
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE II.

A LAYMAN'S VIEW OF THE CRITICAL THEORY.

BY HERBERT W. MAGOUN, PH.D.,
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

III.

IN the two papers preceding this one, nothing has been said of the "duplicate accounts," so often postulated in various parts of the Pentateuch by members of the critical school. This has been regarded by many as a particularly strong point in the defense; and yet, as a matter of fact, it is an exceedingly weak one. Its plausibility may enable it to entrap the unwary, because they judge by appearances; but the hypothesis is not one that can commend itself to the thoughtful, since the well-known antithetical balancing of verse parts in Hebrew makes it particularly liable to a form of composition that lends itself easily to the sort of analysis exhibited in these supposed accounts. This, in itself, is a ground for suspicion. Tautological expressions are often to be found in other similar compositions, and balanced statements are a common peculiarity of various forms of literature. They are therefore by no means as significant as they have been represented to be, and little or no value can be attached to them.

Although this may seem like a strong statement to some, it can be abundantly justified by an appeal to experience; for it has often been remarked that it is possible to separate different kinds of literary compositions into parallel accounts, and numerous examples of the thing itself have already been furnished by well-known writers. Naturally the selections

have been mostly Biblical, and New Testament authors have been employed to furnish much of the material. There is no necessity, however, of confining such efforts to that field; for some of the classical poets can be pressed into the service, and they will readily yield specimen narratives of the kind needed. A brief one, selected almost at random from Vergil's Æneid, as it appears in Conington's translation, may not be out of place. The passage reads as follows:—

"When the banquet's first lull was come, and the board removed, then they set up the hugh bowls and wreathe the wine. A din rings to the roof — the voice rolls through those spacious halls; lamps hang from the gilded ceiling, burning brightly, and flambeau-fires put out the night. Then the queen called for a cup, heavy with jewels and gold, and filled it with unmixed wine; the same which had been used by Belus, and every king from Belus downward. Then silence was commanded through the hall" (i. 723 ff.).

The selection might easily be prolonged; but this may be sufficient for the purpose. It yields two parallel accounts. They are well balanced and admirably illustrate the point at issue:—

"When the banquet's first lull was come, they wreathe the wine. A din rings to the roof; lamps hang from the gilded ceiling, burning brightly. Then the queen called for a cup and filled it with unmixed wine. Then silence was commanded through the hall."

"When the board was removed, then they set up the hugh bowls. The voice rolls through those spacious halls; and flambeau-fires put out the night. Heavy with jewels and gold, a cup which had been used by Belus, and every king from Belus downward, was filled."

Similar examples can be furnished from other parts of the Æneid with but little effort, and Homer may be split up in like manner. Tautological forms of statement are common to both authors, and the practice is by no means confined to Old Testament writers.[1]

[1] See above, vol. lxv. pp. 77 f.

The weakness and futility of claiming any definite results on such a basis must be patent to any unprejudiced mind. If there is anything whatever in the contention that there were parallel accounts, it must rest on some definite internal evidence in the documents themselves, in addition to any and all analyses like the one just given, and it must plainly require some such explanation to account for the facts. The only thing of this character that can be found, as will duly appear in the course of the argument, distinctly favors the Mosaic authorship.

If there were two accounts of any extent, he wrote them both or dictated them to a scribe, which amounts to the same thing. That this is a possibility, in a certain sense; — nay, that it is even a probability, this paper will endeavor to show; but let it not be supposed that the critical theory will receive any genuine support, because it will not. The two things are not alike, and they cannot be made alike; and yet, if the theory herein advanced should receive any considerable support, the higher critics may make haste to assert that it is what they were really aiming at all the time! It could not be, however, since the foundation is not the same.

Incidentally, one other point needs to be touched upon at the very start. As was indicated in the first paper, much has been made of the stylistic differences found in the Pentateuch. But the instability of this argument has been rendered apparent by the discovery that the canonical earmarks of style get woefully mixed in the different hypothetical documents, which simply means that the same mind was back of the entire production. That differences really occur, however, must be self-evident when it is remembered that so slight a thing as the exchange of a pen for a typewriter or the cessation of the effort of writing in order to dictate to a

stenographer has an immediate effect upon the verbal form of a composition in the matter of style, as more than one author has discovered for himself.

But, more than this, men differ at different times in their phraseology, and some of their own productions they would never recognize but for the handwriting. Any one who will take the time to look over his old letters can verify this, and he may receive some enlightenment on the whole subject, as may also any minister who will take the trouble to review his written sermons.[1] Differences of time, of subject matter, of object aimed at, of mental attitude, of viewpoint, — nay, even of physical condition, — may affect results and, incidentally, stylistic qualities. Any careful student of psychology can find material to substantiate this, if he will follow up his own productions with care and compare them with one another. He will soon discover that he is several different persons combined, and he may begin to have some anxiety lest there should not be enough of his anatomy to furnish a proper corporeal backing when he comes to be divided up among the several gentlemen whom the linguistic argument thrusts before him as himself.

The truth is that a man of any parts is more or less complex, although there are those who belong in the one-idea class. Moses was not a man of that type, however, although some of the critics may be, and he cannot be correctly judged on that basis. The utter futility, moreover, of attempting to utilize his stylistic peculiarities as a basis for determining the sources of the Pentateuch must be clear from an experience recounted below. Meanwhile, it should be remembered that Moses, like all other Orientals, undoubtedly utilized various statements already formulated and stored in his memory

[1] See above, lii. 61 f.

in definite verbal shape; and this unquestionably affected his style more or less, although no mortal that now lives or ever did live could accurately separate any part of his work into its constituent elements. No man dares try it in a modern instance, though some do venture to attempt it where all the original writers are safely dead.

The style of a modern writer is not grasped even by his hostile contemporaries; for, when Mr. Robert Buchanan began to suspect that his English critics were actuated by personal motives rather than by any real demerits in his literary productions, he determined to put the whole matter to a conclusive test in a practical way. The story is told by Urquhart in his "New Biblical Guide," vol. i. pp. 76 f. Suffice it to say that his next book, a poem entitled "St. Abe and his Seven Wives," was published anonymously and was highly praised by the very men who had become habitual faultfinders whenever anything of importance appeared from his pen. Repeating the experiment with a less ambitious production, he had the satisfaction of obtaining like results. Not one of his critics recognized his style, in spite of their former assaults; and his work was even attributed to Lowell in the first instance and to Swinburne in the second. Some of the editorial writers were furious when they knew the truth.

But there is another phase of the matter. Many men seem to have an incurable mental strabismus or else a sort of intellectual astigmatism which affects their literary vision and warps it out of shape if not out of all semblance to the truth. Some eyes see a circle as an ellipse and a square as a rectangle, while some have a double vision that confuses and intermingles whatever objects they behold. It is the same with the eyes of the mind; for few have a clearness of perception so accurate as to grasp the truth in all its simplicity and

beauty. Some see it distorted in one direction and some in another; and few take the pains to view it on all sides in order to get an accurate idea of its various parts. Worst of all, most men judge by appearances, with little or no regard for any modifying circumstances.

A good story is told of a farmer who owned a frog pond. It varies in its details; but in substance it is as follows. Going to the city, he persuaded a wholesale commission merchant to handle, in his interest, a carload of frogs' legs. He then contracted with a railway company to furnish him a car just a day earlier than the time set. Returning home, he rounded up the neighbors and drained his pond. Every frog that showed itself was captured; but when he saw the result he wired the railroad company to cancel his order. He also wrote the dealer that he would not be able to furnish the quantity specified but would bring in what he had. When he appeared he produced just six dozen pairs of the dainty morsels and somewhat sheepishly remarked: "Them pesky frogs made such an infernal noise that I thought there must be a carload on 'em."

It may be a trifle disconcerting to those who have committed themselves to the critical theory, when it is known that this story is actually in circulation, among certain learned theologians who have not accepted the conclusions of the critics, as an illustration of the frame of mind characterizing many who have accepted them. The application is so clear that it needs no elucidation.

While such a method of approach is not argument, — the gentlemen who use the story would be the last to claim that it is, — it is legitimate; for the anecdote is intended solely as an illustration, and it serves the purpose admirably. With a prejudiced mind, as with a non-logical one, reason is power-

less, and some other method of approach is imperative. When it becomes necessary to find the joints in the harness of such a mentality, ridicule, winged with the yew of a good illustration, is often the best possible shaft for the purpose. Lincoln understood this well, and many a situation was saved by his witty stories. He told them to avoid profitless discussion, and he was justified by the results obtained. Willful blindness and unreasoning prejudice must be disarmed before they can be reached.

Another illustration may make the position of those who appreciate the situation more clear. Suppose there are twenty learned men in a certain group and that three out of the twenty arrogate to themselves all the wisdom of the company and assume that the other seventeen must either agree with them or not be counted as "scholarly." How would the seventeen be likely to take such an assumption? If they ridiculed, among themselves, the complacent arrogance of the three, would it be any wonder? This is but a fair and just representation of actual conditions. Novelty has been exploited by the papers, and a few have been exalted thereby. The many "do not count."

The time for using gloves is past. Men who have known enough to combat the position of the critics have often been engaged in other pursuits and have not cared to start a controversy. Business men have said repeatedly that the documents themselves were enough to upset the critical theory, because their very nature belied it; but they have made such remarks in private, being no match for their opponents in public discussion. Their common-sense, however, has refused to accept the "scholarly" teachings, and their acquired contempt for professional men has grown apace. It can hardly be wondered at.

The truth is that scholars have their limitations exactly as other men have theirs, and they are of such a nature that fellowship with business men on the latter's level would vastly improve them. They need the practical, hard-headed, every-day, common-sense which business men must acquire or go under, and neither class is in a position to despise the other. The statement that "most men are bluffers" is practically a proverb in the business world, and it may almost be considered worthy of canonization; for it apparently holds good elsewhere, even when professional men are the ones involved. If this is heresy, it is also truth; and truth is all that counts in the long run.[1] We need to see ourselves as we

[1] Experience is a great teacher even in these things. Many years ago an oculist, widely known as "the best there is," fitted me with glasses. His reputation was such that he was able to charge a regular fee of ten dollars for an examination. "Myopic astigmatism" was the diagnosis reached, and the prescription was made to correspond. Some time afterward, an optician asked to be allowed to test my eyes. Neither lens was found to be correct, and the superficiality of the oculist's work was made painfully apparent. Becoming intimate with me later on, the head of the firm lent me his books to study optics. He also gave me this bit of sage advice: "Never go to a man whose reputation is made, — if you want careful attention, go to a young man who is still working for a reputation." He further intimated that the above-mentioned oculist's prescriptions were a standing joke in his store. A few years later, another "best oculist" not only injured my sight by weakening the ciliary muscle with large doses of atropina but — by fully correcting, in defiance of all optical principles, the myopic element of what had by that time turned out to be mixed astigmatism — also damaged my left eye by producing progressive myopia. Fortunately, my own knowledge of optics enabled me to discover what he was doing, and I immediately rewrote his last prescription and began to force my eyes slowly backward along the path by which he had led them. Continuation would have meant total blindness. This process soon involved bifocals, and five impossible pairs were made by different "experts" from their own examinations. This second optical problem, involving an error of approximately two dioptrics in each eye, was finally solved by

really are; for, when we do, we shall begin to grow, and we shall broaden out in due proportion. Until then, we need modesty above all other things.

But, again, spiritual insight may outweigh learning, as a brilliant minister was once made to realize when an invalid quietly remarked: "I am glad to hear you say that; for I have always thought that the passage you have just explained meant what you say it does." He had spent hours of hard study in reaching his conclusions and had then taken them to her as a special favor! In my own experience, a woman who had had just six weeks of schooling — barely enough to learn to read — never failed to score, in direct competition with college and theological professors, in a weekly prayer meeting. She knew her Bible. Do we know ours?

What, for instance, is the real significance of Jethro's advice to Moses, which we find recorded in the eighteenth chapter of Exodus? And what did it lead to? It is clear that the appointment of minor judges would have been a useless complication of machinery if the men themselves were not qualified to perform their work. Moses was overburdened with the details of petty cases brought to him for adjudication. He accepted the advice of his father-in-law and appointed men whose duty it was to undertake this work for him. But how were they prepared to accomplish it? Evidently by a due course in the law which they were to

an hour of hard study; but the verdict, "It won't do," was at once pronounced by a "doctor of optics," to whom it was taken. It worked just the same, because it elliminated the prismatic effect produced by conflicting lens axes, two of which were divergent. I have written my own prescriptions and had my bifocals made from a diagram ever since, and I now know that I should have had hyperopic lenses for reading at the start and that I ought never to have worn myopic lenses at all!

administer; for there was no other way. Memory was first called upon (Ex. xviii. 20); but, with most men, memory at times is uncertain at its best, and something more was thus needed. What was it likely to be?

That Moses himself knew all the learning of the Egyptians is clear. He must, therefore, have been familiar not only with codes of law, which he would know by heart in the ancient way, but also with methods of writing; for in Egypt, as the monuments plainly show, writing was already old in his day. What could be more natural, then, than the preparation of a manuscript containing the laws which the minor judges were to administer? And what could be more natural than the use of laws already familiar to him as a basis for his own code? That he followed such a plan, internal evidence, as well as the testimony of the monuments, seems to show clearly, and there can hardly be any question but that he prepared such a manuscript, or had it prepared; for it was the only sensible and logical thing to do under the circumstances. When that had been done, a written document could be appealed to in all cases of uncertainty or doubt and Moses himself would not be constantly drawn into unimportant disputes and difficulties.

But the matter does not end there. These men were to become the authorities, within limits, to whom the people were to go, and they needed to be endowed with wisdom beyond their fellows in other things than the secular law. What could be more natural, then, than a course of instruction by Moses concerning the past history and, in time, the future destiny of their race? But this would, in turn, call for written documents, and it would lead first to the production of just such a book as Genesis now is, of which he is the traditional author; for this book contains just such a history. A natural

supplement would then include the first part of Exodus with the code of laws at the end.

But where did Moses acquire the material for Genesis? Partly in the wilderness, where he took his postgraduate course, so to speak, in preparation for his work. To suppose that his training would be neglected in any particular is to discount the divine forethought, and his forty years with the "Priest of Midian," the descendant of Esau, gave him every opportunity for mastering all the traditions of that branch of the Semites. He doubtless improved them, for nothing else would have been like him; and his sojourn among the Kenites is therefore full of significance. But see below.

A new development arose when the ceremonial law needed men who could give their whole time to it. To meet the requirement, as we learn from Exodus xxviii., Aaron and his sons were set apart for the priesthood. But here a new complication arises; for these men, like the others, needed to know the law which they had to administer. They also needed to know all else that was of importance to their race, and that involved the documentary material already prepared. When writing became sufficiently easy, it can hardly be doubted that they got a copy of their own, together with a new book, Leviticus. In preparing this copy, Moses probably depended upon his memory, and slight verbal variations were the natural result.[1] Where the context favored such an out-

[1] As was outlined in the previous paper, Orientals regularly employ this method. They are trained to do so. The precepts of Buddha were intended to be transmitted by word of mouth, and they were framed to this end. So were the Sanskrit epics and the sacred writings. A similar motive is apparent in the form of composition used by Moses; for it is rhythmical, although it cannot be reduced to meter. The peculiar accents used in Hebrew to divide a verse into sections are really employed to indicate its rhythmical

come, the word used for God would naturally be Jahveh rather than Elohim, because the priestly document would have a character of its own. Both words have two syllables in Hebrew, and the rhythm would not be affected. There would be other slight variations in diction, and a basis would be furnished for confluent texts, and duplicate statements, such as the present Pentateuch exhibits. Conservatism would furnish the motive.

Moses, then, probably arranged Genesis as soon as leisure and writing materials made it possible, and he utilized, incidentally, all his knowledge, including that obtained from his maternal nurse in his childhood and that acquired from his Kenite kindred. If there is any admixture of narratives in the book, this is its source, and Moses is the redactor; for

divisions, and Hebrew thus represents the earliest stage in the development of poetic forms. Sanskrit shows the second, with its *pâdas* containing four variable syllables and four which must conform to a definite cadence. Greek exhibits the next, with its compound feet in which the first two syllables remain variable and the other two become fixed or nearly so. A further step admitted the reversal of the order of fixed and variable simple feet, and then came the final stage in which meter is dominant and rhythm becomes more or less subordinate. All literature began, apparently, with a poetic form, and the habit of memorizing everything may have been the cause. The chances are that this dependence upon the memory was the easiest method for Moses to pursue. It is said that Mithridates knew eighty thousand soldiers by name, as Themistocles did every citizen of Athens, and Scipio of Rome, while Seneca is reported to have repeated correctly, in reverse order, two hundred unconnected verses after hearing them recited, and two thousand names in their correct order after hearing them read. Our own Blaine is said never to have forgotten a name or a face; and it is further claimed that Cranmer committed a translation of the Bible to memory in three months, that Leibnitz knew the whole of Vergil, and that Bossuet knew by heart the Bible, Homer, Vergil, Horace, and other works. Verbal memories had a part to play, in the formation of the Pentateuch, that has never been given its due. It is not the part of wisdom to overlook the fact, or its possibilities.

he compiled the traditions of his people, including any documents that may have come into his possession.[1] This is the only natural supposition in the premises and the only one that tallies with tradition. All else is merely the guessing of modern scholars who have tried to account for the facts.

A new book, Exodus, was begun at the point where he appeared in the history. It may have ended with the laws, and it may also have been the first prepared. There are reasons for so thinking. Events soon supplied the material, however, for the rest of the book, and the priestly copy doubtless contained it. Sooner or later the other would also be completed, and two full copies would thus be available. These would likewise contain minor variations in diction and in other particulars, and some of the variants would survive in the collated text of a later age. Conservatism would again score, and its product would furnish material for scholars to puzzle over, exactly as has actually happened.

Political exigencies would naturally lead to an historical document like Numbers, and the judges or princes would be its normal guardians. Each set of manuscripts would thus lack a book; but the lacuna would ultimately be filled. Priest and prince have ever been rivals, and the Israelites had their Dathan and Abiram. The priests would want Numbers, and the princes Leviticus. They would get them; but the copies might differ in details, as befitted their different environment. The joint use of the two names of God, if they may be so spoken of, may have arisen in some such way, and the usage

[1] Particular statements affecting some phase of the general subject do not constitute a "parallel account," even if careless observers persist in making claims of that sort; and the acceptance of such claims by those who either do not think or think but superficially cannot be accepted as substantiating any such hypothesis. This point has been made clear too often to need detailed explanation here.

became more or less fixed. When collation finally took place, various "difficulties" would thus inevitably be prepared for the critics by the regular operation of an Oriental conservatism.

As the time for Moses to depart drew near, he became anxious for the people. He addressed them in the plains of Moab (Deut. i. 1) on sin and obedience. Then he summoned them again (v. 1) and spoke to them at some length on the precepts of the law. Then he assembled them a third time (xxvii. 1), and with the elders exhorted them to observe and fulfill the law, explaining the blessings and curses that were involved. Then, in the sight of all Israel (xxxi. 7), he exhorted Joshua. Then (*l.c.* 9), he committed his speeches to writing, to insure their preservation, and added further instructions. Finally (*l.c.* 28–30), he collected the elders and officers and recited his "song" in the ears of the people, after which he left the plains of Moab for Mount Nebo (xxxiv. 1).

From the present form of Deuteronomy it is evident that Joshua was solicitous lest any part of the words of Moses should be lost. He seems, accordingly, to have proceeded at once to prepare a book embodying the three discourses and the song, filling in from memory wherever further information was necessary and attaching a supplement at the end.[1] He may also have included things omitted by Moses from his version, in order that nothing should perish. Marginal notes might then be added, as other sayings of Moses came

[1] There are reasons for thinking that the Book of Numbers had a history similar to that of Deuteronomy and that it did not receive its present shape until after the death of Moses. The Book of the Wars of the Lord is mentioned as an authority (xxi. 14), and it is entirely possible that Joshua compiled the materials now found in Numbers, taking them from documents left by Moses and filling in the history as it seemed to be necessary. If so, it was but another genuine Oriental effort to preserve intact all that had pertained to a great leader and to his administration of affairs.

to mind, and these would ultimately find a place in the text itself. Deuteronomy would thus be accounted for; but the Pentateuch then becomes the natural outgrowth of historical conditions. Was this situation deliberately planned by the clever manipulations of post-exilic forgers or was it merely an incident of the Exodus?

If Deuteronomy originated as is here suggested, Moses deserves the credit for it, although Joshua gave it its present form. Whatever assistance can be obtained from the linguistic argument favors this solution, and it is both natural and in keeping with the facts. When a second copy had been prepared, there would be two sets of slightly different documents of the same kind, and each would have its advocates and copyists. Human limitations would affect results, as they always do, and errors would creep in from time to time. The final heritage is ours; but we also have our limitations, and they are sometimes not conspicuously less than theirs appear to have been.

One other point needs to be noticed; for the character of the Pentateuch is exactly what might be expected if men having great verbal memories were its authors and preservers. Direct logical statement seems to be almost an impossibility for such persons, and they are not disturbed by digressions or by an illogical arrangement of subject matter. They are disturbed if anything is left out, however, and this characteristic may account for much in the present text.[1]

[1] Such memories can still be found even here. Less than twenty-five years ago Nettie ——— used to entertain Mrs. H——— and her sister Mrs. W——— in the city of Lowell by reciting Stoddard lectures attended for the purpose. She could duplicate the performance a month later by a little thought. I saw her put to the test at Ossipee Park, New Hampshire. She spent about an hour on an article in a recent magazine and recited it in the evening, taking about the same time. I read it myself and saw her

The work done by such men does not savor of the part assigned to a redactor. Redactors do more than edit. They alter and rearrange, if they do not practically rewrite their texts. Those of the critical theory, moreover, instead of being eyewitnesses, as they purport to be, are but copyists and plagiarists and importers of ideas from Babylonia.

Now, no item that can be explained by the ordinary rules of textual criticism has any place in the documentary theory. This is too self-evident to need elucidation; but, if it is once admitted, example after example, now stowed away in the "hold" of the documentary hypothesis, will have to be jettisoned. When that is done, however, the whole theory will suffer shipwreck. What difficulties remain, can be accounted for on the basis herein laid down, and those of the critics themselves will then disappear. There doubtless were different sources; for Moses did not originate everything in the Pentateuch. He utilized, in the ordinary Oriental way, whatever was stored in his memory. This meets the objections of those who think too much has been claimed for him, and a United States senator has illustrated in his own person what sort of a memory Moses probably had. Schools for the blind, hampered by a lack of conveniences, precisely as the ancients were, produce — by training their pupils to

do so. She stumbled once — on an Irish bull — and then went on correctly as fast as she could speak. My Jewish friend, mentioned above (p. 62), recited a poem to me, after a single reading, and repeated it three years later before a public audience in my hearing. He had not seen it in the meantime; for I took pains to find out. He knows over half the Hebrew Bible by heart, to say nothing of other things. I have repeatedly tested his powers. There used to be a reporter, moreover, on the London Times who on one occasion retained a set political speech, made in French in Paris, long enough to cable a translation while the other men were still at work on their manuscripts. These things cannot be ignored by scholars.

retain accurately whatever has been read to them once — the same phenomenal memories. It is less remarkable than it seems. Nature responds to the demands made upon her.

The Hebrew texts were originally written without points, and in time this led to trouble. The consonants were there; but the vowels were not, and the meaning was not always clear. Different vowels would produce different meanings, and in places they could be supplied. This led to the present Massoretic text with the vowel points, which may have involved some changes from the true original. They were based, however, on the belief that the reading chosen was the correct one. To think otherwise is to misunderstand and misinterpret the Jewish character.

A significant passage at the beginning of Joshua seems to justify the claims thus far made. It reads:—

"Only be strong and very courageous, to observe to do according to all the law, which Moses my servant commanded thee: . . . . This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success" (R. V., i. 7–8).

Similar evidence can easily be found elsewhere, not only in Joshua but also in the Pentateuch.[1]

There are those unsophisticated enough to wonder what part the redactors played, especially the "pious" ones, in the case of such passages as this. Did they forget to take out the words which made Moses the author of the book of the law? Did they quietly appropriate them as applicable to their own redaction? Moses was commanded to write in a book a record of the discomfiture of Amalek (Ex. xvii.

[1] See Ex. xvii. 14, xxiv. 4, xxxiv. 27; Num. v. 23, xxxiii. 2; Deut. xvii. 18, xxviii. 58, 61, xxix. 20, 21, 27, xxxi. 9–12; Josh. viii. 31, 34, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 26; and cf. 1 Kings ii. 3, etc.

14). Did he do it? "Moses wrote all the words of the Lord" (xxiv. 4). Is that a falsehood? He was told to write the covenant (xxxiv. 27). Did he do that? The other testimony is similar. Is it all a fraud or were these the "documents"? But if they were, what was Joshua doing that he failed to put them into shape and left them unedited? And where were all the Levites during those hundreds of years that they did not do the work?

When all the facts are considered, is it within the bounds of possibility that human beings could have done what the redactors, whether one or many, are credited with having accomplished? How did they know the obsolete borrowed words of Egyptian origin now found in Exodus? Where did they learn the facts of the ancient geography that continually crop out in the narrative? Had they been in Egypt as well as in Babylonia? And were the things mentioned still there? Had there been no changes that would destroy their perspective? Or did they find these items in the "documents" and elucidate them in the texts they prepared? Is it not far easier to suppose that the Pentateuch originated as suggested above and that Joshua's marginal notes and additions were incorporated in the ordinary fashion as the years went by?

Documentary evidence of variant readings has already removed the two names of God from the foundations of the critical theory, and a hasty retreat to other grounds is in progress. But textual criticism has hardly begun its work as yet, and "higher" criticism has no place at all in the premises until the work of the "lower" criticism is completed! When that is done the critical structure will come tumbling down about the ears of its builders, because its very foundations will crumble into nothingness. The ruins

will then show Moses as the real literary architect, but they will also show that he utilized much ancient material. He had it or else he was not fitted for the task assigned him. And he knew his material by heart or else he was not "skilled in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," to say nothing of the traditions of Israel. Scholars did not depend upon books in those days; for books were rare and costly. They remembered things as the Chinese and Hindus continue to do.

In the first of these papers it was suggested that an explanation must not produce difficulties worse than itself. That, however, is exactly what the critical theory does do, with its "pious" redactors, who are withal deficient in moral qualities, although they must have possessed a skill worthy of an archangel to accomplish the work accredited to them. It was likewise stated that a satisfactory theory must offer a better solution of the problem than any other hypothesis presented for the purpose. Does the critical theory do so? Is it more natural, or more probable, or more in keeping with the historical situation, the Jewish character, Oriental conservatism, and the requirements of textual criticism, than the one herein outlined? Can it stand if its "proof texts" fall? Will they endure the strain of a searching analysis? Is it not wiser to find a solution that does not depend upon such a flimsy foundation and one that tallies with known Oriental methods of work?

Can it be claimed that the critical theory is necessary in the light of what has now been said? And if it is not necessary, what excuse has it for being? Harsh as the figure may seem, the time is at hand when the critical bluff must be called. Business men see that that is what it actually is, although they hesitate to say so, and scholars are beginning to suspect the truth. Ministers sometimes feel the same

thing, although their vocabulary is not of a type to formulate it in these words. Those behind the theory erred in trying to monopolize the Biblical wisdom of their age, and the rebuke which they are receiving at the hands of others is not undeserved, even if it is severe.[1]

The temptation is strong, in this connection, to liken the critics to the so-called purists. Philologians sometimes feel that the latter arrogate to themselves a degree of authority out of all proportion to their actual knowledge, and they have more than one quiet laugh at the gyrations indulged in. The aforesaid gentry strain out the gnat of a split infinitive and then swallow the camel that forthwith makes its appearance, and they do this without the assistance of even so much as a salad dressing to obscure the taste. Moreover, instead of entirely discarding an ungrammatical idiom, they make it grammatical and then never seem to recognize its stilted artificiality. They thus advertise the narrowness of

[1] It is curious to what an extent some men imagine that their way is the only one there is of doing a thing. Intellectual myopia restricts their vision. A wider knowledge of the facts effectually silences the opponents of the spelling reform; for we have been cherishing many errors and not a few artificial spellings that were once fairly forced upon a long-suffering public. Variations in spelling were formerly fashionable, and the worst sometimes survived. Other curious results have also appeared. The Plymouth records show four spellings of my own family name, — Magoun, Magoon, Magoune, and Magoone, — and there is said to be an older one; namely, Magune. Two spellings have survived, — Magoun and Magoon. The pronunciation has remained the same; but the spelling M a g o u n led to the conclusion, in one small city, that the name must be Magown, and one man so declared in the local paper on the ground that *ou* never had the sound of *oo* but always that of *ow*! He did not realize that such words as *croup*, *group*, *soup*, *through*, and *surtout* contain the true phonetic value of the letters and that the *ow*-sound is really a perversion to the proper value of *au*, which has likewise been perverted in English. Have the critics been guilty of a similar provincialism?

their own linguistic horizon. Why not let such an idiom die and not perpetuate it in a form that has no excuse whatever for being? If one avoids the split infinitive because his gullet is not large enough to admit the camel so certain to be thrust between his jaws by the copy reader, driven thereto by the club of the purists, a rebellious spirit is not entirely out of place; and a wider knowledge of the anomalies of English makes one tolerant even of Shakespeare's "had rather" and similar forms.

It remains to sum up the matter in a few words. Textual criticism, together with the plain requirements of the historical setting and the ordinary vicissitudes of manuscripts long transmitted by scribes, will be found sufficient to cover the difficulties, if conservatism and the rival claims of priests and princes are once recognized as factors in the problem. Each class would demand its own official copy of the law, and each would get it. Indeed, it was definitely commanded that the king, when chosen, should have a copy for himself (Deut. xvii. 18). It is specified that he is to copy the law in a book "out of that which is before the priests the Levites." One of the two versions is thus mentioned, and the other almost seems to be implied. Collation would not necessarily mean the selection of the best reading; for it might mean a combination of the two[1] where differences appeared, which is probably what actually happened in some places. Such is Oriental conservatism.

No redactors with impossible qualifications are thus needed, and the entire process becomes a normal one. Man is, with-

[1] After this paper was in type, my attention was called to the Samaritan tradition that Moses made two copies of the Pentateuch. See above, p. 315. This is favorable presumptive evidence. Versions lying between the two would naturally tend to develop, and they plainly did so.

out doubt, a paradox; but the inability of the critics to see what their theory involves is one of the most puzzling things in the whole history of higher criticism. A bog or a quicksand may be safe, or even fair, to look upon; but woe to the luckless wight who treads upon its surface. He may be enveloped in mud, and he may find himself held fast in a relentless grip that only tightens as he struggles to be free. Either outcome is a pitiable one; but undue haste in accepting a delusive theory seems destined, figuratively speaking, to besmirch some, while others are being slowly swallowed up with no hand reached out to save them.

But there is another consideration that cannot be passed over, and it is a most damaging one. Without a scrap of historical evidence upon which to hang their claim, and with tradition flatly contradicting it, the critics must face the laws that govern testimony. They are based on the theory of probability, which includes two elements, — the reliability of the witness and his intelligence. Of these, one refers to the ability to grasp all the facts and see them in their right relations, and the other to the lack of bias or self-interest.[1] The latter quality is said to be extremely rare. Ninety per cent is therefore a high average. But intellectual acumen is never perfect, and ninety per cent is again a high average in that field. The two combined give eighty-one per cent as their product. It follows that seventy-five or eighty per cent of truth is all that can be safely expected in a man's testimony.

But suppose he fails to see or does not wish to see a part of the facts and is prejudiced in his views, what then? Each average is liable to drop to fifty or below, and the product will not be over twenty-five per cent, or one in four at best. The critics do not see, in spite of all their brilliancy, the in-

[1] See above, lxiii. 57 ff. and lxv. 57 ff.

congruities of their position or its contradictions or the presumptive value of an uninterrupted tradition, and many of them have made their reputation in exploiting the theory. How much, then, is their testimony worth? What would it count for in a case at law? Would they be rated as accurate and sound witnesses? The burden of proof is with them; for they have undertaken to destroy the validity of tradition, the testimony of the documents themselves, and the presumption that the records are honest. Can they do it?

Incidentally, they must explain the amazing cleverness of the supposed redactors in the use of Hebrew. What was its origin? Late portions of the Old Testament, especially parts of Ezra and of Daniel, are in Aramaic, the dialect of Aram, the province from which the Jews could most easily return. After that event, the common people could not understand the Scriptures, and Targums, or paraphrases in Aramaic, were the result. The Jews have never been averse to speech admixture, as Yiddish plainly shows and Nehemiah bitterly implies (xiii. 24). The educated knew Aramaic even before the captivity (2 Kings xviii. 26). During that period, Aramæan colonists settled in Palestine, two generations passed, and, according to Jewish tradition, Hebrew was forgotten. Before the beginning of our era it had certainly been driven out by Aramaic as a spoken tongue. Plainly, then, even in Ezra's day, the language of the Pentateuch was fast becoming obsolete, if it was not so already. That opinion, however, is "untenable." It conflicts with the theory!

A knowledge of Hebrew unquestionably survived; but how? Printing was unknown and could offer no assistance. But the Pentateuch, if known and revered because of its sacred character, could and would accomplish the task. Could the "documents"? If so, they likewise must have

been sacred and also extensively known among the educated. What, then, became of the howl of protest inevitably raised when the aforesaid redactors got in their work? Did the others tamely submit to the desecration? Would they have been Jews if they had done so? This dilemma must also be faced and solved by the critics. Are they equal to it?

While it is too early yet to dogmatize, certain conclusions seem to be warranted by the conditions thus far found. To begin with, the copy of the law mentioned above (p. 402) as "that which is before the priests the Levites" would naturally be the most sacred of all the MSS. This particular copy could not have been available when the Massoretic text was prepared; but a recension of it undoubtedly was available, and a much earlier one must have been available for the Samaritan version. These two versions, then, had essentially the same origin; for the Samaritans got theirs from the disobedient priests who refused to divorce their foreign wives at the command of Nehemiah, and the Massoretic text must certainly have been based on a later recension of the same priestly document. At the time they were made, however, both versions doubtless contained certain slight accretions, gradually added in the usual manner, and both had probably suffered somewhat, since each was liable, especially the Samaritan one, to have corrections made in the text in the process of copying. Now, the official priestly text, when the time came, would almost certainly be regarded as too sacred for the use of translators; but if there was another, such as the second one herein postulated, its use for that purpose would not be prevented by religious scruples, and the facts thus far discovered seem to point to just such an origin for the LXX, with its parallel texts. This would account for some of the curious verbal changes found here and

there in the LXX and its companions, when compared with the Hebrew and Samaritan versions, and it would also help to explain the mutual discrepancies exhibited by the Massoretic and Samaritan texts, on the one hand, and the Septuagintal group on the other.

In conclusion, let it be said that, while no one but myself has had anything whatever to do with the writing of this series of papers, the canons of criticism would plainly "prove" something quite different. Indeed, if they were applied to other writings that have come from my pen, some would be shown to be "poor imitations" if not actual "forgeries." In the present instance, instead of disclosing the connected work of a single mind, which is exactly what the articles really are, the said canons would probably bring to light the following gentlemen: — a linguist, presumably an American; a psychologist, apparently a Hindu; a business man, seemingly a Hebrew; a farmer, who may have once followed the sea; a poet, nationality unknown, but from his views on rhythm evidently neither English (including American) nor German; an optometrist, who is also something of a philosopher; a lawyer, who is likewise, naturally, a logician; and a redactor, unless, possibly, the lawyer acted in that capacity, as "seems highly probable."

Moreover, while the stylistic characteristics of each of these gentlemen can be found intact in places, a mixture of the same characteristics will also appear at times in genuine Pentateuchal fashion. If Lewis Carroll (Charles L. Dodgson) was the author of "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland," he was also the author of various abstruse mathematical works, and there is no disputing the fact. There are men who can show a development along different lines of effort, and such must be reckoned with as well as the others. Nar-

row-gauge cars cannot possibly run on wide-gauge rails, and any attempt to have them do so must end in disaster. Moses belonged in the broad-gauge class. The rest of the metaphor can be supplied by the reader without great effort, and he can also easily find the "discrepancies" in these papers.[1]

[1] In confirmation of the various sections severally apportioned to the different gentlemen mentioned above, it should be added, to complete the statement, that the observant critic would not fail to notice, among other things, the marked difference that exists between the second paper and the other two. One of its most notable peculiarities is the lack of footnotes, which are a persistent characteristic of this author's style. He uses them both for references and for explanations, and, except for some brief notes which do not count, nowhere else in the articles published in the Bibliotheca Sacra under this author's name can this lack be discovered save in a recent paper on Josephus, which is itself, on this very ground, a subject for suspicion, inasmuch as the same characteristic appears in all that he has published in the American Journal of Philology. It is hardly conceivable, moreover, that in referring to the "çrotriya" priests, as he does, he would not call attention to the experience of Max Müller with these men, which is related in his interesting book, "India: What can it Teach Us?" Another significant item, probably an oversight on the part of the redactor, is the use, in the different papers, of the expression "common-sense," both with and without the hyphen, the former being the more modern usage. Evidently, the man who wrote it without a hyphen was an older man than the other, since the latter is more up to date. Then, too, the Sanskrit transliteration is peculiar. But, — enough of this nonsense! It is hardly necessary to parody the critical arguments further to show the general absurdity of their character. The simple truth is that the differences mentioned were the result of causes totally unlike those suggested. The lack of footnotes was due, in each paper, to a deliberate purpose to eliminate them entirely, and the exclusion of references from such notes was intentionally accompanied by a change of phraseology, in order to get by the copy reader whose duty it is to see that such material is so treated. Easier reading and a neater page result; but, personally, I prefer the other arrangement and always so write my references, unless I take pains to remember that they will not return from the printer in that form. The transliteration used was due to the linotyping.