

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE DIVINE NAMES IN GENESIS.

THE question which I propose to discuss in this and subsequent articles is one of great interest, but at the same time of almost unmanageable complexity. It is matter of general knowledge that for many years back Old Testament scholars have adopted what is known as the documentary theory of the Pentateuch, and that that theory originated in observation of the names for God used in different places of the Pentateuch, and especially in the Book of Genesis. Most readers are also aware that of recent years this aspect of the theory has been subjected to persistent, and sometimes embittered, attack on the lines of textual criticism. We have been told in every accent of assurance, from the cool emphasis of Eerdmans to the superheated invective of Wiener, that the "higher" critics have built their house on a rotten foundation. They have worked with a blind faith in the inerrancy of the Hebrew text, and have been too slothful to examine the evidence for and against the soundness of that text. The assailants on their part have certainly not been slothful. They have striven with might and main to discredit the Hebrew text, and have not been backward in proclaiming their own success. They believe their hour of complete triumph is at hand. Insinuations have not been wanting that nothing but the arrogant and disingenuous perversity of a few individuals, whose scholarly reputation is at stake, keeps an exploded theory in being before a deluded public. But the imposture cannot endure much

longer! The linch-pin has been removed from the axle, and the collapse of the cart is momentarily expected.

It must be allowed that under a heavy bombardment the fire of the besieged has been slack. The critics have seemed to say in effect that since the enemy's shells were falling wide there was no need to waste powder merely to add to the noise. Their silence has evidently been misunderstood. It has not been due to a dishonest and cowardly shirking of a discussion in which they knew that they would be worsted, and from which they would emerge as "broken men"! As one of the incriminated persons I protest that Wiener's war-whoop has not struck one instant's terror into my soul, and that I have even read the temperate arguments of Redpath and Eerdmans with unruffled composure. And I rather think that critics generally have had a better knowledge of the text than their assailants give them credit for. The great quarry in which those who impugn the Hebrew text have been digging of late is the Septuagint. Now every Old Testament scholar is aware that the MSS. of the LXX simply teem with various readings of the divine names, as of many other things besides; and that an immense number of these variants are of no value. Critics had a well-founded suspicion that those on the divine names in Genesis were no better than the rest. If they have not ceased their work and come down to inspect the supposed foundation of their theory, they have only acted as reasonable men might be expected to act. For one thing the textual evidence as to the divine names (as I shall show later on) has much less importance than certain writers imagine. In the next place the Hebrew text possesses credentials to which no version, and perhaps the LXX least of all, can pretend. Moreover, the criticism of the LXX is even now not sufficiently advanced to enable us to determine in any scientific manner what the original Greek text was; and until that stage has

been approached the mass of variants is merely so much evidence of confusion in its text. It is true that while on the whole the LXX is inferior to the Hebrew it can often be used to correct the Hebrew in virtue of the intrinsic superiority of isolated readings. But in dealing with the divine names this resource fails us, because it is very rarely the case that one name is more suitable to the context than the other. Therefore it is unscientific trifling to cite a number of MSS. which differ from the Hebrew, as if any one of these threw doubt on the accuracy of the Hebrew. So that unless the whole business of criticism was to be suspended until LXX scholars had completed their task, the only practical course to follow was to rely on the general soundness of the Hebrew text, and see whether it led to important results. That that confidence has occasionally been pushed too far I am not concerned to deny, but that in the main it has been justified by its fruits remains for me an indisputable fact. When it is added that in the attack textual work has often been associated with improbable explanations and arbitrary theories, as in the case of Redpath and Eerdmans, or with hastily improvised scholarship, as in the case of Wiener, there is little to wonder at in the attitude of reserve which upholders of the documentary hypothesis have hitherto mostly observed in regard to this matter.

But there are obvious reasons why an attitude of defensive silence cannot be indefinitely prolonged. We must frankly acknowledge that the trustworthiness of the Hebrew text in its transmission of the divine names calls for more thorough investigation than it has yet received at the hands of critical scholars. Whether the impulse to that investigation comes from one side of the controversy or the other is, or ought to be, a matter of indifference: provided the question is raised in a judicial and scholarly manner, it is right and proper that it should be examined. It may be a regret-

table circumstance that the initiative has been left to opponents of the critical position ; but they at least need not complain if the advantage of the attack has fallen to them. It is none the less the duty of the critics to put before the public the grounds on which they withhold assent from the conclusions so confidently urged upon them.

The immediate occasion of these remarks is the appearance of a new book by Johannes Dahse,¹ a German pastor who has already done excellent work in the department of LXX criticism. In many ways the book marks a great advance in the treatment of the question before us. The author is a competent scholar who has devoted many years to the investigation of the subject. He has contributed a number of acute and interesting observations on the minutiae of the text ; and has collected and tabulated the textual data of the LXX in a form which, though unfortunately not free from errors and defects, nevertheless represents an approach to completeness which has never been realized before. He has sought to establish the existence of recensions of the LXX which rest on earlier recensions of the Hebrew. A still more important advantage is that he does not confine himself to negative criticism, but brings forward a positive solution of the problem which has at least the charm of novelty. Over against the documentary hypothesis he will set a " pericope-hypothesis," worked out with great ingenuity. Last, but not least, he maintains a tone of uniform respect and courtesy towards his opponents. I do not mean that Dahse is the first on his side to exhibit these qualities, but we have had enough of their opposites to make us feel that we could do with a little more of them.

I wish, then, to take this opportunity to explain and defend the sceptical attitude which I hold as regards this whole

¹ "Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage": I. *Die Gottesnamen der Genesis* ; Jakob und Israel ; P in Genesis 12-50 (1912).

movement to undermine the foundation of the documentary theory by destructive criticism of the Hebrew text. Dahse's work has raised many new points, and though I shall not be able to deal with them all, I shall try to meet the issues new and old impartially and candidly. But I will say at once that I have seen no reason to modify the opinion I expressed in writing on Genesis a few years ago. I may find occasion as I proceed to reply to some of the strictures which Dahse passes on positions I then took up; but that is quite a subordinate interest. The main issue as between Dahse and me is wrapped up in his acceptance of a challenge which I ventured then to throw out. He writes, "Skinner hat mir auf meinen ARW-Aufsatz erwidert, nur dann sei meine Hypothese von dem Einfluss der Vorlesungspraxis auf den Gebrauch der Gottesnamen bewiesen, wenn sie im einzelnen sich durchführen lasse. Ich denke, im vorstehenden ist das nunmehr zur Genüge geschehen und für Gen. 12-50 dieser Einfluss endgültig nachgewiesen." I will try to show that he has not succeeded.

It may be necessary at the outset to put the reader on his guard against a misleading assumption which underlies much of what is written on the opposite side of this controversy. It is usually asserted, and constantly taken for granted, that the documentary analysis of the Pentateuch depends on the distinctive use of the divine names in different sections to such a degree that if this criterion can be shown to be unreliable the whole edifice crumbles to the ground. That is a very great exaggeration. Dahse ought to know this, for he quotes no fewer than four passages from various writers (one of them friendly to his enterprise) in which the case is stated with perfect precision and clearness. Yet he sets these aside as "shilly-shally" ("halb 'Ja' halb 'Nein'") evasions; and roundly asserts (p. 121) that "im Grunde genommen auch heute noch die ganze Quellenschei-

dung von dem Gebrauch der Gottesnamen abhängt" !¹ There is really no cause for evasion : the issue is very simple and easy of apprehension. It is *true* to say that the use of the divine names was the critical fact first observed (by Astruc in 1754) which furnished a positive clue to the separation of documents in Genesis, and that it is still regarded as a valuable aid to the analysis. It is *untrue* to say that it is the sole criterion, or that apart from it there would be no evidence of diversity of authorship in the Pentateuch at all. A moment's reflexion might convince any one that if Astruc's discovery had never led to anything beyond itself—if no difference could be observed between documents except their use of the names for God—it would have lost all its interest long ago. Its whole value springs from the fact that almost immediately it led on to the discovery of characteristic differences in the documents—"clearly marked and distinctive linguistic character," "numerous differences in subject matter, and distinguishable varieties of religious and historical points of view" (as Dahse's friendly correspondent puts it). These characteristic features were of course not all perceived at once ; but having been worked out by patient and minute research they now afford criteria of

¹ Dahse devotes nearly five pages of his book (116 ff.) to a series of extracts from Gunkel's commentary, to show that the analysis still depends on the names for God ; and he does me the occasional honour of associating my name with his. There I believe he does a grave injustice to Gunkel, as he certainly does to me. It is an injustice to Gunkel to cite the words which refer to the divine names and omit nearly all the other criteria adduced in connexion with them. As for my own observations, I should hope that any one with eyes in his head will see even from the sentences quoted that I am utterly sceptical of any analysis that depends solely on isolated occurrences of *Yahwe* or *Elohim*. If he had had occasion to read my book through, Dahse would have found that on p. 155 I have ventured to suggest a division of sources which sets aside a universally attested occurrence of *Elohim*. The paragraph in which he professes to sum up the effect of these citations (p. 121) contains misunderstandings or misrepresentations of the plain meaning of language which are difficult to reconcile with a dispassionate regard for an opponent's position.

authorship sufficiently striking to enable us in many important cases to dispense with the evidence of the divine names. That this is no empty vaunt is capable of experimental proof from two incidents in the history of the problem. (a) There was a stage of Pentateuchal criticism when practically only two writers were recognised in the Book of Genesis, an Elohist and a Yahwist. In 1854 Hupfeld showed to the ultimate satisfaction of all critics that there were really two writers using the name *Elohim*, and he succeeded in separating them with a very remarkable approach to finality. This important critical operation was necessarily carried through without assistance from the names for God, and in fact it turned out, as Hupfeld himself perceived, that the general affinities between the two Elohistes were not nearly so close as those between one of them and the Yahwist (J)^a. Yet every critic would admit that the achievement ranks with the surest results of literary analysis. (b) After Exodus vi. 2 the divine name ceases to be a criterion of the three sources distinguished in Genesis. One Elohist document (now called the Priestly Code [P]) regularly uses *Yahwe* henceforward, and the other (E) uses sometimes *Yahwe* and sometimes *Elohim*. But, although this fact increases the difficulty of distinguishing J from E, it does not in the least affect the separation of P from J, which can be performed with as much certainty in Exodus and the following books, without the criterion of the divine names, as in Genesis, where that test is available. It is clear, then, from these examples that in the division of sources which is accepted by the majority of critics the divine names have not the exclusive importance which is attributed to them in the ill-considered utterances of controversial writers on the subject. Similarly the style and character of Deuteronomy stand out clearly from the rest of the Pentateuch, and are entirely independent of the divine name used. In fact the only part

of the documentary theory which is largely dependent on the names for God is the separation between J and E.¹ There the analysis is often uncertain even with the help of the divine names ; and of course it would be still more precarious if that test were proved to be worthless. Now the distinction between J and E is certainly an element of the accepted documentary theory, but it is by no means its most important element. It ought to be clearly recognised that the really vital points in the critical position are the relations to each other of the combined JE, of Deuteronomy, and of the Priestly Code. These relations are established, as we have seen, on grounds which are independent of the use of the divine names by the various writers ; and therefore the critical theory would still in all essentials remain intact even if it could be proved that the distribution of the divine names has nothing whatever to do with diversity of documents or of authorship.

After this lengthy explanation the reader will perhaps understand how an adherent of the documentary hypothesis can examine the question of the divine names in Genesis with an easy mind, and without feeling that he is entering on a combat *pro aris et focis*. At the same time it is my purpose to meet Dahse squarely on his chosen field of textual criticism.

I have only to add in the way of introduction that I shall endeavour as far as possible to bring the various matters in

¹ It is noteworthy that the quotations from Gunkel and others referred to in the last note are confined to the JE sections of Genesis—the only sections *within* which the divine names are important for the analysis. On p. 53 Dahse quotes from Driver the remark that if the untrustworthiness of the MT were established “ it would leave untouched what is after all the most important element in the critical analysis, viz., the separation of P from JE ” ; and calmly takes this as an admission that apart from the divine names J and E could no longer be distinguished ! Driver's words certainly imply that the internal analysis of JE would be “ touched ” (by the removal of *one* criterion) ; he has never said or implied that there are no *other* criteria by which an analysis might still be effected.

dispute within the comprehension of general readers, whose judgment is otherwise apt to yield to the loudest pretensions and the most assiduous assertion. With this aim in view I have thought it advisable to introduce explanations of technical points which Dahse quite rightly takes for granted as understood by the specialists whom he addresses. Fortunately, in England it is not only specialists who are interested in these discussions ; and the more this unprofessional interest can be cultivated the better it will be for the cause of truth. For it remains true that the common sense of mankind, when fairly enlightened, is the "ultimate solvent" of all critical and speculative theories whatsoever.

I. EXODUS VI. 2, 3.

Dahse begins with an examination of the text of Exodus vi. 2, 3, quoting from Dr. Carpenter a sentence to the effect that these verses contain the real key to the composition of the Pentateuch. In the Hebrew text they read as follows :

" And *Elohim* spoke to Moses and said, I am *Yahwe* ; and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as *El Shaddai*, but by my name *Yahwe* I did not make myself known [or ' I was not known '] to them."

The crucial importance of these words must be apparent to the least critical reader. Three names for the Deity are used : *Elohim*, which is the generic name for God, applied alike to the true God and to heathen deities ; *Yahwe*, the proper name of the God of Israel, and in fact *the name par excellence* of the true God ; and *El Shaddai*, a somewhat rare title of the Deity, whose etymology and historic origin are obscure. And the verses distinctly state (1) that God had revealed Himself to the three patriarchs under the name *El Shaddai* ; (2) that He had not disclosed to them His true name *Yahwe* ; and (3) that this name is now (for the first time) **made known to Moses**. It is evident that the author of

these statements cannot have written any passage which implies on the part of the patriarchs a knowledge of the name *Yahwe*, and in particular any passage which records a revelation of God to them under that name. It is conceivable that the writer himself might have used the name *Yahwe* in speaking of God, just as a historian might speak of the childhood of Charlemagne, although no one could have thought of applying that honorific title to him during his early years. But it would not be a very extravagant assumption to expect that the author of Exodus vi. 3 would avoid the anachronism of calling God *Yahwe* before that name was known, and restrict himself to the use of *Elohim* or *El Shaddai*. How far these observations will carry us in the analysis of the Pentateuch we shall see presently.

According to the generally accepted documentary theory of the Pentateuch, the verses Exodus vi. 2, 3 belong to what is called the Priestly Code. As the result of minute and protracted investigations, critics have arrived at an almost perfect consensus of opinion regarding the contents of this document, and it is important here to note that in the course of these investigations the distinctive use of the divine names has come to play a very secondary part. The analytic process has been guided by a number of characteristic features of language and style and thought which make it a comparatively easy thing to detect a fragment of this document even if no divine name occurs at all. If now we take the Priestly Code as it has emerged from the hands of the critics, we find some remarkable correspondences with our reading of Exodus vi. 2, 3. We find, in the first place, that the name *El Shaddai* actually occurs in the histories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: twice in self-revelations of God (xvii. 1, xxxv. 11) and once in an utterance of Isaac (xxviii. 3).¹ It appears nowhere else in this document. We note next that

¹ Outside of the Code it occurs three times: for details see below.

the writer himself, when speaking of God in the third person, up to Exodus vi. 2 invariably uses *Elohim*, save in two instances (xvii. 1, xxi. 1*b*)—by a scribal error, as some think—after Exodus vi. 2 he regularly uses *Yahwe*. Moreover, the first disclosure of the name *El Shaddai* to Abraham (xvii. 1) is in the form “he said to him, I am *El Shaddai*,” exactly corresponding to the “he said to him, I am *Yahwe*” of Exodus vi. 2. This careful distinction of three stages of revelation, marked by the names *Elohim*, *El Shaddai*, *Yahwe*, is in strict harmony with the affirmations of Exodus vi. 2, 3: the name *El Shaddai* was revealed to the patriarchs, while the name *Yahwe* was reserved for the crowning revelation to Moses. Whether the critical construction be sound or not, we see that there is ample justification for the statement of Dr. Carpenter that Exodus vi. 2, 3 has proved the “key” to the analysis of the Pentateuch.

But to meet Dahse on his own ground, we must of course start anew from the foundation. We must try to obliterate from our minds all that we have heard about a Priestly Code, about the sources of the Pentateuch, or about its composite authorship. We must take the bare words of the text by themselves, and inquire whether they be consistent with the supposition that the Pentateuch is a literary unity and the work of a single author. Now we observe (still using our Hebrew Bibles) that the name *Yahwe* is freely used in Genesis and the first five chapters of Exodus. I have already admitted that this fact does not prove that the writers were ignorant of the theory that *Yahwe* was first revealed to Moses. But when we see that there are whole sections of Genesis where *Elohim* alone is used, and others in which *Yahwe* is used, there is surely a presumption that those who held that theory are likely to be the authors of the former and not of the latter. But not to press that point, we look again at our Hebrew text and find the express statement that from

the days of Enos men " began to call by the name of *Yahwe*," i. e., to invoke the Deity under that appellation (Gen. iv. 26). The very same phrase is used of Abraham (xii. 8, xiii. 4, xxi. 33) and of Isaac (xxvi. 25). And that is not all. The name *Yahwe* is constantly found on the lips of the patriarchs (more than forty times) and (to crown all) it is twice used by *Yahwe* Himself in self-revelations to Abraham (xv. 7) and to Jacob (xxviii. 13).¹ The inference is irresistible that these passages cannot have been written by the same author as Exodus vi. 2, 3, *if the Hebrew text be correct*. The Pentateuch, therefore, is not a unity ; and even if we should never be able to take another step in disentangling its sources, we have to recognise that the axe is already laid at the root of the tree.

We can now understand how Dahse, in his perfectly legitimate attempt to discredit the documentary theory of the Pentateuch, is laid under a necessity to undermine the authority of the Hebrew text. He must either challenge the accuracy of the Hebrew transmission of the divine names throughout Genesis, or make out that the passage in Exodus means something different from what the Hebrew most undoubtedly says. As a matter of fact he essays both ; and we have now to examine his treatment of the text of Exodus vi. 2, 3, to which he devotes the first five pages of his book. It is impossible to follow all the windings of his argument, which indeed occasionally leads us up a blind alley, where we have simply to retrace our steps. But I will try to deal fairly and candidly with the really material points on which his whole position seems to hinge. And I do so with sincere respect for the thoroughness of his research and the acuteness of his reasoning.

¹ It is a not unimportant confirmation of the critical theory that these two passages are duplicates of two self-disclosures of the Almighty to the same two patriarchs in the PC, the אֲנִי יְהוָה of xv. 7, xxviii. 13 corresponding to the אֲנִי אֱלֹהֵי שְׂרַי of xvii. 1, xxxv. 11. See Gunkel, *Genesis*, Ed. 2, p. 342 f.

1. His first point is that the word נודעתי, "I made myself known" or "I was known," is represented in all texts of the LXX by εδηλωσα, which is the equivalent of הודעתי "I made known." Thus for the statement, "by my name Yahwe I was not known," we obtain the sentence "my name Yahwe I did not make known." Now I propose for the sake of argument to make Dahse a present of this reading. Not that I consider it to have any claim to be preferred to the Hebrew. True, it is supported by the Targum of Onkelos, the Peshitta, the Vulgate, and one Hebrew codex. But there is an almost equal array of external evidence in favour of נודעתי: the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Targum of Jonathan, and all Hebrew codices except one. I believe that an impartial textual critic would say that the external evidence of the Versions is pretty evenly divided between the one reading and the other. My preference for the Massoretic reading, however, rests chiefly on the consideration that there is an obvious reason why נודעתי should be rendered by a causative verb, but none at all that I can think of for changing an original הודעתי into נודעתי. The clause שמי נודעתי, although perfectly unexceptionable in syntax, is nevertheless a somewhat subtle Hebrew idiom, and one which a translator might naturally evade without being unfaithful to his text. That the translators actually found הודעתי in their original is certainly possible, but it is not proved; still less is it shown to be a superior reading to the Massoretic נודעתי; for if הודעתי had been the authentic text it is difficult to account for the change to נודעתי. If it be set down as a copyist's slip, we have to ask which is more likely: that the clerical error is on the side of the overwhelming majority of Hebrew MSS. or on the side of the single codex which reads הודעתי. The agreement of a single codex with one or more versions is not sufficient

evidence that the variant reading was once widespread in Hebrew, or that it lies behind the versions in question. There are such things as chance coincidences. But I do not insist on this point, because I am prepared to argue that it makes not the slightest difference to the critical implications of the verse whether we read יהוה or נידעתי.

2. Nor, again, is it necessary for our immediate purpose to join issue with Dahse on the soundness of the text at the beginning of verse 2, "and *Elohim* spoke to Moses," where he thinks that *Yahwe* stood originally instead of *Elohim*. The former, it appears, is attested by five Greek cursives, by the Old Latin version, and by a citation in Justin. It is also the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The old Latin and Justin are fairly taken as presumptive evidence that the reading is pre-Hexaplaric; i.e. it was found in LXX MSS. before Origen undertook the task of bringing the LXX into closer correspondence with the Hebrew in the monumental work called the Hexapla. It does not follow that it is the older reading, or even that it existed in Hebrew MSS. Many errors had crept into the LXX text before Origen; and for what we know this may be one of them. It seems to me, indeed, that Dahse is much too ready to assume a Hebrew original for any Septuagintal variant which strikes him as significant. On the other hand we must admit that in this case there is one consideration that pleads in favour of יהוה being original. The tendency of the LXX is to substitute θεος (אלהים) for κυριος (יהוה) rather than *vice versa*; hence, as Dr. Buchanan Gray has remarked, "wherever (α) κυριος appears in LXX it deserves attention as a possible indication of the original text." Let us grant, then, that the κυριος of the Old Latin and Justin and the יהוה of the Samaritan Pent. in Exodus vi. 2 is a

possible indication of the original text, and that all the remaining LXX evidence, as well as the Massoretic text, may have to be set aside; how would this affect the use of the passage as a key to the analysis of the Pentateuch? Would it inflict a very deadly blow on the documentary theory if its supporters had to admit that a writer who has avoided the name Yahwe up to this point had anticipated by half a verse the disclosure of the name which he is about to record? I hardly think so; and for that reason I waive the point here, and pass on to others of more importance.¹

3. We come now to issues of really vital interest. The first is the genuineness of the name *El Shaddai* in Exodus vi. 3. Dahse seeks to prove by a somewhat intricate line of argument that the name is not original, but was introduced into the text by an editor at a comparatively early date (before the time of Origen) and he reaches the same conclusion regarding five out of the six cases where the name appears in Genesis. It is necessary to examine this position very carefully; but the questions raised are extremely complex, and the reader may be prepared for a rather tedious discussion.

Let us look first of all at the actual occurrences of the name. The Hebrew reads *El Shaddai* in Genesis xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xliii. 14, xlvi. 3, xlix. 25. The LXX renders *ο θεος σου* in xvii. 1, xxxv. 11, *ο θεος μου* in xxviii. 3, xliii. 14, xlvi. 3, and *ο θεος ο εμος* in xlix. 25. In Exodus vi. 3, it has *θεος ων αυτων*. There are traces of pre-Hexaplaric readings: omission of *σου* in xvii. 1, xxxv. 11, of *μου* in xlvi. 3, and of *ων* in Exodus vi. 3; but as

¹ Dahse is entitled to make the most of the circumstance that in Gen. xvii. 1 יהוה stands (by error, as I believe) in an account of the self-revelation of God; and so in xxviii. 13; and to argue that from analogy the same name should be read in Exod. vi. 2. But what of xxxv. 11, where אלהים is all but unanimously supported by the LXX, or xlvi. 2, where no LXX variant is recorded at all?

these do not materially affect Dahse's final conclusion we shall do him no injustice if we neglect them here.

Now the first thing that strikes us is that the LXX invariably renders *El Shaddai* by *o θεος* followed by a possessive pronoun in the person appropriate to the context. It looks as if the translators had not understood the word שׁדַּי , but had the notion that somehow it expressed a closeness of personal relation between the Deity and His worshippers. I confess that I have no satisfying explanation to offer of this strange idea,—that שׁדַּי was equivalent to a possessive pronoun. Eerdmans thinks that the LXX pronounced the name as שׁדַּי לֵא (*El Shēdī*), "God my demon," and understood *El Shaddai* as the special guardian deity of the individual patriarchs. That explanation is not quite convincing because it fails to account for the change of the first personal pronoun or adjective to the second or third where the circumstances required it; but I can suggest nothing better. Anyhow, I am in no worse case than Dahse himself; for the difficulty has to be faced in xlix. 25, the only passage in which Dahse allows the name to be genuine. If he can produce an explanation of the *ο εμος* in that verse, it will probably suit all the other cases as well. In the meantime I think that we are entitled to hold by the *prima facie* impression which the usage of the LXX makes upon us, viz., that *Shaddai* was a puzzle to them, and that they concealed their embarrassment as best they could.

But let us see how Dahse succeeds (or does not succeed) in eliminating *El Shaddai* from all these passages except one. The writer of Exodus vi. 3, he argues, must have found in Genesis three separate self-revelations of God, to Abraham Isaac and Jacob; and if he wrote בְּאֵל שׁדַּי he must have found the name in each of these. Now we find such revelations in the case of Abraham (xvii. 1) and of Jacob (xxxv. 11); but there is none in the history of

Isaac. The only passage which the writer of Exodus vi. 3 could have had in view, according to Dahse, is xxvi. 24; and there *El Shaddai* does not occur. Therefore it cannot have stood originally in Exodus vi. 3! Further, in xxvi. 24 God calls Himself "the God of thy father," and similarly to Jacob in xxviii. 13. But the God who is to Isaac and Jacob the God of their father must have named Himself to Abraham "thy God"; and this is how we read in the LXX of xvii. 1. Consequently their Hebrew text must have read אלהיך, "thy God," and we must accept this as original! In the same way we must read in xxviii. 3 אלהי, "my God," in xxxv. 11 אלהיך (or simply אל), in xliii. 14 אלהי, in xlvi. 3 אלהי (or אל), and in Exodus vi. 3 אלהיהם, "their God." The only genuine instance is xlix. 25. A "theological redactor" (*Bearbeiter*) found the name here, and proceeded to insert it in the other passages. Fortunately for Dahse's detective pursuit, he overlooked xxvi. 24.

Such arguments carry no conviction. But since this hypothesis of a theological redactor is an essential part of Dahse's main contention, I will point out some of the difficulties under which it labours.

(1) One would like a better reason than Dahse gives for retaining *El Shaddai* in xlix. 25¹ while deleting it in all other cases. To be sure the theory would break down unless the name were left in one case; for the supposed theological redactor must be allowed a little capital to start operations with. But that is not a reason that can be seriously advanced; and Dahse does not advance it. What he says is that the LXX rendering in xlix. 25 is unique. But is it so very unique? Is the difference between *μου* and *ο εμος* so great that a translator who rendered שדי

¹ The received Hebrew text has אלהי שדי, but of course I agree with Dahse that אל is the true reading.

by the one might not also have rendered it by the other ? One would have thought that a passage in which *El Shaddai* stands in poetic parallelism with "God of thy father" is the place of all others where we might suspect that it stands for an original אֱלֹהֵי, if one were to indulge such suspicions at all.

(2) The procedure attributed to the redactor is arbitrary and irrational in the extreme. How could it have occurred to any man to manipulate the text by multiplying instances of a most unusual divine name ? How does it happen that he confines his operations to the histories of the three patriarchs ? Why did he select these particular passages and leave others untouched ? Why did he pass over such revelations as xv. 7, xxviii. 13, as well as xxvi. 24 ? It cannot have been to give an air of reality to the statement in Exodus, for, according to the theory, he was himself responsible for the insertion of the name in Exodus vi. 3. What could have suggested its insertion there ? Was it because he took exception to such empty phrases as "my God," "thy God," "their God" on solemn occasions like those before us ? That motive would be creditable to his religious instinct, but it is certainly not a probable one. In any case it would not explain his choice of the particular name *El Shaddai* as a substitute. Dahse may reply that he is not bound to answer such questions as these : he has satisfied himself that the LXX has the superior text and has suggested an explanation of the Hebrew, and that is enough. But with all respect I submit that the questions are pertinent. Those who do not share Dahse's confidence in the LXX have a right to ask which of two theories is more reasonable : that the strong, clear-cut sense of the Hebrew is the result of redactional action for which it is impossible to find any adequate motive, or that the comparatively weak and pointless LXX reflects the ignorance

of Greek translators making the best they could of an unintelligible original.

(3) We have to consider the time at which such a redaction would have been possible. Dahse is at some pains to show that *El Shaddai* must have been found in the Hebrew text in most of the passages in the time of Origen. We may safely assert that it was found in all of them long before then. The Massoretic recension had been fixed by the middle of the second century A.D., and there can be no reasonable doubt that in all essential respects it lay before Origen in the form in which we now have it. But more than that: the Hebrew is supported by the Samaritan Pentateuch. Hence if any such redaction as Dahse supposes ever took place, it must have been at latest in the fourth century B.C., nearly 100 years before the Greek translation was made. I will not deny the possibility that Hebrew MSS. of an older date may have been in the possession of the Alexandrian translators; but surely the hypothesis that their MSS. had escaped a redaction which must have been carried out at least a century earlier is too incredible to be entertained on such slender grounds as Dahse has produced.

(4) Expressions like "my God," "thy God" are extremely rare in the patriarchal history (xxvii. 20 being the only case at all parallel to those imagined by Dahse): and that should make us cautious in substituting them for a well authenticated Hebrew reading. Still, if there *had* been a redactor on the look out for opportunities of inserting **אל שדי** there is no apparent reason why he should have passed over xxvii. 30 any more than xxviii. 3, especially if, as Dahse thinks, the original LXX of xxvii. 20 was simply *ο θεος σου* (without *κυριος*).

(5) It is by no means clear that Exodus vi. 3 presupposes a separate revelation of the divine name to Isaac. It is

perhaps enough that Isaac knew the name *El Shaddai*; and *that* we learn from xxviii. 3. At all events xxvi. 24 is a broken reed for Dahse to rely on. We read there certainly of a revelation of God to Isaac; but it is neither as *El Shaddai* nor as "thy God," but as the God of Abraham. Therefore, if "their God" were the right reading in Exodus vi. 3, it must be understood not distributively of each separate patriarch, but collectively, the revelation to Abraham covering the case of Isaac and (if need were) of Jacob also. In precisely the same way we may hold that the Hebrew reading אל שדי is to be taken collectively, i. e., that the disclosure of the name to Abraham includes its disclosure to Isaac; and we may accept this sense all the more readily because the name is actually used by Isaac (xxviii. 3) in passing on the blessing to Jacob.¹

I hold, therefore, that Dahse has entirely failed to dislodge the name *El Shaddai* from Exodus vi. 3.² It stands

¹ From the standpoint of the critical theory it would be natural to explain the omission of Isaac by the supposition that the section of the Priestly Code in which the revelation to Isaac was recorded had been suppressed in the course of the redaction. I do not myself believe, however, that that is the true explanation. In the older Yahwistic tradition there are two disclosures of the divine name *Yahwe*, one to Abraham (xv. 7) and the other to Jacob (xxviii. 13), but none to Isaac. The authors of the Priestly Code adhered to this tradition of a twofold revelation of the name; only, in accordance with their theory, they changed *Yahwe* into *El Shaddai*. See the footnote on p. 300 above.

² Dahse promises (p. 5) that the reason why *El Shaddai* was inserted in the 6 passages mentioned, and not in xxvi. 24, will be explained in the last part of the volume. He seems to refer to p. 157, where he points out that in xliii. 14 it occurs at the beginning of a new Seder (perikope of the Synagogue lectionary), and adds that the Seder-division shows us why it stands just here: it was inserted here as in xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11 and xlviii. 3, "after the reading-lessons had been introduced!" Rarely has a point of exclamation concealed such looseness of argument. How in the world do we see that the interpolation is later than the Seder-division? Is it because it never occurs twice in one Seder? Surely that is not very wonderful, seeing there are 37 Sedarim in which it does not occur at all. Moreover, as far as that goes it might just as well have been inserted in xxvi. 24. I suppose that what Dahse would have *liked* to say is that it never occurs except at the beginning of a Seder; but he could

there, the signature of an incomplete revelation under which the patriarchs lived. It stands also as the contrast to the name *Yahwe*, which is now for the first time made known to Moses. But here we have to meet another contention of Dahse, directed this time against the very citadel of the critical position, viz., the genuineness of the reading *Yahwe* in verse 3.

4. Dahse thinks it doubtful if the word יהוה stood after שמי in the original text, so that *possibly* we may be right in reading simply "my name I did not make known." The evidence he adduces is of the slightest. The word is omitted only in two unimportant cursive MSS. of the LXX, a MS. of the Ethiopic version (which is derived from the LXX), and in citations of Justin, Philo, Eusebius, Theodoret, and a few later writers. Dahse appears here to be conscious that he stands on weak ground, for he proceeds to strengthen it by urging that the authority of Justin's citation is much better attested in regard to the *κύριος* at the beginning of verse 2, which we have already discussed. I must leave it to expert students of the LXX to say whether all this is sufficient to prove that the omission of *κύριος* points to a pre-Hexaplaric text, although I cannot think that a decision in this sense will be very confidently pronounced. In any case it is not the *only* pre-Hexaplaric text, the *κύριος* being supported by the consensus of all other LXX codices. The question is, which of the two represents the original LXX, and again, whether the original LXX or the Massoretic text (supposing the two to differ)

not put it that way in view of xxviii. 3, where the name stands in the middle. If he means that it is too remarkable to be a mere accident that in 5 cases (including Exod. vi. 3) out of 6 it stands at the beginning, we must remind him that the phrases "my God," etc., which are supposed to have invited the interpolation, must have stood (on his view) in precisely the same places *before* the Sedarim were instituted, and nowhere else (except in xxvii. 20). The coincidence is no more remarkable in the one case than in the other.

represents the original Hebrew. And these questions can only be decided by considerations based on the meaning of the passage.

Hence it is of importance to note the use which Dahse would make of the shorter reading, supposing it to be established. If, he says, the *Yahwe* be not original here, then Exodus vi. is not a parallel to Exodus iii., but a continuation of it. He alludes to another part of the documentary theory : viz., the recognition of a third document (known as the Elohist), which records the first revelation of *Yahwe* to Moses in Exodus iii, 14, 15, and consistently avoids the name up to that point. On that view Exodus iii. 13 f. and vi. 2 f. are parallel accounts of the same incident by two different writers (E and P). Dahse's reading of vi. 3 enables him to repudiate that analysis, and to hold that vi. 3 refers back to and presupposes iii. 13 ff. But what follows ? Simply this : that the "name" revealed to Moses, and not revealed to the fathers, *is* *Yahwe* after all ; only, the revelation was not made on this particular occasion but a short time previously. In other words, Dahse will have succeeded in overthrowing one particular point in the documentary theory, but he leaves intact the key to the position, in the statement that the name *Yahwe* was first made known to Moses.

5. But in order to appreciate the full force of Dahse's contention, we must take account of another assertion which he makes. He will not admit that the formula **אני יהוה** at the end of verse 2 is a new self-manifestation of God. That depends entirely on whether or not the name has been revealed before. Critical writers hold that it appears here for the first time in a particular document ; Dahse denies this ; and until that point is settled it is idle to discuss whether the phrase in the instance before us marks a new disclosure of the divine name. It is at least

a very solemn re-affirmation of it. But look at the verse again. Dahse, if I understand him aright, concedes that "my name" *means* Yahwe even if the writer did not expressly say so. Thus we cannot get behind the statement that God did not reveal the name Yahwe to the patriarchs, whereas He *does* reveal it to Moses. The only advantage that Dahse can derive from his two contentions is the opportunity of maintaining that the revelation did not take place in Egypt but a short time previously at Sinai. And that leaves the main critical position untouched.

6. We can now see how utterly irrelevant is the distinction between נודעתי, "I was known," and הודעתי, "I made known." Dahse apparently thinks it important. He remarks in a footnote on page 2, after citing two examples of the use of *Yahwe* in Genesis, "not however in words of God Himself, cf. LXX Genesis xv. 7, xxviii, 13." I suspect that he has in mind an ingeniously futile notion of his lively confederate, H. M. Wiener, who has learned from the anthropologists that "many savages" have an intense aversion from uttering their own name, while making no objection to being accosted by it, or even to its being divulged to a stranger by a third party. The Israelites of the Mosaic Age being in a "very rudimentary" intellectual condition, we may believe that Moses was capable of attributing this superstitious feeling to his God; and there you have the wide difference between הודעתי and נודעתי in Exodus vi. 3. We need not discuss this solution: it will be time to do that when some evidence is produced of the existence of the superstition in question amongst the Hebrews at any stage of mental development. Here it is enough to say that it does not meet the real difficulty, which is to know how, without a previous revelation, the patriarchs were in a position to "accost" the Deity by His true name. For surely Dahse, as a Christian theolo-

gian, knows that in the thought of Old Testament writers a knowledge of the divine name can only be gained through a self-revelation of the Deity. It is neither a human invention, nor discoverable by human guess-work. Therefore if he admits the use of the name *Yahwe* by the patriarchs (and I do not understand him to deny this), he must allow us to postulate such a revelation, even if it were not recorded. And if, as I believe to be the case, his assault on the integrity of Exodus vi. 2 f. has demonstrably failed, the only resource by which the unity of the Pentateuch can be saved is to follow the example of two Catholic writers¹ whom he mentions, and maintain that in the original text of Genesis i.-Exodus iii. 12, *Yahwe* never occurred at all.

My reply to Dahse, as regards Exodus vi. 2, 3, may be summed up under three heads. I claim to have shown (1) that he has failed to make good His objections to the Hebrew text of the verses; (2) that if we grant some of his positions the evidential value of the passage for the purpose of critical analysis is not greatly affected; and (3)

¹ Hummelauer and Hoberg (see p. 21 f.). Another Catholic writer, Prof. Schlögl of Vienna, has arrived at the same conclusion. He has published in the *Expository Times* (Sept. 1909, p. 563) a "zusammenfassende Statistik" of the results reached by himself and his pupils in Seminar; and winds up with the following *Machtspruch*: "When we consider that the tendency to use יהוה for or along with אלהים was incomparably greater than the contrary, those few passages which support יהוה as against אלהים are of little account. The conclusion is therefore justified that the name יהוה did not originally occur in Gen. i. 1-Exod. iii. 12. It is consequently quite unscientific to determine the analysis of a source by the names of God." His reasoning comes to something like this: in 118 cases where M.T. has *Yahweh*, "other texts" (no matter what!) have *Elohim* or *Yahweh Elohim*: therefore, in all read *Elohim*. In 30 passages all the texts read *Yahweh*: therefore change it to *Elohim*. In 59 places where M.T. has *Elohim* the "other texts" have *Yahweh* and in 47 *Yahweh Elohim*: therefore, read *Elohim*. "Those texts which have the name אלהים instead of יהוה are less important": nevertheless still read *Elohim*. Could arbitrariness further go? I have no doubt that the work of the Hebrew Seminar at Vienna is very thorough and meritorious; but it is really a little too much to expect independent students to invest its decisions with a Papal infallibility.

that if we grant *all* his contentions he gains his end only by emptying the words of definite meaning and significance. They would read thus : “ And Yahwe spoke to Moses and said, I am Yahwe : and I appeared to Abraham Isaac and Jacob, being their God ; but my name I did not make known to them.” So we are left with the following bald and jejune statement as the gist of the communication imparted to Moses on a solemn occasion : that Yahwe had appeared to the three patriarchs but without giving His name ! Whether the meaning be that, while the patriarchs knew the name, it was not Yahwe who revealed it ; or that, they being ignorant of it, it had been revealed to Moses at an earlier time ; or that it is now revealed for the first time ; or that the name is something other than *Yahwe*—something ineffable, which had not been disclosed before and is not disclosed now—we cannot tell. Such is the plight to which we are reduced by a textual criticism which is divorced alike from exegetical intelligence and historical and religious insight.

JOHN SKINNER.

DID JESUS LEGISLATE ?

THIS is to-day a question of urgency and importance ; for on the one hand modern society is in many of its current opinions and sentiments placing itself in evident antagonism to the Christian tradition in morals ; and on the other hand there are menacing problems, economic, social and international, where the world seems to the Christian believer to need the guidance which the teaching of Jesus alone can afford. To give only a few instances, the passage of the act legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister appears to many churchmen to bring the law of the State into conflict with the canons of the church. The Protestant denun-