

the passage as it stands in the LXX must surely be regarded as translation Greek.

What Mr Coleman seems to me to have proved is that the translators of the Greek Bible took *hen*, which usually stands for 'behold', in the sense of 'if' more often than is now recognized in Hebrew grammatical tradition. But it is a long step from that to infer a questionable derivation for the common Biblical Aramaic word for 'if', and a still longer one to apply the result to reverse the hitherto accepted meaning of Mark viii 12.

F. C. BURKITT.

YĀHŌ^h.

It seems almost impertinent to reopen in England¹ the question of the vocalization of the Tetragrammaton, when the term Yahweh has spread to the very text-books of our secondary schools. Yet there is something to be said.

Not that anything is to be said in favour of the name Jehovah. That word is not to be found earlier than the beginning of the fourteenth century, when Porchet wrote his *Victoria* in 1303,² and it is (to my mind) doubly wrong. First, it represents merely the vowels of Adonai, the 'surrogate' of the Tetragrammaton³; and secondly, it gives a consonantal value to the third letter of the Four. The form Jehovah cannot be right.

I. Is then Yahweh? It may be granted at once that no vocalization is more natural to any reader of the letters YHWH in Exod. iii 15, vi 3, if the word be considered in itself. It looks like an 'imperfect' of a *h* verb, and the only doubt would be the quality of the first syllable and the 'voice' which the word was intended to represent.⁴ Nor again can it be denied that the curious '*Ehyeh*' in Exod. iii 14 ('I AM hath sent me unto you'⁵) suggests a verbal form like Yahweh as the actual Name. But one cannot say more. Scholars have hardly

¹ The subject has recently been discussed from points of view other than that of this paper by Luckenbill in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages* xl 277-283 (July 1924), Albright *Journal of Biblical Literature* xliii (1924) pp. 370-378, and xliv (1925) pp. 153-162, and Burkitt, xliv pp. 353-356.

² Printed in 1530.

³ All the available information on this subject is given by Dr Dalman *Der Gottesname Adonai* 1889, to whom I would say 'Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume,' &c.

⁴ It must, however, not be forgotten that the system of punctuation which ultimately prevailed was only one out of several, though I do not know that there would have been any difference in the case before us.

⁵ I assume that the text is not interpolated, in spite of W. R. Arnold's arguments in his essay 'The Divine Name in Exod. iii 14', in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* xxiv 1905, pp. 129, 134.

attempted to explain why in *Yahweh* the form is archaic, and in '*Ehyeh* ordinary Hebrew. Nor have they given sufficient weight to the suggestion that '*Ehyeh* itself may be a kind of 'surrogate' (throwing no more light on the original word than does Adonai); for to later Hebrew minds it seemed impossible that God should tell Moses to pronounce the Tetragrammaton with its proper vocalization, and the verse implies that it was to be so pronounced.¹

There is, however, some external evidence in favour of *Yahweh*. Such force as this evidence possesses depends chiefly on a statement expressed clearly in the Palestinian Talmud, and probably (but very obscurely) in the Babylonian. A discussion was held with reference to those who have no share in the world to come, to which R. Saul in the Mishna contributed the saying, 'also he who expresses the Name by its letters'. To this R. Mana (Cent. iv) adds in the Gemara, 'As these Cuthaeans (Samaritans) when they take oaths'.²

What, then, did the Samaritans say? First, what *do* they say? For they have been an extraordinarily conservative race, and the old traditions remain among them.³

It appears that in their religious services they do not pronounce the Tetragrammaton, but use the surrogate *Shemmah* (שֵׁמָה, *The Name*), or occasionally *Elohim* (God). But, as J. A. Montgomery shews, there is some evidence (though it is rather obscure and uncertain) that in the sixteenth century and even later they said *Yahweh* or *Yahwah*. He ends his paper, however, in a remarkable way: 'But conclusive evidence on this question (whether it is *Yahwe* or *Yahwa*) was given by Prof. N. Schmidt in the discussion of the present paper at the meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. He said that he had learnt orally from the son of the Samaritan high priest, whom he had met in the preceding winter in Jerusalem, that the Samaritans pronounce the name either as *Yahwa* or *Yahu*'.⁴ If both the young man and his reporter may be trusted, and there is no reason, so far as I am aware,

¹ It can hardly be doubted that God is described as giving to Moses a name by which He had not been known to the Patriarchs, though Lagarde and others think the reference was only to the carrying out of what the Name implied (*Psalt. juxta Hebr.* 1874, pp. 154 sq.). Van Hoonacker rightly points out that there is no reason why the Name when first given should have been of a normal and readily intelligible formation (*The Schweich Lectures of 1914*, p. 72).

² כָּנֹן אֵילִין כּוֹתְאֵי דְּמִשְׁתַּבְּעִין: T. J. *Sanh.* x 1 end, p. 28^b top. cf. T. B. *Sanh.* 101^b. The words of Raba bar Ḥama in T. B. *Kiddushin* 71^a also imply that the true pronunciation was known by the Jews in the middle of the fourth century.

³ See Gaster's *Schweich Lectures, The Samaritans*, 1925.

⁴ 'Notes from the Samaritan. A nineteenth-century witness to the pronunciation of YHWH' (*Journal of Biblical Literature* xxv 1906, pp. 50 sq.).

why they should not be, the conversation makes the evidence of the Samaritans in modern times much less certain than has been assumed to be the case.

Secondly, what *did* they say? There is one witness of fairly early date. Theodoret (born *c.* 393 at Antioch, died *c.* 458 as Bishop of Cyrrhus, some seventy miles north-east of Antioch) twice mentions the Samaritans in this connexion.

In *Quaest.* xv on Exodus (Exod. iii 14) speaking of the Tetragrammon (*sic*) he says that the Hebrews are not allowed to utter it. 'But the Samaritans call it *Yabe*, but the Jews *Aia*.'¹ It will be observed, by the way, that he here puts the Samaritans and the Jews on precisely the same footing.

When the *Quaestiones* were written we do not know. But the *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium* evidently belongs to the late years of Theodoret's life, if the chapter in it attacking Nestorius is his.² In this work he speaks of certain stolid folk who suppose that every name of God represents a different God, e. g. *Adonai*, *Elohi*, and *Sabaoth*, because they do not know the signification of the Hebrew names. He therefore will explain these. At last he says, 'Now Saddai signifies Him who is sufficient and able, but *Aia* Him who is. This also was not to be uttered among the Hebrews. But the Samaritans call it *Iabai*, not knowing the force of the expression'.³

Now it is not surprising that many suppose that the question what was the old pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton by the Samaritans is settled by these two statements of Theodoret's. Possibly, but far from certainly. The *Aia* assigned to the Jews is evidently used as a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton and may be the equivalent of 'Ehyeh ('I am') in Exod. iii 15. It is not impossible that the Samaritans used *Yavai* for a surrogate also. Further, it must not be forgotten that Theodoret, who wrote a hundred years later than R. Mana, had no personal acquaintance with Samaria proper, and depended on wandering members of the tribe, and also that these were not always distinguished from those of other tribes and sects, being given, like them, to posing as exorcists and sorcerers. Further, it is

¹ Hatch and Redpath's statement (*Suppl.* i p. 9) that in Exod. vi 3 the Sam. reads 'Αἰά seems to be due to a confusion of Theodoret's words *καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ Σαμαρείται μὲν Ἰαβέ, Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ Ἀἰά*. Migne *P. G.* lxxx c. 244. There is unfortunately no critical edition of Theodoret's writings. The Greek is also in Field's *Hex.* at Exod. vi 3, where for *αἰά* is a *var. lect.* Ἰά. I print *β* in *Yabe* to represent the Greek *β*, but presumably it was sounded *v*.

² iv 12 sq. Migne *P. G.* lxxxiii cc. 432-437.

³ V. 3 end, τὸ δὲ Σαδδαί, τὸν ἰκανὸν καὶ δυνατὸν ἡσμαινεῖ· τὸ δὲ Ἀἰά τὸν ὄντα. Τοῦτο καὶ ἀνεκφώνητον ἦν παρ' Ἑβραίοις. Σαμαρείται δὲ Ἰαβαὶ αὐτὸ λέγουσιν, ἀγροῦντες τὴν τοῦ βήματος δύναμιν. Migne *P. G.* lxxxiii c. 460.

one thing to pronounce the Holy Name in solemn oaths, and quite another to use it in a casual way, or even in charms. Theodoret may easily have heard the use of *Yabai* in cases of the latter kind, and yet never have heard the proper pronunciation in an oath. In any case, he is the only person who attributes the use of *Yabai* to the Samaritans.

What, then, of Epiphanius (born between A.D. 310 and 320, died 403)? For, though he does not say anything in this connexion about Samaritans, he lived most of his life (save for a few years with monks in Egypt) in or near Eleutheropolis, which is about twenty miles north-west of Hebron, and about sixty miles from Mount Gerizim.

In *Panarion* xl § 5, he is speaking of certain heretics called Archontics, who have come from Armenia to Palestine, and suppose that *Sabaoth* is God of the Jews, and the devil is His evil son. 'They think that Sabaoth is the name of a certain God, as we have already explained at length with reference to the other heresies,' where we have shewn that the various names are terms of the one God, and do not represent different Gods. He then gives a list of such names, viz. '*Eli, Elohim, El, Saddai, Ellion, Rabboni, Ia, Adonai, and Iabe* (Var. lect. *Iaue*)'. He then explains each. '*El* is God, *Elohim* Ever God, *Eli* My God, *Saddai* The Sufficient, *Rabboni* The Lord, *Ia* Lord, *Adonai* The Lord who is, *Iabe* (Var. lect. *Iaue*) He who was and is, the ever Being, as He interprets to Moses, "He who is hath sent me, shalt thou say unto them," and *Ellion* the Highest, and *Sabaoth* is interpreted Of Hosts,' which he further explains.¹

It will be observed that Epiphanius makes here no special claim for the term *Iabe* or *Iaue*. It is just one of the names of God, and apparently a Biblical name (judging by the others), and in this, no doubt, lies the strength of its evidence. The pronunciation of 'Iaβε' is clear; that of 'Iavé' not so clear.²

Again, there is no doubt that the term *Yahweh* occurs sometimes in magical formulae and charms. But it would be very strange indeed if it did not, considering the endless permutations and abbreviations of the Tetragrammaton to be found in such sources.³ This part of the evidence for *Yahweh* is of little weight.

¹ νομίζοντες ὄνομα εἶναι [τοῦ] θεοῦ τινὸς τὸ Σαβαώθ, ὡς ἤδη καὶ ἐν ταῖς πρότερον αἰρέσει δια πλάτους ἡμῶν πεπραγματεύεται . . . τοῦ τε Ἑλλ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλωείμ, τοῦ τε Ἑλλ καὶ τοῦ Σαδδαῖ τοῦ τε Ἑλλίων τοῦ τε Ἑραββωνί τοῦ τε Ἰὰ τοῦ τε Ἀδωναὶ τοῦ τε Ἰαβέ ('Iavé M) . . . τὸ Ἑλλ Θεός, τὸ Ἑλωείμ Θεὸς αἰεὶ, τὸ Ἑλλ θεὸς μου, τὸ Σαδδαῖ ὁ ἰκανός, τὸ Ἑραββωνί ὁ κύριος, τὸ Ἰὰ κύριος, τὸ Ἀδωναὶ ὁ ἄν κύριος, τὸ Ἰαβέ ('Iavé M) ὃς ἦν καὶ ἔστιν ὁ αἰεὶ ἄν, ὡς ἐρμηνεύει τῷ Μωυσῆ 'Ὁ ἄν ἀπέσταλάκῃ με, ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτοῦς', καὶ τὸ Ἑλλίων ὕψιστος, καὶ τὸ Σαβαώθ δυνάμεων ἐρμηνεύεται (Leipzig 1922, ii p. 86).

² On Clement of Alexandria, *vide infra* p. 282 n. 2.

³ See, for example, Gaster *The Sword of Moses* 1896, pp. xi sq., 34.

It will, I hope, be admitted that neither by literary arguments nor by external evidence can the claim of Yahweh to be the true pronunciation of the Name be considered established.

II. There is, however, a further consideration which has been entirely overlooked, but is now becoming prominent, in view of recent investigations of the nature of the Hebrew cult. For it is more and more evident that this was not that decorous, almost silent, worship to which we ourselves are accustomed. It was a loud worship, such as orientals love, and part, perhaps even a large part, of it (but the proportion is wholly unimportant) consisted in calling upon the sacred Name aloud. Gunkel has shown this, as, for example, in the brief summary in his Commentary on Ps. xx 6.¹

What, then, was the Name which was invoked so loudly?

Was it YĀHWEH, with a long 'a'? Certainly not, for no scholar, so far as I know, has ever proposed that as the Name of the Tetragrammaton. YĀHWEH is only our English and typically clumsy pronunciation.² The Name proposed is YĀHWEH or YĀH^aWEH. True, there is some question about the exact shade of the pronunciation of the first vowel, whether it should be 'a' as in 'pat', or 'e' as in 'pet', or 'i' as in 'pit'—it matters little—but in any case it is short, very short.

This being so, a congregation at worship, or even a body of soldiers charging the enemy, would find YĀHWĒH a poor word to shout out.

As a word to be used in public worship or in solemn and personal invocation, YĀHWEH seems to be improbable to a degree.

What other form is there? There is YĀŌ or YĀHŌ. That this existed in early, and even in pre-Mosaic days, is, I believe, generally acknowledged, though this is more a matter of inference than of sharp and undisputed evidence. There are, for example, the names of Hebrew men or women, in which it occurs either at the end, e.g. נתניהו (Nethaniah, Jer. xl 8 and often), which is like נתנאל (Nathanael, Num. i 8), or at the beginning, e.g. יהונתן (never יהנתן, Jehonathan, 1 Sam. xiv 6 and often) and יונתן (Jonathan, 1 Sam. xiii 2 and often). The name of Jochebed (יוכבד), Moses' mother, is an early instance.³

¹ Cf. the Baal worship 1 Kings xviii 26. So in India devotees will call out 'Ram', 'Ram', repeatedly. See further Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *RE der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* xxii (1922) s.v. *Kultus* sp. 2154 sq.

² It should, however, be mentioned that the vocalization YĀWĒ occurs in a list of magical names in an Ethiopic document of unstated age (Driver on the Tetragrammaton in *Studia Biblica* i 20, 1885).

³ Much ink has been spilled in endeavouring to show either that 'Yahweh' has

So in the Assyrian period Jehoahaz is represented in cuneiform by *Ja-u-ḥa-zi*; Hezekiah by *Ḥa-za-ki-ja-a-u*; Azariah (not the king of Judah) by *Az-ri-ja-a-u*.¹

The Jews at Elephantine worshipped Yau or Yao (יהו, once ירה), as stated in documents ranging from 465 to 407 B.C.² Diodorus Siculus, who finished his book in 8 B.C., speaking of the God of the Jews, says that He was called 'Iaó.³ Origen uses the same name of Him.⁴ Porphyry, as quoted by Eusebius, cites Sanchuniathon as using 'Iεω of Him.⁵ Similarly the margin of Cod. Marchalianus (Q) has at Ezek. xi 1 an explanation of the name Βαβαίου (בניהו) οικοδομῆ ἡ (perhaps ἡ) οἶκος 'Iaó.⁶ Jerome says that the Name 'can be read IAHO'.⁷

Further 'Iaó is much more common in charms and amulets than 'Iaβέ or the like, and Epiphanius records that among the Marcosian heretics when a man is baptized by them he says, 'I have been redeemed, and I redeem my soul from this age and all the things that are from it in the name of Iao who redeemed his soul unto redemption in the living Christ'.⁸ *Yahweh* is not mentioned, but *Yao*. I suggest, then, that this YA-O or YA-HO is fundamentally the right pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. It gives a solemn and a sonorous cry, fitted for a very emotional people, whether as a prayer for help, or as

given rise to such forms, or that they have produced 'Yahweh'. The possibilities on either side hardly come within the compass of the present paper.

¹ See D. D. Luckenbill *The Pronunciation of the Name of the God of Israel* (*AJSL*. xl p. 278, [1923-1924]). My friend Mr Chauncey Winkworth tells me that Zimmern *KAT*⁸ 1903, pp. 465-468, is still the best authority. Zimmern is more than doubtful about the Divine reference of Ja-u-um-il, &c., in the time of Ḥammurabi, as these have no 'Gottesdeterminativ' before them.

² See Cowley *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, 1923, nos. 6, 13, 22, 25, 27, 30, 31, 33, 38, 45, 56.

³ *Hist.* i 94. Irenaeus i 4. 1 uses the word in connexion with the Valentinians.

⁴ *In Joan.* ii p. 49 (Brooke, 1896).

⁵ *Praep. Evang.* i 9, p. 31 (Gifford).

⁶ The text of Q is said to be 'not later than the sixth century' (Swete), and this note (which is in uncials) is little if at all later (Ceriani *De Codice Marchaliano*, 1890).

⁷ 'Domine, Dominus noster. Prius nomen Domini apud Hebraeos quattuor literarum est, *Jod, He, Vau, He*: quod proprie Dei vocabulum sonat: et legi potest IAHO, et Hebraei ἀβήρον id est ineffabile opinantur' (*Breviarium in Psalmos* Ps. viii, Vallarsi vii 21; Migne *P. L.* xxvi c. 838). Thought by Vallarsi to be spurious, but now considered genuine, and to be dated before A.D. 392. See Bardenhewer *Alté. Lit.* iii 620 (1912).

⁸ λελύτρωμαι καὶ λυτρούμαι τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου καὶ πάντων τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ 'Iaó, ὃς ἐλυτρώσατο τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν ἐν τῷ χριστῷ τῷ ζῶντι: Panarion xxxiv 21. Leipzig 1922 ii p. 36. Migne *P. G.* xli c. 623. It is sometimes quoted as Lib. I. iii 20. It should be noted that several strange Hebrew words have preceded, evidently used as a kind of incantation.

a paean of victory, or as an acknowledgement of the claims of Him who is addressed.

III. But it will be objected that while this theory accounts plausibly for three of the letters of the Sacred Name, it says nothing of the fourth, the final H.

I suggest that this H represents only the explosion of breath after the loud and prolonged O. If the reader will pronounce YĀHŌ in this way, he will find himself involuntarily uttering a something, comparatively slight, I grant, but there, unavoidably there, if the O be closed sharply.¹

I suggest, further, that, as in calling upon a God the exact and full pronunciation was deemed to be of the greatest possible importance, it became *de rigueur*, when using the sacred Name in worship, or on solemn occasions, always to express this final sound fully. Hence, when the time came that the Name was put into writing the writer was careful always to add a letter to indicate its full pronunciation, i. e. the pronunciation of the Name *in its sacred use*. We, no doubt, in such a case would write YAHŌ^h, in capitals, with a little 'h' at the top, but of old they had no such a device. They had to write an H of the same kind as that of the second letter.

Thus, when the Name was written down for sacred purposes (but only then, and *not when it formed part of an ordinary proper name*) it was written YHWH, the Tetragrammaton.²

IV. Lastly, it may be asked what is the meaning of the word YĀHŌ^h? Frankly, no one can tell for certain. For it belongs, presumably, to a primitive language at present unknown. But this much is clear, that it seemed to the Hebrews to have some connexion with their own word, HAWAH or HAYAH, 'to be'.

¹ This may lie at the basis of the fact that a final ה often represents the O sound. See, for example, the Moabite Stone, l. 12, דורה (Dodo). The Stone is the oldest inscription or document of any kind that contains the Tetragrammaton. It is unfortunate that the destruction of two letters in the preceding words (or possibly the preceding word) makes the exact sense of the clause doubtful. Dr Cowley even supposes דורה here not to be the Name at all, and translates, 'And I took from thence what *should be* for myself', but this makes an awkward sentence, and the name of the God of Israel is to be expected at this point.

² If we wish to express the sacred pronunciation by the recognized system of vocalization we may possibly point יהוה, but this would represent an exaggeration. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* V. vi 34, Leipzig, 1906, ii p. 348) tells us of 'the mystic four-lettered Name, which only they who had the right of entering the shrine had upon them—now it is said Iaoue ('Iaoue)'.
 On the analogy of Σουε for הוה and שוע, and Ἰαουε for יהוה this may have represented YAHŌ^h. But *ou* does often represent a *waw* pronounced to-day as a consonant, e. g. οὐλώ for הוה and, in consequence, Clement's statement has been claimed as evidence for *Yahweh*.

Thus to the Hebrews the fully pronounced Tetragrammaton suggested 'being' or perhaps 'becoming' (see God's words in Exod. iii 14 sq.), and that in a timeless, or rather all-time, sense, of which the Apocalyptic $\delta \omega\nu$ και $\delta \eta\nu$ και $\delta \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ¹ is a not unfair expansion.

In conclusion, then, I submit that the evidence for Yāhweh is by no means as sure as is commonly asserted, and that an unbiased examination gives reason to suppose that, while Yāhweh was known (as could hardly fail to be the case on any hypothesis), the term Yāhō, or Yāō, was far more usual, and that the definitely sacred name was Yāhō^h. Yāhweh was probably a purely literary, though extremely natural, formation, but the original and religious sound of the Tetragrammaton was Yāhō^h, the cry of full-lunged, strong-voiced men.

A. LUKYN WILLIAMS.

THE TARGUM ON THE LATER PROPHETS.

MR. A. SPERBER'S communication to *ZAW.* N.F. iii 175 f on a proposed edition of the Targum on the Earlier Prophets raises the hope that his work will be extended to the Later Prophets. Lagarde's work (*Prophetæ Chaldaice*) is worthy of Lagarde, but it needs the addition of an Apparatus containing at least the readings of the Yemenite MSS. I have examined the text of these for about thirteen chapters of Ezekiel, and have found a good number of variants worth recording. I append a small selection of these by way of illustration. I should add that I have not been able to examine the MSS a second time for verification. I offer these notes only in support of my contention that work can be done and should be done on the Targum of the Later Prophets.

Ezekiel

(Lag. = Lagarde's *Prophetæ Chaldaice*, 1872.

Bxt. = Buxtorf's text in his Rabbinic Bible, Basel, Anno 379, i. e.

A. D. 1619.

b = B. M. Or. 1474.

m = B. M. Or. 2211.

y = B. M. Or. 1473.

The three MSS are Yemenite, the oldest of them being m, which is dated A. D. 1475.)

¹ Rev. i 8.