

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 *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

pastoral aid in spiritual exigencies to clear his faith and reassure his soul, but not as needing any mediator with his One Mediator. He is not *more* dependent on human intermediaries than the Jewish believer was before him, as the medieval theory of confession, totally without primitive warrant, would make him to be ; he has access direct to his God through the blood of Christ and in the grace of the Spirit. Yet none the less, because Christians are a holy community, and also because in the Divine order, man is God's great instrument for the spiritual service of man, the Church in the New Testament, as with us, needs, and has, a sacred pastorate. The community is tended, guided, served by a ministry, commissioned from above, constitutionally and temperately authoritative, successional within itself, a mighty factor for permanence and cohesion, capable, if true to itself and its gifts, of incalculable potencies for example and inspiration. It is not the creature of the Church but the Lord's gift to the Church. It is not the depository of His grace, but it is the commissioned bearer of His message and of its effectual seals. It is the attendant, not the mistress of the holy society. It exists altogether for the Chief Shepherd and His flock. It lives and it is continued in order to preach and to set forth Christ Jesus as Lord and itself as bondservant of all, for Jesus' sake.



The Divine Name Jah.

BY THE REV. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D.

WHAT is the origin of the name "Jah" (or, rather, *Yāh*, יה), what is its meaning, and in what relation does it stand to "Jehovah" (more correctly *Yahweh*)? These questions are of great interest not only to the Hebraist but also to all devout students of the Bible. We desire to consider them, with all reverence, in this article.

If we accept the etymology given in the Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew Lexicon, we must conclude that *Yāh* is a contracted form of *Yahweh*, and would thus mean what the latter does—*i.e.*, “He who is,” the Existent One, ὁ Ὄν. But there are some difficulties in the way of this solution, and both in England and in Germany quite a different etymology has been suggested. It does not follow that either theory is correct, and it may not be possible to trace the word back to its origin, but it is well worth making the attempt.

Can the Divine name *Yahweh* be contracted at all, and, more particularly, can it be contracted by omitting its last¹ syllable, even though the first be lengthened in compensation, without manifest irreverence? In later times at least, as is well known, the Tetragrammaton יהוה was deemed too sacred to be pronounced at all, and another Divine title was substituted for it in reading. This renders it rather doubtful whether it would be considered right and reverent to abbreviate the name. Even among Gentile nations we do not find many examples of names of gods used in a contracted form—for, of course, those used as exclamations, like “*pol*” and “*hercle*,” cannot be taken into account. *Iovis-pater*, is, it is true, contracted into *Iuppiter*, but in that instance the shortening is in consequence of the two words being compounded into one. Yet such an instance as *Ἀθηνᾶ*, from *Ἀθηναία*, shows that, at least among Gentiles, contraction of a Divine name might sometimes occur. But the shortening of *Yahweh* into *Yāh* would be equivalent to apocopation of the verbal form, and would thus change the meaning from “He that is” into “He that was,”² except, of course, for the long vowel in the first syllable of *Yāh*. This seems a strong argument against the

¹ The fact that both “*Jah*” and “*Jehovah*” occur together in Isa. xxvi. 4, “For in *Jah* *Jehovah* is the rock of ages,” hardly agrees with the theory of contraction.

² The analogy of Assyrian shows that the change of meaning from present to past is caused by the *apocopation*, and not by the *waw* commonly prefixed to such a form in Hebrew, and hence called *conversivum*.

theory that Yāh is a contraction of Yahweh, though we cannot therefore consider it impossible.

Another theory, strongly advocated by Dr. Hommel in Germany and by Dr. Pinches in this country, is that the word *Yāh* has no connexion whatever with Yahweh, but is the Hebraized form of the name of the Accadian god Êā. Dr. Hommel prefers to transliterate this Accadian name as *Ia*, while Dr. Pinches would rather read *Aa*. Now, it is quite possible, *a priori*, that a Divine name should, among Polytheists, sink from conveying a very lofty conception to denoting something less worthy. Hence the fact that the god Ea (regarding whom the strange tale of how he came out of the Persian Gulf to instruct the early Sumerians was told in later times) does not strike us as a conception worthy of comparison with the Hebrew idea of the True God by no means settles the matter. It is possible that the conception of Ea as a god was originally very high. Certainly very lofty titles—such as “Lord of Deep Wisdom,” “Lord of the Earth,” “Lord of Life,” “King of Destinies”—are given to him. The legend known to us from Bêrôssos is very late, and mythology often sadly corrupts religion. It is not by any means improbable that Ea was originally not only the supreme god of Eri-du (Eri-dug-ga, “the good city”), but also had at one time been recognized by the Accadians as the one and only God. Even his connection with the sea puts us in mind of the case of Varuṇa in India, since the latter, from being at least the chief of the Asuras (or supreme deities), and a great, almighty, beneficent being, has now sunk to the position of god of the sea, of darkness, and finally to that of a malevolent demon. Ea’s abode, the “Bright Mount” (in Accadian, *Tu azag-ga*), is the Eastern horizon, where sea and sky met to the eye of the inhabitants of Eridu, which originally stood on the Persian Gulf itself. Hence a syllabary explains the “Bright Mount” as equivalent to the deep.¹ Sea and sky, melting into one another, were there, as

¹ Rawlinson’s “Western Asian Inscriptions,” vol. v., p. 50, i. 5; p. 41, No. 1; cf. Sayce, “Rel. of Eg. and Bab.,” p. 374; also pp. 327 and 457.

in India, regarded as one; hence both Ea and Varuṇa were gods at once of the heavenly and of the earthly abyss. The fact that other deities were after a time associated with Ea in the worship which was paid to him in Accad does not negative the possibility of Dr. Hommel's theory that he may have been originally identical with Yāh, and that the latter is the Hebrew form of Ea's or Ia's name. If it should be proved that this theory is correct, it will give no just grounds for the unbeliever to scoff.

But the theory seems open to objections from other points of view. In the first place, it seems most unlikely that Ea or Ia was the proper pronunciation¹ of the name. As written in Accadian, the word would mean "the House," a somewhat strange name for a god.² But, be this as it may, the first element in the name enters into the formation of *e-gal*, "the great house, the palace," whence came the Assyrian *ekallu*, the Hebrew and Aramaic *hēykāl* (הֵיכָל), and the Arabic *haikal*. Now, though in Accadian and Assyrian there seems to have been no means of representing the rough breathing *h*, yet, when we find that the latter letter occurs in not only the Hebrew and Aramaic, but also in the Arabic form of the word, we naturally conclude that it was *heard* in Accadian. At any rate, its occurrence in *hēykāl* shows that, had *Ea's* (or *Ia's*) name been adopted into Hebrew, *it would have begun with the aspirate*, and would not have assumed the form Yāh. The final aspirate in this Hebrew word is not added only to assist in the pronunciation of the vowel, but is *radical*, as is shown by the fact that *mappiq* is inserted in it (thus הֵיכָלִי). This is a matter of some importance. Hence the theory we are considering accounts neither for the omission of *h* at the beginning nor for its occurrence at the end of the name Yāh.

¹ Bêrôssos Hellenizes it into Ὠάννης, which can hardly represent the sound *Ea* or *Ia*.

² Unless "the House" meant "Heaven"; but, if so, why not use the word *Ana*, the usual Accadian word? Is it possible to compare this name "the House" with the Rabbinical *ham-māqôm*, "the Place," meaning God, and used for the sake of reverence instead of the Divine Name?

But there is another difficulty. Dr. Hommel has shown that, when the ancestors of the Hebrews entered Babylonia from Southern Arabia and established on the throne the dynasty to which Ḥammurabi and other kings belonged, they were monotheists,¹ and that they already spoke of their God by the title of the "Name" (Hebrew, *shēm*; Assyrian, *shumu*). This being so, it is hard to believe that they actually rejected the sacrosanct appellation (whatever it was) in place of which this expression was used, and for it substituted the name of Ea, more especially as by that time Ea had sunk from his lofty pre-eminence, and had at Babylon become of quite an inferior rank to a number of other gods, Bel Merodach in particular. Is it not much less incredible to suppose that Yāh (doubtless in its original form *Yāhūm*² or *Yāhū*) was even then the holy Name which they deemed too sacred to use lightly? At least, before accepting the theory that they abandoned the sacred name of their deity and adopted another from the conquered people in its stead, we may well ask for other similar instances to be alleged.

Dr. Hommel shows that Ea was afterwards identified with the god \hat{A}^3 (also read *Ai*), and with *Ana*, or "Heaven." Now \hat{A} means "Father," and he acknowledges that it is a contracted form of *ad* (*cf.* Turkish *ata*, Magyar *atya*) with the same sense. It is from this \hat{A} that Damascius gets the Hellenized name *Aos*, which he uses for Ea. The word *ad* might be softened into *ai* or *ay*, but it would be impossible to turn it into Yāh.

Moreover, Professor Sayce has shown⁴ that this god \hat{A} 's name was really *Sirrigam*, the other appellation being merely a title. Whether this deity is identical with the later goddess *Ai* is by no means certain, nor does it affect our argument.

If we do not accept either of the theories above quoted which attempt to account for and explain the meaning of the Divine Name Yāh, it may be expected that we should formulate

¹ "Die altisraelitische Überlieferung," p. 87.

² Sayce, "Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia," p. 484.

³ "Sumerische Lesestücke," p. 40, No. 440.

⁴ Hibbert Lectures for 1887, p. 178, note.

another theory in their stead. But this by no means follows. It is one thing to adduce reasons against proposed derivatives, and quite another thing to assert that one can succeed better oneself. The problem is one of great, probably insuperable, difficulty, and the word we are considering had possibly ceased to have any definite and well-understood meaning (except that it denoted God alone) even in Abraham's time. It will not be at all surprising, therefore, if we should not be able to discover its original significance and its etymology. But may not the name Yāh be derived from the root which is found in Æthiopic in the form *yawēha*,¹ and which in that language means "to be kind, clement, merciful, upright"? The verb occurs in Hebrew only in the form חָיַב , "deceit" (*cf.* Syriac *yāyē*, "benigne tractavit"), though not the Arabic *ya'ya*. But it must have been once in use in most of the Semitic tongues. If this suggestion—which we venture on with great diffidence—be correct, it agrees fully with the attributes of Yahweh, mentioned in Exod. xxxiv. 6: "The LORD, the LORD, a God full of compassion and gracious (רַחוּם וְרַחוּם), slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy and truth."

The antiquity of the name Jah (Yāh) is shown, not only by its occurrence in ancient poetry, in Exod. xv. 2, xvii. 16, but also by its use in the name of Moses' mother, Jochebed (Yôkebed for Yēhōkebed = Yāhū + Kebed). It was replaced by the form Yahweh under the circumstances detailed in

¹ Dillmann's "Lex Æthiop.," where such derivations as *yawāh*, "gentle," "kind," "merciful," "upright," "innocent," are found. A comparison of another root will show how the form Yāhū might, perhaps, spring from the above root. In Æthiopic we have the verb ጥሀ *tēha*, "to be astounded," which implies a root תיה , as *yawēha*, *yauha*, does ייה . Now, from תיה (not found in Hebrew) we have Hebrew תִּהוּ *tōhū* (the Arabic root is *tāh*). In Assyrian the Hebrew *bōhū* (a similarly-formed word) is *ba'u*, and *Yāhū* (when written as an element in Jewish proper names) is *Ya'u*. This would seem to imply that the original Hebrew pronunciation was *Yōhū* (if the vowels in *tōhū* and *bōhū* are right). *Yōhū* might easily arise from the verb *yawēha*, *yauha*, *yoha* (*cf.* *tēha* above for *tayēha*, *tayha*). Or, more probably, on the analogy of *tāh*, the form *yāh* would be that assumed in Arabia by the root, whence the noun *Yāhū*. The termination *-ū* in each instance is the old nominative ending (originally *-ūm*, as in Hīmyaritic, which in Assyrian is *-ū*, in Arabic *-un*: *cf.* *Pēn-ā-ēl*, and such forms as *Jehoahaz* (Yāhū-ahaz).

Exod. iii. 12-15. That Yahweh was *not* used in earlier times is distinctly implied in Exod. vi. 3. Hence, where it occurs in Genesis it has taken the place of the original Yāhū¹—*e.g.*, Gen. iv. 26. The reasons why the new Name was revealed seem to have been twofold: (1) The name Yāh had ceased to be understood, and (2) was in great danger of being confounded with the Egyptian name *āāhu*, *āāh* (probably pronounced *ēāhū*, *ēāh*, or *iāhū*, *iāh*; *cf.* Coptic *ioh*, whence the name and story of Iō among the Greeks). Now this word denoted the *moon*, and occurs in the Book of the Dead as the name of the Moon-god, who was not, however, a leading divinity in Egypt. True, the aspirate in this Egyptian word was harsher than in the Hebrew *Yāh*, but still, among a people inclined to idolatry, the danger was real, and this explains the incident of the Golden Calf.²

It may perhaps be of interest to notice that this Egyptian word *Āāhu* is probably identical with the *Aku* of the Accadians. This god's name occurs in the compound Arioch (*Ariōk*; Accadian *Eri-Aku* = "Servant of the Moon-god) and in the Tablets,³ though he was generally known by other appellations, such as Sin and Nannaru. The word *Aku* probably meant "white," and in that sense is still preserved in the Turkish *āg*,⁴ while in Magyar it has assumed the form *agg*, and the meaning "old" (*i.e.*, white-haired). *Aku* is quite distinct from *Ea* and *Ā*, and etymologically there is no connection between these words. *Ea*'s own name seems to have puzzled the Accadians, for their idea that it meant "the house" was probably erroneous. One is strongly tempted to compare the Yakut word *iä*, "well disposed"; Ottoman Turkish *eyi*, *eyu*, "good," which in Magyar is *jó* (the *j* is pronounced *y*), "good." The Yakuts use *ayi*, as meaning both "goodness" and "divinity." Perhaps these

¹ יהוה was probably read יהוה in Genesis.

² Had this and the Greek legend that Io was changed into a heifer any connection with the fact that the Egyptian word for "cow," *āh*, was one way in which the word for "moon" might also be written?

³ W. A. I., vol. ii., p. 48, col. i, line 48, where we read that *Aku* = Sin (the Moon-god).

⁴ In Accadian also *ak* meant "white."

Turkish vocables¹ go back to a very early date, and are connected with the old Semitic root, from which we have ventured to suggest the derivation of *Yāhū*. But *unless in this way* we see no reason to connect the Divine Name with that of the Accadian god.

It is remarkable that the word *Yāhū* as the name of God still exists in Arabic. The creed of the Ansāriyyah² preserves it, though as two separate words, *yā* and *hū*, which a false etymology renders, "O He." The word is thus one of the very earliest Divine Names to be found in any language.



Confirmation: A Symposium.

BY THE REV. CANON G. S. STREATFIELD, M.A.,
Rector of Fenny Compton.

I.

WHETHER the subject of Confirmation is debated in town or country its difficulty is freely admitted, and seldom, so far as my experience goes, are any very definite conclusions reached. Since the difficulties that arise are closely connected with the history of the ordinance, it will not be thought out of place if I devote the first part of a discussion of the subject to the diversities of form and custom that meet us as we trace the rite back to its origin in Apostolic days.

It is perhaps strange, considering the important place that Confirmation holds in the discipline and organization of the Church, that we know so little of the ordinance as administered

¹ Turkish in its oldest form presents many points of agreement with Accadian (or Sumerian). Regarding the latter I thoroughly agree with Dr. Hommel's words: "Angesichts solcher Übereinstimmungen wie . . . wo gerade die sumerische Lautlehre das überraschendste Licht auf analoge indogerm. Lautübergänge . . . wirft, dürfte das eingehendste Studium des Sumerischen, dieser ältesten Sprache der Welt, die wir kennen, für Indogermanisten und Altaisten bald zu unabweisbarer Notwendigkeit werden" ("Sum. Lesestücke," p. 55).

² Catafagos's "Arabic Dictionary," p. 463: "Yā hū, yā hū, yā man lā ya'lamu mā hūa il-lā hūa."