

THE NAMES OF GOD
IN THE
BIBLE

Graduation Thesis
HENRY ENGLANDER.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE.

Cincinnati, 1901.

—oOo—

In love and affection

dedicated to my

P A R E N T S

to me a source of true religious inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	I - IV
BOOKS CONSULTED	V - VII
INTRODUCTION	1 - 12
<p>Discriminative use of name as viewed by the rabbis and early Church Fathers - by the philosophers - by the modern school of critics - Change of meaning of a name in the successive centuries - Resume - How the subject is to be treated.</p>	
ENUMERATION OF THE DIVINE NAMES	13 - 17
<p>Traditional division of divine names into שמות and שבעים - Seventy divine names.</p> <p>A forty-two and twelve-letter name of God - The Divine names with the traditional enumerations in view, properly reduced to five - Yahn and Yah.</p>	
MEANING OF JAHWE	18 - 24
<p>Names as vehicles of ideas - Original meaning of</p>	

Jahwe conjectural - Jahwe never as a heathen deity - Jahwe as a nature God - Etymologies - Form of Jahwe - Philosophic ideas put into the same - Its probable meaning.

אֱהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיָּה

25 - 29

As biblical etymology of Jahwe - Meaning of the phrase - As rendered by the Versions.

HISTORICAL RISE OF JAHWE

30 - 37

According to Ex.3:14 ff and Ex.6:3 - Contradictions of these passages with facts found in Genesis explained by traditional and modern authorities - Pashi's explanation - Ibn Ezra - Jehuda Halevi - Views regarding the probable sources from which the name was taken - From Egypt - From Midianites, Kenites, Phoenicians and tribe of Joseph - Prior knowledge of Jahwe in the family of Moses - Proper names compounded with divine names as indication of the prevailing des-

ignation for God.

SUPPRESSION OF THE NAME JAHWE

38 -53

Passages of the Bible in which יהוה was referring to God, foreshadow an increasing holiness of His name - Avoidance of the name in rabbinical literature - Its avoidance as already found in biblical literature.- The different theories for the suppression of the tetragrammaton in the latter books of the Bible - Zimmermann's view - Lagard's - Tradition on the suppression of the name - Biblical basis for the custom - Other early sources on the topic in question - Philo - Josephus - Early Church Fathers - Hieronymus.

VOCALIZATION OF יהוה

54 - 61

The incorrect pronunciation Jehovah - Proofs that the present vowels are not its own - Jacob Bachrach on the vocalization of the name - Vocalization of the early Greek writers - Kuenen's

proofs for the correctness of the pronunciation
Jahwe.

יְהוָה

62 - 66

As a common Semitic designation of God - Nature
of its suffix or ending - As viewed by Böttcher
and others - Ambiguous use of Adonai as present-
ed by tradition.

THE TIME IN WHICH THE READING ADONAI WAS SUBSTITUT-
ED FOR JAHWE

67 - 77

The Greek rendering of Adonai - Traditional
views - These criticized - Low's presentation of
the matter - Hengstenberg's opinion - Dalman's -
Whiston's - Geiger's.

ה' צב אוֹר

78 - 84

Dr. Max Lohr's complete list of passages contain-
ing Sabaoth - The different Greek renderings for
the same - As found in the prophets - Tradition-
al interpretation - That of Kautzsch and others -

Its original meaning - Its later meanings -

Smend's view.

85 - 96

אלהים

Elohistic documents - Difference of meaning between Elohim and Jahwe that decided the choice of one name or the other - This difference not always the determining factor in the choice of name - Elohistic Psalms - Probable derivation of Elohim and its possible connection with El-Function of the plural form - Traditional view-Modern views - The singular form.

אל

97 - 99

Traditional interpretation of the name - Modern views -

אלה

100 - 104

Traditional interpretations of the name - The different roots from which it has been derived - Its consequent meanings - Its form - Patriarchal name according to Ex. 6:3.

P R E F A C E.

It is hardly necessary to state that originality in the subject matter of our work, within the comparatively short time at our command, was entirely impossible. This was not the case with the presentation of the material gleaned through the patient search of isolated references in books, essays and pamphlets. Constant care had to be exercised in the separation of the chaff from the wheat, much of the former being in evidence in the older treatments of our subject.

The only merit that can be claimed is a conscientious reading of everything we could obtain relating to our thesis, and a faithful verification of all cross references that came to our notice. Original sources, such as the Talmud, Midrash and the earliest translations of the Bible were consulted as

far as possible. All unverified references are duly noted and properly credited to the writer from whom they were taken.

It has been thought advisable and profitable to embody in the work, though contrary to common usage, all scattered references in Talmudic, Mishnaic and like literature, for the reason that the presentation of the traditional views, forms a most important item in the study before us.

The timely suggestions of Dr. Mielziner saved us from wading into the deep and engulfing waters of higher criticism, by pointing out the sure and trodden paths of tradition.

It was our original intention to trace the development of the different divine names, but this, we soon discovered, was still to a large extent terra incognita and far beyond our limited knowledge. We have, therefore, limited ourselves to the collating of

the best that was known and said in ancient and modern times concerning the names themselves. With the exception of an occasional reference, we shall have nothing to do with the fantastic and often contradictory systems of theology and philosophy which in former days, were built up on the supposedly intensioned use of different names for the Deity.

We take this opportunity of expressing our sincerest thanks to Professor Levias, Bittenweiser and Deutsch for the valuable aid they have given us in the way of books. We also acknowledge our especial indebtedness to Dr. Grossmann, whose well equipped library never failed to furnish us with any number of pamphlets and books, otherwise difficult to obtain.

In conclusion we wish to thank Dr. Mielziner most sincerely for the suggestion of a subject, that has given us an opportunity for using Jewish and kindred sources to an extent, that thoroughly acquainted us

with facts and writings, which to know, would perhaps have been left to the distant future.

H.E.

- XI Die Eigennamen des Alten Testamentes
M. Grunwald.
- XII Synonyma fur Gott in der neuhebraischen
Literatur. E. Landau.
- XIII Lehrbuch der Alttestamentlichen Religionsge-
schichte. Rudolph Smend.
- XIV The Prophets of Israel, - W. Robertson Smith.
- XV Introduction to the Literature of the old Tes-
tament (parts relating to E. & J. documents)
Driver.
- XVI Zeitschrift fur die Alttestamentliche Wissen-
schaft (Z. A. W.)
- XVII Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenlandischen Ges-
ellschaft (Z. D. M. G.)
(References to these works will be duly noted)
- XVIII Commentar uber die Genesis. - Delitzsch.
- XIX The Hexateuch (the parts treating of the differ-
ent documents: translation of P.H. Wicksteed)
Kuenen.

- XX Hamburger's Real Encyclopedia.
- XXI Gesenius Dictionary (last edition)
- XXII Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible.

I N T R O D U C T I O N.

The discriminative use of the names of God in the Bible has already attracted the attention of the rabbis and the early Church Fathers. Each volunteered statements purporting to explain satisfactorily the specific use of a divine name in any context.

The persistent use of אלהים in Gn.1-2:4^b, of יהוה in 2:4^b-3:24, and of יהוה in chapter 4, was regarded as proof irrefutable, that each of these names contained within itself something intrinsically different from the other. Not doubting in the least the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, they naturally presumed that this inherent difference was the sole determining factor in the choice of the one name or the other. For them, each name connoted a special phase or characteristic of the Divine Being, in accordance with which a context would be supplied with

1. See Hengstenberg *Genuineness of the Pentateuch* Vol.I p.214.

the proper designation of God.

According to the Midrash¹ God himself made the following broad distinctions in the meaning of his several names

א' ל הקל'ה למשה שמי אתה חבקש לידע לפי מעשי אני
נקרא פעמים שאני נקרא באל שדי, בצבאות, באלהים
בה' שכשאני דן את הבריות אני נקרא אלהים וכשאני
עשה נחלמה ברשעים אני נקרא צבאות וכשאני
תולה על חסאיו של אדם אני נקרא אל שדי
וכשאני מרחם על עולמי אני נקרא ה' שאין ה'
אלא מדת הרחמים

Thus a distinction between יהוה and אלהים once made, their alternate occurrence in the opening chapters of Genesis was easily explained by the rabbis.

In accordance with this distinction Rashi, the exponent of traditionalism, accounts for the use of these names in the above passages as follows:

ברא אלהים: לא אמר ברא ה' שבתחלה עלה במקשבה
לבראת בסדת הדין וראה שאין העולם מתקיים והקדים
מדת רחמים ושתפק לסדת הדין והיינו דכתיב ביום
עשות ה' אלהים

¹ (ו.ו.מ.)
Midrash Rabba Exodus 3 ()

With the rise of philosophy and of a more critical spirit of investigation, this easy disposition of the variable use of the divine names was by no means satisfactory. From the simple view of God as a personal force ever active in Israel, attention was directed to the finding of deep metaphysical truths that were supposed to underlie the use of the two names אלהים and יהוה. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, it must be remembered, was still taken for granted. The difference in the theories explaining the philosophic significance of the divine names was fully proportional to the number advanced. Endless diversity replaces strict oneness of view.²

Philosopher and exegete exhibit remarkable ingenuity in upholding their respective views.³

¹(Gen.1:1)

²For different theories see אלהים and יהוה M.H.Landauer
Introduct. pp X-XIV.

³Landauer's presentation of the matter though decidedly cabilistic is most interesting for its consistency and thoroughness.

The names by which the Deity was known were made to bespeak ideas far beyond the grasp of the primitive Israelite. The pure monotheistic conceptions of a later age were extracted from a name belonging to a time when the oneness of a Supreme Being had yet hardly dawned upon the human consciousness. The absolute and unconditioned existence of God was read into the designation Jahwe, the name revealed just before the Exodus. To-day, however, there is not likely to be a dissenting opinion in the modern school of critics from that expressed by W. R. Smith,¹ "The new message that Moses brought to his brethren was not an abstract revelation of Jehovah's spiritual attributes, but an assurance of His personal interest in Israel and a promise of effectual help."

The Mosaic authorship once doubted, the belief that the Pentateuch was but a combination of differ-

¹Prophets of Israel p.34

ent sources having once gained ground, a new impetus to explain the changeable use of the divine names was aroused. The explanations that were now offered were entirely different from those that had hitherto been advanced.

We should, perhaps rather have said that it was this noticeable interchange of God's names in the account of the creation, that drew upon the Pentateuch the suspicion of the plurality of its sources. In 1753, a physician, Astruc by name, first advanced the then daring assumption that the different names were due entirely to external reasons: to the different manuscripts used by the compiler of the Pentateuch.¹ This theory, at first scarcely noticed spread like wildfire during the last half of the eighteenth century and it still holds its own to the present day.

¹ Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse (Brussels 1753) on development and modification of his theory see Tuch's Genesis 2nd ed. p.78 ff- De Wette-Schrader Einleitung in das A.T. p.309 - 311.

The theory being established the work of separating the Pentateuch, or rather, the Hexateuch (see Drivers Introd. to O.T. p. 10) into its constituent elements was studiously commenced.

The variable use of יהוה and אלהים offered the key to this difficult task, it being held "that for such variation in similar and consecutive chapters no plausible explanation can be assigned except diversity of authorship." The sections homogeneous in character and style to Gn 1:1-2:4^a (see Zimmerman Elohim pp 20-30) being placed together, a systematic account of the origin of Israel was found to be presented. The Yahwistic documents were also placed together. In this wise much of the disorder in the narratives, many of the contradictions, repetitions and difference of idioms were accounted for. The narratives showing a preference for the name אלהים have been called Elohist^c and their author, the Elohist. Most

recent critics have termed these narratives when joined together the "Priests' Code" usually represented by the large letter "P".¹

It has been shown that the part of the Hexateuch remaining after the P. documents have been taken out, is a combination of two originally independent narratives combined and enlarged by a later editor. The documents using *אלהים* have been called the E. documents and those using *יהוה* the J. documents.²

Higher criticism in the matter of determining the date of the different sources is, as yet, in its infancy. Hence the widely different periods in which a book or document is placed by different critics. Dillman, Kittel, Riehn, Wellhausen and Kuenen agree that the E. source shows itself to be a product of the Northern kingdom and that the J. documents bear³ unmistakable criteria of having Judea as their home.

¹For Elohist Redaction see Zimmerman *Elohim* pp 31-54

²See Drivers *Introd. to O.T.* pp. 10 ff; also the Hexateuch-Kuenen p. 65 ff (translation of Wicksteed)

³See Driver *Introd. to O.T.* p. 122 f.

The opinions of eminent critics differ as to the priority and date of J. and E. but they are one in declaring that they belong in all probability to the early centuries of the monarchy.

The hypothesis of an Elohist and Jahwistic redaction being established beyond a doubt, the old query as to the special significance of a certain divine name in a certain context is no longer in force.

We believe that the thesis of Astruc is, in general, correct, namely: That the use of different divine appellatives in certain portions of the Bible is to be attributed to external causes and not to any intrinsic difference of meaning that may have been supposed to obtain between the names. There was indeed a broad distinction between אלהים and יהוה in that the latter was the generic term for deities, while the former was used only of the God of Israel,

but this distinction, it must be remembered, arose only gradually in the evolution of the religious consciousness.

It was the recognition of the fact that the variable use of God's name was often due to mere accident, that prevented us from drawing fine distinctions in the several names, distinctions such as made by Landauer and others, were to hold good throughout the Bible in all contexts and narratives.

Furthermore Smend, W. P. Smith and a host of others have shown conclusively that the content of the names of God was never the same in the successive centuries of the biblical period. There was a continual broadening of the ideas respecting the nature and activity of God. From monolatry there is an advance to monotheism: from tribalism there is an advance to nationalism and from nationalism to universalism.

Jahwe, originally, perhaps the God of the tribe of Joseph (Smend Rel Gesch p.29 ed.1893), becomes, with the entrance of Israel into Canaan, Jahwe, the God of Israel (monolatry c.p.I K.11:33 ^{יְהוָה} יְהוָה שׁוֹמֵר) Then Jahwe, the God of Israel, becomes for Amos the universal God of the nations. It is evident therefore how the ever changing conceptions of God during the formative period of Israel's religious history, rendered the drawing of cut and dried distinctions between the names of God impossible.

Briefly summarizing what has thus far been said, we come to the following conclusions:

(1) The metaphysical and theological puzzles that were read into the names of God by later exegetes and philosophers are valueless as far as critical study of the names is concerned.

(2) The traditional view alone, though false, presents unanimity of interpretation.

(3) The hypothesis of the plural authorship of the Hexateuch explains to a large measure the interchangeable use of Jahwe and Elohim.

(4) The inner meaning of the names changed with the growth of religious ideas, hence the impossibility of absolute definitions.

How then is the subject "The Names of God in the Bible" to be treated? We are not to explain the reason for the use of a special name in a certain book or context, we are not to trace the development of the ideas contained in the different names (for that is beyond our ability), nor are we, as some have attempted to do, to lay down distinctions that will hold good everywhere. Hence the only course we saw left open to us was the presentation of what the rabbis and others had said about the names of God, as names.

Thus, considerable has been said by the rabbis and later writers about the peculiar yet interesting

history of the name יְהוָה, which shall occupy most of our consideration in this work. Here and there in the great storehouse of Jewish literature we also found single references to other divine names. In fact we endeavored to present everything that tradition had to say on the subject in question. We were careful to give in full the opinions of the chief authorities and wherever possible to volunteer a statement as to our preference of opinion. We have avoided lengthy philological discussions that surround each name, being incapable of possessing any discriminative judgment in the matter.

E N U M E R A T I O N
of the
D I V I N E N A M E S

The first question that presents itself to us upon entrance to our subject proper is, "What are the names of God in the Bible?" Not few are the expressions by which God was known to the ancient Hebrew.

Tradition divides all names into two broad classes, viz: (1) שמות "nomina propria" or the names proper, (2) כְּנוֹיִם attributes. It remains to be determined which are the "nomina propria" and which the attributes, for tradition by no means agrees as to the number that belong to the first class. Another broad division regards יְהוָה as the only proper name while all the others are looked upon as כְּנוֹיִם . Thus Rashi in Sanhedr. 66^a to the words קָלַל בְּכֹנִי

הנני כנויין כגון אלהים שדי צבאות
remarks:

The inference to be derived is evident.

Before proceeding to give the different views held in reference to the enumeration of the divine names, it is interesting to note that in Midrash R. to Num. 17:13 we find seventy given as the number of names belonging to God.¹ This, of course, includes all the attributes ascribed to him throughout the Bible.² The Targum to Shir Hashirim 2:17 tells us expressly that the שמא רבא ספרש בשבעין שמהן³

Besides the names known to us, there was supposed to have existed a seventy-two-letter name. Kiddushim 71^a also speaks of a forty-two-letter name (שם בן שתיים) and a twelve-letter name (שם בן שתיים עשרה) and a twelve-letter name (שם בן שתיים עשרה) -- sometimes, in pronunciation, taking the place of the tetragrammation (שם בן ארבע אותיות)

Now as to the number of names proper. A boraitha in Shevuoth 35^a places the number, that are not permit-

¹ שבעין שקל בסקל הקדש כנגד שבעים שמות שיש לו הקדש

² For enumeration of these 70 names see Jacobben Asher's commentary to Nm. 11:16; also ritual

³ (אסתי שמו מפורש בשבעים) שבעות

For all other references to the 70 names see Zunz Gottesdienstli-Porträge.

ted to be erased after once written, at nine. We take it for granted that the prohibition to erase a name is equivalent to an assertion of its being one of the holy names of God.

יש שמות שנחקקו ויש שמות שאין נחקקין כגון
אל אלוה אלהים אלהיכם, אהיה אשר אהיה,
אלף דלת יוד ה', עדי, צבאות

This list, as is readily noticed, contains among others, one name (אלהים) in different forms, and therefore when properly reduced becomes seven.

In J. Megil 1:9 eleven enumerated names also contain certain variations of one name that cannot be counted as separate designations. In Masechta Sof-
erim 4, the number of names that are invested with such holiness as not to permit of being erased is properly reduced to six and according to Rabbi Jose, who places the name צבאות in the category of חול= not divine, the list dwindles down to five, viz:

אלף דלת, אלף למד, יוד ה', אהיה אשר אהיה

This enumeration, with the retention of **צבאות** (which Jose excluded), and the omission of **איהיה** **אשר איהיה** which is nothing more than the biblical etymology for Jahwe, we have come to regard as the one containing all the names of God that can properly be called such. All other designations are to be regarded as **לשונות**

Hieronymus in epistle "one hundred and thirty six"² speaks of ten names of God that are used by the Hebrews.³ In his list he adds to the names already mentioned in Shevuoth 35^a **יהוה אליוה**

These three names are, indeed, found as strict and absolute designations of God: the first, however, we readily recognize as the singular of **אלהים**, and the last two are generally regarded as abbreviated forms of **יהוה**⁴, therefore calling for no special treatment.

¹ Maim in **הלכות יסודות** enumerates seven names. of God based upon **שבועות** 35 a.

² This unverified ref. taken from Dalman Adonaj: p. 36.

³ Abboth de Rabbi Nathan (36) also has ten names with slight modification.

⁴ See Geiger Ursch u. Nebens d. Bibel p. 274 ff; Z.A.W.

According to Erubin 18^b (see also Pesach.50^a and Kidd.71^a) יה took the place of יהוה when the latter, after the death of Simon, the Just, ceased being pronounced.

ו"א ירמיה בן אלעזר מיוס שחרב בהמ"ק
 דין לעולם שישתמש בשתי אותיות שנאמר כל
 הנשמה תהלל יה

Herbert Baynes¹ has advanced the hypothesis that the Jews of the exile in the fifth century B.C. pronounced יהוה as Jahwe and that those at home pronounced it Jahn; hence the form יה. The evidence, however, does not seem to be sufficient or conclusive.

1898 pp 172-180. Ed König. "Die formell genetische Wechselbeziehung der beiden Wörter Jahweh und Jahn"; Z.A.W. 1896 pp 1-16. The origin of the form of the Divine name.

¹The Idea of God and the Moral Sense in the Light of language.

MEANING OF JAHWE

Language is the vehicle of thought, of ideas. A people's vocabulary frequently reveals its inner life. Philology often holds the key to an ancient civilization. In religion, as in philosophy and science, there exists a close correspondence between external fact and internal thought. The religious consciousness of a primitive people can be read in its expressions for the spiritual. A simple word or phrase may throw some light upon the conceptions held regarding the deity.

The "God who comes from Sinai" (Dt.33.2) shows Israel to be like the other Semitic peoples in the matter of localizing their God. The name "Baal" given to Him after the Jews were fairly settled in Canaan is the record of an advance made by the Jews from a nomadic state to an agricultural people, of the evolu-

tion of Jahwe, hitherto the God of Sinai, to the God of Canaan (Hos 9:3: IS.26:19) or the God of agriculture. The descriptive title Elyon (*עליון*) bespeaks a time when the Jews, like the kindred nations, proclaimed their God to be superior to all other Gods, whose existence was by no means doubted.

Thus, we may affirm with reasonable certainty, that every name was originally something more than a mere title or designation: it contained within itself, at the outset, some living, concrete idea which in later times was frequently forgotten or misunderstood.

What then, we ask, was the leading or underlying idea which the ancient Semite intended to convey by the name *אלהים* . The answer, as in the case of the other divine names, it must be confessed, can only be conjectural. There exists a great diversity of opinion regarding the origin and meaning of Jahwe.

One thing is readily noticed by the casual reader, that while all other names of God may at the same time be generic expressions for deities, Jahwe was used of the one God alone, never of heathen deities or by heathens.¹ Unlike other designations, its application is nowhere doubtful or ambiguous, (with the exception, according to some of the rabbis of Jdg. 20:18-23 - see Shevuoth 35^b). It is never open to the two-fold interpretation of being holy or profane. The name Jahwe, it was supposed, expressed par excellence the holiness and essence of God², so that as a result it was invested with such reverence and awe as to evoke a prohibition against its being pronounced in ordinary or daily conversation.

Though the etymology of יהוה is doubtful, we found that modern critics are one in declaring Jahwe to be originally some kind of nature God.³ The theophanies are usually accompanied by some nature dis-

¹See A.B. Davidson's note to Jb. 1:21; Cheyne's note to Is 40:12 (in his comm.)

²See יהוה to Is 42:8

³See Smend 1893 p. 208

turbances. The law is given to Moses in the midst of thunder and lightning. His "cherubin" have been interpreted to mean the storm clouds and His "Sera-
phim" the lightning of heaven.¹ Characteristic of a tempest God, it has been shown are common, to many of the pre-historic gods.

The primitive nature of Jahwe having been discovered through the telling evidence of certain passages in the Bible, etymologists have attempted to find some indication of this nature in the word יהוה whose etymon is otherwise entirely uncertain.

Accordingly Ewald derived the name from the Arabic هَوَى to fall, to blow, to breathe. Taking יהוה as a causative form, he comes to the conclusion that the name contains some idea of a lightning God, one who causes to fall, who prostrates. Or it may signify a tempest God, one who causes to blow.

Others again, wishing to retain the biblical

¹ Cornill Prophets of Israel p.21

idea of the name as "to be" derive יהוה

from an Aramaic stem הוה

The older Jewish exegetes point to the fact that the interchange of van and Yod is frequent. To this effect Nachmanides says:

הוא קורא ע צטו אהיה ואני קוראין אותי וא"ו
במקום יוד כמו כי מה ה"ה לאדם¹

It is not unlikely that there existed an older form of ה"ה as הוה, traces of which are still to be found in passages that have a predilection for antiquated forms, c.p. ה"ה Is.16:14, Gn.27:29. In the course of our study this year, we have come across the interesting Kethib ה"ה in Jb.6:2 which the Kere changes into ה"ה, which is generally rendered as "my calamity". This, perhaps, may be indicative of the existence in Hebrew of a stem הוה bearing the same idea that Ewald wished to convey by his Arabic derivation.

¹Quotes from "Ben Chananya" 1862 p.372. See also
השתדלות עם ש"ץ
He makes יהיה and ישלך to שלות, קורא
to קורא

We thus find all opinions regarding the basic meaning of יהוה flowing into two main streams. The one represented by Ewald, finding in the name, traces of a nature God, the other represented by the etymology of the Bible itself, finding in it some idea of "to be", "to exist".

With the removal of one difficulty another hydra-like arises. The question of the derivation of Jahwe being conjecturally determined, we are confronted by another question, asking "What kind of a form is יהוה and what is its consequent meaning?"

Lagarde maintained that יהוה was a Hiphil or causative form, and he therefore attributed to it some such meaning as "to cause to exist". "to bring into being". But, it has been clearly demonstrated that "no Semite of those days ever described the creative power of God as a 'calling into existence'."

With an equal disregard of an historical perspective of the human consciousness, others.¹

¹For different etymologies and remarks concerning them see Smend Alt.Felig.Gesch.note p.21.; also W.Robertson Smith Proph.of Israel p.386 ff.

(and among them our Jewish philosophers) have attempted to deduce from the name, the principle of His eternity, immutability or aseity. "God was, is, and will be" was a popular explanation of the meaning of **יְהוָה**¹. This the Midrash expresses as follows:-²

אמר ל' הקב"ה למשה אמר להם אני הוא
שהייתי ואני הוא עכשיו ואני הוא לעתיד לבא

The primitive mind did not busy itself with abstractions. It was unable to think of Jahwe as a metaphysical entity which later writers have read into the name. He was worshipped as a living, personal force: as One who was with Israel in its journeys and who sometimes withdrew his presence (literally) because of some displeasure.

This personal relation between God and His people is correctly brought out in the rabbinical interpretation of **אֱהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיָּה** which, we said, was the earliest etymology of **יְהוָה** that we possess.

¹Targum Jonathan Dt. XXX:39

²Midrash Rabba to Ex. 3:14.

אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה

That the phrase in question (Ex.3:14) is by no means clear is already evidenced by the different interpretations that tradition has offered us.

God had heard the cry of the Israelites in distress. He appears unto Moses and tells him of the mission he is to fulfill. Moses with characteristic modesty exclaims, "Who am I that I should go unto Pharaoh?" God then assures him of His presence in all that Moses will do. Then the law-giver, with a good insight into the character of the people whom he is to liberate, said unto God, "Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel and I shall say unto them, the God of your fathers hath sent me unto you: and they shall say unto me, 'What is His name'? What shall I say unto them?" And God said unto Moses "I AM THAT I AM" (אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה).

Thus shall thou say unto the children of Israel
I AM (אֶהְיֶה) hath sent me unto you".

An oracular deliverance this, for the particular force of the explanation is not apparent: hence the many attempts to explain it. The passage, it has already been said, cannot bear any of the metaphysical conceptions, such as the absolute existence, the unchangeableness or eternity of God, which translators and commentators have ascribed to it. But, surely, the time of its utterance would demand that it have some practical bearing in the way of comfort or assurance of help in the distressing situation of the people in bondage.

We, therefore, think that one of the rabbinic interpretations was eminently correct when it said, that the passage paraphrased, would read:
 "Just as I am with them in their present troubles, so I will be with them in their future troubles."¹ In other words, they will discover that I am their helper.²

¹Berachoth 9^b; Midr. r. to chapt. 3: Rashi to Ex. 3:14;

See also Kusari Kassel Ed. Chapt. IV. 3p. 304.

²See Smend Alt. Relig. Gesch. p. 21: also Ben Chananya 1862 p. 38.

Others again, in common with another traditional interpretation of the passage (Mid.r.to Ex.3) have taken the answer to be a "nomen nescio" one. That is to say, God's essence cannot be expressed by any word or words. This idea of namelessness or indefiniteness is indeed indicated by the peculiar yet not unfrequently occurring "idem per idem" construction,¹ c.f. II. Sam.15:20; Ex.16:23; Ex.33:19. Grammatically translated, the phrase would read "Be I what I may". Yet, in spite of such strong analogy in favor of the indefinite meaning of the phrase

אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה, it is hardly probable that the awfulness and majesty of God, would be impressed upon the Israelites who were to ask "What is His name?"

The Versions differ in their rendering of the phrase. The Peshita, Targum, Onkelos and Saadya,² retaining the original Hebrew, make no effort to in-

¹See Driver's Hebrew Tenses.p.38 note B.

²Phillipson's Bible Comm.to Ex.3:14

fort to interpret or translate the phrase. This may be due to the fact that they regarded it as one of the names of God. We have, indeed, seen that in the enumeration of the divine name tradition has included: **אֱהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיָּה** which, like **יְהוָה** was not permitted to be erased.

The Septuagint followed by Philo and Zunz translate the phrase in this manner: **ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ὢν** "I am He Who is." The Hellenistic tradition regards the passage as a proof of the absolute being and aseity of God in contradistinction to the Palestinian which finds in it the immutability and eternity of God. Aquila and Theodotian, always faithful to the original, translate literally: **ἔσομαι ὅς ἐσομαι** Thus far the versions throw no light upon our text.

The Targumim Jonathan and Yerushalmi poorly paraphrase **אֱהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיָּה** so as to bear a meaning akin to the biblical phrase "He said and it was" (**דאסר לעלם א קוי וקוי**)

Jonathan

The Targum of Ben Uziel to this passage we found wanting.

There is no doubt that the אֱהִיָּה which immediately follows the אֱהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיָּה is an abbreviated form of the later expression.¹ אֱהִיָּה it has been suggested, is equivalent to יְהוָה, but this is mere conjecture. The rabbis explained the shortened form אֱהִיָּה as follows:

When God told Moses that He would be with His people in the future trouble as well as in the present, Moses exclaimed:- "O Lord, the present troubles are sufficient, why mention future troubles." God then told Moses to simply tell the people אֱהִיָּה שְׁלָמָה ²

Theodoret, it seems identified אֱהִיָּה with יְהוָה (perhaps because of his ignorance of the Hebrew) For, after translating the phrase אֱהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיָּה as ὁ ὢν

ὁ ὢν, he immediately adds, οὗτος
 οὗτος ὁ ὢν ἑβραϊστίς ἀφραστον

¹See Ibn Ezra on the passage.

²See Rashi to the passage. Also Berachoth 9^b.

HISTORICAL RISE OF JAHWE

The discussion of Ex.3:14 ff has brought us to the next point to be considered. To whom was Jahwe originally known and when came he to be known as the God of Israel? According to Ex.3:13 ff and Ex.6:3, Elohim, or the El Shaddai of the patriarchs, revealed himself as Jahwe for the first time unto Moses. As a matter of fact we do find God calling himself Jahwe in the book of Genesis. It has therefore been claimed that such passages cannot be assigned to the author of Ex.3:13-15 or of Ex.6:2-3. Yet it has been shown that the narrative containing God as Jahwe can be ascribed without hesitation to later manipulation or corruption of the text.¹

Rashi to Ex.6:3 has given a hitherto commonly accepted explanation of the fact that we find Jahwe in Genesis, the statements in Exodus to the contrary not-

¹For modern views see Kueven The Hexateuch p.60.

withstanding. For our exponent of tradition, God as Jahwe, is one step in advance of **אל שדי** the process of revelation. As El Shaddai he gave the patriarchs certain assurances of the welfare of their descendants; as Jahwe he was to redeem his promises.

In the words of Rashi,

הבטחתים הבטחות וככלן אמרתי להן אל שדי
לא נכרתי להם במדת אמתות שלי שקליה
נקרא שמי יהוה נאמן לאמת דברי שהרי
הבטחתים ולא קיימת.
Jahwe in other words,

was the God of revelation whose true nature became known only through an historical process. El Shaddai so to speak was the potential Jahwe.

Astruc, who, it will be remembered, was the first to advocate the plural authorship of the Pentateuch, volunteers a similar explanation for the removal of the difficulty when he says, "Le passage de l'Exode bien entendu ne prouve point que le nom de Jehova fut

un nom de Dieu inconnu aux Patriarches et revelé à Moïse le premier mais prouve seulement que Dieu n'avait pas fait connoître aux Patriarches toutes l'entendue de la signification de ce nom au lieu qu'il l'a manifestée à Moïse."¹

Ibn Ezra quotes the interpretation of Saadya, who removes the apparent contradiction caused by the statement found in Genesis, by saying that the word **לְבַדִּי** is to be understood after **יְהוָה**. He thus makes the passage read as follows: "And I was not known unto them by my name Jahwe alone".

וְיָרָא עֲלֵיהֶם בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה But, at times, he continued, I appeared unto the patriarchs as El Shaddai and at times as Jahwe.

Jehuda Halevi (Kusari 11:2) after making a grammatical remark similar to that made by Ibn Ezra, namely **שְׁבִית בְּאֵל שַׁדַּי תִּשְׁרַת לְשֵׁנִי הֵם** proceeds to explain that God did not reveal himself

¹Quoted from Delitzsch Kommentar Uber Genesis 26 ff.

to the patriarchs with the accompaniments of the supernatural, because they were "faithful". Theirs, was a trust that did not think of questioning the omnipotence or the omnipresence of the Infinite, but the Israelites, who because of their trials were inclined to be skeptical. He revealed His true nature. He was therefore known to them as Jahwe- the $\gamma\tau\omega\lambda\alpha$ in action.

In general, modern critics agree that Jahwe, as a name of God was in existence before it was used as the designation for the national God of Israel, and that it received its special significance with the political birth of our people.

From whom, then did Moses adopt the deity as Jahwe? Some take it that Moses most naturally received all his ideas from the home of his birth and education. As evidence of this they point to the identity of phrase, in the "I am that I am" and the

Egyptian saying "Nuk pu Nuk". It has been shown, however, that the latter phrase has no reference to God or gods. The strongest proof, moreover, that Jahwe was not known in Egypt is found in Pharaoh's own words, "Who is Jahwe that I should obey his voice and let Israel go?"

Tiele, Stade and others take it that Moses learned of Jahwe through the Midianites, in whose midst, he had spent some time upon becoming a son-in-law of Jethro. In favor of this conjecture, Jethro's aid and counsel and the proximity of his home to Mt. Sinai are looked upon as strong evidence. The Kenites, the tribe of Joseph and even the Phoenicians have been honored by some, with the claim that they originally had Jahwe as their God.

Whatever be the source from which Moses drew his religious inspiration, it stands to reason that in order to gain the general support and interest of the

Israelites he was constrained to appeal to them through a God who possessed a common interest for them, and, moreover, by a name with which they were already familiar, "for a new name would mean a new God."¹

It appears, therefore, that the tribes living in Goshen acknowledged a common ancestry and that their God was Jahwe, an appeal to whom served Moses as a practical starting point in his efforts to form a nation out of the enslaved masses before him.

Prior knowledge of Jahwe in the family of Moses has been maintained on the ground that the name of his mother 'YHWH' contains traces of that name². But the infant science of higher criticism will not permit this statement to pass for proof inasmuch as the name Yochebed may be of later origin.

In general, however, it is true that certain periods show a predilection for proper names, compounded

¹Smend note to p.18

²See Hebrew Proper Names G.Buchanan Gray p.257

with a certain name of God. These names, therefore, are strong indications as to what divine name was best known or most frequently used. Hebrew proper names in common with those of other peoples, were frequently vehicles of prevailing ideas or conceptions.

Thus, when the religious syncretism of Jahwe and Baal worship took place after the conquest of the land of Canaan, proper names compounded with Baal became frequent. Of especial significance is it that they are common among the royal names of the House of Saul and of David.

The increasing and diminishing number of the compounds with B^{a} or B^{a} in certain periods "argues with considerable probability to the approximate date when the corresponding names of God flourished and decayed."

That Jahwe was not the common name by which

God was known before the Exodus, is shown in the very few compounds with יְהוָה, (and these are of doubtful date) while those with יְהוֹ are quite numerous. And again, after the Exodus, the number of names in which יְהוֹ enters into composition gradually increases. When, however, the name Jahwe for certain reasons was suppressed, a reaction in favor of proper names compounded with יְהוֹ set in.¹

¹Buchanan Gray Hebrew Proper Names p.256.

SUPPRESSION OF THE NAME JAHWE.

In not a few passages of the Bible the word ~~אֱלֹהִים~~ ^{יְהוָה} when used of God, is spoken of in a manner that in time came to invest the name Jahwe with a holiness almost equal to that of God himself. Now we read that the "name" of the Lord they God shall not be taken in vain, (Ex.20,7-Lev.19:12) and now of the duty "to fear this glorious and fearful name" (Dt.28:58). The name Jahwe is a stronghold (Prov. 18:10). God's blessing is assured in all places where he causes "his name" to be remembered (Ex.20:24). God has chosen Jerusalem as the city in which to place "his name". (IK.11:36-Neh.1:9). The priests shall place my name upon the children of Israel that I may bless them (Ex.6:27).¹

From passages such as these, it is evident that "the name" was in some manner identified or associa-

¹ See Dalman Adonaj. pp.63-67

ted with God, with His spirit or presence. It is not likely that שׁוּב or שׁוּבָה as yet had reference to the written or spoken word. To say He caused His name to dwell in a place, was equivalent to asserting His presence in that locality.

Yet we can readily perceive how this constant use of the phrase "my name", or "the name" when used in reference to God, gave to the written word Jahwe a sanctity and sacredness that almost rendered it too holy for human lips, thus leading to its final suppression.

In rabbinical literature the name is avoided entirely except when quoted in its abbreviated form יהו or as יהוה ; which change of letters finds its parallel אלהים for אלהים . In the place of Jahwe the rabbis have used many synonyms that admirably attempt to express the highest and broadest conception of the Deity.¹ A consideration of these names is beyond the

For all synonyms see Landau Synonyma für Gott pp 6-10

province of this work.

It has been pointed out that the independent use of דש for God so frequent in post-biblical literature is already found in the Bible.¹ (Lev.24:11,16 Chron.13:6). But it is not probable that דש was used in these passages with the purpose that made it such a common substitute for Jahwe with the rabbis.

There is, however, one fact that seems to prove quite conclusively that the pronunciation or rather the use of Jahwe was avoided in later biblical times. Thus, we find that the book of Esther avoids the mention of any name of God. Ecclesiastes though frequently using אלהים studiously avoids יהוה . The books of Job, Daniel (יהוה occurring only in the Pre-Eloh. portion IX:3-20), Ezra, Nehemia and Chronicles present but few passages with יהוה ; Job using אלהים and אל quite frequently and the

¹ Geiger Urschrift und Ueben der Bibel p.274;
Dalman Adonaj p.45. See also Steinschneider Jewish Literature in Hebrew: ספרות ישראל

76 Note 2.

last four > אֱלֹהִים . One, reading the later books of the canon, cannot but be struck by the fact that the designation Jahwe for some reason is eschewed.

And what may this reason be? The one commonly advanced and already stated is, that the name becoming closely identified with God, assumed a holiness that permitted it to be pronounced only on special occasions.

Zimmermann departing from the traditional view, advances the theory that אֱלֹהִים after the exile became the "nomen proprium" of God,¹ that with the advance of monotheism, the יְהוָה, the national God of Israel, gave way to אֱלֹהִים, the universal God and hence the prophet's words יְהוָה הוּא אֱלֹהִים

In keeping with his view Zimmerman places the Elohistie Psalms 42-83 in an advanced stage of monotheism. Lagarde, following tradition, attributes the persistent use of Elohim in these Psalms to the pro-

¹ Elohim p.68 ff

hibition against uttering the name Jahwe. But Zimmermann shows this explanation to be faulty, in that, it does not account for the several times that יהוה does occur in these Elohistic Psalms. Then he himself proceeds to account for the fact by stating that it was the prerogative of the poet to use obsolete forms and words and that it was natural, therefore, that they should take this name from Jahwistic documents; especially so, since the old national name Jahwe still had some hold upon the people but not with its original significance. It may not be amiss in this connection to call attention to the fact that for Zimmermann there is also a post-Elohistic period (300-150 B.C.) that is characterized by the use of אלהים. This he shows by pointing out the fact that wherever the pre-Elohist or the Henotheist used יהוה and the Elohist אלהים there post-Elohist used אלהים;¹ and that also, when in

¹For citation of passage see p.56.

the Elohist redaction we find the double name of יהוה אל, in the writings of Ezra, Nehemia and Chronicles (post-Elohistic) we find יהוה אלהים

What has tradition to say regarding the suppression of the name יהוה ? It is well known that the Mishna and like post-biblical literature as codifications of the oral law were concerned not only in establishing new laws for new occasions, but also in finding biblical support for customs and traditions, that unquestioned, were in vogue among the people. Thus, there can be no doubt, that the rabbis finding this custom of avoiding the ineffable name firmly established, set about to find the biblical injunction to that effect.

It was considered a most grievous sin in their day to give expression to "the name" as written. Divine punishment overtook him who pronounced the tet-

ragammaton. This is learnt from a statement made by Rabbi Saul, one of the oldest teachers in the Mishna. Among several acts which he enumerates as depriving man from an inheritance in the world to come, he includes him who speaks the name Jahwe as it is written

1 אף ההיגה השם באייתיו אין לו חלק לעולם הבא

Not a few other passages to this effect are found.

But whence such opinion? Which the biblical passage that has evoked such severe condemnation? We find that Targum Onkelos to Lev. 24:16 (a much abused, and misinterpreted passage) reads into the verse a decree of death against one guilty of pronouncing the name of God, expressing it as follows:

דיפדש שקא זיי אתקטלא יתקטל

In this passage (אין יתקטל) we have one of the oldest grounds for suppressing the name Jahwe. נקב was wrongly interpreted to mean

¹See also Abboth De Rabbi Nathan 36

"to express" (שיפרש) God's name according to its consonants." The Septuagint to this verse reads:

ὄνομαξων δὲ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θανάτω
θανάτουόςω

This shows how early this misinterpretation of the passage was in vogue. This translation was generally understood by the later Greek writers and commentators as implying capital punishment for the mere pronunciation of the tetragrammaton.

The whole context of Lev.24:11-16, however, clearly shows that the punishment of death has reference only to him who curses or blasphemes the name of God or with the name of God. Our text does not prohibit the use of the name of God but its misuse. This the Jewish authorities recognized when they said

(Mish. Sanhedr.7:5 also Sifra to Lev.24:11) to which Bartimoro in his commentary says: ויברך יטם

ב שם שנאמר ונתקב שם ה' בנקבו שם שיתקב בשם

To this effect also Sanhedr 66^a

מה תל בנקבו שב יוסת... המקלל אביו ואמו
אינו חייב עד שיקללם בשם

It is interesting to note in this connection,
that while the Babylonian Targum to Lev.24:16 reads

דמפרש דמפרש, the Palestinian reads דמפרש
דמפרש In a later targumic recension חרף is drop-
ped and פרש is found alone. This fact Löw has tak-
en as one of the proofs for his thesis, that the sup-
pression of the tetragrammaton became common in Pales-
tine much later than it did in other countries, and
that Lev.24:16 was to the Palestinian merely an in-
junction against the misuse of the name while to the
Babylonian and Alexandrian Jew, in whose midst the
Septuagint came into being, it served as a direct pro-
hibition to pronounce the name.¹

Ex.20:7 לא תשא את שם יהוה לשוא) was also
misinterpreted by some as referring to the utterance

¹ Gesammelte Werke Vol.I p.203 ff.

of the שם הקודש in ordinary conversation. But there can hardly be any doubt as to the real meaning of the command. Jewish sources have given the proper interpretation to the verse (vid. Joseph Ant. III 5⁵ Targum Onkelos; Sabbath 120^b and Shevuoth 19^b f).

The Samaritans who, according to Löw, avoided the mention of the name Jahwe even before the Palestinian Jews, replaced it by שֵׁם, the אֱלֹהִים of rabbinic literature. They unlike the Jews, as Grunbaum has well pointed out, grounded the prohibition to utter the divine name in question upon the much abused passage Lev. 24:16. For, the Samaritans, instead of translating בָּרַךְ by בִּלְבָב, לֵאמֹר, לְשׁוֹן the word usually found in connection with the idea of cursing or blaspheming, paraphrased it by the word, קִרְא which in Syriac bears the meaning of "reading letter for letter" (legit syllabim). This, Grunbaum be-

believes settles beyond a question, the Samaritan basis for the suppression of the name. But the validity of this proof is entirely dependent upon the correctness of meaning given to דלח .

We found that Dalman, by this word, tries to prove the contrary of Grünbaum's contention. דלח , he says contains the idea of swearing or magic. Hence, he infers that the Samaritans also interpreted the passage as having reference to the use of God's name in oaths.¹ If Dalman's statement be correct, then the Samaritan interpretation agrees with the Palestinian, which Hieronymus, under the influence of Jewish teaching, also accepted, as is evidenced in his translation of the verse: "Et qui blasphemaverit nomen Domini morte moriatur".

Having shown that Lev. 24:16 was not as was thought by some, the common ground for the prohibition to pronounce the tetragrammaton, we ask, whence

¹Mishna Sanhed. 10:1: Aboda Zara 18^a; Abboth de Rabbī Nathan 36.

did they deduce the prohibition?

The custom, it has already been said, was firmly established and its transgression carried with it divine punishment.¹ It now remained for the rabbis to legalize the custom by deducing it from the Bible. This they did by the distinctive *רבוזי ומיעוט* method originated by Nahum of Gimzo and developed by P. Akiba, which fact has been taken as proof of the lateness of the law that was deduced from the words of Ex. 3:15 *זֶה שְׁמִי לְעַלְמָא וְזֶה זְכָרִי לְדֹר וְדֹר*

The defective spelling of *זֶה שְׁמִי לְעַלְמָא* said the rabbis, certainly implies that it may be vocalized differently, and thus bear an entirely new meaning.

Thus Yalkut, based upon Kidd. 71^a and Pesach 50^a comments upon the passage: *זֶה שְׁמִי לְעַלְמָא קָדִישׁ וְזֶה זְכָרִי לְדֹר וְדֹר* שלא יהגק את ה' באותיותיו וְזֶה זְכָרִי שֶׁאֵין אומר אותו אלא בכינוי מדלג כתיב

Rashi to the same effect says:

שְׁמִי זְכָרִי חֲשַׁמֶּעַ שְׁלֵמָה שְׁתִּי שְׁמוֹת וְאֶמְרָלוּ זֶה שְׁמִי קִיּוּמָד לִי וּבִזְכָּה הַשְּׁנִי אֲנִי נִזְכָּר

¹ Mishna Sanhed. 10:1; Aboda Zara 18^a; Abboth de Rabbai Nathan 36.

In other words, it was believed that God had given two names to Moses by which he was to be known. One was to be concealed (לעלם) or rather not uttered, the other to be pronounced (יקרא).

was to be a perpetual Kere, in the words of Kidd 71^a (also Pesach 50^a)

כחש כחש כחש כחש
 כחש כחש כחש כחש

Having noted the Jewish sources, we naturally ask, What have our early sources to say on the subject? Philo in his Vita Moses¹ speaks to the effect that the disciples of Moses did not lightly esteem the mentioning of God's name. He then continues

οὐδέ τις οὐ λέγω βλασφημήσειεν εἰς
 τὸν ἀνθρώπου καὶ θεῶν κύριον ἄλλὰ
 καὶ τολμήσειεν ἀκαίρως αὐτοῦ
 φλέγξασθαι τὸ ὄνομα θάνατον ὑποκεινάτω
 τὴν δίκην.

In this statement our author undoubtedly has in view Lev. 24:16 and Ex. 20:7. Philo also speaks of the tet-

1 ὁμοίοις τοῖς ὧτα καὶ γλῶτταν σοφία
 κεκαθαυμένοις θέμις ἀκούειν καὶ λέγειν ἐν
 ἁγίοις ἄλλω δουδενὶ τὸ παράπαν οὐδαμοῦ

ragrammaton as one "which only those who have ears and tongues purified by wisdom have a right to hear and utter in holy places but no one besides."¹

Josephus² likewise shows how firmly the custom of not pronouncing the name Jahwe was established in his day. He, too, considers it a transgression of a divine (*θείης*) law to utter the "ineffable" name. He says: *ὁ θεὸς αὐτῷ σηαίνει τὴν ἰαοτοῦ προσηγορίαν περὶ ἧς οὐ μὲν θεὸς εἰπεῖν*

Josephus, considering it "unlawful" for him to speak the divine name, does not even dare to give the exact words of the decalogue.³ For, speaking of the Sinaitic revelation, he says, "And they heard a voice that came to all of them from above, inasmuch that no one of these words escaped them, which Moses wrote on two tablets, which it is not lawful for us to set down directly, but their import we will declare."⁴

¹ note on previous page

² Ant. II 12^a

³ Ant. III:5⁴

⁴ Transl. from Ed. of William Whiston vol. I p. 193.

The Greek writers in general, as well as the early Church Fathers, make some mention, either directly or indirectly of the suppression of the name Jahwe. The great difference of opinion that exists among them regarding the correct vocalization of יהוה proves conclusively that the real pronunciation was seldom, if ever, heard. When speaking of the tetragrammaton they would usually preface their remarks by saying that the name amongst the Jews was ἀφραστον unspeakable, ἀρρητος ineffable or ἀνεκφώνητος not to be pronounced according to the consonants.

In his enumeration of the names of God, Hieronymus makes the following remarks concerning the tetragrammaton: "quod anekphonetos, i.e. ineffable putaverunt, quod quidam non intelligentes propter elementarum similitudinem cum in graecis libris reperirent $\pi\iota\pi\iota\pi\iota$ legeri"¹ From this we infer that in the time of Jerome there existed manuscripts in which stood for the of the Hebrew text.

¹Quoted from Löw Gesam Werke. Vol. I p. 179.

These Greek letters, it has been remarked, are evidently late, for the old Hebrew script could not produce such transcription. The $\pi|\pi$ is nothing more than a letter for letter copy of $\pi|\pi$ read from left to right.

VOCALIZATION OF יְהוָה

It is but natural that in the course of time the true vocalization of the suppressed name should be forgotten. There is no doubt whatever that the vowel points of יְהוָה, sheva, cholem and kametz are those of Adonai. The old pronunciation "Jehovah" in vogue for almost four centuries is due to the ignorance of one Petrus Galatinus of the sixteenth century.

Aside from historical and documentary evidence showing יְהוָה to be a conflate form, having the consonants of one word and the vowels of another, there are several grammatical anomalies when יְהוָה is pronounced as Adonai that conclusively prove that the present vowels are not its own.¹

(1) If the present vowel points are the original ones of יְהוָה how account for the fact that

¹ Following reasons appearing in Gensenius' Hand Wörterbuch (revised by Dr. Frants Buhl Ed. XIII) already appeared in a work called "Decas exercitationum philol. de pronuntiatione nominis Jehovah, c. proef. Relandis Utrecht 1707, also in book אשכולות in paragraphs שם יְהוָה

when it follows or precedes אֲדוֹנִי it is vocalized יְהוֹה

(2) The letters ח וכלב when prefixed to a word beginning with a sheva usually have a chirik as their vowel. This is not the case when any one of them is prefixed to יְהוֹה.

The letters "act" as if they were placed before אֲדוֹנִי; "וכלב" receiving a patach and "ח" a zere.

(3) The letters בג זכפת following יְהוֹה always receive a dagesh which would not be the case if the name, as it now stands be the original.

(4) Words like שׁוּבָה and קוֹסָה, commonly accented on the penult receive accent on the ultimate when preceding יְהוֹה, because of the following implied ע (this point only in Ges. Ed. XIII)

(5) Abbreviations of יְהוֹה such as יְהוֹ and יְהוֹ cannot be explained from יְהוֹה (ibidem).

* The last proof that the vowels of יְהוֹה are

those of Adonai, of which we shall have more to say later on, is the fact that the LXX translates יהוה by *Κύριος* which is the ordinary rendering for אדוני

Jacob Bachrach, in spite of these seemingly irrefutable points attempted to prove that the present vowels of יהוה are original and that if the temple were in existence to-day the name would be pronounced Jehovah instead of Adonai, which of necessity took the place of the former when its utterance was interdicted after the destruction of the temple.¹ His course of reasoning is as follows: If the vowels of יהוה are those of אדוני how is the sheva under the yod to be accounted for? (This to us is no real difficulty, as a transfer of vowels would naturally necessitate the change of -i to -e, both of which, ultimately are equivalent to the same half-vowel). Again, why did the Talmud mention the fact, "I am writter with יה but read with אדוני",

¹ (קל"ז ח"ב) אשתדלות עם שד"ל

why did it not add "and sometimes I am read with

ל'א" This question might be answered, he continues, by saying that it was known by tradition that יקוק was to be read אלהים when preceding or following אדוני

But then, tradition equally informs us that יקוק was to be read אדוני and therefore, the statement of the Talmud is seemingly unnecessary. Bachrach then proceeds to show that the Talmud was after all justified in omitting the statement that יקוק is sometimes read אלהים because the vowels themselves indicate the fact which is not the case when יקוק is read אדוני. He thus comes to the conclusion that the Kethib יקוק was also the kere for the priests of old.

It is amusing to note with what seriousness he takes it upon himself to refute the unreasoned opinion of those who held that the vowels of יקוק are

those לְעֹלָם or of קִבְיָךְ which, aside from the significance of the meaning in these words were supposed to account for the sheva.

Having decided to his entire satisfaction that Jehovah was the correct pronunciation for the tetragrammaton, he felt it incumbent on himself to make some remark made by Bernfeld אוצר הספרות נרנא to the effect that he saw an old manuscript with the tetragrammaton vocalized יְהוֹה , which would establish beyond a doubt the correctness of the position of those who maintain that "Jehovah" is a conflated form with the vowels of Adonai. This he does by saying that he questions the authenticity of the manuscript, and that even granting it to be genuine, the chatuf patach is most likely due to ignorance of some scribe who heard Jehovah pronounced as Adonai, or because it was written יְהוֹה , which he thought ought to be changed to יְהוָה .

The most telling proof that can be cited against those who agree with Bachrach, is tradition itself, which, through its many conjectures as to the original form has given a verdict from which there can be no appeal.

The early Greek writers finding that Adonai was used as a substitute for the tetragrammaton whose real pronunciation was lost or forgotten, volunteered readings purporting to be the original ones. Amongst others, the following were the most common: Iav' , $\text{Ia}'\beta\epsilon$

and Iaw ¹ Stange believed that this deference in the readings is due to the fact that the Greeks not knowing how the ineffable name was to be read, reproduced it letter by letter.² Thus, $\text{I} = \text{T}$, $\text{A} = \text{A}$ or E , $\text{J} = \text{U or O}$ and $\text{N} = \text{A or E}$

Therefore also such forms as Iawa , Iew or Ieu\epsilon These readings according to Stange's view are mere transcripts of the Hebrew consonants and therefore

¹ Bengtstenberg Authen. of the Pentateuch. Vol. I p. 249 ff.

² Ibidem.

give us no clue as to the real vocalization of the tetragrammaton.

Ἰα βε' according to Theodoret, was the name of the Samaritan God. He says: *καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ Σαμεριτῆται ἡν Ἰα βε' Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ Ἀῖα* by which no doubt is meant, *יְהוָה* which Theodoret confuses with *יְהוֹה*¹

Kuenen² has given in full all the arguments pro and con for readings of *יְהוָה* that have been advanced by different critics. We can do no better than give the gist of his presentation of the subject. Especially so, since we are least capable of possessing judgment in matters philological.

The only possible, and at the same time correct pronunciation of *יְהוָה* is *יְהוֹה* or *יְהוּה*. No other could be intended, for the readings of Yahu or Yaho (so frequent in compounds and other shorter forms, for whose correctness Philo, Byblius, Clemens

¹This fact is taken from *ibidem* p.248.

²Hibbert Lectures of 1882 p.308 ff.

Alexandrinus and Origen have been summoned as witnesses) would necessitate the omission of the fourth letter.

Assuming that Yahweh is the original form, then the shorter forms Yah and Yahw can easily and without the violation of any grammatical laws be explained as derivatives abridged from Jahwe.

But what is to be said regarding the witnesses for the pronunciation of Yâo, Yaî or Yâè? It must be admitted that the authorities for the Yahweh form and for the shorter forms are pretty evenly balanced. However, the consideration that the shortening of proper names is quite accordant with analogy and their lengthening or expansion unusual, tips the beam of the scale in favor of the pronunciation Jahwe, the primitiveness of which is proven beyond a question by the appearance of the four letters Yhwh as early as 900 B.C. on the Mesha stone (line 18).

Balman has well pointed out how natural it was for the Semite to call his God "Lord" or Master. The personal relation that existed between the primitive worshippers and his deity found expression in such titles as *Adonai*, *Yahweh*, and *Elohim*. The Hebrew, unlike the tongues of the other nations possesses no feminine form for God, thus at the outset differentiating Him from other gods.

The anthropomorphism of the name *Elohim* is self-evident. It presents no real difficulties as do *Adonai* and *Yahweh*. The meaning is well given in the Mishnah where it is represented as saying "God is God". It is not difficult to comprehend how *Elohim* being a mere attributive or epithet of God (*El* or *Elo*) was used as a divine name, which, in the opinion of Balman is only second in im-

portance or holiness to that of יהוה

The name, as it now stands, has aroused some discussion as to the nature of its ending. Is it that of the first person plural or is it an old poetic plural.

For the following few condensed statements we are indebted to Dalman¹, who has fully substantiated each statement by many biblical quotations which we have omitted.

Batcher in his Grammar 868 quotes this name as an example of a suffic that has lost its original significance. This view, we think, is more probable than that held by Kimchi and others that יהוה is a peculiar plural.

Others hold that יהוה is of the same word formation as יהוה . This he, (Dalman) shows has been contested by the most prominent critics. The original meaning of Adonai was undoubtedly "My Lord"

¹Adonaj.p.20 ff.

as is seen from the fact that in the Hexateuch it is used only in directly addressing God. When in these books God is indirectly spoken of as Lord,

יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ gives way to יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי

In succeeding times יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ like יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ became a title or name. Interesting is the fact that יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ in the singular and without suffic refers to God while the plural without suffic has reference to earthly judges.¹

The slight increase or decrease in the use of the name by different writers did not justify us in drawing any definite conclusion respecting its use in different periods, as we did in the case of the tetragrammaton. In later literature Adonai, or the אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהֵינוּ was invested with a degree of holiness almost equal to that given the name which it supplanted. The designation אֲדֹנָי though originally used for אֱלֹהֵינוּ was in the course of time extended to אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהֵינוּ

¹With this fact our exclusive indebtedness to Dalman ends.

Only a few cases have been noted in which אֱלֹהִים was ambiguously used (i.e. **הַשֵּׁם קָדֵשׁ וְחוּל**) Tradition records a difference of opinion as to whom the אֱלֹהִים of Gn.18:3 refers.

As illustration of instances in which doubt exists as to the intended use of some divine name, we shall treat the just-mentioned passages in particular. Abraham, seeing three men coming towards him, hastened forward and bowed down before them. The context then continues:

וַיֵּצֵא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֲבְרָהָם לָהֶם
מִלִּפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים

Is it God who is addressed or is it the men?

This is the question raised by the rabbis. Shevuoth 35^b and Sopherim 4:6 come to the conclusion that אֱלֹהִים in Gen.18:3 as well as in 19:2 is חוּל

Rashi gives the two possible interpretations

י" לגדל שבתן אחר... ובלשון זה הוא חול
י" קדש הוא והיה אומר להקב"ה להמית לו עד שירחיק
וכנס את הארקה

Ramban rationalizes the passage by saying:

הביר ברהם שהם חלאכי עליון כאשר יקראו אלהים ואליהם

Difference in the interpretations of this passage obtains also among the versions. Being foreign to the purpose of this work we did not chronicle the very interesting results we found by a comparison of the different renderings.

What we have said is sufficient to illustrate the nature of the discussion that sometimes turns about the ambiguous use of a name. As said אדוני did not give much opportunity for such discussion,

אלהים still less, while אל and אלהים being the designations of deities in general, gave rise (as will later be noticed) to frequent doubts as to whether God, the vicegerents of God or heathen deities were referred to.

THE TIME IN WHICH THE READING
of
יְהוָה WAS SUBSTITUTED FOR אֲדֹנָי

The Greek translation of יְהוָה by *κύριος* has been generally advanced as one of the proofs indicating the early suppression of יְהוָה. Of all the authorities read we found that Dalman alone maintained that this was by no means a sure proof,¹ for we have evidence of manuscripts existing in which the tetragrammaton was not avoided but was transcribed literally. To this effect Hieronymus in his *Praefatio Regnorum* says: *Et nomen Domini tetragrammaton in quibuscum graecis voluminibusque hodie antiquis expressum litteris invenimus.*

Hebrew tradition points to the fact (Rashi to Ex.3:14 to the contrary notwithstanding) that the utterance of the ineffable name had not always been

¹Adonai p.38

prohibited. The question then arises, when and where was its pronunciation first interdicted and that of **יְהוָה** substituted in its place?

According to the traditional interpretation of Num.6:27 the priests alone were permitted to utter the ineffable name while bestowing the prescribed blessing upon the people. The **כִּי יְבִרְכֶנּוּ** of verse 23 was taken to mean the letter pronunciation of the tetragrammaton which occurs in the three following verses:¹

The utterance of the name was furthermore limited to the sacred precincts of the temple alone. This limitation was deduced from Ex.20:24 where it said **וּבְלִיקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אֶזְכֹּר אֶת שְׁמִי אֵלַי וּכְרַכְתִּיךָ** ²

We are informed that in places outside of Jerusalem **יְהוָה** the **כְּנוִי** of **יְהוָה** was used. Thus Mishnah Bamidbar r.to 6:23 Sec.11. **שֶׁהַמִּפְרָשׁ אֶסוּר**

כּוֹמֵר בְּגִבּוּלֵי

¹See Siphre to Num.6:22 & 27. Sota 38^a

²Sota 7:6-Bartimore as locum: Siphre to Num6:22; Tamid 7:6; Sanhedr 101^b

Maimonides¹ with Sota 7:6 and Tamid 7:2 in view puts the matter as follows:

השם ככתבו וקאשם הנהגה בלוד הא ואו הל וזה הא
 השם המפורש האסור בכל מקום ובמדינה אוקרים אותו
 בכינויין הוא באלף דלת שאין מזכירין את השם ככתבו
 אלא במקדש בלבד

We have already noted how one pronouncing "the name" could not enter the world to come. The rabbis even went so far as to assert² השוקף הזכרת השם חפז Teachers, therefore, has to exercise the utmost circumspection in the delivery of "the name" to their disciples, who were permitted to receive it but once a week and according to some twice a week.³

In place of the tetragrammaton, the Talmud informs us, there was given to the people, a twelve-letter name of God; but even this, as the number of ignorant increased, was delivered only to the more discreet of the priesthood, who, in uttering the

¹Mishne Tara 14:10

²Nedarim 7^b

³Kidd 71^a

name during divine service, would utter it indistinctly, "swallowing it" as it were, so as to make it unintelligible to those standing about.

We again quote Maimonides, who has this passage of the Talmud in view:

זה שאמר שם בן ארבע אותיות חכמים קוסדים אותו
לבניהם ולתלמידיהם פעם אחת בשבוע אין זה אין
יהיה הדבור בו בלבד אלא ללמד גם הענין
אשר בעבורו ייוחד זה השם ויהיה בו סוד אלה

It thus appears from Kidd 71^a that even the biblical injunction to pronounce the ineffable name in the temple was no longer in force. We learn, moreover, from Menachoth 109^b and Joma 39^b that this suppression of the tetragrammaton in the "place where God caused his name to be remembered" dates back to the time of Simon the Just (c.270 B.C.) But this statement is most likely one of the many myths to which Wise ע"ה had reference when speaking of Simon

¹More Nebuchim 1:62

the Just, as serving "to show that he was considered the last high priest in whom learning, piety, patriotism and statesmanship were united."¹

The historical value of the statement that the promunciation of "the name" ceased with the death of Simon the Just, is still more to be questioned when we find that according to Palestinian authority (Joma 3:7) the tetragrammaton was heard on the Day of Atonement in the Temple as long as it was in existence. Only the manner in which it was uttered was modified. In earlier times the name was pronounced without reserve and in a voice audible to all; but in times nearing the destruction of the temple it was uttered in a subdued tone so that R. Tarphon, a cotemporary of P. Johanan b. Zaccai, was unable to hear the real promunciation which was drowned in the voices of the accompanying priests.

When and where was the tetragrammaton first sup-

¹Hebrews' Second Commonwealth p.53

pressed still remains unanswered. Löw thinks that the talmudic statement "I am not read as I am written" is quite late. He believes that Egypt, the home of the Septuagint, was the first to give the pronunciation of יְהוָה to יְהוֹה, that while the later Psalmists (Palestinian) still pronounced the tetragrammaton (c.p.Ps.148:13 יְהוָה בְּשֵׁם יְהוֹה) the Greek translators rendered it by κύριος = אֲדֹנָי

The custom, he believes, then spread to Babylonia, then to the Samaritans and finally between the time of Simon the Asmonean, and Gamaliel I it became firmly established amongst the Palestinian Jews.¹ That the pronunciation of יְהוֹה was not yet prohibited in the early Asmonean days is shown, in his opinion, by the passage בְּרִיךְ הָאֵל בְּשֵׁם יְהוֹה occurring in Ps.118:26 which he attributes to this period. קִרָא he interprets as meaning בְּשֵׁם ה'

¹Löw Gesammelte Werke Vol.I p.203 ff.

We have already called attention to another proof that Löw advanced in support of his view that the Jews of Palestine were the last to substitute the pronunciation of אֱדוֹןִי for that of יְהוָה viz: The B. Targum to Lev. 24:16 reads ^{יְהוָה} אֱדוֹןִי שֶׁאֵין אֵין (i.e. pronunciation alone), while the Palestinian Targum reads אֱדוֹןִי שֶׁאֵין (i.e. blaspheming) which in a later targumic rescension became

אֱדוֹןִי alone. The omission of אֱדוֹןִי in the latter translation Löw thinks is strong evidence of the adoption by the Palestinians of a custom already established in Egypt, Babylonia and Samaria.

Hengstenberg¹ places the beginning of the tendency to suppress the tetragrammaton in times immediately succeeding the return from the captivity. This view is in accord with the fact found regarding יְהוָה in the later books of the Bible.

Dalman comes to the conclusion that inasmuch

¹Authenticity of the Pentateuch Vol. I 149'

as the period of history between Ezra, Nehemia and the Maccabees is one of darkness and obscurity to those living in the time of Christ (as is evidenced by the account of Josephus) and inasmuch as it is also one during which many radical changes took place, both civil and religious, which in later times were considered ancient, it is not unlikely that it was during this period that the suppression of the old name of the God of Israel took place.¹

Whiston in a note to this translation of Josephus Antiquities III:12⁴ says, "It is however, no doubt, that these cautious concealments (referring to the sacred custom of not pronouncing the tetragrammaton) were taught to Josephus by the Pharisees; a body of men at once very wicked and very superstitious". We cannot agree with this statement in its entirety nor with such sweeping characterization of the Pharisees; yet their strict religious principles, in

¹Adonaj pp 42 & 43.

opposition to the national ideas of the Sadducees, are well known. "With these Hasidim, of course, the knowledge, the expounding and the practice of the Law, religious observances and deeds of charity were the main objects of man's existence."¹

It is not improbable, therefore, that in their zealous desire to distance themselves from anything that might partake of the sacriligious they instituted this custom of not pronouncing "the name" of God, the sacredness of which we have pointed out, was already evident in the Bible.

Geiger, while attributing the custom in question to this period says it was due to the Sadducäische-Zadokitische influence and not to that of the Pharisees, as is seen in their enactment of the Halacha found in Berachoth 9:5.

להתקין שיהא אדם שואל את שמו חבריו בשם
שנאמר והנה בעו בא מביית להם ויאמר לקוצרים
ה' עמכם

¹ Wise's Hebrew's Sec. Commonwealth p.120

The correctness of Geiger's view depends of course upon his belief that the Halacha is Pharisaic. Other, however, hold the opposite view and hence nothing is gained through this passage, unless its author is definitely determined.¹

¹Urschrift u.Neb.d.Bibel p.264

יהוה צבאות

A cursory reading of some of the prophetic books brings us into contact with a divine appellation not found in the Pentateuch **יהוה צבאות**, occurring for the first time in I Sam.1:3:11, though evidently one of the important and significant names for God during the time of the prophets, is an obscure phrase that has evoked different views as to its history.

Before proceeding to a detailed examination of these views we shall note some facts concerning the name Dr. Max Löhr in an appendix to his "Luch Amos" (1901) has given a complete list with the Greek equivalents of all passages in which the divine name **צבאות** is found. The Septuagint column reveals the three following variants for **יהוה צבאות** **κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων** (2) **ὁ παντοκράτωρ** (3) **Σαβᾶωθ**

"Yahwe Sabaoth" is an abbreviated expression
 for ¹יהוה אלוקי צבאות and this in turn for
 יהוה אלוקי צבאות ² or ³אלוקי צבאות

3

The name in question occurs frequently in Jeremiah but especially in Is.40-66. While occurring once or twice in some of the minor prophets it is entirely absent from Ezek, Joel, Obad, Jonah and from the Hagiographic writings with the exception of fifteen times in eight Psalms and of three passages in Chronicles that are parallel to passages in Samuel.⁴

Rabbi Joshua,⁵ it has been said, did not class יהוה צבאות among the divine names. He, no doubt, considered it as an ordinary word, referring either to the hosts of Israel or to those of heaven, but Cheyne has said that "Jehovah Sabaoth is a fuller and more expressive proper name for the God (primarily) of Israel."

¹II.Sam.5:10; Smend 187.

²Amos 3:13

³Amos 9:5

⁴See Smend p.185

⁵Sopherim 4.

⁶His commentary to Isaiah p.5 note.

Midrash r.to Ex.3 retaining the martial idea implied in the word צבא quotes God as saying
 of himself ^{צבאוי} וּבְשִׁמִּי לְעוֹשֶׁה מַלְחָמָה בְּרַשְׁעִים אֲנִי נִקְרָא

Resh Lakish

gives to the phrase, what probably is its most primitive meaning

אֲדָן הוּא בְּצִבְאָ שְׁלִי

Kautzsch² and before him Herder³ and Schrader⁴ have advanced the opinion that צבאוי originally referred to the armies of Israel, whom Yahwe as leader led in battle. In support of this view Kautzsch has called attention to the fact that not less than five of the eleven passages of Samuel in which צבאוי occurs have either a direct or indirect reference to the ark of the covenant which in primitive times was a holy war emblem.⁵

צבאוי in the book of Samuel in all probability represents its earliest meaning,

¹Chagiga 16^a

²Z.A.W.1886.

³Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie II 84,85.

⁴Jahrb.für protest.Theologie 1875 pp 316-320

⁵See also Welh.Prolegomena, Germ.Ed.p.47

) quoted
 from
 Cheyne

for the rise of the name can be traced to the time immediately succeeding the period of the judges,"on the ground of its evident popularity in the time of David."²

Passages in which God is spoken of as fighting or leading his people to battle, are not infrequent. In fact Jahwe was at one time distinctively the God of battle.² Israel's wars were also Jahwe's,³ their enemies were his enemies;⁴ for David the צבאות יהוה is the אלהי מערכות ישראל⁵ God is said to go in the midst of the camp of Israel when marching against its enemies.⁶ He is also spoken of as an אש על סוסים⁷ and a גבור על סוסים⁸ All this undoubtedly points to a martial God and therefore the צבאות may have originally signified earthly hosts. Israel indeed was called God's host.

It has been contended that צבאות does not primarily refer to the hosts of heaven for they with two exceptions (Ps.103:21 & 148:2) are always expressed

¹ Cheyne Comm. on Is. p.11

³ Num.21:14; I Sam.18:17:25;26

⁵ I Sam.17:45: 36:26

⁷ Ex.15:3

² Smerd p.33 f & 95

⁴ I Sam.30:26

⁶ Dt.23:15

⁸ Ps.24:10

through the singular כָּבֹד , Shrader would therefore read in place of כָּבֹד and כָּבֹד in the above two Psalms כָּבֹד which indeed is the Ketheb of Ps.148:2.

Ewald¹ regarded "the host" as originally referring to the angels who are called "the hosts of heaven" (I K.22:19 Neh.9:6). It is true that the word was used in this sense, but with Herder, we believe, that only in the course of time did the name broaden in its significance until it comprehended not only earthly and heavenly hosts but also the whole fullness of the Divine Glory in creation.

Sperd does not agree with these stages of development through which the name is supposed to have passed. He declares that the development was just in the reverse order² citing passages that for us were not convincing.

We have thus seen that כָּבֹד as a name hav-

¹Hist.of Israel III 62.

²p.187

ing its rise in a time of conflict and struggle undergoes a change of meaning so complete as to entirely lose its original significance. "Between the time of the battle cry 'The sword for the Lord and Gideon', and the words of Isaiah, 'in returning and rest shall ye be saved', a word has passed away and a new one has arisen"¹. From Jahwe Sabaoth, the God of the armies of Israel, (κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων) we finally pass to Yahwe Sabaoth, the all-containing, the Almighty (ὁ παντοκράτωρ).

The prophets, no doubt, used the phrase as the loftiest name of Yahwe, expressive of his majesty and his glory, without stopping to consider whether the name referred to the earthly or heavenly hosts. They found an expression, and applied it in their own peculiar way. Without analyzing it, they used it as a proper name "laying special stress on his supermundane being". Be the true meaning of

¹Hastings Dict. of the Bible article on DYN

the phrase $\text{שׁוֹמֵר אֶת הַבְּרִית}$ what it may, the fact remains, that for the prophets it served as one of the highest and most comprehensive designations for God.

אלהים

We now come to a name of God whose origin like that of the other divine names is cloed in obscurity. We have already called attention to the manner in which the seemingly purposed interchange of Yahwe and Elohim was explained by the older exegetes and by the modern school of critics. We have also noted the different facts known concerning the Elohistie documents, to which, in most cases, we have claimed, the arbitrary use of Elohim is to be ascribed.

We have shown how before the hypothesis of the plural authorship of the Pentateuch was advanced, philosopher and exegete vied with one another in the attempt to find some underlying difference between Yahwe and Elohim, that would unerringly give the reason for the choice of one name in preference to the other.¹ The attempts usually led into the region of metaphysics,

¹See Hengstenberg Auth. of Pent. Vol. I p. 181 ff- Landauer and even as late as 1900 Dr. E. Seligkowitz in the "Jüdische Litteratur Blatt. ed. by Dr. M. Pahmer Magdeburg.

which, to the primitive Semitic mind, was an utter stranger.

It cannot be denied that some broad and general distinction does or did originally exist between the two names, the Elohim being a more inclusive or general term for deity while Yahwe was identified more as the God of Israel.¹ Yahwe was the Elohim of Israel.

This distinction determined the choice of name in not a few passages, Thus when the God of Israel was referred to in contradistinction to other gods he was spoken of as Yahwe, (I K.18:21,36,37; Judg.11:24-Ex.12:12, etc.) and again when a heathen is represented as speaking of God, the name Elohim with few exceptions (Gen.2::28,29; I S.19:6; I K.5:21-10:9) was used.² Similarly when an Israelite spoke of God to a heathen, he used Elohim as being the name of most significance to the non-Israelite.

But this difference by no means explains the per-

¹See י"י to Is.42:8

²See Davidson's note to his Job 1:21

sistent use of Elohim in certain parts of the Bible, as for example in the opening chapter of Genesis or in Psalms 42-84 where Elohim is the prevailing but not exclusive name of God.

That this difference was not the invariably determining factor in the choice of names is clearly shown by the fact that Jahwe and Elohim are frequently found side by side and that one sometimes replaces the other in parallel passages (e.g. Ps. 3, 5-7 14:2, 4, 6, 7; Ps. 48:8, 9 Judg. 5:4, 6). This, it seems to us, points to a time when one or the other was preferably used.

The preponderance of Elohim in certain Psalms or in a series of passages, in the words of Kuenen, can be attributed only to "subjective causes",¹ such as the age or place in which the writer lived, or perhaps, as we are told in Exodus, one was revealed later than the other.

Thus, on reading the later books of the Bible it

¹For some of the above facts I am indebted to Kuenen's Hexateuch Weksteed's transl. p. 56 ff.

is at once noticed that Elohim is used far more often than Jahwe, which at times as was indicated, was altogether studiously avoided. Zimmermann's explanation of the fact was already given. It is practically the same as that given by Renan in his "History of Israel" in which he continually repeats the thought that Jahwe as the national God of Israel was a most narrow conception of the deity; that the prophets worked back to the old patriarchal idea of a universal God, until even the narrow name of Jahwe became distasteful so that it was finally discarded for the broader and more comprehensive name Elohim.

We already know how tradition accounts for the fact by saying that Jahwe as the nomen proprium of God became more and more sacred until Elohim or Adonai was reverently substituted in its place. We see then here, as in the case of Jahwe, how fruitless and useless would be the attempt to give reasons for the use

of Elohim in certain passages.

After reading the opinions of the different authorities regarding the derivation of Elohim and its possible connection with E, we found all views so clearly and succinctly represented in the recent and as yet incomplected "Hebrew and English Lexicon of the O.T."¹, that we felt we could do no better than give in epitomized form its presentation of the matter.

אלהים and אלה according to some from the root אלה which must be assumed are the two names derived from the same root, if so, what is their relation to each other.

Following are the chief theories regarding the matter.

I (a) Gesenius followed by others considers the two names distinct from one another. He regards אלה as participle of אלה, therefore containing the idea of strong.

¹Based on Gesenius ed. by Francis Brown, Driver and Briggs.

(b) לָא and לְאֵלֶיךָ distinct from one another

לָא from לָא and לְאֵלֶיךָ is a plu. of לָא from $\sqrt{\text{לָא}}$ in Arabic meaning "to go to and fro" in perplexity and fear. Hence לָאָה = fear; an object of fear; reverently, revered one לָאָה־יְיָ Gn. 31⁴ לָאָה־יְיָ Is. 43¹³ c.p. also לָאָה־יְיָ in Neo-Hebrew literature.

II. לָא and לְאֵלֶיךָ possibly connected לָא = Lord, leader, from $\sqrt{\text{לָא}}$ to lead; in front of.

III. (a) לָא and לְאֵלֶיךָ from common $\sqrt{\text{לָא}}$ = strong
(b) לָא from לָא not ($\sqrt{\text{לָא}}$) strong and לְאֵלֶיךָ plural of לָא For such formation of plural c.p. לָאָה־יְיָ plu. of לָאָה־יְיָ . Their sing. לָאָה־יְיָ is inferred or is a back-formation from the plural.

IV לָא (לָאָה־יְיָ and לָאָה־יְיָ disregarded) from $\sqrt{\text{לָא}}$ stretch out; to reach out after (לָאָה־יְיָ , לָאָה־יְיָ)

Hence God whom we strive to reach or emulate.

He is the goal of all human striving.¹

In the course of our study of Isaiah we found that Rashi in commentary on the words אלהים יחיה of chapter 42:5, speaks of אלהים as במלך קדוש thus identifying אלהים with אלהים

We are not prepared for the vexed question as to the nature of the plural form Elohim. We found that tradition again anticipated modern views in the answer it gave to the question.

Dillman and others regard the function of the plural form Elohim as one expressing the fullness of the might or powers possessed by God, as one indicative of the plenitude of all the forces centered in him or as Jewish philosophy has it אלהים הוא כל This view, needless to say, is merely the product of the philosophic mind, and like the later conceptions of Jahwe, is far too abstract for

¹Hastings Dictionary of the Bible likewise gives the different views without giving the valuable reference to the sources of the individual opinion.

primitive thought.

The most widely accepted explanation is that given by Kimchi and Ibn Ezra. They look upon the plural in question as a "conspectus honoris" or as the "pluralis majestatis", an expression for his supreme eminence and highness. Analogy for such plural is not wanting. We let Ibn Ezra speak for himself

אלהים אמר שמצאנו אלהי יצמנו כי אלהים נשין
 רבים ושמש זה הדרך הל' כי כל לשון יש לו דרך
 כבוד וכבוד לשון לע שיאמר הקסן לנכח הגדול
 לשון רבים ובלשון הקודש דרך כבוד לומר על
 הגדול לשון רבים כמו אדונים ובעלים שאמר
 אדונים קשה ולקח בעליו וכן חלם עליו אנו
 ועדיו על כן אמר הכתוב ברא ואל בראו

The singular verb that usually accompanies and has been taken as proof that no idea of plurality is contained in the word, rather that of "power", or abstract "Godhead" (אֱלֹהִים בְּרָא).

¹ Gen. 1:1.

Hengstenberg¹ claimed that the plural form in Elohim served the same purpose as an accumulation of divine names in other passages such as Josh.XXII:22, Is.VI:3 and Dt.X:7. He likewise pointed out some examples, which, though plural in form, are certainly singular in meaning. He quotes among others the classical example of נִצְחָה in Proverbs and ἀληθεια αληθεια which in Greek is translated δὴ λῶς καὶ ἀληθεια. The plural form in this case, he says, denotes the assemblage of all light and infallible truth. By parity of reasoning αληθεια denotes the assemblage of all powers.

It is but natural that the idea should have come to some, that the plural form points back to a primitive polytheism. In earlier years and even to-day some have presumed to find unmistakable evidence of the trinity in the persistent use of the plural. The grounds for this view, it need not be said, pre-

¹Authen. of Pent. Vol.I p.273

clude it from any consideration.

W. Robertson Smith's view of the matter is frequently referred to as being quite illuminating and suggestive. He says that the plural is used "not in the sense of a definite number of clearly individualized deities but with the same indefiniteness as characterizes the conception of the *ginn*.¹ When this indefiniteness gave way to the conception of an individual God presiding over a sanctuary, vagueness of the plural form gives way to a definite *sing* Being.

Unlike *Jahwe*, *Elohim* was also used of heathen deities, of rulers and judges who served as God's vicegerents on earth. This varied use of *Elohim* naturally introduced confusion at times so that discussion as to whether *אלהים* is *אל* or *הוה* are not infrequent in the Talmud. We need only refer to Geiger's *Urschrift and Uebersetzungen der Bibel*

¹Religion of the Semites p.426

(pp 279-299) to note the numerous cases of the ambiguous use of Elohim as discussed by the rabbis.

Then Septuagint, Vulgate, Targum and Peshita, also differ in their renderings of the doubtful cases; at times their peculiar renderings are due to dogmatic reasons such as the desire to avoid anthropomorphism. In order to distinguish Elohim, the true God, from the idol-deities, qualifying words such as יְהוָה and אֱלֹהֵי were sometimes joined to Elohim as was also done in the case of El, the most widely distributed of divine names in the Semitic language.

The homymous use of Elohim led some to conjecture that the word was not originally a nomen proprium of God, rather an appellative of generic significance. For they could not understand how the early Semite, otherwise so scrupulously careful in everything pertaining to God should be so lax in the application of a name.

This, it may be, that aided in the discovery of the two different Elohistic documents spoken of in the Introduction. Herman Schultz in his *Alttestamentliche Theologie* makes the following statement regarding the two-sided use of Elohim.¹ "Alseigentlicher Personennamen für den Gott Israels ist das Wort in sehr später Zeit von einer angestrichelten Frömmigkeit gebraucht."²

Of the singular אֱלֹהִים no more need be said than that though frequently found in the Hebrew it is relegated only to poetic and a very few prose passages. The book of Job, for instance, has a special predilection for אֱלֹהִים . It has been pointed out that like the plural it also serves in the capacity of an appellative and a name proper.

¹Quoted from Zimmermann's *Elohim* p.2.

²For example of the primitive use of Elohim as attributive see *ibid* p.17 ff.

לֵא

We have already given the different views that are extant regarding the probability of El and Elohim being derived from the same root.

It will be remembered, that one view, upheld by Lagarde and Felitzsch, connected El with לֵא or לֵאִי striving towards, that is, the Being towards whom all striving is directed.

There is an Arabic root 'اَل' "to be in front of", to govern, with which the name in question is sometimes connected. If this be correct, El will have some such meaning as "leader" which is said to be in accord with other Semitic designations of God such as אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִים and אֱלֹהִים¹.

Jehuda Halevi (Kusari 3) as do some of the moderns connects El with the idea of strength for he says: אֱלֹהִים מַעֲלֵה מַיִם יַעֲלֶה לָנוּ מִן הַיָּם

¹ Smend Alt. Relig. Geschichte p. 26

Ramban also entertains this traditional view. In his commentary on El Shaddai of Gen. 17:1 he says: $\text{אֱלֹהֵי שְׁמַיִם וְאֶרֶץ וְיָם וְכָל הַבְּרִיאָה}$

$\text{יְקִיָּהוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$

In his interpretation of Shaddai he quotes Rashi and Ibn Ezra both of whose views will be presented in the discussion of that name.

Dr. Wise, of blessed memory, in common with others, professed to find a system of theology in the divine names of the Bible.¹ His views, therefore, will be more interesting than scientific. In connection with El he tells that it is the positive of the negative אֵין or לֹא Hence El is the Absolute Being, causative and constant.

In Mosaic times, he continues, El was used when anthropomorphic or elemental qualities were predicated of God. Thus he is spoken of as $\text{אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$, $\text{אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$

$\text{אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ etc.

All this represents God

¹ Theology of Judaism in the World's Parliament of Religions, 1894.

as Immanent in Nature. In Post-Mosaic time El was used for Elohim.

It would be folly to attempt to give in a work of this nature the different views and systems that have been built upon the divine names, for their number and divergence far exceed the limits of a few month's work.

We have already spoken of El as entering into composition with proper names and of what we learn therefrom.¹

¹See above p.

שדי

We now come to a designation of God, which though evidently an attributive, was regarded by the rabbis as one of the divine names invested with a degree of holiness that did not permit it to be erased after once written. Shaddai, though originally a qualifying term, as is שדי was in later times used absolutely. Thus in Job 15:25 Shaddai is parallel to El.

According to Ex. VI:3 שדי is the name by which God appeared unto the patriarchs. In keeping with this information it is interesting to note that this name occurs most often in the history of the patriarchs, from and after the time of Abraham, until the time of the Exodus: from then on it occurs but rarely, most often in poetic portions. Moreover, the compounds with Shaddai can be traced to the Pa-

triarchal period.

The diversity of opinion regarding the meaning of Shaddai is proportional to the number of roots from which it has been derived. The word has been frequently identified with the root **שד**, to destroy. This idea is perhaps in harmony with the primitive notion of God as a nature deity.¹ To this effect Ibn Ezra speaks in his commentary on Gen.17:1

אני אל שדי: שם הנאמר וטעמו תקיף ורבים
פירשוהו סגירת שודד שהוא מנצח ומתגבר

The common translation "Almighty" has come down to us from the Greek rendering of Shaddai as **ἰσχυρός** παντοκράτωρ. The Seventy also regarded Shaddai as a nomen proprium as is evidenced by their occasional transliteration of the word as **Σαδδαι**

"Robertson Smith derives the name in question from the Aramaic root **שד** "to pour", hence, "the Paingiver". But such derivations, Hastings tells us

¹ See above p.

have little to recommend them.

Noeldecke regarding שדי as the proper vocalization of 'שד considers it to be derived from שׁד meaning "Lord", thus connecting it with the Aramaic name of God שדא ; this, in turn, is parallel to other Semitic designations of God such as אחן and בעל^1

More recently Shaddai has been connected with the Assyrian Shadu, "mountain" from the root "to be high". Hence $\text{שדי} = \text{שדא}$ with adjectival^{al} sense = "Most High".²

Pashi, as usual, inclining towards the traditional interpretation gives the one found in Chagiga 12^a which regards Shaddai as a compound of די and אשר . The following is his comment on the name (Gen. 17.1)

אני אל שדי: אני שד הוא שיש די באלקותי לכל
בריה ולפיכך התהלך לפני ואמרה לך לא ליה
ולפטרון וכן כל מקום שהוא בחקרא פירושו וכן
די שלו והכל לפי הענין

¹See above p. 1.

²See Hastings Dict. of Bible on Shaddai.

Rambam holds a similar view which he supports by

the following passage of Maimonides:
 שגינו צריך
 במציאות מה שנקרא ולא בקיום מציאותו לבולטו
 אבל מציאותו תספיק בעצמה

The traditional view of שד as self-sufficient is very old as evidenced by the Greek rendering *ἰκανός* occurring twice in Ruth, three times in Job and once in Ezekiel.¹

Ibn Ezra, with a more critical turn of mind, recognizing the difficulty in explaining the name, contented himself with the mere quoting of different views. He himself believes that Shaddai is not a compound. Interesting to note is the early attempt to explain the suffixal ending, which to modern critics, is still a mooted point. We quote him in full in as much as he gathers together the views that were extant in his day.

קלת שדי קשה בפירוש והגאון כי ישן בספר כשאין
 שאתה מדבר עמי וקטנם שמך לעולם די ולא
 אדע סלם לפירוש זה כי אין יקרא שם אשר די רק
¹Hastings Dict. of Bible on Shaddai.

להיותו תאר כמו טוב ושלח עלי לבי דוי עב
 והנאיד רב שמאאל פי בו בלשון ערבי אלק האר
 ופירושו מנצח ותקיף וקלוד תחת אות הכפל
 כלוד דליו שוקים מפסה ואלף אשר בצא נהרים
 וכחוקו כקול שזי וקיה שדיבצירן ויפה פירש

The ending of Shaddai like that of Adonai has been variously explained. Hofman in his Schrift, Bewers I p.80 and Herman Schultz in his Alttestamentliche Theologie I p.288 f. seem to regard Shaddai and Adonai as some archaic formations.¹

Noeldecke, as was said above, derived Shaddai (according to him שדי, שדי) from שד He therefore considered the ending as nothing more than the ordinary pronominal suffix which like that of Adonai, lost its meaning in the course of time.²

We have already given above what tradition had to say regarding the relation of El Shaddai to Jahwe, that was inferred from Ex.3:14 ff and 6:3.³

¹Fact taken from Dalman's Adonai p.24

²Z.D.M.G. 1886 p.735 ff and 1888 p.480 ff.

³See Pamban to Ex.3:13 and to Gn.17:1.