Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee   https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON   https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal   https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY AND PHILOLOGY

W. F. ALBRIGHT

JERUSALEM, PALESTINE

1. CHAOS AND THE ORIGIN OF LIGHT IN GENESIS I[1]

The first verses of Genesis have been interpreted in support of the most varied cosmogonical theories,[2] as well as of the most divergent hypotheses of comparative mythology. It would seem that additional discussion would be superfluous, at least until discovery of further materials for comparison. The following

---

[1] Note the following abbreviations: AA = *Archäologischer Anzeiger*; AAA = *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*; AJP = *American Journal of Philology*; AJSL = *American Journal of Semitic Languages*; AJTh = *American Journal of Theology*; Annual = *Annual of American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem*; AV = Authorized Version; EA = Knudtzon-Weber-Ebeling, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*; G = LXX; GB = Gesenius-Buhl, *Heb. u. aram. Handwörterbuch*; JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*; JBL = *Journal of Biblical Literature*; JEA = *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*; JPOS = *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*; JSOR = *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*; M = Masoretic text; MVAG = *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*; RA = *Revue d'Assyriologie*; RB = *Revue Biblique*; OLZ = *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*; OT = Old Testament; Z = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*; ZATW = *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*; ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.

[2] It has even been maintained that the creation described in Gen. I is a recreation of a destroyed earth. Few scholars could perhaps be found to endorse the following argument, which the writer heard in an address by the present pastor of "Moody's Church" in Chicago, that the word "replenish," used in the AV for Heb. *mil'û*, means "fill again," and refers to the repopulation of the earth.

remarks may, however, contribute in slight degree to the inter-
pretation of the passage.

As is well-known, there are two alternative explanations of
the syntax of Gen. 1 1 f., both of which were recognized by the
Masoretes as valid, and indicated by them implicitly in the
vocalization of the first two words. They thus left it open to
their successors either to read *berêšiṭ berô elôhîm*, "in the be-
ginning of God's creating," or *bārêšiṭ bārâ elôhîm*, "in the be-
ginning God created." The Greek transcriptions βαρησηθ and
βαρησεθ indicate that the second alternative triumphed in
ordinary exegesis, a fact established by the versions. On the
other hand, ancient oriental parallels, especially from Meso-
potamia, show that the first possibility is more original. Nearly
all Accadian cosmogonies begin with the word *inûmi*, later
enûma, literally "in the day that," but semantically meaning
"when." Thus the Seven Tablets of Creation begin *enûma eliš
lâ nabû šamâmu, šapliš ammatum šuma lâ zakrat* = "When
above the heaven had not been named, Below the earth had not
been called a name." The style is typically Sumerian; Sumerian
cosmogonies also usually begin with *ud(a)* = *inûmi*: e. g., *ud
an-ki-ta dab-gi-na bad-a-ta-eš-a-[ba]* = "When from heaven and
earth the sure fastenings had been removed."[3] In cosmogonies
the concluding clause is not introduced by a special conjunction,
but must be worked out from the sequence of ideas. It is only
in the theological introductions with cosmogonic background
which we find so often prefaced to historical inscriptions or
royal edicts, that the more stilted formal style, *ud(a)—ud-bi-a*
= *inûmi—inûmišu*, "when—then," is employed; e. g., in the
Code of Ḥammurabi, col. I, lines 1 ff., 27 ff. The absence of a
particle, such as *az*, to introduce the concluding clause of the
Hebrew, is doubtless related to the Accadian usage already
described. It naturally does not follow that the Hebrew is
translated from a cuneiform prototype, but only that Hebrew
(i. e., Canaanite and Phoenician) cosmogonic literature has been
stylistically influenced from Mesopotamia (a term which culturally
includes northeastern Syria, i. e., the western side of the Upper
Euphrates valley).

    [3] Ebeling, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*, no. 4.

We are, therefore, entirely justified in rendering Gen. 1 1–3 as follows: When God began to create heaven and earth—and the earth was chaotic and empty, and darkness was over the primordial ocean, and the spirit of God was hovering over the water—, (then) God said, Let light come into existence, and light came into existence. For effectiveness combined with simplicity this cosmogony can hardly be excelled. One would, however, very much like to know the background of the conceptions indicated so summarily, though we are sorely hampered by the effacement of original outlines in the form in which P has handed them down to us. As will appear, the writer does not believe that the cosmogony of P is derived from Mesopotamia, but that it belongs to the same general milieu as the eastern Mediterranean cosmogonies preserved to us in Hesiod and "Sanchuniathon," from which the philosophical cosmogonies of the Ionian school, especially of Thales, sprang directly. Since the milieu in question was highly syncretistic, and borrowed freely from Egyptian[4] and Mediterranean sources, we are justified in drawing on both for elements of comparison.

The expression *tōhû wa-bōhû* is very interesting because of its being the clearest case of rhyme-formation in Hebrew, but there is still a lack of clarity as to its exact meaning, and the relative originality of the component elements. *Tōhû* is generally regarded as the more original word, and supposed to be connected with Arab. *tîh*, "desert," *tyh*, "lose one's way, be distracted," Aram. *twh*, "be distracted," etc.[5] It would then mean "waste, desert," and *bōhû* might be derived from it just as Arabic *barṭûm* (humorous: "snout") is derived from *ḥarṭûm*. But "desert" is a most unsatisfactory explanation of a word which should, according to all analogies, mean something like "chaos." *Bōhû*, on the other hand, has a perfectly natural series of cognates: Arab. **bh* has the meaning "be empty," illustrated variously by the derived stems—*abhâ* (from *bhw*), "to empty, house, vessel, etc.," = *baha'a* and *abha'a*; *bahw*, "vast plain,

⁴ For Egyptian religious influence on Phoenicia and Canaan cf. especially JPOS II, 190—198.
⁵ For the Egyptian cognate cf. AJSL XXXIV, 253, no. 121.

cavity of the chest," i. e., "empty space"; Assyr. *bûbûtu* for
*buhbuhtu, "emptyness, hunger." Since Gr. χάος also means
properly "empty space," from χαίνειν, "gape, yawn" (cf. the
Norse *Ginunga Gap*), the suitability of the etymology is evident.
We must evidently consider *bōhû* as the primary word, and
regard *tōhû* as a blend between *bōhû* and *tehôm*, from which
the initial *t* was borrowed.[6] The Phoenician βααv, explained by
Philo Byblius as meaning "night," shows that the original form
of the noun was *bdhu,[7] like Arab. *bahw*; *buhw has changed
a to *u* under the influence of the labials. The two words then
refer to chaos as "void," in the early Hellenic sense, and chaos
as a watery deep, or *tehôm*, in the Mesopotamian sense. The
same obvious tendency to harmonize the opposing theories of
chaos is found in the Byblian cosmogony transmitted to us by
Philo, whose two primordial elements are "dark, breath-like air"
(ἀέρα ζοφώδη καὶ πνευματώδη or πνοὴν ἀέρος ζοφώδους) and
"muddy pitch-black chaos" (χάος θολερὸν ἐρεβῶδες), from the
"sexual" union of which the world egg comes into existence.
There is accordingly a much closer similarity between the
Byblian and Priestly cosmogonies than has generally been
supposed. This similarity is illustrated also by the second
Phoenician cosmogony described by Philo, in which Aeon
(— 'Ôlâm) and Protogonos (— Adam?) are born of the first
pair, Κολπία ἄνεμος and his consort Βααv, whose name is ex-
plained by Philo as meaning "night," probably because the first
pair of Hesiod are Erebos and Nyx. The term κολπια can
hardly be explained otherwise than as the name of a particular
wind or type of wind, though the old interpretations on the

---

[6] For the principle of blend formation in Semitic cf. also Contribution 3,
below, and note 9.

[7] Several futile attempts have been made to identify *bōhû* with the
Sumerian goddess Bau, consort of Ninurta. For the latest effort see
Caspari (in the Hommel memorial volume, MVAG XXII, 1—20), whose
arguments are singularly weak and mainly irrelevant, though some good
observations are scattered through his discussion. On the other hand
there seems to me little doubt that the name of the Aramaean Gnostic
archon, Yaldabaoth, has been correctly explained as *Yaldâ de-Bahût*,
"Child of the Primordial Chaos" (like *Dumu-zi-abzu* in Sumerian); cf. AJSL
XXXVI, 291 f.

basis of fanciful Hebrew etymologies are worthless.[8] In its present form the word is evidently corrupt, perhaps owing to the influence of the similar word κόλπος or a derivative like κολπίας, which misled the scribe, as so often. Possibly ΚΟΛΠΠ (the Λ may be dittography of the initial Λ of the following word) is a corruption of ΚΟΔΜ, i. e. east (wind); cf. Phoen. qdm, applied by the Byblians, according to the Sinûhe Romance, to the region east of them, as well as Heb. qadîm, Aram. qaddûmâ, both "east wind." For the vocalization with u cf. Assyr. qudmu. In this case the (east) wind would represent the element of dryness, the baau that of moisture, by the mixture of which the other elements were created.

It is difficult to separate the idea just described of the union between wind and the baau from the continuation of our cosmogony in Genesis: And darkness was over the primordial ocean, and the rûᵃḥ elôhîm was hovering over the water. Here it is obvious that we must think of the darkness as belonging to the ocean (tehôm); the rûᵃḥ elôhim created light, so it cannot have been dark, but was rather neutral. By "waters" the waters of the ocean are naturally meant. The relation between the rûᵃḥ and the tehôm is "sexual," and does not refer to the brooding of the rûᵃḥ, conceived of in bird form, upon the world egg, as held by many exegetes, misled by an erroneous interpretation of meraḥèfeṭ. The rendering of Heb. rḥp as "brood" must be given up definitively in favor of the alternative one, "flap wings, flutter, hover," after the late Dr. Peters' articles on the subject in JBL XXX, 44—54, and XXXIII, 81—86. The stem rḥp does not occur except in Hebrew and Syriac, where it may not be original (cf. JBL XXX, 48, n. 10), and is therefore perhaps a secondary blend-form in Hebrew. Haupt long ago combined the word with Arab. raffa, rafrafa, "quiver, flutter, beat wings, of bird," found also in Hebrew as rff, "sway, tremble." For the other element behind the blend one may compare Arab. ḥaffa, "flap wings, make noise in fluttering"; rḥp would then be a blend of rpp and ḥpp.[9] It has, in any case,

---

[8] For a selection of these etymologies cf. Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Heft I, p. 13.

[9] For the principle involved in the formation of triconsonantal stems

a meaning precisely opposite that of "brood." The world egg
theory, favored especially by Gunkel, falls to the ground complet-
ely. On the other hand, Peters' view that the *rûᵃḥ* corresponds
to the winds which Marduk sends against Tiâmat (= Tehôm)
is very improbable; these winds, or better, storms, called *abûbu*
and *imḫullu*, are the characteristic weapons of Marduk, as
storm god, and have no further cosmogonic significance in the
Mesopotamian myth. Nor can there be any question of a sexual
union between the storms and Tiâmat, whom they serve to
destroy. The most probable view seems to be that *rûᵃḥ elôhîm*
means "spirit of God," but is substituted for an original *rûᵃḥ*,
"wind," in order to bring the personality of God into the
cosmogony from the beginning.[10] It is hardly probable, there-
fore, that P had in mind an intermediate feminine hypostasis of
a divine attribute, like the Aramaic Ḥokmetâ or the Sophia of
Philo Judaeus;[11] the feminine gender of *rûᵃḥ* doubtless had no
more significance at this stage than the same gender in the
words for "hand," or "eye," when used in connection with the
Deity. But the *rûᵃḥ elôhîm* was evidently still thought of as
exercising a "sexual" influence upon the *tehôm*, just as in the
case of the ἄνεμος and βαau. The conception of God's creative
activity as corresponding to sexual activity in man is very
prevalent in Rabbinic thought, especially in the Qabbâlâ, though
hardly less in Philo Judaeus.

The first result of the divine action upon the inert mass of
tehôm was the creation of light. The idea that light sprang from
water is very wide-spread, and cannot be called Mesopotamian,
since it survived there only in traces. Even there, however,

from original biconsonantal roots cf. Blakes's important paper on "Con-
generic Assimilation as a Cause of the Development of New Roots in
Semitic," in *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield* (New Haven, 1920),
pp. 35—48.

[10] The verb *rāḥáf*, which is particularly applied to the fluttering of
birds, suggests that the *rûᵃḥ elôhîm* was conceived of originally in the
form of a bird, like the Egyptian *bı nṭr*. The author of our section
presumably used the word because it was the most natural one in this
connection, and without any mythological connotation.

[11] Cf. AJSL XXXVI, 285 ff.

Gibil, the fire-god, was called *mâr Apsî*, "son of the subterranean ocean" (— *tehôm*), perhaps, it must be said, because of the naphtha wells, whose burning substance was believed to rise from the subterranean ocean.[12] In Egypt fire first came into existence with the emergence of Amôn, the sun-god, as a "living flame" from the primordial ocean (Nûn). In view of the tremendous influence exercised by Egyptian religious ideas upon Phoenicia, and hence perhaps also upon Palestine, this parallel is probably the most significant. Yet we should add, for completeness, that similar ideas prevailed among the Indo-Europeans; Agni, god of fire (*ignis*) is born from the water, and the rain-clouds are his womb.[13] Here the origin of lightning in rain-clouds is responsible for the conception, which, as shown long ago by Kuhn, lies also behind the story of the theft of fire from heaven by Prometheus. In Genesis the sequence of water and light (fire) is preserved, though the concrete ideas lying behind it have been discarded, as usual with P. P's mind was an enlightened product of the sixth century B. C.; we must consider his world-view in connection with the philosophy of contemporary Ionia, and of other cultured lands of the eastern Mediterranean, instead of comparing it directly with Mesopotamian myths which were fully developed at least 2000 B. C., and only continued in favor among the erudite because of their hoary antiquity and the possibilities of a fanciful exegesis, which could be used, as in contemporary Egypt, to modernize the crudest and most primitive conception. The founder of the Ionian school of philosophy, Thales, flourished in the beginning of the sixth century B. C., and thus was almost contemporary with the author of P. That both were able to throw off the mythical point of view and simultaneously adopt a logical scheme of cosmogony in which water was the primal element argues for a common milieu which influenced both. This common background was probably the syncretistic culture developed in the eastern Mediterranean by the Phoenicians.

[12] Cf. AJSL XXXV, 165.
[13] Cf. Bloomfield, JAOS XVI, 1—24 (*passim*).

2. THE NAME *YAHWEH*.[14]

Of theories advanced since Hellenistic times to explain this sacred name there is no lack, and it may seem rash to enter the lists once more. Our justification is, that we will not propose a new explanation of the name, but will rather try to establish the reasonableness of an old view, now generally disregarded. There is no gain in recapitulating all the hypotheses which have been suggested by an almost endless procession of scholars, beginning—so far as our information goes—with the unknown Alexandrian who equated the contracted form *Yô* with Late Egyptian *yô* (Coptic ⲉⲓⲱ), "ass," and started the canard regarding the image of an ass in the Holy of Holies. The latest that the writer has seen is that proposed by Torczyner,[15] who thinks that *Yahwêh* stands for **Wahwah*, "the roarer" (Arab. *whwh*, "to roar"), though he has not explained the absence of a *mappîq* in the final ה.

It is doubtful whether any serious scholar now adheres to the theory of the Mesopotamian origin of the name *Yahwêh*, especially since the element *ya'um* found in early Accadian proper names has been convincingly explained as being the independent possessive pronoun of the first person, so that *Ya'um-ilu*, for instance, means "Mine is god," i. e., "I have a (protecting) deity."[16] On the other hand, it is probable that the view that *Yawêh* is an expansion of *Yâhû*, itself the name of some hitherto unidentified non-Semitic god of early Syria, a view which became popular after the publication of the Elephantine Papyri, is the most widely accepted one today. Before proceeding, we will try to show that this theory is untenable from the standpoint of Hebrew phonology, which requires the operation of the opposite process, the reduction of *Yâhû* from *Yahwêh*.

---

[14] It is hardly necessary to go into detail on the subject of the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton; for a clear and full recent discussion cf. Arnold, JBL XXIV, 153 ff.

[15] See the discussion at the end of his brochure, *Die Bundeslade*, Berlin, 1922, pp. 73 ff.

[16] Cf. Landsberger, ZA 1923, 24, n. 2.

There are three main suggestions as to the original form of the name *Yáhû*, on the theory that *Yahwéh* is a secondary formation: that **Yāhō* was original (Sachau);[17] that it is derived from **Yáho*, *Yahwéh* being an old abstract plural with the ending *ai* (Grimme)[18]; and that the original form was **Yáhō*, with endorsement of Grimme's further theory of the abstract plural ending (Leander)[19]. All these theories are based on the supposed necessity of deriving the form *Yehô* in composition from an original form with *ô*, while the *û* in *Yáhû* is then explained as due to the fact that the syllable bearing it is unaccented, *ô* being elsewhere changed to *û* in an unaccented syllable—though not always. They are all, however, artificial, since they disregard the philological analogies of Hebrew, and postulate forms and processes that have never been found elsewhere. A name *Yáhô* is otherwise wholly unknown, and the "abstract plural" in *ai* is a pure assumption, since the plural in question does not actually occur in any Semitic language, unless one maintains, in defiance of analogy, that the Heb. *šamáyim*, Assyr. *šamai*, and similar forms are plurals instead of duals. But if one does regard them as plurals, one must not forget that a *Yáhû* with this ending would become *Yahwáyim*, or the like, in Hebrew, and not *Yahwéh*.

If one cares at all to be guided by analogy, i. e., by a method which takes the relative probability of things into account, it should be evident that *Yahwéh* must be a form like *Ya'qob*, *Yiṣhaq*, *Yôsef*, and other imperfects, properly hypocoristica of theophorous names, usually with *el*, "deity," as the second element. Such abbreviated names, with the theophorous element left out, are common in the whole ancient orient, especially in Egypt, but also in Mesopotamia and Palestine. In the OT we find, e. g., *Aḥaz* for *Yehô-aḥaz*, and in the case of *el*-names, *Yaḥdi-el* and *Yaḥdô* or *Yaḥdi*, *Ya'śi-el* and *Ya'śô* or *Ya'śai*, *Yiftaḥ-el* and *Yiftaḥ*, *Yeraḥme-el* and *Yeroḥam* or *Yeraḥem*, etc. The same alternation is found in the Canaanite names preserved in

[17] Cf. *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus Elephantine*, p. 9.
[18] OLZ XV, 12—13.
[19] OLZ XV, 151—3.

the Amarna Tablets and the Phoenician inscriptions: cf. *Yan-ḥamu* — *Yan'am(-el)*, *Yabnî-el* — *Yabne-el* or *Yabnêh* in the OT.

It does not, however, follow that *Yahwêh* is a hypocoristicon of *Yawêh-el*! The very fact that the abbreviation in question was so common gave the imperfect an independent status, raising it to the level of an appellation or designation of deity. In Western Semitic names we seldom or never have the participle used, as regularly (though by no means invariably) in Accadian, a fact which shows clearly that the imperfect was not used in them with a future, but rather with a present or general connotation. Just as we have, therefore, Accadian divine names of participial form (*Nâbû*, *Bânîtu*, *Pârisu*, *Namra-ṣit*, etc.) so we have Western Semitic divine names of imperfect form, as *Ya'qob*, *Yakin*, *Yahwêh*, *Ya'ûq*, *Yaġût*, etc. The formation of appellative names in this way was favored also by the fact that, since *el*, *ilu* was only a general designation for the supernatural power which was incorporated secondarily in individual gods, the easiest way in which to form new appellations of deity, in some one of its phases, was to take an imperfect form which was familiarly associated with it in personal names. Thus *Yabnî-el* does not mean primarily either "God builds," or "a god creates," but "supernatural power creates," with the proviso that "supernatural power" is an approximate rendering equivalent to the *mana*, *orenda*, or *wakonda* of Marrett and his followers. The present writer has believed for years that *el* in early Semitic thought had this connotation, and was very glad to find his views, already developed independently, coinciding almost entirely with those of Beth, as presented in the latter's article, "El und Neter" (ZATW XXXVI, 129—186).[20] Names of this type do not,

---

[20] Cf. also ZATW XXXVII, 199—208, for Grapow's criticism, replied to by Beth in ZATW XXXVIII, 87—104. While Grapow's observations on the technical Egyptological side are mainly just, they do not affect the arguments of Beth at all seriously. Some of Grapow's criticisms are gratuitous, and only show all the more clearly that Egyptologists do not really understand what such an expression, e. g., as *pꜣwty*, "Urgottheit" in current Egyptological jargon, connotes. Of course, it can hardly be doubted that Beth, with the enthusiasm of the discoverer, has pushed his

therefore, prove either that the early Semites were monotheists, or that they worshipped an *agnostos theos*, but only show that they did revere an impersonal *mana*, which might be male or female, and might appear simultaneously in a celestial body, a tree, and a sacred stone (see below on the *maṣṣebah*). Naturally, the worship of more personal manifestations of this primary godstuff began before the dawn of history, but traces of the original conception, antedating polytheism, pantheism and monotheism, may be found as late as the second millennium B. C. —From such expressions as *Yabni-el* it was easy to abstract special designations for a more personal characteristic of deity, as "Creator," etc. We may even go farther and maintain that, in view of the facts cited, the imperfect form of the verb was the normal mode of expressing a "hypostatized" divine attribute.

Unless the writer has overlooked some discussion of the subject, no previous student seems to have had a clear idea of the reason for the variant *Yáhû*, which appears beside *Yahwéh*, especially in the Elephantine Papyri, the jar-stamps from the same period found in Jericho, and as the final element in proper names. Imperfects used in composition or separately, as hypocoristica, may appear either as indicatives or as jussives. The origin of this variation may perhaps be sought in imperfect forms which could be regarded as either, and thus formed a bridge over which it was possible to interchange jussives and indicatives of different structure occurring in proper names.[21] In the OT we find numerous jussives employed as proper names: e. g., *Yôsef* for **Yôsîf*, *Yadôn* for **Yadûn* (Neh. 3 7), *Ya'beṣ* (1 Chr. 2 55; 4 9 f.), *Ya'zer*, *Yaflet*, *Yamlek* (?), *Yanô"ḥ*, etc. The last named case is particularly instructive, since there can be no possible question here of a different interpretation, or of a mistake of the Masoretes, since *Yanôḥ* appears in modern Arabic as *Yānûn*, whereas a *Yanûḥ* could only appear as *Yānûḥ*, or the

interpretations too far, like Curtiss in his attempt to identify the saint-cult of Moslem welis with primitive Semitic religion, psychologically speaking.

[21] For a similar interchange between imperfect and imperative of the verb in composition with a noun, especially, in this case, 'am, "people," cf. *Annual*, II—III, p. 24, n. 10.

25

like.²² Since *Yáhû* is a perfectly regular jussive from *Yahwéh*,
there is thus not the slightest difficulty in assuming it to be a
normal by-form of *Yahwéh*. The only difficulty offered by the
reduced forms of the word is in the case of *Yehô-*, where we
have an anomalous product of analogy, like the equally absurd
Yehôsef for *Yôsef*. The Assyrian *Yauhazi* shows clearly enough
that the actual pronunciation was *Yᵉhú-* in composition. *Yehô-*
is obviously formed on the analogy of the contracted form *Yô-*,
used in the late pre-exilic period (Jewish seals, ostraca of Samaria)
both for the divine name at the beginning of theophorous com-
pounds, and also at the end. The postexilic writing *Yáhû* is
naturally due to a revival of the historical spelling, accompanied,
no doubt, by a similar archaistic pronunciation.

If we, then, regard *Yahwéh* as an imperfect verb, it is most
naturally to be derived from *hwy* (as still in Aramaic), later
hayah, "to come into existence, become, be." The preservation
of an archaic form with *waw* in proper names is illustrated also
by *Ḥawwah*, "Eve," as well known. The *a* vowel, moreover,
shows that *Yahwéh* must be a causative, corresponding thus
exactly to Late Hebrew *mehawweh*, "he who causes to be, brings
into existence." The principal objection raised to this inter-
pretation seems to be that it is too abstract to have originated

---

²² This statement will perhaps appear cryptic, until elucidated. In
Hebrew place-names we have two entirely distinct endings, *ô* (from *âyu*—
Annual, II—III, p. 6, n. 6), as in '*Akkô*, *Yap(p)ô*, *Megiddô*, *Ûsô*, *Yerîḥô*,
Šilô, *Gilô*, *Sôkô*, and *ôn* (from *ânu*), as in '*Abdôn*, *Dibôn*, *Kesalôn*, *Bêt-
ḥôrôn*, '*Efrôn*, *Madôn*, etc. Both used the same gentilic, *ônî*, and hence
there arose a confusion in forms, *Šilô*, e. g., becoming *Šilôn*, modern
Seilûn, by a back-formation from the gentilic *Šilônî*, and *Kesalôn* becoming
Kesalô, Arab. *Keslā* (the change must have taken place actually in
Aramaic, where the later back-formation *Keslân* became, by the operation
of the same principle, *Keslâ*). Now, a number of place-names with long
ô in the final syllable, followed by a weak laryngeal ('*ayin* or *ḥet*), were
attracted into the double category of place-names in *ô* and *ôn*: e. g.,
Eštemôᵃ, actually pronounced *Eštemô*, becomes *Eštemô* (with *he*, Jos. 15 50);
Neftôḥ becomes *Neftô*, whence Arab. *Liftā*; *Gilbôᵃ* becomes *Gilbô*,
Gilbôn, Arab. *Jelbûn*. On the same principle we have *Yanôḥ* = *Yānûn*,
though we have also *Yanôḥ* (name of a town in Galilee) = *Yanûḥ*. On
the other hand, *Yanûḥ* could not be attracted into the *ôn* category,
because of the *û* vowel.

among the Hebrews of the second millennium B. C., and that concrete explanations like "the one who blows," from Arab. *háwâ*, "blow," or "the one who fells," from Heb. *hawah*, Arab. *háwâ*, "to fall," are more plausible for so early a period. This objection does not, however, reckon with the facts. In Assyrian, *šubšû*, the causative of *bašû*, "come into existence, be," is common from the earliest period, while *šhpr*, the causative of Egyptian *ḫpr*, "come into being, become," is still commoner, and occurs at all periods from the Pyramid Age on down. In Phoenician the corresponding verb is *kwn*, like Arab. *kâna*, and the imperfect causative, *yakîn*, occurs in composition with *el*, as *Yakîn-ilu*, "god brings into existence, creates," as early as the first quarter of the twentieth century B. C.[23] The same form, *Yakîn*, is also the name of one of the pillars which stood before the Temple of Solomon, personifying (?) attributes of Yahweh, but borrowed from Phoenician sources, and hence meaning "Creator," rather than "Establisher." In Aramaic at a later age, we find both the *af'el, ahwî*, and the causative *pa'el, hawwî*, both meaning "cause to be," nor may it be irrelevant to remind ourselves that the Hebrews of the Mosaic age probably spoke Aramaic.

The suggestion that *Yahwéh* is causative of *hayah*, "to be," was apparently first made by Le Clerc (Clericus) in 1700 (cf. De Lagarde, *Übersicht*, pp. 137—8), with the rendering *creator et effector rerum*. De Lagarde's own explanation as "derjenige, welcher das Verheissene in das Dasein ruft," which is too elaborate to convey a clear idea, is hardly an improvement; Haupt's "Insdaseinrufer"[24] is much better, though hard to reproduce adequately in English.[25] "The one who brings into existence" means, to all intents and purposes, "Creator."

The question of the meaning of our name is indissolubly connected with that of the text and interpretation of the famous passage of E, Ex. 3 13–16. By far the fullest and best treatment

---

[23] See Pinches and Newberry, JEA VII, 196—9; and for the correct reading of the cuneiform name, which Pinches read *Pikin-ilu*, cf. JPOS II, 120.

[24] Greek offers suggestive equivalents to this expression in γενεσιουργός and δημιουργός.

[25] See Haupt's article, *Der Name Jahwe*, OLZ 1909, 211—4.

of this passage is found in Arnold's elaborate paper "The Divine
Name in Exodus iii. 14" (JBL XXIV, 107—165), where the
conclusion is reached that no light is thrown upon the Hebrew
text by the versions, even after an exhaustive consideration of
them, and that the Hebrew text must therefore be interpreted
from itself. Arnold here pointed out convincingly that the
famous phrase אהיה אשר אהיה, in its Masoretic form *ehyéh
aŝer ehyéh*, can only mean in idiomatic Hebrew "I will be
whatever I choose."[26] Since such a statement naturally connotes
"resentment and rebuke", Arnold further concluded that there
must be something wrong with it, since an innocent questioner
cannot well be "rebuked for impertinence and inquisitiveness
before even the occasion for his question has been encountered."[27]
He accordingly supposed that verse 14a, containing this phrase,
is a Midrashic gloss to 14b, though not explaining why a glos-
sator should have hit upon so extraordinary a comment on his
own responsibility. There is, however, another much more natural
way out of our dilemma, to suppose that the phrase is not
pointed correctly by the Masoretes, perhaps because of a slight
previous corruption. As it stands the phrase does not explain
the divine name *Yahwéh*, which is causative, as shown again
above. The problem has been solved, in the writer's opinion,
by Haupt's happy emendation to אהיה אשר יהיה, *ahyéh aŝer
yihyéh*, "I cause to be what comes into existence" (Haupt: Ich
rufe ins Dasein was da ist).[28]

Since Haupt did not attempt to reconstruct a plausible text
of E in our passage, we may try our hand at it, following a
valuable suggestion made by Arnold in the paper already cited.
According to him, the reading אהיה in 14b is not original, but
secondary, being a purely phonetic *kinnui* of יהוה, designed
"to prevent the utterance of the ineffable name in this one
passage of the Pentateuch where the employment of the ordinary
synagogue surrogate for יהוה, namely אדני, was from the nature
of the case impossible."[29] This explanation of the enigmatic

---

[26] *Op. cit.*, p. 128.
[27] *Op. cit.*, p. 129.
[28] *Op. cit.*, col. 211.
[29] *Op. cit.*, p. 162.

אהיה seems to me very happy indeed. If we accept it, we find ourselves face to face with a new problem, which Arnold apparently failed to consider: since both 14b and 15a are couched in practically identical terms, are they not doublets? That they are is indicated by the suspiciously harmonistic ויאמר עוד, which introduces 15a, bringing the verb ויאמר for the third time in rapid succession, in a single brief speech of Yahweh. 15a is thus a variant of 14b containing the identical words כה תאמר אל בני ישראל יהוה שלחני אליכם, and deriving its additional matter from verse 16, which introduces the following J section, and cannot possibly be severed from it and attached to E. Moreover, 15a is not only an amplification of 14b on the basis of J, but also breaks the connection between 14 and 15b: This is my name for ever, and my designation (zikrî) from generation to generation. In discussing the supposed gloss אהיה אשר אהיה, Arnold has pointed out that it spoils the natural sequence, which demands that 14b follow as the reply to Moses' question in 13. This is very true, but may be avoided if we suppose that scribe was led astray by the repeated *wayyomers*, and transposed 14a and 14b in part, a correction which has the great additional advantage of restoring the connection in what follows. We may now read the text as follows: ויאמר אלהים אל משה כה תאמר לבני ישראל יהוה שלחני אליכם ויאמר אהיה אשר יהיה זה שמי לעלם וזכרי לדר דר — And God said to Moses, Thus shalt thou say to the Israelites, Yahweh hath sent me unto you, and He said, I cause to be that which cometh into existence—this is My name for ever, and My designation from generation to generation. The formula *ahyêh ašer yihyêh* is in fact the complete form of the name of Yahweh, put into the first person in God's mouth. In the third person it would be *yahyêh* (older *yahwéh*) *ašer yihyêh*, "He causes to be what comes into existence."

The writer has elsewhere[20] pointed out that this formula is not a mystification, but is an old litanic or liturgic formula which

<hr/>

[20] Cf. JBL XXXVII, 142. In this connection it may be observed that the writer, though adhering to the principles and main contentions of this paper, has altered his opinion on a great many minor points, so that it can no longer be considered as accurately reflecting his point of view.

goes back unmistakably to Egyptian modes of thought and expression. This identical formula is found not infrequently in Egyptian inscriptions of the Eighteenth Dynasty, referring to the sun-god, or to his royal incarnation on earth, the reigning Pharaoh, god in his own right. Besides the formula *šhpr. f pw wnn. ty. fy*, "he creates (lit. causes to come into existence) that which comes into existence," we have, e. g., *'Imn-Rʿ qmȝ wnn. t*, "Amôn-Rêʿ, who has created what exists," etc. Variations of the same idea are very common in Egyptian theology; the sun-god, in some manifestation of his as the supreme deity, has created the universe, and continues daily to recreate it—creating whatever comes into existence. The conception is characteristically Egyptian, and does not occur in any of our available Mesopotamian sources, where all that exists was created at the beginning of the world, and continues to unfold itself according to the eternal plans prefigured then.[31] Now that we know that the Levitic names are largely Egyptian, and that Egyptian influences on early Hebrew religion and culture were almost as important as Syro-Mesopotamian (Sumero-Accadian), this additional testimony to Egyptian influence on Mosaic thought and theology cannot be surprising. Whether Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians or not, he was without doubt profoundly affected by the environment of his formative years in Egypt, where the germs of Yahwism were planted in his mind.

3. GOG AND MAGOG.

Here again we are attacking a problem whose solution has long been associated with squaring the circle and counting the number of miracles involved in the Noachic Deluge. I naturally have no intention of competing with our chiliastic friends, though perhaps tempted to accept the views of a Persian Jewish "Messiah," one Mosheh Eliyahu, as he outlined them to me once in his Persian Hebrew. After giving the good old identifications of Magog, Rosh, Meshech and Tubal with Mongol,

---

[31] Cf. JBL XXXIX, 143—151, especially pp. 150 f.; JSOR VII, 79.

Russia, Moscow and Tobolski, he advanced an original theory regarding Gog. The latter, he said, is Trotzsky, since the number of the Beast is made up of תרנ = 400 + 200 + 6 + 60 = 666 — and *sky*, being found in all Russian names, does not count anyway.

The names *Gôg* and *Magôg* are obviously based on some process of blending or rhyme-formation, such as that which produced the rhyming pair *tōhû wa-bōhû* (cf. above, on Gen. I). Rhyme-formation is, of course, so common in Arabic, as well as in the Indo-European languages, that it is hardly necessary to establish its existence in Hebrew. A large number of good illustrations of rhyme-words and blend-formations in Hebrew are given by Blake, in his paper on "Congeneric Assimilation in Semitic," mentioned above, pp. 42—4. It may not be self-evident, however, that rhyme-formations are just as common in place-names and personal names as in common nouns, so a few illustrations, mainly from Hebrew and Canaanite, may be given. First there is the classic case of *Pelētî u-Krētî*, "Pelethites and Cherethites," which is clearly a modification of an original *Pelištî u-Krētî*, "Philistine and Cretan," as noted by Brockelmann, ZDMG LXVII, 108. There is also that pair of prophets in the Wilderness, called *Eldad* and *Mêdad* (Num. 11 26–9), whose legendary fame was still further amplified in the late apocalyptic Book of Eldad and Modad (so). Gen. 4 20 ff. furnishes us with a typical *Märchen* group of the three sons of Lamech, who introduced the arts of civilization into the world— *Yabal*, *Yûbal*, and *Tûbal the Smith* (קין). Since *Yabal*, though unexplained, offers a perfectly normal Semitic form, and *Tûbal* is the people of Tûbal living in the ironbearing mountains of Pontus (Kizzuwadna), the name of *Yûbal*, inventor of music, is evidently a blend between the other two, perhaps influenced in its connection with music by *yôbel*, "jubilee."

The foregoing examples from Hebrew illustrate the principle that alterations of this type are usually made in legendary or remote and unfamiliar names. Countless cases of this character may be collected from Arab legend: e. g., *Jîḥân wa-Sîḥân* = Gihon and Pishon; *Habil wa-Qâbîl* = Abel and Cain; *Tâlût wa-Jâlût* = Saul (David) and Goliath (Heb. *Šaʾûl we-Golyat*);

Yajûj wa-Majûj = Gog and Magog. Many more may be found in such repositories as *Qiṣaṣu 'l-Anbiyâ'i.*

In judging cases of rhyme formation in Hebrew we must naturally be on the watch for mistakes in lists of persons or places which are due to dittography or erroneous repetition of letters. A good case of this is found in Jos. 15 49, where *M* now reads דנה וקרית ספר instead of דנה וקרית סנה היא דבר היא דבר, which the text naturally should have.

The names *Gôg* and *Magôg* are mentioned together only in the apocalyptic section of Ezekiel, ch. 38—9. There are two formulas, the first of which (Ez. 38 2) reads in our present text נוג ארץ המגוג נשיא ראש משך ותובל, and the second, shorter of which (Ez 38 3, 39 1) runs נוג נשיא ראש משך ותובל. Following *G* most commentators have regarded ראש as a proper-name, *Rôš*, but this desperate assumption does not make any better sense out of our text, besides introducing us to a proper name nowhere else mentioned in our sources, which happen to be very full for this period of unrest in the North. As so often elsewhere in awkward passages, there has been a transposition, due to accidental omission of a phrase, which was inserted on revision in the margin, and later put into the text in the wrong place.[32] We should naturally read the longer formula in the following order: נוג נשיא ארץ המגוג ראש משך ותובל, Gog, prince of the land of Magog, chief of Meshech and Tubal. The shorter formula, which is repeated, then means, Prince Gog, chief of Meshech and Tubal.

Of all the suggestions advanced by modern scholars for the explanation of the name *Gôg*, only three deserve attention. The

---

[32] The writer must confess that he has been needlessly slow in accepting the principle of transposition as a method of textual emendation of OT passages. His partial conversion has come through intensive study of the topographical material in the OT, where the sources may be checked by the facts of topography. Striking illustrations are found in the account of the northern boundary of Benjamin, in Joshua, and in the description of the extent of the Megiddo district in Solomon's kingdom, 1 Kings 4 12, where the present order of clauses, abcdef, should certainly be altered to acfdeb. The former will be discussed in the *Annual*, Vol. IV—V, and the latter in a paper on the administrative divisions of ancient Palestine, to appear in JPOS.

first is the identification of *Gôg* with *Gûgu* (Gyges) of Lydia, who flourished a century before Ezekiel, and undoubtedly made a great impression upon his contemporaries.[33] This view is probably correct in part, in so far as it explains why the name *Gôg*, whose similarity to *Magôg* suggests a different origin, becomes that of a mythical personage, a chief of Anatolian peoples. The second idea which we may single out for special mention is that of Van Hoonacker, who thinks that *Gôg* is the Sumerian *gug*, "darkness," while *Magôg* is *ma* (MA = *mâtu*, Brünnow, no. 6774) + *gug*, "land of darkness."[34] *Magôg* as an ethnic name is vouched for by Gen. X, so this awkward Sumerian etymology need not be taken very seriously, but since *gug* = *kukku* = LÛ = *dalâḫu*, "muddy, confuse," probably means "chaos" in Sumerian,[35] this explanation of *Gôg* would be plausible if *gug* were ever used in Sumerian as an appellation of the monster of chaos. Since it never is, Van Hoonacker's hypothesis will have to be rejected. The third view is based upon EA no. 1, lines 36—40, where the Cossaean king Kadašman-Ḫarbe is quoted as fearing that the Egyptians had palmed off on his emissaries as his sister some daughter of a plebeian (*muškênu*), of a man of Gaga (*Gagâ'a*), Ḫanikalbat, or Ugarit. That this land of Gaga refers to a barbarous region is evident, and since it is mentioned with Ḫanigalbat, or Melitene, and Ugarit in north-western Syria, it clearly lay also in the north, a circumstance which has led many scholars to identify it with Gog. Since, however, *Gaga* is not mentioned elsewhere in our Egyptian or cuneiform sources, it is presumably a contraction of some better known name—*Gargamiš* (Carchemish) according to Weber, EA 1015. But it is not easy to see why Carchemish should be a proverbially barbarous land, as Gaga clearly was. In the writer's opinion, *Gaga* is a slight corruption of *Gašga*, a name applied in the Boghaz-köi tablets to a wild, mountainous district north of Melitene, on the confines of Armenia and Cappadocia.[36]

[33] Cf. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, pp. 246 f. and Meyer, *Geschichte*, § 464.

[34] See ZA XXVIII, 336.

[35] Cf. JAOS XLII, 198.

[36] For the location of Gašga see Garstang, *Index of Hittite Names*, I, 14, and AAA X, 177 ff. Having worked with Professor Garstang over

According to Forrer, the people of Gašga are spoken of as swineherds in the Hittite texts, a fact which sufficiently characterizes their barbarous habits of life.[37] In the Egyptian texts of the Nineteenth Dynasty the people of Gašga are called the *Kškš* (Hittite Gašgaš), and in the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser I they appear as a race of northern barbarians, under the name *Kaški* (written *Kaski*, but pronounced *Kaški*); in the Anatolian languages there is little or no distinction between the voiced and voiceles stops.[38] The correctness of our result is supported by the fact that we now have a regular geographical sequence—Gašga, Ḥanigalbat, and Ugarit—from north to south.

Since *Gôg* is a perfectly regular Hebrew obscuration of *Gâga*, the gentilic seems to have survived long after the Gašga folk passed into oblivion, with the general meaning "barbarian." Whether *Gôg* in Ezekiel reflects the historical Gyges or not, it almost certainly is, to some extent, at least, a reminiscence of *Gâgâ'a*, "barbarian."—But what is the origin of the name *Magôg*, so curiously like *Gôg*?

Aside from our passage in Ezekiel, *Magôg* only occurs in the list of the sons of Japheth: *Gomer, Magôg, Madai, Yawan, Tûbal, Mešek,* and *Tiras,* i. e., Cimmerians (Assyr. *Gimirâ'a*), Magog, Medes, Ionians, Tibareni of Pontus, Moschi (Assyr. *Muski, Muški*)[39] of Phrygia and Cappadocia (later of Armenia),

most of the material, the writer feels certain of the correctness of the main results of his work.

[37] Forrer's discussion may be found in a recent issue of MDOG.

[38] Cf. JPOS I, 57, n. 2.

[39] The Heb. *Mešek* shows that *Muski* (pronounced *Muški*) is the right spelling. The writing *Muški* is parallel to that of *Išgûza* or *Ašgûza*, where the correct form, as shown by the Hebrew, would be *Asgûza*. This variation is not, however, anomalous; the writer has elsewhere (JBL XXXIX, 167) pointed out that in Assyrian the *s* is confused with *š* before *k, q,* and *g.* In the Assyrian dialect this means that *šk* becomes *sk,* not the reverse, as might be thought from the orthography. If any are still uncertain in their minds about the law that Assyrian and Babylonian have inverted the values of the sibilants, let them read the remarks of Tallquist, *Assyrian Personal Names,* pp. XVIII f. This does not, however, indicate that the Babylonians preserved the original Semitic values, which the Assyrians reversed, but precisely the opposite; the Assyrians kept the Accadian values of the sibilants, which are those of

and Tarsus (?—Assyr. Tárzi, Aram. Tarz). *Magôg* evidently
refers to a nomadic people of the north, probably, according to
Josephus, the Scythians. No other people whom the references
fit is known. It is true that the Scythians seem to appear again
as *Aškenaz*, i. e., *Škunz* (?),[40] listed among the Cimmerian tribes,
but this misunderstanding is quite as natural as the double
listing of the Sabaeans under the heads *Sebâ* and *Šebâ*, one being
properly the native South Arabian, the other being the Hebrew
pronunciation of the name. The name *Magôg* I would explain as
a blend of *Manda*, the regular Mesopotamian designation for
"northern barbarian," and *Gôg*, the Hebrew equivalent, just ex-
plained. The Manda, or Ummân Manda are usually, perhaps
always, combined with the nomadic Indo-Iranian hordes which
periodically burst into Western Asia, and are often referred to in
the cuneiform documents from Babylonia, Assyria, and Cappadocia,
from the early part of the second millennium, if not earlier, down
to the sixth century B. C.[41] In the earlier sources the terms *Manda*
and *Gôyîm* are practically synonymous, it would appear.[42] *Magôg*
would then represent a fusion of *Ma(nd)*, with the short vowel
dropped, as regularly in Hebrew, and *Gôg*. This is more likely
by far, it seems to me, than the alternative suggestion that *Magôg*
is Assyr. *mât*, "country," plus *Gôg*, like *Zamua* and *Mazamua*.[43]

parent Semitic (cf. Worrell, JPOS I, 19; Luckenbill, AJSL XL, 12 f.;
the writer, JPOS II, 124).

[40] Most cuneiformists accept this equation without hesitation, but the
supposed scribal error of *nun* for original *waw* is improbable, since the
matres lectionis would not have been written when Gen. X was composed.
On the other hand, Forrer's recent effort to reintroduce the old iden-
tification with Ascanios and Ascanian cannot be treated lightly. It is
true that the termination offers difficulty, and that the name is never
mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions, but my suggestion that *Aškenaz*
stands for *Škunz* is just as doubtful.

[41] The term *Manda* for the Indo-European (and other?) hordes from
the northeast is now known to be very much earlier than supposed, since
it occurs in texts of the Akkad Dynasty, and is also not uncommon in
the Boghaz-köi texts (Forrer, ZDMG, 1922, 247—269).

[42] Cf. JPOS I, 75 f.; II, 129.

[43] That *Mazamua* cannot stand for *mât Zamua* is pointed out by
Forrer, *Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches*, p. 43. Mazamua
is the capital of the land Zamua, and the prefix cannot be Semitic.

The difficulty here is that *Gôg* is not an Assyrian word at all, while *mâtu* is not Hebrew at all.

Fortunately, we are able to exhibit a perfect parallel, from the Amarna Tablets. ARAD-Ḡepa,[44] prince of Jerusalem, writes to the Pharaoh (EA no. 288) complaining that the latter is not supporting the Egyptian administration in Palestine adequately, and that the country has fallen into a state of anarchy. He goes on to say (line 33 ff.): "As truly as there is a ship in the midst of the sea, the mighty arm of the king will seize Naḥrima (Naharîm = Naharáyim) and Kapasi, but now (meanwhile) the Ḥabiru (Hebrews) are seizing the towns of the king."[45] *Kapasi* is usually considered a mistake of the scribe for *Kasi* = *Kaššì*, the land of the Cossaeans (Babylonia),[46] but there is nothing to explain the intrusion of *pa*, whereas all other mistakes in proper names in the Amarna Tablets are due to omissions of syllables, or the like (*Gu-la* for *Gu-ub-la*, *Na-aḥ-ma* for *Na-aḥ-ri-ma*). A much more natural explanation is at hand: *Kapasi* is a blend of *Kaptara* = *Kaptor* of the OT and *Alasi* = *Alašiya-'rs-Elîšaḥ*,[47] i. e., *Kap(tara)-(Al)asi*. *Kaptara* means properly Crete, but was probably applied to Aegean lands in general, while *Alašiya* is Cyprus. The form *Alasi* is due to the omission of the typical Anatolian ending *ya*, and the use of the Amorite pronunciation of the sibilants, as in *Urusalim* for *Yerušalem*; the people of Jerusalem spoke an Amoritic dialect, in which *s* was the prevailing sibilant, while *š* was the prevailing one in Canaanite and Hebrew.[48] The worthy prince of Jerusalem—or his scribe—had a hazy idea of Mediterranean geography and

[44] This pronunciation of the name read ordinarily '*Abdi-ḥeba* will be defended elsewhere; cf. for the present the Egyptian transcription *gp* for *ḥe-ba* or *ḥe-pa*.

[45] This translation will be explained in a paper on the occurrence of the name *Selê* ("*Zaru*") in the Amarna Tablets, to appear in JEA.

[46] Cf. Weber, EA 1340 f.

[47] For Alašiya = Cyprus cf. Weber, EA 1076 f. The equation is demonstrated by the Report of Wen-Amôn, and the references in the Boghaz-köi texts. Contrast Wainwright, *Klio*, Vol. XIV, 1—36, who tries to show that Alašiya lay on the coast of Northern Syria, a view which is now no longer tenable.

[48] The writer expects to treat this theme at length in the near future.

nomenclature, and the notions he had imbibed from time to
time converged and formed a composite picture in his mind.[49]
We can hardly smile; have we not ourselves perpetrated such
monstrosities as *Eurasia* and *Amerindia?*

4. THE RÔLE OF THE POSTDILUVIAN PATRIARCHS IN HEBREW HISTORY

It has long been recognized that the list of eight patriarchs
between Shem and Abram, Gen. 11 12–24 is a traditional
document of great importance, but there were as many different
ways of interpreting it as there were commentators. Passing by
the two extreme groups which believe either that the list re-
presents an actual primogenitive genealogy or that it is a tribal
pantheon, we have every possible intermediate view. Some have
even thought that the postdiluvian list of ten was a doublet of
the antediluvian list, nor are there lacking arguments to support
such a contention. The striking analogy which exists between
some of the names of our list and geographical names of north-
western Mesopotamia has, however, convinced most scholars
that a connection is there and must be explained. In our opinion
the connection is much clearer and more important than has
generally been realized; in fact, our list seems to shed unexpected
light on the prehistory of the Hebrew people, and to enable us
to bring important evidence in support of the fundamental
equation, Ḫabiru = Hebrew.

In the case of the last three pre-Abrahamic patriarchs, we
have little difficulty, since the necessary combinations have
already been made by others. Yet there are some fine points
which have not been properly elucidated. The name of Serug
(שרוג) was compared long ago with Syriac *Sarûg*, Assyr. *Sarûgi*[50]
(written with *s* but pronounced with *š*, as always in Assyrian),[51]
modern Arabic *Serûj*, the name of a town or district west of

---

[49] Exactly such a composite picture in the early Greek mind is
illustrated by the blend of Ἀσσύριος and Τύριος to Σύριος, "Syrian."

[50] For Assyr. Sarûgi cf. Schiffer, *Die Aramäer*, p. 64, n. 1, etc.

[51] Cf. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names*, p. xviii.

Ḥarrân. The sibilant offers no difficulty when we recall that
Heb. שׁ, which corresponds etymologically to Aramaic ת, is
transcribed with a s, pronounced š, in Assyrian; e. g., Širlâ'a
(written Sirlâ'a) — Yiśra'elî, Sanîru (written Sanîru) — Šenîr, etc.
The explanation of this seeming inconsistency cannot yet be
given; there are still serious difficulties in defining the exact
pronunciations of Hebrew *sin* and *samek*. We can only establish
the philological rules governing them, and trust to the future
for the interpretation of our rules.

Heb. *Naḥôr* (נחור) corresponds, as suggested for years, to
Assyr. *Til-Naḥiri*, the name of a town in the Ḥarrân district.[52]
The vocalism of the two names is really exactly equivalent, for
Naḥiri should evidently be written *Naḥḥir(i)*; since Heb. *qaṭôl*
(e. g., *qarôb*, *qadôš*) corresponds morphologically in a whole
grammatical category to Aram. *qaṭṭil* (e. g., *qarrib*, *qaddîš*), the
two forms are practically interchangeable, on the principle of
morphological adaptation, or analogical back-formation (cf. above).
In this case, *Naḥḥir* is presumably original, while *Naḥôr* is a
back-formation in Hebrew, since the Hebrews originally spoke
Aramaic.

The third name of this group, *Teraḥ* (תרח) is presumably to
be found in the place-name *Til-ša-turâḥi*, belonging to a town
on the Baliḥ. This combination was originally suggested tent-
atively by Delitzsch, *Prolegomena*, p. 80, and remained unnoticed
until Kraeling proposed it independently.[53] Assyr. *turâḥu* means
"ibex," so we clearly have to do with a personal name, which
also appears as *Trḥ* in the Safaitic inscriptions. The two names
Til-Naḥiri and *Til-ša-Turâḥi* are very interesting, since they
belong in the same category as *Tell el-ʿAmârneh* (one below
Carchemish, another in Egypt), "Mound of the ʿAmârneh Tribe"
(Benî ʿAmrân), and *Tell Ḥasan eṣ-Ṣâliḥ*, *Tell Abû Maḥfûz*
(both in Palestine), called after former owners of the sites.
Place-names formed with the word *tillu*, "mound," are found
almost exclusively within the Aramaic region of northwestern
Mesopotamia, where they are very common. Their formation

[52] For Til Naḥiri cf. KAT 477 f.; Kraeling, *Aram and Israel*, pp. 24 f.
[53] ZATW XL (1922), 153 f.

seems to be like that of Arabic place-names with *tell*; e. g., one of the most important Aramaic centers of Upper Mesopotamia was called *Til-abnê*, "Mound of Stones," like modern Arabic *Tell el-Hajar*, a common name. Another important town was called *Til-Barsip*, i. e., "Mound of (the city) Barsip"; in the early Sumerian period of Mesopotamian history Barsip was the name of the place,[54] afterwards destroyed and renamed Til-Barsip. There can be no doubt as to the general period at which the old Sumerian and Hurrian(?) towns of Upper Mesopotamia were destroyed; this must have occurred in the early part of the second millennium, presumably in connection with the great irruption of northern barbarians between the nineteenth and the seventeenth centuries B. C.[55] It was at this time that we must place the first development of the Aramaean settlements in Mesopotamia (see below). The Aramaean settlers gave names beginning with *tell* to the mounds which represented the sites of old towns, destroyed in the great barbarian inundation; when they became sedentary they reoccupied many, perhaps most of the ancient sites, which still kept their former Aramaean names, however. Exactly the same process is familiar to all students of Arab history in Syria and Mesopotamia.

Having found the names of the last three patriarchs before Abram represented by place-names in Upper Mesopotamia, let us turn to the two preceding, Peleg and Reu. Peleg is probably identified correctly with Phaliga on the Euphrates, just above the mouth of the Ḥâbûr. Isidore of Charax explains the name as meaning "half-way station" (μεσοπορικόν),[56] naturally thinking

---

[54] The name *Barsip* can hardly be separated from *Barziba* = *Borsippa*, with which it seems to have first been compared by Hommel. There are a number of other Sumerian place-names in Upper Mesopotamia; e. g., *Ḥa-bur*, "River of Fertility" (identical in name but not otherwise with the river Ḥubur in the underworld); *Kar-Gamiš*, "Quay of Gamis" (JAOS XL, 319); *Ḥarran*, "Road"; not to mention more doubtful cases. In the light of this material, Ungnad's theory that the Subaraeans or Ḥurrians formed the aboriginal stock of Mesopotamia becomes doubtful, to say the least; cf. his brochure *Die ältesten Völkerwanderungen Vorderasiens*, Breslau, 1923, p. 8.

[55] Cf. JSOR VIII, 55 and n. 8; JPOS II, 122 ff.

[56] *Parthian Stations*, 1; Schoff's edition, p. 4.

of Aram. *pilgâ*, "part, half, middle," but a derivation from Assyr. *palgu*, "canal," seems more likely. The idea expressed in Gen. 10 25 that Peleg received his name from the division of the earth in his days is naturally a learned deduction from a popular etymology.

The name Reu (רְעוּ) has not been identified, so far as we know. The ending *û*, as in *Penû-el*, etc., shows clearly enough that *Re'û* is an abbreviation or hypocoristicon of *Re'û-el*, a name otherwise familiar in early Hebrew history. The view that *Re'û* is shortened from *Re'û-el* is also held by Skinner (*Genesis*, *ad. loc.*). We would propose the identification of the name with that of Ra'ilu, a town situated on an island in the Euphrates just below 'Anat ('Anah), and thus about half-way between the mouth of the Ḫābûr and the Babylonian frontier at Rapîqu. The place is mentioned by Šamaš-rêš-uṣur, prefect of Sûḫi and Maeri (Mari),[57] who spells it *Ra-ilu*, and also in the new Nabopolassar Chronicle,[58] where it is written *Ra-ḫi-i-lu*, so the pronunciation *Ra'ilu* is quite certain.

We still have left three names between Shem and Peleg, those of Arphaxad, Selah, and Eber. Arphaxad (אַרְפַּכְשַׁד) is still a puzzle. The difficulties in the way of a combination with the district of Arrapḫa, older Arrapḫu^m and Greek Arrapachitis, are too serious to make this view likely at present, though the writer formerly defended it.[59] The name is most certainly non-Semitic, and resembles the numerous Ḫurrian(?) or Anatolian place-names beginning with *ar* or ending with *ad/t* (voiced and voiceless stops are practically interchangeable in the Caucasian and Anatolian languages) closely in formation. It surely belongs with such Upper Mesopotamian place-names as *Ḫaligalbat*,[60] *Ukulzat, Aštat, Araḫat,* and *Kaḫat,* all in use during the second

---

[57] Weissbach, *Babylonische Miscellen,* no. 1, col. IV, 1.

[58] Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh,* p. 38, line 33, and n. 10.

[59] Cf. JBL XXXVII, 133 ff.; JPOS I, 78. My attempt to connect Ur with Arbela was unfortunate, and deserves the drastic statement of it given by Clay, *Origin of Biblical Traditions,* p. 43, n. 9. One may operate too freely by far with hypothetic alterations of text.

[60] The form *Ḫanigalbat* is probably dissimilation of a more original *Ḫaligalbat*; cf. AJP XLIII, 167.

millennium B. C. We may, therefore, expect it to turn up before long in the triangle formed by the Ḫābūr and Euphrates, or in the land of Ḫana-Šangar[61] to the south of the Ḫābūr. It is hard to answer the query which comes up in spite of all: is there a connection between *Arpakšad* and *Ûr-Kaśdim*? Such a connection has often been assumed, and may well exist, though one suspects a modern calembour; one cannot be too careful to avoid making artificial comparisons which belong to the category of misplaced wit rather than to that of scientific method. Yet the possibility that the enigmatic *Arpakšad*, handed down by hoary tradition, was explained by some ingenious scribal historian as representing the South-Babylonian city of Ur, then in Chaldaean hands, cannot be gainsaid. It is certainly wiser at present to avoid making elaborate hypotheses on the basis of the *Ûr-Kaśdim* of our Masoretic text, which is not even found in *G*, offering a translation based upon a Hebrew *ereṣ hak-Kaśdim*, or the like.

The following name Selah (שֶׁלַח) cannot be identified as yet, though it is probably a good old Semitic personal and tribal name like Methuselah. The element *šelaḥ* is also a separate word which means in Hebrew "dart, lance" or "canal, watercourse," where the final consonant was originally *ḫ* as in Assyr. *šilīḫtu*, "canal."[62]

'*Eber*, on the other hand, has a certain identification, though a muchdisputed etymology. Since the question is coming up again for discussion, we may defend our position, which has not been clearly stated, so far as we know. In our opinion, Heb. '*Eber*, for **Ibr*, stands by epenthesis for **Abir*,[63] an intransitive participle of the type *fāʿil*, from the stem '*br*, "traverse, cross, wander," and thus means "wanderer, nomad." The name is thus equivalent in significance to '*Arab*. Haupt has pointed out that the stems '*br* and '*rb* are practically transposed doublets, since their derived verbal and nominal forms transpose their

---

[61] Cf. now my discussion of Šanḫar-Šangar in AJSL XL, 125 ff.

[62] Cf. Dhorme, JPOS III, 45—8.

[63] The philological process is familiar in all the Semitic languages; the classical example for this particular type is Arab. *biʾsa* from *baʾisa*.

consonants frequently.[64] Since the oldest known form of the
name ʿArab appears as ʿAribi, i. e., ʿArib, in the Assyrian texts,
we are hardly going too far if we consider ʿAbir and ʿArib as
actually transposed doublets. In this case, the former was the
term in use during the third and second millennium B. C., with
the sense of "Aramaean Bedawī" (the parent Hebrew stock is
termed arammî ôbéd, "wandering Aramaean," in Deut. 26 5),[65]
while the latter was the designation applied to Arab Bedawîn
from the beginning of the first millennium B. C., after the former
had become restricted to the Israelites and related Palestinian
tribes alone.

Since the discovery of the Tell el-ʿAmârneh Tablets it has
generally been assumed that the ᵃʷⁱˡᵃᵗHabiru which appear in
the letters of the prince of Jerusalem are identical with the
Hebrews. After the discovery of the identity of the SA-GAZ
people with the Habiru,[66] there has been more hesitation, because

[64] The suggestion that the words "Hebrew" and "Arab" are transposed
doublets we owe to Haupt, who has maintained it for many years. Among
the transposed derivatives we may mention ʿarabah — ʿabarah (Haupt).
In Ethiopic ʿabra, "to be desert," is clearly denominative from an archaic
*ʿabir, "desert wanderer," or the like. The derivatives of the Arabic
stems ʿbr and ʿrb are closely interrelated, so closely, in fact, that it seems
impossible to disentangle them, as may readily be seen by a careful
comparison.

[65] Luckenbill has recently suggested another explanation for the ex-
pression Arammî ôbed, AJSL XXXVI, 244f., equating it with Aramu
ḫalqu munnabtu of the Taylor Cylinder, col. V, 11. It is true that mun-
nabtu, "fugitive," comes from the same stem as ôbed, but as a reflexive
(nifʿal) it is rather voluntary than involuntary. The expression Arammî
ôbed may perhaps be rendered "stray Aramaean," like seh ôbed, "stray
sheep," for the sake of the metaphor, but since the Aramaeans were
nomadic to begin with, "wandering" is much more adequate as an English
rendering than "stray." On the other hand, the expression ḫalqu in the
Assyrian passage is a synonym of amîr damê, "bloodsoaked," and ḫabbilu,
"bandit," so must have a pejorative meaning not attached to ôbed, though
the stems have the same significance.

[66] Thanks to the Boghaz-köi tablets, the identity, divined by Winckler,
has been established beyond cavil. Yet there is no agreement as to the
reason why the ideogram SA-GAZ, which stands also for ḫabbatu, "robber,"
should be employed regularly in the second millennium for Ḫabiru. The
usual idea, which we share, is that no clear distinction was made between

of the wide range of the *SA-GAZ* in the 'Amârneh and Boghaz-köi correspondence. The god Ḫabiru also appears in Hittite and Assyrian documents. Dhorme has recently emphasized the importance of the new material for the elucidation of the problem, regarding it as decisively settling the debate against the identity of the Ḫabiru with the Hebrews.[67] His theory is that the Ḫabiru were a group of Syrians hostile to Egyptian domination, and hence under Hittite protection. The word he considers an appellative, derived from Canaanite *ḥaber*, "friend, companion," and thus to be rendered "confederate" or "Eidgenosse." He argues that *Ḫabiru* is an appellative and not a gentilic at all.

Undoubtedly *Ḫabiru* could be considered as respresenting *ḥaber*, but this explanation is difficult to reconcile with other facts. In the letters from Jerusalem, other names of peoples,

roving bands of robbers and bands of equally thievish Bedawin. Even in our days practically every Bedawi is an actual or potential robber; in ancient times it was still more so. The close relation is illustrated by the fact that the same word means "Bedawi" in Egyptian (*šôse*) and "robber" in Hebrew (*šôseḥ*); cf. Böhl, *Kanaanäer und Hebräer*, p. 89, n. 2. Very likely, the suggestion for the use of this particular ideogram came from the similarity in sound between *ḥabbatu* and *ḥabiru*, as 'abiru was pronounced by the Accadians. Luckenbill's view (AJTh XXII, 37, n. 1; AJSL XXXVI, 244 f.) that *Ḫabiru* is an Accadian appellative, meaning "brigand," from an otherwise unknown stem *ḥabâru*, parallel to *ḥabâtu*, breaks down before the fact that the god Ḫabiru and the gods of the Ḫabiru are mentioned in Assyrian and Hittite sources (cf. Jirku, OLZ 1921, 246 f.; Gustavs, ZATW XL, 313 f.). Moreover, *Ḫabiru* is marked once as a Canaanite word in EA 290, 24, while in another passage it is written with the determinative for "country." These objections do not affect Dhorme's theory, however. The exact meaning of the Sumerian expression *SA-GAZ* is difficult to decide, since *sa* means "cord, tendon," while *gaz* is "to kill." Ungnad (*op. cit.*, p. 15) thinks that *SA-GAZ* means properly "slinger" (Schleuderer), but this is apparently deduced from the ideogram, which hardly lends itself to such an interpretation, since *gaz* means "strike, slay," not "throw." I would suggest that *SA-GAZ* means properly "strangler" (slayer with a cord); it is well-known that a robber guild like the Thugs of India practises this mode of slaying victims almost exclusively.

[67] Dhorme's paper, read before the Palestine Oriental Society May 8, 1924, will appear in the *Journal* of the society, vol. IV; cf. already RB 1924, 12—16.

like *Kâśi*, are treated in the same way as *Ḫabiru/i*. Thus in
no. 287, line 31 we have (in genitive, *ana* accidentally omitted)
awîlût Ḫa-bi-ri; in line 33 (also in genitive) *awîlût Ka-śi-ya* (written
PI), "my Nubians," like *awîlût Su-te-ya*, "my Bedawîn," in no.195,29
(here immediately after *awîlût SA-GAZᴾˡ-ya* = "my Ḫabiru").
Illustrations may be multiplied, but this is not necessary here.
To judge from a passage like no. 288, 38, where we have *telêqi'û*
awîlût Ḫabiru, "the Ḫabiru take (in the plural)," *Ḫabiru* is treated
as a collective, like *Midyan*, *Mô'ab*, *Yiśra'el*, etc., in the Old
Testament; cf., e. g., 2 Kings 3 21: כֹּל מֹאָב שֹׁמֵעַ. This con-
struction is so exceedingly common in Hebrew that we cannot
be surprised to find it in the older Canaanite.

Moreover, the Ḫabiru appear in Mesopotamia long before the
Egyptian Empire in Asia. They are mentioned several times in
documents from the Larsa Dynasty, toward the close of the
third millennium B. C.[68] More recently the *SA-GAZ* have been
found mentioned in Hittite translations of the inscriptions (or
romance?) of Narâm-Šin of Akkad.[69] Here, however, one can-
not help suspecting that *SA-GAZ* is a translation of the archaic
*Su-ti-um*ᴷᴵ, or the like, and merely shows that *SA-GAZ* was
the ordinary Hittite equivalent of "Semitic nomad" in general.
The occurrences in the Larsa texts are, however, phonetically
written, and thus make it impossible to accept the correctness
of Dhorme's view unless we suppose that these Ḫabiru have
nothing in common with the Ḫabiru of the fourteenth century,
a highly improbable supposition.

The picture of the Ḫabiru which we draw from our inscrip-
tional sources is very like that we draw from our analysis of the
Old Testament traditions concerning the Hebrews. In both we
have a nomadic people occupying the steppes of Mesopotamia
during the general period corresponding to the end of the third
and the early part of the second millennium B. C. This folk
played so important a rôle in Upper Mesopotamia and northern

---

[68] The texts mentioning the Ḫabiru have been published by Scheil
(RA XII, 114 f.) and Miss Grice, whose publication does not happen to
be accessible to me.

[69] See Forrer, *Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift*, Leipzig, 1922, no. 5,
rev. 10.

Syria that its gods are mentioned in the oath formulae of the treaties between Ḫatte and Mitanni, as well as between Ḫatte and Nuḫašši. Since the oath formulae in these treaties are almost exhaustive, mentioning even the Indo-Iranian divinities of the Manda hordes, who seem to have formed a privileged category of the population, it would be surprising if the gods of the Hebrews were omitted. From the list of the ancestral Hebrew tribes preserved in our catalogue of patriarchs, as well as from the traditions concerning the career of Abram, Laban, and their families in Ḫarrân, it is evident that the Hebrews were one of the most important elements in the population of the region between the Euphrates and the Ḫâbûr, though they were presumably looked down upon as semi-nomadic barbarians by the inhabitants of the civilized centers.

There are many additional phases to this question, but we have said enough for the moment. It can no longer be doubtful that the first home of the Aramaeans, which then called themselves "Hebrews" after leaving their cradle in Arabia, was in the valleys of the Euphrates and its tributaries, in the west and northwest of the greater Mesopotamia. It was from this region, called Paddan-Aram by the Hebrews, that Abram and the Benê Ya'qob came to Palestine and Egypt, probably swept into the current of the Hyksos irruption, as the writer has maintained elsewhere.[70] [71]

[70] See JPOS I, 65 ff.; II, 121 ff.

[71] The writer hopes to continue this series of biblical notes with brief studies of the maṣṣebôt, teraphim, etc., as well as discussions of lexicographical and hermeneutic questions.