

Yahwe Elohim

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

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 *o Θεος*, without a preceding *Κυριος*, in Gen. 2 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 19, 21, 22, 3 13, 14, 22, while the secondary character of *Κυριος* 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 *Κυριος*, with this sign, before *o Θεος* 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 *Κυριος* in 2 4, 5, 8 with the asterisk, and in 2 21, 3 13, 22 with the sign \times showing that other indications were relied upon than the hexaplaric MSS. and direct patristic testimony. *Κυριος* 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 *o Θεος* in 2 5, 7, 8, 9, 19, 21, 22, 3 22 (and also 3 11 where MT. has no name), and *Κυριος o Θεος* 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 \aleph is also wanting, printed A which has only *o Θεος* 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 Theos* in 2 4, 7, 19, 21, 3 13, and neither *Kyprios* nor *o Theos* 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 Theos* in 3 22 which he found in Holmes 19, 44.¹ The Aldine, based on Holmes 68,² has *o Theos* 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 Theos* 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 8b, 13 (but not 3 11), and *çoeis phnut* in 2 4, 8, 15, 16, 18, 22, 3 1, 8a, 9, 14, 21, 22, 23, while the Sa'idic omitted *çoeis* in 2 16, and had it in 2 19. The Palestinian Aramaic had only ܕܘܣܘܝܐ at least in 2 4, 8, 3 9, 13, 22. The Ethiopic has *'egzi'a behër* everywhere (also in 3 11); and the Arabic version of Saadia has everywhere الله. 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 *'egzi'a 'amläk* or *'egzi'a behër 'amläk* (cf. e. g. *Jub.* 2 1) for *Kyprios o Theos*. Saadia probably thought it inelegant to use a term like الله, 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 Theos* is the constant element. Only in 2 22 the Aldine, 31, 83, 121, Georg., have *Kyprios* without

¹ Cp. *Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griechischen Übersetzung des AT.*, 1882, p. 36.

² Cp. Delitzsch, *Fortgesetzte Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Complutensischen Polyglotte*, 1886, p. 24.

³ The Paris and London Polyglots print الله everywhere in Genesis except in 6 5 where they have الرب, but there also Saadia seems to have written الله, according to the edition of Derenbourg.

ο Θεος, and Origen once omits both names and once ο Θεος, rendering it doubtful whether in his text the subject was expressed at all. We know that Origen added Κυριος, 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 יהוה. 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 ο Θεος, we may be reasonably sure that a preceding Κυριος 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, respondeant, quibus? tot enim sunt exemplaria, quot codices."⁴ 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 conficere licuit . . . Liber Geneseos integer utcunque est recuperatus et confectus maxime ex Augustini, Hieronymi et Ambrosii libris."⁵ Nor are we much better off

⁴ Migne, *Patrologia Latina* XXIX, S. Hier. X, p. 526.

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 *Dominus* 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 *o Theos* in 2 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 19, 21, 3 13, *Kypios o Theos* in 2 15, 16, 18, 3 1, 8a, 9, 14, 23,⁶ and elsewhere⁷ *o Theos* 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 criticism⁸ 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 *Kypios o Theos* against *o Theos* 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 15.¹⁰ 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 *Κυριος ο Θεος* is used in a quotation of Gen. 1 26. 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,¹¹ yet *ἔπλασεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς λαβῶν* 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 *Κυριος* before *ο Θεος* for the first time in the narrative, and subsequently alternated between *ο Θεος* 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 *יהוה* everywhere in the Hebrew text and everywhere rendered it with *ο Θεος*. 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 *יהוה* or *יהוה*. Philo's unique reading in Gen. 1 26 is possibly supported by a variant in the Ignatian Epistle to the Antiochenes. Holmes

¹⁰ *Leg. alleg.* I, 95 (ed. Cohn): 'Ἡ δὲ παραίεσις γίνεται δι' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν κλήσεων καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, "ἐνετέλατο" γὰρ "Κύριος ὁ Θεός" ἵνα, εἰ μὲν πέλειτο ταῖς παραίεσεσιν, ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐεργεσιῶν ἀξιώθει, εἰ δὲ ἀφηρηθεί, ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ὡς δεσπότου καὶ ἐξουσιαν ἔχοντος σκοραλίζοιτο. Bréhier omits καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, probably through an oversight.

¹¹ *Antiq. Jud.* I, 34 (ed. Niese).

says: "Κυριος ο Θεος Ignat. MS. Ep. ad Antioch." But where is this MS.? Lightfoot and Hilgenfeld both print ο Θεος 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 Κυριος ο Θεος is used, ο Θεος is, as a rule, better supported than Κυριος. Even in Gen. 9²⁶ Holmes VI, 57 omit Κυριος,¹² and this probably represents the original.¹³ Though the double name in Gen. 27²⁰ 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. 4¹¹, where a very large number of MSS. have Κυριος before ο Θεος, the context suggests that ο Θεος is the addition. The second יהוה in Ex. 36⁸ is lacking in Kennicott 171 and many MSS. of G., and ο Θεος does not present אלהים but אל. MT. has only יהוה in Deut. 29³; ο Θεος ημων, was the original addition, as many MSS. show, though ημων has disappeared from some copies.¹⁵

If this Κυριος before ο Θεος could have found its way into Philo's text frequently and into Origen's, as it would seem, more than twenty times in other parts of the Pentateuch where the Hebrew to all appearances did not have a יהוה before אלהים, there is no reason to question that it could have drifted into nine places out of twenty-four where the divinity was referred to in the story of the Garden of Eden, without any special warrant for it in the Hebrew text of these nine passages. The Jews of Alexandria no doubt employed in their synagogue service the name Κυριος ο Θεος as a translation of אדני יהוה or יהוה אלהים, both of which would be pronounced אדני אלהים. This would account for its appearance occasionally for emphasis

¹² So also Philo, *De sobrietate*, 51 (ed. Wendland), according to Ms. L. which formed the basis of the *editio princeps* by Turnebus.

¹³ Cp. my article on "The Blessing of Japhet," to appear in this JOURNAL.

¹⁴ *Quod deus sit immutabilis*, 92 (ed. Wendland).

¹⁵ Similarly, the original Hebrew text in Deut. 14¹ no doubt had a suffix, whether it was אלהים, as MT., or אלהיך, or אלהינו, though Philo once seems to have left it out and written only Κυριος ο Θεος in *De confusione linguarum*, 145 (ed. Wendland). In *De sacrificantibus*, 318 (ed. Cohn) he added ημων (A.H.) or ημων (R.).

or variation. It is quite likely that the introduction of *Kyprios* before ο *Theos*, 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 יהוה, another אלהים, one אדני, another יהוה, 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 11: *כי שמע אל עניך*; "ita enim habetur vera interpretatio nominis Ismaelis," as De Rossi rightly remarks;¹⁶ the longer form אלהים is found in De Rossi 669;¹⁷ יהוה יהוה ad marginem restitutum est," but scarcely "ipsa primi scriptoris manu." In Ex. 6 2, where MSS. and versions differ as to אלהים or יהוה, De Rossi 262 has יהוה אלהים. Yet the remarkable absence of יהוה אלהים practically everywhere in the Masoretic text of the Pentateuch outside of Gen. 2-3, contrasted with the frequent occurrence of *Kyprios* ο *Theos* in our MSS. of G., and the systematic manner in which יהוה אלהים is employed in this section of MT., compared with the late appearance and irregular use of *Kyprios* ο *Theos* 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 MT., and so does the Samaritan Targum with its יהוה אלהים. The Arabic version of Sam., unlike Saadia, makes a distinction between الله which stands for יהוה and الله الهيم which represents יהוה אלהים.¹⁸ 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 יהוה 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 tashdid, and الهيم with fatha and kasra.

Theodotion, the Jewish Targums, the Peshiṭa¹⁹ and Jerome followed our *kethibh*.

It is very generally assumed that the son of Joiada who had married a daughter of Sanballat, when he was banished from Jerusalem,²⁰ 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 Josephus²¹ 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 Judæan 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

¹⁹ The Peshiṭa differs from MT. only in having *לֵאמֹר* *לֵאמֹר* also in 3 24; so the Polyglots, Lee, the Urmia ed. and Cod. Ambrosianus.

²⁰ *Neh.* 13 28.

²¹ *Antt. Jud.* XI, 302-347 (ed. Niese).

new temple demanded it, as Stade²² and others have maintained. Montgomery²³ 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, 28, 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.

²² *Bibische Theologie d. A.T.*, 1905, p. 355: "Den sich von Mose herleitenden, in seinen Vorstadien bereits zur Zeit ihrer Entstehung gültigen Pentateuch, hat sie wie die Hoffnung auf den Messias später von der Gemeinde auf Zion entlehnt."

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; *τις με ορα* (G.) in Prov. 30 9 suggests מִי יְהוָה for מִי יְהוה. 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 1 b-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 אֱלֹהִים, 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 אֱלֹהִים in some of Kennicott's MSS., as in 2 9 (K. 9), 15 (K. 5), 18 (K. 191),

21 (K. 69, 252), 22 (K. 89), 3 14 (K. 103), 23 (K. 80), and of יהוה, as in 2 18 (K. 89), 3 22 (K. 152), as well as the presence of יהוה in 3 1 b (K. 132), clearly due to the negligence of scribes, can have no significance. When Kittel observes: "aut יהוה aut אלהים . . . 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 אדני יהוה, and Sam. Trg. with its טראי יהוה; but B. 29, 130 have τον Κυριον, Syr.-Hex. marks ⲕⲁⲣⲓ with an asterisk, the Arabic translation of Sam., at least in my MS., has only انا, which generally stands for יהוה, and Saadia likewise has אללה, while A has τον Θεον. The אדני יהוה of Sam. shows that both אדני יהוה and יהוה אלהים were pronounced at one time אדני אלהים 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 אדני יהוה in both verses, and some that have אדני אלהים in vs. 22. G. seems to have had Κυριε μου Κυριε which clearly points to אדני יהוה. 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 אלהים steht in der Chronik überall für אדני יהוה unseres Textes; hier und v. 25 ist es auch in diesen letzteren eingedrungen wie I Sam, 6 11, 17 טחרים,"²⁵ and Driver translates this statement without comment or explanation.²⁶ Yet neither does יהוה אלהים occur everywhere in the Chronicler's copy of David's words where the Samuel text has אדני יהוה, nor can it be shown that in all the nine passages where יהוה אלהים occurs in the Chronicles it represents אדני יהוה, if that is the meaning, nor is it apparent wherein the similarity consists between the

²⁴ *Biblia Hebraica*, ad loc.

²⁵ *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 1871, p. 173.

²⁶ *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*. 1890, p. 213; repeated, without change, in the 2nd ed., 1913, p. 277.

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 אדני יהוה is found six times, vss. 18, 19ab, 20, 28, 29; to these correspond in I Chron. 17 16-27 יהוה אלהים, vs. 16, אלהים vs. 17a, יהוה אלהים, 17b, יהוה alone, vss. 19, 26, 27. For יהוה אלהים, II Sam. 22, 25, Chron. has only יהוה, I, 17 20, 23; for יהוה אלהים and צבאות אלהי ישראל and צבאות אלהים על ישראל, II Sam. 7 26, 27, I Chron. 17 24, 25 have יהוה צבאות אלהי ישראל אלהים and אלהי לישראל and אלהי, and both II Sam. 7 24 and Chron. 17 22 have יהוה. G. seems to have read אדני יהוה 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 אדני in six out of eight cases. He probably read יהוה everywhere; אדני was subsequently added everywhere in these passages of the Samuel text, and because of the pronunciation אדני אלהים was changed in two places to יהוה אלהים. A later copyist of Chron., remembering the emphatic double name, אדני יהוה, 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 יהוה 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 עיר גדולה לאלהים 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 יהוה in 3 10b. MT. is no doubt right in giving only יהוה in 4 3 against Δεσποτα Κυριε of G., which goes back to an expansion into אדני יהוה, natural in direct address. Five of Kennicott's MSS. read אדני יהוה in 4 6. This may have been changed under the influence of the pronunciation אדני אלהים into Jahwe Elohim, rendered Κυριος ο Θεος, Dominus Deus, čoeis phnut, الرب, מריא אלהא, and curiously enough, not 'egzi'a beher 'amlāk, as in 1 9, 2 2, 3, 4 2, but simply 'egzi'a behēr. There can be little doubt that the author wrote only יהוה. 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,²⁷ 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 אדני יהוה צבאות, Kenn. 117, is more probable than יהוה אלהים צבאות or יהוה אלהי צבאות, but the original no doubt had only יהוה צבאות, as Kenn. 92. Similarly, in 84 12 the original יהוה seems to have been expanded into אדני יהוה, Kenn. 245 (afterwards changed into יהוה אלהים) or into יהוה צבאות אלהים, Kenn. 40.

In I Chron. 28 20 G's *Kyrios o Theos mou* shows that the original was יהוה אלהי, and not יהוה אלהים אלהי; אדני seems to have been first introduced before יהוה, Kenn. 89, and then אדני יהוה changed to יהוה אלהים; the emphasized contrast in I Chron. 29 1 between man and God renders לאלהים, Kenn. 118, *τω Θεω*, Holmes 56, more probable than ליהוה 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: הוה ואף לא לך להקטיר על מזבח הקטרת; 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, 17 b, II Chron. 6 41 a; יהוה אלהי 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 יהוה אלהים as the characteristic name used by the Hebrews for the "Eternal

²⁷ *Das Dodekapropheten*, 1904, p. 256.

God" and supposed that it was employed in Gen. 9 28. 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 Hebreux 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."²⁸ 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 יהוה אלהים for אדני יהוה in 43 19, 44 9, 12, 15, 27, 45 9ab, 46, 1, 16, 47 13, 23, 48 29. His reasons are that in these passages B. has *Kyrios o Theos*, while elsewhere in the book it employs, as a rule, *Kyrios Kyrios* for אדני יהוה; that *Adonai Kyrios* is of hexaplaric origin, since *Adonai* alone is translated *Kyrios*; 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 *Adonai Kyrios* in early MSS. seems to show that אדני יהוה was translated at least in two ways. While in some Christian circles at the end of the fourth century *Kyrios Kyrios* was common, others used *Adonai Kyrios*; and the latter is less likely to have originated among Christians than among Alexandrian Jews. In 18 25, 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 25, 29. Hence Rothstein does not cite them, while he calls attention to those in 33 17, 20.²⁹ Later scribes would naturally

²⁸ *Conjectures sur la Genèse*, 1753, p. 346.

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 **אדני יהוה**, an **אדני יהוה** would very easily turn into a **יהוה אלהים**. It is only necessary to remember that copies were made at dictation. This would account for **יהוה אלהים** being written where the original had **אדני יהוה אלהים**. A comparison of MT. and G. in Isaiah and the Minor Prophets tends to show that *Kyrios o Theos* not only appeared where H., in all probability, had **אדני יהוה**, but also frequently was an expansion of a simple *Kyrios* within G. There is no reason to suppose that the Hebrew text ever had **יהוה אלהים** 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 *Kyrios o Theos*; at least our best MSS. give that reading. On the assumption that every *Kyrios o Theos* stands for **יהוה אלהים**, this name would, in spite of the questionable *Kyrios Kyrios* in 49 22, 50 45, 5, 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 *Kyrios*, viz. 1 8, 4 2, 5, 6 8 b, 7 4 a b, 5, 8 a; twice, viz. 3 13, 9 5, *Kyrios o Theos παντοκρατωρ* seems to represent **יהוה אלהי צבאות**, used elsewhere 6 times, rather than **אדני יהוה הצבאות**; 5 times **אדני יהוה** is rendered *Kyrios o Theos*, viz. 3 7, 8, 11, 7 1, 9 8, and 5 times it is rendered *Kyrios Kyrios*, viz. 5 3, 6 2, 8 1, 3, 8. In the last ten cases **יהוה אלהים** or only **יהוה** occurs sporadically in the MSS. It cannot be proved that Amos ever used **יהוה אלהים**. For emphasis he occasionally seems to have said **יהוה אלהי צבאות**, **יהוה יהוה**, or **אדני יהוה**. Obadiah 1, Micah 1 2 and Zeph. 1 7 also exhibit the double name Adonai Yahwe; and among the variants is **יהוה אלהים**; but **יהוה אדני**, **יהוה צבאות**, and only **יהוה** 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 אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה 228 times and B. *Kyrios Kyrios* 58 times and *Adonai Kyrios* twice in 1-39. In 40-48 B. has *Kyrios o Theos* 15 times; other MSS. have *Kyrios o Theos* in the first part of the book as well as in the second, and *Kyrios Kyrios* in the second as well as in the first, or carry *Adonai Kyrios* 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 אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה 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 אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה, the preference for *Kyrios o Theos* 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 יהוה אלהים in these chapters. In Dan. 9 3, 4 Codex Chisianus has *Kyrios o Theos*; Theodotion had an additional *μου* in vs. 4 and, according to many MSS., also in vs. 3. MT. has אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהִים in vs. 3 and יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי in vs. 4; for אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהִים many MSS. have יהוה אלהים; but it is probable that יהוה אֱלֹהֵי was used originally in both vs. Probably no double name was intended in the Prayer of Azariah, Dan. 3 45 where *σ υ ε ι Κ. ο Θ. μ ο ν ο ς* (Chisianus) or *σ υ ε ι μ ο ν ο ς Κ. ο Θ.* (Theod.) may be a translation of אֲתָהּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד and meant as a variation on the Shema. As for Tobit 13 11 *το ονομα Κυριου του Θεου* B. may be a rendering of שְׁמַא דִּי מְרִיא אֱלֹהָא in the Aramaic, but *το ονομα το αγιον σου* (A) 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 Yahwe Elohim. 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 יהו אֱלֹהָא 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.

XVIII, Col. 2, 1, XXXVI 4. Sachau³¹ translates it "der Gott Yaho." That is, of course, a possible translation, and it may seem to be supported by the אלהא with חנוב, Pap. I 5, and after חרמביתאל, Pap. XXVII 7. In the first of these passages, however, the sentence כמריא זי חנוב אלהא זי ביב, "the priests of Hnub, the god who is in Yeb," is construed in precisely the same manner as אנורא זי יהו אלהא זי ביב, "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 אלהא which is imperfectly preserved may be ב, so that it would read על חרמביתאל אלהא ביב, "before Harem-Bethel, the god who is in Yeb," or חרמביתאל אלהא is formed on the analogy of יהו אלהא. It is true that the Teima inscription, CIS, II, 114, has לעלם אלהא, the Carpentras inscription, CIS, II, 141, has אוסירי אלהא, the Nabataean inscriptions, CIS, II, 160, 199, 442, have דושרא אלהא. 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 אלהא 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 יהו אלהא corresponds exactly to the Syriac ܝܗܘ ܐܠܗܐ, except that, of course, ܐܪܢܝ (= ארני) represents יהוה. 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

³¹ *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,³² and Aristeas unquestionably refers to Psammetichus II (594-588) whose Ethiopian expedition is mentioned in the king's own inscription at Karnak³³ and by Herodotus³⁴ and to which probably the Abul Simbel inscriptions also bear testimony.³⁵ 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 Ethiopia³⁶ 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.³⁷ 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 Yaho and also other gods; they make unto them from among themselves priests who offer sacrifices. Among their deities are

³² *Epistula ad Philocratem*, 13 (ed. Wendland).

³³ Published by W. Max Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, 1906, Plates 12, 18. If there is no error in the copy, 'Ib nfr Re 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.

³⁴ II, 161.

³⁵ *CIS*, I, 1 135.

³⁶ Herodotus, II, 30.

³⁷ *L. c.* p. 35.

הו, אשמביתאל, ענתביתאל or ענתיהו, and הרמביתאל. 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 (ענמלך where מלך represents יהוה) 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 אלהימ, 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 הצבאות or יהוה צבאות, it is clearly an abbreviation of יהוה אלהי הצבאות, 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 אלהים or בני האלהים i. e. individuals of the species indicated by אלהים. A distinction was later made between אלהים and בני האלהים; 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 אלהי האלהים, whether that form was ever used or not, and designates Yahwe as the god who comes with the אלהים, 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 יהוה הוא האלהים, I Kings 18 39. As a *pluralis majestatis* אלהים 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, Budde³⁸ 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 1b-5, and that, in uniting both, the author of the story of the fratricide introduced a Yahwe before Elohim everywhere, except in 3 1b-5, in one recension and added Elohim after Yahwe wherever this name was found in the other, so that every trace of the Elohist revision by the second Yahwist disappeared. Budde, however, did not notice that the Elohist 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. 232 ff.

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 *Kυριος* to *ο Θεος* in 4 26, while allowing Eve, 4 1, and Adam, 4 25, to use only *ο Θεος*, seems to have been more consistent than Budde's J², who, according to him (p. 228) either did not notice *אלהים* 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.³⁹ On the other hand, Eerdmans⁴⁰ 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 Jahve 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 *ο Θεος*." 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-

³⁹ *Genesis*,³ 1910, pp. 5, 26.

⁴⁰ *Alttestamentliche Studien*, I, 1908, pp. 78 ff.

tations of **תְּרַנּוּם ע** 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, 1918, 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 Elohist, 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".