Jehovah their God;’ but to Ephraim he says, ‘Ye are not my people, and *I will not be* for you.’ The promise made to Moses is there withdrawn from Ephraim.

This view is, undoubtedly, an attractive one. Dillmann, indeed, objects that the principal fact, viz. what Jehovah will prove himself, is not expressed, but must be supplied in thought: but the substantive verb may well be understood in a pregnant sense, *give evidence of being*. It differs, however, but slightly from that of Oehler and Delitzsch. The essential point in both is that they see in יהוה not the idea of abstract existence (such as is denoted by the unfortunate rendering *the Eternal*), but of active being, manifestation in history. The principal difference is that on the one view this is conceived as realized in history at large; on the other, in the history of Israel in particular. On the whole, the meaning of יהוה and אהיה אשר אהיה may probably be best explained as follows: יהוה denotes *He that is—is*, viz. implying not one who barely exists, but one who asserts his being, and (unlike the false gods) enters into personal relations with his worshippers. He who in the mouths of men, however, can only be spoken of as *He is* becomes, when he is speaking in his own person, *I am*; and the purport of the phrase in iii. 14 is, firstly, to show that the divine nature is indefinable, it can be defined adequately only by itself; and secondly, to show that God, being not determined by anything external to himself, is consistent with himself, true to his promises, and unchangeable in his

purposes. The latter aspect of the name became certainly prominent afterwards: and the prophets, by many allusions¹, show that they saw in it the expression of moral unchangeableness².

To sum up briefly the substance of what has been said. The theories of the *origin* of the name, or the meaning once attached to it, relate to the time *prior* to Exod. iii. 14: their truth would in no way invalidate or affect the revelation there given, so that they may be considered impartially upon their own merits. Upon their own merits they cannot be regarded as established. The theory of an Accadian origin unquestionably breaks down; the theory of some other non-Israelitish origin rests, at least at present, upon an insecure foundation, and is rejected by the most competent Old Testament scholars of every shade of theological opinion. The *Ἰάω* of the Greek writers is late; and nothing can be built upon it till it has been shown not to be derivable from the Old Testament tradition itself. The Hamathite and Phœnician names cannot be explained away: the *possibility* of a point of contact with non-Israelites remains; but we await further discoveries. So much for the name, as a name. Then as to the meaning. The possibility of a stage in which the name denoted the author of some physical phenomenon is undeniable. There is no positive evidence adducible in its favour; though some minds may be influenced by the weight of analogy. Similarly, though from the time when Exod. iii. was written, the name must have been understood by Jews in the neutral sense *ὁ γιγνόμενος*, the possibility of a prior stage when it was interpreted in the sense *He that causeth to be* (or *to come to pass*) must be conceded. More than this cannot be said: positive evidence is again not forthcoming. Indeed, the advocates of this opinion hardly contend for more: both Kuenen and Schultz, for instance, speak very cautiously. The considerations advanced in support of the theories which have been discussed are not, I

¹ E. g. Isa. xxvi. 4, 8, xli. 4; Hos. xii. 6; Mal. iii. 6.

² Comp. Philippi, *l. c.* p. 179 f.; Dillmann, p. 35, both of whom regard the word as having the sense of a Qal.

venture to think, sufficiently strong to render them plausible: no ground appears at present to exist for questioning either the purely Israelitish origin of the Tetragrammaton, or the explanation of its meaning which is given in Exod. iii. 14.

Coin found near Gaza, referred to on page 5.



The following is Mr. Poole's description:—

'*Obv.* Bearded male head, three-quarter face towards r., in crested Corinthian helmet.

'*Rev.* 𐤇𐤀𐤏𐤍 (יהו). Deity resembling the Greek Zeus, clad in mantle, seated r. in a car to the axle of which wings are attached, holds in r. eagle or hawk; in front, below head of Bes or of a Satyr l.: the whole in a dotted square. Silver. Weight 50.7 grains.

'Published by J. P. Six in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1877, p. 229, as struck probably at Gaza, but for this there is no authority. See also Combe, *Vet. pop. et regum numi qui in Mus. Brit. adservantur* (1814), p. 242⁵, and pl. xiii. 12; De Luynes, *La Numismatique des Satrapies et de la Phénicie* (1846), p. 29¹, and pl. iv. ("Sohar").

'The legends in Phœnician and Aramaic characters on coins give (a) names of kings or satraps: (b) names of towns or gods of towns, so specified,—besides dates; generally (a) and (b) are combined on the different sides of the same coin. I know of no instance of the name of a god occurring without the qualification of the name of the mint, as *Baal-Tarz* on coins of Tarsus. I am, therefore, inclined to read יהו as a proper name. That the reading is correct I am not sure, as the form of the second letter is strange for ה.'

Respecting the origin and use of 𐤀 and its relation to אלהים, a discussion has recently arisen in Germany which is sufficiently cognate to the subject of the preceding essay to be mentioned here, and which deserves the attention of those interested in such questions. It is contained in the following articles: 1. Lagarde, *Orientalia*, ii. (1880), pp. 3-10 [connects 𐤀 not with אלה but with אלהי]; 2. Nöldeke in the *Monatsberichte der Kön.-Pr. Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* for 1880, pp. 760-776 [adduces evidence, chiefly from inscriptions, to show that the vowel in *El* was originally

long]; 3. Lagarde in the *Göttingische Nachrichten*, 1882, pp. 173-192 (= *Mittheilungen*, 1884, pp. 94-106), [reply to No. 2]; 4. Nestle in the *Theol. Studien aus Württemberg*, 1882, Heft iv. pp. 243-258 [conjectures מַהְלֵךְ to be the plural of הֵלֵךְ]; 5. Nöldeke in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the same Berlin Academy, 1882, pp. 1175-1192 [criticism of No. 4, and answer to No. 3]; 6. Lagarde in the *Mittheilungen*, pp. 107-111 and 222-224. The course taken by the discussion has been indicated in outline; but no abstract of the argument is here attempted: the field covered by it is so wide that in order to be properly appreciated it must be studied *in extenso*¹.

My friend, Mr. D. S. Margoliouth, of New College, while examining an Ethiopic MS. recently acquired by the Bodleian Library (MSS. Aeth. 9. 5), and containing the same *Preces magicæ xii discipulorum* as No. 78 in Dillmann's Catalogue of the Ethiopic MSS. of the British Museum, has observed מַהְיֵי vocalized almost exactly as by Epiphanius and Theodoret (Ἰαβέ). The passage occurs (fol. 6^b) in a list of magical names of Christ said to have been given by him to his disciples. As the context is curious, I transcribe a portion of it (vocalization unchanged):—

ወእመድሳሪሁ: ነገሮመ: አስማቲሁ: ሊዮሂ: ብሂል:
ግሩመ: ቡራሂ: ብሂል: ዓቢይ: ድመናሌል: ብሂል: ኃዖል:
.....መርዮን: ብሂል: ዓቆቤ: ኩሱ: ሶእ: ብሂል: ረዳሊ:
አፋራን: ብሂል: መድሳን: መናቲር: ብሂል: ኖላዌ: ሌል:
ሌል: ብሂል: ከዳኔ: ኩሱ: አካ: ብሂል: ተግጋሁ: ሊሎሂ:
ብሂል: ፀዋሪ: ኩሱ:.....ዖዌ: ዖዌ: ብሂል: አማን: ርቱዕ:

‘And after that he told them his names: *Iyâhê*, i. e. terrible; *Sârâhê*, i. e. great; *Demû’êl*, i. e. mighty;..... *Meryon*, i. e. all-watching; *O’è*, i. e. helper; *Aphrân*, i. e. saviour; *Manâtêr*, i. e. shepherd; *’Él, ’Él*, i. e. protector of all; *Akhâ*, i. e. patient; *Élôhê*, i. e. supporter of all;..... *Yâwê, Yâwê*, i. e. faithful (and) just.’

¹ See also Professor Francis Brown's note in the *Presbyterian Review* (New York), 1882, pp. 404-407; and (still more recently) M. Halévy in the *Revue des Études juives*, 1884 (ix), pp. 175-180 (pp. 161-174 on מַהְיֵי, maintaining its Israelitish origin, and explaining nearly in the sense of Rashi).