

STUDIA ORIENTALIA
EDIDIT SOCIETAS ORIENTALIS FENNICA
XVI:3

THE APPEARANCE OF THE NAME
YHWH OUTSIDE ISRAEL

BY
A. MURTONEN

HELSINKI 1951

The Appearance of the Name Yhwh outside Israel.

Traces exist in the Old Testament which seem to indicate that Yhwh has been worshipped outside Israel. In 1 Sam. 6: 14. 18 mention is made of a man from Beth-shemesh, by name *Y^ehōš'ā^a*, apparently a man whose family had dwelt there some time as he owned a field there, and because he is expressly described as from Beth-shemesh and not as belonging to any one tribe of Israel. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility, however, that he is an Israelite who (or whose father) for some reason has withdrawn from his tribe and settled down at Beth-shemesh.¹ Another possible instance comes in 2 Sam. 8: 10, citing a Prince of Hamath (in Northern Syria), by name *Yôrām*. This is supported by the fact that according to some inscriptions of Sargon II, the King of Assyria², a king, by name *^dIa-u₂-bi-'-di*, [var. *I-lu-(u₂-)bi-'-di*] ruled over Hamath in the year 721 B.C. It has been stated that *Yôrām* could be a stressed form of *H^adôrām*, which appears as the name of the same person in 1 Chron. 18: 10³, but it is difficult to understand the intention of the writer of the passage; on the other hand, it is very easy to understand how the Chronicler came to believe that the form *Yôrām* was erroneous: he knew nothing of the worship of Yhwh in Hamath or, if he did, regarded it as having been started by the Israelite emigrants mentioned in Isa. 11: 11. *Iaubi'di* would be an Israelite who usurped the throne of Hamath.⁴ Against this it must

¹ Noth, M., Die israelitischen Personennamen, p. 110. Stuttgart 1928.

² Stele I, 53; Nimrud 8; X, 3, 33; Saal II, 3, 10. See Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons, ed. H. Winckler & L. Abel, tbl. 47, 48, 31, 1. Leipzig 1889.

³ Driver, G. R., ZAW 46/1928, p. 9.

⁴ Driver, ZAW 46, p. 9.

be stated that the latter part of the name does not seem to be Hebrew. This argument, however, is not entirely satisfactory.⁵

The passage Gen. 4: 26 is of more importance. It states that men began to call on the name Yhwh for help long before the people of Israel existed. The general argument against this has been the assertion that the passage means that men began to pray to the god of that time, but the passage states that they began to call on the name Yhwh. This is supported by the name of the mother of Moses, *Yôkâbüd*.⁶

In addition to these the name *Az-ri-ia-a-u₂*, the King of Yaudi⁷, can be mentioned in this connection. Yaudi is usually held to be identical with *Y'dy*, in Northern Syria, mentioned in the inscriptions from Senġirli, but it can also be = Judaea.⁸

In the cuneiform texts dating from the time of the Cassite period and earlier certain personal names appear in which the tetragram seems to be the one component. In the following, therefore, we give a list of such names, where an intelligible interpretation of each name is possible.

The names are:

A-bi-ia-u₂-ti (Cass), Gelb, I.J., etc., Nuzi Personal Names, Chicago 1943, 320 b (1; BM 3031, 4, see BE XIV, 26,) »My father is my *yautu*» or *vice versa*.

Ahî(ŠEŠ)-ia-wi₄/mi (Kan), (Sellin-)Hrozný, B., Tell Ta'anek, Wien 1898, Anhang, p. 121 (1; Ta'anek 2, 2) »*Yawi (Yami)* is my brother».

A-ĥi-ia-u₂-ti (Cass), *ĥAh-ti-ia-u₂-tu* (Susa), NPN 320 b (3) »My brother (sister) is (my) *yautu*» or *vice versa*.

⁵ As is known, there are some personal names in the OT made up from the tetragram, the remaining component of which does not appear in the OT, e.g., that of the King *Y^ehō'āš*.

⁶ There is no serious argument against the genuineness of this. Noth, *Isr. Pers.-n* p. 111, can only say that it is »sehr unsicher», that the composition of the name includes the tetragram.

⁷ Cf. KAT³, p. 54, 262, 465.

⁸ Noth, *Isr. Pers.-n.*, p. 109 sq.

- Bir-ia-ma-a* (WSem), Tallqvist, APN 64 b (1; K. 1359, IV, 5, see Johns, ADD, 857) »Son of *Yama*».
- Ha-li-ia-um* (Amor), NPN 321 a (5) »*Yaum* is exalted».
- Ia-e-a* (Cass), Clay, A. T., PNCP 82 a (2).
- Ia-ah-*, *Ia-/wi-AN*, *Ia-wi-i-la* (Amor), Bauer, Th., Ostkanaanäer, Leipzig 1926, 26 (3), Jean, Ch.-F. in *Studia Mariana*, p. 95 (2) »*Ya(h)wi* is god» or »El (Ila) is *ya(h)wi*».
- Ia-ma/wa*, (Kan?), PNCP 82 b (2).
- Ia₃-mi-ba-an-da* (Kan), Ta'annek 3, 13 (1) »Bound to *Yami(n?)*».
- Ia₃-mi-u₂-ta* (Kan), APN 91 b (1; VAT 1684, 2; see Der Thontafelfund von el-Amarna, hrsg. L. Abel, Berlin 1889 sq., tbl. 170) »Protected by *Yami(n?)*».
- Ia-u-ba-ni* (Cass), PNCP 83 a (5) »*Yau* is (my?) creator».
- I-a-u-i-li₂* (Amor), *Ia-u₂-*, *Ia-wu-/um-AN*, *Ia-a-um-[AN]* (OBa? Amor?), Baqir, T., in *Sumer 5: II*, p.137 sqq.; Bauer, Ostkan., 31 (1 + 2 + 2 + 1, resp.) »*Yau(m)* is (my) god».
- Ia-u₂-š_u₂* (OBa), Bauer, Ostkan. 31 (1; VAT 901: 23, see VS VIII, tbl. 14) »He is *yau*».
- Ia-wi-^dDagan* (Amor), Bauer, Ostkan. 31 (1; AO 1629, 9, see Thureau-Dangin, F., *Lettres et contrats*, Paris 1910, N:o 158) »*Yawi* is Dagan» or *vice versa*.
- Ia-wi-um* (hypocor.) (Amor, OBa?), Bauer, Ostkan. 31 (1: King of Kish, 2: Father of *Hali-iaum* Bu. 91 — 5 — 9, 2499, 8, see CT VIII, 44 a).
- Li-pu-uš-i₃-a-um* (OBa), Thureau-Dangin, *Königsinschriften*, Leipzig 1910, p. 167 (1; unverified) »May *yaum* do it!»
- Nūri-ia-u₂-ti*, (Cass), NPN 321 b (2) »My *yautu* is my light».
- Tukulti(KU-ti)-ia-u₂-ti* (Cass), NPN 321 a (reads *Ku-ti-*) (1; CBM 6625, 6, see BE XIV, 44) »My *yautu* is my support».

In these names the element *yau(tu)* represents without doubt more than one originally different element. Only the name *Lipuš-iaum* (a granddaughter of Naram-Sin) can be regarded as definitely Akkadian. Another name probably belonging to this group is *Iaušū* (from the time of Ammiditana). In the names from Susa *yau(tu)*

may represent a Heth.-Churr.-Proto-Ind. name of the god *i-á/Yae/Yaya(š)*⁹, as in those from the Cassite Period in which, however, it can be regarded as West Semitic too. In Amorite names the element is, of course, West Semitic. For *Yama* and *Yami(n?)* see below (p. 11).

There is also a list¹⁰ containing a number of equivalents of the well-known star-logogram which is the most usual sign for *ilu*. Among these equivalents comes, in the first place, the word *ia'-u*. The most recent copyist has failed to understand the meaning of this word, for he has »explained» it with the pronoun *yāti* which, however, suggests that he was also acquainted with the feminine form.¹¹

In the Ugaritic pantheon there is a god by name *Yw*. Albright's doubts¹² concerning the reading of the word are groundless. The *w* is exactly like all the other *w*:s in the same column, and clearly distinguishable from all the *r*:s.¹³ Since A's main reason for expressing uncertainty is that the reading *yw* does not fit the context, we give here the text in question¹⁴, and a translation of, to enable the reader himself to discover why the reading *yw* does not fit the context. The author sees no reason for question.

⁹ See Jensen, P., *Hitt. u. Arm.*, p. 26, n. 8, Strassburg 1898, Lewy, J., in *RÉS* 1938 p. 49 sq., Hrozný, B., in *Journal of Jur. Papyrology* 1950, p. 46.

¹⁰ Br. Mus. 93035. See CT XII, 4.

¹¹ Sayce, A. H., *Exp. Times* 19, p. 525; Burney, C. F., *Book of Judges*, London 1920, p. 247. — That this explanation is really secondary can be seen in the fact that the sign AN has been used nowhere with the meaning »me». Also the words in lines 3—5 can be intended only to explain the word *ia'-u* as being more recent guess-work (against Hehn, J., *Gottesidee*, Leipzig 1913, p. 239 sq.). — The lack of mimation also points to a name.

¹² Von der Steinzeit . . ., Bern 1949, p. 436, n. 99.

¹³ AO 16643. Photograph in Virolleaud, Ch., *Déesse 'Anat*, Paris 1938, tbl. XIII.

¹⁴ Acc. to Gordon, C. H., *Ugaritic Handbook*, Roma 1948, p. 190.

'nt pl. x. IV.

(1) _____	_____
<i>gm.šh.lq[</i>	aloud he cries to . . .
<i>lrhqm.lp[</i>	to those being distant, to . . .
<i>šh.il.ytb. b[</i>	'Il called sitting in . . .
— — <i>t. 'Ulmn.[</i>	_____
<i>ilm.bt.b'lk[</i>	gods, the house of your lord . . .
<i>dl.ylkn.hš.ba[rš (?)</i>	which verily go hurrying in [the earth? . . .
<i>b'pr.hblttm.[</i>	in the dust, destruction (?) . . .
<i>šqy.rta.tnmy.ytn [ks byd</i>	drinking — — Give water! He puts [a cup in the hand,
<i>krpn.bklat yd.[</i>	a goblet in both hand(s) . . .
<i>kmll.khš.tus[</i>	_____
<i>tgr.il.bnh.tr[</i>	'Il — — his son, <u>T</u> or . . .
<i>wy'n.lt(p)n. il.dp[id</i>	And Ltpn, god of mercy, replies:
<i>šm.bny.yw.il[</i>	»The name of my son is Yw 'Il (m?) ¹⁵ . . .»
<i>wp'r.šm.ym[</i>	and he gives the name Ym (to him?) .
<i>t'nyn.lzntn[</i>	They answer: . . .
<i>at.adn.tp'r[</i>	thou art called »Lord» . . .
<i>ank.ltpn.il [dpid</i>	I am Ltpn, god [of mercy . . .
<i>'l.ydm.p'rt ?[</i>	on the hands, thou art called . . .
20 <i>šmk.mdd.i[l</i>	thy name is »Darling of 'I[l . . .
<i>bt kspy.d[</i>	my house of silver which . . .
<i>bd.aliyn b['l</i>	in the hands of Aliyn Ba['al . . .
<i>kd.ynašn(Gordon: yn ašn)[</i>	thus he despises me . . .
<i>gršnn.lk[si mlkh lnht lkht</i>	drive him out from the se[<u>a</u> t of his kingship, from the dais, the throne
<i>drkth.š[</i>	of his sovereignty . . .

¹⁵ A horizontal stroke remains after the last letter in the line; it seems to be the remnants of an *m*. The *ts* in the column are regularly a little longer. Cf. note 13).

<i>whm.ap.l[</i>	and they, even . . .
<i>ymhsk.k[</i>	he will smite thee as . . .
<i>il dbh.[</i>	'Il, sacrifice . . .
<i>p'r.b[</i>	to name . . .
<i>tbh.alp[m ap šin šql</i>	slaughter ox[en and small cattle, kill
<i>trm.w[mri ilm 'glm dt šnt</i>	oxen and [fatlings of rams,
	yearling bullocks
(32) <i>imr. [qmš llim</i>	little lambs, [kids . . .

The words in the 23rd line do not appear elsewhere in the Ugaritic texts. This may be the basis on which Gordon issued his emendation. *kd*, however, when interpreted as »thus», receives support from Hebrew (*kāzā^h* in the combination *kāzoh we^ekāzā^h*, and *kāzot*), Aramaic (*kiḏnā^h*), Arabic (*kāḏūr*), etc. *naš* »to despise» has isoglosses in Akkadian and in Hebrew. The pers. pron. suff. sg. 1 acc., which Gordon (UHB p. 117) has reconstructed, receives its first confirmation in this passage. In addition to this, considering the fact that our translation fits the context very well while Gordon's wholly confuses the sense, there is little doubt as to which of the two is better.

In addition to these it can be mentioned that the name appears as a part of two personal names in a Northern Arabic inscription¹⁶, but it is likely that the two persons mentioned are Jews. — In a wellknown oracle of Apollo Clarius *Iaw* appears as the name of the supreme god. It is hard to imagine that it means the OT God, for the oracle presupposes that *Iaw* is a vegetation god who dies in the autumn and rises in the spring ascending the throne of the supreme god¹⁷, and *Yhwh* has never been conceived of as belonging

¹⁶ Jaussen & Savignac, Mission archéologique II, Paris 1914, p. 462.

¹⁷ Macrobius, Saturnalia I, 18. The oracle runs as follows:

Φοράζω τὸν πάντων ἑπατον θεὸν ἔμμεν *Iaw*.
 χεῖματι μὲν τ' Ἀίδην, Λία δ' εἰαρος ἀρχεμένοιο,
 Ἡελίον τε θέρεως, μετ' ὀπώρας δ' ἄβρον *Iaw*.

(Reconstructed on the ground of an edition published 1585.)

to these gods¹⁸, least of all in the times the oracle was given (ca. the time of the birth of Christ or a little later). — The reputed appearance of the tetragramm in the Old Sinaitic inscriptions¹⁹ is quite uncertain.²⁰ — On the other hand, it can be the latter component in the place name *Ba-ti-y-a* in the Palestine list of Thutmosis III²¹. — Finally, Euseb mentions that a god *Ieww* was worshipped at Gebal ca. 1000 B.C.^{21b}

How can we explain these names? *-yau* and *-yautum* are usually regarded as hypocoristic terminations (cf. the name books). In the Akkadian names this is doubtless usually the case, but the name *Lipuš-iaum*, at all events, remains outside of the time the termination appears²², besides which this explanation does not account for cases where *yau(m)* stands at the beginning of the name. It has been said that *yaum* is a pronoun meaning »mine». *Yaum-ilu*, then, would mean »the god is mine».²³ Where in all the Semitic languages can we find a parallel for such a name? The nearest parallels are *Īšu-ila* and *Rāši-ili* (reading uncertain²⁴) which mean »He has (got) god» and »One who has (got) god», resp., and are thus of very unlike sense. For if we say that we have god, it does not mean that the god is ours, that he is one of our possessions. Moreover, the name *I-a-u-i-li₂*, though very old (from the time of *Sumu-la-el*), shows the word *yau(m)* without imitation, which points to a proper name²⁵, being in addition Amoritic²⁶ — and

¹⁸ See Hvidberg, F. F., *Graad og Latter i det GT*, København 1938, p. 118

¹⁹ Grimme, H., *Altsin. Buchst.-inschr.*, Berlin 1929, N:o 356, etc.

²⁰ See e.g. Sprengling, M., *The Alphabet*, Chicago 1931, p. 25 sqq.

²¹ Müller, M., *MVaG* 12: 1, p. 26. ^{21b} *Praeparatio* I, 9.

²² See Gelb etc., *NPN*, p. 321b sq.

²³ Landsberger, B., *ZA* 35, p. 24, n. 2, and following him Bauer, *Ostkan.*, p. 56, Schleiff, A., *ZDMG* 90, p. 691, n. 2, Albright, W. F., *Von der Steinzeit . . .*, p. 260; etc. — Schleiff applies this interpretation to the name *Yawi-ilu*, too, leaving *Yahwi-ilu* unexplained.

²⁴ Stamm, *ANG*, p. 252.

²⁵ Gelb, I. J., in *Archiv Orientalní* 18: 1—2, p. 197.

²⁶ Baqir, T., in *Sumer* 5: II, p. 137 sqq

what would be the sense of a name meaning »My god is mine»?! But let us suppose that this explanation is correct. It still does not explain the names *Yahwi-ilu* and *Yawi-ilu*. It has been stated that *yahwi/yawi* is a verbal form from the root *hwy* »to be», either a causative²⁷ or a ground stem form.²⁸ Against this it must be pointed out that the so-called Amoritic, if not identical, is in all cases very closely connected with Ugaritic²⁹, and neither Ugaritic nor the later Phoenician knows the root *hwy*. In Akkadian a verbal form such as *ya(h)wi* is impossible. If we presume that *yahwi* comes from *hwy* »to live», the form *yawi* still remains unexplained, for there is absolutely no evidence or analogy to support the supposition that this verb could be inflected similarly to verbs formed by means of the u-augment.³⁰ In addition, considering that in the Ugaritic pantheon there is a god Yw, that a god *Ieww* was worshipped at Gebal ca. 1000 B.C., that a god Yau was worshipped at Hamath during the first centuries of the last millennium B.C. (*Yôrâm*,

²⁷ Bauer, Ostkan., p. 61, 74. As a reason he gives: »Eine Übersetzung 'Gott ist' wäre für das Ostkanaanäische mit seinen konkreten Nameninhalten zu farblos».

²⁸ Bauer, H., ZAW 51, p. 93 with note 7: a causative form is impossible, because no such stem from the root *hwy* exists, and if it did exist, it would have been *yhhwy* at that time. — Clay, Light on the OT², Philadelphia 1907, p. 237. — Noth, Isr. Pers.-n., p. 109, says generally: »In den ostprotoaramäischen Namen . . . ist das erste Element nach *z a h l l o s e n* (sp. by us) Analogien ohne allen Zweifel verbal, und nicht ein Gottesname». No analogies, however, are given. One would satisfy the present writer. — Cf. even Daiches, S., ZA 22, p. 125 sqq.

²⁹ Baumgartner, W., Theol. Zeitschrift 2, p. 56, proposes the following evidence against the supposed identity of Amoritic with Ugaritic: » . . . das Amoritische . . . hat ursemitisches *š* als *š* (ug. *s*), und *d* als *z* (ug. *d*); dem Ugaritischen fehlen auch die im Amoritischen vorhandenen Verbalstämme '*mn*, *hšn*' (für *hsn*) und *qlb*». The first two statements, however, are too positive. See Gordon, UHB, p. 20 sqq., and Bauer, Ostkan., p. 64 sq.

³⁰ Clay, Light on the OT², p. 237, however, suggests this interpretation, too. — The same argument is used in the supposition made by Schorr, M., Urkunden, Leipzig 1913, p. 294, that the word belongs to *hwy/w* »to declare».

Iaubi'di), and perhaps also elsewhere in Northern Syria (*Azri-iau*), nothing is more likely than that the first element of these names is a divine name.³¹ The same must be said of the element *yau(m)* in the Amoritic and Old Babylonian names *Yau(m)-ilu*, *-ili*, *Lipuš-yaum*, *Hali-yaum*, etc., considering the equation AN = *ia'-u*. — The name *Yaušū* is equivalent to that of the King of Israel *Yōhū'* (dissimilated from *Yōhū'*, cf. *Yēšū' < Yōšū'*³²).

The name has been confused with another (or perhaps two other³³) divine name, viz. *Ym* (*-yām*, *Iama*, *Iami*?). In the Ugaritic poem on p. 7 sq. a son of 'Il is mentioned first by the name *Yw* 'Il(m?) and on the second occasion by the name *Ym*. The poem is fragmentary, it is true, but we can at least deduce from it that 'Il in the poem urges his son *Yw/Ym* to take revenge on *Ba'al*³⁴ for the disrespect he has shown towards 'Il. If we presume that *Yw* and *Ym* are names of separate gods, the poem would divide itself in two parts entirely unconnected with each other. The same variation appears in an OT name *'Abiyāhū = 'Abiyāh = 'Abiyām*. It is hard to see, also, how the two deities *Yami(n?)*³⁵ and *Yawi* in the names *Yami-banda*, *Yami-uta*, and *Ahi-yawi* (as clearly Semitic likely to be read thus, cf. the name list) could always be distinguished in times when the pronunciation of *m* and *w* was probably confused in Palestine too, (cf., e.g., *'argāmān > 'arg'wān*).³⁵

A. MURTONEN

³¹ Cf. Burney, Book of Judges, p. 245.

³² Philippi, F., in Zeitschr. für Völkerpsychologie 14, p. 178; Bauer, H., in ZAW 51, p. 93.

³³ See O'Callaghan, R. T., Aram Naharaim, Roma 1948, p. 61a, 63.

³⁴ Aliyn Ba'al = Ba'al. See, e.g., Baumgartner, W., in ThZ 3, p. 87.

³⁵ Cf. even König, E., in ZAW 35, p. 50.