

## ARTICLE IX.

## ELOHIM OUTSIDE THE PENTATEUCH AND BAUMGÄRTEL'S INVESTIGATION.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., OF LINCOLN'S INN,  
BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

THE recent discussion of the bearing of textual criticism on Astruc's clue and all that depends on it has brought into the field a new writer. As a student of theology at the University of Leipzig under Professor Kittel, Friedrich Baumgärtel competed for, and won, a prize given for an investigation as to the difference of the divine appellations in many books of the Old Testament in the academic year 1911-1912. He has since devoted further study to the subject, and now publishes the first fruits of his labors in the form of a preliminary investigation which is intended to clear the ground and lay the foundations for a later attempt to solve the main problem.<sup>1</sup> This must constantly be borne in mind in a perusal of the book, for it explains many of its limitations. It also suggests the main lines that criticism of the work should take.

Baumgärtel is careful and temperate in tone. He goes a long way towards recognizing the importance of the issue that has been raised. "Opinions may differ as to how far all these attacks perhaps represent one-sided exaggeration or not: it is quite certain that the doubts expressed on textual

<sup>1</sup> *Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament* herausgegeben von Rudolf Kittel. Heft 19 ELOHIM ausserhalb des Pentateuch Grundlegung zu einer untersuchung über die Gottesnamen im Pentateuch von Friedrich Baumgärtel, l.c. Theol. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1914.

grounds as to the originality of the divine names of the Massoretic text touch a point which does in fact expose a manifest defect in previous investigations of the Pentateuch." Then, after admitting that, "extraordinary as it may seem," it is yet the fact that the division into sources on the ground of the divine appellations has been conducted in complete reliance on the trustworthiness of the Massoretic text without previous inquiry as to the soundness of the textual tradition in this matter, he continues: "It is quite comprehensible and very justifiable that the opponents of the current Pentateuchal criticism lay full stress on this point. The question demands an answer: Are the names of God of the Massoretic text in the Pentateuch original, or have alterations taken place in them? Mere reference to the fact that the analysis operates with the assistance of other criteria—justified as it is—does not settle the question of the divine names. I should not like to maintain that the Pentateuchal theory stands or falls with the question of the textual certainty of the names of God. But I too go as far as this: if it can be seriously proved that reliance cannot be placed on the Divine Names of the Massoretic text considerable difficulties will arise in many passages: for the divine Name is very frequently used as at least significant for the analysis, often too as decisive by itself" (pp. 13 f.). This is plain speaking. The author has not indeed recognized all that is involved in the controversy, but he has fairly faced the issue that he sees; and for this he certainly deserves credit. Further study should lead him to see that, on the one hand, the whole question of the textual transmission of the Old Testament has been raised; on the other, the methods and results of the entire critical school have been challenged. A little more experience will surely teach him this; but, in the meanwhile, it

is fair to observe that the recent books of König and Simpson appeared only after his MS. was complete, and the present writer's reply to König of course much later. Professor N. Schmidt's article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*<sup>1</sup> was also unknown to him. It is, however, a pleasing feature of his work that he has a considerable acquaintance with the literature of his subject. Had he only taken the precaution of reading in their entirety the books included in his own bibliography, instead of merely the sections that appeared to him to bear on his special theme, he would have had his eyes opened.

The fact of the matter is that Baumgärtel lives, and has been trained, in a country which cannot boast a single theological professor of sufficient mental clearness to be able to distinguish between a cairn and a house. Consequently his teachers have led him into grievous error. On pages 40 and 44 he commits himself to the terrible blunder that I have exposed so often. It is argued that Elohim in the Book of the Covenant means God: therefore, the slave of Exodus xxi. 6 is to be taken to the door of the public sanctuary, and indeed in those days "causes at law were decided before the Deity by the priests." How are Baumgärtel and his fellows to be made to understand that an altar of earth or stones at which a layman offered sacrifices without priestly assistance will not become a house of God served by priests on being called a sanctuary? Or that justice was not in fact administered by the priests? I observe that he cannot believe (p. 3, n. 1) that there has been any attempt to kill conservative work by silence. I invite him to read from cover to cover those books of mine which he has cited in his bibliography, and to compare them with the reviews of them by members of the

<sup>1</sup> Vol. xxxiii. (1914) pp. 25-47.

critical school which he has also cited. If he can then find any reasonable explanation of their conduct that can be held compatible with the ordinary canons of scholarly honor, he will be free to publish it. If not, perhaps he will give his teacher Kittel instruction as to the true contents of these volumes and the conduct of the German professorate.<sup>1</sup> He will thus be able without difficulty to more than repay any intellectual debt that he may owe him.

The first fourteen pages of the book are taken up with an introductory sketch in which due prominence is given to the work of Dahse. It is a gratifying feature that, in addition to noticing Troelstra, Tisdall, and others, the author does justice to Möller (p. 6), whose work is so often ignored in his own country. Baumgärtel has read "*Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung*" to good purpose. The introduction ends with a sketch of the author's purpose. Following Kittel, he wishes the textual investigations as to the Divine appellations to be extended to a wider field. "In the attempt to answer the question I have become even more certain that the treatment of the names of God within the Pentateuch does not lead to a solution; it is necessary to examine all the books of the O. T. as to the names of God: it is necessary to get a conspectus of the manner and way in which the individual books treat the names of God alike within the Massoretic text and the individual versions. More, we must try and attain to a history of the name of God. Only then will it be possible to pronounce a really well-founded decision on the Pentateuch. Not that observations made in other books as to the names of God can be regarded as valid for the Pentateuch without

<sup>1</sup>As a matter of fact, I exposed this blunder clearly as far back as 1904 in my "*Studies in Biblical Law*" (London: David Nutt). Will Baumgärtel claim that the critics have ever sought to deal with that volume fairly point by point?

further investigation: my plan is rather to understand and appreciate the state of affairs as to the names of God in the Pentateuch in relation to the Massoretic text as well as in regard to the versions from the connection with a greater development" (p. 14). This is a fine conception, if it be properly executed. It really involves study of the textual history of every individual book of the Old Testament, but whether Baumgärtel will carry it so far remains to be seen. In the meanwhile, the present volume is but a first installment, dealing with some preliminary questions relating to the material outside the Pentateuch. Until the scheme develops, it is a little difficult to judge some of its features. Thus it would have been in place to give the full textual material relating to all the passages discussed, but possibly this will be done in some further installment of the work.

The second part of the introduction (pp. 15-22) strikes the keynote of the investigation. It is necessary, thinks Baumgärtel, to distinguish between the uses of (ha)-*elohim* as a proper name and as a mere appellation. He points to instances of confusion in the critical commentaries as to the two ideas. Obviously there is something in the contention, but it is going too far to say that in this state of affairs textual investigations lack any secure foundation, and that first we must attain completely clear notions as to which occurrences of *Elohim* are to be taken as proper names and which as appellations (p. 17). Let me illustrate this. Suppose that a Hebrew author wrote "Mercy of Baal," and that this was later altered by the scribes. One alteration might give "Mercy of God." In this case the phrase might be taken as being equivalent to "divine mercy," i. e. the word "God" would be used in an appellative sense, or again it might be interpreted as "mercy of the Being we call God," i. e. it would be

a proper name. Or suppose that the original text had "mercy of the LORD," and that a desire to remove the Tetragrammaton had led to the substitution of Elohim. There again the doubt would arise: Of course in both instances it would probably be impossible to recover the original text; but evidence of MSS. and versions and other extrinsic considerations, such as meter, might throw grave doubt on the originality of the Massoretic text. It is therefore obvious that the distinction between appellations and proper names does not always displace the necessity for textual criticism. It is one element to be borne in mind in the criticism of the text, and only one. The importance assigned to it by Baumgärtel is excessive. Elsewhere he recognizes this. On page 81 he writes that "in many places the appellative Elohim might also be the result of an alteration," and he instances cases where the Tetragrammaton is also used, as in combination with "the House" or "the Ark." If that be so, perhaps a preference by later scribes or editors for Elohim, *just because it had the appellative sense and was vaguer than the Tetragrammaton*, may sometimes be responsible for its occurrence in our Massoretic text. It is curious that he lays stress on the fact that where the Chronicler uses Elohim it is very frequently in the appellative sense. Now if the Chronicler preferred to speak, e.g., of "the divine Ark" rather than of "the Ark of the Lord," may there not have been a general tendency operating on the minds of scribes and editors? And is the need for textual criticism not increased rather than diminished by such considerations?

His second point is that there are a number of phrases in which Elohim occurs in an appellative or quasi-appellative sense. Here again similar criticisms apply. In some cases, as in the phrase "man of God," Elohim is clearly the equivalent

of an adjective or adjectival phrase in some other languages, and Baumgärtel is right. But when he quotes such a phrase as "angel of God" I cannot follow him. The expression "angel of the Lord" is also found in the Massoretic text of the Old Testament, and for this reason it is absolutely impossible to say when we find "angel of God" that the word is necessarily either appellative or original. Of course there are instances (e.g. God in opposition to man) where Elohim must be original, but much of Baumgärtel's contention here merely begs the question. Some of his other passages have already been examined in the light of other facts in the January BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, and I need now merely refer to that for views which do not tally with our author's.

The investigation covers the Old Testament with the exception of the Pentateuch, Books II. and III. of the Psalms, Ps. cviii., Job iii. 1-xlii. 6, Ecclesiastes, and Daniel. The first main division (pp. 23-46) is concerned with occurrences of Elohim that are to be regarded as appellatives on internal grounds, the second (pp. 47-57) with instances of Elohim that can be held to be appellative on external grounds, such as "man of God" (*never* "man of the LORD," whatever the context), the third (pp. 52-62) with Elohim in particular turns of phrase, the fourth (pp. 63-67) with the other occurrences of Elohim, and the fifth (pp. 67-74) with Elohim in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Finally (pp. 75-82) a section deals with his conclusions, and is followed (pp. 83, 84) by a list of passages outside the Pentateuch in which the word occurs.

It is not my purpose to go over the whole ground after him. It will be more useful to show by specific instances how historical textual criticism modifies his methods and conclusions.

It is well known that there are certain passages where the text has been altered by the scribes from motives of reverence. Among these is Job ii. 9. It was shown above (Oct. 1914, p. 639) that the LXX actually reads "Lord" here, but Baumgärtel ignores this, and proceeds on the footing that *Elohim* is always used after a word of cursing. So it is, but that is because later Jewish scribes would not write the Tetragrammaton after such a word for reasons of reverence (see Lev. xxiv. 10 ff. and the commentaries *ad loc.*). Even *Elohim* was not generally allowed to stand (as in the M. T. of 1 Sam. iii. 13, where the LXX has "God," but Lucifer "Lord"); *a fortiori* the personal name of the Deity was removed.

Textual criticism suggests something similar in the case of some passages of Samuel where we hear of an evil spirit of the Lord. Baumgärtel (p. 34) claims that the Lord has nothing to do with this. Historical textual criticism has another tale to tell.

"It is difficult," writes Professor H. P. Smith, "to discover the exact idea of the Spirit of God in the mind of this author. There seems to be no trace of a belief in the existence of evil spirits, in our sense of the word, throughout the earlier period of Hebrew literature. And if the belief existed, the spirits could hardly be called *evil spirits of God*. In an instructive passage of the later history, 1 K xxii. 19-23, we find *the Spirit* offering to be a spirit of deceit in the mouth of the prophets. From this we conclude that the Spirit thought of as the agency of evil was the same Spirit which stirred up men to good, and it is not improbable that the adjective *evil* is a later insertion in the account before us. The author's conception is certainly very different from that of verse 13 in which the Spirit seems to be viewed as the con-



stant endowment of a consecrated person.”<sup>1</sup> The first criticism to be made on this is that the conception of verse 14 is *not* necessarily different from that of verse 13, because we read that “the spirit of the Lord departed from Saul.” But the first part of the note seems to me to be sound. Early Hebrew thought attributed evil inspiration and evil occurrences to the God of Israel. Later this doctrine did not always find favor. One is inevitably reminded of 2 Samuel xxiv. 1 as contrasted with 1 Chronicles xxi. 1. According to the earlier writer, the Lord stirs up David to take a census: the later theology could not admit this, and substituted Satan.<sup>2</sup> Consequently I do not think that Smith is right in regarding the adjective “evil” as a later insertion in 1 Samuel xvi. On the contrary, I think that just as the Lord could be conceived as stirring up David, so He could send an evil spirit; and that just as the Chronicler took exception to the one expression, so later scribes and editors objected to the other, and sought to remove it by various alterations of the text. One such alteration would be the substitution of the quasi-adjectival *Elohim* for the Tetragrammaton. There is a sensible difference between attributing an evil spirit to God by his personal Name, and using a substantive which might be felt to mean little more than “sent from above.” Again, the word “evil” might be omitted by a scribe who could not conceive that the spirit of the Lord could be evil. Another alteration may have been to omit all reference to God; but in some instances, at any rate, this may have been the original text, the Divine appellation having been introduced into the

<sup>1</sup> H. P. Smith on 1 Sam. xvi. 14–23, p. 147.

<sup>2</sup> It is of course possible that the original text used the word *Baal*, to the exclusion of both our present readings. See next note as to 2 Sam. xxi.; and cp. xxiv. 1, which apparently looks back to the calamity there narrated.

shorter phrase by glossators from its occurrence in the first passage. Let the following evidence be considered in the light of these observations:—

- 1 Samuel xvi. 14 an evil spirit from the Lord M.T. Vulg. LXX.  
 15 an evil spirit of Elohim M.T. Vulg. an evil spirit HP 82, 245 Slav Ostrog: an evil spirit of [some authorities "from"] the Lord: LXX except as cited, K 70, 96, 128.  
 16 an evil spirit of Elohim M.T. HP 247: from Elohim HP 82, 108: an evil spirit of the Lord Vulg: from the Lord HP 93: an evil spirit Syriac LXX except as cited.  
 23 Spirit of Elohim M.T. LXX except as cited: an evil spirit of the Lord Vulg: an evil spirit from Elohim HP 19, 82, 93, 108; 52, 144: an evil spirit of Elohim 8 Heb. MSS.  
 xviii. 10 an evil spirit of Elohim M.T. Vulg. The whole verse and others are missing from the original LXX and were inserted under an asterisk by Origen. K 96 has the Tetragrammaton before Elohim.  
 xix. 9 an evil spirit of the Lord M.T. Vulg A HP 74, 120, 134, 247: an evil spirit K 128 HP XI [=N] 44, 55, 56, 64, 82, 93, 106, 108, 119, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246: an evil spirit of Elohim LXX except as cited, some authorities inserting one or other of the Greek words for "from."

To my mind the textual evidence tells a tale of the theological views of later scribes like so many other Old Testament passages.

In considering the evidence as to the Divine appellations in Genesis, we saw reason to believe that the removal of Baal from the Biblical texts was responsible for some of our present readings.<sup>1</sup> It seems to me that there are some passages

<sup>1</sup> I may add that this seems to me to be the explanation of a passage where I have always felt a difficulty. In Ex. xv. 3 we find the strikingly inappropriate "man(Ish) of war" applied to God. But Hosea ii. 18 says that "my Ish" is to be used, not "my Baal," etc. I suspect, therefore, that baal was original in the passage of Exodus, and was altered under a mistaken view of

in those noted by Baumgärtel where it may very plausibly be conjectured that this has happened.

In Judges ix. 7 Jotham is speaking to the baalim of Shechem who worshiped Baal-berith. The sense and verbal plays and assonances of the verse make it probable that the original verse was "*Listen to me baalim (masters) of Shechem, and there shall listen to you the Baal (Master).*" As a matter of fact. HP 53, 58 read "Lord the God," suggesting conflation of two substitutes for Baal, of which "the Elohim" ultimately prevailed, perhaps because it was more in accord with the theological tastes of later scribes. This view should probably govern other occurrences in the same chapter in verses 56, 57. In the former of these, HP 75 has "Lord."

In Judges ix. 23 we find that according to the M. T. Elohim sent an evil spirit, but according to K 224, 225 and the Vulgate it was the Lord. Probably here too Baal may have been original, or the cause we have seen operating on the evil spirit in Samuel may have been effective.

Similarly, in Joshua xxiv. 1, where the scene is again laid at Shechem, we find that, though M. T. has ha-Elohim, the Vulgate Arm 1 and Arm-ed have "the Lord," and HP 64 Georg, Slav the conflate "Lord God." It is submitted that here again Baal would be in place. In verse 26 the Vulgate has *legis Domini*, not *Dei*.

Again, in 2 Samuel xv. 32, M. T. has "to Elohim," but K 70, 154 Vulg HP XI 19, 93, 98, 108, 243, 244, 247 have Lord. K 85 has both readings, and HP 56 has a conflate "to the

Hosea's meaning. So, too, substitutions for Baal may explain a number of narratives that are very puzzling in their present form, e.g. Ex. iv. 24. 2 Sam. xxi. (the Gibeonites). Beth-aven (House of nothingness or idol) can only be explained as a substitute for some phrase it was desired to remove, e.g. Beth baal. In Judges ix. 46 beth el berith of M.T. stands for beth baal berith, which is still preserved in some Septuagintal authorities.

Lord God." Very likely the title Baal was locally used on the hill referred to in this passage and stood in the original text.

Very striking results as to the removal of Baal are suggested by Baumgärtel's work, combined with an examination of some other passages. It seems that the Chronicler uses the Tetragrammaton 440 times and (ha)Elohim only 132 times, of which 35 are in the phrase "house of God," for which he has a marked preference. He has (ha)Elohim 32 times where Samuel or Kings has the Tetragrammaton, but 11 of these 32 present the phrase "house of God." In one other case (2 Chron. xxxv. 27) we have the phrase "before God . . . saith the Lord," and it may reasonably be held that the original text had "before me," and that both Kings and Chronicles present glosses. Now let us look at two very tell-tale passages. According to the Massoretic text, Ahab—who of all people was a Baal worshiper—consulted no fewer than four hundred prophets, who assured him that the Lord (1 Kings xxii. 6) or God (2 Chron. xviii. 5) would deliver Ramoth-gilead into the hand of the King. Thereupon, according to the same text, Jehoshaphat asked, "Is there not here besides a prophet of the LORD, that we might inquire of him?" Obviously the 400 prophets whose views he had heard were not, in his opinion, prophets of the Lord. Clearly, therefore, the original text of the common basis had Baal, and the difference between Kings and Chronicles is due to different substitutions.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, in 2 Samuel v. 20, 1 Chronicles xiv. 11, the name Baal-perazim shows that the original text had Baal,

<sup>1</sup> It probably follows that we should read Baal in 1 Kings xxii. 11, 12—2 Chron. xviii. 10, 11. Here the prophetic connection secured uniform substitution of the Tetragrammaton in accordance with a principle to be noted later.

and that again we are face to face with different substitutions. I note further that, except in the instances already mentioned (i.e. 2 Chron. xxxv. 27 and "house of God"), all the discrepancies are in the history of David and Solomon. I therefore suggest that Baal was commonly used of the God of Israel in the common basis of the history to the end of Solomon's reign (compare especially 2 Chron. xxxiii. 7 in connection with David and Solomon). This further explains many other anomalies in the texts of the Historical Books.

Another question which may perhaps be raised is whether the removal of Baal has affected any set phrases. We shall see hereafter that there are two such phrases (those relating to Sodom and Gomorrah, and Eden) where this may plausibly be conjectured. When I find such a standing expression in the historical books as "do so to me and more" sometimes with Elohim and sometimes with the Tetragrammaton, I confess that I should like to see a full textual investigation which did not leave out of sight the possibility to which I have adverted.<sup>1</sup>

In the January *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* we saw reason to suppose that the various texts of the Pentateuch had been affected in varying degrees by the tendency to transcendentalize the idea of God which operated on the minds of late scribes and editors, and in particular we found that sometimes one or more texts would introduce an "angel" (messenger) where another or others spoke only of God.<sup>2</sup> Something similar has happened in some of the later books. Thus in Judges,

<sup>1</sup> A full investigation of the phrase Lord Sebaoth, with its variations, in the light of textual and other evidence, would be interesting. See Dahse, *Textkritische Materialien I.*, p. 12. Has the removal of Baal from the Massoretic text any bearing on this? Was there once a phrase "Baal of Sebaoth" or "LORD Baal of Sebaoth"?

<sup>2</sup> For details. see *ante*, pp. 98 ff., 103 f., 144 ff.

Moore (on ii. 1, vi. 11) holds very emphatically that the messenger of the Lord is the Lord himself. He points out that in vi. 14 the ordinary Septuagintal reading is "the angel of the Lord" for the Massoretic "the Lord." As a matter of fact HP 53, 75 have "the angel" only, and K 145 reads "an angel." In verse 16 there are similar differences of reading. I refrain from any investigation of this matter here, because it will be possible to conduct the inquiries with much greater ease and fullness when the books concerned have appeared in the Cambridge LXX, and I think that then Baumgärtel should thoroughly investigate the whole subject (including "angel of the Lord" and "the Lord") in the historical books in the light of all the evidence. But meanwhile something may be said on two small manifestations of the general line of thought. In Zechariah xii. 8 we read "the house of David shall be like Elohim, like an angel of the Lord." Mitchell (*ad loc.*) notes that the Targum modifies "like Elohim" into "like princes"—an interesting illustration of the later tendency. He is inclined to omit "like an angel of the Lord," taking it for a gloss by some one "who, like the Greek translators of Ps. viii., was offended that men should be compared to the Deity." In view of the strength and constancy of the tendency this is probably correct. Further, I observe that the Complutensian LXX and K 271A, 283A, 288, 601 read "and an angel" for "like an angel." Of these, 271A refers to a marginal variant in the printed Bomberg Bible of 1518, 283A to a variant in the appendix to a Münster Bible of 1536, 288 to a variant in a printed Bible edited by Michaelis in 1720, and 601 to a MS. which Kennicott thinks should be attributed to the fourteenth century. These facts confirm the opinion that this view of the text is right, "angel of the Lord" having first been added as a transcendentalizing gloss

on Elohim, then taken into the text, and then altered, first by the addition of "and" and then by the modification "like," to fit the context. This view is strengthened by an observation of Baumgärtel's. He points out (pp. 52 ff.) that "angel of Elohim" occurs seven times, and that in five of these it is in a comparison (in the other two passages there are important variants). On the other hand, "angel of the Lord" occurs in forty passages outside the Pentateuch (19 in the Book of Judges) not in a comparison, and it is only in this one passage that it occurs in a comparison. This adds to the probability that the phrase as it stands in the Massoretic text is not original. The second observation I have to make is that I believe the reason why Elohim is found in comparisons in our Massoretic text is due again to the same motive. A phrase that could mean little more than "like a divine messenger" would obviously shock the feeling of reverence rather less than one that included the personal name of God. It may be added that in several of the passages where "angel of Elohim" occurs there are textual variants which require consideration.

We may next treat of a set of passages which Baumgärtel groups together, as it seems to me unreasonably, where he claims that Elohim is used particularly in connection with a seat of worship. This (pp. 40-42) is the feeblest part of his book. We have already seen that his starting point—Elohim in the Book of the Covenant—is derived from the colossal blunder of the Wellhausen school in confusing a mound and a house, and here I can only commend to him once more a careful study of the sixth chapter of "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism." To this must be added the fact that the Tetragrammaton is of course frequently used in connection with the seat of worship, so that it would be impossi-

ble to claim any special propriety for, or exclusive usage of, Elohim. The passages which he claims here are Joshua xxiv. 1, Judges xxi. 2, 1 Sam x. 3, xiv. 36, 2 Sam xii. 16. We have already seen that the reading in Joshua is not unimpeachable. In Judges xxi. 2 the Vulgate has *ejus*, i.e. it reads "before him," and this is probably right on palaeographical grounds. "Lord" is read by Georg Arm 1. Probably, therefore, "before him" was misread as "before"—לפניו as לפני — and different words were supplied by different glossators. First Samuel x. 3 does not seem to be questioned by the readings of LXX and Vulgate, and would require fresh consideration when all the other occurrences in the historical books had been thoroughly examined in the light of all the textual material. In 1 Samuel xiv. 36 Georg and Slav Ostrog again have "the Lord" for "ha-elohim." In 2 Samuel xii. 15 M. T. Vulg and LXX have "Lord," but HP 19, 93, 158 have "God," and in verse 16 "Lord" is the reading of the Vulgate Targum and HP 29, 98, 108, 243. Whatever the explanation of these readings — and I think that full investigation of the phenomena of the historical books may well be delayed till we have the materials of the larger Cambridge LXX — they are not favorable to Baumgärtel's hypothesis. As at present advised I think it not impossible that the removal of Baal is responsible for the phenomena in some passages. It would be interesting to see an investigation with the full textual material of the possible use of Baal in connection with specific places and also with worship.

Baumgärtel repeats the old observation that Elohim is used in connection with non-Israelites (p. 39). This is another instance where textual criticism is needed. Probably this would give us a truer insight into the real state of affairs. The usage doubtless varied at different periods. It is improb-



able that in the pre-Mosaic age the Tetragrammaton was put into the mouth of non-Israelites unless they stood in some special relation to the family of the Patriarchs. In the post-Exilic age its utterance would almost certainly not be attributed to them with any great frequency, and the later the period the less the probability of any Biblical author's assigning it to them. But in the intervening period other considerations apply. We know that Mesha of Moab used the word on the Moabite stone just as Jephthah could speak of Chemosh (Judges xi. 24), and that the Bible puts it into the mouth of Naaman without hesitation. When therefore we find passages in the earlier historical books where (ha)-*elohim* is used by the Massoretic text, and "Lord" by other authorities, we are entitled to ask whether it is not much more probable that the Massoretic reading is due to substitution for Baal or the Tetragrammaton. The former seems to me to be the case in Judges i. 7, where Adonibezek uses *Elohim*, but K 257 (a printed Hebrew folio) has LORD God, and there is an Armenian variant, and in vii. 14, where Gideon hears Midianite soldiers speaking of *ha-elohim* but the Vulgate HP 55, 56, 63, 75 Arm-ed and Slav Ostrog have the Lord, the latter in 1 Samuel xxii. 3, where David uses *Elohim* in the land of Moab, but HP 245 has the Lord.<sup>1</sup> It will thus be convenient to deal now with the general cause that has produced this reading, for it appears to have affected whole books and sections of the Massoretic text. We saw in the January number of the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* (pp. 126 ff.) that the concluding chapters of Genesis had probably been rendered *Elohistic* in the Massoret-

<sup>1</sup> It is true that in xxix. 6 Achish, according to the Massoretic text, uses "as the LORD liveth"; but this seems to me to be a substitution for Baal allowed to stand in this form because it was felt that there was but One who was the living God, by whose life one could swear. (On 2 Sam. ii. 27, see Kittel, *ad loc.*, and Baumgärtel, p. 64.)

ic text at a time when the idea was current that the Tetragrammaton should not be uttered on foreign soil. As at an earlier epoch David could not serve Israel's God outside Palestine, as Naaman required Palestinian soil to enable him to offer sacrifices to that God outside the national territory; so we saw reason to suppose that at a later period the utterance of the Sacred Name was confined to the territory of Israel, and that this had affected the readings in Genesis. In point of fact, both principles probably rest on the same verse, for Exodus xx. 24 uses the words "*where I shall cause my name to be remembered.*" Now the extra-Pentateuchal books offer us a most satisfactory field for testing this theory, for there are a number in which the scene is laid outside Palestine.<sup>1</sup> In the Book of Esther, as is well known, no mention is made of God, but how about the Book of Job? The Tetragrammaton is never used in a speech in the Massoretic text except in i. 21 and xii. 9. In the former case it was inevitable, because of the phrase "name of the LORD,"<sup>2</sup> which made the substitution of Elohim or any like word impossible. Indeed, if in an inspired book mention is actually made of "the name of the LORD" outside the land of Palestine, this would probably, in the view of the scribes, constitute a causing of the Name to be remembered within the meaning of Exodus. In Job xii. 9 the words are a clause taken bodily from Isaiah xli. 20, and even so I find the following curious note in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* 7 MSS. + 1 MS. ad marg *מלך*.

<sup>1</sup>The Massoretic text has the Tetragrammaton in 1 Sam. vi. 2, 8. In the former passage it is wanting in K 1 and H P XI, in the latter in practically all Septuagintal MSS. Thus it is clearly a very late gloss, and when this is noticed, it is remarkable how throughout this passage the Massoretic text avoids the use of the Tetragrammaton by any speaker on Philistine soil.

<sup>2</sup>"This is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations" (Ex. iii. 15).

Many critics regard the clause as an interpolation, but in any case its occurrence in Isaiah would explain the Tetragrammaton's maintaining itself or being restored here. In the LXX, on the other hand, as a glance at Hatch and Redpath's concordance shows, the word *κύριος* is freely used in Job: and it is frequently used in the Massoretic narrative of Job, where there can be no question of its being pronounced in a foreign land, e. g. ii. 7; xl. 1, 3, 6.

Another brilliant illustration of the principle is provided by the Book of Daniel. For our purpose it falls into two parts — ix. 4–19 and the rest of the book. The reason why we have to make this division is stated thus by Dr. Charles, *ad loc.*: “The prayer contains clear evidence of having been written in Palestine and not in the Exile. Thus in verse 7 it speaks of those ‘that are near, and that are far off in all the countries whither thou hast driven them.’ Those ‘that are near’ are obviously the Jews in Palestine as opposed to those ‘that are far off in all the countries.’ Again in verse 16, ‘Because for our sins and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are *round about us*’ the words in italics show that the prayer was written by a resident in Judea.” This prayer consequently presupposes Palestine, and uses the Tetragrammaton freely. On the other hand, it is avoided throughout the rest of the book (Daniel's utterances being outside the land of Israel),<sup>1</sup> except in the single instance of the citation from Jeremiah in ix. 2, where, as in the somewhat similar instance of the quotation from Isaiah in Job xii. 9, the Massoretic text has the Tetragrammaton. The actual phrase is of course something like a hall mark of a prophecy, and for

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps, however, if the rest of the book was originally entirely Aramaic, that may be the cause.

that reason it is easy to understand that the Tetragrammaton was always retained in some texts or else reasserted itself in spite of alteration, if the phrase is genuine. But the LXX has *προσταγματη γη* for "word of the Lord," i.e. it read אֱלֹהִים, and accordingly the Tetragrammaton was probably not original in the recension that our Massoretic text represents.

Thus it would seem that throughout the Old Testament the Massoretic text has been edited in the interests of a theory that the Tetragrammaton must not be pronounced on foreign soil, and that the only exceptions are occasional glosses and a few passages where some overwhelming consideration compelled its retention or restoration.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The exceptions admitted by the Massoretic text are of great interest. They may be classified as follows: (1) The revelation of the Name in Ex. vi. 2, and its consequent use, and the other passage where the word Name has guaranteed its presence, i.e. Job i. 21. The Tetragrammaton was the personal Name of God, and accordingly "Name of Elohim" was an impossible phrase. Ps. xlix. 31 is only an apparent exception, due to the mistakes of a copyist who read "my Elohim" (so LXX) as an abbreviation for Elohim, final *ב* being often omitted in Hebrew MSS. This consideration is responsible for the inept use of the Tetragrammaton in Gen. xvi. 13, Hebrew scribes having used it after the word Name: "This is My Name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations" (Ex. iii. 15). This passage doubtless operated on the minds of the scribes, and explains their use of the word in such contexts as Gen. iv. 26, where the conflate Greek reading is evidence of an alternative substitution "God" for the original word, which was probably "Baal." (2) As the personal and intimate Name of the Deity the Tetragrammaton is used (*a*) in swearing by his life, 1 Sam. xxix. 6, 1 Kings xvii. 12; (*b*) after a word of blessing, 1 Kings v. 21 (7) (Baumgärtel, p. 25); (*c*) in invoking him in prayer, Gen. xlix. 18, Judges xvi. 28 (Samson in Philistia), 1 Kings xvii. 20 (Elijah at Zarephath), Jonah's prayers, Ps. cxxxvii. 7 (By the Rivers of Babylon); (*d*) in connection with his service, 2 Sam. xv. 8 (Absalom's vow), Ps. cxxxvii. 4 (How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?). (3) By a natural extension it is uttered in narratives relating to victory given by him in foreign soil or where he is asserting his power (the introduction to

The Book of Jonah presents some curious features, but there is a valuable note on the subject at the end of Bewer's Commentary,<sup>1</sup> He says that in chapters i.—iii. the name used by the heathen is *Elohim* or *ha-elohim*, by the Hebrew the Tetragrammaton. This is obviously right in view of the sense of the book. In iii. 10 *ha-elohim* is used where the Tetra-

the Exodus, 2 Sam. v. 20-23, 2 Kings iii.). (4) As He is the God of prophecy the word is uttered in prophecy or references to it (Ezekiel, Jeremiah in Egypt, 1 Kings xvii. 14, 24 (in Zarephath), 2 Kings viii. 10, 13 (Damascus)). Indeed, the Hebrew prophet spoke in, by, or with (the preposition may mean either) his Name, and for that reason the Tetragrammaton is inevitable. Of the above passages I feel some doubt as to Ps. cxxxvii. (because that occurs in a collection of Psalms that were probably intended for public use in the place which the Lord had chosen to set his Name there, and that may be responsible for its phenomena), and as to 2 Sam. xv. 8, because the words are spoken by Absalom in the land of Israel. If these passages be eliminated, then the Massoretic principles may be thus expressed. Prophets speak in his Name (4), therefore, wheresoever he sends a prophecy he causes his Name to be remembered. So also 2 (c) (if Ps. cxxxvii. 7 falls out) represents cases of the same principle, for in Jewish thought Jacob, Samson, Elijah, and Jonah were alike under the influence of the prophetic spirit on the material occasions. Otherwise the word is uttered only in the place where he has caused his Name to be remembered, and in places over which his Name is called. cp. 2 Sam. xii. 28 (3). Really, therefore, all these cases resolve themselves into the Name being mentioned only in every place where—by a land's being his through Israelitish ownership or conquest, or by his sending the prophetic Spirit—he has caused his Name to be remembered. Apart from this, it is uttered only in blessing him and in oaths by his life. Of course the Massoretic usage is no guide to the original autographs of the Biblical authors. The whole question should be thought of in connection with the old notions as to the Name as a manifestation of Power and Personality (see *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 47 ff.). This is the true original interpretation of such phrases as "I cause my name to be remembered" and "setting my Name," to which the editors of the Hebrew recension of the O. T. have given so remarkable an application.

<sup>1</sup> See, also, N. Schmidt, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xxxiii. pp. 36 f.

grammaton might have been expected, but I think it must be conceded that it follows on iii. 9 in a way which makes the author's choice of the word preferable.<sup>1</sup> But in chapter iv. the Divine appellations are used promiscuously. Bewer examines some remarkable textual variants, and comes to the conclusion that the author wrote the Tetragrammaton all through, that the Massoretic reading in iv. 6 is "conflation pure and simple,"<sup>2</sup> and that "a copyist, or reader under the influence of ch iii. wrote *elohim* probably all through chapter iv., but in some instances the original readings reasserted themselves."<sup>3</sup> I venture to suggest that some of the readings are mere glosses. But in any case the evidence of the struggle between the two sets of readings is most interesting. I believe that it is due to a conflict between the two principles — that of using the Tetragrammaton in prophecy and the influence of the foreign seamen and the Ninevites.

From *Jonah* it is natural to turn to the other prophets. There are one or two small points on which I differ from *Baumgärtel*. Thus I think that in *Hosea* xii. 4 the use of *Elohim* is due to the play on *Israel*, and it seems to me that in *Malachi* iii. 14 and *Proverbs* ii. 5, while the reasons he assigns are sound, parallelism may have been a contributory motive in the choice of the word. Subject to this and to at most two or three doubtful exceptions, he seems to me to have proved that the Massoretic text of the three major and eleven minor prophets (i.e. all except *Jonah*), and also of *Proverbs*, never uses *Elohim*, except (*a*) where some transparent considerations of sense or sound make it inevitable

<sup>1</sup> Its second occurrence in the verse is probably a mere gloss. K 109 has the Tetragrammaton. K 72, 108, *Elohim*, *not* *ha-elohim*.

<sup>2</sup> In point of fact, K 182 omits *Elohim*.

<sup>3</sup> In verse 9, K 182 omits *Elohim* and K 30, 394 read the Tetragrammaton.

( e. g. in oppositions between God and man, use by heathens Zech. viii. 23, in appellative or adjectival phrases), and (*b*) in connection with Sodom and Gomorrah and in the phrase "garden of Elohim." I have expressed my opinion on the former of these elsewhere (Jan. 1915, p. 140).<sup>1</sup> The latter phrase occurs in Ezekiel xxviii. 13, xxxi. 8 (*bis*) 9. The Tetragrammaton is used in Isaiah li. 3. It appears to me that just as the narrative in Genesis must originally have used Baal, so here we have to do with substitutions for this word.

Canticles has no Divine appellations. Ruth and Lamentations do not use Elohim. The Psalms are divided, some being Elohistic, and Baumgärtel excludes these from his investigation,<sup>2</sup> as also Ecclesiastes, which is Elohistic in the Masso-

<sup>1</sup> It should be added that some of the Septuagintal readings of the name of the King of Sodom in Gen. xiv. 2 suggest that originally Baal in some form constituted a part of it, and that the Massoretic Bera (apparently = with evil) is a corruption.

<sup>2</sup> I desire to express my agreement with Waldo S. Pratt in his statement that there is as much need for investigation in Bk. I., for example, as in Bks. II.-III. See the whole of his article (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xxxiii. pp. 1-24). Baumgärtel's attempt to deal with Elohim only, and then only in some parts of the Psalter, seems to me to be mistaken in principle. The subject should here be treated as a whole. A few remarks occur to me as the result of the observations I have made. (1) I am of opinion that the removal of Baal has been an efficient cause of the present state of the text. (2) I think that the principles as to the utterance of the Tetragrammaton have been effective in two ways: (*a*) as already observed, it seems to me that it was used as far as possible exclusively in certain versions of Psalms adapted for use in worship in the place which God had chosen to make his Name to dwell there, and (*b*) that, on the other hand, it was removed in certain versions of Psalms adapted for use outside Palestine (e.g. apparently xlili., xlii., li., liii., lvii., etc.). Very interesting is the case of Psalm lvi., attributed by the Massoretic heading to David in Gath. Note that in verse 11 a phrase has actually been preserved in both forms "In the LORD (God) will I praise his word,"

retic text. There are, however, traces of other texts. Thus in chapter v. the following variants may be noted: verse 3, HP 23 Cyril "to the Lord" K 4, 128 "to the LORD"; verse 5, "before God," in *conspectu angeli* Old Lat; verse 19, Old Latin "Lord." In chapter vii. we have HP 23 giving us "the Lord" in verse 19, and A introducing the same word in verse 30. This book and the Psalms must be left for future investigation in the light of more complete textual material. Perhaps the present notes may suggest a probable reason for the Elohist character of our Massoretic text.

The work of the Chronicler should be held over for discussion when the full textual material is available for that and the earlier historical books. Meanwhile Baumgärtel has made some striking observations which help to clear the way for further inquiries.

It remains to say a few words about some of his conclusions. He sets up the extraordinary theory (p. 80) that if the Massoretic text can be shown to conform to certain canons, that proves its originality, and he asserts that it is impossible (why?) that such conformity could have been achieved by systematic alteration extending over all the books in question. Such assertions totally ignore what is known of textual history. It must be remembered that we definitely know that Baal was systematically removed as a Divine title, and that some clear canons were observed by the guardians of the text at various times. Probably the necessity for removing Baal was the first *vera causa* of the textual alteration, the original text having here survived side by side with the Elohist substitution, due to the location in foreign soil. Thus in the Psalms we have to consider both the historical situation supposed by the authors of the Hebrew recension and the usage to which they put the Psalm. (3) The numerical principle appears to have been operative, at any rate in the editing or arranging of Books (see the Pentateuchal Text, pp. 253 f.).



the words of Hosea being read as a definite prohibition to continue to apply the term to the God of Israel.

But the substitution of "God" or "the Lord" for Baal would have several results. For one thing, it would make many passages too anthropomorphic, and so lead to further change. For another, it would impress on the minds of scribes and editors the idea that the Divine appellations were a particularly variable element of the text, and lead them to look round in the Bible for principles by which to fix them. There is no difficulty whatever in supposing that at some period a particular principle gained acceptance and was impressed on the text of the Biblical books, and all unprejudiced observers who have followed the discussion carefully must see that a strong case has been made out for some such principles affecting the Divine appellations. To show that the Massoretic text conforms to such principles does not prove in the very least that it is original; it may — and, according to the nature of the principles we have observed, it does — provide a strong presumption the other way. On the other hand, a study of the versions may bring to light other principles and show us approximately when the Hebrew principles gained acceptance.

Another weakness of our author's position is that he proposes to try to prove that certain expressions with Elohim are very ancient — indeed, taken over from the Canaanites. His view rests chiefly on the expressions about Sodom and Gomorrah. It is curious that though he goes so far as to say on page 60 that if any of these stories related to local deities of the Canaanites, baal would have been expected rather than Elohim, he should not have remembered the removal of baal from the Old Testament text. Taken in conjunction with the use of Elohim, which would be a natural substitu-

tion for baal in the age when such changes were made, his own admissions on the point seem to rob his view of plausibility. But, further, in attempting to give it additional strength, he quotes some extraordinary expressions. Thus he alleges — I know not on what authority — that ark of ha-elohim is the oldest name for the Ark. Does he seriously suppose (even if his assertion had any substance) that the Ark and its name were taken over by Israel from the Canaanites? Further, some of his phrases, like “man of God,” “fear of God,” are such that the idea conveyed could not have been expressed in any other way. They *may* have been Canaanitish, but they are such as must have been coined by any people working with a language possessing such a structure as the Hebrew. Perhaps, however, the objection to his method that cuts deepest here is his neglect of textual criticism. If he sets out to spin fly-away theories of this kind on the basis of the Massoretic text, he will inevitably end by attributing to pre-Israelitish Canaanites conceptions that in fact are due to the theology of late editors and scribes. It must be hoped that he will take these matters into serious consideration, for this first publication certainly warrants the expectation that, if he does, he will do useful work for Old Testament scholarship.