

JACOB AND THE FLOCKS
GENESIS 30:39

BY

RICHARD LEROY ANDERSON

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity in
Grace Theological Seminary
May 1956

PREFACE

This monograph was written for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of God's Word. This was accomplished for the writer during the preparation of this paper, and it is his wish that those who later read the following pages may experience the same enlightenment. The basic truths of God's Word are so simple that a child can understand them, but in its details there are problems so complex, that the most careful research is necessary for a clear understanding of their meaning. Prayer for guidance by the Holy Spirit is also a most important factor in attempting to solve a problem in scripture.

The writer wishes to express his deepest appreciation to the faculty of Grace Theological Seminary for their guidance in thinking during his years of preparation. He wishes especially to thank Professor John C. Whitcomb, faculty advisor, for his sympathetic counsel and excellent suggestions while this manuscript was being prepared; and Mr. Benjamin Hamilton for his guidance in the details of the format of this manuscript.

All scripture quotations in this monograph are from the American Standard Version.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.....	111
INTRODUCTION.....	2
HEBREW TEXT.....	5
ENGLISH VERSIONS.....	7
ESSENTIAL BACKGROUND.....	9
STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS.....	14
VARIOUS INTERPRETATIONS.....	16
<u>Major Problem: What Caused the Flocks to</u> <u>Bring Forth Young That Were Ringstreaked,</u> <u>Speckled, and Spotted?.....</u>	16
<u>Minor Problem: Did God Direct Jacob to Place</u> <u>the Rods before the Flocks?.....</u>	26
WRITER'S INTERPRETATION.....	31
<u>Minor Problem: Did God Direct Jacob to Place</u> <u>the Rods before the Flocks?.....</u>	31
<u>Major Problem: What Caused the Flocks to</u> <u>Bring Forth Young That Were Ringstreaked,</u> <u>Speckled, and Spotted?.....</u>	36
ENGLISH PARAPHRASE.....	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	61

INTRODUCTION

The writer of this monograph believes in the plenary inspiration of the Bible. Consequently, with the exception of a very few insignificant errors brought about by copying the manuscripts, God's Word must be accepted as true.

The writer has sat under certain professors of liberal colleges who felt at liberty to class as untrue certain passages of scripture which did not suit their theories of Christianity; and likewise made much of so-called contradictions which they claimed were in the Bible. The writer accepted the claims of these men as a challenge to investigate many of these problems; in order to satisfy his own mind that these things could be reconciled.

The passage under discussion in this monograph, Gen. 30:39, is an example of those which liberal theologians or atheistic scientists would condemn as untrue. The writer of this paper has used the writings of scientists both Christian and non-Christian in his efforts to solve the problem at hand, along with scripture commentaries written by godly men. Therefore, the solution reached is felt to be both in harmony with science as it is understood today and the teachings of the Word of God.

The writer was interested in finding a discussion of the problem of this monograph in a play, The Merchant of Venice, by William Shakespear.¹ In the discussion different view points are taken by Shylock and Antonio which coincide with those discussed later in this work, as, for example, in the third scene of the first act;

Shy. When Jacob graz'd his uncle Laban's sheep--
This Jacob from our holy Abraham was,
As his wise mother wrought in his behalf,
The third possessor; ay, he was the third--

Ant. And what of him? Did he take interest?

Shy. No, not take interest, not, as you would say,
Directly interest; mark what Jacob did
When Laban and himself were compromis'd.
That all the eanlings which were streaked and
pied
Should fall as Jacob's hire, the ewes, being
rank,

In end of autumn turned to the rams;
And when the work of generation was
Between these woolly breeders in the act,
The skilful shepherd pill'd me certain wands
And in the doing of the deed of kind,
He stuck them up before the fulsome ewes,
Who, then conceiving, did in eaning time
Fall parti-colour'd lambs;
and those were Jacob's.

This was a way to thrive, and he was blest;
And thrift is blessing, if men steal it not.

Ant. This was a ventive, sir,

that Jacob serv'd for;

A thing not in his power to bring to pass,
But sway'd and fashion'd by the hand of
heaven.

¹William Shakespear, Merchant of Venice (New York: Knickerbocker Leather and Novelty Co., n. d.), pp. 32, 33.

HEBREW TEXT

According to Biblia Hebraica, Rudolph Kittel, ed.

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יָדָהּ לְעַמּוּנָהּ 39.

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יָדָהּ לְעַמּוּנָהּ

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יָדָהּ

ENGLISH VERSIONS

ENGLISH VERSIONS

Five Books of Moses, William Tyndale, 1530

And the fhepe cōceaued before the ftaues & brought forth ftraked, fpotted & partie.

King James Version, 1611

And the flocks conceived before the rods, and brought forth cattle ringstraked, speckled, and spotted.

The English Revised Version, 1881, and The Modern Reader's Bible, Richard G. Moulton, 1907, agree with the above version. The American Standard Version, 1901, makes "ringstraked" into "ringstreaked", but agrees otherwise.

Rotherham's Emphasized Bible, 1896 (Old Testament)

...and the males of the flock were in heat before the rods, --so the flocks brought forth ring-straked, speckled, and spotted.

The American Bible, 1931

Since they bred when they came to drink, the sheep bred among the boughs, and so had lambs that were striped, speckled, and spotted.

Moffatt's Bible, 1935

...they bred when they came to drink, and as they bred in front of the sticks they brought forth young that were striped, speckled, and spotted.

The Revised Standard Version, 1952

...the flocks bred in front of the rods and so the flocks brought forth striped, speckled, and spotted.

ESSENTIAL BACKGROUND

The character of Jacob is unique among all those portrayed in Holy Writ. The circumstances connected with his birth were unusual, and they were evidently an indication of the kind of life that was to follow.

The marriage union of Isaac and Rebekah was childless for twenty years.

And Isaac entreated Jehovah for his wife, because she was barren; and Jehovah was entreated of him, and Rebekah his wife conceived. And the children struggled together within her... Gen. 25:21,22a.

Here we have an account of unusual prenatal activity; so unusual, in fact, that Rebekah inquired of Jehovah as to its meaning. Jehovah replied to Rebekah's inquiry with a remarkable prophecy.

Two nations are in thy womb,
And two peoples shall be separated from thy bowells;
And the one people shall be stronger than the other
people;
And the elder shall serve the younger. Gen. 25:23b.

When the time came for Rebekah's delivery, the first child to be born was red, and he was given an appropriate name, "Esau". The second child came forth with his hand clutching his brother's heel, and as a result of this action was named "Jacob", meaning, "One who takes hold by the heel" or "supplants". (Margin ASV Gen. 25:26)

Perhaps for the first few years of his life, Jacob's parents might have considered his name a mis-nomer,

for he is described as a quiet man, living in tents. (Gen. 25:27). However, his outward actions probably belied his inmost thoughts. Certainly his conduct in securing Esau's birthright has every appearance of being carefully planned in advance.

Although Jacob secured Esau's birthright by his own craftiness, it was the goading of his mother that secured for him Esau's blessing. Perhaps such open deceit was distasteful to Jacob, but nevertheless, he successfully carried out his mother's bidding.

As a result of this, Esau declared no further doubts as to Jacob's character.

"And he said, Is not he rightly named Jacob? For he hath supplanted me these two times; he took away my birthright; and, behold, now he hath taken away my blessing." Gen. 27:36a.

Because of Esau's fury, it was expedient for Jacob to leave his immediate surroundings. Isaac, evidently prompted by Rebekah, sent Jacob to Paddan-aram on the pretext of securing a wife from his mother's family.

In the midst of his journey, Jacob had a soul-searching spiritual experience at Bethel, in which Jehovah spoke many promises to him. This was probably Jacob's first real acquaintance with the God of his forefather's, and it left him shaken.

Jacob was well received in the house of his uncle, Laban; and he promptly fell in love with his cousin, Rach-

el. After a month, Laban very generously stated that Jacob should name his wages, and Jacob pledged seven years of labor for Rachel's hand in marriage.

At the end of this period of time, Jacob went to Laban and demanded his wages, which was, of course, Rachel. In substituting Leah for Rachel in the wedding ceremony, and thus subsequently gaining another seven years of service from Jacob, Laban exhibited a character that proved that Jacob came by his own naturally.

At the end of the second seven years of labor, Jacob approached Laban and asked that he be given leave to return to his father's country, along with his wives and children. Laban, however, was loathe to let him go, declaring that he realized that Jehovah's blessing was upon him as a result of Jacob's presence with him. Then, again, Laban asked Jacob to name his wages. Jacob reminded Laban that his flocks had marvelously increased under his, ie, Jacob's, care; and if Laban would agree to the terms at hand, then Jacob would continue caring for Laban's flocks. The terms were simple enough; Jacob was to pass through the flocks and remove every unusually colored animal, all the black or brown among the sheep, and all the white or light colored among the goats, along with every striped, spotted, or speckled animal, and these were to be Jacob's. Such unusually colored animals would only constitute a small percentage of the flock, and Laban readily agreed to the terms. The understanding also was that every animal

that was born thereafter of an unusual color was to be Jacob's.

Laban must have chuckled many times over the simplicity of his nephew for driving such a bargain, and probably considered himself very fortunate at having such expert labor at such a low price. However, Jacob evidently knew his uncle pretty well by this time and realized that Laban would be both satisfied and unsuspecting at the agreement of the terms.

But Laban thought that he had best be present at the removal of the unusually colored animals from the flocks; and after it was done, he set them under the care of his own sons, with instructions to place three days journey between themselves and Jacob.

But Jacob apparently entered into the agreement with ulterior motives in mind. At least he took steps which he thought would increase his share of the animals born to Laban's flocks.

And Jacob took him rods of fresh poplar, and of the almond and of the plane-tree; and peeled white streaks in them, and made the white appear which was in the rods. 38. And he set the rods which he had peeled over against the flocks in the gutters in the watering-troughs where the flocks came to drink. 39. And the flocks conceived before the rods, and the flocks brought forth ringstreaked, speckled, and spotted. Gen. 30:37-39.

Thus the final verse of this passage, verse 39, which tells of the results of the mating of Laban's flocks, constitutes the text of this monograph.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS

Major Problem

What caused the flocks to bring forth young that were ringstreaked, speckled, and spotted?

Minor Problem

Did God direct Jacob to place the rods before the flocks?

VARIOUS INTERPRETATIONS

Major Problem: What Caused the Flocks to Bring Forth Young That Were Ringstreaked, Speckled, and Spotted?

The Liberal View

This view assumes that the Scriptural account of Jacob is pure fiction, and such details to the story as flocks bearing unusually colored young due to maternal impressions are simply told to make the story more interesting.

Simpson¹ expresses this view;

This story of one knave outwitting another--doubtless another piece of shepherd lore--is of a piece with that in 25:27-34, and it was told by J¹ with unfeigned delight; clever Jacob had outwitted the dull nomad Aramaean.

Among other things, the terms used by the liberal commentators to describe this account suggest that they regard it as fictional. Erith² and Alleman³ refer to it as a "shepherd's story" and "shepherd's tale", respec-

¹Cuthbert A. Simpson, (exposition), "The Book of Genesis", The Interpreter's Bible, ed. by George A. Buttrick et. al. (New York; Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951), I, p. 708.

²Erith, "The Book of Genesis", A New Commentary On Holy Scripture Including the Apocrypha, ed. by Charles Gore et. al. (New York; The Macmillan Co., 1928), p. 57.

³H. C. Alleman, Old Testament Commentary, ed. by E. E. Flack (Philadelphia; The Muhlenberg Press, 1948), p. 196.

tively. Other commentators who hold this view are Skinner,⁴ Houghton,⁵ and Jastrow.⁶

Van Loon⁷ also holds the liberal view as to the fictional character of this account, but he places an unusual interpretation upon Jacob's actions, making the cause of the birth of the unusually colored animals, not pre-natal influence, but environmental influence.

Jacob really was a very good shepherd. He understood his business and had learned a good many tricks. He knew how to change the food and the water of his flocks, so as to increase the number of certain strangely coloured goats and sheep.

Will describes the process as follows:

In the first place, he took fresh rods of sorax, maple, and walnut trees, all of which have a dazzling white wood under their dark outside, and peeled white stripes upon them... These partially peeled, and therefore mottled rods, he placed in the drinking troughs, to which the flock came to drink, in front of the animals, in order that, if copulation took place at the drinking time, it might occur near the whitened sticks, and the young be speckled and spotted in consequence. This artifice was founded upon a fact frequently noticed, particularly in the case of sheep, that whatever fixes their attention in copulation is marked upon the young.

⁴John Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary On Genesis. The International Critical Commentary. Ed. by C. A. Briggs and S. R. Driver. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 390.

⁵Louise S. Houghton, Hebrew Life and Thought, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1907), p. 104.

⁶Morris Jastrow, Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914), p. 280.

⁷Hendrick Willen Van Loon, The Story of the Bible, (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1935), pp. 57, 58.

This view was a very popular one among the conservative scholars before 1900. Its explanation of the unusual coloring of the animals is that it is due to maternal impression, or the fixed attention of the female upon some object at the time of conception, which through the force of imagination marks the young in a similar manner.

Keil⁸ describes the process as follows:

In the first place, he took fresh rods of storax, maple, and walnut trees, all of which have a dazzling white wood under their dark outside, and peeled white stripes upon them...These partially peeled, and therefore mottled rods, he placed in the drinking troughs, to which the flock came to drink, in front of the animals, in order that, if copulation took place at the drinking time, it might occur near the mottled sticks, and the young be speckled and spotted in consequence. This artifice was founded upon a fact frequently noticed, particularly in the case of sheep, that whatever fixes their attention in copulation is marked upon the young.

⁸ H. Payne Smith, "Genesis", A Bible Commentary for English Readers, by Charles John Ellul (London: Messrs. and Co., Ltd., n. d.), I, 183.

¹³ John Gill, An Exposition of the Old Testament (London: William Hall Callaghan, 1832), I, 183, 184.

¹⁴ Matthew Henry, Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1908), I, 183.

¹⁵ F. Z. Raven, "Genesis", The New Bible Commentary,

⁸C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Vol. I of Pentateuch, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., reprinted in 1951), pp. 293, 294.

Other commentators who ascribe to this view are Jamieson,⁹ Calvin,¹⁰ Kurtz,¹¹ Smith,¹² and Gill.¹³

Henry¹⁴ also holds this view, but adds an interesting note by saying that this custom was probably commonly used by the shepherds of Canaan, "who were called by a Hebrew word signifying speckled, and coveted to have their cattle of this motley color."

Kevan,¹⁵ a contemporary writer, infers that such methods are used in modern day animal husbandry.

This kind of device is adopted for obtaining certain colours of horses and dogs. White lambs even now, are secured by surrounding the troughs with white objects.

⁹Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown, A Commentary Critical, Experimental and Practical on the Old and New Testaments (Grand Rapids; Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., reprinted in 1945), I, 207.

¹⁰John Calvin, Commentaries on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis, trans. John King. (Grand Rapids; Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1948), II, 156.

¹¹J. H. Kurtz, History of the Old Covenant, trans. Alfred Edersheim (Edinburg; T. & T. Clark, 1870), I, 318.

¹²R. Payne Smith, "Genesis", A Bible Commentary for English Readers, by Charles John Ellicott (London; Cassell and Co., Ltd., n. d.), I, 116.

¹³John Gill, An Exposition of the Old Testament (London; William Hill Calllingridge, 1851), I, 163, 164.

¹⁴Matthew Henry, Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible (New York; Fleming H. Revell Co., 1935), I, 183.

¹⁵E. F. Kevan, "Genesis", The New Bible Commentary, ed. F. Davidson (Grand Rapids; Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1954), p. 96.

Other writers uphold the physiological principle of prenatal influence, but go further and say that God was the causative Agent in this instance; and some even go so far as to say that God directed Jacob to use this method.

This view holds that the results brought forth by the mating of Laban's flock were not due to any action on Jacob's part, but were wholly produced by the Divine Agency. This view would preclude any natural situation by which the unusually colored animals would be produced. Therefore, the whole situation is a supernatural one, in which God is the overruling agent in the normal course of proceedings.

Barlinton¹⁶ states this view as follows:

It is scarcely necessary to say, that so simple an artifice was quite insufficient in itself for the production of the result desired; and that, if success attended it, the effect must be attributed, not to Jacob's contrivance, but to the Divine Will, which was bent on enriching him, and compensating him at Laban's expense for the hard measure which he had received at Laban's hand.

¹⁶George Barlinton, Isaac and Jacob: Their Lives and Times, Men of the Bible (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., N. Y.), p. 133, 137.

This view holds that the results brought forth by the mating of Laban's flock were not due to any action on Jacob's part, but were wholly produced by the Divine Agency. This view would preclude any natural situation by which the unusually colored animals would be produced. Therefore, the whole situation is a supernatural one, in which God is the overruling agent in the normal course of proceedings.

Rawlinson¹⁶ states this view as follows:

It is scarcely necessary to say, that so simple an artifice was quite insufficient in itself for the production of the result desired; and that, if success attended it, the effect must be attributed, not to Jacob's contrivance, but to the Divine Will, which was bent on enriching him, and compensating him at Laban's expense for the hard measure which he had received at Laban's hand.

¹⁷Arthur W. Plunk, *Meanings in Genesis* (Chicago: Bible Institute Colportage Ass'n., 1923), I, 70.

¹⁸G. G. Murphy, *A Critical & Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis* (Boston: Bates and Gabriel, 1873), pp. 423.

¹⁹H. G. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis* (Columbus, Pa: The Warburg Press, 1902), pp. 224, 225.

²⁰B. H. Carroll, *Genesis* (Nashville, Tenn.: The Banner Press, 1843), p. 237.

²¹G. W. Whitelaw, "Genesis", *The Pulpit Commentary*, ed. by H. D. M. Spence & J. S. Hesell (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1850), I, 875.

¹⁶George Rawlinson, *Isaac and Jacob Their Lives and Times, Men of the Bible* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., n. d.), pp. 106, 107.

Others who hold to this view are Pink,¹⁷ Murphy,¹⁸ Leupold,¹⁹ Carroll,²⁰ Whitelaw,²¹ and Scott.²²

Since the discoveries of Gregor Mendel have been published, the science of genetics has become a very important factor in our everyday life. By this science the results of breeding tests can be foretold and controlled. The view of natural genetics has been applied to the account of Jacob and the production of the unusually colored animals, stating that under the circumstances such results are certain.

This view takes into consideration a passage of scripture found in Gen. 31:10-12:

10. And it came to pass at the time that the flock conceived, that I lifted up mine eyes, and saw in a dream, and, behold, the he-goats which lay upon the flock were ringstraked, speckled, and grizzled.
11. And the angel of God said unto me in a dream, Jacob; and I said, Here am I.
12. And he said, Lift up now thine eyes, and see, all the goats which lay upon the flock are ring-

¹⁷Arthur W. Pink, Gleanings in Genesis (Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Ass'n., 1922), I, 70.

¹⁸J. G. Murphy, A Critical & Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis (Boston: Estes and Lauriat, 1873), p. 405.

¹⁹H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Genesis (Columbus, O.; The Wartburg Press, 1942), pp. 824, 825.

²⁰B. H. Carroll, Genesis (Nashville, Tenn.: The Broadman Press, 1943), p. 387.

²¹T. W. Whitelaw, "Genesis", The Pulpit Commentary. ed. by H. D. M. Spence & J. S. Excell (Grand Rapids; Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1950), I, 373.

²²Thomas Scott, The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments (Boston; Samuel T. Armstrong, 1830), I, 121.

The Natural Law of Genetics View

Since the discoveries of Gregor Mendel have been published, the science of genetics has become a very important factor in our everyday life. By this science the results of breeding tests can be foretold and controlled. The view of natural genetics has been applied to the account of Jacob and the production of the unusually colored animals, stating that under the circumstances such results were certain.

This view takes into consideration a passage of scripture found in Gen. 31:10-12;

10. And it came to pass at the time that the flock conceive, that I lifted up mine eyes, and saw in a dream, and, behold, the he-goats which leaped upon the flock were ringstreaked, speckled, and grizzled.
11. And the angel of God said unto me in a dream, Jacob; and I said, Here am I.
12. And he said, Lift up now thine eyes, and see, all the he-goats which leap upon the flock are ring-streaked, speckled, and grizzled; for I have seen all that Laban doeth unto thee.

Since all of the unusually colored animals had been removed from the flock, then those animals which the angel of God declared were unusually colored must have been of a heterozygous nature, ie, carrying a hereditary factor which was mixed. But the solid color factor being the dominant one, the animals were of a solid color, although carrying unusually colored genes; and therefore to the natural eye it was impossible to tell their mixed heredity.

Tinkle and Lammerts²³ were the only scholars found by the writer to hold this view. *Genetics View*

In the herd mentioned above it is true that many spotted kids were born, but not because of Jacob's clever scheme. God revealed to Jacob in a dream the true reason; "All the he-goats which leap upon the flock are ring-streaked, speckled, and grizzled; for I have seen all that Laban doeth unto thee." The rams which impregnated the ewes were spotted, and therefore the kids were spotted in large numbers. To the casual observer they were of solid color, for all the spotted goats had been removed; but their hereditary factors or genes for color were mixed, the condition which the geneticist calls heterozygous. At this point modern genetics helps us, for breeding tests have shown that spotting is recessive to solid color in goats, making it possible for a goat to have spots that can be transmitted, although they do not appear to the eye.

It thus becomes evident that the appearance of the ringstreaked, speckled, spotted and the brown was not due to anything other than the operation of Mendelian laws under the special direction of the Author of laws.

²³William J. Tinkle and Walter E. Lammerts, "Biology and Creation" Modern Science and Christian Faith, by Members of the American Scientific Affiliation (Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1950), pp. 70, 71.

The Divinely Controlled Genetics View

This view assumes that the unusually colored animals were born from naturally colored parents by the operation of natural laws following Mendelian principles. But it also assumes that God overruled in one phase of the process, by reversing the usual dominant color characteristics in order that more unusually colored animals would be born for Jacob than naturally colored ones for Laban.

Marsh²⁴ and Van Haitsma²⁵ were the only scholars found by this writer to advance this view. Marsh expresses it thus:

It thus becomes evident that the appearance of the ringstreaked, speckled, spotted and the brown was not due to anything other than the operation of Mendelian laws under the special direction of the Author of laws.

Marsh²⁴ states it thus:

Even on this supposition Jacob cannot be considered as violating his contract, for he only used such means to produce variegated cattle as his knowledge of natural causes afforded him. But it is evident from ch. 31:5-13, that there was something miraculous in it, and that in the means which he employed, he followed some divine intimation. If so, his conduct, so far from being culpable, was praiseworthy, as being a compliance with the will of God. He is, in fact, hereby acquitted of selfishness and every other improper motive, just as the divine command to the Israelites to borrow of the Egyptians' acquits them of fraud.

²⁴Frank Lewis Marsh, Studies in Creationism (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Pub. Ass'n., 1950), p. 373.

²⁵John P. Van Haitsma, The Supplanter Undeceived (Grand Rapids: Privately Printed, Copyright 1941 by John Van Haitsma), p. 158.

Minor Problem: Did God Direct Jacob to Place the Rods Before the Flocks?

The Affirmative View

The scholars who hold this view state that Jacob was acting according to God's direction when he placed the rods before the flocks, and therefore there was nothing sinful in the action. Jacob's spiritual life at this time was as it should be, as a result of his experience at Bethel and his daily communion with Jehovah. Jacob was not, in this procedure, following the course of deceit and selfishness which had characterized his earlier life.

Bush²⁶ states it thus:

Even on this supposition Jacob cannot be considered as violating his contract, for he only used such means to produce variegated cattle as his knowledge of natural causes afforded him. But it is evident from ch. 31:5-13, that there was something miraculous in it, and that in the means which he employed, he followed some divine intimation. If so, his conduct, so far from being culpable, was praise-worthy, as being a compliance with the will of God. He is, in fact, hereby acquitted of selfishness and every other improper motive, just as the divine command to the Israelites to borrow of the Egyptians' acquits them of fraud.

²⁶George Bush, Notes, Critical and Practical on the Book of Genesis (New York; Mark H. Newman & Co., 1848), I, 137.

Other scholars who hold this view are Scott,²⁷ Gill,²⁸ Whitelaw,²⁹ and Henry.³⁰

Many scholars are of the opinion that Jacob was definitely wrong when he placed the rods before the flock and he was not acting according to God's direction. Such believe that Jacob was continuing in the cunningness and craftiness that had characterized his early life, and was doing such as a reprisal against his uncle who had deceived him many times. Jacob was, therefore, by his own efforts, trying to build his own fortune and at the same time even a score with his uncle.

Strong³¹ supports this view as follows:

The language employed upon this occasion shows that Jacob's character had gained considerably during his service, both in strength and comprehensiveness; but the means which he employed in order to make his bargain with his uncle work so as to enrich himself, proved too clearly that his old moral feelings had not undergone an equal improvement, and that the original taint of prudence, and the sad lessons of his mother in deceit, had produced some of their natural fruit in his bosom.

²⁷Scott, op. cit., p. 121.

²⁸Gill, op. cit., pp. 163, 164.

²⁹Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 373.

³⁰Henry, op. cit., p. 183.

Many scholars are of the opinion that Jacob was definitely wrong when he placed the rods before the flocks, and he was not acting according to God's direction. Such believe that Jacob was continuing in the cunningness and craftiness that had characterized his early life, and was doing such as a reprisal against his uncle who had deceived him many times. Jacob was, therefore, by his own efforts, trying to build his own fortune and at the same time even a score with his uncle.

Strong³¹ supports this view as follows:

The language employed upon this occasion shows that Jacob's character had gained considerably during his service, both in strength and comprehensiveness; but the means which he employed in order to make his bargain with his uncle work so as to enrich himself, proved too clearly that his [sic] moral feelings had not undergone an equal improvement, and that the original taint of prudence, and the sad lessons of his mother in deceit, had produced some of their natural fruit in his bosom.

³²George Williams, *The Student's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publications, 1903), p. 33.

³³G. H. Mackintosh, *Notes on the Book of Genesis* (New York: Loiseaux Brothers, 1941), p. 250.

³⁴Samuel Cox, *The Hebrew Twins* (New York: Thomas Watsaker, 1894), p. 78.

³⁵J. H. Kerts, *op. cit.*, pp. 323 ff.

³⁶G. S. Leopold, *op. cit.*, pp. 224, 225.

³¹John McClintock and James Strong, *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1872), IV, 729.

Others who hold this view are Williams,³² Mackintosh,³³ Cox,³⁴ Kurtz,³⁵ Leupold,³⁶ and Fausset.³⁷

³²George Williams, The Student's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1953), p. 33.

³³C. H. Mackintosh, Notes on the Book of Genesis (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1941), p. 293.

³⁴Samuel Cox, The Hebrew Twins (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1894), p. 79.

³⁵J. H. Kurtz, op. cit., pp. 318 ff.

³⁶H. C. Leupold, op. cit., pp. 824, 825.

³⁷A. R. Fausset, Bible Encyclopaedia and Dictionary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub. House, n. d.), p. 322.

Minor Problem: Did God Direct Jacob to
Place the Rods before the Flocks?

The writer of this monograph does not believe that God directed Jacob to place the rods before the flocks for the following reasons.

It is not expressly stated in scripture that God directed Jacob to do this. Those who hold to the affirmative view assume their position by the passage in Gen. 31:5-13, in which God revealed to Jacob that His overruling hand was responsible for the unusually colored animals. In reading through this passage there is absolutely no mention of peeled rods. The "angel of God" who spoke to Jacob in his dream makes no mention of them, or in any way gave Jacob any instructions as to his care of the flocks.

Also, a further examination of Gen. 31:5-13 confirms the fact that Jacob did not experience this dream of revelation until after he had placed his rods before the flocks. In verse 10 we read,

And it came to pass at the time that the flock conceive, that I lifted up mine eyes, and saw in a dream, and, behold, the he-goats which leaped upon the flock were ringstreaked, speckled, and grizzled.

In the first part of this verse Jacob gives the time at which his dream occurred, "at the time that the flock con-

ceive..." It does not state at which particular breeding time this was, but it was probably at least two or three seasons after Jacob had begun trying for unusually colored animals. This may be assumed by the statement of the Angel in verse 13, in which He commands Jacob to arise and get out of the land, as it was not God's intention for Jacob to leave until his wealth had been secured.

Thus, we may safely assume that there is no possible intimation in Gen. 31:5-13 that God instructed Jacob to place peeled rods before the flocks.

If, then, the passage in Gen. 31:5-13 cannot be demonstrated to be a Divine direction for the placing of the peeled rods, where can such a passage be? It can only be said that there is none. To assume that God did direct Jacob to place the rods before the flocks, and such a command was not recorded in scripture would make this a unique occurrence. There are very strict commands in scripture against any practice that would emphasize fetishism or wizardry. Ex. 20:4, 22:18, Lev. 19:31, Deut. 14:21. Upon occasion God did give specific commands for the making or using of such articles, such as the Urim and Thummim, Lev. 8:8, and the brazen serpent in the wilderness, Num. 21:9. However, upon all of these occasions, where supernatural power was displayed in connection with an article, God's commands are carefully recorded, and usually such an article was a symbol of some future or heavenly reality. Such cannot be said of Jacob's rods.

Whitelaw¹ does not insist upon Divine direction for Jacob's act, but he does claim that his act had God's approval. He writes; "That in what Jacob did there was nothing fraudulent may be inferred from the fact that he acted under the Divine approval (ch. 31:12)..."

The verse that Whitelaw cites as indicating God's approval upon Jacob's act reads as follows: 12. "And he (ie. the Angel of God) said, Lift up now thine eyes, and see, all the he-goats which leap upon the flock are ring-streaked, speckled, and grizzled; for I have seen all that Laban doeth unto thee."

To insist that this verse indicates God's approval upon Jacob's act, is to assume that because God allowed the unusually colored animals to be born, it was an indication of His approval. This is not necessarily so. There are many instances in scripture where God blessed, not because of a person's action, but in spite of it. God richly blessed many Old Testament saints who practiced polygamy, but yet we read in the New Testament (Mk. 10:2-12) that such a practice was not according to God's approval. This verse seems rather to indicate that God was showing Jacob what actually happened to cause the unusually colored animals to be born.

Thus, the writer of this monograph feels justified in stating that God did not direct Jacob in this act.

¹Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 373.

Jacob's action, then, must have been the product of his own self. Such an action would have been in accord with the character of the people with whom Jacob was closely associated. His favorite wife, Rachel, upon two separate occasions demonstrates her faith in fetishism. In Gen. 30:14-16 she bargains with Leah for Reuben's mandrakes, or "love apples", thinking they would somehow make it possible for her to bear children. But we read in verse 22 that Jehovah opened her womb. In Gen. 31:19 is the account of Rachel's stealing her father's teraphim, or household gods, perhaps as her second attempt at child-bearing. Jacob's father-in-law, Laban, also upon occasion illustrated his belief in fetishism. In Gen. 30:27 Laban says, "I have divined that Jehovah hath blessed me for thy sake." The Hebrew word translated divined in this verse gives us a clue to Laban's methods of divination. The word is וַיִּדְּבֹר , a verb with the root meaning of "snake", which Fausset² translates "by omens from serpents".

Thus we may see that Jacob's environment was conducive to his action.

But we may also state that Jacob's character was such that this practice was in harmony with his previous deeds. Mackintosh³ has this to say concerning the subject;

²Fausset, loc. cit.

³Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 293.

In place of allowing God to multiply the ring-streaked, speckled, and spotted cattle, as He most assuredly would have done had He been trusted, he sets about securing their multiplication by a piece of policy which could only have found its origin in the mind of Jacob. So in all his actings, during his twenty years sojourn with Laban; and finally, he most characteristically "steals away", thus maintaining in everything his consistency with himself.

Jacob had not as yet wrestled with the angel and had his name changed, so he was still $\alpha\pi\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\eta$, the "supplanter".

Thus we may conclude that when Jacob placed the rods before the flocks, he was not acting under Divine direction, but was attempting by an origination of his own mind to influence by wizardry the offspring of the flock.

The scholars who hold this view do so because they hold certain principles that will not let them accept this account as being true. First of all, they have that God never interferes in the affairs of men, and consequently, the miraculous is impossible. With these assumptions it becomes impossible for the liberal to accept this account of Jacob as true, and so he must adopt an interpretation that is more in accord with his beliefs. In the scriptural account it is ultimately stated that Jehovah has greatly blessed Jacob. This the liberal cannot accept because, according to his theory, God never interferes in the affairs of men. In Gen. 31:3-13 it seems likely that the account is stating that a miracle occurred to bring forth the unusually colored animals. This also the liberal scholar cannot accept, because the miraculous is impossible. The easiest way out, then, is to declare that this account is fictional, merely a "shepherd's tale".

Major Problem; What Caused the Flocks to Bring
Forth Young that were Ringstreaked,
Speckled, and Spotted?

The Liberal View

The writer of this critical monograph rejects this view for the following reasons;

First, such a view is contrary to the fundamental Christian doctrine of God which states that God is active in the preservation of the universe.

The scholars who hold this view do so because they hold certain principles that will not let them accept this account as being true. First of all, they deny that God ever interferes in the affairs of men, and consequently, the miraculous is impossible. With these assumptions it becomes impossible for the liberal to accept this account of Jacob as true, and so he must adopt an interpretation that is more in accord with his beliefs. In the scriptural account it is ultimately stated that Jehovah has greatly blessed Jacob. This the liberal cannot accept because, according to his theory, God never interferes in the affairs of men. In Gen. 31:3-13 it seems likely that the account is stating that a miracle occurred to bring forth the unusually colored animals. This also the liberal scholar cannot accept, because the miraculous is impossible. The easiest way out, then, is to declare that this account is fictional, merely a "shepherd's tale".

It is not the purpose of this writer to attempt to set forth here an extended proof of Theism. The Bible declares that God does exercise a governing hand over the universe, consisting of both men and things. In addition to the Biblical assertions, many volumes have been written by many able and godly scholars that prove beyond any reasonable doubt that the universe is not a self-sustained mechanism, from which God withdrew as soon as He created it. Strong⁴ gives three basic arguments in refutation of this theory;

(a) It rests upon a false analogy. - Man is able to construct a self-moving watch only because he employs preexisting forces, such as gravity, elasticity, cohesion. But in a theory which likens the universe to a machine, these forces are the very things to be accounted for.

(b) It is a system of anthropomorphism, while it professes to exclude anthropomorphism. - Because the upholding of all things would involve a multiplicity of minute cares if man were the agent, it conceives of the upholding of the universe as involving such burdens in the case of God. Thus it saves the dignity of God by virtually denying him omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence.

(c) It cannot be maintained without denying all providential interference, in the history of creation and the subsequent history of the world. -But the introduction of life, the creation of man, incarnation, regeneration, the communion of intelligent creatures with a present God, and the interpositions of God in secular history, are matters of fact.

Secondly, the liberal view is contrary to the fundamental Christian doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scripture.

⁴Augustus H. Strong, Systematic Theology (Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1951), p. 415.

There is no instance in this account of the production of unusually colored animals by the flocks that implies that it is a "shepherd's tale" or any other sort of fiction. The passage when read implies only one thing - that it is a true account of an actual happening. Scripture does record prevarication, e.g. II Sam. 1:6-10, but in such instances the untruth is clearly labeled as such by the authors of Holy Writ, while giving a true account of the act of prevarication as it occurred.

The Bible, if it is to stand, must stand as a complete unit of veracity. To label one part as false, when it professes to be true, opens the way for doubt to fall upon any passage contained within its covers. By the same logic which declares the account of Jacob's flocks as false, one might question any instance as recorded by scripture.

Van Loon⁵ is a prime example of one who has followed this logic of skepticism to its utmost. He says this concerning the Old Testament:

For many centuries, the Old Testament was the only history of old Asia which our grandfathers could decipher and understand. But a century ago, we began to learn how to read the hieroglyphics of Egypt, and fifty years ago we discovered the key to the mysterious nail writing of Babylon. We now know that there was a very different side to the stories which were related by the old Jewish chronicle writers.

We see them commit the mistakes of all patriotic historians and we understand how they perverted the truth to increase the glory and the splendour of their own race.

⁵Van Loon, op. cit., p. 19.

and concerning the New Testament he⁶ says:

The early Christians, therefore, could not go to a book store and say; "Please give me a 'Life of Christ' and an account of the acts of his Apostles." They got their information from secret little pamphlets which were passed from hand to hand. Thousands of such pamphlets were copied and re-copied, until people lost all track of the truth of their contents.

Again, it is not the purpose of this writer to give an extensive proof of the truth and therefore the inspiration of the Bible. Many have done it, and their works are easily accessible. Suffice it to say, if the Bible is true, then it must be inspired of God; and conversely, if it is inspired of God, then it must be true in all parts. This writer holds it to be such, and he accepts en toto the following passage by McClain:⁷

The lines of proof for the inspiration of the Bible are numerous and convincing. There is its marvelous unity, unexplainable apart from the divine authorship. There is its righteous character, giving it indeed a right to be called "the Good Book". There is its transforming power, as evidenced in the lives of men and nations. There is its consciousness of authority, unparalleled in any merely human book. There is its mysterious indestructibility, a link which surely binds it to God, "who only hath immortality". Besides all this, we have strong proof for the inspiration of the Bible in its fulfilled prophecy, in its scientific accuracies, and in that latest but not least of the Biblical sciences - archaeology. Taken alone, each one of these lines of proof constitutes a powerful argument. When taken together, they are overwhelming and unanswerable.

⁶Van Loon, op. cit., pp. 20, 21.

⁷Alva J. McClain, The Inspiration of the Bible (Philadelphia: Philadelphia School of the Bible, 1924), pp. 4, 5.

The writer of this monograph rejects this view for the following reasons:

The contextual argument.--The context of the passage under consideration in this monograph does not support this view. If the record here did not extend beyond chapter 30, then the argument would be a very strong one for the prenatal influence view. For that matter, the writer of this monograph firmly believes that Jacob acted as he did because he believed in prenatal influence, and that his actions were a result of ignorance. However, it is certainly no surprize that Jacob thought that prenatal influence would work, because it has been a popular theory for hundreds - even thousands - of years. Even in our modern day the belief is still largely held, although science has proven it false, as we shall shortly see.

To illustrate how universally this idea has been held, Driver⁸ gives several examples of scholars who have held this view:

The physiological principle involved is well established, and, as Bochart shewed (Hieroz II c. 49; I. p. 619 ff., ed. Rosemn.) was known to the ancients, and was applied, for instance, for the purpose of obtaining particular colours in horses and dogs (Oppian, Kynēgetica, I, 327 ff., 353-6).

However, the record of evidence does not end with

⁸S. R. Driver, The Book of Genesis (London: Methuen & Co., 1948), p. 279.

chapter 30. At the end of this chapter we feel, with Jacob, that the maternal impression received at the time of conception is responsible for the unusually colored offspring, but in chapter 31 the truth appears. In this chapter Jacob relates his experience to his wives, and tells how the truth of the matter had been revealed to him in a dream.

Gen. 31:10 And it came to pass at the time that the flock conceive, that I lifted up mine eyes, and saw in a dream, and, behold, the he-goats which leaped upon the flock were ringstreaked, speckled, and grizzled.

That Jacob was surprized at what he saw is evident from the Hebrew word וַיִּשְׂתַּחֲוֶה , an interjection, "...enabling the reader to enter into the surprise or satisfaction of the speaker or actor concerned..."⁹ His surprize came when he saw the color of the he-goats, for all those of this unusual color had been removed, leaving only animals of a solid color in the flock for which he was caring. Nor does Jacob at this time claim any personal responsibility for what happened, for in verse nine he says, "Thus God hath taken away the cattle of your father, and given them to me." Jacob was both ready and willing to get all he could from Laban in payment for his years of service, but it was the Supreme Judge of the universe that awarded the cattle to Jacob, even as it is written in Rom. 12:19, "Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord."

⁹Gesenius, op. cit., p. 244.

The argument from modern science.--Within the past century there has been a vast amount of scientific discovery, and the thoughts, habits, and general attitudes of people have been changed as a result. Louis Pasteur in the 19th century, by using the microscope and scientific technique, totally disproved the old theory of spontaneous generation. In following this method of approach other scientists have been successful in disproving many old wives tales, including that of maternal impression. Today, modern scientists are almost wholly agreed that it is impossible for a mother, either human or animal, to mark her unborn child with a mark corresponding to any vivid mental impression she might receive. Here is what a few men of scientific ability have to say on the subject.

Dunn¹⁰ writes:

We must also lay at rest the old bogey of maternal impression in man and mammals in which the embryo develops within the body of the mother. A vast body of human myth and the lore of animal breeders insist that certain unusual characters such as birthmarks are caused by specific experiences of the mother during pregnancy. The farmer whose black cow kept in a red barn gave birth to a red calf kept this quaint superstition alive. But the fact is there is no evidence of a cause and effect relationship in any of these cases.

And Tracy I. Storer,¹¹ a professor of zoology and zoologist in the Agricultural Experiment Station of the

¹⁰L. C. Dunn, Heredity and Variation (New York: The University Society, 1934), p. 79.

¹¹Tracy I. Storer, General Zoology (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951), p. 170.

University of California, expresses his view thus:

Modification of the embryo by maternal impressions, or experiences of the mother during pregnancy, is another erroneous idea about heredity. The embryo is, of course, influenced by the health or nutrition of the mother, but that is quite another thing.

Likewise, this is the opinion of F. A. E. Crew.¹²

Maternal impressions. Again, there is no scientific support for this belief. There is no mechanism known by which a mental impression can become accurately reflected upon the embryo offspring. Maternal impression is not fact but superstition born of an unscientific attitude on the part of the popular mind towards outstanding isolated instances. Remembrances of strong coincidences are longest borne in mind; the ordinary is unremarkable and is overlooked.

Thus we can safely state that modern authorities are in agreement that it is impossible for a mother to mark her unborn child via the agency of a maternal impression. However, doctors, psychologists, and physiologists are now becoming more and more convinced that a mother can influence her unborn child's health, either physically or mentally, by being in a constant nervous state or by suffering from malnutrition. But as it is here stated by Montagu and Schweitzer,¹³ this does not affect the situation being discussed in this monograph.

...there is now sufficient evidence from many sources to indicate that the unborn child can be variously affected by physical changes in the mother, and that although a woman cannot mark her baby by seeing some-

¹²F. A. E. Crew, "Genetics", Black's Veterinary Cyclopedia, ed. Wm. C. Miller (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1928), p. 424.

¹³A. Montagu and G. Schweitzer, "There is Prenatal Influence", Ladies' Home Journal, (February, 1954), p. 116.

thing unpleasant before he is born...there are ways in which she definitely can influence his behavior pattern.

The writer of this critical monograph does not hold this view to be false, but inadequate, and for the following reasons:

It fails to account for what actually happened.— It leaves the reader in doubt as to how God caused the unusually colored animals to be born. Was the result caused by God's allowing Jacob's rods to function as he had planned, or was it caused by first creation? Pink¹⁴ says:

One thing seems clear: unless God had prospered in Jacob's plan had failed, for something more than sticks from which a part of the bark had been removed was needed to make the cattle bear "ginger-streaked, speckled, and spotted young ones".

This is a typical example of a commentator's remarks on this verse, in which he ascribes the credit for what happened to God. Notice that the greatest intimation is that God did cause Jacob's rods to become effective, in which case the miracle would have been in the nature of a material impression. But again this writer appeals to Gen. 31:10-12 in proving that such was not the case. As has been previously stated, Jacob's vision of the unusually colored he-goats which sired the offspring, if it is to make sense at all, must mean that some hereditary characteristic was responsible for the unusually colored young.

¹⁴ Pink, op. cit., p. 7.

The writer of this critical monograph does not hold this view to be false, but inadequate, and for the following reasons:

It fails to account for what actually happened.--

It leaves the reader in doubt as to how God caused the unusually colored animals to be born. Was the result caused by God's allowing Jacob's rods to function as he had planned, or was it caused by first creation? Pink¹⁴ says:

One thing seems clear; unless God had prospered it Jacob's plan had failed, for something more than sticks from which a part of the bark had been removed was needed to make the cattle bear "ring-streaked, speckled, and spotted young ones".

This is a typical example of a commentator's remarks on this verse, in which he ascribes the credit for what happened to God. Notice that the greatest intimation is that God did cause Jacob's rods to become effective, in which case the miracle would have been in the nature of a maternal impression. But again this writer appeals to Gen. 31:10-12 in proving that such was not the case. As has been previously stated, Jacob's vision of the unusually colored he-goats which sired the offspring, if it is to make sense at all, must mean that some hereditary characteristic was responsible for the unusually colored young.

¹⁴Pink, op. cit., p. 7.

The miracle view assumes an antithesis between the laws of nature and the will of God.--The miracle view, when held at its extreme, would advocate an act of fiat creation on the part of God. In other words, it would leave no room for the employment of natural causes in the proceedings.

The writer of this critical monograph firmly believes that natural causes played a major role in the proceedings of which this discussion is concerned, as will be revealed fully later. The writer also believes that the laws of nature and the will of God are in perfect accord. Strong¹⁵ says:

...all miracles may have their natural explanations and may hereafter be traced to natural causes, while both miracles and their natural causes may be only names for the one and self-same will of God.

Darwin¹⁷ gives us further information on this mat-

Experimentally one can demonstrate the operation of this so-called "Mendelian law" by breeding black rats with white rats. In this case black is dominant over white, with the result that the first generation of hybrid rats will all be black but they will be hybrid black, that is, carrying the genes which make

¹⁵Franklin J. Mearns, The Universal World Reference Encyclopedia (Chicago: Consolidated Book Publishers, 1945), Vol. 5, 2nd numbered.

¹⁷Strong, op. cit., p. 119. of Healthful Living (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1945), p. 429.

The Natural Law of Genetics View

The writer of this monograph holds this view to be inadequate, and for the following reasons:

It is contrary to the laws of genetics.--According to the laws of genetics as they are understood today, it would be impossible under normal circumstances for the flocks to bring forth unusually colored offspring in great numbers. These laws were formulated by Gregor Mendel, an Austrian monk, who in the middle 19th Century carried on extensive experiments with garden peas.

Although Mendel's law was derived from experimentation with peas, its principal [sic] is applicable to human life. This theory may be illustrated by crossing yellow and green peas. The first generation of this union will appear as yellow peas. In this case the yellow parent peas are said to have dominant characteristics over recessive [sic] characteristics of the green pea. When the first generation is planted, each will produce, four peas for example, three of which will appear yellow and the fourth green. Thus the Mendelian ratio of 3 to 1 is derived; that is, in the second generation, the dominant trait is to the recessive trait as 3 is to 1.¹⁶

Diehl¹⁷ gives us further information on this matter;

Experimentally one can demonstrate the operation of this so-called "Mendelian law" by breeding black rats with white rats. In this case black is dominant over white, with the result that the first generation of hybrid rats will all be black but they will be hybrid black, that is, carrying the genes which make

¹⁶Franklin J. Meine, The Universal World Reference Encyclopedia (Chicago: Consolidated Book Publishers, 1946), VII, p. not numbered.

¹⁷Harold S. Diehl, Textbook of Healthful Living (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1945), p. 429.

both for black and for white fur. If rats of this first generation of hybrid blacks are bred together the next generation will be one-fourth pure black, one fourth pure white, and one-half hybrid black or mixed. Among small numbers of offspring these proportions may not hold but in large numbers these ratios will invariably hold true.

The scientific term for an organism carrying genes for only one characteristic, eg. color, is "homozygote", while the term for the organism carrying genes for two different characteristics is "heterozygote". It can be said with certainty, then, that the flocks tended by Jacob contained animals of both natures, for the presence of some unusually colored animals would indicate this. The normal and dominant color for goats of that region is black, and for sheep the normal and dominant color is white. (S. Sol. 4:1)

Since Laban removed all of the unusually colored animals, the brown and black sheep, and the ringstreaked, spotted, and speckled goats, the animals left under Jacob's care were all uni-color. But because of the dominance of the solid color, it would be impossible to determine by sight which were the heterozygous animals, or those carrying genes of a mixed heredity.

To prove that it would be impossible for the flocks under normal circumstances to bring forth off-color animals in great numbers as the scripture says happened, let us construct a hypothetical case and examine the mathematical results.

Let us suppose that the flock consisted of one thousand animals of breeding age. From Gen. 32:14 we may conclude that the ratio of the sexes was nine to one in favor of the females, which would give us nine hundred females and one hundred males. Next we must decide what percentage of these were heterozygous. This is somewhat hard to determine, but let us say that fifty per cent were of this nature, which this writer believes to be larger than it actually was. This leaves us, then, four hundred and fifty each of heterozygous and homozygous females, and fifty each of heterozygous and homozygous males.

In order for any recessive characteristics to show up at all, both parents must be heterozygous. Under these conditions, the mathematical ratio of the chances of a heterozygous female mating with a heterozygous male is one to four. Then we may assume that one-fourth of the hybrid females will mate with a like male, which would be approximately one hundred and twelve. So, then, let us assume that each female bears one off-spring. By the Mendelian ratio of three to one, we may assume that of these one hundred and twelve off-spring, eighty-four will be unicolor, while twenty-eight of them will be unusually colored.

Jacob's profit for one breeding season would be about thirty lambs per one thousand mature animals, or three per cent. No wonder, then, that Laban was so anxious to agree to these terms. Even with two breeding

seasons a year, this would hardly keep Jacob's family in meat, for we read in Gen. 31:38 that he did not eat Laban's animals.

The natural law of genetics view is contrary to scripture.--For this view to be true it must be assumed that the animals would continue according to their natural habits. Laban was acquainted with the habits of these animals, possibly even better than Jacob was, because he was older than Jacob. Laban knew that if things went naturally with the flock, then Jacob would only receive a small percentage of the young. Jacob apparently realized this also, because he thought he was taking steps to change the natural results. We have already stated that Jacob was acting on the maternal impression theory, so therefore nothing that he did changed the results of the mating of the animals.

Perhaps only one action of Jacob's could be misconstrued in an attempt to explain his great gain, and that was his separation of the unusually colored young after the first birth season. These animals, being homozygous, if separated would breed true to type, and therefore, all of their young would be Jacob's. But there are several factors which would prevent Jacob's own flock from multiplying to vast proportions in a short period of six years. He would have had to have waited a year for the animals to reach breeding age. Also, about one half would have been males, probably the most of which would have

been eaten; and Jacob was required to replace any of Laban's flock that were destroyed by beasts or stolen. Gen. 31:39.

Thus we see that according to scripture it would be reckoned impossible for Jacob to thrive as he did simply because the natural law of genetics would continue to operate in the flock.

Jacob's blessing is evident from many passages of scripture. Isaac's blessing upon Jacob in Gen. 27 describes it:

23. And God give thee of the dew of heaven,
And of the fatness of the earth,
And plenty of grain and new wine;
24. Let peoples serve thee,
And nations bow down to thee:
Be lord over thy brethren,
And let thy mother's sons bow down to thee.
Cursed be every one that curseth thee,
And blessed be every one that blesseth thee.

In Gen. 28 God promised His especial blessing upon

Jacob:

13. And, behold, Jehovah stood above it, and said, I am Jehovah, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land wherewith thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed.

15. And, behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee whithersoever thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of.

In Gen. 30 Laban acknowledged Jehovah's blessing

upon Jacob:

17. And Laban said unto him, If now I have found favor in thine eyes, tarry; for I have divined that Jehovah hath blessed me for thy sake.

In Gen. 31 Jacob acknowledged God's especial in-

tervention in his behalf:

The Divinely Controlled Genetics View

The writer of this critical monograph hereby states that he accepts this view as being the true one, and for the following reasons:

The scriptural argument.--That God intervened in Jacob's behalf is evident from many passages of scripture. Isaac's blessing upon Jacob in Gen. 27 decrees it;

28. And God give thee of the dew of heaven,
And of the fatness of the earth,
And plenty of grain and new wine;
29. Let peoples serve thee,
And nations bow down to thee;
Be lord over thy brethren,
And let thy mother's sons bow down to thee.
Cursed be every one that curseth thee,
And blessed be every one that blesseth thee.

In Gen. 28 God promised His especial blessing upon Jacob:

13. And, behold, Jehovah stood above it, and said, I am Jehovah, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed.

15. And, behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee whithersoever thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of.

In Gen. 30 Laban acknowledged Jehovah's blessing upon Jacob:

27. And Laban said unto him, If now I have found favor in thine eyes, tarry; for I have divined that Jehovah hath blessed me for thy sake.

In Gen. 31 Jacob acknowledged God's especial intervention in his behalf;

7. And your father hath deceived me, and changed my wages ten times; but God suffered him not to hurt me.

9. Thus God hath taken away the cattle of your father and given them to me.

Thus we may conclude that God was both able and willing to supercede the natural order to fulfill His promise to Jacob.

That God did supercede in the natural order of genetics is evident from several passages of scripture, including the text of this monograph;

30:39 And the flocks conceived before the rods, and the flocks brought forth ringstreaked, speckled, and spotted.

It may be assumed from this verse that at least a majority of the animals born were unusually colored.

Jacob's supernatural vision (Gen. 31:10-12) informed him of the uselessness of his own efforts and of the working of God in his behalf. As has already been stated, the unusually colored he-goats seen by Jacob in this vision were God's clue to him of His miraculous intervention, and a clue to us that this miracle took place in the factors determining genetics.

Also to be considered here is the fact that Laban changed Jacob's wages ten times, and with each change there was born a large number of animals of the color allotted to Jacob. (Gen. 31:7,8) This in itself would be sufficient to imply a supernatural re-arrangement of the factors governing genetics.

Thus we may conclude that scripture implies God's

especial favor manifested to Jacob, one phase of which was God's divine control, resulting in a re-arrangement of the factors determining heredity.

The rational argument.--It was formerly proven by Mendelian ratios, using a hypothetical case, that such laws, which are based entirely on the laws of chance, could not be responsible for the increase of Jacob's animals. Since this is not true, then it necessarily follows that something else must be true.

It is unthinkable that animals could receive their natural coloring by any other means than by that which God has set up and ordained, namely, the controlling factors found in the genes of the chromosomes of both the reproductive and body cells. While a scientist, according to the world's definition, could claim to be an atheist, nevertheless, he would acknowledge the laws of heredity as governing principles and loudly protest any statement that would discredit their operation. So, then, we must say that the unusually colored animals born to Jacob's flocks received their coloring through the natural process of genetic factors.

But when we admit this, it then becomes necessary for us to explain how these genetic factors became re-arranged so that the usually recessive characteristics apparently became dominant. Being a theist, this writer does not hesitate to say that a miracle was performed in this situation. However, as man through his diligent re-

search discovers more and more about the laws of this universe, it becomes increasingly possible for us to understand how God controls various factors to the advantage of some, and for His own glorification.

Strong¹⁸ says in this respect;

Miracle is an immediate operation of God; but, since all natural processes are also immediate operations of God, we do not need to deny the use of these natural processes, so far as they will go, in miracle. Such wonders of the Old Testament as the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, the partings of the Red Sea and of the Jordan, the calling down of fire from heaven by Elijah and the destruction of the army of Sennacherib, are none the less works of God when regarded as wrought by the use of natural means. In the New Testament Christ took water to make wine, and took the five loaves to make bread, just as in ten thousand vineyards today he is turning the moisture of the earth into the juice of the grape, and in ten thousand fields is turning carbon into corn. The virgin-birth of Christ may be an extreme instance of parthenogenesis, which Professor Loeb of Chicago has just demonstrated to take place in other than the lowest forms of life and which he believes to be possible in all.

The miracle which took place, then, in the flocks of Jacob, was a reversal of the dominance of the color characteristics. How God accomplished this, it is, of course, impossible to say. But in reading several books on genetics, written by men who apparently knew their field, several interesting things were found by this writer.

For example, while most of the authors discussed dominance and recessiveness, none were able to say why some characters were dominant and some recessive. That is,

¹⁸Strong, op. cit., pp. 119, 120.

what especial power or authority does a certain character have to make it dominant? Very few authors cared to even venture a theory.

The writer was also interested in finding a case on record in which reversal of dominance had occurred, and the following quotation from Shull¹⁹ throws interesting light in this respect.

So-called dominant characters are sometimes exceedingly variable in heterozygotes, even to the extent of being wholly lacking...A considerable number of human characters show occasional reversal of dominance, if the pedigrees are to be believed. Among them are far-sightedness, hairlessness, left-handedness, congenital dislocation of the hip, detachment of the retina and several other eye abnormalities, and rarely hemophilia and color-blindness.

So, then, if we take what this man says as truth, we must conclude that there is no such thing as an unalterable rule that specifies that a dominant character must remain forever dominant, and a recessive character forever recessive.

Klotz²⁰ advances an interesting theory on the origin of dominance which could have a bearing on the problem at hand.

Still another suggestion for the origin of dominance has been the theory of increasing potency, according to which a gene recurs with different potencies. Under favorable environmental conditions and with maximum strength it might appear as dominant.

¹⁹A. Franklin Shull, Heredity (New York; McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1931), pp. 146, 147.

²⁰John W. Klotz, Genes, Genesis, and Evolution (St. Louis; Concordia Pub. House, 1955), pp. 291, 292.

In Gen. 30:41, 42 we read;

41. And it came to pass, whensoever the stronger of the flock did conceive, that Jacob laid the rods before the eyes of the flock in the gutters that they might conceive among the rods;

42. But when the flock were feeble, he put them not in; so the feeble were Laban's, and the stronger Jacob's.

To say that this was the method the Lord used in controlling the dominance of the characteristics would be presumptuous; however, it may be stated that this could have been the means, as there is nothing to argue against it.

But let us again consider our hypothetical case, this time making two changes which this writer feels God brought about in Jacob's flock. The first change is the reversal of dominance, and the second change is in only allowing the heterozygous males to carry on the mating. This last change is suggested in Gen. 31:10-12.

Starting with our flock of one thousand animals with nine hundred females and one hundred males, with fifty per cent of each being heterozygous, we will assume that the fifty heterozygous males carried on the mating. This would be one acting male for each eighteen females. Mayo,²¹ of Purdue University, suggests that "one yearling ram or older should be provided for each 25 to 40 ewes."

Under these circumstances both the heterozygous and homozygous females would be mated with a heterozygous

²¹Henry Mayo, "Making Money with Sheep" (Lafayette, Ind.; Purdue University Cooperative Extension, n. d.), p. 1.

male. With the reversal of dominance, three-fourths of the lambs born to the former union would be of unusual color, and one-half of the latter union. Assuming one off-spring per female, this would make a total of five hundred and sixty-three of the unusually colored lambs, or approximately sixty-two per cent of the lambs would be Jacob's.

However, this figuring is done assuming that the normal ratio would be carried out, which is based entirely on the laws of chance. It would be entirely possible under the above arrangement for every lamb born to be of the unusual color, as God could also control the ratio, and the unusual color genetics factor would be available in each instance.

ENGLISH PARAPHRASE

Gen. 30:39 And the flocks conceived before the rods, which were placed there by Jacob in an effort to cause the animals to bring forth ringstreaked, speckled, and spotted, through the agency of a maternal impression; but since this device was in itself incapable of the desired results, God controlled the genetic factors of the animals so that they would bear unusually colored offspring which would be to Jacob's advantage, and thus blessing him, not because of his actions, but in spite of them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alleman, H. C. Old Testament Commentary. Ed. E. E. Flack. Philadelphia; The Muhlenburg Press, 1948.
- Baumgartner, W. et al. Biblia Hebraica. 3d ed. Edited by Rudolph Kittel, et al. Stuttgart; Priv. Wurt. Bibelanstalt, 1937.
- Baxter, J. Sidlow. Genesis to Joshua. Vol. I. Explore the Book. London; Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1951.
- Bush, George. Notes, Critical and Practical on the Book of Genesis. New York; Mark H. Newman & Co., 1848.
- Calvin, John. Commentaries on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis. Translated by John King. Vol. II. Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1948.
- Carroll, B. H. Genesis. Nashville, Tenn.; The Broadman Press, 1943.
- Cox, Samuel. The Hebrew Twins. New York; Thomas Whittaker, 1894.
- Crew, F. A. E. "Genetics", Black's Veterinary Cyclopedia. Ed. W. Miller. New York; The MacMillan Co., 1928.
- Diehl, Harold S. Textbook of Healthful Living. New York; McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1945.
- Driver, S. R. The Book of Genesis. London; Methuen & Co., 1948.
- Dunn, L. C. Heredity and Variation. New York; The University Society, 1934.
- The English Bible. English Revised Version. New York; Oxford University Press, 1885.
- Erith, L. E. P. "The Book of Genesis", A New Commentary on Holy Scripture Including the Apocrypha. Edited by Charles Gore, H. L. Goudge, and Alfred Guillaume. New York; The MacMillan Co., 1928.

- Fausset, A. R. Bible Cyclopedia and Dictionary. Grand Rapids; Zondervan Pub. House, n. d.
- Gill, John. An Exposition of the Old Testament. Vol. I. London; William Hill Callingeridge, 1851.
- Gray, James Comper and Adams, George M. Gray and Adams Bible Commentary. Vol. I. Grand Rapids; Zondervan Pub. House, n. d.
- Henry, Matthew. Commentary on the Whole Bible. Vol. I. New York; Fleming H. Revell Co., 1935.
- The Holy Bible. American Standard Version. New York; Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901.
- The Holy Bible. King James Version. New York; Oxford University Press, n. d.
- The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. New York; Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.
- Houghton, Louise. Hebrew Life and Thought. Chicago; University of Chicago Press, 1907.
- Jamieson, Robert, Fausset, A. R., and Brown, David. A Commentary on the Old and New Testament. Vol. I. Grand Rapids; Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., Reprinted 1945.
- Jastrow, Morris. Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions. New York; Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.
- Keil, Carl Frederick and Delitzsch, Franz. Vol. I of Pentateuch. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Translated by James Martin. Grand Rapids; Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., reprinted 1945.
- Kenoyer, L. A. and Goddard, H. N. General Biology. New York; Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1945.
- Kevan, E. F. "Genesis", The New Bible Commentary. Ed. F. Davidson. Grand Rapids; Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1954.
- Klotz, John W. Genes, Genesis, and Evolution. St. Louis; Concordia Pub. House, 1955.
- Kurtz, J. H. History of the Covenant. Translated by Alfred Edersheim. Vol. I. Edinburg; T. & T. Clark, 1870.

- Leupold, H. C. Exposition of Genesis. Columbus, O.: The Wartburg Press, 1942.
- Macfadden, Bernarr (ed.) The Encyclopedia of Health. Vol. IV. New York; Macfadden Book Co., 1940.
- Mackintosh, C. H. Notes on the Book of Genesis. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1941.
- Marsh, Frank Lewis. Studies in Creationism. Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Pub. Ass'n., 1950.
- Mayo, Henry. "Making Money with Sheep". Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Extension, n. d.
- McClain, Alva J. The Inspiration of the Bible. Philadelphia: Philadelphia School of the Bible, 1924.
- Meine, Franklin J. The Universal World Reference Encyclopedia. Vol. VII. Chicago: Consolidated Book Publishers, 1946.
- Moffat, James. (tr.) A New Translation of the Bible. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.
- Montagu, A. and Schweitzer, G. "There is Pre-natal Influence". Ladies Home Journal. Vol. # XIII. (Feb. 1954.)
- Morgenstern, Julian. The Book of Genesis. Cincinnati: The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, n. d.
- Murphy, J. G. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Boston: Estes and Lauriat, 1873.
- Nelson, Byron C. After Its Kind. Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. House, 1952.
- Pfeiffer, Robert. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941.
- Pink, Arthur W. Gleanings in Genesis. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Ass'n., 1922.
- Rawlinson, George. Isaac and Jacob Their Lives and Times. Men of the Bible. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., n. d.
- Rotherham, Joseph Bryant. The Emphasized Bible. Vol. I. Cincinnati: The Standard Pub. Co., 1897.
- Scott, Thomas. The Holy Bible. Vol. I. Boston: Samuel T. Armstrong, 1830

- Shakespear, William. The Merchant of Venice. New York: Knickerbocker Leather & Novelty Co., n. d.
- Shull, A. Franklin. Heredity. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1931.
- Simpson, Cuthbert A. "The Book of Genesis", Vol. I of The Interpreters Bible. Ed. George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951.
- Skinner, John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. The International Critical Commentary. Ed. C. A. Briggs, Alfred Plummer and S. R. Driver. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.
- Smith, J. M. and Goodspeed, Edgar J. (eds.). The Bible an American Translation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935.
- Smith, R. P. "Genesis". Vol. I of A Bible Commentary for English Readers. Ed. Charles John Ellicott. London: Cassell and Co., Ltd., n. d.
- Storer, Tracy I. General Zoology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951.
- Strong, Augustus H. Systematic Theology. Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1951.
- Strong, James and McClintock, John. "Genesis", Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1872.
- Tinkle, William J. and Lammerts, Walter E. "Biology and Creation". Modern Science and Christian Faith. By members of the American Scientific Affiliation. Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1950.
- Tyndale, William. (tr.) The Five Books of Moses. Ed. J. I. Mombert. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., 1884.
- Van Haitisma, John. The Supplanter Undeceived. Grand Rapids: Author, 1941.
- Van Loon, Hendrick Willem. The Story of the Bible. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1953.
- Whitelaw, T. W. "Genesis". Vol. I of The Pulpit Commentary. Edited by H. D. M. Spence and J. S. Excell. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1950.

Williams, George. The Student's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, Fourth edition, 1949.