Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal   https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., BARRISTER-AT-LAW,

LINCOLN'S INN, LONDON.

III.

THE "CLUE" TO THE "DOCUMENTS."

WE now come to the most important of all the points we have to discuss. Mr. Carpenter states the critical case with respect to it as follows:—

"The real key to the composition of the Pentateuch may be said to lie in Ex vi 2–8. . . . Two facts of the utmost importance are here definitely asserted. In revealing himself as the LORD, God affirms that he had not been known by that name to the forefathers of Israel; but he had appeared to them as El Shaddai. On the basis of these words it would be reasonable to look for traces in Genesis of divine manifestations to the patriarchs under the title El Shaddai, and their discovery would afford a presumption that they belonged to the same document. On the other hand the occurrence of similar manifestations in the character of the LORD would directly contradict the express words of the text, and could not be ascribed to the same author. The distinction which Astruc adopted has thus the direct sanction of the Pentateuch itself, and its immediate application is simple and easy. Does the book of Genesis contain revelations of God to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as El Shaddai? To Abraham and Jacob, certainly: 'I am El Shaddai' Gen xvii 1 and xxxv 11; but the corresponding announcement to Isaac is missing. Mingled with these, however, are other passages of a different nature, such as the divine utterance to Abram xv 7 'I am the LORD that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees'; or to Jacob xxviii 13 'I am the LORD, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac.' Side by side with these stand many others describing the recognition of the LORD by the patriarchs and their contemporaries. Between Bethel and Ai Abram 'builded an altar unto the LORD, and called upon the name of the LORD' xii 8 cp xiii 4, 18 xxi 33.

To the king of Sodom Abram declared that he had sworn 'to the LORD' to take none of the 'goods' recovered from the Mesopotamian Invaders xiv 22. Sarai complained to her husband, 'the LORD hath restrained me from bearing' xvi 2. When the mysterious visitor rebukes her for her incredulity, he asks 'Is anything too hard for the LORD?' xviii 14. Lot is warned by the men whom he has entertained, 'the LORD hath sent us to destroy' this place xix 13. But it is not needful to accumulate further instances. The name is known beyond the confines of Canaan. The 'man' in search of a bride for his master's son is welcomed with it at the city of Nahor by Laban, 'Come in, thou blessed of the LORD' xxiv 31. And it is of such ancient use that it can be said of the family of Adam, 'then began men to call upon the name of the LORD' iv 26. But unless the writer of Ex vi 2 contradicts himself, not one of these passages can have issued from his hand." (Mr. Carpenter adds a footnote: "It does not, however, follow that he would never have employed the name in narrative.") (Oxford Hexateuch, vol. i. pp. 33 f.)

In the issue the main division is effected into three documents, the now well-known J, E, and P.

It might naturally be inferred that the critics had succeeded in dividing the early portions of the Pentateuch into three documents in two of which (P and E) Elohim was consistently used to the total exclusion of the Tetragrammaton, while in the third(J) the Tetragrammaton alone was used. We believe that Mr. Carpenter himself has sometimes come near to drawing this inference, at any rate so far as relates to J, and we must therefore begin by attempting to discover his conception of what the critical case is. On page 98 of his first volume he does indeed say in a footnote, that "when Abraham enters the story, the use of the name 'the LORD' is usually limited to his descendants, though not invariably cp Gen xxvi 28 xxxix 3," but in his notes he puts forward other views. On page 71 of the second volume (note on Gen. xlv. 9) we are told that "the language of this verse is not inconsistent with J except in the use of 'Elohim' which is no longer dramatically appropriate as in xliii 23, 29 xliv 16 between supposed

strangers, and may be due to editorial assimilation [i.e. one of our old friends the redactors whom we rejoice to meet again so soon] cp 1 24 note." The material portion of that note is as follows: "There remains the use of the name ' Elohim.' [1] This appears to be due to the peculiar revision through which the Joseph stories have passed [i.e. a redactor]. The name ' the LORD ' does not occur in J after xxxix 23.[2] It might have been expected in xliii 29 (cp xxxix 3 where an Egyptian recognises the LORD's presence with Joseph) cp xliv 16 xlv 9." On the other hand, there is a note on Genesis xxxiii. 5 (p. 51) which is in direct conflict with the ideas underlying these comments: "The occurrence of the name ' Elohim ' in 5 and 11 at first sight suggests the assimilation of material from E. But J also uses this name (cp xxxii 28) especially in connexion with those who are (or are supposed to be) outside the close line cp iii 1 xliii 29 xliv 16."

Now the plain meaning of all these inconsistent observations is as follows: In the abstract, either of two cases is conceivable. There might be an author who used Elohim and the Tetragrammaton either indifferently or discriminating them on some fixed principle: or again there might be an author who uniformly used the Tetragrammaton only. The latter is the case that the critics would prefer. The reason (or perhaps instinct) that prompts them is not difficult to discern. It is one of the suppressed premises of their case that the use of language is throughout uniform, rigid, mechanical. If J can use Elohim as well as the Tetragrammaton, it becomes very difficult to deny him Elohim passages merely because of the use of this term for God. Accordingly Mr. Carpenter, who has noticed a few of the occurrences of Elohim in J (characteristic-

[1] Elohim is not a name — but let that pass.

[2] It occurs in xlix. 18, which Mr. Carpenter assigns to a redactor.

ally enough he has not noticed all) makes desperate efforts to invent subtle reasons which would discount the effect of these passages on the minds of his readers.

The whole theory of a division on the basis of the supposed clue afforded by Exodus vi. 3 breaks down completely under examination. We propose to submit it successively to five different tests.

1. It is not, in fact, possible to divide the early portions of the Pentateuch into three main sources (P, E, and J), each of which shall be self-consistent in the use of the designations of God and shall also conform to a uniform practice.

(1) As to P: The Tetragrammaton occurs in two passages of P (Gen. xvii. 1 and xxi. 1b). In both cases a redactor or copyist has to be invoked to get rid of it.

(2) As to E: The Tetragrammaton occurs in four passages of E (Gen. xv. 1, 2; xxii. 11; xxvii. 7b). In all these cases recourse is had as usual to a redactor.

(3) As to J: There are here two separate lines of argument.

(*a*) The discrepancy as to the use of the Tetragrammaton which the critical theory was designed to remove reappears, though on a smaller scale. J uses the Tetragrammaton before (according to J) it was known. His statement is that after the birth of Enoch men began to call upon the name of the LORD (Gen. iv. 26). Yet not only does the Tetragrammaton occur very freely in the narrative of the preceding chapters, but it is actually put into the mouth of Eve, the grandmother of Enoch, long before Seth, his father, had been born. She is made to say, " I have gotten a man with the LORD" (iv. 1). How is this possible on the critical theory? Why is it conceivable that the author of J could do that which, *ex hypothesi,* the author of the Pentateuch could not?

(*b*)   As already stated, J uses *Elohim* in many passages, and only a few of these have been noted by Mr. Carpenter. We have observed the following: Genesis iii. 1, 3, 5; iv. 25 (contrast iv. 1) ; vii. 9 ; ix. 27 ; xxvi. 24 (in a Divine revelation where the Name ought most certainly to appear on the critical theory) ; xxx. 29 (28) ; xxxiii. 5, 10, 11; xxxix. 9 ; xliii. 23, 29; xliv. 16; xlv. 9 ; xlviii. 15 (twice) ; l. 24. We have seen that in some instances Mr. Carpenter is reduced to postulating redactors, in others he invents brainspun subtleties to account for the word, while his silence in yet others indicates that he has not considered the phenomena they present.

2.   An even more serious objection is to be found in the divisions which the critics are compelled to effect in order to carry through their theory.   It is one thing to suggest that a continuous passage like Genesis i. 1–ii. 3, or xi. 1–9, or xiv. may be ultimately derived from a separate source; it is quite another to postulate such proceedings as are attributed to the redactors of the critical case.   The following instances are limited to those in which the appellations of the Deity are the sole or determining criterion: in xvi. the use of the Tetragrammaton in verse 2 compels Mr. Carpenter to wrench 1b and 2 from a P context and assign them to J; in xix., verse 29 is torn from a J chapter in which it fits perfectly, to be given to P; in xx. the last verse is assigned to a redactor, though all the rest of the chapter goes to E, and the verse is required for the expla- · nation of 17; in xxii., verses 14–18 go to redactors because the story is assigned to E (a redactor being responsible for the Tetragrammaton in 11).   An even more flagrant instance occurs in xxviii. 21, where Mr. Carpenter is compelled to scoop out the words " and the LORD will be my God " and assign them to J, the beginning and end of the verse going to E.   What manner of man was this redactor who constructed a narrative on

these strange principles? In xxxi., verse 3 has to go to a redactor because the preceding and subsequent verses belong to E; yet that gentleman actually postulates the redactor's work by referring to the statement of 3 in verse 5. However, he receives compensation in xxxii., where verse 30 is wrenched from a J context for his enrichment, though verse 31 (J) cannot be understood without it.

During the later chapters there are no instances, because the Tetragrammaton occurs in Genesis only once after xxxix. 23, so that "a peculiar revision" has to be postulated to justify the analysis during the remainder of the book. It must be remembered further that we have confined ourselves to flagrant cases where the Divine appellations are the sole or determining criterion: there are others where it is one of the criteria (e.g. the assignment of v. 29, the division of the flood story). It will be felt that the critics must have been very hard up for something to believe before they credited such theories as these.

3. The third great objection is alone sufficient to give the *coup de grâce* to the whole theory.[1] Unfortunately somewhat lengthy explanations are needed to make it intelligible: but in view of the importance of the topic we must ask our readers to bear with us. We shall show that the text is in many instances extremely unreliable in regard to the occurrences of the Tetragrammaton and Elohim, and that the critics have ef-

---

[1] Our attention was first drawn to the evidence of the Versions in this connection by a notice of a paper by Dr. H. A. Redpath. After working at the subject, we wrote and asked an eminent disciple of Astruc and Wellhausen, how he dealt with the matter. In reply he referred us to an article by Dr. Johannes Dahse, entitled "Textkritische Bedenken gegen den Ausgangspunkt der heutigen Pentateuchkritik," in the Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 1903, pp. 305–319, attacking the Wellhausen theory on the ground of the evidence of the Versions. We have since asked another eminent critic whether

fected their partition on the basis of a text which is sometimes demonstrably wrong and frequently quite uncertain.

The oldest biblical Hebrew MSS. of which the date is certainly known do not go back before the seventh century of the Christian era.[1] They are therefore not the earliest extant witnesses to the text. Moreover, with slight exceptions, they all represent one official Jewish recension of the Hebrew text. This recension was the work of certain persons unknown (commonly called Massoretes, from a Hebrew word meaning tradition) who lived at some time unknown and were guided by critical principles that are also unknown. They took steps to secure the accurate transmission of what they regarded as the best text known to them, and with such success that variants are very rare in our Hebrew MSS., though, as we shall see, they are not unknown, and sometimes preserve readings that are superior to those of the received text. Textual criticism has therefore to employ other aids in addition to Hebrew MSS., and the most important of these are the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Versions.

any answer has been put forward to Dr. Dahse, and he tells us that so far as he knows this has not been done. Our views have not been materially affected by Dr. Dahse's work, and it does not appear that Dr. Redpath had ever seen or heard of his paper. We have now read Dr. Redpath's paper, which will be found on pages 286–301 of the American Journal of Theology, vol. viii. (1904), under the title "A New Theory as to the Use of the Divine Names in the Penta-teuch," and we find that our views differ very largely from his; but this does not detract from our debt to his work for giving us the first clue to the line of investigation here followed. We desire to add that, as far back as 1784, De Rossi pointed out, in reply to As-truc, that many instances of changes of the Tetragrammaton into *Elohim* are found in the MSS. (see his note on Genesis vii. 1, Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti, vol. i. p. 10).

[1] Apart from the Nash papyrus, which contains only two short passages. There is a Pentateuch of the year 604 (see Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary, p. 617b).

The origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch is as follows: At an unknown date some centuries before Christ the Samaritans obtained a copy of the Hebrew Pentateuch. They seem to have edited it, making additions and alterations that were designed either for the purpose of subserving their religious views or else to remove seeming discrepancies, etc. Subject to such alterations (which are easily distinguished), and to such errors as may have crept in as the result of some centuries of MS. tradition, they have preserved the Hebrew text in substantially the original character. There is no evidence that their original MS. was better as a whole than those which were the ancestors of the Massoretic Text, but it may have had some superior readings, and, moreover, the Samaritan tradition, cut off from Jewish influences and preserving the text in a different character, may have remained free from some of the later corruptions of the Jewish text. Hence a reading of the Samaritan is always entitled to careful consideration.

In addition the early Versions are important, and of these the Septuagint is *facile princeps*. It has preserved a very large number of readings that differ greatly from the Massoretic text, and is regarded on all sides as the palmary aid to textual criticism. The version that stands second to it in importance, though infinitely inferior, is the Syriac, usually called the Peshitto.

In order to estimate the higher critical position properly, it must be remembered that the principle of using the Versions for textual criticism is universally accepted by modern commentators and applied in the other books of the Bible. For instance, in 1 Samuel ii. 1, for the second " Lord," twenty-eight MSS. and the Septuagint have " my God," which improves the parallelism and is accepted by modern critics. It would be

extremely easy to multiply instances, but it will be sufficient to refer to the well-known case of Chronicles and its parallels in the earlier books. It is usually the Chronicler who substitutes Elohim for the Tetragrammaton; but in one or two cases he has the Tetragrammaton where our present text gives us Elohim in the earlier books (cp. 2 Sam. vii. 2 with 1 Chron. xvii. 1, and 1 Kings xii. 22 with 2 Chron. xi. 2). No doubt many instances of various readings are to be explained by the desire of late writers and copyists to avoid the Tetragrammaton, but in some cases it would appear that the Divine Name has ousted Elohim in the Hebrew text, as in the passage just cited from 1 Samuel ii. 1, where the parallelism seems to support the variant.

Coming now to the Pentateuch, it is to be observed that the higher critics fully recognize the principle of textual criticism as applied to the Divine appellations when it suits their convenience. (See attempts to apply it by Dr. Gray (Numbers, pp. 310 f.) and Mr. Carpenter (Hexateuch, vol. ii. pp. 109, 225, etc.)) One of the strangest of many strange phenomena in the critical treatment of the Pentateuch is to be found in the extraordinary mixture of simple, unquestioning acceptance of the received Hebrew text and textual criticism, of knowledge, and of ignorance that characterizes Mr. Carpenter's notes on Genesis. For example, in his margin he notes that in vii. 9 the Targum of Onkelos,[1] the Samaritan, and the Vulgate have " the LORD " for " God." He does not seem to know that one Hebrew MS. also preserves this reading, and that it has a good deal of Septuagintal support. We believe that his only previous recognition of any conflict of evidence in this matter is in the

[1] Mr. Carpenter probably means the Targum of " Jonathan," as Onkelos habitually paraphrases. See, e.g., Genesis i., where it has " throughout.

note on ii. 4c, which contains the highly misleading statement that the Septuagint employs " the LORD God " down to viii. 21 and even in ix. 12. This is a fair sample of his work in this matter. How indefensible such a use of the Versions is will appear more fully when we take into consideration the existing material which evidences differences of reading (not merely through the occurrence of the double phrase " LORD God ") in an enormous proportion of the occurrences of both Elohim and the Tetragrammaton both before and after vii. 9. Either textual criticism is proper, in which case it should be practised with thoroughness and impartiality, or else it is not, in which case Mr. Carpenter should have left it alone altogether.

Now there is always a preliminary question to be asked in using the Versions. Does the text really represent a different Hebrew? If it be due to a mistranslation or to some desire to give a rendering which shall be clearer than a more literal version, or if again the variant be the result of internal corruption in the Version, it is obvious that it will be of no value for the criticism of the Hebrew text. That this is not the case with, at any rate, the majority of the readings we shall have to consider, is proved by the following considerations :—

(1) Although the divergences of the Hebrew MSS. are (as has been explained) inconsiderable, there are yet a number of instances where there is support for the renderings of the Versions either from one or more Hebrew MSS. or from the Samaritan or both.

In the following lists we give some variants recorded by (*a*) De Rossi and (*b*) Kennicott in their collations of Hebrew MSS. We have added to these some notes on various Septuagintal readings taken for the most part from the larger Cambridge Septuagint. It will appear hereafter that the readings of the Septuagint present peculiar difficulties. We shall have

to make certain suggestions as to the solution of these difficulties at the proper time. For the moment it will be sufficient to notice that there are variations, and that sometimes a Septuagintal reading that has little Greek authority is supported by a Hebrew MS. As we do not read Syriac, we have relied on Kittel's Biblia Hebraica for the reading of this, as also of the less important Versions.

De Rossi chronicles the following variants :—

REFERENCE.	RECEIVED TEXT.	DE ROSSI.	OTHER SOURCES.
Gen.vii. 1.	LORD.	2 MSS. God.	Samaritan, Syriac, God. The best MSS. of the Septuagint, LORD God, with some authority for God only, and LORD only in 1 cursive.
Gen. vii. 9.	God.	1 MS. LORD.	Samaritan, Targum of " Jonathan," Vulgate, LORD; Septuagintal authorities divided between God, LORD, and LORD God.
Gen. viii.15.	God.	1 MS. LORD.	LXX, LORD God. ⸴
Gen. xvi. 11.	LORD 2°.	1 MS. God.	LXX, divided between LORD, LORD God, God.
Ex. v. 17.	To the LORD.	4 MSS. to our God.	LXX, to our God.
Ex. vi. 2.	God.	2 MSS. LORD. 1 MS. LORD God.	Sam. LORD. Some Septuagintal authority (i.e. Lagarde's Lucian, see *post*), for LORD.

Kennicott [1] has the following additional variants :—

REFERENCE.	RECEIVED TEXT.	KENNICOTT.	OTHER MATERIAL.
Gen. ii. 22.	LORD God.	1 MS. omits God.	LXX, LORD God, except 1 cursive, which omits God.
Gen. iii. 1.	God 2°.	1 MS. LORD God.	LXX, preponderance of authority for God. 1 uncial and 3 cursives read LORD God.

[1] Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, cum variis lectionibus, edidit B. Kennicott, Oxford, 1776.

REFERENCE.	RECEIVED TEXT.	KENNICOTT.	OTHER MATERIAL.
Gen. iii. 22.	LORD God.	1 MS. omits LORD.	It is known that the LXX originally read God only. Our present MSS. are, however, divided between LORD God and God. while it is said, on the authority of Holmes. that 1 cursive has LORD only.
Gen. xxxi. 53. ⁄	The God of their father.	Omitted by 2 MSS.	Omitted by the original LXX.

There are also extant some fragments of a tenth-century Karaite MS., and in Exodus iii. 4 these give the reading " LORD " for the " God "[1] of the Massoretic text. The LXX here also reads " LORD."

(2)   A second body of evidence — if more be needed — is contributed by extant notes as to various readings that have come down to us, showing that Septuagintal readings were supported by other authorities. Thus we read that in Genesis iv. 1, where our text has " LORD," the reading " God," which has the unanimous support of our Septuagintal authorities, was the reading of somebody who could be described as " the Hebrew " (i.e. probably an unknown translator or commentator so quoted[2]) and an authority described as " the Syrian."[3] In iv. 26 the LXX has " LORD God," and this is supported by a note that " the Hebrew " had this reading.[4] In xxx. 24, for the Hebrew " LORD " both our Septuagintal authorities and our Syriac have " God." Now it is known that the Septuagint was supported in this, not merely by the Greek rendering of Symmachus, but also by that of Aquila. Of this scholar very little

---

[1] R. Hoerning, Karaite MSS. in the British Museum, p. 14.
[2] Field, Hexapla, p. lxxvii.
[3] See Field, Hexapla, *ad loc.*. and on " the Syrian," see pp. lxxvii–lxxxii.
[4] See Field, Hexapla, or the larger Cambridge Septuagint. *ad loc.*

is known, save that his translation was distinguished by extreme literalness and a refusal to translate the Tetragrammaton at all. He habitually retained the Name itself, and not in Greek but in the old Hebrew character. Hence on this point at any rate no mistake is possible as to the reading he had before him. Further he is supposed to have been a proselyte to Judaism in close touch with the most authoritative Jewish circles of his day, so that a reading of his is extremely valuable evidence as to the best Jewish text of *circa* 125–130 of the Christian era.

For these reasons it is certain that the Versions do, at any rate in the great majority of cases where they differ from the Massoretic text, provide us with genuine Jewish variant readings, and this at once opens up the question as to the soundness of the Massoretic text with regard to the appellations of God.

It is conceivable that in defense of the higher critical theory it may be asserted that in all cases the Massoretic text is to be preferred. Coming from men who never hesitate to invoke a copyist, harmonist, or redactor to conjure away the facts of the Massoretic text with regard to the usage of the two appellations when their theory demands it, the argument would sound rather strange: but consistency is as little to be expected from the critics as accuracy. Therefore we propose to meet this argument by pointing to some of the readings in which for one reason or another the variant is demonstrably superior to the Massoretic text.

In Genesis iv. 1, " I have gotten a man with [1] the LORD " is impossible, in view of iv. 26. The unanimous reading of the

[1] The pronoun is doubtful, but this is immaterial to the present discussion.

LXX, " God," supported by the note in the Hexapla attributing
to " the Hebrew " and " the Syrian " a reading differing from
the LXX only in the pronoun, is clearly preferable. It is notice-
able that here it is the Tetragrammaton that has for some
reason ousted Elohim from the Hebrew text, not *vice versa*.

Genesis xvi. 11 is another example of this. It is certain that
the explanation of the name Ishmael cannot have contained the
Tetragrammaton, for in that case the name must have been
Ishma–*yah*. Ishmael, on the other hand, is of the type of
Isra*el* and Peni*el*, and, like these, must have been explained by
a sentence containing *Elohim*. Therefore the reading of the
MS. which has preserved this, supported as it is by the Lucian-
ic recension of the LXX and the Old Latin, is certainly right.

Similarly, in xxx. 24 the Tetragrammaton of the Massore-
tic text is less probable than the Elohim of the LXX, Syriac,
Aquila, and Symmachus, in view of the Elohim of the preced-
ing verse, and in 27 the Elohim of the Syriac and LXX is at
least as probable as the reading of our present Hebrew.

On the other hand, there is at least one instance in which
something like the converse process has taken place. In Gene-
sis xlviii. 15 the best MS. of the LXX has preserved a reading
which, on literary grounds, must be regarded as superior to the
Elohim of the Massoretic text. Jacob gives a triple descrip-
tion of Him whom he served, and he does so in terms that
necessitate three substantives. Of these, the first (15a) is God
(Elohim) and the third is angel. In the Massoretic text the
second has been replaced by God. But Codex B of the Septua-
gint has retained the reading " the Lord " (i.e. not the Tetra-
grammaton, but the Hebrew word lord, which is applied here,
as in some other passages of Genesis, to God). And this is
clearly right.

Another class of cases in which Septuagintal readings are

demonstrably superior to those of the Massoretic text is afforded by certain omissions. According to an ordinary principle of textual criticism the shorter reading is to be preferred in cases where the addition involved by its variant is of such a nature as to be probably explained as being a gloss. It is within the knowledge of everybody that there exist people who will write notes in their books: and in cases of MS. tradition such notes are apt to get incorporated with the text in later copies of the book. Hence there is usually a presumption in favor of the shorter text.

In Genesis xiv. 22 it is for this reason more probable that the Tetragrammaton is the addition of some reader than that the Syriac and almost all the Septuagintal authorities should have omitted the word by accident. So in xv. 2, where the Tetragrammaton (represented by the GOD of the R.V.) is omitted by the Lucianic recension and many MSS. of the Septuagint. In xxxi. 42, " God of my father Abraham," which was undoubtedly the original reading of the LXX, seems better than " God of my father the God of Abraham "; and in xxxi. 53 "the God of their father " which was omitted by the original LXX, is an unmistakable gloss. So is the word " God " in Exodus iii. 1, which is known to have been missing in the original Septuagintal text. This last gloss has given endless trouble to interpreters. Lastly, a number of considerations combine to show that in Genesis xxviii. 13 the true reading is, " I am the God of Abraham thy father," etc.; but, as we shall have to deal with this passage later in the discussion, we omit the arguments for the present.

The above instances will suffice to show that there are cases in which the Septuagint has preserved readings that are demonstrably superior to those of the Hebrew text, though they do not exhaust the passages in which this has happened. It has

also in a number of cases preserved readings that are demon-
strably inferior. But in the great majority of variations there
are no decisive criteria; for in the great majority of cases the
difference to the sense is nil and to the sound indecisive. In
writing a history of England during the Victorian age an
author might use " the Queen " and " Victoria " indifferently
in many cases. The same is true of the Divine appellations in
Genesis. Many of the narratives would read just as well with
the one word as with the other, and in the great majority of
cases where variants exist it can only be said that intrinsically
one reading is as probable as the other. It is, therefore, only
necessary to show that these variants are extraordinarily
numerous to cut away the ground from under the feet of the
documentary critics. If it is seldom certain whether the orig-
inal text of Genesis used God or Lord, it cannot be argued
that the occurrences of these words in the Massoretic text
afford any presumption at all as to authorship.

The great quarry for variant readings is the Septuagint. But
in order to use it critically some sketch of its history is neces-
sary; for its fortunes have been very chequered, and the task
of ascertaining its true readings is frequently as difficult as it
is fascinating.

It is known that in the fourth century the Greek-speaking
Christian world was divided between three recensions of the
Septuagint, prepared by Hesychius, Lucian, and Origen [1]
respectively. If we had these before us, it would in many cases
be possible to argue, from a critical comparison of the three,
what the original text of the Septuagint was. It is clear that
where they all agreed their unanimous testimony would fre-

---

[1] In the case of the work of Origen, the edition in common use was
prepared by Eusebius and Pamphilus on the basis of the Hexapla.

quently be above suspicion: where they differed, the causes of the deviation might often be sufficiently obvious to allow more or less certain inferences as to the original. This is the more probable, owing to the known critical procedure of Origen, one of the editors. He observed that there were many instances in which the MSS. of the Septuagint differed from the accepted Hebrew text of his day. He concluded that in all such cases the Hebrew was right and the Septuagint wrong. But the position that the Septuagint had won in the Christian world was so strong that it could not be ousted by any new translation. Accordingly Origen decided to produce a work which should not be limited to the text of the Septuagint, but should also supply the materials for its correction. The result was his famous Hexapla. The bulk of the work was in six columns: One gave the Hebrew text in Hebrew characters: the second contained a transliteration of the Hebrew in Greek characters: the remaining four were devoted to four Greek renderings — those of Aquila. Symmachus, and Theodotion, as well as the Septuagint. An important feature of the work was the treatment of the latter. Where Origen found that words were missing from the Septuagint which appeared in the Hebrew, he supplied them from one of the other translations; but to make this clear he put the insertions between an asterisk and another sign called a metobel. For example, in Genesis ii. 4 he found that the Hebrew had " LORD God," while the LXX had only " God." In his LXX column he therefore wrote " LORD God," with an asterisk before, and a metobel after, " Lord." This would be understood by his readers to mean " The reading of the LXX as found by Origen is, God; but the Hebrew has ' LORD God,' and the word ' LORD ' has therefore been added from another translation to the original text of the LXX." Similarly, if the LXX contained words that were missing in

the Hebrew he inserted critical signs (an obel followed by a metobel) to show that these words were only to be found in the LXX.

The ultimate result of these labors was the production of a number of MSS. presenting hybrid texts. Where Origen's recension was copied, his critical marks were frequently omitted. The three recensions — those of Hesychius, Lucian, and Origen (i.e. as edited by Eusebius and Pamphilus) — did not remain absolutely distinct. A MS. representing originally one recension might be corrected from a codex of another recension, or indeed from another Greek translation. The result is that all our extant MSS. represent more or less mixed texts. They frequently differ greatly among themselves, and the recovery of the original Septuagintal reading is a task that is often difficult and sometimes impossible. Moreover it is not certain that these were the only recensions. We have been greatly struck by the fact that a twelfth-century cursive (called n by the Cambridge editors) frequently exhibits a text which entitles it to rank among the authorities available for the criticism of the Massoretic text, and we think it represents a recension which is not in the main Lucianic or Hexaplar. Attempts have been made to group it with g and (more recently) with d, p and t. In our judgment such attempts break down. In its most excellent and characteristic readings in Genesis it seldom has much MS. support. Possibly it may some day be found that it represents Hesychius, though there are other candidates. If it does not, criticism will ultimately have to concede a fourth important recension. Thus it is necessary to take into account all variants, and judge them on their merits.

We are, however, not altogether without a clue in this task. The view of Origen that the Hebrew text of the day was necessarily superior to the LXX being extensively held, there was a

constant tendency to assimilate the Greek MSS. to the Mas-
soretic text. Accordingly it will be an equally constant princi-
ple of Septuagintal criticism that a reading which differs from
our present Hebrew is more likely to be original (other things
being equal). Of course even where the original text of the
LXX has been ascertained, we have the further question,
whether it should or should not be preferred to the Massoretic
text; but that is a distinct question, which is subsequent to the
ascertainment of the Septuagintal original.

The materials with which we have to work are as follows:—

(1) Occasional notices have been preserved as to the read-
ings of the Hexapla in particular passages: and sometimes
Origen's critical signs have been handed down. The great bulk
of these are to be found in Field's Hexapla, but a little addi-
tional material can be obtained from the larger Cambridge
Septuagint.

(2) It was observed that certain readings which were
known from other sources to have been distinguishing readings
of Lucian's recension were exhibited by certain cursive MSS.
It was therefore inferred that these MSS. preserved the Luci-
anic text in a more or less pure form, and P. de Lagarde under-
took the task of producing an edition of " Lucian." His work,[1]
unfortunately, never went beyond the first volume; but that of
course covers the books that are important for our present pur-

[1] Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canonicorum Pars Prior Graece,
Göttingen, 1883. Dahse has lately argued that the MSS. regarded as
Lucianic are not in fact the best representatives of Lucian's work
in Genesis, and do not contain a distinct recension (Zeitschrift für
die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (1908), vol. xxviii. p. 19). The
readings hereafter quoted are incompatible with the latter conten-
tion. Dahse's reasoning appears to us extremely weak, and his
main ground for arguing that a different group of MSS. (the f, i, r
of the Cambridge Septuagint) represents Lucian is a note ΔΕ in
the margin of a MS. referring to a reading in xix 2. He first

pose and often gives readings that are extremely valuable. The main defect of the book is the absence of information as to the readings of the MSS. and other sources used by Lagarde. This makes it impossible to control his views as to the original text. It is plain from the larger Cambridge Septuagint, which contains the readings of some (but unfortunately not all) of Lagarde's MSS., that in the matter of the designations of God he sometimes had to choose between different readings. He has undoubtedly chosen rightly in some instances, but who shall say that his judgment was never at fault?

(3)   In addition to the above information as to special recensions, we have a large number of MSS. and translations from the LXX. By far the best edition of the LXX for those who have to consult these is the larger Cambridge edition, of which, at the time of writing, Genesis only has appeared.[1] It contains the readings of all the uncials, thirty selected cursives, and the ancient versions from the Septuagint that are of textual importance. It also gives the readings of church fathers who quote the LXX, but these are frequently valueless for our special purpose, and need not be considered. (In view of the statement that the Ethiopic version is a very free translation, we shall not generally quote this.)   Lastly, it reports some additional

changes this to ΛΕ, and then interprets it as Lucian's edition (Λουκιανου Εκδοσις).   That is probably right; but he has overlooked the fact that Lagarde has this reading as the result of an examination of the Lucianic MSS.   Thus his only important evidence that the group f, l, r is Lucianic is not a test that excludes the bulk of the MSS. on which Lagarde relied.   Such a reading as that in Gen. xvi. 11 proves beyond a peradventure that Lagarde's MSS. have preserved a distinct and most valuable version where f, l, r are at fault.   Moreover, Lagarde appears to have used evidence for his edition that has not been employed by Dahse.

[1] The Old Testament in Greek, edited by Alan England Brooke and Norman McLean, Vol. I, The Octateuch, Part 1. Genesis, Cambridge, 1906.

readings of other MSS. given in the earlier edition of Holmes; but, as this book does not enjoy a first-rate reputation for accuracy, these readings can be used only with some reserve.

After this lengthy introduction it is possible to arrive at some principles which may guide us in the use of the Septuagintal material.

(1) Where all the available Septuagintal authorities are agreed in reading either " LORD " for a Hebrew " God " or " LORD God," or in reading " God " for a Hebrew " LORD " or " LORD God," we may be certain that they have preserved the original reading of the LXX. (It will presently appear that this inference is not equally certain where they all agree on " LORD God.")

(2) Where the facts are as in (1), save that some of the Septuagintal authorities support the Hebrew while the variant is supported by strong Septuagintal authority, the variant will be the original reading of the LXX.

(3) Where it is definitely known that Origen altered the text to bring it into conformity with the Hebrew, the unaltered text will be the original reading, even if all or most of our other Septuagintal authorities support the Hebrew.

(4) Where Lucian alone has " God " for a Hebrew " LORD " or " LORD " for a Hebrew " God," his text represents an original Hebrew variant; though not necessarily the original text of the LXX.

Other canons will emerge as the inquiry proceeds: for the present we desire to exemplify these in a simple manner. In the following table we set out those readings in Genesis ii.–iii. for which Hexaplar information is available.

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Reading of the Best Extant MS. of the LXX.	Lagarde's Lucian.	Field's Hexapla.	Other Information.
Gen. ii. 4.	Lord God.	Lord God.	God.	Origen added Lord to the Septuagintal God.	1 cursive (g) omits God. All the other authorities are divided between Lord God and God, in reading God.
Gen. ii. 5.	Lord God.	God.	Lord God.	Origen added Lord to the Septuagintal God.	5 cursives support the Hebrew. The Armenian also reads Lord God; but some of its MSS. have preserved Origen's critical marks. The rest of the authorities (including n) preserve God.
Gen. ii. 7.	Lord God.	God	God.	Origen added Lord to the Septuagintal God.	Some MSS. read Lord God. But the great preponderance of authority (including n) is for God alone.
Gen. ii. 8.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Origen added Lord to the Septuagintal God.	About 12 cursives (including n) omit Lord, with some support from versions.
Gen. iii. 1.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Septuagintal authorities unanimous.
Gen. iii. 22	Lord God.	Lord God.	God.		Origen's asterisk found in the margin of an uncial showing that he added Lord. Authorities divided between the 2 readings (n supporting God). 1 cursive of Holmes apparently reads Lord only.
Gen. iii. 23.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord God.	Lord added.	1 cursive (b) omits God.

These comparisons are very instructive. In one of the seven instances Origen appears to have found " LORD God," and this is supported by all our authorities. In the remaining six, what he regarded as the true Septuagintal text had " God " alone, and he added " LORD " to bring it into conformity with the Hebrew. In one instance all trace of the original reading has vanished from all our other Septuagintal authorities: in the other cases they divide, but not on any uniform principle. On three occasions Lucian is right, on two occasions the best MS. In all five, n has preserved the right reading. No definite rule can be laid down as to the probable source of the best readings. It can only be said that *no* information can be safely neglected. Consequently where the Hexapla fails us we must compare all our other information.

But it may be asked, What do the higher critics say to this? Would they approve of such methods? Let the following facts be considered:—

There passes, under the name of Dr. S. R. Driver, a volume entitled " Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel " (dated 1890). On pages lii f. the following passage will be found:—

"But what imparts to Lucian's work its great importance in the criticism of the O.T., is the fact that it embodies renderings, not found in other MSS. of the LXX, which presuppose a Hebrew original self-evidently superior in the passages concerned to the existing Massoretic text. Whether these renderings were derived by him from MSS. of the LXX of which all other traces have disappeared, or whether they were based directly upon Hebrew MSS. which had preserved the genuine reading intact, whether in other words they were derived mediately or immediately from the Hebrew, is a matter of subordinate moment: the fact remains that Lucian's recension contains elements resting ultimately upon Hebrew sources which enable us to correct, with absolute certainty, corrupt passages of the Massoretic text. . . . The full gain from this quarter is in all probability not yet exhausted. . . . 'Let him who would himself investigate and advance learning, by the side of the other Ancient Ver-

sions, accustom himself above all things to the use of Field's Hexapla, and Lagarde's edition of the Recension of Lucian' (Klostermann)."

There also passes, under the name of Dr. S. R. Driver, a volume entitled " The Book of Genesis, with Introduction and Notes," and the first edition bears date 1904 — i.e. long after the volume on Samuel. Naturally when we come to ii. 4 we find a note on " LORD God." Has any attempt been made, either here or in any other passage where they throw light on the appellations of God, to use either Field's Hexapla or Lagarde's Lucian? No. Instead, we read, " It is usually supposed that in ii. 4b–iii. 24 the original author wrote simply LORD: and that *God* was added by the compiler, with the object of identifying expressly the Author of life of ii. 4b–25 with the Creator of ch. 1." Would Dr. Driver (and when we say Dr. Driver we include the author or authors, source or sources, redactor or redactors, if any, of this note) have supposed anything of the kind, if he had been aware that the LXX here read " God " only at a date long subsequent to that of the supposititious compiler?

In Mr. Carpenter's Hexateuch there is a note on the passage in which the " God " of the Hebrew text is assigned to the compiler, and we read that " Klostermann has suggested that it was an instruction to the reader, when i 1–iii 24 was regarded as one section, to pronounce the same divine name (*Elohim*) throughout." Klostermann is the author of the impressive exhortation quoted in the " Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel," " above all things " to use Field's Hexapla and Lagarde's Lucian. Why do not the higher critics practise what they preach?

The evidence as to the remaining cases in ii. and iii. where the Massoretic text has " LORD God " is as follows:—

REFERENCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	BEST MS. OF THE LXX.	LAGARDE'S LUCIAN.	OTHER INFORMATION.
Gen. ii. 9.	LORD God.	God.	God.	2 cursives and the Armenian insert LORD. All other authorities (including n), God.
Gen. ii. 15.	LORD God.	LORD God.	LORD God.	1 cursive of Holmes omits LORD.
Gen. ii. 16.	LORD God.	LORD God.	LORD God.	1 cursive (f) and the Sahidic omit LORD.
Gen. ii. 18.	LORD God.	LORD God.	LORD God.	2 cursives omit LORD.
Gen. ii. 19.	LORD God.	God.	God.	LORD inserted by about 2 cursives and the Armenian and Sahidic. All other authorities, God.
Gen. ii. 21.	LORD God.	God.	God.	4 cursives and the Armenian insert LORD. 1 cursive (h) reads LORD. All other authorities, God.
Gen. ii. 22.	LORD God.	LORD God.	LORD God.	1 cursive omits God.
Gen. iii. 8 1°.	LORD God.	LORD God.	LORD God.	1 cursive (m) omits God.
Gen. iii. 8 2°.	LORD God.	LORD God.	LORD God.	1 uncial (E) and n and the Bohairic omit LORD.
Gen. iii. 9.	LORD God.	LORD God.	LORD God.	2 cursives (b, y) and the Palestinian omit LORD. 1 uncial (L) omits God.
Gen. iii. 13.	LORD God.	LORD God.	God.	LORD omitted by 1 uncial (L), 12 cursives, the Bohairic and the Palestinian. All other authorities, LORD God.
Gen. iii. 14.	LORD God.	LORD God.	LORD God.	2 cursives (e, o) omit LORD.
Gen. iii. 21.	LORD God.	LORD God.	LORD God.	Some MSS. of the Armenian omit LORD. 1 cursive of Holmes omits God.

The evidence is absolutely clear as to ii. 9, 19, 21, and iii. 13. In these cases the original LXX had God only. It would be premature to express any opinion on the other variants before considering the independent support that Septuagintal readings with very slight authority sometimes obtain from other

sources, but for those who know how often n alone preserves
a text that is superior to that of all other Septuagintal author-
ities, there can be very little doubt about iii. 8 2°.

On pages 145–149 we give a select list of variant readings
from Genesis iv. onwards:—

Probably few will doubt that in the great majority of the
passages cited in this table the LXX originally had a read-
ing that differed from our present Massoretic text. But there
is other material which can be utilized. We have seen that in
one passage an addition that is known to have been made by
Origen has been embodied in all our authorities. We have also
seen enough to show that no certain rule can be laid down as
to what authorities will contain variants. It is always possible
that one or more MSS. will detach themselves from the general
body and present a reading that is independent of that of most of
their compeers. Moreover there are an enormous number of
passages where " LORD God " is evidently a " conflate " reading,
i.e. a reading that has been produced by the amalgamation of
two readings "LORD" and " God." Sometimes both these earlier
readings are found in Septuagintal authorities: sometimes one
is represented only by the Massoretic text or some other wit-
ness: sometimes a conflate Septuagintal reading is repre-
sented by two other readings in extant sources. In these cir-
cumstances we are of opinion that two other canons may be
framed for dealing with the Septuagintal evidence as to the
Divine appellations.

(5) A reading that has very little Septuagintal authority
often represents an original Hebrew variant.

(6) A conflate Septuagintal reading frequently goes back
to varying Hebrew readings sometimes through a conflate He-
brew text. The process of mixing two readings had sometimes

REFERENCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	BEST MS. OF THE LXX.	LAGARDE'S LUCIAN.	FIELD'S HEXAPLA.	OTHER INFORMATION.
Gen. iv. 1.	LORD.	God.	God.	Origen's LXX, "the Hebrew," and "the Syrian," God; Symmachus and another (anonymous) translator, LORD	Unanimous.
Gen. iv. 3.	LORD.	LORD.	LORD.		1 uncial, 2 cursives, the Armenian and Sahidic, God; 1 cursive, LORD God; rest, LORD.
Gen. iv. 4.	LORD.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. iv. 9.	LORD.	God.	God.		1 other uncial and about 9 cursives (including n), God; rest, LORD God.
Gen. iv. 16.	LORD.	God.	God.		1 cursive (f), LORD God. All other authorities, God.
Gen. vi. 6.	LORD.	God.	God.	LXX, God. Aquila, LORD.	About 9 cursives, LORD God. All others, God.
Gen. vi. 7.	LORD.	God.	God.		About 9 cursives and 2 versions, LORD God. 1 version omits. All others (including n), God.
Gen. viii. 20.	LORD.	God.	LORD.		1 uncial (L) and about 14 cursives, LORD. Two cursives (f, n) and the Sahidic, LORD God; rest, God.

REFERENCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	BEST MS. OF THE LXX.	LAGARDE'S LUCIAN.	FIELD'S HEXAPLA.	OTHER INFORMATION.
Gen. ix. 16.	Between God.	Between me.	Between me.		About 5 cursives, God; rest, me.
Gen. xii. 17.	LORD.	God.	LORD.	LXX, God (other copies, LORD).	Authorities divided between LORD, LORD God, and God, (which is read by n).
Gen. xiii.10 1°.	LORD.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. xiii. 10 2°.	LORD.	God.	God.		1 cursive, LORD; rest, God.
Gen. xiii. 13.	LORD.	God.	God.		No important variations of certainty.
Gen. xiii. 14.	LORD.	God.	God.		2 uncials, 9 cursives, the Bohairic, LORD; Old Latin, LORD God; all others (including n), God.
Gen. xiv. 22.	LORD.	Omitted.	Omitted.		Two cursives only insert LORD. Syriac also omits.
Gen. xv. 2.	lord GOD.	lord GOD.	lord.		Most authorities divided fairly evenly between Lord GOD and lord. 1 uncial (L) omits the whole phrase. 1 cursive and the Sahidic omit lord.
Gen. xv. 4.	LORD.	LORD.	God.		7 cursives, the Armenian and Sahidic, God; 6 cursives and Old Latin omit LORD.
Gen. xv. 6.	LORD.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. xv. 7.	LORD.	God.	God.		1 cursive and the Armenian prefix LORD; all others, God.

REFERENCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	BEST MS. OF THE LXX.	LAGARDE'S LUCIAN.	FIELD'S HEXAPLA.	OTHER INFORMATION.
Gen. xv. 18.	LORD.	God.	LORD.		3 cursives support God; all other authorities divided between LORD and LORD God.
Gen. xvi. 5.	LORD.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. xvi. 11 2°.	LORD.	LORD.	God.		2 cursives (one of which, called by the Cambridge editors b, is one of Lagarde's Lucianic MSS. and the other of which (w) appears also to be Lucianic though apparently collated for the first time for the larger Cambridge Septuagint), and Old Latin, God; all others, LORD.
Gen. xviii. 1.	LORD.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. xviii. 14.	LORD.	God.	LORD.		All authorities, God, except b, w, which have LORD.
Gen. xix. 29 1°.	God.	LORD.	God.		9 cursives and the Palestinian, God; E omits altogether; all other authorities, LORD.
Gen. xix. 29 2°.	When he overthrew.	When the LORD overthrew.	[The LORD.]		3 cursives (f, b, w) omit the LORD; 1 uncial (E) reads LORD God; all others, LORD.
Gen. xx. 18.	LORD.	LORD.	God.		4 cursives (including b, w) and the Bohairic, God; a cursive of Holmes omits; all others, LORD; the Samaritan also reads God.

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Best MS. of the LXX.	Lagarde's Lucian.	Field's Hexapla.	Other Information.
Gen. xxi. 2.	God.	Lord.	Lord.		Armenian, God; many cursives, Lord God.
Gen. xxi. 4.	God.	God.	Lord.		5 cursives (including b, w), Lord; about 8 cursives and the Armenian, Lord God; rest, God.
Gen. xxi. 17 2°.	God.	God.	Lord.		6 cursives (including b, w), Lord; 1 cursive, Lord God; rest, God.
Gen. xxv. 21 2°.	Lord.	God.	God.		1 uncial and 1 cursive (f), Lord; all others, God.
Gen. xxviii. 13 2°.	Lord.	Omits.	Omits.	LXX, God (i.e. God of Abraham); other copies, Lord the God.	About 12 cursives, the Armenian and Sahidic add Lord; Old Latin, Lord, omitting God.
Gen. xxx. 24.	Lord.	God.	God.	Aquila, Symmachus, and LXX, God.	Unanimous. Syriac agrees with LXX.
Gen. xxx. 27.	Lord.	God.	God.		Unanimous. Syriac agrees with LXX.
Gen. xxxi. 42.	God of Abraham.	Omits God.	Omits God.	Origen inserted God.	6 cursives and Armenian insert God; all others omit.
Gen. xxxi. 49.	Lord.	God.	God.		Unanimous.
Gen. xxxi. 53.	The God of their father.	Omits.	Omits.	Inserted by Origen.	A few MSS. and versions insert in varying forms.

REFERENCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	BEST MS. OF THE LXX.	LAGARDE'S LUCIAN.	FIELD'S HEXAPLA.	OTHER INFORMATION.
Gen. xxxv. 9.	Nothing.	Adds God at end of the verse.	Adds God.	Origen found God, and obelized it.	Only 1 cursive (o) omits God; rest, unanimous; Samaritan adds God.
Gen. xxxviii. 7 2°.	LORD.	God.	God.		Only 1 cursive, LORD; rest, unanimous.
Gen. xxxviii. 10.	LORD.	God.	God.		Old Latin, LORD; 3 cursives, LORD God; rest, unanimous.
Gen. xlviii. 15 2°.	God.	lord.	God.		All others, God.
Ex. iii. 1.	God.	Omits.	God.	LXX omits, but other copies insert, God.	
Ex. iii. 4 2°.	God.	LORD.	LORD.		
Ex. iii. 12.	And (he said).	And God.	And the LORD.	LXX, and God said; other copies, and he said.	

been performed in the Hebrew originals from which the LXX was translated.

The following table shows a number of cases where Septuagintal variants with very little authority are supported by extant variants either in Kennicott's collations or in the Samaritan Pentateuch of Blayney's edition.

Reference.	Massoretic Text.	Variants.	Septuagintal Evidence.
Gen. ii. 18.	Lord God.	1 MS. omits God ; 1 MS. omits Lord.	2 cursives (e, c₂) omit Lord.
Gen. ii. 21.	Lord God.	2 MSS. omit God.	1 cursive (h) reads Lord.
Gen. ii. 22.	Lord God.	1 MS. omits God.	1 cursive (y) omits God.
Gen. iii. 1.	God 2°.	1 MS. Lord God.	1 uncial (E), 3 cursives. Lord God ; 1 cursive of Holmes, Lord only.
Gen. iii. 22.	Lord God.	1 MS. omits Lord.	Lord omitted by 1 uncial (M), numerous cursives and Palestinian Aramaic. It is known to have been added here by Origen.
Gen. iii. 23.	Lord God.	1 MS. omits God.	1 cursive (b) omits God.
Gen. v. 22.	With God.	1 MS. omits.	1 cursive of Holmes omits. There are other variants.
Gen. vi. 5.	Lord.	1 MS. God.	Lord God. 1 cursive of Holmes, God.
Gen. vi. 13.	God.	1 MS. Lord (in abbreviated form JH) God.	1 uncial (D), 14 cursives Armenian, Sahidic, Syriac, Lord God ; 1 cursive (n), Lord.
Gen. vii. 1.	Lord.	2 MSS.¹ and Sam. God.	Lord God. 2 cursives (c, w) (with some Armenian support), God ; 1 cursive (k), Lord.
Gen. vii. 9.	God.	1 MS. and Sam. Lord.	1 uncial (M). 4 cursives. Armenian, and Bohairic. Lord God ; 1 uncial (E) Lord.

¹ See Kennicott, *ad loc.;* also his addenda on page 119.

REFERENCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	VARIANTS.	SEPTUAGINTAL EVIDENCE.
Gen. vii. 16.	God.	1 MS. LORD.	1 uncial (E) and about 13 cursives, LORD God; 2 uncials (D, M), Bohairic, with some Sahidic support, LORD.
Gen. xv. 2.	lord GOD.	3 MSS. LORD God; 1 MS. God	1 cursive (a), Sahidic, Tetragrammaton only. Much authority for lord only.
Gen. xv. 8 .	Lord God.	3 MSS.¹ LORD God; 2 MSS. God only.	Sahidic, LORD God; 2 cursives (b, w) lord, GOD, God.
Gen. xvii. 15	God.	1 MS. LORD.	2 cursives (b d₂), LORD God; Latin, LORD.
Gen. xviii. 33.	LORD.	1 MS. omits.	1 cursive (c₂) omits.
Gen. xix. 29.	God 1°.	1 MS. LORD.	LORD, 9 cursives, Palestinian, God. 1 uncial (E) omits altogether.
Gen. xxviii. 4.	God.	Sam. LORD.	1 uncial (E), 1 cursive (f), LORD God.
Gen. xxx. 22.	God 2°.	2 MSS. omit.	2 cursives (e, n), omit; Latin, LORD God.
Gen. xxxv. 9.	God 1°.	1 MS. omits.	1 cursive (b) omits.
Gen. xxxv. 10.	God.	1 MS. God LORD. 1 MS. omits.	Ordinary reading, God; but D, 5 cursives, and the Sahidic omit.

These coincidences are too numerous to be due to chance, and it must be admitted that in every case where any Septuagintal authority presents a reading that differs from the Massoretic text without any reason for supposing that the variant originated in the Greek, there is prima–facie evidence for suspecting that a Hebrew variant once existed.² Readings, whether He-

¹ See Kennicott, *ad loc.;* also his addenda on page 119.

² It may be remarked that there are also variants evidenced by the Samaritan, the Syriac, or a Hebrew source in cases where the LXX supports the Massoretic text, e.g. xxii. 15 (RJe), M. T. LORD, Syr. God; xxxi. 7 (E) M. T. God, Sam. LORD; 9 (E) M. T. God, Sam.

brew or Greek, showing " Lord God," naturally rouse the sus-
picion that they are conflate, and that at one period two He-
brew readings were extant, one having " Lord " and the other
" God," though, owing to the abbreviations used in both lan-
guages, they may sometimes be due to dittography.[1] We think
that the tables we have already printed are amply sufficient to
dispose of the higher critical case on the appellations of God;
but, in order to make it quite clear how frequently the reading
is precarious, we propose to print all the variants of any conse-
quence in a couple of selected passages. The higher critics
hold that J and E are not always distinguishable from each
other: but P is said to possess such well-marked characteris-
tics that doubt is seldom possible as to his authorship. Accord-
ingly we begin with Genesis vi. 9–xi. 17 — the story of the
flood. In giving the Septuagintal evidence we in all cases set
out the reading of the best MS. first.

Reference.	Source.	Massoretic Text.	Septuagint.
Gen. vi. 11.	P.	God.	God; about 4 cursives and the Sahidic, Lord God.
Gen. vi. 12.	P.	God.	Lord God; 2 cursives, God; 1 cursive, Lord.
Gen. vi. 13.	P.	God.	God; 1 uncial, about 14 cursives, Armenian, Sahidic, and Syro-hexaplar Lord God; 1 cursive (n) Lord (as before stated there is a Hebrew variant, Lord God).
Gen. vi. 22.	P.	God.	Lord God; 1 uncial, about 16 cursives (including n) and the Palestinian, God.

and 1 Heb. MS. Lord; 16 (E) M. T. God 1°, Sam. Lord; M. T. God 2°,
Syr. Lord; xlv. 5 (E) M. T. God, 2 MSS. Lord; 7 (E) M. T. 2 MSS.
Lord. The MSS. are Kennicott's.

[1] Again glosses may be responsible in some passages.

REFERENCE.	SOURCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	SEPTUAGINT.
Gen. vii. 1.	J.	LORD.	LORD God; 2 cursives and some MSS. of the Armenian, God; 1 cursive, LORD (as stated before, there is Samaritan, Syriac, and Hebrew evidence for God).
Gen. vii. 5.	J.	LORD.	LORD God; 1 cursive, God; 1 cursive and the Sahidic, LORD.
Gen. vii. 9.	J.	God.	God; 1 uncial, about 4 cursives, the Armenian and Bohairic, LORD God; 1 uncial, LORD (as stated before there is Samaritan, Latin (Vulgate), and Hebrew evidence for LORD).
Gen. vii. 16a.	P.	God.	God; 1 uncial and about 13 cursives, LORD God; 2 uncials, the Bohairic, and some evidence from the Sahidic, LORD (as already stated there is Hebrew evidence for LORD).
Gen. vii. 16b.	J.	LORD.	LORD God; 1 uncial, God; Bohairic, LORD.
Gen. viii. 15.	P.	God.	LORD God.
Gen. viii. 20.	J.	LORD.	God; 2 cursives (f, n) and Sahidic, LORD God; 1 uncial and about 14 cursives, LORD.
Gen. viii. 21a	J.	LORD.	LORD God; Origen obelized God. It is omitted by 1 uncial and about 5 cursives.
Gen. viii. 21b.	J.	LORD.	LORD God; Sahidic, God. Origen found LORD God and obelized God.
Gen. ix. 1.	P.	God.	God; 2 cursives and the Sahidic, LORD God.
Gen. ix. 8.	P.	God.	God; 1 uncial, about 4 cursives, Armenian and Sahidic, LORD God; one of these cursives (f) originally had LORD only.
Gen. ix. 12.	P.	God.	LORD God; 1 uncial, God. 1 cursive, LORD.
Gen. ix. 17.	P.	God.	God; 1 uncial, about 6 cursives, and some Armenian MSS. LORD God; 1 cursive, LORD.

The only subsequent passages of any length assigned to P are chapters xvii. and xxiii. The latter does not contain any Divine appellation. The variants of any consequence in the former are as follows:—

REFERENCE.	SOURCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	SEPTUAGINT.
Gen. xvii. 1a.	P.	LORD.	LORD; 1 cursive and the Armenian. LORD God.
Gen. xvii. 15.	P.	God.	God; 2 cursives, LORD God; Old Latin, LORD (as already stated there is Hebrew evidence for LORD).
Gen. xvii. 18.	P.	Nothing.	1 cursive adds LORD at the end of the verse.
Gen. xvii. 19.	P.	God.	God; 1 cursive, LORD.

When to these are added the variants that have already been set out in other passages of P where any Divine appellation is used (Gen. xix. 29; xxi. 2, 4; xxviii. 4; xxxv. 10), it will be seen that for sheer worthlessness as a test of authorship the use of the Divine appellations by the Massoretic text would be difficult to surpass.

With regard to J and E the facts are of course similar. While the witnesses are not unanimous, the preponderance of evidence certainly favors *Elohim* alone as the original reading of Genesis ii.. iii. ; and on the whole iv. 26 is favorable to this conclusion. It is true that there are a number of Hebrew variants in these chapters giving the reading " LORD " only. Of these we can say only, that they do not seem to have been regarded as the best reading by any well-recognized Hebrew authority. But with this matter we are not here concerned. Our business is not to produce a critical edition of the Hebrew text of Genesis but to test the critical theory. In so far as that depends on the usage of the appellations of God in Genesis we

submit that we have accomplished our task when we have
proved that in some cases the Massoretic text is demonstrably
wrong, and in an enormous proportion of other cases quite un-
certain.[1]

4. In the passage quoted above, Mr. Carpenter claims that
" the distinction which Astruc adopted has the direct sanction
of the Pentateuch itself." What Pentateuch? The answer
can only be the Samaritan Pentateuch, supported by the Mas-
soretic recension of the Jewish Pentateuch. But not the sanc-
tion of the Jewish Pentateuch of Septuagint or Onkelos or
Peshitto or Vulgate. In the crucial passage (Ex. vi. 3) these
authorities all support a reading that has been preserved in a
tenth-century Karaite MS.[2] It differs from the Massoretic
reading only in a single letter. At first sight it appears to
differ imperceptibly in sense, but we shall see that when the
comparative method is brought to bear the difference turns out
to be enormous. For נודעתי " I was known," it has, הורעתי
" I made known," which is even more like the Massoretic text
when both are written in the old Hebrew than in the square
characters. In the result the LXX, at any rate, presents an abso-
lutely consistent text, for in the two passages of Genesis (xv. 7

[1] The enormous number of variations suggests that Genesis must
have been current in more than one form. Either owing to some
palaeographical peculiarity, or some religious or other theory, or
through some other cause, the Divine appellations varied. A num-
ber of ancient variants are due to the fact that ' was often regard-
ed as an abbreviation for the Tetragrammaton. We quote the fol-
lowing from Dr. Redpath: "There is no doubt, I think, that before
the time when so much attention was directed to the accuracy, let-
ter for letter, of the Hebrew canonical Scriptures, a considerable
amount of abbreviation of words was used in their reproduction.
There are frequent indications of this in the LXX; but I need not
go into that now. What more concerns us, however, is the fact that
the Hebrew fragments of Ecclesiasticus show that two or three
forms of abbreviation were used for the Tetragrammaton; and, if
[2] R. Hoering, Karaite MSS. in the British Museum, p. 17.

and xxviii. 13) where God appears to a patriarch and uses the Tetragrammaton in a self-revelation the Greek has " God." The form of the Hebrew sentence is also favorable to this reading — so much so that Kittel wishes to alter " My Name " to " by My Name " which would go better with " I was not known." Surely a reading with so much authority involving so slight a departure from the received text of the Hebrew deserves some consideration before Genesis is split up under the sanction of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Massoretic text.

5. While our book of Genesis was assuredly based — at any rate in part — on preëxisting sources, the division into J, E and P does not meet the facts of the case. Nobody in his right senses ever supposed that the author of the Pentateuch sat down and invented all the statements made in the book of Genesis. He used preëxisting material, and it is even possible that the critics have really detected some glosses and (very occasionally) some points where different traditions join. But any services they may have rendered in these directions are more than outweighed by the crass absurdities they have put forward and by their failure to account for the evidence of pre-Mosaic date. We may take, as an example, Genesis x. 19, where

some similar form of abbreviation were used for the name Elohim, it is easy to see how constantly confusion might arise between the two names, in badly written or partly perished codices " (American Journal of Theology, vol. viii. p. 293). The duplicate psalms and the variations between Kings and Chronicles afford parallels for variations in the Divine appellations. It may reasonably be held that, in the entire absence of evidence, the reading of the Massoretic text should be preferred in most cases, other things being equal, the presumption being that the Jewish view, which ultimately prevailed, was on the whole sounder than any which did not ultimately prevail. It may also be added that the difficulty of forming an opinion is due to the supreme unimportance of the subject. The difference between the two appellations so seldom makes any appreciable difference to the text that all criteria fail.

the border of the Canaanite is fixed with the words, " as thou
goest toward Sodom, and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Ze-
boiim."

The places named were destroyed in Abraham's lifetime. It fol-
lows that this passage must have been originally composed before the
catastrophe narrated in Gen. xix. Mr. Carpenter attributes it, how-
ever, to a late stratum of " J " making it subsequent to xii 10, which
was obviously composed *after* the destruction of Sodom. Dr. Driver
assigns the passage to J and writes :

"Nor does the language of 'J' and 'E' bring us to any more
definite conclusion. Both belong to the golden period of Hebrew
literature. They resemble the best parts of Judges and Samuel
(much of which cannot be greatly later than David's own time) :
but whether they are actually earlier or later than these, the lan-
guage and style do not enable us to say. . . . All things considered,
both J and E may be assigned with the greatest probability to the
early centuries of the monarchy " ("Literature of the Old Testa-
ment," sixth edition, pp. 124–125).

In other words, Dr. Driver would on "literary" grounds be pre-
pared to accept a date 1,000 years after the age of Abraham as the
time of composition of this passage. What precisely is the value of
a method which does not permit its ablest and most cautious expo-
nent to arrive at results that are correct to within 1,000 years?
[The Churchman (London), February, 1908, p. 95.]

Precisely the same tale is told by the legal evidence in Gene-
sis, which repeatedly attests the superior antiquity of the
stories in Genesis to the laws of Exodus–Deuteronomy.[1] For
example, the law of homicide contained in Genesis ix. (P) is
demonstrably earlier than that of Exodus xxi. (E): The criti-
cal scheme does not and cannot account for such facts as these.

On the other hand, many of the divisions, even when not
based on the appellations of the Deity, are as absurd as they
can possibly be. Here is the scheme of the composition of
Genesis xxxiv. 25 as believed by Dr. Driver :—

P :   And it came to pass on the third day, when they were sore,
      that
J :   two of

[1] See the Churchman (London), January, 1908, pp. 15–23.

P : the sons of Jacob,
J : Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brethren.
P : took each man his sword, and came upon the city unawares, and slew all the males.

And where the critics cannot effect their purpose even by such divisions as these, they have recourse to the familiar machinery of redactors, harmonists, and glossators to conjure away inconvenient facts.

To sum up : the famous clue provided by Exodus vi. 3 leading to the division of the earlier portions of the Pentateuch into three self-consistent documents, J, E, and P, of which J uses the Tetragrammaton while E and P do not, breaks down for five different reasons : First, no such division can in fact be effected. Secondly, in so far as it is effected, it postulates a series of redactors whose alleged proceedings are unintelligible and inconceivable. Thirdly, in an enormous proportion of cases no reliance can be placed on the readings of the Massoretic text with regard to the Divine appellations. Fourthly, the reading adopted by the higher critics in Exodus vi. 3 is almost certainly wrong. Fifthly, the documentary theory founded on this " clue" does not account for the frequent traces of pre-Mosaic date, and postulates the most ludicrous divisions even where nothing turns on the appellations of the Deity.

It only remains to solve the difficulty presented by Exodus vi. 3 and the kindred passages.

As already explained, there is an alternative reading, differing from the Massoretic text only in a single letter, according to which God says," I am the LORD : and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as El Shaddai, but my Name the LORD I made not known unto them." This was regarded as the true reading by the best Jewish authorities of many countries and many ages, being embodied in numerous versions, including the Targum of Onkelos.

If now we look through Genesis to find whether the Tetragrammaton is used by God himself (as distinct from his angel) in a revelation, we should probably only count xv. 7 and xxviii. 13. The other passages must be shortly considered.

(1) In xxii. 16 an *angel* appears to Abraham and uses the phrase " saith the LORD." But though Hebrew thought frequently made little or no distinction between God and his angel, yet at other times there is a clear difference, and it appears in this passage where the angel treats God's words as being those of a Being distinct from himself and accordingly makes them a quotation.

(2) In xviii. 19, the narrative represents God as using the Name in a *soliloquy*. This then is no contradiction of the statement of Exodus vi. 3.

(3) Lastly in xviii. 14 we have the speech " Is anything too hard for the LORD." Here all the Septuagintal authorities, except the Lucianic MSS., unite on " God " as the original reading of the LXX. This may be right, but we are not certain that even the Massoretic text is strictly in conflict with Exodus vi. 3. The true meaning of that passage (in so far as it can be ascertained with our present materials) can only be realized in the light of the comparative evidence, and it might be argued that it is to be interpreted of direct revelations of the Name, not of its use incidentally in conversation. This is a point on which no certain conclusion is at present possible, and we must therefore leave it as doubtful, bearing in mind the fact that there is an important variant in the LXX.

This exhausts the other passages, and it only remains to consider xxviii. 13 and xv. 7. The former case is absolutely clear on mere grounds of textual criticism. (*a*) A Hebrew MS. omits the word " LORD " and there can be very little doubt that originally the LXX did too. (*b*) The analogy of xxvi. ·24

favors the reading " I am the God of Abraham thy father."
(c)   Palæographically the presumption is in favor of the
shorter text.   It is known that ׳ was frequently treated as an
abbreviation of the Tetragrammaton.   A good instance occurs
in Exodus xxxiii. 19, where the LXX treated בשמי, as one word,
and translated " On my name," while the Massoretic tradition
divided it into two and read ׳ בשם " On the name of the Lord."
But אני " I," ends in ׳.   Hence the reading has arisen from
this ׳, probably from its having been accidentally written
twice over, possibly however in another way.   There are two
ways of writing this word — in full with the נ , or *defectivè*
without the ׳ .   Thus in days before separate forms were
adopted for some of the final letters, and when the words were
not divided, it would be possible, if the word were written
with the ׳ , for a reader to think it was written *defectivè* and
read אני as ׳ אֶן .   Quite apart therefore from the testi-
mony of Exodus vi. 3, it is clear that the Tetragrammaton is
not original in this passage.

There only remains xv. 7.   Here the Massoretic text reads
" Lord " and the LXX " God."   There is no palæographical pro-
bability one way or another.   We have seen that the Tetragram-
maton has certainly ousted *Elohim* in the Massoretic text in
some other passages, and it is therefore possible that it has
done so here.   We think the Septuagintal reading right, be-
cause (1) the testimony of Exodus vi. 3 is here certain and ex-
plicit; and (2) in all the other passages in Genesis where God
appears the Tetragrammaton is avoided in the revelation.

Thus it would seem that originally the Pentateuch presented
a consistent text in which God announced to Moses that He
had revealed Himself to the patriarchs, but had not revealed
Himself by His Name.

While this text is formally consistent, it at first sight appears

to mean nothing intelligible. It is at this stage that the comparative historical method comes to the rescue, and enables us to appreciate the true sense — at any rate to some extent.

In order to understand the Pentateuch we must so far as possible restore the conditions for which it was in the first instance designed. Those who believe in a God will not doubt that it is possible for him to give men new hearts in the spiritual sense; but no attentive reader of the Pentateuch will suppose that he is represented as having done so to the Hebrews who left Egypt. Still less can it be conceived that he gave them new hearts in the intellectual sense. Enactment after enactment, narrative after narrative, are only intelligible when it is realized that the intellectual condition of the Israelites in the Mosaic Age was very rudimentary.[1] Customs, laws, actions, alike receive a new aspect when considered in the light of what is known of other races in a more or less primitive condition. Accordingly when we find a passage in which obvious importance is attached to the revelation of a name, we proceed to ask: (1) whether there are any known primitive ideas which would assist us in comprehending this; and (2) whether there are any traces of such ideas in the Bible.

The very familiarity of many of the biblical passages frequently prevents our realizing how far removed are the ideas they represent from those of our own day. Yet they contain the most convincing evidence that names were often regarded as something very much more than the mere labels they are to-day. Take the numerous passages in which we read of God's " setting his Name " at Jerusalem, or making his Name dwell there, or of a House being built to his Name. They presuppose the *objective existence* of the Name. In Deuteronomy

[1] See Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary (1908), p. 462b.

xxviii. 58 we read of " this glorious and awful Name " as a proper subject of fear. This Name may be profaned not merely by false swearing (Lev. xix. 12) — an idea that is comparatively intelligible even in the light of modern notions — but by actions such as giving seed to Molech (Lev. xviii. 21; xx. 3), or by priests violating the rules laid down for their caste (Lev. xxi. 6; cp. Mal. i. 6 ff.). In this Name men may trust (Isa. l. 10): in it men may find help (Ps. cxxiv. 8; cp. xx. 1 f.). But perhaps the two passages in which the conception of the objective existence of the Name is carried farthest are Exodus xxiii. 20 f. and Isaiah xxx. 27. The former passage runs thus: " Behold, I send an angel before thee, to keep thee by the way, and to bring thee to the place which I have prepared. Take heed of him, and hearken unto his voice: provoke him not: for he will not pardon your transgression, *for My Name is in him."* It would be impossible to hold a clearer view of the definite objective existence of a name and of its being indued with special powers, than is here revealed. Isaiah xxx. 27 is a little different: " Behold, the Name of the LORD cometh from far, burning with his anger, and in thick rising smoke: his lips are full of indignation, and his tongue is as a devouring fire." Here the Name of the LORD might almost be taken as a term for God himself. But whatever interpretation be put on this passage, one thing is clear: the use of language here can have arisen only out of notions in which a name was regarded as having a separate objective existence.

These notions are widely spread among primitive peoples. Here is the testimony of various writers.

" Unable to discriminate clearly between words and things [writes Dr. Frazer], the savage commonly fancies that the link between a name and the person or thing denominated by it is not a mere arbitrary and ideal association, but a real and substantial bond which unites the two in such a way that, for example, magic may be

wrought on a man just as easily through his name as through his hair, his nails or any other material part of his person. In fact, primitive man regards his name as a vital portion of himself and takes care of it accordingly." (Frazer, Golden Bough (2d ed.) vol. i. pp. 403 f.)

"It may be said [says Dr. Tylor] . . . . that the effect of an inability to separate, so clearly as we do, the external object from the mere thought or idea of it in the mind, shows itself very fully and clearly in the superstitious beliefs and practices of the untaught man, but its results are by no means confined to such matters. . . . But between our clearness of separation of what is in the mind from what is out of it, and the mental confusion of the lowest savages of our own day, there is a vast interval. . . . Especially we may see, in the superstitions connected with language, the vast difference between what a name is to the savage and what it is to us, to whom 'words are the counters of wise men and the money of fools.'" (E. B. Taylor, Early History of Mankind (3d ed.) pp. 148 f.)

"Barbaric man believes that his name is a vital part of himself, and therefore that the names of other men and of superhuman beings are also vital parts of themselves. He further believes that to know the name is to put its owner, whether he be deity, ghost, or mortal, in the power of another, involving risk of harm or destruction to the named. He therefore takes all kinds of precautions to conceal his name, often from his friend, and always from his foe. This belief, and the resulting acts, as will be shown presently, are a part of that general confusion between the objective and the subjective—in other words, between names and things or between symbols and realities—which is a universal feature of barbaric modes of thought. This confusion attributes the qualities of living things to things not living. . . . To look for any consistency in barbaric philosophy is to disqualify ourselves for understanding it, and the theories of it which aim at symmetry are their own condemnation." (E. Clodd, Tom-Tit-Tot, pp. 53–55.)[1]

This theory of the objective existence of the name is evidenced by all sorts of superstitions. The idea underlying some of them gives us the necessary clue to the explanation of our passage. Thus Dr. Tylor writes that "the intense aversion which savages have from uttering their own names, has often been noticed by travellers." (*Op. cit.*, p. 140.) Numerous customs could be cited from the works of Tylor and Frazer,

[1] We are indebted to Frazer's Golden Bough for this reference.

but they would consume too much space. We therefore limit ourselves for the present to the following extracts from Frazer's " Golden Bough."

"When an Ojebway is asked his name, he will look at some bystander and ask him to answer. 'This reluctance arises from an impression they receive when young, that if they repeat their own names it will prevent their growth, and they will be small in stature.' . . . In this last case no scruple seems to be felt about communicating a man's name to strangers, and no ill effects appear to be dreaded as a consequence of divulging it; harm is only done when a name is spoken by its owner. Why is this? and why in particular should a man be thought to stunt his growth by uttering his own name? We may conjecture that to savages who act and think thus a person's name only seems to be a part of himself when it is uttered with his own breath; uttered by the breath of others it has no vital connection with him, and no harm can come to him through it. Whereas, so these primitive philosophers may have argued, when a man lets his own name pass his lips, he is parting with a living piece of himself, and if he persists in so reckless a course he must certainly end by dissipating his energy and shattering his constitution. . . .

"However we may explain it, the fact is certain that many a savage evinces the strongest reluctance to pronounce his own name, while at the same time he makes no objection at all to other people pronouncing it, and will even invite them to do so for him in order to satisfy the curiosity of an inquisitive stranger. Thus in some parts of Madagascar it is *fady* or taboo for a person to tell his own name, but a slave or attendant will answer for him. . . . The same curious inconsistency, as it may seem to us, is recorded of some tribes of American Indians. Thus we are told that 'the name of an American Indian is a sacred thing, not to be divulged by the owner himself without due consideration. One may ask a warrior of any tribe to give his name, and the question will meet with either a point-blank refusal or the more diplomatic evasion that he cannot understand what is wanted of him. The moment a friend approaches, the warrior first interrogated will whisper what is wanted, and the friend can tell the name, receiving a reciprocation of the courtesy from the other.'

"This general statement applies, for example, to the Indian tribes of British Columbia, as to whom it is said that 'one of their strangest prejudices, which appears to pervade all tribes alike, is a dislike to telling their names—thus you never get a man's right name from himself; but they will tell each other's names without

hesitation.' . . . In the whole of the East Indian Archipelago the etiquette is the same. As a general rule no one will utter his own name. To inquire, ' What is your name?' is a very indelicate question in native society."

Mr. Frazer then quotes a number of other examples, concluding, " No Warua will tell his name, but he does not object to being addressed by it." He then proceeds to deal with other customs which bear on our subject and should be considered by all who are interested in it (see Golden Bough, 2d ed., vol. i. pp. 403 ff.). In particular Exodus vi. 3 should be compared with what Dr. Frazer says about secondary names.

On the other hand, Dr. Giesebrecht, who has written a monograph on the importance of the Divine Name in the Old Testament, in summing up the results of his examination of a quantity of comparative material, comes to a somewhat different conclusion with regard to the use of the name of a deity. He holds that the name of the god puts his power at the disposal of the person using it. By its very nature the power of a god is greater than the power of a man. Therefore the name of a god is the strongest conceivable source of power that a man can hold.[1]

With the precise explanations that have been offered of the varying phenomena we are not greatly concerned. Possibly no single explanation will account for all the facts. For our present purpose we have to note two points. First, a name is conceived as having an objective existence and as being either closely linked with or else an actual part of its bearer: (and it is immaterial whether this is best expressed by comparing the relation of the two to that of a man and his shadow or in some other way). Secondly, there is a wide difference in the view of many savages between a man's pronouncing his name him-

[1] Giesebrecht Die Alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und ihre Religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage, Königsberg, 1901, p. 90.

self in answer to the direct question and merely being accosted by it. If in reply to a question he gives his name, it is held that he is giving his interlocutor some hold on him.

We proceed to apply these notions to the problem before us. We have seen that among the ancient Hebrews some similar ideas prevailed, and the great work of the Mosaic Age was necessarily conditioned by the intellectual condition of the people for and through whom it was wrought. It is of course evident that the Pentateuch regards the Name of God as wonderworking. We have quoted the passages from Deuteronomy where it is spoken of as " glorious and awful " and the command to fear it is given, and from Exodus where an angel will punish sin because this Name is in him. Now let us go back to another passage that has an important bearing on our point. Jacob wrestles with a stranger, and asks his name. The answer refuses the information sought. " Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my name?" (Gen. xxxii. 30 (29).) Still more significant is a passage in the book of Judges: "And Manoah said unto the angel of the Lord, What is thy name, that when thy words come to pass we may do thee honor? And the angel of the Lord said unto him, Wherefore askest thou after my name, seeing it is wonderful " [1] (xiii. 17 f.). But most interesting and significant of all is the refusal of the Name to Moses himself. He endeavors to induce God to say " I am the Lord." The result is a most interesting evasion. Instead of the clear answer, the reply " I am that I am " is given (Ex. iii. 14). This appears to be an example of the common Semitic *idem per idem* construction by which a speaker refuses information. Then as the Name could not be withheld quâ information, while it was desired to withhold it quâ pledge of God's presence, recourse is had to a quotation. God does not say, " I am

[1] Or " secret."

the LORD." On the contrary, he instructs Moses to say to the children of Israel, " The LORD, the God of your fathers," etc., and this method is persistently adhered to (iii. 15, 16, 18). How unnatural it is will be seen when we contrast (1) the subsequent frequency of the " I am the LORD " that rings through the Pentateuch after vi. 2, and (2) the very direct " I am the God of thy father " used in iii. 6 and in other places. We shall revert to this passage in a moment, for we have not yet exhausted the information it conveys. But we shall understand it better when we have examined Exodus vi. 2 more carefully. Meanwhile there is a savage parallel that comes very close to this: " Among many tribes of South Africa men and women never mention their names if they can get any one else to do it for them, but they do not absolutely refuse when it cannot be avoided." [1]

To the Israelite of the Mosaic Age it is clear that what may be called the direct and intentional revelation of the Divine Name by God (i.e. the unambiguous statement " I am the LORD ") to a mortal had a very special significance. It may be that it was regarded as a direct pledge of the Divine presence : or again as an objective handing over of power to work certain wonders : or as establishing a special relationship between the Deity and the favored mortal: or as involving all these. The precise shade of meaning must be left to be determined by future research. That there was such a meaning appears to us indubitable in the light of the passages and parallels we have considered.

It remains to examine the narrative and see how Exodus vi. 2 fits into the context on this conception of its meaning. Is there anything to lead an impartial reader to hold either that this passage gives a pledge of closer connection or of the use of

---

[1] Frazer, *op. cit.* vol. 1. p. 411.

Divine might or that such a pledge would be in place? The answer to both branches of the question can be only in the affirmative. The intervention of Moses has served only to make the position of the Israelites worse, and they are not slow to give vent to their dissatisfaction (v. 21). Then Moses returns to the LORD with the words: "Lord, wherefore hast thou evil entreated this people? Why is it that thou hast sent me? For since I came to Pharaoh to speak in thy name, he hath evil entreated this people; *neither hast thou delivered thy people at all.*" The last words in particular show that Moses was in a mood when some guarantee of the Divine assistance was needed. Then comes the promise " Now shalt thou see what I will do to Pharaoh: for by a strong hand shall he let them go, and by a strong hand shall he drive them out of his land." Then comes the revelation of the Name, clinching this promise. The context thus leads up to the passage admirably on this view of its true meaning: if now we examine vi. 2–8 in the light of these ideas it will be found that the other portions of the Divine utterance bear this out. Stress is laid on the fact that something — some connection with God — is being given to the Hebrews that had not been given to the patriarchs. And this relationship either includes, or at any rate is linked with, the sure promise of salvation: " I am the LORD, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians," etc. That is the answer to the complaint of Moses, and it is a complete answer.

We thus conceive the utterance of the words " I am the LORD " not as the introduction of a new and unfamiliar name, nor as the revelation of a new meaning possessed by a name already known, but as the inauguration of a new and more intimate relationship. By them the use of the Divine might on Israel's behalf was irrevocably pledged in a manner in which it

had not been before: and this was done in the way that would
be most intelligible and convincing to people in the intellectual
condition of the Israelites of that day.

We return now to the narrative of Exodus iii. In verse 6
God reveals himself to Moses with the words " I am the God
of thy father, the God of Abraham," etc. Two points call for
attention. First, the Tetragrammaton is not used; and, second-
ly, the revelation is made to stand on precisely the same level as
the revelations to the patriarchs. Here God raises Moses to
the same position as Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob, but to no more
intimate relationship. He then proceeds to give Moses his mis-
sion. This draws from the mortal an expression of his own
incapacity, to which God replies that He will be with him (ver.
12). Then comes the question as to the Name. It has a double
meaning. Superficially and ostensibly it is a request for infor-
mation: but in its full and most fundamental signification it is
a demand for a guarantee — to put the matter at its lowest.
Accordingly it receives a twofold answer. The request for the
guarantee is unambiguously refused: the desired information
is readily given. And throughout that answer the identifica-
tion with the God of the fathers is carefully maintained. Moses
is still kept on the same plane as the patriarchs. This leaves him
as dissatisfied as before, and it becomes necessary to give him
the power to work certain signs. Thus the narrative contrasts
with the later revelation in two important respects: (1)
Whereas in Exodus iii. Moses receives the same sort of reve-
lation as the patriarchs, in Exodus vi. God enters into a con-
nection with the Hebrews that differs fundamentally from his
relation to their ancestors. (2) In the earlier incident it is
necessary to confer on Moses power to work certain signs, in
the later the phrase " I am the LORD " is in itself sufficient,
without anything more. Both these points are comprehended

in the third great distinction — the use of the phrase " I am the
LORD " in chapter vi. as against its studied avoidance in chap-
ter iii.

To modern ideas it seems strange that God should say, " Is
it not I, the LORD " in iv. 11, or that there should ever have
been a time when such a phrase or the statement " Thus shalt
thou say. . . .The LORD, the God of your fathers," etc., should
not be held to embrace everything that is comprehended in the
formula of vi. 2 f., but we must take early societies as we find
them.   The sentence already quoted from Mr. Clodd sums up
the opinion of all the ablest and most experienced investiga-
tors of this branch of anthropology : " To look for any consist-
ency in barbaric philosophy is to disqualify ourselves for under-
standing it, and the theories of it which aim at symmetry are
their own condemnation."   Thus it comes about that to the
Israelites of the Mosaic Age there would be no inconsistency or
difficulty in the statements of the Pentateuch.   They would
realize that the true inward meaning was to make the LORD
their God, to bind him to them and them to him in a closeness
of connection which he had never before vouchsafed to any of
his creatures.