

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

ARTICLE V.

A LACUNA IN SCHOLARSHIP.

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

II.

It is commonly supposed that the atomic theory is modern. As a matter of fact it is ancient. It goes back to the days of Leucippus, who lived approximately five hundred years before Christ. He invented it to combat the views of Anaxagoras, who held that the world was the product of intelligence (*nous*) rather than of chance (*tuchē*). Leucippus was a doughty champion of the latter notion, and his pupil, Democritus, who is credited with having lived one hundred and ninety-nine years (B.C. 460–261), developed the idea, teaching that an infinite number of atoms in infinite space, homogeneous in quality but heterogeneous in form, were in rapid motion and that some of them were by chance combined, the universe being the ultimate result. That was the original evolutionary theory, and it was pure materialism. Its object, in fact, was the elimination of any divine element from the Greek doctrines concerning creation. It had no room for the gods.

For the latter reason it appealed to Epicurus (B.C. 342–270) and also to the Roman poet Lucretius, who committed suicide about B.C. 51. Before doing so, however, he formulated in his “*De Rerum Natura*” the entire theory for the benefit of his countrymen, as he wished to emancipate them from the fear of any such beings as gods, a thing which he regarded as

the source of all human ills. The same notion is likewise attributed to Epicurus. When the whole theory is studied, it becomes apparent that Herbert Spencer's famous definition of evolution—"Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation"—amounts to little more than a restatement, in the form of a definition, of the pet doctrines of these ancient worthies, who first championed such a theory.

Darwin's contributions to the discussion contained the same fundamental element; namely, the elimination of all theistic functions in creation. In short, throughout its entire history the true basis of Evolution has been a blank materialism in which there was no room whatever for any such factor as a divine *fiat*. The whole thing, on that basis, was merely a question of matter and inherent force, the source of which was not disclosed. Theism and Evolution are therefore, intrinsically, opposites, and that means that they are mutually antagonistic in their very essence. They must be so in the nature of things. Theism starts with a divine agency. Evolution starts with matter and then endows it with qualities which are supposed to eliminate the need of any such agency. That elimination, in fact, is still the actual animus of the theory, although modern readers have failed to realize the impossibility of escaping this conclusion.

Darwin lived to see his error and to regret it keenly. Concerning that point there is no longer any room for doubt. His own statements to two credible witnesses settle the question beyond a peradventure. He especially deplored the popular interpretation placed upon his writings. "I was a young

man," he says, "with unformed ideas. I threw out queries, suggestions, wondering all the time over everything; and to my astonishment the ideas took like wildfire. People made a religion of them." They did. They wished to be rid of God, and they still quote Darwin to that end. He himself realized that his whole theory was wrong, and he said as much to a friend who was an American professor. Unbelievers refuse to admit that this is possible. That refusal, however, makes no difference with the facts. They are well authenticated.

This conclusion of his has now been confirmed by the biological experiments of thirty-five years. Minute changes, such as he postulated, have been definitely proved to be abnormal. If changes come, they are not minute. A "sport" appears, and the "sport" is different from its fellows. A four-leaf clover is an example of what is meant. The plant does not stop there, however, since I have personally found not only many five-leaf clovers but also two six-leaf ones, a seven-leaf one, and what appeared to be an eight-leaf one. It was really a double four; for half the leaves were smaller than the others and rested upon them. If such forms could be propagated and fixed, they would constitute a new variety in each instance. That is about all that can be said concerning them.

The truth is that we know every little with regard to such matters. We get navel oranges and other such fruits; but the end is not yet, and we have much still to learn. Now and then a navel orange will contain a seed or two and thus show a tendency to revert to type. Much more often, however, the punky pulp of the fruit suggests deterioration. Nature abhors a vacuum, and she may detest a purposeless fruit, although the banana has become sterile, having lost the power to propagate itself by seeds, and other plants show similar leanings. Disuse accounts for it, and the power may still be latent. If

so, the suggestion is not invalidated by the banana, even if it is sterile and at the same time extremely prolific in its yield.

Nature's secrets have not all been fathomed yet, and they will not be in our day. Indeed, we may not know any of them in full; for overhasty generalization is extremely common and very seductive. It is, perhaps, the one factor that is to be guarded against most carefully in the effort to be rid of the lacuna in scholarship which prompted the writing of these lines. It is present in Evolution from start to finish, as a single consideration will suffice to make evident.

The weakest spot in the evolutionary theory is and always has been the involved implication that the lower can be an adequate cause for the higher. This implication cannot be avoided without a restatement of the theory in its entirety. That simple fact, after twenty years of strenuous work in the defense of Evolution and of bitter attack against its opponents, ended the career of one evolutionist, because he was honest enough to admit the validity of the objection. His public retraction and final rejection of the whole theory was made where it was my good fortune to hear what he had to say. His remarks were certainly illuminating.

As a working hypothesis, the theory has been of great value, especially in the field of comparative anatomy, and that much can be admitted without hesitation; but as an explanation of the phenomena of nature it is a colossal failure. It is not and never has been a "scientific doctrine," and it never can be such a doctrine until it is proved "beyond reasonable doubt." As that is no longer regarded as within the bounds of possibility, the outlook for the theory is not particularly bright. It ought not to be.

In spite of that limitation, in spite of the unfortunate affiliations and dubious history of Evolution, and in spite of its

materialistic nature and its atheistic tendencies, some of its most enthusiastic proponents have been theologians. They have not only swallowed it *in toto* but have actually applied it to their own field without any sort of question or *proviso*. Old Testament History has thus been rewritten on a purely "rationalistic" basis, things that differ have been confused, and much that is woefully misleading has been promulgated as truth. Where the facts are against them, the attitude has been,— "So much the worse for the facts." Here, then, is another lacuna in scholarship. It needs careful consideration.

Theism and Evolution are really antipodal. Blended together they make a "white blackbird." They will no more mix than will oil and water; for you cannot put a divine element in and still leave it out any more than you can leave it out and still have it in. "Theistic Evolution" is therefore a misnomer. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing and there can be none.¹ The same statement is also applicable to

¹That I may not be misunderstood by those who use this term, let me say that my objection to it has nothing whatever to do with the assumption that what God had involved could later be evolved. In effect, that is exactly my own belief. As a linguist, I am constrained to object to loose forms of nomenclature, because such things are of necessity an abomination to all linguists. In spite of that fact I was long disposed to be lenient with this particular term because of my belief that God could involve potentialities in the universe and then leave them to *develop* according to his original design; but direct personal experience finally convinced me that the term itself is mischievous and should therefore be abandoned. It tends to obscure the issue, it leads to loose thinking especially on the part of the young, it helps infidels in their arguments, and it produces other unfortunate results in an age when clear thinking is becoming more and more an imperative necessity. If any one cannot see this and wishes to go on using the term, that is his affair and his responsibility. For myself, it is impossible to countenance a thing which I have been compelled by the logic of the situation to abandon and also to condemn because of my interest in the religious life of the rising generation.

“Paroxysmal Evolution,” since you cannot continue to roll after you once begin to leap like a kangaroo.

Why not try some other means of expressing the idea? You believe that God was a factor in creation, in spite of the teachings of science to the contrary — such teachings are now always conveyed by implication and never by direct statement, so that few can see where the reasoning must end if carried to its logical conclusion — and in spite of your own acceptance of the theory that one species was derived from another by a “natural” process. Very well. What is such a process like? Does it take place of itself without any antecedent “First Cause” involving design? What do you mean by “natural”?

Would it be natural for a monkey to give birth to a man? For various reasons, that theory has now been definitely abandoned; for a foot could not be developed from a posterior hand — no such thing has happened in the entire monkey family,—an ape’s brain capacity could not be immediately increased in any such ratio as would be necessary (early races had a brain capacity equaling if not exceeding that of modern men), human blood reacts with human blood of any other race but not with the blood of apes to any appreciable extent, horse and walrus blood show some traces of reaction as do fowl and serpent blood, and the conclusion is inevitable that men and apes are as far apart as snakes and birds. That, at least, is what the blood tests are said to show. There are other technical items bearing on the matter.

As a result, the physicists are all at sea in their theories regarding the “descent of man.” The logic of the situation, however, as developed by them, points unequivocally to the *elephantida*, as I long ago intimated,¹ with its original, small-sized, trunkless ancestors, whose bones, found in Egypt, might

¹“Health,” Dec. 1908, pp. 722-724.

easily be mistaken for skeletons of some gigantic human race now extinct. It is even claimed that they have been so mistaken. Would such a line as this be "natural"? How will you escape from the dilemma?

Some look to the theory of Monism with that end in view. Do you? It has various forms. One makes the spirit the all in all. This form is not modern but very ancient. The Hindu doctrine of the *ātman* or "All-soul" is the same in essence, and reabsorption into the "All-soul" constitutes the Nirvāṇa of the Buddhists, which is tantamount to annihilation of the individual. They tried to meet the materialistic difficulty with their doctrine of illusion or *māyā*, which made all material things unreal. This form of Monism is called Idealism. The opposing form is Materialism. Between them lies a third which refers both mind and matter to a single ultimate substance of which mind and matter are but different manifestations.

In any guise, Monism is but a form of Pantheism. Even Materialism endows matter with qualities that are beyond our ken, as do the other two, and we forthwith arrive at the—supernatural. The mystery is still unsolved and unaccounted for. The Christian doctrine of Immanence is often little better; for that too may lead to pantheism, and some nominal Christians are honest enough to admit that they are pantheists. I met one such not long ago, and he is in a position of some prominence. Is pantheism the way out?

Does it satisfy? Does it meet the needs of the case? What else is there? Possibly you believe that there was a process of development of some kind whereby "sports" appeared and did not revert to type but were themselves the progenitors of other sports which likewise remained fixed, and, in that way, gradually the diverse forms of nature were produced. Many

so believe. What made the sports appear? Teleology is now accepted as a necessary part of the physicist's belief, although its counterpart, the old theistic "Design," has been emphatically rejected by evolutionists. When you put in Teleology¹ with your other belief, you postulate Mutation and that may be theistic.

This latter theory now appears to be the only rational explanation of the flora and the fauna of our earth; but it is only an hypothesis still, and such it must remain. Moreover, the problem of life is not solved by postulating floating spores in space or by any other such subterfuge. It is made more remote, but it is not rendered less acute. Our limitations often cause us to confuse things that differ, we do not see clearly, we jump at conclusions, we omit important factors in our equations, we do not think logically when we think at all, we cling with tenacity to an "ambiguous middle," and then, with this highly adaptable instrument, we perform all sorts of jugglery in our mental apartments. Of this there is plenty of evidence.

Mr. Wiener has repeatedly called attention to one such process involving the confusion of two things. The confusion is the result of applying the evolutionary hypothesis to the religion of Israel, and a third element is occasionally added.

¹The physicists have saved their faces, as the Chinese say, by coining this other term, which is defined as "a tendency to an end"; but the fact still remains that "design" constantly appears in the careful adaptation of everything in nature both to its uses and to its environment. Even the despised appendage of the human alimentary canal is now said to be an "oil can" and a "germ destroyer," with two definite missions to perform; and its needless removal is condemned by a large and increasing number of physicians. Our knowledge is really so limited and our ideas are so subject to change in the light of new facts that it behooves us to be modest in our assertions concerning things only partially understood.

The two originals are the tabernacle, with its horned altar, and the simple private altar of an individual. The other object is the grove or high place. The indiscriminate use of a single term, "sanctuary," is the cause of all the trouble. The things themselves were about as much alike as a church service, family prayers, and a lewd debauch in a New York "dive." It is not easy to come any nearer to the actual observances by way of comparison.¹

What we have taken for a figure of speech in the Old Testament is really a statement of fact. In India we might learn the truth. In America lascivious debauchery cannot be conceived of as a religious rite. In India it is so conceived of, and "The Cultus of the Left Hand" means just that in the worship of the female deities. It is not only indescribable but actually inconceivable from our point of view. Baal-peor shows that the cultus of the high places or groves was of that type, and the "plague" of which four and twenty thousand

¹This may appear like a strange statement in the light of such passages as 1 Sam. ix. 12-14, 25; but with them must be placed other passages like 2 Kings xxiii. 13 and Hosea ii. 5, iv. 13-14. What Samuel actually did was doubtless very similar to what a Christian chaplain might do in conquered Mohammedan territory. He utilized a place that was convenient, since it had already been set apart for worship. What happened later was in effect the restoration of the mosque to its original uses. Incidentally, it may be said that the wooden poles and stone pillars of the high places were probably not relics of tree and stone worship, as has been extensively taught and believed, but of a definite sex idolatry resembling the phallus-worship of Greece and the linga-worship of India, with one or both of which it may have had some historical connection. The poles probably represented a female deity and the pillars a male one. In India Civa was commonly represented by an image of the linga, and the pillars found suggest a similar intention with regard to Baal. The cult itself also favors such a solution of the problem. The worship must have been wholly distinct from that involving pillars erected to Jehovah, even if the two can be and have been confused or intentionally combined in a way not authorized by the facts or the evidence.

died on that occasion was simply the acute form of an unmentionable disease. In plain language Moses had no alternative but destruction, if he was to keep his own people from becoming mentally, morally, and physically rotten. He made no "mistakes" in this connection. He had no hospital with a "horror" ward for such patients, as we now have, and he had to act quickly. If Colonel Ingersoll had known a little more he would have said a good deal less.

Unfortunately, he is not the only one who has written without taking pains to understand the peoples and customs of other days. That accounts for the *Quelle* theory, which undertakes to explain the origin of the Gospels. Its basis is subjective,—How would I have done that work? The answer should be quite different from the one usually obtained; for any man who lived in that age must of necessity have done it as the men of his times were wont to do such things — or not at all. The method arrived at by the sponsors back of the theory is wholly modern, being that of German or English or American professors with a university library to draw on.

Now just look at the thing for a moment. The steam engine has revolutionized all our habits of life, our customs, and our ideas; and yet it does not antedate the seventeenth century even if sporadic instances of what might be classed as steam engines can be found as far back as Hero of Alexandria or about 130 B.C. Electricity is much more recent, and we do not need to go further back than the year 1600 A.D. to be rid of everything now classed as machinery. Every modern convenience also goes,—cookstoves, sewing machines, egg-beaters, apple-parers, rubber goods, matches, etc.

The printing press disappears with the fifteenth century, and coal does not antedate the ninth. The year 800 A.D. will therefore disclose a condition of things that would render mod-

ern methods utterly impossible. They had not even been dreamed of in all probability. Public schools depend upon cheap printed books. There were none. The lead-pencil is very modern, the slate is not old, and the blackboard belongs with the lead-pencil. Double wax tablets there were and a stilus, and letters were sometimes written on them and sealed with the wax faces together. They were also used by boys in learning to write. Writing with ink was done by professional scribes.

School facilities in those days were almost *nil*. We have nothing to compare with the limitations thus placed about education, except in our schools for the blind. Printed books are of no use to them, and books with raised letters are neither common nor cheap, comparatively speaking. Even the Braille system is too limited in its application to meet the difficulty on any sort of a par with printing. What is the result? Ancient methods are in use, and the pupil's notebook is his brain.

Take a class in Arithmetic. The problems are read — once. The next day they are recited from memory and solved before the class by the individual members. "But," you say, "do they remember like that?" They do, and they do other things to match. That is what the ancient boy did too, and it is what his modern Oriental descendant does; for the hardest task set our missionary teachers in American schools located in those countries is the breaking up of the habit of bringing back, in its exact verbal form, everything that has been either heard or read, even if it happens to have been in English.

For centuries these peoples have been trained to remember exact verbal forms. For centuries we have been trained to forget them. We remember ideas and principles. We cannot quote *verbatim*. It is a case of marked and unequivocal anti-

thesis. That fact, however, has not had the slightest weight with the men who framed the theory concerning Gospel "Sources." Nor is that all. In a country without roads, printed books, newspapers, transportation facilities, or anything else that we moderns consider essential for our well-being or suited to our civilization, these ancient peoples lived, moved, and had their being. Science, in the modern sense, was a thing unknown. All knowledge was primitive, and a gifted man could compass the whole of it by diligent study. Moreover, even then he would not burden his memory as we moderns are accustomed to burden ours with our reading matter alone. Is it to be wondered at that the men of those days could retain what they heard and retain it in its original form?

This, then, is the explanation of the marvelous memories of the modern Chinese and Hindus, and of the Armenians and Asiatic Jews. As they never overburden the faculty, they are able to train it to perfection. Some of them astonish American missionaries by repeating former conversations *verbatim*, but it is nothing to them to do such a thing. In like manner the *çrotriya* priests of India develop memories so tenacious that they know the Rig-Veda intimately and infallibly down to every letter and every accent. The Chinese know their *Lî Kî* by heart, and the bards of India still repeat the *Mahābhārata* — it is nearly eight times as long as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* combined — and do it without apparent difficulty.

Now, think a moment. Writing is going out of use in our day, even in correspondence that is not strictly devoted to business. It takes too much time to read the sort of thing that passes for writing now. What if our books were all of the same character — all written in a hand that it took an expert to decipher? Would we read as much as we do? Would we not find it easier, especially if we were used to that sort of

thing, to walk twenty miles or so and talk matters over with some one who knew? With the two alternatives before us, provided we had been trained in the ancient fashion, which would we be likely to choose? Is there any question on that score?

But if we walk twenty miles to find out something, are we going to make any undue haste to forget it? Would trained memories work that way? Do you suppose that theirs did?

Now push things back another seven hundred and fifty years and arrive at the date 50 A.D. That will be apostolic times. Will the men of that age be more like us than those of the year 800 A.D. were? Or will they be more like them? Will Matthew read up what John Mark has written, after learning it from Peter's talks, and then "crib" from it to make a Gospel? Can you make such an idea anything but preposterous? Would Luke or John know how to compile their Gospels out of others in the modern parasitic fashion? Would they even understand the use of the word "Sources" in this connection?

With two and a half years in which to consult living witnesses, while Paul was in bonds at Cæsarea, what motive would Luke have to read what Mark had to say, except as a mere incident in his search? Is it even possible or thinkable that he would prefer such a document to the living authorities who knew the story at first hand? Would he be a normal man if he did? Nay, would he be a sane one? Now add those other factors,—custom, habit, difficulty in reading written volumes, and human nature. What conclusion must you reach?

Now suppose that various gospels have been written and that the Apostolic Church has set the seal of its approval upon four of them. What will be the standing of the four? Can

they fail to be authoritative? But if they are authoritative, what possible chance will there be that any rewriting whatever can then take place without some definite notice of the fact being preserved, to say nothing of a record for future use? Is there a shred of evidence anywhere that any such rewriting was ever done or even so much as proposed? Can you imagine it, in fact,—an apostle, or an evangelist, squatting on the ground (chairs indicated wealth then) in the midst of manuscripts, out of which he is industriously making a bit of literary patchwork by a process that amounts to pure plagiarism to all intents and purposes? Is such an idea easier to accept than the traditional view, which merely requires that we give ancient memories the credit undoubtedly due them? That will suffice to explain all the difficulties produced by the various divergencies and agreements found in the narrative. Why resort to such an anachronism as the *Quelle* theory unquestionably is? Do you need it to explain the facts,— unless you first pervert them?

In reality, this theory was framed to round out the documentary hypothesis so extensively exploited in the Old Testament. It duplicates, in a sense, the feat of Leonardo da Vinci, whose "Last Supper," although an acknowledged masterpiece, is almost wholly mediæval, not only in the settings and the furniture but also in the attitudes depicted. There is, in short, hardly a single feature in the entire painting that is true to the life of our Saviour's day. Consider this one fact,— the New Testament words used of "sitting" at meat are *anakeimai*, *sunanakeimai*, *anaklinō*, *anāpiptō*, *katakeimai*, and *kataklinō*, every one of which means 'to recline.'

The words that do mean 'to sit'—usually 'to squat,' as a matter of fact — are these: *anakathizō*, *kathēzomai*, *kathēmai*, *kathizō*, *parakathizō*, *sugkathēmai*, and *sugkathizō* (*sun-*).

In neither list is there a single verb that is accurately rendered in our English versions. An accurate translation, in fact, would hardly be welcome in many quarters. It would lack refinement, a thing that has become a sort of fetic. Then, too, we want things modernized. That is what the *Quelle* theory does. It modernizes the situation, the processes, and the people, until they are no longer recognizable as men and features of the first century of our era. It may be a fine theory, but it falsifies practically everything, about as Leonardo's fine painting did.

When men once know what is involved, will they continue to admire without question that which they recognize as a sort of imposition? Can they do so, as a matter of fact? Well, suppose we go back fifteen or sixteen centuries further, for a moment, to the times of Moses. Did he live in a modern environment, or was it one that was rather primitive? Can there be a grain of truth in the application of the doctrines of Evolution to the Old Testament, unless his environment was decidedly primitive from our point of view? The limitations of 800 A.D. would necessarily be less than those of 50 A.D., while those of 1500 B.C. would naturally be more than those of 50 A.D. They are credited with having been a good deal more, and that is possibly the reason why men have a fashion of assigning the Pentateuch to a date a thousand years or so later than its proper time. It will not account, however, for their propensity to assume, without a particle of reason for it, that the men of about 500 B.C. worked as they themselves are wont to do.

Was the thing a possibility? Did those men have the materials, the habits, the knowledge of comparative methods of study, or even the desire to do so? Their environment and every one of their characteristics say, No. It is not a ques-

tion of what we would do to-day but of what they had to do then. A marked conservatism was one of their traits, and it cannot be overlooked. If people could not read, they could remember what they heard read and retain it indefinitely. Such memories can be found even now among such people. They served as one more check upon all innovations.

If a second reading did not tally with the first, they would notice it and want to know the reason. Nor would they be easily fooled. We underrate such things, because we are not familiar with them. It would be an advantage if scholars did not confine their attention to their own class exclusively. Moreover, it might save some of the blunders into which they now fall when at work on matters outside of their own field.

Take, for example, the documentary hypothesis with its J, E, JE, etc. A difference in style is made much of in this connection, along with a difference in nomenclature, and it is assumed that these things can be accounted for only on the assumption that they are the result of a compilation as late as Ezra's day. That implies written documents made over by some scribe. But is there any need of such an hypothesis?

Moses was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." The critics admit that and then fail to realize what it means. They look at their own learning and think they understand! Moses must have known that wisdom in a fixed verbal form. It was the only way in which wisdom could be known at that time. It is still the way of the East. He knew the legal lore of Egypt, then, as exact formulated laws, not as principles. As such he would make use of them in secular matters. There was, accordingly, just one natural thing for him to do when legislation became necessary,—translate the Egyptian laws into Hebrew with such modifications as might be necessary, omitting those that were not necessary and supplying needed

additions. The last alone would reflect his own style. All others would be colored by their prototypes. In other words, differences in style would be inevitable in the legislation of Moses, and the ritualistic laws that were original would be the ones most characteristic of the man himself.

But, again, Moses knew all the traditions of the Hebrews; for without this knowledge he never could have been their leader. Some of it he acquired from his nurse-mother and some of it from his associates in Midian. Jethro, his father-in-law, was also his guide and counselor in various things, and he doubtless taught him all his own religious lore. Every word of it, however, would have a definite fixed verbal form. It would resemble the Oral Law which is now embedded in the Talmud after centuries of transmission by word of mouth. Without such a form it would have been worthless. In short, it had to have such a form to be Oriental. Concerning that point there can be no question.

Go where you will in the East, to China with its *Lî Kî*, to India with its *Rig-Veda*, to Persia with its *Zend-Avesta*, and everywhere you find the same condition—their wisdom is fixed in its verbal form. Take the secular writings, if you prefer, and go to Greece with its *Iliad* and *Odyssey*,¹ to India with its *Mahābhārata*, to Persia with its “*Thousand Nights and a Night*,”—it should be said that this last work has suffered various changes in passing from land to land, beginning as it probably did with certain tales in the *Bṛhatkathā* of India and gradually becoming the “*Arabian Nights’ Entertainments*,”—or to any other Oriental country that has a literature, and the

¹The higher criticism that once flourished in this connection is dead and buried, Homer survives, and the two poems belong to the same age: for the linguistic argument has been carried out to the bitter end with fatal results to the theory of Wolf and his followers.

story is the same. Translation varies the form somewhat, but transmission preserves it faithfully. Human fallibility rather than human intention is the source of change and alteration. It has always been so in the East.

That much is certain, and the Israelites were no exception to the rule; for they were not unlike all the rest of the world in this matter. Every one of the traditions received by Moses, therefore, had its own verbal form. It accordingly bore the imprint of the style of some former leader of the people and did not reflect the style of Moses himself when used by him in his writings. When he thus gave it bodily form, he did no more than other men have done elsewhere. The Rig-Veda was never written until changes began to creep in and a final authority was needed. Confucius resurrected the teachings of the sages from spoken words and written documents and put them into what was essentially their present form.

That, in effect, was the thing that Moses did. A flood tablet, for example, coming down from Noah himself may be embodied in Genesis, including parts of vii. 6 to viii. 14; for it is useless to deny the flood, since evidence of it has now been found all over the earth. Moreover, to deny it is to remove the only adequate explanation that has ever been offered for more than a score of geological problems, every one of which can thus be solved. The ice cap sunk two continents and thus forced portions of the ocean bed upward. Into that theory every known geological fact will fit, and so will the account in Genesis. It is safe to say, then, that Moses took what he had received and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit produced the Pentateuch.

He did not cease to be human in so doing, and he did not cease to be Moses. He therefore showed some characteristics that are wonderfully modern, if we but have eyes to see.

Reporters are seldom satisfied to leave a story or dispatch exactly in the form received. They restate it or amplify it to bring out certain features, and that is what Moses did. We do not postulate two or more documents for the two or three accounts thus produced in a single article in our newspapers. We simply recognize the truth. Why part with our common-sense in dealing with the Biblical problem?

If the learning possessed by Moses was not formulated learning, transmitted in definite verbal shape rather than by ideas expressed in various ways, it was not normal. It could not be for his times. But if he did not add to it in putting it into shape for his people, he was not human. He recognized their needs and their limitations, and he tried to meet the situation accordingly. He did meet it amazingly, and it is only the over-refinement of a highly educated class in our own day that denies his work or calls it in question. The book was meant for all kinds of people, not for modern scholars, and it is time to give that fact some sort of recognition.

Moses is credited with two copies of it, according to tradition; but here again conditions justify the teachings of the fathers. Secular judges needed a copy for their ultimate authority, and so did the Levitical priesthood. Jealousy there would be, if only one copy was available, and two would become imperative. Confluent readings would be the ultimate result, because slight verbal variations, especially in the names of God, would be inevitable in the two copies, and Oriental conservatism would retain every word found in either text if it was possible to do so.

Our present Scriptures would thus be a normal development, defects and all, for they contain defects, due to the limitations of the men who have been used in their transmission. The wonder is that none of these defects amount to

anything! That condition, however, is more than a wonder — it is a miracle — if the Pentateuch is a forgery made in the days of Ezra, as the critics would have us believe. Not a scrap of tangible evidence for such a belief has ever been found; but scholars are still busy manufacturing what passes in many quarters for such evidence. The artificiality of the product is fully as clear and the product itself fully as unsatisfactory as is the synthetic food of our modern chemists. Such food may appear to be the genuine article; but it is not really nourishing and it is apt to go to pieces somewhat as the pair of boots did, of which the seller said: “Och himmel,— did you walk in dose poots? Dose vas cavalry poots, not valkin’ poots!”

Differences of style, then, are normal features of a Pentateuch compiled by Moses in the traditional fashion. If they were lacking, it would be proof positive that the whole was a forgery of the sort outlined by the critics. We need to orientalize ourselves before we undertake to say anything whatever on such a subject, and what we would do now has no bearing at all on what they would naturally do then. Memory was a vital element in the finished product, and Jewish boys still exhibit the same tenacity for words and phrases. One such student at Oberlin knew two thirds of the Old Testament in Hebrew when I was on the faculty there, and he could not help retaining what he read *verbatim*.

Thus easily may the differences in style, made so much of by the critics, be disposed of,— they are merely normal features of a normal product of an ancient day,— and as suggested above, thus easily may the parallel accounts be disposed of also, if we are not unduly anxious to maintain them. Let us now turn our attention to one of these accounts which has played an important part in the arguments of the critics. I

refer to the so-called parallel descriptions found in Genesis i. and ii., the second of which is supposed to begin at ii. 4: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created," etc.

The natural interpretation of the words would seem to be this,—the acts of creation now recorded constitute the generations of the heavens and the earth. They are not so taken by all advocates of a double account at the place under discussion; for some persons see in them a reference to that which follows, although others are at a loss to understand why they should do so. That is my own position; for the critical explanation came as a distinct shock to me because of its apparent unnaturalness. Not being able to see why the words should be so taken, I began to wonder whether linguistic usage had anything to do with it.

That led to a study of the Hebrew demonstrative *הוא*, which is the word that would naturally introduce the so-called second account. There is a shorter form, *א*, which is supposed to occur but eight times, always in the Pentateuch and always with the article. Two other passages are cited, however, in which it is used without the article. The list therefore includes Gen. xix. 8, 25 (those), xxvi. 3, 4, Lev. xviii. 27, Deut. iv. 42, vii. 22 (those), xix. 11, and also 1 Chron. xx. 8 and Ezra v. 15. In these passages, without exception, the demonstrative refers, beyond a peradventure, to what has preceded: for in Deut. iv. 42 the thing alluded to is the expression "three cities" which occurs just above. It is not the names of the cities, which follow in apposition in the next verse.

It happened that all of these passages were cited in Young's "Analytical Concordance." For the longer form, but eight were found, one with the article, as was learned later. They were Gen. ii. 4, xxxiii. 5 (those), xlv. 6 (*הוא*). Ex. xxxviii.

21 (this), Lev. xviii. 24 (two cases), Isa. xxviii. 7 (they), Jer. x. 11, and Ezek. iv. 6 (them). Unless the first is an exception, all of these likewise refer to something which has preceded. As this could not possibly be a complete list, I mentioned the matter to a friend of mine, Rev. S. F. Goodheart, and he recalled two other passages, both in Deuteronomy.

The second of these was like the others. It occurred at v. 22 (19) and employed the article. The other, being the initial word of the book, appeared to refer beyond question to what followed. As such it was taken, although another possibility was plainly discernible, as will presently be made clear. This other possibility makes it conform to the other passages in every particular, and the chances are that it really does so.

Before attempting to settle the matter, Gesenius was appealed to, and his citations were then carefully studied. The passages in which the reference was apparently — with two or three exceptions unquestionably — to what preceded, were as follows:— Gen. ix. 19, x. 20, 31, 32, xiv. 3, xv. 1, xxv. 4, xxvii. 46 (such, etc.); Lev. x. 19 (such, etc.), xi. 24, xxi. 14, xxii. 22, xxv. 54, xxvi. 18 (this), 23; Num. xv. 13, xxviii. 23, 24 (this); Deut. xi. 18, xviii. 12, 22 (that), xxii. 5 (so), xxv. 16 (such, etc.); Josh. viii. 22 (some . . . some); Judges xiii. 23; 1 Sam. xvi. 10, xvii. 39; 2 Sam. xxiii. 17, 22; 1 Kings viii. 59, xxii. 11, 17, 23; 2 Kings xxv. 17; Ezra ii. 62, 65 (of whom), ix. 1; Neh. vi. 14; Job viii. 2, xii. 3 (such, etc.), xvi. 2 (do), xviii. 21 (do); Ps. xv. 5, xlii. 4 (5), l. 21, lxxiii. 12, cvii. 43; Isa. xliv. 21, xlvii. 7, 9 (like Deut. iv. 42 above), xlviii. 14, xlix. 12 (these = some, three times), lvii. 6, lxiv. 12 (11), lxvi. 2 (those), 8 (such, etc.); Jer. v. 9, x. 16 (them), xiii. 22, xviii. 13 (such, etc.), li. 19 (them), lii. 22; and Hos. xiv. 9 (10).

This list added to the others gives over seventy-five cases

in which the reference is to what has preceded, and that too after allowance has been made for possible differences of opinion. That usage may therefore be regarded as sufficiently clear. Closely allied with it is another, in which the thing referred to is either present in bodily form or is already distinctly before the mind of the speaker. The passages found in this class were as follows:—

- Ex. ix. 14. "For I will at this time send all my plagues upon"
 x. 1. "that I might show these my signs before him:"
 xi. 8. "And all these thy servants shall come down unto me,"
 1 Ki. x. 8. "happy *are* these thy servants, which stand continually"
 2 Ki. i. 13. "the life of these fifty thy servants, be precious"
 vi. 20. "open the eyes of these *men*, that they may see."
 Je. xxxi. 21. "O virgin of Israel, turn again to these thy cities."

Closely akin, though somewhat indefinite, is the verse,—

- Ps. xx. 7 (8). "Some *trust* in chariots, and some in horses: but"

Both classes were before his mind when he spoke, and the usage is therefore essentially the same as in the other passages.

Thus far the position of the critics has received no support, save in the case of Deut. i. 1, where the position of the word seems to favor their interpretation of Gen. ii. 4, "These *are* the generations" etc. The italicized words, as is usual, are those supplied in the English translation. Their omission helps make the Hebrew idiom and viewpoint somewhat more clear.

A few passages still remain. They appear to favor the critics and will accordingly be given with some fullness.

- Gen. vi. 9. "These *are* the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God.
 10. "And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth."
 x. 1. "Now these *are* the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth: and unto them were sons born after the flood.
 2. "The sons of Japheth; Gomer, and Magog," etc.
 6. "And the sons of Ham; Cush, and Mizraim," etc.

Gen. x. 21. "Unto Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder, even to him were *children born.*"

xxv. 7. "And these *are* the days of the years of Abraham's life which he lived, an hundred three score and fifteen years."

12. "Now these *are* the generations of Ishmael, Abraham's son, whom Hagar the Egyptian, Sarah's handmaid, bare unto Abraham:

13. "And these *are* the names of the sons of Ishmael, by their names, according to their generations: the first born of Ishmael," etc.

Dt. xxvii. 12. "These shall stand upon mount Gerizim to bless the people, when ye are come over Jordan; Simeon, and Levi," etc.

13. "And these shall stand upon mount Ebal to curse; Reuben, Gad, and Asher," etc.

Here, at last, the critics seem to be justified. But are they? In the first example, Shem, Ham, and Japheth have just been mentioned, in v. 32, and are therefore already in mind; and verse 10 renders any forward look unnecessary. In the second example, not only is the forward look emphasized by the "Now," but it is also made clear by the added statement "unto them were sons born." Moreover, so soon does it fade that we have in verse 20, "These *are* the sons of Ham," in verse 31, "These *are* the sons of Shem," and in verse 32, "These *are* the families of the sons of Noah," all referring to what has preceded.

The third example concludes the story of Abraham's life and therefore refers to something already in mind, although adding a necessary detail, and it then emphasizes the fact that the gaze has been turned ahead by the use of "Now" and by adding "these *are* the names" etc., an item necessarily involved in the process of giving the generations. The last example does not help the matter; for it comes under the head of things already present in bodily form. The natural inference is this. In its normal use the demonstrative refers to

what precedes, but it may be used of what follows if care is taken to make the fact apparent. It has no carrying power, however, when so used, and, unless the thing referred to is very brief or perfectly clear, a further explanation is deemed necessary.

It should be added that one more example was cited in support of the usage under discussion, namely, Ps. xlii. 4 (5): but it seemed so questionable that it was finally taken out of this list and placed in the one previously given. Allowance was then made for it and for two or three others of a similar sort, where it was possible to interpret the passage in two ways.

Lest it should be imagined that the investigation is now complete, let it be said that it is not so by any means. Enough ground has been covered, however, to show the probable character of the Hebrew usage. A few other passages were found, of the same general sort, namely:—

- Gen. xi. 10. "These *are* the generations of Shem: Shem . . . begat"
 27. "Now these *are* the generations of Terah: Terah begat"
 xxv. 17. "And these *are* the years of the life of Ishmael,"
 19. "And these *are* the generations of Isaac, . . . Abraham begat Isaac:"
 xxxvi. 1. "Now these *are* the generations of Esau, who is Edom."
 2. "Esau took his wives of the daughters of Canaan;"
 9. "And these *are* the generations of Esau the father of the Edomites in mount Seir;
 10. "These *are* the names of Esau's sons; Eliphaz the son"
 Num. iii. 1. "These also *are* the generations of Aaron and Moses" . . .
 2. "And these *are* the names of the sons of Aaron; Nadab"
 Ruth iv. 18. "Now these *are* the generations of Pharez: Pharez begat"
 1 Chr. i. 29. "These *are* the generations: the first born of Ishmael, Nebaioth: then Kedar," etc.

They contain nothing new. The usual "Now" or "And" or "also" (1) whichever the translators preferred, is omitted in the first example; but the list has been anticipated in x.

21-30, and it is therefore already in mind. The last example also omits the introductory word, but verse 31 has "These are the sons of Ishmael," referring to what has preceded. It parallels Gen. xxv. 16, which does the same thing.

A single passage, Gen. xxxvii. 2, "These *are* the generations of Jacob," failed to fit in anywhere. The nearest list is in chapter xxxv. 23-26, and the words have no apparent application where they are now found. There is evidently something still to be learned concerning this particular demonstrative; but it is clear that usage does not justify the critics in their interpretation of Gen. ii. 4, where the backward look is the natural one.¹ Moreover, Deut. i. 1 now looks decidedly dubious.

The pronoun plainly does not have carrying power enough to refer to the entire book that follows, and the words referred to were uttered in the wilderness, in the Arabah. Moreover, it came to pass at the end of the fortieth year (ver. 3) that Moses spake unto the children of Israel, and he did it (ver. 5) in the land of Moab. As the wilderness is definitely said to have been over against the Red Sea, it could not have been the land of Moab. The implication is this. Moses, in

¹After this was written, Dr. Wright called my attention to the able argument of Professor Green, in his "Unity of Genesis," pp. 8 ff. He strongly advocates the forward look and uses some of the passages already cited as possible confirmations of the critical attitude, together with the others that are like them, to support his contention; but he is constrained to do this by his admission that Gen. ii. 4 is a heading, which is exactly what it cannot be as I see it, even if some of the critics do so maintain. They would place it at the beginning of chap. i., and Dr. Green rightly combats any such notion. In doing so, however, he employs the same special pleading which is of dubious value in other Old Testament scholars. It is a question of learning vs. common sense. The notion that a man can use only one method is fallacious; for, on that basis, some of my own articles would have to be taken from me and given to several different persons.

true Oriental fashion, gave the Pentateuch to Israel orally at first and then committed it to writing in the third person, as was to be expected. It was all of a piece to him, and the reference at the beginning of Deuteronomy is therefore to the four books that have preceded it. A bit of evidence of his authorship is thus incidentally uncovered.¹

With this conclusion the critics can hardly take issue, since they have traveled much further with less to go on. Their duplicate accounts are often manufactured, none of them have any solid foundation beneath them, and the wonder is that sensible men have been induced to accept them as a basis for such a theory as they are supposed to help prove. If men were not so busy with their doing that they have no time to spend in thinking, the result might have been different.

There is, however, that other side to which reference has

¹ There is nothing in this to militate against the supposition that the actual writing was done by Joshua. In the case of Deuteronomy there can hardly be any question on that score. He probably did it and did it from memory, filling in such items as the final chapter. It would not be a particularly difficult thing to do in those days — there are men and women now who can duplicate it, one of each having come under my own observation and testing — but rather one to be expected. The words of introduction, which are paralleled in chap. xxix. 1, may therefore belong to Joshua. They make it clear that the covenant was completed before Israel left the region of Horeb and that then, when over two hundred miles distant, Moses renewed it in his speeches in Deuteronomy. It is not without significance that xxix. 1 is placed with the preceding chapter in the Hebrew text. The abruptness of the introduction and the lack of smoothness at the junction with what follows can thus be accounted for. Joshua added only what he regarded as absolutely necessary. Moses amplified to make things clear. Gen. i. is admittedly very old. Moses probably transmitted it as he received it; but he went on to clarify things by some further remarks in chap. ii., as is made plain by a change in the style. That is all there is in the supposed two documents, and thus easily may the style difficulty be met. It is a proof of genuineness rather than a proof of forgery.

already been made. As a witty divine recently remarked, "We have smoked too long the opium pipe of evolution." This is really the main trouble. Everything has been warped to fit that theory, not even excepting theology. Inspiration has thus been ruled out, revelation has been discarded, the idea of God has been made a purely subjective matter with no adequate explanation of its exalted character, the divinity of man has been taught as a necessary inference—some men do like the idea that they are "it,"—the Bible has been made a mere collection of Israelitish books the source of whose power is thus made a mystery, the Scriptures have been robbed of their authority and their effect upon the lives of men has, thereby been rendered either unaccountable or else miraculous, the character of Jesus has been made an impossibility or another unfathomable miracle, the testimony of history as well as that of the Bible itself has been disputed, the fact that the Israelites were absolutely unique in their religious development has been ignored, and the evidence that the logical result of an evolutionary process in religion is inevitably pantheism has been passed by without a word.

There is certainly something wrong with our scholarship. The lacuna appears to gain in extent the deeper one looks into what men think and teach. Are we merely careless, because we are driven at such a pace that we cannot take time to think, or have we reached the place where we do not even care to think but prefer to accept almost any doctrine that is already formulated, provided it bids fair to win a place for itself in the public mart? Is that the sort of stuff of which scholarship is made? If it is, the lacuna must increase in size until it can no longer be ignored, and a demand will then arise for something more worthy of the name of learning.