

think that Moses did not write the book dwell strongly on the exceedingly fragmentary character of certain portions of it, and the supposed repetitions in the narrative. And then, there is the celebrated Jehovistic and Elohistic controversy, arising out of the circumstance that in some portions the word "Elohim," "God," is exclusively used, while in others the word "Jehovah," badly translated in our version, "Lord," is found either solely or in combination with "Elohim," "God." The comparison of the second chapter with the first may serve to illustrate both the point of supposed repetition and diverse use of the Sacred Name. On so great a controversy it may here suffice to say, that in the *balance of arguments* I am inclined to think the right lies with those who hold by the Mosaic origin of one document; though ever if there were extant more ancient documents embodying the traditions of the past, the value of Genesis would not be invalidated by supposing that Moses, under the guidance of God, blended them together into one consecutive form. From all we know of the Semitic races, and especially of the Jewish branch, it is most probable that, from the earliest times, traditions were carefully treasured and handed from father to son. The more precise and careful the early wording of the earliest traditions, the more fixed would the language of each story become, as it was repeated age after age. And, as the tradition of the different ages would, of course, be put in form of words by the men of the age when the events occurred, we should expect to find, as the traditions of one age were supplemented by those of another, a diversity of style and expression more or less traceable. Moses, doubtless, found a good number of these diversely originated traditions in vogue among the children of Israel in Egypt. They were a beautiful series of stories on which faith and hope were nourished. If then, under the guidance of God, Moses proceeded to reduce these traditions to accurate order with such emendations and additions as the Spirit of God might suggest, it is just what we might expect if we find traces in his composition of colourings not entirely his own. Nor ought we to deprive Moses of the possibility of that diversity and variation of narrative which arises from a work being written, not at a single sitting, as in the haste of modern times, but in fragments spread, for ought we know, over a space of fifty years. As to the use of the Sacred Name under two forms—it should be considered that the words Jehovah (Lord), and Elohim (God), in many passages, are so intermingled, that the separate document theory is beset with immense difficulties; while on the supposition that the one, Jehovah (Lord), was employed exclusively in some instances, to set forth His covenant and merciful relations to man, and on the other, Elohim (God), to indicate the creative and controlling power in general, there is not only a rational explanation, but also, a reason why both terms should be used indiscriminately, when there was nothing in the narrative to require an exclusive exhibition of one relationship. The first chapter is distinctly creative, and there Elohim (God) is used. The second chapter is almost entirely declarative of His special relation to man, and there Jehovah (Lord) is