

P. Ser. Al. etc.
2644
10



THE EVANGELIST.

May 3, 1894.

THE CRITICAL PARTITION OF THE NARRATIVE OF THE DELUGE.

By the Rev. W. Henry Green, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary.

My attention has been called to the Sunday-school Lesson paper in *The Evangelist* of January 8th, in which, as in other papers of the series, the attempt is made to initiate the young people and the children of the Church into the mysteries of the Higher Criticism, and to teach them that Genesis and the Pentateuch were not written by Moses, as has always been currently believed, as our Lord and the inspired writers of the New Testament repeatedly declare, and as is testified likewise in the Old Testament from the death of Moses to Malachi, the latest of the prophets. On the contrary, it is alleged that they are a compilation by an unknown compiler from preexisting documents of unknown origin. I quote from the paper just spoken of:

The story of the Flood in Genesis vi.-ix. is so clear an illustration of the method of the writer or compiler of the Book of Genesis, that we may profitably spend a little time in examining it.

It is hardly possible that we, who have been familiar with this story from infancy, have not observed many repetitions in these chapters. And we have been careless readers indeed, if we have not observed that where the same fact is twice mentioned, it is usually with some points of difference. . . We may with great ease separate the story into two parts, each of which, we shall find, reads right along and gives a complete account of the Flood, with no discrepancies whatever to be "reconciled." For example, beginning with vi. 9, let us read straight along as follows: 9-22, vii. 6, 11, 13-16a, 18-21, 24-viii. 2a, 3b-5, 13a, 14-19, ix. 1-17, we find a perfectly consecutive story which is harmonious in every part. Next let us go back to vi. 5, and read straight along to 8, then vii. 1-5, 7-10, 12, 16b, 17, 22, 23, viii. 2b, 3a, 6-12, 13b, 20-22, and we find that we have also a perfectly harmonious story, and complete but for the want of a few connecting phrases, which were necessarily omitted when the two stories were woven together. This can by no means be an accidental circumstance; there is no writing by a single author that we can so separate as to make of it two complete and perfect narrations. It can only be explained by the fact that these were originally two distinct accounts of the same story. . . Here and there, in dove-tailing the two narratives, a few words by the compiler himself were necessary. They appear to be marvelously few; as far as we can see they are only the second clause of vi. 7, a few words in vii. 9 (there went in two and two . . . the male and the female), the second clause of vii. 23, and perhaps the word *God* in vii. 9. These additions are all made to the prophetic narrative, and are apparently designed to bring the style a little more closely into harmony with that of the priestly writer.

It requires but a slight examination to show how misleading all this is. For

1. The narrative of the deluge is not divisible into two complete and continuous narrations.
2. Narratives of unquestioned unity can be divided into two continuous accounts with equal plausibility.
3. The alterations by the compiler, whose office it is to cover the halting places of the critical hypothesis, must have been not "marvellously few," but marvellously many and marvellously great.

For the sake of brevity we shall call the prophetic narrator of the critics J., and the priestly writer P. Let us now examine the

portion of the narrative which is assigned to the former, and see whether it "reads right along and gives a complete account of the flood, with no discrepancies whatever to be reconciled." It begins with vi. 5-8. We read in verse eighth, "But Noah found grace in the eyes of the LORD." This implies that the reader had already been made acquainted with Noah. And so he had in the Scriptural account, which details his ancestry in chapter five; but this is given by the critics to P. No previous mention of Noah, or allusion to him is made in the sections attributed to J.; yet here he is spoken of as a well known personage. Evidently something is wanting in J. corresponding to what has been abstracted from preceding chapters and assigned to P. In verse 7 we are told that the compiler has inserted the second clause, "both man and beast and creeping thing and fowl of the heaven," because such detailed enumerations are foreign to his supposed style. This is a confession that the text, in its present form, cannot, on critical principles, be assigned to J. It does not suit the hypothesis, but must be amended into conformity with the hypothesis. In other words, the hypothesis must here be supported by an inference drawn from the hypothesis. But this clause, though unwelcome to the critics, cannot be omitted from the verse, for the plural pronoun "them" at the end of it refers to these particulars in this second clause, not merely to "man" in the first clause, which would call for a pronoun in the singular (see "his heart," verse 5).

If, however, we take verse seven, as the critics have corrected it, leaving out the second clause, then it declares that the LORD said, not to Noah, but to Himself, *i. e.*, He resolved to destroy man, no mention being made of the way in which this was to be effected, nor whether the inferior creatures would be involved. J. then springs at once to vii. 1, where "the LORD said to Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark," though there is no previous allusion in J. to the fact that Noah had a family, or that there was an ark, or any occasion for there being an ark. To be sure, all this has been explained before; vi. 10 speaks of Noah's three sons, and verses 13-22 tell how God told him of the coming flood and bid him build an ark for the safety of his house and the various species of living things, and that Noah did so. But all this is assigned to P.: there is not a word of it in J. Clearly there is something missing in J.; and just that is missing which has been abstracted from the previous narrative and given by the critics to P.

In verses 7-10 we have J.'s account of Noah's entry into the ark. But verse 9, we are told, has been manipulated by the compiler. The words, "there went in two and two," "male and female," and "God," have been inserted by him. Here again the text is not in accord with the hypothesis; a number of P.'s words and expressions are in a J. paragraph, and it must be the fault of the compiler. But this is not all. There is not a verse in the paragraph which is just as it should be, if the critics are right. The detailed enumeration "Noah and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives" (verse 7), instead of simply Noah and all his house as in verse 1, is foreign to J.; so in verse 8, "beasts and fowls and everything that creepeth," instead of "every living thing," as in verse 4; and "waters of the flood," verses 7, 10, refer back to P.'s phrase, vi. 17, vii. 6. It is said that the compiler "apparently designed to bring the style a little more closely into harmony with that of P." But why he should be so concerned just here as to alter expressions which he leaves unchanged elsewhere, does not appear. And it is particularly surprising

that he should of his own motion introduce what the critics consider a discrepancy into J.'s account. How could he make J. appear to say, in verses 8, 9, "of clean beasts and of beasts that are not clean . . . there went in two and two unto Noah into the ark," in open contradiction, as the critics allege, with what he had said just before in verse 2, that clean beasts were to go in seven and seven, and of beasts not clean two. And yet we are told that the documents "are woven together in a highly artistic manner" and the compiler's work is "admirably" done. If this is so, the compiler must have been an intelligent person, and he could not have made grossly contradictory statements within the compass of a few lines without perceiving it. He certainly could have seen nothing of the sort here, or he would not gratuitously have inserted a discrepancy in the text of his own accord, which was not there in the document from which he was copying. And if he did not see it, perhaps there is no contradiction after all. It may be the critics who are mistaken in fancying that there is one. And in point of fact, there is no discrepancy between the general statement that two of every species, a male and a female, entered the ark, and the more particular declaration that there were seven of every species of clean beasts, and two of those that were not clean. If, then, the compiler harmonizes with J. vii. 2, 3, neither is there any discrepancy between J. vii. 2, 3 and P. vi. 19, vii. 15.

In what follows the semblance of continuity can only be made out for J. by means of scattered sentences and clauses torn from their connection in an arbitrary manner. Thus J. proceeds verse 12, and then skips to 16b: "And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights . . . and the LORD shut him in." It is natural to ask why the LORD waited forty days before He shut the door of the ark behind Noah. It is obvious that the last clause of verse 16 has no proper connection with verse 12, to which the critics attach it. It plainly belongs where it stands in the text.

The rise of the waters of the flood is depicted in verses 17-20 in four successive stages. The critics arbitrarily sunder one of these, verse 17, from the rest, and assign it to J. The destruction accomplished by the flood is similarly described in three successive statements of growing intensity, verses 21-23. Two of these are parted from the remaining one and given to J., verses 22, 23.

The next clause of J. is viii. 2b, "and the rain from heaven was restrained." Just before we read in vii. 24, "The waters prevailed upon the earth an hundred and fifty days." The critics find a discrepancy between this and vii. 4, 12, according to which it rained forty days. The intelligent compiler has been at fault here again. He has inserted this clause respecting the stopping of the rain in the wrong place. It should have preceded vii. 24, instead of following it. But we may shelter ourselves behind him here again. If he saw no impropriety in putting this clause where he did, perhaps there was none. He may not thus have brought J. into conflict with himself after all. If it had been said that the rain from heaven was not restrained after 150 days had passed, there would indeed have been a discrepancy. But where is the discrepancy in saying that it had stopped?

The last clause of viii. 2 is separated from the first, one being given to J. and the other to P. But this is severing what of necessity belongs together. We find the same combination here as in vii. 11, 12, where the sources of the flood are described, and the critics split them asunder after the same fashion. These sources were two, viz: the rushing in of the waters of the ocean upon the land, and the

torrents descending from the sky. The tenses of the Hebrew verbs at once indicate to the reader that the bursting forth of the fountains of the great deep and the opening of the windows of heaven are separate items, while the fall of the rain is a sequence of that which just preceded. The opening of the windows of heaven prepares the way for the down-pour, but is not the downpour itself. The thought is not complete until the actual fall of rain is added (compare Malachi iii. 10). The opening of the windows of heaven cannot, therefore, be attributed to one writer and the rain to another; both belong indissolubly together. The same is the case with viii. 2; the last clause is inseparable from the first. And besides, "the rain from heaven" is evidently contrasted with "the fountains of the deep," so that the two clauses of the verse are bound together thus again. And verse 3a cannot be separated from verse 2. The latter states that the sources of the flood had ceased; but this would not of itself account for the subsidence of the water. The stopping of the fountains of the deep and of the windows of heaven are purely negative; to this must be added the positive flowing off of the water, if the flood was to be reduced. To sever this clause from P. and give it to J., as is done by the critics, leaves P.'s statement inadequate and incomplete. And the phraseology used shows the same thing; "the waters returned"; whither? Certainly not to the heaven, 2b, but to the deep, 2a, from which the great body of them had come. So that if the word "returned" is to have anything like its proper force, verse 3a is tied to 2a, and cannot be severed from it as the critics propose.

Then the sending out of the birds, verses 6-12, is given to J. In verses 13, 14 the drying of the earth is stated in two stages; one of these, verse 13b, is arbitrarily given to J., and the other, verse 14, to P. J. makes no allusion to Noah's leaving the ark, which is another serious break in his narrative. This is spoken of indeed in the Scripture account, vs. 15-19; but this is given to P. So that here again we miss in J. precisely what has been abstracted by the critics and attributed to the other document. J.'s account concludes with Noah's sacrifice, verses 20-22.

Instead, therefore, of a complete account with no discrepancies, we find in the portion assigned to J. several important gaps created purely by the critical partition: other chasms scantily bridged by scattered clauses torn from their context, in which they are indispensable, or attached to passages where they are inappropriate; expressions which by critical rules cannot belong to J., and require the assumption, which has no other basis than the exigencies of the hypothesis, that the text has been manipulated by the compiler; and discrepancies so called, which are wholly due to the compiler's gratuitous interference.

Let us now see how it is with P. The first paragraph assigned to him is vi. 9-22. We here read, verses 11, 12, "And God saw the earth, and behold, it was corrupt"; and so corrupt that He was determined to destroy it. Yet in i. 31 P. had said, "And God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good." There is not a word of explanation offered to account for this dreadful change. It is, indeed, explained sufficiently in the Scripture narrative. The intervening chapters tell us of the fall of the growing degeneracy of the ugly race of Cain, of the infection even of the godly race by inter-marriage with the rest. But all this is by the critics attributed to J.; there is nothing of the kind in P. Plainly something is missing here; and just that is missing which the critics have transferred to another document. P.

then proceeds to tell that Noah was instructed to build the ark, which he did, then his age at the coming of the flood, vii. 6, 11, and his entry with some of all living things into the ark, verses 13-16.

The sacred writer labors to produce a vivid impression of the enormous rise of the waters of the flood by describing it in four successive stages until it reached the prodigious altitude which it actually attained. First, verse 17, the water rose sufficiently to float the ark. Then, verse 18, it rose very much higher still, and the ark mounted aloft upon its surface. Next, verse 19, it attained such a height as to cover all the high mountains within the entire horizon. Finally, verse 20, it reached its maximum, fifteen cubits above the mountain tops. This regular gradation is broken apart by the critics who assign the first or lowest stage to J., and the other three stages to P., thus giving to each a truncated description, which when put together match precisely, and supply just what before was wanting in each. Is this a lucky accident, or has not this entire description emanated from one mind?

The sacred writer seeks again to give adequate expression to the destruction wrought by the flood by three successive statements of increasing strength. First, verse 21, he declares with emphatic particularity that all flesh died, fowl and cattle and beast and creeping thing and man. Then, verse 22, in the most universal terms, "All in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life, of all that was in the dry land, died." Finally, verse 23, universal and particular terms are combined, and the most forcible expression for complete destruction added in contrast with the sole survivor: "And every living thing was wiped out which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle and creeping thing and fowl of the heaven; and they were wiped out from the earth; and Noah only was left, and they that were with him in the ark." Disregarding these climactic periods, which are heaped together in order to intensify the contrast of the last clause, the critics give the first of the sentences to P., thus sundering it completely from what follows, the result of which is to make P. affirm in the most absolute manner the universality of the destruction without so much as a single survivor.

The next two verses are given to J. in spite of the enumeration of particulars in verse 23, "both man and cattle and creeping thing and fowl of the heaven," which, according to critical principles, is foreign to his style, and must be thrown out of the text as an insertion by the compiler. The passage does not correspond with the hypothesis, and is hence corrected into conformity with it. And yet this clause, which is objectionable to the critics, and which they propose to eliminate, is one of the features of the verse which adapts it to the climactic position that it occupies.

It has before been shown that viii. 2, 3, cannot be partitioned as the critics propose; and that the severance of verses 2b, 3a, as an insertion from J., would leave P.'s statement incomplete.

The narrative then proceeds after the same analogy to describe the subsidence of the flood. And it may be proper to note that the seven stages of the decline of the water precisely correspond with the four stages of its rise added to the three statements of its widespread desolation. First, viii. 1, a wind passed over the earth, which served to reduce the volume of water. Secondly, verses 2-4, the sources of the flood had ceased, and the water flowed off to such an extent that the ark rested on the mountains of Ararat. Thirdly, verse 5, the water still further decreased

and the tops of the mountains appeared. Fourthly, verses 6-9, as the water continued to sink, a dove was sent forth after forty days, but the flood was still at such a height that no resting place could be found. Fifthly, verses 10, 11, after seven days more the water had abated sufficiently for trees to emerge, as was shown by the olive leaf plucked off by the dove. Sixthly, verse 12, the dove was sent out and returned no more; it was able to find a suitable abode. Seventh, and finally, verse 13, the day is noted, on which Noah discovered that the water was dried up from off the earth. This regular gradation is spoiled by the critics, who assign verses 6-12, the mission of the birds, to J.; the consequence of which is that P. springs at once from verse 5, the first appearance of the mountain tops, to verse 13, where the waters were dried up from off the earth.

The prominence given to the sending out of the birds in the Chaldean account of the deluge, which is universally confessed to stand in an intimate relation to that in Genesis, further shows that the narrative would be incomplete if this were not included. Least of all can this be questioned by those who maintain that the Hebrew narrative was borrowed from the Chaldean.

The drying of the ground is likewise stated in two successive stages. First, verse 13, the surface was so far dried that the water had disappeared. Then, verse 14, the earth was dry. These are distinct sentences, the second a sequel to the first; and they should not be separated.

P. proceeds to tell of Noah's leaving the ark, verses 15-19. But he records no act of worship or thanksgiving for this great deliverance. Yet he had spoken of Noah as a righteous man who walked with God, vi. 9. In fact throughout the entire patriarchal history, P. never mentions an altar, or sacrifice, or any act of worship. These are indeed spoken of repeatedly in the sacred history; but they are invariably referred to other documents, never to P. And yet P., according to the critics, is the priestly writer, who is especially interested in ritual worship and in ceremonial matters. It is he who records the institution of the Sabbath, ii. 3, and of circumcision, xvii. 10, and the prohibition of eating blood, ix. 4, which is based on its use in sacrifice, and he never records anything derogatory to the patriarchs, but always exalts them as model men of God. Is it conceivable that he should have omitted to mention that Noah devoutly praised God for His merciful interposition on his behalf? Surely there has been an omission here, and the more evidently so, as such a sacrifice is so prominent a feature in the Chaldean account of the deluge.

It thus appears, also, that there are serious chasms in P.'s account likewise, that the symmetry of the narrative is spoiled in repeated instances by the proposed partition, and that passages are rent from their connection and assigned to J., which are indispensable in the context in which they stand.

It is further claimed that there are repetitions, which betray the composite character of the narrative, and show that it has been made up by combining two separate accounts. But this is a mistake: there are no superfluous repetitions to warrant such a conclusion. We are pointed, in the first instance, to the opening verses. It is said that vi. 5-7 contains J.'s account of the wickedness of man and of the LORD's purpose to destroy the race; then follows, in verses 11-13, P.'s account of the very same thing. But a slight consideration of the circumstances will make it appear that the critic's conclusion is altogether unwarranted. According to the plan of the

writer of Genesis, a new section begins with vi. 9. The division of the book into chapters and verses, as is well known, is quite modern. The writer of Genesis pursued a plan of his own, which this modern division altogether obscures. After the opening section, i 1-ii-3, the remainder of the book is divided into ten parts, each of which is introduced by a title of its own, suggesting the theme of what follows, and all these titles are of a uniform pattern. Thus ii. 4, "These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth," v. 1, "the generations of Adam;" vi. 9, "the generations of Noah;" x. 1, "the generations of the sons of Noah," and so on to the end. Accordingly, vi. 9, "These are the generations of Noah" begins a new section of the history, and indicates its subject to be the fortunes of Noah's family. In entering upon this topic the writer first explains the situation with the view of placing distinctly before the minds of his readers at the outset the causes of what was about to take place. He commences by stating the character of Noah, verse 9b, which explains the intimation in verse 8 of the special favor shown to him. He then recapitulates some statements previously made, which are necessary to the understanding of the following narrative. He speaks of Noah's three sons, verse 10, though they had been named in identical terms in cha. v. 32, which the critics likewise refer to P.; no one thinks of a difference of writers because of this repetition. He further speaks of the universal corruption, verses 11, 12; this had already been stated at the close of the preceding section, verse 5, as a sequence from disclosures previously made. But it lay so at the basis of what was to be recorded in this new section, that it is mentioned here again. And there is no more reason for suspecting a diversity of writers than there is in verse 10, which all acknowledge to be by the same writer as cha. v. 32. It is just such a recapitulation as any writer might be expected to make under the circumstances. On the other hand, verse 13 is not a repetition of the statement made in verse 7, but is an advance upon it. In verse 7 mention is made of the LORD'S purpose to destroy man; in verse 13 this purpose is communicated to Noah, which is quite another thing.

In verse 18, while directing Noah to build the ark, God tells him the purpose for which it was to be made, and that he was to take with him into it some of every species of living things in order to keep them alive. After the ark had been built, and the time for sending the flood drew nigh, the LORD bade Noah to go into it with his family and with some of every species of animals, vii. 1-3. But there is no superfluous repetition here. Two distinct divine communications were made at different times, and each is reported in its proper place.

The critics, however, lay great stress upon the fact that the entry into the ark is twice recorded; verses 7-9, they tell us, is J.'s account, and verses 13-16 that of P. But this, too, is a mistake; there is nothing here requiring the supposition of distinct documents. It has been before shown that verses 7-9 cannot, by critical rules, be referred to J. without a reconstruction of the text in each individual verse. But besides this, it is to be noted that verse 6 gives a general statement of Noah's age at the coming of the flood; he was then 600 years old. In verse 11 this is stated again with more particularity in order to indicate the precise day on which the flood began, viz: the 600th year of Noah's life, the second month, the seventeenth day of the month. The critics do not find this repetition incompatible with the sameness of the writer; verses 6 and 11 are both alike referred by them to P. In precisely the same man-

ner, with the view of exhibiting the precision of the divine arrangements, the sacred writer points out the fact in verses 13-16 that Noah and all his company entered the ark on the self same day on which the flood broke forth; and the emphasis, which he puts upon this thought, appears from the particularity of detail and the iteration in these verses. Now why should this repetition for this evident purpose be any more suggestive of a diversity of writers than the like repetition in regard to Noah's age?

The critics are embarrassed here by their own hypothesis. Different views have been entertained in respect to the relation of J. and P. According to some critics, J. and P. each wrote a separate and independent document, and these, after circulating singly for a time, were at length combined by a compiler or redactor. These are known as documentary critics. Others have held that J. did not write a complete document of his own, but simply edited an enlarged edition of P. The document of P. was made the basis, to which J. simply made additions, supplementing it here and there as he had occasion. These are known as supplementary critics.

In the case before us the documentary critics make this point against the supplementary critics, that no editor in supplementing a pre-existing work, would introduce of his own motion what was already in almost identical terms in the work before him. Such a superfluous repetition could only be accounted for by supposing that a compiler was combining two works, for each of which he had a great reverence, so that he was reluctant to omit anything that either of them contained. Thus it came to pass that, after copying a statement from one of his sources, he finds the same thing stated likewise in the other, and copies it also. This has a plausible sound. It certainly silences the supplementary critics. But there are two insuperable difficulties in the way of accepting the solution which the documentary critics offer. 1. Judged by their own critical rules, the compiler has not preserved what was peculiar to J. in verses 7-10, but has conformed it throughout to the style of P. 2. In other cases he has not shown a similar care to preserve all the contents of his sources. Why has he not given a duplicate account of the building of the ark, or of the exit from it, as well as of the entry into it? The obvious reason is that in the former there was no coincidence in time to emphasize as there was in the latter. Hence the emphatic repetition in the one, whereas there was no occasion for it in the others.

It has before been shown that the statements respecting the rise of the waters, their destructiveness, and their subsequent fall, cannot be parcelled between different writers; and that the attempt to find two parallel accounts of these particulars by J. and by P. is not successful. The verses and clauses which are given to J. cannot be sundered from the context in which they stand. Moreover, the description of successive stages is not identical repetition, and as such suggestive of distinct documents. And if it were, four statements of the rise of the waters, three of their destructive effects, and seven of their fall, cannot be distributed between two documents without leaving repetitions in each. More than two documents are necessary, if each repetition is indicative of a separate writer. The critical argument is, in this case, plainly self-destructive.

It has also been claimed that Noah's sacrifice and the Lord's resolve not to destroy all living things again, viii. 20-22, are parallel to God's blessing Noah, and his covenant not to send another universal flood, x. 1-17. And that the former is the account of J., and the

latter that of P. respecting the same thing. But these are not the same; one is the sequel of the other; viii. 21, 22 states the divine purpose, what "the Lord said in His heart"; in ix. 1-17 this purpose is made known to Noah.

It is still further urged that the alternation of divine names in successive paragraphs of this narrative gives evidence of its composite character. It is affirmed that this requires the assumption of two different writers, who were in the habit of using different terms in speaking of the Most High. One (P) always spoke of him as "God," the other (J) as LORD (Hebrew, Jehovah). The narrative, as we possess it, has been made up from the combination of the accounts in these two documents; and hence the blending of these two names as they are here found. But this is a superficial and mechanical explanation of what really is due to a different and more satisfactory cause. The names of God are not precise equivalents. We often use the terms "God" and "Lord" indifferently in relation to the Supreme Being. And the rendering of the incommunicable name "Jehovah" in our English version by "LORD," obscures to the ordinary reader its true significance and its distinctive meaning. God is the general designation of the Most High, in His relation to the world at large and to all mankind, as the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of all. Jehovah is His name in the strict and proper sense, by which He has made Himself known to the chosen race; it is His designation as the God of His own people, the God of revelation and of redemption.

There are two aspects under which the flood can be contemplated, and two points of view from which its place and function in the sacred history can be regarded. It may be looked upon as the act of the Creator destroying the work of His hands because it had become corrupt and perverted from its original intent, and at the same time providing for the perpetuation of the several species of living things. Or, on the other hand, it may be considered in its relation to the work of redemption. The wickedness of man threatened to put an end to the scheme of grace and salvation; in order to prevent His merciful designs from being thwarted thus, the Most High resolved to destroy the ungodly race, and rescue the one surviving pious family to be the seed of a new race, amongst whom true religion might be nurtured until it should ultimately fill the whole earth. The sacred writer has both these aspects of this great catastrophe in mind, and he suggests them to his readers by the alternate use of the divine names. When he has regard to the divine government and providential care as manifested in it, he speaks of it as the act of God. When he has regard to his special guardianship over the pious, or to aught that concerns divine worship, he uses the sacred name Jehovah.

Thus it is God, who sees with displeasure the disorder introduced by the corruption of mankind, and makes known his purpose to destroy them, but institutes measures for preserving the various species of animals by means of an ark to be built for this end, vi. 9-22. It is God, agreeably to whose command creatures of both sexes went in unto Noah into the ark, vii. 9, 16. It is God who remembered Noah and every living thing that was with him in the ark, and who made a wind pass over the earth to assuage the waters, viii. 1. It is God who bade Noah go forth of the ark, and bring forth with him every living thing that they may multiply upon the earth, viii. 15-17. It is God who blessed Noah and his sons as He had blessed man at his creation, i. 28, bidding them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, ix. 1. It

is God who established His covenant with Noah and with every living creature, pledging that there should be no flood in future to destroy all flesh, ix. 8-17.

On the other hand, it is Jehovah (Authorized Version, the Lord) in whose eyes Noah found grace, vi. 8, and who was resolved to put a sudden end to the downward progress of growing wickedness which infected every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart and threatened to banish piety from the earth, verses 5-7. It is Jehovah who bade righteous Noah to come with all his house into the ark, and to take with him animals fit for sacrifice in larger numbers than the rest, vii. 1-3. It is Jehovah who shut Noah in after he had entered the ark, verse 16, though in the very same verse it is God who commanded that the beasts of both sexes should enter in. It is Jehovah to whom Noah builds an altar and offers sacrifice, and who graciously accepts the offering verses 20, 21.

It thus appears that the divine names are discriminatingly employed throughout the entire narrative; there are no superfluous repetitions, suggestive of a combination of distinct documents; there are serious gaps and halting places in each of the accounts into which the critics propose to divide the history of the deluge; and in numerous instances the partition attempted is impracticable, because it would sunder what is plainly indivisible. It is further noteworthy that there is no pretence of basing the critical partition of these chapters on diversity of diction. The scattered clauses assigned to J., which have already been shown to be inseparable from their contexts, have not even this poor pretext in their favor. In fact, there is scarcely more than three or four words or phrases in all that is attributed to J. in the entire narrative of the deluge, which is claimed elsewhere as characteristic of that document, while there are several phrases and forms of speech, as has been already pointed out, that are elsewhere held to be characteristic of P., not to speak of the word "create," vi. 7, which in chapter i. is made a mark of P. in distinction from J.

The critical arguments for the severance of this narrative thus collapse entirely upon examination. And yet this is accounted one of the most plausible cases of critical partition. As it fails here, so it does everywhere else throughout the Pentateuch. The evidences of unity of authorship are everywhere too strong to be overcome by the devices which the critics employ for the purpose.

It remains to be added that the futility of the methods by which the Pentateuch has been parcelled into different documents, may further be shown by the readiness with which they can be applied, and with equal success, to writings, the unity of which is indisputable. If a narrative can be divided into two continuous narratives, this is reckoned by the critics a demonstration of its composite character, and a proof that the parts into which it has been severed are the original sources, from which it has been compounded. This may be tested by a couple of passages selected at random:

THE PRODIGAL SON. Luke 15: 11-32.

11. A certain man had two sons: 12. and the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion of thy substance that fall eth to me. . . . 13. And not many days after the younger son gathered all together. . . . and there he wasted his substance with riotous living. . . . 14b. and he began to be in want. 15b. And no man gave unto him. . . . 29. And he arose and came

to his father: . . . and he ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. 21. And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son. 22. But the father said to his servants, Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and get a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: . . . 24. for this my son was dead, and is alive again. . . . And they began to be merry. 25. Now his elder son was in the field; and as he came and drew nigh to the house, . . . 28. he was angry, and would not go in: and his father came out and entreated him. 29. But he answered and said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and I never transgressed a commandment of thine; and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends; 30. but when this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou killedst for him the fatted calf. 31. And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that is mine is thine. 32. But it was meet to make merry and be glad; for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again.

* Omitted by the compiler () There are here two complete narratives, agreeing in some points and disagreeing in others, and each has its special characteristics. The only deficiencies are enclosed in parentheses, and may be readily explained as omissions by the compiler in effecting the combination. A clause must be supplied at the beginning of B., a subject is wanting in verse 13b and verse 25b, and the verb "said" is wanting in verse 23. As these omissions occur exclusively in B., it may be inferred that the compiler placed A. at the basis and incorporated B. into it with only such slight changes as were necessary to adapt it to this purpose.

A. and B. agree that there were two sons, one of whom received a portion of his father's property, and by his own fault was reduced to great destitution, in consequence of which he returned penitently to his father and addressed him in language which is nearly identical in both accounts. The father received him with great tenderness and demonstrations of joy, which attracted the attention of the other son.

The differences are quite as striking as the points of agreement. A. distinguishes the sons as elder and younger; B. makes no mention of their relative ages. In A. the younger obtained his portion by solicitation, and the father retained the remainder in his own possession; in B. the father divided his property between both of his sons of his own motion. In A. the prodigal remained in his father's neighborhood and reduced himself to penury by riotous living; in B. he went to a distant country and spent all his property, but there is no intimation that he indulged in unseemly excesses. It would rather appear that he was injudicious; and to crown his misfortunes, there occurred a severe famine. His fault seems to have consisted in having gone so far away from his father and from the holy land, and in engaging in the unclean occupation of tending swine. In A. the destitution seems to have been chiefly want of clothing; in B. want of food. Hence in A. the father directed the best robe and ring and shoes to be brought for him; in B. the fatted calf was killed. In B. the son came from a distant land and the father saw him afar off; in A. he came from the neighborhood, and the father ran at once and fell on his neck and kissed him. In B. he had been engaged in a menial occupation, and so he thought himself of his father's hired servants, and asked to be made a servant himself; in A. he had been living luxuriously, and while confessing his unworthiness, makes no re-

quest to be put on the footing of a servant. In A. the father speaks of his son having been dead because of his profligate life; in B. of having been lost because of his absence in a distant land. In A., but not in B., the other son was displeased at the reception given to the prodigal. And here it would appear that the compiler has altered the text. The eldest son must have said to his father in A., "When this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou didst put on him the best robe." But in order to make a better contrast with "kid" in the preceding verse, the compiler has introduced the B. phrase, "thou killedst for him the fatted calf."

THE GOOD SAMARITAN. Luke 10: 29-37.

A B 29. But he, a lawyer, verse 25 desiring to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbor? 30. Jesus made answer and said, A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho. . . . and they beat him. . . . leaving him half dead. 31. And by chance a certain priest was going down that way; and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. 32. And a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: . . . and took care of him: 33b. and when he saw him, was moved with compassion. . . . 34. And he set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn. . . . 35. And of the morrow he took out two pence, and gave them to the host and said, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, I, when I come back again, will repay thee. 36. Which of these (three) thinketh he proved neighbor unto him? . . . 37. And he said, He that showed mercy upon him.

* Omitted by the compiler () + Inserted by the compiler ()

Both these narratives are complete; only a subject must be supplied in B., verse 30b, the omission of which was rendered necessary by its being combined with A. "Three" is substituted for "two" in A., verse 36, for a like reason. The compiler has tampered with the text and altered the sense in verse 32 from his desire to put the Levite on the same plane with the priest in verse 31, the language of which he has borrowed; the genuine text of B. will be restored by omitting the insertions of the compiler, which are included in brackets. He has likewise transposed a brief clause of B. in verse 37b., and added it at the end of verse 36. These changes naturally resulted from his making A. the basis, and modifying what he has inserted from B. into accordance with it. Hence the necessity of making it appear that it was not the Levite, but the Samaritan who befriended the injured traveller, and that Jesus spoke not to the traveller, but to the lawyer. In all other respects the original texts of the two narratives remain unaltered.

Both narratives agree that a man grievously abused by certain parties, was treated with generous kindness by a stranger, and that Jesus deduced a practical lesson from it. But they differ materially in details.

A. relates his story as a parable of Jesus in answer to a lawyer's question. B. makes no mention of the lawyer or his question, but seems to be relating a real occurrence.

The spirit of the two is quite different. A. is anti-Jewish; B. pro-Jewish. In A. the aggressors are Jews, people of Jerusalem, or Jericho, or both, and a priest pitilessly leaves the sufferer to his fate, while it is a Samaritan, with whom the Jews were in perpetual feud, who takes pity on him. In B. the aggressors are robbers, outlaws, whose nationality is not defined, and it is a Levite who shows mercy.

Both the maltreatment and the act of generosity are different. In A. the sufferer is beaten and half killed, and needs to have his

11. A certain man had two sons: 12. and the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion of thy substance that fall eth to me. . . . 13. And not many days after the younger son gathered all together. . . . and there he wasted his substance with riotous living. . . . 14b. and he began to be in want. 15b. And no man gave unto him. . . . 29. And he arose and came

to his father: . . . and he ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. 21. And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son. 22. But the father said to his servants, Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and get a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: . . . 24. for this my son was dead, and is alive again. . . . And they began to be merry. 25. Now his elder son was in the field; and as he came and drew nigh to the house, . . . 28. he was angry, and would not go in: and his father came out and entreated him. 29. But he answered and said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and I never transgressed a commandment of thine; and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends; 30. but when this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou killedst for him the fatted calf. 31. And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that is mine is thine. 32. But it was meet to make merry and be glad; for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again.

29. But he, a lawyer, verse 25 desiring to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbor? 30. Jesus made answer and said, A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho. . . . and they beat him. . . . leaving him half dead. 31. And by chance a certain priest was going down that way; and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. 32. And a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: . . . and took care of him: 33b. and when he saw him, was moved with compassion. . . . 34. And he set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn. . . . 35. And of the morrow he took out two pence, and gave them to the host and said, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, I, when I come back again, will repay thee. 36. Which of these (three) thinketh he proved neighbor unto him? . . . 37. And he said, He that showed mercy upon him.

wounds bound up and liniments applied, which is done by his benefactor on the spot. In B. he is stripped of all he had and left destitute, but no personal injury was inflicted; accordingly he was taken to an inn, and his wants there provided for at the expense of the Levite who befriended him.

The lesson inculcated is different. In A it is that the duty of loving one's neighbor is not limited to those of the same nation, nor annulled by national antipathies. In B. it is that he who has been befriended himself should befriend others.

These illustrations are sufficient to indicate the method by which the critics undertake to effect the partition of the Pentateuch, and to show how they succeed in creating discrepancies and contradictions, where none really exist, by simply sundering what properly belongs together. The ease with which these results can be accomplished, where obviously they have no possible significance, shows how fallacious and inconclusive this style of argument is. No dependence can be placed upon a process that leads to such palpably erroneous conclusions in other cases. An argument that can be made to prove everything, proves nothing. And a style of critical analysis which can be made to prove everything composite, is not to be trusted.

HINDRANCES TO REVIVALS.

My Dear Dr. Field: I have been wishing to write to you ever since The Evangelist put on new robes, but the pressure (the longed-for pressure) of exhausting work (happy exhaustion) has taken up the hours. I know your deep interest in revivals of religion, and that The Evangelist has done much to promote them from the year of gracious revivals in which it was born, to the present time, when in so many places showers of blessing have fallen from the opened heavens, and converts have come home to their Father's house as doves to their windows. Your weekly visits have given light and warmth and direction, not only to those who have been asking what they should do to be saved, but to those who were asking what they should do to save others. During the past months many ministers who believe that the great aim of their life must be and is, to make others know and love and imitate the Lord Jesus, have read your columns, hoping to find aid and suggestions, nor have they looked in vain.

We have read everything that we thought might help us in revival work; we have studied the modes of successful evangelists, and when we could, we have visited other churches where revivals were in progress, to see if we could learn anything which might help us to preach the Gospel more effectively. We have called upon our memories to bring out what they had stored away when we had the opportunity of listening to the Moodys and Pentecosts and others of less celebrity, but perhaps of as great a fame in heaven. We have gone over our notebooks to see if we had jotted down any happy thoughts which might be of use in these emergent days. We have read theological lectures, sermons, essays, biographies of the dead and the living, of missionaries home and foreign, of ministers and laymen, with one overmastering aim, to be helped in winning souls.

You see, then, that it has been a busy winter for many of us. We have not had either time or inclination to read attacks or defenses, higher criticisms or lower criticisms, warnings against hidden foes, hints as to dark treasons plotted against the Church by unknown Presbyterian ministers in secret conclave in November last, or any arguments for or against our immediate union with our brethren of the South. Each of us has felt like

Nehemiah when he sent word to Sanballat and Geshuri: "I am doing a great work, and cannot come down"; nor have we allowed any *nullus hereticorum* of Philadelphia, or Cincinnati, or anything earth-born and transient to be a distraction.

As the work has gone on, with others of my brethren, I have had a deep solicitude lest something should check or disturb it, and so have been desirous of learning all that I could in reference to Hindrances to Revivals, for I have had some sad experiences. Those dancing parties which some kept on attending as usual, did much to prevent the union of sentiment and purpose and effort which are so essential, and the ill-advised reproofs which some of our zealous brethren and sisters warmly and publicly administered, almost alienated from the church the young people and their friends. And the church socials, with their pleasant entertainments, designed to raise money from outsiders, took so much time and thought that the concentrated efforts which the occasion demanded, could not be given, and the revival did not advance.

As these things had to be guarded against so that no sensitive spirit should be agrieved, and no inquiring soul be turned away, I have taken down Vinet's Pastoral Theology to see what help that exhaustive treatise might contain, and read again that priceless chapter by the translator, Dr. Thomas Skinner of sacred and holy memory. To read it is to read the wisdom of one who won many souls in his active ministry, and whose countenance in the lecture-room was radiant with heavenly love, and whose prayers always recalled "the golden vials full of odors" in the Revelation. I have read Abbe Mullois' wise books on the "Pulpit and Clergy," and on "Sacerdotal Zeal." Wise books they are, for our Roman Catholic brethren have had long years of experience in the conduct of revival meetings, which they call "missions." But the book of all books has been "Lectures on Revivals," by that great master in revivals, Charles G. Finney. The chapter on "Hindrances" I have read often, and each time with a new appreciation of the truth it so solemnly and so earnestly sets forth. I wish you had time to read that lecture (they all appeared, you know, in the early files of The Evangelist, in those days of wonderful revivals), but as I do not believe you have, I will quote a few sentences which have a lesson not out of place to-day.

After speaking at length of what diverts the attention of Christians in general, and so checks the work of grace in a community, he speaks of those things which affect ministers. First and foremost he places ecclesiastical difficulties: "It has always been the policy of the devil to turn off the attention of ministers from the work of the Lord. President Edwards was obliged to be taken up for a long time in disputes before ecclesiastical councils, and in our days, in the midst of these great revivals of religion, these difficulties have been alarmingly and shamefully multiplied. In the Presbyterian Church at large, these ecclesiastical difficulties have produced evils enough to make angels weep. Brother Beman of Troy was shamefully and wickedly called off from promoting revivals to attend a trial before his own Presbytery, upon charges which, if true, were most of them ridiculous, but which could never be sustained. Brother Duffield of Carlisle, Brother Barnes of Philadelphia, and others of God's most successful ministers, have been hindered a considerable part of the time for years by these difficulties. O, tell it not in Gath! When will those ministers and professors of religion who do little or nothing themselves, let others alone and let them work for God?"

"These things in the Presbyterian Church, these contentions and janglings, are so ridiculous, so wicked, so outrageous, that no doubt there is a jubilee in hell every year about the time of the meeting of the General Assembly. And if there were tears in heaven, no doubt they would be shed over the difficulties of the Presbyterian Church. Ministers have been dragged from home year by year, and perhaps have left a revival in progress and gone up to General Assembly, and there heard debates and witnessed a spirit by which their souls have been grieved and their hearts hardened, and they have gone home ashamed of their Church and ashamed to ask God to pour out His Spirit upon such a contentious body."

Yours for revivals unhindered,

T. D. O'BRYAN.

LACKAWANNA PRESBYTERY.

This Presbytery met in Tunkhannock April 16th-19th. The successful work of the pastor, Rev. S. C. Hodge, is seen in every department of the church life. Rev. G. G. Smith was chosen moderator. Rev. John Merriam was dismissed to Binghamton Presbytery. Mr. H. W. Luce and Mr. John McDowell were received as candidates for the ministry. The new church organized in Taylor had its name enrolled, and it stands as Lackawanna's One Hundredth Church. A petition for a church organization was answered favorably, as was also a petition from the citizens of Carbondale living near the chapel, which the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the church has built. The Dimock church organization was disbanded, and letters ordered to be given to the two remaining members to unite with the Brooklyn church. Mr. John Klusac was ordained as a local evangelist for the First American Slavonic Church, located in Peckville, Pa.

On Tuesday evening Dr. E. B. Hodge, in an admirable address presented four prominent points with reference to the Board of Education, its revival-birth, its exalted aim and standard, its draft of the most of the men aided from the humble walks of life, and the world's great need of the ministry. Dr. C. E. Robinson presented the Report of Woman's Presbyterian Foreign Mission Societies, and Mr. A. B. Williams and Henry Luce spoke with enthusiasm on the growth of The Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Mission Fields.

On Wednesday evening Dr. S. C. Logan, Secretary of Presbytery's missions among our people of foreign tongues, read the first report of the Executive Committee, showing the organization of the body, their initial acts, the lines of work, and the field. During the past six months thirteen churches have been contributed, twenty-seven conversions and additions reported. We have 110,402 foreign born in our midst. Of Italians, 6,000; Poles, 9,000; Slavonians, 45,000; Lithuanians, 3,000; Magyrs, 2,000, and Bohemians, 1,000. Col. H. M. Boies, Chairman of this Committee, and the Treasurer, Elder A. W. Dickson, aroused Presbytery with their array of facts and appeal to Christian motives.

As to Synodical Sustentation, Presbytery unanimously recommends, in general terms, that the women of our churches aid this scheme by funds, using such methods as the women of each church may prefer.

"The Lackawanna Presbyterian" was adopted as the organ of Presbytery, and a committee was appointed to arrange for its publication.

The following were elected as commissioners to the General Assembly: Ministers—W. S. Stites, T. W. Swan, and W. A. Beecher; Elders—W. G. Parke, A. Thompson, B. W. Lewis, P. H. Brooks, S. C.