

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

EXPOSITOR, a contribution from New Zealand. Dr. Ranston is a Methodist scholar in Auckland, and his paper on "The Orphic Mysteries" will clear up the subject for many readers who are unfamiliar with the origin and aim of these mystery-religions. Dr. Ranston has just published a study of "Ecclesiastes and the Early Greek Wisdom Literature," which strikes out along fresh lines. We hope to review this important monograph before long.

* * * * *

The article by Mr. Dallas follows up the allusion made by Professor C. A. Scott (p. 28) to Heiler's remarkable volume. We make no apology for printing another article on prayer. Christianity has been called "the religion of prayer," and there is no aspect of it which requires more attention, practically and theoretically, than that of prayer. Our English literature is rich in modern studies, as Dr. Scott has shown. But the Swedish scholar has things to say which are vital, and, as his book is still untranslated, Mr. Dallas has done good service in explaining what are its main contentions.

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS.

Recent criticisms of the documentary hypothesis.

- I. Ex. 6³—a central position.
 1. Part of a passage full of characteristic phrases linking it to other passages.
 2. Five specially important words and phrases.
 3. Conclusion. Ex. 6³⁻¹² is one of a series of related passages.

- II. Attempts to discredit the prima facie meaning of Ex. 6³.
 1. Naville: his incorrect paraphrase; his misunderstanding of the critical position.
 2. Dahse and Wiener; *ἐδηλωσα*; 'Yahweh not used in self-revelations'; theory as to self-use of Name.
 3. Dahse rewrites the verse with the help of the LXX; eliminates El Shaddai both from Ex. 6³ and from Genesis (except in 49²⁶); and does the same with Yahweh in Ex. 6⁸.

III. Attempts to discredit the whole analysis, based on the Divine Names.

1. The basis. Not the Divine Names only; broader foundation employing other criteria.
Objections to these as (a) subjective; (b) often failing to give any sure result. Answers.
2. Möller, W. H. Green, etc.: significance of the Divine Names. Baumgärtel's position.

Article 2. RECENT CRITICISM, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO EXODUS 6²⁻³.

IN our first article we saw that certain scholars had in the last twenty-five years called in question the soundness of the current theory of the composition and age of the component parts of the Pentateuch, and we prepared the way for an examination of the arguments they adduced, by reminding ourselves of

- (1) The Problem presented by the Pentateuch as it stands;
- (2) The Solution set forth by the current documentary theory; and
- (3) Some specimens of the alternative theories.

We are now in a position to take up, one after the other, the above-mentioned criticisms and to seek to arrive at a just estimate of their worth.

I. *Exodus 6²⁻³: its prima facie meaning and its context.*

It will be quite clear from what we have already seen that Ex. 6²⁻³ with its context is, so far as the use of the Divine Names is concerned, a central position of the documentary theory. Unless the *prima facie* meaning of that passage can be proved to be wrong, the existence of at least two documents in Genesis, one of which uses the name Yahweh and the other does not, must be regarded as beyond question. Accordingly attempts to set aside that meaning have been made by dissentient critics on various lines. In order to estimate their strength, we must first make a careful study of the passage in question.

1. We note that it does not stand alone. It forms part of a longer passage of eleven verses (verses 2-12), which is full of characteristic phrases that link it on to other passages of a similar type. If anyone will take the trouble to look up the occurrences of the following phrases: 'established my covenant,' 'land of Canaan,' 'land of their sojournings,' 'remembered my covenant,' 'redeem' (Heb. *gā'al*, cfr. *pādāh* in Dt.), 'judgments,' 'be to you a God,' 'spake unto—saying,' they will see that this passage has affinity with Gen. 6⁹⁻²², 9¹⁻¹⁷, 17, 23, etc., and that some of these phrases are found also in Ezekiel.

2. In addition to the above, there are five words and phrases in Ex. 6²⁻³ which deserve special attention.

(a) 'I' (Heb. *'ānī*). In Hebrew two parallel forms of the personal pronoun, first person singular, (*'ānī* and *'ānōkī*) maintained their position for a time side by side, but a growing preference for the shorter form is to be seen in the later writings. This may be shown in tabular form as follows:

Book.		<i>'ani</i>	<i>'anoki</i>
1 and 2 Samuel	50	50
Jeremiah	54	37
Ezekiel	138	1
Lam., Hag., Ezr., Est., Eccl.		45	0
Chronicles	30	1 (1 Chr. 17 ¹ from 2 Sam. 7 ²)
Daniel	23	1 (10 ¹¹)

In Deut. with its rhetorical style *'anoki* is habitually used.

It would appear significant that in the passages in Gen.—Numb. assigned by the dominant hypothesis to JE the proportion is—

<i>'ani</i>	<i>'anoki</i>
48	81

while in the P passages it is 130 1 (Gen. 23⁴).

In Ex. 6²⁻¹² *'ani* is used 6 times, 4 times in the phrase, 'I am Yahweh,' once in verse 5, 'I have heard,' once in verse 12, 'I am of uncircumcised lips.'

(b) 'I am Yahweh' ('ani YHWH) in Ex. 6^{2, 6, 8, 29} and 12¹². Nu. 3^{31, 41, 45}. Lev. 18-26 (20 times).

The phrase also occurs with amplifications as follows :

'I am Yahweh your God' (Lev. 11⁴⁴).

'I am Yahweh that brought you up out of the land of Egypt' (Lev. 11⁴⁵).

'shall know that I am Yahweh' (Ex. 7⁵, 14^{4, 18}).

'shall know that I am Yahweh your God' (Ex. 16¹²).

'shall know that I am Yahweh your God that bringeth you (brought them) out from . . .' (Ex. 6⁷, 29⁴⁶).

'May know that I am Yahweh which sanctifieth you' (Ex. 31¹³).

All these uses occur in sections assigned by the current theory to P. 'I ('ani) am Yahweh' also occurs in Gen. 15⁷ (a passage which shows many signs of being composite) and 28¹³. Compare 'anoki Yahweh' in Ex. 20^{2, 5} (? from the parallel passage, Dt. 5^{6, 9}), Hos. 12^{10 (9)}, 13⁴, Ps. 81^{11 (10)}, Isa. 43¹¹, 44^{24 (51¹²)}. The formula 'know that I am Yahweh' occurs rarely outside definite P sections (Ex. 7¹⁷, 8^{18 (22)}, 10³, Dt. 29^{5 (6)}, 1 Ki. 20^{13, 28}) until suddenly we find it brought into constant use by Ezekiel (62 times).

(c) 'And I *appeared* unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as El Shaddai' (EV God Almighty), cp.

Gen. 17¹ : 'and Yahweh *appeared* unto Abraham and said unto him : I am El Shaddai.'

35^{9, 11} : 'and Elohim *appeared* unto Jacob, . . . and Elohim said unto him : I am El Shaddai.'

48³ : 'Jacob said unto Joseph : El Shaddai *appeared* unto me in Luz.' The verb is in the Niphal mood, which has primarily a reflexive force, but 'equally characteristic is its frequent use . . . to express actions which the subject allows to happen to himself' (Gesenius-Kautzsch. § 51, c). In the above passages God is said to 'allow Himself to be seen.' The force of this particular verb, when in

the Niphal mood, is well seen in 1 Ki. 18¹: 'Go, shew thyself unto Ahab' (see further under (e)).

(d) El Shaddai, see the passages quoted under (c). See also 28³, 43¹⁴, 49²⁵ (El should clearly be read here [instead of 'eth,' the Heb. sign of the object] as do Samaritan, LXX, Syr., Targum of Jonathan, Saad., 4 Heb. MSS.). In 49²⁵ the title occurs in what is obviously an early poem. In the other passages it seems to be used as an archaic title, no longer in colloquial use. It only occurs once again in the Old Testament. It is significant that this once is in Ezekiel (10⁶).*

(e) 'But by (or 'as to') my name YHWH I was not known to them.' The verb is in the Niphal and has the same force as the corresponding verb in (c). It should be translated: 'I did not make myself known to them.' This force of the same verb in the Niphal is clearly seen in Ruth 3³, 'make not thyself known unto the man.' There are four significant parallel uses of the same verb in the same mood in Ezekiel.

Ez. 20⁵: 'In the day when I chose Israel . . . and *made myself known unto them* in the land of Egypt, when I lifted up mine hand unto them, saying, I am Yahweh your God; in that day I lifted up mine hand unto them, to bring them forth out of the land of Egypt. . . .'

20⁹: '. . . the nations (AV the heathen) in whose sight *I made myself known unto them* in bringing them forth. . . .'

35¹¹: 'I will do according to mine anger . . . and *I will*

* Shaddai without El occurs in an early poem (Nu. 24^{4, 16} Balaam) and in later literature in Ruth 1^{20, 21}, Ps. 68^{15 (16)}, 91¹, Joel 1¹⁵ (= Is. 13⁶), E-ek. 1²⁴, and 31 times in Job (5¹⁷, etc.). Neither the Greek translators nor any others seem to have had any real clue to its meaning. In the Pentateuch the LXX translates El Shaddai by δ θεός with a possessive pronoun. In Ezek. 10⁶ Shaddai is transliterated. In 14 Job passages it is translated παντοκράτωρ (Almighty). Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, and sometimes LXX (Ruth) translated by $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in accordance with the Rabbinic explanation of Shaddai as compounded of Shē and dai (as if = self-sufficient), an explanation not accepted by any modern scholars.

make myself known among them [i.e. the children of Israel], when I have judged thee [i.e. Edom].’

38²³: ‘And I will magnify myself . . . and *I will make myself known* in the eyes of many nations and they shall know that I am Yahweh.’

In the first two of the above passages Ezekiel, like the writer of Ex. 6^{2,3}, looks back to the time just before the Exodus as the time when the God of Israel ‘made himself known to them’ by a new name and by an accompanying manifestation of his power.

3. In view of the above stylistic phenomena it would seem an eminently reasonable conclusion that Ex. 6²⁻¹² forms part of a series of passages, which hang together and which among other peculiarities avoid up to this point the use of the name Yahweh.

II. *Efforts to explain away the prima facie meaning.*

1. M. Naville, in *The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch* (English Translation by J. R. Mackay, 1923), gives the following as his rendering of Ex. 6³: ‘I revealed myself to the fathers as their own God, but I did not make known to them that I am Jahveh’ (p. 69).* ‘Their own God’ he takes from the LXX; the second part of the rendering is an incorrect paraphrase, not a translation. M. Naville expands this into ‘I said to Abraham, I am Jahveh, that brought thee forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, in order to give thee this land †; but I did not make known to him what this expression, I am Jahveh, means, for my promise was not yet fulfilled, and I have not even yet manifested to the Israelites by my acts that I am Jahveh’; and again, ‘Thus the Israelites should know Jahveh, not at all by his saying to them: My proper name is Jahveh,

* In dealing with M. Naville I, like his translator (pp. 69-70), use the French form of the Divine Name.

† This is a reference to Gen. 15⁷.

but by his acts. I am Jahveh *means* I am the God that manifests Himself, that maketh Himself known by His acts, of which some are acts of judgment and others acts of mercy.* In other words M. Naville says that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did know the proper name Jahveh, but they did not know its meaning; that was only known, when He shewed His judgments upon Pharaoh and His mercies upon Israel. A number of passages, in which the phrase 'Ye shall know that I am Jahveh' occurs, are quoted to shew that to 'know' Jahveh means to experience His power (see quotations in I. 2 (b)).

If we want to know what M. Naville would have liked the writer of Ex. 6 to have written, this is excellent; but if we want to know what that writer really did say, it is most misleading. 'I am Jahveh and I appeared unto Abraham . . . as El Shaddai, but by *my name* Jahveh I did not make myself known unto them' can only mean one thing. To know anyone by his name is one thing; to know his nature and power is another. To know by experience the power and grace of Jahveh is an infinitely greater thing than to know the mere name Jahveh, but that does not justify us in quietly substituting one for the other and saying that the Biblical writer really meant the one although he said the other. Of course in many passages the knowledge of experience is promised and set forth, but in this particular passage a prior knowledge is referred to. The God of the Patriarchs was going to manifest His power on behalf of His people and, as a token and pledge of this new display of power, He here and now made Himself known by a new name. Hitherto He had spoken of Himself as El Shaddai; now and henceforth He is to be known as Jahveh.

* (pp. 69-70). If 'I am Jahveh' means this in Ex. 6³, why did it not mean the same in Gen. 15⁷?

M. Naville as a matter of fact completely misunderstands the theory which he is criticizing. According to him 'the critics,' as he calls them, assert (a) that one writer (J) believed and wrote 'that Jahveh from the beginning was worshipped under that name and that Abraham entered into covenant with Jahveh and received the promises. Jahveh was the national God of Israel, because first He was the God of their forefather Abraham.

(b) That another writer (P) denies all this. Abraham never did enter into covenant with Jahveh. Jahveh was not the God of Abraham. He could not be, because Jahveh was not known before Moses (pp. 77-79). 'The Critics,' it is surely hardly necessary to say, assert nothing so foolish. J and P, in their view, are absolutely at one in believing that the God of Israel is the very same God as Abraham worshipped, with whom he entered into covenant and who promised him the land of Canaan. There is no difference whatever between them on that point. That upon which they do differ is simply as to the *Name* by which God was known to Abraham. J regards the name Jahveh as known from the beginning. P thinks that God appeared to Abraham as El Shaddai and that He did not make Himself known as Jahveh until He revealed that name to Moses. It would never have occurred to the priestly writer that anyone could imagine that he thought of El Shaddai and Jahveh as different Gods. They were to him only two different names for one and the same God. The covenant was with the One God, whatever the actual name by which He was called. His great point was that the God of Abraham in the days of Moses manifested His power in a very wonderful new way and that, as a token and pledge of this new departure, He revealed Himself under a new name. This idea is not confined to Ex. 6. We have already seen that it runs implicitly in a whole series of passages in

Genesis in which El Shaddai and Elohim are used and Jahveh is not used (for Jahveh in 17¹ see p. 15 in July number). The facts are too clear to be got rid of on M. Naville's lines. I think I have said enough to shew (1) that Mr. Naville does not understand 'the Critics' and (2) that he has failed to explain away the plain meaning of Ex. 6.*

2. A second attempt to get away from the prima facie meaning of Ex. 6²⁻³ is adopted by J. Dahse in Germany and H. M. Wiener in England.† They point out in the first place that the LXX translates nōda'tī (AV and RV I was known) by ἐδήλωσα. That, they say, indicates that the translators read hoda'ti (the causative mood instead of the Niphal mood) with the meaning: 'I made known' (my name). Even if they did, it does not follow that their reading is the right one.‡ But it is not clear that they did. As we have seen (I 2 (c) and (e)) the Niphal mood has the force, 'I did not make myself known' (and so RVm.). No change of reading is therefore necessary and the parallelism with the other verb in the same sentence is in favour of the Niphal form. The exact form of the verb is not however of any importance. What is of importance is whether the interpretation put upon the word by these two writers is the right one or not. They would restrict the meaning to self-revelations. The name Yahweh, they say, was known to, and used by, the Patriarchs, but Yahweh did not use it Himself in revelations. It is true that in Gen. 15⁷ and 28¹³ the Hebrew text asserts that He did, but this they

* There is much else that might be said about M. Naville's views and theories, but I am obliged to confine myself here to the one point as to the true interpretation of the passage in Ex. 6.

† J. Dahse, *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage*, I. H. M. Wiener, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*. Elliot Stock, 1912.

‡ The Samaritan Pentateuch, one of the Targums, and all known Heb. MSS. but one, support the Masoretic text. The value of the LXX as an authority for the determination of the original Hebrew text will be considered in Article 3, Parts II and III.

would set aside on the ground that the LXX in 15⁷ reads $\delta \theta ε ο ς$ and in 28¹³ omits Yahweh altogether.* But what difference is there between the use of the name in self-revelations and the use of it on the lips of men? Mr. Wiener answers † that (1) a number of Old Testament passages shew that the Israelites regarded the Divine Name as having *an objective existence* of its own. ‡ (2) Sir J. G. Frazer and others have recorded the intense aversion of 'many savages' to uttering their own name, though they have no objection to being accosted by it or even to its being divulged to a stranger by a third person. Among early Hebrews similar ideas prevailed.§ So in Ex. 3¹⁴, in answer to Moses' question: When the children of Israel say to me, What is His name? what shall I say unto them? God evades the question with the words 'I am that I am' and refuses to give His name directly, but in 15. 16. 18 Moses, as a third person, is authorized to give it indirectly. In 5²³ Moses implies that something more was needed than this indirect use of the Divine Name and in 6² God responds by giving a new guarantee of Divine assistance—not the introduction of a new name, but a new direct use of the already known name, viz. in a self-revelation, which pledged Yahweh in a new way, a way which would be convincing to the Israelites in their then intellectual condition.

This is ingenious, but, in answer, it is sufficient to say that (1) the passages referred to in no way prove either that the Israelites had any aversion to uttering their own name || or (still less) that they or Moses himself attributed

* ADEM 15 cursives and 1 Egyptian version omit, but 12 cursives and 4 versions, including the Old Latin, agree with the Hebrew text.

† *Essays*, pp. 45–56.

‡ See Deut. 28⁵⁸, Lev. 19¹², Ex. 23^{20 t}, etc. The italics are Mr. Wiener's own.

§ See Gen. 32²⁹, Judg. 13^{17 t}.

|| Gen. 45^{3, 4}, 'I am Joseph,' supplies an exact parallel to 'I am Yahweh.' Jacob (Gen. 32²⁷) and Ruth (Ru. 3⁹) have no aversion to giving their own name.

this 'savage' superstition, as to the danger of uttering one's own name, to their God; (2) it is impossible to understand how, *on Old Testament principles*, without a self-revelation on the part of God, the Patriarchs could know and use the Divine Name Yahweh at all. To suppose that man invented this name for his God, in the same way that, according to Gen. 2¹⁹, "the man called every living creature," would indeed be a modern notion. The use of the name Yahweh in Genesis is explained by 'the dominant hypothesis' as being due to a writer who believed that even before the Flood God revealed Himself as Yahweh. That is reasonable. If on the other hand we are to see in Genesis the work of only one author and if we are to accept the theory that there was no self-revelation of the Name before Ex. 6², no explanation of how the Name came to be used in earlier days seems possible.

3. Dahse, in addition to the attempt just dealt with, endeavours to rewrite Ex. 6^{2,3} with the help of the LXX and thus to evacuate it of all significant meaning. I think that he would acknowledge that, as it stands, it can only bear the *prima facie* meaning. But that, he would say, is not the original form of the passage. (a) He points to the well-known fact that the LXX translates El Shaddai by $\delta \theta ε ο ς$ with a possessive pronoun ('thy' twice, 'my' 4 times, including 49²⁵, once 'their'). It has been an axiom in Textual Criticism that, other things being equal, the harder reading is to be preferred. The natural explanation of the LXX renderings is that the translators were puzzled by the archaic word Shaddai and avoided it by the substitution of something easy to understand. Dahse, however, prefers the easier reading for obvious reasons. Naville, we remember, does the same. But how then are we to account for the occurrence of the unusual Divine Name, El Shaddai, seven times in the Hebrew text? Here is

Dahse's explanation: (i) he reads El Shaddai in 49²⁵—no doubt correctly (see I 2 (d)), but in the other 6 passages he reads 'my (or 'thy' or 'their') God'; (ii) he brings in his 'Liturgical Editor' (Ezra), who, according to Dahse, divided the Pentateuch into 'Readings'! This Editor, it seems, wrote Ex. 6^{2f.} himself as a sort of recapitulation of Ex. 3^{esp. 15f.}. This was originally placed in the margin for the use of the Reader, but it was soon inserted in the text. (iii) Ex. 6^{2,3}, according to Dahse, originally ran: 'I am Yahweh and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, being their God, but my name * I did not make known to them.' But this production of the Liturgical Editor does not seem to have pleased the 'Theological Editor,' who came after him. Apparently this Editor thought the above to be very weak and colourless and so he substituted El Shaddai for 'being their God' and inserted Yahweh after 'my name.' This necessitated his going back to Genesis and inserting El Shaddai in the five passages already mentioned (I 2 (d)). Presumably he took the title from Gen. 49. He did not alter 26²⁴ (the self-revelation to *Isaac*), because he only added names in Ezra's insertions (28³, 35¹¹, 48³) or at the beginning of a Reading (17¹, 43¹⁴)! He however made up for the omission in 26⁴ by inserting the name in Isaac's blessing of Jacob in 28³. I use the word 'apparently' above, because Dahse himself gives no reason, and we are therefore left to grope about for some conceivable motive which could have led an Editor to make such an extraordinary series of changes.

* Yahweh is omitted here in 2 cursives of the LXX, 1 Eth. MS., citations by Justin, Philo and others. Dahse seizes upon this to throw doubt upon Yahweh being original even in Ezra's day and then, assuming that it is not original, to argue that therefore Ex. 6²⁻³ is a reference back to 3^{13 f.}. The textual evidence is of the flimsiest; and, even if it were strong and the argument sound, what has Dahse gained? He has merely dated the revelation of the name Yahweh back a few weeks at the most, viz. to the revelation at the burning bush. He is no nearer to a proof of his own position. The name is still first revealed to Moses and not to the Fathers.

Could anything be more arbitrary and irrational than all this? Who would have thought of such a theory, if he had not been hard put to it to explain away the clear meaning of Ex. 6³, as it stands in the Hebrew text? Moreover when could the Theological Editor have effected these changes? The Samaritan Pentateuch supports the Hebrew text in every case, and this carries back these readings at latest to the 4th century B.C., i.e. nearly 100 years before the LXX translation was made.

How refreshing to turn from the feeble version of Ex. 6²⁻³, given us by Dahse and quoted above, so unworthy of the solemn occasion on which it is said to have been uttered, and read again the version of it, which we have given to us in our English Bible. After full consideration of all that has been said on the other side, we can only conclude that the Hebrew text on which the latter is based stands firm and unshaken.*

III. *Attempts to discredit the whole analysis, as built upon a precarious and shaky foundation.*

“The question,” as Dr. Welch says (p. 346), “has been raised from two sides as to whether the differing use of the Divine Names, Yahweh or Elohim, forms a reliable basis for such an analysis.”

1. Before measuring the force of these two types of criticism, it will be well to clear the ground by inquiring to what extent ‘the differing use’ referred to *is* to-day the basis for the analysis. Undoubtedly it was of inestim-

* For a full discussion of Dahse’s theory of the text see Dr. Skinner’s *The Divine Names in Genesis*, chap. i, and note on pp. 270-1. As for his theory that the usage of the Divine Names is largely determined by the Synagogue readings and that these were the work of Ezra, I do not know a single writer of repute who accepts it. His friend and ally, H. M. Wiener, himself rejects it and, as Prof. Welch well says (p. 348), it “has been fully, in my judgment conclusively, answered by Dr. Skinner” (see *The Divine Names*, chaps. ii-viii).

able value in the earlier stages of investigation, as setting students upon the track which led to the documents-hypothesis, but it has long ceased to be the sole basis. Present-day scholars with good reason believe in the substantial accuracy of the Hebrew text in regard to the Divine Names, but they do not think of denying that here and there in the course of transmission errors may have crept in, and they base their theory upon a much wider foundation. Dr. Welch acknowledges this. It is "perfectly true," he says, that "the whole question has now been shifted from so narrow a basis and has come to rest on a much wider foundation. Difference in language, difference in theological attitude, difference in moral and social outlook, have now come in to supplement and correct the original single test." But he offsets this acknowledgment by disparaging these other criteria as equally unreliable on the grounds that these are (a) in some cases 'subjective' in character and (b) in others absent or so uncertain and even contradictory that finally the critic has nothing but the use of the Divine Name on which to base his analysis (pp. 349 ff.).

A few words must be said^v on each of these two points.

(a) The charge of 'subjectivity.' This Dr. Welch speaks of as "the curse of *all* Old Testament criticism." It is not then in any way peculiar to any particular set of critics. And indeed nothing could be more clearly 'subjective' than Dr. Welch's argument with regard to the story of the Flood (pp. 350-1). It is none the worse for that. Subjectivity is all right, so long as it is a sane and healthy subjectivity. There is no need to regard it as a curse. Differences in theological and cultural outlook are real. Dr. Welch uses them effectively in his new book, *The Code of Deuteronomy* (e.g. pp. 58-9), and no critic need be ashamed to use such criteria. But there are other criteria

of a literary kind, which are not liable to this charge. Against them the Professor brings—

(b) the charge of inconclusiveness and uncertainty of import. It will be noted that the only examples given of this are 'the early stories of the period prior to the Flood.' It is quite true that in some of these, such as that of 'the Sons of God' in Gen. 6, literary criteria are less obvious and the theological outlook is not uniform, but that is only to be expected. The compiler incorporated these antique stories in his work with a minimum of change, the use of the name Yahweh being the clearest indication as to who was the compiler.* But in others, such as the two versions of the stories of Creation and the Flood, the phraseology and the details of the two presentations are markedly different and clearly differentiate the one from the other. As Dr. Welch says: 'P can be distinguished with ease' (p. 362). And after the first eleven chapters of Genesis, this charge has no longer any valid ground at all. It needs also to be pointed out that admittedly the criterion of the differing use of the Divine Names is no longer available once Ex. 6 has been reached, yet the analysis is able to separate P from JE from Ex. 7 onwards with as much practical certainty as before.

On p. 352 Dr. Welch asserts that "neither the use of the divine names nor the use of other criteria leads to sure results. And (he adds) when the insufficiency of the one method is pointed out, to seek refuge in the other is neither dignified nor convincing." I am sorry that he says this. There is no thought of 'seeking refuge.' The two methods have been in operation side by side from the days of Astruc and Eichhorn in the eighteenth century. When the evidence

* Dr. Welch speaks of Dr. Skinner as reviving 'the old exploded fragmentary theory' in his treatment of these stories. On this see Article I, p. 13, footnote.

of one witness is questioned, it is plain common sense to point out that his evidence does not stand alone but is corroborated by that of others. I am sure that Dr. Welch would not rule out in similar terms those legal arguments, based on the cumulative force of a large number of pieces of circumstantial evidence, which are daily accepted in our Courts of Law.

2. Let us now consider the first of the two criticisms mentioned by Dr. Welch, leaving the second to be dealt with in the following Article. "A number of students, such as Möller,* have insisted that Yahweh and Elohim are not employed as synonyms in the Old Testament. Elohim is frequently employed where we should employ an adjective like divine; Yahweh, on the other hand, often carries the sense of the God of revelation. . . . Hence a work of Elohim may simply correspond to what we should call a divine work, while a work of Yahweh may mean what we should name specifically an act of God in revelation or even in redemption."

There are two forms of this argument. (i) Möller, Naville and W. H. Green,† for example, would apply this line of argument to the whole body of uses of the Divine Names. Elohim, wherever it is used, means the God of Creation; Yahweh always signifies the God of revelation. The same writer could therefore use both names and pass readily from one to the other according to the particular connotation with which he wished to use it. But if so the hypothesis of different authors restricted to the use of either the one or the other of the two names falls to the ground. The weakness of this line of argument is that it "suffers from what is," according to Dr. Welch, "the curse of all Old Testament criticism—the subjective character" of the

* *Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung.*

† *The Unity of the Book of Genesis.* Scribners, New York, 1895.

reasoning. It is easy for anyone with a lively imagination, and a determination to make the evidence point one way, to find subjective reasons why the one or the other Divine Name was used in any particular place, but as soon as these reasons are subjected to an impartial scrutiny it is seen how futile they often are. Of course there are passages in which critics of all types are agreed in recognizing that one name is more appropriate than another. The documentary theory attributes Gen. 3 to J but in verses 1-5 (the conversation between the woman and the serpent) Elohim is used. So, in other passages, Elohim is used in connexion with those who are (or are supposed to be) outside the chosen line.* It must be remembered that while P and E were by their view prevented from using the name Yahweh in Genesis, J had no view to prevent his using Elohim. No critic therefore uses the Divine Names as a clue to analysis without discrimination. But as soon as this occasional use of Elohim in J is exceeded and the attempt made to find a significant meaning in every use of the Divine Names, the arbitrary character of the applications of the theory is clearly seen. Take, e.g., Prof. Green on Gen. 11²⁷⁻²⁵† “Throughout this section,” he says, “the divine Names are used with evident discrimination. Jehovah is used in 12-16. Elohim does not occur till chap. 17, where it is found repeatedly and with the exception of ver. 1 exclusively.” Why, we ask, is this change made in chap. 17? Is it not still Jehovah, who enters into covenant with Abraham? Is not this eminently a passage where the name of the God of revelation should be used? Yes, but, says Green, the fulfilment of the promise given twenty-four years before had been so long delayed that it

* E.g. 33⁵⁻¹¹ (Esau), 39⁹ (spoken to Potiphar's wife), 43^{23, 29} (Joseph, as Egyptian governor, and his Egyptian servant), 44¹⁶ (Judah and Joseph as Egyptian governor).

† *Op. cit.*, pp. 151-4.

was necessary to emphasize the Divine omnipotence by using El Shaddai and Elohim! This section includes two narratives of Abraham's deceit with regard to Sarah. In chap. 12 Yahweh is the name used, but in chap. 20 it is Elohim. In the first passage Green says that it is "Jehovah, the God of the chosen race," who is appropriately named as guarding Sarai, Abram's wife, in Egypt. But, when he comes to the second, he says "Elohim is the proper word," because Abimelech was "a Gentile." Wasn't Pharaoh (chap. 12) also a Gentile? It is the same with the two narratives relating to Hagar and Ishmael. According to Green, in 21⁹⁻²¹ "Elohim is used throughout, because they are now finally severed from the family of Abraham; whereas in 16⁷⁻¹³, while Hagar still belonged to the family, it is the angel of Jehovah who finds her and sends her back"! Green acknowledges that in 25²¹ "Jehovah would certainly have been appropriate here. And yet Elohim is appropriate likewise." It is evident that this critic would find appropriateness in almost any possible use of the Divine Names. Even if Dahse succeeded in proving that the Names were to be altered in a number of cases in conformity with the LXX text, his ingenuity (were he still living) would enable him to give equally good (or bad) reasons for these new uses as once for the old.

We may add that, even if he were able to do this, he would be only at the beginning of his task. He would still have to explain how it comes to pass that in the passages assigned by so many scholars to P the use of Elohim is accompanied invariably by other linguistic phenomena and by different conceptions of worship and of history.

(ii) I am sure that Dr. Welch would not approve of the arbitrary methods, of which specimens have just been given. When he says that "Elohim is frequently used where we should employ an adjective like divine" and

that "the contention can be supported by the differing use of the divine names in the later historical books," he may be referring to Baumgärtel's much more reasonable and scientific investigation of the uses of the Names outside the Pentateuch, of which some account was given in the supplementary note to Article 1. If readers followed that statement and accepted as correct the application of Baumgärtel's method to the Pentateuch, they will have realized that at the outside only 33 uses of Elohim in Gen. 1-Ex. 3¹⁶ are affected by such reasoning and that with regard to the majority of these there is no dispute. They have not been used by careful writers as marks of Elohist authorship. But in any case, the utmost amount of change is to reduce the uses of Elohim, as a proper name and the equivalent of Yahweh in other passages, from 178 to 145, while the application of the same principles to Ex. 3¹⁶-Deut. reduces similar uses of Elohim in those books from 61 to 22! The contrast between the use in Gen. 1-Ex. 3¹⁶ and that in Ex. 3¹⁶-Deut. becomes not less but greater! As a matter of fact, whether Dr. Welch is referring to the lines of argument adopted in (i) or (ii) (he seems to me to mix up the two) he evidently does not regard this first method of attack as of much value. He speaks of the second method as raising "a much more serious objection." But at the same time he does use it. He writes: "If a writer was able to use Yahweh in the special sense and Elohim in the general sense, he *may* have used both names . . . and *may* have passed readily from one to the other. So soon however as this is recognized, the use of Yahweh or Elohim in *any* particular passage ceases to be a distinctive thing." * The point however is not what a writer *may*

* There are five 'mays' in eleven lines. And did Dr. Welch mean 'any particular passage' or 'some particular passages'? The latter is all that Baumgärtel would contend for.

have done, but what a writer *has* done. On that point Dr. Welch does not commit himself. He calls for "renewed, close and unprejudiced examination" both as "to the reliability of the MT in connexion with the employment of the divine names" and as "to the practice throughout the whole of Scripture in the use of the same names," * but meantime leaves his readers in a haze of uncertainty. May I in the most friendly spirit use his own words in regard to other critics and call this proceeding "neither dignified nor convincing." * The haze seems to me to be one which careful study of the actual usage of Genesis dispenses. As we have seen, all critics realize that there are cases where Elohim is deliberately used by J, but in the vast majority of cases the use of the two names prior to Ex. 3, seems plainly attributable, not to the discriminating use of the names by one single writer, but to the different views of different writers as to the date at which the name Yahweh first became known to the people of Israel.

J. BATTERSBY HARFORD.

SOME NOTES ON NAHUM I.-II. 3.

(c) THE ACROSTIC POEM.

WE now approach the most difficult question, and the one which has caused much discussion—the question whether the whole or any part of chapters i.-ii. 3 is an alphabetical or acrostic psalm.

Alphabetical psalms are a well-known phenomenon.

* *Expositor*, May, 1923, p. 352. The curious thing is that, although Welch refers, in a footnote to this paragraph, to Baumgärtel's pamphlet, p. 13 f., he seems not to have read to the end or else he would surely have told us that Baumgärtel had made the very examination which he speaks of as so needed and that, as the result, he had come definitely to the conclusion that "the MT *has* faithfully transmitted the divine names" (see Article 3, Part III 3 v, in October issue).