NOTES AND NOTICES

CRITICAL NOTE ON EXODUS VI. 3

In criticising a document there are at least three fundamental principles upon which we should proceed: *First,* the document must be supposed to be in harmony with itself and interpreted accordingly. *Secondly,* it must be presumed to be in harmony with its sources of information. *Thirdly,* it should be in accordance with its supposed time, place, and circumstances.[1]

I. The Critical Theory is Inconsistent

1. The critics hold that Exodus vi. 3, which the RV renders, "And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as God Almighty (*El Shaddai*); but by my name Jehovah I was not known unto them," belongs to P and that P means to say that El Shaddai and not Jehovah was the name of God known to the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Therefore they assign four passages, Gen. xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, and xlviii. 3 to P., since El Shaddai is found in them. It is to be observed, however, regarding these passages that, in xvii 1, it is said that *Jehovah* appeared to Abram, saying, I am El Shaddai; and in xxxv. 11 that *Elohim* appeared to Jacob saying, I am El Shaddai. In xxviii. 3 Isaac says to Jacob, El Shaddai bless thee; and in xlviii. 3 Jacob says in the presence of Joseph and his two sons, El Shaddai appeared unto me. In a fifth passage, Gen. xliii. 14, Jacob uses this appellation in his prayer for his sons who are starting for Egypt. But this verse is assigned to E or J by the critics and the El Shaddai attributed to the Redactor. Is it not singular that if P thought El Shaddai was a proper name for God he should have used Elohim about seventy times before Ex. vi. 3 and El Shaddai only four times? Is it not extraordinary that, if the writer of Ex. vi. 3 meant that God "appeared" to the patriarchs under the name of El Shaddai, only once in P should it be said that El Shaddai "appeared," just the same number of times that P says that Jehovah "appeared" and that Elohim "appeared"? Jehovah alone (or Jehovah Elohim) is alleged to have occurred in J, and Elohim alone in E; but El Shaddai is found but four times in P and Elohim seventy times.

---

[1] Briggs, *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch,* p. 4.

If P alone thought that El Shaddai was the only name of God known in the time of the patriarchs, how about Gen. xliii. 14, which the critics assign to E or J? We have seen that they escape the consequences of this assignment simply by asserting that El Shaddai is an interpolation of the Redactor. But did the Redactor also think that the patriarchs used El Shaddai rather than Jehovah? Why, then did he not cut out Jehovah and put El Shaddai into the text of J? Besides, if P alone thought that Shaddai was a specifically patriarchal designation, how about its use in Gen. xlix. 25 and Num. xxiv. 4, 16, which are assigned to J or JE? All of these questions will be appropriately answered if we take Shaddai and El Shaddai as appellations, "the Almighty" or "a mighty God," and not as proper names.

2. A historical or ostensibly historical document should, if possible, be interpreted in harmony with its sources and with earlier histories supposedly known to the author. What then were the sources of P? According to datings advocated by the critics they could have been only J, E, D, H, and Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah, and parts of other books. Now the only one of these sources or earlier works in which El Shaddai occurs is Ezek. x. 5, "And the sound of the cherubim's wings was heard unto the outer court as the voice of Almighty God (El Shaddai) when he speaketh." Shaddai alone occurs in the Pentateuch only in Gen. xlix. 25 (J) and in Numbers xxiv. 4, 16 (JE). In Gen. xlix. 24, 25, we read in the Blessing of Joseph that "the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the Almighty One (אביר) of Jacob (from thence is the Shepherd, the stone of Israel) even by the God of thy fathers, who shall help thee, and by the Almighty (Shaddai) who shall bless thee." The Samaritan Hebrew text and version of this verse both read El Shaddai instead of Shaddai, a reading supported by the Syriac and apparently by the Septuagint. If we take the latter reading we would find God Almighty to be parallel with the Almighty One of Jacob who is also called the God of thy fathers (*i.e., of Jacob*). This psalm of Jacob refers in verse 18 to Jehovah in the words, "I have waited for Thee, O Jehovah"; so that if P got his information about El Shaddai in this psalm he would have known that Jehovah was

used by the patriarch Jacob at least. Nothing is said in this psalm about either Jehovah or El Shaddai having "appeared." In Num. xxiv. 4, 16 Balaam uses the phrase: "which saw the vision of the Almighty (Shaddai)."[2] Since this chapter is assigned to JE, P must have known, if he got his information here, that Shaddai was supposed by his sources to have been used after the declaration made in Exodus vi. 3; for JE certainly places the episode of Balaam about forty years after the event recorded in Exodus vi. 3.

These being the only places in the old Testament where Shaddai occurs in the portions assigned by the critics to a date before 550 B.C., it follows that the critics' interpretation of Ex. vi. 3 makes P to be out of harmony with all its known sources.

3. In documents which in their opinion were written after 550 B.C. we never find El Shaddai; but Shaddai alone occurs thirty times in Job, and in Ruth, i. 20, 21; Isa. xiii. 14; Joel i. 15; Ps. lxviii. 15, xci. 1. Not one of these passages refers to the patriarchs or to God as "appearing" to them or to anyone else. In twenty-seven of them Shaddai is used as parallel to other names of God, to wit: nine times to אלוה, thirteen times to אל, once to עליון, and four times to יהוה   There is no intimation that Shaddai was a more ancient designation than these other terms. It follows, therefore, that, as interpreted by the critics, P in its use of El Shaddai is not congruous with the usage of these other books which the critics allege to have been written in post-captivity times. To be sure, if Job was written in the time of the patriarchs we can see where the author of P got his idea that they had used Shaddai as a name for God. Or even if some of the other passages came from the time to which they have been assigned by tradition we might see how he got the idea; even though they say nothing of revelation or the patriarchs. But as the case stands for the critics we find that the author of P must have invented the whole conception. For neither Ezekiel, Job, J, E, H, D, Joel, Jonah, Deutero-Isaiah, Ruth, nor the Psalms, furnish any ground for supposing that the patriarchs used this appellation for God; and the certainly late writings such as Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Esther,

---

[2] Shaddai is rendered in Greek and Syriac by "God," in Arabic by "the sufficient one"; and in the Samaritan version by "field," they having read *sadai* for *shaddai*.

Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, never mention the name at all. Whether we take the traditional view of the post-captivity literature, or the radical, there would therefore be no contemporary evidence to show that the hypothetical writer of P, provided that he lived in post-captivity times, was in his use of Shaddai in harmony with contemporaneous usage and ideas.

II. Correct Exegesis Supports Unity of Pentateuch

Having shown that the interpretation of Exodus vi. 3 advanced by the critics is out of harmony with the rest of P, that it does not agree with the rest of the Pentateuch, and that it does not fit into the time at which P is alleged to have been written, it remains to see whether this passage can be so interpreted as to be brought into agreement with the traditional view of the Pentateuch as the work of Moses. This we shall attempt to show by an examination of the text, grammar, and vocabulary of the verse, under the following heads: 1) "appeared," 2) "as" (כ), 3) "God" (El), 4) "Almighty (Shaddai), 5) "but" (waw), 6) "name," 7) "known," 8) the form of the last sentence,—can it be interrogative?

1. The "appearing" of God to men is described in several different ways in the Old Testament.

a. The most usual expression is that found here in Ex. vi. 3, where the Niphal of the verb "to see" (ראה) is used. With the Deity as subject this verb occurs forty-three times as follows:

(a). Jehovah, Gen. xii. 7 bis (J), xvii. 1 (J), xviii. 1 (J), xxii. 14 (J), xxvi. 2, 24 (J), Ex. iii. 14 (E), iv. 1, 5 (J), vi. 3 (P), Lev. ix. 4 (P), xvi. 2 (P), Num. xiv. 14 (JE), Deut. xxxi. 15 (JE), 1 Kings iii. 5, ix. 2, 1 Chron. i. 7, iii. 1, vii. 12, Jer. iii. 13, Zech. ix. 14.

(b). The glory of Jehovah, Ex. xvi. 10 (P), Lev. ix. 6, 23 (P), Num. xiv. 10 (P), xvi. 19 (P), xvii. 7 (P), xx. 6 (P), Isa. lx. 2, Ps. xc. 16.

(c). The angel of Jehovah, Ex. iii. 2 (J), Jud. iii. 21 bis, vi. 12, xiii. 3, 21.

(d). Jehovah of Hosts, Mal. iii. 2.

(e). Jehovah, God of Israel, 1 Kings xi. 2.

(f). Elohim, Gen. xxxv. 9 (P).

(g). The man (i.e., the angel of Jehovah), Jud. xiii. 10.

(h). El, Gen. xxxv. 1 (E).

(i). El Shaddai, Gen. xlviii. 3 (P).

b. Other expressions are the following:

(1) In the following cases it is said that man "saw" the Deity, the Kal of the verb ראה being used:

(*a*). Jehovah, 1 Kings xxii. 19, 2 Chron. xviii. 18.

(*b*). The glory of Jehovah, Ex. xvi. 7 (P), Isa. xxxv. 2.

(*c*). The angel of Jehovah, Num. xxii. 31 (E), 1 Chron. xxi. 16, 20.

(*d*). The majesty of Jehovah, Isa. xxvi. 10.

(*e*). יה יה, Isa. xxxviii. 11.

(*f*). The King, Jehovah of Hosts, Isa. vi. 5.

(*g*). Lord (*Adonai*), Isa. vi. 1, Am. ix. 1.

(*h*). The Holy One of Israel, Isa. xvii. 7.

(*i*). Elohim, Gen. xxxii. 30 (J), xxxiii. 10 (J), Jud. xiii. 32, 1 Sam. xxviii. 13.

(2) The Hiphil of ראד, with the Deity as subject, occurs in the Old Testament twenty-two times: Gen. *1*, Ex. *2*, Deut. *3*, Judg. *1*, 2 Kgs. *1*, Pss. *4*, Jer. *3*, Ezek. *1*, Nahum *1*, Hab. *1*, Zech. *2*. In the Pentateuch it is found in J in Ex. ix. 16, in E in Gen. xlviii. 11; in P in Ex. xxv. 9, Num. viii. 4; in D in Deut. iii. 24, iv. 36, and v. 21.

(3) The verb חזה "to see" is used in Ex. xxiv. 11 (J) with Elohim as object, in Job xix. 26 with Eloah as object, and in Num. xxiv. 4, 16 (JE) with Shaddai as object.

(4) Of the words for "vision" *mar'eh* is used in Gen. xv. 1 (E), in connection with Jehovah and *mahazeh* in Num. xxiv. 4, 16, with Shaddai.

(5) The verb "to reveal" (נגלה) is found in the Pentateuch only in Genesis xxxv. 7 (E). Isaiah employs it in xl. 5, liii. 1, lvi. 1. It is found also in 1 Samuel in ii. 27, iii. 7, 21.

It is clear from the above evidence that the Deity is said in all the documents J, E, D, H, and P to have "appeared" and that the Niphal of ראה, "to see," the most common expression used to describe it, is found in *all* of them.

2. The preposition ב which occurs in Ex. vi. 3 before El Shaddai is the so-called *Beth essentiae* and is to be translated ordinarily by "as," or "as being," or "in the character of." It is found in Gen. xxi. 12 (P), in Ex. xviii. 4, xxxii. 22, (both E), and in Deut. xxvi. 5, xxviii. 62, xxxiii.26, and in Lev. xvii. 11 (H). It occurs also in Jud. xi. 35, Pss. xxxv. 2, xxxvii. 20,

xxxix. 7, liv. 6, lv. 19, lxviii. 5, 33, cxviii. 7, cxlvi. 5, Prov. iii. 26, Ecc. vii. 14, Job xxiii. 13, Isa. xxvi. 4, xl. 10, xlviii. 10, Ho. xiii 9.

In Ex. vi. 3 we should translate "as being El Shaddai," and "as being Shemi Jahweh" or "in the character of a mighty God" and "in the character of my name Jehovah," the force of the proposition being regarded as carried over to the second phrase.

3. *El* occurs about two hundred and twenty times in the Old Testament, in Gen. *9*, Ex. *4*, Num. *11*, Deut. *10*, Josh. *3* (or *35* times in the Hexateuch, J *2*, E *5*, D *10*, P *5*[3]), 1 Sam. *1*, 2 Sam. *2*, Isa. *25*, Jer. *2*, Ezek *7*, Dan. *4*, Hos. *3*, Jonah *1*, Micah *2*, Nahum *1*, Zech. *2*, Mal. *2*, Pss. *71*, Job *55*, Prov. *1*. It frequently takes after it an attributive adjective, or a noun in construction. Thus E represents El as jealous, D as great and terrible and merciful, JE as jealous, merciful, gracious and living; and J speaks of a seeing God (*El Ro'i*) an eternal God (*El 'Olam*), Deut. xxxii, of a God of a stranger (or a strange God), a god of trustworthiness, and a God who begat us, 1 Sam. ii. 3 of a God of knowledge. Gen. xiv. four times calls El the Most High (*'Elyon*), and Deut. xxxii. 8 names him simply *'Elyon*. From this evidence it seems clear, that El was in use in all periods of Hebrew literature and also that the limiting adjectives and genitives did not denote names of different gods, but were generally at least nothing but appellations of attributes or characteristics.

4. As to the word Shaddai, there is uncertainty as to its root, form, and meaning. If it were from a root שׁדה, it would be of the same form as *sadai* which is sometimes read in the Hebrew text instead of *sadé* "field."[4] In Babylonian the root *shadu* means "to be high," and derivatives mean "mountain." and "the summit of a mountain" and perhaps "majesty." In this case, we might take *shaddai* as a synonym of *'elyon* "Most High," as used in Gen. xiv.

A second derivation is from the root *shadad* "to be strong" The ending *ai* is found also in חרי (Isa. xix. 9) and in נובי (Am. vii. 1, Neh. iii. 17) and perhaps in כילי (Isa. xxxii. 5;

---

[3] It is not found in H.

[4] In fact, the Samaritan version reads Shaddai as *sadai* in Num. xxiv. 4, 16.

114   THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Olshausen, *Lehrbuch* p. 216). This ending is found also in Arabic and Ethiopic (Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, I. p. 220; Dillmann, *Aethiopische Grammatik*, p. 204). If from this root the word *shaddai* would mean "might, strength." The Greek translator of Job apparently had this derivation before him when he rendered *shaddai* by παντοκράτωρ, "Almighty,"[5]—a translation which has been generally followed in the English version. In the Syriac an equivalent word *ḥassino* "strong" is found in Job vi. 4, viii. 3, 5, xi. 7, xiii. 3, xv. 25, xxvii. 2, 13, xxix. 5, xxxvii. 23.

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

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

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

5. The particle *Wau* usually means "and." The meaning "but" is comparatively seldom the correct one.

6. *Shemi* has been taken by most interpreters and translators as meaning "my name." The Syriac, however, renders it "the name of," taking the final *i* as the old nominal ending, as in בני (Gen. xlix. 11), חכלילי (Gen. xlix. 12), אסרי (Gen. xlix. 11), ננבתי (Gen. xxxi. 39), שכני (Deut. xxxiii. 16), בריתי

---

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

Lev. xxvi. 42),[6] or else having read but one Yodh where the Hebrew text now gives two.[7]

As to the syntactical relation of the phrase "my name Jehovah" the ancient and modern versions vary. Some take it as the preposed object "my name Jehovah did I not make known" (so the Septuagint, Latin Vulgate, Syriac, and the Targum of Onkelos) and seem to have read the Niphal as a Hiphil. The Samaritan Targum gives a literal rendering. The AV puts "by" before "my name" and inserts "the name of" before El Shaddai. The RV puts "as" before El Shaddai and "by" before "my name." The RV margin suggests "as to" before "my name" and omits "the name of" before "El Shaddai." The Targum of Jonathan renders literally except that it explains "and my name Jehovah" as meaning "but as the face (or presence) of my Shekina." By this simple interpretation the Targum of Jonathan, without any change of text, brings the verse into agreement with the preceding history of the Pentateuch.

As to the meaning of "name" it can scarcely be held that any post-captivity writer really thought that the mere sound of the name itself had never been heard before the time of Moses. But if the writer of P did think so, it is preposterous to suppose that the Redactor who put J and P together should have accepted P's opinion and then allowed the Jehovah of J to remain

---

[6] See other examples in Ex. xv.6, Isa. i.21, xxii.16, Ho. x.11, Ob. 3, Jer. x.17, xxii.23, xxxiii.20, *bis*, 25, xlix.16, *bis*, li.13, Zech. xi.17, Lam. i.1, iv.21, Ezek. xxvii.3, Mi. vii.14, Pss. ci.5, cx.4, cxiii.5-9, cxiv.8, cxvi. 1. See Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, §90 *l,m*, Olshausen, *Lehrbuch*, and Ewald *Ausführliches Lehrbuch*.

[7] That is the original text may have read שם יה where we now have שמי יהוה Jehovah was possibly written יה here, as in Isa. xxvi.4, Ps. lxviii.5, Ex. xv.2 and other places, and the Yodh was read twice. This monographic writing where the letter is to be doubled in reading is to be found on the inscriptions as well as in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. It is familiar to all Semitic scholars in the so-called intensive stems where the second radical is written once and read twice. E.g kṭl may be read kiṭṭel. So, in the Panammu inscription (l.19) כרכב is to be read Bar-rekab; in Clay's *Aramaic Indorsements* בנשׁיא is to be read Bana-neshaya. So, also, in the *Spicilegium Syriacum* (p. 21), ככבל is to be read Kokab-Bel, and in Jud. vi.25 ירבאר is Yerub-Baal. Massoretic notes also give an example in Lam. iv.16, suggesting that *u* should be read twice. The ancient versions, especially the Septuagint, afford many cases of this doubling of the letters of the Hebrew text, e.g., Hos. vi.3, 2 Chron. xii.2, Neh. x.7.

in Genesis as the ordinary name of God. The Redactor at least, and the people who accepted his composite work as the work of Moses, must have interpreted this verse in a sense agreeing with what had gone before. Now such sentences as "my name is in him" (Ex. xxiii. 21), "to put his name there" (Deut. xii. 5), "for his name's sake" (Ps. lxxix. 9), "according to thy name so is thy praise" (Ps. xlviii. 11), show that the name meant the power, visible presence, honor, or repute, of the person named. The Targum of Jonathan explains "my name Jehovah" as "the face (or presence) of my Shekinah."

7. That "knowing" the name of Jehovah means more than merely knowing the word itself, is apparent from Is. xix. 21, where we read: And Jehovah shall be known to Egypt and Egypt shall know Jehovah in that day.

The form used here in Ex. vi. 3 may mean: I was known, I was made known, or I allowed myself to be known.

8. Questions in Hebrew and other Semitic languages may be asked either with or without an interrogative particle. The following evidence goes to show that the last clause of Ex. vi. 3 might be read "was I not made known to them?" This interpretation would remove at one blow the whole foundation of the critical position, so far as it is based on this verse.

In *Arabic* "a question is sometimes indicated by the tone of the voice" (Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, II, 165); *Potest quidem interrogatio solo tono notari* (Ewald, *Grammatica Critica Linguae Arabicae*, §703).

In *Syriac* there is no special syntactical or formal method of indicating direct questions. Such interrogative sentences can only be distinguished from sentences of affirmation by the emphasis. Thus רב הו אלהא may mean "God is great," or "Is God great?" (Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar*, §331). "Il n'existe de particule Syriaque pour l'interrogation; le phrase interrogative ne se distingue donc que par la sense general" (Duval, *Grammaire Syriaque*, §382). "Generally, the interrogative is denoted by the inflection or connection without any particle" (Wilson, *Elements of Syriac Grmamar*, §132. 2.).

In *Ethiopic*, the question can be denoted by the arrangement of the words or by the tone; though ordinarily a particle of interrogation is used (Dillmann, *Aethiopische Grammatik*, §198).

In *Hebrew* "frequently the natural emphasis upon the words (especially when the most emphatic word is placed at the beginning of the sentence) is of itself sufficient to indicate an interrogative sentence" (Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, §150). "Ist der Satz im ganzen fragend, so stellt sich das Wort welches die Kraft der Frage vorzüglich trifft in seiner Reihe voran; und die kräftliche Voranstellung dieses Wortes kann allerdings in Verbindung mit dem fragenden Tone ohne jedes Fragwörtchen genügen" (Ewald, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, §324).

As examples of this type of interrogative sentence, the following may be cited: Gen. xviii. 12, After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also? Gen. xxvii. 24, Thou art my son Esau? Ex. viii. 22, Should we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before them, would they not stone us? Ex. ix. 11, As yet exaltest thou thyself against my people, that thou wilt not let them go? Ex. xxxiii. 14, Shall my presence go, then I shall give thee rest? (So Ewald, *Gram.* §324, and Gesenius, *Gram.* §150). Jud. xi. 23, And shouldest thou possess it? Jud. xiv. 16, Behold I have not told it my father nor my mother, and shall I tell it thee? 1 Sam. xi. 12, Shall Saul reign over us? xx. 9, If I knew certainly that evil was determined by my father to come upon thee, then would not I tell it thee? xxii. 7, Will the son of Jesse give every one of you fields and vineyards? xxii. 15, Did I then begin to inquire of God for him? xxiv. 14, If a man find his enemy, will he let him go well away? xxv. 11, Shall I then take my bread and my water? xxx. 8, Shall I pursue after this troop? 2 Sam. xi. 11, Shall I then go into my house? xvi. 17, Is this thy kindness to thy friends? xviii. 29, Is the young man Absalom safe? xix. 23, Shall there any man be put to death this day in Israel? xxiii. 5, Verily will he not make it to grow? 1 Kings, i. 24, Hast thou said Adonijah shall reign after me? xxi. 7, Dost thou govern the kingdom of Israel? 2 Kings v. 26, Went not mine heart with thee? Hos. x. 9, Shall not the war against the unjust overtake them in Gibeah? (Ewald, Henderson, *et al.*). Is. xxxvii. 11, And shalt thou be delivered? Jer. xxv. 29, Like a hammer which breaketh the rock in pieces? xlv. 5, And seekest thou great things for thyself? xlix. 12, And art thou he that shall go altogether unpunished? Ezek. xi. 3, Is not the building of houses near? (Ewald). xi. 13. Wilt thou make

a full end of the remnant of Israel? (Ewald). xxix. 13, And shall I be inquired of by you? xxxii. 2, Art thou like a young lion of the nations? (Ewald). Jon. iv. 11, Should I not spare Nineveh? Hab. ii. 19, Shall it teach? Zech. viii. 6, Should it also be marvelous in my eyes? Mal. ii. 15, And did not he make one? Job ii. 9, Dost thou still retain thy integrity? ii. 10, Shall we receive good? x. 9, And wilt thou bring me into dust again? xiv. 3, Dost thou open thy eyes? xxxvii. 18, Hast thou with him spread out the sky? xxxviii. 18, Hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth? xxxix. 2, Canst thou number the months? xli. 1, Canst thou draw out Leviathan? Lam. i. 12, Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? iii. 38, Out of the mouth of the most high proceedeth not evil and good? Neh. v. 7, Do ye exact usury every one of his brother?

In view of the exegetical problems which are involved in the interpretation of this verse, the Versions, both ancient and modern are of unusual interest. The following may be cited:

1. The Greek Septuagint: And God (ὁ θεός) spake to Moses and said to him: I am (the) Lord (κύριος) and he appeared to Abraam and Isaac and Jacob, being their God, and my name κύριος I manifested not to them.

2. The Latin Vulgate: And spake the Lord (*Dominus*) to Moses, saying: I am the Lord who appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as (*in*) omnipotent God, and my name Adonai I did not show (*indicavi*) to them.

3. The Targum of Onkelos: And spake Jehovah with Moses and said to him: I am Jehovah, and I was revealed to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as God Almighty (באל שדי) and my name Jehovah I did not make known (אודעית) to them.

4. The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan: And Jehovah spake with Moses and said to him: "I am Jehovah who revealed himself unto thee in the midst of the bush and said to thee, I am Jehovah, and I revealed myself to Abraham, to Isaac, and Jacob as an Almighty God. (באל שדי) and my name Jehovah, but as the face of my Shekina (באפי שכינתי) I was not made known to them.

5. The Peshito: And spake the Lord (Moryo) with Moses and said to him: I am the Lord and I appeared to Abraham and to Isaac and to Jacob as the God El Shaddai (באיל שדי אלהא) and the name of the Lord I did not show to them.

6. The Samaritan Hebrew text agrees with the Hebrew, except that it has Jehovah instead of God in verse 2, reads וֵאָרָאָה instead of יאָרָא in verse 3, and adds Wau (and) after Abraham.

7. The Samaritan Targum is a literal rendering of the Hebrew.

8. The Arabic of Saadya: Then spake God to Moses and said to him: I am God who named myself to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as the Mighty, the Sufficient, and my name is God.

9. The English version: And God spake unto Moses and said unto him: I am the Lord (RV, Jehovah) and I appeared unto Abraham and unto Isaac and unto Jacob by *the name of* (RV, as) God Almighty; but by (RV, or "as to") my name Jehovah was I (RV I was) not known (RV or *made known*) unto them.

10. The Dutch translation: Then spake God unto Moses and said unto him: I am the Lord and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as God the Almighty; but by my name Lord I was not known to them.

11. Luther's German version: And God spake with Moses and said unto him: I am the Lord and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob that I would be their Almighty God but my name Lord was not revealed to them.

On the basis of the investigation of the verse given above the writer would suggest the following renderings: And God spake unto Moses and said unto him; I am Jehovah and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob in the character of the God of Might (or, mighty God) and in the character of my name Jehovah I did not make myself known unto them. Or, if the last part of the verse is to be regarded as a question, the rendering should be: And in the character of my name Jehovah did I not make myself known unto them? Either of these suggested translations will bring this verse into entire harmony with the rest of the Pentateuch. Consequently, it is unfair and illogical to use a forced translation of Exodus vi. 3 in support of a theory that would destroy the unity of authorship and the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch.

Princeton.   R. D. WILSON.

DR. J. LEIGHTON STUART'S *New Commentary on the Apocalypse
of St. John the Divine*

This book, recently published in China, is of more than or-
dinary interest. This is due primarily to its being a com-
mentary prepared for the use of native Christians. The develop-
ment of a distinctively Christian literature is one of the great
problems of the missionaries, especially in a country like China,
which, despite the abysmal ignorance of the great mass of the
population, has a vast native literature and sets a very high value
upon education. It has an added interest because its author is
President of Peking University, one of the great union educa-
tional institutions of China, and consequently occupies a position
of great influence and responsibility in the field of Christian
education. This Commentary has not been translated into Eng-
lish. The third of the "Introductory Discourses" is here given
in full with a view to indicating its general character. The trans-
lation was made by Rev. Hugh W. White, D.D., and was care-
fully revised by Rev. Henry W. Woods, D.D., and verified in
part by Rev. H. Maxcy Smith.

INTRODUCTORY DISCOURSES. THIRD DISCOURSE. THE APOCALYPTIC BOOKS.

What has been said above about the relations between the church and
Rome gives the general basis of interpretation. While the main purpose
of the book can be thus in a general way understood and judged, yet the
style is strange, ancient, deep, not easy to fathom. In past generations
illustrious men of the church, by not interpreting the text obscured the
meaning. Also some, following out their own lines of thought, in read-
ing deeply symbolic passages, would add extraneous interpretations,
and thus unavoidably ran into confusions and errors. Happily some
modern theologians in taking up the Jewish apocalyptic authors, know
that this kind of style was begotten in the Jewish apocalyptic books.
Taking up the origin of this class of apocalyptic writers, we would say
a few words. The prophets of the Old Testament times had a foretelling
insight so high and clear, a spiritual vision so vast and great that we can
know them without being told. But the prophets had shortcomings.

(1) They stressed their own times too much. In saying that future
kingdoms of the earth should have wonderful blessings, a new heaven
and a new earth, it was all centered on Jerusalem, and did not go
beyond the purview of their own times.

(2) They spoke of nations rather than individuals. Their mind bore
on the perpetuation of the kingdom. Although successive generations
had come and gone, they had not in earlier times taken notice of this.
The result was this. The beautiful hope of the prophets had proved
empty. The Israelites had broken the commandments, left the true way;
God had sent strong neighbors to attack them, caused them to suffer;

as a final punishment he had transferred the populace to Babylon; they had spent several tens of years there; those who returned were few; the nation was poor and weak; what the prophets had said had not come to pass; then they changed their ideals and entertained other hopes, thinking that God's teachings would not conquer, that the prophets' words were without results, that the strong neighbors had not succumbed, and there would have to be heaven-shaking, earth-moving, supernatural, transcendent miracles to overturn things. The Old Testament phrase, the Day of the Lord, must be so interpreted. As to the Messiah, some spoke of Him as a great ruler, some as a hero, some as a god-man. While allowing for these differences, yet all thoughts of the Messiah embodied the idea of a great Jewish kingdom. After suffering in the Babylonian exile, some of the Jews became affected by gentile influences and left the old church. In the times of the return the descendants of these Jews not only stressed the kingdom but even more stressed individual good and evil, believing that when Messiah should come, He would reward the good and punish the evil, and furthermore they said that their forebears, although dead, must in that time all come before the Messiah, the good to be rewarded and the evil to be punished, and the wicked angels also must be judged.

Because they held such views, the writers of this apocalyptic literature had three especial characteristics.

The First Characteristic. This kind of literature generally appeared in times of distress. In ancient times there were two seasons which were prolific of this kind of literature.

(1) In the times of the Syrian King Antiochus, *i.e.,* 175 B.C. to 154 B.C., Antiochus wanted to destroy the old Jewish church and compel the people to submit to Grecian instruction. A minority of the Jews "helped Chieh" (a Chinese ancient tyrant) in his tyrannies and heartily cooperated with him. So the writers of Apocalyptic books anathematized those Jews who helped the king. The Book of Daniel appeared about this time. The writer of the Book of Daniel used the Stories of Daniel, on the one hand to stimulate the Jews in religious faith and from religious faith beget patriotism, coordinate the strength of the mass, and thus throw off Gentile oppressive governments and break their fetters; and on the other hand to anathematize the Gentile-toadying Jews. The visions and wonders used in the book, being secretly aimed at national and international affairs, either already past or contemporaneous, all had their deep significance.

(2) The times when Rome was destroying Judea. In the final struggle between Rome and Judea, when Jerusalem was being destroyed, those Jews who were rich in faith, thought that God must protect the holy capital and the holy temple, that he could not give them up; so then, with dangers imminent and disaster impending, half believing and half doubting, terrors arising off and on, for this reason many wrote apocalyptic books to comfort the people, and strengthen them in the hope. But when Jerusalem was destroyed, their quondam hopes perished. The Jews dispersed abroad, then took a very pessimistic view of things and

said they must wait for the Day of the Lord when there would be wonderful, cosmic, stupendous changes to then carry out the hope of a great Jewish kingdom,—that except for this there was no hope.

Furthermore in those times, not only did the Gentile oppressions give rise to apocalyptic literature, but also the Maccabean priest-kings and the Sadducees worried the Pharisees, and the Pharisees also wrote apocalyptic books anathematizing them. The expressions used to anathematize the Maccabeans and Sadducees were unusually fierce, similar to those used to anathematize Antiochus and the Roman government. While this kind of apocalyptic literature was intended to be comforting, yet its thought and expression breathed the most violent spirit of all. Ancient and modern literature utterly lack mild, loving language, and this class of apocalyptic books is exceptionally so. It is no wonder the New Testament apocalypse follows this apocalyptic style. The expressions used towards the wicked disclose a fierce tone which causes it to lose the New Testament's original spirit of benevolent love.

The Second Characteristic—strong in borrowed imagery. The imagery used, all wonderfully fine symbolism, has a fixed interpretation. Thus stars, horns, wild beasts, numbers, letters, all have their allegorical significance. The reason writers used this kind of illustrative style rather than speak out men's faults in direct language was the fear of exciting a hostile reaction on the part of the government, just as the modern book, "The Record of the Stones" uses names with allegorical meaning. But this book reveals the living Christ and deals with realities, not like the things in the "Record of the Stones," all fictitious, similar to the "Dream of the Red Chamber." Thus it cannot be classified with these works of fiction.

The Third Characteristic—using the names of ancient saints and former worthies as though what is related really took place in the times of those saints and worthies. For example, the books of Daniel, Enoch, and Jeremiah tell of Baruch, Ezra, Moses, Isaiah, etc. The authors, fearing that readers might treat their books lightly, purposely introduced the names of these illustrious men to make impressive the special meaning they wished to convey. Furthermore, as the matters treated of were different from what the Old Testament prophets spoke of, they felt it would not be easy to make men believe. And besides, if in the books the real names were used, the rulers would certainly take the matter up Therefore they borrowed and used the names of ancient men with cryptographic meaning. And further, by using the names of ancient men the meaning was manifest and no interpreting was needed.

Not a few of the other books of the New Testament were influenced by literature of the apocalyptic class, but there is no need to discuss them, and we will only discuss the Apocalypse. It uses entirely the apocalyptic style of writing. The Messiah it speaks of is the same as he whom the other apocalyptic books speak of as the victorious warrior with bloody garments. The New Testament constantly uses the slain lamb to represent Jesus as the Messiah. The Apocalypse, although like other apocalyptic books it borrows the figure of the victorious

warrior, also sometimes uses the New Testament figure of the slain lamb, and indeed makes this the central topic of the book. As to the origin of evil it is rooted in Satan's opening the bottomless pit, or when illustrations are used of the scorpions and locusts, they are all illustrations used in other apocalyptic books. The phrase, "Millennium," is borrowed from "The Mysteries of Enoch." ("The Mysteries of Enoch" was written in the times of Jesus.) Further, as to the first resurrection, the Old Serpent being chained, the lake of fire, the tree of life, the ministry of angels, and such things, they are all taken from other apocalyptic books.

The value of the New Testament Apocalypse is not in its points of resemblance with other apocalyptic books, but in the differentials. The most important of these differentials are given below.

(1) This volume opens with the name "John." But there is more than one man named "John," and who is the man this book calls "John"? This question is open to discussion. If we can prove that the name is really "John" and is he whom the believers of the Province of Asia knew and honored, the matter is settled. (2) The books of Daniel, Enoch, etc., have a secret purpose; the hidden meaning of the books is not disclosed. But the New Testament Apocalypse is different. He who makes the announcement wrote plainly—Seal not the words, *e.g.*, 1: 11; 12: 10. This seems to show intention to reveal. (3) This book is written to the believers of the Province of Asia just as a modern pastor writes to his church members. From the above three points we can see that the writer directly received the revelation of God and published it to men, thus fulfilling the prophet's function, and the value of the book is thus known.

Also a great distinction between the New Testament Apocalypse and the other apocalyptic books of the class is the New Testament conception of the Messiah, after Jesus became man. Among those conscientious Jewish church members what they saw was the good weak, and the evil strong; God's rewards and punishment not yet in operation in the world, and there must be sometime a day of great overturnings, coming all of a sudden. This book, on the other hand, is based on the reality of Jesus' humanity, he being still on the earth as a living Christ, such as cannot be compared with the vaporings of the other kind of apocalyptic literature. So, then, as to the conflict of good and evil, although the prince of demons is still on the earth, He who conquers that prince of demons is not an imaginary Christ, but an actual Christ who has begun his work.

The author fully believes that in the contest between Rome and the church, Christians will certainly be triumphant, because the principles of Jesus will promote the evolution (or progress) of the world. The matters discussed in this book through nineteen and a half chapters are all historical realities. After finishing the discussion of matters relating to the issues of the times, then it speaks of the final judgment of good and evil and the last things of heaven and earth. From this can be seen that the main topic of the book is the new relation between Christ and the life of men. The use of the apocalyptic style is accidental (not es-

sential). The use (of the book) lies in the essence and the deep signifi-
cance of the book and not in the external style. It is like old skins hold-
ing new wine. Regarding the other apocalyptic books, the writers as to
the state of the world all take a pessimistic view of things. Their view
is that the wicked do as they please in the earth, although God is in
heaven, seeing but not looking, paying no attention to them, and giving
the evil free rein, yet in the end there must be a day of wrath and pun-
ishment. This book declares that all things even now are under the
sovereignty of the Lord Christ, unlike the hopes of those men based
on the future. The phenomena attending the great physical changes of
nature spoken of in the book, how can they be anything but the voice of
the Lord Christ warning the world? If not heeded, this voice will in the
future turn into wrathful judgment. When believers suffer persecution
for the Lord, it is really because the Lord is in the world. And further-
more He is contending with Satan, with evil spirits, and is victorious.
So then this book reveals Christ in history, already helping the good
and fighting the evil and not waiting for a future day. He will certainly
enable the good to fully accomplish their work in the world and mani-
festly bear fruit. The future has hope and the present also has hope.

So the writer is at one with the prophets of Old Testament times
and also holds the various important ideas of the apocalyptic books, and
he also enlarges their conception and extends their vision, e.g., as has
been mentioned, the resurrection, the judgment, the future life,—all of
which were beyond the scope of the prophets, and are only spoken of
in this book. So that what the prophets told of pertaining only to present
times, in this is revealed its greater depth, and with greater value, for
the present and the future, though differing in name, are really directly
connected.

The following points are worthy of especial notice: the atti-
tude assumed toward Prophecy and Apocalypse in general, and
toward the Book of Daniel and The Apocalypse in particular.

Prophecy and Apocalypse.—Apocalypse is represented as a
popular reaction or revolt against Prophetism, an attempt to
make up for its deficiencies. The prophets were provincial, "all
centered on Jerusalem." They were short-sighted, "did not go
beyond the purview of their own times." They had proved
mistaken in their views, "The beautiful hope of the prophets
had proved empty," and "What the prophets had said had not
come to pass." In view of the "shortcomings" of the prophets
the people "changed their ideals and entertained other hopes."
These found expression in the apocalyptic literature. The apoca-
lypses appeared in times of distress. They were pessimistic and
fierce, symbolical and cataclysmic, and they were pseudony-
mous.

The Book of Daniel.—The Book of Daniel "appeared" in a time of distress, "the Maccabean period." Its "visions and wonders" were "secretly aimed at national and international affairs, either already past or contemporary." This means of course that they were pseudo-prophecy. It was also pseudonymous, the name of Daniel like those of other "illustrious men" being used to make "impressive" its special meaning, and also to save the real author or authors from persecution at the hands of the "rulers."

The Apocalypse.—The key to The Apocalypse lies in the study of "the Jewish apocalyptic literature." "Illustrious men" of past generations misinterpreted The Apocalypse because they failed to realize this. "Some modern theologians" have discovered it. The Apocalypse has borrowed its symbolism largely from these apocalyptic books, *e.g.,* "the phrase 'millennium'," the conception of "the origin of evil," and in part, the conception of the Messiah. Its "fierce tone" comes from this literature and "causes it to lose the New Testament's original spirit of benevolent love," —which, Dr. Stuart says, is "no wonder"! Apparently the distinctively apocalyptic features are to be regarded as in the main decidedly detrimental to the value of the book and we may be thankful for the "differentials," which give to it its permanent value. Nineteen and a half of the chapters are history in apocalyptic dress. The writer of The Apocalypse believed in the triumph of the Church "because the principles of Jesus will promote the evolution (or progress) of the world."

It is difficult to reach a perfectly clear understanding of Dr. Stuart's position regarding prophecy and apocalypse, because his statements are by no means consistent and harmonious. Thus, the statement, "The prophets of the Old Testament times had a foretelling insight so high and clear, a spiritual vision so vast and great that we can know them without being told," might seem to those ignorant of "modernist" phraseology to amount to a recognition that the prophets as inspired men could predict the distant future. But the meaning of such words as these ought to be plain to everyone, when the author goes on immediately to assert that the prophets had "shortcomings" and were provincial, shortsighted and mistaken; and when he restricts the "visions and wonders" of Daniel to events "already past or contemporaneous," despite the fact that the language is distinctly

that of prophecy and that in the New Testament Daniel is expressly called "Daniel the prophet." It is plain that occasional statements to the contrary notwithstanding the language which Dr. Stuart speaks most readily is that of the theological liberal.

In an article entitled "Modernism in China" which appeared in this REVIEW (October 1921), Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas, after commenting on certain statements made by Dr. Stuart in lectures delivered at the Y.W.C.A. Secretarial Conference in Sungkiang in 1919 and published in the *Annual Report* of the Conference, made the following summary statement (*ibid.* p. 655): "Reviewing this teaching, I do not hesitate to say that it is not safe teaching to give to the Y.W.C.A. secretaries, or, indeed, to anyone else, in China or in America." The Third Introductory Discourse of the *Commentary on the Apocalypse* shows that, as Dr. Thomas contended, Dr. Stuart's attitude in matters of first importance in the sphere of Christian truth is in direct conflict with the plain teachings of the Scriptures.

Princeton.   OSWALD T. ALLIS.