

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

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

THE NAMES "ISRAEL" AND "JUDAH" WITH AN EXCURSUS ON THE ETYMOLOGY OF TÔDÂH AND TÔRÂH

W. F. ALBRIGHT

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH, JERUSALEM

THE casual student may be surprised to discover that many of the most familiar and most important personal and tribal names of the Bible are veiled in an almost impenetrable obscurity, so far as their morphology and exact meaning are concerned. Up to recently, the consensus of scholarship, that amorphous and perhaps over-docile body of learning, has been content to copy what has come down to us from the Hebrew grammarians and lexicographers of the past. Now, however, with the rapidly growing mass of materials from the Ancient Orient, this attitude is fast becoming an anachronism, as fully realized by the most progressive spirits.

Before utilizing the materials made available by cuneiform, hieroglyphic, South Arabian, Canaanite and Aramaic inscriptions already published, it is important to understand the elements of comparative Semitic philology, as this science has been and is still being developed by a devoted band of students. One need only mention the names of Brockelmann, Bergsträsser,¹

¹ Bergsträsser is probably the best all-around comparative Semitic philologist of the present day. To a thoroughly scientific approach to the ancient Semitic languages he adds an excellent phonetic training and a mastery of the modern Arabic dialects. When the edition of Gesenius's *Hebrew Grammar* being prepared by him is complete we shall have a standard handbook at last. In this paper I have consistently referred to Bauer and Leander's grammar, because of its historical point of view, which is of vital importance for researches in the philology of proper names.

Littmann, Lidzbarski, Bauer, Leander, Meissner, Zimmern, Ungnad, among others, to realize the difficulty and the brilliance of the researches which they have carried on in the last few years, building on the foundations of Gesenius, Barth and Haupt.² But there are few scholars with the necessary preliminary training to enable them to understand just what is meant by "comparative philological method." There are still fewer who enjoy the training and natural endowments of a Johannes Friedrich, who represents the highest point yet attained by the Orientalist in this field. Trained in both Semitic and Indo-European philology, his studies in the Phoenician and Aramaean inscriptions³ rank with his researches in Hittite as the high-water mark of scientific method in both linguistic groups. It should be recognized that with the proper training and willingness to work one may do better in two or more specialties than another who lacks these prerequisites can do in the narrowest field. Semitic philology is a rich and productive territory, with very few who are willing to settle in it. We can only plead for more workers, so that this phase of oriental and biblical science may not continue to be neglected.

Before taking up the discussion of the names "Israel" and "Judah," it may be well to sketch briefly the method employed. It is now recognized by all Hebrew philologists of note, such as Bergsträsser, Bauer and Leander, Margolis, that we can no longer content ourselves with a blind following of Massoretic

² The importance of Haupt's researches in the comparative phonology and morphology of Assyrian and Hebrew is still very great. In his brilliant monographs and papers on these subjects, published between 1880 and 1895, he laid the foundations of scientific Assyrian grammar, as fully recognized by Delitzsch and Brockelmann. An account of his work has been given by the present writer, who happens to be his pupil, in the *Haupt Anniversary Volume*, and an analysis of his contributions to Semitic philology has also been prepared for the forthcoming volume of the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, to consist largely of papers by Haupt himself.

³ Cf. his papers in the *Zeitschrift für Semitistik*, Vol. I, 8-14; II, 1-10. They show what can be done by a penetrating analysis of consonantal texts for their vocalization, and also what a sound method in historical philology can accomplish for our knowledge of the Canaanite dialects related to Hebrew.

rules for vocalization. We must compare the Egyptian (B) and revised (A) recensions of the Greek Bible, for which the Hexaplaric material studied especially by Margolis is of the greatest value. Yet we must not fall into the opposite danger of disregarding the vowel-points, on penalty of finding our last state worse than our first. We must compare the cuneiform materials with the utmost care, taking the precaution of distinguishing sharply between the dialects and languages represented, and paying the closest attention to the laws governing transcription in different periods and dialectic territories.⁴ Want of care in these details has spoiled many promising efforts to make use of the rich data from cuneiform sources. We must understand the principles of Egyptian phonology, as worked out by Sethe and the present writer,⁵ and must be able to apply them to the increasingly numerous hieroglyphic transliterations of West Semitic personal names. Last, but by no means least, we must be able to apply the methods of modern comparative philology, as emphasized above. It is of vital importance to understand the laws governing the reconstruction of the basic Semitic forms and their appearance in the later written languages. Classical Arabic still remains fundamental, since it is the only fully known Semitic language which preserves the original phonetic system virtually without modification. This applies to consonants, vowels and accentuation alike, as we know from the fact that a scientific

⁴ To claim, as used to be done by Neville, for example, that transcriptions are not bound by philological law, is simply to exhibit an extraordinary ignorance of what this expression means. It does not mean, as he seems to have thought, that *soi-disant* philologists apply hypothetical "laws" governing the etymological relation of words in languages of the same group to sporadic transcriptions of words from some foreign tongue. "Philological law" is simply induction from a body of facts of the same class, like any other scientific law. Even in language everything is subject to law, but linguistic laws cannot be enunciated *a priori*, nor can we expect satisfactory results by restricting our induction to a selected series of facts. The same logical principles hold in all scientific reasoning.

⁵ See Sethe, *ZDMG* LXXVII (1926), 171 ff. and *Nachschrift*; the writer, *Recueil de Travaux* XL (1923), 66 ff.; *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* (*JEA*) X, 6 ff., XII, 186 ff.; *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache*, Vol. LXII, 64; Spiegelberg, *JEA* XII, 34; Gardiner, in an appendix to his new *Egyptian Grammar*.

comparison of the other Semitic tongues almost invariably leads us to assume forms which are practically identical with the corresponding ones in Arabic. Naturally, blind reliance upon Arabic forms is equally bad, since the morphology of the language has unquestionably changed much more than its phonology.

A. THE NAME "ISRAEL"

The original form and etymology of Heb. **יִשְׂרָאֵל** have been made the subject of extended discussion recently by Sachsse and Caspari. Sachsse's study may be found in his article *Die Etymologie und älteste Aussprache des Namens יִשְׂרָאֵל*, *ZATW* XXXIV (1914), 1-16, while Caspari's refutation was published under the title *Sprachliche und religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Namens Israel*, in the *Zeitschrift für Semitistik*, Vol. III (1924), pp. 194-211. Sachsse's study is in some respects excellent, and his conclusions have been accepted, e. g., by Sellin, *Geschichte*, Vol. I, p. 26. The present writer does not agree fully with either Sachsse or Caspari, as will be seen, considering both as philologically weak.

Sachsse gives an interesting and practically exhaustive list of nine different explanations of the name **יִשְׂרָאֵל** in ancient and modern times. Five of these are ancient, being either biblical or postbiblical, while four are modern. One of each group, the fourth and the ninth, drop out at once, because of their obvious improbability, and need not be repeated here. The rest may be described briefly, in the order given by Sachsse, with additional comments, where needed.

In the story of Jacob's wrestling with the "angel" (Gen. 32) it is related that the latter gave the former a new name, *Yisrā'ēl*, as a memorial of his partly successful struggle, with the explanation **כִּי שָׂרִית עִם אֱלֹהִים וְעַם אַנְשִׁים וְתוּכַל**. In Hos. 12 4-5 there is an important poetic description of the same contest, in the course of a recital of Jacob's history:

בְּכַמֵּן עֵקֶב אֶחָיו וּבְאוּגוֹ שָׂרָה אֶת־אֱלֹהִים
נִישָׁר אֶל מְלֶאךָ וַיִּקַּל בְּקֶה וַיִּתְחַנְּקֵלּוּ

Marti and others think that 5a is a gloss to 4b, but this is improbable for two reasons. First, the "gloss" is more difficult

to understand than the "original text"; and secondly, the metrical form and parallelism are now quite satisfactory, and would be destroyed if Marti's view were adopted. That there are difficulties must be admitted. The most serious one is that we do not know the true rendering of the verb כָּרַע , which only occurs in these two passages, nor whether כָּרַע is correctly pointed or not. Before taking up the translation of the passage in Hosea it will be well to discuss the stems in Semitic which contain the strong consonants *šr* (Arab. *šr*, Heb. *šr*, Aram. *sr*, Assyr. *šr*). The discussion must be rather summary, however, since this is not the place for a full analysis, which will appear elsewhere.

First we find the root-meaning, "cut, saw," illustrated by Arabic *wāšara*, "to saw," and Eth. *wašāra*, while in Assyrian we have *mašāru* (for *wašāru*), "to cut," and *šaššaru* (for **šaršaru*), "saw." The Aram. *nesūr* and Arab. *nāšara*, "to saw," are both secondary denominatives from a noun corresponding to Heb. *maššōr*, from which Aram. *massārā* and Arab. *minšār* are borrowed, perhaps from a still unknown Assyrian synonym of *šaššaru*. The original Semitic form of the noun is shown by Eth. *mōšart*, for **mawšart*.⁶ Assyr. *mašāru*, *wašāru*, with the intensive *uššuru*, *muššuru*, also belongs with this root-meaning, since its significations, "be free" (intr.), and "let free, let go, abandon, send away, give over, entrust," clearly go back to "sever."

Another important root-meaning of *šr* is "to shine, be brilliant," illustrated by Assyr. *šarāru* — Arab. *šarra* — *šārā* — *šawwara*, etc. It may be that the words *šarru*, "king," *šar*, "prince," belong here, since *šarāru* and *šārār*, "be king, rule," are in any case denominatives, like *malāk* and Arab. *mālaka*, while *malku*, *mēlek*, *mālik* are derived, as well known, from the stem *malāku*, "consult, plan, decide," in which case we may connect *šarru* with Arab. *'ašāra*, "counsel," *mušīr*, "counsellor." While the Arab. stem *šarra* has apparently not preserved this meaning, it interchanges otherwise with *šārā*, *šawwara*. Eth.

⁶ This Ethiopic form is most certainly not due to a secondary dissimilation, as suggested by Brockelmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, I, p. 226. Nor is the Eth. *wašāra* denominated from it, as he thought, oblivious for the moment of the Arabic and Accadian situation.

šarāra, "to be high," may, however, be the true stem of *šarru*, though it is impossible to be sure of the sibilant in Ethiopic, owing to the early confusion of all four *s*-sounds. At all events, Eth. *šārāra*, "to found, establish," certainly should have a *sin*, not a *šin*, since it belongs with Aram. ܫܪܐ, Syr. *šar*, "be firm," just as the closely related *šerā* and Assy. *šurrū* mean "to found, establish," while Eth. *šerw* (properly *serw*) is "foundation, root, tendon" (connected with Assy. *šir'ānu*, Heb. partially reduplicated *šōreš*). The meaning "shine" is presumably connected ultimately with "cut," a very common semantic relationship, which does not concern us here, however, since it belongs rather to the field of linguistic origins.

The Arabic stem *šārā* (شَرَى) introduces some more difficult semantic considerations, but most of its rather multifarious meanings may be satisfactorily related to one another. The meaning of the first form is both "buy" and "sell," while the eighth means simply "buy." The fourth has the sense "put discord between" (*'āšrā bajn*), while the third (*šārā*) means "persist in contention with, vie with," and the tenth "persist (in), be devoted (to something), etc." The nouns *šāra* and *šariyah* mean, respectively "road," and "way, mode of doing or acting." Arab. *šarwā* is "the like (of a thing)," its equivalent. The situation will become clearer if we compare the stem which appears in Assyrian as *šanānu*, "be like, counterpart," *šitnunu*, "vie, contend, struggle," *šinnatu*, "likeness, form" while in Ethiopic we have *tasannāna*, "rival, contend," and *sen* (= *šen*), "form, beauty." The word *šārā* may be explained in the same way; first we have "be like, correspond," from which the sense of "try to equalize, negotiate, buy and sell" arises. The fourth form means simply "cause to vie with, cause to contend," while the third corresponds exactly to *šitnunu*. The meaning of the tenth is secondary, as usual, and is derived from the third in the sense "strive, contend for something in one's own interest." There are other meanings of the stem which belong elsewhere, such as *šārā*, "flash, shine," *šārā*, "be angry," perhaps a conflation of the two stem-meanings, and *tašarrā*, "be dispersed, scattered," which has a wholly different origin, belonging ultimately with *nāšara*, "scatter," and its congeners. It is quite

likely that the new root-meaning "be like," which we have deduced, is ultimately related to "shine," through "reflect," but this possibility is no further concern of ours here.

Among the less common stem-meanings which have fallen together in the *šr* category is one which is particularly interesting to us, and may be discussed briefly here. In Ethiopic *šarāya* means "to cure, heal." The stem has been connected with *sarāya*, "to remit sins," but the ideas are not at all identical, and *sarāya* belongs with Aram. *šerā*, Arab. *sārā*, "to loosen," in Aramaic also "to remit, absolve," while *šarāya* cannot be separated from Arab. *nāšara*, "revive, resuscitate (a sick man), provide (a patient) with amulets."⁷ The nouns *našr* and *nušūr* mean "life, resurrection." As is well known, there is in all Semitic languages, but especially in West and South Semitic, a constant interchange between stems *primae waw* and *primae nūn*, due to morphological contamination, as pointed out by Nöldeke.⁸ We are, therefore, justified in assuming an original Arabic stem "*wāšara*, in this sense, just as *nāšara*, "to saw," goes back to *wāšara*, with the same meaning. The stem *nāšara* has its own established sense in Arabic, "to scatter," a fact which is sufficient to suggest that *nāšara*, "to cure," is not original. Just how the meaning "to cure" arose is not easy to answer, especially since words of this type frequently have a rather less transparent derivation than less specialized verbs.

Returning to the passage of Hosea which is under discussion, it is evident at once that there is only one meaning occurring in related stems in the other Semitic languages which will fit the two occurrences of the verb *šarāh*: "vie with, contend against (in rivalry)." That this fits the context admirably is clear. Arab. *šārā* and Heb. *šarāh* are thus identical both in form and in primary meaning. Gen. 32²⁹ should be rendered: For thou hast contended in rivalry with God and with men, and hast prevailed. The first stichos of the couplet which we have been considering may be rendered:

(Already) in the womb he tricked his brother,

And in his (manly) strength he vied with God.

⁷ See Dillmann, *Lexicon*, col. 245.

⁸ Cf. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge*, on Arab. *wgd* (*wāǧada*) — Eth. *ngd*.

Just what the Massorettes had in mind when they pointed the next word **נִשָּׂר** is hard to say, since the stem **שׂוּר** is a *hapax legomenon*. Josephus believed it to mean "oppose," while Symmachus, Aquila and Onkelos derived it from **שָׂרַר**, "to rule." It is, at all events, clear that none of these interpreters had any other stems than *sarâh* and *sarûr* in mind. If one were to solve the Gordian knot by the usual method of emendation, it might be suggested that we read as follows:

נִשְׂרָאֵל מְלַכְתּוֹ וְזָכַל בָּכָה וְיִתְחַנְקֵלּוּ

This could be rendered, by pointing **נִשְׂרָאֵל**, from **נִשְׂרָאֵל**, Assy. *našâru*:

And he prevented God from going; He wept, and (God) forgave him.

However, this is dangerous, not least because of the secondary meaning of *našâru*, properly "to check, reduce," which we would have to assume. It is better to leave the stichos unexplained, except to insist that **אֵל** is not the preposition, but means "God," since the play on the name **יִשְׂרָאֵל** can hardly be accidental.

The second and third explanations of the name listed by Sachsse, those given by Josephus, Symmachus, Aquila and Onkelos, have already been mentioned, and need not be repeated. The fourth is the well-known patristic analysis of **יִשְׂרָאֵל** as **אֵל יִשׂרָאֵל**, which is first found in Philo. For centuries no scholars have taken it seriously. The fifth explanation is that of Jerome (who inveighs against it in another place, however), who derived the verbal element from *yašâr*, "to be straight, right." Since the sibilant is entirely different, we should hardly be justified in taking this view into consideration at all, were it not for the fact that it was adopted by Renan, from whom it has come down to more recent students, including Sachsse himself and Sellin, as already noted. The former makes no attempt, however, to justify the change in sibilant, apparently not regarding it as important. It is true that there are dialectic variations and loan-words which occasionally produce apparent violations of the laws regarding the sibilants in Semitic,⁹ but in this case

⁹ As an illustration of the importance of a correct treatment of the sibilants cf. the writer's review of Bauer, *Die Ostkanaanäer*, *Archiv für Orientforschung*, vol. III, pp. 123ff. The subject of loan-words is only

there can be no question of a loan-word, or of a dialectic peculiarity, since "Israel" is the name of the entire people, and not that of a remote or insignificant subdivision of it.

Coming down to recent times, we find that virtually all the old explanations are abandoned. In his work, *Die israelitischen Eigennamen*, written more than fifty years ago, Nestle pointed out that the divine element in theophorous names is always subject, and never the object. It is true that, as Sachsse observes, there is an occasional exception, like *Yehallel-el* (2 Chr. 29 12), in Hebrew, but the exception only proves the rule. In Accadian we also have the same rule, also with a few exceptions, like *Atānah-ili*, "I cry unto the gods," an exceedingly popular name in the third millennium and the beginning of the second. But, of course, no personal name could ever mean "He contends with God," so the old popular etymology must drop out. All later students recognize this and follow Nestle's position that the divine name is the sub-

beginning to be studied scientifically on the foundations laid by Fränkel, Haupt and Zimmern. A very fine illustration of the results of a sound method is the case of the Heb. *šir*, "poem," long thought by many scholars to have some anomalous etymological connection with Arabic *šir*, "poem." The true explanation of the relation was discovered by Zimmern, who found that there was an Old Babylonian (Accadian) word *širu*, *šēru*, "stanza, poem," which is the regular equivalent of Arabic *šir*. The Hebrew word has simply been derived from the Accadian. But at what time? Since the Babylonian sibilants, which are identical with the Canaanite (Phoenician and probably North Israelite; the Jewish series has a *šin*, pronounced like the Aramaic equivalent, *samek*; cf. *JPOS* VI, 83) were reversed in the Assyrian dialect, it follows that *šir* was borrowed from Babylonian, not from Assyrian. But the specifically Assyrian, or North Mesopotamian pronunciation of the sibilants is known from the cuneiform transcriptions of Egyptian words and other sources to go far back into the second millennium, if it is not even older in part than the Babylonian. It thus covers not only the age of the Assyrian Empire, when northern influences were dominant in Syria and Palestine, but also the Late Bronze Age, when the West was under the sway of the Hurri culture of North Mesopotamia. The natural conclusion is that the word *šir* was borrowed in the Old Accadian or Old Babylonian age; that is, before 1800 B. C., since it cannot have been borrowed as late as the Neo-Babylonian period, the only other one in which Babylonian influence prevailed over North Mesopotamian.

ject. Nestle and most of his successors render "Gott kämpft." Against this a number of arguments may, however, be brought. In the first place, as we have seen, there is no evidence for any rendering of *šārāh* except "to vie with, to contend in rivalry." It probably does not mean "to wrestle," and there is no basis whatever for the view that the story of the wrestling is aetiologically drawn from the name *ישראל*. In all likelihood the story of the wrestling is derived from a natural popular etymology of the name "Jabbok," as though it were *יַבְבֵּק* instead of *יַבֵּק*.¹⁰ The verb *יַבֵּק* is the very word used of the wrestling match on the banks of the Jabbok. If, as we have seen, the first element of the name "Israel" bore a related meaning, it is only natural that the name was connected with the story, but this is no indication that they were originally related. Now, returning to Nestle's theory, it is impossible to translate the name "God contends (in rivalry)," since God has no rivals with whom to contend. Such a name is unparalleled, and, so far as the writer can see, almost unthinkable.

Eduard Meyer's slight modification of Nestle's view, found in his *Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, p. 252, does not affect the theory. He renders "Der, welcher streitet, ist Gott," emphasizing the detachability of the verbal element, which in the early period is often found without the divine name. Morphologically, Meyer's interpretation is forced, since the imperfects were used alone as hypocoristica, perhaps in part because of a certain fear of using the divine name too freely, or in unpropitious ways. But it cannot be denied that the imperfects did assume an independent value as the statement of a quality or a characteristic, and were used commonly as divine appellations by themselves, so that Meyer's view is largely justified. But it does not help the case to render "He who contends (in rivalry) is God."

The suggestion of Vollers, *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, Vol. IX (1906), pp. 176-184, that *ישראל* is to be connected with *šārā*, "to shine," and means "God shines," with especial reference to the solar character of the early Hebrew religion,

¹⁰ See Nathaniel Schmidt, *JBL* XLV (1926), 273.

is of a different type. Sachsse's objection that *šārâ* does not actually mean "to shine, of the sun" in Arabic is hardly valid, since the related stems listed above do have this specific meaning, which, moreover, survives in a secondary use in Arab. *šārâ*, "to expose to the sun." But it is rare in early Semitic to find natural phenomena referred to in theophorous names, which are nearly always social or individual in their applications. Moreover, the solar religion of the early Hebrews is only an unprovable assumption, just as obscure as their supposed lunar inclinations, and not nearly so easy to establish as an original Hadad or Storm-Baal cult.

Having gone through the list of previous views, Sachsse proceeds to analyze the vocalization of the name **יִשְׂרָאֵל**. Here he is quite unsuccessful, though he has given us some useful suggestions, which will be duly appreciated. We shall have to go our own way, however.

The vocalization of **יִשְׂרָאֵל** in **א** is not directly paralleled in any other name. Otherwise the rule is that the second consonant in the stem of an imperfect which precedes the substantive element in a compound name receives a *šewâ* when the verb is **לִי**, **לִי** or **לִי**. We should expect the pointing **יִשְׂרָאֵל***. As examples of this rule we may cite **יִבְרָאֵל** and **יִחְזָאֵל** for **לִי** verbs in composition, **יִרְפָּאֵל** for **לִי** verbs, and **יִרְעָאֵל** for **לִי** verbs. There is at least one interesting case where a **לִי** verb is treated in the same way, which is only natural. This is **יִבְרָאֵם**, for **Yibil'am* < **Yâbil-'am*. In a paper to appear in *AJSL*, attention has been called to this name, in connection with the explanation of *Bildad* as standing for **Yabil-dad*, like *Bi'am* for *Yabil-'am*. Among the Amorite names of the First Dynasty of Babylon we also find the name *Yabil-werra*, literally "Wêr (the name of Hadad or Rammân in the Upper Euphrates country) produces (crops, offspring)." In hypocoristic formations the imperative often replaces the full imperfect and even the jussive, itself essentially of the same nature when found in proper names.¹¹

There are some exceptions to the general rule which has

¹¹ Cf. *Annual of Am. School of Or. Res.*, Vols. II—III, p. 24, n. 10.

been given in the previous paragraph. We have one name which is really a good parallel to **יִשְׂרָאֵל**, but which differs from it superficially, in that the vowel of the second syllable of the imperfect is protected by the final 'ayin: **יִשְׂרָאֵלְיָ**. The Chronicler also offers a number of cases where a *yôd* is inserted, e. g.: **יִשְׂרָאֵלְיָ**, **יִשְׂרָאֵלְיָ**, **יִשְׂרָאֵלְיָ**. Sachsse very correctly observes that these anomalous spellings are due to the fact that the Chronicler wrote at the time when *plene* writing was coming into general use, and the later redactors, following their custom of respecting whatever was in the text, did not disturb them, though they did not insert the *yôd* in corresponding names in other parts of the Bible which had received their final form before the Chronicler's time. When the Massorettes came to vocalize the text, they naturally had to follow the consonantal text. Sachsse thinks that the form *yigli'el* is, therefore, older than the Massoretic *yigle'el*. In this view he is certainly wrong, since the former vocalization is wholly out of harmony with the development of Hebrew morphology, and the Greek transcriptions prove, as we shall see, that the final vowel of the verbal element had an *a* coloring, not an *i* coloring at all. The fact that the transcriptions in **6** of the *yigli'el* type of name in Chronicles also exhibit an *i* only confirms the age of the *plene* spelling; the Greek scribes behaved just as the Massorettes did later when confronted with the same situation. The true explanation of these forms in the Chronicler's work is simply that he wrote in an Aramaic milieu,¹² before the Hebrew reaction was strong enough to be thoroughly self-conscious, and so he employed numerous Aramaic name-forms. Nothing could be simpler or clearer.

The explanation of the *a* vowel in *Yisrā'el* is furnished by a study of the Septuagintal and Hexaplaric transcriptions of the *šewā* in names of this type. Thus **6** writes *Ισραηλ*, but also *Ιεζραηλ*; *Ιβλααμ* (A) and *Ιεβλααμ* (so for the *Εκβλααμ*, etc., of B), as well as *Βαλααμ* for the shortened form **עֲבָלָם**; *Ιερφαηλ*, to give only a few clear examples. Just what this

¹² For the date of the Chronicler see *JBL* XL, 104 ff, and *JPOS* VI, 98 ff.

means is explained by the careful analysis of the new Hexaplaric transcriptions which has been published by Margolis.¹³ According to this it is only when the *šewâ* is followed by a laryngeal that we have an *a* vowel in Greek, as in βαεζραθι for יִצְחָקָה, λααβδ for לְעָבָד, and so on. The fact is that we have only the elements 'ēl and 'ām, as well as yāhū, after the imperfect verb in composite names of the type we are interested in. The first two begin with laryngeals, while the third begins with a *y*, which habitually assimilates a preceding vowel, so is not of value for this study.

From the preceding paragraph it becomes clear that our *šewâ* had an *a* coloring before a weak laryngeal in the pre-Massoretic age, from the third century B. C. to the third century A. D., regardless of whether it belonged originally to a יִצְחָקָה, לְעָבָד or יִצְחָקָה imperfect. The latter case proves conclusively that it is a secondary development under the influence of the laryngeal. Under the influence of Aramaic the Massorettes reduced what then amounted to a short *a* vowel in an open syllable to *šewâ*, except in the case of the two best known, and constantly used names, *Yisrā'el* and *Yišmā'el*, where the *a* was so well established that it could not be eliminated easily, and was, therefore changed to tone-long *a*, or *qāmes*, the only other possibility in the Massoretic system.

The Massorettes have preserved the *a* vowel correctly in a number of clipped forms, that is, in hypocoristica with the substantive element dropped, but with its original presence still betrayed by the vocalization. We are referring to such personal names as יִרְחָה, יִצְחָה, יִמְנָה, יִמְלָה, יִתְחָה, etc., the vocalization of which is supported by the Greek *Ierua*, *Iouda*, etc. The original names from which they have been clipped were naturally **Yôr^a'el* > **Yôr^a'ēl*, **Y^ehūd^a'el* > **Y^ehūd^a'ēl*, etc. Had they been preserved we should have had the Septuagintal spelling **Iωραηλ* and **Iουδαηλ*, while the Massorettes would have given us יִרְחָה* and יִצְחָה*, or more probably, in the latter case, on the analogy of יִשְׂרָאֵל, יִתְחָה*. By the side of

¹³ In his paper, "The Pronunciation of the יִצְחָה according to New Hexaplaric Material," *AJSL* XXVI (1909-10), p. 66.

these clipped forms there are in Chronicles some Aramaizing ones like יָנַי , which are strictly on a par with the well-known Aramaizing hypocoristica *Yannai* for *Yōnatān* and *Honnai* for *Yōhanān*, etc., which become so common in the Macca-baeen age.

The attempts of Sachsse and Caspari to explain the *a* vowel in *Yisrā'ēl* are no better than De Lagarde's suggestion in his *Bildung der Nomina*, p. 131, endorsed and further complicated by Caspari.¹⁴ De Lagarde maintained that the length of the vowel was due to an archaic preservation of the original verbal form of the *rāḏiya-yardā* (**šāriya-yašrā*) type in names of important eponymous heroes. Sachsse's objection is mainly that commonly used names are just as likely to exhibit advanced phonetic decay as artificially retained archaism. He forgets, however, that Biblical forms tend to show a conscious, literary archaism, which would be most likely to appear in important names, where the tradition was best preserved. He rather evades the question of the *a* vowel by telling us (p. 5): "Das *jiqtol* von יִשְׂרָאֵל - יִשְׂרָאֵל [!], verschmolzen mit dem Gottesnamen יְהוָה ergibt יִשְׂרָאֵל ohne weiteres." This remarkable statement is maintained by showing that apocopated names of *jiqtol* form regularly have the vocalization *i*-*a*, except in a few archaic forms like יַעֲקֹב and יִשְׁבָּח . He neglects, however, to make a distinction between the *qāmeš* which represents a tone-long *pataḥ* and the *qāmeš* which represents short *o*, properly a *qāmeš haṭūf*, though the Massoretic system is far from consistent in its treatment of the short *o*. That these forms were originally clipped from the full composite names, and preserve the shortened vocalization, has been shown above. With their shortened vocalization they became indistinguishable from jussive forms, and were actually treated as such.¹⁵ One

¹⁴ Caspari has not only cited the wrong page of De Lagarde's book, but he has completely misunderstood him. On p. 196 of his article he ascribes to him the extraordinary view "daß der Name Israel noch lange als Satz, aus Subjekt und Prädikat, also zwei Worten, bestehend, aufgefaßt worden sei." Such treatment is unjust to a very great scholar.

¹⁵ See *JBL* XLIII, 373.

cannot, however, extend the analogy of strong verbs and verbs *tertiaie laryngalis* to verbs *tertiaie infirmae* "ohne weiteres," without being guilty of the most serious philological *non sequitur*. Caspari, on the other hand, while completely misunderstanding De Lagarde, correctly insists on the comparison of *Ιερφαναλ*. It is only strange that he did not cite the Arabic personal name *Yarfā* (يَرْفَا),¹⁶ a hypocoristicon from **Yarfā'u*, where the intransitive verb is actually formed on the model required by De Lagarde for *Yisrā'el*. Of course, we are only setting up this parallel in order to tear it down; in Arabic *yārdā* stands for **yārday(a)*, and originated probably in the elision of intervocalic *yōd* in the subjunctive. In Hebrew final *ay* in the imperfect became *ê* (written as an open *segôl* with *hê*), which prevailed over the **i* and **û* of the regular transitive imperfects of verbs *וָיָ* and *וָיָ*.

Having disposed of the *וָיָ* of *אֱל*, we are free to derive the verb from *וָיָ* (= *srw* or *sr̄y*), *וָיָ** (= *sr'*), or *וָיָ** (*wsr*). In discussing the semantics of the Hebrew stem *šarāh* = Arab. *šarā*, we have made it improbable that *Yisrā'el* can be derived from it, since neither the meaning "He contends (in rivalry) with God," nor the better "God contends (in rivalry)" is at all acceptable. If we assume that the verb developed the general meaning "to fight," which is quite without evidence, we still find ourselves faced with a very unusual meaning for an ancient Semitic theophorous name, quite without parallel, so far as the writer knows. Even the elaborate and more or less relevant discussion of Caspari, in the paper to which we have often referred, only succeeds in impressing, not in convincing.

No verb *וָיָ* appears to be known, either in Hebrew or in the other Semitic tongues, so we have only the one alternative *wsr*, which has something to be said in its favor, both morphologically and semantically. If it is the true source of the imperfect in which we are interested, we should expect an

¹⁶ For this and similar names cf. the interesting paper of Bräu, *Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vol. XXXII (1926), especially p. 89.

original **Yašir-'el*, later becoming **Yišir-'el* > **Y^šir-'el* > *Yišr-'el*, by a perfectly normal and regular Hebrew development, like *Yibt^š-ām* for original **Yabitām*. The loss of the short vowel between the second and third stem-consonants of the verb is ancient, being paralleled by the old West Semitic name *Binahme-el*, by dissimilation for **Minahme-el*, for **Minahhim-el*, like Heb. *Y^šrahme'el* for **Yirahhim-'el*.¹⁷ Originally it was naturally due to the elision of the 'alef in ordinary conversation, leading to the pronunciation **Minahmêl*, **Y^šrahmêl*. Since the separate force of the element 'el was always fully understood, this elision of the 'alef remained sporadic, and never attained the rank of a phonetic law, as we see plainly by the fact that the 'alef gave the *šewâ* an *a* coloring in later times. By the side of **Yašir-'el* we should expect some indication of a shorter form **Sir-'el*, based on the imperative, like *Bišām* for *Yibt^š-ām*, *Šefar-ām* for **Yišpar-ām*, *Qabš^š-el* for *Y^šqabš^š-el*, *Hišqiyâhû* for *Y^šhišq^š-yâhû*, etc. As a matter of fact, we do have this very form in Assyrian transcription, just as we have *Y^šhûd*, the shorter form of the name *Y^šhûdâh*, also preserved (see below) in Assyrian spelling. In the inscriptions of Shalmaneser III, the mention of the name of Ahab is followed by the gentilic *Sir-'i-la-a-a*, i. e., *Sir'ilâ'a*, the man of Sir'il. Since the Assyrians pronounced the Accadian š as *s*, and *s* as š,¹⁸ the actual pronunciation of the word was *Šir'il* or *Šir'el*. The sibilant in the corresponding Hebrew word could be either ש or שׁ, since both are transcribed *s*, i. e., š, in Assyrian.¹⁹

¹⁷ See *Archiv für Orientforschung*, Vol. III, p. 125 b.

¹⁸ Cf. the ample material collected by Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names*, especially the introduction, p. xviii, and Delaporte, *Épigraphes araméens*. Cf. also the remarks *JEA* XII, 187.

¹⁹ See *JBL* XLIII, 386, and for the explanation of the apparent difficulty *JPOS* VI, 83: in Northern Israel the three *šins* all fell together, as in Babylonian and especially in Phoenician, with which the dialect of Samaria seems to have been essentially identical. In Judah the *šin* was pronounced as *samek*, following Aramaic practise (perhaps due to the fact that the South Judaean tribes actually spoke an Aramaic dialect, as we know from the Shishak List and the traces which have survived of the Edomite language). The Jews were, however, forced to preserve the *šin* because of the powerful influence of

The decision between them is a matter for the Hebraist to decide, and he has not the least difficulty, in spite of Sachsse. Caspari has correctly compared the Assyrian form to the reduced Hebrew names just cited, but without understanding it fully. It is possible that *Šir'il* stands for **Š^r'el*, containing the imperative of a verb *tertiaae infirmae*, but in this case the spelling **Si-ri-'i-la-a-a* would be expected. In any case it is impossible to compare *Sir'ilā'a* directly with the Heb. gentile *Yisr'ēli*.²⁰ It is by far the most natural to compare **Šir'el* with *Bi'am*, and to regard the element *šir* as the regular imperative of a stem *wšr*, just as *bil* is the imperative of *wbl*. Sachsse's reconstructed **Y'šar'el* exhibits an *a* vowel which is not found in the Assyrian transcription, and is hence quite arbitrary. His further attempt to prove from the Egyptian syllabic spelling in the Merneptah Stèle that there was a vowel between the *s* and the *r* is quite misleading, as correctly pointed out by Caspari, though the effort of the latter to prove from Burchardt that the writing proves just the opposite is equally misleading. As is becoming increasingly certain, now that we know something about the prehistory of the syllabic orthography, and find that Max Müller's derivation of it from cuneiform was wrong, after all, neither vowels nor lack of them are indicated in the Egyptian transcriptions of foreign names. The writing of the sibilant as *s* (bar) in the hieroglyphic form of the name does not prove anything either, since the Egyptians followed Hebrew (Canaanite) and Amorite use of the sibilants quite indiscriminately in their transcriptions.²¹

We have thus made it probable, though not certain, that the original form of the name *Yisrā'el* was **Yasir-'el*, from a verbal stem *wsr*. The usual meaning of this stem in the Semitic languages is "to cut, saw," which is not suitable, and

the historical spelling, which had come to them from the more literary North.

²⁰ As has been done by most scholars; cf. Brown, Briggs and Driver, *Hebrew Lexicon*, s. v., and the writer, *JBL* XLIII, 386. The mere fact that the Assyrians employed their own gentile shows that they were not trying to reproduce the Hebrew gentile.

²¹ Cf. *JPOS* VI, 82, n. 15.

has no semantic modifications which fit our requirements. However, we have seen that Arab. *nāšara* for **wāšara* and Eth. *šarāya* share the significance "to heal (the sick)." Interchange between stems *primae waw* and *tertiæ infirmæ* has been common in Semitic from the earliest times, being just as frequent in Egyptian²² as in the Semitic tongues of Asia, so there is no difficulty here. The fact that the stem **yašār* is not found in Biblical Hebrew is rather in favor of the combination, since its disappearance would explain how the meaning of the name came to be so thoroughly forgotten. "God heals" is a meaning which may be closely paralleled in all the Semitic languages; one need only refer to the familiar Hebrew names *Yirpe'el* and *Rafā'el*. Even if we accept the derivation of *Yisrā'el* from a verb *šarāh*, we may translate it in the same way, following Ethiopic *šarāya* directly; cf. the name *šerāyāh*.

If the original meaning of the name "Israel" was "God heals," it follows that it was not primarily a tribal name, as has been often thought, but a personal name, the name of the founder of the tribe, whose later members regarded themselves as his offspring, the *Benē Yisrā'el*. It therefore becomes impossible to regard the name as one assumed by the followers of Moses in Transjordan. The name is pre-Mosaic, and, to judge from the traditions in Genesis, the tribal chief *Yisrā'el* replaced the tribal chief *Ya'qob* during the Patriarchal Age. In both cases we may, equally well, say "tribe" instead of "tribal chief."

B. THE NAME "JUDAH"

The name "Judah," **יְהוּדָה**, is generally considered as decidedly obscure. Certainly one does not gain much confidence as to its etymology from the perusal of the rare attempts which have been seriously made to explain it fully. The lexicographers are usually contented either with a *non liquet* or with a question mark after their "explanation." And yet there is nothing mysterious about the form, as will appear

²² Cf. *Recueil de Travaux*, Vol. XL, pp. 69, 71.

on a careful analysis and comparison of related forms. It is, however, quite true that the explanation of the form is not altogether obvious; at least the writer is not willing to consider it as such on recollection of the devious paths by which he came to his present view, and the erroneous interpretations with which he dallied. So far as we know there has not been any recent discussion of the subject, so we shall have to collect our own list of explanations, without, however, trying to make it as complete as has been done by Sachse, in his discussion of the name "Israel."

We may distinguish seven explanations of the name יהודה, which have been proposed, beginning with biblical times. Two of these are already found in the book of Genesis. In connection with the birth of Judah, Leah is represented as saying (29 34) הַפַּעַם אֲחַדָּה אֶת יְהוָה, "This time I will praise Yahwêh." In the blessing of Jacob, Judah, not God, is made the object of the blessing:

יְהוָה — אֵתָה יְדוּךְ אֲחִיךָ יָד בְּעַרְףְּ אֹיְבֶיךָ

Judah: Thou, thy brethren will praise thee,

While thy hand is on the neck of thy foes.

There is a double paronomasia, once with the verb *yôdû*, and again with the noun *yâd* (also pronounced *yôd*). The old explanations are all based on one or the other of these two, and the verb is taken, sometimes as active, sometimes as passive. Up to recently the standard explanation, found in most handbooks, was "Praised(?)." So far as I know, the only serious attempt which has been made to explain the vocalization is that of Haupt, *OLZ* XII, 162 f., *ZDMG* LXIII (1909), 513, n. 1. According to him *Yehûdâh* is a feminine collective of **Yehôdêh*, "Er bekennt," in the sense "He acknowledges allegiance to the religion (of Yahwêh)." **Yehôdêh* is the older form corresponding to the later participle *môdêh*, just as the name *Me'ir* represents older *Yâ'ir*. The expression מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה is really equivalent to the Arabic *'amîr al-mu'minîn*, "Commander of the Faithful." For the feminine collective Haupt compared GK (Gesenius-Kautzsch) § 122s, while for the vocalization *û* instead of the *ô* which we should expect he

referred to GK § 27 n and Brockelmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, I, 143 d. The obvious objection to this extremely ingenious explanation is its artificiality. We do not find names which show any such development in early Western Asia, nor do we find a feminine abstract (or collective) employed as a tribal name. Moreover, it is dangerous to consider the *û* in such a common and well-known name as *Yehûdâh* as being a corruption of *ô*; there can be no question of dissimilation here.

In 1893 (*JBL* XII, 61-72), Morris Jastrow Jr., then at the very outset of his scholarly career, discussed the name in full, though he unfortunately based his treatment upon the erroneous reading of the tribal name "Judah" in the Amarna Tablets. However, his views were original, and are still worthy of consideration. On pp. 68 ff. he discussed the original and derived forms of the name. He pointed out correctly that the Assyrian transliteration *Ya-u-du* can only be the equivalent of *Y'hûd* (see below), which is not an Aramaic form, as formerly believed. He also called attention to some old place and personal names which are connected with *Y'hûd*, Judah, but since they will all be taken up in due course, we need not dwell on them here. He was, however, inclined to think that, while *Y'hûd* and *Y'hûdâh* might be originally connected, they are distinct names, belonging probably to distinct tribes, an older one in Northern Palestine and a younger in Southern Palestine. The names were later confounded in form because of the common gentile *Y'hûdî*. He was inclined also to consider *Y'hûdâh* as a contraction of the name *Yâhû* and some verbal element, either *yûdâh* (from יָדָה, but the form is not explained), or *dâ'âh*, found in *El-dâ'âh*. For a **Yahû-yûdâh* he compared the similar contraction in *Y'hûkûl*, for **Yahû-yûkâl*. This is very ingenious; the writer also first tried to explain the name as either **Yahû-yûdêh*, or preferably **Yahû-hûdâh*, which would become directly **Yahûdâh*, by the simplest type of haplogy. However, there is a much better explanation of the name, as we shall see, so it is not necessary to resort to philological gymnastics at all.

In *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, p. 441, Eduard Meyer connected *Y'hûdâh* with the noun *hûd*, "majesty," and

rendered the name "Er ist majestätisch." *Y'hūdāh*, he thought, stood for **Y'hūdāh-'ēl*, a view in which he was entirely correct, as we shall see. With his usual clear-sightedness Meyer recognized that the previous explanations were defective, and found one which suited ancient nomenclature better, though it must be confessed that he rather passed over the philological exegesis of the name.

We need not linger on the theories which have been advanced from time to time, connecting the name יְהוּדָה with the name of the district יָבֵדָה, perhaps the Assyrian Yaudi, in Northern Syria. Some of these scholars regard the name as Semitic, others as non-Semitic, while still others connect the name *Yahwēh*, or *Yāhū* with it. None of them have, of course, been propounded by Semitic philologists, and they all serenely disregard scientific method.

The name יְהוּדָה is supported in its vocalism by the Greek transcriptions 'Ιούδας for the patriarch, and 'Ιούδα for the tribe and kingdom. These transcriptions indicate that the historic spelling no longer represents the actual pronunciation, which was rather contracted to *Yūdāh*, just as we should expect from such parallels as *Yō* from *Yāhū* and *yōdēh* from *y'hōdēh*. As we have already noted, there is not the least evidence for a possible pronunciation **Y'hōdāh*, as assumed by Haupt. The Assyrian transcription *Yaudu* (*Ya-u-du*) can only reflect an actual pronunciation *Yahūd* or *Y'hūd*, as correctly seen in 1893 by Jastrow (cf. above). That *Yaudu* does not represent a possible *Y'hūdāh* or *Y'hūdāh* is shown by such cuneiform transcriptions as *Ta-am-na-a*, *Tamnā*,²³ for Heb. *Timnāh*, properly *Tamnāh*, like the *Thamna* of the Greek. Were the name Phoenician or North Palestinian we should have the transcription *Tamnāt*, but in Judah and Philistia the feminine ending was early changed to *āh*, as proved both by the Egyptian and the Assyrian transcriptions; cf. Eg. *Rbn* for *Libnāh*.²⁴ A form *Y'hūdāh* would have to

²³ Taylor Cylinder of Sennacherib, II, 83.

²⁴ See Max Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, Vol. II, p. 114. That *Rbn* is *Libnāh* near Ekron follows from the fact that it precedes the latter in this very list. The Shishak List shows a number of very

be transcribed *Ya-u-da-a*, i. e., *Yaudâ* (which must not be confused with the gentilec *Ya-u-da-a-a*, *Yaudâ'a*, found several times in the Assyrian texts). In the period of the Late Assyrian inscriptions the case endings had long since disappeared, and the use of an apparent nominative ending in *Yaudu* means nothing, since it was not pronounced. This is not the place to discuss the possible form *Yaudi*, supposed by most scholars to refer to the North Syrian state of *YN*, when it occurs in the inscriptions of Tiglathpileser III. Luckenbill has recently given a strong argument in favor of the identification of *Yaudi* with Judah,²⁵ as maintained by all students down to the time of Winckler, but the question is still very obscure. At all events, a possible variant form *Yaudi* would not affect our results in the least, because of the negligible character of the case endings, as just noted.

What is the relation between the forms *Y^ehûdâh* and *Y^ehûd*? It is at first sight tempting to accept the suggestion of Jastrow, that the names are connected through the common gentilec *Y^ehûdî*, formed regularly by both *Y^ehûdâh* (like Arab. *Makkah*, *Makkîy*; Accad. *Subartu*, *Subarû*; Heb. *Timnâh*, *Timnî*) and *Y^ehûd*. Jastrow thought that the two distinct names were thrown together by the common gentilec. It would be more likely that *Y^ehûd* arose as a secondary back-formation, like **Šilôn* from *Šilôh* through the gentilec *Šilôni*; cf. Arab. *Seilan* from **Šilôn*. Another parallel would be the development of *Efrât* from *Efráyim* through the gentilec *Efrâti*. The phenomenon is very common, and many additional examples might easily be given. But this explanation is not necessary, as we shall see.

The explanation of the form *Y^ehûdâh* is rendered simpler if we compare some other ancient personal names containing a similar verbal element. From early Hebrew history two very interesting names have come down to us: '*Ammîhûd*, mentioned Num. 1 10, etc., as the name of the father of *Elisâmâ*', official

striking differences in the phonetic system of Hebrew when compared to the lists of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. For one thing, the old *h* and *h̄* have fallen together, becoming *h*, as has been the situation ever since; cf. *JPOS* VI, 62.

²⁵ "Azariah of Judah," *AJSL* XLI, 217-232.

representative of Ephraim in the time of Moses; *Abihûd*, the name of one of the sons (later clans) of Bela' son of Benjamin. We may divide these names so as to obtain from them a noun *hûd*, which might be identical with *hôd*, "majesty," but the names cannot mean "My people is majesty," and "My father is majesty." It is, therefore, only left to us to analyze the names so as to yield verb-forms: **Ammi-yhûd* and **Abi-yhûd*. Since these forms would, of course, be contracted to the present Hebrew forms, there is no difficulty whatsoever in the way of accepting them. They are clearly jussives of the unused *hof'al* of *hōdâh*, "to praise." In order to bring these forms clearly before our minds, it may be well to present the relevant paradigms of *hōdâh* and the parallel verb *hōrâh*, "to instruct in *tôrâh*," in a skeleton table. The etymology of the verbs will be elucidated in the excursus to this paper.

	<i>Hif'ûl</i>		<i>Hof'âl</i>	
Perfect	הִתְּהַלַּח	הִתְּהַלַּח	הִתְּהַלַּח*	הִתְּהַלַּח*
Imperfect	{ הִתְּהַלַּח הִתְּהַלַּח	הִתְּהַלַּח	{ הִתְּהַלַּח* הִתְּהַלַּח*	הִתְּהַלַּח*
Jussive	{ תִּתְּהַלַּח* תִּתְּהַלַּח*	תִּתְּהַלַּח*	{ תִּתְּהַלַּח* תִּתְּהַלַּח*	תִּתְּהַלַּח*

From this table it will be seen that *yhûd* is the regular uncontracted *hof'al* jussive of *hōdâh*, and the names *'Ammihûd* and *Abihûd* must, accordingly, mean, respectively, "Let my people be praised, Let my father be praised." The uncontracted imperfect of the *hof'al* would be *yhûdeh*, and its Massoretic form in composition with 'el would be *הִתְּהַלַּח**, which would appear in the Greek spelling of the Septuagintal period as **Ioudaηλ*. Above, in our discussion of the Massoretic form of the name *הִתְּהַלַּח*, Greek *Ισραηλ*, we showed that the *qames* in that name is simply the pretonic lengthening of the traditional short *a* vowel, which originated in the influence of the weak laryngeal 'alef upon the preceding *šewâ*, giving it an *a* coloring, as proved conclusively by the Septuagintal and Hexaplaric material. When hypocoristica were formed from composite names of this type, the clipped imperfects retained the *a* coloring,

which was lengthened to *qāmeš* under the tone, as in *Yôrâh* and *Yôšâh*, etc. This is the natural explanation of the final long *a* in *Y^ehûdâh*, and the definitive proof as well that *Y^ehûdâh* is a hypocoristicon of **Y^ehûd^e'êl*, which means either "God is praised," or more probably "Let God be praised." Passive verbs are not nearly so common in proper names as are actives, but this is naturally true of the Hebrew language in general. There are a number of passive verbs in proper names, besides the *'Ammîhûd* and *Abîhûd* just cited. We also have *Yefunnêh* (a *pu' al*, which should perhaps be vocalized **Yefunnâh*, however) and especially the group of town names (originally personal names) ending in *'êl* and *'âm*: *Yoqn^e'âm*, *Yorq^e'âm* and *Yoqd^e'âm* (though the two latter are probably identical, and should be read *Yoqr^e'âm*),²⁶ *Yoqt^e'êl*. *Yoqn^e'âm* appears in 6 as *Ιεκυαμ*, which suggests a vocalization as *Yiqn^e'âm*, literally "The people acquires,"²⁷ but the other forms are probably correctly vocalized.

The town name *Y^ehûd* in Dan is frequently quoted as connected in some way with *Y^ehûdâh*. This is, however, erroneous, since a critical study of the versions, in connection with the outside topographical material, shows that the Massoretic text is wrong. 6 offers *Aζωρ* (B), which has reminded both Alt and the writer independently of the Assyrian *Azuru*, modern *Yazûr* near Jaffa.²⁸ We should read in the Hebrew text *יזר*^{*} and in 6 **Iaζωρ*. Since the situation of the town is even more suitable to the sequence in the lists of Danite towns than is the site of *el-Yahûdiyeh*, formerly identified with "Jehud," this correction is absolutely certain. In passing it may be observed that it is an excellent illustration of the great value of the Septuagintal text for the study of Palestinian topography. When some new studies of the writer have been published, probably not until after the appearance of Margolis's edition of the Greek Joshua,

²⁶ The name *Yoqn^e'âm* would mean "The people is called (invited)," *sc.* to settle, or the like, which offers a perfectly fitting significance; the present forms of 6 are unintelligible, and 6 does not seem to help.

²⁷ *Annual*, II-III, 24, n. 10.

²⁸ See *Palästinajahrbuch*, Vol. XXI (1925), p. 54.

its importance will be even more evident than has previously been the case.²⁹

It has been shown above that the cuneiform transcription *Ya-u-du* reflects a Hebrew *Y'hûd*, or rather **Y'hûd*, where the coloring of the *šewâ* is due to the influence of the weak laryngeal. *Y'hûd* was evidently the form employed commonly by the pre-exilic Jews in everyday language, and was still used by the Aramaic speaking Jews after the exile, as we know from the Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra, where it is frequent, as well as from the Elephantine Papyri (Sachau 7 : 1). Since *Y'hûd* is not explicable as an Aramaizing of *Y'hûdâh*, it has always been a puzzling form to the student of the relation between Hebrew and Palestinian Aramaic.³⁰ We have, moreover, a perfect parallel in the fact that the jussive form of the divine name *Yahwêh* was ordinarily used by the Aramaic speaking Jews after the exile, as we know from the Elephantine Papyri and the official stamps of the temple treasury from the fourth century B. C.³¹ The jussive *Yâhû* instead of the literary Hebrew *Yahwêh* is exactly on a par with the jussive *Y'hûd* in place of the literary *Y'hûdâh*.

The parallel between the use of *Yahwêh*, *Yâhû* on the one hand, and *Y'hûdâh*, *Y'hûd* on the other is so significant that it will be of importance to insist on the explanation of the development of the name *Yahwêh* which the writer has already given *JBL* XLIII (1924), 370-8, and XLIV, 158-162. In these papers the following process is defended. First of all we have a regular imperfect of the *hif'îl* of the stem *hwy* (Heb. *hayâh*, "to be"), in the sense "He (who) causes to come into existence," like later Hebrew *mehawwêh*. The element *yakin*, "cause to exist, create," is found not infrequently in early West Semitic proper names, just as we find the causatives *šubšû* and *šhÿr*, "to cause to be," employed in Accadian and Egyptian personal

²⁹ See especially the writer's paper "The Topography of the Tribe of Issachar," *ZATW* XLIV, 226 ff.

³⁰ Gesenius-Buhl considers it a back-formation from *Y'hûdî*.

³¹ For the temple seals see *JPOS* VI, 93 ff., especially p. 101. The views here expressed have been endorsed by Vincent; see *Revue Biblique*, 1926, 635 f.

names from early times. *Yahwêh*, however, is not a hypocoristicon, nor a clipped form (which explains why it was not vocalized *Yahwâh*), but is simply a divine name formed on the then common analogy of names of ancestral tribal deities which arose as hypocoristica of composite names with an imperfect verb as the first element. Our stock of similar early West Semitic names is now being materially increased by the Amorite material from Babylonia,³² as well as by the West Semitic names found on broken vases of about 2000 B. C., recently published by Sethe.³³ The form of the name offers no difficulty, since doubly weak words with *waw* as a stem consonant often retain it in Hebrew, and do not change it to *y*, just as in Accadian the *waw* of the early languages is often retained (written as *m* = *w*) in doubly weak verbs and forms, like *emû*, "to be," for **hawâyû*, *emû*, "to speak," for **hawâyû*, etc. That the same is also true of Amorite was shown by the writer recently.³⁴ From *Yahwêh*, the jussive *Yâhû* arose regularly, as in the numerous cases gathered by the writer in the first of his two papers. Above we have explained the interchange of hypocoristica of the imperfect and jussive types as originating in composite names where they fell together. Once the confusion had arisen, it was naturally extended by analogy even to imperfect forms which were not abbreviations, and hence show no traces of clipping. However, it is quite possible that the shorter form *Yâhû* was influenced in its spread by theophorous names in which *Yahwêh* was followed by an imperfect verb. Thus the name **Yahwêyarîb* (*Yôyârîb*), with a *šewâ*, as we have seen in our discussion of the name "Israel," could not be pronounced otherwise than *Yahûyarîb*, since the *šewâ* is naturally absorbed by the following *yôd*.³⁵ When the analogy of the jussive was fortified by the actual occurrence of the form *Yâhû* in proper names, the latter naturally became the usual popular

³² See Bauer, *Die Ostkanaaner*, Leipzig, 1926, and the writer's review, *Archiv für Orientforschung*, Vol. III, pp. 124 ff.

³³ See Sethe, *Abh. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1926, *Phil.-hist. Klasse*, Nr. 5.

³⁴ *Archiv für Orientforschung*, Vol. III, p. 125 a.

³⁵ Bauer-Leander, § 17 e, p. 201.

pronunciation of the name of the God of Israel. We thus find it becoming the regular form of His name, not only among the common Aramaic speaking Jews of Elephantine, but also among the official circles in Jerusalem, as we know from the fact that it was used on the seals of the temple treasury in the fourth century B. C. After the exile it is safe to suppose that all four forms, *Yahwêh* (= Babyl. *Yâwa*, *Ya-a-ma*), *Yâhû*, *Yah* (in the temple liturgies, etc.) and *Yô* or *Yau* were employed together. The form "*Y'hô*" originated with the Massorettes, as the writer pointed out in the two papers referred to above.

The writer's views have been more or less opposed by several scholars recently; we may refer especially to the papers of Burkitt, "On the Name Yahweh" (*JBL XLIV*, 353-6), Driver, "The Aramaic Language" (*JBL XLV*, 323-5) and Waterman, "Method in the Study of the Tetragrammaton" (*AJSL XLIII*, 1-7). The purpose of Burkitt is only to call attention to the theory of Van Hoonacker,³⁶ which he believed the writer to have overlooked. This happens to be wrong; the writer was interested in the philological side, and saw no reason to quote Van Hoonacker, whose view did not happen to be peculiar to that distinguished scholar. According to the latter, the old name *Yâhû*, then thought erroneously to be attested in cuneiform texts of the third millennium, was transformed by Moses in order to bring the idea "to be" into it. The name *Yahwêh*, not a regular form from יהוה, is "the result of the transformation of *Yâhû* on the model of *yihyêh*," which explains the presence of the vowel *a* in the preformative and of *w* instead of the radical *y*. This theory requires no further refutation than a request to compare the remarks in the foregoing paragraph.

G. R. Driver's short paper is devoted to the defense of a thesis which has no particular connection with the title. He maintains that both in Aramaic and in Hebrew *hê* is often a *litera prolongationis*, with no consonantal force, in the middle of a word. According to him such forms are found in Hebrew occasionally as early as the ninth century B. C., יהוה being one, and shortly afterwards in Aramaic as well. Even Aram. כהת

³⁶ *Une communauté judéo-araméenne à Éléphantine*, p. 71.

and **יהוה** are really, he holds, false pronunciations based on misunderstood writing—and in the living language, not in a learned revival! Driver passes over the mass of secondary *h* formations in Arabic and Ethiopic without a word. How thoroughly they are opposed to his results may be seen from the fact that **אֲבְרָהָם**, which is to him a “misinterpretation of *Abhrā(h)m*,” is supported by the Sabaeen name *Yhrhm* (CIS IV, 394a), compared by the editor with Arabic *’ārhamā*, “to drizzle.” Driver’s evolutionary scale for the Israelite divine name has at least the merit of originality: *Yaw* (י) > *Yā(h)w* (יָ) > *Yahw* > *Yāhū* or *Yēhō* > **יהוה** (pronounced *Yāhū*). Even if this development places normal linguistic method upside down, all that is needed in order to obtain perfectly reasonable results is to set it upright again.

Waterman’s analysis of the recent discussion of the Tetragrammaton is quite judicious, aside from his preference for an original **Yahwōh*, ascribed by *lapsus calami* to “Albright,” instead of “Luckenbill.” However, it is a pleasure to read his rational discussion after the paradoxical speculations of the previously quoted scholar.

After this diversion we may return to our consideration of the name “Judah.” As we have seen, the name has an early form, belonging with a group of proper names with passive verbal elements, found only in early personal names, as well as in still earlier place-names. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt that *Y’hūdāh* is a very ancient and probably a pre-Mosaic tribal name.

C. THE ETYMOLOGY OF TÔDÂH AND TÔRÂH

In our discussion of the name “Judah,” we had occasion to study the forms of the verbs *hōdāh* and *hōrāh*, paradigms of which we presented in tabular form. In the course of our investigation it became necessary to form a clear idea of the etymology of the former verb, especially in connection with Meyer’s derivation of *Y’hūdāh* from *hōd*, “glory, majesty.” To subject *hōdāh* to a philological analysis without also studying the closely parallel *hōrāh* would be manifestly unmethodical,

so the latter was also considered. The analysis has been crowned with success, we believe, in both cases, thus settling one of the most elusive problems facing the Hebrew philologist. We refrain from giving a history of the efforts to relate the words to other Semitic words and roots, since this would unduly prolong the excursus and obscure the main subjects of our paper.

Neither *hōdāh* nor *hōrāh* are accompanied by any other conjugations in Hebrew, a fact which itself indicates strongly that they are both denominatives from the corresponding nouns *tōdāh* and *tōrāh*. It is still more striking to find that neither have any cognates among Semitic verbs derived from the stems *wdy* and *ury*, or related stems. The meaning of these stems is in both cases primarily "cast, throw," with various derived senses. It is true that *tōdāh* has been compared to *dī'ah* < *dīyat*, the old Arabic infinitive of the first conjugation of *wādā*, which means "compensation, blood money," while *tōrāh* has been connected with Arab. *rāwā*, "to report a tradition, recite a poem," but the comparisons are equally forced. In Jewish Aramaic we have some loan-words, which later passed into Syriac and Arabic, but despite the curious attitude of Bauer and Leander,³⁷ they are admitted by all other scholars to be loan-words, since they have exactly the same meanings as the Hebrew words, and are totally without Aramaic analogy. From *tōdāh* was borrowed Aramaic and Syriac *taudīṭā*, while *hōdāh* passed over as the *af'el* *ōdī* or *audī*. The reflexive *תתן*, "to give thanks for oneself," is derived from Hebrew *תתן*, and from it comes Arabic *استودى*. From *tōrāh* Jewish Aramaic borrowed **tōraitā*, in the sense "law of Moses," but dissimilated it to *ōraitā*,³⁸ in which form it passed into Syriac, while the undissimilated

³⁷ On pp. 495-6 of their grammar they derive *tōrāh* from **taṣrajat*, comparing *'ōraitā*, and *tōdāh* from **taḏḏijāt*, comparing *taḏḏifā*. The practice of using loan-words to determine the original vocalization of the words from which they have been borrowed is certainly quite foreign to the historical method of the authors, so we may set it down as a slip.

³⁸ Cf. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge*, p. 35, and Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*², p. 49a.

form came into Arabic (long before Mohammed!) as *taurât*, "Old Testament."

Having cleared the ground of encumbrances, we would propose the identification of the word *tôdâh* with Accadian (Assyrian) *tânattu*, later *tânittu* (the usual form), "glory, praise, song of praise," having thus the same meanings exactly as the Hebrew word. Heb. *tôrâh* we would identify with Accadian *têrtu* (for **târtu*, like *eršitu* for **aršatu*, etc.), "commission, command, oracle, especially of hepatoscopy (the oracle *par excellence*)." Haupt and Zimmern long ago tried to explain *tôrâh* as a loan from the late form *têrtu*, comparing the South Arabian pronunciation *mêri* for *môrêh*, "teacher," etc. But there is no parallel, and *tôrâh* is too well attested in early sources to be a loan-word of the time of the Babylonian Exile, as they maintained.

Acc. *tânittu* is derived from the stem *na'âdu*, "to praise," and thus stands for **tan'adatu*; the plural is *tânadâti* (not *tanâdâti*, since there is compensatory lengthening of the first *a*). The stem *na'âdu* appears in Ethiopic as *né'da*, "praise," and Haupt has proposed that the same verb be restored in the Song of Moses.³⁹ Since Ethiopic is not very accurate in its weak laryngeals, and the verb appears in Arabic as *nhd*, "to swell," it is better to trace the Accadian and Hebrew words back to a stem **nahâdu*, especially since we actually have the noun *hôd* in Hebrew. The etymological associations of the stem have been discussed by the writer in *AJSL* XXXIV, 255, in connection with the treatment of Egyptian *dhn*, which may be a transposition of *nhd*. The original form of the word *tânittu* = *tôdâh* is thus **tânhadatu*, with the accent on the first syllable, as is the rule in parent Semitic.⁴⁰ In Assyrian, as in Egyptian, as well as

³⁹ Ex. 15:2 he read 𐤏𐤍𐤁𐤏. In the notes to his reconstruction, *AJSL* XX, 170-2, Haupt collected much of the material from the cognate languages, but forgot to mention *né'da*, which he unquestionably had long combined with *na'âdu*. But it is much more likely that we should read simply 𐤏𐤍𐤁 instead of the 𐤏𐤍𐤁𐤏 of 𐤏𐤍𐤁𐤏, if an emendation is necessary.

⁴⁰ Cf. Brockelmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, I, pp. 72-3; Bauer-Leander, p. 179. While in Classical Arabic there is hardly any stress accent, in parent Semitic there must have been a rather strong accent

some dialects of Modern Arabic, the accent was shifted forward so that it could never fall before the antepenult, counting the case ending, or the penult, disregarding it.⁴¹ The original **tánhadatu* thus became **tan'údatu* > **tánúdtu* (with compensatory lengthening of the first *a* and elision of the short *a* following the accent, in an open syllable) > *tánattu*, *tánittu*. In Hebrew, as in Ethiopic and Aramaic, the accent moved forward to the last syllable, disregarding the original vocalic endings. Accordingly **tánhadatu* became **tanhadát*. But in Hebrew there was always a tendency to assimilate the *nún* to a following consonant, even a laryngeal. The assimilation of *nún* to a following laryngeal is most common in a syllable some distance before the accent, as **יָסִי** for **yi'asip* < **yin'asip* < **yan'asipu*, and **מִיחָאִס** for **mihhaqís* < **minhaqís*. Hence **tanhadát* became **tahhadát* > **táhádát*, and with the elision of an intervocalic *h*, which also is most frequent some distance before the accent, as in **תָּאָדָה** for **תָּאָדָה**, **táädát*, **tádát*, from which *tódáh* is directly derived. Since *tódáh* appears to be a derivative from a **יָד** verb, the denominative *hódáh* was naturally formed on this analogy. As will be seen, there is not the least difficulty in the derivation of *tódáh* from **tánhadatu*; all the changes are perfectly regular.

The fortunes of language have preserved two nouns from the stem **nhd* in Hebrew: *nód*, "skin-bottle" (Assyr. *nádu*), and *hód*, "glory." The word *nód* (**נֹד**) may be a direct loan from Assyrian *nádu*, or it may stand for **nahd*; the Arabic cognate *nahd* means "female breast;" cf. Arab. *naṭb*, which is both "skin-bottle" and "female breast" (*AJSL* XXXIV, 255). Words for "skin-bottle" in Semitic are often derived from verbs meaning "to swell, become large." The second word *hód*, "glory," with a meaning included in that of Assyr. *tánittu*, is probably the infinitive of **הָיָה***, just as *búl*, "produce," properly *ból*, seems to be the infinitive of **בָּלַל** (cf. Assyr. *billu*, the correct old infinitive of *wabálu*, with the same meaning as *búl*). All beginners in

on the long syllable of a word, and on the first syllable when all were short.

⁴¹ For Assyrian (Accadian) see the remarks of the writer in *Revue d'Assyriologie*, Vol. XVI (1919), p. 175 above; for Egyptian *Recueil de Travaux*, Vol. XL (1923), p. 66.

Hebrew are now told that verbs *primae nân* in Hebrew generally follow the analogy of verbs $\Upsilon'D$, so there is no need of explaining this phenomenon here. The forms *hôd* for **n'hôd* and **bôl* for **y'bôl* are presumably due to the analogy of the alternative infinitives **hêdet* (like *gêset*) and **bêlet* (< *biltu*).

Turning to *tôrâh* = *têrtu* we find a decidedly easier problem to solve, since **tâu'aratu*⁴² is by no means so formidable in appearance as **tânhadatu* = *tôdâh*. **Tâu'aratu* became **tau'arât* by the Hebrew accent shift, and the latter form became inevitably **tô'arât*. Between vowels the 'alef is generally elided when one is a semi-vowel (Bauer-Leander, § 25h, p. 224), so **tô'arât* became quite naturally *tôrât*, *tôrâh*. The best parallel is in the Hebrew word for "twins," which appears as *tômîm* (תומים) in Gen. 25 24, and is written elsewhere with the historic spelling תומים and תומים, both pronounced, however, *tômîm*. The former is the correct vocalization, since *tô'amîm* stands, as we shall see presently, for **tau'âmîm*; the later is vocalized on the analogy of תמר, pronounced *bêr* for **bê'r* < *bî'r*. Brockelmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, Vol. I, p. 79, thinks that there were double singular forms, just as in Arabic *tâu'am* and *tu'am*, but the latter is quite secondary, and represents a conformation to the nominal class *fu'âl*, as is shown by the Assyrian *tû'amu*, for **tâu'amu*, parallel to *takšû*, "plural birth," for **tâkša'u*, as shown by the writer in the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, Vol. XVI (1919), p. 193, on No. 46.

⁴² From the stem *wa'âru*, preserved in the first, second and third conjugations, with numerous derivatives, in Accadian. The first, with later infinitive *'âru*, means "to go, in general," while the second, with later infinitive *mu'uru*, means "cause to go, send, bring, commission, rule." The noun *urtu* (for **wa'urtu*, later **wu'urtu*, *'urtu*) has exactly the same meanings as *têrtu*, which is alone enough to prove that *têrtu* really is derived from this stem, as held by all the lexicographers, including Bezold-Götze, despite occasional suggestions such as that *têrtu* may < **tahrirtu* (Haupt), which replaced a much earlier connection by Haupt with Eth. *temhert*. Now that the Old Accadian forms of the stem *wa'âru* have been found, it is no longer possible to combine the later *mu'uru* with the stem מור , as was previously the natural thing to do. The latter is, of course, actually found in Acc. *mâru*, "colt" = Arab. *muhr*, and *mâru*, "child," etc.

The only possible objection that can be raised to the derivations proposed for *tôdâh* and *tôrâh* from the standpoint of the Hebrew grammarian is that one would expect some trace of the historic spelling, at least in the word *tôrâh*. Otherwise the explanations given are inexpugnable, since we have the corresponding Accadian words, with the same meanings precisely, and have excellent Hebrew parallels for every phonetic change required. Bauer and Leander have proved that the 'alef had quiesced in such words as *rôš*, "head," for **ra's*, before the fifteenth century B. C. But the historic spelling with 'alef was retained for two reasons. First, there were probably dialects of Hebrew-Canaanite where the 'alef either did not quiesce, or was restored secondarily. Moreover, all such words have related words or grammatical modifications where the 'alef does not quiesce. Thus *rôš* stands side by side with a plural *râšim*, where the quiescing is proved to be very recent, comparatively speaking, by the fact that the short *a* vowel has become *qâmes*, but not *hôlem*. In other words, while **ra's* became **râš*, *rôš*, **ra'sim* remained, only becoming *râšim* later. As soon as there ceased to be any such reason for the retention of the 'alef, it was naturally dropped. In the case of *tôrâh*, there was no such inducement to preserve the 'alef, since no other word from the stem *w'r* appears to have survived. Moreover, the denominative *hôrâh* bears a perfectly regular relation to *tôrâh*, as though the latter were a *taf'alat* noun derived from it, so the pressure of the tendency to conformation was entirely against the insertion or retention of the 'alef.

In this connection it will be useful to direct attention again to the various strata of feminine *t*-formations which we find in Hebrew.⁴³ First of all we have the form *taf'alat*, regularly derived from verbs *tertiaef infirmae*; illustrations are *tiqwâh*, "hope," *ta'wâh*, "desire," to which *tôdâh* and *tôrâh* have become attached by analogy. *Tiqwâh* and *ta'wâh* stand for **taqwayût* and **ta'wayût*, respectively. These contracted forms are un-

⁴³ On the *t*-formations in Semitic see especially Barth, *Nominalbildung*, pp. 274 ff. The latest treatment for Hebrew is by Bauer and Leander, pp. 495 ff., but this section is inferior to most of their work.

questionably part of the most primitive stock of the Hebrew language. Secondly, we have the form *taf'ilat*, also regularly derived from verbs *tertiaef infirmae*; illustrations are *tûšiyyâh*, "cleverness" (with secondary *û* for *ô* as in *tûgâh*, "grief," for **tôgâh*, a *taf'alat* form derived from the stem *yagâh*),⁴⁴ and *ta'niiyyâh*, "lamentation." The doubling of the *yôd* is secondary, following the analogy of **Y'hûdiyyâh*, for **Yehûdiyât*,⁴⁵ and similar feminine gentilics. We should most emphatically not be justified in assuming from the doubling of the *yôd* that *tûšiyyâh* represents a form *taf'ilat*. The third feminine *t*-formation is the *tabnît* class. This class is exceedingly common in Accadian, where we have, e. g., *tabnîtu*, *taknîtu*,⁴⁶ *tašrîtu*, *tašlîtu*, *tabrîtu*. It is just as common in Aramaic, where it is also original, though there are numerous Accadian loanwords of the same type. In Accadian, however, both *taf'alat* and *taf'ilat* forms are represented; *taknîtu*, for instance, may stand for either **taknâyatu* > **taknaîtu* or **takniyatu* > **takniîtu*. We also have this nominal type in Phœnician, as in the name of king Tabnît, who flourished in Sidon in the fifth century B. C. At the same time, it is quite likely that many, if not most of the nouns of this class in later Hebrew are Aramaic loan-words. The originally *taf'ilat* nouns which are not loan-words probably

⁴⁴ Heb. *tûšiyyâh*, "cleverness," has never been adequately explained etymologically. **Tûšiyat* is derived from a stem *wsy*, which would be *وسى* in Arabic. But there actually is an old stem *وسى* in Arabic, meaning "to cut," in *mûsâ*, "razor," combined long ago by Ember with Eg. *wsy*, "to saw." *Tûšiyyâh*, therefore, is properly "keenness, sharpness, shrewdness," naturally without the unpleasant connotation which these words have in modern languages; see RA XVI, 178 f.

⁴⁵ Originally the gentilic ending was *ayyu*, *iyyu*, but in all the Semitic languages the doubling was early given up, with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, so the Hebrew doubling is probably secondary.

⁴⁶ Assy. *taknîtu*, "completion, perfection, skilful preparation," is identical with Heb. *taklîit*; for the change of *l* to *n* cf. Arab. *kannaḥ*, "bride," Heb. *kallâh*, Assy. *kallatu*. The stems *killâh* in Hebrew and *kunnû* in Accadian are, therefore, identical, a discovery which disposes completely of the etymological struggles of the writer, JAOS XL, 322, n. 32. The meaning assigned *kunnû* there is wrong; cf. Bezold-Götze, e. v. *Kunnû-killâh* has nothing to do with the other stems there mentioned.

came into Biblical Hebrew (the dialect of Jerusalem, as we now know from the inscriptions and ostraca) from Northern Israel, where the feminine *t* was usually preserved, whereas in Judah it was almost always lost. *Ta'niyyâh* is thus characteristically South Israelite, while *tablit*, etc., are properly North Israelite. That we must assume a considerable amount of fusion of dialects in the Classical Hebrew of Jerusalem is just as certain now as that Modern German has grown up in this way.

The preceding pages are designed as a contribution to a scientific study of Hebrew proper names.⁴⁷ We need scientific study in this field very badly, especially since the recent reaction against over-reliance on orthodox Hebrew grammar has led to hopelessly eclectic modes of investigation, where philological laws are honored only in the exception. But a better day for scientific philology is dawning, partly because the dilettantes are abandoning the philological ship, whose popularity they have reason for doubting. When the rats are gone, serious students will see that the vessel is made seaworthy!

⁴⁷ There is a great need for a new book along the lines of George Buchanan Gray, *Hebrew Proper Names*, in its day an excellent treatise. Now, thanks to the discovery of the early West Semitic and South Arabian proper names, as well as to the researches of scholars like Moritz in the vast field of North Arabic and Nabataean names, our material for comparison has been enormously increased. Moreover, a more scientific study of the Greek transcriptions in the Septuagint, along the lines being marked out by Margolis, will dispose of many peculiar and corrupt forms of 𐤀. A most admirable preliminary study has just been published by Noth in the *ZDMG* 1927, 1-45.