

THE NAME OF יהוה: A REEXAMINATION OF THE FORM OF THE SACRED NAME COMPOUNDED
IN PERSONAL NAMES IN ITS RELIGIOUS CONTEXTS

Keion Sampson
October 2015

© 2015 - Keion Sampson
All rights reserved.

THE NAME OF יהוה: A REEXAMINATION OF THE FORM OF THE SACRED NAME COMPOUNDED
IN PERSONAL NAMES IN ITS RELIGIOUS CONTEXTS

Abstract

The present study within ancient Hebrew onomastics successfully identified the original form of the abbreviated sacred name, while simultaneously identifying both the time when the variations in this form began to occur and why there arose the many variations in the first place. This area has been a difficult area of research for quite some time, but was simply impaired by the lack of understanding of the most critical aspect of all the data that have been accumulated over centuries of research—the change in the phonological form of the abbreviated sacred name in compound names going into the exile. Essential to achieving our objective was the inclusion in the linguistic study of the religious context of the name Yahweh in these so-called Yahwistic names, but here called *personal names compounded with the sacred name* (PNNCSN). Once the identification of the original form and the cause behind the change were made, the further analysis became quite easy, since there was now an ideological understanding of the earlier changes against which the later transformations can be checked. However, the strangest but most astounding aspect uncovered was the late manifestation of the early ideological convention that both showed the late association between the full name Yahweh and correct abbreviated form (phonologically) and explained many apparent textual anomalies pertaining to sacred names in the New Testament texts.

לֹא לָנוּ יְהוָה לֹא לָנוּ כִּי־לְשִׁמְךָ תֵּן כְּבוֹד עַל־חַסְדֶּךָ עַל־אֱמֶתֶךָ

Not to us, Yahweh, not to us, but to your name give glory, for your lovingkindness and for your truth.

(Psalm 115:1)

CONTENTS

Abstract.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Contents.....	v
Abbreviations.....	ix
0. INTRODUCTION.....	1
0.1. Goals and Methodology.....	1
0.2. Yahweh and Yāhû—Questions, Answers, and Questions.....	3
1. THE PRE-EXILIC PERIOD (1000–597 B.C.E.).....	6
1.1. -Yhw-, -Yw-, and -Yh in Pre-exilic Israel.....	6
1.2. Neo-Assyrian Transcriptions in the Pre-exilic Period.....	7
1.2.1. The Transcriptions of PNNCSN Compared with Toponym יהוה' and Diphthong /aw/.....	7
1.2.2. YHW and YW Indistinguishable from First Two Syllables of Toponym in Cuneiform.....	10
1.3. Hebrew Orthography and PNNCSN.....	11
1.3.1. Orthography in Pre-exilic Hebrew Inscriptions.....	11
1.3.2. Applying Orthographic Principles to the Pre-exilic Israelite Onomastica.....	13
1.3.3. The Phonology of the Abbreviated Sacred Name Reflected in Ancient Hebrew Orthography.....	16
1.4. The Name Yahweh in its Pre-exilic Religious Contexts.....	18
1.4.1. The Independent Name.....	18
1.4.2. The Compounded Form of the Name in the Pre-exilic Period.....	20
2. THE EXILIC PERIOD (597–539 B.C.E.).....	23
2.1. Continuity and Consistent Inconsistency.....	23
2.2. Neo-Babylonian Transcriptions.....	24
2.2.1. <i>Yhw</i> and/or <i>Yw</i> in the Weidner Texts?.....	24
2.2.2. Only One Resolution.....	25
2.2.3. The Transcription <i>ia-ḥu-ú-</i> in the Exilic Period.....	27
2.3. The Name Yahweh in its Exilic Religious Context.....	28
2.3.1. The Independent Name.....	28

2.3.2. The Compounded Form of the Name in the Neo-Babylonian Period	29
2.3.2.1. Abbreviated Name in Transition in Neo-Babylonian Period?.....	29
2.3.2.2. A New Religio-linguistic Convention in the Exilic Period.....	30
3. THE POST-EXILIC, SECOND TEMPLE, AND TANNAITIC PERIODS (539 B.C.E.–220 C.E.).....	31
3.1. THE PERSIAN PERIOD (539–332 B.C.E.).....	31
3.1.1. Pre-exilic Continuity in the Persian Period and Beyond?	31
3.1.2. Bilingualism in the Persian Period.....	32
3.1.3. PNNCSN in the Onomastica of the Persian Period	32
3.1.4. Post-exilic Akkadian Transcriptions of PNNCSN	34
3.1.5. Post-exilic Orthography and PNNCSN	36
3.1.5.1. Orthography in the Post-exilic Period.....	36
3.1.5.2. Implications of Post-exilic Orthography for Onomastics	37
3.1.6. The Name Yahweh in its Persian-Period Religious Context.....	37
3.1.6.1. The Independent Name	37
3.1.6.1.1. YHWH.....	37
3.1.6.1.2. Possessors of a Further Innovation—Yāhû	38
3.1.6.2. The Compounded Form of the Name in the Persian Period.....	41
3.1.6.2.1. IMASN Persists in the Post-Exilic Period.....	41
3.1.6.2.2. IMASN Reveals -Yhw- = -yw = -yh in the Post-Exilic and Second Temple Periods....	41
3.2. THE HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN PERIODS (332 B.C.E.–220 C.E.).....	43
3.2.1. Yəhō- and Yô-: the Result of Ancient Hebrew Phonological Processes?.....	43
3.2.2. PNNCSN and Others in the Hellenistic- and Roman-Period Jewish Onomastica.....	44
3.2.2.1. A Transformation of the Jewish Onomastica from Persian to Hellenistic Periods.....	44
3.2.2.2. Yāhûd/Yahûdāh.....	45
3.2.2.3. Egypt	47
3.2.2.4. Mt. Gerizim.....	47
3.2.2.5. <i>Terminus a Quo</i> for Orthographic and Phonological Changes Within Initial PNNCSN	47
3.2.2.6. A Judean Onomastic Anomaly	48

3.2.2.7. What about Yahûdāh and Hôšē'?	49
3.2.3. Greek Transcriptions	50
3.2.3.1. Transcriptions of PNNCSN	50
3.2.3.2. Greek Transcriptions of Yahûdāh and Hôšē'?	51
3.2.3.3. No Phonological Processes Permitted by Greek Transcriptions of PNNCSN	52
3.2.4. The Name Yahweh in its Hellenistic- and Roman-Period Religious Context	53
3.2.4.1. The Independent Name	53
3.2.4.1.1. <i>YHWH in the Hellenistic/Roman Periods</i>	53
3.2.4.1.1.1. Hellenistic-period continuity?	53
3.2.4.1.1.2. The Essene community	53
3.2.4.1.1.3. Samaritans on Mt. Gerizim	55
3.2.4.1.1.4. Tannaitic sources	56
3.2.4.1.1.5. The Nazarenes	61
3.2.4.1.1.5.1. Anomalies in the earliest copies of the New Testament?	61
3.2.4.1.1.5.2. The Tetragrammaton in the New Testament?	64
3.2.4.1.1.5.3. The background of θεός and κύριος in the Graeco-Roman period	67
3.2.4.1.1.5.4. <i>Nomina Sacra</i> ?	70
3.2.4.1.1.5.5. θεός and κύριος in original New Testament documents?	73
3.2.4.1.1.5.6. Conclusion	78
3.2.4.1.2. Yāhû in the Hellenistic/Roman Periods?	79
3.2.4.2. The Compounded Form of the Name in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods	80
3.2.4.2.1. Is Substitution of 'adōnāy and Introduction of /ō/ in PNNCSN Related?	80
3.2.4.2.2. A Major Revision of IMASN from Persian to Hellenistic Periods	81
3.2.4.2.3. IMASN in the Hellenistic Period—Enforced Thoroughly Yet Not Unchallenged	83
3.2.4.2.3.1. IMASN enforced	83
3.2.4.2.3.1.1. Iāō	83
3.2.4.2.3.1.2. Yāhōsēp or Yōsēp?	84
3.2.4.2.3.2. IMASN challenged?	85

3.2.4.2.3.2.1. yswm (<i>ἰάσων</i> , Jason).....	85
3.2.4.2.3.2.2. ynʔy (<i>ἰανναῖος</i> , King Alexander)	86
3.2.4.2.3.2.3. yhwš ^c	86
3.2.4.2.3.2.3.1. IMASN produces fourth century yēšū ^c not yôšū ^c —an anomaly.....	86
3.2.4.2.3.2.3.2. Only true challenge to IMASN epigraphy and papyrology have produced ..	89
3.2.4.2.3.2.3.3. In the New Testament?	91
3.2.4.2.3.2.3.4. Māšīḥ, X̄Σ, and <i>χρηστιανός</i>	92
3.2.4.2.3.2.3.5. Eusebius’ ancient Hebrew onomastics involving yēšū ^c —in Greek.....	95
4. CONCLUSION.....	96
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	102

ABBREVIATIONS

AJ	Antiquities of the Jews
B.C.E.	Before Common Era
C.E.	Common Era
CPJ.....	Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum
CPR.....	Corpus Papyrorum Raineri
IMASN.....	Intentional Misrepresentation of the Abbreviated Sacred Name
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NT.....	New Testament
OT.....	Old Testament
PNAE.....	Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire
PN(N)CSN	Personal Name(s) Compounded with the Sacred Name
TAD.....	Textbook of Aramaic Documents from ancient Egypt

0. INTRODUCTION

0.1. Goals and Methodology

The field of ancient Hebrew onomastics¹ has not been devoid of uncertainty and speculation from a phonological standpoint, and when it is combined with what is sacred and revered, the product of any analysis therein has more bearing on the heart than on the ear. Therefore, any careful and sober attempt to remove uncertainties and clarify speculations in this field of study must certainly be welcomed. In this discussion, we will concern ourselves with the class of ancient Hebrew personal names compounded with the Sacred Name² Yahweh³ (PNNCSN).⁴ As the form of this name is “now accepted almost universally,”⁵ further discussions specific to its form will not be attempted here; however, with regards to its vocalization when abbreviated and combined with other predicative elements in forming PNNCSN⁶ as expressed in the vocalized text⁷ of the Tiberian Masoretes, there are unexpected variations, which at times had been difficult to explain.⁸ So, the primary goals in this study are to determine which of these forms, if any, comprises the *original* one, and also how did these variations develop? To answer these questions we will consider the *relevant* information pertaining to the onomastica of ancient Israel⁹ that is available and analyze them through the chronological spectrum of the pre-exilic, exilic, and post-exilic,

¹ Cf. Zadok 1988 for linguistic analyses and prosopography of Israelite names down to the Hellenistic period. Also cf. Noth 1928. Cf. Ilan 2002 for a prosopographic study of Jewish names from the Hellenistic to the tannaitic periods. Cf. Fowler 1988 and Tigay 1986 for possible religious implications inherent in onomastics. For the preservation of *archaisms* in personal names (morphologically speaking) cf. Layton 1990. For a much broader bibliography of Jewish onomastics, cf. Singerman 2001.

² The name has primarily been referred to as the divine name, and also the sacred name, ineffable name, shem hamephorash, shem ha meyuḥad, etc. We utilize the phrase *Sacred Name*, highlighting an early and key feature of *sacredness* held by it within the Hebrew tradition, as will become even clearer throughout this study.

³ In 1986 Freedman and O’Connor stated that there was no consensus, but that this name had been explained as the 3ms, causative imperfect of the root *hyh* (< *hwy*). Cf. Freedman and O’Connor 1986: 500, 513.

⁴ These names are *generally* classified *theophoric* names (names compounded with the name of a deity), while *specifically* referred to as *Yahwistic*. Here, they are called *personal name(s) compounded with the Sacred Name*, PN(N)CSN.

⁵ Freedman 1986: 500. Cf. n. 3 above.

⁶ That is, personal names formed by the Sacred Name being compounded with other elements to form them. See n. 4 above.

⁷ Given the consonantal nature of the 22 letters of the Phoenician alphabet, with each letter representing a consonantal sound, throughout this discussion the phrase *consonantal text* will refer to the *letters* of the Hebrew alphabet that the Tiberian Masoretes (ca. 850 C.E.) preserved in the Masoretic Text while the *vocalization* that they indicated through their system of *diacritics* will be termed the *vocalized text*.

⁸ We attempt here to put forth somewhat of a “reset,” since the difficulties have been caused by incomplete analyses, as the data was simply lacking, and earlier studies have not accurately established the full ideology that existed at the time these personal names originated, flourished, morphed, and diminished, which was unique for each.

⁹ That is, northern Israelites and Judahites (Judeans), a specific reference to whom will be written accordingly. For the purposes of this discussion each ethnic branch’s onomasticon is viewed independently.

Second Temple, and tannaitic periods. These will include primarily: 1) Akkadian cuneiform or Greek transcriptions of proper names, which can help fill the vocalic gap left by the consonantal alphabet; 2) Hebrew orthography (especially in the pre-exilic period), a study of which, especially the use of internal and final *matres lectionis*, should also help narrow the possibilities of vocalization represented by the consonantal spelling; and 3) The religious contexts of the full name *Yahweh*,¹⁰ where we will consider on the one hand, from a morphological standpoint, the Pentateuch's early and persistent emphasis¹¹ on the *inviolability* of this one name (and hence one *verbal form*¹²) and the exclusivity of its use and reverence,¹³ which inviolability and exclusivity could have been (and were) carried over into personal names.¹⁴ But, on the other, a distinct consideration that must be included in any analysis of PNNCSN is that of the *diachronic development of Israel's own religious ideologies* regarding the use and reverence of the full name *Yahweh* beginning likewise from the pentateuchal and post-pentateuchal times and continuing through to the tannaitic period (utilizing both literary and epigraphic material, if available). It must be remembered that these ideologies, as in language, are not consistently the same at every period of their history.¹⁵ These two considerations about the use and reverence of the full name *Yahweh* (from the *morphological* consideration and also the *diachronic development of Israel's religious ideologies*) in the study of PNNCSN are critical, because although we are considering an abbreviation of the Sacred Name,¹⁶ it must still be studied in the religious contexts of the *full name* of *Yahweh*, seeing that the Sacred Name was in our opinion the most important aspect of the religion of Israel and could have very well influenced their onomastica in *other* unique ways. By all means, any analysis of PNNCSN that does not consider these religious contexts of the name will necessarily be incomplete.¹⁷

¹⁰ Cf. Meyer 1987 for a discussion of the exclusivity of the use of this name in the Bible as religious doctrine.

¹¹ This includes especially that found in the Decalogue, but also other considerations.

¹² The consistent utilization of *Yahweh 'Ēlōhîm* (or other such combinatory forms with *Yahweh*, especially *Šəbā'ôṭ*) strongly highlights this *morphological emphasis* attached to this personal name in the biblical text. Cf. Freedman 1960: 156.

¹³ This, of course, contrasts with the polytheism that was prevalent all throughout the ancient Near East. Cf. Deuteronomy 6:4–6. Also, cf. Fowler 1988: 297–298 and Tigay 1986: 10–11 for this aspect in the light of Semitic onomastics. However, it should be noted that this by no means ventures to be a survey of the religion of Israel, nor an analysis of it. Only that aspect within the religion of Israel specific to the Sacred Name (albeit in our opinion the most important aspect of Israelite religion) will be considered in our analysis.

¹⁴ Cf. n. 3 above. Abbreviations may indicate *several forms*, since after all they are exactly that. However, we venture to examine if any *particular type* of abbreviation is better suited for this particular religious demand with regards to Hebrew PNNCSN, especially remembering that the *full name is never contained in personal names* (but cf. Jeremiah 23:6; also see below).

¹⁵ As such, this *religious ideology* would obviously be indistinguishable from that of the Pentateuch's requirements for a great part of this history, but differences would develop over time. Cf. Lemaire 2007 for an attempt to analyze a facet of this diachronic development by means of archaeological support.

¹⁶ Here, we are specifically referring to the spelling <yhw>.

¹⁷ Zevit (1980: 12, n. 14) has remarked "The history of the pronunciation of this theophoric element in personal names is extremely difficult to trace for any number of reasons: 1) The data in inscriptions are distributed chronologically over many centuries, linguistically over many languages and dialects, and are represented in many orthographic systems involving unique conventions. . . . 2) The significance of the element in Israelite personal

0.2. Yahweh and Yāhû—Questions, Answers, and Questions

The forms that the name Yahweh assumes in PNNCSN that have been inherited from the Tiberian Masoretes are represented in the consonantal text as *yhw-* and *yw-* at the beginning of names, and *-yhw* and *-yh* at the end,¹⁸ which have been represented in the vocalized text of the Masoretes as *yāhō-*, *yô-*, *-yāhû*, and *-yāh* respectively. The initial shortened form (i.e. *yw*) does not appear at the end of names in the consonantal text and the final shortened form (i.e. *yh*) does not appear at the beginning, although this distribution is not historical as will be seen below.¹⁹ The Tiberian Masoretes inherited a text (Masoretic text or Hebrew Bible) that does not represent textual traditions from one historical period, but from various periods in Israelite history, as its own textual particularities show. Therefore, these spellings do not necessarily reflect what was current in the biblical text of any specific period being discussed.²⁰ However, these forms have raised numerous questions about their connection to the name Yahweh as the knowledge of its correct form became well established, some being found already at the end of the nineteenth century.

In 1885 S. R. Driver²¹ presented a paper in which he responded to the theory put forth by Frie. Delitzsch,²² who argued that the form *yāhû* was not the product of Yahweh, but the *source* upon which the full name was built, the origin of *yāhû* then being Assyria/Babylonia. Driver then responded with his own refutations and that of others, especially that of F. A. Philippi, whose arguments he lists,²³ trying to show that the connection between the two Hebrew terms can only be understood by acknowledging the then accepted development—that the form *yāhû* developed from Yahweh by analogy just as *yīštāhû* (in pause *wayyīštāhû*) developed from *yīštāhāweh*.²⁴ However, one significant indirect acknowledgement by Driver was his admittance of a difficulty in ascertaining the form that this name should assume when

names from the biblical period onward may have resulted in socio-linguistic factors complicating the issue even more.” This study, therefore, does not neglect the *importance* of including these *additional complicating factors* in our analysis. So, by utilizing the early biblical and epigraphic accounts on the one side and the information acquired from the later period of Jewish religious history on the other, it is hoped that a more diachronic religious context specific to the Sacred Name can be established.

¹⁸ Cf. Freedman and O’Connor 1986: 501; Gray 1896: 149.

¹⁹ Cf. Coogan 1973: 183.

²⁰ Furthermore, these texts were apparently the oldest available at the time, since, when compared with most of the text types from Qumrân, the Masoretic Texts apparently preserved more archaic orthographic traditions (Freedman, Anderson, and Forbes 1992: 8–15).

²¹ Driver 1885.

²² Delitzsch 1881.

²³ Philippi 1883: 175–190.

²⁴ That is, the shortened form is the *jussive* of the *indicative* or *imperfect*. Furthermore, he highlighted Delitzsch’s own indirect acknowledgement of an inherent weakness in his argument when Delitzsch admitted that *Yahweh* was indeed, however, derived from the verb of existence (Driver 1885: 3). Cf. also Exodus 3:14–15.

attached to personal names, since “other names of the same form from verbs יהל do not occur (the form is itself a rare one).”²⁵ Continuing to cite Philippi’s refutations, he quotes:

Admitting a Babylonian yau, it is difficult to understand how a Hebrew yahu can have arisen from it: the form which the regular phonetic laws would lead us to expect is yô; and if yau became in Hebrew indiscriminately יהו, or יהו, how is it that the latter appears never at the end of a compound proper name, the former never at the beginning? This difference can be accounted for upon the ordinary view, but not by Delitzsch’s theory. “The יהו abbreviated from יהוה, when standing at the beginning of compound names became yehau, yehô, after the analogy of גבר from *גבר, because yāhû, in such a position, as part of a compound word with an accent of its own, would have drawn the tone unduly back, whereas יהו for יהו, in the second part of the compound, was excellently adapted to receive the tone.”²⁶

Thus for Philippi, with partial acceptance by Driver, but who seems more inclined toward a *verbal yāhû* directly from *Yahweh*, at least the original was *yahw*, although there is no indication of *exactly when* these two phonological changes took place.

In 1924 W. F. Albright²⁷ from our standpoint practically picked up where Driver left off and questioned if anyone still adhered to the Mesopotamian origin of the name *Yahweh*, explaining that the Akkadian “*ia’um*” found in personal names is merely the independent possessive pronoun of the first person.²⁸ However, he then proceeded to put forth an explanation for the PNNCSN found in the Masoretic text that would persist for some time. He stated first of all that the name *Yahweh* belongs to a class of imperfects that are abbreviations (or hypocoristica) of theophorous names joined usually with *el*, but not itself also being originally compounded with *el*, as these imperfects developed an elevated status of their own.²⁹ Furthermore, he stated that “The origin of this variation [*Yāhû*] may perhaps be sought in imperfect forms which could be regarded as either [jussives or indicatives], and thus formed a bridge over which it was possible to interchange jussives and indicatives of different structure occurring in proper names.”³⁰ He proceeded then to explain the origin of the other abbreviated form, namely *yāhō*, which he calls “an anomalous product of analogy” (especially in a name like *yāhōsef* for *yōsef* which he specifically deemed “equally absurd”)³¹ that resulted from the form *yô*,³² which itself contracted from

²⁵ Driver 1885: 5, n. 1. But, see below.

²⁶ Driver 1885: 6.

²⁷ Albright 1924: 370–374; Albright 1925:158–162.

²⁸ Albright 1924: 370.

²⁹ Albright 1924: 371. Cf. also Freedman 1960: 156.

³⁰ Albright 1924: 373. Also, cf. Albright 1968: 147.

³¹ Albright 1925: 159.

³² Thus, he explained the Masoretes knew only *one pronunciation* for the initial form of this name (namely *yô*), and when, therefore, they found three graphemes, *yhw* (יהו), in the initial position of a personal name, they resolved this discrepancy with the most insignificant phonemic element, *a*, producing *yāhō* (יהו). Cf. Albright 1925: 158–160. Also, cf. Cross 2006: 79.

yau,³³ after the *he* of *Yāhû* had syncopated.³⁴ Thus, for Albright, *yāhû* is the original form of the Sacred Name when compounded in personal names.

However, these answers to difficult questions in turn generate more questions for the student. Firstly, if this imperfect formed “a bridge over which it was possible to interchange jussives and indicatives” then how does the *independent form* of the jussive (*Yāhû*) find no representation in the Masoretic Text, the bulk of the history of Israel (especially in poetry), or in epigraphic material from pre-exilic Israel,³⁵ and is only found at its earliest in the fifth century especially outside of Israel in Egypt (Elephantine) or even in late fourth-century Idumea, where the indicative *Yahweh*, the unequivocal independent form, has no representation whatsoever?³⁶ And, if it is assumed that the independent *Yāhû* was not as conservative for the “Deuteronomic innovations” as *Yahweh*,³⁷ then we are hard-pressed to explain the difference of this form and the independent *Yāh* (and representing *Yahweh*), which is found not only in later poetry, but also in a poetical record in the Pentateuch.³⁸ The invariable independent form (*Yahweh*) would not be viewed differently from its equivalent “jussive” if this form likewise found free use in pre-exilic Israel.³⁹ Certainly, Albright himself stated that the longer name *Yahweh* “had been replaced for some purposes by ‘Yahu’ long before the Exile,”⁴⁰ and Cross confers that the form “*yahû*” is “early,” but adds, “in fact it is surprising that *yahû* as an independent name does not appear before the fifth century B.C.E.”⁴¹ Secondly, there is the question of abbreviations that we already saw asked above.⁴² Does the *form* necessarily change when the name is compounded with other elements in forming *other* names, or should it merely be shortened?⁴³ Thirdly, and directly connected to the second, the religious context likewise questions the morphological variant *yāhû*, since as one examines the religious injunctions and expectations in the Pentateuch, and also afterward, revolving around the name *Yahweh*, its use, and

³³ This phenomenon (*aw > ô) occurs in ancient Hebrew earlier in the Northern Kingdom than in the Southern, but also occurred generally in many other Northwest Semitic languages at different periods in their history, such as Phoenician (the earliest and probably the source of the phenomenon), Ammonite, Moabite, etc. But, it occurred also independently in Akkadian (of the Northeast Semitic branch). Cf. Cross and Freedman 1952; Garr 1985:35–40.

³⁴ Albright 1925: 159.

³⁵ The attestation of *yhw* in Kuntillet Ajrud is not to be assumed to be *Yāhû*. All other attestations of *Yahweh* at Kuntillet Ajrud have the regular four graphemes. Those pre-exilic *attestations* seems most likely a result of the fading of the final *he*. Cf. Gogel 1998: 414. Also cf. Cross 1973: 61. But, neither should it be assumed that these are actually indications of defective orthography, as suggested by Dobbs-Allsopp, Roberts, Seow, and Whitaker (2005: 284 [KAjr 9]).

³⁶ Cowley 1923: XVIII–XX; B. Porten 1968: 105; B. Porten 1995: 60, n. *.

³⁷ Albright 1925: 159.

³⁸ Cf. Exodus 15:2 and Psalm 68:4.

³⁹ Cf. also Exodus 20:7. B. Porten (Porten 1995: 60, n. *), acknowledging the nonexistence of any reference to *Yahweh* at post-exilic Elephantine (although there exists obvious allusions to him), suggests that *Yāhû* was confined to “vernacular” usage, and *Yahweh* to sacred writings. The real considerations, however, are the full linguistic capabilities of these Jews at Elephantine. Cf. Cowley 1923: XV, 118–119. And, see section 3.1.6.1.2 below.

⁴⁰ Albright 1942: 52.

⁴¹ Cross 1973: 61

⁴² Cf. n. 25 above.

⁴³ Cf. Philippi 1883: 185–186.

misuse thereof, the connotations indicate an exclusivity of sorts in this *one form* above any *other* in the religion of Israel, a contrast from their Semitic neighbors.⁴⁴ This would then make any modifications of its *form* to *another form(s)* or *unrecognizable abbreviation(s)* a religious taboo.⁴⁵ But, the *yǎhû* of the post-exilic period and the Masoretic text must be accounted for. However, the answers to the questions posed must be sought in the evidence derived from pre-exilic Israel and carefully traced thereafter to detect any significant patterns in the development of our abbreviation(s).

1. THE PRE-EXILIC PERIOD (1000–597 B.C.E.⁴⁶)

1.1. -Yhw-, -Yw-, and -Yh in Pre-exilic Israel

The corpus of pre-exilic excavated epigraphic material bearing on the onomastica of Israel is well documented, and attests to PNNCSN that have the abbreviated name⁴⁷ spelled *-yhw-* and *-yw-* (both at the beginning of names and also at the end).⁴⁸ In the Northern Kingdom of Israel only the spelling *-yw-* is found through to its deportation in 722 B.C.E.⁴⁹ In the Southern Kingdom the spelling *-yhw-* is found in the ninth century⁵⁰ and in the eighth century, along with some names spelled *-yw-*, but the spelling subsequently reverted again to *-yhw-* by the seventh century.⁵¹ From the seventh century through to the deportation in 597 B.C.E. the form *-yhw-* is found *exclusively* in the Southern Kingdom.⁵² Zadok, however, noted that “*-yw* did not disappear entirely,”⁵³ where he gave the spelling *zkryw* (no provenience), dated to ca. 700 B.C.E. But, it must also be noted that the spelling *-yh* is also found in pre-exilic Israel,

⁴⁴ Thus, while in Babylonia, Assyria, and Sidon, various deities are represented in the onomastica of particular families in a given period, this is not the case (natively) in Israel. Cf. Tigay 1986: 10–11. Also, cf. Fowler 1988: 297–298.

⁴⁵ Cf. Exodus 20:7; Psalms 5:11, 7:17, 8:1, 9:10, 68:4, etc.; Isaiah 26:8; Jeremiah 44:26, etc. Thus, *Yh* is represented as merely an abbreviation of the one form *Yahweh* used in poetry, and there is great emphasis on the *singularity* of the name all throughout the texts from the various periods of Israel’s history. Cf. Meyer 1987.

⁴⁶ For the purposes of this discussion, we will consider the pre-exilic period as extending up to 597 B.C.E., rather than the traditional date for the beginning of the exile (i.e. 586 B.C.E.).

⁴⁷ For the sake of simplicity, all orthographic variations that stand for the *original abbreviated Sacred Name* will be so called, although this study will reveal that some of these are not in fact thus.

⁴⁸ These archaeological artifacts vary from seals and bullae, jar handle impressions, papyri, ostraca, and many other inscriptions dated before the exile on stratigraphic, paleographic, and epigraphic grounds. There are also several unprovenienced epigraphic artifacts that have been acquired on the antiquities market, some of which have been deemed fakes and counterfeits. Cf. Avigad and Sass 1997.

⁴⁹ Zadok 1988: 182, 184; Cross 1983: 57.

⁵⁰ A seal containing the name *šm’yhw* is dated paleographically by Cross and Freeman (1952: 47–48) to the ninth century, after it was roughly dated in Diringier to the eighth-seventh century. Cf. Gogel 1998: 57. The Tel Dan Stele written in Aramaic dated to ca. 840 B.C.E. indicates a spelling [xxx]-*yhw* at the end of a Judahite name (presumably that of King Aḥaz from context). Cf. Biran and Naveh 1995.

⁵¹ Cf. Cross 1983: 57; Cross 2006: 79; Zadok 1988: 184; Tigay 1986: 47–63.

⁵² Cross 1983: 57; Zadok 1988: 184; Avigad and Sass 1997: 42; Shiloh 1986: 32.

⁵³ Zadok 1988: 184.

although attestations are far fewer than exist for the longer form and seems peculiarly limited to seals or inscriptions in seal style.⁵⁴ This spelling has been deemed an abbreviation of the longer form *-yhw*.⁵⁵ The vowel phoneme(s) of these abbreviations can be identified somewhat from the spellings on the epigraphic material. In the Southern Kingdom, the spelling *-yw* is vocalized /yaw/, representing the diphthong /aw/, and not /yô/, as the diphthong in this period had not yet contracted. However, this may not always be the case with the Northern Kingdom, as the diphthong /aw/ did contract to /ô/.⁵⁶ However, the consonantal nature of the alphabet prohibits a *full* identification of the vowel phoneme(s) present in the abbreviated form *-yhw*, but a related Semitic language that does utilize a writing system indicating vowels, such as Akkadian and its cuneiform script, may be helpful in making an identification of the vowel phoneme(s) in this element (and also that of *-yw*) found in Hebrew PNNCSN transcribed into that writing system.

1.2. Neo-Assyrian Transcriptions in the Pre-exilic Period

1.2.1. The Transcriptions of PNNCSN Compared with Toponym יהודה and Diphthong /aw/

Various West Semitic names are found in numerous types of records in the Assyrian language (a dialectal offshoot of the Akkadian language) during the Neo-Assyrian period (1000–600 B.C.E.⁵⁷),⁵⁸ among which are names that can fairly to quite certainly be identified as Israelites.⁵⁹ There are, however,

⁵⁴ Cf. Zadok 1988: 185. Zevit (1983: 8–10; 1988: 227–234) argues rigorously in favor of clear, unrestricted usage of this short form in pre-exilic personal names, but Avigad and Sass (1997: 42) made the important statement that “the fact that there is no clear instance of a name ending in *yh* is noteworthy, in light of the fact that many of the names on the bullae are especially common in the later books of the Bible, where the *yh* suffix frequently appears in theophorous names.” Shiloh, who admits of a few clear examples of this short ending, sees the spelling as merely an orthographic variation due to “the limited space available on the face of the seal,” but was still pronounced as the long form (of course, assuming a regular pronunciation of the long form as *yâhû*) (Shiloh 1986: 30). Certainly, there is a great numerical discrepancy in the epigraphic attestations of the long form as opposed to the short, but this study provides the answers. Cf. section 3.1.6.2.

⁵⁵ Coogan 1973: 190; Cf. also Silverman 1969; Zevit 1983: 1.

⁵⁶ According to Cross, the contraction of *yaw* to *yô* took place “in the course of the 4th century” in the Southern Kingdom of Judah (Cross 1983: 57, n. 17), and, although the diphthong /aw/ had already contracted in the north, as well as other Semitic languages (cf. n. 33 above; Garr 1985: 40.), some personal names in the Neo-Babylonian period in 603 B.C.E. from Šēḥ Ḥamad, if reflective of northern Israelites (and not Judahites), may still have reflected *yaw*. Cf. Postgate 1993. Also, see just below.

⁵⁷ Huehnergard 2005: xxii.

⁵⁸ Cf. Baker and Radner 1998–2002 (= PNAE); Zadok 1977; Zadok 1988. Also, cf. Younger 2002.

⁵⁹ Both northern Israelites and Judahites can be identified: 1) fairly certainly by specific Hebrew morphological features unique to that language (or present in one or two other Semitic language[s]) and reflected in the names, and 2) quite certainly by the presence of the abbreviated Sacred Name compounded with some other predicative element unique to Northwest Semitic languages or the Hebrew language itself (especially when the name is marked with the Akkadian determinative for deity). An exception to the second is found in the north Syrian ruler Az-ri-ia-(a)-ju/ú and the Hamathean rulers ^lia-(ú)-bi-’-di (also called ^li-lu-bi-’-di) and Yôrām. Cf. Zadok 1979: 4, 9.

incompatibilities in the Neo-Assyrian and Northwest Semitic phonemes of this period;⁶⁰ however, these limitations do not prohibit a recovery of the vowel phoneme(s) that existed in the alphabetic spelling of the abbreviated form(s) of the Sacred Name.⁶¹ Furthermore, it can also be noted that the transcriptions from Assyria after 722 B.C.E. should mostly be reflective of northern Israelites, rather than Judahites.⁶² Our goal then is to determine if the *full* phonemic picture that lay behind the specific transcription can be uncovered at all, whereby we will be able to perceive what was heard by the Assyrian scribe. But, to achieve this goal, for the sake of comparison and isolation we will also include: 1) other proper names that do contain the vowel phoneme /ū/ after the /h/—the toponym *Yhdh/Yhwdh* (Judah) and the personal name *Yhʿ* (Jehu), and 2) a name containing a diphthong *before* its contraction—the personal name *Hawšēʿ* (later *Hôšēʿ*).

At the beginning of PNNCSN in Neo-Assyrian the abbreviated name is transcribed as **ia-u-** (𐎲𐎠𐎺) and **ia-ú-** (𐎲𐎠𐎺𐎠) (or **iu-u-** and **iu-ú-**, which would be reflective of *yô*⁶³).

The transcriptions of royal biblical persons' names are:

(The abbreviated Sacred Name is bold.)

Jehu, King of Israel (843-816 B.C.E.) in reign of Shalmaneser III (858-824 B.C.E.)

- 1) **'ia-a-ú** (839 B.C.E.; Brinkman and Schwemer 2000: 496)—paid tribute.
- 2) **'ia-ú-a** (828-827 B.C.E.; Ibid.)—paid silver, gold, tin, staffs, and spears.
- 3) **'ia-ú-a** (841 B.C.E. (?); Ibid.)—paid tribute
- 4) **'ia-ú-a** (839-838 B.C.E. (?); Ibid.)—paid tribute

Joash, King of Israel (798-782 B.C.E.) in reign of Adad-nerari III (810-783 B.C.E.)

- 1) **'iu-ʿa-su** (**'ia-ʿu-su** and **'ia-ʿa-su**)⁶⁴ (Baker 2000: 590)—paid tribute

⁶⁰ The cuneiform writing system is not *alphabetic*, so that an individual sign does not indicate each *phoneme* (except vowels [V] which do have independent signs), but, rather, indicates half of or a full syllable at a time in the format: V, CV, VC, and CVC (such as *ba, ab, bab, tam*, etc.). The vowel phonemes found in Assyrian are short: /a/, /e/, /i/, and /u/, as well as long /ā/, /ē/, /ī/, and /ū/. The vowel phoneme /ō/ is represented in Neo-Assyrian cuneiform by the same sign for <u>. The West Semitic phoneme /h/ is mostly not represented in Neo-Assyrian, and /ʿ/ is represented by the sign for /ḥ/ and /ʿ/. Neo-Assyrian /s/ transcribes West Semitic /š/, and this phoneme, /s/ in West Semitic, is transcribed by the Neo-Assyrian sign for the phoneme /š/. Cf. Tallqvist 1914; Radner 1998: xxiv.

⁶¹ Cf. Millard 1976 for a discussion of the Assyrian royal names transcribed into Biblical Hebrew.

⁶² Cf. Zadok 1979: 7.

⁶³ Cf. Malamat 1971. Since the cuneiform sign *ia* (*i + a*) could mean not only *ia*, but *i + any other vowel* (*ii, ie, iu*), other factors need to be considered (cf. n. 33 and 56 above) to determine which is to be preferred. S. Page (1968) initially published **'ia-ʿa-su** for the *northern Israelite* king, but Malamat (1971) suggested **iu-ʿa-su** (indicating *yô- < yaw-*). As of 1988, Zadok (1988: 25 and n. 92) was not convinced that the contraction took place in this name and rendered it **ia-ʿu-su**. In 1997, Naʿaman, citing a Samaritan's name spelt ¹ahī(PAP)-i-ú (Achiō—possibly same person as ¹PAP-ia-ú; cf. Zadok 2002: 21) and a comparison of a royal person spelled Asau/Asû and Sua with laau/laua (King of Israel), thought that Malamat was correct. Zadok (1997) accepted this possibility as consistent with the contraction that may also have affected this form of the compound Sacred Name in northern Israelite names.

⁶⁴ Cf. n. 63 above.

Jehoachaz, King of Judah (741-725 or 744-729 B.C.E.) in reign of Tiglath-pileser III (744-727 B.C.E.)

- 1) ¹ia-ú-ḥa-zi (734-733 B.C.E.; Schwemer 2000b: 497)—paid tribute

Hoshea, King of Israel (732-723 B.C.E.) in reign of Tiglath-pileser III (744-727 B.C.E.)

- 1) ¹a-ú-se-a' (𐤀 𐤅 𐤍 𐤍 𐤁) (733-732 B.C.E.; Cole 1998a: 238)—installed by Tiglath-pileser

Other transcriptions of personal names of northern Israelites or Judahites are:

- 1) ¹ia-u-ga-a (reign of Sargon II [721-705 B.C.E.]; Schwemer 2000a: 497)—team commander who is one of 13 Samaritans
- 2) ¹ia-u-ḥe-e (633 B.C.E. (?); Schwemer 2000c: 497)—from Kalḥu.

The toponym **Judah**:

- 1) ^{kur}ia-ú-da-a-a (𐤊 𐤅 𐤁 𐤁 𐤁) (734-733 B.C.E.; Schwemer 2000b: 497)—gentilic.
- 2) ^{lú}ia-ú-da-a-a (701-700 B.C.E.; Schwemer 2000d: 469)—gentilic, written twice.
- 3) ^{kur}ia-ú-du/ia-u-di/ia-ú-di (Zadok 1988: 302)—place name.

At the end of PNNCSN in Neo-Assyrian the abbreviated name is transcribed as **-ia-u** (𐤁 𐤅), **-ia-ú** (𐤁 𐤅 𐤁), **-ia-a-ú** (𐤁 𐤅 𐤁 𐤁), **-iá-a-u**, **-ia-a-u** (𐤁 𐤅 𐤁 𐤅), **-iá-u**, **-Ci-a-u** (𐤁 𐤅 𐤁 𐤅), **-Ci-a-a-u**, **-ia-a**, **-i-ú**, and **iá-u**.

The transcription of the royal biblical personal name is:

(The abbreviated Sacred Name is bold.)

Hezekiah, King of Judah (725-697 B.C.E.) in reign of Sargon II (721-705) and Sennacherib (704-681)

- 1) ḥa-za-qi-**ia-ú** (701-700 B.C.E.; Schwemer 2000d: 469)—rebels against Sennacherib.
- 2) ḥa-za-qi-**ia-a** (ibid.)—submits to Sennacherib.
- 3) ḥa-za-qi-**ia-a-u** (701-700 B.C.E.; Zadok 1988: 302)
- 4) ḥa-za-qi-**ia-(a)-ú** (ibid.)
- 5) ḥa-za-qi-**a-a-u** (ibid.)

Other transcriptions of personal names of northern Israelites or Judahites are:

- 1) ¹az-ri-**ia-a-ú** (738 B.C.E.; Cole 1998b: 240)—a King
- 2) ḥi-il-qi-**ia-u** (reign of Tiglath-pileser III [744-727 B.C.E.]; Schwemer 2000e: 472)—from Kalḥu
- 3) ḥi-il-qi-**a-u** (same person)
- 4) ¹na-ad-bi-**ia-a-ú** (709/08 B.C.E.; Zadok 1979)—from Kalḥu
- 5) ¹gír-**ia-ú** (reign of Sargon II (721-705); Zadok 1979)—from Kalḥu

- 6) ¹ah̄i(PAP)-**ia-ú** (710-708 (?); Cole 1998c: 63)—team commander in Kalḫu
- 7) ¹ah̄i(PAP)-**i-ú** (“almost certainly” same as 6; *ibid.*)—one of thirteen Samarian charioteers
- 8) ¹a-za-ri-**ia-a-ú** (737, 691, or 686 B.C.E.; Cole 1998b: 240)—commander from Aššur
- 9) ¹a-za-ri-**ia-ú** (682 B.C.E.; *ibid.*)—witness in Qaštu
- 10) ¹maḫ-si-**ia-a-u** (681-680 B.C.E.; Zadok 1979: 36)
- 11) ¹barak-**ia-ú** (665 B.C.E.; Fabritius 1998a: 269)
- 12) ¹barak-**ia-u** (same person; spelled this way on envelop)
- 13) ¹ba-na-**ia-a-u** (627 B.C.E.; Fabritius 1998a: 262)—witness in Aššur
- 14) ¹il(DINGIR)-**ia-a-u** (624-623 or 621-620 B.C.E.; Zadok 1988: 304; *idem* 1979: 37)
- 15) ¹nim-**ia-ú** (622 B.C.E.; Zadok 1979: 37)
- 16) ¹ra-pa-³a-**ia-ú** (622 B.C.E.; Zadok 1988: 304)
- 17) ¹na-tan-**ia-u** (648 B.C.E.; Zadok 1988: 304)
- 18) ¹né-ri-**ia-u** (after 650 B.C.E.; Zadok 1988: 304)
- 19) ¹pal-ṭi-**ia-u** (after 650 B.C.E.; Zadok 1988: 304)
- 20) ¹pal-ṭi-**ia-ú** (same person)
- 21) ¹ah̄-zi-**ia-a-u** (603 B.C.E.; Postgate 1993: 121)—father of Dadi-larim (a witness).
- 22) ¹sa-me-e-³**ia-a-u** (603 B.C.E.; Postgate 1993: 121)—father of Am-yadi³ (a witness).
- 23) ¹ḫa-za-qi-**ia-a-u** (603 B.C.E.; Postgate 1993: 121)—landowner
- 24) ¹ah̄-**ia-³u** (602 B.C.E.; Cole 1998c: 63)—father of Nabû-malik

1.2.2. YHW and YW Indistinguishable from First Two Syllables of Toponym in Cuneiform

Some important observations can be noted about the data presented above. The most common transcriptions are **-ia-u** and **-ia-ú**.⁶⁵ Also interesting is that the transcription of the alphabetic spelling *yhw-* with intervocalic *he* and that of the spelling *-yw-* with the diphthong *aw* are represented *virtually* the same way. This observation, however, has already been noted before, especially by Zadok, who also noted the personal name *A-a-u-id-[r]i*.⁶⁶ Also, note the indication of a long vowel phoneme following the *yod*, /ā/, even in northern Israelite names, reflecting their diphthongal element as *-yāw* (actually phonetically the same as *-yaw*; cf. section 3.1.6.2, n. 265 below). In the above names, the ambiguous **ia-** (𐎲𐎠) sign is often followed by an additional <a> (𐎠) sign, as in ¹az-ri-**ia-a-ú** (also compare ¹ḫi-il-qi-**ia-u** and ¹ḫi-il-qi-**a-u**; ¹ḫa-za-qi-**ia-(a)-ú**, ¹ḫa-za-qi-**ia-a**, etc.). The extra **a** in Akkadian mostly indicates a long

⁶⁵ This is an incomplete list of names from the Neo-Assyrian (and the beginning of the Neo-Babylonian) period, but an attempt was made to represent *most* names and the variations. Therefore, this statement is based on this list, not the entire corpus of PNNCSN in Neo-Assyrian, which could place either of these (but one) at the head of the list.

⁶⁶ Cf. Zadok 1988: 183. Likewise, McCarter (1974: 6) made note of the ambiguity that the cuneiform spelling possessed “in the absence of contemporary alphabetic evidence.”

vowel.⁶⁷ But, this also indicates primarily an /a/ vowel in the abbreviated Sacred Name. This would not preclude the equation of ia = iu (when without the extra <a>), which is already noted above, but strongly indicates an initial /a/ following /y/ in the names as primary. However, with regards to our other phoneme (the <w> in -*yhw*-) we emphasize that because the Assyrian scribes had a zero-representation for *he*, proper names transcribed into Neo-Assyrian cuneiform from an alphabetic *yhw/yhø*, with two syllables (the last of which possessing a long /ū/), and those from *yw*, comprising a diphthong with an <a> followed by a <u> in cuneiform, are *indistinguishable*. Therefore, in the light of the vocalization of the final -*yhw* in the Masoretic Text, coupled with the long-discovered fifth century Late Babylonian *ia-a-ḥu-u*,⁶⁸ the undeniable evidence of *Yāhū* at Elephantine, and the Neo-Assyrian reference to Jehoachaz as 'ia-ú-ḥa-zi^{LÜ}ia-ú-da-a-a (with the first two signs of names *identical*), it is tantalizing to accept -*yāhū*- as the unequivocal original pre-exilic form. But conclusions are based on a *complete study* and such a study is not so until all *relevant* evidence have been aptly considered. Thus, to determine if the *waw* does indeed represent a long /ū/ we must again return to the epigraphic sources in pre-exilic Israel and consider if a study of *Hebrew orthography* could clear up our ambiguous cuneiform transcription(s).

1.3. Hebrew Orthography and PNNCSN

1.3.1. Orthography in Pre-exilic Hebrew Inscriptions

In 1952 Cross and Freedman did a study of the Hebrew orthography exhibited on ancient inscriptions, and presented some rather interesting observations. Utilizing the principles of comparative linguistics, they sought to trace the development of the spelling conventions of various Northwest Semitic languages to determine the nature of the connection, especially considering a possible center of radiation for the orthographic conventions. They basically concluded that the original form of Hebrew orthography paralleled the Phoenician form, which maintained the principle of phonetic consonantism inherent in the Proto-Canaanite alphabet,⁶⁹ and represented no vowels (long or short) in its orthography in the tenth century (Gezer Calendar), but later on exhibited a system of *matres lexionis* in the final position in the ninth century, wherein the letters *waw* and *yod* were used to represent final long /ū/ and /ī/ respectively. The letter *he* represented final long /ā/, /ē/, and /ō/. The Arameans appeared to have started using the system of *matres lexionis* before the Hebrews just shortly after their adoption of the Phoenician alphabet between the twelfth and the tenth century and was the center of radiation for such a system,⁷⁰ but initially represented *only* final long vowels exactly as noted above in the case of the

⁶⁷ Cf. Huehnergard 2005: 71.

⁶⁸ This is the case in the personal name ^{ld}*ia-a-ḥu-u-na-tan-nu* in the Murašū archive, represented as *yhwntn* on the Aramaic docket that accompanied the cuneiform tablet. Cf. Clay 1908: 292 and 304.

⁶⁹ Cross and Freedman 1952: 9–10.

⁷⁰ Cross and Freedman 1952: 59.

Hebrews. They also concluded that diphthongs contracted in northern Israel, but remained uncontracted in the southern Kingdom, where only the consonantal element was indicated orthographically (*ay* represented by <y>; *aw* by <w>). From the very fact that the Arameans used *matres lexionis* to indicate final long vowels *earlier* than the Hebrews (and both orthographic systems were the same), Cross and Freedman posited that the Hebrews borrowed the system from the Arameans (as Moab did also in the middle of the ninth⁷¹) and did not develop it independently through historical spelling (the letters remained in their historic position, although there was a phonological change, thereby now indicating the new pronunciation). At some point later (in the early sixth century), the Hebrews sporadically begin to use internal *matres lexionis*, wherein only (apparently) *yod* was used to represent long /ī/, since they did not find any case of *waw* for /ū/.⁷² The letter *he* was never used as a *mater lexionis* internally. The letter *waw* did not represent /ō/ in medial position, nor did *yod* represent /ē/.

Various other studies have subsequently been presented on this topic, such as by Bange,⁷³ Cross and Freedman,⁷⁴ Zevit,⁷⁵ Freedman, Anderson, and Forbes,⁷⁶ and, more recently, by Gogel,⁷⁷ Anderson,⁷⁸ and Rollston.⁷⁹ Zevit challenged Cross and Freedman and correctly showed that there were cases of internal *matres lexionis* earlier than they posited, but attempted to force the issue for *matres lexionis* in unwarranted areas, such as Ugaritic,⁸⁰ which is primarily consonantal in its orthography, and in other cases where the supposed vowel letter may be from Aramaic influence or is historical.⁸¹ Certainly, the thesis of Cross and Freedman had to be modified since 1952, as many other inscriptional material became available, but their main argument still continues to be “most authoritative.”⁸² The Tell Fakhariyeh Aramaic inscription dated to the ninth century showed both internal and final *matres lexionis* being utilized,⁸³ and the late eighth century Silwan Tomb inscription in Hebrew discovered in 1953 showed the use of internal /ū/ in *ʾrwr*. Gogel, who attempted to “test” the theory of Cross and Freeman,⁸⁴ stated that “until further texts are discovered, the question of the first introduction of internal *m[atres]*

⁷¹ The Mesha stele exhibited the same orthographic principle, wherein *final long vowels only* were indicated in the orthography. Cf. Cross and Freedman 1952: 35–44.

⁷² Cross and Freedman 1952: 59.

⁷³ Bange 1971.

⁷⁴ Cross and Freedman 1975.

⁷⁵ Zevit 1980.

⁷⁶ Freedman, Anderson, and Forbes 1992.

⁷⁷ Gogel 1998.

⁷⁸ Anderson 1999.

⁷⁹ Rollston 2006.

⁸⁰ Gogel (1998: 54, n. 76) cites Pardee (1982: 503–4), who discusses that *matres lexionis* in Ugaritic is unsolved and these supposed cases may be affirmative particles.

⁸¹ Zevit 1980: 4, 22–25; Gogel (1998: 54, n. 77) points out that *šmnh* from the seventh century Phoenician Arslan Tash inscription is possibly due to Aramaic influence, which Zevit does indicate as possible. Other cases Zevit cites of *matres lexionis* are cases where the supposed vowel letters are historical (Gogel 1998: 54, n. 77; 55, n. 81; 56).

⁸² This is the conclusion of Rollston (2006: 61, n. 37).

⁸³ Cf. Freedman and Anderson 1992: 137–170.

⁸⁴ Gogel 1998: 1.

[*lexionis*] into epigraphic Hebrew will remain unanswered,” but adds that the “earliest proven” date of the use of internal *matres lexionis* is to be found in the late eighth century.⁸⁵ Rollston likewise did his own comparative analysis and highlighted that the “lion’s share of the eighth century” does not exhibit the use of internal *matres lexionis*,⁸⁶ especially when considering verbal forms and proper names where one expects them and even finds them written with internal *matres lexionis* later on (but never consistently before the exile),⁸⁷ and he described the Hebrew orthographic practices as exhibiting synchronic consistency, but with diachronic development.⁸⁸

1.3.2. Applying Orthographic Principles to the Pre-exilic Israelite Onomastica

Thus, a definite period for the introduction of internal *matres lexionis* exists and can be utilized in an analysis of PNNCSN. But, even as we acknowledge the *limitation* still inherent in *precisely* defining the stages of Hebrew spelling conventions,⁸⁹ our own attempt to analyze PNNCSN in the light of ancient Hebrew orthography is not affected, because merely the recognition of a diachronic development of Hebrew spelling conventions from a clearly perceived period of *less frequent* use of internal *matres lexionis* to one of *more frequent* use would certainly be reflected in the onomastica of the period under review, and, as a matter of fact, it does, except in the case (interestingly enough) of PNNCSN. Consequently, while a few proper names containing an internal long /ū/ or /ī/ appear with a *defective* orthography (not representing these vowels internally) in the eighth century and a *plene* one (indicating vowels) later, most actually seem to maintain that defective orthography into the late seventh or sixth centuries. Some proper names even have both *defective* and *plene* spellings at the same time, a clear example of a transitional period. Turning then to a pre-exilic *yāhû-*, there *should* be forms likewise with an internal /ū/ represented by \emptyset (not represented orthographically).⁹⁰ Therefore, since Rollston has pinpointed,⁹¹ along with Gogel (albeit more cautiously), that the late eighth and very early seventh century provides a “window on the incipient usage of the internal *matres lexionis*,” we will consider on the one hand examples *before* the late eight/early seventh century of: 1) PNNCSN with initial *yhw-* and determine if the orthography indicates a long /ū/ after an intervocalic *he* or not; 2) other proper names likewise containing an internal long /ū/ or /ī/, including the toponym *Judah*; and 3) other terms and

⁸⁵ Gogel 1998: 74.

⁸⁶ Rollston 2006: 63.

⁸⁷ Rollston 2006: 64.

⁸⁸ Rollston 2006: 64.

⁸⁹ The limitation is that there is not as large a corpus of early eighth century inscriptions to provide a full database of ancient Hebrew texts from which more *precise* conclusions may be drawn, although the amount of inscriptions that do exist from the beginning to the middle of the eighth century are more than exist from the ninth and do provide examples that can establish a date of the incipient usage of internal *matres lexionis* as seen above, and the data continues to grow. Cf. Gogel 1998: 57, 61–74 and Rollston 2006: 63–64.

⁹⁰ The attestation of *yhbnh* on a seal at Beth Shemesh is anomalous.

⁹¹ Rollston 2006: 63.

forms with these long vowels. Then, on the other hand, analyzing inscriptional material from the seventh to early sixth century, we will determine if there are *orthographic differences* reflected in the examples from the same three categories listed above. Hopefully, then, we will be able to answer the questions that the cuneiform inscriptions could not answer precisely.

EIGHTH CENTURY

(Potential **waw** and **yod matres** or **ø** [zero representation] are bold.)

PNNCSN with initial **yhw**-

- 1) yhw^ʔb (Arad 59, 1—Stratum IX [eighth century])
- 2) yhw^ʔb (ibid. 49, 9—Stratum VIII [eighth century])
- 3) [yh]w^ʔz (ibid.)
- 4) yhw^hyl (prov.) (Avigad and Sass 1997, 672A; Ramat Raḥel, no. 2106/1—Stratum V)
- 5) yhw^hyl (prov.) (Avigad and Sass 1997, 672B; ibid., no. 4350/1—Stratum V)
- 6) yhw^hl (prov.) (Avigad and Sass 1997, 673A; ibid., no. 1983/1—Stratum V)
- 7) yhw^hl (prov.) (Avigad and Sass 1997, 673B; Lachish, no. 10622/1)
- 8) yhwbnh (prov.) (Avigad and Sass 1997, 677A; Beth Shemesh, no. 1263/1—Stratum II)
- 9) yhwbnh (prov.) (Avigad and Sass 1997, 677B; Ramat Raḥel, no. 5103—Stratum V)

Other proper names with long **ū** or **î**:

- 1) ʔhømlk (Arad 72, 2)
- 2) ʔløplṭ (Orem/Tell al-ʿrēme)
- 3) ʔøryhw (Qom 3)
- 4) ʔøry[w] (Sam. 112, 4)
- 5) brøk (ibid. 111, 1, 2)
- 6) brøk (ibid. 116)
- 7) døml^ʔ (ibid. 117)
- 8) ʿøzyw (KAjr 21)
- 9) Glgøl (Arad 49, 3)
- 10) šøʿl (ibid. 14)

Other spellings with long **ū** or **î**:

- 1) brøk (KAjr 9)
- 2) høʿ (ibid.)
- 3) ymøm (KAjr 14)

LATE EIGHTH/SEVENTH/SIXTH CENTURY

(Potential **waw** and **yod matres** or **ø** are bold.)

PNNCSN with initial **yhw**-

- 1) yhw^ʔz (Arad 31, 2)
- 2) yhwzrḥ (Hebron seal 1)

- 3) yhwzrh (Tell Amal seal Impression)⁹²
- 4) yhwʿb (Arad 39, 4)
- 5) yhwʿb (Jerusalem Bulla 10)⁹³
- 6) yhwkl (Arad 21, 1)
- 7) yhwkl (Lachish V, Seal 1)
- 8) yhwrm (Lachish V, Seal 9)
- 9) [y]hw[km] (Lach 31)

Other proper names with long ū or ī:

- 1) nḥøm (Jslm 34)
- 2) ʿḥyʿ[l] (Jslm 26) [m]
- 3) ʿḥyq[m] (ibid.) [l]
- 4) dʿwʿ[l] (ibid.) [l]
- 5) ʿwryhw (Arad 31, 2)
- 6) ʿḥyqm (ibid.)
- 7) ʿøryhw (Mar 1)
- 8) ʿḥøqm (Ira 6)
- 9) ʿøzʿ (ibid. 7)
- 10) ʿwryhw (Jslm 1, 8)
- 11) yḥødh (K. b. Lei 1, 2; Cf. Naveh 1968: 74, n. 38 and Cross 1970: 304 for date.)
- 12) yḥwd(h) (Arad 40, 12)
- 13) ʿlyrøb (Lach 32)
- 14) yʿør (Lach 31)
- 15) ʿyrh (Lach 4)
- 16) yʿwš (Lach 2, 1)
- 17) dømlʿ (Gibn 22)
- 18) šbøʿl (Gibn 22)
- 19) nørʿ (ibid.)
- 20) ʿlyšøb (Arad 1-12, 14-18, 24, 38, 47, 64)

Other spellings with long ū or ī:

- 1) ʿrør (EnGd 2, 1)
- 2) brøk (ibid. 4)
- 3) ʿyš (Lach 3, 10)
- 4) ʿyr (Mar 1)
- 5) šmnøm (Jslm 3)
- 6) šbrøm (ibid.)

⁹² Hestrin 1974.

⁹³ Shiloh 1986.

The most significant observation to be made even from this mere sample of the onomastica of pre-exilic Israel is the consistent representation of the *waw* in the orthography of all PNNCSN with initial *yhw*- both before the introduction of and during the more frequent usage of internal *matres lexiōnis*.⁹⁴ Comparing these names then to other personal names and the toponym of the southern kingdom, which do possess internal long /ū/ or /ī/, presents some unexpected results.⁹⁵ Before the late eighth/early seventh century there are consistent *defective* spellings of names as in the cases of ^ʾhmlk, ^ʾlplṯ, and ^ʾryhw. After the eighth century, names with the epithet ^ʾhy- are spelled *plene*, while one maintains a defective spelling (^ʾhqm). The name ^ʾ(w)ryhw is likewise spelled both defective and *plene* in virtually the same period, with earlier attestations written defectively. Even the *toponym Judah* in the late period is also spelled *both defective* (*yhdh*) and *plene* (*yhwdh*) as well. The name ^ʾlyšb is always spelled *defectively*, without the *yod mater* (before /b/). This is what one should expect for this transitional period in the use of internal *matres lexiōnis*, but is significantly non-existent in the cases of PNNCSN with initial *yhw*-. Significant it is only because this abbreviated form of the Sacred Name in pre-exilic Israel has been prominently associated with the pronunciation *yāhû-*, but, as is clearly demonstrated here, this form is not upheld by Hebrew orthography. If, however, our ambiguous phoneme does not represent a long /ū/ in these names (both at the beginning and also at the end), then what else does it represent? It has to be nothing more than a /w/—the third consonant phoneme in the Sacred Name Yahweh (יהוה).

1.3.3. The Phonology of the Abbreviated Sacred Name Reflected in Ancient Hebrew Orthography

Of course, the vocalization **yahw* (יהו) for the abbreviated form of the Sacred Name (-*yhw*-) is certainly not new to students. Having already been seen discussed by Philippi above,⁹⁶ who was preceded by Olshausen,⁹⁷ a similar form was also put forth by G. R. Driver in 1928, although from quite a different perspective.⁹⁸ However, it has more recently been the opinion of D. N. Freedman and F. I. Anderson. They stated:

In view of its universal and persistent occurrence, we are convinced that the *waw* in the sequence **yhw** was originally consonantal . . . We must start further back in the series with the full name **yahweh** and postulate a combining form such as ***yahwi-** and then ***yahw-**.⁹⁹

⁹⁴ For a full list and transcription of provenienced and unprovenienced ancient Hebrew inscriptions, cf. Dobbs-Allsopp, Roberts, Seow, Whitaker 2005; Gogel 1998: 385–494.

⁹⁵ The results of this sample can certainly also be indicative of the entire corpus of the onomastica of pre-exilic Israel, since the orthography continued to be inconsistent even into the exile, so that defective spellings continued to persist even at that time. The later Second Temple orthography (Qumrân) presents a fuller and more consistent use of *matres lexiōnis*.

⁹⁶ Philippi 1883: 185–186.

⁹⁷ Olshausen 1861: 611.

⁹⁸ G. R. Driver 1928: 20. Specifically, he posited a form *yā(h)w*, actually representing an original *yā*.

⁹⁹ Freedman, Anderson, and Forbes 1992: 173.

Their need for a combining form **yahwi* before the posited **yahw*, however, is interesting. Using the comparative evidence of an apparent parallel Amorite verbal form *yahwī* (ya-wi-), or *yahwē* (ya-wi-e), from personal names in the Mari texts written in cuneiform, Freedman, along with O'Connor, discussed aspects of the possible phonology of the name and the possible phonological processes that produced its abbreviated forms in ancient Hebrew.¹⁰⁰ Beginning with a form *yahwēh* in ancient Hebrew, Freedman and O'Connor argued that the changes in the abbreviated forms of the Sacred Name result from "the shift of the Tetragrammaton from a verb to a proper noun."¹⁰¹ Since the Tetragrammaton was originally the verbal element in a sentence name,¹⁰² the final vowel was not dropped initially, but then was shortened and dropped when combined with other elements to form PNNCSN. The /w/ was vocalized, and could have been lengthened to /ū/, or dropped if not lengthened (like all final short vowels), and so developed from **yahwi*, **yahw*, **yahū*, and **yah*. This final form then lengthened to produce *yāh*.¹⁰³ Consequently, Freedman and Anderson (and O'Connor) do not go to another verbal form (a jussive, *yahū*) for the *original* shortened Sacred Name when compounded in personal names, but to a possible *earlier combinatory form* of this verbal form, which then produced the shortened *nominal* forms. If, however, the formation of PNNCSN *did not develop over time beginning with the full name Yahweh*, but resulted simply from a deliberate abbreviating of the Sacred Name, this "combinatory form," of course, would not apply.¹⁰⁴ Additionally, it is an interesting observation that **qatl* (including other **qVtl* forms) nouns were still tolerated even until well into the Hellenistic and Roman periods in ancient Hebrew, especially frequently with liquids.¹⁰⁵ Yet, Hebrew personal names do not always appear to be consistent for whatever reasons.¹⁰⁶

Cross, in a related discussion, puts forth some important morphological observations about this possibly causative (or possibly simple [G]¹⁰⁷) imperfect perceived in Amorite personal names, as well as that of *yahwī*, which in turn may have phonological implications for it in ancient Hebrew.¹⁰⁸ One example of *yahwī* is seen in ya-wi-ʾIl(DINGER) (*yahwīʾIl*), meaning "Il brings (brought) into being." Both

¹⁰⁰ Freedman and O'Connor 1986: 511–513.

¹⁰¹ Freedman and O'Connor 1986: 512.

¹⁰² Cf. Albright 1924: 371–372; Freedman 1960: 151–156; Cross 1973: 61.

¹⁰³ Freedman and O'Connor 1986: 512.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Numbers 13:16.

¹⁰⁵ Note some transcriptions of personal names found in the Septuagint (LXX), produced about 250 B.C.E. Also, cf. Garr 1985: 46; Zadok 1988: 64–88. It should be clear that this element actually "mimics" a **qatl* nominal form.

¹⁰⁶ Thus, Garr (1985: 38) shows the dialectal phenomenon of the diphthong contraction (aw > ô) in northern Hebrew (which possibly originated in Phoenicia, Garr 1985:40), but in 732 B.C.E., the personal name *Hôšē* is spelled 'a-ú-se-' in Assyrian (cf. above), but which should have already reflected the contraction. There are, however, evidence of this same name with the contraction. Cf. Zadok 1996: 726–27, quoted in Mykytiuk 2004: 64. Also, some personal names (if reflective of northern Israelites) with final *-yaw* appear uncontracted in Neo-Assyrian transcriptions (Postgate 1993: 109; also cf. above). Note additionally PNNCSN transcribed into Neo-Assyrian above with no indication of a vowel following the *u* (*ú*).

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Freedman and O'Connor 1986: 512, 513.

¹⁰⁸ Cross 1973: 62–63.

verbal forms (*yahwī* and *yahwī*) apparently had parallel jussives as evidenced in other Amorite personal names. The apocopated jussive of *yahwī* seems to appear in *ya-u-i-li* (*yahūʾlī*), and that of *yahwī* in *ya-ḥi-ʾil* (*DINGER*), the former often being associated with a possible parallel jussive (**yahū*) of the causative imperfect *yahwēh* in ancient Hebrew.¹⁰⁹ However, the *almost exact correspondence* of the Amorite jussive here perceived (**yahū*) and the *yāhū* of the exilic, post-exilic, and Masoretic onomastica is, in fact, *coincidental* (which is also indicated by Freedman and O'Connor's *nominal yahū*¹¹⁰). But, see below.

Others have tepidly accepted the possibility of the abbreviation *yahw* for alphabetic *-yhw-*, such as Millard (but who still appears to prefer *yāhū*), and, later, Gogel, who would like to vocalize an /ē/ after the /w/, but this is not upheld by any other observations.¹¹¹ As previously noted, the Neo-Assyrian transcriptions would have reflected this additional vowel phoneme following the *ú/u* in PNNCSN. Thus, the name of King Hezekiah is transcribed into Neo-Assyrian as *ḥa-za-qi-ia-(a)-ú*. This absence is consistently attested. Others are not as tepid. Stuart believes both final and initial Masoretic forms to be derived from *yahw*, in alignment with Freedman and O'Connor (see just above).¹¹² Tropper, however, saw this shortened form as actually the *original name*, a **qatl* nominal lexeme, that resulted in a long form with a *he mater* for /ā/.¹¹³ But importantly Zadok, based on Neo-/Late Babylonian transcriptions of PNNCSN (e.g. *-ia-a-ma*), also believes “/yaw/ </yahw/.”¹¹⁴ On the other hand, Millard, in discussing the /w/ of the initial element (*yhw-*), stated that this form could have been considered “quasi-independent” and treated as a “final vowel letter” (as the type of name with predicate initial does indeed appear in epigraphic sources more times than those with predicate final¹¹⁵), and would, therefore, *always* indicate a /ū/ orthographically.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, some may indicate, orthographically speaking, that the <w> is mere historical spelling and so is *always* indicated in PNNCSN although it is a *ú*, but this too actually presents more difficulties for a *yāhū*, since it logically admits a former spelling of *-yahw-*, with no indication of exactly when the phonological change took place. But, the religious context of the personal name behind the abbreviated form must be considered before we proceed further in our quest for definite answers.

1.4. The Name Yahweh in its Pre-exilic Religious Contexts

1.4.1. The Independent Name

¹⁰⁹ Albright 1924: 373.

¹¹⁰ Freedman and O'Connor 1986: 512.

¹¹¹ Millard 1980: 212 and Gogel 1998: 58; 59, n. 93; 60, n. 95.

¹¹² Stuart 1986: 487.

¹¹³ Tropper 2001.

¹¹⁴ Zadok 2004: 7, n. 7. Also, cf. Zadok 1997.

¹¹⁵ Fowler 1988: 33–37.

¹¹⁶ Millard 1980: 212.

Elder Jacob O. Meyer (OBM) has also long believed and taught that the first three letters (-*yhw*-) in these names constitute one syllable with a pronunciation *yahw* (having the same pronunciation as the shortened form containing the diphthong—*yaw*),¹¹⁷ but this time that was achieved by a method that simply utilized the *ideology of the full name* to *define* what any abbreviation is expected to be. Firstly, when one views the Pentateuch's injunctions against the misuse of this name and the numerous prophetic exhortations (repeating the Pentateuchal traditions) all emphasizing an *exclusivity* of use and great reverence for the name *Yahweh*, from a morphological point of view, any *other verbal form* standing in lieu of this name seems intolerable (but a simple shortening of this same form *with two or three letters* is),¹¹⁸ leaving no allowances for a verbal *yahû*.¹¹⁹ Additionally, that this inviolability of name and the exclusivity of use and reverence are early, rather than late, is confirmed by the strong association of them with Moses and their emphases in the Pentateuch.¹²⁰ This consideration then is one religious context through which we must analyze PNNCSN and perceive how it could have been carried over into these names. Secondly, when diachronically considering Israel's *general* pre-exilic religious ideology regarding the use and reverence of the name *Yahweh* not only is an *apparent parallel* found with that use in the Pentateuch, but so are *diversions away from this ideal reverence*, which then begs the question as to how may PNNCSN in these *divergent instances regarding reverence of the name* be thus considered and affected. These *two contexts* will be inspected together. Therefore, we ask how is the Pentateuch's instructions and emphasis regarding the use and reverence of this one name (and *verbal form*) *Yahweh* realized in the pre-exilic Israelite religion and daily life? Do they only speak of one form of the name and also how is its sacredness treated? After answering these questions, we will determine how this context carries over into the onomasticon.

Firstly, let us consider its use. The important fact is emphasized over and over again that this one name was to be used *exclusively* and not to be defiled or disesteemed.¹²¹ But, in spite of this, it was used freely in the worship of Israel and also in *common usage*.¹²² We see that this name is said to reside in the sanctuary, which is called by the one name of *Yahweh*,¹²³ or the *bayit/bêt Yahweh*.¹²⁴ Even other nations were familiar with and also used this name.¹²⁵ By all means, the nations are greatly encouraged to call

¹¹⁷ Cf. Meyer 1983: 4.

¹¹⁸ This is already realized by *Yh* in early Hebrew poetry. Cf. Exodus 15:2. Also, cf. above.

¹¹⁹ This would then be the jussive verbal form of the imperfect *yahweh*, paralleled to that identified in Amorite, as just discussed by Cross above.

¹²⁰ Exodus 3:14–15, Exodus 6:2–3, and Exodus 34:5–6, 14.

¹²¹ Exodus 20:7 and Leviticus 24:10–16.

¹²² Exodus 19:8, Numbers 27:3, Numbers 32:7–9; Judges 4:14; Ruth 1:6–9.

¹²³ Exodus 20:24; 1 Samuel 1:9; Jeremiah 3:16–17; 7:10–14, 30.

¹²⁴ Judges 19:18; 1 Samuel 1:7, 24; 3:15, etc.; 2 Samuel 12:20; 1 Kings 3:1, 6:1, 7:12, etc.

¹²⁵ Numbers 22:8, 13; 23:8; Joshua 2:9–10; 2 Kings 18:22, 32–35.

upon this name.¹²⁶ Oaths, too, were sworn by this name, and greetings and blessings extended in the name of *Yahweh*.¹²⁷

A similar picture can be perceived from the extra-biblical perspective, where we find Mesha, the king of Moab, using only the name *Yahweh* (apparently) in relation to Israel's sanctuary on lines 17 and 18 of the Mesha Stele— *w'qh mšm '[tk]ly yhw w'shb hm l'ny kmš* (and I took from there the vessels of *Yahweh* and dragged them before *Kemosh*). In Judah at Arad we find reference to the *byt yhw* (the house of *Yahweh*). An inscription in a tomb at Khirbet el-Qôm also contains a blessing using the name in the form *brk 'ryhw lyhw* (blessed be *Uriah* of *Yahweh*). We also find very common use of *only* the name *Yahweh* at Arad in greetings and *common* communication, as in *brtk lyhw* (I bless you by *Yahweh*) or *yhw yš' l lšmk* (may *Yahweh* lookout for your welfare).¹²⁸ From both the biblical and extra-biblical perspective during the pre-exilic period interestingly not only is the one name and form of *Yahweh* solely found, but this name also finds free and uninhibited use in the *public* or *secular*, as well as *private* and *religious* life of the Israelite.

And, with regards to reverence of the name, in the regular communication that we find at Arad *Yahweh* certainly does appear to be held in high esteem, since we already saw in the greeting formulas that he is the one who is looked to for good news, for blessings, and good health. Additionally, two silver amulets from Ketef Hinnom dated about 600 B.C.E. containing a scriptural quote extending a blessing of *Yahweh* were apparently worn around the neck of the bearer.¹²⁹ Such esteem would then be associated with the name in those contexts. However, not all uses of the name, even favorable, conformed to the biblical guidelines, as is indicated in the tomb inscriptions from Khirbet el-Qôm and Kuntillet 'Ajrud dated to the eighth century, where *Yahweh* is used in an apparent syncretistic context with *Asherah* and also *Ba'al*.¹³⁰ Clearly, we see in this pre-exilic period religious contexts that are a direct continuation (for the most part) of the Pentateuchal traditions so that there are: 1) the use and reverence of *only one name—Yahweh*, and 2) free and uninhibited use of the name in daily life.

1.4.2. The Compounded Form of the Name in the Pre-exilic Period

Now, however, the questions may be asked, morphologically speaking, could any evidence at all indicate whether an attempt is made to maintain the exclusivity of this *one form* also when the name is abbreviated and compounded in personal names, or, put another way, does this religious context of the name carry over into personal names? The ultimate question is, "What exactly constitutes an *acceptable* abbreviation of the name from a Hebrew perspective?" The answers may be indicated in the onomastica of Israel.

¹²⁶ Jeremiah 10:25.

¹²⁷ Leviticus 19:12; Deuteronomy 6:13, 10:20; Ruth 2:4; Jeremiah 12:16; Jeremiah 31:23.

¹²⁸ Arad 16.2–3; 18.2–3. Cf. also Arad 21 and 40.

¹²⁹ Ketef Himmon 1 and 2.

¹³⁰ K. Ajrud 7.2; K. Ajrud 8.2; K. Ajrud 14.1; and K. Ajrud 15.5–6.

We have already noted earlier that only *-yw-* is attested in the northern kingdom (as opposed to *-yhw-* in Judah). But *-yw-* did make its appearance in Judah in the eighth century, but then subsequently actually reverted to *-yhw-* exclusively by the exile.¹³¹ Cross explains these variations as due to the “court dialect” of the north affecting the Judahite court dialect, with the latter eventually supplanting the former, leading to the change in pronunciation followed by a reversion to the more “rustic” former pronunciation *-yahû-*,¹³² and he notes that the royal houses of Judah and Israel were “mingled from the days of the dominant Omrides.”¹³³ But, we would like to now consider this in the light of the remarks of Thiele, who, in establishing a harmonious chronology of the kings of Israel from the biblical data, noted that:

Israel at the time of the schism followed the nonaccession-year system and continued its use till the close of the ninth century B.C. when under Jehoshaphat a shift was made to the accession-year system, which continued to be used to the close of Israel’s history. Judah at the time of the schism used the accession-year system and continued its use to **the middle of the ninth century; from Jehoram to Joash reigns are reckoned according to the nonaccession-year system; and from Amaziah, at about the beginning of the eighth century, to the close of Judah’s history the accession-year system was *again* in use.**¹³⁴ (Emphasis ours)

The date Thiele gives for the beginning of the sole reign of Jehoram is 848 B.C.E. and that for Amaziah of 796 B.C.E. He associates the adoption by the royal scribal administration of Judah of the northern Israelite practice of antedating (using non-accession years)¹³⁵ the reigns of the kings in their records with the obvious “rapprochement” between northern Israel and Judah, which saw among other things the intermarriage of King Jehoram of Judah and Athaliah, the daughter of King Ahab and Jezebel of Israel. After the reign of Joash, Amaziah’s reign saw a resumption of the regular custom of postdating the reigns of the kings in the records of Judah (as well as that in northern Israel for that matter¹³⁶). Thus, we have an *eighth* century period for the orthographic practice of *-yw-* in PNNCSN in Judah before a time of reversion to *-yhw-*, and a *mid-to-late ninth* century period of northern Israelite influence in the royal scribal administration of Judah before a reversion to a former practice. The obvious connection between these two items of data cannot simply be ignored. That northern Israel influenced Judah’s onomasticon is

¹³¹ Cross 1983: 57; Zadok 1988: 182–184. See above in section 1.1.

¹³² Cross rejects the possibility of *yahw*, and states that “*yhw* arose not from a restoration of historical spelling, but reflected the actual pronunciation *-yahû-*.” Cf. Cross 1983: 58.

¹³³ Cross 1983: 58. Cf. 2 Kings 8:16–29.

¹³⁴ Thiele 1983: 60.

¹³⁵ A prime distinction of northern Israel and Judah as deciphered by Thiele (1983) is the *non-accession year* (antedating) and *accession-year* (postdating) method of computing the reigns of their kings. In the former the year the king came to the throne is his *first* year, with the passing of the calendar year (nisan or tishri) as the beginning of the *second* year, and so forth. In the latter the year the king came to the throne is considered an *accession-year*, then the passing of the calendar would produce year *one*, and so forth.

¹³⁶ Cf. Thiele 1983: 58–60, 109.

clear, but not necessarily so at all periods,¹³⁷ but accepting that, the influence may well be something other than “dialectal.” But what else could it be? According to the biblical account, the kingdom in northern Israel departed from the worship of Yahweh from the days of the schism with Rehoboam, being led by Jeroboam the son of Nebat, and they never returned thereto.¹³⁸ Judah had a similar propensity, but this was checked by periodical revivals in the worship of Yahweh, being noted especially in the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah in the late eighth and seventh centuries. These facts may very well indicate that at some point after 930 B.C.E. when northern Israel split from Judah they no longer indicated the “correct” abbreviated Sacred Name in PNNCSN by *-yhw-*, pronounced *yahw* (since they no longer worshiped *Yahweh*), which a large segment of their inhabitants bore, but by *-yw-* (*yaw*). The phoneme /w/ of this northern Israelite form identifies the <w> in the Judahite spelling (as the northern Israelite spelling is deemed to be derived from the longer Judahite spelling) as indicative of a simple shortening of the *one verbal form* of *Yahweh*, but with the final *he* (and preceding vowel phoneme) dropped.¹³⁹ This *-yw-* now would be merely a nationalistic sacred marker (with no connection to the worship of *Yahweh*) of a northern Israelite or Samaritan, just as their other Semitic neighbors possessed the names of their deities (national or otherwise) compounded in their names, but mostly written fully and not abbreviated.¹⁴⁰ However, the date discrepancy between the two events need not trouble any, for the fact that the biblical record clearly gives an earlier period (mid-ninth century) for the royal scribal influence would place the *production* of the seals or stamps (which would have been by royal decree) *anywhere* after this period being one of the many changes northern Israel would have made in Judah, but which *production* would have stopped at the beginning of the eighth century when the northern Israelite influence ceased. Therefore, the *resistance* on the part of Judah in the eighth and seventh centuries to *continue* spelling the name *-yw-* and the reversion to the “correct” spelling of *-yhw-* exclusively seems to be consonant with their desire to maintain the inviolability of this one name and form, even when compounded in personal names.¹⁴¹ But, another possibility may simply be that *-yhw-* acquired a *nationalistic* significance for the southern kingdom, while *-yw-* one for the northern kingdom. But, the first possibility certainly appears to indicate that merely utilizing simply *any two* letters of the name *Yahweh* was *not* an acceptable abbreviation, but only representing it by using the *first letters* and partially *maintaining its form* was accepted. This leaves no room for the form *Yahû* in this religious context.

However, additionally, in the light of our other religious context that saw the free and uninhibited use of the name *Yahweh* in daily life, one should also note the *prolific attestations of the long form*

¹³⁷ So Zadok (1988: 182) comments about *-yw-* at Kuntillet Ajrud.

¹³⁸ Cf. 1 Kings 12:25–33 and 13:6.

¹³⁹ Thus, from the religious context, if we accept a verbal *yahû* then we would vitiate all the biblical emphases on the name *Yahweh* found all throughout Israel’s history. The only three-grapheme form (using <yhw>) that would marry well to this ideological factor and the epigraphic and Akkadian data is *yahw*.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Driver 1928: 23. But, cf. Freedman and O’Connor 1986: 502.

¹⁴¹ Again, we obviously do not imply that this abbreviation could *only* indicate the one form *yahweh*, but any abbreviation of *Yahweh* would necessarily be faithful to that *form*.

<yhw> in *both initial and final* positions (except during northern Israelite influence), especially from the seventh and sixth centuries, when the final short form of *-yh* is extremely rarely found in the pre-exilic period and its initial counterpart (*yh-*) is virtually non-existent.¹⁴²

Consequently, we would expect a strong religious principle in this period to dictate the form the name assumes in PNNCSN, especially while also considering Numbers 13:16. Furthermore, as Layton has highlighted that personal names in the Bible, for certain reasons, preserve important archaic features, then this specific class of names and especially this very peculiar form could certainly prove *religion* to be a very important vehicle in carrying onomastic archaisms,¹⁴³ but our study continues. The name of the supreme ruler of Israel is one.¹⁴⁴ This is a consistent feature of the religion of Israel, being perceived all through the Bible down to the period just before the Exile and even from the Exile into the post-exilic period. And, allowing these considerations to carry over into the abbreviated form of the Sacred Name when compounded in personal names, this abbreviation for the spelling <yhw> seems certain. However, although there are very good indications of *yahw* as a pre-exilic alternative to the generally accepted form *yāhū* (as the Neo-Assyrian cuneiform transcriptions can indicate both [*-ia-(a-)ū-*], the orthography appears to indicate the former, and the religious context does likewise), this alternative is *still* not pristine. But, another witness to provide a confirmation of this alternative seems desirable, and even necessary. This witness will be sought for in the exilic period.

2. THE EXILIC PERIOD (597–539 B.C.E.)¹⁴⁵

2.1. Continuity and Consistent Inconsistency

The onomasticon of Judah during the exilic period is certainly not rich, yet it is very interesting. To decipher, once again, on the one hand, what alphabetic form(s) (*-yhw-*, *-yw-*, or even *-yh*) was being indicated, and on the other, what is the vocalization of this form(s), we will consider evidence from that area that affected Judah in this period—Babylonia. Neo-/Late Babylonian (the southern dialect of Akkadian) differs from Assyrian somewhat, but not significantly,¹⁴⁶ and cuneiform transcriptions of Judeans are attested for this period. The documents containing these transcriptions are sometimes dated and occasionally are recorded not very long after the Exile. In the light of this short time period, therefore, what one expects is a continuation of the same general consistency perceived in the orthography of the abbreviated name in initial and final positions (*-yhw-*) of PNNCSN in pre-exilic

¹⁴² Cf. Tigay 1986: 47 for a remark about the final form *-yh* in the pre-exilic onomasticon, where there appears to be a peculiar affinity of this form and seals in this period. Cf. above in section 1.1, n. 54. But see below.

¹⁴³ Cf. Layton 1990.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Exodus 20:7. Also, cf. n. 45 above. Especially, cf. Meyer 1987.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. n. 46 above.

¹⁴⁶ From the phonological perspective, of note is that alphabetic /š/ is transcribed /š/ in Neo-Babylonian, and West Semitic /s/ is likewise represented by /s/. Cf. Millard 1976: 3–6 for other noted differences.

ancient Hebrew inscriptions and in Assyrian cuneiform transcriptions discussed above, and there has generally been no doubt that both positions (*with three letters*) had the same pronunciation.¹⁴⁷ Consistently, however, in Neo-/Late Babylonian cuneiform transcriptions, this is not the case. Our first examples are attested already in the first decade of the Exile in the cuneiform transcriptions mentioning another Judahite king—Jehoiachin.

2.2. Neo-Babylonian Transcriptions

2.2.1. *Yhw* and/or *Yw* in the Weidner Texts?

King Jehoiachin is recorded to have been deported in 597 B.C.E.¹⁴⁸ Evidence of his captivity exists already from the beginning of the sixth century, when we arrive at the four Neo-Babylonian cuneiform tablets mentioning him and several other men of Judah partially published by Weidner,¹⁴⁹ only one of which is dated (Babylon 28178, Text B, to 592 B.C.E.).¹⁵⁰ As seen above, in Neo-Assyrian transcriptions of PNNCSN the abbreviated Sacred Name is rendered virtually the same whether it is initial or final (*ia-ú-[u]-* and *-ia-[a]-ú[-u]*) and it is not distinguished from the two syllables before the <d> of the toponym *Judah* (^{KUR}ia-ú-du) and the ethnonym derived therefrom (^{LÚ}ia-ú-da-a-a).¹⁵¹ But, in these Neo-Babylonian texts this is not the case.

The name of the king of Judah (both entirely visible and partially restored) is rendered: ^{LÚ}ia-ú-kīnu(DU) (𐎠 𐎢𐏁 𐎠𐎢𐏁 𐎠𐎢𐏁) in Babylon 28122 (Text A); ^{LÚ}ia-ú-kīnu(DU) in Babylon 28178 (Text B); ^{LÚ}ia-a-ú-i[] (𐎠 𐎢𐏁 𐎠𐎢𐏁 𐎠𐎢𐏁 . . .) (on obverse of clay tablet) and ^{LÚ}ia-ku-ú-ki-nu (𐎠 𐎢𐏁 𐎠𐎢𐏁 𐎠𐎢𐏁 𐎠𐎢𐏁) (on reverse of clay tablet) in Babylon 28186 (Text C); and ^{LÚ}ia-ú-kīnu(DU) in Babylon 28232 (Text D).¹⁵²

Judah (both as a toponym and as an ethnonym [Judean]) is represented as: ^[KUR]ia-ú-du and ^{LÚ}ia-ú-da-a-a (twice) in Babylon 28122 (Text A); ^{KUR}ia-a-ḥu-du (𐎠 𐎢𐏁 𐎠𐎢𐏁 𐎠𐎢𐏁) and ^{LÚ}ia-a-ḥu-da-a-a in Babylon 28178 (Text B); *ia-ku-du* (twice on reverse of clay tablet) in Babylon 28186 (Text C); and ^{KUR}ia-a-ḥu-du (twice) in Babylon 28232 (Text D).¹⁵³

The transcriptions of both the personal name Jehoiachin and the toponym Judah (in its hypocoristic form—properly *Yāhūd* < *Yahūdāh* [see below]) from Text A are what we expected based on our above analysis of the Neo-Assyrian transcriptions in the pre-exilic period, as they reflect the same practice.

¹⁴⁷ This is especially the case here in our period which virtually parallels the period before the destruction of Lachish. Cf. Coogan 1976: 51, n. 45 for the difficulties of the orthography of the elements at Elephantine. Also, cf. below.

¹⁴⁸ See 2 Kings 24:10–17. The Babylonian Chronicle specifically dates March 16, 597 for the capture and deportation. Cf. Wiseman 1985: 32.

¹⁴⁹ Weidner 1939: 923–935.

¹⁵⁰ Weidner 1939: 925.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Zadok 1979: 11, 34–37.

¹⁵² Weidner 1939: 925–926.

¹⁵³ Weidner 1939: 925–926.

Those from Texts B and D provide an interesting comparison, since the Babylonian scribe now distinguishes between the abbreviated name of the PNCSN and the two syllables before the <d> of the toponym Yāhûd (indicating a different pronunciation), so that the abbreviated form of the Sacred Name is rendered [ia]-ʾu- or [ia-]ʾ-ú- and his land, reflecting the intervocalic *he* after *yod*, is rendered ^{KUR}ia-a-*hu-du*. The scribe's transcriptions in Text C is the most interesting, since on the obverse of the cuneiform tablet he transcribes the abbreviated Sacred Name in the name of the king as *ia-a-ú-*, but then on the reverse of the same tablet departs from all previous transcriptions and renders it *ia-ku-ú-*, while he renders Yāhûd as ^{KUR}ia-ku-du, the *he* in both names being made to be /k/.

Not surprisingly, various views have been put forth to explain these ambiguities. Weidner associated the transcriptions of the name of the king with the shorter alphabetic spelling of the abbreviated Sacred Name *yw-*, exactly as in Albright's "Eliakim na'ar yawkin" seal excavated by him,¹⁵⁴ and Albright himself followed up with his own confirmation,¹⁵⁵ this association being accepted by most contributors after that publication.¹⁵⁶ But Cross, along with Coogan, disagrees and would have all of these transcriptions of the abbreviated Sacred Name in the name of this king representative of *yahû-*,¹⁵⁷ as the onomasticon of Judah in this period does consistently indicate orthographically <-yhw->, as discussed above.¹⁵⁸ In the former suggestion, the difficulty that surfaces is that Text C clearly shows the longer spelling (-*yhw-*) underneath the transcription (especially when the transcription of the abbreviated name of the same name on the obverse of the clay tablet [i.e. *ia-a-ú-*] virtually matches that on the other three tablets) and strongly implies a vocalization *yāhû-* (*ia-ku-ú-*), especially when compared with the transcription of the toponym Yāhûd (^{KUR}ia-ku-du). However, in the latter suggestion, if we accept that all of them indicate *yāhû-*, then we are hard-pressed to explain the clear distinction the Babylonian scribe makes in Texts B and D between the first letters of the king's name (*ia-ʾ-ú-*) and the two syllables before the /d/ of the toponym Yāhûd (i.e. *ia-a-ḥu-*), which we know *does* indicate *yāhû-* because of Hebrew orthography and phonology, but from our perspective the answer is easily found when considering the assumptions that have been made.

2.2.2. Only One Resolution

Both of these arguments share the same two assumptions that, on the one hand, alphabetic *-yhw-* carries only the pronunciation *yāhû*, and, on the other hand, that a pronunciation *yaw* can only be found

¹⁵⁴ Weidner 1939: 926; Albright 1932: 81.

¹⁵⁵ Albright 1942: 49–55.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Zadok 1979: 8.

¹⁵⁷ Cross 1983: 57; Coogan 1973: 188, n. 1.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Mykytiuk 2004: 23–29 for a discussion of the debate and resolution that involved the misidentification of the *Eliakim na'ar yawkin* seal formerly thought to mention King Jehoiachin, but subsequently proven to be unrelated, as it was shown by Ussishkin in his excavations of Lachish level III (parallel stratum to that of Tell Beit Mirsim where Albright found one Eliakim seal) that this stratum was destroyed in 701 B.C.E. not 597 or 586 B.C.E. (Ussishkin 1976: 1–13, Ussishkin 1977: 28–60). Also cf. references in Mykytiuk 2004: 29.

in an alphabetic *-yw-*, both transcriptions being indicated virtually the same in Neo-Assyrian (as emphasized above). Also, neither has explained the transcription *ia-ku-ú-* for *yāhû-* in Text C, especially when considering that the *he* of the toponym *Yāhûd* was also represented by /k/, and *no transcription* in the four texts of the abbreviated Sacred Name in the name of the king utilizes /h/ (as is the standard practice in transcriptions beginning a bit later on in this period and into the post-exilic period).¹⁵⁹ However, these two assumptions have already been shown to be incorrect, since, orthographically speaking, there is the strong possibility that alphabetic *-yhw-* could also indicate *yahw* (pronounced exactly as *yaw*). Thus, our only option for a resolution of the transcriptions in the texts is to accept that Text A maintains the regular Neo-Assyrian transcriptions, writing *ia-ʔ-ú-* for *yahw-* and *ia-ú-du* for *yāhûd*, while Texts B and D reflects the practice, evidenced already at Mari (although not as frequent)¹⁶⁰ and is here now being followed by this Babylonian scribe,¹⁶¹ of transcribing intervocalic *he* by *h* rather than \emptyset , while continuing to render *yahw-* as *[ia]-ʔ-u-* and *[ia]-ʔ-ú-*. Text C appears to be transitional, reflecting *yahw* by *ia-a-ú-* on the obverse, but on the reverse phonetically equating both *yhw* of the toponym and *yhw* of the king's name, and rendering both as *ia-ku-(ú-)*. It may be asked then how can we explain these transcriptions on the reverse of the tablet of Text C which can be no mistake? At the very least, they indicate that the scribe definitely wanted the pronunciation *yāhû* to be associated with the alphabetic form of the king's name when read in Neo-Babylonian cuneiform (especially in the light of the almost exact orthography of the toponym *Yāhûd*). But, considering the other option available to him (i.e. *ia-a-hu-*), these transcriptions definitely represent an anomaly, as /k/ is not associated with alphabetic /h/ in any cuneiform transcription,¹⁶² but it is an anomaly that may very well be explained by viewing this PNCSN in the religious contexts of the name Yahweh. However, before this, we must consider the other PNNCSN that are found in these four tablets.

Besides the king and his five unnamed sons, eight unnamed and five named Judeans are mentioned. Those possessing PNNCSN are: *sa-ma-ku-ia-a-m[a]* on the obverse of Text A,¹⁶³ *šá-lam-ia-a-ma* on the obverse and reverse of the same text,¹⁶⁴ and *qa-na-ʔ-a-ma/qa-na-a-ma* on the reverse of Text C and on Text D.¹⁶⁵ It will immediately be observed that these transcriptions of the abbreviated Sacred Name, all in final position, lay in sharp contrast to those in the name of the king of Judah, as these exhibit a clear difference from the Neo-Assyrian transcriptions of the abbreviated Sacred Name, presenting it as *-ʔ-a-ma/-a-ma* and *-ia-a-ma* (or *-ʔ-a-wa₆/-a-wa₆* and *-ia-a-wa₆*), the first for these forms. But, they *are nonetheless indicative of a pronunciation /yaw/* (including the former with only the *a* sign preceding *ma*),

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Zadok 1979: 7.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Cross 1973: 62.

¹⁶¹ The Babylonian Chronicle, in giving an account of the capture of Jerusalem on March 16, 597 B.C.E., testifies to the transcription of the toponym *Judah* as ^{URU}*ia-a-hu-du* (i.e. Jerusalem), exactly as in Texts B and D above (section 2.2.1. Cf. Wiseman 1958: 81.

¹⁶² Cf. Tallqvist 1914: XIX; PNAE 1998: XXIV.

¹⁶³ Weidner 1939: opposite 924, pl. I, line 28.

¹⁶⁴ Weidner 1939: opposite 924, pl. I, line 31 and Weidner 1939: opposite 926, pl. II, line 22.

¹⁶⁵ Weidner 1939: opposite 930, pl. IV, line 18; Weidner 1939: opposite 932, pl. V, line 21.

which, if reflective of an alphabetic *-yw*, is again astounding for Judahite names in this period in the light of late pre-exilic Hebrew onomastics attesting consistently *<-yhw>*.¹⁶⁶ And, we cannot assume that the initial and final elements had a different pronunciation in this period, because in the pre-exilic period the Neo-Assyrian transcriptions that we already saw above are the same for both. Again, our only resolution is to propose that *-ʿa-ma/-a-ma* and *-ia-a-ma* are representative of an alphabetic *yahw*. Additionally, these transcriptions for the abbreviated name here in final position appear to be earlier than the *ia-ku-ú-* in Text C, since they are found side by side with those transcriptions that closely followed the Neo-Assyrian transcriptions of the same element found in initial position in the king's name on other tablets (Texts A and D), and they are certainly earlier than *ia-(a-)ḥu-(u/ú)-*, which is found as the standard transcription for the abbreviated Sacred Name in initial position later on at Bīt-Nabû-leʿ, āl-Yāḥūdu, āl Našar, Til-gubbi, and Nippur (and which is also attested in the final position as well in 532 B.C.E. at āl Našar¹⁶⁷), but, again, is *not associated* with the abbreviated Sacred Name in these texts at all (as noted above). However, it should be noted that final *-ia-a-ma* and *-ʿa-ma/-a-ma* are *not exclusive* transcriptions for the final abbreviated name in Neo-Babylonian cuneiform, but the regular Neo-Assyrian transcription was still found at Nippur in 584 B.C.E in the patronym *ba-da-^dia-a-ú*.¹⁶⁸ Nevertheless, *the reason behind the supersedure* of this transcription by the original Neo-Babylonian transcriptions (*-ia-a-ma* and *-ʿa-ma/-a-ma*) and the transcription of the king's name as *ia-ku-ú-* may, in fact, be connected, and may also explain why the former persisted, but not *-^dia-a-ú*, which was avoided. Furthermore, we could additionally connect this *ia-ku-ú-* in some way to the transcription *ia-(a-)ḥu-(u/ú)-*, which transcription (like *-ia-a-ma* did over *-^dia-a-ú*) likewise superseded the *ia-ʿ-ú-* found in the Weidner tablets. But, what was so wrong with *-^dia-a-ú* or *ia-ʿ-ú-* and so right with *-ia-a-ma* and *ia-ḥu-ú-*? Before we propose where the answer to this question may be found, we will now note the earliest occurrences of the latter.

2.2.3. The Transcription *ia-ḥu-ú-* in the Exilic Period

Beginning already in 583 B.C.E. the transcription *ia-ḥu-ú-* for the abbreviated Sacred Name is already attested. And, the corpus of cuneiform texts soon to be published from a town of Judean deportees called āl-Yāḥūdu in the Nippur-Keš-Kakara triangle unevenly distributed between 572 B.C.E. and ca. 484 B.C.E. adds much more early documentation of this transcription than has been available. The first PNCSN to utilize this element in initial position is *^lia(?)a-ḥu-nu-ú-ri* of Bīt-Nabû-leʿ recorded in 583 B.C.E.¹⁶⁹ There is also the patronym *^lia-ḥu-ú-ra-am*, the father of *^lmi-nu-eš-šú*, in a document written in Til-gubbi, a town

¹⁶⁶ Cf. section 1.1 above. It should be realized that even allowing the occasional appearance of *-yw-* in late pre-exilic Hebrew epigraphs (although there is no reason to) by no means explains the numerous and persistent orthography of *-ia-a-ma* and *(-')a-ma* in PNNCSN in these and later cuneiform transcriptions.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Joannès and Lemaire 1999: 17–34; Vanderhooft 2003: 223.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Zadok 2002: 27.

¹⁶⁹ Zadok 2002: 28.

near Sippar, in 551 and 545 B.C.E.¹⁷⁰ Again, assuming a pronunciation *yāhû*, why is this transcription not utilized in Text C of the ration tablets instead of the totally new innovation *ia-ku-ú-*, especially since we did see that the writing *ia-(a-)ḫu-(u/ú)-* (for *defective/plene* alphabetic *yḥø-/yhw-*) of the toponym Yāhûd had precedent already in the Babylonian Chronicle? It seems clear that we are not observing a phonological phenomenon more than we are the incipient emergence of a religio-linguistic convention, so that we must now seek an answer from the exilic religious context of the full name Yahweh.

2.3. The Name Yahweh in its Exilic Religious Context

2.3.1. The Independent Name

We have seen a pre-exilic religious context of the name Yahweh in which only *one form* is emphasized (from biblical and extra-biblical sources).¹⁷¹ But, additionally, we also observed the important point that in spite of this great sanctity of the name Yahweh, in the religious ideology of pre-exilic Judah the name still finds uninhibited regular use in public or secular settings, as well as religious, being even known by other nations, as there was no other form of the name and no restrictions on daily use. These pre-exilic religious contexts were those in which the onomasticon of Judah was formed attesting to PNNCSN spelled *-yhw-* (in initial and final positions) exclusively by the beginning of the sixth century, with Neo-Assyrian cuneiform transcriptions (*ia-ú-[u]-* and *-ia-[a]-ú[-u]*) representing *yahw*.

Now, in our analysis in the exilic period, we will focus *exclusively* on the religious context of the name Yahweh from the *further diachronic development of Israel's religious ideology* regarding its use and reverence, seeking to determine if changes in this ideology are likewise paralleled in their exilic onomasticon. Simply asked, is the religious ideology of Judah with regard to the name Yahweh realized differently as they move from one religious and linguistic reality to rather diverse ones—in Babylonia? And, if the answer is in the affirmative, could this realization be connected with the transcriptions of PNNCSN here analyzed in the exilic period, as it certainly did in the pre-exilic? Let us first consider the use and reverence in the exilic period.

Although the account of Daniel¹⁷² discusses events occurring from *slightly before* our period, it can be a point of departure in establishing the religious context of the Sacred Name during the exile.¹⁷³ From an observation of the instances where Yahweh is inferred from context but not used while either Daniel or

¹⁷⁰ Zadok 2002: 28; Zadok 1988: 305.

¹⁷¹ Cf. above.

¹⁷² This aspect of the study, of course, rests *inter alia* upon further observations of the religious context of the name Yahweh in the Hellenistic/Roman periods (section 3.2.4.1 below) which is clearly distinct from that in the Persian period and which necessitates a pre-Hellenistic provenance of “Hebrew Daniel,” chapters 1, 7–12. Cf. Collins and Flint 2002 for the consensus and other dissenting opinions. Also, cf. Montgomery 1927. Cf. also Jeremiah 44:26, Ezekiel 20 [also v. 27], but see below.

¹⁷³ The events in Daniel date from ca. 605 B.C.E. Cf. Wiseman 1985: 24.

his three Judean friends are communicating publicly in Babylonia, the general pattern appears to be the avoidance of speaking the name Yahweh in a non-Hebrew tongue (Aramaic). Rather, Yahweh is described as “the Elah of Heaven.” Thus, when Daniel blesses Yahweh, we read, “Blessed be the name of the Elah of Heaven,” and *yhwh* is not written. When Nebuchadnezzar addresses the three friends with respect to their Elah, they resisted uttering the name of their Elah. Furthermore, the epithet “the Elah of heaven” or the like is consistently attested throughout the book when speaking in the Aramaic vernacular about *Yahweh*.¹⁷⁴ When the name is recorded, it is in the Hebrew narrative at the beginning of the book, and in Daniel’s prayer given in Hebrew.¹⁷⁵

The book of Jeremiah records in Hebrew the events taking place in Judah just before the exile of the elites of Judah in 597 B.C.E. and both before and shortly after the final onslaught of Nebuchadnezzar in 586 B.C.E. Here, however, with no apparent communication in foreign speech, the name continues to be used freely by the king of Judah, the captains in Judah, and even by Nebuzaradan, the captain of Nebuchadnezzar’s army (most likely *indirectly*). Also, the book of Ezekiel, recording also in Hebrew, demonstrates a similar continuity, as the elders of Israel is recorded as continuing to inquire about the word of Yahweh from the prophet in Babylon before 586 B.C.E.

From the extra-biblical perspective a similar situation is evidenced at Lachish just before 586 B.C.E.¹⁷⁶ Here, Judahites swore oaths in the formula *hy yhwh* (*by the life of Yahweh*) while still in the land, just as we saw in the biblical text.¹⁷⁷ They also continued using the name Yahweh regularly in their greeting formulas.¹⁷⁸

Thus, from these perspectives what seems to be indicated is that those Judean elites that went into captivity where they were faced with a different religious and linguistic reality apparently made a distinction between the sacred and the common, *the sacred being the Hebrew tongue*. Thus, we may conjecture that it seemed they did not speak the name Yahweh in a foreign tongue publicly or privately, but continued using it in Hebrew privately and possibly also publicly.

However, that being the case, what would occur with the name in PNNCSN? Would this apparently new religious ideology regarding the name carry over into PNNCSN? Since the full form of the name never appears in personal names, one wonders how would the “correct” abbreviated form be viewed by the zealous elite exiles. Would it also be avoided or simply its origin misrepresented?

2.3.2. The Compounded Form of the Name in the Neo-Babylonian Period

2.3.2.1. Abbreviated Name in Transition in Neo-Babylonian Period?

¹⁷⁴ Note also the similar use attested by the Jews at Elephantine (see below) and in the books of Ezra-Nehemiah.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Daniel 9.

¹⁷⁶ Lachish dates from just a few years before the fall of Judah to Nebuchadnezzar’s army in 586 B.C.E.

¹⁷⁷ Lachish 3.9; 6.12; 12.3. Also, cf. Arad 21.5.

¹⁷⁸ Lachish 2.1–3; 3.2–3; 4.1; 5.7–8; 6.1; 9.1.

A timeline on our newly-attested Neo-Babylonian transcriptions of exilic PNNCSN is here necessary. Our cuneiform transcriptions of the abbreviated name as analyzed beginning with the Weidner texts are -*ia-a-ma* and -*a-ma* in final position, along with one case of -^d*ia-a-ú*. The former are the earliest *original* Neo-Babylonian transcriptions of the abbreviated Sacred Name.¹⁷⁹ In the king's name the transcription of the abbreviated Sacred Name initially followed that of the Neo-Assyrian of writing *ia-ʔ-ú*- for *yahw* (not *yaw*), even while transcribing ^{KUR}*ia-a-ḫu-du* for *yāhūd*. Then, in another text (Text C) we find the remarkable transcription *ia-ku-ú*- for *yāhū*-, which is the *first clear* indication of an actual pronunciation of the abbreviated Sacred Name as *yāhū*- (with intervocalic *he*, although represented by <k>), but which, at a time when the orthography of Judah more frequently used internal *matres lectionis*, would reflect alphabetic *yhw*-. The transcription *ia-ku-ú*- is not seen again, but is replaced by *ia-(a)ḫu-(u/ú)*- (which is more “correct” since alphabetic <h> was transcribed by <ḫ> in the Mari texts, as mentioned before), first seen in 583 B.C.E.,¹⁸⁰ but possibly used already before that. Again, the forms -^d*ia-a-ú* and *ia-ʔ-ú*- were clearly avoided and were superseded by the transcriptions -*ia-a-ma* and *ia-(a)ḫu-(u/ú)*-.

2.3.2.2. A New Religio-linguistic Convention in the Exilic Period

These transcriptions point to the implementation of a religio-linguistic convention by the elite exiles of Judah that we would like to call *Intentional Misrepresentation of the Abbreviated Sacred Name (IMASN)*, both spoken and written, the goal being to guard the name *Yahweh* from defilement by making a clear pronunciation (even if unintentional) impossible to the foreigner when using the PNCNSN. But, there are two facets. Firstly, the cuneiform transcription *ia-ú/u*- could not be used for the abbreviated name (-*yahw*-), because, unlike final -*ia-a-ma*, it actually possessed two possible diphthongal pronunciations after the *i*: 1) [aw] (vowel followed by a semi-vowel or glide, pronounced like /ā/),¹⁸¹ as well as, 2) [a] [ū] (two contiguous vowels, as in *Yahūdāh* without the aspirate *he*). With the latter in initial position *and the appropriate predicative element* in the PNCNSN *the pronunciation Yahweh could be produced*, or something too similar, before what's left of the predicative element is articulated.¹⁸² This transcription was thus avoided, and consequently misrepresented. The distinction between *ia-ú/u*- and -*ia-a-ma* is clear and it can *only be* the result of their phonemic possibilities, for even final -*ia-a-ma* could have likewise fallen into the avoided taboo *if* it was pronounced as two contiguous vowels, which also explains why even final -^d*ia-a-ú* (note *determinative*) never naturally persisted. But, secondly, probably more as a later amendment to IMASN, -*ia-a-ma* could not be equal to alphabetic -*yhw* when using an alphabetic script,

¹⁷⁹ That is, the transcriptions from Text A, which otherwise follows the Neo-Assyrian transcriptions for both the toponym Judah and the abbreviated Sacred Name in initial position. Cf. above.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. above. Zadok 2002: 28.

¹⁸¹ This sound is exactly the same as a lower-mid/open-mid, back vowel [IPA ɔ]. Cf. Driver 1928: 20–21.

¹⁸² To better understand this, one may consider how the articulation of the king's full name (**yahwiākīn* = *ia-ʔ-ú-ia-kinu*) would have been in Neo-Babylonian if the abbreviated name in the first cuneiform transcriptions (*ia-ʔ-ú*, *ia-a-ú*) were used and pronounced as two contiguous vowel phonemes.

especially Aramaic.¹⁸³ However, at this point, these misrepresentations were only for non-Hebrew speech. The transcription *-ia-a-ma*, which *did* indicate the correct abbreviated name (*yahw*),¹⁸⁴ as just noted, fell outside of the avoided taboo in the first facet, and so was maintained within IMASN,¹⁸⁵ but it was still ambiguous in terms of its alphabetic representation. However, from Text C of the Weidner texts, it must be realized that the transcription *ia-ku-ú-* was the first deliberate “attempt” that epigraphy has produced of IMASN with the *initial* abbreviated name, which sought to correspond alphabetic *yhw-* to *yāhû-*, but it was “corrected” to *ia-(a-)ḥu-(u/ú)-* later on in the exilic and into the post-exilic period.¹⁸⁶ This transcription in PNNCSN was *not related* to a Northwest Semitic jussive **yahû*, which was *not connected with Yahweh in the religion of the Hebrews at any point in pre-exilic Israel* but was only inspired, we believe, by as many as two things: 1) the similar (sometimes exact) *cuneiform transcriptions* of the abbreviated name (*ia-ʾ-ú-/ia-a-ú-*) and the first letters of the toponym *Yāhûd* (*ia-ú-*) seen for example in the Weidner texts, and 2) after the regular use of internal *matres lectionis*, by the exact orthographic correspondence of the first three letters of the toponym *Judah* (*yhwdh/yhwd*, formerly *yhdh/yhd*) and the three letters of the abbreviated name (*-yhw-*), which was *always* indicative of the pronunciation *yahw* before the exile.¹⁸⁷ However, one would wonder then, if the form *yahw* returned in the post-exilic period, or did these “new misrepresentations” replace the abbreviated Sacred Name in the Judean onomasticon.

3. THE POST-EXILIC, SECOND TEMPLE, AND TANNAITIC PERIODS (539 B.C.E.–220 C.E.)

3.1. THE PERSIAN PERIOD (539–332 B.C.E.)

3.1.1. Pre-exilic Continuity in the Persian Period and Beyond?

Does a return to *Yāhûd*¹⁸⁸ (although now a Persian province rather than an independent monarchy) see, on the one hand, a return to the pre-exilic onomasticon wherein PNNCSN would again attest to *-yhw-* in both initial and final positions, and, on the other, the consistent pronunciation *yahw* for this abbreviated name in both positions? To answer this two-faceted question as accurately as is possible, we must inspect the epigraphic and numismatic evidence of *Yāhûd* and any other closely related area, thereby determining if the consistent representation of *-yhw-* in both initial and final positions is attested

¹⁸³ Cf. section 3.1.4 and 3.1.6.2 below in POST-EXILIC PERIOD. Especially, cf. Stolper 1976: 27.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Coogan 1973: 189; Cross 1962: 253, n. 122. On the pronunciation of final vowels in Akkadian, cf. Hyatt 1941. The sign *ma* also reflects *wa* (*wa₆*) in Akkadian (cf. von Soden and Röllig 1967).

¹⁸⁵ See section 3.1.6.2 below for a further discussion of the Hebrew diphthong [aw].

¹⁸⁶ One must note the importance of the Weidner texts and a correct understanding of the phonological and orthographic correspondences of *all* names therein, since it reveals possibly the most critical point in our analysis.

¹⁸⁷ Thus, we depart from the opinion that the supposed shortened form of the name *Yahweh* (*yahû*) reflects a parallel *jussive*, which, however, is not a consensus opinion today. Cf. Freedman and O’Connor 1986.

¹⁸⁸ This toponym has been written *Yehud*, expressing [ə], but should be *Yāhûd*, as the reason for the [ə] becomes clearly evident later on in this study.

for PNNCSN. And, if not, what is? Then, we will attempt to recover the vocalization in both positions. Thus, our analysis now, in addition to continuing to confirm the *original* abbreviated form of the Sacred Name, will seek primarily to answer one of the secondary questions initially posed of how did these “variations” of the abbreviated name arise, since their source is *only one* name. But, before we do, we must first consider an important new characteristic of the returnees to Yāhūd that will certainly be beneficial to our analysis—Bilingualism.

3.1.2. Bilingualism in the Persian Period

In contrast to the pre-exilic period where Hebrew was the predominant language in daily life, in the post-exilic period the returning exiles were affected by Aramaic, language and script, as it was now the imperial language of Western Asia and the language of governance.¹⁸⁹ The beginning of this linguistic influence and one consequence were already indicated in our analysis of the religious context of the name Yahweh in the exilic period. But now, these returnees who were the children of those who went into exile (or even themselves young exiles) were bilingual, speaking both Hebrew and Aramaic.¹⁹⁰ Hebrew literary use, however, apparently gradually decreased to the point where it was only used in a limited context for “religious purposes,”¹⁹¹ but there may have continued a distinct Hebrew vernacular utilized either generally in “private” circles or among the priestly spheres.¹⁹² This consideration must be factored into our analysis of the onomasticon of new Yāhūd in the post-exilic period, because if our identification of IMASN in the exilic period is accurate (which we are confident it is), then we must also draw a similar conclusion for spoken Aramaic in the post-exilic period just as we did for both Aramaic and (to a lesser extent) Neo-Babylonian in the exilic period in Babylonia. In non-Hebrew speech Judeans misrepresented the abbreviated Sacred Name, with the goal being to “protect” the name Yahweh from recovery and defilement, and not rather to “protect” the common abbreviated form of the Sacred Name in PNNCSN (*yahw*). This misrepresentation in speech was paralleled, of course, by misrepresentations in written form in cuneiform. But, how did they now represent PNNCSN in the alphabetic Aramaic script, and for that matter the paleo-Hebrew script? The answers to this question, in addition to our two-faceted question above, may be found in the epigraphic and numismatic evidence attesting PNNCSN not only in Yāhūd, but also in Samaria, Egypt, and even Idumea. We will begin with the evidence from the Persian period, followed by an inspection of those in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

3.1.3. PNNCSN in the Onomastica of the Persian Period

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Polak 2006: 591; Knoppers 2006: 274. Also, cf. Naveh and Greenfield 1984.

¹⁹⁰ Zadok 1979: 18. Also cf. above.

¹⁹¹ Polak 2006: 614. Cf. also Knoppers 2006: 274 and Lemaire 1995: 153–163. Cf. Kottsieper 2007 and Schniedewind 2006 for the views of a complete cessation of spoken Hebrew preceding a revival.

¹⁹² Polak 2006: 606 and Kottsieper 2007:111–112. Also, cf. Naveh and Greenfield 1984.

On seals, bullae, or other stamp impressions from the province of Yāhūd in the Persian period, we find Aramaic (unless otherwise indicated) inscriptions: *yhw*d ʾwryw (Jericho),¹⁹³ *hlqyw* (patronym; Mesopotamia),¹⁹⁴ *dyhw* (patronym; Near Jerusalem; in Hebrew script),¹⁹⁵ *yhwysm*ʿ (in Hebrew script),¹⁹⁶ *yhʿzr* (Jericho),¹⁹⁷ *yhw*d *yhwʿzr*, the governor (Ramat Raḥel),¹⁹⁸ and *zbdyw*.¹⁹⁹ From Arad and Jerusalem PNNCSN dating to the middle of the fourth century and written also in Aramaic script on ostraca and/or graffiti include: *yhzqyh br šmʿyh*,²⁰⁰ *qbyh*,²⁰¹ *[mt(?)nyh]*,²⁰² *pnyh*,²⁰³ *yhwntn*,²⁰⁴ and *yhwysp*.²⁰⁵ The Samaria papyri in Aramaic from the fourth century²⁰⁶ likewise attest to numerous PNNCSN spelled predominantly *yhw*- initial and *-yh* final.²⁰⁷ Unique is the single name spelled *mkyhw*.²⁰⁸ In the province of Idumea also in the late fourth century we find Aramaic ostraca attesting to the names: *yhwkl* (patronym),²⁰⁹ *hunnyh*,²¹⁰ *yhšm*ʿ[?],²¹¹ *[šm]ʿyh*,²¹² and ʾhyw (but see note).²¹³ In Egypt in Aramaic in the fifth century not only do we find the exact patterns of spelling of PNNCSN with *yhw*- and *-yh* primarily, but there are also occurrences with the unique form *yhh*- (which reflects the independent *Yhh* = *Yhw*), and the spelling *yh*- on one name, this latter having been already seen above at Jericho and Idumea.

In analyzing the data above, a recent study of about 532 Yāhūd stamp impressions, some of which were formerly unpublished, by Lipschits and Vanderhooft (2007) will be helpful, as they have noted important information about these Yāhūd stamp impressions imprinted mostly on jar bodies or handles, some of which we have above.²¹⁴ First of all, they categorized the impressions into three chronological periods of early (late sixth to fifth centuries), middle (fourth to third centuries), and late (second century) types, having secure stratigraphic information for the early and late types confirming that these

¹⁹³ Cross 1969: 24; Naveh and Greenfield 1984: 123.

¹⁹⁴ Zadok 1988: 333.

¹⁹⁵ Zadok 1988: 333.

¹⁹⁶ Naveh 1982: 114. Cf. Magen, Misgav, and Tsania 2004.

¹⁹⁷ Zadok 1988: 333.

¹⁹⁸ Naveh and Greenfield 1984: 123.

¹⁹⁹ Naveh and Greenfield 1984: 123; Cross 1969: 26.

²⁰⁰ Yardeni 2000: A 360.

²⁰¹ Zadok 1988: 290; ArIns Aram. 12.3

²⁰² Zadok 1988: 290; ArIns Aram. 2.1

²⁰³ Zadok 1988: 290; ArIns Aram. 34.1

²⁰⁴ Zadok 1988: 290; ArIns Aram. 13.1; 14. face r.

²⁰⁵ Zadok 1988: 290; ArIns Aram. 14. face

²⁰⁶ They are generally dated from 375/365–335 B.C.E. (Cf. Cross 1969, Naveh and Greenfield 1984: 122.)

²⁰⁷ Cross 2006.

²⁰⁸ Cross 2006: 82.

²⁰⁹ Lemaire 2006: 415 (AL 365. 4); 424 (P2. 3).

²¹⁰ Lemaire 2006: 415 (AL 365. 6)

²¹¹ Lemaire 2006: 415 (AL 365. 13)

²¹² Lemaire 2006: 429 (W5'. 2)

²¹³ Lemaire 2006: 429 (W5'. 4); 421 (P8. 5). This name may not belong here, but may be related to the same personal name recorded by Cowley and then Porten in Egypt with the same spelling, which Porten explains as meaning "little brother" (1968: 136). Also, cf. Driver 1928: 18 for a similar opinion.

²¹⁴ Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007: 75.

don't overlap.²¹⁵ They noted that the early type of stamp impressions is *only written in Aramaic script*, primarily Lapidary. They stated:

Paleo-Hebrew letter forms begin to appear in coins and epigraphs of the fourth century.⁴ The absence of Paleo-Hebrew forms from the early type is, therefore, an important chronological criterion.²¹⁶

Another feature of these Yāhûd stamp impressions of the early type is that the province name, Yāhûd, is *always* written in the Aramaic script fully, rather than defectively (*yhw*d and not *yhd*), with *waw* as a *mater lexiōnis*. Also, personal names or titles don't appear on the middle and late types written in paleo-Hebrew with the province name written defectively.²¹⁷ Finally, there appeared to be a “rapid consolidation” of types of stamps in the *fourth century*, so that while in the sixth to fifth centuries there was a diversity of these stamp types (12 types), in the fourth to third there are only three types.²¹⁸

Therefore, our Yāhûd stamp impressions above can be dated somewhat, namely those of *yhw*d ʾwryw and *yhw*d *yhw*ʾzr, the governor. Additionally, we find predominantly Aramaic epigraphic records, the only exceptions being the personal names ʿdyhw and yhwysmʿ in Hebrew script, which confirms the increased use of Aramaic over Hebrew. These records indicate that the abbreviated Sacred Name in *initial position* mostly corresponds to the regular pre-exilic spelling through to the fourth century (*yhw*-), with the rare and new innovation *yh*-, and, interestingly, the final spelling is now predominantly *-yh*, which is pre-exilic, but infrequently attested, as noted above. But, this is not the exclusive final spelling found, however, since we have an “official” stamp impression, namely *yhw*d ʾwryw (as well as others), with an alternative one, namely *-yw*, which we can place in the sixth-fifth centuries with Lipschits and Vanderhooft (2007). To answer our questions, the returnees did not return to their pre-exilic orthography of PNNCSN (at least not fully). But, the multiple sources with the spelling *-yw* may have answered the second facet of our first question—*yahw* could have returned after the exile. But, while we can easily be led to state that the “correct” pronunciation and spelling were used only in Hebrew and the new “misrepresentations” continued to be used in Aramaic, our analysis is still not complete. The *precise* vocalization behind all these spellings of *yhw*-, *-yh*, occasional *-yhw*, *yh*-, and even *-yw* noted above needs to be determined exactly now, to do which the growing corpus of cuneiform records in Late Babylonian can be quite beneficial, along with an update to what we have learned about Hebrew orthography.

3.1.4. Post-exilic Akkadian Transcriptions of PNNCSN

²¹⁵ Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007: 79–80.

²¹⁶ Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007: 78.

²¹⁷ Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007: 79.

²¹⁸ The twelve early types were additionally said to resemble the private seal impressions from the end of the Iron Age (late pre-exilic period), especially since many contained personal names on them. However, the three middle types have only the province name as יהו or יהוה. Cf. Lipschits and Vanderhooft 2007: 84–85.

The primary extra-biblical source for studying post-exilic PNNCSN in Neo-/Late Babylonian up until recently has been the Murašû firm archive dating from 454 to 404 B.C.E. Now, the corpus of texts from āl-Yāhūdu and Bīt Našar dating between 572 and 484 B.C.E. adds significant new information, the beneficiaries of which will be many once they are published. These texts continue utilizing the known transcriptions of the abbreviated Sacred Name, giving forms of *ia-(a)ḥu-(u/ú)-* in initial position and *-ia-(a)-ma* (*-ia-(a)-wa₆*) in final position.²¹⁹ But, it also attests to a form *^de-ḥu-ú*.²²⁰ Furthermore, we have already noted that the form *^diá-a-ḥu-ú* is also attested in final position in more than one PNCSN from the āl-Yāhūdu and Bīt Našar vicinity.²²¹

However, the Murašû archive remains valuable. The forms of the abbreviated name in initial position found here are *^dia-a-ḥu-ú*, *^dia-ḥu-ú*, *^dia-a-ḥu-u*, *ia-a-ḥu*, and even *^dḥu-ú*.²²² The final forms are most frequently *-ia-a-ma*, less frequently *-ia-ma*, *Ci-a-ma* (*ma-la-ki-a-ma*), *Ca-³-a-ma* (*ḥa-na-na-³-a-ma*), *Ca-a-ma* (*ḥa-ta-a-ma*), and *Ce-e-ma* (*gír-re-e-ma*).²²³

These forms all indicate some amount of continuity of the vocalizations from the exilic period to this point; however, it is especially at this juncture that much speculation has again arose with regards to the “correct” form and pronunciation of the abbreviated Sacred Name, in both initial and final positions, a distinction that interestingly was not needed in the pre-exilic period neither in alphabetic script nor in cuneiform. However, we are confident that these speculations can now be appropriately addressed. An Aramaic endorsement contained on one of the cuneiform tablets has assisted in identifying the initial element (*ia-[a]ḥu-(u/ú)-*) as reflective of *yhw*,²²⁴ but the final element (*-ia-(a)-ma*) has been more difficult to analyze. Most have acknowledged the clearly acceptable vocalization of this as /yaw/, but have derived it from alphabetic *-yw*, the adopting of which seems odd for the exiled Judahites especially since earlier periods of influence of this form from the north within Judah (evident in their eighth to seventh-century onomasticon) was resisted and never continued to be utilized, as noted above.²²⁵ Stolper, however, brought to light the only Aramaic endorsement of this form in a name written in cuneiform as *pi-il-ia-a-ma*, and spelled *plyh* on the endorsement in Aramaic script, and he cautiously noted that “even if *-ia-a-ma* usually represents *-yaw*, a final form *-yh* was in at least occasional use as an acceptable equivalent of *-ia-a-ma* in 5th century Nippur.”²²⁶ Cross, however, seeing the impossibility of this from a

²¹⁹ Pearce 2006: 405. Also, cf. also Magdalene and Wunsch 2011: 119–123. Now, see the newly completed volume Pearce and Wunsch 2014.

²²⁰ Pearce 2006: 405.

²²¹ Joannès and Lemaire 1999: 17–34; Vanderhooft 2003: 223; and Magdalene and Wunsch 2011: 122. Pearce (2011: 270) gives the Nippur-Keš-Kakara triangle as the possible location of āl-Yāhūdu.

²²² Zadok 1979: 7–8; Clay 1908: 292.

²²³ Zadok 1979: 7–8.

²²⁴ Zadok 2003: 564; Clay 1908: 292, #13.

²²⁵ The proper association should be that *ia-(a)ma* produced *-yw*, and not *ia-(a)ma* resulted from *yw*. Cf. also Zadok 2004: 7, n. 7.

²²⁶ Stolper 1976: 27.

linguistic standpoint, suggested that this *-yh* is representative of *yô*, with *he* a *mater lexionis* for *ô*.²²⁷ Zadok at first accepted this suggestion.²²⁸ Coogan noted that the forms with alphabetic *-yw* are few, and that *yw*- “does not occur in post-exilic names,”²²⁹ but is found in *later* personal names as we will see momentarily. But, Zadok made the important statement later on that “All the cuneiform spellings of *Yhw* as 2nd component reflect *-/yaw/*,”²³⁰ which seems obvious from a comparison of all late pre-exilic alphabetic spellings of the ubiquitous *-yhw* and the same predominance of *-ia-a-ma* in final position already from about 592 B.C.E.²³¹ But, after the new evidence surfaced that *ia-a-ḥu-ú* is also attested in final position, Vanderhooft indicated that it disproves the statement of Zadok, since the scribes apparently differentiated between *yāhū* and *yaw*.²³² Again, as in the Weidner texts, the misunderstanding has been caused by incorrect presuppositions, and, in this period, all presuppositions about PNNCSN must be checked by a thorough evaluation of the relevant evidence at hand. Thus, en route to establishing what was the precise phonology of these alphabetic forms in this period we must once again evaluate the nature of Hebrew orthography at this time, then we will return to a consideration of the religious context of the full name Yahweh, since we continue to observe that changes in the ideology regarding this name often parallels changes in its abbreviated form(s).

3.1.5. Post-exilic Orthography and PNNCSN

3.1.5.1. Orthography in the Post-exilic Period

In our evaluation of pre-exilic Hebrew orthography we observed that it maintained the use of *matres lexionis* to indicate long vowels, from the ninth century only *final vowels*, but from about the end of the eighth century also *medial*. Hence the letters <w> and <y> indicated final long /ū/ and /ī/ respectively, and <h> represented final long /ā/, /ē/, and /ō/ in places where historically they did not appear before. In medial position only <w> and <y> were utilized in the same manner as *matres lexionis*. At that time the letter *waw* did not indicate /ō/, and *yod* did not indicate /ē/ as *matres lexionis*, as the diphthongs *aw* and *ay* had not yet contracted.

Now, in the post-exilic and Second Temple periods this is not the case. While many changes can be noted about the differences in the orthography now in this period in contrast to that in the pre-exilic, the most important to note is that discussed by Freedman and Anderson of the progression from “sporadic to more extensive to full use of vowel letters internally.”²³³ It should also be noted too that now to say

²²⁷ In Stolper 1976: 27.

²²⁸ Zadok 1979: 10.

²²⁹ Coogan 1973: 190.

²³⁰ Zadok 1988: 185

²³¹ Cf. Weidner 1939: opposite 924, pl. I, line 31.

²³² Cf. Vanderhooft 2003: 225, n. 21.

²³³ Cf. Freedman, Anderson, and Forbes 1992: 8.

“Hebrew orthography” is not painting a very clear picture since for many now Hebrew was not the language used primarily on a daily basis, so that Aramaic orthographic practices undoubtedly now defined Hebrew. According to Freedman and Anderson, the earliest orthographic features of about the sixth to fifth centuries B.C.E. (seen, for example, in the oldest Hebrew manuscripts from Qumrân, 4QSam^b) are characteristic of *regular use* of <w> and <y> for /ū/ and /i/ respectively, but no <w> for /ō/ or <y> for /ē/, “except when these are or were diphthongs.”²³⁴ However, there is *rare* use of <w> for /ō/ from /ā/ and *none* for /ō/ from /u/, but we now see <w> representing ô for the 3rd m s possessive pronominal suffix in place of pre-exilic <h>.²³⁵

Later on, in about the fifth to fourth centuries B.C.E. there appears to be greater use of <w> for /ō/ medially.

3.1.5.2. Implications of Post-exilic Orthography for Onomastics

These new developments in orthographic habits do not actually assist in identifying the precise phonology of PNNCSN in this period, but rather expand the possibilities for vocalization, since we now have another “possible” phoneme (that of /ō/) that can be represented by the <w> in the abbreviated name within PNNCSN. However, this does not trouble us, since it is not independent of our historical onomastic analysis, which indicated the *source* of the initial abbreviated Sacred Name reflected in PNNCSN, and also the religious context of the full name Yahweh, which taken together certainly paints a complete picture as far as we can see.

3.1.6. The Name Yahweh in its Persian-Period Religious Context

3.1.6.1. The Independent Name

3.1.6.1.1. YHWH

The religious ideology regarding use and reverence of the full name Yahweh in the Persian period is a further development of that which began already in the exilic period. The sources indicated that the name Yahweh was not used in non-Hebrew speech, speaking primarily of Aramaic, but also any other. However, in Hebrew it continued to be used. This environment saw the emergence of the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN in PNNCSN, wherein our *totally new vocalization* of the compounded abbreviated Sacred Name arose—*yāhû*. Now, the onomasticon of Yāhûd and elsewhere attests *primarily* to *yhw-* (initial) and *-yh* (final), with early variations. But, in the Persian period the name Yahweh continues to be a part of Judean religious life.

²³⁴ Freedman, Anderson, and Forbes 1992: 9.

²³⁵ Freedman, Anderson, and Forbes 1992: 9.

An examination of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah confirms our conclusions. Here we see the Hebrew account where interestingly Cyrus is attributed to using the name Yahweh *publicly*.²³⁶ Then, we see the phrase *house of Yahweh* being utilized again, as in the pre-exilic period.²³⁷ The people were recorded as singing praises to *Yahweh* when the foundation of the temple was laid.²³⁸ The leaders also spoke using the name *Yahweh* to outsiders (the Samaritans) who also knew and spoke Hebrew.²³⁹ Ezra blessed Yahweh in Babylon when permitted to go up to Jerusalem,²⁴⁰ and prayed to Yahweh in the temple.²⁴¹ However, in Aramaic sections of the book of Ezra the phrases *house of Yahweh* and *house of ʿĒlōhîm* are now *house of ʿĒlāh*,²⁴² and *Yahweh* is now ʿĒlāh, ʿĒlāh of heaven, or ʿĒlāh of Israel.²⁴³

Nehemiah, likewise, in Hebrew prays to Yahweh in Shushan, while mourning and fasting.²⁴⁴ In Nehemiah's account, Ezra uses and blesses the name of Yahweh in the broad place before the water gate. But then, in the account of Nehemiah, we observe that ʿĒlōhîm was used exclusively in the latter portions.²⁴⁵

Thus, from the biblical perspective, it certainly appears that in the *early* Persian period the name Yahweh continued to be used in *Hebrew only* both publicly and privately, inside and outside the temple, and this mere limited use of which was indicative of a great reverence for him. But, confirmation of the historicity of these books as well as further support to our analysis is evident from certain important archaeological data from Jews in Egypt.

3.1.6.1.2. Possessors of a Further Innovation—Yāhû

The name *Yāhû* was *never* a part of pre-exilic²⁴⁶ Judahite religion as our evidence indicates, *neither in personal names nor as an independent name* for Yahweh.²⁴⁷ Therefore, what could be the possible explanation for its use by Jews in Egypt in the fifth century? It is obviously a post-exilic continuation of possibly an already exilic innovation, being borrowed for independent use. This product of the religio-

²³⁶ Ezra 1:2–4. It is clear here that there was a record within Jewish circles that Cyrus used the name of Yahweh, since the same is not found in the records preserved in Daniel pertaining to Nebuchadnezzar and also in Ezra with Artaxerxes in 458 B.C.E. Thus, Cyrus may very well have spoken the name of Yahweh in Persian most likely utilizing the method corresponding to (*h*)*uzvarišn* (*mephorash*), where his spoken words in Persian are written by a competent scribe in Aramaic and then taken to the destination, where it was read out in Persian or *another language* (Aramaic or Hebrew?) to its recipients. Cf. Naveh and Greenfield 1984: 116.

²³⁷ Cf. Ezra 1:1–4:7, etc.

²³⁸ Ezra 3:10–11.

²³⁹ The Samaritans, of course, also worshiped Yahweh. Cf. Ezra 4:2.

²⁴⁰ Ezra 7:27–28.

²⁴¹ Ezra 9–10.

²⁴² Ezra 4:24, 6:16–18.

²⁴³ Ezra 5:1–12; 7:18–26.

²⁴⁴ Nehemiah 1: 4–5.

²⁴⁵ Nehemiah 11:1ff.

²⁴⁶ That is, our pre-exilic period, which terminates in 597 B.C.E.

²⁴⁷ Cf. our analysis above in the PRE-EXILIC period, section 1 above.

linguistic convention of IMASN (*yāhû*) was confined only to the Judean onomasticon among the exiles who went into Babylon and other areas in the empire. It was not for the Judeans at that time, but it was for non-Hebrew speaking foreigners, who would associate this name with the *supposed* Judean “deity” in their PNNCSN. The *independent name* *Yāhû* was a totally new innovation and was only borrowed from the onomasticon of the Judean exiles sometime after 597 B.C.E., who in turn developed *-yāhû-* from the toponym of the southern kingdom (*Yāhûd*). However, whether this innovation was made by the Judean elites in Babylon or the Jews in Egypt themselves, and therefore quite early, is not known to us at this time. It has been noted that the name Yahweh is not found in the fifth century Aramaic papyri from Elephantine (Yeb) in Egypt, but only *Yāhû* (also *Yhh*).²⁴⁸ However, that this name was intended to be *associated* with Yahweh is clear from the onomastica of the Judeans, the fact that they *are* called Judeans, the obvious titles associated with Yahweh found in other Persian period sources,²⁴⁹ and these Jews’ connection to other communities that definitely worshiped Yahweh.²⁵⁰ But, *the fact is they just did not worship Yahweh*. However, much more may be learned from a linguistic consideration of these Jews. Did they also speak Hebrew, along with Aramaic, and, as a further “test” to our conclusion, is there *any evidence for possible use of the name Yahweh?*

Speaking about the Elephantine community, Cowley states that “there is no document in Hebrew, nor any direct evidence that Hebrew was used by the community for any purpose. (But see p. 119).”²⁵¹ He then notes on pp. 118–119 the many “Hebraisms” and extensive corrections found in the letter requesting petition to rebuild the temple at Elephantine sent to the leaders in *Yāhûd* and Samaria as indicative of native Hebrew use.²⁵² However, in writing this *important* letter to the “conservators” of Hebrew in Jerusalem about a totally religious need they did not open the letter with the name Yahweh, but with *ʾlh Šmyʾ*, and afterward spoke in the name of *Yāhû* throughout. Furthermore, what is more instructive is that in the letter of response to this letter from *Yāhûd* and Samaria the speakers did not acknowledge *Yāhû at all*, but simply utilized the common phrase *ʾlh Šmyʾ*.²⁵³ Porten stated that *Yāhû* was

²⁴⁸ Porten 1968: 105; for different reasons, Cowley 1923: xviii and Cowley 1920: 175. The phonology of YHH has not been speculated upon here. All that we may say is that there clearly were two independent pronunciations of this name at Elephantine for whatever reasons. Actually, Driver (1928:20–21) suggests the medial *he* to be a *litera prolongationis* to prevent contraction of the diphthong in a form put forth as *yāhw*, which he sees in the <yhw> orthography used here, and so was also used as such in *yāhh*. But, Cross (2006: 79) suggests a vocalization *yô-* with the second *h* of *yhh* being “a survival of the old *mater lectionis* for *-ō*, the *hê* following *yōd* as historical spelling.” This orthography is certainly unique to Elephantine, but perhaps a likewise unique situation led to this particular need. Everywhere else the pronunciation remained *yāhû* in PNNCSN in the Persian period. This need may not be ideologically unrelated to the late Persian-/Hellenistic-period need by the Judean elites, however. Cf. section 3.2.4.2.

²⁴⁹ One such title is *ʾĒlāh Šamayāʾ* (Ezra 5:12, 7:12ff). Cf. Cowley 1923: 111 (#30:2).

²⁵⁰ *Yāhûd* and Samaria. Cf. Cowley 1923: 111.

²⁵¹ Cowley 1923: xv.

²⁵² Cowley 1923: 118–119.

²⁵³ Cf. Cowley 1923: 123 (#32:3–4). This has also been observed by Lemaire (2007: 111).

“confined to vernacular usage, while sacred writings used the form YHWH.”²⁵⁴ This is partially correct.²⁵⁵ The absence of the name Yahweh in this Aramaic-speaking community supports our analysis thus far. The name Yahweh was not used in a non-Hebrew tongue. But also remember that the independent name *Yāhû* was also *not used in Hebrew-speaking Jewish communities at all*, even when speaking Aramaic for administrative or business purposes. Certainly, it is non-existent in all manuscripts of the Masoretic Text or documents from the later normative community. To them, who obviously knew of its origins, it was simply a religio-linguistic convention in their onomasticon for contact with non-Hebrew speaking foreigners and nothing more. Thus, the Aramaic portions of the exilic/post-exilic books have *ʾlh* or *ʾlh Šmy* instead of Yahweh (and not *Yāhû*), and *Yāhû* is not found in the later Aramaic inscriptions on Mt. Gerizim, which likewise have *ʾlh*.²⁵⁶ The Egyptian Jewry, thus, attests to the earliest independent use of *Yāhû*, influenced undoubtedly by the post-597 B.C.E. implementation of IMASN by the Judean elites in their onomasticon in foreign language contexts. Additionally, one must also note that they also “independently” before 525 B.C.E. built their own temple and offered animal sacrifices contrary to the sacred writings,²⁵⁷ and the parallel community in Babylonia had no temple (which shows an ideological difference)²⁵⁸ and the Samaritan temple to Yahweh was built in the mid-fifth century after the one in *Yāhûd* was built.²⁵⁹ Put simply, *yāhû* in any form originated in a post-597 B.C.E. timeframe in our exilic period as evidenced from the above information and also from the Weidner texts, being formulated because of religio-linguistic reasons.²⁶⁰ Now, already by the end of the sixth century, we see a rather strong *Yāhû*-worshipping community, which is significant.²⁶¹ But it should not be supposed that Egypt was the only place *Yāhû* was both known and worshipped or that independent *Yāhû* is found at the latest in the fifth century, since we also find Jews in Idumea in 312 B.C.E. documented above associated with a *house of Yāhû* there.

There clearly was a difference ideologically between the communities in *Yāhûd* and Samaria and the community in Egypt, but such a difference as is not significantly apparent from the onomastica, but can certainly be detected from the religious context of the name Yahweh during this time. However, how does this religious context of the name Yahweh, where we see continued use of it in Hebrew but continued avoidance in non-Hebrew speech, now carry over into personal names in the Persian period, where we now have a rather complex cultural and linguistic scenario? Considering the Late Babylonian transcriptions of the PNNCSN of Judeans from Babylon and their representation in alphabetic script

²⁵⁴ Porten 1995: 60, n. *; Also, cf. Porten 1968: 106.

²⁵⁵ Cf. also Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania 2004: 22–23.

²⁵⁶ Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania 2004: 23. Also cf. below.

²⁵⁷ Cf. Exodus 20:24.

²⁵⁸ Cf. Porten 2003: 451, Beaulieu 2011: 254, and Lemaire 2007: 114.

²⁵⁹ Cf. Magen 2007: 158.

²⁶⁰ Cf. above in EXILIC PERIOD, especially in the Weidner texts, section 2.2.

²⁶¹ The first Elephantine document is dated to 495 B.C.E. just a few years after the end of the sixth.

noted above, the difficulties can easily be removed once it is realized how fully the onomastica were shaped by the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN.

3.1.6.2. The Compounded Form of the Name in the Persian Period

3.1.6.2.1. *IMASN Persists in the Post-Exilic Period*

Just as we have shown in the exilic period, final **-ia-a-ma** (**-ia-a-wa₆**) is reflective of the accurate pronunciation of the abbreviated Sacred Name when compounded in personal names, which was *yahw* (the same pronunciation as *yaw*). This cuneiform transcription in the post-exilic period is surely a continuation of the exilic religio-linguistic convention of IMASN. For the elite exiles who began implementing IMASN, this transcription in PNNCSN was maintained, but the transcription **ia(-a)-ú** was not, because, with the appropriate predicative element, it could lead to a pronunciation and hence defilement of the Sacred Name. Again, this becomes clear from the Weidner tablets. However, additionally, the transcription **-ia-a-ma** could never be *associated* with the first three letters of the Sacred Name, which was helped by the nonexistence of the grapheme <h> in cuneiform, and a transcription via which could very well resemble the former northern Israelite form (-yw-). The reason for this disassociation, however, may be similar to the reason for avoiding **ia(-a)-ú**, a recovery and pronunciation of the Sacred Name, which the “impossible” but undeniable alphabetic form *yahw* in Semitic necessitates.²⁶² In initial position, however, the need arose to “misrepresent” the *he*, which was attempted by utilizing <k> sometime after 592 B.C.E. to make it *intervocalic*,²⁶³ but then adjusted to <h> sometime before 583 B.C.E. Both were separate ways of doing the same thing, misrepresenting the combination of spelling and pronunciation of the element -yhw-, and hence the recovery of the name and form *Yahweh*, which was *not to be spoken in a foreign tongue*.

3.1.6.2.2. *IMASN Reveals -Yhw- = -yw = -yh in the Post-Exilic and Second Temple Periods*

So, those Judahites that went into exile undoubtedly continued this monosyllabic diphthongal pronunciation (*yahw*), but also “adopted” the pronunciation utilizing the two syllables (without the /d/) of *yāhūd* in foreign speech to fully achieve their goal. The case of final **-^dia-a-*hu-ú*** in a few names is thus obviously part of this innovation, but is later than initial **^dia-a-*hu-ú***, with simple implementation of the innovation in final position as well. If, however, they still had the pronunciation /yaw/ in their speech in personal names with the compounded Sacred Name at the end, but did not want it reflective of *-yahw*,

²⁶² So Freedman and O’Connor call it (1986: 512). Driver notes that other Semitic races generally do not abbreviate the name of the deity in theophoric names (1928: 23), and Freedman and O’Connor (1986: 502) find rare exceptions of this.

²⁶³ This was the case in the transcription of Jehoiachin in the Weidner texts, which was about 592 B.C.E. Cf. section 2.2.1 above in the EXILIC PERIOD.

since *it must somehow be connected* with the initial innovation *yāhû-* (which they wanted to be seen “comparatively” as the *Judean deity*, and also remember <yw> was reflective of northern Israelites or their rejection of Yahweh²⁶⁴), what could satisfactorily represent this monosyllabic *final form* in alphabetic script? The resolution was to utilize *-yāh* (note stress), which for them could be interpreted by the foreigner as shortened from *yāhû*, but which *-āh* apparently *was not phonologically distinct from the diphthong /aw/*, and *-yāh* was used in names, although oddly limited to seals, in pre-exilic Judah as an “acceptable” abbreviation of *Yahweh* and phonologically paralleled to *yahw*.²⁶⁵ In light of this then, we may very well be in a strong position to say that whenever Hebrew was spoken, and certainly in a religious setting (whether in a gathering or at the temple), not only would the full name *Yahweh* be used, but the abbreviated Sacred Name in both initial and final positions would have been also.²⁶⁶ However, the onomastica would have continued to be ambiguous. Thus, the sources with the spelling *-yw* in *Yāhûd* confirms almost certainly that *yahw* did return after the exile, but with inconsistencies. In Egypt, of course, they worshiped *Yāhû* (also reflected in their onomasticon) with its abbreviation *yāh*.

But, this is still certainly not the religious context in which the onomasticon of the Masoretic Text received shape, seeing there is still one other form (or forms) of the Sacred Name that is still not accounted for—that initial form(s) with the phoneme /ō/, the explanation for which may well be found later in the Persian and into the Hellenistic/Roman periods.

²⁶⁴ Cf. section 1.4.2 above for the pre-exilic analysis of these forms.

²⁶⁵ An important phonological observation pertaining to the diphthong /aw/ must be repeated. G. R. Driver (1928: 20) in seeking to account for the wide variations in the forms of the name suggested that all forms of the abbreviated name in pre-exilic Israel were indicative of one pronunciation, although, while acknowledging that *Yahweh* was considered more sacred than the abbreviated forms (1928: 23), still reasoned in the opposite direction. This study, however, corrects his. Adding to his evidence that presented by Stolper above (1976: 27), we must say that, phonologically speaking, for the most part G. R. Driver was correct, since our analysis has come to similar conclusions. This is especially applicable to diachronic linguistics and also explains ancient Hebrew orthography (especially pertaining to diphthongs) more clearly. The Neo-Assyrian transcriptions (*-ia-a-ú/u*) indicated a long vowel in the diphthong, which is only phonologically peculiar in its usual pronunciation. But additionally, carefully taking the Neo-Babylonian transcriptions where *-ia-ú/u-* was clearly avoided, while *-ia-a-ma* remained, and the apparent equivalence of the final forms *-yāh*, *-yāhw*, and also *-yāw* (and even *yā-* [cf. Driver 1928: 20, n. 1], but no certain attestations of pre-exilic *yah-*), all of which were reflective of the Akkadian transcription *-ia-a-ma* (but not *yā-* [no /w/]), it seems clear that the phoneme /w/ in the Hebrew diphthong /aw/ (which would be consonantal in such a position, as indicated in ancient Hebrew orthography) is distinct from vocalic /ū/, so that the diphthongal sound is actually /aw/ (like the lower-mid/open-mid, back vowel sound [IPA ɔ]) and not /aū/ (two contiguous vowel sounds: a low/open, front vowel {[a]}, followed by a high/close, back vowel {[ū]}, as in the Greek diphthong), and the same is true of /wa/ (with [w] pronounced as a glide). In Northwest Semitic languages, the phenomenon of the Canaanite shift has been oft noted, where */ā/ shifted to /ō/, and different dialects exhibited the phenomenon at different times into the Iron Age and later (see section 1 above, PRE-EXILIC PERIOD). This phenomenon also affected the diphthong /aw/ which likewise shifted to /ō/. They are not phonetically distinct.

²⁶⁶ One can also note that one of the personal names listed above was found on a Persian period stamp seal that reads “*yhwysm' brt šwššr' šr*” in which the Hebrew name is spelled in paleo-Hebrew script and the Babylonian name is spelled in Aramaic script. Cf. also Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania 2004: 40, n. 96.

3.2. THE HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN PERIODS (332 B.C.E.–220 C.E.)

3.2.1. *Yəhō-* and *Yô-*: the Result of Ancient Hebrew Phonological Processes?

Again, the forms of the abbreviated Sacred Name in initial position in the vocalized text of the Masoretes are *yô-* and *yəhō-*, which is very significant, since in our analysis thus far the only initial forms²⁶⁷ we have analyzed are the quite dominant *yāhû-* and also the less frequent *yāh-*.²⁶⁸ But, certainly, initial <yhw> in the sixth and fifth centuries could be contrived to be *yahō-* or *yəhō-* (because of the *waw*), but this cannot be the case so early because of a combination of Hebrew orthography, our historical onomastic analysis, and Akkadian transcriptions. Again, our identification of the *source* of the element *-yāhû-* in personal names clarifies the Akkadian transcriptions, so that we are confident that in Aramaic they are reflective of *yāhû-* and not *yahō-*.²⁶⁹ Cross has suggested that Masoretic *yəhō-* is a “hypercorrection” such as in *məʾōd* and *bəʾōš* (for **môd* and **bôš*), in which he follows the argument of Albright discussed above (1925: 159).²⁷⁰ The *he* of the original *yāhû-* syncopated and produced *yaw*, which then contracted resulting in *only yô-*. The spelling *yəhō-* then arose when the orthography <yhw> in PNNCSN was adapted to the pronunciation *yô*, producing a written form *yəhō-*, but still pronounced *yô*.²⁷¹ Freedman and Anderson, however, in discussing this same conundrum in the names in the Samaria papyri of the fourth century B.C.E. state: “. . . therefore we question the traditional explanation of the preformative *yəhō-* as a back-formation from an original *yahu* → *yaw* → *yô* and then with the restoration of the original *he*, *yəhō-*.”²⁷² They favor, therefore, a form *yahaw* (that developed from *yahw*) that was the antecedent of the later Masoretic form(s) in initial position. The form *yəhō* resulted from reduction of *a* to *ə* and then contraction within the final syllable, and *yô* arose through elision of *h* in *aha* to *a*, the resultant *yaw* then contracting to *yô*.²⁷³

However, both of these suggestions produce difficulties in the light of the evidence. In the former suggestion, a singular pronunciation *yô* resulting from various phonological processes would not explain this variation in relation to the *independent* name as $\omega\omega$ in the Dead Sea Scroll Greek fragment 4QLXXLev^b, the magic papyri of the first century C.E., and even Jerome’s independent *yaho*.²⁷⁴ But, the latter suggestion does not explain why *all of the early* Greek transcriptions of PNNCSN are spelled *almost exclusively* with initial $\omega-$, with no indication of any other vowel preceding ω .

²⁶⁷ On the form *yhh-*, see n. 248 above.

²⁶⁸ We consider the form to be uniquely *yāh-* (and not *yah*) since it is to be associated with final *-yāh* and *yāhû*, but not necessarily abnormally stressed.

²⁶⁹ The phoneme /ō/ is transcribed <u> in Akkadian, as in ¹*ú-se-* (*Hôšē*). Cf. Zadok 1996: 726–27. Also cf. Mykytiuk 2004: 63–64.

²⁷⁰ Cf. section 0.2 above, n. 32.

²⁷¹ Cross 2006: 79.

²⁷² Freedman, Anderson, and Forbes 1992: 173.

²⁷³ Freedman, Anderson, and Forbes 1992: 173; Freedman and O’Connor 1986: 501.

²⁷⁴ Cf. Freedman and O’Connor 1986: 509. Also, cf. Lemaire 2007: 128.

We now seek to answer primarily three questions. Firstly, when did the change in the spelling(s) within PNNCSN occur? And, secondly, can this change in the phonology of the abbreviated name in PNNCSN from /ū/ to /ō/ only be explained by the above phonological processes (or any other), since neither of these explanations is satisfactory? Thirdly, did PNNCSN with the abbreviated name in final position likewise exhibit changes? Again, the answers can be obtained by a careful inspection of the relevant evidence at hand, and by carefully noting the changes within the various onomastica (particularly in PNNCSN) as we move from the early to the later periods.

3.2.2. PNNCSN and Others in the Hellenistic- and Roman-Period Jewish Onomastica

3.2.2.1. A Transformation of the Jewish Onomastica from Persian to Hellenistic Periods

Many different changes within the onomastica of various Jewish communities from the end of the Persian to the Hellenistic periods have been oft noted. Continuing the work begun by Zadok,²⁷⁵ T. Ilan's prosopographic study of the Israelite onomastica of this period and beyond is very important for any study on Graeco-Roman Jewish onomastics.²⁷⁶ In 1976 N. G. Cohen attempted to account for an onomastic anomaly as she quoted the remarks of Cowley that names of "Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Samuel, or David, so commonly used later, do not occur [in the Elephantine community]." She then proceeded to argue that factors other than religious motives led to the popularity in the later period of patriarchal names.²⁷⁷ Beaulieu, however, suggested this later popularity was indicative of a change in focus, which now was on "ancestry, lineage, and history."²⁷⁸ Other significant points in Jewish onomastics have also been noted. Clarysse, discussing the Jews in Egypt, repeated a note made by Tcherikover in the *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* (CPJ) that these Jews especially favored names that were "phonetic equivalents of Jewish names, translations of Jewish names, monotheistic names, and dynastic names." S. Honigman also made an important contribution in the light of Ilan's work as she sought to highlight the occurrences of names of "secondary biblical figures" in the Jewish onomastica underrepresented in Ilan's work, and focused on the Ptolemaic period which Ilan covered minimally. She analyzed the Egyptian Jewish onomasticon (especially in Lower and Middle Egypt, assuming strong parallels particularly there with the local Judean onomasticon), and fills a gap and draws an important parallel with the local Judean onomasticon.²⁷⁹ However, Beaulieu highlighted another important area of change when he discussed the apparent expression of cultural (patriotic) and religious identity of Jews in the Persian period perceived through the proliferation of PNNCSN in use during that time. He noted significantly that these names experienced an "ossification and disappearance during the Hellenistic

²⁷⁵ Zadok 1988.

²⁷⁶ Ilan 2002.

²⁷⁷ She concludes cultural influences outside of Israel were responsible (Cohen 1976: 128).

²⁷⁸ Beaulieu 2011: 259.

²⁷⁹ Clarysse 1994: 195–196; Honigman 2004.

period,”²⁸⁰ which saw names like those N. G. Cohen discussed become popular. But it must not be forgotten that other factors too led to the popularity of certain frequently-occurring names, such as *papponymy*, naming after the grandfather.²⁸¹ Again, our focus is especially on PNNCSN, as we now answer our initial questions posed above. Beginning just before the Hellenistic period in Yāhūd, we will now analyze the various onomastica within Yahūdāh, Egypt, and Mt. Gerizim, note significant phonological deviations, and then determine how they can be explained. But, again, for the sake of isolation we will also include in our discussion changes in the phonology of the toponym Yāhūd/Yahūdāh (or derivatives therefrom) and the personal name *Hôšē’* (formerly *Hawšē’*).

3.2.2.2. Yāhūd/Yahūdāh

Beginning in the fourth century numismatics began to play an important role in Yāhūd.²⁸² While personal names no longer appeared on official Yāhūd seals, with the minting of their own currency not only were personal names now found on Yāhūd coins, but they were, like the new seals of the fourth and third centuries, written in the paleo-Hebrew script. In this context we find the inscription < **ywhnn** hkwhn > in paleo-Hebrew script on a unique Yāhūd coin, dated to the “mid-fourth century.”²⁸³ However, this spelling of the abbreviated Sacred Name is not consistently attested hereafter in Yāhūd.

During the Hasmonean rule, coins of the high priest John Hyrcanus I (134–104 B.C.E.) attest to the older spelling of < yhw- > in paleo-Hebrew, with a single variation < yw- > in Meshorer’s F group (F23), along with transposition of letters in the E group (E15 and E16).²⁸⁴ However, in the second to first centuries B.C.E. under Alexander Jannaeus the king and high priest (103–76 B.C.E.) coins exhibit more variations in spelling, attesting primarily paleo-Hebrew < yhw- >, but also frequently < y- >, along with < yw- >, and even < yh- >.²⁸⁵ The final shortened form of the abbreviated name (< yh >) is also attested in paleo-Hebrew on these coins into the latter part of the first century, as in those of Mattityah Antigonus (41–37 B.C.E.).

Other instances of PNNCSN with the initial abbreviated Sacred Name are (abbreviated name in bold): **ywhnn** (3 times in Jericho papyri, post-323; 6 times an ossuary, tomb, papyri of first century C.E., but otherwise written fully as **yhwḥnn**; tannaitic/rabbinic sources usually use this short spelling; at Qumrān this spelling is used for Hyrcanus).²⁸⁶ **yhwḥzy** (Jericho papyrus, post-323).²⁸⁷

²⁸⁰ Cf. Beaulieu 2011: 248.

²⁸¹ Cf. Cross 1998: 192–195 for his discussion of papponymy in his reconstruction of the line of the high priests in Jerusalem. Cf. Ilan 2002: 32–33 and Cf. also Bauckham 2012.

²⁸² Cf. Meshorer 2001: 1.

²⁸³ Cf. Meshorer 2001: 14, where he gives Barag’s dating.

²⁸⁴ Cf. Meshorer 2001: 201–209.

²⁸⁵ Cf. Meshorer 2001: 209–217.

²⁸⁶ Ilan 2002: 134–138.

²⁸⁷ Ilan 2002: 134.

yhwrm (Jericho papyrus, post-323 B.C.E.).²⁸⁸

yhw^zzr (Jericho papyrus, post-323 B.C.E.; written both long and short [**yw^zzr**] in epigraphical and papyrological sources; tannaitic literature uses *only* the short form).²⁸⁹

yhw^hhnn (1 time in Gezer ostrakon, third century B.C.E.; almost always written fully in epigraphic and papyrological sources; tannaitic and Qumrân literature has shorter form, **yw^hhnn**).²⁹⁰

yhwsp (second most popular name in Ilan's corpus [*note spelling*]; 1 time in Jericho papyrus, post-323 B.C.E.; 1 time in Gezer ostrakon, third century B.C.E.; most frequently found and almost always written this way in epigraphic and papyrological sources; tannaitic literature has shorter form, **ywsp**, and its abbreviation **ywsy**).²⁹¹

yšw^c (Sirach, third century B.C.E.; almost always written this way in epigraphical and papyrological sources; tannaitic literature normally uses the long form, **yhwš^c**, but this short spelling for the leader of the Nazarenes [in later Amoraic material without final pharyngeal]).²⁹²

yhwntn (almost always written fully in epigraphic and papyrological sources, but also **yn^tn**, **ywn^tn**, **yhn^tn**; tannaitic and Qumrân literature has the shorter form, **ywn^tn**, but King Alexander Janneus is written as **yn²y**, apparently his well-known abbreviation of **yhwntn**).²⁹³

yhw² (Masada ostrakon, pre-73).²⁹⁴

yw²b (Masada “lot” ostrakon, pre-73).²⁹⁵

y²hz (Masada ostraca, pre-73).²⁹⁶

yyšw^c/yhwšw^c (Incantation bowls, pre-70 C.E.).²⁹⁷

Many occurrences of PNNCSN with the final abbreviated Sacred Name are also found from the earliest period and also exhibit orthographic peculiarities. Just a few variations are:

y²znyh (Gezer ostrakon, third century B.C.E.).²⁹⁸

hnnyh (Tell al-Fûl ostrakon, third to second century B.C.E.; Gezer ostrakon, third century B.C.E., etc.).²⁹⁹

hnn²y (Jerusalem Ossuary, pre-70 C.E.).³⁰⁰

hzqyn (Masada ostrakon, pre-73 C.E.).³⁰¹

²⁸⁸ Ilan 2002: 134.

²⁸⁹ Ilan 2002: 126–129.

²⁹⁰ Ilan 2002: 136–138.

²⁹¹ Ilan 2002: 150–157.

²⁹² Ilan 2002: 126–129.

²⁹³ Ilan 2002: 144–147.

²⁹⁴ Ilan 2002: 112.

²⁹⁵ Ilan 2002: 133.

²⁹⁶ Ilan 2002: 134.

²⁹⁷ Ilan 2002: 126.

²⁹⁸ Ilan 2002: 110.

²⁹⁹ Ilan 2002: 105.

³⁰⁰ Ilan 2002: 104.

³⁰¹ Ilan 2002: 96.

3.2.2.3. Egypt

In Egypt from the third to the second centuries PNNCSN are recorded in Edfu and elsewhere. In an Aramaic papyrus (Cowley 1923: 190–199 [#81]) dated about the end of the fourth or the beginning of third century the spellings of PNNCSN are found: *ywnṭn* (twice), *yḥnn* (twice), along with *bnyḥ*, *zbdyḥ*, *ḥnyḥ* (three times), *ḥdyḥ*, and *ḥdyḥw* (three times).³⁰² In another Aramaic document dated by Porten and Yardeni to the third or second centuries B.C.E. we find the names: *yḥnn*,³⁰³ along with *ḥdyḥ*,³⁰⁴ *zbdyḥ*,³⁰⁵ *ḥqbyḥ*,³⁰⁶ *mkyḥ*,³⁰⁷ *dlyḥ*,³⁰⁸ *ḥdyḥ*,³⁰⁹ *ḥnnyḥ*,³¹⁰ *bydyḥ*,³¹¹ and *ḥdyḥw*.³¹²

Note that in Egypt *only the shorter spellings* <yw-> and <y-> for PNNCSN with the initial abbreviated name are found.

3.2.2.4. Mt. Gerizim

The onomasticon of Mt. Gerizim follows the same pattern as in Yāhūdāh. The inscriptions on the walls of the temple within the Hellenistic city of Mt. Gerizim at the end of the third or beginning of the second centuries B.C.E. document numerous proper names.³¹³ The PNNCSN found here are: *yḥwḥnn*, *yḥwsp*, *yšwʿ*, along with *bʿyḥ*, *dlyḥ*, *ṭbyʿ*, *mtys*, and *[š]mryḥ*.

3.2.2.5. *Terminus a Quo* for Orthographic and Phonological Changes Within Initial PNNCSN

Many items of significance can be pointed out from an examination of these PNNCSN.

Firstly, the paleo-Hebrew inscription on the Yāhūd coin is significant. This coin was intentionally placed at the beginning of our analysis in the Hellenistic period because it is the *first post-exilic attestation* of the orthographic practice of *yw-* for the abbreviated name in initial position of PNNCSN in Yāhūd, which has been found so far spelled primarily *yḥw-* and even occasionally *yḥ-*. The spelling *-yw* seen earlier in final position *actually resulted from* Neo-Babylonian *-ia(-a)-ma*, but we learned above that this transcription was then also represented later in alphabetic script by *-yḥ* (and not the correct *-yḥw*) as a

³⁰² Cf. Cowley 1923 = AP: 192–196.

³⁰³ Cf. Porten and Yardeni 1986–89 = TAD D8.4:12.

³⁰⁴ Cf. TAD D21.8.

³⁰⁵ Cf. TAD D21.7.

³⁰⁶ Cf. TAD D21.4.

³⁰⁷ Cf. TAD D8.8.

³⁰⁸ Cf. TAD D8.7.

³⁰⁹ Cf. TAD D8.6:1.

³¹⁰ Cf. TAD D8.6:3.

³¹¹ Cf. TAD D8.6:4.

³¹² Cf. TAD D8.5.

³¹³ Cf. Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania 2004: 25–30; Dušek 2012: 59–63.

result of IMASN. However, the introduction of this new spelling (<yw->) for the abbreviated name in initial position of PNNCSN does not mean its exclusive use. Nevertheless, it *clearly* is an indicator of a *phonological change*.

Secondly, although there is now this new orthographic practice in Yahûdâh, the full spelling continues to be the dominant one in PNNCSN, alongside these new shorter spellings there. In the Aramaic Egyptian documents variously dated from the third century, however, the onomasticon there does not reflect initial <yhw-> in PNNCSN at all, but only <yw-> or <y->. From the temple on Mt. Gerizim, whose onomasticon closely parallels that of Yahûdâh,³¹⁴ we also see continued use of the full spelling <yhw->, along with an instance of one with <y-> (yšw'). Some of these names *clearly* reveal trends that are characteristic of PNNCSN of this period, and certainly show a *later* stage of development from the names in the Samaria papyri (375/365–335 B.C.E.). The spelling *yhwsp* is *especially important* in this regard and says much about the phonological change of the initial element in PNNCSN.³¹⁵ However, the names with final -y', -yn, and -ys are direct examples of Judean spelling practices within their post-fourth century onomasticon, where we expect to find *-yh*, which generally does remain the dominant final form of the abbreviated name, being attested frequently in the Hellenistic period and later on. Clearly, a change in the initial abbreviated name of PNNCSN occurred *beginning in the fourth century*, perceived here first in the *ywhnn* the high priest inscription on a Yâhûd coin,³¹⁶ and the final form too does exhibit changes.

However, a third observation revealing another significant change within our corpus of PNNCSN and also pertaining to the initial abbreviated Sacred Name must also be repeated and emphasized, which from our standpoint is certainly an anomaly, but one too that may very well be resolved from a consideration of the religious context of the name Yahweh.

3.2.2.6. A Judean Onomastic Anomaly

We would like to reemphasize an anomaly that T. Ilan already highlighted in her lexicon pertaining to PNNCSN with the initial abbreviated name.³¹⁷ A similar observation have been made by Foerster and Zadok.³¹⁸ In epigraphic material and papyri from the third century B.C.E. to the second century C.E. in Yahûdâh mostly in Aramaic script PNNCSN with the full spelling <yhw> are found most frequently (but not in third-century B.C.E. Egypt which has only <yw-> and <y->), but alongside occasional

³¹⁴ Knoppers 2006: 275. Besides their onomastica, one may also note the absence of pagan cultic figurines in these two territories, the dual language and linguistic scripts (as well as legal conventions) shared with the Judeans, along with others. Cf. Naveh 1998; Stern 2006: 199–205.

³¹⁵ Ilan 2002: 158.

³¹⁶ Cf. Cross 1983: 57, n. 17.

³¹⁷ Ilan 2002: 129, 138, 147, 169.

³¹⁸ Foerster 1965: 284, 286–87. Zadok (1988: 187) also notes this anomaly: “Yhw- is extant there [rabbinical literature] only in *yhwš'*.”

attestations of names with the new shorter variations <yw->, <y->, and also less frequently even <yh->, just as we saw on coins of the Hasmonean king and high priest Alexander (103-76 B.C.E.). But, during this same time, the PNCSN $y\check{s}w^c$ is almost always found with this spelling throughout this period. This is an anomaly, as it is not apparent why this short orthography (and different pronunciation) persisted in Yahûdâh for it, and, even if not spelled in the long form, it should have been spelled at least $*y\check{w}\check{s}w^c$ or $y\check{w}\check{s}^c$. In tannaitic (rabbinic) literature the opposite is the case. Mostly the shorter spelling <yw-> is found in other PNNCSN with the initial abbreviated Sacred Name, except for this PNCSN, which is now spelled $y\check{h}w\check{s}^c$ there, except when referring to the leader of the Nazarenes, who is spelled with the short $y\check{s}w^c$ in T. Ḥullin 2:22, 24 (but otherwise without the pharyngeal ʕ). This too is significant, although polemics can easily be put forth as an explanation, but yet the context in which the two spellings are used does reveal an *ideological distinction* between them. However, there is still one more question to answer. But, two other personal names must be included in our analysis for the sake of comparison before we proceed further.

3.2.2.7. What about Yahûdâh and Hôšē^c?

What changes occurred in the spelling of the toponym Yahûdâh beginning with the Hellenistic period, since, as far as we see, it is almost phonologically identical to the initial abbreviated Sacred Name in Aramaic?³¹⁹ Should it not too follow the same phonological development with elision and contraction within the first syllables? In Yahûdâh it maintains the orthography <yhwdh> frequently (with little variations³²⁰), and also with a defective <yhdh>.³²¹ In Egypt the female name $y\check{h}d\check{t}$ is found on ostraca from the third century,³²² and on Mt. Gerizim the personal name $y\check{h}w\check{d}h$ is found in inscriptions dating approximately to 200 B.C.E.,³²³ and on a coin of Judah Aristobulus (II or I?) in Yahûdâh as a personal name it is also spelled consistently $y\check{h}w\check{d}h$.³²⁴ Thus, from this perspective there appears no significant deviations from the traditional spelling, except that there are occasional variations. In the case of $y\check{h}d\check{t}$ in Egypt it is without the *waw mater*. Thus, there are also *no* dominant changes in the orthographic form of the toponym Yahûdâh throughout the various communities, whose first two syllables up to this time was similar to the initial abbreviated name in PNNCSN in non-Hebrew speech.

The name Hôšē^c is likewise found in the middle to late fifth century on several ostraca from Egypt and always spelled $h\check{w}\check{s}^c$.³²⁵ Now, it is also attested with the same orthography during this period as well.³²⁶

³¹⁹ In the shorter form $Y\check{a}h\check{u}d$ it is phonologically identical.

³²⁰ Ilan gives also $y\check{w}d\check{n}$, $y\check{d}\check{n}$, $y\check{h}w\check{d}\check{n}$, $y\check{h}w\check{d}$, $y\check{h}w\check{d}y'$, and $y\check{h}w\check{d}'$. Cf. Ilan 2002: 114–116.

³²¹ Ilan 2002: 117.

³²² TAD D8.7:3 and D8.8:9.

³²³ Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania 2004, #43 and #49. Also, cf. Dušek 2012 for dating.

³²⁴ Meshorer 2001: 217–218.

³²⁵ TAD D1.11:4, D3.17.3, 4.25:3, D9.7:1, and D19.7:2.

These spellings lead us to reconsider our unanswered question. Was the change in PNNCSN with the initial abbreviated name a result of any phonological processes of elision, contraction, or any other within the abbreviated Sacred Name? To answer this question we must now attempt to recover the precise phonology of this element as reflected in the alphabetic forms, where we should find (similarly to the orthographic variations seen above) in the short period of the fourth to the third century a phonological distribution of older pronunciations on the one hand before elision and/or contraction mixed with later ones on the other? Later on, the newer pronunciations would then persist? Any other trend must see an explanation elsewhere. PNNCSN transcribed into Greek both from epigraphic and biblical (Septuagint = LXX) sources will certainly be of assistance as we proceed.

3.2.3. Greek Transcriptions

3.2.3.1. Transcriptions of PNNCSN

In Yahûdâh PNNCSN³²⁷ transcribed into Greek are:

ἱανναῖος (*yn'y < yhwntn*): Antiquities of the Jews, 103–76 B.C.E.³²⁸

ἰοῦ (*yhw'*), as in LXX (spelled also as ἰηου and ἰηουλ):³²⁹ Murabaat parchment, pre-135 C.E.³³⁰

ἰωνάθης (*yhwntn*): Jerusalem ossuary, pre-70 C.E.³³¹

ἰησοῦς (*yšw'/yhwš'*): Jerusalem ossuary, pre-70 C.E.³³²

ἰεσοῦς (*yšw'/yhwš'*): Mt. of Offence ossuary, pre-70 C.E.³³³

ἰησου (*yšw'/yhwš'*): Franciscan Museum ossuary, pre-70 C.E.³³⁴

ἰησοῦ (*yšw'/yhwš'*), two persons: Babatha archive, 110-132 C.E.³³⁵

³²⁶ Ilan 2002: 88.

³²⁷ We will not include the name *yôsēp(p)* (Joseph) in this list of transcriptions, but it nevertheless is still applicable. This is not a PNCNSN, but it began to be spelled <yhwsp> with most other PNNCSN attested already at the end of the third century B.C.E. in Aramaic script in the Mt. Gerizim inscriptions, so we included that spelling in our alphabetic epigraphic evidence above. Cf. Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania 2004. Here, it could indicate either of these Aramaic spellings. It is found in the earliest Greek transcriptions in Egypt. In Trikomia in the middle of the third century B.C.E. we find ἰεσηφτις, and three persons named ἰωσηφτις in a “cluster” of 34 persons identified as Jews (Clarysse 1994: 194).

³²⁸ Ilan 2002: 144.

³²⁹ The Septuagint transcriptions of this personal name are interesting. It is consistently translated ἰοῦ in 1 and 2 Kings, but in 1 Chronicles it is first seen in the initial chapters (2:38) translated ἰηου, and in the second instance (4:35) *the translators replaces the personal name with a personal pronoun* (as if attempting to *avoid a taboo*), and in the third instance (12:3) it transcribes ἰηουλ. More will be said on this below, however. Cf. n. 350.

³³⁰ Ilan 2002: 112.

³³¹ Ilan 2002: 145.

³³² Ilan 2002: 127.

³³³ Ilan 2002: 127.

³³⁴ Ilan 2002: 127.

³³⁵ Ilan 2002: 128.

ιασσούου (yšw^c/yhwš^c), two persons: Babatha archive, 124 C.E.³³⁶

ιησούου (yšw^c/yhwš^c), two persons: Babatha archive, 110–132 C.E.³³⁷

ιωάννης (yhwḥnn/ywḥnn): Railway station ossuary, pre-70 C.E.³³⁸

ιωέζρου (yhw^czr): Jericho ossuaries, pre-70 C.E.³³⁹

ιοζρου (yhw^czr): Jericho ossuaries, pre-70 C.E.³⁴⁰

Beginning already in the third century we find PNNCSN among the Jews listed in various towns in Egypt. In tax rolls from Trikomia dated 253–231 B.C.E. we find *ιωάνις, ιωάννας, ιωάννης, άκαβίαις, άνανίαις, ήλίαις* (or from Lysimachis?).³⁴¹ In Samareia (Egypt) we find papyri naming *ιωναθοῦ* (232 B.C.E.), *ιωναθαῖς* (218 and 232 B.C.E.), *ιωάννης* (155/144 B.C.E.), *ιωάννα* (153/142 B.C.E.).³⁴² Also in Thebes, we find *άβδίους* (162 B.C.E.).³⁴³

The Septuagint likewise attests to a similar transcription, where we find the initial abbreviated name in PNNCSN spelled consistently *ιω-*. In final position we find often *-ια, -ιας, and -ιαν*, but also *-ιου*.

3.2.3.2. Greek Transcriptions of Yahûdâh and Hôšē^c?

In Yahûdâh this personal name is transcribed quite frequently especially on ossuaries, but also in papyri as: *ιούδας*, but also *ιούδου, ιουδου, ιουδιου, ιοδιου, and ιεδδοῦν*.³⁴⁴ However, significantly, we do find a personal name transcribed *ιαύδα* (father of Titus, a pagan priest) in a Hermon inscription in 172 B.C.E.³⁴⁵

In the village of Samareia in Egypt numerous persons are defined by the ethnonym derived from the toponym Yahûdâh, being called *ιουδαῖος* or similar around 232 B.C.E.³⁴⁶ In Trikomia between 253–231 B.C.E. the personal name *ιουδεῖτις* is found associated with two female inhabitants of this village.³⁴⁷

In the Septuagint, this toponym is also invariably transcribed into Greek as *ιούδα*, with frequent variations with the Greek nominative declension (-ς), but always with a consistent shortening of the first two syllables into one representing /ū/.

³³⁶ Ilan 2002: 128. The context in which this spelling occurs in the Babatha archive is very important. While Babatha's first husband, son, and all others with the same PNCSN uses the regular conventional forms of this name for themselves, this particular spelling is used twice in official government documents from the Petra town council, representing an external orthographic decision. Cf. below for analysis.

³³⁷ Ilan 2002: 128.

³³⁸ Ilan 2002: 136.

³³⁹ Ilan 2002: 168.

³⁴⁰ Ilan 2002: 168.

³⁴¹ Cf. Clarysse 1994: 194. The author draws from the source *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri (CPR) XIII*, containing census lists of villages in Egypt published by Harrauer. Clarysse refines the lists of Jews found therein.

³⁴² Cf. Kuhs 1996: 68–69.

³⁴³ Cf. Honigman 2004: 295 who cites O. Bodl. 153.5 (CPJ I 73).

³⁴⁴ Ilan 2002: 113–116.

³⁴⁵ Ilan 2002: 116.

³⁴⁶ Cf. Kuhs 1996: 64ff.

³⁴⁷ Cf. Clarysse 1994: 194–195.

In the case of the personal name Hôšē', in the Septuagint it is regularly transcribed as ὠσηέ, but the *original diphthong is preserved* in the Torah and refers to the Israelite general, spelled אֹשֶׁה, so that *traditional pronunciations* were maintained at about 250 B.C.E.

3.2.3.3. No Phonological Processes Permitted by Greek Transcriptions of PNNCSN

From a comparison of these proper names in mostly Aramaic script, but also paleo-Hebrew, to the transcriptions of often the exact same name in Greek, it becomes obvious that the change in the phonology of the abbreviated name in PNNCSN *was not a result of expected phonological processes of elision, contraction, reduction, etc. of any order*. This is realized primarily from an inspection of how both the initial abbreviated name in PNNCSN and the toponym Yahûdāh are transcribed into Greek compared to the Aramaic and Hebrew orthography utilized at about the same times. Any expected phonological process *would necessarily have produced* forms of the toponym Yahûdāh as *ιαου-* or *ιαυ-* (but in Greek pronounced *virtually* the same) *in the middle of the third century B.C.E.*, just as the Septuagint preserved a traditional pronunciation of the personal name *Hawšē'* (אֹשֶׁה),³⁴⁸ but has no indication of an alphabetic *Yahû-* in the initial two syllables of the toponym. Interestingly, however, such an attestation does show up once in the personal name *ιαύδα*, *but in 172 C.E.*, so that the correct form was certainly known in that late post-Second Temple period!

But the same can be said of PNNCSN with the initial abbreviated name. Our analysis has shown that orthographically we may expect *ιαυ-* (as in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian), but in Greek this would not phonemically produce the “little” diphthongal sound equal to the open-mid/lower-mid, back vowel (IPA ɔ), but only two contiguous vowels as in Yahûdāh without the *he* (as just seen). Therefore, we may even expect simply *ια-*, which *a* would actually be indicative of the phoneme /ā/ (since Greek does not distinguish orthographically between the long /ā/ and short /a/ vowel phonemes). Significantly, this too is found in the unique PNNCSN transcribed as *ιασσούου* in 124 C.E. Yet, there is still no explanation of how the first two syllables in the toponym do not at all resemble the initial abbreviated name in all other circumstances. Especially telling is the personal name *ιουδεϊτις*, which clearly indicates the first two syllables of the toponym, but completely eliminates the /a/, and instead makes the first syllable produce /ū/, followed by /o/ in the second syllable. The forms *ιαου-*, *ιαυ-*, and even *ια-*, *were clearly avoided for the abbreviated name in initial position of PNNCSN* for reasons that can only be explained from a religious-linguistic perspective.³⁴⁹ The first, however, is found in the Septuagint but only in the name *ιαούς* (יְהוּדָה) which is not a PNCNSN.³⁵⁰ But the transcriptions of the PNCNSN *yhw'* (Jehu) as *ιού*, and even as *ιηου* and

³⁴⁸ Cf. PRE-EXILIC period above for examples of the ancient form of this name before contraction of the diphthong documented in Neo-Assyrian cuneiform.

³⁴⁹ We may additionally note that the forms *-ιαου* and *-ιαυ* were also avoided in final position of PNNCSN as well, but *-ια* did remain, however.

³⁵⁰ Cf. 1 Chronicles 7:10, 2 Chronicles 11:19. Also see 2 Chronicles 8:10 for *y'wš* written *ιαως*.

once as *ἰηουλ* also speak volumes as to the source of our change.³⁵¹ It is clear that the new phonology of the initial abbreviated name was indeed deliberate, but can only be explained, as just indicated and probably already suspected based on our above analysis, by the religious context of the name Yahweh.

3.2.4. The Name Yahweh in its Hellenistic- and Roman-Period Religious Context

3.2.4.1. The Independent Name

3.2.4.1.1. *YHWH in the Hellenistic/Roman Periods*

3.2.4.1.1.1. Hellenistic-period continuity?

The use and reverence of the full name Yahweh sees a quite diverse array of manifestations including substitution, nonuse, allusions, and other interesting types as we come to the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Of course, there are linguistic developments from the Persian period. The use of the Hebrew language itself becomes more limited, and the Greek language gradually replaces Aramaic as the Hellenistic period lingua franca. Consequently, we may now ask with the coming of the Hellenists, does the simple case of nonuse of the name Yahweh in non-Hebrew speech, but *consistent* use in Hebrew persist or were there now modifications? We now seek to identify how the name was treated by various Jewish communities in various linguistic contexts even into the tannaitic period inside and outside of *Yahûdāh*. We begin at Qumrân.

3.2.4.1.1.2. The Essene community

Evidence for the use and reverence of the name Yahweh is found in the Essene community from Qumrân whose library dates from the end of the third century B.C.E. to just before 70 C.E., two oldest manuscripts being 4QSam^b (1 Samuel) and Jer^a (Jeremiah), both dating to about the end of the third into the beginning of the second century B.C.E.³⁵² The other documents date from the second century B.C.E. onward. Various studies have been done on the Essenes and the name Yahweh, all of which clearly indicate a phenomenon of great significance to us in this study. In contrast to the Persian period, *the Hebrew tongue by itself was no longer the sanctum for the use of the name*, so that now even in Hebrew it was clearly avoided. A recent study pertaining to the conventions used by Essene scribes to avoid

³⁵¹ The transcription *ioú* for this personal name places it clearly in our category with *Yahûdāh*, so that we again confer with Driver (1928: 20, n. 1) that its correct form is *Yāhû'*, and comports with the Assyrian evidence. The transcriptions *ἰηου* and *ἰηουλ* at the beginning of 1 Chronicles in the Septuagint, even with an instance of *total avoidance of writing the name altogether and substituting a pronoun*, further strengthens our conclusions. Cf. above n. 329.

³⁵² Cf. Cross 1975: 168. Also, cf. Lemaire 2007: 128.

reference to the name Yahweh has been done by Parry, who analyzed the documents CD, 1QS, and 4QMMT.³⁵³ He noted: “Although the Qumrân sectarians were thoroughly versed in the Hebrew Bible, they were programmatic in avoiding usage of the Tetragrammaton”³⁵⁴ He then proceeded to show how they 1) substituted pronouns for the Tetragrammaton, 2) replaced it with *El*, 3) didn’t indicate antecedent (but only the pronoun), 4) used scriptural paraphrases (in order to avoid writing Yahweh), 5) changed attributions, 6) used surrogates, 7) apocoped scriptural phrases, 8) omitted the Tetragrammaton in scriptural citations, and 9) did not use revelatory formulas.³⁵⁵ Siegel also in his study on the use of the paleo-Hebrew script for the Tetragrammaton in several Hebrew documents written otherwise in the regular Jewish script at Qumrân noted that they indicated the *sacredness of the name with this practice* and he linked it to a tannaitic discussion in Y. Megillah 1:9 (71d) about erasing the Tetragrammaton and other epithets.³⁵⁶ Of note is the clear scribal distinction in a particular Psalm (IIQPs^a XIV:13) between *Yahweh and the shorter Yāh*, so that in the clause *אין כיה און כיהוה*, only *yhw* is written in paleo-Hebrew script, but *yh* is not. This use of paleo-Hebrew in some texts at Qumrân may be as indicated in his discussion, but seems to be for the one reading the text.³⁵⁷

In another study of the disappearance of the name Yahweh from the Jewish communities during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, Lemaire especially noted that:

Whatever the reasons, toward the end of the Hellenistic period and during the Roman period, Jews, especially Jews of the Diaspora but probably also Jews living in Judea, avoided pronouncing the name ‘YHWH.’ In reading the old religious texts that came to form the Bible, they replaced ‘YHWH’ with the reverential Hebrew title ‘Adonai’ . . .³⁵⁸

It is clear that a change took place after the fifth century and is evident now at about the second to the first centuries B.C.E. where we perceive that, before, the point of demarcation for the use of the name was the Hebrew tongue, but now, even within Hebrew in this sectarian Jewish community there is also a clear avoidance for using the name Yahweh, where we now find the tendency to substitute *Adonai*. This is significant. Referring to the scribal schools whose work is evident in the texts of the Dead Sea scrolls (including the Qumrân school), Lemaire also noted 12 ways they transcribed the Tetragrammaton, some of his points being: 1) in same script as entire scroll, 2) as five supralinear dots above following word, 3) as four points above line, 4) as *’dny* (*’adōnāy*), 5) preceded by two vertical points, 6) replaced with *’lywn* or *’l ’lywn* (*’elyōn*), 7) replaced with five strokes, and 8) replaced with *hw’h* (*hū’āh*).³⁵⁹ Furthermore, he also noted the direct prohibition of pronouncing the name Yahweh in the rules of the community, which states:

³⁵³ Cf. Parry 1997.

³⁵⁴ Parry 1997: 438.

³⁵⁵ Parry 1997: 439.

³⁵⁶ Cf. Siegel 1971: 159–172.

³⁵⁷ Cf. Lemaire 2007: 129; Freedman and O’Connor 1986: 501; Mathews 1983: 550–551.

³⁵⁸ Lemaire 2007: 128.

³⁵⁹ Lemaire 2007: 129–130.

Whoever pronounces the name honored (YZKR DBR BŠM HNKBD) over all . . . by surprise when confronted by misfortune (‘M QLL ‘W LHB’H MŠRH) or for any other reason . . . or if he reads in a book or if he blesses, then he will be excluded and he will not return any more to the council of the community (1QS VI, 27-vii, 2).³⁶⁰

Thus in the second to the first centuries B.C.E. within this Jewish community the name Yahweh was not to be pronounced. However, were there occasions in this period in which the name could be utilized? The answer may be indicated from a parallel Yahweh-worshipping community on Mt. Gerizim.

3.2.4.1.1.3. Samaritans on Mt. Gerizim

Recently, Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania published Hebrew and Aramaic inscriptions from the Mt. Gerizim sanctuary destroyed in 111–110 B.C.E., which they broadly dated to “the Hellenistic period (third–second centuries BCE), although some may belong to the earliest period of the sacred precinct (fifth–fourth centuries BCE).”³⁶¹ Dušek subsequently narrowed these inscriptions to about the end of the third or the beginning of the second centuries.³⁶² Most inscriptions (No. 1–381) are in Aramaic scripts, a lapidary and a proto-Jewish script. There are seven (No. 382–388) in paleo-Hebrew script.³⁶³ In the *editio princeps* Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania noted significantly that there is a clear association between the Tetragrammaton and the paleo-Hebrew script (referred to by Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania as the Neo-Hebrew script), which then appears to have been used by the priests, who seem to have been the only ones to use the Tetragrammaton, but the inscriptions in proto-Jewish script mentions only אלהא and אדני. Pertaining to this use of the name Yahweh in a paleo-Hebrew inscription, while Adonai is found in a Hebrew inscription written with the “square” proto-Jewish script, Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania noted that:

These two inscriptions reflect a sort of linguistic compromise: on the one hand their language is Hebrew, as is the language of the inscriptions in the Neo-Hebrew script; but unlike the latter, these do not contain the Tetragrammaton but another Hebrew name of the Deity, אדני, because they are not written in the “sacred” Neo-Hebrew script.³⁶⁴

They concluded that only the priests used the Tetragrammaton, but the non-priests didn’t. If this hypothesis is correct, may it be assumed that about 200 B.C.E. the name was pronounced only by the priests in the Mt. Gerizim Temple and possibly also in the Jerusalem Temple (both communities being strikingly similar at this time), but not outside the sacred precincts? The answer may be derived from the

³⁶⁰ Lemaire 2007: 130.

³⁶¹ Cf. Magen, Misgav, Tsfania 2004: 14.

³⁶² Cf. Dušek 2012: 59.

³⁶³ Cf. Magen, Misgav, Tsfania 2004: 42ff.

³⁶⁴ Cf. Magen, Misgav, Tsfania 2004: 23.

traditions *repeated* by the tannaim in the first and second centuries that can be found in various tannaitic (Mishna, etc.) sources.

3.2.4.1.1.4. Tannaitic sources

From the traditions of the tannaim in the first two centuries C.E. we can learn much about the religious ideology regarding the use and reverence of the name Yahweh by the elites of the Jewish community at that time and earlier, and many studies have been done on this particular topic. Marmorstein discussed the pronunciation of the name in the tannaitic period and associated the view in Hellenistic sources of the namelessness of deity and magic practices as *the very reasons for the prohibition* against pronouncing the name Yahweh.³⁶⁵ Before this influence, he believed there were no restrictions at all.³⁶⁶ He noted the Septuagint translation of Leviticus 24:16, which clearly shows that the translators desired the Greek reader to not pronounce the Sacred Name. It reads: “ὀνομάζων δε τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θανάτω θανατούσθω . . .” McDonough, who also discussed the name in tannaitic sources, however, in analyzing this particular passage concludes that this translation could “be used to support a prohibition against saying the divine name, but this does not mean the translators intended it to be taken that way.”³⁶⁷ Then he notes that the context, even if referring to not speaking the name, is clearly that of *cursing*, seen elsewhere in early Judaism.³⁶⁸ However, Marmorstein also noted that Targum Onqelos reads in a similar way as the Septuagint and contrasts this idea with that of others, such as Targum Jonathan, who, supposedly, only know of a *blasphemy* of the name, not of speaking it. Both of these positions are incorrect, however. Two things must be pointed out about Marmorstein’s analysis. His first presupposition about the *very origin* of this prohibition of using the name as being directly attributed to Hellenistic influence is, of course, incorrect, as our analysis has shown there *always was an avoidance of using the name in the exilic and post-exilic periods*, but it was related only to non-Hebrew tongues. At that time, in Hebrew it was used. The Hellenistic non-use is, therefore, only a *continuation* (although a bit different, as will be seen below). Additionally, those who only speak of blasphemy do not necessarily differ from those who speak of not pronouncing the name, as the scriptural declaration itself never talks of not pronouncing the name, only of not blaspheming it. Secondly, Marmorstein did not consider the earliest ideas of what exactly *fully embodied blasphemy of the name*, which, again, as our analysis indicated, included its use in non-Hebrew tongues. Hence, McDonough is also incorrect, since it is clear the translators then intended the readers to *not say the name in Greek*. But now, however, it is seen in the second century B.C.E. for whatever reasons *avoided also in Hebrew* at Qumrân. This is a significant

³⁶⁵ Cf. Marmorstein 1927: 17–19.

³⁶⁶ Reisel, likewise, in his treatment (1957: 66–68), also held the same opinion.

³⁶⁷ McDonough 1999: 63. Cf. also Reisel 1957: 117, n. 361.

³⁶⁸ McDonough 1999: 63, n. 25.

development. Once these important facts are accepted, we can view our information from the Mishna and other tannaitic literature through their prism.

Where and when could the name Yahweh be used in the tannaitic period and before, and what changes occurred in use or nonuse at or before these times? Marmorstein noted M. Sotah 38b which states: “In the Sanctuary the priests said the Tetragrammaton according to its writing, outside the Temple by its substitute.”³⁶⁹ This statement parallels the observations of Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania in the Mt. Gerizim inscriptions noted above. However, Marmorstein declared that this contradicts another tannaitic tradition from the Tosefta (T. Sotah 13:8), which records that after the death of Simon the Just *his companions (his brethren the priests³⁷⁰) ceased blessing in the name* (“ומת נמנעו חביריו מלברך בשם”). McDonough dealt with this seeming contradiction by following Urbach and removing its historicity altogether.³⁷¹ However, these passages need not be seen as contradictory at all, as indicated and discussed by Reisel.³⁷² The key is which *priests* are to be understood in each. The former comment in discussing if and where the name was used can be seen as *merely referring to the priests in a general context but not necessarily to all of them*, while the passage in the Tosefta *specifically* refers to the regular priests, and *not the high priests*. This indeed appears to be the case.³⁷³ However, these two passages are very important. In the former tractate, it appears to conflict with yet another tradition that we will discuss below (M. Berachot 9.5),³⁷⁴ but with the latter we can also note a major change with regards to the use of the name and the identification of a historical context for it. We will first take a closer look at this last statement.

Again, the Tosefta says that after the death of Simon the Just *his companions or brethren (other priests, not high priests) ceased blessing in the name*. Reisel put it that “the other priests no longer considered themselves worthy to pronounce the Tetragrammaton distinctly and completely in the daily priestly blessing.”³⁷⁵ However, Marmorstein, who didn’t distinguish regular priests from high priests, didn’t see a “cessation” at all in the Baraita. Using MS. W., which reads “פסקו מלברך בשם . . .” (. . . they paused blessing in the name), he interpreted it as a temporary instance with a later resumption of use. Thus, he put it that the name ceased to be spoken after Simon the Just and then resumed at some period afterward. With this resumption the name was at first pronounced clearly, then, citing R. Tarphon’s report of hearing the high priest say the blessing inaudibly,³⁷⁶ he stated that it was later “swallowed” and inaudible late in the period.³⁷⁷ Reisel is not troubled by the seeming contradiction, however, and notes:

³⁶⁹ Cf. also M. Tamid 7.2.

³⁷⁰ In B. Yoma 49b the reading follows the Tosefta but this phrase replaces that of *his companions* (חביריו).

³⁷¹ McDonough 1999: 102.

³⁷² Reisel 1957: 65-66.

³⁷³ Hence, we accept Reisel’s distinction between the use of the name by the regular priests and the high priests.

³⁷⁴ Cf. just below.

³⁷⁵ Reisel 1957: 64. Cf. Yoma 39b, Menaḥoth 109b, Sotah 13b, etc.

³⁷⁶ Cf. B. Kiddushin 71a.

³⁷⁷ Marmorstein 1927: 24–26.

A. Marmorstein . . . suggests that this happened only during a certain period. In due course, in his view, the name was pronounced again, but in such a manner that it was almost inaudible.

However, these two suggestions are not mutually exclusive. Precisely the fact that the priests now pronounced the Name inaudibly, in contrast to their custom before the death of Simon the Just, indicates that this death formed the conclusion of the period during which the Tetragrammaton was normally used in the priestly blessing.³⁷⁸

Although Reisel allows for the possibility that the “cessation” of use by the priests *could be* equivalent to the incipience of the practice of “swallowing” the name, important is his distinguishing between these regular priests from the high priests. Again, it seems certain to us that it was only the *other priests* (not the high priests) that initially ceased pronouncing the blessing in the name. Later on, the high priests, who continued using the name in the blessing, would have begun “swallowing” the name for some other particular reason that we shall see. Confirmation of this position may be found in yet other tannaitic traditions. Another Baraita from B. Kiddushin 71a reads:

ת"ר בראשונה שם בן שתיים עשרה אותיות היו מוסרין אותו לכל אדם משרבו הפריצים היו מוסרים אותו לצנועים שבכהונה וצנועים שבכהונה מבליעים אותו בנעימת אחיהם הכהנים.

(R. Tarfon said At first the name of twelve letters was handed over to all men. When lawless men increased, it was handed over to the pious that were in the priesthood, and the pious that were in the priesthood swallowed it in the tune of their brethren, the priests.)³⁷⁹

The “*tzanû'im* (pious) in (not all) the priesthood” who are said to have been “swallowing” the name seems to be equated with the high priests in these tannaitic accounts, so that Marmorstein need not have seen a *pause and resumption* in the use of the name.

Reisel consequently placed a *terminus ad quem* for the use of the name in the daily blessing in the temple at about “+ 200 B.C.E.” (or last quarter of the third century after the death of *Simon II*).³⁸⁰ Thus, we have here a significant development with regards to the use and reverence of the name Yahweh in this period, where we find that such reverence now actually removes the name in Hebrew altogether initially from: 1) general Jewish society outside the sanctuary, and then, 2) also within the sanctuary from use by the “sacred” priests. That the name was used less restrictively at a prior period is also indicated by Midrash Tehillim’s statement about the “men of the Great Synagogue” and the generation of the *shāmād* (persecution) using the name and other tannaitic reports of the name at first being handed over to *all men* at some very early period.³⁸¹ In the final phase of the Second Temple only one instance remained of the use of the Sacred Name. Reisel stated “The High Priest continued to use the original pronunciation on the Day of Atonement, but reduced its sonority. Eventually, after the destruction of the

³⁷⁸ Reisel 1957: 115, n. 341.

³⁷⁹ Also, note Cant. R. 3. 11, where it states the change was by a *statute*, because of “הפושעים” (=הפריצים).

³⁸⁰ Reisel 1957: 75.

³⁸¹ Cf. Reisel 1957: 68 and Y. Yoma 40d (iii.7).

Second Temple, this pronunciation lost its audibility altogether . . .³⁸² Thus, after the death of Simon the Just, the High Priests were the only ones to use the name and eventually only once a year. But, while they initially proclaimed it loudly when they did pronounce it, they gradually reduced its sonority.

Now, we can discuss our other important point mentioned above. We saw above from M. Sotah 38b the statement that the priests (high priests) pronounced the name in the Temple as written, but outside by its substitute. Furthermore, even in the temple the *regular priests* ceased using the name themselves. However, M. Beracoth 9.5 decrees that men should greet their fellow men *by the name* which custom appears to date before the destruction of the temple. Marmorstein dealt with this difficulty in the light of the parallel peculiar Tosefta passage (but reconstructed by him) that is found written: “At first, when the law was forgotten in Israel the elders were swallowing it [the name] between themselves for it is written And behold Boaz came from Bethlehem and said to the reapers ״״ be with you, etc. . . .”³⁸³ This Tosefta appears incomplete, however, as the antithesis is missing. After Marmorstein’s own reconstruction, he saw this greeting as an institution that came along with the resumption of use of the name (after his *pause* we just discussed) by the priests in the temple, which at first was done with the name clearly spoken, but then later “swallowed” in pronunciation. Others dealt with it differently. Marmorstein, referring to one such, commented:

This reconstruction of the Boraita is preferable to that of Dr. Pearls, who suggests the following reading: בראשונה שהיתה תורה חביבה על ישראל היו זקנים מבליעין את השם משקלקלו המינים והיה תורה משתכחת מישראל 'התקינו שיהא אדם שואל את שלום חבירה בשם שנ' והנה בועז וגו' We cannot agree to this for various reasons. The reform was not directed against the early Christians, whom P. sees in the *Minim* of the text, but against the Hellenists whose praxis is well established.³⁸⁴

Although we cannot accept Dr. Perls’ reconstruction over Marmorstein’s in seeking to fill in the missing details of this peculiar Tosefta, a very important aspect pertains to the *minim*. Marmorstein’s presupposition about the prohibition of use being related to the *Hellenists alone* leads him to see *them* as the *minim* in the Tosefta.³⁸⁵ But, as we indicated initially, this presupposition must be rejected. Yet, Marmorstein also mentioned another contributor to the debate saying, “While Graetz was inclined to establish that the prohibition was the final stage in the history of the Name, his pupil, B. Jacob . . .

³⁸² Cf. Reisel 1957: 71; M. Yoma 3.8 and 4.2. This use of the name once a year on the Day of Atonement thus is to be contrasted with the other instances when the high priest “swallowed (מבליע) the name in the tune of his brethren” when pronouncing the daily blessing.

³⁸³ T. Beracoth 7.23; cf. Marmorstein 1927: 26.

³⁸⁴ Marmorstein 1927: 27–28.

³⁸⁵ Please note S. Katz’s statement, “The terms *min*, *minim*, and *minuth* are undoubtedly used in tannaitic sources to refer to heretical groups other than Jewish (or Gentile) Christians, and so the one-to-one correspondence of these terms – that is, that *minim* = Jewish Christians – is untenable.” (Katz 2006: 292). Obviously, each case must be carefully evaluated before identifications are made. Katz noted that A. Schlatter argued for the correspondence, but G. F. Moore and Herford criticized such an argument (literature cited in Katz 2006: 292, n. 115). In the passage above Reisel’s suggestion (1957: 68, 118, n. 364) of the Maccabean period for this custom also sees the *minim* there as Hellenists.

comes to the conclusion that the latest tendency gave the use of the Name quite free to everyone in order to counteract Gnostic and Christian tendencies. The action of the priests after the death of Simon the Just is limited to a day's duration, or to the time of the surviving contemporaries."³⁸⁶ There is a clear tradition here about a particular use of the name outside the temple after the *general cessation of use by the regular priests in the Temple*, but from the above Tosefta and all other relevant tannaitic material it seems that this use was done inaudibly or swallowed (מבליע), as was done by the high priests while blessing on regular days (other than on Yom Kippur). Furthermore, this tradition is shown to be connected with the *minim*, whose identification is significant in our quest to establish a proper religious context for the use and reverence of the name Yahweh.

Again, free use of the Sacred Name by the “normative” community would be in conflict with yet other tannaitic traditions (see below). Thus, the best we can do is to accept that it was “swallowed” and hence inaudible, but must have had *significant* impetus.³⁸⁷ If, as some thought, the reform of greeting was to “counteract” the tendencies of other heretics, such as, say, the Nazarenes, does this imply that they actually utilized the name *freely* in contrast to the “normative” community? Another well-known tannaitic passage may help clarify. T. Shabbath 13:5 also mentions the “minim” in connection with sacred names. It states:

הגליונים וסיפרי מינין אין מצילין אותן אלא נשרפין הן במקומן הן ואזכרותיהם ר' יוסי הגלילי אומ' בחול קורא את האזכרות וגונן ושורף את השאר אמר ר' טרפון אקפח את בניי שאם יבואו לידי שאני שורפן הן ואזכרותיהן

(The *gilyônîm* [evangels] and the Books of the Minim, one does not save them, but they are burned in their place, they and their *ʾazkārôth* [sacred names]. R. Josê the Galilean said: In the week one cuts out [B. Shabb.116a reads קודר not קורא] the *ʾazkārôth*, hides them, and burns the rest. R. Tarfon said: May I bury my sons if, as they come into my hand, I would not burn them and their *ʾazkārôth*.)³⁸⁸

This account appears to identify the *minim* in the Tosefta referred to above with the Nazarenes because of the reference to the name there and the *ʾazkārôth* here. And, about which, Marmorstein himself indicated that while *ʾazkārôth* refer to the Tetragrammata, some Babylonian and Palestinian teachers (R. Joseph and R. Hoshaya) also included *Elôhîm* in this term.³⁸⁹ Yet, another well-known tannaitic passage seems also to marry well to this discussion about the nonuse/use of the name by the tannaim and the Nazarenes. M. Sanhedrin 10.1 contains a list of those who do not have a share in the world to come. It reads:

³⁸⁶ Cf. Marmorstein 1927: 29.

³⁸⁷ Cf. above.

³⁸⁸ The *minim* in this particular passage is clearly the Nazarenes (see just below). Cf. also S. Katz 2006: 279 and Schiffman (in Katz 2006: 279, n. 66) on *gilyônîm*. Others, following Rambam, have read *gilyônîm*, as “margins” throughout in this passage, which in itself presents more difficulties. See literature in Katz 2006: 278, n. 64. Also, see n. 385 just above.

³⁸⁹ Marmorstein 1927: 34.

ואלו שאין להם חלק לעולם הבא האומר אין תחית המתים מן התורה ואין תורה מן השמים ואפיקורוס רבי עקיבא אומר אף הקורא בספרים החיצוניים והלוחש על המכה ואומר כל המחלה אשר שמתי במצרים לא אשים עליך כי אני ה' רפאך אבא שאול אומר אף ההוגה את השם באותיותיו

(There is not for these a portion in the world to come: The one who says there is no resurrection of the dead in the Torah, and there is no Torah from heaven, and an Epiqoros. R. Akiva says also one who reads heretical (החיצוניים) books and whispers over the wound and says All the diseases that I have put on the Egyptians I will not put upon you, for I am ה' who heals you (Exodus 15). Abba Saul says also the one who pronounces the name according to its letters.)

As with the so-called *min* Jacob of Kefar Sekanya' in Avodah Zarah, R. Akiva's statements about reading "heretical" books and healing the sick with a passage of Scripture containing the Tetragrammaton appear to likewise concern the Nazarenes.³⁹⁰ But especially significant is Abba Saul's statement immediately following, which must likewise be associated with *minim* that use the name. Thus, this *certain period* after the general cessation of using the name by the priests in the Temple (with clear use of the name on only one day in the year by the high priests) may fascinatingly be in connection with the Nazarenes.

3.2.4.1.1.5. The Nazarenes³⁹¹

3.2.4.1.1.5.1. Anomalies in the earliest copies of the New Testament?

Of the tannaitic material cited above the most significant is T. Shabbath 13:5, with its specific mention of *'azkārôth* and *gilyônîm*.³⁹² Among all the prominent groups affiliated with Second Temple Judaism that we have considered thus far from about 200 B.C.E., whether it be the Samaritans, the Essenes, or the

³⁹⁰ Cf. Avodah Zarah 27b. Although the "heretical books" here has been connected by G. Moore to that of early Nazarenes, this has been criticized by L. Ginzberg, who would see "ספרים החיצוניים" as "outside books" (outside the canon). Katz, however, rightly questions this identification as the context begs for a more provocative object. See literature again in Katz 2006: 276; 277, n. 62.

³⁹¹ From even before F. C. Baur brought the topic to prominence in the nineteenth century (references in Paget 1999: 731), it has long been recognized that the earliest community described in the New Testament were little distinguished from Jews. The phenomenon has been called 'Jewish Christianity,' a title which itself is an acknowledged "neologism" (Paget 1999: 733), and its counterpart (associated with Paul) then has been called 'Gentile Christianity.' Nevertheless, great clarification can result when the New Testament is studied in the light of both extra-biblical historical sources of the early centuries C.E. and also rabbinic sources. See Pritz 1988 and Paget 1999: 731–775, and references there. Thus, of the groups discussed as being included under the term "Jewish Christianity" (Ebionites, Nazarenes, and the Elchasaites) the Nazarenes appear to be most fascinating not only for being mentioned in Acts, but also for such an identification in the third/fourth century that sees them unmorphed into a more non-Semitic group and curiously even antagonized against by so-called "Gentile Christians." Besides noting them using "both Old and New Testaments," knowing the Hebrew language "well," having a "positive view of Paul," and also engaging the rabbis, primarily from Epiphanius and Jerome (Pritz 1988: 44, 64, 70), Pritz commented, "The Nazarenes refused to accept the authority established by the Pharisaic camp after the destruction of Jerusalem, and in so refusing they adjudicated their own isolation from the converging flow of what we call Judaism. Just as they rejected the Church's setting aside of the Law of Moses, so also they refused the rabbis' expansive interpretations of it. In other words, they rejected *halakāh* as it was developing in rabbinic Judaism." (Pritz 1988: 110).

³⁹² Again, to read "margins" here is to deny the details of this Tosefta. Cf. n. 388 above and literature cited.

Pharisees, none appear to deviate from the now modified tradition of non-use of the name Yahweh *even in* the Hebrew language outside the Temple (whether in Jerusalem or on Mt. Gerizim), except now for the Nazarenes, the earliest group described in the NT. This becomes even more plausible when we consider that the Nazarenes, although continuing to be a sect within Judaism, did not adhere to rabbinic *halakoth*, some of which traditions were explicitly cited as being unscriptural.³⁹³ The “ineffability” of the name is another very important tradition, which significantly we have specifically identified as extending back even to the exilic period. Of course, the importance of the claim made in the tannaitic material requires an even more careful investigation to test it from all possible aspects, which is what we now seek to do in the consideration of this last group as we endeavor to provide an accurate religious context of the name Yahweh in the Greco-Roman period.

Yet, few are the studies that actually tackle the issue of use of the name in the light of the tannaitic datum. Howard did reference this in his discussion of the Tetragrammaton in the NT, but his primary concern was the earliest Old Greek LXX’s Tetragrammaton (not κύριος) and an expected parallel in the NT texts only. He did not consider “spoken” use, and he did not specifically cite the Nazarenes in mentioning the tannaitic account.³⁹⁴ Other studies have also dealt with an important related issue, the curious *nomina sacra*, but again, have not considered the early rabbinic information to provide some background in considering this other anomaly.³⁹⁵ Fitzmyer considered the linguistic hurdles.³⁹⁶ Of course, the possibility we set forth is inseparable from the fact that no NT manuscript testifies positively to the presence of any such sacred name/title, the earliest of which manuscripts dates from the late second century C.E.,³⁹⁷ but as just seen it would be a flagrant mistake to say these early manuscripts testify to what we find in the Greek texts today.³⁹⁸ What becomes clear from these studies is that various unsatisfactorily explained anomalies still remain regarding the specific use or nonuse of the sacred name Yahweh or substituted titles among the early Nazarenes and will undoubtedly benefit by our clarification of the many ambiguous trends concerning the use of the name Yahweh and its abbreviation(s) from the earlier Persian into the Hellenistic periods.³⁹⁹

The first partially related anomaly is the presence in the earliest (B.C.E.) LXX texts of a Hebrew יהוה or even ΙΑΩ and not a κύριος as in the present texts with no satisfactory reasons for its presence, with important arguments by Howard and Pietersma, especially Howard’s further analysis of the ambiguity involved with the title κύριος in the manuscript tradition of the NT. The quotations of the OT in the NT

³⁹³ Cf. Matt 15:1, 11; 3–6; and Mark 7:3–13.

³⁹⁴ See G. Howard 1977: 77, n. 71, who specifically gives an example of the Ebionites, and not the Nazarenes.

³⁹⁵ Cf. Traube 1907; Paap 1959; Howard 1977: 63–83; Fitzmyer 1979: 115–142; Pietersma 1984: 85–101; Hurtado 1998: 655–73; 2006: 95–134; and Nagel 2012.

³⁹⁶ See Fitzmyer 1979: 1–19, 85–153 for consideration of the Semitic substratum in the NT.

³⁹⁷ This point is strongly emphasized in Wilkinson 2015.

³⁹⁸ See immediately below. Also, cf. Appendix 1 in Hurtado 2006 for the earliest manuscripts.

³⁹⁹ Regarding the substitution of *Yahweh* with *’adōnāy*, Howard noted, “If this is the case, we can date the oral pronouncement of אֲדֹנָי, whenever יהוה occurred in the text, to at least the third century B.C.” (Howard 1977: 69). Also, see section 3.2.4.2.1. below.

mostly align with LXX. Then, there is the very prohibitive background of the terms *θεός* and *κύριος* themselves in purely pagan spheres, which appears to not affect the use of them among certain Greek-speaking Jewish communities in Egypt or the Diaspora from about the second century B.C.E. to the first few centuries C.E., but which conflicts with more “orthodox” Jewish ideology as in Palestine, and which “orthodoxy” is actually applicable to the early Nazarenes (including Paul). Also, there is the curious phenomenon hinted at above that the earliest extant manuscripts (late second century C.E.) of the NT do not even contain the words *κύριος* and *θεός* (or even *ἰησοῦς* and *χριστός*) but the very peculiar and certainly unique abbreviations of $\bar{\kappa}\Sigma$ and $\bar{\theta}\Sigma$, coined *nomina sacra* in 1907 by Ludwig Traube,⁴⁰⁰ the presence of which are clearly still not well understood although speculated upon. Finally, upon revisiting these NT literary texts themselves as preserved there is a unique ideological emphasis on the name *Yahweh* as reflected in both the OT quotations used and the direct statements made, and certain obscure passages involving the titles *κύριος* and *θεός* become much clearer when the ideology of the sacred name is factored in.

Peter Nagel, in an unpublished dissertation, dealt with some of these peculiarities involving the use of the terms *κύριος* and *θεός* specifically in Paul’s citations of Scripture (he, like Howard, notes “*κύριος* is used ambiguously as a reference for the Tetragram and Jesus”⁴⁰¹) in comparison with the Jewish literary use of these same terms from the third century B.C.E. to the second century C.E. and attempted to formulate a plausible concept of his Hebrew deity. In formulating the problem, Nagel asks a number of important religious, linguistic, and ideological questions that if answered are key to illustrating Paul’s own understanding of *Yahweh*, and he then commented:

What comes to the fore when one considers related terms, particularly from the 3rd century BCE onwards, is the relationship between יהוה, אדוני, אל, אלהים; *κύριος*, *θεός*, *δέσποτης* and מרי. The complexity level of these questions are further emphasised by the realisation that there is no Greek manuscript of Jewish origin¹³ in existence – as far as it is known today – where the term יהוה is rendered by an uncontracted¹⁴ term *κύριος*.¹⁵ Furthermore, there are only two or three Old Testament¹⁶ manuscripts dated to the 3rd century BCE up until the 2nd century CE that attests to an uncontracted *θεός* term; and no New Testament Greek¹⁷ manuscript of Christian origin dated to the first two centuries CE, attesting to an uncontracted term *κύριος* or *θεός*.⁴⁰²

⁴⁰⁰ This is simply saying that the way the texts *appear* today is not what the earliest manuscripts necessarily indicate, as noted by Hurtado (1998: 672). Of the fifteen words termed *nomina sacra* in these ancient Greek manuscripts, Hurtado noted, “The words given this special treatment fall into three groups: (1) the four earliest attested and most consistently rendered words, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, Κύριος, Θεός; (2) three additional terms, which appear to be slightly later and less uniformly treated: πνεῦμα, ἄνθρωπος, σταυρός; and (3) the remaining eight, πατήρ, υἱός, σωτήρ, μήτηρ, οὐρανός, Ἰσραήλ, Δαυεῖδ, Ἰερουσαλήμ, which are abbreviated less consistently and appear to have joined the list of sacred terms latest.” (Hurtado 1998: 655–656). The first group are abbreviated with primarily the first and last letters as $\bar{\iota}\Sigma$ (but also $\bar{\iota}\bar{\eta}$), $\bar{\chi}\Sigma$, $\bar{\kappa}\Sigma$, $\bar{\theta}\Sigma$ (note stroke above characters), with uncials (or majuscules), of course, in the earliest manuscripts. Cf. also Traube 1907.

⁴⁰¹ Nagel 2012: 1. On Howard’s theory, see immediately following.

⁴⁰² Nagel 2012: 8–9. As regards *θεός* in the Old Greek OT, see immediately following.

While opinions of various sorts for the phenomena presented above have been quite eloquently expressed, as long as they are based on incorrect assumptions they must be revised, and consequently a study to resolve these clear anomalies has long been a desideratum.

3.2.4.1.1.5.2. The Tetragrammaton in the New Testament?

In 1977 George Howard suggested, based on a convergence of factors, that “the divine name, יהוה (and possibly abbreviations of it), was originally written in the NT quotations of and allusions to the OT and that in the course of time it was replaced mainly with the surrogate $\overline{\kappa\zeta}$.”⁴⁰³ He indicated this replacement was actually what created the apparent discrepancies which are evident in the manuscript tradition of the NT involving a confusion of whether the Father or the Son is meant when the term $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is being used. But, in presenting this “revolutionary” theory⁴⁰⁴ Howard carefully highlighted his emphasis on the sacred name only “as it was actually *written* in ancient documents, not with what word or words a reader pronounced when he came across the divine name in a document.”⁴⁰⁵ Therefore, the theory itself in substance is at its outset distinguished from the present one, since our investigation thus far has not only accounted for obvious orthographic ambiguities but has also correlated these with clear phonological necessities. Consequently, while Howard did not discuss the possible phonological realities, we believe we are in a perfect position to do just this.

What factors could possibly warrant such a suggestion of a replacement of the Tetragrammaton (or Tetragram) in original NT documents and does any available data allow us to speak to the question of *positive pronunciation* in addition to Howard’s textual considerations? Howard began by documenting the presence of YHWH in second/first century B.C.E. Jewish documents and later: 1) actually spelled utilizing Hebrew characters (both paleo-Hebrew and Aramaic square script) within the Old Greek OT (so-called LXX), as in P. Fuad 266 and the *Kaige* 8HevXIIgr; 2) spelled utilizing the word IAΩ (twice) in its stead in a Qumrân fragment of the Old Greek Bible (4QLXXLev^b); 3) found in Greek fragments of the Minor Prophets published by B. Lifshitz from the first century C.E. (or B.C.E.) in one (or two) case substituted by $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ but otherwise written as the usual paleo-Hebrew Tetragram; and 4) absent in both Qumrân commentaries where אל or אלהים is used and in Aramaic targumim, but found in biblical documents or a few others (Hebrew) with a “biblical ring” to them.⁴⁰⁶ As to his analysis of the occurrences of *Adonai* where the *triple yod* occurs in late copies of Hebrew Ben Sira, please see elsewhere.⁴⁰⁷ From the beginning of the second century C.E. in later Greek translations of the rabbinic Bible, the custom of writing the sacred name in Hebrew characters was maintained, although occasionally found as Π I Π I (PIPI).⁴⁰⁸ Howard then went on to note the curious ‘*nomina sacra*’ ($\overline{\kappa\zeta}$ and $\overline{\theta\sigma}$) in early NT texts, questioning why the usual יהוה is not likewise found in these early manuscripts.

⁴⁰³ Howard 1977: 63.

⁴⁰⁴ Howard 1977: 82.

⁴⁰⁵ Howard 1977: 63, n. 1.

⁴⁰⁶ Howard 1977: 63–65.

⁴⁰⁷ Cf. Sampson 2014.

⁴⁰⁸ Howard 1977: 72–73.

However, before any presuppositions can be made regarding the habits of the NT authors pertaining to these titles and the sacred name we must first establish a *clear idea* of exactly what ideology lay behind these Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic epigraphic and literary sources and whether this ideology should be seen as embraced by the Nazarenes and expressed in the NT or externally. First of all, regarding Howard's orthographic limitation, we will note that the form ΙΑΩ does certainly allow us to speak to the question of *positive pronunciation*, as this ΙΑΩ is not an orthographic phenomenon but a phonological reality. While paleo-Hebrew or Aramaic square script YHWH in a Greek text could *only* be an *orthographic phenomenon*, ΙΑΩ in a Greek text is an indication of a desire for a *positive pronunciation*, although a quite interesting one.⁴⁰⁹ Secondly, what ideology can be understood from the sources about the context of these names? The presence of YHWH in a Greek text should not be seen as equivalent to YHWH in a Hebrew text. We know now that in this period outside of the Hebrew the name Yahweh was not used by the greater Jewish community (and even *in Hebrew* outside the temple it was avoided also).⁴¹⁰ Certainly, YHWH is not even found in any of our Aramaic material as Howard did take note of.⁴¹¹ So, if it is not in the Aramaic what privilege would the Greek have that would warrant its presence there? The answer is none. But to simply say that the Greek substitute would be used when this is seen (just as אדני is read when יהוה is written) is to miss the point. Substitutions were made in Aramaic (generally אלהא) and the same should be in Greek. But was this not used? We learned above that in the Persian period the protection of the Name was achieved via IMASN by Yāhû in Aramaic (first in names, then independently), and we saw above that interestingly *Yāhû in any form is clearly avoided now in Greek*. Why is this? Was the tradition forgotten in the early Greek period? Undoubtedly not! We saw in 4QLXXLe^b the name ΙΑΩ. This is not to be seen as *Yāhû*, which in Greek would actually be *ιαυ/ιαου*, but which spellings we already saw *were clearly avoided* for some reason. Skehan concludes about this ΙΑΩ, "This new evidence strongly suggests that the usage in question goes back for some books at least to the beginnings of the Septuagint rendering . . ."⁴¹² This is an important statement, as it places ΙΑΩ in the earliest period.⁴¹³ But, Howard stated about YHWH that, ". . . it is clear from the former's [Hellenistic Jews] preservation of the Tetragram within the Greek Scriptures that θεός was not generally held to be equal to יהוה, nor was it held to be suitable as a replacement for the Tetragram within the written text of the Bible."⁴¹⁴ Whether ΙΑΩ or יהוה has the precedence (or both appeared simultaneously), it is not certain. Yet, Howard's statement needs qualification because: 1) θεός is once (or twice) found in the Lifshitz fragments where יהוה is in the Masoretic Text (and one need not assume a different *vorlage*), and 2) θεός is consistently found for אלהים in the P. Fuad 266 fragments which latter does also have *special reverence* in

⁴⁰⁹ See Wilkinson 2015: 95.

⁴¹⁰ Please see our analysis in the pre-exilic, exilic, and post-exilic periods above.

⁴¹¹ Howard 1977: 72.

⁴¹² Skehan 1975: 221.

⁴¹³ Wilkinson, too, appears inclined to the possibility of an initial ΙΑΩ, but allows for varying scribal practices (Wilkinson 2015: 65–66).

⁴¹⁴ Howard 1977: 76.

Jewish sources.⁴¹⁵ It is important also to note the common context of ΙΑΩ, being found especially in pagan spheres (Egyptian magic papyri). Skehan adds that this form was, “previously known to us in manuscript only from the margin of the codex Q of the prophets,” which dates to the sixth century C.E.⁴¹⁶ The most we can conclude from these pieces of information is that this ΙΑΩ (which is *not Yahweh*) shows that it was not a sacred presence that inhibited θεός from replacing it in Alexandrian spheres in the earliest period, but rather that *YHWH needed to be phonologically equated with ΙΑΩ* in Greek at that time. We need not overstate this simple recognition at this time.

However, this realization does not affect the main fact observed by Howard and others⁴¹⁷ that κύριος is absent in these early Greek OT texts but present in those found later on, but simply shows that the *initial* motivation for the LXX Tetragrammaton was unassociated with that desire of *Hebraica veritas* (obtaining the true Hebrew sense) that is often found later among persons working with the Greek translations of Hebrew biblical texts, although it may have been fodder for the ignorant. And, it is in these two connections that although Pietersma’s critical examination of both these ancient Greek LXX manuscripts and those received in responding to Howard and others regarding the Tetragrammaton is invaluable, his own attempt to present positive proof for original κύριος falls far short. If ΙΑΩ/YHWH indicates *hebraica veritas*, wherein an earlier κύριος was replaced by a more Hebrew representative, then why was not the same done with θεός, which is prominent in P. Fouad 266? Why was θεός more acceptable than κύριος, especially when, as discussed below, κύριος is not even found used religiously for deity in epigraphic material before the first century B.C.E. and then in clearly pagan contexts alongside θεός, and in reference to deified rulers? Certainly, to Pietersma’s point, a κύριος would certainly be a perfect tool to protect the “ineffability” of the name, but the fact is that: 1) Pietersma was not even certain of “ineffability” in this period, and 2) an argument of *hebraica veritas* is not given by ΙΑΩ and יהוה, because ΙΑΩ is not the true representation of Hebrew יהוה, and thus our argument must move elsewhere.⁴¹⁸ It is safer to first understand clearly the ideology of the time before going positively in either direction. One of the questions now is why is κύριος NOT FOUND in these early copies of the LXX if θεός is not only found therein but also in epigraphy from before the first century B.C.E. used by Hellenistic Jews in Egypt and elsewhere in the diaspora,⁴¹⁹ and if it wasn’t in original LXX when was it introduced? Of course, the “dubious practices” as Williams called it often exhibited by some of these Hellenistic communities clearly

⁴¹⁵ Although *Elohim* in Hebrew may not be *the ineffable name* par excellence, it: 1) was considered *’azkārôth* (sacred names) with Yahweh by certain tannaitic Palestinian teachers as we saw above; and 2) was also occasionally found in *distinctive script* along with YHWH in some Qumran fragments. Cf. above and Howard 1977: 66–67; Skehan 1975: 215. See also Wilkinson (2015: 80) who also notes the absence of the full אלהים in Ben Sira.

⁴¹⁶ See Skehan 1975: 221.

⁴¹⁷ Robert Wilkinson (2015: 87) comments, “It would appear that there is no unambiguous manuscript evidence for kurios used for the Tetragrammaton in a pre-Christian Jewish Greek biblical fragment.” Cf. also Fitzmyer 1979: 121 and below.

⁴¹⁸ Pietersma 1984: 98.

⁴¹⁹ Horbury and Noy 1992: 19.

conflict with Palestinian “orthodoxy.”⁴²⁰ But, what is further needed is a clearer understanding of *θεός* and *κύριος*, both their background and place in “orthodox” Jewish ideology, since if *θεός* was present in the LXX (and paralleled to *elohim*, etc.), if as we have surmised *ΙΑΩ* was not “innately orthodox” (a part of an ‘orthodox’ Jewish ideology), then that likewise places *θεός* in that same non-orthodox context as *ΙΑΩ*.⁴²¹ What is the background of *θεός* and *κύριος*?

3.2.4.1.1.5.3. The background of *θεός* and *κύριος* in the Graeco-Roman period

The background of the term *θεός* is well-known by all acquainted with Graeco-Roman culture, being used in purely pagan contexts in the ancient Greek world for the numerous local deities as far back as the late Bronze age (ca. 1200 B.C.E.) as the Linea B tablets’ numerous attestation of *te-o* exhibits.⁴²² Yet, we already noted the use of *θεός* also by Hellenistic Jews before the C.E. as can be seen in the inscriptions,⁴²³ especially in the Jewish context of the much discussed *θεός ὑψίστος*. One that can be cited is in synagogue inscriptions from Delos, an island in the Aegean Sea, inscribed on column bases dating to at least the first century B.C.E. presenting vows to *θεός ὑψίστος*. Another, from Gorgippia in the Bosporan Kingdom, dating 41 C.E. also mentions *θεῶι Ὑψίστῳ παντοκράτορι εὐλογητῷ*, but oddly also invokes three pagan deities *Δία, Γῆν, Ἥλιο[ν]* (Zeus, Ge, and Helios) to witness the transaction.⁴²⁴ We can also note that the phrase *θεός ὑψίστος* has also been found associated with *Ἥλιῳ* (Helios), *Ἀπόλλωνι* (Apollo), *Ἄττει* (Attis), and other deities and contexts.⁴²⁵ But, most of the occurrences of *θεός ὑψίστος* in Jewish contexts are not as blatantly pagan, although questionable.⁴²⁶ Then there is the even more interesting *κύριος*, with its own context and prohibitive associations—from an “orthodox” standpoint.

In addressing the absolute use of *κύριος* in the NT manuscripts Fitzmyer presented four different views that have been put forth for its origin and background and lists the fourth view advocated by R. Bultmann and others as “A Hellenistic Pagan Background.” He remarks:

(1) *Does the Kyrios-title Have a Hellenistic Pagan Background?* Here my remarks will be brief. This solution has in large part been adopted because of the unsatisfactory evidence hitherto adduced

⁴²⁰ Cf. Williams 1999: 83.

⁴²¹ Something can be said of the term *adōn* in the Semitic realm and *θεός*, and the use of sacred terms. Fitzmyer referenced the pagan context of “*adon*” in Punic inscriptions simply to illustrate the *absolute use* of that title in pagan contexts (1979: 119), which *absolute use* is, of course, also found in Jewish contexts. Yet, while one may be led to assume because this sacred term in Judaism is also used by Semitic pagans (whether absolute or not), Jews would see no aversion to a pagan *θεός*, the important factor is a *linguistic* one. Two things can be said of Judaism in this period: 1) There were recognized sacred words and terms, and 2) there was an important holiness attached to the Hebrew language. The pagan foreign Semitic context of a sacred *Hebrew* term in Judaism would not have *desensitized* orthodox Jews to the pagan contexts of other foreign terms. *Adonai* was understood in a Semitic realm from an early period (Gen. 18:3) and would not lose significance because of associations in foreign pagan contexts, whereas terms encountered in pagan contexts did not have such historical cultural precedence.

⁴²² Cf. Bremmer 2010: 1.

⁴²³ See Horbury and Noy 1992.

⁴²⁴ L. Levine 1999: 1012.

⁴²⁵ Roberts, Skeat, and Nock 1936: 68, n. 77. Cf. also Levinskaya 1996: 92–93.

⁴²⁶ Cf. Levinskaya 1996: 83–97.

for other solutions and because a Pauline passage such as 1 Cor 8:5-6 in the NT itself seemed to reflect it. It is well known that *κύριος* was used absolutely of gods and human rulers in the ancient world of the eastern Mediterranean; the Greek title is attested in this way from *at least* the beginning of the first century b.c. in texts from Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor.⁴²⁶ Indeed, it occurs once in the NT itself for Nero (Acts 25:26). So no one who works seriously with the NT title can ignore this extrabiblical Greek material.⁴²⁷

Fitzmyer obviously acknowledged the clear parallel between the use of *κύριος* in these provocative “extrabiblical Greek material” and that *absolute use* of *κύριος* witnessed in the NT manuscripts.⁴²⁸ Yet, that absolute use is the least concerning to us when the broader context of *κύριος* is considered.

Foerster, in his extensive treatment of *κύριος*, made a distinction between the Greek and Oriental concept of deity, stating “. . . what separates Greeks from the barbarians is that the Greeks do not basically regard their gods as lords and themselves as *δοῦλοι*.” The *creative activity* of the Almighty finds “almost no place at all in the Greek concept of God,” but he says it is a fact in the Orient.⁴²⁹ Foerster traced the utilization of the term *κύριος* first as an adjective, with the meaning “‘having power,’ or ‘having legal power,’ ‘lawful,’ ‘valid,’ ‘authorized,’ ‘competent,’ ‘empowered’; also ‘important,’ ‘decisive,’ ‘principle,’” and gradually as a noun. As an adjective, he notes it is used thus “. . . from the class(ical) to the NT period but does not occur as such in the NT or later Jewish lit. This must be connected with the fact that the Heb(rew) Aram(aic) equivalent for the noun *ὁ κύριος* has no corresponding adj(ective).”⁴³⁰ Foerster noted as a noun, it first occurs with a precise sense in the fourth century B.C.E. and means “the lawful owner of a slave,” of “subject peoples,” or “of a house,” and also the “legal guardian of a wife or girl.”⁴³¹

But, the most important notices of Foerster pertain to the historical development of *κύριος* beyond a simple nominal legal or authorized referent of an *owner* or *master having the power of disposal* to a nominal epithet now associated with deities and deified rulers especially in the Orient. This is comparable to the Semitic בעל (*ba'al*) that was used in the OT for *owner, husband, or master* (Ex. 21:3ff; 24:14, etc.) and was extended to the status of epithet or *nomen* in Semitic paganism, but was never used for *Yahweh* but used to express *possession* or *personal qualities*.⁴³² Foerster notes:

At the commencement of the Hellenistic era, then, the noun *κύριος* was still comparatively rare . . .
. If gods and rulers were later called *κύριος*, this usage must have developed in Hellenism. There

⁴²⁷ Fitzmyer 1979: 117–118.

⁴²⁸ Fitzmyer 1979: 118.

⁴²⁹ Foerster 1965: 1047–49.

⁴³⁰ Foerster 1965: 1041. He later cites Baudissin’s note that the Semitic parallel to the Greek *κύριος* is not בעל, but “the Phoenician Canaanite אדון fem. רבת, and . . . the Aram. מרא” (Foerster 1965: 1053), which was discussed by Fitzmyer above. Cf. n. 415.

⁴³¹ Foerster 1965: 1043.

⁴³² Cf. Hosea 2:17–18. Also, cf. the preexilic Samaritan inscriptions from the ninth century. Foerster seems to minimize any parallel of *ba'al* and *κύριος*. Cf. Foerster 1965: 1048, n. 22.

are no instances of Phillip of Macedonia, of Alexander the Great, or of any of the early Diadochoi being called *κύριος* in this period. . . . THE FIRST EXAMPLE OF ΚΥΡΙΟΣ USED OF DEITY IS TO BE FOUND IN THE LXX, AND IN THE LIGHT OF THE ABOVE EXPOSITION IT IS MOST UNLIKELY THAT THIS IS FOLLOWING AN ACCEPTED USAGE.”⁴³³ (Emphasis ours.)

Since Foerster then appeals to the numerous Egyptian documents available from before the first century B.C.E. and rules out an accident of discovery for *κύριος* not being used for deity in that earlier period in Egypt, our next option is to assume the LXX was the *pioneer* in this regard. However, this seems unnecessary as we have already pointed out above the fact observed that the oldest copies do not have *κύριος* for *Yahweh*, but YHWH in Hebrew scripts or *IAΩ*. Certainly, one may check the instances in Horbury and Noy of the Jews in Egypt dedicating their *προσευχή* (*place of prayer*) and find that it is always *θεῶ*, and we do not find *κυρίῳ*. The one instance of *κύριος* found in that source is in the phrase “*εὐλογία, Κ(ύρι)ε, χαριτόν*” and is dated by them to the “4th–5th century A.D.”⁴³⁴ Interestingly, Foerster also commented that even in Syria Greek inscriptions do not exhibit this later religious usage of *κύριος*.⁴³⁵ Again, he noted about Hellenistic *κύριος*:

Except for *κύριος* with the gen. → 1042; 1044, n. 13, *κύριος* is never used of gods or rulers prior to the 1st cent. B.C.²⁶ It is first used of Isis in Egypt, CIG, 4897a (99-90 B.C.): *τὸ προσκύνημα . . . παρά τῆ κυρία Ἰσιδι*], also from the 1st cent. CIG, 4898; 4899; 4904; 4917; 4930b; 4931; Ditt. Or., 186, 8f. Already in 81 B.C. we find the phrase *προσκυνησας τὴν κυρίαν θεὰν Ἰσιν*, CIG, 4936d, addenda; all from Philae. Similarly we read of the god Soknopaios (Seknebtynis) in the 1st cent. B.C.: *ὡς θέλει ὁ Σεκνεβτῶ[νις] ὁ κύριος θεός*, P. Tebt., 284, 5f. From Gizeh comes the dedication of a building *τῷ θεῷ και κυρίῳ Σοκνοπαίῳ*, Ditt. Or., 655, 24 B.C. From the time of Augustus or Tiberius we have a Syrian inscr. with the formula *θεὸς Κρόνος κύριος*, Ditt. Or., 606.⁴³⁶

This specific development then whereby *κύριος* is now applied to deity (or deified rulers) Foerster attributes to “the translation of an alien usage and no more,” transferred from both Egypt and Syria independently in the first century B.C.E.⁴³⁷ With this development then in Greek, the use of *κύριος* is also seen to exhibit a personal reverential affinity between the individual and the deity, as is shown by the numerous examples in Egypt of *προσκύνημα* made to the deity.⁴³⁸ Nevertheless, as regards deified rulers Foerster emphasized that from the time of Tiberius Ceasar there appears to be a cessation of use of the titles *κύριος θεός*, *κύριος βασιλέως*, *κύριος καῖσαρ*, and *θεός και κύριος βασιλέως* to be discussed shortly, but the acquired religious aura of the title appeared to have never been completely eliminated. In the first century C.E. *κύριος* could be used in the imperial title with no strong association with the imperial cult

⁴³³ Foerster 1965: 1046.

⁴³⁴ Horbury and Noy 1992: 225.

⁴³⁵ Foerster 1965: 1050.

⁴³⁶ Foerster 1965: 1049.

⁴³⁷ Foerster 1965: 1051. Foerster shows Baudissin’s assumption of Syrian influence upon Egypt to be unnecessary as there is an Egyptian parallel in *nb* and even *nb.t* (Foerster 1965: 1054).

⁴³⁸ Foerster 1965: 1051–52.

and found without θεός, as seen at the earliest in P. Oxy., I, 37, 5 f.: “(ἔτους) Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου.”⁴³⁹ But, during this same time and into the second century C.E. it could be utilized with the clear religious association between ruler and deity, as seen with both κύριος and δεσπότης.⁴⁴⁰

This chronological account is significant, but the specific reference to deified rulers has also been discussed elsewhere. Roberts, Skeat, and Nock discussed the phrase θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου specifically in the context of honorific titles applied to the ruling king (βασιλέως). In the Greek text they published that describes the law of a society (association), which they date “in the reign of Ptolemy Auletes, perhaps one between 69 and 58 B.C.,” libations are to be poured out and prayer made in the sanctuary of Zeus (called Διὸς Ὑψίστος) on behalf of the “θεο(ῦ) καὶ κυρίο(υ) βασιλέως.”⁴⁴¹ They indicated this title does not appear to be found earlier than Ptolemy Auletes (first century B.C.E.). In 88 B.C.E. (P. Bouriant 12), there is τὸν μέγιστον θεόν used for Soter. But, in other Egyptians texts between ca. 64 and 44 B.C.E. (BGU VIII: 1764.8, 1789.3, 1834.6/7, and 1845.5/6), they note the title τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου βασιλέως is found (plural in the last two texts), although one after 64/63 B.C.E. (1767.1) does utilize the sole κυρίου in “ὑπὲρ τε τ[οῦ] κυρίου βασιλέως καὶ τῶν τέκνων.” In ca. 1 C.E. (P. Oxy. 1143) we find θυ]σίας καὶ σπονδὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου αὐτοκράτορος referencing Augustus. They, too, note the title ceased in the C.E.⁴⁴²

It would appear from these studies that the pagan religious association of κύριος developed in the first century B.C.E. especially in the pagan cults. But, it would seem, in Palestine and Egypt it could never be relinquished because of the precedent now established both with the local pagan cults and with deified rulers. Therefore, knowing that Palestinian Judaism of the time regarded certain names and terms as holy primarily for linguistic reasons (as seen at Qumran above), what can be said of the early Nazarenes of the first century C.E., who were clearly orthodox in lifestyle (both the Ἑλληνιστής and Ἑβραῖος, Acts 6:1), but who did evangelize in other languages besides a Semitic (Acts 2:4, 8–13; 17:18–22; 21:37)? At the least, they were not desensitized to these pagan environments (Acts 17:16–18), even if they did not follow rabbinic *halakoth*. One thing seems certain, however, that their parallel is not to be found in the Hellenistic Jewish communities in Egypt and the Diaspora. This, we must look into further, but not before we investigate another important aspect of the study Howard considered before drawing his conclusions—*nomina sacra*.

3.2.4.1.1.5.4. *Nomina Sacra?*

⁴³⁹ Foerster 1965: 1054.

⁴⁴⁰ Foerster 1965: 1056. Foerster then comments that κύριος may have “a different content according to the context and inner attitude of those who use it” (1058); and later interestingly noted, “It is no doubt true, as Prümm, 134, says, that the richer and weaker senses of κύριος as applied religiously to the emperor were often present together, but the point is that the weaker sense was the normal one to which a fuller content was sometimes added.” (Foerster 1965: 1058, n. 96).

⁴⁴¹ Roberts, Skeat, and Nock 1936: 41-43. Coincidentally, their text also testifies to the adjectival use of κύριος, where the νόμος is given as being “authoritative.” Roberts, Skeat, and Nock 1936: 40.

⁴⁴² Roberts, Skeat, and Nock 1936: 50 and n. 19.

What was the purpose and origin of this curious standard of abbreviation that is found in the earliest manuscripts of the NT that dates to the late second century C.E.?⁴⁴³ The answer to these questions is still not fully given in earlier studies, only very interesting suggestions. We earlier noted Larry Hurtado's statement about these fifteen terms called '*nomina sacra*' that are usually divided into three chronologically-distinct groups.⁴⁴⁴ The earliest attested and most consistently found group is that which is relevant to us, containing the words *ἰησοῦς*, *χριστός*, *κύριος*, *θεός*, abbreviated as $\overline{\text{ΙΣ}}$ (or $\overline{\text{ΙΗ}}$), $\overline{\text{ΧΣ}}$, $\overline{\text{ΚΣ}}$, $\overline{\text{ΘΣ}}$ with the stroke above the abbreviation. These are mostly abbreviations by contraction (first and last letter) of *specific* religious terms ($\overline{\text{ΙΗ}}$ is abbreviation with *suspension*), but the usual type of Greek abbreviation (in manuscripts, ostraca, and inscriptions) is by suspension (first and second letter) and is of *common, well known* words. Additionally, Hurtado noted abbreviations appear regularly in documentary papyri, but not so often in literary texts (except marginal notes and in texts intended for private use).⁴⁴⁵ Hurtado listed the relevant suggestions for the origins and proposed his own, all suggestions revolving around one or other of these four terms.

Both Traube and Paap saw *θεός* as the initial "*nomen sacrum*," written without vowels to imitate the Tetragrammaton, originating among Greek-speaking Jews. However, Paap argued that the development of other terms "beyond *θεός* took place among Christians," whereas Traube divided these into *Κύριος*, *πνεῦμα*, *πατήρ*, *οὐρανός*, *ἄνθρωπος*, *Δαυειδ*, *Ἰσραήλ*, and *Ἱερουσαλήμ*, originating with Jews, and the later amended list additionally containing *ἰησοῦς*, *Χριστός*, *υἱός*, *σωτήρ*, *σταυρός*, and *μήτηρ*, the product of Christians.⁴⁴⁶ Brown proposed *κύριος*, not *θεός*, as the initial *nomen sacrum*, this being a reverential contraction as it was a substitute for YHWH in the Greek OT, introduced by Christian scribes. Then, Brown suggested the practice was "rapidly extended in one direction to *θεός* and in the other direction to *ἰησοῦς* and *χριστός*." According to Kurt Treu, *κύριος* and *θεός* were the initial *nomina sacra*, introduced first by Jews, and contracted with a stroke over them to distinguish them as equivalents of YHWH in the Greek text. From there, "Christians took up the idea and quickly broadened it to include 'the remaining persons of their Trinity' and then a wider list of religious terms."⁴⁴⁷ C. H. Roberts thinks *ἰησοῦς* is the initial *nomen sacrum*, influenced by the Jewish reverence for the name of Yahweh, and the other terms that followed all developed within a later "Christian" religious context. Hurtado's own suggestion utilized Roberts' theory as a springboard, taking *ἰησοῦς* as the first "*nomen sacrum*." He himself thought that the suspended form of *ἰησοῦς* (i.e. $\overline{\text{ΙΗ}}$) served as the first *nomen sacrum* actually comprising a type of *gematria*, being indicative of the numerical value 18, which in Hebrew is \aleph , the Hebrew word for *life*. In

⁴⁴³ See citations in Hurtado 1998: 657, n. 7, where Egerton Papyrus 2 and Bodmer papyri are to be dated at the beginning of the third century (ca. 200 C.E.) and P4, P64, and P67 to the late second century C.E.

⁴⁴⁴ Please see n. 399 above.

⁴⁴⁵ Hurtado 1998: 658–659.

⁴⁴⁶ Hurtado 1998: 664.

⁴⁴⁷ Hurtado 1998: 665.

support of this he cites the utilization of the stroke over a Greek letter to indicate its use as a number sign.⁴⁴⁸

Again, the problem with all of these theories is not so much one of ingenuity, but of contextual inapplicability and even chronology. For while the primary assumption of the abbreviations being linked with the “sacred nature” of the terms themselves (Traube’s *nomina sacra*) may, it appears, apply to Hellenistic Jews from Egypt and the Diaspora (firstly, only θεός) from at least the third or second century B.C.E. and even to later Greek writers influenced by the NT message (here with both θεός and κύριος) seen as early as in the second century C.E., this assumption seems unnecessary and in fact inapplicable to the earliest first century C.E. Jerusalem assembly both from evidence outside the NT, and, as we shall see, what is expressed about their habits inside the very texts themselves. If the four terms were influenced by the Jewish reverence, it could not be Hellenistic Jews because they show no such abbreviations or avoidance of θεός in inscriptions from Egypt, and it could not be Palestinian Jews, because the NT documents show the opposite—that the early disciples (especially Paul) was spreading the *kerygma* with the sacred names to the Gentiles, not hiding them, as we investigate below. Additionally, we saw attestations to θεός and κύριος all over the pagan Greek world, so why would these disciples suddenly see them as so sacred that they need conformity to this tradition of *hiding* them due to reverence. These are but the obvious problems with these theories.

Of course, of the four terms, our concern is only with κύριος and θεός for now. The name ἰησοῦς (and consequently χριστός) will be considered when we discuss the compounded form of the name in the period under study. Because of obvious discrepancies, from the outset of this section concerning the primitive community in the first century described in the NT we have been careful to make a distinction between the post-second through fourth century C.E. “χριστιανοί”⁴⁴⁹ and the *mînîm* in the tannaitic material or “*נאציωראיִוֵן*” in the Acts, which included Paul.⁴⁵⁰ And, because of the inclusion of Paul, this need not become a discussion of sacred names in so-called “Jewish Christianity” and “Gentile Christianity,” since the message of the early community in the NT was one (Gal 2:8). Our separation of post-second century “χριστιανοί” is in keeping with the divergence this later entity historically exhibits (and which has been often discussed as we saw above) from the earliest first century community described in the NT.⁴⁵¹ Upon investigation, they do not appear to be one and the same! Undoubtedly, because of one’s own questions when these phenomena and the other discrepancies were pondered, one may be just too happy to speculate. However, in light of the seeming early ubiquitous use of at least θεός

⁴⁴⁸ Hurtado 1998: 668.

⁴⁴⁹ Yes, interestingly, the root of this term, χριστός, we remember too is also a so-called *nomen sacrum*, but this term is also NOT WITHOUT its own historical discrepancies, as is attested in early Latin and Greek historians. See the compounded form of the name below where we consider the name ἰησοῦς.

⁴⁵⁰ See Acts 24:5. The term נוצרי which appears in the Babylonian Talmud appears to be popular later in the Amoraic period, from about the third century C.E., rather than the earlier מינין (מינים) found in tannaitic material. Cf. Pritz 1988: 97.

⁴⁵¹ Pritz 1988.

one must still prove whether the earliest Nazarenes (again, including the Ἑλληνοιστῆς of Acts 6:1) did indeed utilize the pagan Greek “sacred” names of θεός and κύριος, with at least θεός being initially popularized especially via the LXX translation of the third century B.C.E. by Greek-speaking Jews (and specifically by those who spoke *only* Greek). This would obviously then lead to the conclusion that they did not utilize their “sacred” Hebrew counterparts, which use is indicated *at least* in tannaitic (and later) literature and even upon close inspection in the current Greek documents themselves.

3.2.4.1.1.5.5. θεός and κύριος in original New Testament documents?

When it comes to the NT documents the difficulty that arises is that which we have already emphasized that not one of these manuscripts currently has explicit use of the name Yahweh therein which would have been a contrast from Jewish religious material that were not biblical scrolls in Hellenistic Judaism or even Palestinian Judaism for that matter. Those Old Greek biblical scrolls with Hebrew יהוה show merely an orthographic phenomenon, present only because the document *was* Greek, and that document with ΙΑΩ shows anything but the name *Yahweh*. But now, we have shown, hopefully effectively, that there were stark differences between 1) various groups within Palestinian Judaism on the one hand; and 2) Hellenistic Judaism (or those capable of speaking *only* the Greek language) and Palestinian Judaism (those familiar with Aramaic and Hebrew and [in the case of some] also Greek) on the other regarding the use of the name Yahweh.⁴⁵² The Nazarenes, in addition to being outside Palestinian Judaism in not following rabbinic *halakoth*, greatly diverge ideologically from Judaism of the time as well, especially regarding the identified Messiah, placing a new interesting emphasis apparently on the name ישוע but actually most likely on יהושע (itself a PNCSN), while also continuing with the same OT style of emphasis on the name יהוה, as has been oft discussed about the language in Luke 1 for example.⁴⁵³ In light of the religio-linguistic tradition inherent in rabbinic Judaism about the non-use of the “ineffable name,” especially outside Hebrew (Greek and Aramaic) and then even in Hebrew itself (first outside the temple, then also inside, except by the high priest), in considering the NT passages we will distinguish the use of θεός and κύριος as found for both יהוה and אלהים in the OT quotations within the NT and then the actual use of θεός and κύριος in the NT itself, and determine if they fit those contexts. We will answer the question: Does the Nazarenes appear to follow the tradition about the non-use of the “ineffable name” or not?

Foerster noted that the quotations or allusions from the OT found in the NT mostly correspond to the Greek OT (LXX) and most show that the name *Yahweh* is represented by κύριος.⁴⁵⁴ Yet, this is only as far as later manuscripts are concerned, as we have already seen, since this use was preceded by an earlier ΙΑΩ or יהוה. The exclusion of κύριος from earlier editions of the LXX may not be supposed to be because the Hellenistic Jews saw a negative religious association in κύριος, because in these same LXX manuscripts we find θεός where אלהים is found in the Hebrew text, which former is not less religiously

⁴⁵² Cf. Fitzmyer 1979: 123.

⁴⁵³ Cf. Howard 1977: 82, n. 82.

⁴⁵⁴ Foerster 1965: 1086–1087.

unsuitable than *κύριος*. Its absence then must be connected with the historical development of the term itself, as discussed by Foerster himself above in the background of *κύριος*, unless one still holds on to the hope of a possible early *κύριος* alongside a *ΙΑΩ*.⁴⁵⁵

But, in preparation for our analysis of the NT, we will consider a small sample from the LXX of the transcriptions of the Tetragrammaton itself, and will find some abnormalities to this expected norm (called ‘rule of thumb’ by Peter Nagel⁴⁵⁶) of representing יהוה by supposedly only *κύριος*. Using the first 10 chapters of Gen only from the Hebrew text, we considered the representation of the Tetragrammaton in Greek. Beginning with Gen 2, we find in verses 4, 5, 7, 9, 19 the two terms יהוה אלהים, which is interestingly represented in the LXX by *ὁ θεός* only, with the remaining five instances of the same two terms in Gen 2:8, 15, 16, 18, 22 represented as the normal *κύριος ὁ θεός*. Chapter 3 mostly follows this normal pattern, except in 3:22, where it is again represented by *ὁ θεός* only. Then, from chapters 4 through 10 the single term יהוה in the MT is actually represented by *κύριος ὁ θεός* (4:6, 15, 26; 5:29; 6:3, 5, 8; 7:1, 5, 16; 8:21; 10:9) and even by *ὁ θεός* only (4:1, 4, 9, 16; 6:6, 7; 8:20). Note the absence of אלהים after the Tetragrammaton in the MT in these, where the LXX consistently has a peculiar *ὁ θεός*. Only in 4:3, 13, and 10:9 does a single יהוה represent a single *κύριος*. The LXX itself, therefore, is capable of raising its own questions. Yet, this sample only points to a broader issue, which was discussed by Peter Nagel, who performed an even more thorough text-critical introductory analysis of the broader LXX texts. He noted, “The general accepted ‘rule of thumb’ among biblical scholars is that the term *θεός* is the Greek equivalent for the Hebrew term אלהים, which would also apply to the term אל; while the equivalent Greek term for יהוה is *κύριος*.²⁰ The inconsistencies in applying the so-called ‘rule of thumb’ is visible throughout the constructed LXX^{Götl} text, not to mention the variations and discrepancies pointed out by the text critical data.” These are important observations. After his introductory sample of texts Nagel concluded:

The small number of cases presented above, is but a mere spec of dust in the vast array of text critical discrepancies and variations noted by both Hebrew and Greek eclectic text editions. This was but an introductory attempt to introduce the reader into the complexity of the *κύριος-θεός*, -יהוה אלהים and אדוני problem. These examples should be viewed as merely introductory in nature. It presents but one aspect of the backdrop surrounding the literary problem that ***there exists an inconsistency in reproducing the Tetragram in the Greek biblical texts at least from the third century BCE onwards.***³¹ It is thus of imminent importance as a first necessary step, to determine the extent of the alleged ‘transmission problem’.⁴⁵⁷ (Emphasis Nagel’s)

⁴⁵⁵ Wilkinson (2015: 88) concludes, “In short: it appears prudent to conclude that there was no one way of way of [sic] presenting the Tetragrammaton or its substitutes in the Greek biblical texts of the time of the Apostle Paul. But importantly, the evidence of anticipations of the Palestinian *Qere* in the LXX prophets and the usage of Philo prevent us from excluding *tout court* the presence of *kurios* in Jewish Greek biblical manuscripts.”

⁴⁵⁶ Nagel 2012: 28.

⁴⁵⁷ Nagel 2012: 33.

From this understanding of the LXX which has always been closely studied in analyses of the NT documents we continue to consider the question of whether the NT indicates use of the sacred name.

Regarding the actual references to the Father, when one begins an investigation with Matt and Mark, one is struck by what one finds especially in light of what was just observed about the LXX. In Matt, κύριος mostly refers not to the Father but now to the identified Messiah, and it is only approximately eight times does κύριος refer to the Father.⁴⁵⁸ Otherwise, *Yahweh* is generally found represented by θεός in Matt. Yet, even so most of the κύριος references are in the common phrases ἄγγελος κυρίου and τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου. This leaves only the passages of 5:33 and 11:25. This latter is significant because it shows an address to the Father as the κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ και τῆς γῆς. Here κύριε must represent a spoken יְיָ, the only such reference. In Mark there is only one reference to *Yahweh* as κύριος, which is 13:20. Otherwise, *Yahweh* is referred to by θεός in the current texts. Foerster, also noting these phenomena,⁴⁵⁹ commented that “This shows that יְיָ was not in common use in the primitive Palestinian community.”⁴⁶⁰ Of course, this is only on the assumptions that firstly this community did not use *Yahweh*, but *Adonai* for the Father, and secondly that הוה is represented only by κύριος and not θεός.⁴⁶¹

However, these assumptions may not be necessary, because with the first as one goes through the entire corpus of the Synoptics and John one does find a particular emphasis on the name of *Yahweh*, as can be seen in the significant acclamation in Luke 19:38, λέγοντες· Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἰ βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου· ἔν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις,⁴⁶² where in “Blessed is the king who comes in the name of κυρίου,” the emphasis on the name could only be a spoken *Yahweh* where κυρίου is now found. Yet, even this reference is still indirect. One could also refer to the actual statement in John with the peculiar, ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε με· ἐὰν ἄλλος ἔλθῃ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἰδίῳ, ἐκεῖνον λήμψεσθε (5:43), or . . . Εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε· τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου ταῦτα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ (10:25). In both of these “in the name of my Father” is significant and does not seem to be simply a reference to that authority, but also use. But, perhaps, this too may be seen unclear. Is there an actual statement affirming use of the name? John 17:6 makes an important declaration, Ἐφάνερσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὓς ἔδωκάς μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. . . . And, in this same chapter there is also, ὅτε ἤμην μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἧ δέδωκάς μοι (17:12). These statements of “manifesting the name” and “keeping them in the name” do seem to convey more than simply using the name. However, the fact remains that they must entail *some* type of use in their Semitic background. Yet, there is the outright statement in verse 26, καὶ ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ γνωρίσω, ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με ἐν αὐτοῖς ἦ καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς.

⁴⁵⁸ Matt 1:20, 22, 24; 2:13, 15, 19; 5:33; 11:25.

⁴⁵⁹ Foerster (1965: 1087) also included Matt 5:19, but this appears to refer the work of the Son as the next verse indicates.

⁴⁶⁰ Foerster 1965: 1087.

⁴⁶¹ Wilkinson also importantly noted Ben Sira’s use of only the terms *Adōnai*, *El*, and *Elyōn*, but not *Yahweh* and *Elōhim*. The same tendency was observed in many of the instances at Qumran. Cf. Wilkinson 2015: 80.

⁴⁶² Cf. also Matt 21:9; Mark 11:9; John 12:13.

One may argue that whatever use of the name existed is only pertinent to the identified Messiah therein and not to his disciples. Yet, in investigating the book of Acts one can still find certain indications of use. In Acts 2, we find the account of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem, where Peter immediately quoted the prophecy of Joel 2:28 which speaks of this pouring forth of the spirit and ends, *καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἑὰν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται*. Although these words here quoted are not central to his message, they are still applicable, because they are included. Yet, Peter appears to be very distinct when quoting the Messianic Psalm 110:1 in Acts 2:34 and said: *οὐ γὰρ Δαυιδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, λέγει δὲ αὐτός· Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου*. He then concludes in verse 36: *καὶ κύριον ἑαυτὸν καὶ χριστὸν ἔποίησεν ὁ θεός*. The first κύριος in verse 1 reflects *יהוה* and the second correlates Israel's Messiah figure to *משיח*. This is significant. Peter strongly confirms from the Hebrew Scripture that Israel's Messiah is Adonai! Of course, throughout the NT there is also an additional emphasis on the name of the identified Messiah, which we will consider below, but certain passages involving the Father do indicate some obscurity in their present state. One such is Acts 18:12, which gives an account of the accusation of Paul by the Jews before Gallio, proconsul of Achaia. The difficulty is both the accusation as given and Gallio's own understanding as seen in his reply. In verse 13 the accusation was . . . *Παρὰ τὸν νόμον ἀναπειθεὶ οὗτος* τοὺς ἀνθρώπους σέβεσθαι τὸν θεόν. Why is it unlawful to worship? By itself, this passage is already peculiar. However, Gallio's response does assist in clarifying. He said, *εἰ δὲ ζητήματα ἔστιν περὶ λόγου καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς, ὄψεσθε αὐτοί*. While this can become a question about what is here written and what was heard by Gallio, we have much information in this one sentence. Gallio identifies a debate or reasoning among the Jews about three things: a word, names, and the law according to the Jews. These only coincide with the accusation if our *σέβεσθαι τὸν θεόν* is an indication of a forbidden name, and such an act could only be "unlawful" because of an interpretation of it (*νόμου τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς*). If the phrase as presently found was *σέβεσθαι τὸν κύριον* the name referred to could either be that of the identified Messiah or the Father, since preaching the former was forbidden in Acts 4:18, 5:28, but *τὸν θεόν* seems to indicate a use of either the Hebrew terms *Yahweh* or *Elôhîm* by Paul, and we are inclined to the former.

Yet, we may find the objection that it was linguistic and ethnic, and all of these situations involve Jews, who may have used the name only when they spoke Hebrew. In Greek then they would have used these substitutes. On the linguistic side, this too is problematic when we consider the primitive community, since we already saw Acts 2, where it is said of the Apostles, *καὶ ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐδίδου ἀποφθέγγεσθαι αὐτοῖς*, which would conflict with Joel 2:32 (quoted by Peter in Acts 2:21) if *Yahweh* was not implied. And, in Acts 17:18–22, we saw Paul preaching to the philosophers in the Areopagus, most likely in Greek (cf. Acts 21:37). From the ethnic side, which somewhat coincides with the linguistic, Peter first spoke to Gentiles in Acts 10, and this was referred to by Jacob (James) in Acts 15:14, where he specifically states, *Συμεὼν ἐξηγήσατο καθὼς πρῶτον ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ*. But then, he went on further to quote Amos 9:12, saying, *ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ καταλοίποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπ'*

αὐτούς, λέγει Ἡ κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα (Acts 15:17).⁴⁶³ While in Acts 2 the name was not the central point in the quotation, this is not the case here, because of both Jacob's acknowledgement of what Peter spoke and his own affirmation of the prophecy that Yahweh is named upon the nations (ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς). This is important.

But then there are additionally the writings of Paul. Speaking to Timothy concerning blasphemy, he warns Timothy Ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δούλοι, τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότας πάσης τιμῆς ἀξίους ἠγείσθωσαν, ἵνα μὴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία βλασφημῆται (1Tim 6:1). First of all, here, we are thrust back to our observations in the LXX and Mark (and Matt) of the Father being often referenced in the present texts by θεός and not κύριος, especially in this reference to the name. But then there is also the simple fact that blasphemy usually involves the name of Yahweh, not a surrogate already used in profane contexts all over the Greco-Roman world, which Luke was not oblivious to. However, an even clearer reference than this is the emphatic declaration by Paul himself in 2 Tim 2:19 of καὶ Ἀποστήτω ἀπὸ ἀδικίας πᾶς ὁ ὀνομάζων τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου. Again, the parallel to these expressions are the OT passages where the sacred name bore great emphasis and sanctity, but not prohibition, and is consistently so expressed in the NT, but ὁ ὀνομάζων τὸ ὄνομα (naming the name) was certainly *taboo* in Palestinian Judaism at this time outside the temple by any but the high priest.⁴⁶⁴ Yet, we can cite another Pauline passage already referred to by Fitzmyer above. 1 Cor 8:4–6 states: Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὐκ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς Ἡ θεὸς εἶ μὴ εἷς. καὶ γὰρ εἶπερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, ὥσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί, ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ. Paul, speaking of idolatry, contrasts the Hebrew creator and Messianic figure with many idols or θεοὶ and κύριοι, which he states are called thus. But there are two anomalies here. What does Paul mean by εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ and at the same time εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ? Was Paul's "one" Father actually called θεός? If one answers in the negative, then Paul either initially wrote ἸAdōnāy for the Father according to Palestinian Jewish tradition (not Hellenistic, which should be the odd θεός), or *Yahweh* quite against the Jewish tradition. But, this brings us to the second anomaly. Paul also says there are κύριοι πολλοὶ but εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, but besides the same problem of same term found in paganism but used here as above, there is the further difficulty that if the Father is also frequently called κύριος elsewhere in Paul's own writings, it appears he oddly uses one term for three referents—and regularly ambiguous with two of these. Of course, the difficulty is removed once we acknowledge the fact that Paul must have *wrote* three unique terms: κύριοι (many) found referred to in papyrology and epigraphy, *Yahweh* the Father, and ἸAdōnāy, the identified Messiah, as Peter declared in Acts 2:34.

It appears from all these that Paul, Jacob (James), and also Peter see a single יהוה when speaking in the events of their time. There is no ambiguity discerned. But, surprisingly, there is an additional singularity and uniqueness when the κύριος in the current texts has a religious referent other than

⁴⁶³ Cf. also Romans 15:9–11.

⁴⁶⁴ Cf. McDonough (1999: 65, n. 33) who discussed this specific anomaly and makes the association with the numerous instances of "calling upon the name."

Yahweh, which clearly shows the identified Messiah being called אדני, which is actually what Palestinian Judaism of the time used as a substitute in Hebrew for Yahweh (יהוה). Even more significant is that we find a continuity whether the dialogue is to Jews in Jerusalem, as in Acts 2, or to a Gentile audience as in Corinth. This harmonizes with our observations in the NT writings themselves that the practices of the Jewish disciples are not separated from that of the early Greek converts, since these texts simply do not allow separation.⁴⁶⁵

3.2.4.1.1.5.6. Conclusion

Now, we can return to George Howard, as it is clear that our observations are not exaggerations but careful considerations of the problems that have plagued NT scholarship for the past century. They highlight the key areas of weaknesses in the established views, systematically confronting the many discrepancies that have long been speculated upon with no satisfactory explanations, and give logical solutions consistent with the data. When we add to these Howard's text critical consideration of the variations involving the four terms Χριστός, θεός, κύριος, and even Ἰησοῦς we see further areas of opportunity in the study of the NT. George Howard poses his own conclusions in the form of questions. One such reads:

(e) What are the implications of the use of the divine name in the NT for current christological studies? Are these studies based on the NT text as it appeared in the first century, or are they based on an altered text which represents a time in church history when the difference between God and Christ was confused in the text and blurred in the minds of churchmen? Can it be that current scenarios of NT christology are descriptions of second- and third-century theology and not that of the first?⁴⁶⁶

While we cannot agree with all aspects of Howard's theories as set forth in his study, the one point made that seems corroborated by all that we have also considered is that of *document alteration*. Howard, therefore, seems correct in asking if the current "NT christology" is not that of the first. The changes appear early and very specific, but do not seem to affect the integrity of the literary whole, which must be studied in harmony with other information (epigraphic and papyrologic), both B.C.E. and C.E. They simply involve sacred names. Howard, however, saw only the Tetragrammaton being involved. The evidence points to more than simply this, since it is clear that the abbreviations ΘΣ and ΚΣ (so-called *nomina sacra*) and the full terms θεός and κύριος were not part of the first century community (including Paul) and these would not have been considered sacred by them!

⁴⁶⁵ Cf. Acts 11: 12, 19–20; Rom 2:4–10; 1 Cor 1:10–13; Gal 2: 9. The statements in Acts 15:20 appear related to basic initial purity requirements while learning, just as circumcision was seen to be by some prominent Jews who was attaching themselves to the early group, but must be followed by instructions as seen in verse 21: Μωϋσῆς γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος. Therefore, the Gentiles too must learn the law.

⁴⁶⁶ Howard 1977: 83.

Judaism in the first century can clearly be identified as generally adhering to the tradition concerning the “ineffability” of the name Yahweh. We have here traced this tradition all the way back to the exile, having originated with the avoidance of the name in a non-Hebrew tongue, at the time, especially Aramaic. This did not change in the Hellenistic-Roman period, but Greek, not Aramaic, was the *lingua franca* of the period and further differences can additionally be noted. Judaism in this late period had differing groups within its domain. First of all Palestinian Judaism of the time had certain religio-linguistic characteristics, where in Hebrew certain sacred terms can be found utilized but mostly not in Aramaic—primarily *Adonai* and *Elohim*. In Aramaic in religious reference we do not find *Adonai*, but *El*, or *Eloah* and *marey* at Qumran. Then, there are Hellenistic Jews, primarily in Egypt, but also in the Diaspora, who appeared to have used only θεός in the first century C.E., but seemed to have later incorporated also κύριος, but the specific time of incipient use of this latter is quite elusive. The Nazarenes of the first century appear to deviate from all of these, as evidence from the NT and tannaitic literature appear to indicate an apparent *unrestricted use* of the terms *Yahweh* and *Elohim*. The original NT documents themselves then must have contained a representation of the actual name *Yahweh*, the term *Elohim*, and even the term *Adonai* (but not used primarily for the Father), unmodified or substituted, greatly contrasting from and most likely troubling to rabbinic Judaism of the time. This then necessarily implies that the current manuscripts (all copies of the originals), including the earliest available copies that actually attest to the examples of the curious abbreviations called *nomina sacra* for both this name and the other ideologically sacred terms, were indeed altered. Contra Howard, the alteration was not by confused Gentiles but by parties who did not desire these sacred Hebrew names in the documents of this community for ideological reasons. Why replace the terms with these unique abbreviations? We are not certain at the moment. Howard concluded that, “Thus somewhere around the beginning of the second century the use of surrogates must have crowded out the Tetragram in both Testaments.”⁴⁶⁷ To this timeframe we can agree. Yet, although this seems accurate from the vast array of literature on the topic we have amassed in considering the religious context of the name Yahweh in this period, we can even go one step further and confirm our conclusions through further analysis of PNNCSN in the Greco-Roman period, since we again are astounded at how the one area (PNNCSN) programmatically complements the other (religious context—use and reverence—of the name *Yahweh*). But this we will do only after we make some additional needed remarks concerning the apparent shortened equivalent in the Greco-Roman period.

3.2.4.1.2. Yāhû in the Hellenistic/Roman Periods?

It should have become apparent to many that if the name Yahweh was gradually removed from use in the course of the Hellenistic period and began to be substituted with *Adonai*, then it would not be found transcribed or attempted to be transcribed into Greek at all. But, contrariwise, in light of our analysis of

⁴⁶⁷ Howard 1977: 77.

the non-Hebrew context of Yāhû in the Persian period, which is a product of IMASN, originating from the equivalent compound in PNNCSN formed in the Neo-Babylonian period, we do expect to find at least this name, which in Greek would actually be $\iota\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$ - or $\iota\alpha\upsilon$ -. However, these are those very Greek transcriptions that we saw scrupulously avoided in the Hellenistic period and beyond! Instead, what we do find is a shortened name apparently for Yahweh written $\text{IA}\Omega$ in the early LXX fragment from Qumrân, with the only difference being the Ω instead of an Υ .

It is obvious to us that $\text{IA}\Omega$ is in the Hellenistic period (in the Greek language) what Yāhû was in the Persian (in Aramaic), which we also saw worshipped in Idumea in the last quarter of the fourth century B.C.E. Remember that independent Yāhû was never worshipped in the normative community, nor equated in its due reverence with Yahweh, neither in Yahûdāh nor Samaria. It simply does not occur! But, if $\iota\alpha\omega$ (which must be $i\bar{a}\bar{o}$) descended from it, then this name too must certainly not have been used likewise by them, although it does appear in 4QLXXLev^b for *Yahweh*. On the other hand, $i\bar{a}\bar{o}$ is frequently found in the first centuries C.E. especially utilized as a prominent name of many names in magic spells on charms and amulets.⁴⁶⁸ Ganschietz believes its use in magic was not connected with the magicians' religious ideals or reference to a deity, but rather they only sought the "power" from the particular name, as it was a *dynamis*.⁴⁶⁹ However, Goodenough sees a Jewish syncretistic scenario where $i\bar{a}\bar{o}$ is depicted as encompassing many attributes of a supreme solar deity.⁴⁷⁰ Certainly, $i\bar{a}\bar{o}$ is connected with Yahweh, but could the appearance of this unique spelling and the avoidance of $\iota\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$ - and $\iota\alpha\upsilon$ - elsewhere in proper names be related? Again, all evidence seems to be pointing to the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN.

Therefore, does this religious context of the name carry over into proper names in the Hellenistic and Roman periods? Are the changes that we have observed in the phonology of PNNCSN and other proper names (which we have shown are not the result of phonological processes) connected likewise to these changes in the religious context of the name Yahweh? There may very well be some important parallels that can't be ignored, and consequently we certainly concur with Beaulieu's suggestion that the abandonment of PNNCSN during the Hellenistic period "is probably related to the gradual disappearance of the name of Yahweh and the prohibition of pronouncing the Tetragrammaton."⁴⁷¹

3.2.4.2. The Compounded Form of the Name in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods

3.2.4.2.1. Is Substitution of $\text{'}ad\bar{o}n\bar{a}y$ and Introduction of $/\bar{o}/$ in PNNCSN Related?

⁴⁶⁸ Cf. Freedman and O'Connor 1986: 509, with references. Also cf. Goodenough 1953 and Ganschietz 1914.

⁴⁶⁹ Quoted in Goodenough 1953: 252.

⁴⁷⁰ Goodenough 1953: 252.

⁴⁷¹ Beaulieu 2011: 248, n. 7.

Although we were not able to establish a precise *terminus ad quem* for the time when the name Yahweh *even in Hebrew* was no longer used freely outside the temple but began to be substituted with Adonai, we noted that it was after the fifth century but is attested already at the end of the third or very beginning of the second (at Mt. Gerizim). This was a significant change since the *Hebrew tongue alone* was no longer the sanctum for the name Yahweh. Another desire led to its exclusive use in the temple by the priests. At the earliest, therefore, we propose it occurred in the fourth century possibly under the High Priesthood of Yôḥānān, who is found on a paleo-Hebrew coin. But it possibly could also have occurred in the third century. If the former is indeed the case, then it is no coincidence that this change parallels another major change we noted in the onomasticon of Yāhûd in the fourth century—the introduction of the phoneme /ō/ into PNNCSN with the initial abbreviated name (which was never the case before⁴⁷²) *first seen in this same high priest’s name in paleo-Hebrew script*, so that the <w> here became reflective of /ō/ from an orthographic standpoint. One must note that this phenomenon occurs in a Hebrew linguistic context, whereas changes in PNNCSN in the Neo-Babylonian and Persian periods were only in non-Hebrew contexts.⁴⁷³ But, we say here “introduction” since it should now be clear that this change cannot be adequately explained by any combination of phonological processes. Well, if it cannot, what else could possibly explain this latter phenomenon as we observe Yāhûd moving from the Persian into the Hellenistic period? In the light of the obvious religio-linguistic realities, they can only be related to tradition, and tradition that dates back to the exilic period.

3.2.4.2.2. A Major Revision of IMASN from Persian to Hellenistic Periods

From the Persian to the Hellenistic periods, we see clear developing trends in the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN. Remember, this convention was directly related to the desire to avoid use of the full name in a non-sacred non-Hebrew tongue, at that time especially Aramaic. Thus, in PNNCSN with the initial abbreviated sacred name, the /h/ became aspirated and the /w/ was made to reflect a /ū/ exactly as in (and in fact copied from) the toponym Yāhûd, producing PNNCSN with initial yāhû-, and thus barring the possibility for one pronouncing the sacred name (even if unintentional) as could be the case if the form yahw- was utilized—spelled ia-ʿ-û- in cuneiform. In addition, this final monosyllabic pronunciation of the abbreviated name could not be represented by <yhw->. Now, with the Hellenists and the new *lingua franca* of Greek, it is clear this tradition could not be perpetuated in this language. The absence of the phoneme /h/ in Greek would certainly inhibit the parallel form of yāhû- in this language, but would produce ιαου or ιαυ, which interestingly are the forms that we saw now in the Hellenistic period scrupulously avoided in both PNNCSN and incredibly also in the toponym Yahûdāh in

⁴⁷² The <w> was always reflective of either /w/ or /û/ (û).

⁴⁷³ Cf. above in the PNNCSN in the Persian period where we see that all the names in *paleo-Hebrew script* (with initial or final abbreviated name) are written *yhw*.

Greek transcriptions in Egypt and the Septuagint. Certainly, the grapheme <a> was now totally omitted from the first syllable in both these PNNCSN and the toponym. This is significant.

It is clear that we are here witnessing a major revision of the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN as it is now adapted to the Greek language. Hence, the source of the phonemic change is not to be found in any expected Hebrew phonological process, but rather in the traditions of the elites of Jewish society, beginning possibly with the high priest himself. The desire now was not only to continue with the ancient tradition of avoiding the potential pronunciation of the name Yahweh in a non-Hebrew tongue, but also to obscure its phonemic composition altogether, and, in PNNCSN with initial yhw- and vocalized yāhû-, this element would be exactly like that faced by the elites in the Neo-Babylonian period with the avoided ia³-û-, that is, now *ιαου* or *ιαυ*, with the /i/ followed by two contiguous vowels then the predicative element of the personal name. Hence, as yāhû- was no longer possible, they achieved their goal this time by allowing the <w> in the spelling of these names to now appear to reflect /ō/, and completely eliminated the phoneme /a/ in the initial syllable (as in <yw-> = /yō/), so that the abbreviated name in PNNCSN (regardless of orthography, which now suggests <yhw> = <yw>) would always phonemically produce /yō/ (yô), in which case the recovery of the Sacred Name was made quite impossible. But, yet, while doing this, they also shortened the initial syllables of the toponym to just one, also eliminating the /a/, so that they would now only be pronounced yû, and hence were clearly distinguished phonemically from the initial abbreviated name in PNNCSN, as would have certainly been the case in the Persian period in Hebrew. The terminal element -yh (-yāh) because of the absence of the <w> could not lead to a recovery and potential pronunciation of the sacred name and so again survived, but the taboo certainly ran deep as it too was avoided at times in Aramaic and Greek. But, those final forms with the <w>, which interestingly do occur, are transcribed *-ιους*, again eliminating the phoneme /ā/.⁴⁷⁴

The consistency with which this absence is attested strongly confirms that the changes are not related to changes in speech, but were ideological. This, along with further evidence below, also enhances our identification of IMASN being maintained into the Hellenistic period. Thus, it is rather easy to perceive that, at a time when the name Yahweh was not used publicly under any circumstances (even in Hebrew), PNNCSN would either be avoided or made quite unrepresentative of this name (also even in Hebrew). Hence, at the earliest phase of this phenomenon, inside the temple the correct pronunciation of such names (if known) would naturally have been used (among priests?), but not outside (double names?). At the period when even the priests in the temple would not use the name Yahweh, the correct pronunciation of PNNCSN with the initial abbreviated name would be avoided at all times. As to how this convention of IMASN was implemented in the onomasticon of Yahûdāh, it may have been by administrative means, just as the full form of the Sacred Name was prohibited, but coupled with propaganda (see below), such as can be deduced from a consideration of Jewish numismatics. Once established locally, it would then spread to other communities directly or indirectly.

⁴⁷⁴ Cf. Honigman 2004: 295. Cf. also CPJ I 73 and Porten and Yardeni 1986–89 (D21.8:1).

The epigraphic evidence, of course, indicates this. Again, we saw that the convention called for the transformation of the phonological structure of the initial abbreviated name to *yô*, and this now whether the language was Greek, Aramaic, or even Hebrew. Thus, at the earliest period, in Egypt, in Aramaic documents the long form (<yhw>) in initial position is virtually nonexistent after the fourth century,⁴⁷⁵ and the Greek transcriptions there do not once reflect the initial phonemes /a/ or /ā/ within the initial abbreviated name in PNNCSN as just noted. However, the long form still predominates in *Yahûdāh* after the fourth century B.C.E. But, the variations from this long form on some coin types of the high priests⁴⁷⁶ and even on ossuaries clearly indicates a desire to equate all forms with this new pronunciation, especially when *yhw-* was equated with *īω-* in personal names on bilingual ossuaries.⁴⁷⁷ But more important than this phenomenon was the increase in popularity of the personal name *Yôsēp* with its new spelling, now primarily written <yhwsp>! We are clearly observing a religio-linguistic convention that certainly avoided an ancient linguistic reality. But yet, the realities are more complex, since, although thoroughly enforced, as can be seen in the new popularity of this personal name (*Yôsēp*) and in our transcription *iāō* in the Hellenistic period, IMASN still saw challenges against its basic tenets.

3.2.4.2.3. IMASN in the Hellenistic Period—Enforced Thoroughly Yet Not Unchallenged

3.2.4.2.3.1. IMASN enforced

3.2.4.2.3.1.1. *iāō*

From the sobering observations above pertaining to the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN reflected in the changes in PNNCSN and the toponym *Yahûdāh* now in the Hellenistic period, it is now clear that *īω* was merely an aspect of this religio-linguistic convention. We have just seen that *-yāhû-/Yahû-* could not be tolerated in those personal names or in the toponym. In both this original compound form was modified. Thus, it is really not surprising at all now to see this new innovation of *iāō* appearing instead of our Persian-period form *Yāhû-*, with the only difference being that this new name is never found compounded in personal names, but was constructed to represent the source of *īω-* (*yô-*) in PNNCSN. Thus it seems obvious that the convention placed the independent name *Yāhû* likewise in the avoided taboo, since it would immediately be connected with PNNCSN, and hence the appearance of this independent name is directly related to IMASN now in this period. Whether the community in Idumea followed closely the demands of the elites in *Yahûdāh* is not known, but what is known is that by the second century we do see a Greek *īω* for *Yahweh* in a Septuagint fragment and in other contexts.

⁴⁷⁵ Cf. Porten and Yardeni 1986–89 (TAD A–D).

⁴⁷⁶ In the case of Alexander Jannaeus, all variations are found, *y-*, *yh-*, *yw-*, and *yhw-*.

⁴⁷⁷ Cf. Ilan 2002: 145, 150, and 168.

The only logical explanation for how this unique spelling arose from independent Yāhû is that it was adapted to Greek via IMASN by the elites to allow $\iota\omega$ to be an alternative name for Yahweh throughout the Hellenistic world (just as was done with -yāhû- in the Neo-Babylonian period), thus not necessarily applicable to previous fourth-century bona fide worshipers of Yāhû, such as in Idumea. Its use in the LXX then seems to actually have been for Greeks who would desire to know the “sacred name” of the Jews, but which Jewish tradition could not permit in a foreign tongue and especially now in pagan Hellenistic contexts. But, another method to achieve the goal of the elites would also have been the utilization of the paleo-Hebrew script for the Sacred Name in the Greek text itself. Thus, it certainly seems that the spelling $\iota\omega$ was actually coined because of the $\iota\omega$ - in PNNCSN, and not $\iota\omega$ - resulting from $\iota\omega$, since the Persian period Yāhû otherwise produced forms with only /ū/ (with the /a/ phoneme being avoided in all spellings of this form), such as our form $\iota\omicron\upsilon$, the common transcription of the original name of the biblical Yāhû’ (Jehu),⁴⁷⁸ the transcriptions of which indicate just as clearly as the phenomenon with the personal name Yôsēp how very thorough the elites were in implanting IMASN deep within the onomastica.

3.2.4.2.3.1.2. Yəhōsēp or Yôsēp?

We return to one of our initial discussions in this study and again highlight W. F. Albright’s statement of “the equally absurd *Yehōsef* for *Yōsef*.”⁴⁷⁹ What linguistic reality must be evident for the name $ywsp$ to become $yhwsp$, especially when it is clear that this ancient name was a causative jussive 3rd m. s. (with $\delta < aw$) and not a PNCNS?⁴⁸⁰ Albright (and others) in his analysis with the evidence at the time associated this phenomenon (*yəhōsēp*) to the pre-exilic period, where the northern Israelite form yw - penetrated the southern Kingdom for a period, but was changed back to yhw -. The form $yhwsp$, however, is not found in the pre-exilic period.⁴⁸¹ It is found only after the fifth century, and we noted this personal name already on the Mt. Gerizim inscriptions and on a Gezer ostrakon.⁴⁸² Now, in our study, it should be obvious that the orthography for this personal name is directly related to the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN. Not only can this form *only occur* at a time when the abbreviated Sacred Name began to be vocalized $y\delta$, but it also can occur when there was certainly a *great desire* to make the orthography $<yhw>$ be indicative likewise of this vocalization. Thus, in the third century B.C.E. in Greek documents especially from Middle and Lower Egypt we find an increase in popularity already of this personal name,⁴⁸³ and on the ossuaries from Jerusalem that dates from the first century B.C.E. to the first century C.E. we also find

⁴⁷⁸ Cf. just above.

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. Albright 1924: 374 and Albright 1925: 158.

⁴⁸⁰ Cf. Zadok 1988: 134.

⁴⁸¹ Cf. Avigad and Sass 1997; Zadok 1988.

⁴⁸² Cf. just above.

⁴⁸³ Cf. Honigman 2004; Ilan 2002; Clarysse 1994.

both spellings utilized, both of which would obviously be vocalized *yô*.⁴⁸⁴ Hence, this early orthography for this personal name most likely was, in fact, a propagandistic element within the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN. But, exceptions do exist, and it is these exceptions that more fully indicate the strong connection between the religious context of the full name (its use and reverence) and the correct abbreviated name in PNNCSN and also brings to the forefront an important observation made by scholars of Greco-Roman onomastics.

3.2.4.2.3.2. IMASN challenged?

3.2.4.2.3.2.1. *yswn* (ἰάσων, Jason)

We mentioned above that the name *ιαω* occurs only independently for Yahweh and never in PNNCSN transcribed into Greek within the Jewish onomastica. But, were there any instances in which the original phoneme (/ā/) could be utilized? Or better, did anyone maintain the original pronunciation of the initial abbreviated name in PNNCSN at any time in apparent violation of the stipulations of the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN? This convention was utilized so that the name Yahweh would not be pronounced or recovered; to them, it was sacred, obviously, not the abbreviated pronunciation, since the short final form of the abbreviated name (-*yh*) survived and was used in the normative community.⁴⁸⁵ Therefore, if the phoneme /ā/ is contained in an initial syllable of a personal name after a /y/, this name obviously could not be a PNNCSN and have a *Hebrew* predicative element following that initial syllable, since this would betray the correct abbreviated name as represented in its *common* orthographic representation (*yhw-*) and, consequently, possibly also betray the full name Yahweh. It is in this context then that we may refer to a significant statement made by Clarysse, who, in discussing the Jews in Trikomia that customarily chose names that were “phonetically close to an original Jewish name,” noted that, “The Greek name Jason was popular with the Jews since its first syllable reminded them of the numerous Jewish names beginning with Jahweh.”⁴⁸⁶ Thus, this personal name highlights a subtle workaround. Clarysse surely noted that this name was not Hebrew but originally Greek, but apparently chosen because it bore an initial syllable with /a/. This is significant since we do find a Hellenistic high priest with this Greek name, which is then associated with the PNNCSN *yšwʿ*, but yet, in Hebrew there is no /a/ vowel in the first syllable of the conventional pronunciation,⁴⁸⁷ and this name is already found associated with Jews in Egypt in the middle of the third century.⁴⁸⁸ From our standpoint the reason seems obvious.

⁴⁸⁴ Cf. Ilan 2002: 150–168.

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. Lauterbach 1931: 62–67.

⁴⁸⁶ Clarysse 1994: 199.

⁴⁸⁷ T. Ilan (2002: 289) notes that “Many assume that Jason is the Hellenized form of Joshua.” Also cf. Foerster 1965: 286.

⁴⁸⁸ Cf. Clarysse 1994: 196.

3.2.4.2.3.2.2. yn'y (ἰανναῖος, King Alexander)

We may compound this with another interesting observation. The unique abbreviated form of the Hasmonean king and high priest Alexander (103–76 B.C.E.) was yn'y (*yannay*), spelled ἰανναῖος in Greek, which is thought to be an abbreviation of *yhwntn*, but again the initial syllable of *yhwntn* does not carry the phoneme /a/ or /ā/ (at least not under the stipulations of IMASN). But, importantly, the -n'y element shows no connection to the Hebrew -ntn of the full form. These are clear indications of workarounds that do reveal the “correct” abbreviated name, but yet still allow conformity to *an apparent prohibition*. The phoneme in this initial syllable must be /ā/, so that the abbreviated Sacred Name is *iā-*. Remember, we have shown above that this pronunciation applied to *all the pre-exilic and post-exilic ancient forms* of the abbreviated Sacred Name, so that it is applicable to -yahw-, -yaw-, yā-, -yāh, and even later post-exilic yāh- (= -yāh). Certainly, the first and most ancient form (and the ubiquitous form in pre-exilic Yahūdāh) could be transcribed -iav-; however, in Greek this would not produce the lower-mid/open-mid, back vowel phoneme (IPA /ɔ/), but rather the /y/ followed by two consecutive vowel phonemes, as in the diphthong in ἰαύδα. Therefore, it is obvious why now in Greek although we would expect iav- in those rare workarounds of IMASN, we now find simply iā- being accepted (and avoided in PNNCSN). But, although the initial syllable of the Greek name Jason has no connection to the Sacred Name, the same cannot be said for the name yn'y (ἰανναῖος), since it is certainly an abbreviation of *yhwntn*, the king's full name, although it is also found in the Septuagint reflecting a different name, ya'nay. It is, therefore, the closest any Hebrew PNCSN from the Graeco-Roman period has come to its correct form without violating the stipulations of the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN, but had to first be ambiguously abbreviated, and is, therefore, quite different from the Greek name Jason. However, being that the religious context of the name Yahweh saw the high priest as the last to pronounce the Tetragrammaton, this subtlety with regard to the high priest in this late period is actually not unexpected. However, yet another name, apart from its enigmatic history, also finds attestations that, too, not only confirm the necessity for a consideration of the religious context of the name Yahweh in its case, but also makes this name the first of those recorded thus far in our post fourth century onomastic repertoire to be completely unconventional as regards the stipulations of IMASN—the Hebrew name *yhwš*^c.

3.2.4.2.3.2.3. yhwš^c

3.2.4.2.3.2.3.1. IMASN produces fourth century yēšû^c not yôšû^c—an anomaly

Many have been baffled by the form of this name and also the name *yēhû'* (which have generally been placed in the same category) for a long time simply because it is not at all quite certain exactly what form they exhibit. They have before been supposed to be the product of *dissimilation* so that the

same or similar vowels would not follow each other in the PNNCSN, so the δ became \bar{e} .⁴⁸⁹ Praetorius, however, saw them as caritatives, in which the hypocoristic element alone is left.⁴⁹⁰ But, since we have proven, we believe, that $y\bar{e}h\hat{u}'$ actually should be $y\bar{a}h\hat{u}'$, the change resulting from the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN (as seen in LXX transcriptions), there is no reason to not consider this strange form of $y\bar{e}\check{s}\hat{u}'$ (ישיע) too as a resultant of IMASN. However, it is not at all quite that simple with this name as we stated above. The post-fourth century B.C.E. spelling should also have been as is found with all other PNNCSN with the initial abbreviated name, that is, either mostly in the long form (yhw -) or the new short form (yw -), in addition to this even shorter form used—but all with the pronunciation $y\hat{o}$ -. Instead, it consistently attests to *only* this very short orthography of $\langle y\check{s}w^c \rangle$ and vocalized $y\bar{e}\check{s}\hat{u}'$, so that the abbreviated name is represented here as $y\bar{e}$ - and not $y\hat{o}$ -.⁴⁹¹ The change is, therefore, chronologically paralleled to all other PNNCSN that began using initial $y\hat{o}$ -, which in those names clearly indicated this new abbreviation of Yahweh (ω - = yhw -, as in יהוסף for Joseph above). In any event we can say that after IMASN was revised for the Greek language by the elites of Yahūdāh beginning in the fourth century, while other PNNCSN were spelled regularly $\langle yhw \rangle$, $\langle yw \rangle$, along with $\langle y \rangle$, but vocalized $y\hat{o}$ -, this name began to be spelled exclusively $\langle y \rangle$, and vocalized $y\bar{e}$ -, not $y\hat{o}$ -.⁴⁹² One may presume this to be insignificant; however, once one realizes that this shorter orthography as found in Ezra-Nehemiah, where it primarily refers to the Zadokite high priest that returned from captivity, actually conflicts with the prophetic texts of Zechariah and Haggai that use the full spelling of $\langle yhw\check{s}^c \rangle$ for the same person (in both this PNCNSN and in his patronym $y\hat{o}\check{s}\bar{a}d\bar{a}q$), not only is there an obvious confirmation of possibly a fourth-century literary influence, but one is also forced to contemplate why this unique pronunciation was utilized in this name when IMASN was revised by the elites from the fourth century on when it was clearly spelled $\langle yhw \rangle$ in the post-exilic period.⁴⁹³ We have no definite answers as of yet, but we can speculate.

First of all, while the choice of the phoneme $/\bar{o}/$ in the change in the initial abbreviated name of PNNCSN by the elites of Jewish society in the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN can be seen as being out of convenience due to the capabilities of the $/w/$ as a *mater lexionis* for both $/\bar{u}/$ and $/\bar{o}/$ at that time, the abbreviated name must still somehow be phonologically connected to its source—the name of the *deity* it represents. Of course, we have already shown that $i\bar{a}\bar{o}$ was not used in the normative Jewish community, but was for the Greeks to use instead of the Sacred Name,⁴⁹⁴ so the phoneme $/\bar{o}/$ would not be reflective of $i\bar{a}\bar{o}$ to them (but this *must have been* certainly constructed to be so associated

⁴⁸⁹ Cf. Foerster 1965: 284, n. 1; Gesenius 1910: 92.

⁴⁹⁰ Praetorius 1905: 342.

⁴⁹¹ Again, the reason for the form $Y\hat{o}h\hat{u}'$ (yhw') is clear, as its earlier form was $Y\hat{a}h\hat{u}'$. This name never attests to any longer spelling for the abbreviated name. That places the name $y\bar{e}\check{s}\hat{u}'$ quite apart from it and all other PNNCSN.

⁴⁹² Cf. section 3.2.2.5 above, where the name is already found utilizing this orthography in the Mt. Gerizim inscriptions dating about 200 B.C.E.

⁴⁹³ Cf. Ilan 1988: 7 (Hebrew). Also note that 2 Chronicles 31:15 utilizes this late orthography of $\langle y\check{s}w \rangle$ for a pre-exilic personage.

⁴⁹⁴ Cf. above in section 3.2.4.2.3.1.1.

to outsiders). The only logical and sensible alternative suggestion *a priori* would be the /ō/ is now connected to that in ʾĀdōnāy, the new substitute for Yahweh, as the /a/ just could not work. Again, remember that these abbreviations of Yahweh were not produced through linguistic processes; therefore, we cannot look to a phonological process to explain their appearance, but to ideology, as we have just shown these new forms to be somehow connected with a very deliberate, precise religio-linguistic convention. Therefore, returning to the peculiar *yēšūʿ* found now already in the second century B.C.E., this name appearing exclusively in this form does not seem to represent Yahweh or even ʾĀdōnāy at all, being generally considered hypocoristic. It appears that our only knowledge of it being a PNCSN is because of the biblical manuscripts attesting to *yhwšʿ* for the Israelite general or the high priest, where the <yhw-> could only be pronounced *yô-* in this late period. Why would this be? All evidence points to the fourth century revision of IMASN and a specific targeting of this PNCSN. Of course, our general knowledge of the fourth century B.C.E. Palestine is limited, but some information comes from Josephus, who does speak of a fourth century *ἰησοῦς*, who was the *brother* of the high priest Yôḥānān (same Yôḥānān as is depicted on silver coin, according to Cross). Josephus documents in *AJ* 11:7 that he was slain by this same high priest while they quarreled in the Temple at some point within the period of 358–338 B.C.E.⁴⁹⁵ There is no reason to question the accuracy of this account as given by Josephus, but it certainly speaks to some significant developments in fourth century Palestine.

However, the fourth century also sees the exposure of Palestine to Greek influences and deities, among other avenues, through numismatics, where we find coins of Greek, Phoenician, Jewish, Samaritan, and other minting all bearing imagery of deities with various inscriptions.⁴⁹⁶ For one, there is the famous drachm with the Greek-looking deity on a winged wheel with the inscription YHD (formerly thought to be YHW), which has been declared by some to be the representation of the Jewish deity because of its similarity in depiction to Zeus, as it is seated on a throne, etc.⁴⁹⁷ Knoppers notes a “stronger western cultural influence in Samaria than in contemporary Yehud,” where he noted on a Samaritan coin the Greek deity Zeus, spelled IEYΣ, who was also depicted as seated on a throne, with a PNCSN spelled *yhwʿnh* on its reverse, and on another coin the name KAEYΣ (Heracles).⁴⁹⁸ But there is no evidence of any early syncretism in Yahûdāh in the fourth century. The name *yēšūʿ*, therefore, must remain partially anomalous. However, let us not forget that when we consider the association between the religious context of the name Yahweh as established for the Nazarenes and PNCSN, the name *yhwšʿ* becomes even more significant especially because it was borne by another famous Jew in the late Second Temple period but had unusual emphasis in the NT, making it unlike its onomastic parallel <yšwʿ> .

⁴⁹⁵ Cf. Cross 1998: 153-156 for a reconstruction of the genealogy of the high priests from Nehemiah’s time to the Hellenistic period. Cross sees this Yôḥānān as Yôḥānān III, grandson of the Yāhûḥānān of the Elephantine papyri.

⁴⁹⁶ Cf. Stern 2001: 558-570. Many of the coins follow the dominant Athenian minting standard with the head of Athena and an owl, with olive spray, with the abbreviation AΘE (ATHE for Athens). Cf. Meshorer 2001: 7-8.

⁴⁹⁷ Cf. Meshorer 2001: 2.

⁴⁹⁸ Knoppers 2006: 277; Cf. Meshorer and Qedar 1999: 29, 90-91 and Meshorer 2001: 3 for depiction of the Samaritan coin.

3.2.4.2.3.2.3.2. Only true challenge to IMASN epigraphy and papyrology have produced

There is one more important deviation in transcription that so far has no parallels in our onomastica with regards not only to this PNCSN but also to all PNNCSN transcribed into Greek, and yet greatly substantiates our analysis. We noted in the case of Alexander Jannaeus that his abbreviated name *yn'y* (*ἰανναῖος*) was the closest any PNCSN came to its correct form without violating the stipulations of IMASN, and we expected this based on the religious context of the Name *Yahweh*. Being that this high priest in that period (103–76 B.C.E.) was the only one allowed to use the Sacred Name, it is expected that he would desire its correct form to be included in his personal name if the restrictions of the full name relate to the initial abbreviated Sacred Name also; certainly, he was *Yahweh*'s anointed priest. For others who didn't and couldn't use the name at all by prohibition, such attestations as with Alexander may not have been the case with regards to their PNNCSN. Nevertheless, the name *yn'y* is still incomplete from an onomastic standpoint, as the predicative element (*-n'y*) is rather obscure as far as the subject (<y- = *Yahweh*) is concerned. However, when it comes to another particular deviation, the same cannot be said. We mentioned above the PNCSN recorded in Greek as *ιασοῦου* in 124 C.E. T. Ilan noted that the quite conventional orthographic customs (but unconventional declension) in this particular PNCSN produced this rather unconventional spelling for it, and concludes it is a result of a scribal idiosyncrasy.⁴⁹⁹ From an onomastic standpoint this is certainly a *bona fide Hebrew PNCSN*, but in this case even more so than *ἰανναῖος* (*yn'y*), since it is very clear what the predicative element *-σσοῦ* is—i.e. Hebrew *šū'* (with Greek *σσ* = š [sh], as is found infrequently in Septuagint transcriptions⁵⁰⁰)—and the abbreviated name is actually correctly transcribed (as best as it could be in Greek), so that *ια-* represents *iā-* (<i> followed by IPA /ɔ/), as discussed above. But, the context in which the transcription (actually written twice) occurs is even more important than the very existence of the transcription itself when one analyzes the *editio princeps*.⁵⁰¹

We noted above that the *persons bearing the names didn't use this particular orthography themselves* as almost all the other instances of Babatha's first husband's and son's name (patronymy, father and son bearing same name) in other documents are written conventionally as *ιησοῦ* or *ιησοῦου* with uncommon declension (P. Yadin 13-15, 17), and represented by *yšw'* in the Aramaic documents. However, our unconventional transcriptions were the product of the *governmental authorities* in the town council of the metropolis of Petra (*βουλῆς Πετραίων τῆς μητροπόλεως*) that produced *official records or minutes* (*ἄκτα*) of their appointing two named guardians for the orphan by this name (Babatha's son) in the first half of 124 C.E., of which the document in Babatha's archive (P. Yadin 12 in *editio princeps*) was a *verified and exact extract from these official government minutes*, which were displayed to the public in the Aphrodite

⁴⁹⁹ Ilan 2002: 132.

⁵⁰⁰ Cf. Ilan 2002: 18, 132. This convention is also used to transliterate the *šadē* in personal names as well.

⁵⁰¹ Lewis 1989.

Temple (Ἀφροδείσιω) in Petra.⁵⁰² But, the choice of this orthography for this particular PNCSN by the authorities in the council is significant. It could not emanate from the normative and even many in the sectarian Jewish community, as this initial syllable containing the phoneme /ā/ in a genuine PNCSN fell in with IMASN and was clearly an avoided taboo in this period as shown above.⁵⁰³

We suspected from Foerster's, Zadok's, and T. Ilan's note about the name in rabbinic literature that there was more ideology associated with the forms as utilized than is apparent, since the regular orthographic practice of using יהושע rather than ישוע (ἰησοῦ) is not just "a return to the biblical form,"⁵⁰⁴ since they maintained יהונן (Yôḥānān) for יהוהנן. They reserved ישוע for the leader of the Nazarenes. But, there is also a peculiar emphasis in the NT on the name of the leader of the Nazarenes, the identified Messiah, which, too, provokes great curiosity, especially when considering the simple meaning and frequent attestation in epigraphy and papyrology of ἰησοῦς for ישוע, which meaning cannot be clearly shown as the form of this hypocoristic name is not certainly known. Therefore, from what we presented above regarding the religious context of the name Yahweh in this period among the Nazarenes, coupled with these data now, we seemed to have touched upon a lost reality,⁵⁰⁵ the very name which was declared by Paul to be "the name which is above every name."⁵⁰⁶ This orthography from Petra which was an accurate transcription of the ancient form of this PNCSN prior to the onset of the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN at the beginning of the exile (which would have produced *yāhūšū' [and abbreviated name written *ia-(a-)ḥu-(u/ū)-* in Neo-Babylonian cuneiform]) and its major revision in the fourth century (which should have produced only yōšū', but instead became almost exclusively yēšū') we believe was *representative* of the leader of the Nazarenes, which became a well-known sect in the first century C.E. and which tradition placed as relocating to Transjordan after 69 C.E.⁵⁰⁷

However, one may argue that this indicates nothing of the sort since this transcription by the council at Petra could be seen as merely by one who did not follow the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN and so transcribed *all* proper names phonetically correct. But, against this, we would refer again to P. Yadin 12 in the *editio princeps* and indicate that the name of one of the guardians in this same official document (itself a PNCSN) was indeed transcribed ἰωάννης ἐγλα (and spelled ywḥnh 'gl' [yôḥānā 'eglā] in P. Yadin 15 in the Aramaic portion of the text⁵⁰⁸) and the ethnonym of the orphan transcribed as ἰουδαίου. Any knowledge of the convention of IMASN would have necessarily affected either this PNCSN or the ethnonym derived from the toponym (properly *Yahūdāh*), which, as we saw, are unaffected. The former is transcribed conventionally with ἰω-, and not ἰα-, and remember the latter was found transcribed

⁵⁰² Lewis 1989: 47–50.

⁵⁰³ Cf. Ilan 2002.

⁵⁰⁴ Foerster 1965: 287.

⁵⁰⁵ Cf. also Reisel's note about the tannaitic tradition of the name being taught to *selected students* once every seven years (1957: 68).

⁵⁰⁶ Phil 2:9.

⁵⁰⁷ Tradition in the histories placed the Nazarenes as relocating to Pella, although Petra has been infrequently suggested in later discussions. The fact is the Nazarenes had a presence in Transjordan after 69 C.E.

⁵⁰⁸ Cf. Lewis 1989: 60.

correctly as *ιαύδα* above in 172 C.E., but as a personal name (father of one Titus). In other words, the authors clearly have /yōḥānāh/ and /yūdāh/ as phonologically realities, alongside /yāšū/ (= *yahwšū*^c = יהושע).

3.2.4.2.3.2.3.3. In the New Testament?

It would be a very difficult argument for one to deny the implications of the phenomenon of the new spelling יהוסף (like a genuine PNCSN; unique only to this late period) for Joseph (יהושף), or the equating of the Greek name *ιάσων* with *yēšū*^c by the Hellenistic high priest, or the unique abbreviation *ιανναῖος* (*ya'naï*) for *yhwntn* (יהונתן) the high priest, especially when it is well-known that obvious phonological changes occurred at the end of the Persian period but have not been understood. When we add to these our peculiar (but *linguistically accurate*) transcription of *ιασοῦου* at Petra around the first quarter of the second century C.E., we believe we have acquired an even clearer lens through which we can recognize another aspect of our peculiar *nomina sacra* and consider the name of the identified Messiah of the NT.

We already noted above the significant fact of the so-called *nomina sacra* in the NT, which not only included ΘΣ and ΚΣ, but also ΙΣ (or ΙΗ) and even ΧΣ. Thus, these four abbreviations point to a commonality that caused their appearance in the earliest NT documents. Nevertheless, as we just noted, there is certainly an enigmatic emphasis in the NT on the name of the leader of the Nazarenes, and many examples can be cited in support of this. One certain *locus classicus* for this emphasis is Acts 4:12, where Peter says Ἦ οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς. (. . . for neither is there any other name under heaven given among men in which we must be saved). This statement was given in the middle of a particular account wherein the leaders capture and question Peter and John, then specifically charge them not to speak any more nor teach in this name.⁵⁰⁹ That pattern is continued, however, with Paul, who declares καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὄνομα (and gave to him *the name which is above every name*).⁵¹⁰ Yet, we will also note the belief in the name (John 3:18), baptizing in the name (Acts 2:38), the calling upon the name (1 Cor 1:2), and the giving thanks in the name (Eph 5:20). However, we do all remember that the name *יהשוּע* (*yēšū*^c) was very common at the time as seen from the Babatha archive above, for example. Consequently, we must pinpoint this one particular name to be specific to the peculiarity and then associate it with the religious context of the Name Yahweh and hence to the leader of the Nazarenes.

But, Paul's statement in Phil 2:9 leads to one more observation, however. We have thus far followed the principle that the religious context of the name Yahweh is such that its informed use carries over into the onomasticon where it is utilized, so that use of the name produces the use of its correct abbreviation. However, in this last first century C.E. case of the use of the name and correct abbreviation it is not quite certain if this same principle could fully apply, because now we have a unique case wherein the bearer

⁵⁰⁹ Acts 4:18.

⁵¹⁰ Phil 2:9.

of the completely phonologically accurate PNCSN is a revered figure. And, the possession of the name Yahweh within one's personal name was considered highly honorable. Hence, knowledge of the accuracy of PNNCSN in this last instance may not have translated necessarily into utilization in other Hebrew personal names, although it appeared to for Jannaeus the high priest. Nevertheless, it should be clear from this analysis that the name *ἰησοῦ* (*yēšū'*) for the leader of the Nazarenes in the evangels is *odd* at the least, but a result of *early document alteration* for whatever reason at best.

3.2.4.2.3.2.3.4. *Māšīh*, *ΧΣ*, and *χρηστιανός*

We will now treat the remaining term of the so-called *nomina sacra* primarily for its close association with (and even extension of) the PNCSN used by the leader of the Nazarenes, *עֲשֵׂה*, having arrived at the status of *nomen* in the NT, but also for the amazing credence it lends to our support for the problem of early document alteration.⁵¹¹ We mentioned in passing above that the root of the term *χρηστιανός* is “NOT WITHOUT its own historical discrepancies,” but this is not as surprising to us since we have proven above that of the four curious so-called *nomina sacra* three of them were almost certainly replacements of actual Hebrew sacred names and titles used by the early Nazarenes and consequently maintained by Gentile converts, which certainly left the remaining fourth quite suspect. This remaining so-called *nomen sacrum* is *χριστός*, abbreviated *ΧΣ*, which is evident in *χρηστιανός*.

Historically, not much can be said of this term other than it is found in the LXX for the Hebrew *Māšīh* (*Masoretic* *מָשִׁיחַ* with *patach furtivum* at pharyngeal). The term *χριστός* is understood as being derived from *χρίω*, “anoint in our lit. only in a fig. sense of anointing by *G o d*.”⁵¹² It was simply seen as a Greek alternative to *Māšīh*, *anointed*, which is from *māšah*, *to anoint*. Yet, as simple a Greek equivalent as this term appears to have been in the present NT manuscripts, the same simplicity of understanding is often lacking in antiquity when one considers the earliest literary and epigraphic/papyrological evidence for the terms *χριστός* and *χρηστιανός*, about which there is a growing literature.

Beginning in the second century C.E. literary sources, one observes a phenomenon that has been variously discussed as a seeming “confusion” or “confusing” of the terms *χριστός* and *χρηστιανός* with the quite frequently attested terms *χρηστός* and *χρηστιανός*, which has an entirely different meaning altogether as we will see next. Robert Van Voorst discussed this strange phenomenon evident from various Latin (and Greek) sources including: Tacitus (c. 116),⁵¹³ Suetonius (c.120),⁵¹⁴ Justin Martyr (150 C.E. in Greek),⁵¹⁵ Tertullian (197 C.E.),⁵¹⁶ Lactantius (309 C.E.),⁵¹⁷ funerary Greek inscriptions from Phrygia

⁵¹¹ We will not treat this topic extensively, as it lies somewhat outside the scope of the present work, but must be included for the sake of continuity and clarification.

⁵¹² Arndt and Gingrich 1979: 887.

⁵¹³ *Annals* 15.44.2–3. Tacitus speaks of some “quos per flagitia invisos, vulgus Chrestianos appellabat,” (whom the crowd called ‘Chrestians’) but then uses Christ: “Auctor nominis eius Christus.”

⁵¹⁴ *Claudius* 25.4. Suetonius uses Chrestus: “Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit.”

⁵¹⁵ 1 *Apology* 4.1. “Χρηστιανοί γὰρ εἶναι κατηγορούμεθα · τὸ δὲ χρηστὸν μισεῖσθαι οὐ δίκαιον.”

dating 240–310 C.E.,⁵¹⁸ papyrus P72⁵¹⁹ (third-fourth century) Greek biblical texts with 1 Pet 2:3 reading *χριστός* instead of *χρηστός*, and even Codex Sinaiticus (fourth century), which has *χρησιανός* in all three references where *χρησιανός* is now found in the Greek NT.⁵²⁰ The discrepancies are quite pronounced. Van Voorst discussed two primary reasons for the supposed “confusion”: 1) phonological changes involving a merger of /i/ and /ē/, so when *iota* is heard *eta* is written, and 2) deliberate social preferences for the more familiar and common *χρηστός*. Why would fourth century Codex Sinaiticus spell *χρησιανός* everywhere *χρησιανός* or P72 change the usual adjective *χρηστός* to *χριστός* just before *ὁ κύριος*? It would be well for us to consider next the definition of *χρηστός* and its historical attestation before the first century C.E.

The Arndt and Gingrich Greek lexicon defines the term *χρηστός* as “useful, suitable, worthy, good.” As an adjective it is, “a. of things—α. good, pleasant, kindly, easy (to wear). . . β. (morally) good, reputable” As a substantive it is “kindness.”⁵²¹ In tomb inscriptions in Leontopolis (Tel el-Yehoudieh), Egypt, documented by Horbury and Noy in *Jewish Inscriptions of Greco-Roman Egypt*, we find *χρηστός*, where it is mostly in the vocative and translated “excellent one.”⁵²² Inscription no. 73 from 7 B.C.E. gives the reading, Νικομήδη χρηστὲ πασίφιλε χαῖρε· ὡς (ἐτῶν) κ'. (ἔτους) κε' Χο(ῖακ) η' . (Nikomede, excellent one, friend of all, farewell. About 20 years old. In the 25th year, Choiak 8 [?]). Another inscription (no. 74) dating around 5 B.C.E. reads: Μάριο[ν] χρηστὴ πασίφιλος ἄλυπος· κλαύσατε· ὡς ἐτῶν εἴκοσι τρίω[ν]. (ἔτους) κε' Κα[ίσα(ρος), Παῦ]νι λ'.⁵²³ No. 77 from Horbury and Noy 1992 has: ἄωρε πασίφιλε χρηστὲ χαῖρε· ὡς ἐτῶν εἴκοσι δ[ύο]. (ἔτους). (K....., untimely dead, fiend of all, excellent one, farewell. About twenty-two years old. In the ... year....)⁵²⁴ We learn that the formula is quite consistent, but does have variations. One inscription (no. 78) from the same place and period (Leontopolis, 1 B.C.E.-1 C.E.) actually changes the usual *χρηστὲ* (along with the other adjectives) to the nominative: Δωσᾶς ἄωρος χρηστός πασίφιλος ἄλοιπος χαῖρε· ὡς ἡ'. Τευφίλα γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἀνέθηκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ. (Dosas, untimely dead, excellent one, friend of all, who caused pain to none, farewell. About 18 [years old]. Theophila his wife raised [this stone] on his behalf.)⁵²⁵ The editors then note about *χρηστός*: “This stele is unusual both in specifying who erected it and in describing the deceased man in the nominative rather than the vocative; even the very common

⁵¹⁶ 1 *Apology* 3.5. Tertullian declares “. . . you wrongly pronounce it Chrestian.”

⁵¹⁷ *Divine Institutes* 4.7.5. Lactantius speaks of “the error of ignorant people” who wrongly call him “Chrestus.”

⁵¹⁸ E. Gibson 1978 in Van Voorst 2000: 35, about which Van Voorst comments: “In the forty-five inscriptions Gibson reproduces and analyzes, only six have correct spelling.” (Van Voorst 2000: 35, n. 45)

⁵¹⁹ Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX: VII L’Épître de Jude; VIII Les deux Épître de Pierre; IX Les Psaumes 33 et 34, ed. MTestuz, 1959.

⁵²⁰ Van Voorst 2000: 29–46. Levinskaya also briefly discusses these difficulties (1999: 178–82).

⁵²¹ Arndt and Gingrich 1979: 886.

⁵²² Horbury and Noy 1992.

⁵²³ Horbury and Noy 1992: 143–145.

⁵²⁴ Horbury and Noy 1992: 148.

⁵²⁵ Horbury and Noy 1992: 149.

χρηστέ occurs here with the nominative ending. Although the vocative was in regular use at Tell el-Yehoudieh, its replacement by the nominative has been noted as a feature of New Testament Greek.”⁵²⁶

It is clear that *χρηστός* was a common term of complement or commendation in the Greek speaking world, but is this enough for someone familiar with a *χριστός* with the presumed religious weight behind it to rather prefer *excellent one* over *follower of χριστός*? This seems at the crux of Van Voorst’s discussion. Discussing the aspects of possible phonological confusion between the two terms, Van Voorst noted,

Friedrich Blass argued more than a century ago that the forms *Χριστος* and *Χριστιανος* were greatly preferred by Christian writers from the New Testament on, while non-Christians typically used *Χρηστος* and *Χρηστιανος*.⁴⁴ However, this phonological confusion between *iota* and *eta* was, to judge from the surviving manuscript and inscriptional evidence, present to a significant degree among Christians as well.⁵²⁷

Van Voorst is consequently inclined to see *χρηστός* the product of a phonological confusion of the *iota* with the sound of the *eta* in addition to personal preferences by some. He concluded,

What Elsa Gibson concludes about the usage in the Phrygian inscriptions is true in general: ‘Occurrences of the form with *eta* seem to be deliberate; the word ‘Christian’ was mistakenly thought to be derived from *Χρηστος*.’⁴⁸ So by the slightest of changes, aided by converging vowel sounds, some Christians and many pagans changed the strange name ‘Christos/Christus’ into a name more familiar and intelligible, ‘Chrestos/Chrestus.’⁵²⁸

Van Voorst, and of course many modern authors, maintained the natural expectation of a *χριστός* behind the unusual attestations of *χρηστιανός*, therefore, seeing *χρηστός* as obviously a mistake for the common *χριστός*. But, still, problems exist.

As often as the title become name *χριστός* is now found in the NT, we may think that very early such “confusion” of *χριστός* with *χρηστός*, even resulting in *χρηστιανός*, by anyone connected with the NT (whether pagan convert or historian) should not be as pronounced as the current literary and epigraphic material indicate. Yet, just as we saw above with the other terms of significance, we appear to be seeing another deviation from the reality that existed within the earliest assembly of believers in the NT. Just as we suggested with the first three so-called *nomina sacra*, the only resolution to the problems with this fourth is to accept that it too must have been likewise introduced into the NT texts (ostensibly in the form $\overline{\text{X}}\Sigma$), replacing another Hebrew term used by the Nazarenes, *Māšīh*.⁵²⁹ It was unacceptable because of the religious significance of this Hebrew term in Judaism. However, we noted that *χρηστιανός* was a reality, as seen by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Lactantius, and others but was a later third to fourth century

⁵²⁶ Horbury and Noy 1992: 150.

⁵²⁷ Van Voorst 2000: 35.

⁵²⁸ Van Voorst 2000: 36. He then notes that Gibson herself “rejects phonological convergence of *eta* and *iota* as a factor in the confusion on the ‘Christians for Christians’ inscriptions, while admitting that some convergence does occur in them (p. 61).” (Van Voorst 2000: 36, n. 48).

⁵²⁹ For the possible dating of the merger of /h/ with this phoneme, cf. Steiner 2005: 229–267.

C.E. phenomenon, but we also know they were well acquainted with the received NT manuscripts from the second century. Thus, the term *χρηστιανός* was indeed original and was only associated with the initial spread of the *kerygma* among Gentiles (see Acts 11:26), who evidently saw something *excellent* in these people. Obviously, there were no connections between *Māšīh* and *χρηστιανός*. Therefore, those Latin authors who had the knowledge of the texts that the pagans did not assumed those who used the term *χρηστός* (who possibly saw only $\bar{\chi}\Sigma$ and knew of those called *χρηστιανός*) were “ignorant people.” But why was this particular abbreviation itself utilized by the parties responsible for the alteration? We are not quite certain at the moment. Whatever it was, it was closely associated with *θεός, κύριος*, and *ἰησοῦς* in Greek. In the earliest assembly, however, *Māšīh* must have become too much an extension of *yahwšū‘* (עֲשִׂיָּהּ) to be replaced or tampered with, even among Gentile converts, where it would have been merely transliterated (as best as was possible).⁵³⁰ Clearly, from the NT it was viewed a true *nomen sacrum*.

3.2.4.2.3.2.3.5. Eusebius’ ancient Hebrew onomastics involving *yēšū‘*—in Greek

Although somewhat outside the chronological scope of the present study, we will briefly refer to Eusebius. In his *Demonstratio Evangelica* Eusebius discussed the name עֲשִׂיָּהּ in a peculiar manner indeed that has not been fully understood in its context, but now, we believe, may be better received. In Book IV, chapter 17, verse 23, he writes:

ἐπειδὴ «σωτήριον θεοῦ» εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν τὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μεταληφθὲν ὄνομα σημαίνει (Ἰσοῦ μὲν γὰρ παρ’ Ἑβραίοις σωτηρία, Ἰησοῦς δὲ παρὰ τοῖς αὐτοῖς Ἰωσουὲ ὀνομάζεται Ἰωσουὲ δὲ ἐστὶν Ἰαὼ σωτηρία, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν θεοῦ σωτήριον), εἰκότως, εἴ που »θεοῦ σωτήριον« ἐν τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς ἀντιγράφοις ὀνόμασται, οὐδ’ ἄλλο τι ἢ τὸν Ἰησοῦν κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραίων φωνὴν πέπεισο δηλοῦσθαι.⁵³¹

Eusebius discusses the name from a linguistic standpoint, apparently in a defensive reasoning for the use of Ἰησοῦ against some other unclear alternative. After concluding his discussion of this name from its biblical use in the persons of the Israelite general and then the high priest after the captivity (which was only *yhwš‘*), he goes on here to explain it linguistically, stating on the one hand its similarity in that form (Ἰησοῦ) to the feminine passive participial noun *salvation* in Hebrew—i.e. *yāšū‘āh* (עֲשִׂיָּהּ). On the other hand, he indicates that Ἰησοῦ is also paralleled to the Hebrews’ use of Ἰωσουὲ, because he says it, too, means *θεοῦ is salvation* or *Ἰαὼ is salvation* (where he clearly notes that Ἰαὼ = θεοῦ, and is indicated by Ἰω-). Remember, however, what we have shown above, which is that *ιαω* was not used in the normative Jewish community, but was for the Greeks to protect the true Sacred Name and was, therefore, associated by them with the supposed Judean “deity.” This understanding is very important in our analysis. It next becomes apparent that his concluding remarks involve a difficulty. He concludes that in *Greek versions* where *θεοῦ σωτήριον* is *named*, only Ἰησοῦν *is to be understood according to the Hebrew*

⁵³⁰ Incidentally, the <ss> found in the transcription *Μεσσίας* appear to well reflect the Semitic phoneme /š/.

⁵³¹ Greek text from *Die Demonstratio Evangelica*, by Ivar A. Heikel (Leipzig 1913).

language. This conclusion makes no sense for two reasons. Firstly, θεοῦ σωτήριον is not a *name*, but is merely a *phrase* that could be a translation of a personal name (properly, a PNCSN), but personal names are always transliterated, not translated. Secondly, the antithesis of Ἰησοῦν in the sentence must be a name, but here we have a phrase—θεοῦ σωτήριον. What really is the antithesis of Ἰησοῦν? From the context, it can't be Ἰωσοῦ, since Eusebius just equates this name with Ἰησοῦν through his reasoning that Ἰαὼ is equal to θεοῦ (and he began by indicating that Ἰησοῦν is translated σωτήριον θεοῦ). This is why he did not follow up by stating Ἰωσοῦ as what one *may find named in the Greek versions* (Ἑλληνικοῖς ἀντιγράφοις), but only the phrase θεοῦ σωτήριον (note *inverted word order*). This phrase must now be seen as actually not original to this text at all, but seems to be a *translation* of some previously written *name*. But, what *name* other than Ἰησοῦν or Ἰωσοῦ could be indicated, but mean virtually the same. The only other form of this name we found was that curious transcription from Petra—ἰασσοῦ. However, perhaps others can add to this additional anomaly pertaining to this particular PNCSN after the first century C.E. Our only question that remains now is where are these Greek versions (Ἑλληνικοῖς ἀντιγράφοις) of which Eusebius spoke?

4. CONCLUSION

While it is a difficult task indeed to recover what was heard by the Hebrew in the ancient period, in recovering the original form of the abbreviated name of Yahweh in personal names in addition to the usual linguistic tools now available to make such a task easier, it should also be obvious that recapturing the ideology of the heart cannot be viewed as irrelevant. At certain periods of Israelite history, clear attitudes with regards to the religious contexts of the full name Yahweh realized from the biblical texts and the Judahite and northern Israelite archaeological support manifest themselves likewise in the Israelite onomastica that can no longer be taken as coincidence and unrelated. Yet, this manifestation in the onomastica too is also supported and correlated with the epigraphic and papyrological material preserved at important stages of Israelite history. The diachronic development of the religious contexts of the name Yahweh begin with an early Pentateuchal emphasis of only one form of the name and then such use and reverence from the earlier periods that tolerates consistent common communication with the name in addition to the very sacred. This, therefore, functioned as somewhat of an ideal. But attitudes away from this ideal are also quickly detected as the ideal linguistic environment begins to change, but so does Israel's onomastica.

PRE-EXILIC PERIOD: Consequently, beginning sometime after the period of the divided monarchy, rejection of the worship of Yahweh saw concurrent modification of an ancient abbreviated form of the Sacred Name when compounded in personal names (*yahw*). This modification no longer indicated the abbreviation of the form of this *causative imperfect*, but a mutilated form (*yaw*). This modification originated in northern Israel. Yahûdâh (properly so called) originally maintained the ancient form of the abbreviated name, but was eventually influenced by northern Israel's onomastic practices after the northern royal family became mingled with the southern. However, this was not maintained as Yahûdâh subsequently returned to their former practice beginning sometime later in the eighth century on and into the Judean exile. To what extent these onomastic developments were influenced through

monarchical institutions is not known, but especially in the case of the initial changes made in northern Israel to *yaw* and then later in Yahûdâh as well it seems certainly *a priori* most probable. *It must now be realized that all occurrences of yw- (and -yh for that matter) in pre-exilic biblical texts are later revisions, resultants of later religious ideological developments (see below).* The pre-exilic forms in those texts were originally *-yahw-* in initial and final positions, as the literary works were products of the southern kingdom.

EXILIC PERIOD: At the beginning of the exile, an event that must certainly have been tremendously traumatic and devastating psychologically, several adjustments were necessary for the Judean elites. Firstly, they no longer utilized the name Yahweh freely in public and private communication—certainly not in a foreign tongue and possibly also at times in Hebrew publicly. In Aramaic we find mostly *Elah* and *Elah of heaven* used instead. It is in this context of the name that we also find another change—the incipience of the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN, wherein the elites began “misrepresenting” the abbreviated form of the Sacred Name so that the full name be not “accidentally” spoken in a non-Hebrew tongue and defiled. In initial position, possibly in connection with the name of the king of Judah, the abbreviated form was made to correspondent to the *Yāhû-* actually taken from the hypocoristic form of the toponym, *Yāhûd*, utilized by the Neo-Babylonian and Persian Empires, instead of the original pre-exilic form (*yahw-*). In Akkadian this correspondence is first seen in *ia-ku-ú-*, then eventually *ia-a-ḫu-*, rather than *ia-’-ú-* (or other variations), as beforehand. In this latter, if the sign *ú* is articulated as a full vowel (rather than /w/) the potentiality for the full name Yahweh being heard is increased. It was consequently avoided in both initial and final positions in PNNCSN. In final position, however, the form was mostly different than the innovation in initial position. The form *yahw* persisted in the Akkadian transcription *-ia-a-ma* (where the sign <ma> is the glide /w/), although *-^dia-a-ú* is also unexpectedly attested in a name in this period, but was otherwise mostly avoided, as just noted. But the Akkadian transcription *-ia-a-ma* eventually needed to correspond to initial *yāhû-*, however, allowing the proliferation and supersedure of alphabetic <-yh> (*-yāh*), which is *phonologically equal to -yahw* and which was at least tolerated in pre-exilic PNNCSN (apparently especially on seals where space was limited). A spin-off of these machinations was independent *Yāhû*, worshiped in communities where, presumably, Hebrew was not maintained, but never in the normative Judean communities even in non-Hebrew speech. The onomastica then became *yāhû-*, initial, and *-yāh* final in Aramaic, but *-yahw-* undoubtedly remained in paleo-Hebrew under the guise of the consonantal script.

POST-EXILIC/SECOND TEMPLE/TANNAITIC PERIODS: The Persian and Greco-Roman periods must be classified as the most colorful for *Yāhûd*/*Yahûdâh*. At this time, we now find a different cultural phenomenon from that in pre-exilic times—bilingualism (and eventually even trilingualism)—which led to a decrease of, and eventually complete halt in, the use of the name Yahweh.

In the Persian period, the use and reverence of the name recovered mostly from Ezra and Nehemiah mostly continued as it was in the exilic period. Additionally, in the post-exilic period, the same Judean exilic onomastic trends persisted and are attested in virtually all areas of Israelite presence at this time,

with *yāhû-* and *-yāh* in PNNCSN in Yāhûd, Babylon, Egypt, and even Samaria. In Hebrew linguistic contexts, phonologically speaking, we expect *-yahw-* to have always persisted if the Sacred Name could be or was used. But, in the fourth century with the imminence of the Hellenists, a number of important changes become apparent as we enter the Greco-Roman period.

Firstly, which we would like to see as occurring in the latter fourth century B.C.E., the Sacred Name Yahweh now even in Hebrew linguistic contexts outside the temple was no longer pronounced, but began to be substituted with Adonai. In the temple, it persisted, however. This was a significant change to our religious context of the name Yahweh as we entered the Greco-Roman period. But, secondly, as the phoneme /h/ was absent from the Greek language (but [h] was present as an initial aspirate sound in some words), *yāhû-* could no longer persist within IMASN and incredibly also in the toponym *Yahûdāh*, the original and post-Persian form of the toponym, and, therefore, a major revision to this religio-linguistic convention became necessary. Without the aspirate, *yāhû-* would produce the same form as that which was avoided at the beginning of the exile—*ia-a-û*, with the diphthongal element sounding as two contiguous vowels. This was again avoided. However, interestingly, now the /a/ vowel phoneme *within the initial abbreviated name* in PNNCSN *was also astutely avoided* as well, so that, now, even a form *iā-* could not be utilized as the initial abbreviated name in PNNCSN. Therefore, the abbreviated form of the Sacred Name now morphed into *yô-* in initial position in all linguistic contexts, but mostly continued as *-yāh* in final position. Orthographically, <yhw-> and <yw-> were propagandized as being phonemically equal (both reflecting *yô-*), hence the incredible spelling <yhwsp> arose for Joseph during this period. But, other names were affected. Biblical Yāhû⁷ (Jehu) became *ιού, ιηου, and ιηουλ* in the Septuagint, where we perceive now the need to either eliminate the /ā/ or misrepresent it (with /ē/). Interestingly, independent Yāhû did not follow this pattern, but instead became *ιαω* (*iāō*, presumably to correspond to the initial abbreviated name in PNNCSN) in Hellenistic quarters. Yet, the toponym, too, also underwent modification. Its first two syllables also morphed into one, not *yô-*, however, but *yû-* (just like with *ιού* [Jehu]), *again eliminating the initial /a/*. This is the reason that the name *Judah* does never match its orthography (יהודה ≠ Ιουδα), but the same is the case for all personal names with the abbreviated name represented by *yô-*. *This was the chronological context from which most of the vocalizations preserved in the Masoretic Text originated, and reflects a fourth century ideological development projecting backwards upon early post-exilic and all pre-exilic onomastic realities.* For the elites that maintained historical texts from yet older sources in the fourth century B.C.E., these new phonological revisions within the religio-linguistic convention of IMASN was seen as a means of “protecting” the Sacred Name from defilement and corruption now as they move into the Hellenistic period. *Therefore, an orthographic “leveling” was accomplished so that the consonantal text seemed to indicate at virtually all periods a relatively consistent distribution of <yw-> and <yhw-> initial abbreviations, and <-yh> and <-yhw> final forms.* Historically, as we have seen, this was far from being the case. In the Hellenistic period, there was only one vocalization in initial position, *yô-*, and in final position mostly *-yāh*, but in the earliest period former *-yhw* was pronounced *-yû* (as in the toponym). Notice, however, that the latest post-exilic

compositions utilize the shorter spellings more profusely, but still include a longer form occasionally. Also notice that some prophetic texts were not “updated.”⁵³²

However, it appears that after the fourth century B.C.E., while more structure was beginning to take shape in the religious-ideologies forming Judaism, other fascinating deviations from the norm and accepted conventions did occur. From the second century B.C.E., the norm and accepted convention was only the High Priest used the name Yahweh, and on one day in the year. But, while both normative and sectarian Judaism clung tenaciously to this tradition of “ineffability” of the name, it appears that the early Nazarenes (who it is admitted differed significantly from the later phenomenon “Christianity”) of the first century C.E. deviated from the tradition and used the name freely, as both tannaitic (early rabbinic) sources and internal NT information indicate. Yet, the oldest NT documents leave no trace, only the four curious Greek abbreviations called *nomina sacra*—ΘΣ, ΚΣ, ΙΣ (or ΙΗ), and ΧΣ—and never the full terms θεός, κύριος, ἰησοῦς, and χριστός, with this last term in the second to fourth centuries C.E. being curiously “confused” with the common adjective χρηστός (*excellent, useful, good*). The internal evidence seems to indicate an original use by the disciples of *Yahweh* and *Elohim* where θεός is now found, *Adonai* mostly where κύριος⁵³³ is, and *Māšîḥ* (*Mashi^ach*) where χριστός is, and which were not removed in the Greek language as the presence of the curious so-called *nomina sacra* themselves indicate. George Howard’s theory of document alteration is consequently to be accepted but with necessary modifications.

Yet, it is Jewish onomastics that greatly substantiate our conclusions about the religious context of the name Yahweh, and deviations. That *iā-* was now clearly an esteemed but understood taboo can be found in the fact of the quite early increase in popularity of a certain Greek name among Jews and the attestation of a very peculiar abbreviated Hebrew name, certainly occurrences that we can call workarounds and exceptions to the convention of IMASN. In the former case, the Greek name *ἰάσων* (Jason) became popular among Jews,⁵³⁴ being prominently noted as the name of a Hellenizing High Priest, and equated with *yēšū^ʿ*, yet *ἰάσων* is no Hebrew name. Similarly, the Hebrew name *yhwntn* of King Alexander (seen on his coins) became abbreviated as *yn^ʿy* (*ἰανναῖος* in Greek), also clearly indicating that this ancient initial syllable for the abbreviated name in PNNCSN (*/yahw/* since *yhwntn* = *ἰανναῖος*) was clearly still much desired, but this name too passed since *-n^ʿy* is no clear Hebrew predicative element (and so *iā-* could not be connected with *yhw-* for Yahweh). In the case of the High Priests, after the priests no longer blessed using the name Yahweh in the Temple, they would have been the only ones “legitimately” allowed to pronounce the name Yahweh. However, perhaps the occurrence that is the most interesting exception (and a clear violation of the religio-linguistic convention) is that which must have had the greatest impact in first century C.E. Judaism and seems directly related once again to the religious context of the full name Yahweh. The most peculiar name, historically speaking, that after the

⁵³² Cf. Zechariah and Haggai.

⁵³³ The common noun κύριος could have applied to Acts 25:26 and 1 Cor 8:5.

⁵³⁴ This name is attested frequently already from the middle of the third century B.C.E. among Jews from Trikomia, Egypt. Cf. above.

fourth century B.C.E. has been found prolifically pronounced as $yēšû^c$ (and not $yōšû^c$) in the earliest Greco-Roman epigraphic sources now becomes the only PNCSN that epigraphy, archaeology, and papyrology have produced to bear a post fourth-century B.C.E. Greek transcription that reproduces the most ancient monosyllabic abbreviated Sacred Name correctly (as could be done in the Greek language) in the PNCSN, transcribed into Greek as $ιασσούου$, which in context could only correspond to Hebrew $yahwšû^c$. This is then directly connected to the leader of the Nazarenes, the identified Messiah, who is currently indicated as only $ιησοῦς$, but which too was also one of the curious so-called *nomina sacra* and must have also replaced an original Hebrew term, just like the other three. The Hebrew term that was unacceptable must have been the correct Hebrew vocalization of יהושע (= $yahwšû^c$ = $ιασσούου$), indicating the abbreviated sacred name. Tal Ilan rightly noted the two anomalies that the Mishnaic sources use the short forms generally for the names יוסף and יוחנן, יונתן, but the long form in יהושע for their rabbinic teachers, while using ישוע for the Notzri (Nazarene), and the epigraphical material is the opposite, using the long forms for the names יהוסף and יהוחנן, יהונתן, but always only the short form in ישוע.⁵³⁵ We now understand that both anomalies are unrelated. The first is earlier. The name ישוע is already found in 200 B.C.E. alongside the long forms יהוסף and יהוחנן, יהונתן, at Mt. Gerizim and seems clearly paralleled to these other forms from the fourth century B.C.E., although separated from the rest of these PNNCSN with its own pronunciation of the abbreviated name $yē$. The second, however, seems to attest to the reality that the name of the leader of the Nazarenes was actually not pronounced as the common form $yēšû^c$, but rather with the correct vocalization $yahwšû^{ac}$ = $ιασσούου$, reflecting the abbreviated name of Yahweh. And Eusebius' discussion of this name seems to indicate an apparent attempt at justifying the modified Hellenistic form $ιησοῦς$ (< $yēšû^c$) of this ancient Hebrew name at a later time, against some other alternative other than $yōšû^c$. But, the end of the tannaitic period (ca. 220 C.E.) is the limit of our study. Perhaps others can add to this.

Certainly, the study of ancient Hebrew onomastics has been made easier as very important contributions in the areas of Biblical Archaeology, Semitic orthography, Akkadian phonology, comparative linguistics, and overall Jewish and Semitic onomastics have become available. Giants in their own right have not been able to see the fruits of their efforts, such as William Foxwell Albright, David Noel Freedman, and Frank Moore Cross. However, many still remain. Ran Zadok's contribution is enormous, but as necessary is the continuation of this work by Tal Ilan. Yet, certain phonological difficulties in the available evidence have not allowed this study to be pain free. Surely, we may expect linguistics to be the only force affecting phonology in this study, but yet, combining ancient Hebrew onomastics within the cultural and religious setting of ancient Israel at various periods with that which was considered very sacred, then we are no longer dealing only with linguistics, but also with religion. And, specifically, within the field of ancient Hebrew onomastics, PNNCSN and theophoric names, the very consideration in this study, are the quintessential examples of such a combination. Therefore, it should then be obvious that as we do get involved in linguistic considerations of these specific PNNCSN,

⁵³⁵ T. Ilan 1988: 5.

the proper religious contexts of the name Yahweh must not be excluded from the onomastic analyses. Additionally, while all of the above contributions (and more) for studying ancient Hebrew onomastics are indispensable, also as important as these are is the need to utilize the new information and methods to modify and update ideas that can no longer be deemed valid. We hope such has been the case here. But one important effect that may be highlighted as resultant from this one religious consideration (the Sacred Name) in this study is that, significantly, the work of the minimalists, or even nihilists, as deemed by some, has been greatly weakened, since it is clear that the Masoretic Text had quite a long prehistory and the ancient Jews did not “invent” or “create” pseudo-historical material, which then became incorporated into a canon of texts. In our case they were merely seeking to perpetuate an old tradition, one extending from the initial days of the exile. And, in light of what we have presented here even clarifying ancient Hebrew phonological changes, it would seem incredulous to us for one to discount our main conclusions. But in the event one does, then it would only indicate that for them it was never truly about the ear, but was always about the heart.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albright, W. F.

- 1924 Contributions to Biblical Archaeology and Philology: The Name Yahweh. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 43: 370–378.
- 1925 Further Observations on the Name Yahweh and Its Modifications in Proper Names. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 44: 158–162.
- 1932 The Seal of Eliakim and the Latest Pre-Exilic History of Judah, with Some Observations on Ezekiel. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51: 77–106.
- 1942 King Joiachin in Exile. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 5/4: 49–55.
- 1968 *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: A Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Anderson, F. I.

- 1999 Orthography in Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions. *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 36: 5–35.

Avigad, N. and Sass, B.

- 1997 *Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Baker, H. D.

- 2000 Iû'āsu (Joash). P. 590 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. H. D. Baker. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Baker, H. D. and Radner, K.

1998–2002 *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Bange, L. A.

- 1971 *A Study of the Use of Vowel-Letters in Alphabetic Consonantal Writing*. Munich: Universität.

Bauckham, R.

- 2012 *The Four-Line Ossuary Inscription from Talpiyot Tomb B—An Interpretation*. [Online] Available at: <http://asorblog.org/?p=1848>

- 1971 *A Study of the Use of Vowel-Letters in Alphabetic Consonantal Writing*. Munich: Universität.

Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker.

- 1979 *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beaulieu, P.-A.

- 2011 Yahwistic Names in Light of Late Babylonian Onomastics. Pp. 245–266 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, eds. O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and M. Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Biran, A. and Naveh, J.

- 1995 The Tel Dan Inscription: A New Fragment. *Israel Exploration Journal* 45: 1–18.

Bremmer, J. N.

- 2010 The Greek Gods in the Twentieth Century. Pp. 1–18 in *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*, eds. J. N. Bremmer and Andrew Erskine. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Brinkman, J. A. and Schwemer, D.
 2000 Iāu(a) (Jeḥu). Pp. 496–497 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. H. D. Baker. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Clarysse, W.
 1994 Jews in Trikomia. Pp. 193–203 in *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists: Copenhagen, 23-29 August, 1992*, ed. A. Bülow-Jacobsen. Copenhagen, Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Clay, A. T.
 1908 Aramaic Indorsements on the Documents of the Murašû Sons. Pp. 285–321 in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, eds. R. F. Harper, F. Brown, and G. F. Moore. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cohen, N. G.
 1976 The Jewish Names as Cultural Indicators in Antiquity. *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 7: 97–128.
- Cole, S.
 1998a Awsêa'. P. 238 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. K. Radner. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
 1998b Azri-Iāu. P. 240 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. K. Radner. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
 1998c Aḫi-Iāu. P. 63 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. K. Radner. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Collins, John J. and Peter W. Flint, eds.,
 2002 *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. 2 Vols. Boston and Leiden: Brill.
- Coogan, M. D.
 1973 Patterns in Jewish Personal Names in the Babylonian Diaspora. *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*, 4/2: 183–191.
 1976 *West Semitic Personal Names in the Murašû Documents*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.
- Cowley, A. E.
 1920 A Passage in the Mesha Inscription, and the Early Form of the Israelitish Divine Name. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (New Series)* 52/2: 175–84.
 1923 *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cross, F. M.
 1962 Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs. *Harvard Theological Review* 55: 250–259.
 1969 Judean Stamps. *Eretz-Israel* 9 (W. F. Albright Volume): 20*–27*.

- 1973 *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 1975 The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran. Pp. 147–176 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, eds. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 1983 The Seal of Miqnêyaw, Servant of Yahweh. Pp. 55–63 in *Ancient Seals and the Bible*, eds. L. Gorelic and E. Williams-Forte. Malibu, CA: Undena.
- 1998 *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.
- 2006 Personal Names in the Samaria Papyri. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 344: 75–90.
- Cross, F. M. and Freedman, D. N.
- 1952 *Early Hebrew Orthography: A Study of the Epigraphic Evidence*. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society.
- 1975 *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*. Missoula, MT: Scholars.
- Delitzsch, F.
- 1881 *Wo lag das Paradies?* Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Dobbs-Allsopp, F. W.; Roberts, J. J.; Seow, C. L.; and Whitaker, R. E.
- 2005 *Hebrew Inscriptions: Texts from the Biblical Period of the Monarchy with Concordance*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Driver, G. R.
- 1928 The Original Form of the Name ‘Yahweh’: Evidence and Conclusions. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 46: 7–25.
- Driver, S. R.
- 1885 Recent Theories on the Origin and Nature of the Tetragrammaton. Pp. 1–20 in *Studia Biblica: Essays in Biblical Archaeology and Criticism and Kindred Subjects*, eds. S. R. Driver, W. Sanday and J. Woodsworth. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dušek, J.
- 2012 *Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Mt. Gerizim and Samaria between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV Epiphanes*. Leiden: Brill.
- Fabritius, K.
- 1998a Bana’-Iāu. P. 262 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. K. Radner. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- 1998b Barak-Iāu. P. 269 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. K. Radner. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Fitzmyer, J. A.
- 1979 *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- Foerster, W.

- 1965 Ἰησοῦς. Pp. 284–293 in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. G. Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Fowler, J. D.
 1988 *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew: A Comparative Study*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 49. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Freedman, D. N.
 1960 The Name of the God of Moses. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 79/2: 151–156.
- Freedman, D. N.; Anderson, F. I.; and Forbes, A. D.
 1992 *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Orthography*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Freedman, D. N. and O'Connor, M. P.
 1986 יהוה YHWH. Pp. 500–521 in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 5, eds. G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans
- Ganschinietz,
 1914 Iao. Pp. 698–721 in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. G. Wissowa. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Buchhandlung.
- Garr, W. R.
 1985 *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000–586 B.C.E.*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gesenius, W.
 1910 *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gogel, S.
 1998 *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew*. Society of Biblical Literature, Resources for Biblical Study 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Goodenough, E. R.
 1953–68 *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period*. 13 vols. NY: Pantheon.
- Gray, G. B.
 1896 *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*. London: Black.
- Greenfield, J. and Naveh, J.
 1984 Hebrew and Aramaic in the Persian Period. Pp. 115–129 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, eds. W. D. Davies and L. Finklestein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Honigman, S.
 2004 Abraham in Egypt: Hebrew and Jewish-Aramaic Names in Egypt and Judaea in Hellenistic and Early Roman Times. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 246: 279–297.
- Horbury, W. and Noy, D.
 1992 *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt with an Index of the Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrenaica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howard, G.

- 1977 The Tetragram and the New Testament. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96: 63–83.
- Huehnergard, J.
 2005 *A Grammar of Akkadian*. 2nd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Hurtado, L.
 2006 *The Earliest Christian Artefacts—Manuscripts and Christian Origin*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hyatt, J. P.
 1941 *The Treatment of Final Vowels in Early Neo-Babylonian*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ilan, T.
 1988 להבדלי פתיב של שמות בתקופת בית שני. *Lěšonénu* 52: 3–7.
 2002 *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity. Part I. Palestine 330 BCE–200 CE*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Joannès, F. and Lemaire, A.
 1999 Trois tablettes cunéiformes à onomastique ouest-sémitique. *Transeuphratène* 17: 17–34.
- Katz, S. T.
 2006 The Rabbinic Response to Christianity. Pp. 259–298 in vol. 4 of *The Cambridge History of Judaism Volume Four: The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period*, ed. Steven T. Katz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knoppers, G. N.
 2006 Revisiting the Samaritan Question in the Persian Period. Pp. 265–289 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, eds. O. Lipschits and M. Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Kottsieper, I.
 2007 “And They Did Not Care to Speak Yehudit”: On Linguistic Change in Judah during the Late Persian Era. Pp. 95–124 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, eds. O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers and R. Albertz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Kuhs, C.
 1996 *Das Dorf Samareia im griechisch-römischen Ägypten. Eine papyrologische Untersuchung* M.A. Dissertation, Magisterarbeit, Heidelberg.
- Lauterbach, J. Z.
 1931 Substitutes for the Tetragrammaton. Pp. 39–67 in *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research 1930–1931*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Lemaire, A.
 1995 Ashdodien et Judéen à l’époque Perse: Ne 13:24. Pp. 153–163 in *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East: Festschrift E. Lipiński*, eds. K. van Lerberghe and A. Schoors. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters.

- 2006 New Aramaic Ostraca from Idumea and their Historical Interpretation. Pp. 413–456 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, eds. O. Lipschits and M. Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- 2007 *The Birth of Monotheism: The Rise and Disappearance of Yahwism*. Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society.
- Levine, L.
- 1999 The Hellenistic–Roman Diaspora CE 70–CE 235: the archaeological evidence. Pp. 991–1024 in *Cambridge History of Judaism Volume Three: The Early Roman Period*, eds. William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinskaya, I.
- 1996 *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting*. The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 5, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Lewis, N.
- 1989 *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Greek Papyri*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- Lipschits, O. and Vanderhooft, D. S.
- 2007 Yehud Stamp Impressions of the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: A Time of Administrative Consolidation? Pp. 75–94 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, eds. O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and R. Albertz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Madalene, F. R. and Wunsch, C.
- 2011 Slavery Between Judah and Babylon: The Exilic Experience. Pp. 113–134 in *Slaves and Households in the Near East*, ed. L. Culbertson. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Magen, Y.
- 2007 The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan on Mount Gerizim in Light of the Archaeological Evidence. Pp. 157–211 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, eds. O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and R. Albertz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Magen, Y.; Misgav, H.; and Tsfania, L.
- 2004 *Mount Gerizim Inscriptions: Volume I The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority.
- Malamat, A.
- 1971 On the Akkadian Transcription of the Name of King Joash. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 204: 37–39.
- Marmorstein, A.
- 1927 *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God: I. The Names & Attributes of God*. London: Oxford University Press.
- McCarter, P. K.

- 1974 "Yaw, Son of Omri": A Philological Note on Israelite Chronology. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 216: 5–8.
- McDonough, S. M.
- 1999 *YHWH at Patmos: Revelation 1:4 in its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament Reihe 2, 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Matthews, K. A.
- 1983 The Background of the Paleo-Hebrew Texts and Qumran. Pp. 549–568 in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of D. N. Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*, eds. Carol L. Meyers and M. O'Connor. American School of Oriental Research Special Volume Series 1. Philadelphia, PA: Eisenbrauns.
- Meshorer, Y.
- 2001 *A Treasury of Jewish Coins*. Nyack, NY: Amphora.
- Meshorer, Y. and Qedar, S.
- 1999 *Samaritan Coinage*. Numismatics Studies and Researches 9. Jerusalem: Israel Numismatics Society.
- Meyer, J. O.
- 1983 *What Is the Messiah's Name? משיח*. Bethel, PA: Assemblies of Yahweh.
- 1987 *The Memorial Name Yahweh*. Bethel, PA: Assemblies of Yahweh.
- Millard, A. R.
- 1976 Assyrian Royal Names in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 21/1–2: 1–14.
- 1980 YW and YHW Names. *Vetus Testamentum* 30: 208–212.
- Montgomery, James. A.
- 1927 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Mykytiuk, L. J.
- 2004 *Identifying Biblical Persons in Northwest Semitic Inscriptions of 1200–539 B.C.E.* Society of Biblical Literature, Academia Biblica 12. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Na'aman, N.
- 1997 Transcribing the Theophoric Element in North Israelite Names. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*: 19–20.
- Nagel, P.
- 2012 The Explicit KYPIOS and ΘΕΟΣ Citations by Paul: An Attempt at Understanding Paul's Deity Concepts. Ph.D. diss., University of Pretoria.
- Naveh, J.
- 1982 *Early History of the Alphabet—An Introduction to West Semitic Epigraphy and Palaeography*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University.
- 1998 Scripts and Inscriptions in Ancient Samaria. *Israel Exploration Journal* 48: 91–100.

- Noth, M.
 1928 *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*. Stuttgart: Olms.
- Olshausen, J.
 1861 *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache*. Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg & Sohn.
- Page, S.
 1968 A Stela of Adad-Nirari III and Nergal-ereš from Tell al Rimah. *Iraq* 30: 138–153.
- Paget, J. C.
 1999 Jewish Christianity. Pp. 731–775 in *Cambridge History of Judaism Volume Three: The Early Roman Period*, eds. William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paap, A. H.
 1959 *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries AD: The Sources and Some Deductions*, PLB 8. Leiden: Brill
- Pardee, D.
 1982 *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters: A Study Edition*. Chico, CA: Scholars.
- Parry, D.
 1997 Notes on Divine Name Avoidance in Scriptural Units of the Legal Texts of Qumran. Pp. 437–449 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995. Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Leiden: Brill.
- Pearce, L. E. and Wunsch, C.
 2014 *Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia in the Collection of David Sofer*. CUSAS 28. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- Pearce, L. E.
 2006 New Evidence for Judeans in Babylonia. Pp. 399–411 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, eds. O. Lipschits and M. Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
 2011 “Judean”: A Special Status in Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Babylonia? Pp. 267–277 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, eds. O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and M. Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Philippi, F. A.
 1883 Ist יהוה accadisch-sumerischen Ursprungs? *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* 40: 175–190.
- Pietersma, A.
 1984 Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX. Pp. 85–101 in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, eds. A. Pietersma and C. Cox. Mississauga: Benben Publications.

- Polak, F.
 2006 Sociolinguistics and the Judean Speech Community in the Achaemenid Empire. Pp. 589–628 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, eds. O. Lipschits and M. Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Porten, B.
 1968 *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
 1995 Did the Ark Stop at Elephantine? *Biblical Archaeology Review*, May/June: 54–77.
 2003 Settlement of the Jews at Elephantine and the Arameans at Syene. Pp. 451–470 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, eds. O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Porten, B. and Yardeni, A.
 1986–89 *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt: 1–4*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press.
- Postgate, J. N.
 1993 The Four “Neo-Assyrian” Tablets from Šēḫ Ḥamad. *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 7/2: 109–124.
- Praetorius, Fr.
 1905 Über „Jesus“ und ähnliche hebräische Eigennamen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 59: 341–342.
- Pritz, R.
 1988 *Nazarene Jewish Christianity*. Jerusalem/Leiden: Hebrew University Press.
- Reisel, M.
 1957 *The Mysterious Name of Y.H.W.H. The Tetragrammaton in Connection with the Names of Ehyeh ašer Ehyeh, Hu’Ha’ and Šem Hammephoraš*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Rollston, C. A.
 2006 Scribal Education in Ancient Israel: The Old Hebrew Epigraphic Evidence. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 344: 47–74.
- Sampson, K.
 2014 -Yahw-: A Preexilic Phenomenon, The Inspiration for an Exilic Religio-Linguistic Convention, A Postexilic Sacred Possession, and The Substance of a Late Second Temple Period Revolution. October, 2014. Retrieved from <http://youarethesaltoftheearth.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/YAHW-PREEXILIC-PHENOMENON.pdf>.
- Schniedewind, W. M.
 2006 Aramaic, the Death of Written Hebrew, and Language Shift in the Persian Period. Pp. 141–151 in *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures*, ed. S. L. Sanders. Chicago: Oriental Institute.
- Schwemer, D.

- 2000a. Iāu-gâ. P. 497 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. H. D. Baker. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- 2000b. Iāu-ḥazi (Aḥaz). P. 497 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. H. D. Baker. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- 2000c. Iāu-ḥê. P. 497 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. H. D. Baker. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- 2000d. Ḥazaqi-Iau (Ḥezekiah). P. 469 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. H. D. Baker. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- 2000e. Ḥilqī-Iau. P. 472 in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, ed. H. D. Baker. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Shiloh, Y.
1986 A Group of Hebrew Bullae from the City of David. *Israel Exploration Journal* 36: 16–38.
- Siegel, J. P.
1971 The Employment of Paleo-Hebrew Characters for the Divine Names at Qumran in the Light of Tannaitic Sources. *Hebrew Union College Annual* 42: 159–72.
- Silverman, M. H.
1969 *Jewish Personal Names in the Elephantine Documents: A Study in Onomastic Development*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms.
- Singerman, R.
2001 *Jewish Given Names and Family Names: A New Bibliography*. Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill.
- Skehan, P. W.
1975 The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism. Pp. 212–225 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, eds. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Stern, E.
2001 The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods 732–332 BCE. Vol. 2 of *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday.
2006 The Religious Revolution in Persian-Period Judah. Pp. 199–205 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, eds. O. Lipschits and M. Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Stolper, M. W.
1976 A Note on Yahwistic Personal Names in the Murašû Texts. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 222: 25–28.
- Stuart, D.
1986 Names, Proper. Pp. 483–488 in *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, ed. G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Tallqvist, K. L.
1914 *Assyrian Personal Names*. Helsinki: Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae.
- Thiele, E. R.

- 1983 *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications.
- Tigay, J. H.
 1986 *You Shall Have No Other Gods: Israelite Religion in the Light of Hebrew Inscriptions*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Traube, L.
 1907 *Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung*. München: C. H. Beck.
- Tropper, J.
 2001 Der Gottesname *Yahwa. *Vetus Testamentum*, 51/1: 81–106.
- Ussishkin, D.
 1976 Royal Judean Storage Jars and Private Seal Impressions. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 223: 1–13.
 1977 The Destruction of Lachish by Sennacherib and the Dating of the Royal Storage Jars. *Tel Aviv* 4: 28–60.
- Vanderhoof, D.
 2003 New Evidence Pertaining to the Transition from Neo-Babylonian to Achaemenid Administration in Palestine. Pp. 219–235 in *Yahwism after the Exile—Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Period*, eds. R. Albertz and B. Becking. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Van Voorst, R. E..
 2000 *Jesus Outside the New Testament: An Introduction to the Ancient Evidence*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- von Soden, W. and Röllig, W.
 1967 *Das akkadische Syllabar*. 2nd ed. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Weidner, E. F.
 1939 Jojachin, König von Juda, in babylonischen Keilschrifttexten. Pp. 923–935 in vol. 2 of *Mélanges Syriens offerts à monsieur René Dussaud*. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 30. Paris: P. Guenther.
- Wilkinson, R. J.
 2015 *Tetragrammaton: Western Christians and the Hebrew Name of God*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Williams, M.
 1999 The Contribution of Jewish Inscriptions to the Study of Judaism. Pp. 75–93 in *Cambridge History of Judaism Volume Three: The Early Roman Period*, eds. William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiseman, D. J.
 1958 Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia. Pp. 46–83 in *Documents from Old Testament Times*, ed. D. W. Thomas. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons.
 1985 *Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon*. The Schweich Lectures, 1983. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yardeni, A.

- 2000 *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Texts from the Judean Desert*. Jerusalem: Ben-Zion Dinur Center for Research in Jewish History—Hebrew University.
- Younger, K. L.
- 2002 Yahweh at Ashkelon and Calah? Yahwistic Names in Neo-Assyrian. *Vetus Testamentum*, 52/2: 207–218.
- Zadok, R.
- 1977 *On West Semites in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods: An Onomastic Study*. Jerusalem: Wanaarta.
- 1979 *The Jews in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods according to the Babylonian Sources*. Haifa: University of Haifa Press.
- 1988 *The Pre-Hellenistic Israelite Anthroponymy and Prosopography*. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 28. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters.
- 1996 Notes on Syro-Palestinian History, Toponymy, and Anthroponymy. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 28: 721–749.
- 1997 Jehu. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*: 20.
- 2002 *The Earliest Diaspora: Israelites and Judeans in Pre-Hellenistic Mesopotamia*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.
- 2003 The Representation of Foreigners in Neo- and Late-Babylonian Legal Documents (Eighth through Second Centuries B.C.E.). Pp. 471–589 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, eds. O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- 2004 Old Iranian Anthroponyms and Related Material in Late Babylonian Sources. *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 98/1: 109–120.
- Zevit, Z.
- 1980 *Matres Lexionis in Ancient Hebrew Epigraphs*. Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- 1983 A Chapter in the History of Israelite Personal Names. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 250: 1–16.
- 1988 Onomastic Gleanings from Recently Published Judahite Bullae. *Israel Exploration Journal* 38: 227–234.