

teaching would defeat its own object. The devotion to His person which He demands in all the accounts of the ministry, and which in the Fourth Gospel is characterized as "believing on Him," differs widely from a mere acceptance of His message, however unquestioning and sincere. He requires men to believe His words, but He requires them also to confide wholly in Himself, as the only begotten Son of God.

This paper began with the remark that the Fourth Gospel is preeminently the Gospel of Teaching. It is not less conspicuously the Gospel of Faith. We are accustomed to speak of St. John as the Apostle of Love, and the note of love is repeatedly struck in his Gospel<sup>1</sup> as well as in his Epistles. But the note of faith is heard even more distinctly both in the teaching of our Lord and in the comments of the Evangelist. St. Luke wrote his Gospel in order that Theophilus might know the certainty of the things which he had been taught.<sup>2</sup> St. John's purpose is not less plainly announced: "these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in His name."<sup>3</sup> It is his aim to create in his readers a faith which issues in a life—a faith on the Divine Son, a life in the Spirit which they that believe on Him receive.

H. B. SWETE.

"THE NAME JEHOVAH IN THE ABRAHAMIC AGE."

THIS question-begging title is chosen because it insinuates a theory that the holy name which the Jews, from motives of reverence, vocalized with the vowels of Adonai, thereby disguising for us its original pronunciation, was actually in use as a divine name among the Babylonian contemporaries

<sup>1</sup> E.g. iii. 16, xiii. 34 f., xiv. 21 f., xv. 9 f., 12 f., 17, xvii. 23 ff., xxi. 15 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Luke i. 4.

<sup>3</sup> John xx. 31.

of Abraham. There are many assumptions to be made before that can be considered proved. In order that those who are unable to check the theories of modern Babylonizers of the Old Testament may estimate the audacity, and simplicity too, of some whose opinions are often quoted as authorities, an attempt is made here to show the process by which such results are deduced from the facts.

"The Abrahamic age" is a "catchy" title. It is meant to denote what is often loosely called by Assyriologists "the times of Hammurabi," more exactly "the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon." The estimates of the date of this dynasty differ widely, from B.C. 2300-2000, roughly. "Abraham" hardly covered all that time. The grounds for these estimates will be found set out in most Assyrian and Babylonian histories, or in the new Bible dictionaries. There is no need to deal with them here. But three things will be evident; that the date of Hammurabi is not exactly known; that Abraham's date is difficult to fix, in any sense; and that the attempt to synchronize them must depend upon other considerations than those of chronology alone.

What then is intended? The fourteenth chapter of Genesis, as it stands, makes the patriarch Abraham a contemporary of Amraphel king of Shinar, Arioch king of Ellasar, Tidal king of "nations," and Chedorlaomer king of Elam. Now if any one of these four kings can be proved identical with Hammurabi, or a known contemporary of his, we have it on the authority of Genesis that Abraham was contemporary with Hammurabi; and things, which occurred in the time of Hammurabi and his immediate predecessors or successors, can be said to be in the "Abrahamic age."

Now it has long been suggested [Rawlinson, Sayce, Hommel, etc.] that Amraphel was meant for Hammurabi. Certainly Shinar denotes Babylonia or some part of it, as

it includes Babel, Elrech, Calneh, and Akkad, which were certainly in Babylonia. That Amraphel is meant for Hammurabi is very generally accepted. But the correspondence between the names is not very close. The *p* for *b* is perhaps not a great difficulty. For the sign *bi*, with which the name Hammurabi usually ends, continually is used where the later writers would use *pi*. Further, the spelling Ammurapi actually occurs in Assyrian times. [K. 552, l. 5 f.] The presence of the *l* is more awkward. Professor Hommel points out that the sign *bé*, which could also be read *pil*, may have been used in the cuneiform document from which Genesis xiv. was derived. As the sign is rarely read *bé* in later times, but commonly so at the time of Hammurabi, this would support the contention that the cuneiform document in question was of that period. Also, it would show that the transcription was made at a later date by one who did not know how Hammurabi's name was pronounced.

Another way of accounting for the *l* is to suppose that the name Hammurabi could be read Hammu-rapaltu. This is supported by the fact that a tablet, which interprets the names of the kings who ruled "after the flood," gives for Hammurabi the interpretation Kimtu-rapaštu. This writer then thought the name meant something like "wide-spread family." It is not likely that he was right. The ending *-rabi* is too common in names at all periods of Babylonian history for that. It is more likely that *rabi* means "is great," and that Hammu is a divine name. The change of *rapaštu* to *rapaltu* is quite in accordance with the laws of phonetic change of consonants. [Delitzsch, *Ass. Gram.*, p. 119, (3)]. The objection is that we have a superfluous *t* now.

Another suggestion is that the name in the cuneiform document was really Hammurabi-ilu, a name which was borne by a witness to a document S. 146, in the Constanti-

nople Museum. [Scheil's *Une Saison de Fouilles à Sippar*, p. 123.] This name clearly means “Hammurabi is god.” But it is not very likely that this was ever written as the name of the king himself. It will be seen that the *l* is a real difficulty in the way of the identification.

Then some support is obtained by making Arioch of Ellasar another way of writing Rim-Sin of Larsa, who was certainly a contemporary of Hammurabi. If this be proved, then we should be able to argue that Amraphel was Hammurabi, though we could not account for his *l*. How is this done? We find the name of a king of Larsa written with signs which usually denote “the servant of Sin.” One of these—that denoting “servant”—is usually said to be read *eri* in Sumerian, and the name of the moon-god, Sin, is said to be *Aku* in Sumerian. Thus we should have a name Eri-Aku for the Sumerian reading of the name of the King of Larsa. Then this person has to be proved Rim-Sin. We must then suppose that while Hammurabi was partly recognized by the writer who transcribed his name as Amraphel, Rim-Sin was not. This writer had before him what, if he knew cuneiform well, he would probably have read Ardi-Sin, or perhaps translated Abdi-Sin, but for some reason chose to read as Sumerian Eriaku, and write Arioch. He further transposed the *r* and *s* in Larsa. Another way of accounting for Arioch is to suppose that Rim-Sin was read Riv-Aku, the representation of the Babylonian *m* by *v* or *w* being common enough; compare Evil-Merodach for Amél-Marduk. This would be a hybrid name, one-half read phonetically, the other as Sumerian. The finding of a name Eri-Ekna, or Eri-(E)aku, by Dr. Pinches on tablets of the fourth century B.C. is another elusive support. For it is not known to belong to a king of Larsa, nor that the bearer was a contemporary of Hammurabi. [King, *Letters of H*ammurabi, I. p. liii.]

The same tablets which gave this possible origin for

Arioch also gave a name Tudhula, which had a colorable likeness to Tidal, but did not give him a title which would mark him as king of "nations." In order to account for that title, it has to be assumed that Goyim, "nations," somehow replaces Gutium. But the name of a king of Gutium known to be contemporary with Hammurabi has yet to be discovered in cuneiform. The same tablets give a name, very curiously written, which it was suggested could be read Kudur-laggumal. This also was obtained by assuming unusual values for at least one sign. But it would be easily shown to be a variant for Kudur-lagamar. Such a name would then be of a well known Elamite pattern, several names like Kudur-Mabug, Kudur-Nahhuntu being known as belonging to Elamite kings. There is no difficulty about Lagamar, who is a well known Elamite goddess. The LXX, who read the name *Χοδολλογομορ*, furnish a link with Chedorla'omer. But the difficulty lay in proving that the cuneiform name had any right to be read as Dr. Pinches suggested, though, if that be so, both Arioch and Tidal seem more likely. The absence of Hammurabi from these tablets, of Gutium and Larsa, is to be deplored. A more seductive theory was due to Professor Scheil, who thought he had read Kudur-nuh-gamar on a letter of Hammurabi to Sin-idinnam of Larsa, preserved in the Constantinople Museum. This turned out to be an error altogether. The name was really Inuhsamar. [King, *Letters of Hammurabi*, I. p. xxix. ff.] Hence, likely as the name is to have been that of an Elamite king, it has not yet been found in cuneiform.

The cuneiform originals suggested for the names in Genesis xiv. are therefore only ingenious conjectures. They may all be right, but as yet not one is proved. But supposing them all found on one document, how would Abraham, or Lot, appear? If the writer made such a muddle of the other names as the estimable scholars who

suggest these identifications suppose, what did he turn into Abraham? Surely no cautious scholar can go on assuming that a number of unproved suggestions gain in cogency by their multiplication. All we can say is that they help us to see how the names in Genesis may have arisen, if we have good reason to think that Abraham was contemporary with Hammurabi. But they surely do not justify the use of the term "Abrahamic age" as synonymous with the First Dynasty of Babylon. We may one day find reason to think that the four kings refer to quite a different period. We do not know the names of all the kings of Babylon, or of Larsa, very few of Elam, hardly any of Gutium. Why not wait a little longer?

The identifications may turn out right after all. We do not know all that Hammurabi did yet. It would have been in the early years of this reign, when he was not yet the open enemy of Elam, and the deposer of Rim-Sin, that he could appear as an ally. The events of his reign known to us, year by year, make no mention of such an expedition to the West. If it took place, and turned out so badly, we could not expect to know of it from him. But it might have helped to estrange the four allies and so pave the way for his successes against Elam and Larsa.

There is further a certain unfairness in using the name Jehovah or Yahweh as denoting what has actually been found at the time of Hammurabi. It is a popular version of the matter which slurs over the weak points in the argument. To take the occurrence of Yahweh in the "Abrahamic" age, either as a notable confirmation of the Holy Scriptures, or an attack upon their inspiration—for it seems that this sort of discovery can generally be used either way—is not fair to those who are unable to check the argument, if there is any. Just lately the lectures of Professor Delitzsch on *Babel und Bibel*, now published in this country (Williams and Norgate's

Crown Theological Library), have given a wide currency to a theory which has had the support of such great names as Hommel, Pinches, Sayce, Winckler, and others. But such questions are not to be settled by the authority of great names. In Germany the views, by no means original with Professor Delitzsch, of the way in which the cuneiform names involving such an occurrence of Yahweh could be read and interpreted, were very conflicting; and the discussion provoked has greatly cleared the issue. But even there the ignorance of what is possible was too often only matched by the readiness to assert and opine.

The name which English scholars write Yahweh, or Yahwè, and which the Germans write Jahve, intending the same pronunciation, is known to have been written in cuneiform as Jau, when Assyrian scribes had to write the names of Hebrew kings which contained the divine name as one element. We are here on sure ground. The transcription of the cuneiform signs into Roman characters which we shall use is that now general; and, remembering only that *j* may be sounded as *y* and *v* as our *w*, can afford no difficulty to the reader. Thus Jehu's name appears as Ja-u-a, Ahaz as Jau-hazi (for the fuller form Joahaz), Hezekiah as Hazaki-Jau. Azariah, once thought to be the king of Judah of that name, now usually taken to be a king of the North Syrian land of Jaudi, near Sendširli, is written Azri-Jâu or Izri-Jau. Jau-bi'di was the name of a king of Hamath. (References for the inscriptions can be found in Schrader's *Keilinschriften u. d. Alte Testament*, 3rd edition, p. 465.) Here we have these reasons for regarding the cuneiform Jau to represent Yahweh, (*a*) that it corresponds to some Hebrew form of Yahweh in the names of persons which we know to be compounded of Yahweh; (*b*) that it is the name of a god as shown by the presence of the determinative of divinity before it in the name Jau-bi'di. Hence we can conclude either that Yahweh was worshipped

outside Israel at Hamath and Jaudi, or that Israelites had come to the throne there.

But there are a large number of names which occur in cuneiform where the whole complexion of the name makes us certain of the name Yahweh being part of it. Here we do not know the person named to be a Hebrew, for we cannot identify him with any known Jew or Israelite. In the Arscide times, in the business documents of Murašû and Sons, of Nippur (Hilprecht, *Babyl. Exped.* ix., Proper names, and p. 27), we have such names as Jâhû-lakim, Jâhû-lunu, Jahû-natanu, Ahi-Jâma, Gadai-Jâma, Hanani-Jâma, Jadh-Jâma, Igdal-Jâma, Pađ-Jâma, Peli-Jâma, Tiri-Jâma. Failing reason (a) above, we have reason (b) in the case of the first and third names, where the determinative of divinity is set before Jâhû. Also the similarity of Ahijah, Gedaliah, Hananiah, etc., makes us pretty certain that Jâma answers to the word Jah at the end of Hebrew names. It is not necessary to multiply examples, as could easily be done for either Assyrian or late Babylonian times, nor need we now consider the other forms, such as Aja, Au, Iba, Hiba, etc., under which the name Yahweh has been recognized in cuneiform. They only indirectly bear on the names presently to be discussed as occurring under the First Dynasty of Babylon.

The first of these is Jaum-ilu. It is obvious to imagine that we have a name compounded of Yahweh; for Jaum is the same as Jau, only with the Babylonian mimmation added. As this final *m* is often omitted, and *m* itself is often written for *w*, we may suppose it silent or coalescing with the *u*, and in any case, have only an earlier writing for Jau. This was the Assyrian writing of Yahweh, and we may interpret the name, “Yahweh is God.” Professor Sayce (*Expository Times*, ix. p. 522) was the first to point out this name (August, 1898), in a note headed “Yahveh in Early Babylonia.” He compared Abum-ilu and the names



Jakub-ilu, Jašup-ilu. It would seem to be clear that Yahweh, originally a third person singular of a verb, had already become so fixed as a name as to be treated with a nominative ending *um*, as if a noun ending in *u*. The comparison with Abum-ilu, is a little disconcerting. Abum of course is the nominative of *abu*, "father," also a noun, and Abum-ilu will be "Father is God." Was then Abu a divine name like Jau? or ought we not to read "God is a Father"? If so, why not render "God is a Yahweh"? In view of the fact that Yahweh is really a verb, meaning (say) "he will be," does not the comparison with Abum-ilu suggest that we ought to render Jaum-ilu by "God will be." The words Jakub, Jašup are also third persons singular of verbs. If Jakub and Jašup were known to have already become divine names, we might think that Jakub-ilu, Jašup-ilu, meant "Jacob is God," "Joseph is God." But it is impossible not to suppose that the names may mean "God has been or done," whatever was meant by the verbs implied. The effect would have been greater if we had been left alone with Jaum-ilu, for then we could say without compunction, "Here we have clearly Jau with the mimmation, and Jau we know from Assyrian times to be the cuneiform transcription of Yahweh; therefore we can only have "Yahweh is God."

The next name on which Professor Delitzsch relies is read by him Jahve-ilu. It also occurs in the form Jave-ilu. It seems to have first been pointed out by Professor Hommel in 1900 (*Expository Times*, xi. p. 270). A discussion has arisen as to its reading, in view of the polyphony of the cuneiform sign *PI*. If it is not read Jahve, we have no support for the occurrence of Yahweh in the age of Hammurabi. There is no doubt it can be so read, no proof that it must be. Now this is exactly the right way to write Yahweh in cuneiform, and is in form a third person singular of a verb. We might scruple to say that Jau was a verb

third person singular, because it might be also a noun. But Jahve is a verb in appearance, and can only be used as a noun in the (unproved) case that Yahweh was already so fixed as a name that it could also be used as a noun. If Yahweh was already a divine name, it would be transcribed in cuneiform as Jahve, and here is a case of it. But as this name can obviously be read "God will be," it cannot be used to prove that Jahve is a divine name.

The case would be entirely different if we had the determinative of divinity before Jaum or Jahve, or if either of these words were compounded with one of those verb forms which we had above in compounds of Yahweh. Thus, if we have Jaum-lakim, Jaum-lunu, Jaum-natanu, or Jahve-lakim, etc.; or if either Jaum or Jahve were compounded with any element known to imply that the first part of the name was a divine name, we could be sure. But of all possible compound names this is exactly the one which does not prove its first element to be a divine name; X-ilu does not prove that X is a divine name. If X can only be a noun, it does. When X is only a verb form it does prove the opposite. The only hope that X can be a divine name, though in form a verb, is that the verb form has already become fixed as a name so as to be used as a noun in spite of its form. When X is Jahve, we do not know that.

Of course, Adad-ilu, Marduk-ilu, Nabû-ilu, Sin-ilu, Šamaš-ilu, are examples where the first element is a divine name, but we have independent proof that Adad, Marduk, Nabû, Sin, and Šamaš are the names of gods. But these names cannot be mistaken for verbs. Jakub-ilu, Jašup-ilu do not prove that Jakub, Jašup, are names of gods, they may be verbs. If we had Jakub-natanu, we should be nearer proving Jacob was a god. We may have independent proof of the fact. But even this would not prove that in the name Jakub-ilu we had the name of the god Jacob.

At the same period, that of the First Dynasty of Babylon, we have a string of names like Jahve-ilu in form ;

such as Jabnik-*ilu*, Jadh-*ilu*, Jazi-*ilu*, Jahbar-*ilu*, Jakub-*ilu*, Jakbar-*ilu*, Jamanu-*ilu*, Jambi-*ilu*, Jamlik-*ilu*, Ja'si-*ilu*, Jaḡar-*ilu*, Jarši-*ilu*, Jašbi-*ilu*, Jarbi-*ilu*, Jati-*ilu*. No one would maintain that Jamlik-*ilu* means "Jamlik is god," but "God reigns" or something of the kind. Leaving out the last two as doubtful, we have a dozen examples exactly like Jahve-*ilu* in form, where the first element is a third person singular of the verb and *ilu* is the nominative to it. The only chance that Jahve-*ilu* could be unlike these names is that Jahve was already so fixed as a divine name that its sense as verb was overlooked. It cannot be used to prove that Yahweh was already a divine name.

If it be objected that we have no other example of the verb used in forming names, we can account for that by the peculiar sense of the verb. What name could be formed with it? The sense is admitted to be something like "to be or become a protector, saviour, etc." Who but God would be said to be that? If Sin was a god of the people who used the verb, we might get Jahve-Sin. If it be objected that this meaning of the verb in Yahweh is later and not original, we must know what is to be taken as the real verb and sense, then we may look for examples. The later form Jâhû, however, suggests the same verb as in Jehi-el, or the Phœnician Aduni-*iha*. The form Jâma, if really representing Yahweh, opens up the way to further parallels.

To sum up the whole position. We do know the cuneiform transcription of Yahweh at a time when it was the name of the god of the Hebrews, i.e. from the ninth century onwards. That form suggests that it had already lost, at least to the ear of a cuneiform writer, its obvious verb form, and was something like Jô, Jeho, or even Jah. Later it seemed like Jâhû, which is not so easily reconciled with Yahweh, and the final Jah was heard like Jâwa. But there is no proof, so far, that it was already used as a divine name so early as the First Dynasty of Babylon. If we ever find a proof of this, we may expect it was even then written

Jau (or Jahve ?) and we shall then admit that the names Jaum-ilu and Jahve-ilu may have meant "Yahweh is god." At any rate, they even now show that in all probability the verb from which Yahweh comes was in use among those foreigners in Babylonia, whatever we call them, who bore these names ; which would readily explain the application of the name Yahweh to their god. One name coupling Jau or Jahve with a verb would be enough to show these were then divine names, or the occurrence of the determinative of divinity before either Jau or Jahve, unless the whole name was that of a deity or deified person.

The whole question has here been left open whether Yahweh is after all the original form. Since the Hebrews thought so, Exod. iii. 14, we may leave it so here. But if indeed the divine name was really in use before that event and amongst peoples not Hebrew, we may well doubt if this was the original form. It would be difficult to parallel it with another divine name that could be taken as a verb in the third person singular. The divine names are usually nouns or participles, where we can discern their meaning. The cuneiform transcription may be used to suggest the original form. But it is hazardous to use for that purpose transcriptions made after the name had taken the form Yahweh, or its contracted forms. We may rather look to some fresh information from the names of the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon ; or from cuneiform tablets found on Palestinian soil, like the Lachish tablet, or Professor Sellin's recent discoveries.

It may seem to some an ungracious office merely to seek to prove a negative conclusion, or to advise suspension of judgement ; but in what way can we be considered gainers if the theories advanced above are accepted without rigid proof? Does the Hebrew tradition really become more reliable, or the uniqueness of Israel's religious development more assured? Or is the gain in a destruction of these views?

C. H. W. JOHNS.