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I.

RECENT THEORIES ON THE ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE TETRAGRAMMATON.

[S. R. Driver.]

In the Khorsabad inscription of Sargon, 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.

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 הָיהוּ or יְהוּ, 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 Damaseene יאְלוּ found in an inscription of Esarhaddon\(^1\); the Phœnician Abalai\(^2\), Yool\(^3\), Bitkias\(^4\), the Philistine Mitnati, Sidkal, Padi, names of kings of Ashdod, Ashkelon, and Ekron respectively, mentioned by Sennacherib\(^5\), 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 יהו; for this root,
though known to Aramaic and Hebrew, is not Phœnician\(^1\). 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 (יְהֹוָה), 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 \(Ya-u\).

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 מְנַהֲג 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 Phoenician, as in Arabic and Ethiopic (ヌヌ ī̄īrī by the side of \(U \Delta D\) esse), the substantive verb is יִי (א.ג. יִי הָא לִי in the remarkable inscription, relating to sacrifices, found at Marseilles).
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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. Philippi 1 in the second part of the Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie for 1883 2 , 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 cumbersome; imagine such a word as נהלוחה!), 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-seven 3). 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 יהנ and יהו would be) would not be against analogy.

2. The contractions do not cause difficulty. The transition from Yahweh to -i ( יִי) 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 Z. D. M. G., 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: Noldeke 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 יִי is determined naturally by the context, which is here strongly in favour of יהוה being the name of a God.
The analogy of verbs יָהֵו and יָהִּֽו, there arose first יָהָד; next, the final ו being first vocalized and then dropped, came יָהָד and יָה (with the aspirate sounded — יָהָד)\(^1\): 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 יָה remained, its continuity with the earlier stages was unbroken, so that its real origin would always be felt. The forms, moreover, in which יָה or יָה alone appears (as יָהָדְל פיָה דְל) are at best of uncertain derivation: it is possible that they are not connected with יָה at all\(^2\).

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 others\(^3\) 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 apocoping the imperfect tense of verbs יָה 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 יָה do not occur (the form is itself a rare one): יָהי is shortened as naturally to יָֽהָי in יָֽהָיְנִי as יָֽהָיְנִי to יָֽהָיְנִי, after the waw conversive in יָֽהָיְנִי (in pause יָֽהָיְנִי).

\(^2\) Renan, in an article Des Noms Théophores apocopes 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 יָֽהָי.

\(^3\) As regards Yo'el (יָֽהָי), Dr. Wright, in the Transactions of the Bibl. Archæol. Soc., 1874, p. 397, had already remarked that the vocalization is conjectural. Whether, however, Nestle (l.c.) is right in connecting it with יָֽהָי, voluit (יָֽהָי), and interpreting strong-willed, must remain uncertain: it is at any rate precarious to seek support for this meaning in the יָֽהָי and יָֽהָי of the Sinaïtic Inscriptions (Levy in the ZD MG. 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 Inser. 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 yô; and if yau became in Hebrew indiscriminately יוה, 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 יָה abbreviated from יְהוּ, when standing at the beginning of compound names became יָחַנְי, יָחָה, after the analogy of יָבֵשׁ from יָבָשׁ, because יָחָה, in such a position, as part of a compound word with an accent of its own, would have drawn the tone unduly back, whereas יָה 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 declared 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 further.

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 יָהוה is the Accadian Anu or Anû; 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 writers; 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 Siculus, Origen, Theodoret, Jerome) speak of the God of the Jews under the name 'Iâω: and the same name appears in some of the Gnostic systems. 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 Macarius, Montfaucon, Kopp, C.W. King, and others. Abrasax, for example, we learn from Irenaeus, was the name given to the First Cause in the Basilidean system. If therefore we find the name IΛΩ coupled with CABAΩΘ or ΑΔΩΝΑΙ under the strange composite figure which denoted Abrasax—the head of a hawk, or

1 See the article 'Εψιγναυ, by Mr. W. A. Wright, in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, i. p. 953 f.
2 i. 94 Πάρα δέ τούτο Ιουδαίου Μωνατή [sc. προστοπήσατα τούς νόμους αυτώ διδων] τὸν Ιαω 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 *Abraeus seu Apistopistus* (Antwerp, 1657).
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 ἄρχων 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: IAO CABAΩ."

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 been) 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 IAO, 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, Vitæ Mōsis, 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 Iao), as in pl. vii. 4.
Here 'Iəw 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
Apollo \(^1\)) which appeared to connect 'Iəw with the Phoenician
"Aδωνις" \(^2\), Lenormant, in 1872 \(^3\), considered it clear that the
populations of Phœnia and Syria recognized a god 'Iəw, and
threw out the suggestion that the name was an old one, de-
noting 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 'Iəw: 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 'Iəw 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:—
"Orma μεν ἑπαρκεῖν έχρην νοσένθεα κεύθειν
'Εν δ' ἀπάτῃ παιρὴ σύνεις καὶ νοὺς ἀλαπάνως.
Φάζει τῶν πάντων ὑπατον θεον ἐμμεν 'Ιαώ,
Χείματι μίν τ' Ἀδην, Δία τ' ἐλαφὸς ἀρχομένοιο,
'Ηλέθιον δὲ θέρεοι, μετοπώρου δ' ἄβρον 'Ιαώ.

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 Phœnizier (1841), i. 542–547. They consist chiefly in the similarity (πάντων ὑπατος) or identity (ἄβρον) of the epithets applied in the oracle to 'Iəw, and in other ancient writers to Adonis (e.g. Theocr. xv. 128 ἄβρον 'Αδωνις); partly also in a connexion supposed by some of the ancients to subsist between Dionysus and Adonis on the one hand (Plutarch, Symph., iv. 5, 3), and the God of the Jews on the other (on account, probably, of observ-
ances connected with the Feast of Tabernacles: ib. iv. 6, 2; Tacit. Hist., v. 5, who, however, himself rejects the identification).

that 'Idω with the Horns 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). Bandissin discusses
at the same time the identification of this 'Idω 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 times 1, it would not follow
that the 'Idω 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 'Idω, it may be concluded, is everywhere dependent
on the Hebrew יְהֹוָה 2.

Professor Sayce, lastly, though, as we saw, not admitting
its Accadian origin, still attaches weight to Delitzsch's
arguments for Yahw 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.).
Kuene, Religion of Israel, i. 399 ff., argues strongly on the other side.

2 The theory of a Canaanitish origin of the name יְהֹוָה 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 Kuene in 1869 (Religion of Israel, i. 402),
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 Kuene.
of the Tetragrammaton.

was as much the supreme God of Hamath as of Israel. 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 Phoenician 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 1878\(^2\): '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.' Dillmann\(^3\) and Delitzsch\(^4\) 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 import.

\(^1\) Stade (Gesch. Israel's, i, p. 130 f.) following Tiele (i. e., 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-encyclopaedie, 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 הַיָּהָה 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 names, but used somewhat more widely in Arabic and Syriac, which are considered to denote an object or person from some active or prominent attribute. Jacob, the supplanter, Isaac, the laugh, 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 proposed) 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 Handprobleme der alttestalischen Religionsgeschichte, 1884, p. 27. The derivation of נָהָה 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 יָהָהּ, which such a compound would have given (cf. יָהַּיִים, יָהַּאיְפָּיִים) to יָהֲנָה, is altogether without precedent: where does the disappearance of a lengthen a preceding vowel, or indeed take place at all after a quiescent shewa? (Comp. Delitzsch on Qoh., xii. 5.)

1 See Olshausen, Lehrbuch, § 277 g; Stade, Lehrbuch (1879), § 259.
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 Allttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1883, pp. 280–290; 1884, pp. 21–28.

On the origin of the form IIII, which appears on the margin, and sometimes also in the text, of Greek MSS. of the Old Testament (cf. Field, Hexapla, on Ps. xxv. 1), and which passed thence into Syriac MSS., see, in addition to Jerome, Ep. 136 ad Mareciam, the Scholion of Jacob of Edessa (A.D. 675), published with explanations by Nestle, in the ZDMG. xxxii. (1878), pp. 495–508 (also p. 725 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 γενεσιονυγον. 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 יהוה is used of the fulfilment of a promise
or prediction (1 Kings xiii. 32 רַבְרָסָרָו יהוה יהוה וָכ), but hardly
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 "דולא, whether in the sense of creating or bringing to pass, appears to make it additionally improbable. 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 lightning). 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 Hebrew: 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 observes, it would signify the destroyer—אמרי is used in the Qur'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 "דולא as a היפל, had observed that whenever, in post-Biblical times, a causative of "דולא was required (in philosophical terminology) the piel was the form employed; and quotes an explanation of "דולא by Aaron ben Elijah, of Nicomedia, the Karnite (in his בֶּרֶה הַנְּפָר, written in 1346, and published by Delitzsch in 1841 in the Archibdota zur Gesch. der mittelalterlichen Scholastik, p. 93) as the וּדָלֵא לְכָל הַנְּפָר יִכְשֵׁב, the source of all being. Nestle, in the Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie, 1878, p. 126 ff., answers that this explanation of "דולא by the piel may have been determined by the השָּׁבָע under the †, and appeals in support of its having been a היפל to the examples in 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 ff., which is in fact a reply to Delitzsch, though that scholar is not named. It remains a possibility that "דולא 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.


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

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. ὁ ὄν). 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. ה' is γίγνομαι, not εἰμί; and ה' נאי suggests the meaning come to be, or will be, rather than am. The phrase denotes thus not γέγονα ὁ γέγονα, but either γίγνομαι ὁ γίγνομαι or ἐσομαι ὁ ἐσομαι. 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 ה' is not mere existence, but emerging into reality (werden, γίγνομαι, 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 Commentarius über die Genesis (1872), pp. 26, 60 (der Begriiff des V. ה', oder נא, nicht sowol der des ruhenden, als des bewegten Seins, oder der Selbstbehättigung ist, u.s.w.).
(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 נְדוֹד 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 subjction of their future
captivities'. So Ewald, in his last work (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 נְדוֹד is epeaxegetical 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.):—אַחַיָּה אָפָר אָדָּא אֲלִיָּה כֶּל דָּלֶסֶת נָל אָמֶר לַדָּה—קָנִית וְהָעָשָׂהֱ קָנִית מִיָּה דָּה אָפָר לַדָּה קָנִית מִיָּה דָּה אָמֶר לַדָּה מְלָכְתָּה קָנִית מִיָּה דָּה אָפָר לַדָּה קָנִית מִיָּה דָּה אָמֶר לַדָּה. Similarly, Jehudah ha-Levi (twelfth century), who, commenting
on the word, Ouart, iv, 3 (p. 262, ed. Buxtorf; p. 304, ed. Cassel), writes:—

2 Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott (1873), ii, p. 337f.
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 הוהי 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 הוהי and הוהי תֵּאָשׁ may probably be best explained as follows: הוהי 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 allusions\(^1\), show that they saw in it the expression of moral unchangeability\(^2\).

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 'Iáw 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 Phoenician 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 γεγομένος, the possibility of a prior stage when it was interpreted in the sense Ἡ e 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, xili. 4; Hos. xili. 6; Mal. iii. 6.

\(^2\) Comp. Philipippi, 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. Η AΛV (יו). 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. 242; De Luynes, La Numismatique des Satrapies et de la Phénicie (1846), p. 291, and pl. iv. ("Schar").

'The legends in Phoenician 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-Tars on coins of Tarsus. I am, therefore, inclined to read יהל as a proper name. That the reading is correct I am not sure, as the form of the second letter is strange for י.'

Respecting the origin and use of ייהו and its relation to ייהו, 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 ייהו not with ייהו but with ייהו]; 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 ייהו 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 Wurttemberg, 1882, Heft iv. pp. 243-258 [conjectures מִנִּים to be the plural of מִן]; 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.

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 Precce magicae xii discipulorum as No. 78 in Dillmann's Catalogue of the Ethiopic MSS. of the British Museum, has observed מְדַר vocalized almost exactly as by Epiphanius and Theodoret (Ia30). The passage occurs (fol. 6b) 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):—

[transcribed text]

'And after that he told them his names: Lyâhê, i.e. terrible; Sârâhê, i.e. great; Dəmnuʾl, i.e. mighty; ... Meryon, i.e. all-watching; Oʾe, i.e. helper; Aphrân, i.e. saviour; Mânâtêr, i.e. shepherd; 'Êl, 'Êl, 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 מְדַר, maintaining its Israelitish origin, and explaining nearly in the sense of Rashi).