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In Gen. 2:4-3:24 the double name Jahwe Elohim occurs twenty times. It is also found in Ex. 9:30; II Sam. 7:22, 25; Jonah 4:6; Pss. 72:18, 84:9, 12; I Chron. 17:16, 17b, 28:20, 29:1; II Chron. 1:9, 6:41 twice, 42, 26:18. Whether it was used originally in any of these passages may be seriously questioned. There seems to be strong evidence that G had only θεός without a preceding Κυρίος, in Gen. 2:4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 19, 21, 22, 3:13, 14, 22, while the secondary character of Κυρίος in 2:15, 16, 18, 3:1, 8ab, 9, 21, 23 is highly probable. MSS. that have preserved, more or less completely, the asterisks of Origen show that he introduced Κυρίος with this sign, before θεός in 2:4, 5, 7, 8, 3:22, and there are indications that the same process was followed by him in 2:9, 19, 21, 22, 3:13, 14.

Grabe, in his edition of A, marked Κυρίος in 2:4, 5, 8 with the asterisk, and in 2:21, 3:13, 22 with the sign × showing that other indications were relied upon than the hexaplaric MSS. and direct patristic testimony. Κυρίος in 3:22 should have the asterisk; but Holmes X was not known until 1715 when Montfaucon's Bibliotheca Coisliniana appeared, and Grabe published his text in 1707. For Gen. 1:1-46:28, missing in B, the editors of the Sixtine used Holmes 19 which has only θεός in 2:5, 7, 8, 9, 19, 21, 22, 3:22 (and also 3:11 where MT. has no name), and Κυρίος θεός in 2:4, 15, 16, 18, 3:1, 8ab, 9, 13, 14, 21, 23. This is an excellent MS. closely akin to B and it was reprinted from the Sixtine by Holmes; but Swete preferred an uncial and, since K is also wanting, printed A which has only θεός in 2:5, 7, 9, 19, 21. Brooke and McLean repeated the same text in the editio major, adding their more extensive critical apparatus.
The Complutensian has o Θεός in 2 4, 7, 19, 21, 3 13, and neither Κύριος nor o Θεός in 3 22. It is based on Holmes 108. Among the deviations from this MS. in Lagarde’s attempted restoration of the Lucianic recension is o Θεός in 3 22 which he found in Holmes 19, 44.1 The Aldine, based on Holmes 68,2 has o Θεός in 2 5, 7, 8, 9, 19, 3 9, 13, 22 (and also 3 11), and so, of course, Lonicer’s edition of 1526. Holmes 82 and, according to Brooke and McLean, also the accurate and important Cod. Liguriensis (Holmes 52) have only o Θεός in 3 14; this was also the reading of Irenaeus, if his Celtic translator can be trusted.

The Old Latin apparently had only Deus in 2 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 19, 21; in the other passages Sabatier prints Dominus Deus. But in 3 14 Cyprian read only Deus (Holmes, and Burkitt in the larger Cambridge edition), and the translator of Irenaeus into Latin may have been influenced by the Vetus Latina. Sabatier’s quotations from later Latin fathers show how uncertain Dominus is in many cases. The Buhairic seems to have had phnut in 2 5, 7, 9, 19, 21, 3 8, 13 (but not 3 11), and coeis phnut in 2 4, 8, 15, 16, 18, 22, 3 1, 8 a, 9, 14, 21, 22, 23, while the Sā’idic omitted coeis in 2 16, and had it in 2 19. The Palestinian Aramaic had only לַמּ at least in 2 4, 8, 3 9, 13, 22. The Ethiopic has ’ègza’ a behër everywhere (also in 3 11); and the Arabic version of Saadia has everywhere الل لههم. It is not easy to say why the former, using apparently a Greek text of the type presented by Holmes 19, 68, did not mark the distinction of names by employing ’ègza’ a ’amlāk or ’ègza’ a behër ’amlāk (cf. e. g. Jub. 21) for Κύριος o Θεός. Saadia probably thought it inelegant to use a term like الله الهم, employed by the translator of the Samaritan text.3 Neither is important for text-critical purposes.

In the Greek text presented by MSS., translations, and quotations from early writers, o Θεός is the constant element. Only in 2 22 the Aldine, 31, 83, 121, Georg., have Κύριος without

1 Cp. Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griechischen Übersetzung des AT., 1882, p. 36.
3 The Paris and London Polyglots print everywhere in Genesis except in 6 5 where they have theرب, but there also Saadia seems to have written ﷲ، according to the edition of Derenbourg.
o Θεός, and Origen once omits both names and once o Θεός, rendering it doubtful whether in his text the subject was expressed at all. We know that Origen added Κυρίος, probably from Theodotion, in at least five places and put an asterisk before it. Since he no doubt used a Hebrew text that was substantially identical with our kethibh, there is a strong presumption in favor of the view that he introduced it wherever MT. has מֹלֵא. The fact that one hexaplaric MS. has the asterisk in places where it is not found in another, shows how indifferently these marks were copied even when an attempt was made to give them. Some copyists clearly omitted the words marked by Origen as not belonging to G., others preserved them without the asterisk, and others still reproduced the sign only in the case of words and phrases that seemed important. Where the most MSS., and among them the best, have only o Θεός, we may be reasonably sure that a preceding Κυρίος with an asterisk in Origen’s G. column has been left out. This applies to more than half of the twenty instances. As regards the others, it is probable, in spite of the vacillating tradition, that some of them had exhibited the double name long before Origen wrote his Hexapla.

It is indeed impossible to prove this from the Old Latin version. A Latin translation made from G. no doubt existed before Origen. But how it looked in the first part of Genesis we have scarcely any means of knowing. Jerome complained in the Praefatio in Quatuor Evangelia dedicated to Damasus: “Si enim exemplaribus fides est exhibenda, respondant, quibus? tot enim sunt exemplaria, quot codices.” Even if we could read Gen. 2-3 in one of these “exemplaria,” we should, therefore, be in considerable doubt. But Sabatier was unable to use any MSS. in Genesis, and depended wholly upon quotations, chiefly from Augustine, Jerome and Ambrose: “Primo quidem omnes Pentateuchi libros . . . nonnisi ex collectis veterum Patrum lectionibus conficiere licuit . . . . Liber Geneseos integer utcunque est recuperatus et confectus maxime ex Augustini, Hieronymi et Ambrosii libris.” Nor are we much better off

5 Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae, 1751, Praefatio. p. lxx.
to day so far as these chapters are concerned. For they are not found either in Cod. Lugdunensis, Cod. Wirceburgensis, Cod. Ottobonianus, or Cod. Monacensis. The absence of *Domminus* in 3.14 as quoted by Cyprian and the Latin translator of Irenaeus is therefore of some importance. Yet far-reaching conclusions cannot be based on such an isolated instance. The later writers may be suspected of having used copies corrected from Greek MSS. influenced by Origen’s text.

But Philo’s quotations decidedly give the impression that in respect of the two names the text he used did not differ essentially from Origen’s in this particular section. He has occasion to quote almost every verse in his Allegorical Commentary, and gives *ὁ Θεός* in 2.4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 19, 21, 3.13, *Κυριος ὁ Θεός* in 2.15, 16, 18, 3.1, 8a, 9, 14, 23,6 and elsewhere 7 *ὁ Θεός* in 3.22. It is true that we cannot be absolutely sure about these quotations. Cohn has called attention to the probability that the copyists were occasionally influenced by the wording in their Bibles, and in his reply to Nestle’s criticism 8 rightly maintains that “hier kommen nicht nur gewöhnliche Corruptelen vor, die den Abschreibern zur Last fallen, sondern auch absichtliche Änderungen, die von gelehrten Lesern und Korrektoren auf Grund anderweitiger Kenntnis der betreffenden Bibelstellen vorgenommen worden sind.”9 There is a curious example, showing how easily a translator or copyist may be thus influenced by the form of a familiar Bible passage, in *Leg. alleg.* I, 56 (ed. Cohn) where the Armenian text has *Κυριος ὁ Θεός* against *ὁ Θεός* of the Greek MSS. Now this is precisely what the Armenian version of the Bible has against all the Greek MSS. in this place. In view of the fact that all our MSS. of Philo apparently go back to an archetype in the library at Caesarea, the remarkable agreement with what seems to be Origen’s text of G looks somewhat suspicious. It also deserves attention that the agreement is especially pronounced between the present text of Philo and Holmes 19, 108.

---

6 The passages in *Leg. alleg.* are clearly indicated and may be easily found in the editions of Mangey, Richter, Cohn, and Bréhier; and the quotations in other works of Philo, as a rule, agree with those in *Leg. alleg.*

7 *De confusione linguarum*, ed. Wendland, 169.

8 Philologus, 1900, p. 250.

9 Philologus, 1900, p. 522.
Philo's comment, however, on the double name, giving what he supposed to be the reason for its employment, shows beyond the possibility of a doubt that it existed in his text of G, and also seems to indicate that in this chapter it appeared for the first time in connection with the placing of man in the garden of Eden, i.e. in 2:15. That, nevertheless, his text did not always agree with either our MSS. of G. or MT. is seen in De confusione linguarum, 169 (ed. Wendland) where Κύριος ο Θεός is used in a quotation of Gen. 1:28. Philo's copy of G. manifestly had the double name, but probably not as often as our text of Philo would suggest. Too much stress must not be laid on the form in which Gen. 2:7 is quoted by Josephus, yet ἐπλασεν ο Θεός τον ἄνθρωπον ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς λαβὼν has the appearance of being an accurate reproduction of the text he used.

Now it is not easy to believe that, three centuries before Philo, the earliest translator of the Pentateuch into Greek chose Gen. 2:15 as the proper place for the introduction of Κύριος before ο Θεός for the first time in the narrative, and subsequently alternated between ο Θεός and the double name, either because his Hebrew text demanded it, or arbitrarily in spite of a textual condition like that of MT. The probability is decidedly in favor of the assumption that G. found Κυριων everywhere in the Hebrew text and everywhere rendered it with ο Θεός. This is strongly suggested by the fact that Κυριος ο Θεος is not limited in the Pentateuch to Gen. 2:4-3:24. It is used by Philo in Gen. 1:26; the original of the Buhairic version seems to have had it in Gen. 1:24; it is well supported in our MSS. in Gen. 4:6, 9, 13, 15 twice, 26, 4:3, 5, 8, 12, 13, 7:1, 5, 16, 8:15, 21 twice, 11:5, 6, 8, 27:20; Ex. 4:11, 34:6; Deut. 29:3, and often found in more or less extensive groups of MSS. where MT. has only ΤΩΡ or ΜΗΛΑΣ. Philo's unique reading in Gen. 1:28 is possibly supported by a variant in the Ignatian Epistle to the Antiochenes. Holmes

10 Leg. alleg. I, 95 (ed. Cohn): Ἡ δὲ παραβίωσις γίνεται δ' ἀμφότεροι τῶν ἔλεγχων καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, "ἐπετελεύτα" γὰρ "Κύριος ο Θεός" ἦν, εἰ μὲν τελείως ταῖς παραβίωσισι, ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐρυγενῶν ἀξιωθεὶς, εἰ δὲ ἀφελάθη, ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ὡς δεσπότου καὶ θουσίαν ἐχοντος σκορακλίου. Bréhier omits καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, probably through an oversight.

says: "\textit{Kupios o \(\Thetaeos\) Ignat. MS. Ep. ad Antioch." But where is this MS.? Lightfoot and Hilgenfeld both print o \(\Thetaeos\) and fail to indicate any other reading. It is significant that, in the stories of Cain and Abel, the Giants, the Deluge, and the Tower, where \textit{Kupios o \(\Thetaeos\)} is used, o \(\Thetaeos\) is, as a rule, better supported than \textit{Kupios}. Even in Gen. 9:26 Holmes VI, 57 omit \textit{Kupios},

\footnote{So also Philo, \textit{De sobrietate}, 51 (ed. Wendland), according to Ms. L. which formed the basis of the \textit{editio princeps} by Turnebus.}

\footnote{Cp. my article on "The Blessing of Japhet," to appear in this \textit{Journal}.}

\footnote{Quod deus sit immutabilis, 92 (ed. Wendland).}

\footnote{Similarly, the original Hebrew text in Deut. 14, no doubt had a suffix, whether it was \(\textit{\text{\(\eta\)\(\mu\)\(\nu\)\(\omicron\)}\(\iota\)\(\au\)\(\omicron\)\(\nu\)}\) or \(\textit{\text{\(\eta\)\(\mu\)\(\nu\)\(\omicron\)\(\iota\)\(\au\)\(\omicron\)\(\nu\)}}\) or \(\textit{\text{\(\eta\)\(\mu\)\(\nu\)\(\omicron\)\(\iota\)\(\au\)\(\omicron\)\(\nu\)\(\iota\)\(\omicron\)\(\nu\)}}\), both of which would be pronounced \(\textit{\text{\(\eta\)\(\nu\)\(\omicron\)\(\nu\)\(\omicron\)\(\iota\)\(\au\)\(\omicron\)\(\nu\)\(\iota\)\(\omicron\)\(\nu\)}}\). This would account for its appearance occasionally for emphasis.}

Though the double name in Gen. 27:20 is sustained by many good MSS. of G. and by Philo,14 "Yahwe thy God" (MT.) has also excellent support in MSS. of G., and is more probable. In Ex. 4:11, where a very large number of MSS. have \textit{Kupios} before o \(\Thetaeos\), the context suggests that o \(\Thetaeos\) is the addition. The second name in Ex. 36:6 is lacking in Kennicott 171 and many MSS. of G., and o \(\Thetaeos\) does not present \(\textit{\text{\(\nu\)\(\omicron\)\(\nu\)\(\omicron\)\(\iota\)\(\au\)\(\omicron\)\(\nu\)}}\) but \(\textit{\text{\(\nu\)\(\omicron\)\(\nu\)\(\omicron\)\(\iota\)\(\au\)\(\omicron\)\(\nu\)}}\). MT. has only \(\textit{\text{\(\nu\)\(\omicron\)}}\) in Deut. 29:3; o \(\Thetaeos \eta\mu\nu\), was the original addition, as many MSS. show, though \(\eta\mu\nu\) has disappeared from some copies.\footnote{So also Philo, \textit{De confusione linguarum}, 14 (ed. Wendland). In \textit{De sacrificantibus}, 318 (ed. Cohn) he added \(\eta\mu\nu\) (AH.) or \(\eta\nu\nu\) (R.).}
or variation. It is quite likely that the introduction of $Kvpt\nu$ before $\sigma \Theta\varepsilon\sigma$, in Gen. 1-3 as well as in the rest of the Pentateuch, belongs to the history of the inner development of G.

The possibility should indeed be borne in mind that the same tendency may have led to the use of the name Yahwe Elohim in the Hebrew text before the translation was made in the same haphazard manner as in G. There are many instances recorded by Kennicott and De Rossi where one set of MSS. has יוהו, another יְהוָה, one יְהֹוָה, another יְהוָה, some cases where one name has clearly crowded out the other, and some where they have fused into a double name. Cod. De Rossi 754 has evidently preserved the original reading in Gen. 16:1; "ita enim habetur vera interpretatio nominis Ismaëlis," as De Rossi rightly remarks; 16 the longer form יְרֵא הָאָב is found in De Rossi 669; 17 "vix ad marginem restitutum est," but scarcely "ipsa primi scriptoris manu." In Ex. 6:2, where MSS. and versions differ as to יְרֵא או יְוָה, De Rossi 262 has יְיֹוהוָה יְיֹוהוָה. Yet the remarkable absence of יְהוָה יְהוָה practically everywhere in the Masoretic text of the Pentateuch outside of Gen. 2-3, contrasted with the frequent occurrence of $Kvpt\nu \sigma \Theta\varepsilon\sigma$ in our MSS. of G., and the systematic manner in which יְיֹוהוָה יְיֹוהוָה is employed in this section of M.T., compared with the late appearance and irregular use of $Kvpt\nu \sigma \Theta\varepsilon\sigma$ in the corresponding part of the translation, give the unmistakable impression that G. had before him a recension of the Hebrew text in which the double name did not occur in the Pentateuch.

On the other hand, the Samaritan Pentateuch agrees with M.T., and so does the Samaritan Targum with its יְיֹוהוָה יְיֹוהוָה. The Arabic version of Sam., unlike Saadia, makes a distinction between الله אלים which stands for יְיֹוהוָה and אלים אלים which represents יְיֹוהוָה יְיֹוהוָה. 15 Symmachus followed Sam.; Aquila.

16 Variae lectiones V. T., 1784, I, 15.
17 The Arabic versions should not have been quoted by De Rossi as supporting this variant, since they use الله for יְיֹוהוָה also.
18 A codex in my possession, giving in parallel columns the Sam. text and the Arabic version, has sometimes الله written with fatha and tash-did, and يְיֹוהוָה with fatha and kasra.
Theodotion, the Jewish Targums, the Peshita, and Jerome followed our \textit{kethibh}.

It is very generally assumed that the son of Joiada who had married a daughter of Sanballat, when he was banished from Jerusalem, took with him a copy of the Pentateuch edited by Ezra and went to his father-in-law who made him the first high-priest of the Samaritan sect, and that, because of the enmity between Jews and Samaritans, the copies of his MS. and their descendants never were compared with Jewish MSS. or revised so as to agree with them. Nehemiah does not connect the son of Joiada with the founding of the Samaritan cult-community. But Josephus relates how a certain Manasse, son of Johanan, put by the elders of Jerusalem to the alternative of divorcing his wife, Nicaso, daughter of Sanballat, or renouncing the priesthood, was persuaded by promises to forego his right to approach the altar in Jerusalem, and ultimately made priest of the temple built on Mount Gerizim by Sanballat with the permission of Alexander. Josephus probably knew when the Gerizim temple was built, and who the first high-priest was, as well as he knew when the temple in Leontopolis was built and the name of its first high-priest.

If there was only one Sanballat, the contemporary of Nehemiah, Josephus apparently did not know, as we now do through the Elephantine papyri, that his sons were grown up men and John high-priest eighty years before Alexander. If there were two Sanballats, both of them must have married daughters of theirs to members of the Judaean high-priestly family viz. to the unnamed son of Joiada-Jehudah and to Manasse, the son of Johanan, respectively, which is not altogether impossible, but somewhat less probable. There is no evidence in Josephus for the modern notion that Manasse fled from Jerusalem with a copy of the Torah, as the Chronicler supposed Ezra to have left Susa with the Law of God in his hand. This law may have been taken over later when the exigencies of the

\textsuperscript{19} The Peshita differs from MT. only in having \textit{\textsuperscript{3}\textsuperscript{16}; so the Polyglots, Lee, the Urmia ed. and Cod. Ambrosianus.}

\textsuperscript{20} Neh. 13:28.

new temple demanded it, as Stade and others have maintained. Montgomery has called attention to the probability of rather friendly relations between the younger branch of the Zadokite priesthood at Shechem and the older line in Jerusalem. A comparison of the Samaritan and Jewish Targums must convince any one that they reflect to a certain extent a common halakhic tradition. Even the Pentateuch itself shows signs of a revision not confined to the Samaritan text. It is impossible to prove that the Samaritan Pentateuch has remained the same since it was brought to Shechem, or that it represents an earlier type than that used by G. in the third century B.C.

The conclusion to which the evidence points is that there existed at that time two different recensions of the Hebrew text, one exhibiting nowhere in the Pentateuch the double name, and another identical in this respect with MT. The age of the latter can perhaps be established approximately by the discrimination it shows in the use of the name Yahwe. It seems to be in the Achaemenian period that men began to avoid placing this name upon the lips of foreigners, of those not supposed to be worshippers of Yahwe, or of Jews in addressing such persons. In earlier times a distinction of this sort is not felt to be necessary. Yahwe is used by the Philistine kings Abimelech, Gen. 26:28, and Achish, I Sam. 29:6, the Aramaean Laban, Gen. 31:49, the Pharaoh of Egypt, Ex. 5:2, 8:8, 28, 10:10, 11, 16, 17, and his servants, Ex. 10:7, the Midianite Jethro, Ex. 18:10, 11, Balaam, the Edomite prophet, Num. 22:8, 18, 23:3, 26, 24:13, the Amalekite who slew Saul, II Sam. 1:16, Hiram, the king of Tyre, I Kings 5:7, and the Assyrian Rabshakeh, II Kings 18:30, 32, 35. The angel in Zech. 3:2 exclaims: "Yahwe rebuke thee, O Satan!" In the prose story of Job Yahwe is used, while it is carefully avoided in our present dialogues; even Satan says "Yahwe," according to G. Trg. in 1:9, and Job's wife in 2:9.


23 The Samaritans, 1907, pp. 71 ff.
But Yahwe is avoided in the letter of Tattenai to Darius, Ezra 5 7-17, the decrees of Cyrus, 6 3-5, and Darius, 6 6-12, the firman given by Artaxerxes to Ezra, 7 11-26, and probably also in the proclamation of Cyrus in Ezra 1 2-4 (II Chron. 36 23) where MSS. of MT. and of the early versions suggest that יהוה is a later addition. The same applies to the decrees of Nebuchadnezzar in Dan. 3 28-29, 4 1-37, and of Darius the Mede, Dan. 6 25-27. In Jonah a clear distinction is made between the sailors who, having heard from the prophet the name of his god, 1 9, beseech Yahwe to deliver them, 1 14, and become Yahwe-worshippers, 1 16, and the king of Nineveh and his nobles who, having heard nothing else than that a prophet had predicted the destruction of the city after forty days, can only use the term Elohim in their proclamation, 3 7-9. A similar care was probably taken originally in the case of The Sayings of Agur ben Yakeh; רַעְשׁוֹת אֶחָד (G.) in Prov. 30 9 suggests יהוה יָמִי for יהוה יָמִי. Scruples of this kind may have prevented the insertion of Jahwe before Elohim in the words of the serpent and the answer of the woman, Gen. 3 1b-5, as early as the Persian period. There is not the slightest evidence, however, in the texts representing this recension, of Yahwe having been originally used in the conversation and subsequently removed. The hand that first introduced the double name manifestly hesitated to put it on the lips of the serpent.

Another consideration leads to the same result. The recension represented by MT. and Sam. cannot have existed before the union of the two stories of creation, since in this case it would be impossible to account for the recension represented by G. For the same reason it cannot have been created when the two were united. It is likely to be a development within the substantially completed text of the Pentateuch. But this can scarcely be later than the fifth century. To suppose that יהוה, the constant element in the textual tradition, is the addition, and יהוה, doubtfully supported in the majority of instances, once existed everywhere, is to lose touch with, and run counter to, our present witnesses to the text, and to deprive ourselves of the ability to explain its changes. The absence of יהוה in some of Kennicott's MSS., as in 29 (K. 9), 15 (K. 5), 18 (K. 191),
21 (K. 69, 252), 22 (K. 89), 3 14 (K. 103), 23 (K. 80), and of
יהי, as in 218 (K. 89), 3 22 (K. 152), as well as the presence of
יהי in 3 1b (K. 132), clearly due to the negligence of scribes,
can have no significance. When Kittel observes: “aut יהי aut
יהוה אלוהים . . . additamentum redactoris esse videtur,”24 the second
alternative is not suggested by the textual apparatus, but by a
critical theory.

In Ex. 9 30 MT. is supported by Pesh., Trg., Jerome, Holmes 58,
Arm., probably Sam. which has יהוה אלוהים, and Sam. Trg. with
its יהוה אלוהים; but B. 29, 130 have קֵּיָּוָּיוּ קֵּיָּוָּיוּ Syr.-Hex. marks
ם with an asterisk, the Arabic translation of Sam., at
least in my MS., has only עִי, which generally stands for יהי,
and Saadia likewise has יהוה אלוהים, while A has קְרֵבָּוָּוָּו. The
יהוה אלוהים of Sam. shows that both יהוה אלוהים and קְרֵבָּוָּו
were pronounced at one time קְרֵבָּוָּו among the Samaritans
as well as among the Jews. In the context both Pharaoh and
Moses use the name Yahwe, and there is no reason to suppose
that Elohim is original.

More difficult is the decision in II Sam. 7 22, 25. Kennicott
quotes a large number of MSS. that have יהוה אלוהים in both
verses, and some that have יהוה אלוהים קְרֵבָּוָּו in vs. 22. G. seems to
have had קֵּיָּוָּיוּ קֵּיָּוָּיוּ which clearly points to יהוה אלוהים.
This term appears in six other places in David’s prayer, vs. 18-29.
The Chronicler copied his words (I, 17, 16-27), and a comparison
of the two texts is instructive. Wellhausen says, referring to
vs. 22: “יהוה אלוהים steht in der Chronik überall für יהוה אלוהים
unseres Textes; hier und v. 25 ist es auch in diesen letzteren
eingedrungen wie I Sam, 6 11, 17 וַיְהַלְדוּם,” 25 and Driver translates
this statement without comment or explanation.26 Yet neither
does יהוה אלוהים occur everywhere in the Chronicler’s copy of
David’s words where the Samuel text has יהוה אלוהים, nor can it
be shown that in all the nine passages where יהוה אלוהים occurs
in the Chronicles it represents יהוה אלוהים, if that is the meaning;
nor is it apparent wherein the similarity consists between the

21 Biblia Hebraica, ad loc.
22 Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, 1871, p. 173.
23 Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel. 1880, p. 213; re-
peated, without change, in the 2nd ed., 1913, p. 277.

3*
addition of glosses in I Sam. 6 11, 17 and the change from one
divine name to another in these vss. In II Sam. 7 18-29
is found six times, vss. 18, 19ab, 20, 28, 29; to these cor-
respond in I Chron. 17 16-27, vs. 16, 17a, 17b, vs. alone, vss. 19, 26, 27. For ג והי אלים, II Sam. 22, 25, Chron. has only והי, I, 17 20, 23; for והי
צִבְאוֹת אלהים ישראלי, and II Sam. 7 26, 27, I Chron. 17 24, 25 have 
צִבְאוֹת אלהים ישראלי, and both II Sam. 7 24 and Chron. 17 22 have 
ג. seems to have read ג והי in eight instances in his Hebrew text of Samuel. If the Chronicler had found the
same text, it is difficult to see why he should have omitted
in six out of eight cases. He probably read ג והי everywhere;
was subsequently added everywhere in these passages of the
Samuel text, and because of the pronunciation 
והי אלהים was changed in two places to והי. A later copyist of
Chron., remembering the emphatic double name, 
והי, that meanwhile had found its way into the passage in Samuel,
may have introduced it in a couple of instances, with the same
consequence that it ultimately changed into והי אלהים.

The author of Jonah used the name Yahwe except where the
circumstances seemed to him to demand Elohim. Thus in
1 6, before the mariners have learned to know Yahwe, they
naturally employ the term Elohim. In 3 3 is
an idiom. The Ninevites could not be said to believe in Yahwe
of whom they had never heard, hence Elohim in 3 5 and in the
proclamation, 3 7-9. In 3 10, however, it is probable that Yahwe
was originally used, and Kenn. 109 has ג והי in 3 10b. MT. is
no doubt right in giving only והי in 4 3 against Δεσπότα Κυρίου
of G., which goes back to an expansion into והי אלהים, natural
in direct address. Five of Kennicott's MSS. read ג והי in 4 6. This may have been changed under the influence of the pronunciation 
אֲלֵיהִים into Jahwe Elohim, rendered Κυρίος Θεος, Dominus Deus, coeis phnit, מֶלֶךְ אלהים, 
and curiously enough, not 'egzi'a beher 'amlak, as in 1 9, 2 2, 3, 4 2, but simply 'egzi'a beher. There can be little doubt that the
author wrote only ג והי. But the double name continues in G.
and the versions dependent on it in vss. 7, 8, 9, and this is
probably to be regarded as a sign that the text originally had the name Yahwe, which is the reading of Kenn. 30, 294 in vs. 9. When G. is considered, it becomes evident that יהוה was originally used everywhere in ch. 4, and that אלהים was a later addition. A recourse to the influence of Gen. 2-3, hesitatingly proposed by Marti, is unnecessary.

In Ps. 72 18 אלהים is not read by Kenn. 250, 309, 497, De Rossi 31, 380, G., Copt., Eth., Aquila, Sym., Theod., Quinta, Sexta, Pesh., Jerome, Ar. In Ps. 84 9 את יהוה אלהים כבאת, Kenn. 117, is more probable than יהוה אלהים כבאת, but the original no doubt had only יהוה כבאת, as Kenn. 92. Similarly, in 84 12 the original יהוה seems to have been expanded into אלהי יהוה, Kenn. 245 (afterwards changed into יהוה אלהים כבאת, Kenn. 40).

In I Chron. 28 20 G's Κύριος ο Θεός mou shows that the original was יהוה, and not אלהי יהוה אלהי; יהוה אלהים seems to have been first introduced before יהוה, Kenn. 89, and then changed to אלהי יהוה אלהי; the emphasized contrast in I Chron. 29 1 between man and God renders אלהים, Kenn. 118, τω Θεω, Holmes 56, more probable than יהוה אלהים. II Chron. 1 9 probably had יהוה אלהי, as I Kings 3 7. II Chron. 6 41 a, b, 42 are copied from Ps. 132 8, 9, 10. Only יהוה is used in the psalm, and only once, vs. 8, Kenn. 101 has only יהוה in II Chron. 6 41 a; in 41 b, 42 the divine name has clearly been added by some copyist. The Hebrew text which the Syriac translator had before him in II Chron. 26 18 seems to have read: לא נל מלא התוehler והם יהוה ויאי לא נל חמשיר על מבנה המפרץ; the latter part of the vs. is an explanatory gloss.

The result of these investigations is that in the thirty-six passages where MT. has the double name, אלהים alone seems to have been used originally in 21 instances, viz. the 20 in Gen. 2-3 and I Chron. 29 1; יהוה alone 10 times, viz. Ex. 9 30, II Sam. 7 22, 25, Jonah 4 6, Pss. 72 18, 84 9, 12, I Chron. 17 16, 17b, II Chron. 6 41 a; יהוה אלוהים twice, viz. I Chron. 28 20, II Chron. 1 9; and no name at all 3 times, viz. II Chron. 6 41 b, 42, 26 18.

It should be added that Astruc looked upon אלהים as the characteristic name used by the Hebrews for the "Eternal

37 Das Dodekapropheton, 1904, p. 256.
God" and supposed that it was employed in Gen. 9.26. He explains: "Peut estre que l'Auteur du Mémoire B., après avoir donné à Dieu, dans le verset precedent, le nom de Jehovah-Elohim, l'Eternel-Dieu, c'est à dire, le nom que les Hébreux lui donnoient, en parlant de Sem, dont la posterité conserva la vraie Religion, a cru ne devoir lui donner que le nom d'Elohim, Dieu, c'est à dire, le nom que les incirconcis lui donnoient, en parlant, dans le verset suivant, de Japhet, dont la posterité se livra à l'idolatrie." In spite of the negative conclusions reached above, it is quite certain that at one time Yahwe Elohim was used by the Jews. But in this place the earliest text assuredly had either Yahwe or Elohim, and most probably Elohim.

The fact that Yahwe Elohim has frequently taken the place of Adonai Yahwe because of the common pronunciation Adonai Elohim has naturally led to the suspicion that Adonai Yahwe may occasionally have displaced an original Yahwe Elohim. In his critical edition of Ezekiel, Cornill substituted יְהֹוָה אלוהים for יהוה אלוהים in 43.19, 44.9, 12, 15, 27, 45.9.12, 27, 48.29. His reasons are that in these passages ב. has קָבָּר o Θεός, while elsewhere in the book it employs, as a rule, קָבָּר קָבֶּרָא for יהוה אלוהים; that אדונא קָבָּר is of hexaplaric origin, since אדונא alone is translated קבָּר; and that it would be natural for Ezekiel to use, in his description of the new Jerusalem, a divine name he had found in the account of the earthly paradise. But these arguments are scarcely convincing. The frequent occurrence of אדונא קָבָּר in early MSS. seems to show that יהוה אלוהים was translated at least in two ways. While in some Christian circles at the end of the fourth century קָבָּר קָבֶּר was common, others used אדונא קָבָּר; and the latter is less likely to have originated among Christians than among Alexandrian Jews. In 18.23, 29, 33.17, 20, many MSS. read יהוה. Both Kennicott and De Rossi must be consulted. The latter does not mention the MSS. having this variant in 18.23, 29. Hence Rothstein does not cite them, while he calls attention to those in 33.17, 20.29 Later scribes would naturally

29 In Kittel's Biblia Hebraica, ad loc.
be affected by the form which a common proverb, like that quoted in the four passages, assumed on the lips of the people of their own day. There is no suggestion whatsoever that the author of the sketch of the new theocracy had in mind the description of the Garden of Eden, and there is no obvious relation between the two.

Owing to the pronunciation א"ת יוהו, an א"ת יהוה would very easily turn into a יוהו א"ת. It is only necessary to remember that copies were made at dictation. This would account for יוהו א"ת being written where the original had א"ת. A comparison of MT. and G. in Isaiah and the Minor Prophets tends to show that קֵרִים o Θεός not only appeared where ה., in all probability, had יוהו, but also frequently was an expansion of a simple קֵרִים within G. There is no reason to suppose that the Hebrew text ever had קֵרִים יוהו in Isa. 41 17, 21, 42 5, 6, 8, 13, 21, 43 1, 3, 10, 12, 14, 15, 44 2, 45 1, 5, 6, 7, 51 20 22. Yet in all these passages G. seems to have had קֵרִים o Θεός; at least our best MSS. give that reading. On the assumption that every קֵרִים o Θεός stands for יוהו א"ת, this name would, in spite of the questionable קֵרִים קֵרִים in 49 22, 50 45, 51 20 22, be as characteristic of the so-called Deutero-Isaiah as Cornill thinks it is of Ezek. 40-48. MT. gives the impression that Amos frequently employed the term Adonai Yahwe. But in 8 out of 20 instances G. has only קֵרִים, viz. 1 8, 42 5, 6 8 b, 7 4 a b, 5, 6 a; twice, viz. 3 13, 9 5, קֵרִים o Θεός παντοκρατωρ seems to represent יוהו א"ת, used elsewhere 6 times, rather than יוהו א"ת הצליטא; 5 times יוהו א"ת is rendered קֵרִים o Θεός, viz. 3 7, 8, 11, 7 1, 9 8, and 5 times it is rendered קֵרִים קֵרִים, viz. 5 3, 6 2, 8 1, 3, 9. In the last ten cases יוהו א"ת or only יוהו occurs sporadically in the MSS. It cannot be proved that Amos ever used יוהו א"ת. For emphasis he occasionally seems to have said יוהו א"ת, or יוהו א"ת קֵרִים. Obadiah 1, Micah 1 2 and Zeph. 1 7 also exhibit the double name Adonai Yahwe; and among the variants is יוהו א"ת קֵרִים; but יוהו א"ת, יוהו א"ת קֵרִים, and only יוהו likewise occur, leaving room for doubt whether anything more than Yahwe was used in the original.

The case of Ezekiel is really not very different from that of
Amos. According to Cornill MT. has יְהֹוָה 228 times and B. קֻרְיָו קֻרְיָו 58 times and אֲדוֹנָי קֻרְיָו twice in 1-39. In 40-48 B. has קֻרְיָו o Θεός 15 times; other MSS. have קֻרְיָו o Θεός in the first part of the book as well as in the second, and קֻרְיָו קֻרְיָו in the second as well as in the first, or carry אֲדוֹנָי קֻרְיָו through both parts; but rarely is there a MSS. that gives a double name where B. does not have one. Consequently G. does not seem to have found יְהֹוָה in about 150 places where MT. has this name. But it is by no means certain that the original G. had 75 instances of a double name in his text; the same tendency to expand some solemn formulas existed before his time; and the pen of many a ready writer is no doubt responsible for most of the constantly reiterated claims to inspiration in this book. Where a double name was originally used for emphasis, it is likely to have been יְהֹוָה, the preference for קֻרְיָו o Θεός by one of the MSS. of G. in one section of the book cannot be regarded, in the light of usage elsewhere, as evidence of an original יְהֹוָה in these chapters. In Dan. 9 3, 4 Codex Chisianus has קֻרְיָו o Θεός; Theodotion had an additional μον in vs. 4 and, according to many MSS., also in vs. 3. MT. has יְהֹוָה אֲדוֹנָי אֲדוֹנָי in vs. 4; for יְהֹוָה אֲדוֹנָי אֲדוֹנָי many MSS. have יְהֹוָה אֲדוֹנָי אֲדוֹנָי; but it is probable that יְהֹוָה אֲדוֹנָי was used originally in both vss. Probably no double name was intended in the Prayer of Azariah, Dan. 3 45 where συ ει K. o Θ. μονος (Chisianus) or συ ει μονος K. o Θ. (Theod.) may be a translation of יְהֹוָה אֲדוֹנָי אֲדוֹנָי and meant as a variation on the Shema. As for Tobit 13 11 το oνομα Kυριου του Θεου B. may be a rendering of נַהֲלָת נְאֵר מַיִם in the Aramaic, but το oνομα το αγιου σου (M) probably represents more closely this original text.30

In view of all the facts that must be considered it is quite impossible to determine by the Biblical records alone the age of the double name יְהֹוָה אֲדוֹנָי. But we are now fortunate enough to possess documents that seem to indicate its existence at least as early as the fifth century B.C. In the Elephantine papyri the divine name נַהֲלָת ונָא occurs, without any further modification, seven times, viz. Pap. I 24, 26, II 24, 25, XI 1,

30 Cp. J. Rendel Harris, JAm. Th, III, 1899, pp. 541 ff.
SCHMIDT: YAHWE ELOHIM

XVIII, Col. 2, 1, XXXVI 4. Sachau\(^3\) translates it "der Gott Yaho." That is, of course, a possible translation, and it may seem to be supported by the אֲלוֹהִים with בָנָב, Pap. I 5, and after הרמבחתא, Pap. XXVII 7. In the first of these passages, however, the sentence כִּסֵּרָה זָהָב אֲלוֹהִים זֶבַע, "the priests of Hnub, the god who is in Yeb," is construed in precisely the same manner as אֱלֹהָא יָוֵי אֲלוֹהִים זֶבַע, "the temple of Yaho, the god who is in Yeb," Pap. I 6 (II 7); and in the second, the last letter of the word following אֲלוֹהִים which is imperfectly preserved may be ב, so that it would read עַל רַמְבּעַתא אֲלוֹהִים ב, "before Harem-Bethel, the god who is in Yeb," or הרמבחתא אֲלוֹהִים is formed on the analogy of מְדָנָא אֲלוֹהִים. It is true that the Teima inscription, CIS, II, 114, has זָלָל אֲלוֹהִים מִן, the Carpenteras inscription, CIS, II, 141, has יָאוֹר אֲלוֹהִים מִן, the Nabataean inscriptions, CIS, II, 160, 199, 442, have דָּרְשֵׁר אֲלוֹהִים מִן. But there is no indication of this usage among Jews or Samaritans, and these colonists are likely to have brought with them from their home the characteristic names of their gods. In the petition to Bagqas it may be supposed that אֲלוֹהִים was added to remind the Persian governor that Yaho was a god, though the context made it abundantly plain and the fact must have been known to him. But when Ma'uzijah, of Abydos, evidently a Jew, writes to "Jedonijah, Urijah and the priests of Yaho Elaha," Pap. XI 1; a Jewish fisherman in Syene, addressing Mahsijah in Elephantine, swears by Yaho Elaha as to what he will do with his dried fish, Pap. XXXVI 4; or a list is drawn up including "the names of the army of the Jews who gave money to Yaho Elaha," Pap. XVIII, Col. 2, 1, there can be no need in these cases of identifying Yaho as a god. The name אֲלוֹהִים corresponds exactly to the Syriac וֹדֵד, except that, of course, יָאוֹר (אֲלוֹהִים) represents יָאוֹר. Both stand for Yahwe Elohim.

While it is possible that the custom of employing this double name was introduced by later arrivals in the course of the fifth century, it is more probable that the original "Jewish army" brought it to Elephantine. Concerning the time when this military colony was placed in Yeb we only know that it already

\(^3\) Aramäische Papyri und Ostraka, 1911, passim.
possessed its temple before the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses in 525 B.C. It has been plausibly conjectured that it consisted of some of "those who had been sent against the king of the Ethiopians to battle with Psammetichus," according to Aristeas, and Aristeas unquestionably refers to Psammetichus II (594-588) whose Ethiopian expedition is mentioned in the king's own inscription at Karnak and by Herodotus and to which probably the Abul Simbel inscriptions also bear testimony. This campaign was undertaken in the last year of the reign of Psammetichus II (589-588 B.C.).

Yet it is not impossible that the Jewish garrison was sent to Elephantine already by Psammetichus I to take the place of the rebellious soldiers who fled into Ethiopia apparently at some time between 648 and 619 B.C. Eduard Meyer thinks of the period before the proclamation of the Deuteronomic Code, in 620 B.C. It is not improbable, however, that one of the effects of the centralization of the cult in Jerusalem and the destruction of the rival sanctuaries at Bethel and elsewhere was to drive into exile many men who could earn a living for themselves and their families as mercenaries. The temple at Elephantine may then have been as distinct a protest against Zadokite presumption as that at Leontopolis some centuries later was against an illegitimate Tobiad or Hasmonaean high-priesthood.

A number of interesting facts seem to point to such an origin. The religious situation at Elephantine is very much the same as at Bethel, cp. II Kings, 17 28-41. The people serve Yahw and also other gods; they make unto themsevess priests who offer sacrifices. Among their deities are

22 Epistula ad Philocratem, 13 (ed. Wendland).
23 Published by W. Max Müller, Egyptological Researches, 1906, Plates 12, 13. If there is no error in the copy, 'Ibp 1fr Be within the cartouche would seem to indicate that Psammetichus II is meant, and not Psammetichus I, as Müller maintains. Cp. also Eduard Meyer, Der Papyrusfund von Elephantine, 1912, 9f.
24 II, 161.
25 OIS, I, 1 186.
26 Herodotus, II, 30.
27 L. c. p. 35.
The goddess Ashim(a) of Bethel is no doubt identical with the Ashima introduced in Bethel by the exiles from Hamath. Similarly, the goddess Anath-Bethel, or Anath-Yaho, is probably identical with Ana(th) Melek (אָנָתְךָ מֶלֶךְ where מֶלֶךְ represents מֵלֶךְ) brought into Bethel by the contingent from Sepharvaim. Harem Bethel likely means “The Holy One of Bethel.” Bethel itself may be an abbreviation of El-Bethel, or the name of the sanctuary may be used for him who dwells therein. The gods are referred to in the plural as אֱלֹהִים, and with the verb in the plural. It is significant that these “Judaeans” not only make an appeal to the high-priest in Jerusalem but also turn in confidence to the sons of Sanballat in Samaria. That would be natural, if the original “army” had come from Bethel and the towns of Samaria as well as from various “cities” in Judah.

Yaho Elohim, or as some preferred to pronounce it, Yahwe Elohim, may, therefore, have been used to some extent in Palestine already at the end of the seventh century, and found its way to Elephantine where it long maintained itself in the Aramaic form Yaho Elaha. There evidently was a time when such double names were not yet in vogue. In the oldest remains of Hebrew poetry, the Songs of the Conquest, Deborah’s Ode, the patriarchal blessings, and the prophecies of Balaam, as well as in the earliest prose narratives, such as the tales of eponymous heroes and judges, the excellent account of David’s reign, II Sam. 9-20, the stories of Elijah and Elisha, and the original annals of the kings of Israel and Judah, we look in vain for any double name; either Yahwe or Elohim is used. In Amos we meet Adonai Yahwe and Yahwe Elohe Sebaoth, and in Isaiah Yahwe Sebaoth. These names had no doubt been employed before their time, though words ascribed to David in later narratives cannot be adduced as evidence. Adoni Yahwe, or Adonai Yahwe, “my lord Yahwe” is very natural in direct address, and the consciousness of the pronominal suffix always tends to disappear in cases of this kind.

As for יהוה צבאות or יהוה צבאות, it is clearly an abbreviation of יהוה צבאות, and designates Yahwe as the god of the celestial hosts who is surrounded when he comes by
these companions, fellow-fighters, followers, servants. In earlier times they were called בנים מלאכים or מלאכים, i.e. individuals of the species indicated by מלאכים. A distinction was later made between מלאכים and בני מלאכים; but it is doubtful whether the consciousness of the original divine nature of the angels was ever completely lost among men who used these terms. "Gods" like Nabu, Hermes, Mercury were essentially מלאכים, "angels". In the light of these facts it is not difficult to surmise what the original meaning of Yahwe Elohim was. It is probably an abbreviation, in thought at least, of יהוה אלהים מלאכים, whether that form was ever used or not, and designates Yahwe as the god who comes with the מלאכים, is at the head of them, is the chief among them, the greatest of the gods (cp. Deut. 10:17). That Yahwe is the god par excellence is all that is meant by מלאכים יהוה אלהים, I Kings 18:39. As a pluralis majestatis מלאכים probably goes back to early times. Just as 'adon and 'adonim were used indiscriminately both in regard to divine and human lordship, so 'el and 'elohim. Itani-ya and ili-ya, which constantly occur in direct address to the king of Egypt in the Amarna letters, look like translations of 'elohai.

If the positions reached in this article are sound, the story of the Garden of Eden, which has been called "the gem of Genesis," is not the product of a writer who used the divine name Yahwe. Without going into the textual problem, Budde was led by his critical insight to the conclusion that a text of this story once circulated in which the name Yahwe did not occur at all. But he also supposed that there was another earlier recension, in the main identical with it, which had only Yahwe, except in 3:15-5, and that, in uniting both, the author of the story of the fratricide introduced a Yahwe before Elohim everywhere, except in 3:15-5, in one recension and added Elohim after Yahwe wherever this name was found in the other, so that every trace of the Elohistic revision by the second Yahwist disappeared. Budde, however, did not notice that the Elohistic recension actually survived for centuries, and that many copyists followed no definite principle in the use of the double name either in this section or elsewhere in the Bible. Nor did he

38 Die biblische Urgeschichte, 1882, pp. 232ff.
explain how, in the light of general usage among writers employing the name Yahwe, the author of this story in its earliest form can be supposed to have had any scruples about using it in the conversation between the woman and the serpent, and why the final Yahwistic editor should not have continued his painstaking operation and put in Yahwe Elohim everywhere to the end of ch. 4. The scribe who prefixed Ἰούσιος to θεός in 4:26, while allowing Eve, 4:1, and Adam, 4:25, to use only θεός, seems to have been more consistent than Budde's J², who, according to him (p. 228) either did not notice יָהָ֨וֵה in ch. 4 or else understood it to be used in a different way from that in which it was employed in ch. 2-3. In the original text Eve no doubt said: "I have received a son with (the aid of) the gods," and Adam: "The gods have bestowed on me another descendant in place of Seth."

Gunkel, after some hesitancy, adopts the view of Budde. On the other hand, Eerdmans feels the insufficiency of this explanation and the force of the different textual tradition exhibited by G. He says: "LXX hat 2:9, 19, 21 Elohim gelesen. Daraus kann man folgern, dass Jahwe an verschiedenen Stellen in den Text hineingesetzt wurde... Wenn LXX es 2:9, 19, 21 gekannt hätte, wäre es auch übersetzt worden." This is quite correct. Only it is not apparent why just these three verses should have been chosen. Gunkel, reading a recently printed text, noticed the omissions and declared: "LXX liest abweichend vom hebr. 2:5, 7, 9, 19, 21 θεός." If scholars think so highly of the manuscript A in these chapters that they are ready to quote it as LXX, they would do well to use Grabe's edition. His asterisks and crosses are at least suggestive of Hexaplaric MSS. and generally provocative of doubt and inquiry. Even the critical apparatus of Brooke and McLean is not a substitute for, but only a supplement to, Holmes and Parsons; and it is not easy with both together to find out what readings a certain MS., daughter-version, or church-father really has to offer. To lean upon one single printed MS., though it be a majuscule, is scarcely more safe than to depend upon the spasmodic quo-

40 Alttestamentliche Studien, I, 1908, pp. 78 ff.
tations of יִהְיֶה in Ginsburg's Hebrew Bible, or of G. in Kittel's. Eerdmans thinks that the variants are best accounted for on the assumption that both Yahwe and Elohim were used, yet deems it possible, though not capable of proof, that there was an older form of the story in which Yahwe was not mentioned. Without a more searching examination of the witnesses to the text it is scarcely possible to go beyond such a general suspicion; and it reveals again the keenness of Eerdmans' critical judgment that, on a basis so much more slender than G. in reality affords, he rears a conjecture of such intrinsic plausibility.

The removal of Yahwe from the text in Gen. 2-3, solely on text-critical grounds, does not weaken the impression that the two stories of creation come from different hands. Astruc's clue may prove to be worthless; yet the distinction in style and thought remains. A new theory of Pentateuchal analysis may be necessary; but the analytic work will have to continue. Such a theory, the outlines of which are now becoming discernible, is likely to be as disappointing to those who, cheerfully yielding the integrity of our present Hebrew text, are eager to purge it from all evidences of a post-Mosaic authorship as to those who are ready to defend, at all hazards, the theory so ingeniously elaborated by generations of eminent scholars. Science is not concerned about the maintenance of any theory. Its most urgent demand upon its votaries in this field at present is that methods of textual criticism, at least as rigorous and exact as those recognized and employed in the elucidation of other Biblical books, shall be applied also to the study of the Pentateuch.41

41 It was not until this article had gone to the printer that the author had an opportunity of reading Dahse, Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage, 1912, though some of his earlier articles were familiar. This author has made good use of the critical apparatus furnished by Brooke and McLean. A careful examination of the entire text of Holmes-Parsons 52, 54, 55 will be necessary before these MSS. can be recognized as pre-hexaplaric, and the judgment applies to the other assumed "recensions". Some of the objections to Dahse's pericope-hypothesis urged by Skinner, The Expositor, April-September, 1913, seem well founded. Skinner, however, has no positive suggestions to offer, but simply leans on the veritas Hebraica and the undateable Samaritan text. In regard
to Gen. 2-3 Dahse assumes, like Budde, first a Yahwistic recension, then an Elohistic, and finally one with the double name. More insight is shown in his treatment of "PC". Already in 1902 the present writer expressed his opinion in an article on the Hexateuch in *The New International Encyclopaedia*, to the effect that "the so called Priestly Document never existed in a separate code, but consists of a collection of laws, illustrative stories, annotations and comments, added to the already existing books by the priesthood in Jerusalem, chiefly during the Persian period".