JOEL IV 17–21.

THE verses shew an interesting dependence upon Ezekiel, not only in language but in ideas. Ezekiel believed that it was only when Yahweh departed from Jerusalem that the Chaldeans could violate the otherwise inviolate city. He describes how Yahweh forsook His sanctuary and left it a prey to the spoiler. But he also foretold how, when Judah learned the meaning of its discipline, Yahweh would return to Zion and make it His permanent sanctuary. This return, says the writer in *v.* 17, will again make Zion inviolate, 'then shall Jerusalem be holy and there shall no strangers pass through her any more'. But *vv.* 20, 21 'Judah shall be inhabited for ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation, for the Lord dwelleth in Zion'. Yahweh's return to Zion guarantees the city's immunity.

In that day the land shall not only be secure, but blessed with a new fertility. The promise given in Amos ix 13 of mountains dripping with must, and the other promise of the healing waters from the temple, Ezek. xlvii 1–12, shall find their fulfilment. The presence of Yahweh in the restored land shall make its barrenness cease and make valleys where only acacias could grow blossom.

The dependence here has been generally acknowledged. What I wish to suggest is that the puzzling selection of Egypt and Edom, *v.* 19, as places on which the vengeance of Yahweh shall light may find its interpretation by the same means. Why should these two, and these two alone, be singled out for doom? Here, again, Ezekiel may offer the key. There are two prophecies in the book of Ezekiel which denounce Egypt, chaps. xxix and xxxii. The former confines itself to a detailed threat against the land, and from it the writer of Joel seems to borrow his language, cf. Ezek. xxix 9, 12, as to Egypt. But in chap. xxxii Egypt is associated with a list of other nations, which may be selected as having wantonly oppressed Israel and which are, equally with the Nile valley, threatened with ruin. Now it is possible that the later student of the prophecy observed how in that latter list the only two which have escaped their doom are Egypt and Edom. Asshur, *v.* 22, Elam, *v.* 24, Meshech and Tubal, *v.* 26, the Zidonians, *v.* 30, have already suffered and received their reward: but Egypt, *v.* 18, and Edom, *v.* 29, have as yet escaped. In the day of consummation these also shall be overwhelmed.

Marti has already, on general grounds and without reference to the passages in Ezekiel, stated that Egypt is here selected as the only one of Israel's oppressors which has hitherto failed to receive its chastisement from Yahweh. The weakness of his explanation is that it fails to account for the combination of the two nations, Egypt and Edom, in the one prophecy.

That this combination drew the attention of earlier students and seemed to them to require an explanation, we may conclude from the interpolated sentences in *vv.* 19, 21 'because they have shed innocent blood in their land and I will avenge their blood that I have not avenged' (reading נקם for נקה). I need not give the reasons for holding these clauses to be an addition: I am content to offer a reason for their being added. Egypt and Edom share a common guilt.

This suggestion as to the origin of the verses raises the further question as to whether the section is original in Joel: but that is another matter.

ADAM C. WELCH.

THE HITTITE NAME ARAUNAH.

SOME years ago I suggested in the *Expository Times* that the name of Araunah (2 Sam. xxiv) was Hittite. It is written in various ways—Awarnah (*v.* 16), Arawnah (*vv.* 20 sqq.), and Aranyah (*v.* 18), a sure sign of its foreign origin, while Araunah himself is called a Jebusite, that is to say, one of the Hittite inhabitants of Jerusalem. We now know from the trilingual (Hittite—Assyrian—Sumerian) vocabularies of Boghaz Keui that my suggestion was correct. We learn from them that *arauanis* was the Hittite word for 'nobleman' (Ass. *ellum*) and that the Biblical Araunah was consequently a title rather than a personal name. This explains the gloss in 2 Sam. xxiv 23, where Araunah is interpreted *hammelech*, 'the king'.

Jerusalem, as the Tel el-Amarna tablets first informed us, was of Babylonian foundation and accordingly bore the Babylonian name of Uru-Salim, 'City of Salem'. Its Amurrû or Amorite inhabitants were governed in later times by a Hittite military aristocracy whose 'king' or commander in the Tel el-Amarna age had the name of 'Servant of Kheba', Kheba or Khebe being the supreme goddess of Kizzuwadna who was known throughout the Hittite world as 'the queen of heaven'. In 'Amorite' the 'Servant of Kheba' would have been Ebed-Kheba.

No light has as yet been thrown upon the name Yebus, beyond the fact that *-s* is the suffix of the Hittite nominative. Cf. the city-names Ganis, Burus (Borissos), &c.

Aranyah for Araunah is an attempt to Hebraize the foreign name. It is therefore possible that the name of Uriyah 'the Hittite' has been similarly Hebraized, perhaps from some personal or gentilic name like the Hittite Ura; but it is more probable that it is a second (Semitic) name like that of Ahimelech (1 Sam. xxvi 6). Similar double names, Karian and Egyptian, are found in the Karian inscriptions of Egypt. On the other hand, Bath-Sheba may be a corruption of Bath-Kheba, since שבע for שבועה is philologically difficult to defend, and שבע 'seven'