

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

CRITICAL NOTES

THE HUN AND THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS

To economize space, but few of the Holy Scriptures on which the truths of this article are based are quoted. The reader, therefore, will please study it with his Bible in hand. See Ps. xxxv. 8; lv. 15; lxix, 24, 27; cix, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19.

1. The tender, forgiving character of David precludes understanding these Psalms as "mere spiteful vengeance." Surely, in the light of David's having twice spared the life of Saul, when, with the bloody spirit of the Hun, and without any provocation or reason, he was seeking to murder him, we must interpret his writings as of anything else than the spirit of personal, private, "spiteful revenge" (1 Sam. xxiv. 1-22; xxvi. 5-21). The forgiving, noble spirit of the writer of these Psalms caused even as wicked a man as Saul to confess to him: "Thou art more righteous than I: for thou hast rewarded me good, whereas I have rewarded thee evil" (1 Sam. xxiv. 17-19). And, on the second time when David had spared the life of Saul, who, notwithstanding David had previously so forgivingly spared his life, had continued to seek to murder him, Saul was so impressed with the forgiving and noble character of David, that he confessed: "I have sinned: return, my son David; for I will no more do thee harm, because my soul [life] was precious in thine eyes this day; behold, I have played the fool, and have erred exceedingly" (1 Sam. xxvi. 21). This tender, forgiving character of David is shown so great as to be even a fault in his great life—in his dealings with Absalom and Shimei (1 Sam. xiii. 39; xviii. 33; xix. 4-6, 21-23).

2. The indorsement, by Jesus, of these Psalms cannot be harmonized with interpreting them as the "venom of spite." He read them, prayed them, sung them, and lived them (Luke xx. 42-44; xxiv. 44-46; Matt. xxvi. 30). Of this hymn, Adam Clarke says: "We know from universal

consent of Jewish antiquity that it was composed of Psalms 113, 114, 117, and 118." So, Bengel, G. W. Clark, "The Comprehensive Commentary," and commentators generally. In part, these Psalms are imprecatory,—Ps. cxiii. 48; cxiv. 1-8; cxviii. 6-13. Besides, of the two hundred and eighty-three New Testament quotations from the Old, one hundred and sixteen are from the Psalms; and the imprecatory nature runs through them all; at least none of them are free of being tinged with the spirit of imprecation. Just as the judicial is inseparable from the tenderness, the wisdom, and the love of God, through both the books of God—the natural and the revealed revelation of God.

3. In none of the Psalms can be found more severe and terrible imprecations than are in the words of Jesus and of the apostles (Matt. xxiii. 13-33; xxv. 30, 41-46; Mark iii. 20; xiii. 40; Luke xvi. 23; Rom. i. 18, 32; ii. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 22; 2 Tim. iv. 14; Jude 7; Rev. xv. 7; xvi. 18, 19; xx. 10).

4. The saints in the intermediate world, in spirit, pray the imprecations of the Psalms (Rev. vi. 10).

5. From the foregoing, it appears that, of both earth and Paradise, the imprecatory Psalms are the nature and the voice of the righteous.

6. Without exception, God commends the Psalms as a part of "the inspiration of God" that is profitable for reproof, for "instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. iii. 16-18). The imprecatory Psalms are especially suited for this age of outcry against the infliction of justice, in both this world and in that which is to come.

7. As King, in the place of Jehovah, and, as such, executing the justice of the law, these Psalms were uttered.

8. Some of these Psalms—probably all of them—were the inspired voice of God, prophetically pronouncing His judgments on obdurately wicked persons. The cases of Ahithophel and Judas especially illustrate this proposition (2 Sam. xvi. 21; xvii. 23; Acts i. 20).

9. As a righteous man, in mind, in spirit, and identi-

fied with Jehovah, the Psalmist uttered the imprecatory Psalms. Catiline said: "An identity of wishes and aversions, this alone is true friendship." So the Psalmist says: "Do I not hate them, O Lord, that hate thee. . . . I count them *MINE* enemies." Without this personal identity with one's family, state, church, human or divine ruler, there can be no loyalty to either.

10. As every good man says, in heart, Amen to the vindication of law and government, in the execution of penal justice on the criminal, so do the imprecatory Psalms. Thus Milton prayed:—

"Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints."

Thus the civilized world cries out for justice upon the Hun, while our boys have emphasized the cry with their life's blood. God pity the person whose soul is not imprecatory, as well as otherwise. Joseph Cook says: "A renowned professor, who, as Germany thinks, has done more for New England theology than any man since Jonathan Edwards, was once walking in this city [Boston] with a clergyman of radical faith, who objected to the doctrine that the Bible is inspired, . . . on the ground of the imprecatory Psalms. . . . The doubter would not be satisfied. The two came at last to a newspaper bulletin, on which the words were written,—the time was at the opening of our civil war,—'Baltimore to be shelled at twelve o'clock.' 'I am glad of it,' said the radical preacher; 'I am glad of it.' 'And so am I,' said his companion; 'but I hardly dare to say so, for fear you will say I am uttering an imprecatory Psalm.'" ¹ President Hibben, of Princeton University, uttered the spirit of the imprecatory Psalms in saying: "The test of the individual, the test of a nation, is the capacity for righteous indignation; when we are confronted with great moral wrongs we must oppose them with the anger that is like the flaming sword of the wrath of God." The imprecatory Psalms, in the language of the Holy Scriptures, as they utter the voice of the judicial nature

¹ *Transcendentalism*, pp. 76-77.

of penal law in earthly government and of the Holy Scriptures, are summed up in: "Because he remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even slay the broken in heart. As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him; as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him. As he clothed himself with cursing like as with his garment, so let it come unto his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones" (Ps. cix. 16-19). "Let the sighing of the prisoner come before thee; according to the greatness of thy power preserve thou those that are appointed to die: and render unto our neighbors sevenfold into their bosom, wherewith they have reproached thee, O Lord" (Ps. lxxix. 11-12). "I will not keep silence, but will recompense, even recompense into their bosoms your iniquities" (Isa. lxxv. 6-7). "If any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe" (Ex. xxi. 23-24). (Remember that this law was not given for private revenge, as enemies of the Bible represent, but for execution by the court of law — just as with us. As Tholuck and reliable interpreters agree, instead of repealing this law, Jesus only corrected its perversion.) Or, to sum up the imprecatory Psalms in the universal law of God, that no whining against can gainsay: "God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Gal. vi. 7). In exact line with the imprecatory Psalms is the universal demand of all right-thinking people for no peace before the Hun is bound up to pay — so far as possible — for his devastation of homes, property, and for his worse than cruel murder and unmentionable crimes. With thunder tones, the cry for justice, coming up from every battlefield, in this war, interprets and forever vindicates the imprecatory Psalms.

11. The spirit and letter of the imprecatory Psalms are further vindicated in that one of the severest among them prays that, so far as possible, its judgments may be for the good of the offender — in resultant reformation: "Fill their

faces with shame; *that* they may seek thy name, O Lord" (Ps. lxxxiii., especially ver. 16, 18).

12. The imprecatory Psalms are to be understood as poems in the strongly figurative and peculiar Oriental style. Bold metaphors, and especially startling hyperboles, are characteristics of Oriental style.¹ Max Müller, who cannot be accused of "orthodoxy," one of the greatest of Oriental scholars, says: "The fault is ours, not theirs, if we willfully misinterpret the language of the ancient prophets; if we persist in understanding their words in the outward and material aspect only. . . . Nay, I believe it can be proved that more than half the difficulties of religious thought owe their origin to this constant misinterpretation of ancient language by modern language, of ancient thought by modern thought."²

The last point to this article is hardly necessary, for the others are sufficient.

W. A. JARREL

Dallas, Texas

THE TEXT OF NUMBERS XXI. 14 f.

THE LXX has "therefore it is said in a book *πολεμος του Κυριου την Ζωοβ έφλογισεν και τους χειμαρρους Αρνων* (war of the Lord burnt Zohob and the valleys, Arnon)," i.e. it translated מלחמה as "war of," and regarded it as the subject of a following verb. The divergencies of consonants are probably as follows:—

סרפה	זהב	LXX
בסופה	זהב	M.T.

where the presence or absence of "in" must be due to ditto-graphy or haplography of ם (according to which text be deemed the earlier), and the verb is in the feminine, agreeing with "war." For the form with ם cp. Amos vi. 10.

Most Septuagintal texts then proceed *και τους χειμαρρους κατεστησεν κατοικισαι Ηρ*. So the words מטהר נטה, "which inclined," were unknown to the Greek translators.

¹ See Lowth's Lectures on Hebrew Poetry, De Wette's Introduction to the Old Testament, and Dr. Conant on Psalms.

² Lectures on The Science of Religion, p. 25.

It may be surmised that the explanation is as follows: The clause begins with a word **וַאֲשֶׁר** which is treated by modern commentators as a substantive not found elsewhere in the singular. It appears, however, to have been regarded (I think rightly) as a verb by the ancients, and the explanation **וַאֲשֶׁר נָטָה** i.e. **וַאֲשֶׁר** means **נָטָה** ("inclined") was written in the margin and taken into the text in a slightly corrupt form. The verb is masculine, so that "war" cannot be its subject. Another Greek translator (see Field's Hexapla *ad. loc.*) appears to have rendered "therefore it is said in a list of warriors of the Lord to Auzab in a whirlwind, and of the torrents to Arnon; for the outpouring of the torrents inclined," etc. He therefore had **וַאֲשֶׁר הִנְחִילִים נָטָה**, read some other word for "war," and possibly found other differences; but not much can be made out of small points where we have to do with a Syriac rendering of a Greek translation.

This, however, does not exhaust the Greek testimony, for a σ a, and the Ethiopic omit the second *καὶ τοὺς χεῖμαρρους*, which may of course quite probably have come in from the preceding verse: d, however, omits *τοὺς χεῖμαρρους* only. I think this is right, and that the displacement of the phrase in the LXX, as compared with M.T. is due to its being a later insertion. "(Arnon) inclineth toward the dwelling of Ar and leans on the borders of Moab" makes good enough sense, but can scarcely be combined with a statement that "the war of the Lord burnt Zohob and the valleys, Arnon."

It may be suggested that the seat of the trouble lies in archetypal or pre-archetypal damage to a masculine imperfect verb, which, after it had become illegible, was read **וַיִּהְיֶה**. Arnon is clearly the subject of all the verbs. The passage will then have run something like this: "Therefore it is said in the book of warriors [? war, wars] Arnon [missing verb] Zohab [? Zahab, Waheb] in Suphah [or, if the LXX be preferred, Waheb may be a corruption of a word in the construct state] and the valleys, and in-

clineth toward the dwelling of Ar and leaneth to the borders of Moab."

HAROLD M. WIENER

London, England

EXODUS IV. 16

THE M.T. here has the extraordinary phrase "thou shalt be to him for a God." I call this "extraordinary," because it is contrary to the whole thought of the Pentateuch that Moses should be represented as standing in such a relation to a fellow *Israelite* (as contrasted with an *Egyptian* like Pharaoh). The ordinary Septuagintal texts, however, read *τα προς τον Θεον*, "to Godward," as in xviii. 19 = *לאלהים* for M.T. *לאלהים*. It is easy to see that the discrepancy may have originated in damage to *טו* in the ancestor of the Palestinian text. The Old Latin has *Dnm*, Lord, for God. I think, therefore, that the earliest text had either the Tetragrammaton or "the Baal." I prefer not to choose between these till we have before us the full collections Dahse is understood to have made, and can study the problem of the divine appellations in the Pentateuch as a whole. Damage to the *טו* in either reading would give our present Hebrew, for no Jew would write the Tetragrammaton after the expression "thou shalt be to him for."

HAROLD M. WIENER

London, England

NAVILLE ON THE COMPOSITION AND SOURCES OF GENESIS

[*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (Paris, 1918) contains an article by Édouard Naville, entitled "La Composition et les Sources de la Genèse." As it is too long (38 8vo pages) for us to reprint a translation, we are pleased to give the following summary, prepared by Professor John Roaf Wightman, Ph.D., of Oberlin College.—EDITOR.]

M. NAVILLE first recalls how in two previous works, viz. "Archæology of the Old Testament" (London, 1913) and "The Text of the Old Testament" (The Schweich Lectures,

London, 1915), he had shown that the so-called "Books of Moses" were not original works, and that they had not been written in Hebrew; and how, in his article entitled "The Two Names of God in Genesis," published in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (1917), he had shown that the Book of Genesis could have but one author, Moses, instead of six or seven, as held by Kautzsch and Socin.

He now proposes to examine the sources from which Moses has drawn his material,— a task rendered the more easy because of the recent discoveries of Assyriologists. History in these early times, we know, did not exist, but only biography or annals. The author of Genesis, like those of other ancient writings, wrote with a definite end, to give information about persons. His first aim would be to write intelligibly, and hence in a language familiar to his readers. Now we know, from the excavations of the last thirty years, that this must have been the writing employed in all western Asia, viz. the cuneiform, which was written by a stylus in damp clay. It was in this cuneiform writing, inexactly called the Babylonian, that Genesis must have been written. The writers of that time did not write "books," but "tablets." Now "tablets" differ from "books" in being independent, and sometimes forming a group upon a certain subject, the scribe showing their consecutive order by repeating the last words of one at the beginning of the next. They resemble the several lectures in a course. Of the vast number of Babylonian tablets of the time of Moses, the majority were on religious subjects, as the creation of the world, and these formed the bases for the religions. Composed in Sumerian, the legends were later rewritten and transformed under Semitic influence. At this early period the tablets were not used in commerce, but were in collections, either in royal libraries or in a chest or jar, as at Tel el Amarna. In Moses' day, more so even than to-day, a knowledge of writing was in the East the privilege of the few. To this few belonged Moses himself, who was brought up at Pharaoh's court and 'learned in all the wisdom of the

Egyptians.' But his brethren, the Hebrews, were surely illiterate; or, if they had a written language, it must have been the Babylonian cuneiform, written on tablets such as were in use not only in Mesopotamia but in Palestine. As a Semite and a learned man, Moses would certainly know this language and writing.

But Moses was not a simple scribe. He is to be the founder of a new religion, to give a basis to the worship of Jehovah. For this, like the ancient Babylonian scribes, he drew up religious tablets, upon creation and the deluge, and later he tells of the lives of the ancestors of the Hebrews, — of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. These tablets of the "Genesis" are anonymous; while the later ones, where Moses is the legislator, bear, as we should expect, his name.

Now Moses needed to reveal to his people the record of Genesis, to remind them that they were a people apart, chosen by Jehovah; that they must leave Egypt, not merely because of persecution, but to preserve Jehovah's worship. Moreover, as all other religions of the East, so also the Hebrews, must have documents to tell them of their origin and to form the basis of their religion. The use of such sources, however, does not affect the book's unity or prevent its being the work of Moses. The theory of Astruc and Eichhorn, on the contrary, professes to have found four documents, quite parallel and much alike, but distinguished from each other by the names — Elohim or Jehovah or Yahveh — which they give to the divinity. One objection to this theory is that in the second and third chapters of Genesis, where the name Yahveh first occurs, God is always called by both names, i.e. Yahveh Elohim. Again, the hand of Moses, the man who knows Egypt thoroughly, is evident in many places. But the fundamental objection to the Yahveh-Elohim theory is that it makes the book a mosaic of different fragments instead of a unit, of which Yahveh Elohim, the only God of man, is the cornerstone. The Book of Genesis has but one aim, viz. to show that Israel was the chosen people, the people of God; and other

events, however important, are omitted or touched on but slightly. This one purpose of the writer of Genesis, thinks M. Naville, has been too much lost sight of by critics; and he proceeds to ask what were the documents extending from the creation of the world to the death of Joseph, i.e. all anterior to the time of Moses, which the latter made use of.

I. The first series of tablets, six in number, takes in the first eleven chapters, and leads us to Abraham. The prime object being to show the descent of the man who is to be the father of God's chosen people, genealogies abound in these tablets. Unity of plan is visible throughout. From the creation of the world all leads towards Abraham. The descendants of Japheth and Ham are given, for completeness, but not dwelt on, as are those of Shem, the ancestor of Abram. Chapter xi., contrary to views of critics, is a unity. Abraham (chap. xii.) had received the order of Yahveh to leave his country and his father's house and emigrate to the land of Canaan. It is for a religious motive that he is to emigrate, that he may worship his God in peace, and leave idolaters. But he is to go, not alone, but rather as the sheik, with servants and flocks. In this religious migration it is highly probable that Abram, as founders of sects in our day, would take with him his sacred books, especially as these contained his genealogy, and, being in the form of tablets, could be easily carried.

These tablets, then, brought by Abraham from Haran, contain the sources for the first eleven chapters of Genesis. Perhaps these tablets were not all by the same author, and this may explain the two names for God; but we must hold that Moses wrote them anew, and did for Yahveh what Babylonian scribes did for their gods.

The first tablet, which tells specially of the creation of the heavens and the earth, includes the first chapter and the first four verses of the second — ending with the words, 'Such are the origins, — or, such is the history, — of the heavens and the earth, when they were created.' In the first tablet God is called Elohim, which is not the God of

man, but of the whole of nature. Man is created the same day as the terrestrial animals, but as yet has no moral or spiritual element. Nothing is said as to how the creation has taken place, and the word "day" that is employed means merely a space of time having a beginning and an end. The second tablet deals with the creation of man, or rather of humanity, and extends to chap. v. 1, which should read: 'This is the book of the birth of men, or of humanity.' The word "Adam" here is really a collective, which the LXX translates by the Greek *anthrōpōn*.

In the first tablet is unfolded the series of creations, without further explanations; in the second we are told how man is born, how a companion is given him, and how the garden of Eden is formed for him. Then comes the fall and its consequences for the family of Adam.

There is no contradiction between the two chapters. The first mentions historically the creation of man, the second gives it in detail. Critics point out the differences between the accounts of the creation in the first and second chapters and explain them by their theory of two different sources. But the opposition is really only apparent. The difficulty is largely due to a too literal rendering of the ancient versions. Because there was no pluperfect tense in languages like the Hebrew, one must not infer that the idea expressed by it was lacking. We should adopt the old Geneva translation, 'Now the Eternal *had* formed man from the dust of the ground . . . *had* planted a garden in Eden, . . . and *had* placed there the man . . . and the Eternal God *had* formed all the beasts of the field,' etc. This translation, M. Naville holds, is not only permissible, but it avoids the many difficulties raised by the authorized rendering, and perfectly reconciles the account of creation in the first and second chapters. The description of the watering of the garden of Eden, viz. by a river, with its four great streams, is not such as would have been furnished by a writer of Palestine, but would be perfectly natural to one who, like Moses, was accustomed to the fertilizing effects of the great river Nile.

Another argument that critics have found to prove that the first and second chapters are not by the same authors, is that they give different conceptions of the divinity. The first chapter tells us merely that God speaks, but in chap. iii. 8, "They heard the voice of the Lord *walking* in the garden." But here, as elsewhere, the translation need not be too literal, and may be translated merely as, 'was resounding here and there.'

One must never forget that in ancient texts abstract terms are but few, and ideas must be expressed by things that appeal to the senses, and words are often figurative. So, in creation, we are not told that God *willed* or *decided*, but that God *said*. In the second chapter, as in the first, God *spoke*. The same word is used in both, but man, as an animate being, can and does reply.

One fundamental truth is evident in the first chapters, as in the whole Old Testament, that man has one single God, Yahveh, the same as Elohim, the Creator, and that is why he is called only Yahveh Elohim.

Another reason why the first two tablets, viz. the one that includes chaps. i.-ii. 4, and the second, which includes chaps. ii. 5-v. 1, are intimately connected, is the *résumés* which determine them both. Quoting from the LXX, chap. ii. 4 reads, 'Such is the book of the birth of the heavens and the earth when it was born,' and chap. v. 1 reads, 'Such is the book of the birth of humanity.' The Hebrew word *tholdoth* is here equivalent to the Greek *genesis*, and means birth or origin, as in Matt. i. 1, though in many cases it has the meaning of posterity.

Thus the first two tablets follow each other and are logically connected. They were the first brought by Abraham, and were written anew by Moses, not to change the name of God, but to teach that Yahveh Elohim was the God of creation.

The third tablet begins with the same word as the second: 'In the day when.' Moses wishes to tell us of Abraham, and so in the genealogies he dwells on the posterity of Seth. That of Cain he does not give; though for a modern

historian this would have had great interest, as telling of the rise of agriculture and metallurgy in the persons of Cain and Tubal Cain. This tablet ends with chap. vi. 9: "This is the origin or birth of Noah." The word "origin" we have here taken as a translation of the Greek plural *geneais*.

The fourth tablet describes the Deluge, and has the most marked Babylonian characteristics. It ends with the last verse of chap. ix., with the death of Noah.

The fifth tablet consists of chap. x. It begins with the words, 'This is the posterity of the sons of Noah' (*tholdoth* or *genesis* evidently meaning posterity in this case), and ends with verse 32, 'Such are the families of the sons of Noah.'

The sixth tablet (chap. xi.) is the last. It tells first of the Tower of Babel and the dispersion of mankind; then, of the genealogies, through Shem and Arphachshad, of Terah, the father of Abraham; and finally of Terah's death, at the time of the call of Abraham. Though critics have tried to find three different authors of this chapter, it is a manifest unity.

The six abovementioned tablets are considered by M. Naville as the most ancient sources of Genesis. They were brought by Abraham, when he left Mesopotamia, and were, in accordance with the usual practice at that time, made over again by Moses.

II. With chap. xii. we begin the life of Abraham. Now Abraham was both a great chief or sheik and also a religious leader. Hence it was of prime importance that there should be written down the official events of his family, and especially the commissions given him by Jehovah. Doubtless Eliezer, or some other intendant, was given this high task, viz. to write cuneiform tablets which should record the history, i.e. the genealogy and biography, of Abraham and his family. Such tablets would be carefully preserved, as the sole basis for his religion and family rights.

M. Naville asserts that cuneiform tablets were the only

existing documents till after Moses' time, and that the Yahvist and Elohist critics have furnished no possible sources for their theories.

Chapter xxv. is an intimate family document, telling of the death of Abraham, and the way his heritage was transmitted.

The following tablets, telling of the lives of Isaac and Jacob, are of the same character. Moses probably chose enough from them for his plan, which was to establish the election of the people of Israel and its alliance with Jehovah and omitting all else.

The first series of tablets were, for the most part, of a general character; but the second, as we have seen, were family documents, or archives. Such tablets, of terra cotta, could easily be put in a jar, and carried from one place to another, as archives of the family or tribe. That such existed is a far more likely hypothesis, than the existence of a number of authors, quite unknown, such as the critics suggest. And if Moses wrote this history, he could not have done it without some written archives, which doubtless would be like those of Tel el Amarna, written in cuneiform, and placed in a jar or chest.

III. A last series of documents contains the history of Joseph (chaps. xl.-xlv.). M. Naville follows Astruc in holding to the unity of these documents, but differs from him in thinking the writer not Joseph himself, but some scribe in his employ. The story is much better written than the rest of Genesis, evidently the work of one who had lived at the court of Egypt. It is a simple heart story, attractive and fascinating, and with an admirable literary sense. Though critics have tried to dissect it into several documents, it is evidently one and indivisible. The biography is about as long as that of Abraham, with a character more historic. And yet the history is strictly the memoirs of Joseph—nothing of the events of the time, not even the name of the Pharaoh who is reigning.

In having his biography written, Joseph was but following the customs of the great Egyptians, who had their

lives recorded on their tombs, if not in tablets. But Joseph remained a Hebrew and faithful to the worship of Jehovah, and made his brethren swear: 'When God shall visit you, carry away from here my bones with you.' Joseph's body was embalmed and his mummy preserved by his family; and beside it would doubtless be placed his memoirs, engraven, not as inscriptions on his tomb, but on tablets. The veneration in which he was held is seen from Ex. xiii. 19, which tells us that Moses took with him the bones of Joseph; and from Josh. xxiv. 32, where we are told that Joshua buried at Shechem the bones of Joseph. The biography, then, of Joseph, from its intimately personal character, and its almost total omission of outward events, bears every mark of having been written during his life. Moreover, soon after his death, a revolution banished the Hyksos kings — the Pharaohs of Joseph — and all traces of foreign influence.

M. Naville shows how improbable are the views of the critics as to Genesis. They suppose Yahvistic and Elohist writers, the former in the ninth century, and the latter a century later. But as to who such authors were, why they did not name themselves, by whom they were commissioned, why they wrote, and whence they obtained their information, the critics can tell us nothing. As little can they tell us about the supposed compiler, of the fourth century, who out of the rival Jahvistic and Elohist writings made "Genesis." But, besides that the conception of a "compiler" is utterly foreign to the Ancient Orient, we note how utterly improbable it is that 'the fundamental chart which established the alliance of Jehovah with Israel and the choice of Israel, as an elect people, should be known by Israel, only at the time when, as a dying nation, it had lost its independence. Can it be that only then did the Hebrews obtain that one of their sacred books which should have preceded all the others?'

M. Naville ends his carefully written and illuminating article by stating that the so-called "Higher Criticism" has too often deviated from sound principles by judging

of ancient facts from the point of view of what they consider likely or possible. Thus the critical spirit is none other than their own personal and modern point of view, substituted for the real view of the past. This is particularly true of the way the higher critics have treated the Book of Genesis. In order to prove a system conceived according to modern ideas, which are really the personal ideas of those who hold it, they have supposed a number of authors, utterly unknown, of whom no trace exists. The very fact that the critics differ as to the number of such authors, is a proof that they are giving us not history, but their own personal opinions. Thus these critics, instead of deriving their systems from the documents, first form their systems, and then force the documents to conform, correcting the texts where they are considered faulty.

To show what a just criticism of ancient authors implies, M. Naville quotes, in closing, the words of Fustel de Coulanges, in "Questions historiques" (written about 1866): 'The critical spirit applied to the historian, consists in laying aside absolute logic and the intellectual conceptions of the present; it consists in taking the texts such as they have been written, in their proper and literal sense, interpreting them as simply as possible, without intermingling our own interpretation. The essence of the critical spirit, as applied to the history of the past, is to believe the ancients.'

JOHN ROAF WIGHTMAN

Oberlin, Ohio

"THE STUDENT'S THEODORE"

[The following pages, written by Professor Gola, of Lhasa University, form the introduction to the revised edition of Dr. Budna Kho's well-known work to be issued early in the spring of 3814.

CHARLES DE WOLFE BROWER.¹]

It affords me great pleasure to have the high privilege of supplying the foreword for the new and enlarged edi-

¹Rev. Charles De W. Brower (Oberlin College, 1883; Yale Divinity School, 1886) is now pastor at Sanford, Florida.—EDITOR.

tion of my esteemed colleague's volume which now appears under a slightly changed title.

Nine years have passed since the first edition of "The Theodore Myth" was issued. Its reception was most gratifying. It was adopted for supplementary reading in the Tibetan secondary schools, and has had general circulation throughout Asia, while the demand from Africa has been larger even than was expected. On account of the results presented in the work, but also on account of the method of approach and treatment of the subject, it has fully maintained the reputation of Lhasa University, and fulfilled the expectation of Dr. Kho's friends.

Meantime, the author has continued his researches, and, taking advantage of the liberal provision made by the University for travel, has visited by air ship the regions where once flourished the great cities of the American eastern coast. By use of deep-sea diving, and investigations among the people who still linger among the adjacent hills, he has procured additional data of marked value. He has, besides, had the coöperation of the scholarly Professor Mgandu, of the Zulu Philological Society. With this additional preparation and assistance and in view of the popularity of the first work, a new edition of "Theodore," revised to date, was warranted; but also, and emphatically, because of the attacks made in recent years, and growing more bold, on the very historicity of this ancient character. Magazine articles and addresses before the learned societies of Asia and Africa culminated in a volume which has attempted to discredit the results of Dr. Kho's work. The revised work appears with the title "The Student's Theodore."

It remains for me to present only a few comprehensive statements regarding the problem to the solution of which my learned associate has given so much profound study for many years, with such satisfactory results.

Accepting the historicity of the remarkable man, Theodore, who lived about two thousand years ago, as proved by voluminous testimony, the problem was to isolate the

real personality of the ancient American from the mass of tradition which had gathered about him; in a word, to reveal reality. The peculiar difficulty of the problem is apparent when we consider the evident fable element and quantity of contradictory material in the different accounts of this startlingly influential person who had such a powerful effect on the life of his day. Too much credit can hardly be given to scholars like Chan Su, Amura, Æltzer, who have skillfully untangled many knots, and shown what material belongs to the periods of the age to which Theodore belonged, say 1800 to 1950, proving that the so-called variations of the language must represent the periods, and were not contemporaneous. That the Bostonesque was the prevailing tongue throughout America seems clear, though Chan Su admits that in parts of the far West, and South, there were trifling variations as late as 1900. Much study has also been given to a strange rival of the Bostonesque used by an intermingling race called "Fan," widely distributed, the language being interwoven with the prevailing one. The discussions of the famous *Journal Sporting Pages*, with attempts at decipherment, can be found in Professor Chan Su's interesting work.

The extreme difficulty attending the unraveling of the Theodore material is found principally in the fact that it presents this person as five distinct characters: hunter, statesman, warrior, author and editor, and reformer. It will be evident at once that it is antecedently improbable, even impossible, that any one person could have lived so many and incompatible lives, especially as the records present Theodore as excelling in them all. The tradition-myth element is at once apparent.

In the treatment of the material Dr. Kho has wisely separated the various narratives, following the plan of his first "life," in which the different presentations were given in different inks; but in this latest work he has gathered the substance of the material from all sources and classified it under initials. By this simple system H represents the hunter narrative; S the statesman; W the warrior; Æ

the author and editor, and R the reformer. It has been found difficult, however, always to isolate the narratives as clearly as could be desired.

Dr. Kho rejects the theory of Æltzer that there were at least four Theodores, holding that the one was so influential in one or more directions as to have, as years passed, other characters attributed to him. In that age it was not rare for men in one walk of life to be given titles as honors or rewards without reference to the special accomplishments of the recipients in the direction indicated by the title. So "Colonel" was a name often borne by non-military men; LL.D. or D.D., by business or simply wealthy men. Such titles, often inapplicable, would come in time to be accepted as indicative of reality.

As regards the H, or hunter, narrative, which relates the slaying of many wild animals, the ancient historian puts the story in Theodore's own mouth for the sake of vividness. This H character can undoubtedly be traced still further back several thousand years to the Hercules myth which describes the world-wide roaming of that hero, and his labors in killing many beasts of ferocious sort in distant lands, including the Nemean lion. It would be entirely natural for the admirers of Theodore to attach every possible element of greatness to his life.

Taking up the W, or warrior, narrative, we meet at once with many contradictions. Some of the sayings attributed to Theodore advocate peace, though not peace at any price, but are sufficiently strong to show that he could not have been the dashing fighter which many accounts suggest. The combination of peacemaker between nations and warrior in one person is, to use again an appropriate phrase, antecedently improbable. There is a most interesting tradition recently brought to light by Dr. Kho which bears on this subject, and which was found in some barely decipherable papers, to the effect that a battle was fought at a place named Armageddon. This story, which embodies parts of a song used by the troops, is to the effect that a general named Wilson routed the forces of Theodore with great slaughter, and that the latter soon after retired to

practically semi-obscurity. This tradition probably was originated to reflect discredit on Theodore, and therefore would bring no support to the claim that he was a great warrior. Other facts emphasize how truly he was a man of peace; such, for example, as the beautiful sketches of the love borne him by children. For some long period favorite dolls were called "Teddies," a pet name for Theodore. These dolls were imitation bears to indicate the expression of affection by hugging, a natural way of children with dolls, and an attribute accredited to bears.

As to the *Æ*, author and editor, narrative, while there is a voluminous material, it is clear that different writers assumed the name of Theodore either for the sake of the reputation attaching to it, or because the writings covering a long period would permit of the appearance of several of that name. Dr. Kho is of the opinion that the real Theodore did considerable writing, but as books as well as brief articles are ascribed to him, and often of an exceedingly variant character, — as, for example, sensational tales of hunting, histories, sociological essays, descriptions of fights, tales of the border, accurate studies of the character and habits of animals — much will have to be eliminated. The learned professor is now at work compiling the productions which a conservatively liberal point of view may accept as Theodore's own. The variations in subject, style, and language make this an easier task than one might think; for, given Dr. Kho's scholarship and a predetermined idea as to what Theodore's style, language, and thoughts were or ought to have been, order is soon resolved from the chaos. As regards the editor Theodore, a fact militating strongly against the view that such a position is to be attributed to him is that he is represented as in the background, a secondary personage, associated with, or subordinate to, other editors. This is so wholly inconsistent with all that we know about Theodore as to make the entire narrative untrustworthy.

As to the *R*, or reformer, narrative, it is evident that there was abundant reason for reform work in Theodore's day, and the records seem reliable which place him at the

front of certain movements; as, for example, the one to abolish the drinking customs of society. There is good ground for accepting the records of his appearance in the country far west of New York as an advocate of temperance.

Coming to the S, or statesman, narrative, we are on surer ground than is as a rule the case with the others, as Dr. Kho makes clear to his readers. Reference only in this foreword can be made to the fact that Theodore was at one time governor, or president, as the chief ruler was called, of that part of the continent named the United States, and that he was an efficient and commanding personage, fond of rural life and table delicacies, as his frequent retirement to a place famous for its shellfish would prove.

It only remains to refer to some facts which add complexity to the solution of the Theodore problem in general. One is the confusing him with a certain William who flourished in Europe contemporaneously with Theodore, and who seems to have been looked on in the light of a demi-god. This was not many years before the frightful cataclysm which, beginning on the Pacific coast of America, moved eastward, carrying destruction to the vast cities of the central and eastern parts, and, reaching Europe, decimated its population — the beginning of that new and grandest civilization which has arisen in Asia. Now the fact that Theodore was at one time in William's dominions, probably gave rise to the confusion, for the commanding personality of the American would make itself felt, and his stay, even if short, might have given rise to the tradition regarding his rule as William, or conjointly with him, in William's country.

So, too, Theodore has been confused with a king in England. This was previous to the invasion of that land by a fierce race of destroying beings called "Suffragettes." The claim that these were women is discredited by Dr. Kho because wholly contrary to the character of the female sex of those centuries, since we know that the women of

the time had degenerated physically to a wasp-like stature, as shown by the colored plates representing them, and secured by deep-sea diving at the site of New York. The type of garments worn give substantial grounds for supposing that before the destruction of the cities the climate had become remarkably warm.

All these points will be found satisfactorily covered in the chapters which follow.

After a thorough sifting of all the evidence, our scholarly author concludes: 1. That such a person as Theodore lived; 2. That he was a statesman, and for a time president of the United States; 3. That all the accumulations of myths, fables, and other accretions are simply traditional corroborations of his forceful and wide influence and popularity, but that they must reverently but positively be laid aside.

Y. GOLA

Lhasa University