

The Independent

Entered at the Post Office at New York, as Second-Class Mail Matter.

"EVEN AS WE HAVE BEEN APPROVED OF GOD TO BE INTRUSTED WITH THE GOSPEL, SO WE SPEAK; NOT AS PLEASING MEN, BUT GOD WHICH PROVETH OUR HEARTS."

VOLUME XLVI.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1894.

NUMBER 2370.

The Independent

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

PALINGENESIS.

BY EDITH M. THOMAS.

I DWELT with the God, ere he fashioned the worlds with their heart of fire,
Ere the vales sank down at his voice or he spake to the mountains, "Aspire!"
Or ever the sea to dark heaven made moan in its hunger for light,
Or the four winds were born of the morning and mis-sioned on various flight.

In a fold of his garment I slept, without motion, or knowledge, or skill,
While age upon age the thought of creation took shape at his will;
Sleeping I lay by the right hand that framed it—this wonderful earth—
Nor heard I the stars of the morning, chanting its anthem of birth.

Part had I not in the scheme till he sent me to work on the reef,
Nude in the seafoam, to clothe it with coralline blossom and leaf.
Patient I wrought—as a weaver that blindly plyeth the loom,
Nor knew that the God dwelt with me, there as I wrought in the gloom.

Strength had I not till chiefdom supreme of the waters he gave;
Joyous I went—tumultuous; the billows before me I drove—
Myself as a surge of the sea when impelled by the driving storm;
Nor knew that the God dwelt with me, there in leviathan's form.

Lightness I had not till, decked with light plumes, he endued me with speed—
Buoyant the hollow quill as the hollow stem of the reed!
And I gathered my food from the ooze, and builded my home, at his word;
Nor knew that the God dwelt with me clothed in the garb of a bird.

I trod not the earth till on plains unmeasured he sent me to rove,
To taste of the sweetness of grass and the leaves of the summer grove.
For shelter he hollowed the cave; fresh springs in the rock he unsealed;
But I knew not the God dwelt with me that ranged as a beast of the field.

Foresight I had not, nor memory, nor vision that sweeps in the skies,
Till he made me man, and bade me uplift my marveling eyes!
My hands I uplifted—my cries grew a prayer—on the green turf I knelt,
And knew that the God had dwelt with me wherever of old I had dwelt!

Wild is the life of the wave, and free is the life of the air,
And sweet is the life of the measureless pastures, unburdened of care;
They have all been mine, I upgather them all in the being of man,
Who knoweth, at last, that the God hath dwelt with him since all life began!

My heritage draw I from these—I love tho I leave them behind;
But shall I not speak for the dumb, and lift up my sight for the blind?
I am kin to the least that inhabits the air, the waters, the clod;
They wist not what bond is between us, they know not the Indwelling God!

For under my hands alone the characterized Past hath he laid,
One moment to scan ere it fall like a scroll into ashes and fade!

Enough have I read to know and declare—my ways he will keep,
If onward I go, or again in a fold of his garment I sleep!

WEST NEW BRIGHTON, S. I.

EXHAUSTED ON FINANCE.

BY BISHOP ATTICUS G. HAYGOOD, D.D.

IF, some thousands of years hence, this American nation, in which we trust and of which we boast, should be dug out of ruins by the archeologists of the future times and there should be left only the records of Congressional debates, what would they conclude concerning us? That our God was a something called "Finance."

Whether the exhumers of the year 5000 A.D. could determine what Finance was is not certain; there is such difference of opinion.

What a fine thing if some representative of the people—some Senator, some member of the House—would give the country a new sensation, by making a speech on something other than finance!

It would almost shock the country if a leader in the National Congress were to plead for some measure on other than financial grounds; to urge the passage of some law simply because it would be in perfect harmony with eternal righteousness. We must not expect too much of our representatives; perhaps they do the best they can. At all events, we send them to represent us. Is the heart of all Americans so much on finance as the words and works—almost the sole occupation of Congress—indicates? Has money become a "fixed idea"? Can we think, talk, work or care for anything else?

This writer is haunted by an old-fashioned notion that Government has to do with the people as well as with money. If so, our rulers should consider the fundamental laws under which men live. There can be no good finance without some sort of conformity to the eternal verities which do not depend upon "good times."

What method of government will bring most money? This is the question that fills us. It keeps us awake of nights. It consumes us with anxieties. But other matters concern government—justice, righteousness, efficient and clean administration; these qualities are worth something.

We pay the penalty of over-specializing. When a man fixes his whole mind on any one thing he dwarfs himself. A man may look at one spot till he can't see that. So we are this day in our financial chaos. Statesmanship has exhausted itself on finance till it has become incapable of solving financial problems. Until Government thinks of something besides money it can never escape money panics.

When the people lose confidence in the sense or honesty of their leaders panic must come upon them, when people distrust their rulers they distrust each other; when confidence is gone money hides; and it does not emerge from its hiding place in response to any sort of incantations; it will "not listen to the voice of charmers, charm they never so wisely." Scared capital is deaf—"deaf as the adder"—to entreaty.

Let the Congress get to an end of something, do something, or take an affidavit that it will not do anything.

One says: "Do this and the country is ruined." Another says: "If you don't do this the country is ruined." The people hear both, fear both, and trust neither. Money hides, and labor begs. And the people "revile" their rulers.

Maybe we were getting too rich and getting rich too fast. Few young men are equal to the wise handling of great fortunes. Perhaps a young nation is not equal to it.

It sounds antiquated, let it be allowed, to talk about God in connection with national finances. But a great deal that is old is true. God always holds nations as well as persons responsible for the use of the talents committed to them. It may be God is displeased with the use we have made of our unparalleled prosperity. We seemed bent on paganism; perhaps the "hard times" only indicate divine mercy. While God holds us responsible we may yet be sure that he will do all that can be done to save. Poverty has saved many.

If we could only think of something—not Finance.

OXFORD, GA.

Modern Discovery and the Bible.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

Egyptology and Genesis.

MONUMENTS OF ASSYRIA AND BABYLON.

Discoveries in Palestine.

RECOVERY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN DOCUMENTS.

A Survey by Competent Biblical Authorities.

Prof. WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.,
Princeton Theological Seminary.

BENJAMIN W. BACON, D.D.,
Author of "The Genesis of Genesis."

Prof. D. G. LYON, Ph.D.,
Harvard University.

Prof. IRA M. PRICE, D.D.,
University of Chicago.

WILLIAM HAYES WARD, D.D., LL.D.,

Prof. HUGH M. SCOTT, D.D.,
Chicago Theological Seminary.

Prof. W. MAX MÜLLER, Ph.D.,
Reformed Episcopal Theological Seminary.

PENTATEUCHAL ANALYSIS A FAILURE.

BY WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary.

I am asked for my opinion respecting the result of the attempts at Pentateuchal analysis. I have a decided opinion upon this subject, which has not been hastily or inconsiderately formed, but has been reached after prolonged and careful study, with the best aids that I have been able to obtain. I do not underrate the learning or the ability of those eminent scholars who have elaborated the various partition hypotheses that have successively arisen to supplant their predecessors. The present reigning hypothesis, tho directly antagonistic in some of its leading features to the critical notions previously entertained, rose to sudden popularity through the skillful advocacy of Julius Wellhausen, in 1878. I shall not presume to say whether sixteen years of supremacy in speculative Germany are a sufficient test of its permanence even there. But I express my own rooted conviction, which is strengthened by every renewed examination of the matter, that the critics all and singular have failed in their attempts to show that the Pentateuch is a compilation from pre-existing documents, which can be reconstructed in whole or in part by the critical partition of the existing text. The arguments by which it is proposed to justify the critical partition and to establish the existence of the so-called documents, are fallacious; and their inconclusiveness can be shown in detail in the case of every passage to which they are applied, from Genesis to Deuteronomy, not to speak of Joshua, which it is the fashion at present to include with the preceding books in a Hexateuch, and which is in consequence converted into a most consummate medley. The thorough refutation of the partition hypothesis can only be effected in detail by showing its inapplicability to the Pentateuch from beginning to end. All that can be done within the limits of this article is to indicate in the general the insufficiency of the grounds which are urged in support of the critical partition.

These grounds are chiefly four, viz.:

I. The alternate use of the divine names God (*Elohim*) and LORD (*Jehovah*), in successive paragraphs or sections.

II. The continuity of each so-called document taken separately.

III. The diversity of style, diction and ideas in the different documents.

IV. The repetitions or parallel passages, indicative of distinct documents.

We shall consider these severally in their order.

I. It is claimed that the alternation of divine names in Genesis is due to the combination of distinct documents,

which differed in the term respectively used by them to denote the Most High. Those sections, paragraphs and clauses which speak of him as Jehovah have been taken from a document J (Jehovist), which prevalently made use of this name. Those sections, paragraphs and clauses which speak of him as God (Heb. *Elohim*) are taken either from the document E (Elohist) or P (priestly writer) which alike make use of this term.

But (1) this is a superficial and mechanical mode of dealing with that which finds its only adequate and satisfactory solution in the distinctive meaning of the terms themselves and their discriminating employment by the sacred writer. God (*Elohim*) is the general designation of the Divine Being in his relation to the world at large, to all mankind and all created things, as Creator, Preserver and Governor. Jehovah (A. V., LORD) is his name, by which he has made himself known to his chosen people in the sphere of revelation, redemption and gracious guardianship. In numerous passages throughout the Pentateuch these terms occur together in the same connected paragraph, where they are used with evident discrimination. Yet this is obliterated, its significance entirely missed, and intimately related paragraphs and clauses violently rent asunder, in order to apportion the different divine names to separate documents. For abundant illustrations of this see *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for April, 1894, pp. 266-270.

2. In spite of all the pains that the critics have taken to partition the documents in accordance with their theory, each of these names occurs repeatedly in the wrong document. Thus God (*Elohim*) is found in Jehovah sections, 3: 1-5; 4: 25; 6: 2, 4; 9: 26, 27, etc., etc., where the critics are compelled to admit that J uses both names as he has occasion. But this is putting the employment of these names upon another footing than that of the mere habit of different writers. And this really undermines their whole argument. For, if J could use both names, why might not P? or why in fact is there any need either for J or P? Why may not Genesis have had a single author, who used both names as he saw fit?

3. Again Jehovah (LORD) occurs in *Elohim* sections, where it is assumed that the redactor must have arbitrarily substituted it for God (*Elohim*); e. g., 17: 1; 21: 1b; 23: 11, or inserted the word Jehovah, 14: 22, or the clause containing it, 20: 18; 28: 21, or have borrowed the clause from some imaginary portion of the Jehovah document, 5: 29; 7: 16; 21: 33. These are mere shifts and evasions to parry the force of facts at variance with the hypothesis.

4. The attempt is made to find support for the hypothesis in Ex. 6: 2, 3: "God spake unto Moses and said unto him, I am Jehovah: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob as God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah I was not known unto them." This is interpreted to mean that the name Jehovah was then first revealed to Moses, and that it had not been in use in the time of the patriarchs. All prior sections containing the name Jehovah are held to be in conflict with this statement, and to imply a different belief as to the origin of this sacred name; whence it is inferred that they must be attributed to another writer, who supposed it to have been in use from the earliest periods, Gen. 4: 26. But the sense thus put upon Ex. 6: 3 is altogether inadmissible; for

(a) It is plain that the author or, if the critics please, the compiler of the Pentateuch did not so understand it. After recording the history of the patriarchs, in which free use is made of the name Jehovah, he is here supposed to have stultified himself by introducing the statement from the mouth of God that they had never heard this name.

(b) This verse finds its explanation in the repeated declarations that Israel (Ex. 6: 7; 10: 2; 10: 12; 29: 46), the Egyptians (7: 5; 14: 4, 18) and Pharaoh (7: 27; 8: 10, 23; 9: 14, 29; cf. 5: 2) should know that he was Jehovah; not that they should be told that this was his name, but that convincing manifestations should be made to them of the greatness of the Being whom that name denoted. That he was not so known by the patriarchs must mean, therefore, not that they had never heard the word, but that, while tokens of God's almighty power, had been vouchsafed to them, no such disclosures had been made of what Jehovah truly was, as were now to be granted to their descendants.

(c) The uniform usage of Scripture proves the same thing. To "know the name of Jehovah" uniformly denotes, not a bare acquaintance with the word Jehovah, but a true apprehension of his divine perfections (1 Kings 8: 43; Ps. 9: 10; 91: 14; Isa. 2: 6; 64: 2; Jer. 16: 21; Ezek. 39: 6, 7).

II. The separate existence of the documents J, E and P is argued from the alleged continuity of each taken severally.

But (1) the partition, which the critics have effected, demonstrates their ingenuity, but nothing more. The division of a narrative into two apparently complete narratives is no proof that these are the original sources from which the existing narrative has been compiled. I have illustrated this from the parables of the New Testament in the volume entitled "Anti-Higher Criticism"; and Prof. C. M. Mead has shown the same thing much more elaborately, and on a more extensive scale, in his "Romans Dissected."

2. The alleged documents are not continuous in point of fact, but have numerous chasms and abrupt transitions, occasioned by the removal of paragraphs attributed to other documents. Thus, Gen. 1: 31, P says that God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And then in 6: 11, 12, without the slightest intimation that any change had taken place, he suddenly announces that God saw the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt. This is inexplicable without the account of the fall, the degeneracy of the race of Cain, and the infection of the godly race by intermarriage with the rest; but all this is assigned to J. In 29: 19, P tells what happened when God destroyed the cities of the plain, without having before alluded to such a destruction as having occurred; the account of it is only to be found in J. In 28: 1-5, P tells that Isaac sent Jacob to Padan-aram to obtain a wife. But his entire residence there, eventful as it was, is in P an absolute blank. In 31: 18, he is said to be returning with goods and cattle, and in 35: 22-26, his twelve children are enumerated, the P contains no previous intimation of his having either property or a family. How all this came about is only related in sections assigned to the other documents. Numerous gaps and chasms of this nature occur in each of the so-called documents, and are in every case created by the critical partition. The critics undertake to account for such cases by saying that the redactor, having given the narrative from one of his sources, designedly omits what is contained in the others to avoid needless repetition. And yet in other cases they tell us that he scrupulously retains the contents of his different sources, even tho it leads to what they consider superfluous repetitions, such as the double mention of Noah's entry into the ark, and of various particulars connected with the flood as given both by J and P.

3. In many cases where continuity is claimed, it is only effected by bridging evident gaps by means of scattered clauses sundered here and there from their proper connection, as is done for J in the account of the flood, and for P in the early history of Abraham.

4. The apparent continuity produced by bringing separated passages together, after removing the intervening paragraphs, is altogether factitious. This may be so adroitly done that such passages will read continuously, as tho there had been no omission. But any other book can be subjected to like treatment with a like result. Paragraphs of greater or less extent can be removed from any piece of writing whatever without the reader suspecting it, unless he is informed of the fact.

5. Each of the so-called documents in repeated instances either directly alludes to or presupposes what is contained in the others. This is quite inconsistent with the hypothesis of their independent origin. The critics have taken the utmost pains to construct their documents so as to avoid this interrelation; but it has been impossible for them to prevent it.

III. The diversity of style, diction and ideas in the different documents is alleged to indicate separate authorship.

But (1) the argument is simply reasoning in a circle. The diversity is first created and then argued from. The documents are framed to correspond with certain assumed characteristics; and their correspondence with them is urged in proof of their objective reality. All paragraphs, clauses and parts of clauses, in which a certain class of criteria occur, are systematically assigned to one document, and those having another class of criteria are with like regularity assigned to another document; and when the process is complete, all the criteria of one class are in one document, and those of the other class are in the other document, for the simple reason that the critic has put them there.

2. The proof offered for diversity of diction is fallacious for another reason. All words in one of the so-called documents, which do not chance to be found in the others, are carefully gathered out and strung together in a formidable list. Any one treatise of an author can be equally made in this way to prove that any other of his treatises was not written by him, or any part of one to prove that the remaining portion came from another hand. That certain words which occur in one do not occur in another proves nothing, unless it can be shown that the writer had occasion to use them. Especially is this the case, when the words adduced are of infrequent occurrence, or belong to one particular species of composition. It is not surprising that poetic words should not be found in a document from which poetic passages are systematically excluded; or that legal words and phrases should be limited to the document to which the legal passages are regularly assigned; or that words appropriate to ordinary narrative should chiefly abound in those documents to which the bulk of such narrative is given.

3. When synonymous expressions are used to convey the same idea, this does not justify the assumption that they have been taken from different documents and represent the usage of distinct writers. Synonyms are not exact counterparts, and their discriminating use does not prejudice unity of authorship.

4. The alleged criteria frequently conflict with each other and with the criteria derived from the divine names. Words or phrases said to be characteristic of one writer meet in the same section or even in the same

sentence with those that are said to characterize another writer. In such cases the critics resort to various subterfuges to relieve the situation. Sometimes they admit that what has been affirmed to be characteristic of one document is found likewise in another, which is equivalent to a confession that it is not a distinctive criterion at all. At other times they claim that two texts have been mingled, and that expressions or clauses from one document have been interpolated in the other; whereas these blended criteria simply prove that the same writer freely uses both in the same connection. Still again they claim that such passages belong originally to neither document, but are insertions by the redactor, who is always at hand to account for phenomena at variance with the hypothesis, when no other mode of escape is possible. Any hypothesis however preposterous could be carried through by such devices. If all opposing phenomena could be set aside as interpolations, or as the work of the redactor, the most refractory texts can be tortured into accordance with the critic's arbitrary pre-suppositions.

IV. Repetitions or parallel passages are alleged to be separate accounts of the same thing taken from different documents.

But these are invariably factitious and lend no support whatever to the hypothesis of separate documents. They are of four sorts, viz.:

1. Distinct events having certain points in common are arbitrarily declared to be variant representations of one and the same event.

2. Different parts of the same transaction are distributed among the documents as independent narratives of the whole affair, or of the same identical portion of it.

3. Summary statements, followed or preceded by a detailed account of the particulars included in them, are made a pretext for division, the former being assigned to one document, and the latter to another.

4. Statements introduced upon occasion with the view of supplementing what had been less fully described before, are also dealt with in the same way.

The various arguments urged in support of the divisive hypothesis in its various forms have now been successively examined and found wanting. The alternation of divine names can be otherwise explained, and, moreover, it can only be brought into harmony with the partition hypothesis by a free use of the redactor, and the assumption of repeated changes of the text. Ex. 6: 3 has not the meaning that the critics attribute to it. The continuity of the documents is broken by serious chasms, or maintained by very questionable methods; and it is necessary to assume in numerous instances that the documents originally contained paragraphs and sections similar to those which the critics have sundered from them. The diversity of diction, style and ideas is made out by utterly fallacious and inconclusive methods. And the alleged parallel passages are for the most part falsely assumed identifications of what is distinct, or involve the gratuitous severance of what properly belongs together.

It should be borne in mind that the burden of proof lies altogether upon the critics. There is no intimation anywhere that such documents, as they claim to have discovered, ever existed outside of the critics' own imagination. Tradition is against them. All external evidence and all internal evidence is against them. While the attempted proof of lack of unity signally fails, the positive evidence of unity abides and never can be nullified. The great outstanding proof of it is the unbroken continuity of the history, the consistent plan upon which the whole is prepared, and the numerous cross references which bind all together as the work of one mind. Separate and independent documents, mechanically pieced together, could no more produce such an appearance of unity as reigns throughout the Pentateuch, than a faultless statue could be formed out of discordant fragments of dissimilar materials.

THE CONSENSUS OF SCHOLARSHIP ON THE PENTATEUCH QUESTION.

BY BENJAMIN W. BACON, D.D.,

Author of "The Genesis of Genesis" and "The Triple Tradition of Exodus."

"The Pentateuch question" means one thing to the world of biblical scholarship and a totally different thing to the generality of the Christian public. With very few exceptions, readers of THE INDEPENDENT understand by that phrase the question whether Professor Briggs is right in maintaining that the traditional view of the Pentateuch must be abandoned in favor of the modern "documentary theory," which postulates a "Hexateuch" (Gen.-Joshua) as a literary composite, or harmony of four independent works of various dates later than Moses, by unknown authors, who report traditions of a more or less remote past, transmitted to them through unknown channels; or whether Professor Green is right in clinging to the teaching of the rabbis, presupposed tho not taught in the New Testament. This opinion is, that saving the last eight verses, and possibly slight interpolations here and there, allowing also the possibility that Moses employed written materials for the pre-Egyptian period, the Pentateuch is an irresolvable literary unit, Moses is its author, and hence its statements as to the main facts of Israel's national origin are the indisputable testimony of an eyewitness of supreme authority.