
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

get that about the Cave of Adullam?' And the other member looked at him suspiciously: 'I suppose you think I never read the Arabian Nights.' We were tempted for a moment to give this book under 'New Poetry.'

Mr. Paget Wilkes is a missionary in Japan. He is an evangelical of the evangelicals—a red-hot evangelical, in his own phraseology. He can preach, he can convert, and he can tell how he preaches and why he is made the instrument of conversion. His new book is *The Dynamic of Service* (Hoddesdon, Herts: Japan Evangelistic Band). We are saved to serve—that is the motto. The texts are well chosen, and then every opportunity for service is an exposition of a text.

Messrs. Longmans have issued a second edition of Mr. Archibald Chisholm's *Labour's Magna Charta* (8s. 6d. net). What is it? It is 'a critical study of the Labour Clauses of the Peace Treaty and of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations of the Washington International Labour Conference.' The second edition contains a few additions and corrections, and a new preface which brings the work of the International Labour organizations up to date.

The Seventeenth Chapter of Genesis.

By Edouard Naville, D.C.L., LL.D., Hon. Professor in the University of Geneva.

The seventeenth chapter of Genesis begins with these words: 'And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am God Almighty.'

A note in the margin of the Revised Version, referring to these two last words, says 'Heb. El Shaddai.' Does El Shaddai, אֵל שַׁדַּי, mean God Almighty?

If we look at all the instances where this name of God occurs, we shall see that it is found only seven times in the Old Testament: five in Genesis, one in Exodus, and one in Ezekiel. שַׁדַּי alone occurs once in Genesis, and twice in Numbers.

Not one single time in these passages do the LXX translate אֵלשַׁדַּי, the two words joined together, by 'God Almighty' (*θεός παντοκράτωρ*, *omnipotens*) (Vulg.). It is clear that the LXX had not before their eyes the Hebrew word שַׁדַּי, of which they give the meaning everywhere else, even in one passage of the Pentateuch. This shows that they did not translate from a text in Hebrew. In my opinion, which I have set forth elsewhere, they must have used an Aramaic version which had succeeded to the old original in cuneiform. The words of Genesis are used once by Ezekiel (10^6), but the Greek translators of the prophet's book did not understand them, since they are merely transcribed *θεὸς σαδδαϊ*.

The Hebrew word שַׁדַּי is not rare in the Old Testament: it is found in Ruth, in Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel, some of the Psalms, and it seems to have been a favourite word with Job, where it is met with more than thirty times. The LXX have various ways of rendering it, even in the same book. In a few cases it is merely *θεός* (Is 13^6). Sometimes they use a word which has not this sense in classical Greek, nor even in the New Testament: *ἱκανός* (Ruth $1^{20.21}$, Job 21^{15} 31^2 40^2, Ezk 1^{24}). In the first four passages the Vulgate has *omnipotens*, in the last *deus* and *sublimis deus*. Ps 68^{16} it is *ἐπουράνιος*, *coelestis*. Ps 91^1 *ὑψίστος*, *altissimus*. In the Book of Job, where the word is most frequent, it is generally either *κύριος*, *dominus* or *omnipotens* ($6^{4.14}$ 13^3 21^{20} $22^{23.26}$ 31^{35} etc.), or more often *παντοκράτωρ*, *omnipotens*, or sometimes *dominus* (5^{17} 8^5 11^7 $22^{17.25}$ (the same chapter where we find twice *κύριος*) 27^{13} 32^3 etc.).

It is to be remarked that in Job שַׁדַּי is a distinct name of God, which sometimes follows אֵל, or another name of God, without being linked to it. 5^{17}, 'Happy is the man whom God (אֱלוֹהַּ, *κύριος*) correcteth; therefore despise not the chastening of the Almighty' (שַׁדַּי, *παντοκράτορος*). 8^5, 'If thou wouldest seek diligently unto God (אֵל), and make supplication to the Almighty' (שַׁדַּי). Here the LXX join the two words 'seek' and 'make supplication,' *ὄρθριζε . . . δεόμενος*, and also the two names of God which are separated in Hebrew, *κύριον παντο-*

κράτορα. 27^{11-13}, 'This is the portion of a wicked man with God (אֵל, κυρίου) . . . which they receive from the Almighty' (שַׁדַּי, παντοκράτορος). The same is found in other passages. Once only (8^{3}) we have ὁ τὰ πάντα ποιήσας, *omnipotens*.

This review of the use of the word שַׁדַּי has shown us that, apart from the Pentateuch, we never find the two words אֵל שַׁדַּי joined together, except once in Ezekiel, where the expression is not understood, and is merely transcribed.

Let us now take the six examples of אֵל שַׁדַּי in Genesis and Exodus.

Gn 17^{1}. Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός σου ('I am thy God, or the God of thine').

Gn 28^{3}. Isaac speaks and blesses Jacob: ὁ δὲ θεός μου ('And *my* God bless thee').

Gn 35^{11}. When God appears to Jacob on his return from Paddan Aram: ἐγω ὁ θεός σου ('I am thy God').

Gn 43^{14}. Jacob says to his sons: 'My God (ὁ δὲ θεός μου) give you mercy.'

Gn 48^{3}. Jacob speaks to Joseph: 'My God (ὁ θεός μου) appeared to me at Luz.'

Lastly, the much discussed passage in Ex 6^{3}: 'I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as their God' (θεὸς ὢν αὐτῶν).

Thus in all these examples, without any exception, we see that in the expression אֵל שַׁדַּי the second word is not the Hebrew שַׁדַּי, and has a totally different meaning. I believe we have here a popular etymology. In the version from which the LXX translate, whether it be the Aramaic or the cuneiform original, there was a word indicating possession, something analogous to the *betà* or *metà* which is found in common Arabic, and since it had a sound similar to Shaddai, it was taken as being the Hebrew word. Such translations, derived from similarity of sound, which are frequent in old languages and even in our time, also occur in the Bible. One of the most striking is the name of Moses, the Egyptian form of which, *Mosu*, pronounced perhaps *Moshu*, means 'the child,' and not 'drawn from the water,' from assonance with Hebrew.

The old word Shaddai is found alone in the benediction of Joseph, where the LXX differ from the Hebrew (49^{25}). 'From hence he who strengthened Israel by the God (אֵל) of thy father, and my God (שַׁדַּי, θεὸς ὁ ἐμός), helped thee and blessed thee.' In this case, if we had not the Greek translation, we should be tempted to recognize the Hebrew word which is found twice in Balaam's speeches (Nu $24^{4.16}$), where it is translated θεοῦ, as in Is 13^{6}.

Thus the LXX have shown us that in Genesis and Exodus שַׁדַּי is not the original word and means the God specially attached to a person, his own God. Let us see now how that interpretation agrees with the passages in which it is found. It appears for the first time in this passage (17^{1}). Yahveh appeared to Abram, and said unto him: 'I am thy God, walk before me . . . ,' and the whole chapter relates a covenant between God and Abraham. The second chapter of Genesis teaches us that God has a double name, Yahveh Elohim.[1] Yahveh is the ruler, the God who manifests Himself by His acts, who commanded Abram to leave his country. When the patriarch was established in Canaan, Yahveh said to him: 'I am Yahveh who brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it.' And Yahveh makes a covenant with Abram. He promises Abram solemnly that his posterity will settle in Canaan, and inherit the country. But there is no outward or permanent sign that this promise will be fulfilled. There is only this solemn guarantee, these words by which Yahveh introduces an order or a promise: 'I am Yahveh.'

There is another covenant of a different kind. Yahveh is not only the powerful Lord who directs the events and who makes promises for the future. He says to Abram: that he is *his* God. and that he will bless him abundantly: 'I am *thy* God (and not Almighty), walk before me. . . . I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee throughout their generations *to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee*'; in the Hebrew: 'to be to thee as Elohim, and to thy seed after thee,' εἶναί σου θεὸς καί . . .; and further: 'And I will be their Elohim,' ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεόν. Let us remember that it is Yahveh who speaks. Henceforth Abram can say that Yahveh is *his* God and the God of his posterity after him. And this kind of adoption is authenticated by the

[1] I repeat here what I have said before: I am obliged to follow the custom and to speak of Yahveh, although Mr. Cowley has shown that this name is not correct; it should be Jaho or Jahu.

custom of circumcision which is to be applied to every male. This covenant will be in their flesh. The uncircumcised will be cut off from his people, he has broken the covenant, for thus he shows that Yahveh is not his God.

The first to whom the covenant will apply after Abraham is his son Isaac: 'Thou shalt call his name Isaac, and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant.' Here several manuscripts of the LXX add εἶναι αὐτῷ θεός,[1] 'to be his God,' showing again that the purport of the covenant is to establish that Yahveh is the God, the Elohim of Abram and all his family.

In the first covenant, Yahveh promised to Abram that his descendants would inherit and possess Canaan. In the second, which is confirmed by the custom of circumcision transmitted from generation to generation, Yahveh declares that He is *their* God, *their* Elohim. In this way He elects Abraham and his posterity. From that day we hear Eliezer praying, 'O Lord, the God of my master Abraham,' Jacob speaking of 'my God,' and Yahveh calling Himself, when speaking to the Israelites: 'Yahveh, the God of your fathers, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob' (Ex 3^{16}).

It is natural that in this chapter, except in the first verse where Yahveh says to Abram that He will be his El, in the continuation God should always be called Elohim. The covenant consists in this: Yahveh says, 'I will be an Elohim unto thee.' Therefore, whenever God appears here, it will be under the name of Elohim; it is the logical consequence of the drift of the chapter. The author who relates that Yahveh said, 'I shall be thy Elohim,' is obliged to go on calling God Elohim. It is therefore not only unnecessary, but it implies a complete misunderstanding of the chapter to suppose here two different authors, a Yahvist and an Elohist, or rather one, the Elohist, the word Yahveh at the beginning being an interpolation of the redactor. Take away the word Yahveh at the beginning, the chapter has no sense. It is no longer Yahveh declaring to Abram that He will be his God. The covenant is destroyed and the election of Abram and his posterity vanishes.

Here is an example where the use of the word Elohim is commanded in a text which began with Yahveh. We have here, in the contents of the chapter, an explanation of the presence of this word. Similar explanations can be found in other chapters, where the use of one of the names of God is fully justified. And this leads us to challenge the axiom of the critics, that the two names of God, especially in Genesis, imply two different authors.

This idea was first put forward by Astruc, then by Eichhorn who divided Genesis and the first two chapters of Exodus between several authors, the most important of whom are the Elohist and the Yahvist. They were struck by the fact that some of the chapters use merely Elohim, and others Yahveh (Jehovah). They immediately concluded that it must be due to two different authors; they never inquired whether there could not be another explanation, they considered at once that the existence of various authors was an established fact.

The critics followed them blindly and even went much further. But we maintain that Astruc's idea is not a proved fact; it is only his personal opinion, his way of explaining the irregular employment of the two names of God. There is absolutely no outward proof of the existence of these two authors; they are creations of Astruc, based merely on his way of interpreting the text. There are other explanations, of which this chapter is an example.

Astruc's idea has become a principle. For the critics, what they call disorder, contradictions, useless repetitions, chronological difficulties in the text can only have one cause, the plurality of authors of various dates. And this, which should be the conclusion derived from the study of the text, is on the contrary the preconceived idea, the *a priori* point of view, in conformity to which the text has to be adapted. The logical order has been entirely reversed; it is not the theory which is based on the text. It is the text which has to be dismembered, reconstructed, and trimmed so that it may harmonize with the theory.

I cannot here go fully into that very grave question. I should only like to show that the chapter which I have studied is a striking proof of my statement. We read in the text that Yahveh says to Abraham that He will be his God, and the God of his posterity. It is not only a verbal promise, it is a covenant which is sanctioned by circumcision. The unprejudiced reader will find that this narrative is quite simple, logical, coherent, without any discrepancy whatever, and

[1] See Tischendorf *ad hoc.* The Coptic Version (Memphitic) has also this addition.

that there is absolutely no reason not to accept it as it is.

But this would not agree with the theory. The whole chapter is attributed to an author who was first called Elohist, and now the Priestly Code, proceeding from a school of priests at Jerusalem after the return from the Exile in the fifth century. This document makes a point never to use the name of Yahveh before Ex 6, when this name was revealed to Moses for the first time. Therefore the word Yahveh cannot have been in the original text of the chapter we consider. It is due to a redactor who introduced it there.[1] The critic does not say what word should have been there instead of Yahveh. Even if it were Elohim, it destroys entirely the sense, and I may say the value of the chapter. Here we learn one of the fundamental truths on which rests the whole history of Israel. Yahveh says to Abram: I am thy God, and the God of thy posterity after thee. Yahveh, therefore, will be the national God of Israel, as it was said to their ancestor Abram.

According to the critics, Yahveh never said this to Abram; it does not agree with the character given to the Priestly Code, one of the authors who have been carved out of the text. The consequence is that one of the cardinal declarations of Yahveh, which this chapter is intended to record and to convey to future generations, entirely disappears. When later on Moses will say to the Israelites that Yahveh was the God of Abraham, it is a mere mis-statement.

The unprejudiced reader will decide whether, with eminent French historians, he will accept the text literally as it is, or adopt the conclusions of destructive criticism.

[1] *Bible du Centenaire.* Paris, 1916.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Natural Longing.

'They desire a better country, that is, an heavenly.'—Heb 11[16].

There was a little home at the edge of a heath which bordered on a corn-field. Although it was not what could be called beautiful, there was the sweetness of nature about it. The winds of heaven played round it from morning till night, and, peeping through the long waving grass that surrounded it like sheltering trees, the mother often looked out on the farmhouse children playing about and gathering wild flowers. But she did not tell her little ones to look, for she was really rather afraid of boys and girls. She gathered her little ones closely together, and whispered tenderly, 'Listen, listen! father sings!'

It was a very small house indeed—there was only one room in it; but it was big enough for love to dwell in. The husband and wife were very like each other in appearance; they were dressed in the same colours, reddish-brown coats edged with white, and buff vests streaked with brown, and the wee mother had delightful soft bits of creamy-white about her; but really one scarcely noticed their dress, it was so much a part of themselves. Then they had somehow grown to think the same way about things, and that meant thinking very beautifully.

They had neighbours who also lived in one-roomed houses, but no gossiping went on. Our couple kept by themselves; one idea filled their lives, and that idea they shared with no one. How could they tell chattering neighbours that, while they loved their little home, they were constantly longing to go to a better one? The rough grass of which their house was built meant little to them; it just served its purpose. They kept thinking of a home that was all love and joy, and which they had never seen. They were a strange father and mother, for they were just a pair of dreamers.

When the father left home in the morning it was to fly straight up to heaven. This had been a habit of the family from generation to generation, and so people had come to speak of them as the 'sky-larks.' The father soared over the little home for a few minutes, as we count time. 'Sweet! sweet! sweet!' he called, so that mother lark heard him, and then he sang a most exquisite song that meant a great deal to her and her babies. Then as he