

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

THE USE OF THE DIVINE NAMES IN THE PENTATEUCH

AN EXAMINATION OF THE HIGHER CRITICAL THEORY

AMONG the linguistic peculiarities upon which is based the theory of the diversity of Authorship of the Pentateuch or "Hexateuch" is the alternation of the Divine names, Jehovah and Elohim. We propose to make a brief examination of this argument.

Of course any one can see that these names alternate in a striking way especially in the early part of Genesis; that some portions are marked by the use of one name and some by the use of another. There is not, however, so marked an alternation throughout as is sometimes alleged.

The passage in Exodus vi. 2, 3, is held to teach that, in the opinion of the so-called Priestly writer P, the name of Jehovah was utterly unknown previously, and therefore this writer, in recording the history of those earlier times, could not use the title or represent the personages in the story as using it; and so it is claimed that it is not found in this portion of Genesis. But surely even if this were so, he must be a very pedantic writer indeed who would preserve this distinction all through. For this writer supposed to be living at the close of the Exile, somewhat like one thousand years after the name Jehovah, as he believed, was made known, and writing of centuries before that period, is held to be so exact that he never once can allow himself to use the name in connection with that early period, though as to the subsequent period he never uses any other. I say that is a hopelessly pedantic way of writing which I fancy it is impossible to match.

Arthur Wellesley was not Lord Wellington until he had been some time engaged in the Peninsular war and later he became Duke of Wellington, but anyone referring to him now could speak of Wellington in India or in Portugal as well as at Waterloo; and we even speak of Wellington's schooldays, though, as a matter of fact, as Wellington, he never was at school. So Macaulay can be indifferently referred to as Macaulay or as Lord Macaulay, though it was only in his later years that he became Lord. We can speak of plain John Morley or of Lord Morley, of Mr. Asquith or the Earl of Oxford, of Jix or Lord Brentford, in referring to any phase of their history; and so in many other cases.

So that, even if it were granted that the name Jehovah was not known before the Exodus, it would be very strange if a writer living so long after the event would be so scrupulous in its use. Then again, we have to remember that when this writer is supposed to have lived, he knew that both names were in common use and he must have believed that Elohim which he considered to be alone used at first, continued to be used after Jehovah was revealed : then how could he so persistently use only the one name Jehovah in the subsequent history ?

He must have had a purpose in so doing. He could not mean that Elohim was not known throughout, when it was known from the beginning. Then too it is not only that he represents the persons living before the Exodus as using only the name Elohim, but he uses it himself in his independent statements. He as the historian, who knew that God's specially revealed Name was Jehovah, nevertheless speaks always of Elohim. In the first chapter of Genesis, it is Elohim Who directs all the processes of creation : in his account of the Flood, it is Elohim Who instructs Noah, etc. Now I think this is altogether unaccountable on the theory. The fact that he believed that men in the early days only knew God as Elohim, is surely no reason why he, who knew Him as Jehovah, should thus always speak of Him as Elohim. There must have been some other reason than the critical one.

It is singular that the critics, in question, also say that the other writer, J, thought the Name Jehovah was first known after the birth of Seth's son (Gen. iv. 6) when men began to call "upon the Name of Jehovah." I have no doubt that the statement refers to the public recognition of Jehovah in united worship (lit. "then it was begun to call upon, or invoke, in the name of Jehovah"). But if we take the critics' view, what result do we get ? This : that J thought that Jehovah, as a name was first known to men at the birth of Enosh, just as P thought it was first known at the Exodus ; yet J uses it throughout the second chapter of Genesis, and not only uses it as a historian, but represents Eve as using it, "I have gotten a man from Jehovah, *or* Jehovah." Now if J believed that the name first became known at the birth of Enosh and nevertheless could freely use it for the whole of his previous narrative, what was to hinder P, even though believing it was only known at the Exodus, from using it in his previous narrative ?

But now we go further and contend that the critical interpretation of Exodus vi. is not the correct one. It cannot mean that Jehovah was then first known as a name. The critics admit that the Jehovist writer thought it was known almost from the beginning, so that it could only be P's opinion that it was not known till the Exodus. But how should he know better than J, who lived some four hundred years before P? On the other hand, the critics have a second Elohist writer who not only always uses the name Elohim before the Exodus, but perversely persists in using it all along, though perhaps not so regularly as before the supposed revelation of P. So that manifestly E does not attach much importance to the name becoming known then. Furthermore P knew both the J and E writings and regarding them as divinely inspired (as the British Higher Critics affirm they were), how could he declare the Name unknown before Exodus vi, when J constantly represents the early fathers of the nation as using it? The whole conception bristles with difficulties.

Then again it is very evident that the Redactor who united J and P did not understand P's statement as meaning that Jehovah was now for the first time made known as a name, for he knew that J represented it as known, yet he has no hesitation in linking P's account with the other and seems quite unconscious that there could be any contradiction.

Manifestly what is meant is not that the *name* Jehovah was unknown, but that God had not fully manifested Himself in the character of Jehovah, as He was now about to do. The marginal reading of the R.V. "I was not made known," instead of "I was not known," is well warranted. It is indeed the usual meaning of the Niphal of this verb, here used. When Naomi says to Ruth, "Be not known unto this man," she surely means, as our version translates, it, "Make not thyself known unto this man." In 1 Kings xviii. 16, when Elijah prays, "Let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel," he can mean nothing else than that God should make Himself known. So three times in Ezekiel xx. 5; xxxv. 11; xxxviii. 23, the same form we have here is rendered, "I made myself known," or "I will make myself known." In this same sixth chapter of Exodus we have the true explanation of what is meant, when God tells Moses he is to say to the people, "I am Jehovah, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched out arm and with great

judgments, and I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God and *ye shall know that I am Jehovah*, your God which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians." Repeatedly, in the subsequent chapters, it is affirmed that the people shall know that He is Jehovah. He is to be known as the Covenant-keeping God of Redemption. Jehovah is the ever-living, self-existent One Who has entered into Covenant relations with His people and in Grace becomes their Redeemer. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had received manifestations of His Almighty power and Grace and all-sufficiency, and of course His faithfulness was not to them an unknown quantity; but now in a most conspicuous and striking way He was to appear to His people as the God, Who having made the Covenant with their fathers, now acts in accordance therewith, the God who fulfils the ancient promises, Who in wondrous Grace has drawn near and undertakes their Redemption.

That simple explanation meets all the points in the case. Especially so when we bear in mind that the NAME indicates the Character; it is generally used of God not simply as a title, but as importing His nature and disposition, His Revealed Character. "The Name of the Lord is a strong tower, the righteous runneth into it and is safe." "They that know Thy Name shall put their trust in Thee." And specifically the great answer to the incomparably daring prayer of Moses, "I will proclaim the Name of Jehovah before thee," and He proclaimed the Name of Jehovah: "And Jehovah passed by before him and proclaimed Jehovah, Jehovah El, full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty." That is the NAME, the Moral Glory, the Character of God. And so in the New Testament, we have Christ's saying in His great prayer, "I have declared (made known) to them Thy Name and will declare it (make it known)." Was the Name of God not known before? Surely Jesus means that He had, in a special way, made known the Character of God as the God Who so loved the world that He gave His Son, "that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them and I in Thee."

Among the ancients, too, there seems to have been an idea that when one disclosed his name to another, he thereby gave an assurance of rendering help to his friend. And this is lifted up

to the highest plane in several Scriptural instances. We have the case of Jacob at Peniel asking the mysterious wrestler for His name. Manoah asks the Angel of Jehovah what is his name? God, in making known His great Name as Jehovah to Moses, implicitly was pledging Himself to be to His people all that the Name implied. So that it is something far more than the mere question of addressing the Divine Being by certain vocables. Now I think it will be found that the distinction between the meaning of Elohim which tells of the majesty and might of God, and Jehovah, which indicates His Covenant Grace and Faithfulness, will generally be found sufficient to explain the diversified usage of the titles without any need to resort to the critical hypothesis of diversity of authorship.

Before looking at some of the instances of the usage in the Pentateuch, I may illustrate it from another book: the book of Jonah. We are not concerned at present with the critical view of the authorship and character of this book. But I believe there is no question among the critics that the book however produced and whatever its meaning, is a unity; there is no suggestion of different authors combining to write it.

Note, then, that it is the word of Jehovah, the Covenant God of Israel, that comes to Jonah, and Jonah, in his terror and disobedience, seeks to flee from being in the presence of Jehovah, i.e., he abandons his official position as a prophet of Jehovah. When the storm arises, the heathen captain says to him, "Call upon thy God, if so be that God will think upon us"—Elohim, the general name of Deity, which even the heathen could use. Jonah, then, convicted before the mariners, says "I fear Jehovah," and this Jehovah, the Covenant God of the Hebrews, is "the God of heaven, which hath made the sea and the dry land," thus explaining to these men that his God is not a mere national Deity, but the One Whom they ought to worship. Later on when the sailors cannot make way against the tempest and are constrained to follow the prophet's advice and cast him into the sea, "they cried unto Jehovah," and said "We beseech Thee, O Jehovah." They are now convinced that Jonah's God is the true God and so they appeal to Him and when they are delivered from the tempest, "the men feared Jehovah," and offered a sacrifice unto Jehovah.

Jehovah, the God of Redeeming Grace, prepares a great fish to swallow Jonah and to Jehovah Jonah prays and Jehovah sends

deliverance. Again it is the Word of Jehovah that comes to Jonah and bids him go and preach to Nineveh; but when the alarmed and penitent king issues his proclamation to the alarmed and penitent people, he appropriately bids them "cry mightily unto Elohim, for who can tell whether Elohim will not turn and repent." And then it is fittingly said, "Elohim saw their works, that they turned from their evil way, and Elohim repented of the evil." It was not in His character of Jehovah, the Covenant God of Israel, that He pardoned the Ninevites, but as Elohim, the God of heaven and earth.

Jonah afterwards directs his prayers and complaints to Jehovah, and Jehovah remonstrates with him. Then the LORD God, Jehovah Elohim prepares a gourd; the combination of the names showing that it is the Covenant God Who confers this blessing upon His servant, but at the same time the Creative power of Elohim is displayed; perhaps too hinting that Jehovah Who is now dealing with Jonah, is the same as the Elohim Who had shown His Grace to the Ninevites.

Then it is Elohim Who, as the powerful Creator, prepares the worm to destroy the gourd, and the vehement East wind to beat upon the head of the prophet. And it is as Elohim that He remonstrates with Jonah, while as Jehovah He justifies the manifestation of His mercy to the great city of Nineveh. All this subtle and suggestive interchange of thought would be altogether lost by failing to take account of the significance of the respective names and I maintain that, as in the book of Jonah, so in the whole of the Old Testament, it is usually well to mark the variations of the Divine Names and learn their lessons. And surely even on literary grounds we may contend that as the alternation of the Names in Jonah does not indicate duality of authorship, so in the Pentateuch a similar phenomenon affords no proof against the unity of authorship.

There is another point worth considering. In Exodus vi. the distinction is not made between the revelation of God as Jehovah and His revelation as Elohim simply. It is with the name El Shaddai, God Almighty or All-sufficient, that Jehovah is contrasted, and that very consideration shows that it is not a mere nominal contrast. "I am Jehovah, and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob by my name El Shaddai, but by my name Jehovah I was not known (or not made known) to them." The Revised Version gives "I appeared as God

Almighty." The Hebrew is אֱלֹהֵי שַׁדַּי , lit. "in El Shaddai," i.e., "in the character of El Shaddai." Now, just as to the patriarchs God made Himself known as the All-sufficient One, meeting all their needs in every emergency, so now He is to be known as the Covenant Redeeming God, fulfilling His promises. But it is beside the point for the critics to say that P considered the Name Jehovah unknown before and that it now takes the place of Elohim in his writings. Why on the same reasoning does he not use El Shaddai after the previous revelation to Abraham, for it is a remarkable thing that the Genesis account of God declaring Himself to Abraham as El Shaddai, is attributed by the critics to P? And indeed if they would take that account as it stands it would be clearly proved even there that Jehovah was known to Abraham; for says P, "The Lord (Jehovah) appeared to Abraham and said I am El Shaddai." It may well be asked, How do the critics evade this proof and avoid the conclusion that P represents Abram as knowing Jehovah? By their simple and never-failing device of saying that Elohim and not Jehovah was originally in P's account, but that the Redactor changed it into Jehovah. Why the Redactor should make such a futile change they do not tell us, nor why in one case he should change Elohim into Jehovah and in another reverse the process and change Jehovah into Elohim. The critics' unfounded conjecture is the only proof given of such changes.

I may, at this point, advert to another matter. In an earlier page I referred to the so-called E using Elohim almost as regularly after the supposed revelation of the Name Jehovah as before. But here we are met by varying contentions of the critics. According to many of them E does, in Exodus, like P record the revelation of the Name Jehovah. Ex. iii. 6 is given to him by most recent critics. Dr. Bennett, e.g., thus divides the first fifteen verses of the chapter. The first belongs to E, the second, third and first part of four to J; the second part of four and the fifth verse to J; the sixth to E; the seventh to the first part of the ninth to J; the second part of nine and on to the thirteenth verse to E; the fourteenth verse, with its grand declaration, "I AM that I AM" is assigned to the Redactor; the fifteenth verse is E's and it reads, "And God said moreover (but the "moreover" belongs to the Redactor who supplies the previous verse) unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, Jehovah the God of your fathers, the God of

Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you ; this is my Name forever and this is my memorial unto all generations." Now surely if E wrote that and if he understood the words as the critics do, we might expect him to use Jehovah afterwards. Many of the critics say that he uses either afterwards, but if he did so, why might not P do the same ? Others say that he continues to use only Elohim and that where Jehovah occurs in his portions it has been put there by the Redactor. Dr. Bennett is somewhat confusing. He says on Exodus xiii. 17-19, " God, a mark of the Elohist Document. Although his theory allowed him to use Yahweh after the revelation to Moses, and he usually does so, yet having used Elohim God so far, he retains the usage in some measure, perhaps as a habit." But if he retained the habit in some measure why should not P do the same ?

Again, while Dr. Bennett says that E generally uses Jehovah after the revelation of Ex. iii., yet in the passages following, which he assigns to E, Elohim occurs almost exactly the same number of times as Jehovah. Jehovah occurs mostly in such phrases as " the Lord said unto Moses," but in the more strictly narrative portions, Elohim is used and the singular thing is that the narrative is assigned to E because of this use of Elohim ; and frequently where Jehovah does occur the clause is assigned to the Redactor.

One other point I may note before passing on to consider the general usage, viz., the different grammatical relations of the two names. Elohim is, as every Hebrew student is aware, plural in form, while Jehovah is singular, which emphasises the distinction that Elohim is a general name for Deity, whereas Jehovah is a personal, specific designation. But besides that Jehovah can never take the article ; we do not read of *the* Jehovah, but Elohim often takes it, and *the* God is a common form, the God of Abraham the God of heaven, the God of the whole earth, etc. So again Jehovah is not used with any pronominal suffix, but Elohim is ; not our Jehovah, or my Jehovah, but often our God, my God, their God, etc. That fact also determines the use of one title rather than the other in certain cases. So, too, descriptive epithets are not combined with Jehovah, but with Elohim they are : not the great or mighty, or terrible Jehovah, but the great, the mighty Elohim. If the greatness and majesty of Jehovah are to be described, then we have to say " Jehovah, the great Elohim," etc. Here then are various grammatical reasons which would

determine the choice of one name rather than the other in certain circumstances.

The outstanding difference, however, and so the main determining cause for the variant usage is the difference in meaning which we have already illustrated from the book of Jonah, and we now proceed to take a cursory view of the general usage in Genesis. In the first chapter we have the account of the Creation and appropriately Elohim is used. "In the beginning *God* created the heavens and the earth," and so throughout the account it is Elohim, the all-powerful One ; God in the general conception of Deity. Now not only is this the appropriate title here, but it seems inconceivable that another could be used. For an author to say, "In the beginning Jehovah created the heavens and the earth," would at once raise the question, Who is Jehovah ? Why is that name given to the Supreme Being ? There is a whole history behind that Name which would prevent it being used in this general and pre-historic connection. For any one to say "In the beginning Jehovah created" would imply that he is writing to people who only thought of God under the Name of Jehovah, and even then it would be incongruous and prevent the account from being understood by other people. Indeed, if the writer were the P that the critics fabricate with his peculiar idea of the greatness of Jehovah as revealing His Name at the Exodus, it would seem natural that he would use the title here and indicate that this wonderful Being Who had made Himself known to Israel as Jehovah was indeed the Almighty Creator. For it is not here a question of what the early people, who on the hypothesis did not know the name Jehovah, may have thought, but as to the belief of the writer himself who delights in that Name.

The so-called second account of Creation attributed to J is supposed to begin in that way, "In the day that Jehovah made earth and heaven." But if that were the actual beginning of J's account, we at once feel that it is insufficient ; it seems to need something else upon which to rest for its explanation. Then we may well ask if J could use Jehovah in this connection, Why could not P ? The general critical explanation that P always uses Elohim until the Exodus because he considered that Jehovah was not known before does not touch a point like this, for, again we remark, it is not a question of representing the ancients as using the only name they knew, but it is P himself with all his

fulness of knowledge as to the revelation of the Name ; P who never can use any other name than Jehovah after Exodus vi., P himself giving the account of the Creation. Then, surely, since he so constantly thought of God as Jehovah, why not say now that it was Jehovah Who created the Heavens and the earth ? There was no linguistic or literary difficulty in the way of his doing so. But evidently P knew that Elohim was the fitting name to employ in describing such an event. The generic character of the account, the manifestation of power involved and the whole conception of Creation demanded the Name Elohim.

When we come to the second chapter we have Jehovah used with equal appropriateness, for there it is not the original, absolute Creation of all things that is recounted, but the specific preparation of the earth as the abode of man, and there is the suggestion of God coming into gracious relations with man, and so it is Jehovah. But the writer is careful to show that Jehovah, is not another God, but is to be identified with the Elohim of the first chapter, Jehovah Elohim. The critics constantly speak of the first chapter having Elohim and the second Jehovah ; but as the record stands, the second has Jehovah Elohim, so that the supposed second writer uses Elohim as much as the first. But every one knows how the critics evade this point. They say it was the Redactor who added the word Elohim. Of course there is no evidence for this beyond their own conjecture and assertion. R is supposed to have added it to make it clear that the God called Jehovah was the same as Elohim in the first chapter. But why could not the original writer have thus identified them ? and if R did make the addition surely it would have been enough to do so once : why keep on adding Elohim throughout the two chapters ? And if necessary to add it in these two chapters, why not add it in all subsequent portions where Jehovah occurs ? But the very fact that the critics feel the need of this explanatory addition confirms my suggestion of the incongruity of beginning the Creation account with "Jehovah" and so proves the appropriateness of Elohim in the first chapter without resorting to the hypothesis of a different author. Consider the identification as occurring in the original writer and you have not only the assertion that Jehovah is Elohim, but you have throughout this solemn narrative of the Trial and Fall of Man the fact kept before you that the gracious God, the One Who enters into relations with man and appears as his Ruler is still the All-powerful One. The

Governor and the Creator are One. The God of Revelation is the God of Creation. And it was important that at the foundation of human history this thought should be emphasised.

But then we mark this significant thing. When the writer introduces the serpent speaking, Elohim is the word used. "Yea hath Elohim said?" Eve, in her reply, takes up the serpent's word, "Elohim hath said," and again the serpent, in his rejoinder, uses Elohim, "God doth know." Now here is an Elohist passage embedded in the Jehovistic account. The critics cannot explain it away; very few, if any, of them, venture to suggest that the Redactor is responsible for it. They have to admit that it is the language of the Jehovist. They have to admit that there is a principle involved and that Elohim is the appropriate word to put into the serpent's lips.

In the fourth chapter we get the simple name Jehovah and again it is appropriate. "I have gotten a man," says Eve, "from Jehovah" ("with the help of Jehovah." R.V., lit. "A man, Jehovah"); the God Who had promised the Seed. The offerings of Cain and Abel are presented to Jehovah, the God of Revelation, Who had instituted the sacrifices prefiguring the coming Redemption. It is Jehovah the God of Revelation and the Governor Who reasons with Cain, and it is from the presence of Jehovah, from the scene of His gracious manifestation, that Cain goes away.

When Seth is born Eve says "Elohim hath appointed me another seed." It is the manifestation of Creative power that is emphasised, when the Promise seems failing. But when public worship is in question, "Men began to call upon the Name of Jehovah," Enoch and Noah both "walk with God, Elohim," the thought of the contrast heightening the grace implied: weak men walked with the great God! Elsewhere in Scripture we have the same thought of walking with God, whereas we never have "walking with Jehovah" but "walking before Jehovah." "Sons of Elohim" we have twice in the sixth chapter, and it is an expression found again in Scripture, but never "sons of Jehovah."

It is the Spirit of Jehovah, the God of grace, that strives with men. It is as Jehovah that He repents and determines to destroy the wicked, but when we come to the story of the Flood, it is God the All-powerful Creator Who sends the deluge, while it is as Jehovah that He brings Noah into the ark and cares for him. Throughout the deluge story both names are used and

though it is not always easy to see why one rather than the other is employed, yet the general idea is sufficiently clear. And, of course, it does not follow that the distinction is always emphasised. One or other might be used according to the writer's fancy, but when it is necessary to make a distinction, then the discrimination in the use of the names appears. So it is with all synonyms.

Fittingly, after the Flood has subsided, it is Elohim Who commands Noah and his family to leave the ark and gives the assurance that animal life will multiply in the earth ; while it is Jehovah Who accepts Noah's sacrifice and promises that the earth will never again be destroyed by a deluge. Again, it is Elohim Who defines the relation between Noah's family and the rest of the animal inhabitants of the world and gives directions as to food and as to the sacredness of human life ; and Who also appoints the sign in nature of the Covenant. The two names are beautifully blended in the blessing pronounced by Noah upon Shem, " Blessed be Jehovah, the Elohim of Shem," while it is the All-powerful One Who as Elohim enlarges Japheth.

In the Babel episode it is Jehovah, the Governor Who takes action in the interests of the Redeeming purpose, as it is Jehovah Who calls Abram and gives him the Covenant promise. Through out the story of Abraham Jehovah is most generally used, but there are many times when Elohim appears and generally, I think, we can see its appropriateness. For instance, in the seventeenth chapter we have the passage before-mentioned, where Jehovah appears as God Almighty, El Shaddai, and following that Elohim talks with Abram, the condescension being emphasised. It is as Elohim that He tells that Sarai shall bear a son ; Creative power being involved.

In all the episode about Sodom, it is Jehovah Who visits Abraham, it is with Jehovah he pleads, it is Jehovah Who delivers Lot ; but at the close of the narrative the Creative majesty is emphasised. " It came to pass when Elohim destroyed the cities of the plain, that Elohim remembered Abraham and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow."

Very significantly in the episode of Abimelech the name of Elohim is used. Elohim appeared to Abimelech in a dream. Elohim speaks to him. Abraham, when questioned by Abimelech explains that he thought the fear of Elohim was not in the place. He says Elohim had brought him out of his father's country and

he prays to Elohim for Abimelech, and Elohim gives healing. Surely all this is appropriate where a non-Israelite is in question (as even Driver admits), while the closing verse of the story indicates that it is Jehovah Who has throughout been interposing on behalf of His own servant Abraham.

In the twenty-first chapter is Jehovah Who visits Sarah to fulfil the word concerning the birth of a son, but as before, the Creative energy of Elohim was indicated in the promise, so now in the fulfilment reference is made to the set time that Elohim appointed, and Sarah speaks of Elohim making her to laugh: the Divine action as transcending human power being appropriately suggested by the name. In the account of Hagar and Ishmael, naturally Elohim is the name that appears. It is as Elohim that He hears the voice of the lad and opens the eyes of his mother, and is with the growing boy. In the interview between Abimelech and his captain with Abraham it is as Elohim that Abimelech speaks of Him, but at the close of the interview, when Abraham plants the tree in Beersheba, he calls upon the Name of Jehovah Who is also the Everlasting Elohim.

In the account of the Temptation of Abraham, it is as Elohim that the Divine One speaks to him, perhaps emphasising the thought of His absolute control, but when the life of Isaac is to be spared it is the angel of Jehovah, the Covenant God, Who interposes; and Abraham calls the name of the place Jehovah Jireh, and Jehovah renews the Covenant promise.

Chapter twenty-four gives the account of Abraham's servant going, at his master's bidding, to seek a wife for Isaac. It begins by saying that Jehovah had blessed Abraham in all things—according to the promise. Then he makes his servant swear by Jehovah, but most significantly, it is Jehovah the Elohim of heaven and the Elohim of earth: an identification in the interest of the servant who did not belong to the chosen race. Throughout the servant speaks of and to God either as Jehovah the God of my master Abraham or simply as Jehovah. Laban also speaks of God as Jehovah, and that is also appropriate since he was a Shemite. Later when Isaac and Rebekah pray for the fulfilment of the Covenant promise in the birth of children they address themselves, as was fitting, to Jehovah. In the account of Isaac's sojourn in the land of the Philistines, it is Jehovah Who directs him and Who blesses him and to Whom he builds an altar; and even the Philistine king speaks of Jehovah for he contemplates

Him as Isaac's God, saying, "We saw plainly that Jehovah was with thee, and "thou art now the blessed of Jehovah."

When Jacob brings his venison to Isaac he gives, as the reason for his quickness, "because Jehovah thy God sent me good speed"—Jehovah the God of his pious father, but he has not got the length of recognising Him specifically for himself. Isaac in pronouncing the blessing uses both titles, "the smell of a field which Jehovah hath blessed." All the blessing which came to him was Covenant blessing. Then he goes on "God give thee of the dew of heaven"; God the supreme, the God of heaven and earth, the God of nature and providence; the One Who can do what human power is unavailing to do. Later when he sends Jacob away, realising the great need, he falls back upon the old promise in time of great need to Abraham indicated in the special name, El Shaddai; and says, "God Almighty bless thee," etc., "that thou mayest inherit the land of thy sojournings which God gave unto Abraham"—Elohim Who had the right to dispose of the land as God of heaven and earth.

In Jacob's dream, he sees the angels of God ascending and descending and Jehovah speaks to him as Jehovah, the Elohim of Abraham and the Elohim of Isaac. Jacob in awaking says, "Surely Jehovah was in this place," and the presence of Jehovah makes it the house of God. Then in his vow he appropriately interchanges the names, "If Elohim be with me, . . . then shall Jehovah be my Elohim and this shall be God's house." After the marriage of Jacob it is as Jehovah that God notes his slighting of Leah and blesses her, and she praises Jehovah Who heard her prayer—the grace and faithfulness of God in His dealings being thus emphasised. In the next chapter the name Elohim is the more prominent. Jacob says, in reply to the complaint of Rachel, "Am I in Elohim's stead?" for it is a question of something dependent upon divine power, and when Rachel is favoured with a son, she recognises that it is Elohim Who hath heard and helped her. So it is Elohim Who hearkens unto Leah and helps her, and again Elohim Who remembers Rachel and gives her another son, but at the same time she recognises the grace of Jehovah.

Laban and Jacob both confess that it is Jehovah Who had given the blessing upon the shepherdly labours of Jacob, and it is Jehovah Who calls upon Jacob to return to the land of his fathers. But when Jacob communicates this fact to his wives,

he speaks of Him as "the God of my father," and he tells how Elohim had frustrated Laban's designs, and how Elohim had given him the cattle of their father, and they bid him do what Elohim has told him. Here the divine action is set over against the human and so it is fitting that Elohim should be used. The angel of Elohim appears to Jacob and Elohim speaks to him as the Elohim of Bethel, thus carrying back his thoughts to his memorable experience. He also as Elohim appears in a dream to Laban in his pursuit of Jacob and prevents him from injuring him. Laban speaking of this afterwards to Jacob says "The Elohim of your fathers" and so Jacob speaks in the same way of The Elohim of my father, the Elohim of Abraham, and both speak of Him simply as Elohim, the Supreme One, Whose action is contrasted with man's, but it is Jehovah the God of Promise Who is invoked to see that they keep their mutual promises. Jacob goes on his way and in his weakness and fear he is met by the angels of Elohim, and at the brook Jabbok he prevailed with Elohim; his human weakness is linked to the Divine Power and he has a glimpse of the face of Elohim. When he meets Esau he speaks of Elohim's dealings with him, Elohim had graciously given him his children, Elohim had given him all his possessions.

In the thirty-fifth chapter God again appears to Jacob and bids him go to Bethel and re-consecrate himself, and throughout the chapter it is Elohim that is used, with the exception in one verse of El Shaddai. But the Elohim in this case is practically equivalent to Jehovah, for it is Elohim as manifested at Bethel. He is linked therefore with His former promise to Jacob while at the same time the power which has brought about all that was promised is emphasised by the title. In the next four chapters no name of God occurs, with the exception in ch. xxxviii. 7, 10, of Jehovah three times, Who is displeased with Judah's sons for their sinful action directed in effect against the fulfilment of the Covenant promise.

When we come to the history of Joseph in Egypt it is Jehovah Who is with him and makes him to prosper; but, suitably in his remonstrance with the sinful wife of his master he speaks of the sin against God, and when called before Pharaoh, he assures the king that Elohim will give him an answer of peace; and throughout in his speaking of Pharaoh and in Pharaoh's own utterances it is Elohim that is used. So even afterwards in

speaking to his brethren, as the governor of Egypt, he says, "I fear Elohim." Jacob in sending down the brethren to Egypt the second time prays that El Shaddai may give them mercy; and in the further scenes between Joseph and his brethren Elohim is the word used on both sides, just as we might expect. And even after he reveals himself to his brethren, Joseph in telling of all the Divine dealings still uses Elohim, because in all there had been such a signal display of God's power and wisdom.

Towards the close when Joseph brings his two sons to receive his father's blessing, Jacob uses the favourite, expressive title, El Shaddai; Joseph says of his boys, "These are my sons whom Elohim hath given me," an expression which from the time of Eve seems to have been the appropriate one in that connection, as celebrating the Divine allotment. Jacob in blessing them speaks of the Elohim before Whom his fathers had walked, the Elohim which fed him all his life long, in other words the Elohim of Bethel; and when he says "Behold I die but Elohim shall be with you and bring you again unto the land of your fathers," he plainly indicates that Divine power will do the seemingly impossible, and in spite of the weakness and mortality of earthly leaders, Elohim will not fail.

So after the death of Jacob, when the brethren of Joseph come to him to seek his forgiveness and make sure of their peace in his favour, they speak of the Elohim of thy father, and Joseph bids them not fear for says he, "Am I in the place of Elohim?" and that Elohim, in contrast to all the planning of men, and by His own great power and wisdom had brought all these things to pass; and when his last hour comes he also, like his father, declares "Elohim will surely visit you and bring you out of this land"; the power needed will be displayed, while the Jehovah character of God is sufficiently indicated in the reference to the Covenant by which the land was given to them.

Thus throughout the whole book of Genesis we find the titles generally appropriately, often significantly used and all need for postulating diversity of authorship on the ground of the use of the names is removed.

I need not pursue the analysis throughout Exodus and the other books of the Pentateuch. The critics indeed do not lay so much stress on the usage in these books. The name of Jehovah naturally appears more frequently as we are in the full stream of

the Redemptive Revelation, when according to the true meaning of the great passages in Exodus iii. and vi., Jehovah, the Covenant keeping God is fully revealed in His dealings with His nation. But again and again the name of Elohim appears and I think it will always be found that there is a special fitness in its use.

There is one point which the critics seem to pass over very lightly, in fact they hardly advert to it at all; that is the possibility of any Manuscriptal alteration in regard to the Divine names. They are always ready to suggest an alteration or corruption in the MSS. when there is a difficulty in making a passage square with their theory, and they frequently appeal to the Septuagint translation against the Hebrew. But as to the matter of these Divine names, they practically treat the Massoretic text as infallible, and this on their part seems far from consistent. I am not one to seek for scribal corruptions in the MSS. and I am not very ready to accept the LXX in preference to the Hebrew. But it is not improbable that in some places where the critics claim Jehovah as settling the authorship of a particular passage, the original may have been Elohim or *vice versa*. As a matter of fact there are varied readings in some of the old MSS. on these very points. Again it is undoubted that the Septuagint varies considerably from the Hebrew in its use of the Divine names. I only mention this by the way and do not personally attach much importance to it, but it is a factor that might lead the critics to be a little less dogmatic in their assertions.

Another subsidiary point I mention. With regard to the Jehovah Elohim of Genesis ii. and iii., not only do the critics maintain that the Elohim has been added by the Redactor, but they affirm that "Jehovah Elohim" is an "un-Hebraic" expression, which the original writer could not have used. What, then, was the Redactor ignorant of Hebrew idioms? How utterly unfit for the high functions assigned him must he have been in that case! But I maintain that it is quite incorrect to describe the phrase "Jehovah Elohim" as "un-Hebraic." I need not point to the number of instances in the prophets and historical books as well as in the Pentateuch, of the expression "Jehovah Elohim of Israel, because the critics would say that the junction of Israel, or other epithet with the Name makes it allowable. They would say the same of such terms so commonly used as "Jehovah your Elohim, my Elohim, their Elohim,"

although the juxtaposition in Hebrew is closer than in English since Elohim follows immediately upon Jehovah, the pronoun being represented by the pro-nominal suffix attached to and forming part of the word Elohim.

But I point to cases where it is used absolutely just as in Genesis. In 2 Samuel vii. 22, "Thou art great, O Jehovah Elohim," 25, "O Jehovah Elohim, the word that thou hast spoken fulfil." 2 Kings xix. 19, "Thou art Jehovah Elohim, even Thou." 1 Chron. xxviii. 20, "Be not dismayed for Jehovah Elohim will be with thee." 1 Chron. xxii., 1, "This is the house of Jehovah Elohim." 1 Chron. xxix. 1, "The palace is not for man but for Jehovah Elohim." 2 Chron. i. 9, "Now O Jehovah Elohim, let Thy promise be fulfilled." 2 Chron. vi. 41, 42, "Arise, O Jehovah Elohim, into Thy resting place"; "Let Thy priests, O Jehovah Elohim, be clothed with salvation"; "O Jehovah Elohim, turn not away Thy face." And in Jonah iv. 6, you may remember we have Jehovah Elohim preparing the gourd. So that in the face of these passages it is just a little too much to be told that the phrase is un-Hebraic.

There is only one place in the Pentateuch besides Gen. ii. and iii. where Jehovah Elohim occurs. Exodus ix. 30, "I know that ye will not yet fear Jehovah Elohim." Dr. Driver, in speaking of the addition by the Redactor of Elohim to Jehovah in Genesis, says, "producing an unusual and emphatic phrase (= Jahweh who is God) occurring again in the Pentateuch only, Ex. ix. 30." He does not say as Harper and others that it is "un-Hebraic"; and, in his analysis of Exodus, he assigns the verse to J. Dr. Bennett, however, while giving the verses before and after to J, assigns this verse to the Redactor. Now would it not be a singular thing that the Redactor who is supposed to link Elohim with Jehovah in Genesis should never throughout the Pentateuch do it again, except in this one verse? Take it as part of the original diction and one sees great point in it. Moses in all his interviews with Pharaoh speaks of Jehovah, Jehovah the God of the Hebrews, Jehovah our Elohim; Pharaoh in his replies refers to God as Jehovah, Jehovah your Elohim; now Moses, in foretelling the inveterate opposition of Pharaoh's heart, adds weight to his words by using this most emphatic title, "Ye will not yet fear Jehovah Elohim." Not simply Elohim of the Hebrews as Pharaoh had acknowledged, but Jehovah Elohim absolutely.

One readily remembers too, that a similar combination is used with great frequency and translated "Lord God" in our version, but really "Adonai Jehovah" in the Hebrew; so that it seems peculiarly Hebraic to combine two Names of God in one phrase, and why should it not be in Genesis?

A. McCAIG.

London.