

# The Princeton Theological Review

JANUARY 1927

---

## THE NAMES OF GOD IN THE PSALMS

The importance of fixing the approximate date and probable authorship of the Psalms arises largely from the bearing of these matters upon the history and religion of Israel. The prophetic authorization of the Canon and the trustworthiness of the historic records depend, also, in large measure upon the time at which the Psalms were written. It is not surprising, therefore, that one of the most virulent and persistent attacks upon the traditional view of the time of the composition of the Old Testament books has been made upon these great lyrical productions. If the headings of the Psalms be reliable, then there can be no doubt that many of the Psalms (seventy-three to be exact) were composed by David, the sweet psalmist of Israel. The main attack of the radical critics on the Psalms, therefore, has been upon the veracity of the headings. In two recent articles on "The Headings of the Psalms,"<sup>1</sup> I have endeavored to show on the ground of the testimony of the Hebrew manuscripts, of the ancient versions, of the language of the headings, and of the contents of the Psalms themselves, that there is no good reason for concluding that they are not what the *prima facie* evidence indicates. In these articles, I pointed out the inconclusiveness of such arguments for late date as are derived from the presence of the words "synagogue" and "captivity," and referred also to the false claim of lateness based upon the presence of alleged Aramaisms in certain of the Psalms. This matter of Aramaisms I have also discussed at length<sup>2</sup> with a view to proving

---

<sup>1</sup> In this REVIEW for 1926, pp. 1-37, 353-395.

<sup>2</sup> In an article, "The Aramaisms in the Old Testament," in this REVIEW for 1925, pp. 234-266.

that Aramaisms are not an indication of the lateness of a Hebrew document and that most of the alleged Aramaisms are not Aramaisms at all.

The most important of the alleged evidence in favor of the lateness of many of the Psalms that still remains to be considered is that which is based on the names for Deity employed in them. It is my purpose in this article to investigate the use of these names in the Psalter, and the bearing of their use upon the date and authorship of the Psalms in which they are found. But before doing this attention must be called to four studies which I have already published upon the general subject of the names and designations of the Deity, which may be regarded as preparatory to the present investigation. The first of these, entitled "The Use of 'God' and 'Lord' in the Koran," shows that every kind of variation in the use of the designations of the Deity that is met with in the Bible is found also in the Koran. Since these variations do not controvert the unity of the Koran, so, also, they do not overthrow the unity of the Pentateuch. The other articles are entitled "Use of the Words for God in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Literature of the Jews," "The Names of God in the Old Testament" and "The Names for God in the New Testament."<sup>3</sup> From the collections of designations given in these articles, we learn that most of the arguments based upon the use of the words for God in the documents of the Old Testament are specious and inconclusive, because the induction of the facts in evidence was incomplete. While the evidence does not show, in every case, that the critics are wrong, it does show that the Bible cannot be proved to be wrong. This is sufficient to justify our belief in the substantial veracity of the Scriptures. For it cannot be demanded of us that we should explain all the apparent inconsistencies or alleged inaccuracies of any author or document. The *prima*

---

<sup>3</sup> These articles were all published in this REVIEW for 1919-1921, and are based upon a complete collection gathered from concordances and a reading of the books themselves, where no concordances had been made, with special reference to the ancient versions.

*facie* evidence of the Psalms and of their headings is confirmed by the evidence derived from palaeography, philology, and history; and the critics have no right to reject this evidence simply because it does not please them or because they do not understand it, or because they cannot explain it. Does the use of the names for God in the Psalter discredit the headings, or make it impossible to maintain that it was completed before the year four hundred B.C.? This is the question which we shall now consider.

First, let me present in tabular form the number of times the principal words and phrases for God occur in the five books of the Psalter.

		JEHOVAH	ADONAI	ELOHIM	ELOAH	EL	ELYON	SHADDAI
Book	I . . . . .	271	12	20	1	11	4	0
"	II . . . . .	26	14	155	1	5	3	1
"	III . . . . .	43	14	44	0	14	9	0
"	IV . . . . .	101	1	6	0	4	4	1
"	V . . . . .	223	4	9	1	6	1	0
		—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		664	45	234	3	40	21	2 <sup>4</sup>

I shall now proceed to discuss the use of: (1) Adonai and Jehovah; (2) Elohim and Jehovah; (3) Jehovah Elohim, Jehovah Adonai and Adonai Jehovah; (4) Jah; (5) Eloah; (6) El; (7) Elyon; (8) Shaddai; (9) Sebaoth; (10) The Holy One; (11) The Name; (12) The Rock; (13) The Mighty One.

### I. THE USE OF ADONAI AND JEHOVAH

In the Bampton Lectures for 1889,<sup>5</sup> Professor Cheyne says "it is our duty to enter into the feelings of those who in certain passages changed 'Yahweh' (Jehovah) into 'Elohim' (God), and of those who afterwards by degrees substituted 'Adonai' (the Lord) for 'Yahweh'."<sup>6</sup> If by this "substitu-

<sup>4</sup> Complete tables of names for God for the whole Old Testament will be found in this REVIEW for 1920, pp. 461-472.

<sup>5</sup> T. K. Cheyne, *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter in the Light of Old Testament Criticism and the History of Religions* (1891). Wherever Cheyne is cited the references are to this book.

<sup>6</sup> P. 287.

tion" of Adonai for Jehovah be meant merely that the Jews, at some time after the Old Testament books were written, came to *pronounce* and afterwards to *point* the Tetragrammaton (Jehovah), when standing alone, as if it were written Adonai, he is certainly correct. But if he meant that a written Adonai was substituted intentionally, or frequently, for a written Jehovah, the evidence seems to me to be decisively against him. That he did think, however, that the presence of a written Adonai in a document was a proof of the late date of the original document itself and not merely an evidence of a possible change made by a copyist, is manifest from the fact that he says that Psalm ii. "is post-Davidic because of Adonai which belongs to the prophetic literature"<sup>7</sup> and that if Adonai in Ps. xvi. "means the Lord (absolutely), as Delitzsch assumes, the Psalm is post-Davidic, if not post-exilic."<sup>8</sup>

There are three or four reasons why we cannot accept the statement that the use of Adonai is a sign of the lateness of a document:

1. The Egyptians and Babylonians both addressed the gods as *Lord*. Thus in the "Tale of the Two Brothers" the younger addresses Ra-Harmachis: O my good Lord (*neb*). In the "Festival Songs of Isis and Nephthys," Osiris is called Lord (*neb*).<sup>9</sup> In the *Tel Amarna Letters*, the king of Egypt is called "my Lord (*bêlia*), my God, my Sun."<sup>10</sup> In the Code of Hammurabi, Marduk is called "Lord" (*bêl*).<sup>11</sup>

2. In Phoenician, "lord" (𐤊𐤍𐤏) is a favorite appellation of Eshmun, Baal and Baalshamim.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>7</sup> P. 463.

<sup>8</sup> P. 465. By "absolutely," Delitzsch means as an expression for Lord rather than my Lord, compare the English Milord as used in some of the older novelists.

<sup>9</sup> See Budge, *Egyptian Reading Book*, 13. 2, 50. 3.

<sup>10</sup> See my article in this REVIEW for 1905 on the "Titles of the Kings in Antiquity" and also The *Tel-el-Amarna Letters* by Winckler, or by Knudtzon.

<sup>11</sup> See Harper, *Code of Hammurabi*.

<sup>12</sup> See Lidzbarski, *N. S. Epigraphik* p. 152, and Schröder, *Die Phönizische Sprache*, pp. 226, 228 et pas.

3. In the Old Testament, "Lord" ( אֲדֹנָי ) is used of God in J (Gen. xviii. 3, 27, 30, 31, 32, xix. 18, Ex. iv. 10, 13, v. 22), E (Gen. xx. 4, Ex. xv. 17), JE (Ex. xxxiv. 9 *bis*, Num. xiv. 17, Josh. vii. 8). Besides, it is found twice in Judges, 4 times in Kings, 22 times in Is. i-xxxix and only once in Is. xl-lxvi, 4 times in Ezekiel, 4 times in Amos, and once each in Micah and Zechariah. It occurs 14 times in Lam. i-iii, 11 times in Daniel's prayer (and also in i. 2) and also in Mal. i. 14, Ezra x. 3, Neh. i. 11, iv. 8. In the Psalms it occurs 12 times in Book I, 14 in Book II, 14 in Book III (9 of them in Ps. lxxxvi), once in Book IV, and 4 times in Book V; *i.e.* 45 times in the Psalter and 80 times in all the other books together.

4. Furthermore the evidence of the Hebrew manuscripts does not support the supposition that the tendency of the scribes and copyists was to change an earlier *Jehovah* into an *Adonai*. For example, in 158 out of 272 manuscripts of the Psalms collated in Kennicott, the number of times that *Adonai* is changed to *Jehovah* in a single MS. varies from 1 up to 37 of the 45 occurrences of *Adonai* in the Psalter, making 987 variations out of 12240 possibilities; whereas in 118 out of 272 MSS. *Jehovah* is changed to *Adonai* from 1 to 61 times out of 664 cases of the occurrence of *Jehovah*, making 195 variations out of 180,608 possibilities.<sup>13</sup> That is, in one out of 12 possible cases *Adonai* has been changed, in one MS. or another, to *Jehovah*; whereas in only one case out of 926 has *Jehovah* been changed to *Adonai*. There is no proof, therefore, in the Hebrew MSS. that there was a tendency or an intention to change *Jehovah* to *Adonai*, but rather the reverse.

<sup>13</sup> Since the *Textus Receptus* of the Psalms contains *Adonai* 45 times and *Jehovah* 664 times, these numbers should be multiplied by 272, the number of the MSS., to get the number of the possibilities of variation in the readings. For example, of the 195 variations for the 664 occurrences, 61 occur for Ps. xxx. 9 alone, making 61 MSS. for the change and 211 against. In lxxxix. 2, we have 20 to 252 and in lxxx. 5, we have 13 to 259, but in most only 1 to 3 against 269 to 271.

5. Nor can any proof of the change of Jehovah to Adonai be derived from Hebrew documents outside the Canon nor from the versions.

a. It is well known that the Greek Septuagint ordinarily renders both Jehovah and Adonai by *κύριος*.<sup>14</sup>

b. The Syriac Peshitto commonly uses Moryo' for both Adonai and Jehovah and Aloho' for Elohim, El and Eloah; and the Latin Vulgate uses Dominus for Adonai and Jehovah and Deus for the three words for God.

c. When we come to the Aramaic Targums, we find neither conformity nor consistency in the way the names for the Deity are rendered. Thus, the Targum of Onkelos uses יי for Elohim, Jehovah and Adonai; while that of Jonathan uses יה for the words for Lord and אלקים for Elohim. The Targum on Ecclesiastes uses יהוה for Elohim; on Proverbs אלהא for יהוה; on Job יהוה for יהוה. The Samaritan Targum transliterates Jehovah.

d. The Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus never has Adonai (though אדון is used 4 times). It has אלהו 3 times; אלהים, 25 times; and יי 53 times. In view of the uncertainty of the abbreviations of the Targums, it is impossible to determine whether these Yodhs of Ben Sira stood for one or both of the names for Lord.<sup>15</sup>

e. The Zadokite Fragments never use Adon, Adonai, Jehovah nor any abbreviation for them. Elohim and Eloah, also, are never used. But El occurs 59 times.<sup>16</sup>

f. Jehovah, as the name of the God of Israel, occurs in line 18 of the Moabite inscription of Mesha, dating from

<sup>14</sup> Thus *κύριος* renders Adonai about 100 times and *θεός* at most 4; Jehovah is rendered by *κύριος* over 6000 times and by *θεός* 165 (31 with variant readings in Greek); Elohim by *κύριος* 88 times (and with variant readings about 115 more) and by *θεός* over 1000; El by *κύριος* 44 times and by *θεός* 140; Eloah by *κύριος* 20 times (all in Job) and by *θεός* 24.

<sup>15</sup> This information comes from a concordance on the Hebrew of Ben Sira which I have prepared.

<sup>16</sup> These statements are based on a concordance which I have.

about 850 B.C.,<sup>17</sup> and יהוה a number of times in the Egypto-Aramaic papyri of the 5th century B.C.<sup>18</sup>

In view of the preponderance and the quality of the above testimony the conclusion seems inevitable that in every case of the occurrence of Adonai in the Psalter, the *Textus Receptus* is probably correct; and that there is in no case more than a bare possibility that it is wrong.

## II. THE USE OF ELOHIM AND JEHOVAH

It was the claim of Dr. Driver that

The exceptional preponderance of *Elohim* over *Jehovah* in Book II (Ps. xlii-lxxii) and Ps. lxxiii-lxxxiii, cannot be attributed to a preference of the authors of these Psalms for the former name; not only is such a supposition improbable in itself, but it is precluded by the occurrence of the *same two* Psalms, in the double recension just spoken of, once with *Jehovah* (Ps. xiv.; xl. 13-17) and once with *Elohim* (Ps. liii; lxx.): it must be due to the fact that Book II and Ps. lxxiii-lxxxiii have passed through the hands of a compiler who *changed* "Jehovah" of the original author into "Elohim." The reason of this change probably is that at the time when this compiler lived there was a current preference for the latter name (comp. the exclusive use of the same name in Ecclesiastes, and the preference shown for it by the Chronicler).<sup>19</sup>

Since Professors Cheyne, Driver, *et al*, claim that this use of Elohim instead of Jehovah is a proof of the lateness of the Psalms in which Elohim occurs, what becomes of their theory that E (the Elohistic document) is the earliest part of the Hexateuch and one of the oldest documents of the whole Old Testament? Again, if the editors of the second and third Books of the Psalms changed Jehovah to Elohim for subjective reasons, why may not the author, or editor, of Gen. i have changed Jehovah to Elohim? Again, if Elohim be a sign of lateness, why does Haggai have Jehovah 28 times and never Elohim? Why does Zechariah have Jehovah

<sup>17</sup> See Lidzbarski, *N. S. Epigraphik*, and Nordlander, *Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab*.

<sup>18</sup> Thus in the *Aramäische Papyrus* of Sachau I. 6, II. 15, 24, 26, 27, III. Ob. 7, 24, 25, IV. 5, 8, XII. 1, XVIII. K. 2, 1, XX. K. 7, 4, XXXII. 36, 4, XXXVII. 43, Ob. 2. LX. 15, and in Cowley's *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century, B.C.* 19 times.

<sup>19</sup> See *The Literature of the Old Testament* (abbrev. LOT), pp. 371-372.

143 times and Elohim only once? Why does Malachi have Jehovah 46 times and Elohim but once? Why is Job appealed to as evidence, when it has Jehovah 32 times and Elohim only 16? Why does Chronicles have Jehovah 547 times and Elohim only 120 times, or Ezra have Jehovah 57 times and Elohim but 13? And why does the Greek of Ecclesiasticus written in 180 B.C. have Lord 214 times and God only 11, and the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus have יי (i.e. Jehovah) 53 times and Elohim only 22? Why does Pirke Aboth use Jehovah 8 times and Elohim but 4? And why does the Aramaic Targum of Ecclesiastes always have יהוה for the Hebrew Elohim? That the evidence is for individual, rather than for current preference, appears, also, from the fact that the author of Ecclesiastes uses Elohim 40 times and Jehovah never; that the author of Gen. i-ii. 3 uses Elohim 35 times and Jehovah never (i.e. if this passage belongs to P and if P is late); that the author of the Letter of Aristaeus uses God 105 times and Lord but once; that 4 Maccabees used God 40 times and Lord never; that the third Book of the Sibylline Oracles uses God 41 times and Lord never; and that Tobit, Esdras, Judith, 1, 2 and 3 Maccabees, and 4 Enoch never use Jehovah. In fact this evidence indicates that this argument for individual rather than for current preference was valid all through the centuries. But in view, especially, of the fact that according to the critics the E document always uses Elohim and P always uses it up to Ex. vi. 3, it is inconsistent for the critics to say that a preference for Elohim over Jehovah cannot be attributed to the author of the Elohistc psalms or that such a preference is "improbable in itself," even if these psalms were written at an early date. For anyone who claims that the E document of the Hexateuch used only Elohim and the J document only Jehovah must admit that there may have been psalmists living in the same time as the authors or redactors of J and E who used only Elohim or Jehovah.

As far as Psalms xiv. and liii. are concerned there is more



evidence in the MSS. and versions that Elohim was changed by scribes to Jehovah than contrariwise.<sup>20</sup> That late writers may have preferred Lord to God is abundantly shown by the following table:

	ESD.	SIRA (LXX)	AZARIAH	5 ENOCH	ODES OF SOL.	BARUCH (LXX)
Lord .....	95	194	43	37	93	32
God .....	16	11	2	1	11	3

That other late writers preferred God to Lord we have shown above. That others may have preferred to use both is clear from the following table:

	JUB.	XII PAT.	SUSANNAH (LXX) (THEOD.)	PSALMS OF SOL.	ASSUMP. I BAR. OF MOSES		
Lord .....	184	229	98	83	105	25	19
God .....	73	124	77	99	112	29	15

That some writers used neither Elohim nor Jehovah is shown by Esther, the Song of Songs, Judith, 1, 2, 3 Maccabees and by the Zadokite Fragments. Any "current preference" for either name from the earliest literary period of the critics' own devising (850-700 B.C.) down to 135 A.D. is, therefore, ruled out by the evidence. *Individual* preferences there were, but *current* preferences not. The Chronicler does not show such a preference as Dr. Driver claimed that he did. A comparison between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings in both the parallel and non-parallel passages gives the following results. In the parallel passages Elohim occurs in Chronicles 80 times and Jehovah 220, whereas in Samuel-Kings Elohim occurs 31 times and Jehovah 302 times; but in the non-parallel passages of Chronicles, Elohim occurs 76 times and Jehovah 327 times, whereas in Samuel-Kings, Elohim occurs 97 times and Jehovah 383 times. When we

<sup>20</sup> Thus, for the four Jehovahs in Ps. xiv. two MSS. give Elohim in vs. 4 and one in vs. 7, whereas for the Elohim in Ps. liii thirteen MSS. give Jehovah in vs. 5, one in vs. 6a, one in 6b, and eight in vs. 7. The Targum to xiv. gives יי not merely for Jehovah but also for the Elohim of vs. 5 and in liii. for the Elohim of vss. 3, 5, 6b and 7. The Syriac always has Lord in xiv. and also in liii. 7. The LXX agrees with the Hebrew *Textus Receptus* except in liii. 7 where it has Lord for God. The Latin always has *Dominus* in xiv. and also in liii. 5, 6b and 7.

remember that all but some half dozen of the changes from the Jehovah of Samuel-Kings are not into Elohim but into Ha-Elohim the assumption of numerous, or consistent, preferential changes on the part of the compiler of Chronicles (or even of a copier) is rendered the more absurd.

In view, then, of the above evidence it would seem best to postpone an attempt to account on grounds other than the individual preference of the respective authors for the use in Books II and III of the Psalter, of Elohim instead of Jehovah. Until it shall be proven by sufficient objective evidence, such as manuscripts and versions, that such changes were made, and by whom they were made, it seems futile to attempt a solution.

### III. JEHOVAH ELOHIM, JEHOVAH ADONAI AND ADONAI JEHOVAH

1. In the Psalms, the combination Jehovah Elohim occurs only in lxxxiv. 12; and yet, Professor Cheyne remarks that it "characterizes the widened theological outlook of the Persian period."<sup>21</sup> This he does notwithstanding the fact that it is found 19 times in Gen. ii-iii and in Ex. ix. 30 both of which passages are assigned by the critics themselves to J, a document said to have been written somewhere about 800 B.C. It occurs, also, in 2 Sam. vii. 22, 26, 2 Kings xix. 19, Jon. iv. 6, and nine times in Chronicles. Driver follows Wellhausen in asserting that the phrase in Samuel is a mistake for אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה. But, if it is a mistake in Samuel why not in 2 Kings xix. 19? The great versions agree in all these places with the Hebrew text. And, if the text should be changed in other places, why not in Gen. ii-iii? In other words, why not change it everywhere it suits us to change it? Why not change it in Chronicles and Jonah, also? If we do, we could say that Jehovah Elohim never occurred anywhere except in Ps. lxxxiv. 12. But then, again, what about the Jehovah Elohim of the so-called second account of the Creation in Gen. ii-iii, written according to the radical

<sup>21</sup> P. 132.

critics about 800 B.C.? What, also, about "the widened theological outlook of the Persian period"?

But suppose we change some, or all, of the phrases "Jehovah Elohim" to "Adonai Jehovah" or "Jehovah Adonai," how will the argument for lateness of authorship be affected? For, Adonai Jehovah occurs in Ezekiel 217 times, in Amos 21 times, six times in 2 Samuel, twice each in Genesis, Deuteronomy, Judges, and 1 Kings, and once each in Joshua, Obadiah, Micah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah and Zechariah, 24 times in Isaiah (11 in i-xxxix and 13 in xl-lxvi), and 8 times in the Psalms—294 times in all; and Jehovah Adonai, in Hab. iii. 19, Ps. lxxviii. 21, cix. 21, cxl. 8, cxli. 8. If either of these combinations is late, why does neither occur in H or P, nor in Job, Jonah or Joel? Are we to cut Adonai Jehovah out of Deut., Judges, Samuel, Kings, Amos (21 times!), Micah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah and the first part of Isaiah, just to support a theory? Such conduct would be destructive of all the *prima facie* evidence of every document ever written and would reduce textual criticism to an absurdity. As to Jehovah Adonai, it can perhaps only be said that the evidence is not sufficient to justify any argument as to the date of any of the psalms; but the one occurrence in Hab. iii. 19 certainly does not support the conclusion that the combination favors the Maccabean period for the authorship of any of them.

2. That the combination "Lord God" was used in the older documents is confirmed by the fact that it occurs frequently in the extra-canonical books. Thus Tobit used it 4 times, 1 Esdras 2, Judith 4, Bel and the Dragon 7, 2 Macc. 2, 3 Mac. 1, and 1 Bar. 16 times. Besides, the pseudepigraphical works use it as follows: Ahikar (Syr) once, Jubilees, 27 times, XII Patriarchs 3, Psalms of Solomon 1, 3 Macc. 1, Secrets of Enoch 7, 2 Bar. 4, and 4 Ezra 8 times. And lastly, in the New Testament, we find it in Mat. 3 times, Mark 2, 1 Pet. 1, Luke 5, Acts 3, Jude 1, and Revelation 46 times. This evidence seems to show that the "widened outlook" extended all through the Hebrew literature

from Moses, or certainly from Samuel and Kings, to the second century, A.D.

3. Not much of an argument for date can be derived from the "Adonai Elohai" of Ps. lxxxvi. 12. Adonai Elohim occurs only in Dan. ix. 3 and Adonai followed by our God, etc., seems to be confined to Dan. ix. Thirty-four MSS. read Jehovah instead of Adonai in Ps. lxxxvi. 12. The versions, it must be remembered, as also the works preserved only in Greek, Syriac, Aramaic, Latin, and Ethiopic, do not distinguish between Jehovah and Adonai, rendering both of them by the same words for Lord.

#### IV. THE USE OF JAH OR YAH

As to the date of Psalm lxviii Professor Cheyne says: "Pre-Exilic it cannot be. . . . It was written either towards the close of the Exile, or during one of the dynastic wars between Egypt and Syria for the possession of Palestine; either in the sixth century (more precisely, a little before the defeat of Croesus at Sardis in 549 B.C.); or in the third (probably between 220 and 217, or between 203 and 198 B.C.)."<sup>22</sup>

One of the main arguments for the exilic, or post-exilic, date of Ps. lxviii is derived from the use of many different words for God. Thus, Cheyne says that "י" occurs perhaps in v. 5 of the psalm (lxviii), and certainly in v. 19; also in Ex. xv. 2, xvii. 16 (the first of which may be, and the second must be, Pre-Exilic); and in Cant. viii. 6 (which may be Pre-Exilic); but also forty-two times in Biblical passages which on various other grounds are all most probably (I speak within bounds) either Exilic or Post-Exilic."<sup>23</sup>

The following points are to be noted:

1. Yah in lxviii. 5 occurs in all the Hebrew MSS.<sup>24</sup> of the Psalms, and in all the primary and secondary versions. Why say that "perhaps" it occurs there?

<sup>22</sup> Pp. 112, 113.

<sup>23</sup> P. 124 (note b).

<sup>24</sup> That is in all the MSS. collated in Kennicott's *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus*.

2. Psalm lxxviii is assigned to David in all the Hebrew MSS. and in all the primary and secondary versions.<sup>25</sup> The *prima facie* evidence is, therefore, all in favor of David having written it.

3. In Ex. xv. 2 and Is. xii. 2, Yah occurs in the same phrase as in Psalm cxviii. 14. The Hebrew text of Ex. xv. 1 says that the song comprising Ex. xv. 1-19 was sung by Moses and the children of Israel, after the crossing of the Red Sea. Psalm cxxii is assigned to David in the Hebrew MSS. and in most of the versions. Isa. xii. seems a fitting conclusion of the first twelve chapters of Isaiah's works. If we refuse to accept this *prima facie* evidence as to the date of these documents, we can only say in the words of Prof. Cheyne<sup>26</sup>: "what means have we for fixing their date?"!

4. If Ex. xvii. 16 "must be pre-Exilic," then other documents containing Yah may also be pre-exilic. Cheyne's "must" doubtless arises from the fact that the critics assign this verse to E. This in the opinion of the critics will place the date of the verse before about 750 B.C.<sup>27</sup>

5. Dillmann in his edition of Knobel's commentary on Exodus maintains that Ex. xv. 1-3 belongs to the time of Moses<sup>28</sup> and gives many grounds for concluding that the whole song was written in "high antiquity."

6. Ewald, Hengstenberg, and Delitzsch give the date of Ps. cxviii as shortly after the Exile. Murphy assigns it to the time of David, and Schultz to that of Nehemiah. Apparently, the indications of authorship and date are inconclusive.

Finally, Yah is most probably an abbreviated form of Jehovah. We find יהלל־יה in Ps. cii. 19, and יהללו־יה in cxv. 17, and יהללו יהוה in Ps. xxii. 27, Neh. v. 13. It is used in composition in the form "ya" (e.g. the "jah" in Adonijah) at the end of proper names in the Bible, and in the form "yô"

<sup>25</sup> See the evidence in my article on "The Headings of the Psalms" in this REVIEW for 1926.

<sup>26</sup> P. 31.

<sup>27</sup> Driver, LOT. p. 123

<sup>28</sup> P. 154.

(e.g. the "jo" in Joram) at the beginning of them. In the Samaritan Ostraca we find Yô at the beginning of three proper names and at the end of five.<sup>29</sup> The Egypto-Aramaic papyri give יהו for יהוה,<sup>30</sup> like the ending of the name Hezekiah in Hebrew (חזקיהו) and in Assyrian.<sup>31</sup> The Targum of Jonathan abbreviates into 'ה,<sup>32</sup> and Onkelos and other Targums into ם (used often also for Adonai and Elohim), and the Hebrew of Ben Sira into םם.<sup>33</sup> The Samaritan Targum has יהוה for the Hebrew יה in Ex. xv. 2.<sup>34</sup> The Septuagint and Peshitto render by the same word for Lord that they use for Adonai and Jehovah. Since, according to the Samaritan Ostraca, the time when these abbreviations began was as early at least as 850 B.C., its presence in a document will certainly not favor setting the date of an original document later than that time. Besides, such an abbreviation may readily have been introduced into a copy made at a later time without witnessing to the date of the original.

## V. ELOAH

Professor Cheyne says that Ps. xviii. cannot have an early date because of "the points of contact between the psalm and the so-called Song and Blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxii.)."<sup>35</sup> One of these points of contact he claims to be the name "Eloah." He speaks of the "invention or revival of the names 'Elyōn and Eloah,'" as if it were a post-Deuteronomistic matter;<sup>36</sup> and he states that Ps. xviii. "belongs at the earliest to the reign of Josiah, for, as Ewald suggested and

<sup>29</sup> See Lyon in *Harvard Theological Review* for 1911, p. 141.

<sup>30</sup> See Sachau, *Aramäische Papyrus* and Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century, B.C.*

<sup>31</sup> See Schrader in *KAT*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> See Ginsburger, *Pseudo-Jonathan nach der Londoner Handschrift*.

<sup>33</sup> See both Smend's and Strack's editions of the Hebrew of Ben Sira (*Ecclesiasticus*).

<sup>34</sup> See Petermann, *Pentateuchus Samaritanus*, in loc.

<sup>35</sup> Pp. 204-205.

<sup>36</sup> P. 206.

Baethgen has carefully argued, אֱלֹהִים was probably invented as the singular of אֱלֹהִים by the author of Deut. xxxii."<sup>37</sup>

Now, there are four psalms in which the word Eloah is found, to wit: xviii. 32, l. 22, cxiv. 7 and cxxxix. 19. The 18th and 139th are in the headings ascribed to David. To show that David cannot have written them the argument is made that the author of these two psalms was dependent for the use of the singular upon Deut. xxxii. which was post-Deuteronomic and at the earliest from the time of Josiah. The author of Deut. xxxii. is said to have "invented or revived" the use of the singular, Eloah, as a designation of God.

First of all, let us refer to the *prima facie* evidence of the Scriptures themselves.

1. In the context immediately preceding Deut. xxxii., we read (Deut. xxxi. 25-30), that Moses commanded the Levites saying: "Gather unto me all the elders of your tribes and your officers [or scribes] that I may speak these words in their ears and call heaven and earth to record against them. . . . And Moses spake in the ears of all the congregation of Israel the words of this song." Then follows Deut. xxxii. 1-43. In verses 44, 46, we read that when Moses had come and spoken all the words of this song, he said: "Set your hearts unto all the words which I testify among you this day." The day, when "Moses wrote this song," we learn from xxxi. 2, 22 was the day he spake the law unto the children of Israel in the plains of Moab. The words were written as a final testimony before he died (xxxi. 14). We thus find that the date, place, occasion and purpose, or motive, of the song are explicitly given. The claim of the context of Deut. xxxii., then, clearly is that the song was composed by Moses.

Without discussing other objections that might be made to this claim, let us examine the *prima facie* evidence of the song itself. Does any one know enough, or have the evidence,

<sup>37</sup> P. 467.

to show that there are corruptions in the text, or words, or phrases, or ideas, that countervail the *prima facie* evidence of Mosaic origin? Here, let us, for lack of time confine ourselves to the words for god and demon, mentioned by Professors Baethgen, and Cheyne, i.e., *Shedim* and *Eloah*, Shaddai, 'Elyōn, Jehovah, El and Šur. All of these except *Shedim* and *Eloah* are discussed elsewhere in this article. As to *Shedim*, there is no doubt that it is the same as the Babylonian word *Shedu*, defined by Muss-Arnolt<sup>38</sup> as (a) a destructive god and (b) a protecting deity. As to *Eloah*, the earliest records in both Aramaic and Arabic (Sabean, and Minean) give it as the common word for "god." Since some of the Sabean inscriptions probably go back to the year 1600 B.C., there is no reason why Moses also may not have used it in a Hebrew document. ׀ַוּוֹ is used for God as well as *Adonim*;<sup>39</sup> and so, *Eloah* may have been used as well as *Elohim*, so far as anyone *knows*. To be sure, Baethgen states that *Eloah* has been substituted for an original *El* in Ps. xviii. 32, followed by Ps. xlv. 8; for an *Elohim* in Pss. ii, xxii and cxiv. 7; and for a *Jehovah* in Prov. xxx. 5 and Hab. iii. 3; but whether this was done, or when it was done, or why it was done, no one knows. It is pure conjecture, except that in the *present* text they differ.

2. Professor Baethgen says that it seems as if either the author of Deut. xxxii. or of Job had first coined the word *Eloah*. But since the scene of the poem of Job was the land of Uz it was natural for the author to have Eliphaz, Zophar and Elihu use the name of God to which they were accustomed, just as Daniel has Antiochus Epiphanes refer to the god of his fathers (xi. 36-39).

3. Baethgen says simply that "Ps. cxxxix. is very late," implying that this accounts for its use of *Eloah*. To be sure *Eloah* occurs twice in Ben Sira (xxxv. 13, xlv. 23) while *Elohim* is found 22 times; but it is not found in the Zadokite

<sup>38</sup> *A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language*, p. 1014.

<sup>39</sup> Ex. xiii. 17, xxxiv. 23 (E), Is. i. 24, iii. 1, x. 16, 33, xix. 4, Mal. iii. 1, Ps. cxiv. 7.



Fragments. Ecclesiastes, which the critics place in the second century, B.C., has Elohim 40 times and Eloah never. We see, therefore, that the use of Eloah as against Elohim is in itself no proof of lateness.

#### VI. THE USE OF EL

El alone is found in the Old Testament 145 times, and 79 times in 52 combinations. It is found alone in the Pentateuch 15 times, in the Prophets 30, in the Poetical Books 95, and in the Historical Books 5 times. In the Psalms, it occurs alone 11 times in Book I, 5 in II, 14 in III, 4 in IV, and 6 in V, i.e., 40 times in all; and 54 times in Job. In combinations, it occurs 34 times in the Pentateuch, 17 in the Prophets, 17 in the Poetical Books (all in the Psalter), and 8 times in the Historical Books. Of the 17 times in the Psalms, 4 are in Book I, 3 in II, 5 in III, 3 in IV, and 2 in V. From the above enumeration, it is easy to see why no argument for the date of a psalm can be based on the use of El. It is to be noted, further, that El is the ordinary word for God in Phœnician and that it is equivalent to the Babylonian *ilu* found in the earliest Babylonian inscriptions, even before Hammurabi. It is found, also, in the Aramaic inscription of Hadad from the 8th century B.C., though not used in later Aramaic except in translations and proper names. It is surprising to find it used 57 times in the Zadokite Fragments, being the only name meaning God occurring in this work. It is, thus, used in the earliest and latest works of the Old Hebrew language.

#### VII. THE USE OF ELYON

According to Professor Cheyne, 'Elyōn is a mark of "a late date."<sup>40</sup> "Not only the pre-Exile prophets and Ezekiel, but even the pre-Exile narrators, avoid this name."<sup>41</sup> "Num. xxiv. 16 and Deut. xxxii. 8 are the only undoubtedly pre-exilic passages in which 'Elyōn occurs (Gen. xiv. 18-24 being post-exilic) and these are poetical. The first prophet who

<sup>40</sup> P. 75.

<sup>41</sup> P. 84.

uses the name is *exilic* (Is. xiv. 14) and he only uses it in a poetical speech given to the king of Babylon. Post-exilic writers were specially fond of using it, or its Aramaic equivalent (see especially Daniel, Enoch, and Sirach).” Speaking of Psalms xci and xcii, Professor Cheyne says of the ‘Elyōn that it is found in the first verse of each, and that it is a mark of the late date of the Psalms.<sup>42</sup>

1. In addition to the passages mentioned by Professor Cheyne in the above excerpts, ‘Elyōn occurs in 2 Sam. xxii. 14 and Lam. iii. 35, 38. Thus, not merely do pre-exilic prophets and “narrators” avoid the name, but the post-exilic as well! It will be observed, also, that in order to say that its use outside the Psalter is exilic or post-exilic, it must be assumed that Gen. xiv, Num. xxiv, Deut. xxxii, and Is. xiv are exilic, or post-exilic; and, to make its use post-exilic, that Jeremiah did not write the book of Lamentations. The evidence from Daniel is vitiated, first, by the fact that ‘Elyōn never occurs in the Hebrew of Daniel but only a corresponding word in the Aramaic; secondly, by the fact that in nine out of the fourteen cases, it is found in passages addressed to, or spoken by, or occasioned by, Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. In chapter seven we find the plural form used by Daniel the same as in the case of Elohim in Hebrew. This is the only place I have found where the plural of majesty is used in Aramaic. The appropriateness of Daniel’s using the phrase Most High for God is shown by the fact that its Babylonian equivalent *šîru* was a beloved designation of the gods in the case of Nebuchadnezzar and Nabunaid. They use *šîru* of Marduk, Ninmena, Ninkanak, Ninmak, Gula; and *šaḫu* of Marduk. Besides, Jehovah, Elohim, Adonai and Shaddai are not used in any Aramaic dialect and El only in certain proper names and transliterations in versions.<sup>43</sup> For the sake of variety, Daniel might be expected to use designations of the Supreme Being found in so many

<sup>42</sup> P. 73.

<sup>43</sup> In the peculiar Aramaic of the Sendschirli Inscriptions El occurs twice in Hadad. See Lidzbarski’s *Epigraphik*.

other languages, and used in documents supposed by him to have been written by Moses, David, Isaiah and Jeremiah.

2. 'Elyōn occurs, also, in Is. xiv. 14. There is, we believe, no sufficient reason for doubting that this passage on Babylon, embracing chapters xiii and xiv, was written by Isaiah. Dr. Driver, indeed, says that "the situation presupposed by this prophecy is not that of Isaiah's age";<sup>44</sup> and that "upon the grounds of analogy the prophecy xiii. 2-xiv. 22 can only be attributed to an author living towards the close of the exile and holding out to his contemporaries the prospect of release from Babylon, as Isaiah held out to *his* contemporaries the prospect of deliverance from Assyria." These views of Dr. Driver's are based upon the general presupposition that it was the office of the prophet of Israel to address himself to the needs of his own age "and that it was alien to the genius of prophecy . . . to base a promise upon a condition of things *not yet existent*."

There is nothing in any of these alleged reasons to entitle us to place this prophecy in the age of Nebuchadnezzar or Cyrus rather than in that of Sargon or Sennacherib. Jacob is mentioned twice in xiv. 1 and Israel in xiv. 1 and the Assyrian in xiv. 25. Babylon, it is true, is named in xiii. 1, 19, xiv. 4, 22; but, it will be remembered, that Sargon, Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, were all kings of Babylon as well as of Assyria.<sup>45</sup> In 689 B.C., Babylon was overthrown by Sennacherib just as "when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah" (xiii. 19). Sennacherib says in his own inscriptions,<sup>46</sup> that he overthrew the city of Babylon taking as booty gold, silver, precious stones, palace women, and servants, musicians, and all the troops and portable things. He surrounded the city with a cordon and filled the streets with the dead bodies of her inhabitants, small and great. He took the gods and brake them in pieces, taking away their treasures. Sennacherib's son, Esarhaddon says that the dwellings and temples had

<sup>44</sup> LOT, p. 212.

<sup>45</sup> See K B, II, 289.

<sup>46</sup> K B, II, 83, 84, 105, 117, 118.

been made like plowed land and the inhabitants had gone to be distributed as slaves to the yoke and chains.<sup>47</sup> Esarhaddon says that eleven years later he was called by Marduk to rebuild Babylon and that he rebuilt the free city, brought back from afar the Babylonians and gave them back their rights, renewing the idols of the great gods and setting them up anew in their holy places.

These differing attitudes of Sennacherib and his son Esarhaddon toward Babylon are due to the fact that there were two great political parties in Nineveh, dating as far back as the time of Tiglath-Pileser III,—the militaristic and the priestly parties.<sup>48</sup> Babylon was in somewhat the same relation to Assyria that Rome was to the German empire in the time of the Hohenstaufens. Babylon was the older city and her literature and her gods and temples never lost their hold upon the kindred people of Assyria nor upon its kings. Isaiah was perfectly right in denouncing Babylon, knowing as he must have done, that the power behind the throne of Sargon and Esarhaddon was the hierarchy of which Babylon was the centre. Till Babylon was destroyed, it made little difference which city was the seat of government. The Assyrians, the Chaldaeans, and the Babylonians, stood to Babylon as France, Austria and Spain, did to Rome in the 15th and 16th centuries of our era.

But, someone will say, why does he mention the Medes? To which one might answer, why not? Already, in 844 B.C., Shalmanezar III had conquered the Medes to the east of Lake Ooroomiah.<sup>49</sup> Tiglath-Pileser III had sent expeditions against them and settled in their cities many of the captive Israelites,<sup>50</sup> and Sargon and the later kings of Assyria were in frequent conflict with them.<sup>51</sup> It was perfectly proper and

---

<sup>47</sup> K B, II, 121-125.

<sup>48</sup> See Winckler's able discussion of these parties in his *History of Babylonia and Assyria*.

<sup>49</sup> K B, I, 142.

<sup>50</sup> K B, II, 7. 2 Kings xv. 10, 29.

<sup>51</sup> See, especially, Winckler's *History of Babylonian and Assyria*.

possible for Isaiah to discern in these eastern and northern enemies of Assyria and Babylon the probable future cause of their downfall and destruction, just as for hundreds of years before the fall of the Roman empire the Germans from Varus on foreboded the Alarics and Theodorics of the future. Besides, in accordance with the custom of the warring forces in the time of the last Assyrian kings, auxiliary and mercenary forces served in the armies of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, and probably the most valiant and least corrupt of these "who did not regard silver nor delight in gold" (Is. xiii. 17) were the Medes, the shock troops who dashed in pieces the young men of Babylon and spared not her children and laid in the dust the beauty of the Chaldee's excellency.

In view of all these facts, and especially that the Babylonians so frequently call their gods "the high ones," who can deny that the heading of chapter xiii is correct and that chapters xiii and xiv are indeed the burden of Babylon which Isaiah the son of Amoz did see? And of course, if it is Isaiah's vision, he must have seen it long before the captivity of Judah in 586 B.C.

In saying this with regard to the prophecy against Babylon, it is my aim simply to point out that from the critics' own standpoint this prophecy is not nearly as remote, as out of relation with the Assyrian period in which Isaiah lived, as the critics have so often asserted. Babylon was a potential menace even in the days of Hezekiah. But the points which I have mentioned and which relate it to Isaiah's day do not in any sense satisfy the language of the prophecy nor empty it of its predictive import. It clearly points to a far distant future and does not find its adequate fulfilment until centuries after the time of Hezekiah or of Cyrus.

3. As to Lamentations, its date is hard to fix. Lohr<sup>52</sup> dates it from 570 to 530 B.C., and Dr. Driver<sup>53</sup> seems to follow him. The Aramaic Targum, the Peshitto, the Septuagint

---

<sup>52</sup> ZATW, 1894.

<sup>53</sup> LOT, p. 465.

and the Latin Vulgate, all name Jeremiah as the author; and Josephus in Book X, v. 1, of his *Antiquities* says that Jeremiah composed an elegy over Josiah. This elegy may have been the book of Lamentations. There are two main arguments used by Dr. Driver against the authorship by Jeremiah. The first is that "it may perhaps be doubted whether a writer, who, in his literary style, followed, as Jeremiah did, the prompting of nature would subject himself to the artificial restraint implied by the alphabetical arrangement of c. 1-4."<sup>54</sup> There is absolutely no evidence in such a statement as this. It is another of Dr. Driver's favorite telescopic observations made at long range into the psychology of the prophets of Israel. Having told us that "Jeremiah's style is essentially artless" and without "artistic finish" and that "in his treatment of a subject he obeys no literary canon," he argues as if Jeremiah would not, or could not if he would, "subject himself to the artificial restraint implied by the alphabetical arrangement of c. 1-4."

This all sounds very fine, but yet, after all, it is but an opinion of Dr. Driver as to the mental and literary capacity of Jeremiah, based upon a study of one kind of Jeremiah's writings. One might as well maintain that a man who wrote a work like Milton's *Christian Doctrine* would not, or could not, write *Lycidas* or the *Areopagitica*. But, who knows the unrevealed motives of the human heart and the literary possibilities of a Milton, a David, an Isaiah, or a Jeremiah? Out of the eater comes forth meat and honey from the carcass of a lion. The beautiful face of a Beatrice Cenci may hide the brain of a patricide.

Full many a gem of purest ray serene,  
The deep unfathomed caves of ocean bear.

It is time for the critics of literature to stop trying to measure with their little yardsticks the abysmal depths and sidereal heights, the capabilities, of men like Homer, Shakespeare, Moses and Jeremiah. After the marvels of ingenuity

---

<sup>54</sup> P. 274.

performed by Abd-Ishu in his *Paradise of Eden*,<sup>55</sup> shall we deny to the great prophet Jeremiah an ability to write in the simplest form of this alphabetical species of composition? To all who indulge in this kind of motivating and depreciating criticism of the Scriptures, the best reply is in a "few episodical poohs and pshaws."

The second of Dr. Driver's reasons for not accepting the Jeremian authorship of Lamentations is derived from the fact that we find in Lamentations certain words not occurring in the prophecies.<sup>56</sup> Thus שׁוּע (iii. 8) does not occur in Jeremiah. True; but, if this argument is valid, scarcely a chapter in the Old Testament could be assigned to the author of a book. For, since there are about 1500 words found but once in the Hebrew Bible, few chapters could be discovered without words not used elsewhere by the author of any given work. Scores of words are used but once by Mohammed<sup>57</sup> and Milton.<sup>58</sup> In the *Paradise Lost*, Milton uses "chaos" 26 times but not elsewhere in his poetical works.

That Adonai therefore should be used twice in chapter 1 of Lamentations, seven times in chapter 2, and four times in chapter 3 is noteworthy; as is, also, the fact that it is never

<sup>55</sup> 'Abd-Ishu' bar Berikha (d. 1318) was the last great writer of the Nestorian Church. His principal poetical work was the *Paradise of Eden*. (See Wright's *Syriac Literature*, p. 287f.) The writer of this article has in his possession a beautiful copy of this great work, secured in Ooroomiah about forty years ago. While all the poems contained in this volume are acrostic or abecedarian, there are numerous variations, so that we find from one to eight couplets successively beginning with the same letter; and some, where every couplet ends in the same syllable. In the two parts, also, the first three poems begin with Aleph and the last two with Tau whereas the twenty poems intervening follow successively in the order b, g, d, as in the Hebrew alphabet. It is certainly an elaborate work of art, and one in comparison with which the book of Lamentations is mere child's play.

<sup>56</sup> LOT, p. 463 (note).

<sup>57</sup> See Flügel's *Concordantiae Corani Arabicae*.

<sup>58</sup> See the *Lexicon to the English Poetical Works of John Milton* by Laura E. Lockwood, Ph.D. (Yale). This work and others like it are an excellent preparation for the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, especially when it comes to *Hapax Legomena* and an author's right to use a variety of expressions.

used in chapters 4 and 5. But this does not show that the book is not by a single author nor that the author was not Jeremiah. The occurrences of Jehovah and Adonai in Lamentations are as follows: Jehovah, i. 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, 18, 20; ii. 6, 7, 8, 9, 17, 20; iii. 22, 24, 25, 26, 40, 50, 55, 59, 61, 64, 66; iv. 11, 16, 20; v. 1, 19, 21; Adonai, i. 14, 15 *bis*, ii. 1, 2, 5, 7, 18, 19, 20; iii. 31, 36, 37, 58. Or they may be presented in tabular form thus:

CHAPTER	I	II	III	IV	V	TIMES
Jehovah .....	7	6	11	3	3	30
Adonai .....	3	7	4	0	0	14

Kennicott's MSS read Adonai for Jehovah only 67 times in 30 cases; but Jehovah for Adonai 399 times in 14 cases. Such readings as these do not militate against the unity of the authorship of Lamentations; nor, against the authorship of the Prophecy and the Lamentations by Jeremiah. For Mohammed in the Koran uses Rahman for God in only 17 out of 114 suras. He omits Rab from 21 suras and Allah from 27. In sura xix, Rahman occurs 16 times; Allah, 6 times; and Rab 23 times. As such variations in the use of terms do not destroy the unity of the Koran; so also they do not argue against the authorship of Lamentations by Jeremiah.

However, since Jerusalem was destroyed in 586 B.C. and the critics date Lamentations from 570 to 530 B.C., it is agreed that the book of Lamentations was written at about the time of Jeremiah's death; and it is impossible to argue from the use of a word in a sixth century document that another document containing the same word was written in the 2nd century B.C.

4. As to Gen. xiv, no one but a supreme egotist will deny without qualification that the events recorded in it are true.<sup>59</sup> Jerusalem has certainly been in existence almost continuously for 3500 years. Why not for 4000? Why not in the time of Abraham and Hammurabi? And if it did exist, why may it not have had a king named Melchizedek, who was a

<sup>59</sup> See my *Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, p. 20f.



priest to the Most High God? We know that people speaking Hebrew lived in Palestine as early as the time of Thothmes III. Hence, the name Melchizedek as well as that of Jerusalem is possible at that time and also both El and 'Elyōn.<sup>60</sup>

5. As to Num. xxiv, one of the Balaam chapters, no one without a theory would think of putting the account of Balaam as late as the captivity, and the same may be said of Deut. xxxii. Dr. Driver assigns the Balaam story to JE<sup>61</sup> and Deut. xxxii between a time earlier than JE and the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.<sup>62</sup> There is no objective evidence to show that they do not both come from the hand of Moses. And certainly no one would suppose that a word occurring in documents admitted to be at the latest as early as Ezekiel in the sixth century B.C. would be evidence that another document containing the same word was written in the second century B.C.

6. Lastly, Professor Cheyne says that post-exilic writers (especially Daniel, Enoch and Sirach), were especially fond of using it (*i.e.* 'Elyōn) or its Aramaic equivalent.

As to Sirach, the original Hebrew, discovered since the time that Professor Cheyne's Bampton Lectures were given, shows that 'Elyōn is used alone ten times (xli. 4, 8, xlii. 2, xliv. 2, 20, xlv. 4, 1. 14, 16, 17); and preceded by El three times (xlvi. 5, xlvii. 5, and xlviii. 20). My readers will remember that Sirach is poetry, and that in the parallel sentences of Hebrew poetry it is customary to use synonymous expressions. This is sufficient to account for the large number of 'Elyōns in the work of Sirach. He might readily have used a word which, he must have believed, had been employed by Moses, David and Isaiah.

7. Enoch, also, is mostly poetical. The word for Most High is used only six times in the parts put by Professor Charles in the second century B.C. One line containing the

<sup>60</sup> See further on in this article.

<sup>61</sup> LOT, p. 67.

<sup>62</sup> *id.*, p. 97.

word is rejected as not genuine by Professor Charles and in one he presupposes ׀ַ as the original. The sixth section of Enoch, not having been written till the first century B.C., will not bear evidence of the prevalence of the word in the early part of the second.

8. The Book of Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, though not known in anything but versions and versions of versions, make use of the expressions the Most High, or Most High God, with frequency. Thus Jubilees has Most High twice and Most High God twenty-one times; and the Testaments use Most High eighteen times and Most High God, once. This frequent use is due, doubtless, to the fact that Jubilees is a commentary on Genesis and that both imitate the phraseology of that book. Nevertheless, Jubilees uses *Lord* and compounds with it 219 times and God and its compounds 152 times to Most High and its compounds 24 times; and the XII Patriarchs, Lord and its compounds 232 times and God and its compounds 243 times to Most High and its compounds 19 times.<sup>63</sup> This seems to indicate that for the author of both of these books Most High was after all but an occasional appellation of the Deity.

9. That the same author could in his various works use a great variety of appellations or designations of the Deity, I have shown abundantly and conclusively in my articles in this REVIEW for 1919-1920. Milton, also, shows this; for he uses Almighty for, or of, God in *Paradise Lost* 30 times and elsewhere in his poetical works only in his translation of Psalm cxiv. 4. Further, he uses the Highest and the Most High 16 times in *Paradise Lost*; and, elsewhere, only once in *Paradise Regained* and twice in his translations of Psalms.

Again, it must be remembered that the ancient translations of words for Deity often obscure the original word. Of course, this is true most frequently in such words as those denoting "Lord" and those denoting God, such as Jehovah and Elohim. But, that these words are frequently inter-

<sup>63</sup> See article on the "Use of Words for God in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Literature of the Jews" in this REVIEW, Jan., 1920.

changed in the versions is abundantly illustrated in Ecclesiasticus. Here, the Hebrew has Lord and its compounds 53 times and the Greek 214 and the Hebrew God and its compounds 87 times and the Greek only 25.

Further, the frequency of the use of The Most High in some works written from 100 B.C. to 150 A.D. may be due to the desire to employ in certain connections a less ambiguous term than Lord or God to denote the deity. It is well known that the later kings of Egypt and Syria were hailed as *θεός* and this name is found in their titles. Though Augustus and Tiberius are said to have refused the title Dominus, it was freely given to the succeeding emperors and such terms as Dominus, Deus and Divus were common appellations of nearly all the pre-Christian Caesars. For this reason some of the Jewish writers may have avoided these terms at times and have used instead the less ambiguous terms "The Highest" or "The Highest God." This would account for the fact that the fifth section of Enoch uses it 9 times; the 3rd book of the Sibylline Oracles, 19; 2 Baruch, 25; 4 Ezra, 71; 3 Maccabees, 7; and the Odes of Solomon 27. The authors of the books of the New Testament, writing for readers who were imbued with the ideas of the Old Testament and acknowledged no man as God, did not think it necessary to avoid the use of God and Lord. The true Christians bravely sung hymns to Jesus Christ as Lord, even though it brought them under suspicion of disloyalty to the emperor and led inevitably to death.<sup>64</sup>

In conclusion, it seems evident that any writer from Abraham to Hadrian may have used 'Elyōn, or its equivalent, as an unambiguous designation of the Highest of all, *i.e.*, of God. How often and when one should be expected to use it, we do not know enough to say, whether of Moses, David, Daniel, or any other writer. We do know, however, that any one of these may have used it, and that, consequently, the

<sup>64</sup> See correspondence between Pliny the Younger and the Emperor Trajan in *C. Plinii Caecili Secundi Epistolae et Panegyricus*, liber X. and especially letters 97 and 98.

occurrence of it in a psalm, or prophecy, or other document, is no proof of its lateness.

### VIII. THE USE OF SHADDAI

Professor Cheyne says in treating of Ps. lxxviii,<sup>65</sup> that שׁדַּי "first appears in authoritative religious literature at the close of the Exile." Elsewhere, he adds: "Ps. xci is also a Shaddai psalm (like Ps. lxxviii)."<sup>66</sup> Again he says: "It is clear that this name, like 'Elyōn, was discountenanced by the pre-exilic prophets and narrators (*i.e.*, those who are admitted as such by all critics)." In treating of Ps. xci, he declares that "the two divine names 'Elyōn and Shaddai [both of which occur in xci. 1] are both marks of a late date, and more especially the latter."<sup>67</sup>

This is one of the finest examples extant of what the logicians call "begging the question" or "arguing in a circle," or "assuming the question at issue." Thus, he assumes and asserts, that the word "first appears in authoritative religious literature at the close of the Exile." But this is the very thing that he ought to prove. The heading of the 68th Psalm ascribes its authorship to David. From this ascription, there is not a single variation in the 400 or more Hebrew manuscripts. All the primary versions,—the Aramaic Targum, the Latin, the Syriac, the Septuagint and, so far as we know, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotian agree with the Hebrew in this ascription. All the secondary versions, also,—the Sahidic and Memphitic Coptic, the Harklensian Syriac, the Itala, the Armenian, the Arabic, the Ethiopic—agree with the Hebrew, as do all the ancient commentators.<sup>68</sup> Among the great modern commentators who ascribe the psalm to David, or his time, are Calvin, Ladvoat, Clericus, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Murphy, Perowne, Reinke, Reinhard, Stier, Hofmann, Cornill (?) and Bruston. Besides,

<sup>65</sup> P. 124.

<sup>66</sup> P. 84.

<sup>67</sup> P. 73.

<sup>68</sup> See the testimony at length in this REVIEW for 1926.

those who deny the Davidic authorship differ so much among themselves as to invalidate the conclusions of their criticism. They vary from Hitzig who puts its date at 825 B.C. to Olshausen who dates it about the middle of the second century B.C.

The date of Ps. xci is so hard to determine, that Perowne, Delitzsch, Schultz, Hengstenberg and even Olshausen do not attempt to fix a date for it. Murphy puts it in the time of David, and Hitzig in 151 B.C. Professor Cheyne argues as if Shaddai was late because it is only in these psalms<sup>69</sup> and in Job, Joel, Ruth, Ezekiel i. 24, x. 5, Is. xiii. 16, Gen. xliii. 14 and Num. xxiv. 4, 16. When we turn up the commentaries of the radical critics on those passages, we find them all arguing that the passages are late because this word is in them. Thus we have the vicious argument in a circle: The passages are late because this word is late and the word is late because the passages are late. But let us examine these passages. Of Gen. xliii. 14, Professor Cheyne remarks that "no critic will doubt that 'El Shaddai' is due to the hand of the editor"; but Professor Driver says<sup>70</sup> that it belongs to E, a work written according to him some time before the 8th century B.C.<sup>71</sup> Of Num. xxiv. 4, 16, Cheyne says only that it is in the poetical speeches of Balaam. Dr. Driver assigns this passage to JE<sup>72</sup> and says that J and E were combined in the 8th century, B.C.<sup>73</sup> Shaddai may have been discountenanced by pre-exilic prophets but it is found in the poetical part of Num. xxii-xxiv which was written at the latest in the 8th century, B.C. How, then, is the occurrence of Shaddai in psalms lxviii and xci an argument against their pre-exilic date? Are they, then, not poetry? Is. xiii I have already discussed under 'Elyōn, giving my reasons for believing that it was written by Isaiah. Of

---

<sup>69</sup> It is noteworthy that it does not occur in either Ecclesiasticus or the Zadokite Fragments.

<sup>70</sup> LOT, p. 17.

<sup>71</sup> *Id.*, p. 66.

<sup>72</sup> *Id.*, p. 66.

<sup>73</sup> *Id.*, p. 116.

Ezekiel i. 24, Cheyne remarks that codex "B of the Sept., the Hebrew original of which is alone correct, does not contain it." It is true that it is not in codex B, but A has it and the Coptic, Armenian and Arabic versions of the Greek, as also all MSS but one of the Hebrew and the Syriac (Aloho), Aramaic Targum (שׂרד), and the Latin (Sublimus Deus). Of Ezek. x. 5 he says only that "Cornill has shown it to be an interpolation." But all the Hebrew manuscripts have the word and, also, codices B and A of the Sept., the Vulgate, Peshitto (Aloho) and the Arabic, Coptic and Armenian versions of the Greek. As to Ruth, Dr. Driver says that the beauty and purity of the style point decidedly to the pre-exilic period as the time of its composition.<sup>74</sup> As to Joel, as long as different critics place its date at from about 900 B.C. to about 400 B.C., it seems reasonable to hesitate about accepting its testimony as to the time of the use of this word.<sup>75</sup> Besides, although the Targum, Peshitto and Vulgate and all the Hebrew MSS have read Shaddai in Joel i. 15, the Greek, followed by all of the versions from it, has, probably through reading the Yodh at the end of the word and the Yodh at the beginning of the next word as one Yodh instead of two, read שׂד instead of שׂרד. Lastly, before the rise of the extreme radical school of modern criticism, not one of the great commentators saw any ground for placing Joel after the captivity; and, so far as I have seen, no one even of them cites Shaddai as an evidence of lateness—no one, that is, except Professor Cheyne.

As to Job, the one remaining book to which Professor Cheyne appeals for the lateness of Shaddai, both Cornill<sup>76</sup> and Driver<sup>77</sup> place its composition at about 550 B.C. This affords little support to those who would put the date of either Ps. xci or lxviii in the second century, B.C.

As to the word Shaddai, there is uncertainty as to its root,

<sup>74</sup> LOT, p. 455.

<sup>75</sup> *Id.*, pp. 309-313.

<sup>76</sup> *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 433.

<sup>77</sup> LOT, p. 422.

form, and meaning. If it were from a root שדה, it would be of the same form as *sadai* which is sometimes read in the Hebrew text instead of *sade* "field."<sup>78</sup> In Babylonian the root *shadu* means "to be high," and derivatives mean "mountain" and "the summit of a mountain" and perhaps "majesty." In this case, we might take *shaddai* as a synonym of 'elyōn "Most High," as used in Gen. xiv.

A second derivation is from the root *shadad* "to be strong." The ending *ai* is found also in חרי (Isa. xix. 9) and in גובי (Am. vii. 1, Neh. iii. 17) and perhaps in כילי (Isa. xxxii. 5).<sup>79</sup> This ending is found also in Arabic and Ethiopic.<sup>80</sup> If from this root the word *shaddai* would mean "might, strength." The Greek translator of Job apparently had this derivation before him when he rendered *shaddai* by παντοκράτωρ, "Almighty,"<sup>81</sup>—a translation which has been generally followed in the English version. In the Syriac an equivalent word *hassino* "strong" is found in Job vi. 4, viii. 3, 5, xi. 7, xiii. 3, xv. 25, xxvii. 2, 13, xxix. 5, xxxvii. 23.

A third derivation is from the relative pronoun (ש) and the word "sufficiency" (די). The Greek *ikavósti* found in Job xxi. 15, xxxi. 2, xxxix. 32, Ruth i. 20, 21, Ezek. i. 24, comes from this interpretation. It also accounts for the usual rendering of *shaddai* in the Samaritan version and in the Arabic version of Saadya. The Arabic always renders it *al kafi*, "the sufficient," and the Samaritan always *safuka*, except in Num. xxiv. 4, 16, where it has read *sadai* (field).

Some, also, have conjectured that the original form was *shēdi*. שד is found in Deut. xxxii. 17 and Ps. cvi. 37, translated in the English version by "devil," and in the Greek and Latin by "demon."<sup>82</sup>

<sup>78</sup> In fact, the Samaritan Targum reads *sadai* in Num. xxiv. 4, 16.

<sup>79</sup> Olshausen, *Lehrbuch* p. 216.

<sup>80</sup> Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, I. p. 220; Dillmann, *Aethiopische Grammatik*, p. 204.

<sup>81</sup> Fifteen times in all, to wit: v. 17, viii. 5, xi. 7, xv. 25, xxii. 17, 25, xxiii. 16, xxvii. 2, 11, 13, xxxii. 8, xxxiii. 4, xxxiv. 10, xxxv. 13, xxxvii. 22.

<sup>82</sup> Muss-Arnolt in his *Assyrian Dictionary* defines *shedu* as a destructive god. Brünnow No. 11308 gives it as a synonym of *ekimmu* and *utukku* and in 11314 as a synonym of *utukku* and *rabišu*.

Our ignorance of the real meaning of the word is further illustrated by the fact that the Greek translators of the Pentateuch invariably render both Shaddai and El Shaddai by *θεός*, that the translation of Job renders it eight times by *κύριος*, that the Syriac version renders it twenty-two times by *Aloho* (God), and in the Pentateuch usually transliterates it.

In conclusion, the evidence clearly shows that the Hebrews who translated the Old Testament, or part of it, into Samaritan, Syriac, Greek, and Arabic, knew nothing of a god called Shaddai or of Shaddai as a name for God. Only in the Greek of Ezek. i. 24 and in the Syriac of Gen. xvii. 1, xxxv. 11, and Ex. vi. 3 is there any indication that either El Shaddai or Shaddai was ever considered to be a proper name like Jehovah.

It will thus be seen that Professor Cheyne has appealed to every passage in the Old Testament which contains Shaddai except to six places in the Pentateuch, to wit: Gen. xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xlviii. 3 and Ex. vi. 3, all assigned by the critics to P and Gen. xlix. 25. The last of these Driver assigns to J,<sup>83</sup> Cornill to about 850 B.C.,<sup>84</sup> and McFadyen thinks that it is at least as late as the period of the Judges.<sup>85</sup> It is such differences among the radical critics that reveal the unconvincing character of the evidence upon which they base their conclusions. Of the five other passages mentioned above (all assigned by the Wellhauseans to P, some of them almost entirely because Shaddai occurs in them) it may be truly said, that the evidence derived from the word Shaddai is equally void and fantastic. Where, for example, would the writer of P, even if, as Cornill thinks<sup>86</sup> he wrote *circa* 500 B.C., have gotten the idea that the patriarchs used Shaddai as a designation of the Deity, or to denote the God of the fathers? Neither Ezekiel, Job, J, E, H, D, Joel, Isaiah, Ruth,

<sup>83</sup> LOT, p. 17.

<sup>84</sup> *Introduction*, p. 117.

<sup>85</sup> *Id.*, p. 16.

<sup>86</sup> *Id.*, p. 114.



nor the Psalms, connects the name with the patriarchs. Cheyne himself says that "no critic will doubt that the El Shaddai of Gen. xliii. 14 is due to the hand of the editor."<sup>87</sup> The same may equally well be said of Gen. xlix. 25. This would leave the writer of P no authority but Balaam for his assumption that the patriarchs used Shaddai. And it is passing strange, that no author of any of the books acknowledged by all critics to be post-exilic, *i.e.*, of Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Esther, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, ever uses the word. Whether we take the traditional view of the post-captivity literature, or the radical, there is therefore no undisputed, or conclusive, evidence to show that the hypothetical writer of P, not even Ezra if he were himself the writer, was in his use of Shaddai as a name of the deity, in harmony with contemporaneous usage and ideas.<sup>88</sup> Further, neither the Hebrew of Ben Sira, nor that of the Zadokite Fragments ever uses the word; nor does that of the Pirke Aboth. The Greek *παντοκράτωρ* in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is ambiguous since it renders the Hebrew *Sebaoth* as well as the less frequent Shaddai. Even then, it occurs in the Apocrypha only in 1 Bar. iii. 1, 4, Jud. 5 times, and in the Prayer of Manasseh once, also in the phrase "Lord Almighty" which in the Septuagint is always the rendering of "Jehovah of hosts." In Jubilees xv. 4, xxvii. 11, "God Almighty" is found in two citations from Genesis where Shaddai occurs in the original Hebrew. It is found, also, in the Sibylline Oracles III. 71. In 3 Baruch, it occurs in the phrase "Lord God Almighty," which is obviously the equivalent of "Jehovah God of hosts," as often in the Old Testament. Possibly, also, Shaddai may have been the Hebrew original (if it had one) of the phrase "Most Mighty" in the Decree of Artaxerxes in the Additions to Esther xvi 16. Finally, God Almighty occurs in 2 Mac. viii. 18, 3 Mac. vi. 2, and six times in the Letter of Aristeas. Since all of these apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works which use the word Almighty,

<sup>87</sup> P. 84.

<sup>88</sup> See this REVIEW, XXII, 110.

were written long after the Septuagint version of the Hebrew Pentateuch was made, and since all of the authors were certainly acquainted with the Pentateuch, it is easy to see where they got the appellation. But to say that the word Almighty was common in any age is overstating the case. The Letter of Aristeas alone makes a relatively common use of it and that only six times and in a letter addressed to the king of Egypt, who himself claimed to be a god. In the New Testament "Almighty" alone is found only in Rev. i. 8, and Almighty God and God Almighty in Rev. xvi. 14 and xix. 15. Lord Almighty (*i.e.* Jehovah of hosts) is found only in 2 Cor. vi. 18 and the phrase Jehovah God of hosts (Lord God Almighty) in Rev. iv. 8, xi. 17, xv. 3, xvi. 7, xix. 6, xxi. 22. "Lord of Sabaoth" occurs in Rom. ix. 29, James v. 4.

It seems to me that the evidence given proves conclusively that the presence of Shaddai in a document is not a mark of the late date of that document, and that its presence in Pss. lxviii and xci affords no evidence that they are post-exilic.

#### IX. SEBAOTH

The word "Sebaoth" preceded by Jehovah, Elohim, or both of them is found fifteen times in the Psalms, to wit: Book I, xxiv. 10; II, xlvi. 8, 12, xlviii. 9, lix. 6, lxix. 7; III, lxxx. 5, 8, 15, 20, lxxxiv. 2, 4, 13, lxxxix. 9.

1. Jehovah of hosts occurs in xxiv. 10 (David), xlvi. 8, 12 (Korah), xlviii. 9 (Korah), lxxxiv. 2, 4, 13 (Korah). That this designation may have been used as early as David is shown by the fact that it appears in 1 Sam. i. 3, 11, iv. 4, xv. 2, 2 Sam. vi. 2, 18, xii. 8. That it may have been used in a psalm from the time of Isaiah is shown from its occurrence 41 times in chapters i-xxxix and 4 times in chapters xl-lxvi, and also in Micah. That it may have been used at any time from 700 to 400 B.C., is shown by the fact that it occurs in 1 Kings xviii. 15, 2 Kings iii. 14, 19, 31, Na. ii. 14, iii. 5, Hab. ii. 13, Zeph. ii. 10, Hag. i. 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, ii. 4, 8, 9 *bis*, 11, 23 *bis*, Zech. i. 3 *bis*, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, ii. 12, 13, 15, iii. 7, 9, 10, iv. 6, 9, v.

4, vi. 12, 15, vii. 3, 4, 9, 12 *bis*, 13, xiii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 *bis*, 7, 9 *bis*, 11, 14 *bis*, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, ix. 15, x. 3, xiii. 2, 7, xiv. 21 *bis*, Mal. i. 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, ii. 2, 4, 7, 8, 12, 16, iii. 1, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21. 1 Chr. xvii. 7, 24 are parallel to 2 Sam. vii. 8, 26, and the only other place where the phrase is met with in Chronicles is in 1 Chr. xi. 9 in a statement made about David.

It is significant that neither Ecclesiasticus nor the Zadokite Fragments has the word *Sebaoth* at all. Nor does 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, or Esther, have it. It is not found in any of the apocryphal or pseudepigraphical writings, nor in the New Testament. The evidence from comparative literature is clearly, then, as far as this phrase goes in favor of a date before 400 B.C. for the composition of Psalms xxiv, xlvi, xlviii and even and especially lxxxiv.

2. God of hosts occurs in the Old Testament only in Ps. lxxx. 8, 15 and Amos v. 27. It is found nowhere else except in the Secrets of Enoch lii. 1A from the first century A.D.

3. Jehovah, God of hosts, occurs in Pss. lxxx. 5, 20, lxxxix. 9 and in 2 Sam. v. 10, 1 Kings xix. 10, 14, Hos. xii. 6, Am. iv. 12, v. 14, 15, vi. 8, 14, Jer. v. 14, xv. 16. The evidence, here, is in favor of an early use for the phrase.

4. Jehovah, God of hosts, the God of Israel. This phrase occurs only in Ps. lix. 6 and in Jer. xxxv. 17, xxxviii. 17, xliv. 7, not being found even in the apocryphal, pseudepigraphical or New Testament literature.

5. It appears from the evidence that the occurrence of *Sebaoth* in a document is an indication that the document is as early, at least, as 400 B.C., and that it may be as early as the time of David.

## X. THE HOLY ONE

Professor Cheyne argues further that "the Holy One" ( הקדוש ) was a common designation for the Deity in the Maccabean times and hence that its presence in a psalm indicates that the psalm was from those times. That קדוש was a name of God might be inferred from Ps. xcix. 5; but the

word occurs usually in the phrase "the Holy One of Israel" in Pss. lxxi. 22, lxxviii. 41 and lxxxix. 19,—the first in Book II of the Psalter and the other two in Book III. The 71st and 78th are assigned in the headings to Asaph and the 89th to Ethan. It seems certain that this title of God cannot be used as evidence that the psalms in which it occurs were written in Greek times. For it is found in 2 Kgs. xix. 22 and 11 times in the first 39 chapters of Isaiah, and 12 times in the last 27, in Jer. l. 29, li. 5, and Ek. xxxix. 7; but not elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. It is found in the Hebrew of Ben Sira l. 17 but not in the Greek, or Syriac versions. Since the Hebrew of Ben Sira had not been discovered when Professor Cheyne wrote, he cannot have appealed to its evidence. The phrase occurs once also in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs (Dan. lxxv.). Upon these two instances found in the voluminous literature written after 550 B.C., as against 27 instances in the Biblical literature from Isaiah to Kings, did Professor Cheyne base an argument in favor of putting three psalms in the Greek period!

But some one might say that he refers to the use of "the Holy One" and not to the use of "the Holy One of Israel." This cannot be for the obvious reason that "the Holy One" does not occur in either of these psalms. And, even if it did, the phrase "the Holy One" is found in the Old Testament only in Is. x. 17, Hab. i. 12, iii. 3, Job. vi. 10 and in the obscure verses Prov. ix. 10, xxx. 3, and Hos. xii. 1. In the works from the second century B.C., it is used in Ben Sira in the Hebrew text only in ix. 14 and xxxix. 35. In the three parts of Enoch placed by Professor Charles in the second century, it occurs once in each, and in the third book of the Sibylline Oracles twice. In the New Testament, it is found only in the phrase "holy and just one" of Acts iii. 14. In other Jewish literature outside the New Testament dating between 100 B.C. and 135 A.D., it stands alone only in 6 Enoch once, in 1 Baruch 3 times, and in Pirke Aboth 4 times. Seeing, then, that it is found from the time of Isaiah and Habakkuk to the year 135 A.D. in these few places only, what argument

as to the age of a document could have been based upon its occurrence in an Old Testament composition, even if it had so occurred?

#### XI. THE NAME

Professor Cheyne states that "words like heaven," "the name," and "the Holy One" would generally meet "any need" as substitutes for Jehovah.<sup>89</sup> He says in a note on the same page that "a later scribe (surely not the original writer) sought by substituting יהוה for השם to avoid an unpleasant collocation." Taking up this last statement first, it should be sufficient to ask, how did Professor Chyne *know* that some one substituted "the Name" for Jehovah; how did he know that it was surely not the original writer; and how did he know the motive for the substitution? He did not know and he could not know. All the evidence is against him—the Hebrew text, the Samaritan Hebrew text and version, the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, the Syriac, Greek and Latin versions.<sup>90</sup>

Taking up the second statement, implying that in the Macabean times "the Name" was a substitute for Jehovah, we may be pardoned for asking for the evidence for such an implication. In the Old Testament, Lev. xxiv. 11 is the only place where the Deity is called "the Name"; but such phrases as "my name" always seem to denote Jehovah. In the New Testament "the Name" is never used. In apocryphal and pseudo-epigraphical and other literature of the Jews up to 135 A.D., it is never used. The only item of possible evidence is the fact that the Pirke Aboth uses it once in the fifth section, which was probably not written before the end of the second century A.D. The sentence reads: "The wild beast comes on the world for false swearing, and for profaning of the Name." This is an evident reference to Lev. xxiv. 11.

Upon such slender evidence does Professor Cheyne con-

<sup>89</sup> P. 300.

<sup>90</sup> For a further discussion of this title see this REVIEW, for January, 1924, pp. 114-116.

clude that "the Name" was a substitute for Jehovah in the second century B.C.!

## XII. THE ROCK

It is worth noting that the Septuagint renders צור by θεός "God" 6 times in Deuteronomy xxxii. and 11 times in the Psalms, to wit: xvii. 4, 50, xxvii. 1, xxx. 3, lxi. 2, 7, lxx. 3, lxxii. 25, lxxxii. 15, xci. 15, xciv. 1, cxliii. 1. In 2 Kings xxii. 32, they have rendered it κτίστης, evidently connecting it with the Arabic *sawwar* "to form, or fashion." From this stem we get the noun *musawwir* "an epithet of God as the Former, or Fashioner, of all existing things."<sup>91</sup> In Is. xvii. 10, צור is rendered by κύριος. There seems to be no doubt, therefore, that the Greek translators interpreted the Hebrew in Deut. xxxii and 11 times in the Psalms as *sawwar* "creator" i.e. God. Ben Sira, also, in chapter iv. 6 renders it by ο ποιήσας. Were it not for this obvious derivation, one would have been tempted to connect the Greek rendering "God" with the Babylonian *širu* "high" making it a synonym of 'Elyōn. Whatever, however, be the derivation, it is evident that, even if the word stands for God in the Psalms mentioned above and in Ben Sira iv. 6, it cannot be used as a proof of late date, inasmuch as it occurs six times in Deut. xxxii and once in 2 Kings and in Is. xvii. 10, as a designation of the Deity.

## XIII. THE MIGHTY ONE

In Ps. cxxxii. 2, 3, the LXX renders אביר by θεός as is the case, also, in Is. lx. 16. In Is. xlix. 26, it is rendered by ἰσχὺς and in Is. i. 24 by ἰσχύων in the phrase the Mighty One of Jacob, or Israel. The phrase occurs, also, in the Hebrew of Ben Sira li. 12, and in the text of the XII Patriarchs once. Since the author of the 132nd psalm is not named in the Hebrew text, though David is the subject of the prayer in verse 1, there is room for an open discussion of the date of this psalm.

<sup>91</sup> Lane, *Arabic Dictionary*, p. 1745

## CONCLUSION

At last, then, we have brought to a conclusion this wearisome examination of the names for God in the Psalter. No one is more conscious than the writer of the unsatisfactory character of parts of the discussion owing largely to the lack of direct evidence bearing upon the particular words. But, of so much we can be sure, the *prima facie* evidence is in favor of the headings of the psalms and no convincing proof to invalidate the testimony of the headings is to be derived either from the headings themselves, or from the contents of the psalms, including the names for God found in them. In accordance, therefore, with the law of evidence, the presumption is, and must remain until evidence invalidating them is found, that the headings are trustworthy, that David wrote many of the psalms and may have written, so far as we know, seventy-three of them, and that Christ and the Apostles and the Church in all ages have been right in treating all of them, headings included, as a part of the infallible Word of God.

*Princeton.*

R. D. WILSON.